

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, September 3, 2025
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber
City Hall

Members Present: Andrew Scott, Chair
Bud Adams
Michael Lyons
Theresa del Ninno
James Spencer

Members Absent: Nastaran Zandian, Vice Chair
Margaret Miller

Secretary: William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

1 **Call to Order**

The Board of Architectural Review was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Vice Chair Zandian and Ms. Miller were absent.

2 **Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes of the July 16, 2025 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the July 16, 2025 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

Consent Calendar

- 3 BAR #2025-00300 – OHAD
Request for alterations at 121 Duke Street.
Applicant: Lynn Rogerson Shirey represented by Steven Shirey

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00300 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-1. There were neither speakers nor discussion.

Unfinished Business and Items Previously Deferred

None

New Business

4&5 BAR #2025-00231 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 100 North Pitt Street.

Applicant: Simpson Development Co., Inc. represented by Louis Barbieri, architect

BAR #2025-00232 – OHAD

Request for alterations and signage at 100 North Pitt Street.

Applicant: Simpson Development Co., Inc. represented by Louis Barbieri, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00231 and BAR#2025-00232 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Submit storefront glass specifications with the building permit submission that comply with the Design Guidelines.
2. Work with staff to find an appropriate brightness level for the back-lit address sign.

Speakers:

Louis Barbieri, architect, introduced the project.

Discussion:

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the applicant considered alternatives to the back-lit signage.

Mr. Barbieri responded that the back-lit signage would help create a more subtle form of illumination, with low lumens.

Mr. Scott asked the applicant whether they agree with the staff recommendation on the sign, to clarify what kind of back-lit sign would be used, and whether the new storefront windows would match the existing ones.

Mr. Barbieri responded that he would be willing to work with staff to find an appropriate illumination level for the sign, that the sign would only be for the address and not for business signage, and that the new storefront windows would match the existing ones in design.

6 BAR #2025-00285 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 213 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Christine Kelly

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00285 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

None.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

SPEAKERS:

Christine Kelly, the project architect, gave a brief presentation of the project and was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Scott asked if the proposed alterations were on both elevations, north and south. Ms. Kelly clarified that only on the rear elevation. Mr. Conkey clarified that the rear elevation is not visible from any public way, therefore, the project's design was not under the BAR purview. Mr. Scott stated that even if not visible and not under the BAR purview, it's always good to know what the applicant is proposing. There were no further discussions.

7&8 BAR #2025-00286 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 804 Prince Street.

Applicant: Nabers Cabaniss Johnson represented by Outerbridge Horsey, architect

BAR #2025-00289 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 804 Prince Street.

Applicant: Nabers Cabaniss Johnson represented by Outerbridge Horsey, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00286 and BAR#2025-00289 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The applicant submit final product specifications for the skylights, windows, siding, replacement roof, parapet wall, shutters and trim that comply with the *Design Guidelines*.
2. The proposed roofing material for the addition must be copper.
3. The applicant must work with staff on the composition of the skylights, so they can relate better to the windows below.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations and added additional conditions.

Speakers:

Outerbridge Horsey, architect, presented project and was available for questions.

Discussion:

Ms. del Ninno recommended that the proposed flat roof be composed of copper. She also questioned if additional masonry could be left between the existing building and proposed addition.

Mr. Spencer recommended that the applicant work with staff on the composition of the skylights, so they can relate better to the windows below.

9&10 BAR #2025-00290 - OHAD

Request for alterations and signage at 112 North Washington Street and 113 North Columbus

Street.

Applicant: Kristin Linder represented by F. Michael Ernst, architect

BAR #2025-00316- OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 112 North Washington Street and 113 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Kristin Linder represented by F. Michael Ernst, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Adams, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00290 and BAR#2025-00316 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

Speakers: Michael Ernst, project architect, represented the applicant and was available to answer questions.

Discussion: None.

11&12 BAR #2025-00291 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 820 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Marks-Woods Construction Services represented by Greg Marks

BAR #2025-00293 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 820 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Marks-Woods Construction Services represented by Greg Marks

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00291 and BAR#2025-00293 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

Speakers: Erica Rossi, property owner, was available to answer questions.

Discussion: Mr. Scott asked the applicant if this project had been previously approved but was returning to the Board because construction did not begin within the one-year mandated deadline. The applicant replied in the affirmative. Mr. Scott noted that this rule needs to be modified. Development projects have a three-year deadline and he believes that it is not fair that homeowners only have a one- year deadline.

13&14 BAR #2025-00292 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 1001 Prince Street.

Applicant: Virginia Tech Foundation represented by Jonathan Rodgers

BAR #2025-00301 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 1001 Prince Street.

Applicant: Virginia Tech Foundation represented by Jonathan Rodgers

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00292 and BAR#2025-00301 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
None.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

Speakers:

Jonathan Rodgers, architect, available for questions.

Discussion:

Approved without discussion.

15 **BAR #2025-00294 - OHAD**

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 919 Cameron Street.

Applicants: Ashley F. and Ryan J. Carmen represented by Janene Neely

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00294 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

None.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

SPEAKERS:

Janene Neely, the project contractor, gave a brief presentation of the project and was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Del Ninno stated that even though the rear of the property is not visible from any public way and the design of the proposed doors were not under the BAR purview, she wanted to suggest that the owners consider installing doors with SDL grid instead of the proposed insert grid. Mr. Spenser agreed with Ms. Del Ninno. Mr. Scott advised the applicant that the SDL grid was just a suggestion that may be taken into consideration or not. There were no further discussions.

16 **BAR #2025-00299 - OHAD**

Request for alterations at 425 Gibbon Street.

Applicant: Lorraine and Fred Griesbach

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00299 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-1.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Work with staff to find an appropriate location for the mini risers and drainage pipe on the rear addition.
2. If the rooftop condenser unit is visible from a public right-of-way once installed, work with staff to add appropriate screening.

Speakers:

Lorraine Griesbach, the property owner, introduced the project.

Discussion:

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the applicant had read the staff recommendation.

Ms. Griesbach responded that the HVAC company said the drainage would be better in the originally proposed location.

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the applicant considered running the system through the existing gutter.

Ms. Griesbach responded that the drainage would not be as efficient.

Ms. Del Ninno said it would be preferred to use the existing gutter and not have the mini split system installed on the exterior of the building.

Ms. Griesbach said that she would follow up with the contractor about that possibility.

17 **BAR #2025-00303 - OHAD**

Request for alterations at 905 Duke Street.

Applicant: Amanda Milligan represented by Gerardo Perez

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to **deny** BAR#2025-00303. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

None, the project was denied.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

SPEAKERS:

Amanda Milligan, the property owner, gave a brief presentation of the project and was available to answer any questions.

Brian Jackson, the contractor, showed a sample of the proposed material to the Board members and gave an explanation about the pros of using the synthetic material and was available to answer any questions.

Christine Roberts, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, agreed with staff recommendations and asked the Board to deny the application.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Conkey what the policy for material replacement on Early buildings was. Mr. Conkey explained that, when the original material is known, staff usually requires the replacement to be the of the same material.

Ms. Del Ninno agreed with staff's recommendation. She stated that real Cedar shingles are now treated and have extended guarantee and that she doesn't see a reason for the synthetic material since the mansard roof in question is small, however, very visible and an important feature of the building.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Del Ninno.

Mr. Lyons also agreed and supported staff's recommendations.

Mr. Scott stated that due to the age of the building he had to agree with staff and the other Board members, even though the proposed material would not be highly noticeable from the street, he had to agree with staff given the precedent that the Board had set for using original materials on Early buildings.

18&19 BAR #2025-00304 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 910 King Street.

Applicant: 910 King St LLC represented by Romana J Sanchez

BAR #2025-00322 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 910 King Street.

Applicant: 910 King St LLC represented by Romana J Sanchez

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00304 and BAR#2025-00322 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. For the window infill at the east elevation, the applicant will work with staff to find a brick that is similar in color to the adjacent wall and the bonding pattern will be similar to the adjacent wall.
2. The applicant will work with staff to identify a stone block to replace the existing broken stone sill that is similar in size and color to the existing stone.
3. The applicant removes the stone sill without damaging the nearby masonry or door trim. Any damage will be repaired to match the existing.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

Speakers:

Romana Sanchez, project architect, was available to answer questions

Discussion:

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if the brick at the infilled windows would be recessed from the adjacent wall by 1". The applicant indicated that the brick would be recessed.

Christine Roberts, representing HAF, supported the staff recommendations.

20&21 BAR #2025-00308 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 720 North Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: 720 St. Asaph Partners, LLC represented by Gozde Tanyeri, Architect

BAR #2025-00309 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 720 North Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: 720 St. Asaph Partners, LLC represented by Gozde Tanyeri, Architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to accept the applicant's request for deferral of BAR#2025-00308 and BAR#2025-00309. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

Speakers:

Lauren Reilly and Jenny Crawford represented the applicant and gave a presentation about the design changes of the project since the previous approval.

Melissa Kuennen, a member of the public representing the North Old Town Independent Citizens Association, said that this building is part of the Old Town North Small Area Plan. She said that the plan recommends increased commercial space, which the newly proposed design reduces. She also said that the style may not be appropriate for the neighborhood.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott asked where the fiber cement would be used.

Ms. Crawford responded that it would be used on the first floor near the residential door, and on the top three floors along bedroom walls and columns adjacent to the balconies.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant to clarify the corner details.

Ms. Crawford expressed her preference for the corner to have an inverted “Y” design that is similar to aluminum stripping.

Mr. Spencer expressed concern that on the corners, it would be obvious that it is not a real sandstone material.

Mr. Scott asked why the retail space on the ground floor was reduced.

Ms. Reilly responded that it was done to retain the existing parking space for residents and retail visitors, making it more marketable to potential retail tenants.

Ms. Del Ninno asked if all the columns are structural and whether the existing building uses exposed concrete.

Ms. Crawford responded that on the top 3 floors, the existing columns on the edge of the building are fake and made of pylon. She also clarified that the existing building is metal framing with a mesh and stucco plaster exterior.

Ms. Reilly said that although the faux columns have been removed, there is added symmetry that aligns with the brutalist style.

Ms. Del Ninno commented that it would be nice to have more retail space and less parking space along the ground floor frontage. She suggested removing the trash enclosure from the St. Asaph frontage.

Ms. Reilly responded that the City Council-approved special use permit did not require retail space but some is still provided, and that it is being designed to attract retail tenants and will still enliven the pedestrian streetscape. She also said that the trash enclosure has to be in the same location in order to provide parking and utility access.

Mr. Lyons likes the new design better than the previous one. He also likes the amount of retail space and parking that is proposed.

Mr. Adams suggested adding back in some of the vertical elements of the original brutalist design to make the exterior more striking.

Ms. Del Ninno thinks the new design is more refined, but would like to see some more elements to enliven the pedestrian experience near the parking area.

Ms. Spencer thinks some of the liveliness of the originally approved design has been lost due to the increased parking area. He agrees with Ms. Del Ninno that the space needs something to enliven it. He thinks the originally approved design had more visual interest.

Mr. Scott thinks the vertical element that grounded the building in the originally approved design has been lost in the new design. He thinks the ground floor would look better with no retail space than with the reduced retail space to keep the illusion of a floating building. He also has concerns about the asymmetry of the ground floor. He thinks the existing vertical elements such as the decorative piers helped to ground the building and are a distinctive architectural feature of the building.

Ms. Reilly said the design team could work with staff to recall some of the vertical elements, but that the newly proposed design attempts to replicate the symmetry of the vertical elements and brutalist style.

Ms. Crawford said that the team could work with staff to update the design to recall the exterior column locations.

Ms. Spencer also said the original design's color scheme emphasized the vertical columns, and the new design does not.

Mr. Scott, Mr. Spencer, and Ms. Del Ninno think the design needs more work and would like to see it come back to the Board.

Ms. Reilly stated that she thinks the new design is not only an improvement but would be more economically feasible and would allow the project to move forward.

Other Business

- 22 BAR #2025-00305 - OHAD
Request for a concept review at 333 North Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Ken Wire

BOARD ACTION: The Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and heard public testimony on the proposed concept review at 333 North Fairfax Street.

Speakers:

Ken Wire, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project

Jack McLaurin, project architect, presented the design for the project.

Discussion:

Mr. Spencer asked for clarification regarding the material between windows on the Type 3 buildings. The applicant responded that it will be a smooth material, possibly a metal panel.

Ellen Mosher, OTCA, presented photos of neighboring buildings and examples of other recent townhouse development projects as a model for this proposal. She stated that the proposed design is not compatible with the OHAD.

Mike Doyle, Alexandria Families for Safe Streets, noted that the proposed development should have wide and well lit sidewalks at the perimeter and at interior alleys.

Gail Rothrock, HAF, stated that the design for the townhouses is not compatible with the architecture of the historic district. She would prefer to see gable roof structures with a less industrial design. She praised the inclusion of through alleys and the central open space.

Elizabeth Hayden, 309 Lee Street, opposed the design of the proposed townhouses, specifically

Type 4. She also asked that the number of townhouses at the northwest corner of the site be reduced.

Melissa Kuennen, 525 Montgomery Street, opposed the design for the townhouses, noting that there are no flat roof residential building in the area, encouraging the applicant to consider gable roof forms.

Maureen Doyle, 124 Princess Street, stated that roof decks are not common in this area and opposed their use in this location.

Jennifer Smith, 312 Princess Street, expressed concern about potential damage to existing structures during construction, noting that in previous developments this had occurred.

Mr. Lyons noted that the design for the townhouses appears to be too square and would like to see greater variation within the overall project. He supports the design for Style 1 and 2 but finds that the design for Style 3 and 4 to be inappropriate.

Ms. del Ninno supports the concept of townhouses in this location and the overall layout of the development but noted that the blocks appear to be apartment buildings rather than collections of townhouses. She suggested additional style types with some including gable roofs. She suggested variation in the heights of the units, potentially including taller structures in the central portions of the block. She likes the proposed materials but suggested that in some locations, the brick should extend around all sides.

Mr. Spencer appreciated the openness of the overall block design and the concept of four distinct design styles. He asked the applicant to consider additional variations within the individual blocks, potentially using a variety of brick finish colors. He supported the idea of the inclusion of contemporary designs but noted that the Style four design needs additional evolution.

Mr. Adams supports the idea of townhouses in this location and the overall block design. He noted that corner units should be more special and that in general the townhouse units should more closely replicate the design of historic structures.

Mr. Scott appreciated how the proposed design responds to the approved design for 301 N Fairfax Street. He expressed concern regarding the use of fiber cement at the vertical slots at the ends of the townhouse blocks, noting that in a similar detail at the townhouses at Robinson Terminal South slate is used. He supported the comments from other board members regarding including additional variation within the blocks and a higher level of detailing. He stated that style four could be more contemporary but should include more punched windows.

- 23 BAR #2025-00307 - OHAD
Request for a concept review at 220 South Peyton Street and 224 South Peyton Street.
Applicant: Lauren Riley

BOARD ACTION: The Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and heard public testimony on the proposed concept review at 220 South Peyton Street and 224 South Peyton Street.

Speakers:

Lauren Riley, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project.

Steve Kulinski, project architect, presented the proposed design

Thomas Maresh, 342 Commerce Street, opposed the project, stating that the design is not appropriate for Commerce Street and expressing concern regarding the location of the proposed terraces.

Discussion:

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant to include a high level of brick detailing as the design for the building evolves. He was concerned about the weathering of the light colored brick and noted that the first floor columns were too small. He stated that the building steps down towards Duke Street which typically includes larger buildings.

Mr. Scott suggested that the applicant consider the design for the terrace dividers as an integral part of the building. He expressed concern regarding the use of the patio, noting that it is too exposed for people to comfortably use it.

Mr. Lyons clarified the use of the patio and expressed support for the overall design.

Mr. Adams supported the bay on the south side and asked if a similar one could be included on the north side.

Ms. del Ninno agreed that the ground floor columns are too small and was concerned about the light colored brick. She supported the proposed massing.

Mr. Spencer asked if a retractable canopy could be installed at the terraces.

- 24 Consideration of updates to the single pane window specifications in the Window and Shutters chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Parker-Gray District and the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the single pane window specifications in the Window and Shutters chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Parker-Gray District and the Old and Historic Alexandria District as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

- 25 Fiscal Year 2025 Board of Architectural Review Annual Report

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the FY2025 Annual Report and authorized Chair Scott to sign it. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

18 **Adjournment**

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 10:43 p.m.