

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, July 16, 2025

7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber
City Hall

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

Members Absent: None

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 7:01 p.m. All members were present.

2 **Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes from the July 2, 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 2, 2025 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Consent Calendar

- 3 BAR#2025-00228 - OHAD
Request for an awning at 411 Cameron Street.
Applicant: My Kieu Huynh

BOARD ACTION: This item was moved from the Consent Calendar and heard before items 4 & 5. On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00228 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

The applicant work with staff to: (1) raise the awning to avoid covering up the keystones, and (2) work on the placement of the signage.

Speakers:

My Huynh, the applicant, presented the application and was available to answer questions.

Discussion:

Ms. Miller asked about the size and color of the awning, whether it will be retractable, and whether there will be any signage.

Ms. Huynh responded that the awning will be installed above the windows and door, 3 feet wide and 16 feet long. She said she is still thinking about whether she wants signage on the awning. She mentioned there is already a sign installed on top of the awning.

Ms. Del Ninno said the building's elevation is attractive with the keystone windows and asked if the applicant would be willing to raise up the awning.

Ms. Huynh responded that the main purpose of the awning is to prevent the water from dripping down from above, and she is okay with raising it.

Ms. Del Ninno said that would be a good change because you could then see the header with the keystone over the window, and the openings are higher on both sides of the window.

Ms. Huynh responded that she is concerned about bringing up the awning because of the existing blade sign that would be in conflict.

Mr. Scott suggested moving the blade sign to the left side of the door.

Ms. Huynh responded that she would be willing to make that change.

Unfinished Business and Items Previously Deferred

4&5 BAR #2025-00114 - OHAD

Request for alterations and signage at 910 King Street.

Applicant: 910 King St LLC represented by Romana Sanchez, Architect

BAR #2025-00154 - OHAD

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

Applicant: 910 King St LLC represented by Romana Sanchez, Architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00114 and BAR#2025-00154 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Speakers:

Romana Sanchez, project architect, presented the proposal

Discussion:

Mr. Adams asked the applicant about the history of the windows to be infilled. The applicant

explained that they are not original to the building.

Ms. Miller asked about the function of the rooftop stair enclosure. The applicant explained that it provides access to the roof deck.

Ms. Zandian asked the applicant if they planned to return to the Board for additional building modifications. The applicant responded by indicating that they would be returning to the Board.

6&7 BAR#2025-00139 - OHAD

Request for alterations and new construction at 802 & 808 North Washington Street.

Applicant: 808 Washington LLC represented by Ken Wire and Megan Rappolt, Attorneys

BAR#2025-00202 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 802 & 808 North Washington Street.

Applicant: 808 Washington LLC represented by Ken Wire and Megan Rappolt, Attorneys

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Chair Scott, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00139 and BAR#2025-00202 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Speakers:

Eric Colbert, architect, presented the revisions to the project design.

Gail Rothrock, representing HAF and OTCA, appreciated the changes to the proposal including the details on the restoration of the historic townhome, the use of red brick, and changes to the north and south elevations. She stated that the proposed building overwhelms the historic townhouse and that other projects include significant setbacks that would help this design. She asked that the fifth floor be eliminated in the area of the townhouse and that the fifth floor generally be set back from the lower levels.

Dino Drudi, WOTCA, stated that he was opposed to the project because the height, mass, and density to not conform to the Washington Street standards.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott clarified that the proposed footprint is the same as the previously approved project for the site.

Ms. Zandian appreciated the changes made to the design since the previous hearing. She asked the applicant to work with staff to provide additional muntins in the windows above the entrance.

Mr. Lyons stated that the applicant had been respectful of the BAR comments and supported the proposal.

Ms. Miller liked the changes to the north wall and asked the applicant if they had considered alternate materials to the metal panels. The applicant responded that they had considered other options but that they preferred the metal panels.

Ms. del Ninno asked the applicant if the fifth floor was set back, they replied that it was set back

from the exterior wall below.

Ms. Miller stated her preference that the fifth floor be pushed further back and preferred the massing of the rear of the building to the front. The applicant noted that because of the existing foundation, the floors could not be set back further.

Mr. Adams appreciated the changes to the 5th floor windows. He expressed a preference for the smaller building divisions shown in the previously approved design for the property. He asked the applicant if additional variation could be provided in elements such as the windows between different parts of the building.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant to consider metal panels that include an integral texture of some type to provide additional visual interest.

Ms. del Ninno stated that this project is unique and does not represent a precedence for other projects on Washington Street. She asked the applicant to design the vents so that none are located on the Washington Street façade. She remained concerned regarding the lack of windows on the north elevation and suggested that the applicant consider the use of dark brick at the recessed sections.

Mr. Scott asked the applicant if the conditions associated with the restoration of the townhouse were acceptable. The applicant agreed to these conditions. Mr. Scott stated that the revisions to the hyphen are an improvement to the design and agreed with the comments regarding the addition of additional muntins above the window.

Mr. Scott moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. The final selection of windows and doors complies with the Policies for Administrative Approval at both the new construction and the historic townhouse.
2. Exterior wall vents will be located so that they are entirely within a single exterior material. These vents will be painted a color to match the adjacent material, no through wall vents are to be installed facing Washington Street.
3. The replacement roof at the historic townhouse be slate at the three story section and metal at the rear ell in compliance with the BAR Policies for Administrative Approval. The decorative pattern in the mansard roof is to be recreated in the replacement roof.
4. The applicant work with staff during the removal of paint at the historic townhouse to ensure that any original finish material is not removed.
5. The applicant will work with staff to identify any historic windows that may be retained and repaired, where historic windows cannot be repaired or are missing, the new windows will wood single paned windows in a 2 over 2 configuration.
6. Decorative railings and other woodwork at the side porch of the historic townhouse will be retained where possible and repaired to match existing as necessary.
7. The applicant will provide staff with detailed drawings showing the replacement of the entry stoop and porch base to match the original configuration as closely as possible.
8. The applicant will work with staff to add additional muntins to the windows within the metal panel section of the east elevation.
9. The applicant will work with staff to specify metal panels on the east elevation that include detailed patterns beyond what has been included in the Certificate of Appropriateness submission.
10. The applicant will work with staff to explore color options for the brick at the inset panels at the north elevation.

New Business

8&9 BAR#2025-00235 - OHAD

Request for alterations and an addition at 426 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Leslie and William Golden represented by Trent Sorensen

BAR#2025-00236 - OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 426 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Leslie and William Golden represented by Trent Sorensen

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00235 and BAR#2025-00236 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1, with Ms. del Ninno voting against.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. That the proposed addition doors comply with the BAR policy.

REASON:

Generally, the Board agreed with the staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS:

Trent Sorensen, the project contractor, gave a brief explanation of the project and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Del Ninno asked the applicant the reason for the new addition's roof being taller than the existing building roof. Mr. Sorensen explained that the roof extends beyond the existing roof line for insulation purposes, however the drawing didn't show the main building's roof which slopes down the rear and the new addition will not affect it in any way. Ms. Del Ninno also inquired about the proposed doors not aligning with the doors on the level below. Mr. Sorensen clarified that the wall on the floor below is chamfered.

Mr. Spencer asked about the new addition setback, Mr. Sorensen clarified that the proposed addition will be setback about 4,5 feet. There was no further discussion.

10&11 BAR#2025-00237 - Parker-Gray

Request for alterations at 1612 Princess Street.

Applicant: Joan and Paul Miller represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BAR#2025-00238 - Parker-Gray

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 1612 Princess Street.

Applicant: Joan and Paul Miller represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00237 and BAR#2025-00238 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Speakers:

Karen Conkey, Architect for the project, gave a brief summary and background.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott asked for clarification on replacing any windows and roof.

12&13 BAR#2025-00239 - Parker-Gray

Request for alterations at 1614 Princess Street.

Applicant: Joan and Paul Miller represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BAR#2025-00240 - Parker-Gray

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 1614 Princess Street.

Applicant: Joan and Paul Miller represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00239 and BAR#2025-00240 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Speakers:

Karen Conkey, Architect for the project, gave a brief summary and background.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott asked for clarification on replacing any windows and roof.

14 BAR#2025-00241 - OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 216 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Randy Philips represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00241 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0

Speakers:

Karen Conkey, Architect for the project, gave a brief summary and background.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott as for clarification on why the applicant is returning with the same previously approved application.

15&16 BAR#2025-00243 - OHAD

Request for alterations and an addition at 514 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Robert Wade Hampton III represented by Kulinski Group Architects P.C.

BAR#2025-00242 - OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 514 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Robert Wade Hampton III represented by Kulinski Group Architects P.C.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of

Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00242 and BAR#2023-00243 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Speakers:

Steve Kulinski, Architect for the project, gave a brief summary and background.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott said that it is a nice design and he appreciates that the applicant will retain the chimney.

- 17 Consideration of updates to the Solar Energy Systems Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Parker-Gray District and the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Skylights Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Fences, Gates & Walls Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Masonry Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Roofing Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Windows & Shutters Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Chimneys & Flues Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Stoops, Steps & Railings Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Consideration of updates to the Siding & Trim Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the Fences, Gates & Walls Chapter, the Masonry Chapter, and the Roofing Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the Skylights Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the Solar Energy Systems 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 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the Windows & Shutters Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the Chimneys & Flues Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the Siding & Trim Chapter of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updates to the Stoops, Steps & Railings of the Design Guidelines for the Old and Historic Alexandria District as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Speakers:

None.

Discussion:

Mr. Harris and Mr. Conkey presented the Committee's draft chapters and recommendations to the Board.

The Board adopted the following chapters with amendments:

- Solar Energy Systems
 - The Board requested staff to add the language “visible from the public right-of-way” to the Board Review box in both districts.
- Windows + Shutters
 - The Board requested staff to remove the language “historically or architecturally significant” from the Board Review box on Later Buildings in both districts and just use “architecturally significant”.
 - The Board requested staff to add the language “as determined by staff” to the language about historic and architecturally significant windows in both districts.
 - For the OHAD, the Board requested staff to increase the clarity of the Administrative Review box by separating “replication-in-kind (Type 4)” and “replacement” into two separate bullets.
- Chimneys + Flues
 - The Board requested staff to adopt the Parker-Gray guidelines for the OHAD chapter, with the change that construction or modification of a chimney should be an administrative/staff review regardless of the building elevation, for both districts.
- Stoops, Steps + Railings
 - The Board requested staff to add definitions for “stoop” and “porch” in the Design Guidelines, for clarity.
 - The Board requested staff to remove “demolition of stoops, steps, and railings less than 25 square feet” from the “no review” box and require Board review for any demolition of

stoops, steps, and railings, in both districts.

- The Board also requested staff to clarify that “replacement of railings in-kind” should be an administrative review.

Other Business

No other business was discussed.

18 Adjournment

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.