

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, October 1, 2025
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber
City Hall

Members Present: Nastaran Zandian, Vice Chair
Bud Adams
Michael Lyons
Margaret Miller
Theresa del Ninno
James Spencer
Frances Pratt

Members Absent: None

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 7:01 p.m. Vice Chair Zandian, Ms. Miller, Ms. del Ninno, Mr. Adams, Mr. Lyons, and Ms. Pratt were present.

2 **Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes of the September 17, 2025 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the September 17, 2025 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Consent Calendar

3 BAR #2025-00350 - OHAD
Request for signage at 100 South Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Burke & Herbert Bank, represented by Gary Brent

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR2025-00350 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Reason: The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

Speakers: None

Discussion: None

Old Business

4&5

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. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00308 and BAR#2025-00309 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

Work with staff to refine the fiber cement siding texture and corner details at the center residential entrance and work with staff on the final railing color.

Reason:

The Board found the design updates to be appropriate and adequately addressed the Board's prior concerns, but wanted the applicant to work with staff on some minor material details.

Speakers:

Lauren Reilly and Jenny Crawford, representing the applicant, gave a presentation about the revised project proposal.

Melissa Keunnen, representing the North Old Town Independent Citizens Association, said that the association is delighted by the change in commercial space and the simpler building design. She likes the symmetry and increased commercial space in Old Town North.

Discussion:

Ms. Del Ninno asked whether the west elevation has very little windows and is minimally visible.

Ms. Reilly responded that the proposed elevation is not unlike what is there today, and that they are proposing screening in the back for the mechanical equipment.

Ms. Crawford responded that there is no place to put windows on the rear, so there are mechanical enclosures proposed instead.

Mr. Spencer asked whether the columns at the base of the building will be the same as those above, as some of the renderings show different colors.

Ms. Crawford responded that the columns will be a dark gray color on all floors, similar to what was approved last year.

Mr. Spencer noted that some renderings show the residential doors as orange, while others show them as anodized black, and asked the applicant to clarify which color would be used.

Ms. Crawford responded that the storefront door will be anodized black.

Mr. Spencer asked whether the storefront door will have a horizontal band.

Ms. Crawford responded that it will not, and the doors will be single-lite.

Ms. Del Ninno asked whether the parking screening will be on the north side and whether it will be at-grade.

Ms. Crawford responded that the parking will be partially screened by landscaping and planters and will be at-grade.

Ms. Del Ninno said that the new design is a nice improvement, the darker verticals are subtle and the symmetry is there, and it is a nice improvement.

Mr. Spencer agreed that the vertical nature of the building is softer and brings life to the building, and he likes the new retail spaces. He asked if the center panel will have corners.

Ms. Crawford responded that it will look similar but will match fake wood.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant to work with staff on the corners of the fiber cement coming together on the orange panel in the middle, and it needs more detail.

Ms. Miller asked what Nichiha is.

Ms. Crawford explained that it is fiber cement siding meant to look like fake wood.

Ms. Miller asked whether other colors were considered.

Ms. Crawford responded that the color was chosen because it is a richer color and looks better.

Ms. Miller said the applicant has done a nice job on the proposed redesign.

Ms. Spencer asked the applicant to rethink the use of the textured wood look because it's trying to simulate wood and will not look good. He suggested using a panel that's painted.

Ms. Crawford said they are willing to work with Mr. Conkey on that.

Ms. Zandian asked if the applicant had considered metal siding.

Ms. Crawford responded that it was considered but is too expensive and difficult to source.

Ms. Zandian said she likes the wood look.

Mr. Adams likes the redesign and agrees with Mr. Spencer about reconsidering the use of the fake wood look.

Mr. Lyons thinks it looks more balanced with the reconfigured retail space and the applicant has sufficiently incorporated the Board's feedback.

Ms. Zandian said it looks nice and asked whether the applicant considered matching the railings to the mullions.

Ms. Crawford responded that they prefer the contrast.

- 6 BAR#2025-00326 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 214 North Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Keith and Kerri Urbahn

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Chair Zandian, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00326 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Conditions of Approval:

The applicant work with staff on the final design for trim and for the trim to be modified on the ground floor windows only.

Reason:

The Board found that that since the ground floor window openings are not original the trim may be changed on that level to something appropriate for the style of the building.

Speakers:

Keith Urbahn, property owner, presented the revised design.

Christine Roberts, HAF, showed examples of other Greek Revival houses and discussed the appropriate types of trim for windows on these buildings.

Yvonne Callahan, OTCA, stated that the house should not be made into a higher style than originally designed. She referenced the house at the corner of South Lee and Duke Streets as an example of a similar style house.

Discussion:

Mr. Adams described the simplicity of the four bay wide building as the characteristic that makes the building special. He noted that additional trim at the cornice would not be appropriate.

Ms. del Ninno agreed regarding the simplicity of the building design. She noted that the trim appears original on the second and third floors but would be okay with the replacement of trim on the ground floor. The applicant noted that he does not intend to change the trim at the cornice.

Mr. Lyons expressed support for allowing a modification to the ground floor window trim.

Ms. Zandian agreed that she would support replacing the trim on the ground floor only.

New Business

7&8

BAR #2025-00306 - Parker Gray

Request for alterations at 510 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Leslie McBride

BAR #2025-00321 - Parker Gray

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 510 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Leslie McBride

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Chair Zandian, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00306 and BAR#2025-00321 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

Conditions of Approval

Staff recommendations and that the applicant work with staff to decide whether to use two over two or one over one windows and on the installation of siding between the rear windows.

Reason:

The Board agreed with staff recommendations

Speakers:

Leslie McBride, property owner, presented the proposed design

Discussion:

Mr. Adams asked the applicant to consider using two over two windows in lieu of the proposed one over one windows, the applicant agreed.

Ms. Zandian asked the applicant why they did not get a building permit and BAR approval before starting the construction. The applicant described a misunderstanding with the contractor who was supposed to get the relevant approvals.

Ms. Miller asked the applicant if this would be his residence, the applicant indicated that it would.

Ms. Miller asked the applicant to clarify issues raised by a neighbor in a letter that they received. The applicant described an ongoing trespassing issue that he has been trying to resolve.

Ms. del Ninno suggested that the northern addition be made shorter to distinguish it from the original portion of the building. She also expressed concern regarding the size of the opening at the rear wall. The applicant noted that this wall is not original to the building and is part of a series of additions made over time.

Ms. Miller expressed concern regarding the accuracy of the drawings and suggested that the applicant procure drawings that better represents the design intention.

Mr. Spencer suggested that the windows on the rear of the building align with the ground floor doors. He also suggested that the applicant install small windows on the front section of the northern addition.

Ms. Zandian expressed support for the proposal with the comment that the rear windows should be aligned with the ground floor doors. She appreciated the applicant's goal of retaining as much of the original siding as possible.

9&10 BAR #2025-00331 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 118 South Fayette Street.

Applicant: Marks-Woods Construction Service represented by Cody Stadler, architect

BAR #2025-00333 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 118 South Fayette Street.

Applicant: Marks-Woods Construction Service represented by Cody Stadler, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Zadian, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR20285-00340 & BAR2025-00341 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

1. That the applicant work with staff to refine the windows' proposal to reflect the existing

conditions.

REASON:

The Board found that the proposed new windows would change significantly the overall existing design of the rear/east elevation fenestration.

SPEAKERS:

Cody Stadler, representing the applicant, gave a brief explanation of the project and was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Stadler with the existing conditions of two transom windows and two sets of French doors on each section will be replaced by one transom window and one window in place of the doors. Mr. Stadler stated that the new windows will match the existing conditions, they are only replacing the transoms as shown and the doors with windows, which will be shorter than what's seen there today. Mr. Spencer said that the drawings don't reflect the proposal since the thick middle mullion is not reflected, he would like to see the final drawings again. Mr. Stadler stated that he would prefer to work with staff.

Ms. Del Ninno suggested that the applicant raise the sills up, which Mr. Stadler agreed. Mr. Adams, Ms. Miller and Mr. Lyons stated that the back of the house looks very now as it is now, but they understand that changes are required sometimes to accommodate interior updates. There was no more discussion, Mr. Spenser voted against it.

11&12 BAR #2025-00340 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 617 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Ciara Collins and Colm Dillon represented by Karen Conkey, architect

BAR #2025-00341 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 617 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Ciara Collins and Colm Dillon represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR20285-00331 & BAR2025-00333 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

1. The shutters be constructed of wood or a solid through-the-core, millable composite material with a smooth finish.
2. The entrance door and transom must be made of fiberglass or metal, have a smooth finish and the transom glass must comply with the BAR glass specifications.
3. The applicant must submit specs for the light fixtures to be approved by staff.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS:

Ms. Karen Conkey, the project architect, gave a brief explanation of the project and clarified that

the door surrounding and light fixture were approved administratively in August, 2025.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion.

13&14 BAR #2025-00347 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 908 Cameron Street.

Applicant: Robert Adams, architect

BAR #2025-00348 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 908 Cameron Street.

Applicant: Robert Adams, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR2025-00347 and BAR2025-00348, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 – 0, with Mr. Adams recusing himself.

Reason:

The Board found the proposed design appropriate and the modern technology of electronic switch glass to be interesting and promising. They agreed with Mr. Conkey's suggestion that staff determine the suitability of this new type of glazing as part of the building permit process.

Speakers:

Darren Gruendel, property owner, gave a brief summary and explanation of the proposed alterations.

Discussion:

Mr. Gruendel explained that switch glass is clear, but one can turn on a switch and the glass will then look like a curtain.

Ms. Zandian asked Mr. Gruendel if he had a photo of the door to be infilled. He advised that there are two photos on page 5 of the staff report.

Mr. Lyons asked if the fence and masonry wall would be retained, as they are circled in red in the staff report. Mr. Gruendel explained that the gate currently at the property line will be moved back 15' to where the current lateral fence is.

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Conkey if the proposed glazing meets specifications. Mr. Conkey responded that he believes so, but staff will verify that as part of the permit process. Staff and the Board have not considered the ability of glass to become opaque.

Ms. Miller stated that she found electric switch glass to be the coolest thing she had seen in a long time. Her motion would differ from the staff recommendation that the glazing comply with the *Design Guidelines*, because the *Design Guidelines* do not address switch glass. She therefore moved to approve the application as submitted.

15 BAR #2025-00349 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 706 Miller Lane.

Applicant: Derrick Strosnider

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Zandian, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR20285-00349 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

1. That the front elevation windows be full frame replacements.

REASON:

The Board disagreed with staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS:

Jennifer Smith and Derrick Strosnider, the property owners, gave a brief description of the project and were available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Del Ninno asked the reason for the project. Mr. Strosnider stated that three windows are rotten, and all windows are not energy efficient. Ms. Del Ninno said that the house's front elevation is beautiful and if the owners would consider replacing the front elevation windows with full frame replacements instead of pocket windows. Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Del Ninno and stated that he was initially going to vote against the project, but he thinks that Ms. Del Ninno suggestion was acceptable. Mr. Strosnider advised that other properties in the neighborhood got approval for the same insert windows they were proposing. Mr. Spencer clarified that the policy was changed recently because the Board felt that recent administrative approvals of insert windows didn't reflect BAR standards.

Ms. Zandian asked Mr. Conkey the reason for disapproving insert windows on late buildings. Mr. Conkey clarified that the glazing area of an insert window is smaller because it has an extra frame that is inserted within the existing frame, however the Marvin Elevate, which is the window being proposed, has a narrower frame than other brands and used to be acceptable before the policy change. Mr. Spencer stated that the policy was changed to prevent this type of application to be approved administratively, and if the Board approves, it will set precedent to continue approving what is not acceptable. Ms. Smith clarified that the whole neighborhood was planning to apply for a blanket approval. Mr. Spencer clarified that blanket approval was likely not to be approved by the Board. There was no further discussion. Mr. Lyons voted against.

Other Business

No other business was discussed

16 **Adjournment**

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.