

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

Board of Architectural Review  
**Wednesday, October 20, 2021**  
7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing  
Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: None

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

**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.

**2. Resolution Finding Need to Conduct the Board of Architectural Review Electronically.**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**II. MINUTES**

3. Consideration of minutes from the October 6, 2021 meeting.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the October 6, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

**III. DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING**

**4. BAR #2020-00396 PG**

Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

**5. BAR #2020-00412 PG**

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request the deferral of

BAR #2021-00396 and BAR #2021-00412.

**IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**6. BAR #2021-00543 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 600 Montgomery Street.  
Applicant: 600 Montgomery Street, LLC C/O Jamie Leeds

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00543, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**7. BAR #2021-00454 OHAD**

Request for re-approval of previously expired plans at 0 Prince Street, and 200 and 204 Strand Street.  
Applicant: Old Dominion Boat Club

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00454, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**V. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED**

**Continuation of Board discussion from previous hearing. No public comment period to be included.**

**8. BAR #2021-00341 OHAD (Translation services from English to Amharic will be provided.)**

Request for new construction at 431 South Columbus Street, 416 South Alfred Street, 900 Wolfe Street and 450 South Patrick Street.  
Applicant: Heritage at Old Town PropCo LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Denied**

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2021-00341. The motion carried on a vote of 5-2. Ms. Irwin and Mr. Spencer opposed.

**REASON**

The Board felt that the proposed design is too large for the historic district and is not compatible with the nearby historic properties.

**DISCUSSION**

The Chair took a straw poll of the Board members.

The first question asked which Board members were in favor of the proposed architectural character. Four of the Board members indicated that they support the architectural character of the proposed design.

The second question asked which Board members were in favor of the proposed building height. Three of the Board members indicated that they support the proposed building height.

Ms. Sennott noted the section of the Design Guidelines that notes that “It is not the intention of the Board to dilute design creativity in residential buildings. Rather, the Board seeks to promote compatible development that is, at once, both responsive to the needs and tastes of the late 20th century while being compatible with the historic character of the districts.” She felt that the current design is more compatible with the historic district, specifically noting the portion facing South Columbus Street. She felt that with some additional design revisions, the design could be successful. As submitted, the design is not developed to a point where she would be able to support the project.

Ms. Irwin encouraged the applicant to continue to integrate the specific history of the project into the design. She asked that her written design comments be attached to the project record. She noted that the Design Guidelines talk about the relation of the proposed design to the historic context, this site has limited historic resources and the context for the proposed building will be the adjacent South Patrick Street and planned large buildings nearby. She further noted that the northern gateway to the City includes tall buildings and felt that it would be similarly appropriate for the southern gateway to include tall buildings. She felt that the mimicry of historic buildings serves to dilute the historic fabric. She asked the applicant to employ a more modern language that is compatible with historic buildings instead of mimicking them.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that the proposed design does not comply with the Design Guidelines, the building would overwhelm the surrounding buildings. He stated that decisions to approve projects that do not follow the Design Guidelines are not defensible.

Mr. Adams stated that South Patrick Street is not a highway, it is home to buildings that are one and two stories in height. The site vicinity is a residential area, not an urban center. He felt that the proposed buildings are too tall for this environment. He felt that the BAR review should not be pre-empted by comments from other groups, and that they had the responsibility to decide against the proposal if they feel that it does not comply with the Design Guidelines. He felt that if the project moves forward, it will be a precedent setting project for the historic district.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant if they would be willing to make additional design changes to address comments from the Board. The applicant responded that they were not interested in making additional design changes at this time.

**9. BAR #2021-00496 OHAD**

Request for complete demolition at 101 Duke Street.

Applicant: Eleventh Street Development, LLC

**10. BAR #2021-00495 OHAD**

Request for new construction at 101 Duke Street.

Applicant: Eleventh Street Development, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00495 and BAR #2021-00496, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-2. Mr. Sprinkle and Mr. Adams opposed.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Staff recommendations plus that the applicant work with staff to refine the garage windows and the detail at the downspouts.

### **REASON**

The Board felt that the proposed design complies with the Design Guidelines and is compatible with the historic district

### **SPEAKERS**

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

Shawn Glerum, architect with Odell, presented the revisions to the design in response to comments from staff and the Board.

Barbara Saperstone, 100 ½ Duke Street, felt that the proposed design looks too much like a warehouse and not the nearby residential buildings. She asked if additional decoration could be added to the windows.

Terrence Flanagan, 124 Waterford, stated that the site is in the heart of the historic district and that the design is not compatible with the residential neighborhood.

Ana Gomez Acebo, 100 Duke, was concerned about the height of the proposed building relative to the neighboring structures. She stated that the heights as indicated on the submitted documents are misleading and that the zoning height measurements should be labeled for each neighboring building. She felt that the proposed design is too tall for the neighborhood.

Stephanie Andrews, 411 S. Columbus, thanked the Board for their action on the Heritage project.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, stated that the project is inappropriate for the residential neighborhood. This corner is an important gateway from the south and the design should reflect this. She asked how the fourth floor steps back from the building edge at the Duke Street side of the building.

Ken Wire responded to comments regarding the proposed building height by referencing drawings included in the submission.

Ms. Roberts asked Staff about the historic use of the site. Mr. Conkey referenced the Sanborn Maps included in the Staff Report that describes the presence of warehouses on the project site throughout the history of the site.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Spencer appreciated the changes that the applicant has made to the Duke Street elevation and to the garages. He noted that the current design for the garages gives them the impression of a secondary element. He liked the use of metal for the stoops on the north building. He did not have any issues with the proposed fourth floor or the overall building height.

Ms. Irwin liked the modifications to the garage and wanted the applicant to work with staff to align the garage window with the windows on the building. She further asked that the applicant work with staff to develop the design of the recesses at the downspout. She appreciated the revisions to

the stoops on the north building.

Mr. Sprinkle was concerned about the treatment of the corner of Duke Street and South Union Street. He felt that the garages are not appropriate for the surroundings and felt that the proposed building will overwhelm the neighboring historic structures.

Mr. Adams felt that the proposed building should be more similar to the nearby residential buildings than to the waterfront buildings. He suggested that the addition of an entry stair on Duke Street might help to make the building more compatible with the neighboring buildings.

Ms. Ossman stated that the warehouse precedent for the building was appropriate and that using a more residential motif would be to deny the history of the specific site and the broader waterfront.

Ms. Sennott stated that turning the south building to address Duke Street could be successful but generally supported the proposed design with the recommended modifications.

**11. BAR #2021-00456 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 329 North Washington Street.  
Applicants: Hershel Kleinberg and Lisa Cohen

**12. BAR #2021-00455 OHAD**

Request for addition and alterations at 329 North Washington Street.  
Applicants: Hershel Kleinberg and Lisa Cohen

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended**

On a motion by Ms. Ossman and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00455 and BAR #2021-00456, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Staff recommendations, plus the applicant work with staff on the connection between the elevator shaft and the building. The elevator shaft cladding be mansard brown.

**REASON**

The Board felt the mansard brown color would be the least obtrusive and that staff could oversee the step flashing.

**SPEAKERS**

Tamar King, project architect, gave a brief presentation and answered questions.  
Teri MacKeever, project architect, also answered questions.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Ossman and Ms. Roberts questioned how the elevator shaft would attach to the building, with Ms. Ossman expressing concern about damage to the historic fabric. Mr. Conkey said that he would work with the applicant to ensure that step flashing would be correctly installed.

Mr. Spencer preferred gray or mansard brown color for the elevator shaft cladding material.

Ms. Irwin preferred the mansard brown color, as did Ms. Roberts, Ms. Ossman, and Ms. Sennott.

Mr. Adams did not like the shape of the elevator shaft and spoke against the roof deck.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

### **13. BAR #2021-00148 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 421 Gibbon Street.

Applicants: Christine and Sam Thuot

#### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00148, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None.

#### **REASON**

The Board recognized the importance of protecting the home from future damage.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Sam and Christine Thuot, applicants, showed photos of flood damage and were available to answer questions.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Sprinkle expressed concern over potentially lost archaeological artifacts. Mr. Conkey will put the applicants in touch with Alexandria Archaeology.

Mr. Spencer noted that the project will change the character of the neighborhood but appreciates that it will protect the home.

Ms. Roberts enthusiastically supported protecting the home.

### **14. BAR #2021-00197 PG**

Request for alterations at 1321 Cameron Street.

Applicant: ZNB, LLC

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

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00197. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

N/A

#### **REASON**

The Board did not like some of the changes and felt they should be more in compliance with Design Guidelines.

## **SPEAKERS**

Ben Adada, applicant, was available to answer questions. He noted that Covid caused some complications in communicating with City agencies.

Stephen Milone, 907 Prince, noted that he had opposed the applicant's encroachment request (which City Council approved). He also felt that the changes to the building were unnecessary. He recommended that the Board defer the application and require the applicant to work with staff to change the grade of the sidewalk.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Sennott expressed concern that this was another after-the-fact application. She also disapproved of a back-lit sign.

Ms. Roberts felt that the railing and doors were inappropriate and disliked the changes to the building. She agreed with Mr. Milone's recommendation to defer the application.

Mr. Sprinkle asked about new doors cut into the south elevation.

Ms. Roberts thought that the demolition was over 25 square feet.

## **15. BAR #2021-00509 OHAD**

Request for partial encapsulation at 211 Duke Street.

Applicants: Linda and Griffin Leshner

### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Ms. Ossman and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00509, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None.

### **REASON**

The Board found the project appropriate and agreed with staff recommendations.

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Henry Brigham, representing the applicant, was available to answer any questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion.

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

16. Solar Panel Policy and Railing Design Policy. The Board unanimously approved the proposed changes to the policies, with the edit to replace the word "balusters" with "pickets" in the Railing Design Policy section of the memo.

The Board of Architectural Review unanimously approved a motion to create an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Best Practices for Development Projects.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

## **IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

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

BAR #2021-00511 PG

Request for window replacement at 923 Oronoco Street.

Applicant: Stephen Burwell

BAR #2021-00533 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 118 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Christ Church TRS OF

BAR #2021-00538 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 209 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Mark Kington

BAR #2021-00539 OHAD

Request for signage at 701 King Street.

Applicant: Jamels 701 King LLC

BAR #2021-00548 OHAD

Request for repointing at 109 Cameron Mew.

Applicants: Robert and Karen Boyd

BAR #2021-00550 OHAD

Request for repointing at 609 Oronoco Street.

Applicants: Marina and Frederick Lowther

BAR #2021-00551 PG

Request for roof replacement at 1003 Oronoco Street.

Applicant: Morgan Kinney

BAR #2021-00553 PG

Request for door replacement at 307 North Payne Street.

Applicant: David Nadrchal

BAR #2021-00554 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 417 Wilkes Street.

Applicant: Ann Mazor

BAR #2021-00555 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 423 Wilkes Street.

Applicant: Eion Kelley



BAR #2021-00556 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 421 Wilkes Street.  
Applicants: Thomasson Pergoy and Indie Cather

BAR #2021-00557 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 419 Wilkes Street.  
Applicant: John Burke

BAR #2021-00562 OHAD  
Request for signage at 1218 King Street.  
Applicant: Bill Cammack

BAR #2021-00563 PG  
Request for repointing at 506 North Columbus Street.  
Applicant: Amy Smithson

BAR #2021-00567 PG  
Request for roof replacement at 1008 Oronoco Street.  
Applicants: Donald and Jaki McCarthy

BAR #2021-00568 OHAD  
Request for signage at 610 Madison Street, #100.  
Applicant: Rachel Baron

BAR #2021-00570 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 106 Wolfe Street.  
Applicant: Robert Engstrom