

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, January 21, 2026
7:00 p.m., 4850 Mark Center
Drive, Room 1305

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

Members Absent: Andrew Scott, Chair

Secretary: William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Brendan Harris, Historic Preservation Planner

1 **Call to Order**

The Board of Architectural Review was called to order at 7:02 p.m. Vice Chair Zandian, Ms. Pratt, Ms. del Ninno, Mr. Spencer, Ms. Miller and Mr. Adams were present. Chair Scott was absent.

2 **Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes of the January 7, 2026 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Ms. Pratt, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the January 7, 2026 meeting as ammended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

Consent Calendar

- 3 BAR#2025-00545 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 201 South Washington Street.
Applicant: City of Alexandria represented by Francis J. Delimba

BOARD ACTION: This item was removed from the consent calendar. On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00545 with staff's recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

1- That the awning material be Sunbrella or similar fabric.

SPEAKERS:

Scott Corzine, resident at 300 Queen Street, asked for the item to be removed from the consent calendar. He stated that he was required to replace the windows on his house with wood windows instead of the composite he had previously proposed, and to his surprise, the city was proposing a plastic awning to be installed on its property, which should not be allowed.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Miller also said she wanted to remove the item from the consent calendar since she thought that a drawing for the proposed awning should be submitted with the application. Mr. Conkey clarified that there was a rendering in the application. Ms. Miller, then, stated that she wanted to make sure the applicant, who was absent, was in agreement with staff's recommendation and that she would like to add that the awning should not be made of plastic but of Sunbrella or similar fabric. Mr. Conkey clarified that that was precisely what staff recommended. There was no further discussion.

New Business

4&5 BAR#2025-00540 – Parker Gray
Request for alterations at 602 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Michael Lincoln represented by Matthew Gardner

BAR#2025-00541 – Parker Gray
Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 602 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Michael Lincoln represented by Matthew Gardner

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Ms. Zandian, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00540 and BAR#2025-00541 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

1. The posts and beams are painted to match the facade or trimwork; and,
2. The applicant install a wood railing and third column

SPEAKERS:

Michael Lincoln, property owner, available for questions.
Matt Gardner, contractor, available for questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Pratt asked if the applicant would consider adding a railing.

Ms. del Ninno asked about adding an additional column and railing, similar to other properties on the blockface.

Ms. Zandian asked if the roof design had changed. The applicant said it had not. She also asked where Azek is being used. The applicant stated it is being used on the fascia.

- 6 BAR#2025-00548 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 101 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Old Town #1 LLC, represented by Paul Beckmann, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Zandian, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00548 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

- 1- That the applicant work with staff to determine whether repairing the stucco is feasible and if not feasible, work with staff on details for the appropriate replacement to match the original stucco.
- 2- The applicant should repair the existing stucco where possible and investigate the possibility of installing lath and stucco instead of cement panels.
- 3- If the cement panels are required, they must be mounted through the mortar joints.

SPEAKERS:

Paul Beckmann, the project architect, briefly explained the application and was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Pratt asked the architect if the existing stucco was original to the building and if it had been repaired before. Mr. Beckmann stated that, according to the picture in the staff report, the stucco is original, and he didn't know if it had been repaired before. Ms. Pratt stated that the stucco had been holding very well throughout the time, and if there wasn't any possibility of repairing it. Mr. Beckmann clarified that stucco over brick is not recommended. The contractors contacted for the repair work didn't want to take the job since it's impossible to guarantee the results. Ms. Pratt also asked about the visibility of the seams between panels. Mr. Beckmann clarified that they would be approximately half an inch wide, minimally visible, and that he was happy to work with staff to determine the best option.

Mr. Spencer asked the architect if the new proposed panels would be installed over the existing stucco. Mr. Beckmann clarified that the existing stucco must be removed and that the brick under the existing stucco is recessed, which will accommodate the panels evenly with the rest of the existing brick wall.

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the panels would be painted. Mr. Beckmann stated that the boards come already finished, but they are going to paint them to match the color and texture of the existing stucco. Ms. Del Ninno asked about the size of the panels and how far the joints would be from one another. Mr. Beckmann said that the panels are 4 x 8, and they are going to be integrated with the existing façade elements and look like the existing stucco.

Ms. Zandian asked if the stucco was going to be totally removed. Mr. Beckmann said that they need to investigate further to determine how much of the stucco would have to be removed;

however, they are applying for the worst-case scenario, which is the total removal. Ms. Zandian stated that her preference is to keep as much of the original material as possible, while making sure that the thickness of the panels is flush evenly with the rest of the wall.

Mr. Spencer asked how the panels would be anchored. Mr. Beckmann clarified that the panels would be bolted to the wall. Mr. Sencer said that he was concerned that the panels would crack. Mr. Beckmann clarified that the panels would be installed as per the manufacturer's requirements to avoid cracking.

Ms. Miller asked if stucco is becoming obsolete. Mr. Beckmann stated that it's not really the material but its installation over brick that is the challenge in this case.

Ms. Del Ninno said that the existing stucco is a character-defining element and has been in place for more than 100 years without cracks or major issues, but she could support the application if the stucco removal is restricted to what is deteriorated and if the seams are treated to look smooth as the existing stucco.

Mr. Spencer asked how the exposed edges of the boards would be treated on the corners and around the existing architectural elements to prevent further damage to the brick underneath. Mr. Beckmann stated that there is a corner element that will be used and that they will work with staff to determine the best approach after further investigation is conducted.

Ms. Zandian asked why they are proposing cement panels instead of installing a mesh over the brick and new stucco over it where the replacement is required. Mr. Beckmann explained that the amount of stucco and the location make stucco not feasible.

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the half-inch joints would be flushed with the boards or if they would be accentuated somehow; she would like the joints to be minimal, resembling the existing stucco. Mr. Beckmann agreed.

Ms. Zandian made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendation and added that the applicant should repair the existing stucco where possible and investigate the possibility of installing lath and stucco instead of cement panels. Mr. Conkey added Mr. Spencer's recommendation that the cement panels, if applicable, be anchored through the mortar joints. There was no further discussion.

7&8 BAR#2025-00549 – OHAD
Request for alterations at 601 Wythe Street.
Applicant: 601 Wythe Street LLC, represented by Matthew Lee, architect

BAR#2025-00550 – OHAD
Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 601 Wythe Street.
Applicant: 601 Wythe Street LLC, represented by Matthew Lee, architect

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Ms. Zandian, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review

partially approved BAR 2025-00549 & 2025-00550 with staff recommendations. The applicant requested deferral regarding the staining of the building and asked that the applicant prepare samples of the proposed stain showing color and opacity for review by Board members. The applicant will return to the Board for approval of this scope of work upon completion of this sample.

SPEAKERS:

Matt Lee, project architect, presented the proposed design.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Zandian asked the applicant for the wall material between the windows. The applicant noted that this will be Nichiha fiber cement panels. Ms. Zandian asked about the final color selection for the fiber cement panels. The applicant stated that they have not yet selected a final color but that they want to have contrast between the panels and the wall, noting that surrounding buildings have a variety of different colors.

Ms. del Ninno liked the plan for the replacement of the windows, including the fiber cement panels. She expressed concern regarding the use of stain on the upper levels of the building.

Ms. Miller expressed concern about the use of a dark stain on the upper levels. She clarified the plan for the window replacement and supported the proposed lighting.

Mr. Adams supported the expressed concern regarding the stain on the upper levels.

Mr. Spencer supported the proposal including the use of the Nichiha fiber cement panels.

- 9 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 of 333 North Fairfax Street.

SPEAKERS:

Ken Wire, attorney for the project, introduced the proposal.

Jack McLaurin, project architect, presented the revisions to the design since the previous BAR review.

Scott Corzine, 300 Queen Street, appreciated the changes to the design and suggested the use of a mansard roof at the end of Building 7.

Elizabeth Hayden, 309 North Lee Street, supported the revisions to the design and agreed with the use of a mansard roof at the end of Building 7.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Zandian appreciated the design revisions, noting that the proposal is improved from the

previous design. She asked the applicant to include streetscape elevations when the project returns for the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Miller stated that the design revisions have been responsive to the comments from the Board.

Ms. del Ninno supported the idea of the building at the corner of Princess Street being lowered and asked that the applicant explore some of the bays from the previous design into the revised design.

Mr. Adams expressed support for the project, noting that the design is going in the right direction.

Ms. Pratt appreciated the changes to the design and asked the applicant to consider the mansard roof location requested by the public speakers.

- 10** BAR#2025-00373 – Parker Gray
Request for a concept review at 806 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Ken Wire

BOARD ACTION:

The Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and heard public testimony on the proposed concept review of 806 North Columbus Street.

SPEAKERS:

Ken Wire, project attorney, introduced the proposal

Patrick Bloomquist, project developer, presented the proposed changes to the design since the last BAR review.

Kate Zernes, 814 North Columbus Street, noted that the precedent images show four story buildings, however there are none in this block. She further stated that there is no precedent in the surrounding context for a four story building next to a historic two story building.

Lynne Beasley, 826 Snowden Hallowell, suggested that the horizontal plank fences be vertical to be similar to others in the vicinity. She noted that the Board should be comparing the proposed design to the neighboring structures and not other parts of the historic district. She also stated that roof decks are not appropriate.

Andrew Brack, 728 Snowden Hallowell, expressed concern about accessing the parking from the alley behind the property.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Pratt asked for clarification regarding the changes that were made since the previous review stating that the design has not been responsive to Board and public input.

Ms. del Ninno stated that the brick cladding should be extended to the rear of the north elevation instead of stopping at the front of the setback upper level. She appreciated that the applicant has pushed the building further away from the sidewalk and increasing the setback at the upper level. She suggested that the projecting bay become two levels to reduce the overall perceived height.

Ms. Miller asked about the requested Open Space variance and asked if the front of the building aligns with the neighboring structure. The applicant stated that the proposed building had been pushed back from the sidewalk so as to align with the neighboring building.

Mr. Adams asked the applicant to consider reducing the height of the projecting bay by a floor and supported the comment that the north wall should be entirely brick. He noted that the large picture window on the first floor is not consistent with the design and suggested a window configuration similar to the upper level windows.

Mr. Spencer agreed that the picture window on the ground floor should be revised to be similar to the upper levels and that the bay should be lowered by a floor. He suggested adding areas of inset brick on the north elevation to provide visual interest on this blank wall.

Ms. Zandian appreciated the changes made to the design and agreed with comments from others regarding lowering the bay and using brick with inset panels at the north elevation.

11&12 BAR#2025-00552 – Parker Gray

Request for a concept review at 415 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: PT Blooms, represented by Kenneth W. Wire, attorney

BAR#2025-00551 – Parker Gray

Request for a full demolition at 415 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: PT Blooms, represented by Kenneth W. Wire, attorney

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Ms. Zandian, seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review approved BAR#2025-00551. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

The Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and heard public testimony on the proposed concept review of 415 North Alfred Street.

SPEAKERS:

Patrick Bloomfield, the applicant, gave a presentation about the project.

Alan Bonzio, 419 N Alfred St, said that the block has a mixture of architectural periods. He said this project is a tremendous opportunity, but needs some tweaks to improve the historical aesthetic of the block. He said the project should be an anchor for the neighborhood, but the design appears monolithic and would be a misfit.

Wayne Neale, 405 N Alfred St, said that he is not impressed by the project, and it is not compatible with the surrounding streetscape. He said the mass is monolithic and redundant and appears more as a single institutional building than multiple units.

William Olson, 422 N Columbus St, said that the three properties behind the subject property are all two-story wood townhouses. He also expressed concern about how the project fits into future development plans in the neighborhood.

Ralph Brooker, 422 N Alfred St, said the current building doesn't add anything to the neighborhood, but he would like to see some individuality in the proposed townhouses. He expressed concerns about the use of brick because the color could not be changed.

Alan Jacobson, 521 N St Asaph St, expressed concerns about contamination from the dry cleaner business that used to be on the site.

Nathaniel Choate, 402 & 404 N Alfred St, said that the proposed design is not compatible with the neighborhood as it appears as a single building.

Ed Lockett, 420 N Alfred St, said this block is unique, and the proposed project doesn't fit.

Steven Goldman, 407 N Alfred St, called the proposed building a monstrosity in comparison to the surrounding buildings, in terms of height and massing.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spencer said that the bay window doesn't work here and asked about the buttress element that sticks up on the roof between each unit.

Mr. Bloomfield responded that it is intended to define each unit.

Mr. Spencer said it looks odd and doesn't quite blend in, and that it needs more work.

Mr. Bloomfield agreed that it needed more work.

Ms. Del Ninno asked whether the building to the south has a flat or pitched roof. The applicant responded that it is pitched toward the back.

Ms. Del Ninno asked whether it should be halfway up the pitch.

Mr. Bloomfield responded that it's deceiving on the plans because there is a 6-foot-wide courtyard that recesses back about 40 feet.

Ms. Del Ninno said that in the elevation, it looks like the roof is up close to the flat roof, but that's possibly where the ridge is. She asked for clarification because it appears the 35-foot roof measurement is to the top of the ridge, not the midpoint of the ridge.

Mr. Bloomfield responded that Ms. Del Ninno is correct, but they are dropping the bay to align with the front of the building.

Mr. Spencer asked if the black line is where the gutter sits, and if the midpoint is really at 33 feet.

Mr. Bloomfield responded that is correct, that the roof deck is at 33, and the only thing above that is the parapet, which is an access point on the fourth floor.

Ms. Del Ninno said she is looking at the height of the existing building to the south.

Mr. Adams commented that there is a variety of house types and ages on this block, and there is an opportunity to match the level of variety in the neighborhood and the quality of design. He

recommended that the developer put more effort into the design, as the payback will be greater in terms of the quality.

Ms. Miller commented that, based on the community feedback about how special the block is, the applicant has a clear direction on where to go from here.

Ms. Del Ninno said that the design could be further developed so that there are five individual townhouse styles. She likes the brick but recommends reducing the bays and height, especially on the south end.

Mr. Spencer agreed about the use of brick and suggested using different brick colors to break the monotony and add variety. He said that the rooflines of the bump-outs could change, especially on the bump-out, to add interest and help define individual units. He also said that the bay window design should change, as the design feels a little too simple in terms of the façade, and needs more character.

Ms. Pratt said that the design needs more variety and that it looks more like an apartment or condo building, not individual townhouses like the rest of the block. She recommended differentiating the height of the rooflines and fenestrations to help break up the mass.

Ms. Zandian said that there should be more variety between the homes in terms of height and the bay height. She likes the brick but suggested using different brick colors, and that brick could be used on all sides. She said the middle window should match the upper one, as it currently looks inappropriate. She also recommended lowering the overall height to match the building to the right and lowering the units on the corner to differentiate the height, as this would be more compatible with the existing streetscape.

13 Adjournment

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 10:27 p.m.