

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, March 18, 2026
7:00 p.m., 4850 Mark Center
Drive, Room 1305

Members Present: Andrew Scott, Chair
Nastaran Zandian, Vice-Chair
Bud Adams
James Spencer

Members Absent: Margaret Miller
Theresa del Ninno

Secretary: William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Marina Novaes, Historic Preservation Planner

1 **Call to Order**

The Board of Architectural Review was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Chair Scott, Mr. Spencer, Vice Chair Zandian, and Mr. Adams were present. Ms. del Ninno and Ms. Miller were absent.

2 **Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes of the February 18, 2026 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the February 18, 2026 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

Consent Calendar

- 3 BAR#2026-00030 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 214 & 216 South Peyton Street.
Applicant: Melwood, Inc represented by M. Catharine Puskar, attorney

BOARD ACTION:
On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00030 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

- 4 BAR#2026-00032 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 913 South Alfred Street
Applicant: Ronald Southwick

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00030 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

SPEAKERS:

None.

DISCUSSION:

None.

New Business

- 5&6** BAR#2026-00014 – Parker Gray
Request for alterations at 632 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Andrew Marquardt and Erin Gordon represented by Peter VanderPoel

BAR#2026-00024 – Parker Gray
Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 632 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Andrew Marquardt and Erin Gordon represented by Peter VanderPoel

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00014 and BAR#2026-00024 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

SPEAKERS:

Peter VanderPoel, project architect, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Scott clarified the proposed roof slope and asked applicant about siding options.

Ms. Zandian agreed with staff recommendation.

Mr. Adams preferred third slope option.

- 7** BAR#2026-00034 - OHAD
Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 330 North Washington Street
Applicant: 330 N Washington LLC represented by Mary Catherine Gibbs, attorney

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00034 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

SPEAKERS:

Mary Catherine Gibbs, attorney representing the applicant, described the area of proposed demolition.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spencer clarified how the end of the existing canopy will be finished after the partial demolition.

Other Business

- 8 BAR#2026-00033 - OHAD
Request for concept review at 330 North Washington Street
Applicant: 330 N Washington LLC represented by Mary Catherine Gibbs, attorney

BOARD ACTION:

The Board provided feedback on the proposed design

SPEAKERS:

Brian Vieh, applicant, introduced the project.

Mary Catherine Gibbs, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the design team.

Rodney Williams, project architect, presented the proposed design.

Michael Gaffney, 317 N Columbus, expressed concern that the orientation of the proposed building is being driven by a need for parking at the adjacent office building. He further expressed that this configuration is not consistent with the historic district.

Julie Ortmeier, 319 N Columbus, expressed concern that the orientation of the building is not consistent with the historic district. She was also concerned about the relationship of the proposed four stories with nearby buildings. She requested that the applicant provide a massing study and block face elevation.

Edward Roden, 325 North Columbus, requested that the applicant provide a block face elevation.

Mary Catherine Gibbs, attorney representing the applicant, noted that there are mews developments located in the historic district and that there are four story townhouses near the project site.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spencer clarified the purpose and scope of the Concept Review

Mr. Scott stated that the proposed site design is more suburban in nature than is appropriate for the historic district and prefers the courtyard scheme shown by a member of the public. He further stated that the dormers are out of scale and that the roof forms should be simplified. The applicant stated that they would be open to exploring different roof forms.

Ms. Zandian suggested that the applicant explore ways in which a roof deck could be concealed from visibility from the street. She agreed that the roof is too busy and should be simplified.

Mr. Scott suggested that the applicant consider moving the ATM from the west elevation to the south to open up more area along the edge of the building for parking.

Ms. Zandian stated that the exterior material should be consistent around the perimeter of the building instead of the siding at the west side as designed.

Mr. Adams agreed with previous comments and stated his desire for additional variation between the townhouses.

Mr. Spencer supported the proposed height but agreed that the courtyard solution is more successful than the proposed configuration. He stated that aside from the roof configuration, the Princess Street elevation is the most successful part of the exterior design but that this elevation should have more depth between planes.

- 9 BAR#2026-00035 – Parker Gray
Request for concept review at 1019 Cameron Street
Applicant: Robert T. Pizzano Contractors, Inc represented by M. Catharine Puskar, attorney

BOARD ACTION:

The Board provided feedback on the proposed design.

SPEAKERS:

Cathy Puskar, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project.

Steven Kulinski, project architect, presented the proposed design.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spencer supported the proposed height and mass of the addition. He suggested that as the design progresses, the applicant explore ways in which the industrial past of the building could be expressed in the design of the addition.

Mr. Adams supported the proposed design and agreed with the comment regarding integrating some aspects of the history of the building into the design.

Mr. Scott suggested that there be additional differentiation in color between the existing building and the proposed addition.

- 10 Discussion on Fiber Cement

BOARD ACTION:

Staff postponed discussion on Fiber Cement

11 **Adjournment**

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.