

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
July 17, 2018 – 5:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers - City Hall

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, chair, Carl Schwarz; Mike Ball, Stephan Balut, Justin Sarafin, and Tim Mohr

BAR Members Absent: Breck Gastinger, Emma Earnst

Staff Present: Jeff Werner; Tim Lasley, Carolyn McCray

Call to Order: Chair –Melanie Miller called the meeting to order at 5:30

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

Madison Spencer: He said as a longtime member of the community and an architect, he remains stunned of the apparent missed opportunities in terms of sitting standards for going forward. He said he thinks Charlottesville has chosen to pursue the lowest common denominator. As far as someone looking from afar he sees successes in Charleston, Richmond even, but he said there is no bar low enough for what this board is approving. It pains him to see the last major conduit within the city limits, W. Main Street looking not much better than what he has seen in suburban Atlanta or New Jersey. He is looking to the BAR to explain what their mission is because for the life of him he can't imagine that there is any BAR that is in existence today regulating any of this.

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)

BAR 17-07-05
503 Lexington Avenue
Tax Parcel 530218000
Sean Lymon, owner/Alt Energy Inc., Daniel Walsh, applicant
Addition of Solar Panels

Robert Nickels: He is with Alt Energy, and he said he would like to install solar panels on 503 Lexington Ave and that realizes this is a historical property. He said it is not visible from the main street and it is in a good location to keep the integrity of the architectural nature of the home.

Motion by Schwarz to accept the consent agenda Seconded Gastinger motion passed 7-0 (with corrections)

2. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 17-10-08
550 East Water Street
Tax Parcel 530162300
Neal Sansovich, Owner/ Andrew Baldwin, Applicant
Amendments to the COA

David Wyatt: He is a city resident on 5th and Waters Street. He said as a friendly reminder and as a good neighbor that when this project was before the BAR in 2016, the BAR approval included a specific condition of the 3rd story trellis and lighting be appropriately adjusted upon installation. He said that was in consideration of the possible flood lighting effect on the nearby bedroom windows and living rooms of the neighboring residents. This residents live directly across the street and could potentially be on the receiving end of spill over flood

lighting that might shine upward and outward. In discussion the BAR members noted that the exact direction, shielding, and timing of the flood lighting is important and they accepted and incorporated. Mr. Nickels suggested the best way to take care of that is the appropriate adjustment upon installation. He brought it up because the work on the project is in about that stage and therefore it is timely now to remember this. He said he is sure the 550 people now and going forward contend to be thoughtful, considerate, good neighbors just as he is to them. But even with good intentions, un-intrusive lighting problem might not be obvious from their location but could be very obvious to the people on the receiving end.

Request to amend the COA approved on April 16, 2016:

- Construct an evening ATM vestibule/lobby. Modifications include:
- Extend bluestone paving to provide entry path from street
- Reconfigure previously scheduled black-framed storefront system to include entry door
- Illuminate path with type “S2” wall sconces

Exterior Light fixtures to match previously approved fixtures at similar entrances.

Interior lighting of the vestibule/lobby would include dimmable, recessed fixtures with a color temperature of 3000k, matching nearby exterior fixtures.

Staff recommends that any motion for approval clearly state the following:

- 1) Approval is only for the clearly specified work at and related to the ATM lobby; and
- 2) The base elevations used for this application are obsolete and used here for context only.

Questions from the public

Madison Spencer: he said this again is an example of a missed opportunity for a prominent bend on Waters Street calling it a holding cell for Summit New Jersey. He said because Water St is a terminating public street it looks like a hold cell, and this doesn't meet good modeling standards in this city. A master strategy he said is to the street face. He said the BAR is missing every opportunity on how to build in an urban environment and that they are welcome to email him.

Questions from the board:

Schwarz: said he wanted make sure of the changes: the transformer looks like it got smaller.

Werner: said this elevation looks like something the builder constructed, a really subtle change. His judgement was to be very specific about what at this corner we are looking at. Yes, there might be an error in the plan although our review of these does not buy license for a change. Has something different at the corner.

Schwarz: the transformer enclosure had street trees in front of it, why did you get rid of the tree?

Applicant: the transformer is smaller

Gastinger: it is a better fit.

Ball: sign elimination light referred to ground lighting in the record.

Comments from the public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the board:

Totally in keeping with the design, street tree is very confined, it's really close to the building.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, and for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed amendments to the COA approved on April 19, 2016 satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- The understanding that this COA applies only to the addition of an exterior entry at the west façade to accommodate street level access for a bank office requiring evening ATM access; the extension of bluestone paving to provide access to the ATM entry; the replacement of the approved Black Gum street tree with a

European Hornbeam; the elimination of a wood and steel bench at the public courtyard; the addition of two S2 wall sconces on the north façade matching fixtures approved at other entry locations; and the interior lighting of the ATM vestibule/lobby, which will include dimmable, recessed fixtures with a color temperature of 3000k, matching nearby exterior fixtures.

- The monument sign must come back to the BAR for review.
- The BAR would like to remind the applicant that all exterior lighting should be reviewed when installed, specifically the location, directions, shielding, and timing of those fixtures.

Gastinger seconded. Approved (7-0).

C. **Deferred Items**

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)**

BAR 17-03-03

612 Grove Avenue

Tax Parcel 510049100

Heather Carlton, owner/applicant

Screened porch

Questions from the public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the board:

Gastinger: Is the intention to only paint the post and trim of the screened porch and have all the other wood elements stained?

Carlton: said just as it appears here.

Comments from the public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the board:

Balut: He said he thinks it looks good, he likes the idea of going to horizontal boards. This could be noted in the motion or added in later.

Schwarz: He said he agreed and that you would definitely want to do horizontal boards. He said for the sake of consistency they need to see the changes in a detail and confirm it.

Miller: She said she agrees with the others, and agrees that this is much stronger application. This is appropriate because it meets the guidelines in the conservation district.

Justin: He said he agreed

However, some items remain unaddressed. Staff has requested that the applicant make available the following:

- Railing design and material.
- Deck stain color (or paint), if any.
- Height of the shorter section of privacy screen.
- Clarify condition at the west end of the 3'-0" deck extension.

Should these not be available for BAR review or, upon review, should the BAR find them unsuitable, a recommendation might be made for the applicant to request a deferral.

Motion: Balut moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions in Conservation Districts, I move to find that the proposed new porch addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the note that the applicant submit final details of the privacy screening, railings, and deviations from the submitted proposal to staff and be circulated to the BAR for approval. Schwarz seconded. Approved (7-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-06-02

315 East High Street

Tax Parcel 330067000

City of Charlottesville, Owner/ Scott Hendrix, Applicant

Amendments to COA

Dave Puckett: He said when they first applied for the COA the board made several recommendations and that they embraced those. He said what they did not realize was that the preferences for the mechanical equipment meant that the air chillers had to be bigger and the yard also had to get bigger. They realized that there would need to be some IT equipment on the same wall as the windows and the occupant said that they did not want to look out at the equipment yard either. Oversight on his part and that he is sincerely sorry that he did not mention this to Jeff when they spoke. They are keeping with the code and original design; all will match.

Request for amendments to COA

- Additional bay added onto mechanical area
- Change in metal gate
- Metal canopy added over rear entrance

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public

Questions from the Board:

Miller: asked if the mechanical yard has to be bigger could it turn so that it is not in front of the window?

Dave: he said possibly. His concern is that they would be strapping some space between the face of the wall and the building and he is not sure what they would do with that space. He would like to go back to the original mechanical equipment but that failed as an option. He said this is as close as they can get because the facilities have dictated how big the equipment has to be. But the space does not account for it gracefully.

Miller: asked if he knew the total square footage of the building

Dave: he said 15-18000 square feet

Miller: they do a lot of mechanical screening at the BAR but this seems like an unusually large footprint

Dave: said it is a ceremonial court room that can hold 200 people. Because of this he said there is a wild swing in heat load from nothing to filling it up and needing to heat or cool it. He said they have also made it more complicated by adding a sally port and holding cells. The real driver of the project was the construction of a second circuit court room where the occupancy can also change dramatically. Because of this he said the chillers have to be more robust.

Miller: asked if this the current mechanical screen more similar to what was proposed?

Dave: said currently it is just a tree and there is no screen.

Schwarz: asked if there was any intended planning for the space of grass around the building

Dave: said currently there is not but that the facilities are handling their landscaping efforts. He said there are two schools of thought though. One is that they want nice landscaping around the building but the other is a security concern for being able to see. He said he does lots and lots of courthouses and they are more and more pushing landscaping and development further ways from the front of the building and fitting the entire building with ballistic windows.

Miller: asked if these windows would make any change to the glass?

Dave: said no it will look the same - had a question about the detail of the circular detail on the top of the access gates?

Dave: said yes this matches the railings out front and the sally port.

Gastinger: asked are they relying on the access gate for any of the air make up for the equipment

Dave: said not directly but it helps

Comments from the public:

Comments from the Board:

Miller: said she would like to challenge that they push the applicant to see if there is any other solution. She said the mechanical yard is detailed very well but it is enormous. This is not the street facing view but a lot of people interact with this side of the building and it is an awful lot especially without landscaping.

Balut: said he has been on the board two and a half years and this is the best mechanical enclosure he has ever seen. He said he agrees that it might be large but it integrates with the architecture very well. The detail on the brick looks nice and he does not have a problem with it as it is proposed.

Schwarz: agreed and said that he thinks that this meets their guidelines and that he definitely wants the HVAC system working.

Sarafin: said he does not disagree with Melanie at all. He said he would like to recognize all of the constraints that the architect has to deal with it being a courthouse. He feels that the applicant has dealt with it handily.

Gastinger: said the detailing in the brick actually improves the base detail of the building. He said he would try and find a way to make it 2 or 3 feet longer to give a little more space for the windows. He does miss the previous gates which were more open and these are more transparent. He likes the steel but he would like some more opacity in the gates.

Dave: said this is something they can do and that it would not add significantly to the construction costs. He said there are a variety of things that they can do but they were trying to knit the components together. It is a little too transparent when you think about what you will see on the other side of gate.

Werner: said a lot of spaces downtown want to be able to see through the gates so this is something they are wrestling with.

Miller: said it looks like there may be a tree right in that zone

Dave: said there is a tree there on the parking lot island.

Werner: asked if they could discuss the window and how you want to treat it

Dave: said one of the things they did on the front and side elevations was to create some blind panels. He is not saying this is definitely the way to go but it could work well.

Staff finds the requested amendments to the COA appropriate.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements and Canopies, I move to find that the proposed Amendments to the COA, approved on June 20, 2017, satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following stipulations:

- Submit a less transparent gate to staff to be circulated to the BAR for approval.
- Align the screen wall with the center line between the two existing windows.
- The recommendation of planting a tree at the corner from the Charlottesville master tree list.
- The new window will match existing in-kind.

Sarafin seconded. Approved (7-0).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-06-01

404 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 280046000

New Dominion Bookshop, Owner/ NDB Land Trust/ George B. McCallum III and David W. Kudravetz Trustees, Applicant/ Carla Edwards Window replacement

Questions from the Applicant:

Shawn Martin: nothing to add.

Questions from the Board:

No questions from the board.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Sarafin: said he appreciates his colleagues going out to look at things on site and the letter from Keith and he has confidence in the assessment of the windows

Ball: said they took a good look at the windows and they are in terrible shape.

Schwarz: said one thing that they did notice was that the water coming in was not from the window but from the wall. He said there was concern that there may be water coming into the brick sill. It may be appropriate to take the brick sill off to help keep the water from getting into it.

Applicant: said yes they are planning on submitting another application to fix more things

Schwarz: asked is there still some discussion about the size of the muntins?

Werner: said after they went out there and saw the width of them there was a question about 1 inch and an 8th or 7/8ths but the inch and 8th is appropriate.

All are in favor of this application

Discussion and recommendation

Staff finds the request to replace the rear windows and the use new windows with simulated divided light with spacer bars to be appropriate within City Code and City Design Guidelines.

Staff commends the applicant for a thorough analysis and survey of the existing windows.

Schwarz: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed window replacements satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted to use 1 1/8 muntins seconded Balut, 7-0.

D. New Items

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-07-01

1819 University Circle

Tax Parcel 05003800

John Todd Rutter Lawrence, Owner/ John S.R. Lawrence, Applicant

Window replacement

Since this is a noncontributing structure, the BAR should discuss if the replacement of these windows will have an adverse impact on the surrounding contributing structures in the ADC district. The BAR should also discuss whether a more detailed window survey is necessary.

Comments from the applicant:

John Todd Rutter Lawrence: said unfortunately the picture reported to be 1819 is actually 1817 which has the same windows that he is trying to put in. He has these windows and they work great. He said he rents this house to UVA students and they have a limited budget for heating and cooling and that is why he wants to change the windows

Questions: from the public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the board:

Sarafin: confirmed that they were actually talking about the brick around the windows constructed in 1980

Comments from the public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the board:

Miller: noted that this is a noncontributing building however the guidelines state that prior to replacing or repairing of windows a survey of the existing windows must be done. She said this is what they talked about with the previous applicant who had not done the survey and they asked them to return with the survey to prove that the windows needed replacement. Number two, she said is to retain original windows when possible. Number five, repair original windows if they can be repaired. Six, replace parts of historic windows that are beyond repair. Seven replace entire windows only when they are missing or beyond repair. Also she said they specifically recommend against replacing windows with vinyl.

Sarafin: said vinyl windows are discouraged. He said he understands that the applicant's neighbor has vinyl windows but they did not get approval for those windows so it does not matter.

Miller: said since the building was built in 1980 it is not historic. So he said he does not see an issue with replacing the windows but they do need to meet the guidelines with something that is not vinyl
said to Carl's point and while noting the guidelines they are talking about restoring and repairing 1980s windows. He said replacing them is the best option and the questions is with what.

Schwarz: agrees that vinyl is not the best choice but some of the other options would work

Sarafin: Aluminum clad windows offer a much clearer detail

The proposed replacement windows have the following features:

- Double hung
- White, custom metal wrapped exterior trim
- Simulate divided lights
- 6x6 Colonial style grid pattern
- Foam insulation inside jambs and head

Miller: said there is support for replacing the windows without a survey. She asked there consensus on accepting the applicant's request for vinyl windows or suggesting something that meets the guidelines

Schwarz: said he would recommend that the applicant request a deferral

Balut: said he agrees with Carl.

Response from the Applicant:

Said their prejudice against vinyl has no basis in engineering. He said they should deal with facts not prejudices. Vinyl will perform better than wood or clad and it has superior thermal properties to the alternates. He said he's extremely disappointed that people can inflict requirements that they do not have to pay for. He is all in favor of keeping the neighborhood looking exactly the same and his house looks just like the house next door. He does not understand the process and he hopes that he does not have to make a big issue of this but he will. He said it looks the same from the outside. It is safe and durable and energy efficient and the engineering criteria is met. Prejudice against vinyl is only a prejudice with no basis on fact. He said thousands of windows have been installed this way and they are durable and energy efficient and they look just like the ones on his neighbor's house. If his neighbor was able to do it he should be too.

Schwarz said he is recommending a deferral. If they put that on the applicant it would require the applicant to come to the next meeting. Asked the applicant if they would like to request a deferral.

John Todd Rutter Lawrence: said there is a difference in price between what the board wants and what he is offering. He says there is not engineering difference between the vinyl windows and the wood clad windows. He sees no reason in putting this off and if he has to take them to court he will.

Ball: Said he could offer a difference from an engineering perspective. Vinyl and glass move at very different rates so when the vinyl moves it causes thermal seal failures in the glass and it fogs the windows. These

windows have had issues in the past. Said if the applicant looked into fiberglass windows they are better made and move at the same rate and would not cost too much more.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed rehabilitations do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted. Lohendro seconded. Denied (7-0).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-07-04

0 East Water Street

Tax Parcel 570157800

Alan Taylor, Owner/ Ashley Davies, Applicant

Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Ashley Davies, Williams Mullen: land use planner at Williams-Mullen representing Choco-Cruz LLC, said unused coal and pigeon droppings are visible beneath the tower. From afar, it looks really cool, but the closer you get to it, you're like, this structure is really disgusting. The proposed rehabilitation would remove paint and graffiti from the tower, clean its concrete base and sides, and seal its roof with a waterproof barrier. It also would remove miscellaneous metal from the tower, including an antenna-like structure placed on the roof in 2000 for a modern art installation.

Joe Simpson, of Atlas Construction Management, shared a plan with the BAR to make the coal tower safe and not an eyesore. Simpson proposed repairing and replacing window frames and switching out existing light fixtures underneath the coal tower with bronze-colored fixtures that resemble the tower's scone-shaped roof.

Questions from the public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the board:

Gastinger: he asked about the steel at the top of the structure. It is all lumped together as miscellaneous steel. Some of it was definitely added but some of it seems original. Are you taking all of it off or is there any differentiation between different parts.

Mr. Simpson: said they are planning on taking all of it off. Said when the project is built out it is very tall and it would be hard to maintain things up there so it is easier to just take it all off.

Schwarz: said they are filling all the holes in and you are taking the vent off the roof. Is it going to be air tight or is it going to be open at all? Will these lead to condensation at any time or rust on the inside?

Mr. Simpson: said he is not an expert but does not think that moisture will get in. He said his main goal is to seal it and keep wildlife out. If they did not put something solid on the bottom coal would continue to drop out.

Schwarz: asked if they have thought about taking all of the coal out and cleaning it?

Mr. Simpson: said the main goal is just to keep people from going inside

Lahendro: asked is this on a national historic register?

Mr. Simpson: said as far as they know this is just an individually protected structure in the city. In 2008 there was a listing of several properties that were individually listed and this was added because they knew that the city walk property was going to be developed.

Lahendro: said that the guidelines would require them to maintain the historic features of the structure and he is bothered by them taking off the metal parts on the top that are part of the historic structure. He said it needs to be surveyed and documented when these features were put on and this would guide them as far as what is historic and what needs to be retained or preserved.

Ashley Davies: said she appreciates this comment. She said they feel strongly that before the residences go up they would like to remove any of these metal structures. They are happy to document these features but with

people living so closely they feel that the metal needs to be removed.

Comments from the public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the board:

Lahendro: said it does not have to be an either or of safety or preservation. There could be ways to make them inaccessible and still preserve the historic character.

Gastinger: said he agrees and is not necessarily against the removal of these pieces. But he said he feels that they do not have the information about the importance of these features before they consider removing them. He is thrilled that the investment is being made to maintain this structure. He also supports the maintenance and the efforts to preserve the structure but preserving the legibility of some of the openings is important to show how this structure functioned in the past.

Schwarz: said he would love to see if there was some way to put back the staircase – not all the way to the ground so a kid could climb up but so that the top could be reached by a cherry picker instead of a crane. He said a lot of the metal features are what give it some character instead of it being just a concrete silo. The rust and the iron give it the feeling of the historic railroad character. He is getting a lot of information from a 2012 C’ville article. He is not sure how he stands on the removal of everything but does think that they need better documentation.

Miller: agreed that filling in the openings is good as long as there is a setback so that the impression of an opening remains.

Ball: said he wants to agree but sees that it is difficult to ask the applicant to take rusting metal and keep it and make it safe and maintain it. Said he agrees with figuring out what is original and what is not. There is a hodgepodge of metal at the top now and all of it looks like it is falling apart.

Balut: said he would like to see a rendering of the actual final proposed project. Right now they do not have a good way to tell what the finished project will look like especially without knowing what is being preserved and what is being removed. It is in a good direction but is still not quite complete. The applicant’s appreciation of the tower is good but it would be nice if it was appreciated in a stronger way to make sure they were doing everything they could to maintain the structure for the historic fabric of the city

Miller: asked if this this an application that they may want to defer? She also mentioned that the applicant also wanted to hear about the possible retaining wall.

Gastinger: asked how tall would the retaining wall be?

Applicant: answered two and a half feet

Davies: asked for a deferral to continue rehabilitation of the project.

Motion: Schwarz, Seconded by Lahendro to accept the deferral.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-07-02

430 North 1st Street

Tax Parcel 330088100

George and Austine Howard, Owner/ Scott Weiss, Applicant

Addition and Modifications

Scott Weiss, architect: said he wants to change the style of the railings to something in keeping with contemporary part of the house and in keeping with the addition and anything we add is a little bit different. We are replacing items that are starting to fall apart: the deck, stairs, parking areas, resurface with the brick that matches the house. The widening of the bridge at the entry, it is important to make it look like the shutter are open, not just hanging but are sitting on something and is actually an improvement. The openings in the back addition; the windows are not the same as the awning windows. These are a little more classical, and in keeping with the style of the addition, still not divided as a lot of the older houses in the neighborhood and keeping them vertical as most of the windows are.

Mr. Howard: said one thing to consider is the owners appeared before you in the fall of 2017 and they decided not to go ahead with the project because it got too expensive, they sold the house and we were fortunate enough to buy it.

Mr. Weiss: the massing of the addition in the back is slightly different from their massing of their addition and the back of the parking area now is concrete block wall and pictures of the trash containers sitting right in front for everyone to see. Even though this was something they asked for and it was approved. We kept the back of the parking area to have a low wall with a gate matching the other railings so that we could put wood storage, bikes and garbage out of peoples view.

Questions from the public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the board:

Gastinger: asked about the color you are intending to paint the railings and the wood paneling shows up in several locations.

Mr. Weiss: said the railings would be black and we are proposing the main body of brick to be the lighter off white and the bands which are currently a red brick but are slightly darker paint for that and for the wooden bump outs on the house itself.

Gastinger: asked about the intention regarding a landscape plan as was previously proposed or are there any plans to do any landscape changes.

Howards: no not really.

Comments from the public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the board

Ball: he doesn't see any issues, paint or not to paint. He doesn't have an issue to paint.

Sarafin: the design intent and level of brick work detail is sought of what makes the house, banding and subtlety of the brick work but it's really more about the intent of the original design

Gastinger: does hold significant with the UVA fall lesson from the lawn class, not to paint brick an interpretation of pavilion architect he saw and taught his students and for those reasons he cannot support painting of this house, the addition, massing and strategy is appropriate, and the investment put into this house is really admirable and glad to see it. He likes the idea of the potential incorporation of the historic rail, better than the quazi historic rail and could be an interesting addition that is clearly not a part of the original intention but a way to incorporate contemporary re interpretation of that entrance.

Balut: agrees with what Breck just said and he feels strongly about painting the brick. It is surprising how quickly this building became iconic and is quite lovely and powerful and it not being painting is a huge part of that power and there is a lot of reason and meaning for its temporary abstraction of a lot of history that is shared from UVA to Charlottesville and beyond. He is in support of everything except painting the brick.

Schwarz: said everything you're proposed is fine but the painting. He said you can't really remove paint from brick; it does slowly come off and you create a maintenance out of something that doesn't really have maintenance attached to it. He has to think about what this might look like when it starts to fade and flake off.

He wants to see a rendering of the exterior, maybe some color elevations. The current banding is much darker and much more contrast and maybe the subtlety would be nice, under this light they're pretty close and maybe in the day light is different but that would help him make that decision.

Lahendro: he dislikes painting of the brick. Conforms to the proportions. Strongly object painting the brick.

Staff recommends that the BAR discuss the following

- The use of custom double-hung pocket gravity windows on the sun room addition in juxtaposition with the existing windows on the existing house.
- The replacement of the rails on the front entry bridge, staircase, and deck, with new steel rails.
- The replacement of existing gutters with copper gutters to match the proposed copper scupper and downspout on the proposed addition.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed new additions and modifications to the original house satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following modifications:

- Proposed railing detail must be submitted to staff to be circulated to the BAR for approval.
- Photos showing proposed brick next to existing brick to be submitted to staff to be circulated to the BAR for approval.
- Color choices to be submitted to for administrative approval.
- The BAR does not approve the request to paint the existing exterior brick.

Lohendro seconded. Approved (7-0).

Break - 8:30 - 8:45

D. New Construction

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)

BAR 18-07-03

815 East High Street

Tax Parcel 530197000, 530196000, 530195000, 530194100, 530198000, 530199000,
530200000, 530201000, 530202000

Tarleton Oak, LLC, Owner/ Jennifer Feist, Applicant

New Construction

Andrew Moore: Ashley Davies

Frank Hancock, Timmons group: phase one approval and the rear of the property
The massing and articulation of the building.

Questions from the public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the board:

No questions from the board.

Comments from the public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board

Breck: as far as the landscape plans from the previous meeting, the species of trees added seem appropriate. The internal gardens are concern, he feels in this district and building it is really left to the discretion of the designer. The approach and strategies of the residential unit are appropriate, changes of improvements breaking down the scale and making it feel better related to the residential neighborhood and the street. There are a couple of items that are a bit odd and some scaler proportional changes. 1) the eighth street elevation, idealized façade that moves to the south end of eighth street where there are 3 stories that are visible; 2) as the street rising up, moving to the north the idealized façade is sort of like water level rising the stair and the arch way doesn't change in anyway. It feels really weird. There is a hobbit size opening and only a couple of risers and a medium one and a large one and he understands why that would happen in a normal course of developing a building. 3) the other is related to scale as the water band feels a bit thin understated for the proportions of the building as set out with a pretty strong base. The water course seems appropriate on a couple of façades on 8th Street looks pretty well adjusted and also to the west side of the maple street elevation. As the base course moves further to the east and approaches left hand side of that court excess it really starts to get very high and by the time you get around to Lexington Avenue elevation, the water line is halfway up the building, and it feels like an old man with his pants pulled up to his belly button awkward is there room for changing the last bay and turn the corner directly behind the residence a little bit more. Developed for a 3 story building instead of a 4 story building, the key stones on some windows not on all of them.

Ball: he said the key stones are oddly thrown in and is not sure about the accent brick and how it is going to feel in there to break it up and that is great; but a darker color might be a little more successful.

Lahendro: said he has concerns about the elevation facing the pedestrian walkway on the east side; it is strange to him that even some small openings might add some interest than a blank recessed panels, vines, shrubbery, anything to improve or break down the scale.

Earnst: Guidelines: larger building, this is done very well, the water table is basically in line with the roof line of the building next door. There were 4 more trees along the rear and bummed to see them disappeared.

Is there all internal down pouts: yes off white

Miller: overall massing;

Schwarz: said any vegetation you can add would be beneficial. Putting some trees in the backyard of some of those houses will help that space feel a little more sheltered, greener and private.

Arches on 8th street

The water table turn North corner

The keystones

The accent brick color contrast

The trees between the existing houses back-drop

Vegetation between walkway

Note the tree species

Point of clarification: additional trees to the mass of the building

Pedestrian, makes the suggestion holly appropriate to help get some different buffer

The garage lighting, less harsh and the color of the light

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions in Conservation Districts, I move to find that the proposed height and massing of Phase II of this project satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this properties and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the height and massing as submitted with the following investigations to be reviewed by the BAR at a further meeting:

- Along the 8th Street elevation, address the heights of the arched openings [between the staircases], which get shorter from south to north. (Page 14 revised.)
- At the NE corner, address the height of the water table band [from where the grade drops at the arched opening on Maple Street, continuing east and around the corner onto the east elevation]. (Pages 15 revised and 18.)
- At the upper floor window arches, the keystones appear random. (Pages 12 revised, 14 revised, and 18.)

- Either revise the accent brick to produce more contrast (for example, use a darker brick) or provide a design narrative to support using the one presented [on July 17]. (Pages 12 revised, 14 revised, and 18.)
- Add large trees (conforming to the city’s tree list) within the space between the back of the five houses on Lexington Avenue and the east facade of the parking/residential structure. (Pages 9 revised and 13 revised.)
- Add vegetation along the walls on either side of the pedestrian walk between the back of the five houses on Lexington Avenue and the east facade of the parking/residential structure. (Pages 9 revised, 13 revised and 18.)
- Note on the plan the proposed tree species
- Address the visibility from the outside of the lighting within the parking structure.

Earnst seconded. Approved (8-0).

E. Other Business

11. 815 Tarleton Oak Glass Discussion

On July 17, 2017, at the request of the ERB, the BAR regarding the definition of clear glass and the corresponding 70 VLT that has become the city’s standard.

Background:

While one of several factors used in specifying glass, Visual Light Transmittance (VLT) is generally accepted as the measure of the clearness and reflectivity of glass. High VLT indicates the glass is clearer and less reflective; low VLT indicate less clear, more reflective glass.

The city’s Design Guidelines for Architectural Design Control Districts and Entrance Corridors (EC projects are reviewed by the Entrance Corridor Review Board, or ERB) both recommend “clear glass.” However neither guidelines refers to a specific VLT—see citations below. Several years ago, after evaluating the criteria used to specify glass, the BAR (and the ERB) began using 70 VLT as the threshold for clear glass; tacitly establishing it as the standard.

Summary of BAR Discussion:

BAR concluded that VLT 70 should remain the preference relative to clear glass. However, they acknowledged the case-by-case flexibility offered in the Design Guidelines; specifically, though not exclusively, that this allows for the consideration of alternatives—e.g. VLTs below 70--and that subsequent BAR decisions regarding glass should be guided by the project’s location (e.g. on the Downtown Mall versus a side street), the type of windows and location on the building (e.g. a street level storefront versus the upper floors of an office building), the fenestration design (e.g. continuous glass walls versus punched windows), energy conservation goals, the intent of the architectural design, matching historical glass, and so on.

Additionally, the BAR recommends that the ERB consider a similar approach in its evaluation of the glass proposed for EC projects.

12. PLACE report: no Place report

F. Adjournment - 10:39