

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
August 21, 2018 – 5:30 p.m.  
City Council Chambers - City Hall**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). After presentations by staff and the applicant, members of the public will be allowed two opportunities to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. The Chair will first ask for questions from the public, then from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to ask questions, and up to three minutes to comment. Comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

**PLEASE NOTE THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATUM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT [http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)**

**5:30 A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)**

There were no matters from the public.

**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.)

- |                   |               |                 |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| <b>1. Minutes</b> | June 19, 2018 | Regular Meeting |
|                   | July 17, 2018 | Regular Meeting |

Motion: Balut moved to approve the June 19, 2018 and July 17, 2018 minutes, with the discussed changes. Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0-1, with Mohr abstained, since he was not in attendance at the meeting).

**5:40 C. Deferred Items**  
**2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 18-07-04  
0 East Water Street  
Tax Parcel 570157800  
Alan Taylor, Owner/ Ashley Davies, Applicant  
Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: Since it is not included in the packet, can you tell us exactly where the lighting will be?

Applicant: Under the coal tower, under the coal shed, and behind the shed.

Mohr: Would that be a goose neck version?

Applicant: Yes.

Gastinger: You said the Sally Heming's statue was meant to be a temporary structure, can you explain a more about that?

Applicant: The artist's website describes the temporary nature of the statue.

Gastinger: I assume the Bache court is supposed to go right in between the columns?

Applicant: No, because we are allowing room for an actual walkway.

Gastinger: There are areas in the plan that are just white, are those areas lawn?

Applicant: Yes, that is all grass. The existing coal tower structure is where there is actual structure, there is not actual ground surface.

Gastinger: Could you tell us move about the concrete pavers?

Applicant: Our intention is match what is there

Mohr: What is the curve in the walkway?

Applicant: That is a radius so vehicles can make the wide turn.

Sarafin: More of a question, could we walk through the image on the bottom right? And follow up question, what would we be losing with those pieces going away?

Applicant: Sure. [Makes a small presentation explaining the image]

#### Comments from the Public:

Jerry Fitzgerald: I am excited about this project. Charlottesville used to be a railroad town, and I think that is lost in the current downtown. It is nice that this project speaks to that history.

#### Comments from the Board:

Mohr: I think this is a cool building. The site plan seems a little fussy and strange to me. It seems to me like the building should be straight forward and square cut, to me it is trying to be too artsy.

Gastinger: I am in support with most of the application, with the exception of the removal of the metal on the top of the building. While Charlottesville architectural guidelines are not clear about metal on structures the Secretary of Interior Standards does provide specific guidance in this issue. These guidelines do specifically discuss retaining and preserving metal features that are important in designing the historic character, stabilizing, protecting, repairing, and maintaining metal work, only after all of those have been exhausted can you replace metal. I think the metal is absolutely essential in understanding the function of this structure, and I do understand and sympathize with the challenge of trying to weigh the cost of that maintenance and safety aspect, but I think from our guidelines perspective that is a key feature that shouldn't be moved. I wish we knew more about the Sally Heming's statue, but I know there is a considerable cost associated with removing that in one piece to preserve it

Ball: I do not have a problem with removing the metal. I think if it comes between preserving a structure or letting it deteriorate, let us take some of the metal off, so the rest of it can be preserved.

Sarafin: As a compromise, if you keep the platform by the door, it makes sense of the door, as well as allowing the history of the structure to be told.

Balut: I agree. I would like to see that staircase preserved as well.

Gastinger: The front planting strip, in between the sidewalk and Bache court. There is something splashy and ornamental in the design of that, which does not fit in the industrial landscape you are trying to make. There is also a fence we haven't discussed.

Applicant: The fence will be made to match the fence that is already in existence.

Gastinger: I think grass can work there, just not the grass they have, a more native grass would work there.

Miller: It looks like there is support for the compromise that Justin [Sarafin] proposed earlier.

Mohr: How about straightening out the fence instead of causing a pinch point?

Applicant: Yes, that is fine.

Motion: Sarafin moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, and Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed park design and

rehabilitations to the Coal Tower satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following additions:

- The lower platform [outside of the door at top of tower] to be retained if possible
- Consent to replace windows if repair is not feasible
- Simplify the design of the park
- Explore different grasses to use in the stripe between the sidewalk and Bocce court
- Provide a lighting plan for under the tower.
- Interpretive signs will come back to the BAR for review

Changes to the site plan will be turned into staff and put on the consent agenda for approval next month. Balut seconded. Approved (7-1, with Gastinger opposed.)

**D. New Items**

**6:00**

**3. Preliminary Discussion**

BAR 18-08-02

310 4<sup>th</sup> Street NE

Tax Parcel 330205L00

Great Eastern Management, Owner/ Henningsen Kestner Architects, Applicant

Renovation and addition of square footage and patio area

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: What sort of impact do you anticipate the additions having on the trees?

Applicant: The trees on High Street would stay, the trees on 4<sup>th</sup> Street will need to be replaced, and the trees on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street will have to be evaluated, but they might need to be replaced.

Balut: Have you looked into matching the existing materials?

Applicant: We have done some preliminary research, and we are 95% sure we can match the materials.

Miller: Is there anything about the design you are excited about? What are these additions bringing to the historic district?

Applicant: The additions add some articulation to the building. I also think we are engaging the street a bit more.

Schwarz: Are you intending to use tinted windows or not?

Applicant: The intent is to match what is there, which are tinted windows.

Miller: Originally, the glass was supposed to be clear, it was not installed as such. Would you be replacing that glass?

Applicant: We would want the glazing to match.

Mohr: Look at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street elevations, I don't see anything that feels as deep as the perspective implies.

Applicant: I think that is just the perspective.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Balut: I think engaging the street is a good thing, a couple of things I would do is put in some nice landscaping, smaller scale grasses and trees, and some larger trees for the street. One thing that is missing from these drawings are some railing and awning. Right now everything is very blocky. I think some finer details would help with the pedestrian human scale. For the most part the massing and the strategy is very sound.

Schwarz: I have some problems with this design mainly the infill of the courtyard and bringing the solid mass of the building closer to the street. I think bringing it forward with this much mass and solidity makes it feel more imposing and less residential. Infilling the courtyard is a concern, because I think having that courtyard there breaks up the mass of the building. I would like to see you all do something correct with the windows, and change them all out. I think there is an opportunity there.

Mohr: I understand the massing strategy, but I breaking it up to create a lighter approach would be better. That way you feel the mass of the building behind it, but it is overall a more residential and city street feel. It seems too simplistic to pull the opening from the previous building forward and it is fighting the massing, this would make it much more active. I think the brick approach is too heavy handed.

Gastinger: I agree, I think this building could benefit that other level of detail and lightness. There are some concerns from us about this building and the impact these additions will have on the street scape, so I think having a good site plan that included the streets and landscaped areas, in addition to the street level perspectives will be very helpful. I am very concerned about the parking entrance and its impact on the street. A good understanding on what the landscape plan alterations are going to be, will be appreciated.

Mohr: Since the parking is not high volume, I think the parking could be one lane coming out to the street.

Schwarz: That is a conversation about the zoning code.

Miller: I agree with the others. A loss of the trees that close to the park is a big loss, I think you have the ability to make it a better building than what is there. I would also encourage you to take the opportunity to fix the glass.

Sarafin: I agree with what has been said. As you are making this more residential, thinking about that as a whole, might be able to help influence some of the design direction.

Ball: This feels really leggy, but that might be a perspective thing. Everything just feels very big.

Mike Ball recused himself for this item.

- E. New Construction**
- 6:20 4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
  - BAR 16-01-04
  - 512-514, 600 West Main Street
  - Tax Parcel 290007000, 290006000, and 290008000
  - Heirloom West Main Development LLC, Owner/Heirloom West Main Development LLC, Applicant
  - Amendments to the COA – final details

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:

Miller: I think the signage is appropriate, I think the changes to the storefront you are proposing are appropriate, especially extending the mini mart, but I do not approve replacing windows that have a wooden frame, the painting of the brick it is against the guidelines and takes away from the history. Painting the storefronts a similar color to the new structure, reminds me of the first meetings where you all tried to make the case that these buildings were not important, those permits were denied, and I think painting over the store

fronts erases the history, and we want those store fronts to stand proud of the new construction, painting them all the same color would be a mistake.

Mohr: It is interesting the color rendering and the black and white rendering hint that the buildings have a completely different tonality, which would make a big difference, because the colors would be within the same family, but still jump forward. I think they would be absorbed into the main building, and not have any personality of their own.

Schwarz: I agree with Miller on signage. For the Blue Moon storefront, the piece that is completely rotted out I think you can re-mill something, but if not, you should replace them in kind. I think there is character to the profile of the wooden frames. As far as the paint colors, I do not agree with it, and I have mentioned that I don't like the color scheme for the new structure anyway.

Mohr: It starts sainting the houses, it takes away their character and sense of individuality. Whitewashing them over is not really appropriate, they need to continue to have some of their own personality.

Sarafin: I am going to take a slightly different direction. I have no problem with new storefronts, on the two store front additions to the historic houses. As long as the opens in the masonry for the two store front are kept, I don't take issue with new storefront windows. The painted brick is tricky, since two of the sides are painted already. I understand your point Melanie [Miller], but I also understand needing to consolidate and make that a functional space. The jury is still out on that one. ,

Gastinger: I think the concept behind the signage is a good one, but I find the graphic hard to read.

Balut: I think the signage is fine. I think the store fronts are a tricky. As far as the windows, I can completely understand why you would like to replace that, and I support replacement of the metal store front. The wood storefront is easier to work with and replace, and it helps enrich the context of the historic buildings in their new setting. As far as the paint color, I think we are bowing to the presence of these historic buildings in a strong way, but then in the paint color you are muting them down and not celebrating them at all. I think the historic story that is told from the paint and infilled openings of the back wall could be really powerful, and attractive.

Mohr: Devil's advocate question, is it an appropriate place for a mural?

Motions:

Signs:

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the concept of the proposed signs satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the signs in-concept with the provision that all illuminated signage shall appear to be lit white at night. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0)

Brick infill at south elevation of 512-514 West Main Street:

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the proposed brick infill at the two, first floor openings satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with these properties and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0.)

Painting of brick at south and west elevations of 512-514 West Main Street:

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the proposed painting of the unpainted brick walls does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with these properties and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR denies this portion of the application as submitted. Balut seconded. Denied (7-0.)

Color scheme for Blue Moon diner and Mini Mart:

Motion: Schwarz moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0.)

Storefront renovation of historic, single-story commercial additions:

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the proposed storefront renovations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with these properties and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modifications:

- Maintain the wood storefront on Blue Moon diner (514 West Main Street), and replace in-kind
- Approve the replacement of the aluminum door of the Blue Moon diner (514 West Main Street), with the door replacement to come back to be put on the consent agenda for the next month's meeting
- Approve the replacement of the storefront of the Mini Mart (600 West Main Street); lite pattern and dimensions to match existing
- Approve the replacement of plywood panels [in Mini Mart storefront] with glazed panels

Balut seconded. Approved (6-1, with Sarafin opposed.)

**6:40**            **5.        Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
BAR 18-03-01  
843 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 310175000  
Kim Dabney, Owner/ Clark Gathright, Applicant  
Proposal for new three-story office building

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Balut: You said you aren't using the spandrel panels?

Applicant: Correct.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: While I supported the massing of the building, and I think that the architect took the BAR comments into consideration, I do not think I can support this building any further because it is not compatible with the BAR Guidelines. [Reads through guidelines]

Schwarz: Is it 22 feet to the recessed portion or the planter?

Applicant: To the planter.

Schwarz: Personally, I think a contemporary design could fit in this location. I think it could be very successful.

Gastinger: I think the project would benefit from having design intention for the plaza space. I think it would be good for the city and the general reading of the building. The applicant is going to run into some problems with the clear glass, and I believe you will be back trying to change some of that. Some of the verticality read a bit awkward to me.

Earnst: It seems to me, that we have the most information about the materials, and I don't have any problems with the materials in moderation, but I don't see the relationship of this building to the rest of the street. As it is presented right now, I cannot vote in support of this.

Balut: I think you have done well with modulating the front façade. By articulating a heavier band around the second floor, you have made a solid base and further mitigated the scale in a successful way. Miller brings up

good points about the guidelines and Schwarz makes equally good points about the context of West Main Street, and I think this proposal is somewhat in line with that changing concept.

Schwarz: I think brick needs to be included to break up the metal a bit, and to bring some historic context to the structure.

Gastinger: I think putting a rendering of what this building looks like in place would help both the applicant and the board.

Applicant: I don't think it makes sense to get into the weeds of this design until the design concept is either accepted or rejected by the board. In what way is the city being harmed if this building is built on West Main Street?

Miller: I think the board is trying to figure out if this is a building that they can support with a little more work.

Schwarz: This is something I could support.

Ball: I would like to see more context before I could vote for or against this.

Sarafin: I appreciate Schwarz's comments on this structure and its location. I think with the right details pulled together, I could support this.

Gastinger: I think there is opportunity for this type of contemporary building on West Main Street. The challenge that I have is while I think the scale and massing could work, the detailing might not happen to make this structure feel at home on West Main Street.

Applicant: I don't think I can design a building how the owner wishes it to be and that the BAR thinks fits within the guidelines.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, move to find that the proposed office building satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modifications and requirements

- Does not approve the back elevation and would like to see that revised
- Submit a landscaping plan; explain why the plaza is designed as such
- Approves the concept of recessed lighting in the canopies; need additional information
- Approves the use of metal [ACM] panels
- Approves the general configuration elevations
- Does not approve the ground faced block; investigate another material that relates to West Main Street

Mohr seconded. Denied (2-5-1, Schwarz and Mohr for; Miller, Gastinger, Balut, Earnst, and Ball opposed; and Sarafin abstained.)

Motion: Schwarz moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Mohr seconded. Approved (8-0.)

**7:10**            **6.        Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
BAR 17-11-03  
200 2<sup>nd</sup> Street SW  
Tax Parcel 280069000, 280071000, 280072000, 280073000, 280074000, 280075000  
Market Plaza LLC, Owner/ Keith O. Woodard, Applicant  
New Construction

Sacha Rosen: They have preliminary certificate of appropriate that has allow us to file for a building permit but you all had some specific comments about the details of the project and we are moving forward with that. Gave the report on Market Plaza LLC, with Keith O. Woodard is the applicant, he stated he wants to focus on the brick and the masonry and the end comment they heard from Mr. Schwarz asking for more detail and articulation on the two principle facades and that is what we have focused on. They want to buy the brick not necessarily this exact brick but some design intent for the brick as well as the material also for the detailing. We intend to start construction at the end of October if possible. We have to get

through some permitting issues and some site plan comments that are coming back so hopefully the reviewers will start reviewing the actually building permit as soon as possible. That is our intent to move forward based on the partial COA that we got last time we have actually purchased many of the trades and are ready to move forward. The main changes we have made prior to this meeting are:

- Window metering has been updated on Water's Street and 2<sup>nd</sup> street SW to break the masonry and facades. The main concern was too much consistency on these facades
- Window metering has been updated on Water
- Street and 2nd Street SW to break up the masonry facades
- Pilasters have been used to create hierarchy along the Water Street facade
- Signage panels of alternate brick coursing have been added at Retail and Events signage locations
- Signage has been added at garage entry
- Retail canopies have been adjusted to step with grade along Water Street
- Additional alternate coursing detail has been added at Office Entry and Market Entry
- Trellis has been added at the appurtenance level
- Refined coursing detail at Residential Entry and Retail Entry
- East side wall has additional brick wall portions
- Bases of storefronts along Water and 2nd Street have been made metal panel to match frames
- Plaza paving pattern has been redesigned to subtly delineate circulation and vendor spaces (warm grays and tans)

#### Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

#### Questions from the Board:

Ball: Is the cylindrical concrete piers on the balconies a new need because of not being able to cantilever them?

Sacha: The piers on the balcony have always been there.

Ball: were they always in the previous images?

Rosen: Yes sir.

Schwarz: Are those the metal colors,

Rosen: yes those are the main colors for the main part of the upper façade and these are the window mullions for the retail and office component that go with the brick and also some of the railing elements.

Schwarz: said these are the brick that you are thinking or are these the idea that you are thinking.

Rosen: This is the design intent, if I pick a certain brick and the price triples, this will be the colors and then we will invite a masonry bidders to provide bricks that look like this and with your permission he will work with staff to make sure that if you like those brick it's close enough.

Miller: are you still looking to do the same color mortar, or a contrasting mortar

Rosen: generally fairly matching but in this context will be slightly lighter than the lighter red brick but there will be more contrast where we are looking for the punch accent

#### Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

#### Comments from the Board:

Miller: she would be in favor of a little more contrast between the brick and the mortar, just because it highlights a little more detail. The additional detailing you have done with the brick is really nice the addition of a second color is helpful just because there is a lot of it. She is not sure of the pilasters interrupting that decorative band at the top of the break but doesn't think that is a make or break detail. The trellis in the courtyard seems like it is a little bit off from the rest of the building vocabulary so she was wondering if you would consider something made out of the same metal that you are using in the canopies or something similar; or also in your precedent images you've got one with a frame around the edges instead of leaving them



sticking out and she thought that was a little more successful and she likes the pallet for the plaza and could go either way with the brick pathway or not but can see what you are getting at but doesn't think it is mandatory but either way could be fine.

Mohr: said the street façades are way more activated now than the canopies and the additional detail and thinks that works really well. He said Melanie's point about the trellis might be well taken but seems to be too many layers. One of the examples of the steel frame with just the wood on top that was more in keeping with the canopy and other things that do not have any kind of compound build up but generally he thinks bringing in that darker brick helps to punch it up a little bit more was very appropriate and what you are trying to do in the plaza makes a lot of sense too. From his perspective you responded to everything we talked to you about.

Sarafin: agree with Tim, it is way more activated. The two main facades altering the canopy height really made a difference with the just the pedestrian scale. It is almost scary.

Mohr: said in playing with those proportions really manage to knock down the intention of the parking garage and it is really diminished which is a great thing and still one of those things that drives him crazy is right there on that corner with all of the pedestrian so he thinks that has diminished it quite a bit.

Miller: said when it comes to approving the signage there is a hard and fast rule and although she likes it a lot we cannot approve it.

Schwarz: some of the moves in elevations looking very good, your proportion systems all makes sense but they are all 1/2 inch moves and he thinks the base of the building will feel like a big block. He said he is not sold. Yes you have made some improvements, but he is stuck on the fact that you from the corner of Waters Street and 2<sup>nd</sup>; it is going to feel like a 11 story building that takes up an hold block, and the modulation on the street while there is some of it, it is not there for him. He doesn't think that mitigates the massing as he had hoped and as a condition his vote as last time. Mentioning the trellis, we don't approve bare wood anywhere in the City even fences have to be painted unless you decide to do that with some tropical hardwood or something that you continuously maintain, I would not be in favor of that. It occurred to him that they haven't approved materials yet and he has been saying all along that he is really leery of the building being gloomy. It is a nice color brick but you have a lot of building up above the brick and a lot of building in a dark gray so he is not sold on that either. He is held up on all of those items.

Ball: he has issues with the height and the massing and a lot of things are great here but doesn't take away from the height and massing and we work contingent on the details but he can still say his problem is on the height and massing and it seems fair.

Gastinger: said the changes to the base are elegant and makes sense, the façades from the base makes a lot of sense and are good for the street level. His concern about the project is not his materials or the designs; some of it goes back to conditions that were given to you by forces way beyond all of us. He feels the plaza is not going to be a successful urban space. He thinks it is going to be mad hot most of the time, and he doesn't feel it is going to fulfill the cities desire to have a long term solution for a city market. He still has structural challenges that essentially say neither this urban space nor the building are compatible with out guidelines. He said he cannot support the project as shown. He said the designs has made some leap forward but those things will continue to be a challenge for him in finding the project appropriate to our context.

Balut: he agrees with everyone that a lot of the detailing has been a great improvement. The rendering is quite helpful in seeing what you are doing and the articulation will help a lot of the pedestrian scale. He appreciates the contrast on the two-tone of the brick. He said some of the renderings does seem like it comes through but some does seem like the mortar is darker than the red and he thinks that will help to pixelate that flat surface and create that soft noise. He thinks that will help to extenuate the brick in a nice way to help with the scale a little bit. He would be more of a proponent for a darker mortar to help break it up a little bit and extenuate the brick, so combined with what you are doing it could work well and the changes you have made to the proportions, canopies are all good. He said the materiality of the pavers and the stamped concrete is a convincing image, if you were to propose something that was along those lines of exactly what you wanted convincing, He said he could support it. He was picturing something a little different. So, he could be in support of that. He feels like everyone else that the trellis is out of context, he likes the wood in there somehow like a metal frame or a soft epee on the inside or something that is lite at night but if you really

wanted to incorporate wood, it would have to be a robust wood but combine it with a steel or that is coordinated with the canopy. He said that could be more successful. He wish you could get more trees in there, understanding that you have made every effort to do that, and for the most part there is so much going on the pedestrian scale that he thinks that is going to help mitigate (it's a big building) you are doing everything you can to mitigate the pedestrian scale and it is working quite well.

Mohr: the base is strong enough at this point that's what you are going to read. Your ability to read the full mass is from a half of block away or a block away and at that point you will read it but in terms of the street level it is a bit too tall to actually read it. He thinks it is going to work pretty well right there on the sidewalk but it will feel really big on the plaza side. The base is quite strong at this point and Carl's reservation about it not having enough depth in it and he won't know until he sees a sample of it because we are only talking about halves of inches so there is no true corbelling. He said playing games with the brick colors certainly helps; the question is when do you think about going to a lighter mortar not a darker mortar?

Balut: said his comment was he understood that you meant to go lighter but he was saying darker could be more successful; just his opinion he was stating as a way to break up the scale because do you not agree that it seems like in the rendering it looks like there is a darker mortar than the red.

Rosen: said it does and he is not sure that it helps but he actually agrees with Ms. Miller that that contrast would be helpful and so he asks your permission if you are leaning towards approving this brick he is happy to get a couple more mortar samples and hope they go through staff to look at the contrast.

Mohr: said it makes sense the light mortar would make the darker mortar pop more.

Balut: said yep he agrees, as long as there is a good contrast and it would be helpful to see. He was going off what he saw in the rendering and look quite nice; looked like the mortar was a bit darker.

Rosen: said it looks good in renderings because it is actually a drawing but in reality the light color coding looks better and you get some shadow effects too.

Miller: said if the mortar is recessed

Rosen: said generally for most projects he does a V-struck joint which looks more machine and contemporary but he also favors a matching mortar and this case just an inter-concave joint with the light color mortar, but he is happy to try several different ones.

Schwarz: said with the modern brick we are not going to get that.

Rosen: said he tried that with brown brick and cream mortar and it was horrible. He is willing to try.

Miller: the question is the people that are supportive of the project or there are things that you are ready to move forward for this evening and there are things you feel like.

Balut: said he feels generally in support to answer your questions he thinks just a verification on the mortar sample, and verification on the trellis are the two things that are outstanding in his mind.

Miller: what do you feel good about are ready as is.

Balut: that depends on how far we are willing to go on this. He said for example the stamped concrete would have to come back if they are going that route.

Schwarz: are those samples all pavers or chunks of concrete?

Rosen: said they are random materials to show the general color pallet. He said to clarify he is happy to come back with more of the layout and the color mixed on the plaza. He said what he is hearing you all are in favor of the stamped concrete and really because he wants to get his masonry budget: to purchase the masonry contract to know that we can get there with concrete on the plaza as long as you are happy.

Balut: said he is the only one who stated that he would be willing to support stamped concrete depending on how it comes out.

Mohr: the implications from the photographs concrete; but he has seen really bad stamped concrete; verifying the stamp and the color rendering.

Miller: is it easier to stamp that variation because that is like a cross-walk and it is pretty straight forward. She said you have some more innovated ideas on how you wanted things laid out.

Rosen: we are going to make sure it's the higher quality and not the gloomy stuff.

Schwarz: with the stamped concrete, what kind of control joints are you looking at? The spacing? Are they going to hide within the false joints?

Rosen: they will need to be controlled joints in there but remember this is not a sidewalk on soil, this is actually a finished concrete layer on top of a structural concrete deck. There will be controlled joint but it will not be the same. Having to deal with uplift and things like that.

Schwarz: theoretically they will all be hidden within the pattern.

Rosen: we just had another meeting with Parks and Rec and they are very happy and are still refining the market vendor layout and they are really happy with the pattern as it is evolving because it looks interesting but it also provides a very clear guidance as to where the vendors are going to go. It will be really easy for them to come up with new layouts and stuff.

Mohr: In that this is designed for vehicular traffic, it would be pretty easy to put planters and things in there for some reason if the market ceased to work or gets too big.

Sarafin: said the three items that Stephen mentioned; he is supportive and the street level treatment has gotten where it needs to be. We approved the massing, so he is supportive.

(Jeff is talking can't understand him)

Miller: we need window cut sheets,

Rosen: there is no way he can get window cut sheets and get them approved by you before the building permit is reviewed; a commercial building like this doesn't walk that way.

Schwarz: said they are all store front;

Rosen: said no. some are curtain wall because of their height, punched windows on the second and third floors and window wall on the upper floors. He cannot get shop drawings.

Mohr: said it is just writing the manufacturer a standard detail for a type of window assembly.

Rosen: he can give you the basic design window systems; we he still needs to keep an open spec so we can have a competitive thinking process.

Miller: define the VLT, then that one thing gets approve and then you can come back and revisit that if you like; door cut sheets for a garage door; the elevations we have approved the dimensioned elevations at previous meetings; landscape details, railing awning.

Mohr: said some of this stuff we visited way back when, in the earlier Greg Powe regimen.

Schwarz: said this is a different project.

Mohr: said we have seen a lot of this stuff but we have not seen it in this iteration.

Miller: everything was preliminary discussion up until the last one.

Sarafin: said we approved the elevations and materials with cut sheets and various documentation to come back for the record as it is finalized.

Rosen: said honestly storefront would not be an appropriate application for most of the finish on this building so it is only appropriate for the grade level and for some parts of the penthouse. This will be a heavy commercial grade high end, aluminum window systems that we use on 35 story buildings and they meet all of the high test. We are trying to get into the ground by October.

Motion: Earnst moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, New Construction and Additions, and Public Design, I move to find that the proposed design does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted, based on the comments cited earlier focusing on mass and height and the use of the plaza as a functional public space.

Gastinger seconded. Approved (5-3, with Sarafin, Balut, and Mohr opposed.)

**7:40**            **7.        Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
BAR 17-09-02  
946 Grady Avenue  
Tax Parcel 310060000  
Dairy Holdings, LLC, Owner/ Wendie Charles, Applicant  
Amendments to COA – specifically glass

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:

Miller: I am fine with the 68% for glass Type 1, I am not okay with the 50% VLT. I understand the energy efficient is a goal, but if that is the case, then you shouldn't design a glass box.

Mohr: I don't have a problem with the 50% VLT, but I think it works well with the architecture of the box. From an aesthetic and design standpoint it makes more sense for me.

Schwarz: I agree with Mohr on this, for this specific project and this specific location.

Sarafin: I think as long as we are clear in the motion that it is specific to this project it is fine.

Mohr: To me this is a design consideration.

Sarafin: It is not at street level on a pedestrian way. It is my understanding that 70% VLT is for street level and pedestrian level. In this instance I am fine with the 50% VLT and the 68% VLT.

Ball: Every time we approve a Marvin window we are approving a high 50s% VLT or low 60% VLT, they simply don't come in 70% VLT.

Balut: I agree with a lot of what has been said. If they were proposing 50% VLT at street level I would not approve it. They are creating that box, and making it very clean.

Gastinger: For me the reflectivity is a problem at all levels. I am fine with the 68% VLT, but I do not think the 50% VLT is compatible with the guidelines.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed Amendments to the COA approved on January 17, 2018, satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted for this specific instance because of the project's specific design intent. Balut seconded. Approved (5-3, with Gastinger, Earnst, and Miller opposed)

- 8:10            8.        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

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:

Schwarz: I think they did what we asked.

Miller: I agree.

Ball:

Bault: I agree.

Sarafin: I like the changes and the resolution with the garage, it all makes more sense now

Miller: Could the trees get planted during Phase 1?

Applicant: I believe so. The intent of the client is to plant the landscape as soon as possible, so it can mature.

Gastinger: I think all of the changes are great, just make sure you look for light seeping out of the garage.

Motion: Schwartz 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 residential building design for Phase II and updates to the parking structure (from Phase I) satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with these and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the recommendation to widen the stairs at Maple Street. Earnst seconded. Approved (8-0.)

**8:40**            **9.     Pre-Application Meeting**  
                         17 University Circle  
                         Tax Parcel 060067000  
                         Matthew Schetlick, Owner/Applicant

**9:00**            **F.     Other Business**  
                         **10.    PLACE report**

**9:10**            **G.     Adjournment**