

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
[May 21, 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:** Stephen Balut, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Melanie Miller, Mike Ball, Jody Lahendro, Emma Earnst, and Justin Sarafin

**Staff Present:** Jeff Werner, Tim Lasley, Kari Spitler, and Sebastian Weisman

**Ms. Miller called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm.**

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

**Joey Conover:** An email was sent to the BAR that some members may have seen already, but I am working on an interior upfit with Alexander Nicholson at 110 Old Preston Avenue, which is right behind the Omni building Downtown. There is an old exterior wall air condition that has been there for 30-40 years and we are considering taking it out and putting in a window that would match the existing windows from 1980. Is that something that needs to go through the whole application process? Any feedback would be helpful.

**Ms. Miller:** It certainly seems like something that the BAR would look favorably upon, but it would probably have to be officially reviewed.

**Mr. Gastinger:** It could most likely be a consent agenda item.

**Ms. Conover:** The exterior is not original to the building. There is a vent above it, which is a bath vent that would need to be maintained.

**Ms. Miller:** Would it be a similar size to the window?

**Ms. Conover:** We would like it to be a similar size, but we have to find it and match it, which is a hassle. They are double pane modern windows and it makes the most sense to match it with the above.

**Mr. Werner:** We spoke and it is an alteration to a historic façade. We talked about how to balance it out with the four windows, which could easily be done.

**Ms. Miller:** It's important to provide a cut sheet of the window being proposed.

**Ms. Conover:** Can it be hand drawn? How professional does it need to be?

**Mr. Schwarz:** We just need something that tells us what you plan to do with the window. If it is a nicely scaled, hand drawn might work.

**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** [April 16, 2019] Regular Meeting

**Mr. Gastinger:** Notes that he has two changes to the April 16 meeting minutes. Please update page 11 so Mr. Ball's comment reads "Italianate" and update page 12 to strike the phrase "bigot" so it is not taken out of context for future readers of the minutes.

**Motion: Schwarz moved to approve the consent agenda with the corrections noted by Mr. Gastinger. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).**

**C. New Items**

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 19-05-03

415 Park Street

Tax Parcel 530035000

Clay and Kathy Summers, Owner/Clay James Summers, Applicant

Replace/Erect Fence

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** The drawings in the staff report reflect the applicant's request to omit the proposed lattice sections and to revise the fence heights. This house was constructed c1814 as a residence for William Watson. It is a contributing structure within the North Downtown ADC District and it is one of the oldest structures in the Court Square area. Originally it was brick, but sometime in the late 1800s stucco was applied to the exterior walls. There is an old wire fence along the northern border to be replaced with a wood picket fence. The fence would be painted "Charleston Green." They is some rear parking that they would also like to recover for some lawn within the fenced in area. This is a fairly simple request, but given its prominent location it is important to look at. Staff recommends approval.

**Applicant, James Summers:** As a point of interest, it was built in 1814 for Mr. Watson with red brick. When I purchased it I was disappointed that it was no longer red brick, but that was over 30 years ago and the Victorian rendition is great. We are trying to reclaim what has been a parking lot for the last 40 years and turn it into a lawn with fencing so we can enjoy it as residents. I still practice law in this building and it has been a law building for over 45 years, but it is also my home so we would like to enjoy the rear and side yard. We hope that this fence we recommended does not intrude physically or aesthetically into the neighborhood. The side yard is not really open, it was fenced in already. The hedge in the front is almost 5' in height and that would obscure a lot of the fencing from pedestrian and vehicular traffic on Park Street.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Gastinger:** One of the plans described a portion of the fence either having a 1 or 2' lattice top. A second plan shows it as a 6' fence. Can you clarify that?

**Mr. Summers:** The initial application envisioned us having a 4' high picket fence with 2' of lattice work on top of it. In the sections it was 6' tall that would segue down into a 5' section and a 4' section with no lattice work. In reading through the points, it looked as though simplification was an important recommendation so have elected to simplify the fence. The side that is going to border the parking lot that will remain will be 6' tall, as that is what the original plan called for. The rear was going to be a 4' fence with 2' of lattice work. Extending from the rear of the line along the northern boundary, it would start out as a 6' fence and then reduce into a 4' fence. There is no lattice work at all now.

**Mr. Werner:** The updated staff report notes this and a motion as printed would cover those changes.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** This is a huge improvement. It sets a good example for people in the area with properties that were once homes and were turned into businesses and how they can easily go back to homes. It will be an improvement to the neighborhood.

**Motion:** Motion: Lahendro moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed fencing and driveway conversion satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the modifications noted in the staff report. Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0).

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 19-05-01

109 2<sup>nd</sup> Street SE

Tax Parcel 280026100

Jack Brown's Charlottesville, Owner/Jason Owenby, Applicant

Replace tables on patio

*This item was removed from the agenda prior to the meeting.*

**4. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 19-05-02

713 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520056000

James and Cordelia Gelly, Owner/ W. Douglas Gilpin, Jr., Applicant

Restoration/rehabilitation work and new rear addition

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This was constructed c1861 as a residence for Judge Egbert R. Watson. This house is a contributing structure within the North Downtown ADC District. It's also one of the oldest remaining structures in the City. The BAR has reviewed this before with the garage demolition and renovation in the backyard and this is the formal review of that. There are two pieces of the project, one being the rehabilitation and restoration of the existing components of the house, primarily the masonry. They are proposing to remove the existing roof and replacing it, including the gutters and downspouts. There is a drainage moat on a portion of the house to be repaired, as well as an old door and a window will be reinstalled into that opening. It will be historically appropriate to match the existing house. The renovation is at the rear southwest corner. It is a 1920's addition of a brick wing and a two-story porch structure with it. The porch will be removed and a new addition in its footprint would be constructed. Staff finds the proposed rehabilitations, repair of masonry, including the drainage moat; roof, gutter and downspout replacement; cellar window; trim repair and painting, are appropriate and recommends approval

exclusive of the proposed replacements of the front stairs. That work should be reviewed at a later date when sufficient details are available. Regarding the rear addition, staff recommends approval of the demolition of the c1920s framed addition and approval in-concept of the proposed new construction. However, staff recommends that additional details and information be provided prior to final approval. That information should include architectural drawings and elevations, cut sheets for doors and windows, trim details: door and window casing, fascia/cornice profiles, porch pilasters, etc., stair and railing details, brick pier details, and details on lattice and doors at ground level storage. The BAR may treat it as two motions if you wish.

**Applicant, Doug Gilpin:** A preliminary assessment was given to the BAR in March 2019 to show what we were doing in a global aspect of the house, as well as the garage. In April there was another discussion about the garage itself. The full submittal was then submitted for the design of the rear of the addition on the back. As with any design project, one starts small in schematic. We included a partial design development set that is more than the schematic that had been presented before. We also included architectural details and the cut sheets for all of the windows and exterior doors that were required. Following the Guidelines, we have put the addition wholly within the recesses in the 1920 wing, as well as the 1861 house. We have made differentiations in materials such as the piers, brick, windows, window pane patterns, etc. It is almost like a 1930s porch that may have been upgraded several years later in the 1940s. We do have a few minor adjustments that we are working on with an interior person, including the enclosed sunroom, which will actually be an open air porch. Close to 90% of the first floor will be open air, which gives a lot of transparency and cuts down on any glare. The north side of the house only has one adjustment. When the 1920 wing was added, they took one of the cellar windows out and reused it as part of a pantry. The prior owner removed all of the partitions in the space and the pantry window is now floating above the rest of the kitchen. We have been working to try and utilize it and from the interior standpoint it works best to block it off internally. However, the frame will be kept on the exterior and the blinds will be placed in a shut position. It is 100% reversible if someone wanted to put that window back in place in the future, but we will not be changing the masonry or the exterior frame of the window. The south elevation has no significant changes. The architectural drawings are not 100% complete, but the annotated set presented today will hopefully answer any questions that the BAR may have.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

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

**Mr. Lahendro:** You don't show a railing on the stair going down from the new addition. Is that to be similar to the railing that you have around the main level porch?

**Mr. Gilpin:** It will be the exact same rail, which is the elliptical handrail. Earlier iterations showed a roof over the section but we are not going to include a roof over that. We are also considering not installing a roof over that small projecting landing because the owners felt that it might be nice to have an open space.

**Mr. Lahendro:** What would the plane of the addition look like without the porch roof and the enclosure that lead to the stair?

**Mr. Gilpin:** Where you see typically bays going along it, you would see a large open bay in that space without an intermediate post. It would extend full height up to the frieze board at the second floor level. There would be no door there, but instead it would be a wide, unscreened porch.

**Mr. Ball:** Are you reusing the brick piers below?

**Mr. Gilpin:** No, as they are in marginal shape from 1920. If you looked at the brick work on the 1920 wing, it is a combination of at least two salvaged buildings, which may have been earlier outbuildings on the site. There is some new brick but it isn't the greatest brick work.

**Mr. Gastinger:** What is the material of the columns and the pilasters?

**Mr. Gilpin:** It is a Glen-Gery brick that is very smooth and uniform in color. The porch columns themselves will have structural members on the inside wrapped in a composite material to be painted. The freestanding columns will all be consistent with the composite material painted. The same can be said of the pilasters.

**Mr. Ball:** Do you have any details on the lattice?

**Mr. Gilpin:** It is a very beefy material. There is existing lattice at the front of the house around the front porch and we plan to replicate that character. It is not going to be mounted permanently to the side, but it will be in an area so you could remove it to any painting on the backside.

**Mr. Lahendro:** When would you come back to the BAR with a design for the front steps?

**Mr. Gilpin:** The owners have hired a landscape architect who is very busy during this time of year. We will be developing a design that would work hand-in-hand with the landscape design. It would probably be late summer or early fall.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** There are too many things that are currently unresolved for a full COA to be granted. If you are going to be out of town in future months, the owners could come to keep the process going. In the back there are some significant things that are different than what is represented in the packet and we have to be fair and consistent to all applicants. There are things that we can approve tonight based on what we have, but we are not at the COA level yet.

**Mr. Gilpin:** Agreed. That is why I brought the sets to show because what you see on the full size drawings is what you will be seeing with the full set of plans anyway.

**Mr. Lahendro:** We can give a preliminary review and approval and then base that upon seeing the final CDs and making sure they comply with what we saw during this presentation?

**Ms. Miller:** That is perfectly reasonable.

**Mr. Gilpin:** Everything that you have seen tonight is what you will be seeing on the final drawings.

**Mr. Schwarz:** Instead of seeing a complete set of CDs, can we just see the elevations that show what is described tonight but is not represented in the elevations? Will there be any changes in those details?

**Mr. Gilpin:** There won't be any changes in the details, but there will just be some slight adjustment in the porch bay spacing based on the interior consultant's commentary.

**Ms. Miller:** We don't have a drawing that shows the porch without the windows or without the roof.

**Mr. Gilpin:** Those things can all be submitted as well.

**Mr. Lahendro:** The contractor is going to need more than this to build it and we would like to see what the contractor would be using to build it and make sure it complies. Regarding the design, the new addition has the characteristic of an infill porch, which is appropriate for this style and its location on the building. It's great to see that it's picking up on that kind of historic character and appropriateness for where it is on the house.

**Mr. Ball:** Appreciates the scale and that it takes into consideration the footprint that was already there. It looks great. I did go by the house and the porch is not in great shape so it is a good candidate for it being torn out. I feel comfortable with pushing ahead and letting them start with construction knowing that they will have to come back with details.

**Mr. Schwarz:** They will need a COA to get a building permit so if we leave something as contingent, it would almost be something that Jeff would have to handle.

**Ms. Miller:** The full size drawings are amazing, but for the public record we would need something that we can have archived on the City website digitally.

**Mr. Werner:** If it is balanced and the details express what is going on with the pilasters and the details of the bricks have dimensions we can rely on, staff can go through it and bring it back as a consent agenda item for the next meeting.

**Mr. Schwarz:** If it were to come back on the consent agenda as described, I would vote for approval.

*Mr. Sarafin joined the meeting.*

**Mr. Gastinger:** In general this represents incredible stewardship of an amazing house and the addition is done in a responsible and appropriate way so that it respects the age and history of the house. There is so much care in creating the brick corbel at the column capital at the top of the piers and it feels weird that they don't have a base of some articulation.

**Mr. Gilpin:** It's a challenge because it is sloping on the south side and it's tricky to make sure it doesn't look phony. Sometimes it is great to have the straight pier without the capitals but in this case the capitals give it more character.

**Mr. Gastinger:** The other recommendation was related to the proportion of the pilasters on the first floor. Because of the added height of that floor and the dimension of the windows being placed, the proportion of the columns on the second floor feel right. The ones on the first floor feel very thin and it might be trying to fit too much detail in.

**Mr. Gilpin:** It's going to change visually once the windows are removed and you will be able to see the entire 8"x8" column in the full.

**Mr. Gastinger:** It seems odd that the same dimension column that is almost 1.5x as tall as the one on top of it is the same dimension.

**Ms. Miller:** This speaks to while we need the final rendition so that we can see it.

**Mr. Balut:** You have done a phenomenal job here and by treating it the way that you are says a lot about the entire approach to the project of preserving the integrity of the house and the original design. It is clear that you are knowledgeable and sensitive to the design and deferring to what is there. The addition is also a very sensitive design that integrates well with the whole house. Generally speaking, it's so close but we need the full elevations and depiction of what is here to approve it.

**Ms. Miller:** Shares that she feels comfortable approving the demolition tonight, but technically the demolition should be on the staff report for next time in future applications.

**Mr. Gilpin:** From a construction standpoint, Ilex Construction will be doing the work on the garage and we anticipate them doing this too.

**Mr. Werner:** Notes that staff didn't worry as much about documenting the porch addition in the sense of removal because there wasn't much there to be documented unless we got into the 1920s masonry.

**Ms. Miller:** There are series of questions that get answered about demolitions that we do for everything and every applicant should be treated the same because it is a legal process.

**Mr. Gilpin:** We can certainly take care of that and document it with photos.

**Mr. Lasley:** For the deferral, it might make sense for the applicant to defer so they have the flexibility of time rather than the BAR deferring for him.

**Mr. Gilpin:** Understood. Is there anything in the full sized detail that the BAR has an issue with? If everything looks generally good then we have no problems submitting the drawings at a later date.

**Ms. Miller:** The only outstanding potential concern are the columns at the bottom and if that is proportional.

#### **Rehabilitations and Demolition:**

**Motion:** **Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations and Demolitions, I move to find that the proposed rehabilitations and the proposed demolition [of the 1920s rear porches] excluding the windows and doors [within the adjacent masonry walls], and excluding the front stair [replacement] satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0-1, with Sarafin abstained).**

*Mr. Gilpin requests to defer the rear addition portion of the application.*

#### **Addition:**

**Motion: Schwarz moved to accept the applicant's deferral. Balut seconded. (7-0-1, with Sarafin abstained).**

### **5. Preliminary Discussion**

128 Chancellor Street, Proposed rear expansion

*This item was removed from the agenda prior to the meeting.*

## **D. Other Business**

### **6. Staff Questions**

**500 Park St. (modification to approved ADA entrance)**

**Mr. Werner:** This is the ADA entrance for the church and staff will speak to the applicant about getting something to review in June.

**600 Lexington St. (HC, fence)**

**Mr. Werner:** Regarding this location, they would like to have the height from the back of the house continuing on if it is pulled back off of the sidewalk to the inside of the tree. We suggested a 5'6" max would be acceptable and then start a lower height on the side of the house.

**Mr. Schwarz:** They say they are starting at 4' closer to Lexington and our Guidelines say 3.5'.

**Ms. Miller:** There is also a residence nearby that faces the street so you wouldn't want to set up a weird condition for them.

**Mr. Werner:** Because it is a corner lot we have to follow it all the way into the rear yard and if it were 3.6' then staff could sign off on it immediately. Are there any suggestions if the applicant has to adjust something or modify it? Mr. Schwarz suggested pulling it off the sidewalk, which would work. However, if it is up on the sidewalk then it needs to be reduced.

**Mr. Gastinger:** How far were you suggesting to pull it off?

**Mr. Schwarz:** Perhaps lining it up with the edge of the house would be best. Per the Guidelines, you could technically do a 6' fence from that point.

**Mr. Gastinger:** You would have to move it back significantly. The little side streets are the sides of the houses and our Guidelines are pretty good ones here for the pedestrian character of all of the streets in the district. Notes that he is inclined to stick to the Guidelines for this.

**Mr. Schwarz:** We only have one Guideline for sight to follow.

**Mr. Werner:** There are some tall fences in the area. Stepping back and reducing the height slightly would work. They would like privacy for their grandchildren. Should it be 5'6", 6' or 3'6 only across the entire length?

**Mr. Schwarz:** If it is going to be up against the sidewalk it sounds like 3.6'. Perhaps it could be 3.6' and then suggest having a nice row of shrubbery to help with the privacy.

**Mr. Werner:** The general consensus is to protect that height along the rear and as far as privacy goes they could seek some landscaping solutions.

#### **129 Chancellor St. (front patio, new brick wall)**

**Mr. Werner:** They would like to remove the concrete wall and replace it to match what is there. They also want to do some bluestone paving in the front yard and fix the stairs coming off of the sidewalk. What level of detail would be acceptable? If they say that they are going to replace the concrete wall exactly where it is now and it will match the wall, would that be an acceptable application?

**Ms. Earnst:** What historically was there? We have given people a lot of grief about taking out the concrete walls around Charlottesville. The concrete mix is very particular to the City.

**Mr. Schwarz:** At some point in time people had these in front of their houses and it was quite a while ago.

**Mr. Sarafin:** It is a real defining feature. What they want to match is totally over scale and it is not appropriate.

**Mr. Werner:** This is a trend that is coming before us because everyone wants to look new and improved. Staff has worked with them for a while, as they wanted to clean up the masonry on the exterior and the railing. They may opt not to move forward with this if there is some resistance to it. The stairs do need to be replaced because they are a horrible tripping hazard, but the BAR likely wouldn't have an issue with that.

**Ms. Miller:** What are they replacing it with?

**Mr. Werner:** The stairs to the house are concrete and the stairs off of the sidewalk are concrete. They were hoping to reconstruct them and cap them with a bluestone paver.

**Mr. Sarafin:** This is a character-defining feature of these neighborhoods and it is getting swept away and replaced with things that are suburban and over scaled. I am not supportive of this as a concept.



**Dairy Central (question re: cow mural)**

**Mr. Werner:** Regarding Dairy Central, the only thing they altered was that it used to be a cow.

**Ms. Miller:** This seems more like a piece of art rather than a sign. It hardly has enough left to even tell what it is.

**Mr. Gastinger:** Adding the words does make it a sign in a different way than the cow that was originally shown. It is bothersome and confusing that it looks like an old faded sign that never existed there.

**Ms. Miller:** That is partially our fault because originally they had a super graphic, solid, painted cow and we said that it would be better to leave out some of the background instead of wholesale painting the brick because of unpainted masonry.

**Mr. Sarafin:** This is conceived to look like it has been there and it has worn off over time.

**Mr. Werner:** Is the fake fade problematic overall in terms of aesthetics? Zoning made it clear that the moment it becomes a marketing piece it becomes a sign. Staff will address it with Zoning to determine what makes it a sign, but is it okay if the applicant comes back with a faded appearance or is that troubling?

**Mr. Sarafin:** If it were advertising something that was being sold inside it would be a sign. Faking that it has been there forever and that it is faded is problematic from an interpretive point of view because it isn't integral to the original building.

**Ms. Miller:** We try not to get into the business of regulating the art. It's about the application on the building and if it has a negative impact.

**Mr. Schwarz:** If they came back with a comprehensive signage plan and this was part of it, we would likely be supportive.

**Mr. Balut:** I appreciate this aesthetically and in this case it is provocative as a piece of art to make people wonder what that is representing and if there was something old there. It instigates a train of thought of being investigative, which will be beneficial in the context of this significant renovation project.

**Mr. Schwarz:** In a similar way, the words "Monticello Dairy" are important because that is what it was originally called. It's worth going through the signage package.

**Ms. Miller:** It's good to share with the public that that was the name because not everyone knows that.

**Mr. Werner:** They have been conscientious about not trying to hit their neighbors with a huge new sign. Staff will talk to the applicant about a comprehensive signage plan and see if we can pull it all together.

**Mr. Lasley:** If it were to go into the comprehensive signage plan, would there be a way to perhaps have some type of signage saying that it was painted on a particular year, date, and stating the artist?

**Mr. Sarafin:** It's not about playing curator, but it's about how it leads people to understand the building, which is our purview. We have maintained the historic building and it has new additions but it would be a shame if this confuses that. The sign looks cool, but we don't want to confuse people. Our charge is to help people understand and contextualize this building and the fake, old looking sign is problematic.

**A) PLACE Report, Tim Mohr:** No report. Mr. Mohr was not in attendance.

**B) BAR Guideline Work Session – May 16, 2019 – NDS Conference Room; 5:30-7:30 pm.**

**F. Adjournment: 6:55 p.m.**