

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

Board of Architectural Review

**Wednesday, May 20, 2026**

7:00 p.m., 901 Wythe Street

Multipurpose Room

Members Present:     Andy Scott, Chair  
                          Bud Adams  
                          Theresa del Ninno  
                          Michaela Robinson  
                          Margaret Miller  
                          James Spencer

Members Absent:     Nastaran Zandian, Vice 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 Chair Scott, Mr. Adams, Ms. Miller, Ms. del Ninno, Ms. Robinson, and Mr. Spencer were present. Vice Chair Zandian was absent.

**2     Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes of the May 6, 2026 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Vice Chair Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the May 6, 2026 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**Consent**

**3     BAR#2026-00108 - OHAD**  
Request for signage at 506 King Street (Parcel Address: 520 King Street).  
Applicant: Laura Mercier

**BOARD ACTION:**  
On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00108 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**4     BAR#2026-00119 - OHAD**  
Request for alterations at 320 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Allen Moore, represented by Sean D. Williams, Agent

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00119 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

- 5 BAR#2026-00126 - OHAD  
Request for alterations at 719 Prince Street.  
Applicant: William Cromley

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00126 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**Unfinished Business and Items Previously Deferred**

- 6 **APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED A DEFFERAL**  
BAR#2025-00549 - OHAD  
Request for alterations at 601 Wythe Street.  
Applicant: 601 Wythe Street LLC represented by Matthew Lee, Architect

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Robinson, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR#2025-00549. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**New Business**

- 7 BAR#2026-00134 – Parker Gray  
Request for new construction at 806 N Columbus Street.  
Applicant: 732 and 806 Development LLC, represented by Kenneth Wire, Attorney

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Chair Scott, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00134 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-2, with Ms. Robinson and Ms. Miller voting against.

**SPEAKERS:**

Patrick Bloomquist, applicant, presented the proposed design

Kate Zernes, 814 N Columbus Street, stated that the proposal is for three four story townhouses directly adjacent to two story historic buildings and that this is not found elsewhere in the historic district. She further mentioned that the BAR requested that the buildings be made shorter during the Concept Review but that no significant change in height has been made.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Scott asked the applicant how tall the proposed structures would be. The applicant stated that it would be 35' to the top of the parapet and 42'-6" to the top of the fourth floor.

Ms. del Ninno asked the applicant if the overall building height could be lowered. The applicant responded by saying that the ceiling heights are as low as possible and that the overall height is appropriate for the district.

Mr. Scott appreciated that the overall height is less than allowed by zoning. He stated a preference for brick at the rear elevation and suggested a more substantial cornice at the projecting bay.

Ms. Miller asked the applicant if all three units would be the same color and if so have they explored a variety of colors. The applicant stated that when they explored color options having variety within the three units did not work.

Mr. Scott suggested that the applicant explore mortar options to prevent staining of the light colored brick.

Ms. Robinson expressed concern regarding the overall height, noting that the blockface is comprised of smaller structures. She stated that the top of the parapet should be no taller than 32'. She noted the variety of entry stoop heights on the block and suggested that some height could be taken out of the building there.

Mr. Scott stated that there is often a variety of building heights within a block and that he was not concerned about the overall height. He asked if 6" could be taken out of the top two floors or if the parapet could be shortened. The applicant noted that the parapet height is set by the railing requirement for the roof deck but that a decorative rail could be added to the roof at the correct height to allow for the parapet to be reduced.

Ms. del Ninno stated that if the projecting bay were two stories then it would align with the neighboring structures. She further stated that the middle building could have a taller bay with the north and south building having the shorter bays.

Mr. Adams suggested that the applicant explore additional contrast between the color of the brick and the precast. He asked the applicant to locate the decorative stars on the north elevation in an historically accurate location. He also agreed with previous comments that the rear of the building should be clad in brick.

Mr. Spencer said that he was not concerned about the proposed height and that adding a railing above the parapet might look out of place. He agreed that the rear of the building should be brick and stated a preference for the siding at the fourth floor to be horizontal.

Ms. Miller stated that the proposed design is not appropriate for this block.

Mr. Spencer stated that the door and transom at the fourth floor were awkward as they relate to the trim along the top of the building. He asked the applicant to either increase the height of the transom or eliminate and increase the size of the door.

Mr. Scott summarized the proposed conditions of approval as follows:

- There be greater contrast between the colors of the brick and precast.
- The siding at the fourth floor be horizontal and that the transom above the door be revised.
- The projecting bays at the north and south townhouses be two stories, the height of the middle townhouse can be either two or three stories.
- The size of the cornice at the projecting bays be increased.
- Brick cladding be used on the rear of the building in place of the proposed siding.

**8&9** BAR#2026-00106 – OHAD  
 Request for reapproval of expired alteration and addition plans at 333 Green Street.  
 Applicant: Paul O’Sullivan

BAR#2026-00107 – OHAD  
 Request for reapproval of expired partial demolition and encapsulation plans at 333 Green Street.  
 Applicant: Paul O’Sullivan

**BOARD ACTION:**  
 On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00106 and BAR#2026-00107 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-2, with Ms. Robinson and Ms. Miller voting against.

**SPEAKERS:**  
 Paul O’Sullivan, applicant, presented the case and was available for questions.

**DISCUSSION:**  
 Mr. Scott asked the applicant to elaborate on the minor changes to the design since the project last came to the BAR.

**10&11** BAR#2026-00116 – OHAD  
 Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 428 N Union Street.  
 Applicant: Julie and John Scker, represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BAR#2026-00117 – OHAD  
 Request for an addition and alterations at 428 N Union Street.  
 Applicant: Julia and John Acker, represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

**BOARD ACTION:**  
 On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR#2026-00116 and BAR#2026-00117. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**SPEAKERS:**  
 Karen Conkey, the project architect, gave a brief explanation of the project and was available to answer questions.

Julia and John Acker, the property owners, were present and available to answer questions.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Scott asked the architect if the rooftop deck railing flushes with the roof. Ms. Conkey explained that the roof would slope down from the railing. He also asked if the new proposed garage door would have glass windows. Ms. Conkey confirmed

Mr. Spencer asked if the proposed shutters were operable, Mrs. Conkey confirmed.

Ms. Del Ninno asked about the dormer height and choice of material, shingle vs. metal. Ms. Conkey explained that they wanted to maximize the river view and the material was the customer's choice.

Ms. Robinson was concerned about the solid/void ratio being eliminated by the bigger shed dormer. Ms. Acker said that the attic room is going to be used for entertainment and the large window makes sense for the proposed use.

Mr. Scott, Ms. Del Ninno, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Spencer agreed that the dormer windows are to overpowering and they would like the architect to restudy the dormer, making the windows shorter and/or the dormer narrower. The applicants agreed with the deferral. There was no further discussion.

**12&13 BAR#2026-00120 – Parker Gray**

Request for new construction at 1609 Cameron Street (Parcel Address: 1501 Cameron Street).  
Applicant: City of Alexandria, represented by Sophie Topping Zimmerman, Agent

**BAR#2026-00133 – Parker Gray**

Request for complete demolition and encapsulation at 1609 Cameron Street (Parcel Address: 1501 Cameron Street).  
Applicant: City of Alexandria, represented by Sophie Topping Zimmerman, Agent

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00120 and BAR#2026-00133 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**SPEAKERS:**

Qiaojue Yu, TES staff, introduced project.  
Keith Leonard, architect, presented design.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Scott asked for clarifications of the canopy material and fenced in storage area. Questioned if flexible fencing could be used at the storage area.

Ms. Miller asked about the material of the fence and if additional shades could be added. The applicant stated fence will be metal and the shades will be movable.

Mr. Spencer asked if there would be building lighting. The applicant stated that there would be small LED string light at the top of the brick.

Ms. del Ninno stated that the signage is too small.

Ms. Robinson stated that she likes the warm tones of the masonry and that it is like the Durant Center.

Mr. Adams liked the contrasting black brick.

Mr. Spencer stated that the applicant could explore the contrast between brick and precast materials.

**14&15 BAR#2026-00122 – OHAD**

Request for an addition at 425 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: William Cromley

**BAR#2026-00123 – OHAD**

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 425 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: William Cromley

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00122 and BAR#2026-00123 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**SPEAKERS:**

William Cromley, representing the applicant, presented the proposed design

**DISCUSSION:**

Ms. Robinson appreciated the proposed design.

Ms. del Ninno noted that typically she would not support an addition that is taller than the historic structure, but that in this case the addition will not be visible from the front of the site and therefore she supports the proposal.

**16&17 BAR#2026-00124 – Parker Gray**

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 1109 Queen Street.

Applicant: Case Design/Remodeling Inc, represented by Michael Sass, Contractor

**BAR#2026-00125 – Parker Gray**

Request for an addition and alterations at 1109 Queen Street.

Applicant: Case Design/Remodeling Inc, represented by Michael Sass, Contractor

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00124 and BAR#2026-00125 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. The front (south) elevation window replacements shall use the full-frame installation method.
2. The applicant shall work with staff to submit updated material specifications for the rear

(north) window of the addition.

3. The applicant shall use three matching double hung windows on the front elevation.

**SPEAKERS:**

Michael Sass, the contractor, introduced the project and was available to answer questions.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Scott asked if the applicant had seen the staff recommendation about using the full-frame installation method instead of inserts. Mr. Sass responded that the intention is to use the full-frame replacement method.

Mr. Scott asked staff to clarify the condition about the rear window replacements. Mr. Conkey said it was unclear what type of cladding would be used and that it appeared to be vinyl cladding. Mr. Sass responded that the rear windows will use aluminum cladding and not vinyl.

Mr. Adams asked whether the applicant would consider using three matching double hung windows instead of the one picture window and two double hung windows. Mr. Sass responded that they would do that.

## **18 Adjournment**

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.