

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[March 13, 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, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Melanie Miller, Mike Ball, and Jody Lahendro

Staff Present: Jeff Werner, Camie Mess, Sebastian Weisman, 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 [January 15, 2019] 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

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-11-03

1415 University Avenue

Tax Parcel 090075000

Tiger Investments, LLC, Owner/OTJ Architects, /Applicant

Signage Concept

Motion: Miller moved to pull 512-514, 600 West Main from the consent agenda, and approve the January 15, 2019 minutes and the COA for 1415 University Avenue. Gastinger seconded. Approved (5-0-1, with Ball abstained.)

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

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This is a COA request for some amendments to what had previously been approved. 510 West Main Street is a vacant parcel and 512-514 West Main Street was built in 1884 and known as the Hartnagle-Witt House. Constructed in 1949, the single-story addition on the front originally functioned as The Waffle Shop and is currently home to the Blue Moon Diner. 600 West Main Street was built by James Hawkins in 1873 and known as the Hawkins-Perry House. In 1931, new owner Cecil Perry added to the front the single-story market, which currently operates as a convenience store. All of the buildings are contributing structures in the West Main Street ADC District. The request is to revise the window glazing from a VLT of 70 to a 68VLT. The reasoning for this is associated with the manufacturing in order to have consistency with the different types of glass for the project and to use only one manufacturer. The second element involves the final approval on the metal panels. The BAR received a mockup of the site that was constructed in early February and there were questions regarding the color variation, how it was constructed, the materials used, etc. The BAR should discuss if the revised window glazing of 68VLT is appropriate and if the metal panels are a suitable material within the ADC Guidelines.

Applicant, Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects: The metal color was approved in January and the mockup the BAR received in 2017 in there, however we are all unhappy with the quality of construction. The mockup is meant to work through some of the details, which has already begun. There were three main concerns from BAR members, which was the quality of construction, the monochromatic quality of it, and the hope for more color on the project overall. The BAR was very clear about the color of the metal panels and where they should go. The mockup only includes one color and it isn't exact, so the contractor has been notified that he needs to match the three colors of stucco in their appropriate locations. Right now we are waiting for that to happen and the BAR will be invited out to see the updates. We are continuing to look at planters on balconies, getting greenery on the building, and finding other ways to incorporate color throughout the project. The reason for the change in glass is merely a manufacturing issue and it is not noticeable to the naked eye.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: Is it possible to break this into two motions? As far as the glass is concerned, there are no issues.

Motion: Schwarz having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the proposed window glazing 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 for the window glazing as submitted. Lahendro seconded. Approved (5-0-1, with Ball abstained.)

Mr. Sarafin: Reaffirms the metal panel selection and color and the already approved color scheme and the BAR needs to see a mockup with the approved colors. We can't pass additional judgement on this until we see the full palette mockup.

Mr. Lahendro: We could say that the BAR does not approve the mockup that was put up with the understanding that it was incorrect.

Mr. Gastinger: Going into the project one concern was how reflective the panels might be relative to sun angles. That concern was alleviated by seeing the mockup and the material and color of the panel itself is fine. While there is approval of the color range, the applicant is encouraged to further explore other stucco colors that will help break down the scale of the mass.

Mr. Schwarz: It is still completely inappropriate for the context of West Main.

Jeff Lavien, Owner of Project: The BAR has already approved the palette and it is inappropriate for the BAR to review the color palette again. The COA states for the BAR to give a final review of the approved metal panel only. We know that we have to match the colors to comply with the COA, but it has nothing to do with the approval of the color palette or another chance to approve a mockup. We want to move forward in a timely manner to order the metal panels and want to know that what we're ordering is what we stated that we would order. It is consistent and it's not different from what has been shown for the metal panels. The BAR should only be confirming that the metal panel is what the BAR has seen before and that the review is appropriate to approve.

Mr. Werner: An affirmation that the 4.0 drawing in January 17, 2017 was reviewed and approved by the BAR. There is still a question of the reevaluation of the mockup, as the BAR requested to see the material at the site and correctly constructed. Affirming the color palette and the materials that have been approved is fair, but there is still an opportunity to establish that you'd like to see an affirmation of the mockup panel.

Mr. Schwarz: Is it fair to say that a mockup panel helps to understand colors outside in the sunlight?

Mr. Werner: The metal is approved, but given some of the questions it would be good to see the mockup. It would be helpful to see how it looks with the various colors, as a duty of the BAR is to determine which color seems most appropriate. It is a means to an end that allows the applicant to move forward and it allows an evaluation onsite.

Mr. Sarafin: Isn't the intent of a mockup to see the materials in actual conditions to judge in a final way that they are appropriate for the building and the district? Because we didn't see actual the colors in the mockup, seeing them in the actual conditions with a second mockup is necessary. Nothing that we are discussing would threaten or hold up the project because the metal is approved. At the very least, the approved colors need to be seen in a mockup as requested. This is a huge building on West Main Street and that level of review is not inappropriate.

Mr. Lahendro: Notes that he was not on the board when this project came forward, but if three options were put forward for the stucco, that implies that the choice had yet to be made and it warranted the BAR's opinion on it.

Mr. Gastinger: Those three colors are deployed on the building in different places. They were not 3 options for 1 paint color.

Mr. Sarafin: All three colors were supposed to appear on predetermined places of the building. There were concerns about the somber palette, how the colors look in the daylight, and how they look together. The final review and approval of the mockup is essentially the final approval of everything.

Mr. Gastinger: Many of our guidelines focus on how the building mass is broken down and made appropriate to the relationship with the neighborhood. In this case, color is a very important part of that. We need to see a mockup with the final approved stucco colors.

Mr. Lahendro: Could the BAR just approve the metal panels and reject the mockup?

Ms. Miller: The motion is amended to state that the BAR has not approved the mockup that was reviewed on site in February 2019.

Motion: Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to approve the metal panel, but deny the on-site mockup which did not include the final color pallet selection. The metal panels 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 metal panel as submitted. Lahendro seconded. Approved (3-2-1, with Miller and Schwarz opposed, and Ball abstained).

It should be noted that in order to obtain their Certificate of Appropriateness the applicant needs to provide the BAR with an accurate mock-up panel in the field for final color pallet approval.

C. Deferred Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-08-01

230 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280009100, 280001000, 280009000

Brands Hatch LLC, Owner/ Fred Wolf, Applicant

Amendments to the COA – CODE Building (formerly The Technology Center)

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This is a request for the COA for changes to a previously approved design. There have been discussions with the City Attorney and the language to use when amending a COA should be that we are making revisions to an approved design. The project encompasses multiple properties and structures, specifically 215 West Water Street, 218-220 West Main Street, and 230 West Main Street. All of the properties are located in the Downtown ADC District. 215 West Water Street was built in the 1920s and the BAR approved its demolition in April 2017. 218-220 West Main Street was built 1901, with major storefront changes in 1981. The building façade will be preserved as part of this project. 230 West Main Street was built as an ice skating rink in 1995. The BAR approved its demolition in April 2017. This request is a COA for several revisions to the approved design. The drawings that we are working from are from the January 29, 2019 dated set. The primary changes include a brick assembly update to install a 1" thin brick rain screen system, reduce the width of the office windows, remove the west wall of the 218 West Main building and alter the profile of the brick to allow for a vine scrim, add two additional windows and change the food stall openings to glass storefronts, and to install new a storefront and entry door. In the pedestrian gallery, there will be an addition of bollards near Water Street. At the garage entry, there will be an addition of lift gates. As for the brick walls, the BAR previously approved anodized blades, which have been replaced with a metallic two-coat Fluropon material and the channel profile will be rounded. On the exterior wall there is an addition of air intake louvers near grade. There are revisions to the light fixtures and there is clarification on the landscaping materials for the granite pavers and the stairs along the mall. Staff is generally supportive of the changes, but there are still questions regarding going to an extruded material that will be painted.

Applicant, Fred Wolf, Wolf Ackerman: The front edge of the fins that are being employed between the brick sections will be squared as opposed to an indentation there. The brick being used is the same brick that was brought to the BAR in June. It is a one inch thick brick and it is slotted, which allows the opportunity to have a physical connection and an adhesive that goes with it. Using a thicker brick also allows the ability to create a shadow line just like a traditional brick. The other advantage is that because it is a rain screen system, a cavity will be behind the wall that can be used to ventilate and manage some of the fresh air intake and exhaust. In essence this brick has the same appearance, but the only difference is that 60% of the material isn't there. The reason for changing the windows was that it was a code issue for how close they were relative to the property line. The last major issue was the adjustments that were made to Carytown. Previously the brick had been alternated on the lower piece and fastened vine scrim to the wall. Now the plan is to integrate it so the thin brick is on the lower portion and a full brick on the upper portion, which makes it more architectural while the vines are starting to grow in. In terms of changes of the images, the substrates were added behind the brick. On the Carytown façade, the storefront windows were divided into three bays rather than two. The variation that you can get with anodizing can be rather extreme and in order to ensure

that there is consistency, a noneconomic decision was made to go with the paint so that everything would match. It still gives the reflectivity and variation that the anodized finish would have created. There will be two stainless steel removable bollards that will go in the opening where the courtyard and gallery space connects to the sidewalk at Water Street, which will be used as visual deterrent. The louvers will be the same finish as the metal panels. Lastly, a small proportion adjustment was made to the steps and a railing was added.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: Has anyone from the City approved the step detail?

Mr. Wolf: Not officially. Since everything is happening within the boundary of private property, the decision to how to demarcate that condition falls more to the owner.

Mr. Lahendro: What kind of mortar and joint will be used with the brick?

Mr. Wolf: A rake joint might be used, which is a flat joint that gets pushed back in to get a sharp shadow line. Alternatively, a weathered joint could be used, which would also give off a nice shadow. As far as the mortar color, the darker ones will lighten over time and the inclination is to go with darker ones because they create a striking shadow. At this point, the focus has been on pattern, coursing and sizes. We will propose something in the future, but the issue is finding the right balance so the wall isn't too monolithic.

Mr. Gastinger: There is a new planer island. Is that being fully reconstructed in the current mall extension?

Mr. Wolf: Yes. That was part of a previous reworking of that area to make the grades work. The steps are changing but the raised planter will stay the same.

Mr. Gastinger: Could the railing possibly be moved out of the center of the stair or is that the code reading?

Mr. Gregg Bleam: It is a code reading.

Mr. Gastinger: Could you discuss the use of the pedestal system and how/why it is being deployed since it seems to be very shallow.

Mr. Bleam: There was concern about putting drains and divots in at the courtyard because the goal was for it to be a very flexible space.

Mr. Wolf: A waterproofing/roofing system that allows you to do a completely flat slab. The installation is supposed to let the water through where it migrates to the drain without any sloping of the slab.

Mr. Ball: Regarding the parking barriers, would this be in place of the rolled down cage?

Mr. Wolf: No, the see-through grill will still be down overnight. They still wanted something to control so that people wouldn't drive down and circulate through there and this is a way to control entry when the door is up. It will have infrared set up and there will be room behind the wing walls to tuck the housing back there so all that would be seen is the arm.

Mr. Gastinger: How are the proposed tree grates expandable or modified as the tree grows?

Mr. Bleam: They won't have to cut to expand them. The opening will accommodate the largest that it will need to be.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Lahendro: To be clear, what will the BAR play a role in deciding in the mockup? Is there anything else that has not already been approved in terms of materials? What about the mortar?

Mr. Werner: The mortar hasn't been discussed very much in the past. If there are preferences or guidance, that would be helpful going forward.

Mr. Wolf: We will use it to evaluate the decisions we're making right now. We strongly about the brick and the blend, but the joint and mortar color and understanding how they work together to get them in the right orientation of the site will be important to see. Hopefully the brick and metal will be approved, but there will be an opportunity to see how the mortar interacts with it.

Mr. Lahendro: The mortar color is just as important as the brick so it is surprising that it hasn't been an issue in the past.

Mr. Schwarz: Notes that the mortar color has come up on bigger projects.

Mr. Wolf: This is not a typical joint and it plays up the linear quality of the brick with the horizontality and the shadow line. The brick is a unique shape, but it still speaks to the materiality of the mall.

Ms. Miller: The brick change is an advantage because of the ability to hide the ventilation and the number of windows on Carytown is an improvement because it mirrors the windows above. Pushing the wall in seems weird for a historic building because it wouldn't have been built that way.

Mr. Gastinger: Thinks the wall being pushed in is good change because it makes a distinction about what might have been mistaken as a historic wall.

Mr. Lahendro: Notes that he is fine with the proposed method for reducing the open area on the façade where there is an issue with fire protection.

Mr. Sarafin: Appreciates the explanation of the bronze finish and that it isn't a cost cutting measure. The notion of painting uniformity makes sense.

Mr. Schwarz: There was a concern that it wasn't going to reflect as much light, but it is almost more reflective. In terms of mortar, the reddish brown mortar seemed to warm it up a bit, which helped.

Mr. Lahendro: A light colored mortar would make it look too much like something that it's not because it isn't a brick wall. Using a light colored joint with a tooled joint or having something that mimics a red brick wall would be the wrong approach.

Mr. Gastinger: Notes that he is fine with all of the changes. However, if there was a way to meet code and move the handrail out of the center, it would look much friendlier to the urban environment.

Ms. Miller: If the tree grades don't ever have to be cut to be open, how much space is there between the hole and the tree? How deep is it? The problem on the mall is that the City doesn't want to cut them to wide in case children were to get their feet caught in them.

Mr. Bleam: They will have to be enlarged as the tree grows, but we are looking at what can be put around the tree like stone or rubber material to keep it from being an open hole.

Motion: Sarafin moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements and New Construction I move to find that the proposed revisions satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Lahendro seconded. Approved (6-0.)

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-04-07

608 Preston Place

Tax Parcel 050108000

Psi Chapter of Sigma Chi Fraternity House Corp, Owner/John Matthews, Applicant

Sigma Chi Renovations and Addition

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The building was constructed in 1929 it is a contributing structure in the Rugby Road—University Circle—Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The request is to modify the second phase of a previously approved two phase renovation of the fraternity house. Both phases were approved in 2014 and the first phase has already been constructed. The applicant had a preliminary discussion about their proposal in December and the difficulties that come along with it. The applicant offered clarification and additional information about the fencing, railing, etc. via 10 new drawings dated March 4, 2019. Nothing relative to the design has changed, but there was one change on the north boundary line of the project where a neighbor asked the applicant to consider a taller fence along the property line. The changes primarily refer to the east elevation of the fraternity house, along with changes to some of the additions on the rear that had been approved. Staff's review suggests that the proposed addition and the rehabilitations are appropriate. The materiality distinguishes the addition from the existing building while not adversely altering it. It is suggested that the BAR discuss the proposed roof extension over the rear egress stairs whether it adversely affects the historical character of the existing roofline. There is information in the drawings about lighting and the BAR typically requests dimmable lights with limitations on light temperature. Regarding the fence, the BAR Guidelines for an ADC District recommend nothing higher than 6 feet and the request is for an 8 foot fence. However, there is an existing 8 foot fence at the rear property line and the City Ordinance does not have a limit on the height of a fence so there isn't anything precluding the BAR for allowing a taller fence.

Applicant, Erin Hannigan, Mitchell Matthews Architects: There were changes to the landscape that we tried to accommodate from suggestions that were made in December's meeting. To clarify, the digital copy of the drawing set includes all of the sheets, but the ones that we did not provide hard copies of are the same as the previous submission. The low slope roof over the rear stair is there in order to preserve the rear dormer that is existing and it is required by code to cover and protect that means of egress.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Paul Wright: Notes that he is the neighbor on the left of the fraternity house. There are currently a few existing electrical poles that are not shown on the drawing and it is unclear if they are going to be buried. If so, it would be important to know because his power comes from those poles as well. In terms of the fencing, the current condition is a row of boxwoods that are going to be eliminated to move the fence out. The request to add an 8 foot fence was because if it were lower, people would climb them and get into parties. The BAR should consider this as they move forward because that is a huge concern. The fences also double as security for events to keep people out of parties that are controlled.

Ms. Miller: Do you have problems with people climbing over the boxwoods now?

Mr. Wright: Not the boxwoods, but there have been issues with them climbing over the fence. Notes that he has been maintaining the boxwoods and fixing the fence in the past 5 years that he has lived there. A new fence had to be put on the back part because people would sneak around and break into the parties. Notes that he is also the neighborhood president for Venable and there are not objections to the designs of the house at all and are supportive of the overall design.

Ms. Hannigan: The power poles do serve both properties, but one of the existing power poles will have to be relocated because. There was a chance of the undergrounding causing an upcharge to the neighbor's service, which we didn't want to impose so we hope to solve it by relocating it instead. As for the question about the fence, a metal fence has been proposed that starts 3 feet off the front property line and extends to the 25 foot setback line. From that point to the rear property line, it would be a more solid pressure treated 8 foot tall wood fence that matches the existing fence at the rear property line. This helps to provide some visual openness.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gastinger: How much of the boxwoods are existing and how much is slated to be removed?

Ms. Hannigan: There is a line of boxwoods on the outside of the existing fence. There are 12 existing plants that arch and hang into the neighbor's property. The issue is that in order to get the width for the parking spaces, drive isle, and the curb and still have a boundary line, they would have to go. They are nice boxwoods but there isn't enough space for them.

Mr. Gastinger: Could you point out the changes to the landscape?

Ms. Hannigan: All of the burning bush was removed and continued with privet hedges to maintain consistency. Instead of periwinkle at a planting bed, we are proposing holly to match and give symmetry to the planting beds. There is an existing tree that fell down on the southwest corner last year, which is being replaced to what the original landscape plan had shown. We are also putting liriopie around the enclosures in the back.

Mr. Lahendro: Of the materials being proposed now, were any used in the work that was done to the prior addition?

Ms. Hannigan: Yes, all of them match except for the paver brought this evening. Everything else is the same.

Ms. Miller: Would you consider undergrounding the power? It would look better and offer better service.

Mr. Steve Driver: There are some issues in doing that. There are 3 utility poles along the north line and one in the back, but there could be some implications as far as the cost of going underground affecting other properties.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Paul Wright: A previous proposal had a 6 foot fence and now it has the 8 foot fence with the metal. There is a considerable amount of money that is being spent on the boxwoods and as bad as it is to remove them, it wouldn't be the worst thing in the world. Notes that he is not necessarily opposed to undergrounding the power lines either.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: Notes that flood lights are not appropriate as shown on the lighting plan. It should have a residential feel because it is in a neighborhood with neighbors surrounding it. The Japanese maple selection has a mature height of 18 feet and a real tree would be more appropriate. Japanese maples also don't look very good with the brick and a plant with green leaves would be a better choice. Removing the burning bush, which is an invasive species, was a good idea, but replacing it with another invasive species is not ideal even though it is existing on the property. Despite the fact that the neighbor is in favor of removing the boxwoods, without them the neighbor would be left to only look at parked cars, which is not an improvement

to the site. In regards to the windows, changing the pair of windows just because the kitchen counters are behind it is inappropriate.

Mr. Gastinger: Notes that in general he is supportive of the project, but Ms. Miller made good comments relative to the landscape and agrees with the scale of trees that could be added to the project. There are hundreds of varieties of Japanese maples that have a range of leaf color and scale, so it is possible that a larger, more upright variety might still work within some of the small planting areas. The biggest issue is the fence. Although there are challenges of this particular location, it isn't a reason to ignore the guidelines to maintain a height of 6 feet. The Guidelines relative to walls and fences also includes a note to maintain existing materials such as hedges. We should consider some of the challenges in regards to entry into the property that might be resolved by other means.

Mr. Ball: The extra 2 feet of fence will not make much of a difference and if it is a taller fence, they might just go around it.

Mr. James Moore: One of the greatest concerns that the active chapter has is security at parties and we try to funnel people in a specific pattern to monitor who goes inside. An 8 foot fence that would help channel them in would be a great benefit.

Mr. Gastinger: Notes that he appreciates the realities of that, but the BAR's jurisdiction does not include review of security plans for parties and it's important to stick to the architectural guidelines.

Mr. Ball: At the very least, if we are going to change something and go beyond the guidelines, we would have to see what it would look like.

Mr. Schwarz: A better understanding of the fence might be helpful. Perhaps a compromise could be that the metal fence goes further back and the wood fence starts back by the point of the house. With regards to the lighting, spotlights would likely be on all the time and they are not appropriate. It would be helpful to at least have motion sensors to help a little. Typically the color temperature should be no more than 3,000K and there are some things that only offer 4 or 5K, which may need to be addressed. In general, most of the modifications being made in this application are fine and an exception could be made for the windows in this case because it shows that there was a historic opening there.

Mr. Ball: Agrees and likes the detail of the windows. The kitchen has to move with the plan as it is and it has to be done. Having the panel there is a cleaner detail and it shows that there was a classic opening that we're not trying to hide. As far as motion sensors go, there is always the issue of them being on all the time but they have been approved in other residential areas.

Mr. Schwarz: Notes that these lights do not even have motion sensors but it would be a benefit if they were added if this were to get approved.

Mr. Lahendro: The materials have already been used on the prior addition and is fine with what is being proposed. Finds this to be an exception to the guidelines because of the use and where it is located. A compromise could be arranged where a 6 foot metal fence could be from the street to the plane of the house and an 8 foot wood fence from the front plane of the house to the back.

Mr. Schwarz: Notes that he could see that as a compromise.

Mr. Ball: It's difficult to tell what it would look like with a taller fence based on the pictures we have.

Mr. Werner: Notes that the BAR should state the unique circumstances of this motion if they were to go this route and why the BAR chooses vote the way they do.

Mr. Sarafin: Supports the compromise for the fence as long as it is explained why.

Ms. Miller: By large, the BAR seems supportive of the application, but there are a few points that still need to be figured out.

Mr. Gastingner: It seems like the landscape changes meets the guidelines because of the existing privet hedge, although it is not preferred and it causes a lot of problems for neighbors. The hedge that is surrounding the existing parking can remain privet as it is and a new hedge material should be chosen for the front yard. Are some of our comments relative to landscape limited since the plan had already been approved in 2014?

Mr. Driver: A site plan was approved in 2014 and a portion of that site has been built, as well as a portion of the landscaping that was approved by the BAR that has been put in place. Right now there is a site plan amendment in place for phase 2.

Mr. Schwarz: It looks like there is support for the window change and a compromise for the fence that was suggested.

Mr. Gastingner: Notes that he is not supportive of the fence change, but he wouldn't vote against the project because of it.

Ms. Hannigan: Notes that the lighting can be deferred for now.

Ms. Miller: Understands the need for light in the yard, but there isn't any reason to light up the entire wall from the soffit down and it should be at a more reasonable height.

Mr. Schwarz: In terms of the landscape, it looks like most agree that the Japanese maple should be a more substantial tree.

Ms. Miller: We could create a condition to allow any of the medium-tall range of trees stated in the City tree list.

Mr. Gastingner: Agrees that a selection from the tree list would be appropriate and would be within the Guidelines. Alternatively, a larger green species of Japanese maple would work.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed renovation and additions satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following modifications.

- Fence to be 6 foot metal back to the front plane of the house (on the north border), then 8 feet pressure treated from that point to the back of the property. This was considered because of the security concern, support from the neighborhood, and it was a fraternity house located next to a residential house.
- Replace the Japanese maple in the north corner with a medium/large size tree from the city's tree list or a larger, green species of Japanese maple
- Defer the spot lights, to come back for approval

The drawing we are approving are dated December 18, 2018 and the amended drawings dated March 4, 2019. Ball seconded. Approved (5-1, with Miller opposed.)

D. New Items

6. Preliminary Discussion

201 East High Street

Ms. Mess: Although the applicant is not here tonight, they would like to be sure their project to restore a historic front porch is done correctly. The porch was demolished in the 1970s. The applicant has historic photographs and plans to restore it as is, however they are worried that it will not be approved. If they submit measured drawings, include the historic photograph, and state the changes and materials that would be used, would the BAR need anything else in order to approve this application?

Mr. Werner: The applicant doesn't want to hire an architect unless they are sure that it can be done.

Ms. Miller: If it would be helpful for them to provide a statement, we would support an application if it would include measured drawings of what is being proposed and historic photographs would be helpful.

Mr. Schwarz: There is precedent for this with the Core Knowledge historic building where the historic porches were rebuilt. Looking at that application might also be helpful.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-02-01

721 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520054000

Mark Quigg and Lotta Helleberg, Owner/ Mark Quigg, Applicant

Demolish Current Garage/Construct New Garage

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The house was constructed in 1935. It is a Colonial Revival, three bay, two-story brick structure, and is a contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC District. The house was designed for sisters Emily, Martha, and Elizabeth Duke by the local architecture firm Stainback and Scribner and constructed by the Charlottesville Lumber Company. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish an existing 12 ft. x 20 ft. single story, clapboard garage and reconstruct a 16 ft. x 42 ft. structure that maintains the same architectural style and colors of the original. The differences include a height will increase two stories, a hipped roof with shed roof dormers similar to the house, increase square footage, existing gravel driveway will be enlarged, and the existing fence will be extended and revised. Some of the relocation of the footprint is to retain an existing tree on the site. The materials include Hardiplank siding (painted) and Timbertext three-tabbed slate gray asphalt shingles on the roof. The existing garage is not a contributing structure in the ADC district. Staff commends the applicant for shifting the new structure west in order to protect existing tree. Given the current information, the design of the new outbuilding is compatible with the ADC guidelines; however, staff has requested measured drawings, window, door, and lighting fixture cut sheets, material specific and colors for the new garage, and design/materials for the new gate.

Applicant, Mark Quigg: The goal is to make a functional space out of a building that is falling apart. There is a 275 year old oak tree on the site and we want to get the garage out of the root and push things back a bit.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ball: Tonight are you looking for an approval of the new building or just an approval of demolition?

Mr. Quigg: We want to build the building. The overall theme is that nothing new is being done and we want to make it look like it has been there.

Mr. Ball: Are you matching the color of the existing house with the Hardiplank? Are the shutters and brackets wood?

Mr. Quigg: Yes. The doors are a dark green and we will be preserving that color and the shutters and brackets are wood.

Mr. Schwarz: Notes that one of the requirements for the lights is that they have an external and internal bar and a bar in between the glass.

Mr. Schwarz: What is the material for the door and garage doors?

Mr. Quigg: They are both wood.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: The only thing we are missing are the measured drawings, which staff can get.

Mr. Werner: Notes that the house is pushed back from the street and it fits well.

Mr. Lahendro: We have a rendering of it, as well as a rendering of it in relation to the house, so we can see the proportion of it. Notes that he would be in support of voting on it by indicating that it needs to match the characteristics and material that was presented.

Ms. Miller: As long as we have the measured drawings for the record, that should be fine.

Motion: **Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed garage demolition and new garage satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following condition that measured drawings including the materials discussed during the March 13, 2019 be submitted to staff for the final archived application. Lahendro seconded. Approved (6-0.)**

8. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-02-02

852-854 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 300003000

Madison Loft LLC, Owner/ T-Mobile Northeast LLC, Applicant

Cell Antenna Installation

Staff Report, Camie Mess: 852-854 and 858-860 West Main Street is a non-contributing mixed use building in the West Main Street ADC District. The development was formerly known as the Plaza and is now called the Flats at West Village. The application is to install 3 T-Mobile antennas on the rooftop. The proposed antennas will extend above roof parapet approximately 7 feet, but will be wrapped with 3M Conceal Film. There are similar antennas and wrapping installed on the rooftop of 854 West Main Street. Staff finds the proposed installation appropriate and recommends approval.

Applicant, Rich Wagner, T-Mobile: The reason the 3M film was chosen was because the construction of the building was lightweight and it were to be done similar to the building right beside it, it would have too much wind loading on the roof itself. Instead, we researched the project and feel that it is a viable option because it doesn't change the site lines of the building.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: This seems perfectly appropriate and within the guidelines. Appreciates that the applicant installed the sample in a more visible place than where the actual antenna will be so the BAR could look at it.

Mr. Schwarz: Thinks this will be a great test case.

Mr. Wagner: It has been approved in historic districts in Maryland and D.C. and it is exciting because it is the first one in the Virginia market.

Mr. Schwarz: Notes that he would like to add to the motion that if the concealment should start to fail it should be replaced, and any future antenna should be reviewed and update the concealment plan for the building. Just because it works in this one particular instance doesn't mean it will work for all future instances on this building.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed cell antenna installation satisfies 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 application as submitted for this particular case given

- Should the concealment start to fail it must be replaced
- Future antenna installation needs to be reviewed and the concealment plan updated
- The concealment works for this particular case, but may not work in future instances, therefore any additional antenna installations need to come back to the BAR for approval

Sarafin seconded. Approved (6-0.)

9. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-02-04

218 West Market Street

Tax Parcel 330276000

Market Street Promenade, LLC, Owner/ Heirloom Real Estate Holdings LLC, Applicant

Demolition of Existing Structure

Mr. Schwarz and Mr. Ball recused themselves from this application based on business and employment arrangements.

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: 218 West Market Street is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. City records indicate the building was constructed in 1938. It is important to note that by code, all structures in the Downtown ADC are designated *as contributing*, regardless of historic significance. This request is for the demolition of the existing commercial building. The intent of this demolition is to provide additional parking on the site, with the potential of being redeveloped for the site of a mixed use structure in the future of Charlottesville's Downtown development. The BAR should discuss the positive and negative potential impacts of the demolition of this structure. Additionally, staff believes that the BAR should request additional documentation and complete a survey of the structure prior to demolition. This would include, but is not limited to, photos, floor plans, window details, etc...

Applicant, Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Architects: This application is a question of whether or not this is a feasible development site, given the density and mixed use that the City wants Downtown. We are in a due diligence phase of a study need to understand whether or not the removal of the building would be allowed as the project moves forward. We understand that any replacement structure would need to be approved by the BAR as well. It is currently used as surface parking for 29 cars and this seems like a prime location to get underground parking and mixed use as part of the Downtown Mall. This structure

is of no historic significance and keeping this structure would render the project infeasible. The quick study of parking that was done shows the possibilities of below grade parking. This potential owner would not consider this a parking garage project, but rather it would be a mixed use project with residential, commercial, and retail. With an approval to demolish, an approved plan from the BAR would have to come next. The difficulty, time and expense involved to study it is very large and before heading down that path, we need to know that the building would not be required to remain. Other structures in historic districts have recently been allowed to be demolished including the Studio Art building, the Clock Shop, etc., so there is precedent for this when the site is deemed to be of a higher and better use if redeveloped.

Ms. Miller: To be clear, the BAR is supposed to evaluate the appropriateness of demolition based on the merit of the structure, not on what might come next.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Gastinger: One of the criteria for gauging a demolition is the advantages to the public good and there is a concern that it might become a surface parking lot.

Mr. Dreyfus: We share the same concern and the lease on the property runs for 3 years. We would be willing to consider an approval of a demolition permit contingent upon a building permit for the replacement structure, which would require a COA for the next structure.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Lahendro: Agrees with Mr. Gastinger because tearing down a building for a parking lot would not be serving the public good. It would create more holes in the City and there needs to be more infill projects and more density. There would be no issue with demolishing the building if it has an appropriate use.

Mr. Gastinger: There is no concern with this demolition but having a contingency to know what is coming in its place would be wise to consider.

Mr. Sarafin: The only way the application could be supported was if there was some kind of condition. Before it were demolished it would need to be documented but this would be for the greater good for the site.

Mr. Lahendro: It might be an underutilized site now, but it adds vitality and urban character that a parking lot would not.

Ms. Miller: There are great, vibrant tenants that bring a lot of people to the site.

Ms. Mess: Clarifies that the demolition would have to take place within 18 months. However, if a site plan process has begun it would allow them to have an additionally 5 years.

L.J. Lopez: We would respectfully request the additional year and within that time period, we would have a site plan and building plans come before the BAR to evaluate the replacement.

Motion: Sarafin moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, I move to find that the proposed demolition of 218 West Market Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with the following conditions:

- The COA be extended an additional year past the 18 month to 30 months
- The demolition of the building is contingent upon the granting of a COA and building permit for this buildings replacement
- Request to have the building documented and photographed for the public record, if the building is to be demolished

Lahendro seconded. Approved (4-0-2, with Schwarz and Ball recused.)

E. New Construction

10. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-02-03

0 Rugby Road

Tax Parcel 050047100

West Range Castle Dango, LLC, Owner/ Isaac Miller, Applicant

New Construction

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: 0 Rugby Road is vacant parcel in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The applicant has presented drawings for a new three-story, 12 unit student housing facility that will feature an underground parking garage. Staff recommends the BAR include the following in their discussion: the building's relationship to the site and topography, the massing and materiality, the consistency with the surrounding contributing structures, the contemporary design relative to its incorporation of historical architectural features, and the project's relationship to 513 Rugby Road.

Applicant, Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects: There was a preliminary discussion for the project a few months ago where a traditional front of the building was presented with a more contemporary rear. Along Rugby Road, the most successful buildings on the street have taken a more traditional, stylistic approach. _This building has the same proportional system to the 513 building, which will be renovated in conjunction with this project. This kind of architecture are consistent with the area, which led to this approach for the front of the building. The switch to a more contemporary style in the back picks up on a precedent in these neighborhoods with a more utilitarian structure. The change in style also contributes to breaking down of the scale of the building. If the rear were to also be brick, it would emphasize the scale of the building and not allow the relationship between the buildings on either side to relate to the front. The brick veneer is consistent with the adjacent building and the ZBT house to the north is a short term building. The owner has done cosmetic renovations that will last 5-7 years and anticipate a major renovation or replacement of the building.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Paul Wright, President of Venable Neighborhood Association: Many people are concerned that the size and egress of the building is terrible. It is 14 feet across there are concerns with the current placement of the building because of the heavy traffic flow coming into the site. It is a slope site and the wide boulevard is not indicative of what it would look like, as it is a narrow road. What are the architects' plan to address this?

Mr. Wardell: We submitted a site plan with a widened entrance as the road comes up to Rugby Road. The site plan has just been returned from the City, so those modifications haven't been reflected in this submission. The site plan has a much wider 20 foot entrance and exit at the street. It is a very difficult site because it only has one entrance and it is shared. It straddles the property line, so there will be an easement with ZBT for the configuration of the road and it is extremely limited.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ball: How many parking spaces do you have?

Mr. Isaac Miller: There are 20 spaces underground and 11 behind the 513 building. It would be 31 spaces in total.

Mr. Lahendro: The sidewalk is heavily used and it is a steep incline. There is a hedge and a fence that keeps users from seeing the driveway. Can you address this?

Mr. Wardell: The hedge could be pulled back and when the entrance is widened to reflect the site plan, the landscaping for visibility will be modified.

Mr. Schwarz: What are your thoughts on the detailing of the fiber smith panels in terms of joints?

Mr. Miller: The dark gray area will have a slight reveal for the panels. The lighter gray is shiplap with inherent joints in them.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Paul Wright: The neighbors wanted the BAR to consider the front façade, as there are many different styles being put together. The number one concern was that it would not be a secret new fraternity, which is not the case and isn't within the BAR's jurisdiction. Secondly, the egress of cars and sidewalk safety is very important. If not done correctly, there will be problems because it will essentially triple the amount of cars coming off of the property.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: We need to see the site with the changes that are coming, so we can defer that portion of it.

Mr. Werner: Could the BAR members offer insight and/or suggestions on the architecture of the building?

Mr. Sarafin: In terms of the style, it's almost as if the two sections want to meet somewhere in the middle. It appears like a historic house with a new addition, which is misleading because it is all new construction. Stylistically, it would be interesting to see what it would look like if it were a unified style that met somewhere in the middle.

Ms. Miller: Notes that she likes it because it breaks the mass. However, the building is twice the height as the building next door and it looks too skinny. The roof is also over the center section only and flat on the sides, which looks off.

Mr. Schwarz: It makes it look like it has a flat roof, which is a more contemporary take on the style. The idea of having a traditional front and a contemporary back could be a good idea. Typically, it's better to be more subtle when matching old and new because no one will be fooled that this is an old building. Overall the approach is appropriate.

Ms. Miller: Having the cornus and the water table aligned with the house next door is nice.

Mr. Werner: The rendering is not revealing the roof mass. Wouldn't it be visible?

Mr. Wardell: This is the model and the building could be just as successful as a flat roof building.

Mr. Gastinger: Did not attend the preliminary discussed, but this combination gives a misleading and confusing story about the origins of the building because they are together. If we were looking at a restoration of a project or an addition to the building, they would have their merits. However, together the combination is odd it feels like there has been an evolution in this building's development that hasn't happened. The proportion of the massing is fine, but the front element is a tremendous missed opportunity. Many fraternity/sorority house renovations have nowhere to go architecturally, which creates knock off copies. The Guidelines are specific about the challenges of this type of architecture, noting in the details and

decorations section that one extreme is to simply copy the complete design of a historic building, where the other is to paste on historic details on a modern unadorned design. Neither solution is appropriate for designing architecture that relates to its historic context and yet still reads as a contemporary building. Successful new buildings may take their clues from historic images and reintroduce and reinterpret designs of traditional decorative elements or may have a modernist approach with minimal details and decorations. In many ways, this building would benefit from these considerations.

Mr. Wardell: Taking that interpretation of that passage would then preclude authentic traditional building. If they are authentically proportioned, do the Guidelines preclude doing a building that is designed authentically in a traditional historic style?

Mr. Gastinger: None of the buildings built today are done that fashion.

Mr. Ball: This building isn't strictly historic and there's something that reads in a more contemporary fashion with historic and classical elements. For example, the massing of the flat wings don't read as historic.

Mr. Gastinger: It is most egregious in the detailing of the front door and the portico, as it feels like a mix of styles.

Mr. Schwarz: The railing and pediment above seem like they are competing with one another.

Mr. Lahendro: In reality the pediment is back and the front elevation doesn't read as you would see it on the street in its constructed form.

Mr. Ball: Did you look at dropping the railing down to the midpoint?

Mr. Wardell: Yes and the owner has a strong affection for this kind of entry.

Mr. Lahendro: Agrees with Mr. Gastinger in that it looks like two buildings have been constructed. They are just too different for them to be done at the same time because they are fighting with one another.

Mr. Gastinger: Doesn't mind that they are fighting with one another, but they both have a strong connection to a particular time period. The architectural style tells a confusing story about when it was developed. The back half needs to have a different architectural materiality or color to break down the mass and make it more appropriate to the scale of the site.

Mr. Sarafin: It'd be better if they were more related – if the front was more chaste with less detail and the back had the same brick material but a lower level of decoration and higher level of simplicity. It's a problem that it's being built in one phase.

Mr. Lahendro: Agrees that something needs to tie them together. Even taking the cornice around to the back would help.

Mr. Schwarz: Notes that he is leery of dumbing down the front but keeping it brick. For this to be successful and fit it, it needs to have a residential scale, which tends to be more ornate. Tying in the back and front makes sense but there is a worry that it will become too postmodern.

Mr. Sarafin: The block with the slight reveal is quite attractive. The relationship to the back half just needs to be tied in more.

Mr. Wardell: Perhaps the issue isn't with the material, but rather with color that ties them together. There is also the problem of tying them together too much and losing the scale.

Mr. Gastinger: The project is in the right hands because BRW has a history of doing this successfully.

Mr. Werner: This is a vacant lot and it is in line with the house next door. Determining whether the BAR likes it or not is not in our Guidelines, but if there are suggestions that the BAR can get behind that's the direction we need to move towards.

Mr. Schwarz: For a building of this size, the back portion is lacking in detail. However, it might not be seen as much. The back is so plain that it becomes stark compared to the front.

Mr. Wardell: We can look at color and material to help with that. The danger with making the detailing on the front less robust is that is what makes the buildings that are trying to be classical/traditional look like cartoons. This is a very stylistically constrained site in terms of what the precedents are and the freedom we have to move away from that.

Mr. Schwarz: Some wall sections would be very useful on the back or just throughout to get a better understanding of the materiality being proposed.

Mr. Wardell: Notes that the wider entrance of the driveway and the site lines will be addressed in response to the comments on the site plan for the future. Hopefully, this will be a faster moving process because the idea is to start the construction this summer.

Mr. Sarafin: Notes that there wasn't much of a discussion regarding the massing and scale because they are successful. It boils down to some stylistic things that should be adjusted.

Mr. Lahendro: Agrees and states that the problem lies within the materiality and connective-ness between the two blocks.

Mr. Schwarz: Mr. Gastinger read the details and decorations segment of the Guidelines and ultimately the applicant needs to decide where the building falls within that. The applicant could make the argument that they aren't copying a historic building completely, nor are they pasting on historic details to a contemporary box. At the same time, building detail and ornamentation should be consistent with and related to the architecture of the surrounding context and district, the mass of larger buildings may be reduced using articulated design details, and pedestrian scale may be reinforced with details. On the front, it looks like all of these are being done, but the issue might be simply tying the back to the front.

Mr. Gastinger: The details on the central bay needs the most work, as they seem out of character with the elegant and contextual maxing. There needs to be a stronger relationship between the back half and the front. From a Guidelines perspective, we're talking about the context of a historic neighborhood and what the narrative of a building might suggest about how the neighborhood developed.

Mr. Sarafin: It comes down to what is appropriate in this residential neighborhood and it looks like a historic building with a big addition on the rear. As a new building all at once, it's difficult to find its appropriateness in the neighborhood. It needs to be tied together and color is probably a big part of that.

Mr. Wardell requests a deferral of his application.

Motion: Miller moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Lahendro seconded. Approved (6-0.)

F. Other Business

11. PLACE Report, Carl Schwarz: The BPAC Committee presented their Standards and Designs Manual comments to the PLACE committee and one of the most pertinent items for the BAR that was discussed was minimum block size. The manual says that the minimum block size should be 500 ft. and the Downtown Mall is 230 ft. At some point this will be addressed by the Planning Commission.

G. Adjournment: 9:40 p.m.