

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

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

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

Members Absent: None

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

2 Minutes

Consideration of the minutes of the November 19, 2025 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Ms. Pratt, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the November 19, 2025 meeting as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Consent Calendar

3 BAR #2025-00437 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 201 Duke Street.
Applicant: Martha Peterson

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Chair Zandian, seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00437 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON: The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS: None

DISCUSSION: None

New Business

4

BAR #2025-00465 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 910 King Street.

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

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Vice-Chair del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00465 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1 with Mr. Spencer voting no.

REASON: The Board agreed with staff recommendations with the exception of allowing painting on the sides and rear of the building.

SPEAKERS:

Kahan Dillon, property owner, presented the project and expressed concern regarding the comments from a previous meeting.

Christine Roberts, HAF, recommended that the Board approve the project with staff recommendations with the exception of noting that the proposed new front entry door should be appropriate for the style of the building.

Steve Milone, OTCA, opposed the proposal noting that some portions of the originally proposed modifications have been approved but the remaining work is not appropriate for this historic building. He specifically mentioned the proposed painting of the rear and sides of the building, noting that once they are painted they could become a location for a mural. He further noted that the existing entry doors should be maintained and that any new railings should be installed so as not to damage the existing stones.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Scott asked the applicant if he agreed with staff recommendations, the applicant stated that he did not agree with all of them.

Ms. Zandian noted that the application has not substantially changed since the first time that it was presented to the Board. The applicant stated that he made changes to the design of the roof deck in response to Board comments.

Ms. Zandian stated that any new exterior railings should be in the Greek Revival style to match the building.

Ms. del Ninno pointed out that as shown in the renderings, the height of the exterior railings appears to be in excess of what is required by Code. The applicant stated that the final design would match Code requirements.

Ms. Zandian stated that any changes to the exterior should be consistent with the style of the

existing building.

5&6 BAR #2025-00467 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 115 Quay Street.

Applicant: Deven McGraw and David Parker represented by Karen Conkey, architect

BAR #2025-00468 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 115 Quay Street.

Applicant: Deven McGraw and David Parker represented by Karen Conkey, architect

BOARD ACTION: These items were moved and heard after docket item #3. On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00467 and BAR#2025-00468 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON:

The Board agreed with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS:

Karen Conkey, the project architect, represented the applicant and gave a brief presentation about the project.

Christine Roberts, a member of the public, said that the BAR has found limewash to be appropriate in the past on newer buildings, and that the design guidelines say it is an appropriate treatment for non-historic brick.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Pratt asked whether the new garage and front doors would have frosted glass and whether they would use the same type.

Ms. Conkey responded that they should be able to get frosted glass types that look the same.

Ms. Pratt asked why the design of the garage door was chosen.

Ms. Conkey responded that there is a similar one at 100 Quay Street.

Ms. Pratt remarked that the amount of frosted glass seems odd and incongruent.

Ms. Conkey responded that the frosted glass is meant to add privacy.

Mr. Scott asked for clarification about the front door.

Ms. Conkey and the applicant clarified that the doors will have clear tempered glass, not frosted glass.

Ms. Del Ninno asked for more information about the limewash and stated that she is generally opposed to permanent limewash on natural brick.

Ms. Conkey responded that limewash and stain are acceptable, where paint is not, and that

limewash is breathable material.

Ms. Del Ninno said that limewash is a permanent alteration and asked why it is being requested.

Ms. Conkey responded that the homeowner wants to brighten the brick color, and there are other homes in this neighborhood that have been limewashed.

Ms. Zandian asked if the applicant is open to staining instead.

Ms. Conkey said they may be open to that option.

Mr. Spencer said that the windows on the roofline appear large compared to the windows below them, and that the alignment seems off. He recommended narrowing them.

Ms. Conkey responded that the dormer windows are centered on the roof and that the other windows are not centered on the elevation, meaning the dormer windows don't align with the others. She also said that the dormer windows have to be large enough to meet the egress requirement, but the width could be narrowed slightly.

Mr. Scott suggested using one shed dormer instead of two dormers, to solve the issue of the spacing.

Ms. Pratt asked whether the second floor windows could be made slightly longer to balance with the third floor windows.

Ms. Conkey said they are working with the existing window openings.

Mr. Adams commented that he has seen historic houses where the lower window arrangement is different from the upper windows. He thinks the proposed roof appears balanced, even if it's not completely aligned with the lower windows and looks nice.

Ms. Del Ninno commented that the windows are a bit large for the overall elevation.

Other Business

7 Election of Board Officers for Chair and Vice Chair

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, and seconded by Ms. Pratt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to elect Mr. Scott as Chair.

On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to elect Ms. Zandian as Vice-Chair.

8 Adjournment

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.