

\*\*\*\*\***DRAFT MINUTES**\*\*\*\*\*

Board of Architectural Review

**Wednesday, June 3, 2020**

7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair  
James Spencer, Vice Chair  
Christine Sennott  
Purvi Irwin  
John Sprinkle  
Lynn Neihardt  
Robert Adams

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Principle Planner  
William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. All members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the June 3, 2020 Public Hearing of the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) is being held electronically pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3708.2(A)(3), the Continuity of Government ordinance adopted by the City Council on April 18, 2020 or Sections 4-0.00(g) in HB29 and HB30 to undertake essential business. All of the members of the Board and staff are participating from remote locations through Zoom Webinar. The meeting can be accessed by the public through broadcasted live on the government channel 70, streaming on the City's website and can be accessed via Zoom hyperlink on the docket.

**II. MINUTES**

2. Consideration of the minutes from the **May 6, 2020** public hearing.

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer the minutes from the May 6, 2020 meeting.

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**This item was pulled from the consent calendar.**

3. **BAR #2020-00075 OHAD**  
Request for alterations at 408 North Union Street

Applicant: Elizabeth Reno

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00075, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. Include updated specifications that comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specification in the Historic Districts* when applying for a building permit.
2. Work with staff to choose the best of two options: 1) use the same size panes on the proposed bay window as those in the other four existing windows on this elevation and 2) divide the bay window opening into three sections to accommodate three equal size windows with the same size windowpanes. One possible option involves a center section with a 12 over 12 pane configuration, and the outer two sections with a 9 over 9 pane configuration.

**REASON**

Mr. Adams removed the item from the consent calendar because he felt that equal windowpane size on the new proposed bay window would be aesthetically better and more appropriate for this Colonial Revival townhouse.

**SPEAKERS**

Ms. Elizabeth Reno, the property owner, was available to answer questions

**DISCUSSION**

In general, the Board agreed with Mr. Adams that the different size windowpanes on the proposed bay window are not appropriate. The Board prefers that the windows on the main façade have same size windowpanes.

Ms. Reno clarified that other properties on the same block have the same windows as those she is proposing. She did not understand the Board's issue with the proposed window.

Ms. Irwin suggested that the applicant work with staff to approve the best option in regard to the windowpane size. The applicant should prepare two proposals showing 1) how the bay windows would appear with same windowpane size as the existing windows and 2) a proposal with three equally divided windows. One of the proposals is to be approved by staff. The suggestion progressed to a motion approved unanimously.

**4. BAR #2020-00100 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 804 South Lee Street  
Applicants: Eugene Smith & Laura Doyle

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00100, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

**5. BAR #2020-00111 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 510 Wolfe Street

Applicants: Peter C. Labovitz & Sharon M. Labovitz as Tenants by the Entirety

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00111, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. That the color and shape of the proposed synthetic slate match the existing slate on the porch roof.

**6. BAR #2020-00115 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 728 South Washington Street

Applicant: Washington Jefferson LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00115, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The awning sign have target external illumination, that illuminates only the sign.
2. The two existing wall plaque signs on the Washington Street elevation be removed.
3. The pin-mounted wall sign on the Jefferson Street elevation have a backing to protect the masonry wall.
4. The signs' letters be made of metal or wood.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**7. BAR #2020-00079 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 612 South Lee Street

Applicants: Daniel B. & Sarah M. Lipson

**8. BAR #2020-00078 OHAD**

Request for addition at 612 South Lee Street

Applicants: Daniel B. & Sarah M. Lipson

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00078 & BAR #2020-00079, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. Include the following statements on all construction documents involving demolition or ground disturbance, so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
  - a. No metal detection or artifact collection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

- b. Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703.838.4399) if any graves, buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.

c. **REASON**

The Board agreed with staff recommendations.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Bradley Linden, representing the design company *Linden + Kehyari Associates LLC*, stated that he agreed with the staff report and was available to answer questions.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Irwin had a question about the color black chosen for the new steel doors on the east elevation since all the windows' sashes and trims on the main house are white. Mr. Linden explained that the doors are not going to be visible from a public way and that he found it appropriate to differentiate the new high-quality door system from the windows on the historic main building by using a different color. There was no further discussion.

**9. BAR #2020-00101 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 419 South Royal Street

Applicant: Old Presbyterian Meeting House

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00101, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The intensity of the light is to be reviewed by staff at night in the field to ensure the compatibility of illumination with surrounding residences.
2. Work with staff to find the shortest pole height that will provide the necessary illumination, without adding more poles, that complies with Code requirements.

**REASON**

In general, the Board agreed with staff recommendations, but found that more research is required to establish the minimum pole height that will supply the required light level.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Aaron Siirila, Old Presbyterian Meeting House Director of Operations, and Mr. Thomas Moser, member of the Facility Committee, were available to answer questions. Mr. Moser explained that the existing poles lost power a year and a half ago and no one was able to find the power source, thus, they decided to replace them with solar powered poles which won't require cabling. Mr. Moser also said that they are working with the adjacent property owner at 417 North Royal Street to make sure the illumination of the pole is less intrusive. The proposed light fixture has a LED down light that diffuses less than a regular light, thus reducing light spill.

Elizabeth Walker, resident at 405 Wilkes Street, said that the previous lighting on the parking lot was too bright and that she is pleased with the solar powered option. However, she finds the

proposed pole height inappropriate. She showed an example of a shorter pole which she thinks would work better at the location and interfere less with adjacent properties.

Kevin Coyne, resident at 418 South Pitt Street, thanked church personnel for working with the neighbors answering their questions. He found that the proposed pole battery enclosure is not aesthetically pleasing, and that the solar equipment could be less accentuated.

J. J. Smith, resident at 401 Wilkes Street, stated that he never really had a problem with the parking lot illumination, but would like to see shorter poles with directed light instead.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Moser clarified that the proposed poles are the same height as the existing, 15 feet, the light fixture will be adjustable and dark sky certified. He also clarified that the size of the solar panels is directly related to the number of hours of light provided.

Mr. Spencer stated that the amount of illumination in a parking lot is regulated by code and the reduction in pole height will require adding more poles.

Ms. Roberts suggested that the applicant work with staff to find the shortest pole that complies with the code requirements without adding new poles. The suggestion progressed to a motion and was approved unanimously.

### **10. BAR #2020-00105 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 630 South Pitt Street  
Applicants: Ivar & Rana Draganja

### **11. BAR #2020-00104 OHAD**

Request for addition at 630 South Pitt Street  
Applicants: Ivar & Rana Draganja

### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00104 & BAR #2020-00105, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. Conditions set forth by Alexandria Archaeology

### **REASON**

The Board agreed with staff recommendations.

### **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Ivar Draganja, the applicant, was available to answer questions.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Adams found the project appropriated and agreed with staff recommendations. There was no further discussion.

**12. BAR #2020-00108 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 609 Princess Street  
Applicants: Richard G. & Susan C. Bosland

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00108, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

- 1. Windows must have one over one or two over two light configuration.

**REASON**

The Board agreed with the staff report findings but decided to approve the application by giving the property owner choices of window light configuration.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Richard Bosland, the property owner, stated that the subject windows are not original to the property and he would like to replace them in-kind to keep the window uniformity of the houses on the same block. The other windows on the subject property are multi-light as well and he thinks that it is aesthetically better to have all windows matching throughout the house. He also stated that he is replacing the windows for noise and energy efficiency issues.

**DISCUSSION**

In general, the Board agreed with staff and explained to the applicant that historic and stylistic appropriateness do not always conform to the property owner’s taste. The properties in the same block are of different styles so they cannot be compared with the subject property. Ms. Roberts also explained that storm windows do not require BAR approval and can diminish the noise from the cobblestone street and help with energy efficiency. Ms. Neihardt stated that this application represents a wonderful opportunity to restore the building’s façade with the historically appropriate window light configuration. There was no further discussion.

**13. BAR #2020-00120 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 417 South Lee Street  
Applicants: John & Fiona Moran

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00120, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

**REASON**

The Board agreed with staff’s recommendation and found the project straightforward.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. William Cromley, the project designer, was available to answer questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Irwin wanted to clarify that even though the proposal will not be visible from a public right of way, it was brought before the Board for approval of a permit to demolish as required for properties in the OHAD. This would not apply if the property were in the Parker-Gray District since the districts' policies differ. There was no further discussion.

### **14. BAR #2020-00142 OHAD**

Request for new building at 1300 & 1310 King Street

Applicant: 1300 King, LLC

#### **BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2020-00142. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

## **REASON**

The Board felt that more research and investigation on the historic buildings are required before approving the project. Historic buildings should be the focus of the project and not subsidiary to the new building. The Board also agreed that the removal of the bond stone is required to investigate the historic buildings' original fenestration and decided to defer the application until the inspection is complete.

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Bob Brant, from the firm *Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C.*, represented the applicant and gave a brief summary of the project's path to this final proposal. He took the opportunity to compliment City staff who worked diligently with the applicant's team to make it happen. He said that it was an exciting for his team to be able to preserve the historic buildings and work with the BAR.

Mr. Michael Winstanley, from the *Winstanley Architects & Planners* firm, presented the project highlighting the improvements made from the previous hearing and addressed staff's recommendations.

Ms. Theodora Stringham, attorney representing *Goldtree Realty LLC* at 112 South West Street, stated that the development will impact her client's property and had questions about how the development will address the accessibility to her client's property since the project proposes an encroachment on the public alley that provides access to pedestrians, cars, and utility services such as garbage pickup. Other issues she brought up were the proposed parking that abuts the alley that both properties share and security concerns.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts stated for the record that the project was reviewed by the Board previously and approved for height, mass and scale. Ms. Roberts also clarified that the alley encroachment and parking issues brought up by Ms. Stringham are not under the BAR purview and were approved during the DSUP review process.

Ms. Irwin and Ms. Neihardt stated that they would prefer that the tracery have a more modern feeling than the floral pattern being proposed. Mr. Spencer did not have an issue with the proposed tracery and liked the overall outcome of the project. Ms. Irwin also had concerns about the architectural vocabulary on the west elevation, she would like to see the same architectural vocabulary throughout the building, including the jack arches on the King Street elevation which Mr. Adams found to be complementary and a good architectural detail. Mr. Adams also had questions about the asymmetry of the tracery on the residential entrance section which was clarified to have been intentional to make a differentiation between the commercial and residential portions of the building. During this discussion the architect clarified that the design for the canopy would include the metal tracery.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that he thinks that the proposed balcony on the second story of the King Street elevation is inappropriate and that it will set a wrong precedent in the historic district. He also had questions about the historic buildings' rehabilitation. There are several components of the buildings yet to be revealed and he is not sure how the architect will address the uncovering. He suggested more research and focus on the historic buildings.

Ms. Roberts clarified that the questions about the historic buildings' adaptation to the new development became an issue at this level because in the concept review stage only mass, height, and scale were under review, but now the Board has to review the Certificate of Appropriateness of the whole project and the historic buildings are the main focus for the BAR. Ms. Sennott also found that the historic buildings' portion of the project needs refinement. The Board also requested to see the historic reports submitted by the applicant for the concept reviews. The Board indicated that the design for the new portion of the building should stand on its own. They indicated several areas where they wanted to see revisions on the new portion of the building including: 1) review options for the jack arches; 2) look at a more modern pattern for the tracery, and 3) see a sample of the material for the tracery. They also said that the indentation proposed by staff was not necessary.

**15. BAR #2020-00143 OHAD**

Request for demolition and encapsulation at 210 Wilkes Street  
Applicants: John & Bridget Weaver

**16. BAR #2020-00138 OHAD**

Request for addition and alterations at 210 Wilkes Street  
Applicants: John & Bridget Weaver

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00138 & BAR #2020-00143, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. Modifications to existing gate and masonry wall must maintain existing height and location, applicant must submit proposed gate and wall details to staff prior to submitting for a building permit.
2. Proposed handrails must be visually minimal, with a post and rail without balusters, applicant must submit handrail details to staff prior submitting for a building permit.



3. The statements in Archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including demolition, erosion and sediment control, grading, landscaping, utilities and sheeting and shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
  - a. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703.838.4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
  - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

**REASON**

The Board agreed with staff recommendations

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Patrick Camus, the project architect, was available to answer any questions

**DISCUSSION**

The Board in general liked the design and found the project appropriate, there was no further discussion.

**17. BAR #2020-00145 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 318 South Fairfax Street

Applicants: John & Susan Nelson

**18. BAR #2020-00144 OHAD**

Request for addition & alterations at 318 South Fairfax Street

Applicants: John & Susan Nelson

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0**

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00144 & BAR #2020-00145, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The statements in Archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including demolition, erosion and sediment control, grading, landscaping, utilities and sheeting and shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
  - c. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703.838.4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
  - d. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

**REASON**

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Patrick Camus, the project architect, clarified that the proposed HVAC on the roof had been moved to the side of the property as a result of a neighbor’s concern. He was available to answer any questions.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Irwin observed that the lantern on the pavilion’s roof will obstruct the view of the backyard from the main building windows. Mr. Camus explained that this was an attempt to create a “pavilion-esque” look. Mr. Adams complimented the project and had a question about the transom on the front door, which seem to be more contemporary to him. Mr. Camus explained that the lights in the transom are in diamond shape just to add some flair. There was no further discussion.

**Deferral Requested by Applicant**

**19. BAR #2020-00148 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 277 South Washington Street  
Applicant: 277 South Washington Street, LLC

**20. BAR #2020-00139 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 277 South Washington Street  
Applicant: 277 South Washington Street, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00139 & BAR #2020-00148.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

**REASON**

The Board accepted the request for deferral.

**SPEAKERS**

None

**DISCUSSION**

None

**21. BAR #2020-00150 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 919 Prince Street  
Applicant: The Joey Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc.

**22. BAR #2020-00149 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 919 Prince Street  
Applicant: The Joey Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc.

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00149 & BAR #2020-00150.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

### **REASON**

The Board, in general, found the project confusing and in need of improvement.

### **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Harold Smith, the project architect, was available to answer questions

Mr. Pizzano, from *The Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc.*, explained that the uses of the space will include two accessory apartments and the *Best Program* facility. He explained that they are proposing separate entrances to the different uses addressing the Board's concerns about the different entrances to the building.

Mr. Steve Milone, resident at 907 Prince Street, found the drawings confusing and asked the Board to require the applicant to revise the fenestration proposed for the south facade of the frame addition in the east side yard of the property... Mr. Milone also brought to the Board's attention that the proposed bathrooms on the second floor in this location will have a dividing wall in the middle of the window visible from outside. He additionally explained that the alley on the north side of the property is historic stone gravel which should not be covered with asphalt. Finally, Mr. Milone noted that the drawings of the wrought-iron fence on the South Patrick elevation contained errors. He supported retaining the existing fence, and recommended using brick, not concrete, if a short wall is to be added to the base of the fence.

### **DISCUSSION**

The Board had questions about the functionality of the project and found that elevations were confusing, and more details are needed for better understanding of the project. Ms. Irwin asked for additional views of the project from the North. Mr. Smith tried to explain but agreed that the project needs to be refined. He agreed to defer the proposal at the request of the Board. In general, the Board had issues with the inaccuracy of the drawings and found that the "cube's" door and transoms should be full-light. Overall, the cube should have larger panes and fewer muntins; that the second story bathroom window being divided in the middle needs to be revisited; the blank wall facing Prince Street requires fenestration; the fence needs restudy as well; and the alley paving must be addressed properly. There was discussion that the paving material allow for wheelchair navigation. It was the preference of the Board not to use cobblestones or unit masonry. The Board does not want the use of asphalt, but stamped concrete is a possibility.

## **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

(At this point in the meeting, Mr. Adams excused himself).

### **23. BAR #2019-00556 OHAD**

Request for concept review at 912, 916 & 920 King Street

Applicant: Galena Capital Partners

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Michael Winstanley gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Leejung Hong, of Winstanley Architects & Planner, was also available to answer questions.

Mr. Mike Gimbert, owner of the adjacent building at Firehouse Square, noted that he likes the changes and improvements the applicant has made since the Concept I hearing. He expressed concern about the alley between the two buildings, saying that narrowing the alley as proposed will negatively affect the light and space. He asked Mr. Winstanley if the alley would be converted to solely pedestrian use, as he would prefer greater vehicular access. Mr. Winstanley explained that there are no public alleys on the property, and this alley would remain pedestrian only.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Board expressed enthusiasm for the project and appreciation for the changes the applicant had made since the Concept I hearing. Ms. Irwin recommended that the BAR approve the proposed storefront glazing, which is slightly less than that required by the zoning ordinance, 72% instead of the required 75%. Ms. Roberts and other Board members agreed, noting that they appreciate the proposed design's proportions and rhythm. Ms. Irwin and Ms. Roberts also discussed the six brick color options provided by the applicant, expressing preference for a lighter palette.

## **BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, by unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review endorsed the height, mass, scale, general architectural character, and detailing. They recommended that the applicant move forward with a Certificate of Appropriateness.

### **24. BAR #2019-00557 OHAD**

Request for concept review at 116 South Henry Street  
Applicant: Galena Capital Partners

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Michael Winstanley gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Leejung Hong, of Winstanley Architects & Planner, was also available to answer questions.

Jason Longfellow, owner of Kyo Gallery at 111 South Patrick Street, presented a video expressing his concerns regarding the size of the proposed building at South Patrick Street and Downham Way. He felt that the building was too tall, narrow, and too close to South Patrick Street, recommending that it be set back from the street to reduce its impact.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Board found Mr. Longfellow's video compelling and discussed the merits of moving the proposed building back from the sidewalk. Mary Catherine Gibbs, attorney for the applicant, explained that the zoning ordinance requires the building to be at the property line; the zoning ordinance does not allow a setback. Mr. Sprinkle expressed appreciation that the applicant

responded to the Board's suggested changes in Concept I. Mr. Spencer noted that they addressed many concerns, improving the project. Ms. Irwin also liked the changes, but did not like the red brick on the South Henry Street elevation. The Board also discussed the alley, Downham Way, at the north end of the parcel. The applicant intends to widen the alley to allow for both pedestrian use and two-way automobile traffic. Ms. Irwin suggested different pavement or striping to better protect pedestrians. In regard to the proposed garage, Ms. Irwin asked if the applicant could use a higher quality material than EFIS. Ms. Hong explained that EFIS is an economical choice for such a large area to cover, and that the garage surface would be brick at the sidewalk level. Additionally, EFIS has a metallic looking finish that they will use in some locations, mostly in window spandrels, on the residential buildings. The residential buildings will have stone at the ground level.

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, by unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review endorsed the height, mass, scale, and architectural character. They recommended that the applicant move forward with a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 12:00 a.m.

**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

The following projects were administratively approved since the last BAR meeting:

BAR #2020-00122 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to at 1224 Princess Street

Applicant: Cello Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BAR #2020-00123 PG

Request install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to at 229 North Henry Street

Applicant: Cello Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BAR #2020-00132 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 654 South Columbus Street

Applicant: Nicholas Kalivretenos

BAR #20202-00175 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 16 Duke Street

Applicant: Laurie Fink

BAR #2020-00208 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 805 Chetworth Place

Applicant: Andrew Scott

BAR #2020-00213 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 107 South Alfred Street  
Applicant: Sylvia Kaboy

BAR #2020-00214 OHAD  
Request for antenna replacement at 909 North Washington Street  
Applicant: Jessica Bingham

BAR #2020-00216 PG  
Request for roof replacement at 632 North Columbus Street  
Applicant: Cynthia Ortiz

BAR #2020-00219 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 322 South Pitt Street  
Applicant: Cynthia Ortiz

BAR #2020-00222 OHAD  
Request for siding replacement 320 North Alfred Street  
Applicant: Ricardo Navarro

BAR #2020-00223 OHAD  
Request for door replacement at 606 South Pitt Street  
Applicant: Gary Gust

BAR #2020-00225 PG  
Request for siding replacement at 308 North Fayette Street  
Applicants: Erika King & Jjana Valentiner

BAR #2020-00226 PG  
Request for siding replacement at 306 North Fayette Street  
Applicant: Steven Harper

BAR #2020-00229 OHAD  
Request for signage at 711 King Street  
Applicant: Ken Lake

BAR #2020-00230 OHAD  
Request for siding replacement at 522 South Pitt Street  
Applicant: Gary Gust

BAR #2020-00232 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 1 Potomac Court  
Applicant: Austin Gordon

BAR #2020-00233 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 809 King Street  
Applicant: Austin Gordon

BAR #2020-00234 OHAD  
Request for fence replacement at 328 Commerce Street  
Applicant: Karen Griffin

BAR #2020-00236 OHAD  
Request for antenna replacement at 1202 South Washington Street  
Applicant: Steve Brianas

BAR #2020-00240 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement 734 South Royal Street  
Applicant: Artin Sharolli

BAR #2020-00244 OHAD  
Request for alterations 606 Princess Street  
Applicant: Stacy Spencer

BAR #2020-00245 OHAD  
Request for alteration 418 North Union Street  
Applicant: Cynthia Ortiz

BAR #2020-00246 OHAD  
Request for antenna replacement at 1421 Prince Street  
Applicant: Shea Beltran

BAR #2020-00247 OHAD  
Request for window replacement at 734 South Alfred Street  
Applicant: Nathan Hillery

BAR #2020-00248 PG  
Request for mortar repair at 1201 Cameron Street  
Applicant: David Robbins

BAR #2020-00253 OHAD  
Request for fence replacement at 503 Franklin Street  
Applicant: Lowell Zeta

BAR #2020-00258 OHAD  
Request for fence replacement 312 North Columbus Street  
Applicant: Brad Fleetwood