

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[November 20, 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

Miller called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm

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

Robert Nichols, architect for 550 East Water Street, informed BAR of a revision to submitted for review at the December meeting; modifications re: a steel level canopy.

Questions from the Board:

Board Member: Asks what material would be used for the canopy

Robert Nichols: States the material would be clad and painted bright metal, matching existing canopy

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.)

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda: Balut moved. Schwarz seconded. Approved (7-0). (Approval of the Consent Agenda acknowledged and approved, without amendment or conditions, the recommended motions for 600 West Main Street and 214 18th Street NE.)

1. Minutes	[August 21, 2018]	Regular Meeting
	[September 18, 2018]	Regular Meeting
	[October 16, 2018]	Regular Meeting

2. 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/Applicant

Amendments to the COA

Motion: 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 and paint

color selections 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.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)

BAR 18-11-02

214 18th Street NE; Tax Parcel 55A107000; John R. Diven, Owner/

Shelter Associates, LTD, /Applicant

Closing in porch

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed porch enclosure satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition the applicant submit to staff all pertinent information regarding the porch enclosure including construction drawings (for exterior work), exterior material (list), window and door cut sheets, and paint colors.

C. Deferred Items

5:35 pm

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-10-04

2nd Street NW; Tax Parcel 3301741V0; McGuffey Hill Homeowners Association, Owner/

Cathcart Property Management, Applicant

Roof Replacement

Questions from the Public: None.

Comments from the Applicant:

Applicant approves of current application in progress, but also notes she is open to the City's original suggestion of stripping down the roof to the membrane, building a new membrane and then having the city design a new green roof and maintain it if the City is still interested in pursuing this option.

Comments from the Board:

Board Member: Would need to follow up with Parks and Recreation for this request, but suggests they proceed with the current application and then provide options for the applicant once approved.

Questions from the Board:

Board Member: Asks for applicant to describe the paint finish of the CMU

Applicant: The intention is to match roof with the appearance of the stucco surrounding it. The cap will be custom fabricated metal

Board Member: Asks to clarify the height of the roof replacement

Applicant: Stated the roof would be higher than a guardrail

Comments from the Board:

Board Member: Believes this is a reasonable approach that needs to be handled with care, as three major trees from the park would need to be protected during construction.

Board Member: Made note that BAR may need to follow up with a letter to Parks and Recreation after they make the recommendation to help influence and show their support for the proposed green roof replacement

Board Member: Thinks the endorsement on the motion should be enough when the applicant approaches Parks and Recreation.

Board Member: Recommends copying Council on the action report so they can be aware that this was their recommended action.

Board Member: Would like to note that the green roof option also has the added benefit of reducing the risk on the existing trees from construction activities

Applicant: Notes that by tearing the roof down to its membrane some of the trees have roots that have grown over the space and will have to be removed, though they agree to the stipulation of maintaining the trees as best as possible.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed changes 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 condition that prior to issuance of a Building Permit the applicant will work with the City's Department of Parks and Recreation to satisfactorily address any concerns about construction-related disturbance to the site and/or trees within McGuffey Park. Also, the BAR strongly recommends the city find a way to work with the applicant to retain a green roof in this location with details to be worked out between the city and the applicant. Retaining a green roof would in this area enhances the visual appearance of the park, preserves the sense of space in the park, and assistances with storm water runoff. Sarafin seconded. Approved (7-0).

D. New Items

5:50pm 5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)
(*Applicant not present; matter moved to end of the agenda.)
BAR 18-11-01
128 Franklin Street; Tax Parcel 560114400
Sam Monfort, Owner/Applicant
New Construction

128 Franklin Street is located in a historic conservation district, so the guidelines are less stringent than in an architectural design control district. The request is to construct a single-family attached residence to a vacant parcel. It is a two-story framed residence with the exterior sided with the hardy plank, white trim soppet, pella doors and window, loom clad double hung, architectural asphalt shingle roofing with sections of the building with metal roofing, cedar columns in trim on porch. Deems all items to be appropriate and recommends approval.

Applicant was not present to discuss the application.

Questions from the Public:

Questions from the Board:

Comments from the Public:

Comments from the Board:

**Motion: Miller moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed new construction satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions:
[sides of] Front porch roof brought within the width of the house
Cementitious shakes change to cedar shakes [at front pediment]
Sonotubes [at front porch] be appropriately screened
Strong recommendation that cedar on front porch be painted
Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0).**

6:00pm **6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 18-11-05
518 17th Street NW; Tax Parcel 050066000
Zeta Iota Deuteron, HCB, Owner/ George Stone, Applicant
Front Door Replacement

Front door replacement has been chosen over repairing the door due to warping of the doors, which has created difficulty with the security latch and system, intending to provide a more secure entrance for the occupants. The existing door is 1.75 inches and the replacement is 2.25 inches. The dimensions of the existing rails and styles will be maintained. Staff provides five options: to restore/rehabilitate existing door, replicate/reproduce existing door with the exception of having a thicker door, replace door with new rails and styles matching the dimensions, replace the door with *similar* reproductions as submitted, or install a new door not matching the existing door. If approved, items that will not be replicated include: applied medallions on the lower panels, beaded profile on the stop molding for the oval glass panes and door panels, and the beveled rim on the oval glass. If approved, staff suggests storing or displaying the existing doors.

Questions from the Public: None.

Comments from the Public:

Applicant (George): Security system was updated a year ago from a keypad system to a card swipe/phone app method. The existing doors are double doors with the left door being the only one that is functional, and it is being secured with a magnet because the latching system, thinness of the doors and deterioration of the wood would not allow for another method to be used. New doors would be much thicker and would allow for the magnet to be removed and have the locking latching method be at the door handle level, proving more secure.

Questions from the Board:

Board Member: Asks to clarify if there is a porch over the door

Applicant: Confirms there is a ten foot porch from the front door to the front steps

Board Member: Asks if applicant is planning to keep the shelves and oval windows

Applicant: Confirms that they would be adding these items to the new door if approved

Board Member: Asks if the new doors would have replacement glass and wanted clarity on magnetic door

Applicant: The new doors would require replacement glass. The right door remains stationary, while the left door has slide bolts that would remain. However, rather than having a magnet at the top of the door, a hole would be drilled into the door horizontally to latch the door.

Board Member: Asks if the hardware would be removed from the backside of the doors and if they are original pieces

Applicant: Confirms the bolts would be removed and the new latch itself would provide additional security. The current bolts are old, but could not attest to its originality

Board Member: Requests further explanation on the warpage of the door

Applicant: The doors themselves have a bit of curvature to them, but having the magnet only holding at the top of the door allows for movement at the bottom, which poses a security threat

Board Member: Asks if the problem, then, is that applicant can't get the magnet system he wants in a 1.75 inch door

Applicant: States that the doors themselves have been chewed up due to multiple door handles and locks that have been applied and the wood has begun to disappear

Board Member: Asks if applicant is interested in keeping the existing doors if motion is approved to replace and how might they be cared for

Applicant: States that they would be moved to a storage area on the second floor with temperature and humidity protection

Board Member: Asks if applicant has made every attempt to repair and rectify the situation by keeping the existing doors in place

Applicant: Confirms but noted the occupants' safety was the primary concern, as the doors have been attempted to be reinforced a number of times without success

Board Member: Reiterates that the board encourages repairment of the elements if possible and asked if the doors could be effectively replaced without hardship if the request was denied

Applicant: Given that the primary objective of the repair would be to provide additional security, applicant believes repairing the door would be difficult to do

Comments from the Board:

Board Member: Feels that the applicant has demonstrated good stewardship with the doors and has done what he could to get them to perform

Board Member: Highlights a few guidelines that the BAR must adhere to when making decisions to replace historic elements. Regarding entrances, guidelines state not to strip entrances and porches of historical material and details, remove or radically change entrances and porches in defining the overall building character, when possible, and to reuse hardware and locks when possible, avoid substituting the doors with ones that do not fit properly or are not compatible with the style of the building, repairing windows when possible, etc. Asks if anyone could offer creative solutions to repair, rather than replace the existing doors

Board Member: Suggests possibly patching the area of the door where the hardware has been damaged as long as the thickness of the door would not remain an issue

Applicant: States that the intended standard locking mechanism to use would be thicker than the door itself

Board Member: Suggests an operational change, like only using the back door after a certain time of night

Board Member: Notes the delicate balance between security and protecting details of the historic building

Board Member: States that he is not confident that everything has been done to try and protect the building

Board Member: In favor of deferring until further investigation has been done and asks what timeline applicant is trying to maintain

Applicant: States that the timeline has been contingent on the decision, but the build time for the doors is 8-12 weeks. The replacement would be a summer project anticipated to begin in May while the house is vacant, so a deferral for a month or two would not affect the timeline of the project

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

6:30pm 7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-11-04

Downtown Mall

City of Charlottesville, Owner/Applicant

Tree removal

The request includes the removal of an 18 inch willow oak tree on the Downtown Mall on the east elevation of the Omni Hotel. The applicant and city forester has requested either a) removal of the tree or b) continue to monitor the tree. The design guidelines for public design of street trees and plantings recommends replacement of damaged or missing street trees with appropriate species, however given the age, size and canopy condition of the existing trees, BAR should discuss the viability of planting a replacement tree and of what type and size. The four options available are to approve the request with the condition tree would be planted, approve the request without a replacement tree, deny the request or defer/accept a deferral with a request for additional information.

Questions from the Public: None.

Comments from the Public:

Applicant: States that the tree has exhibited significant decay at the base of the tree and has been declining for two years. Due to the other willow oaks and the canopies surrounding it, applicant does not recommend a replacement, as the canopies will be touching the adjacent trees within a 10 year span and would be very invasive and some of the holly hedges would need to be removed as well.

Questions from the Board: None.

Comments from the Board:

Board Member: Notes that we need to be cautious of trees that may be endanger safety and understands the challenge of trying to replace the same species of tree in a tight space. Offers a few items to consider including: its connection to a large soil volume with access for more places for the roots to go, the unknown fate of the trees across the way, and the fact that it is part of a 10 tree entrance corridor of the mall that is part of a ceremonial entrance, so losing a tree would stand out. States that he is not opposed to challenging some planting designs, but cautious of the absence of a replacement strategy. Recommends the removal of the tree with a replacement of a willow oak and to try and improve the light conditions of the tree.

Board Member: Because the tree is not in imminent danger and there are other changes happening in the area, suggests a more economical approach of waiting until other developments have proceeded further before making a decision

Board Member: Agrees that the future of the entire area is up in the air and because the tree is not currently a public safety issue, suggests not spending the money to remove it until the other plans have developed

Board Member: States that it would also set a nice precedent to the city that there is a long term plan for the trees on the mall since other willow trees on the mall are also declining

Board Member: Suggests monitoring the tree because it does pose a risk. Says the request is reasonable given the condition of the tree

Board Member: Agrees, but thinks the area is just in a flux right now and they should wait to see what the future holds for the area

Board Member: In favor of taking the tree down now

Board Member: Suggests structuring the motion so that the tree can be removed but that they should make recommendations for how it is replaced

Board Member: Wants to make note that the tree commission did weigh in and confirm that they are okay with removal

Motion: Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Public Design and Improvements, I move that removing this tree satisfies the BAR's criteria and is 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 tree be replaced with a willow oak of 2" diameter or bigger Management of the surrounding trees to give the new tree the opportunity for success Schwarz seconded. Approved (6-1, with Miller opposed).

6:50pm 8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-11-03
1415 University Avenue; Tax Parcel 090075000
Tiger Investments, LLC, Owner/OTJ Architects, Applicant
Exterior Renovations

Relative to the storefront and sod rehabilitation repairs, applicant seeks removal of the half circle, multi-light leaded glass and replace with a single light double glaze pane, which would match the other eight on the building, clean and repaint the freeze, remove the existing storefront glass and replace with double glaze panes (where there is no existing glass, to install double glaze panes), remove the existing wall mounted light fixture and repair and repaint the masonry, modify the entrance threshold to accommodate ADA access, and reworking the marble and slate panels below the storefront as necessary. The rooftop AVAC units would also be replaced that are not visible from the street, as well as updating two signs inside the building that are not regulated by the board. Staff recommends the approval of rehabilitating the storefront except that the glass replacement be discussed more thoroughly. Applicant concludes that the leaded glass is in poor condition and would display it inside the building if removed. If further deliberation is needed for the glass, staff recommends approval of the application and only deferring the element involving the glass.

Questions from the Public: None.

Questions from the Board:

Board Member: Asks why the plan for the door in the vestibule leading into the bank would swinging into the bank. If the doors were unable to swing out, it would meet the clearances required for ADA

Applicant: The outward swinging doors is intended for employee use after hours and notes that buttons would not be sufficient either, as the bank and ADA have very stringent restrictions to comply with

Board Member: Asks if there is a way to center the vestibule, as it has an awkward outside appearance

Applicant: Confirms that they could look into centering it

Board Member: Asks if the applicant had a specialist look at the window to determine the usability of repairing it

Applicant: Applicant did not hire a specialist to inspect the window further

Board Member: Asks if there is an alternate plan if the application is not approved

Applicant: Confirms and was prepared to leave the window in place if it is not approved and adjust signage as needed. Applicant would also install the windows at the ground floor and replace the two half circles on the other side for double glaze

Comments from the Public:

Comments from the Board:

Storefront Rehabilitation/Repair Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed storefront rehabilitation and repairs and rooftop HVAC unit replacements satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Corner ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions: BAR does not approve the removal of the leaded glass window
BAR strongly recommends you revisit the double door, investigate a single door [at entry foyer] Earnst seconded. Approved (6-1, with Ball opposed).
(Staff note: At the meeting, applicant provided photos of the leaded glass pane.)

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

7:25pm 9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-11-06

404 East Main Street; Tax Parcel 280046000

New Dominion Bookshop, Owner/ NDB Land Trust/ George B. McCallum III and David W. Kudravetz Trustees, Applicant/ Shawn Martin
Proposed mezzanine addition

Questions from the Public: None.

Questions from the Board:

Comments from the Public:

Comments from the Board:

Motion: Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Additions, and Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed mezzanine addition and rear porch replacement satisfies 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, including the additional material* submitted at the meeting [11/20/2018] with the additional material on the synthetic product [at the rear porch] be submitted to city staff. Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0).

(*Cut sheets for doors, windows and skylights. Two drawings: a) revised elevation showing scuppers at south wall; b) revised section showing mezzanine wall height at 16'-6".)

E. Other Business

8:25 pm 10. PLACE report - Tim Mohr was not in attendance; no PLACE report

8:30 pm G. Adjournment