

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
[March 19, 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](http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)**

**Members Present:** Justin Sarafin, Stephen Balut, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Melanie Miller, Mike Ball, Emma Earnst, and Tim Mohr

**Staff Present:** Jeff Werner, Camie Mess, Kari Spitler, and Sebastian Weisman

**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 18-02-02  
516 Ridge Street  
Tax Parcel 290273000  
Claire and Charles McKinley, Owner and Applicant  
Amendments to the COA – front fence
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness (Historic Conservation District)**  
BAR 19-03-03  
924 Rugby Road  
Tax Parcel 050147000  
Susan and Jonathan Blank, Owner/Sigora Solar, Applicant  
Addition of Solar Panels
4. **Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 19-03-04  
206 5<sup>th</sup> Street NE  
Tax Parcel 530093000  
Allwood, LLC, Owner/Sigora Solar, Applicant  
Addition of Solar Panels

**5. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 19-03-01  
420 Park Street  
Tax Parcel 530120000  
Edward Bain/Robert Downer, Owner/Applicant  
Addition of Solar Panels

**6. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 17-09-02  
946 Grady Avenue  
Tax Parcel 310060000  
Dairy Holdings, LLC, Owner/ Wendie Charles, Applicant  
Amendments to COA

**Mr. Werner:** The staff report for the 420 Park Street application mistakenly refers to a 300 watt system, which is the approximate output of a single solar panel. The output of the system to be similar to the others would be 12.5 KWP.

**Balut. Balut moved to approve the consent agenda. Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0-1, with Mohr recused)**

**C. New Construction**

**7. Certificate of Appropriateness (Historic Conservation District)**

BAR 19-03-06  
120 Franklin Street  
Tax Parcel 560114200  
Loft Realty and Investments, LLC, Owner/Blackbird of Charlottesville, LLC, Applicant  
New Construction

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** The houses at 120 and 124 Franklin Street are by the same owner and both staff reports for the COAs are virtually identical for both. 120 and 124 Franklin Street are vacant parcels in the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required for new buildings and structures within an HC District. The short segment of Franklin Street between East Market Street and the railroad tracks lies at the southern edge of the HC District. Fronting on Franklin Street is one existing structure (123) and four vacant lots (120, 124, 128, and 132). 128 and 132 are under construction, as they were approved in previous years by the BAR. Both applications are requests for COA for new single family detached dwellings. In addition to the Historic Conservation District Guidelines, the BAR must consider the architectural character-defining features established for the Woolen Mills Village HC District. These are to:

- Encourage one-story front porches – Designs both comply.
- Encourage garages to be located in the rear yards – No garages are proposed.
- The levels of a building’s stories should be consistent with those on surrounding structures with respect to the natural grade – Designs both comply.
- Do not exclude well-designed, new contemporary architecture – Designs both comply.
- Encourage standing seam metal roofs – Asphalt shingles on houses; front porches roof appears to be standing seam.
- Maintain and encourage tree canopy – No landscaping shown on plans. No existing street trees.

- Maintain neighborhood massing and form; encourage the use of sustainable materials – Designs are consistent with massing and form of existing contributing structure at 123 Franklin Street and with approved designs at 128 and 132 Franklin Street. Building materials are not specified.
- Encourage existing site features (wrought iron fencing, stone walls, shared streets) – Not applicable.
- Encourage good stewardship of Riverview Cemetery – Not applicable.

In speaking to both designs, the proposed designs are consistent with the HCD Design Guidelines and, where applicable, they comply generally with the Woolen Mills HCD criteria. Both properties are in the Historic Conservation District where guidelines are less stringent than an ADC District. Specifications for building materials generally have not been required, however there may be items that the BAR wants additional information on. A resident of Woolen Mills emailed asking the BAR to consider several conditions of approval, which are to assure that the house is constructed per the drawings relative to the first setback, relative to the orientation shown on the drawings, and that the front elevation match the drawings. They also requested the planting of street trees. Approval of a COA already references the specific drawings, but relative to the front setback and the orientation, the District Guidelines allow for the BAR to review and approve a building's alignment and setbacks. Relative to the elevations, the assurance that what is approved is built will be handled through the building permit process. As for the tree plantings, the District Guidelines only provide that the BAR should encourage new street trees, however it's appropriate to discuss this with the applicant and determine if trees are planned.

**Ms. Miller:** Do we have any information regarding the inquiry the BAR received about a previous nearby property that seemed to be constructed differently than what was approved?

**Mr. Werner:** Staff could pull the building permit and look into it. We don't go out every day to check constantly, but it is part of the process. If it wasn't what was approved, then they won't get their CO.

**Applicant, Nicole Scro, Gallifrey Homes:** This application is similar to what was already approved next door at 128 Franklin. It's a similar farmhouse design. The goal is to allow this to be customized by the buyer, so hopefully we can have some flexibility while adhering to the Guidelines.

**Ms. Miller:** The BAR only comments on the exterior of the building, but any changes that buyer might want to make could be sent to City staff.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

**Mr. Greg Gelbord:** Lives at 1612 East Market Street and his property comes up behind 120 Franklin Street. New construction requires sidewalks; does the application somehow bypass that requirement? The design looks nice, but are these houses allowed to build sheds and is there a requirement for how close they are to the boundaries?

**Ms. Miller:** Sidewalks are not under the BAR's jurisdiction and Zoning dictates the boundary requirements.

**Mr. Werner:** Notes that they would need a building permit for something like a shed and if it is visible it would have to come back to the BAR unless it is under 144 sq. ft.

**Bill Emory:** Resides at 1604 East Market Street. Moving closer to the street is great, however this area used to be low lying and it has been gradually filled in over the years. Woolen Mills is a weird neighborhood in that we don't have any storm water infrastructure and it's a great opportunity to do onsite, thoughtful storm water infrastructure. The concern with the whole area that has been filled in is that it is shunting a lot of storm water into 1610 East Market, which will impact those who live in the historic Graves house on the corner of Market and Franklin. It may not be under the BAR's purview, but it's certainly something to consider.

**Mr. Gastinger:** In a Historic Conservation District, the kinds of materials that are submitted to the BAR aren't strictly in our purview, especially as it relates to storm water. In some of the more stringent Conservation districts, there is some control and review over a site plan that might have a relationship to those issues, but less so in a Historic Conservation District.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Will the site plan that was submitted go on the Planning Commission's consent agenda where there would be an opportunity to bring that up?

**Mr. Werner:** The explanation has been that there isn't another review of this and whatever has been done is done. The subdivision should have dealt with the storm water.

**Mr. Mohr:** The most egregious thing in the City is the parking area mandated by the City, and the runoff is even worse.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Gastinger:** In the recent past there have been quite a few trees either on the 120 property or on its boundary. It is unclear if there are any existing trees on the side boundary between 120 and the adjacent property.

**Ms. Scro:** There is one large tree on an adjacent property.

**Mr. Gastinger:** Several plans and images suggested at least 3 trees in the front yard. Are they part of the proposal?

**Ms. Scro:** That is the hope, but we would like to leave it up to the buyer's choice to determine what they can afford. It would be great to put trees, but there may be cost constraints and it wasn't required for the 2 houses next door.

**Mr. Gastinger:** They are west facing facades, so all 4 of houses would reap the benefits of any shade they would have.

**Ms. Miller:** The City publishes a tree list that has recommended species for medium and large size trees that would be appropriate.

**Ms. Scro:** Peter Russell on the Tree Commission is working on that and could answer questions relating to this better.

**Mr. Balut:** Right now it seems like the color will be selected by the buyer. At this point are we just approving the house and materials, but the color is a nonissue at this point?

**Mr. Werner:** Approval is not required for painting and repainting houses, so it is a nonissue.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Weren't these Guidelines heavily reviewed by the public and through Council, which means the items that were omitted and added were fairly intentional?

**Ms. Miller:** That is correct. They did range in the development of them and at times they landed in a less restrictive place purposely.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Mohr:** The scale makes sense and the storm water and sidewalk considerations make sense, but they fall under Zoning's purview. The parking is a problem but that also falls to Zoning. Allowing the color to be the owner's choice makes sense, especially being in a Conservation District. The house is not adventurous, but it is appropriate.

**Mr. Sarafin:** Agrees.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Is the applicant okay with the list that was provided for the materials if it were to be approved?

**Ms. Scro:** Yes.

**Ms. Miller:** These will likely be the approved materials and any changes from that would need to go through staff and/or the BAR. Any variance could cause a problem later on.

**Mr. Gastinger:** We should also encourage the selection of medium to large tree options provided by the City.

**Mr. Ball:** It's not in our purview, but how is the basement walkout going to work? It looks like a lot of water shedding in there.

**Mr. Gastinger:** It doesn't seem like it matches with the grading.

**Mr. Gelbord:** Notes that there is a stream that goes up into this property. It's important for the builder to know that there is water down there, but it's unclear how deep it is at that point.

**Mr. Werner:** The materials suggest a Hardiplank material but the key is that it not be vinyl.

**Mr. Gastinger:** There is a chance that they run into the same site conditions that caused the adjacent house to pop up. Should that be required, we will need to evaluate that.

**Mr. Scro:** We were worried about that and we dug with an excavator where they hit hard rock on the lot next door and it's softer where it's being placed.

**Mr. Ball:** Doesn't love the twin house idea and would rather see some variation. The color could make a difference, but it feels like a production. Overall it is a nice design individually.

**Motion:** Schwarz 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 design 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.

- Encourage the planting of trees as shown on the plan to be selected from the city's medium to large deciduous tree list
- This approval is based on the drawings submitted February 26, 2019 and the materials list that was submitted in at the BAR meeting on 3/19/2019
- Any design changes need to be circulated through staff

Balut seconded. Approved (8-0.)

## **8. Certificate of Appropriateness (Historic Conservation District)**

BAR 19-03-07

124 Franklin Street

Tax Parcel 560114300

Loft Realty and Investments, LLC, Owner/Blackbird of Charlottesville, LLC, Applicant

New Construction

**Motion: Schwarz 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 design 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.**

- **Encourage the planting of trees as shown on the plan to be selected from the city's medium to large deciduous tree list**
- **This approval is based on the drawings submitted February 26, 2019 and the materials list that was submitted in at the BAR meeting on 3/19/2019**
- **Any design changes need to be circulated through staff**

**Balut seconded. Approved (8-0.)**

#### **D. New Items**

##### **9. Certificate of Appropriateness (Historic Conservation District)**

BAR 19-03-02

604 Locust Avenue

Tax Parcel 510037100

Jeanne Van Gemert, Owner/Applicant

Painting Exterior

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This is a contributing structure in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District. This one-story, three-bay, common bond brick house has a low, front-gabled roof and a front porch with shed roof braced by aluminum supports. The applicant would like to paint the exterior of the small house brick and the paint to be used for the brick will be Biodomus 1 paint from Romabio in a medium-to-light grey, possibly Gray Cloud. It's a permeable, breathable, mineral paint developed specifically for use on brick and other masonry. The Guidelines do specifically discourage painting brick and masonry because it is irreversible and may cause moisture problems, however given the age of the house and the type of paint that would be used in a Historic Conservation District where guidelines are less stringent than an ADC District, staff recommends approval of the request.

*The Applicant was not present.*

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** Notes that she lives close to the applicant and has met her but does not have any financial ties to the property and can participate in the discussion and the vote.

**Mr. Sarafin:** If staff has knowledge of the product and it is suitable for painting masonry, this seems like a reasonable request in a Conservation District.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Although it will look better, the Guidelines state that it is "discouraged" and there isn't a good enough argument for going against that. There are a collection of houses that are vintage and unpainted in this neighborhood.

**Mr. Werner:** There are only 3 painted brick houses in the district and age does play a role.

**Mr. Mohr:** In this case, it is a workman life surface and it is fired really well so painting it won't destroy it. There aren't any issues with painting it.

**Ms. Miller:** This is asking to do the opposite of one of the very few Guidelines we have for a Conservation District. However, one block down we just approved unpainted brick of approximately the same age to be painted. Additionally, on the 800 block of Locust Ave on the opposite side of the street a house was just whitewashed without BAR approval.

**Mr. Balut:** The Guidelines state that it is discouraged but as translators of the Guidelines, if we think it will look better painted, it is just setting a standard of doing what looks best. It doesn't set a precedent of allowing anyone who wants painted brick to have it. We are largely reviewing the aesthetics right now.

**Mr. Gastinger:** There is a landscape component to this and the applicant probably wants a lighter house because the yard is packed with small flowering trees, but they won't be around forever. If someone had planted larger canopy trees, it might have a different architectural decision.

**Ms. Miller:** Since the photos were taken the landscape has been lightened up a bit.

**Ms. Earnst:** There are a number of reasons why this is an appropriate change from what the Guidelines state and it's okay to approve it as submitted.

**Mr. Ball:** It is a good product that is breathable and will last. As it ages, the color can fade and if it is in an area with a lot of direct sunlight or has a lot of rain, it could chip more. However, it's much less likely to bubble like a latex paint. It could look nice over time but it is just like any exterior surface that is painted; it has to be kept up with. There is also a 20 year warranty for no chipping, but they say to expect 50 years before it comes off.

**Motion:** Sarafin moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed exterior painting satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following notes: while the historic conservation district guidelines discourage the painting of masonry the age of the brick and the specific paint, as noted in the application, is meant for masonry and should function well. Earnst seconded. Approved (8-0.)

#### **10. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 19-03-08

506 Park Street

Tax Parcel 530123000

Presbyterian Church Ch'ville Trust, Owner/Isaac Miller, Applicant

New entrance and ADA ramp

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This application may also be referred to as 500 Park Street, as the church is 506 and 500 is the space next to it. The church was constructed in 1955 and is a contributing property in the North Downtown ADC District. It was built in the Colonial Revival style and is based on James Gibbs' 1722 Saint Martin-in-the-Fields in London. The request is to construct an ADA-compliant handicap ramp and entrance at 7<sup>th</sup> Street façade of the Fellowship Hall. That work involves minor demolition of the façade, a new entry with doors and windows, an ADA ramp and stairs, the installation of a concrete bench, and pavers to connect sidewalk and stairs. The materials to be used are metal railing that is painted black, brick and mortar to match existing, doors and windows to match the existing in proportion, color, and lites. The glass will be clear, the window trim will match the existing, and the pavers will match what was found throughout the site. The new entrance and ADA ramp aren't on the primary façade of the building and staff believes they will incorporate well into the existing building. Staff recommends approval.

**Applicant, Isaac Miller, BRW Architects:** This is the entry addition that is phase 1 of a 2 phase project. Phase 2 will be a much larger addition northeast of the site. We will reroute all of the traffic into the preschool prior to that and do most of the work

over the summer. There is a large stair width and ramp with plenty of room for parents and kids to navigate. The goal was to stick to the style of the church so most of the language follows suit with it, but to also let everything become its own visually.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Mohr:** What is the paneling made of?

**Mr. Miller:** The paneling and trim will be painted cement board.

**Mr. Ball:** Does that have a reveal or is the trim over the paneling?

**Mr. Miller:** The trim is thicker.

**Mr. Mohr:** It seems like the paneling is cheap and there are mixed feelings about it, given the building and the detail of materials.

**Mr. Schwarz:** It announces it as an entry that it is a little bigger than it is. If it were just a door it might get lost and the darker color seems to be a more contemporary move.

**Mr. Mohr:** In that case, the window treatment is wrong. There is a more classical detailing on the outside. The basic gesture is fine and the columns are fine, but it just seems a little muddy.

**Mr. Gastinger:** The rendering and the drawing is a little different on how the trim is expressed. It would feel better if the trim felt more part of the window. Generally, the strategy is a good one, but on the long façade the gutters do create a secondary rhythm across the entire façade and this one just has one little 6" kink in it. Is there a way to reattach it?

**Mr. Miller:** The downspouts are cut into the brick and if we move the whole downspout we would have to fill it in with new brick that would be obvious. While it isn't ideal, it's the best course of action to send it through the already cut portion of the brick and the band, and then kink it.

**Mr. Mohr:** Does the entablature project at all?

**Mr. Miller:** No.

**Mr. Ball:** Around the window is the trim board that is about  $\frac{3}{4}$ " and above that is the freeze board. Is that the same depth?

**Mr. Miller:** Initially it was imagined so that the freeze and corner board were thicker so it sticks out a little bit.

**Ms. Miller:** Could the gutter run straight and just become white once it meets a trim board so it disappears?



**Mr. Miller:** It was modeled straight but it hides the column and looks odd jumping over the trim work being introduced. It's something that could be explored more to see if there is a better solution.

**Mr. Mohr:** If it popped out at all, you could incorporate a gutter and redirect or take it out. If the windows were the same color as the paneling, it might feel more at peace. It meets all the guidelines, but there's just something that is unsatisfying.

**Ms. Miller:** Painting the trim around the window the same color would make sense.

**Mr. Miller:** We could feel comfortable with the window being blue.

**Mr. Mohr:** That would tie it together more. These are all just advisements, but it is approvable as it is.

**Motion:** Mohr moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Addition, and Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed new entrance and ADA ramp 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 proviso that the applicant explore the color of the trim further, and take another look at the downspout placement. Schwarz seconded. Approved (8-0.)

#### **11. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 19-03-05

201 West Water Street

Tax Parcel 280012000

Black Bear Properties, LLC, Owner/Clark Gathright, Applicant

Storefront Renovation

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** 201 West Water Street is a single story c1950 brick building in the Downtown ADC District. This area is listed on the VLR and NRHP as the Charlottesville and Albemarle County Courthouse Historic District, however 201 West Water Street is not identified as a contributing structure to that district. Early-20th century maps indicate a residence at this location. A commercial use appears here in the 1951 City Directory, listing 201 Water Street as a Sears Roebuck & Company service station. The 1960 Directory indicates that Braithwaite's Inc., a paint and wallpaper shop, now occupies the building. In May 16, 2017 the BAR approved application to demolish the building. The request is to convert the existing one story building with covered parking into a distillery. The proposed renovations include to remove segments of masonry wall and install a black metal storefront on the West Street façade, to paint exterior brick walls (the Water Street façade has been painted; the 2nd Street has not), remove the existing metal window at the east elevation and replace it with a new, three-lite window with mullions to match the new storefront, repaint the existing metal columns at the front canopy in black, install new fascia and paint it white, install a new gutter and downspout. There is nothing in the application regarding external lighting and new rooftop mechanical units will be screened installed by parapet. In 2017 the BAR approved the building's demolition in advance of subsequent proposals for a new, multi-story building. The proposed alterations should be evaluated in the context of both the to-be-retained building and those nearby. The existing structure is c1950 and was used as a service station, then a paint and wallpaper store. The primary façade does not indicate a larger storefront existed nor is there evidence of garage bays. However, it is staff's opinion that the proposed storefront expansion is consistent with the building's commercial pedigree and the simplicity of the proposed alterations is sympathetic to the building's architectural austerity. In retaining the existing building and being respectful of its past, the proposed removal of the 2nd Street window is problematic. It is understandable to match the new storefront, however this window is on a different façade and not beneath the front canopy. Consistent with the building's simple design, this window is a uniquely commercial/industrial architectural element. Staff recommends that it be retained, understanding that repair and re-glazing is warranted. With this property abuts the Violet Crown Theater and will be adjacent to the new CODE building. Its contemporary renovations are justifiable. Relative to the painting of the masonry walls, the ADC Design Guidelines recommend against the painting of masonry, however this is generally understood as a mechanical concern related to the age of the brick and the irreversibility of painting it. Much of this building has been painted and unpainted the bricks are of an age that is less susceptible to mechanical issues. Additionally, at

least two brick buildings nearby are also painted. Staff recommends approval of the painting provided that on the unpainted segments an appropriate and permeable product is used. Staff also recommends the consideration of conditions that requires repair and/or replacement of missing sections of the terra cotta parapet cap and removal of vegetation and trash in the alley off of 2nd Street.

**Applicant, Clark Gathright:** Notes that the plan is to repaint the columns. There aren't any issues with letting the window on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street remain and fixing it up. There also aren't any concerns about repairing the roof parapet tile and we're happy to clean the alley, but it is not technically on this property.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Gastinger:** Is this intention to also paint the clay tile cap? The renderings suggest that it goes to a lighter color.

**Mr. Gathright:** The intent is to paint it because it would stand out being red.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** This is a good reuse of the existing building and it's great that the applicant is willing to retain the window. The only thing that is not acceptable is to paint the unpainted masonry, as the Guidelines explicitly state not to paint unpainted masonry.

**Mr. Sarafin:** Agrees.

**Mr. Balut:** What about the fact that it is already painted on two sides of it?

**Ms. Miller:** The applicant can keep the brick that is already painted but not anything that isn't painted.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Everything that is already painted is undercover, so it's less susceptible. Although, the painted brick on an adjacent building has a lot of masonry repair issues.

**Mr. Gastinger:** While the painting of the brick in this case might be okay, the paint on the clay may not perform well over time. Given the elegant and appropriate design for this kind of structure, it could be just as engaging and dynamic to paint the current brick.

**Mr. Balut:** There are two buildings near this that were also painted brick.

**Mr. Werner:** There are a lot of moisture issues could be addressed that might help with the masonry issues. If it is going to be painted, it is advised to use the mineral paint.

**Mr. Sarafin:** The age of this new brick is probably less susceptible to these issues for being painted. Painting the ceramic coping at the top is not recommended, but you can make a case either way.

**Mr. Ball:** Where will the electric meter and HVAC go?

**Mr. Gathright:** There is an existing HVAC unit on the roof and a much smaller unit might be put in behind the distillery.

**Ms. Miller:** Having the windows will help lighten the space. The clock has to be taken out in order to do the addition. Will it be rehung on the patio?

**Mr. Gathright:** The photos were taken during the demolition submittal and the clock is not there anymore.

**Ms. Earnst:** Overall it is a great improvement to an existing building. It is preferable to retain the unpainted brick as such and you could accomplish a good bit of the design by just repainting what is already painted.

**Mr. Gathright:** Notes that the reason for painting it was to make it all uniform, but there wasn't a strong feeling either way.

**Mr. Gastinger:** It makes it a stronger design because it's clearer that the change is what's happening under the canopy.

**Mr. Ball:** It doesn't look like there is anything on the roof right now. Distilleries can sometimes have a lot of equipment and it could get out of hand, which is a concern.

**Mr. Gathright:** A small chiller and a small split is planned to be put in but it will have minimal production and is primarily a show piece.

**Mr. Mohr:** It seems like it would be nice to put a skylight in there to lighten up the canopy.

**Mr. Gathright:** It isn't a public space or a tasting room. It is a show distillery where the public can go in but there is no seating. If it were a more public space, lighting may have been considered more. It's also intended to be used as a parking and unloading space, so it will be full of cars.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Should we request that the mechanical equipment be submitted to staff for evaluation if it needs to come back to the BAR? The concern is that it would be a precedent issue.

**Mr. Werner:** It shouldn't be up against the parapet, it should be located in a manner to minimize visibility from the street.

**Motion:** Sarafin moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed renovations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following clarifications

- unpainted masonry remain unpainted
- the ceramic coping remains unpainted
- the window on the east elevation remain intact
- future rooftop mounted equipment be located to minimize it's visibility from the street and submitted to staff for the final BAR archived submission.

**Gastiner seconded. Approved (8-0.)**

## 12. Preliminary Discussion

713 Park Street

**Applicant, Doug Gilpin:** The house was built in 1861 and there is a wing on the back of the house that was built in the 1920s, which is also when the roof was put on. Internally, it is remarkably intact aside from the usual bathroom and kitchen upgrades. The owners want to take it back to the original appearance by removing a lot of layers of paint, fixing cracked windowpanes, and doing masonry repair. A certified house inspector looked at the roof and it is 1920s vintage that likely has

not been painted since before 1974. The owners are interested in replacing the roof and have discussed using a copper roof. The other alternative would be to go to a new type of lead coated copper that is a zinc tin alloy. The front steps are from the 1920s and are in marginal condition. From the house standpoint with regards to expansion, there is a porch on the back of the house built in the 1920s in marginal condition, as it is being supported by pressure treated posts. Neither bathroom is in great condition, so improvements are planned for them. The major opportunity is to possibly replace the back porch with an appropriate master bathroom extension and a powder room. The owners are in their mid-50s, so it would be a long term house and they would like to develop a three stop elevator from the ground floor to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. The garage was built around 1930 and is in marginal condition with cracking foundation, as it was built as a utility structure and hasn't been maintained. The owners are interested in providing a two car garage and have an area on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor with condition storage space for furniture, bikes, kayaks, etc. They would also like to build quickly to occupy the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor loft and live there during the restoration rehabilitation of the house. The primary materials would be board and batten and exterior siding. Other materials on the garage outbuilding are wood shingles, vertical board and batten siding on the one-story shed. Hopefully the BAR can offer general comments regarding the philosophy and the design if there were any issues that stand out. There have also been discussions about the tax credits program and they may consider it.

**Mr. Ball:** Can you explain the front porch?

**Mr. Gilpin:** The 7-8 steps leading up to the front porch has brick cheek walls that are eroding. The wooden formwork for the steps is still in place. It is stable but not appropriate and we have an opportunity to go back to something that would be historically appropriate.

**Mr. Werner:** If the applicant were to apply for tax credits, they would be usable on the house itself and we can administratively approve the project. Secondly, there are two things that would be going on that are non-concurrent.

**Ms. Miller:** In the past, they are usually still lightly reviewed and approved by the BAR.

**Mr. Gilpin:** If there isn't any opposition, the plan is to submit the plans for the garage apartment for the April meeting, and then any work on the original house would be submitted the following month.

**Ms. Miller:** What is the square footage of the house?

**Mr. Gilpin:** About 4,300 is on the tax map, but the ground floor might not be included.

**Mr. Mohr:** Are the windows square head on the inside?

**Mr. Gilpin:** Yes, and they are original.

**Ms. Miller:** It is great that they want to rehabilitate the house, especially using the tax credit program. Everything being proposed in terms of the rehabilitation is appropriate and meets the Guidelines. It is good that the electric lines are being undergrounded and the trees are being taken care of. The hope is that it will be respectful of the parkland-like setting. There are a lot of residences that have been putting up hedges and using them as giant walls, which the BAR has not been approving as of late so they may want to keep that in mind. The garage is probably a contributing structure, especially if it were resurveyed. While the design of the garage is nice, it is inappropriately large and would encourage the owners to take advantage of the 4,300 sq. ft. in the house. It would be more respectful of the house without that additional wing of storage. It looks like it is becoming large enough that it might be competing with the house, which is not what we want.

**Mr. Gilpin:** The owners are from England and plan to have a nice simple garden area that would be appropriate for a 1860s house. They are also considering an appropriately sized fence similar to 610 Park Street. As for the garage, the goal was to help break down the scale and using the board and batten with the shadow lines helps. Color is also important and a soft gray color tends to reduce it visually from a scale standpoint. If the BAR requests it, a perspective could be drawn up.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Is the house on a ridge and the garage is down further than that?

**Mr. Gilpin:** The garage would be to the right of the house about 50 feet back and about 10 feet lower. It's relatively level and then it does drop down.

**Mr. Gastinger:** Is the intention that the new garage would go in the same location as the current garage?

**Mr. Gilpin:** There is a sewer easement back there so it can't go back quite as far as the current garage. We are proposing a 24 ft. so it might be pulled a little closer to the property line and push it back a little further.

**Mr. Mohr:** If the garage was swung 90 degrees, it would substantially reduce its apparent mass and you would still have a long elevation along the yard.

**Mr. Gastinger:** This is great investment and is generally supportive of the direction the owner is going in, however there are a missing pair of shutters from the central window.

**Mr. Gilpin:** All of the missing shutters will be found or replicated.

**Mr. Balut:** It sounds like a great project. Notes that he is less concerned by the size of the garage and it might not be competing with it as much because it's a big house from the back. Having a perspective will be very helpful to see when the time comes.

**Mr. Gilpin:** It could also be staked out as well so the BAR could visit the site.

**Mr. Mohr:** Doesn't see an issue with the size, but it's more about not cutting off the back of the house.

**Mr. Gastinger:** Notes that he likes that suggestion because it would mitigate the concern about the garage being too identical to the front façade strategy for the house that it could create confusion. Turning it would alleviate that concern.

**Mr. Ball:** It looks good, but 46 ft. in width for a garage is a lot. It would be helpful to have some dimensioning to understand what the width means and where it is.

**Mr. Gilpin:** In the application, it says that if you do any demolition that you may require a structural engineer to assess the building. Do you need that for this garage?

**Ms. Miller:** It is not required, it is choice by the applicant. It is a judgement call, so you can make the case by providing photos or you can have an engineer evaluate it.

**Mr. Gilpin:** Are there any issues with replacing the roof with a copper roof?

**Mr. Mohr:** The zinc roof might be nicer, but everyone seems to have copper.

## **E. Other Business**

- 13. PLACE report, Tim Mohr:** There is some additional activity relative to lighting, as they are working on a new lighting plan for the Pavilion and owner of the Nexus building wants the City to reexamine the lighting in that area. Mark Schuyler is advising both of those parties and we're trying to tie it into the final lighting decisions for the Belmont Bridge, which is still unresolved. The Downtown Business Owners Association is pushing for a way to address lighting and Andrew Mondeschein has been working with UVA, so we're beginning to hit a critical mass

with lighting. PLACE is frustrated at this point because it feels like we've put a lot of recommendations out there and they rarely hit the road, but lighting is something that we may actually get some traction on.

**14. BAR Guideline Work Session – March 21, 2019 – NDS Conference Room 12:00-2:00pm**

**15. Other Updates, Mr. Werner:** Relative to the Belmont Bridge there continue to be unresolved issues for the lighting and the railing on the bridge is now an issue. A few weeks ago there was a Council meeting that discussed wanting benches on the Downtown Mall and last night there was a discussion that Parks and Recreation has some of the old benches. If they want the benches that were previous proposed, the appropriate action should be to go through the BAR process rather than a mandate from City Council. The Westminster Presbyterian Church wall and wall are both within the right-of-way and there were discussions with Mike Murphy about getting City Manager approval to remove the tree. The first thing that has to happen is to get permission to remove the tree and the recommendation from the City Attorney is to try that again. The building at 310 4<sup>th</sup> Street has been long-term leased and the condominiums will not go there in the foreseeable future. As for the West Main Streetscape, the community is not very enthusiastic about the markers and staff recommended that it was an infrastructure project and it needs to be decoupled to allow the project to move forward. There was also discussions about relocating the Lewis & Clark statue, which would have to go to the BAR. There will be more to come on that as we move forward. As for 201 East High Street, the owners would like to restore the prior façade and we need to determine if we are considering the adaptation of a front porch to go back on it or if we are looking towards a recreation.

**Mr. Schwarz:** The preservation briefs specifically allow reconstruction with photographic evidence, which is the simplest thing to do for 201 East High Street.

**F. Adjournment: 8:00 p.m.**