

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[January 15, 2019] – 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

Members Present: Justin Sarafin, Stephen Balut, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Melanie Miller, Mike Ball, and Jody Lahendro

Staff Present: Jeff Werner, Camie Mess, and Kari Spitler

Ms. Miller called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

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

None.

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. Minutes** [December 18, 2018] Regular Meeting

Motion: Gastinger moved to approve the consent agenda. Schwarz seconded. Approved (7-0.)

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-08-05
525 Ridge Street (William Taylor Plaza Phase 2)
Tax Parcel 290147000
Ridge Street Plaza, LLC, Owner/ Management Services Corp., Applicant
Amendments to the COA

Mr. Schwarz recused himself from this agenda item.

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The applicant is requesting revisions to some of the previously approved materials on the pediment. They would like to change from a natural cedar shingle to cement fiber (Hardie) shingles. On the rear end of the

building, they would like to change the window sill and head trim to delete at the rear (west) and two end (north and south) elevations. There would be no change in sill and trim at the front (east) and eastern face of two end (north and south) elevations. As for the spandrel panels, they want to change cement panels and trim to EIFS/stucco, as noted at the three entry/stair connector segments on both the front (east) and rear (west) elevations. Lastly, they want to change the stone at the foundation wall by substituting a manufactured stone product for the specified natural stone and reduce area of application as noted at the rear (west) and eastern corners of the two end (north and south) elevations. The BAR should focus their review on the site as a major gateway into the City and, in addition to the neighborhood context, whether the requested amendments to the December 20, 2016 COA meet the pertinent design guidelines and are compatible with the Ridge Street ADC district.

Applicant, Stephen von Storch: Notes that the thickness between the approved and the substitute material for the shingles are almost identical, so it comes down to a texture difference. Normally they would shy away from a designed variety, but a two dimensional texture might read better from the street from a four story building. The stone is 100% authentic Shenandoah manufactured stone, which is a great color with the natural stone.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mark Kavitt: Notes that we seem to be taking a lot of the back ends of buildings and dressing them up. With a lot of the buildings that go up, it seems like the back side often becomes the front side.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Lahendro: Asks if there might be situations where the material could be subjected to abuse from the environment and from people.

Mr. von Storch: There would be almost no abuse because it doesn't touch the ground almost anywhere since it's raised up above the ground at just about every point.

Mr. Ball: If you go to a manufactured stone, how often does the color repeat?

Mr. von Storch: It's all picked up and laid individually so it's up to the designer. You should almost never see a repeat of shape color because it's pretty random.

Mr. Lahendro: Asks for clarification on the mortar of the joints in the new proposal.

Mr. von Storch: The joints are fully mortared and smooth to the face of the stone just as they were proposed to be.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Lahendro: In regards to selecting between two types of shingle patters, it seems like the first might start to weather and twist to look rougher around the edges.

Ms. Miller: Notes that she is opposed to the changes overall because it sets a precedent problem in the future. We should strive to make the true proposal right from the beginning instead of coming back to make changes at the last minute.

Mr. Sarafin: Agrees with Ms. Miller and thinks some of the changes to the rear of the building might be okay. Shares concerns about the manufactured stone and notes that it is located in a very prominent entrance corridor to the City and we approved the materials very deliberately the first time.

Ms. Miller: Reiterates that the parcels fronting Ridge Street are within the Ridge Street ADC district and the ones fronting Cherry Avenue are not in a design control district, however Council thought it was an important enough site overall to impose BAR review on phase 1, which wouldn't have been in the district on its own.

Mr. Gastinger: Finds most of the changes appropriate. Having the shingles that high off the ground is a reasonable request, as well as the change to the stone in the back, but does not feel comfortable with the change to the manufactured stone. This is a project that needs to live up to the best of our guidelines, given its position and location.

Mr. Balut: Agrees that we need to maintain the quality and integrity of the materials already approved. The applicant has made a number of compromises through improved architectural design and development, however this is taking it a step beyond the design intent of what was already approved.

Mr. Lahendro: Support staying with the original recommendation with what was already approved.

Mr. Balut: Supports reducing the stone material at the rear of the building, but that is it.

Mr. Ball: Supports the manufactured stone in this case, but would need to see more samples to see what it would look like because it's important to get a good sense of the repeat of the colors.

Mr. Sarafin: Given the nature of the building, he is in support of the Hardie shingles. At the pedestrian level, the stone base is an important piece.

Mr. Balut: Maintaining some natural quality of materials on the building is important and if we go to the Hardie we would be losing that.

Motion: Bault moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed amendments to the COA do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are not compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, and that the BAR does not approve the amendments as submitted with the exception of reducing the return of the stone foundation on the west face. Miller seconded. Approved (6-0, with Schwarz recused).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-01-01

301 East Jefferson Street

Tax Parcel 330204000

Diane Hillman, Owner/Bruce Wardell (BRW Architects), Applicant

New Site Modifications (fence, benches, and upgraded lighting)

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This COA request is for landscape and hardscape changes that have been deemed necessary to provide physical security of the facility. The work includes to remove the privet hedge along the perimeter of the site on the south and west boundaries and to remove the existing black iron fence and gate and add a new perimeter 4' fence and gate, which provides transparency between the enclosed courtyard and the sidewalk and street environment. The fence will be painted steel anchored in concrete footings. They also would like to construct concrete benches within the perimeter of the new fence at the southwest corner of the courtyard and add exterior lighting meeting local dark sky ordinance requirements. It should be noted that these security changes are driven by a comprehensive evaluation conducted by a

consultant using the standards provided by the Department of Homeland Security. The addition of the benches and exterior lighting are compatible with the ADC guidelines, however the guidelines suggest that existing trees and fences be retained. However, these guidelines are flexible enough to both respect the historic past and embrace the future. Staff suggests that such flexibility be applied here and that the BAR should offer suggestions that may address issues relative to the planting.

Applicant, Bruce Wardell: Notes that his team was the original design team for the synagogue in 1992. After receiving the report from Homeland Security, it was important to bring back the same group to develop these changes. There are three aspects that they are trying to address in the proposal, one being the visibility to the site from the outside and inside that allows people to see across, which is the reasoning for removing the hedge. Secondly, they didn't want this site to become a fortified response to the security requirements, so developing a very light transparent fence with black steel would allow for the visibility from within the property and from the outside into the courtyard. The vulnerability to high speed vehicles on the corner of 3rd Street and Jefferson would be mitigated by the tree and the concrete bench inside the fence. Thirdly, the lighting of the space is important because there are dark spaces in the courtyard right now. The addition of the proposed lights would create an even lighting.

Diane Hillman: Notes that they are not happy to do this project, but it is necessary due to recent events. They have a lot of children and congregants who use the courtyard that felt the perimeter needed to be strengthened. Homeland Security made some very strong recommendations in order to keep a speeding vehicle from hitting the southwest corner of the property and to keep the children inside the property that would require the removal of the hedge. Additionally, a small object could be placed inside near the bottom of the hedges that could be very dangerous. Ultimately, the focus is on security and safety. The lighting is important because it is necessary to be aware of people in the space and to have safety for those who use the outdoor space at night. This is a simple response to a situation that none of us wanted to have.

Kent Schlussol: Notes that one of the main concerns is about vehicles that could be used to harm people, which is why the security around the building has to be increased. As for the hedges, they were placed there in 1990 and they have nothing historic about them. Additionally, they are trying to make it more attractive to everyone and the some of the hedges have died already.

Gregg Bleam: Shares that they have spoken with the manufacturer and the small bollards will be modified to 180 light throw, so they won't throw light out towards the street. The bollards show a stake mounted fixture but they are actually going to be flange mounted with a footing. The idea is to create visibility throughout the courtyard and although it will be sad to lose the hedges, it does help to improve visibility. The bench also helps define the courtyard and is sympathetic with the design.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mark Kavitt: Would like to know how old the current fence is and what is it made of.

Mr. Wardell: The fence was added in the 1992 addition and it is a black iron fence.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: Asks if the lights are dimmable.

Mr. Bleam: Yes, they are all LED lights and dimmable.

Mr. Balut: Were there suggestions on the ground cover planting where the hedges will be removed?

Mr. Bleam: They are showing a minor because it's a tough area to be planted in and it will come underneath the fence. It will be low in terms of its profile.

Mr. Gastinger: With the new fence design with the 2 inch deep section, is it performing any structural function or is it purely aesthetic?

Mr. Wardell: It provides a structural function on the scale of a pedestrian. The idea was that the fence would address the pedestrian scale of security and the concrete bench would address the vehicular scale of security.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mark Kavit: Would like for the fence that is going up to be something appropriate age wise that fits the age of the building. Perhaps cast-iron would work well.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Gastinger: Notes that this project is a very reasonable response and one that is quite elegant. The hedges have gotten taller over the years and it would be a good move for the City to remove them because it will provide more openness and will participate more with the life of the street. Appreciates the design of the steel fence itself because it connects well with the architectural changes that were made in the 1990s.

Mr. Lahendro: Shares that he has seen the site with Mr. Wardell and commends them for obtaining architectural consultation that is sympathetic to what has been done before in the courtyard. It is a sensitive approach to a very unfortunate problem. Comments that the paving of the lower stairs going up to the synagogue were all put in in 1992 and are a grayish color, so it is suggested that the benches should match that color. Shares concerns that having the pickets being 2 inches deep might be opaque as you walk down the sidewalk and asks if they could make them a ½ inch or inch deep to help with openness.

Mr. Schwarz: Is sad to see the hedge go but appreciates that the hedge on 3rd Street will remain and there will still be some greenspace to the area to keep the garden feel. Thinks that using the benches as a barrier is a fantastic idea and the lighting that has been designed for underneath them will be beautiful. Worries that the lines in the fence may make it look a little heavier than intended, but it isn't a huge concern if that was the goal.

Mr. Balut: Having the original architect and landscape architect develop these changes adds a great asset to the sympathetic design and it is very well done. Notes the irony of closing themselves in to be more secure while at the same time they are opening themselves up to the community and making it more visually connected.

Ms. Miller: The bench and the lighting are great ideas, however it would be a real loss to lose the hedge. It is nice that the kids can play there in their own private space. Agrees with Mr. Lahendro's suggestion of matching the concrete so it doesn't pop out since it will be exposed and suggests adding some seasonable bulbs to add interest, life and greenery to the area.

Mr. Ball: The hedge will be missed but he understands why it needs to go. Personally, he would like to see more greenery around the perimeter, but the hedge is problematic the way it is. The fence could be widened unless they are worried about children slipping through.

Mr. Lahendro: Would like for the designer to respond to some of these suggestions that have been made.

Mr. Bleam: In response to the thickness of the fence, it was designed this way due to the strength of it and they wanted the structure to be substantial enough. In terms of the width, it was set up because 4 inches is the standard.

Mr. Lahendro: Asks what Mr. Wardell thinks about the color suggestion for the concrete.

Mr. Wardell: It makes sense and the concrete that exists is a tinted concrete. If there is a color that they are trying to achieve, suggests doing some samples at the beginning of construction to choose from. However, he may not want it to actually match so it will disappear into it.

Mr. Bleam: Shares that the tinted concrete will fade over time due to sun exposure.

Mr. Sarafin: Notes that architecture is a product of its time and this is a response to that. The notion of safety and making the structure a safe space while being part of a community cannot be undervalued. Ultimately, the removal of the hedges will open the area up and make it more fortified. The applicant has done a great job of making the space more open and he is in support of the application.

Mr. Schwarz: Requests a friendly recommendation that the applicant may add some additional low plantings after installation at their discretion.

Motion: Balut having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed security upgrades, 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 recommendations of:

- adding additional low plantings around the perimeter fence
- making sure the new concrete benches are compatible with the existing concrete [in the courtyard and stairs]

Schwarz seconded. Approved (7-0).

D. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-01-02

500 Court Square

Tax Parcel 530096000

500 Court Square, Owner/Kevin O'Brien (on behalf of HOA), Applicant

Installation of two metal security gates

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The application is a request to install two metal security gates into existing openings at the north entrance to the Porte Cochere (facing Jefferson Street) and at the entrance to the Court Square Tavern (facing 5th St NE). The applicant has submitted two designs for the north facing gate and three for the Tavern entrance, and would like input from the BAR for the final selection. There is a monogram in option #2 for the Tavern, which would count for their total square footage for allowed signage. Staff finds that the proposed gates are compatible with the ADC guidelines and they are consistent with similar gates in the area.

Applicant, Kevin O'Brien: Shares that the welder's drawing made them look like footballs, but they will actually be ovals that will match the existing steel work on the building. They are black and will swing in. The Tavern owner prefers the design that has two doors instead of one big one and prefers both gates match even though they're around the corner from one another.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: If the preferred design is the double doors, can they both swing all the way back?

Mr. O'Brien: Yes, the entrance is sort of like a box with a door on the side so it goes all the way back and it doesn't impede the entrance. The thought behind this is that it would give the best access, as the owner carries large items through the door.

Mr. Schwarz: Is there additional egress out of the Tavern other than the front door?

Mr. O'Brien: Yes, there is also a back exit.

Mr. Gastinger: What guidelines does the BAR have relative to security fencing?

Ms. Mess: We currently don't have any guidelines for it.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Sarafin: As far as the design goes, he would simplify it and let it recede rather than trying to replicate the design on the balconies.

Mr. Gastinger: Prefers the scheme that uses the frame for the larger one because it is cleaner.

Mr. Balut: Prefers the in frame pickets on the first gate. Does not prefer the ovals, but appreciates the effort to try and tie them into the original design and aesthetic of the building.

Mr. Ball: Feels like it may need something more so it doesn't look like riot control trying to keep people out. Some of the other gates in the area are very elegant.

Mr. O'Brien: The grill at the top of the Porte Cochere entrance could scale almost exactly like the balcony top if you wanted to leave the decorate piece on that part and just take it out of the operable part of the door.

Mr. Sarafin: Thinks it might be misleading to leave it in and suggest it is part of the original construction, so it might be better to just leave it out.

Mr. Werner: Notes that it is quite deep and something set inside might disappear.

Mr. O'Brien: Perhaps the owner's preference for the double doors was preferable because it might break it up and make it look a little less like an institutional gate.

Ms. Miller: Thinks that the proportions appear to be rather random and the part on the top is a little too big. It should visually line up with something and it won't look very good if it's not intentional.

Mr. O'Brien: The owner wanted to make sure the gas truck could fit under the clearance, but it can be raised if needed. The reason for not making the gates full length is because some residents park their bikes in there and he didn't want them too unwieldy for them.

Mr. Lahendro: The gates are swinging inwards, so will the fence and gate will be close to the plane of the building facade?

Mr. O'Brien: It will be on the inner part because of what the wall is made of, and the door is going to be affixed almost an inch inside the opening in order for it to be properly anchored. He didn't want to put it back any further than he has to because he doesn't want to create another alcove space.

Motion: Schwarz having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design & Elements, I move to find that the proposed metal security gates 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:

- **Drawing #1 for the Porte Cochere (without the ovals)**
- **Drawing #3 for the Court Square Tavern (without the ovals)**
- **Request to look at the proportions for the Porte Cochere [height of gate relative to fixed panel above]**
- **Request the gates be set back and swing inward**
- **Submit the updated final drawings for the BAR Archive**

Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

E. Other Business

5. PLACE report, Carl Schwarz: One of the main points of conversation involved a report from NACTO on how large vehicles impact urban streets that offered suggestions for reducing the size of trucks to allow for smaller streets that are safer for pedestrians. The department and traffic engineer were present and no official compromise was made. The other conversation regarded Minneapolis' decision to end single family zoning and whether or not it could apply to Charlottesville. They weighed the pros and cons of its appropriateness and looked at other ways to resolve some of the drawbacks from it. Ultimately no directive came from the discussion.

6. BAR Guideline Work Session – January 17, 2019 – NDS Conference Room; 12-2 pm.

Camie Mess: Reminds the BAR of this meeting and notes that if there are members that cannot attend, they should check their emails after each meeting for updates that have been made. The changes can hopefully be done in 6 monthly sessions.

7. 416-418 West Main Street - extension of COA (granted in July 2017) requested on the grounds of the work/effort done on the property line issues -zero lot line, fenestration, code clarification from NDS, agreement with adjacent owners, etc.

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The code allows the BAR or the Director of NDS to approve a COA extension, which has been granted by Mr. Ikefuna. Staff had a discussion with the people from 600 West Main last Friday and they asked the BAR to review the metal on site to see what it looks like. The BAR placed a condition to approve the lighting and to see how it can be dimmable, which can be discussed as the project gets closer. They also asked about changing the 70 VLT glass to a 68 in order to maintain the same manufacture for all of the glazing on the project.

Ms. Miller: Notes that they've already changed the VLT on the rear of the building.

Mr. Werner: Let's circulate the letter they submitted and then the BAR can use it for the consent agenda on the next meeting.

Mr. Werner: Lastly, Mr. Kavit missed the public comment portion of the meeting and would like to get guidance from the BAR on the guidelines regarding putting a TV antenna on the chimney of his house, as there is nothing in the guidelines that restricts this. He was hoping to hear what the BAR thought and if they had any suggestions before he submitted a formal request.

Mr. Sarafin: There are television dishes up everywhere and the BAR can't determine where they get placed. It would be preferable to not place it on the main façade of the building, but it's not in our purview. However, making it as reversible as possible is always preferred.

Ms. Miller: Asks if Mr. Kavit would like to add anything to the matter.

Mr. Kavit: Unfortunately, he hasn't been able to get consistent broadcast TV since he moved away from cable. This has been an ongoing problem for about two years, and in trying to deal with this the appropriate way, Mr. Werner suggested asking for advice from the BAR first. They tried installing it on the side of the house, but they had trouble getting access to do so. This is not the preferred solution, but notes that there are no other options at this point.

Ms. Miller: Appreciates the effort to try and handle this correctly and notes that it is likely not in our purview.

Mr. Sarafin: It has to function properly and as long as it's as far away from the primary façade as possible and the mounting is as reversible as possible, this would be acceptable.

Mr. Schwarz: The guidelines actually state antenna and communication dishes should be placed in inconspicuous rooftop locations and not in the front yard. Asks if this project could be reviewed administratively.

Mr. Werner: Yes, it could.

Mr. Sarafin: Thinks it's a great question and is surprised that we don't differentiate between temporary residential installations and things like cell towers. We may want to address it during one of the guideline work sessions.

F. Adjournment: 7:35 p.m.