

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[August 20, 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 VERBATIM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2

Members Present: Melanie Miller, chair ; Tim Mohr, co-chair; Justin Sarafin, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Mike Ball, Stephen Balut, Emma Earnst, and Jody Lahendro

Staff Present: Jeff Werner and Tim Lasley

Mr. Mohr 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 [July 16, 2019] Regular Meeting

Motion: Schwarz moved to approve the consent agenda. Lahendro seconded. Approved (4-0-3 with Mohr, Earnst, and Balut abstained).

C. Deferred/Returning Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-07-05

601-617 East Market Street

Tax Parcel 530100060

Allan H. Cadgene, Owner/Greg Jackson, Applicant
Construction of Plaza Pavilion

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: Framing this south-facing courtyard on the west (601 East Market Street) is a former livery stable constructed in the 1890s that, after WW II, was converted to offices. The buildings north and west were built c1900 by the Carr family for the Michie Printing Company, at that time one of leading legal publication publishers in the country. All of these are structures in the Downtown ADC District. The request is to construct a 10-ft x 50-ft open pavilion within the Michie Building courtyard. The pavilion will occupy a minimally-landscaped section within the roughly 50-ft x 110-ft courtyard. The proposed pavilion will have a standing-seam metal roof on a welded metal frame with an exposed wood ceiling. The roof features a separate, elevated ridge segment to allow for natural ventilation. The revisions from the July submittal features a taller cupola with a steeper pitch, resulting in a reduced opening above the pavilion roof. The pavilion roof will have a similar pitch. The concrete slab is a medium warm tan “Dark Gold,” the patio pavers are typical red brick to match the existing, the metal frame is medium cool gray “Smoke Gray,” the wood ceiling is light warm translucent stain “Natural,” and the standing-seam metal roof is medium/dark warm gray “Burnished Slate.” The landscaping features, the existing landscaped areas are new topsoil and mulch. Within the pavilion there is a 4-inch, colored concrete slab with sandscape finish scored in 2.5-ft x 5-ft grid. The patio outside the pavilion will have new, permeable bricks. Regarding lighting, there will be commercial string lights following the pavilion’s beam perimeter. The lights will be warm and dimmable. The proposed pavilion is appropriately oriented with the courtyard and the adjacent buildings. The roof profile is shallower than that of the adjacent stable building, however the pavilion is set back into the courtyard and, coupled with its simple, minimal framing, it does not present a competing or conflicting element. Staff finds the proposed pavilion appropriate and recommends approval. The BAR often prohibits commercial-looking ridge caps for metal roofs. However, the Design Guidelines recommend this only for residential structures. The pavilion is commercial, however the BAR may still consider this recommendation. Whichever direction is taken, staff suggests that the discussion be made clear for the record. Staff recommends that the BAR discuss the proposed landscaping plan. Additionally, we suggest that the BAR consider a motion that emphasizes and/or conditions the recommendations in the tree protection, landscaping, and storm water management letters included in the submittal. It includes ensuring downspout to drain connections are remedied on neighboring building will mitigate stormwater impact on courtyard, the use of permeable pavers or salvaged brick – recommended on both letters, using proper grading of pavilion hardscape, and the use of shredded hardwood mulch on existing trees, the use of soil inject nutrients before construction and after final grading, pruning the roots before construction starts, and the installation of tree protection fencing.

Applicant, Mr. Jackson: We have a letter about the storm water and the trees, and we tweaked the design to go up higher by looking at different profiles. We eventually came to a consensus to lift it up with the overhangs shorter so there is more of a view that way.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Sarafin: The additional information in this submittal is much appreciated in terms of the water and landscape. It looks like those issues have been assessed.

Mr. Schwarz: I still think it's a bit of a missed opportunity, but it meets our Guidelines.

Mr. Ball: It mentioned commercial string wiring. Is that going to be exposed wiring or anything like that?

Mr. Jackson: It will run inside the post to get the electrical connections up high attaching the lighting.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed pavilion satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modifications:

- Ensuring downspout to drain connections are remedied on neighboring building will mitigate stormwater impact on courtyard;
- The use of a permeable paving system as recommended on both letters
- Using proper grading of pavilion hardscape, and the use of shredded hardwood mulch on existing trees
- The use of soil injects nutrients before construction and after final grading
- Pruning the roots before construction starts
- The installation of tree protection fencing.

Ball seconded. Approved (7-0).

Mr. Jackson: To clarify the terminology regarding the permeable pavers, it is a permeable system using non-permeable masonry units. It is a permeable surface.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (HC District)

BAR 17-08-02

Belmont Bridge

Public Right of Way, Tax Map 53 and 58

City of Charlottesville, Owner/Applicant

Belmont Bridge Design

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The Belmont Bridge, constructed in 1962, is located in the Downton ADC District and provides vehicular and pedestrian crossing over the BBRR/CSX rail

lines, Avon Street, and Water Street. Due to deterioration, replacing the bridge has long been one of the city's transportation priorities. Now fully funded, construction on the new bridge is anticipated to begin in 2020, with completion expected in 2022. The request is for the Belmont Bridge Replacement project. The submittal represents revisions that incorporate BAR comments from prior work sessions. Key elements and components to review include the stair design: SW quadrant from pedestrian plaza/underpass to 9th/Avon Street, the site lighting: pedestrian street lights (sample); handrail lighting (review pending VDOT approval), the bollards: revision to crash-rated, removable bollards, the site furniture: preference is indicated--no change from prior reviews and the approval of alternatives meet procurement requirements, the crosswalks: elimination of stamped concrete; use of City Standard (high visibility thermoplastic crosswalks), the southwest parking lot: elimination of tinted concrete; surface to be asphalt, the bridge parapet wall and railings: revised design complies with regulatory requirements, the retaining Wall (MSE): design concepts for individual panels, the knuckle: revised design. The BAR should determine if the following conditions have been satisfactorily met: further development of the horizontal concept of the retaining walls, the example of proposed street light, and the redesign of stair to achieve more fluidity and cohesion with the design concept for the bridge.

Applicant, Jeannette Janiczek: I am the project manager for the Belmont Bridge. We continue to progress the design and we wanted to disclose the changes and get your input. We have been working with VDOT and have received stage 1 bridge approval. We have also received right-of-way authorization and at this point we are able to move forward with acquiring property. After that will be relocation of utility.

Mr. Sal Musarra: Some of the big picture changes we are looking at were initiated by your request. As we go through the engineering project and an infrastructure project like this, we had wonderful interaction with VDOT and FHWA. As we get further into the engineering details and site investigations, some things will have to be tweaked. There was a lot of interest and comments on the southwest stairs last time and we now have a more simplified version so we aren't competing with the rest of the materials on the west elevation. It will have a fairly simple concrete finish with joint delineation and low-profile stairs. Every time you see stairs in the project there is a bike rental. The handrail detail is the same as what you saw before. This offsets it without making it too crazy unique and it is fairly clean. The footprint is within the landscaped area, which is also part of our biofiltration system feature. It is a constrained footprint so we couldn't expand it much. We have agreed on the product and finish of the light fixture that goes to a 12 ft. height. It was originally at 15 ft. We received comments about the quality of the lighting and there is a preference for something around 90, although our clients preferred an 80 in that range. We can add a dimmable capability to it, but there is a cost associated with it. We originally had an accent lighting on the handrail and wall-mounted lighting fixture. Based on feedback from VDOT and the design of the railings system, the railing design has changed and is a little more vertical because of their requirements. When this happens, the light under the railing throws the light down on the parapet in a way that is not favorable. Our recommendation is that we don't need it to get the coverage we need and it isn't worth the effort to do that. The bollards are now located in front of each of the passageways. After a lot of research, we are going with a consistent bollard that is a concrete core with a cladding over top of it to give the aesthetic. When you remove the cladding, there are bolts that

would allow you to do a mechanical lift. The only difference on the look is we will have the beveled top, but it won't have the battered shape. Regarding the change to the paving of the materials for crosswalks and the parking lot, the tradeoff for the cost and the aesthetic just didn't seem to warrant the extra expense. It was just under \$90,000 additional expense on the crosswalks and it was almost \$300,000 in savings to go to the asphalt. Some concern with the concrete is that over time it gets dingy and it isn't easy to clean. The site design furnishings are similar to what we previously proposed. VDOT and FHWA were very concerned regarding the parapet design and the railing and we had a tremendous amount of interaction with them since we last met with you to find a design that was crash tested, met their requirements, and kept as close as possible to our aesthetic requirement we're after on the railing. The dimensions were very close to what we are presenting now and the smaller top rail that we are proposing is a little sleeker. The main change is that the railing had to be set back a certain amount from the face of the parapet because of the way it was crash tested. We went with a simple version of the bike rentals because it accomplishes the same thing as more complex channels. It works, it doesn't take your eye off the basic design, and it can be accomplished on any of the stairs. The aesthetic of the walls doesn't change. When designing these, we deliver 60% of the design plan on the structural panels to a vendor and have them develop the details and structural drawings to make it work. In addition to the landscaping in front of it, the shadows it creates are really important and helps hide the joint pattern. The aesthetic holds together, but there's only so much we can say today about the exact panel configurations. The geometry of the knuckle is a little tighter in that radius and the plaza area is a little more defined. The existing brick wall today that follows the pavilion is very steep and it isn't ADA accessible. We found a way to make it ADA accessible by making some slight changes in grade and elevation along the walk. There are some landscape differences due to the change in the height of the sidewalk and some small modifications to the steps to the pavilion. The railroad was very cooperative and understanding the position of not installing fencing initially on day one. We are going to design it and provide that it could be installed if deemed necessary, but the approval for moving forward without it has been received in writing.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Lahendro: With the removable bollards, how often do you think they will be removed?

Ms. Janiczek: Under the new pedestrian underpass, it would be only for maintenance. Under the old/existing pedestrian tunnel, they have a forklift onsite so if they need to move in equipment for shows they would have the capability to do that. They are about 5 ft. apart from each other so anything bigger than that would require it.

Mr. Lahendro: Are walks shut down to public access at that point?

Ms. Janiczek: Yes, you would want to limit access. They would be picked up and put back quickly because they are so heavy.

Mr. Ball: What is the plan during pavilion events to block along the bridge in the future?

Ms. Janiczek: We had a meeting with the pavilion and talked about closing it off a few feet from the stairs, allowing people to circulate during the concert. It will not give you a viewing area.

Mr. Mohr: Would that mean there would be no ADA entrance?

Ms. Janiczek: When there is a concert or ticketed events there wouldn't be, which is about 20 times per year.

Mr. Schwarz: For the lights, you specified that they would be black. Is there a reason for that when gray is offered?

Ms. Janiczek: Yes. For the cobra lights, the direction from public works is that we'd like to have the signal equipment in black instead of the standard City green. The ones set inside the parapet should be gray.

Mr. Sarafin: Regarding the individual panel system on the retaining walls, will it be exclusively used for retaining wall situations? Previous design had brick in certain spots.

Ms. Janiczek: Yes. It will be in front of Lexis Nexis and we took your direction on that. It's also on the other side of the bridge in front of Optronics and coming around to the parcel where Champion Brewery is.

Mr. Balut: It seems like there are elements of the design and parts of the bridge that we're not able to see that this point to see aesthetically. This package is missing some information.

Mr. Musarra: It is missing from the standpoint that we didn't repeat everything that we brought before you last time. The only caveat is there may be some cases where there are some very low short walls where it doesn't make sense to try and put that panel on them because they aren't needed structurally. We would make those relate more to the concrete around the stairs. Other than the abutment on Water Street where we transition back to that existing retaining wall would all be that same panel design.

Mr. Balut: I don't see any information or proposal for the Lexis Nexis side.

Ms. Janiczek: We were only coming back with changes to what we had previously shown.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Sarafin: It's a shame to lose the angle of the railing because it really added to the overall flow, but I understand the stipulations you are working with. Generally, you have addressed all of the issues we identified, and it looks comprehensive.

Mr. Mohr: Regarding the parapet, the edges are a little clunky and the whole design of it doesn't have the grace of the earlier one. I wonder if there's anything you could do to the form work that would make it work a little better. Is the edge just to keep it from chipping?

Mr. Musarra: If it gets modified it becomes a whole different thing that needs to be evaluated.

Mr. Lahendro: I agree with the heaviness of that concrete beam and it feels like it's out of place.

Mr. Mohr: Introducing steel there would help because the beam is just out of place and the rest of the construction doesn't talk to it. It's good from a budget standpoint that the railroad isn't going to make you put the protection screen in there, but it still seems like it had a nice reference of bridge in the old sense of the word where you had some upper structure where the roadbed is changing. I think it's a positive thing and that accent over the span makes sense.

Mr. Schwarz: I wouldn't put the infill in if you don't have to and I wish that requirement wasn't part of bridges.

Mr. Ball: I like the form, but I don't like the railroad fencing. It blocks a lot of view and if it's not necessary, it would be nice to not have it.

Mr. Baluz: In theory it adds an elegant sweep. In the previous iteration when there were more elegant moves, especially in the knuckle and the angle of the walls, it contributed to the elegance that made it more holistic. Now we're losing those elements and it went better when it was part of a larger whole. The most iconic element in the design of this bridge up until tonight was that really elegant radius curve at the knuckle combined with the angled wall and rail. The white thinness of that bridge was articulated in those renderings that contributed to the elegance that was supported by the painted dark steel or concrete beams. Now we've lost the main elegance by going into that tight radius, which we don't even have a good look of tonight. I lament the fact that we lost that, as well as the rail and the tactile detail that actually brought it together. There is a way to achieve that thinness by perhaps bringing it down to steel. The most appealing thing about this was the elegance and slenderness of the arch and curve continuing from the path all the way across the bridge. Now it's becoming more and more clunky. The lighting, furniture, bollards, etc. is fine and the package is comprehensive, but I'm having a hard time remembering the other elements that are not a part of this package when we approve a COA for everything. It would have been nice and helpful to have it all together to look at it one last time, but we'll make do.

Mr. Gastinger: I apologize for arriving late. In many ways, there are many things in the project that are going really well and it seems like the plan makes a lot of sense. The planting plan and strategy look appropriate. The parapet seems like it has gotten very standard very quickly and it is a small example of some concerns about the design process. The biggest

concern is that we're still being asked to imagine what the concrete panels and elevations are and that is asking a lot of a design review committee to try to evaluate without being clear about what we are potentially approving. While I understand the necessity and challenges with procurement processes, someone had to do a sketch to tell the graphic designer how to do the photoshop. There are elevations of this project that we just haven't had access to, and I don't know why. If the City and VDOT are going to entertain bids, there should be some graphic representation of what the aspiration is.

Mr. Mohr: When you decide which vender will build the panels, there will be some back and forth before determining what the final product will look like. Could the BAR be involved in that process?

Mr. Musarra: Yes, we can find a way to do that. I don't know what the proper procedure is, but we can certainly have some collaboration. The differences between the aesthetics from different vendors is not going to be perceived in the landscape, given the nature of the project and scale. If you go to a product catalog and you pull that exact product up that we're recommending and put it in a rendering, that essentially is the look. That is the aesthetic the contractors have to achieve.

Ms. Janiczek: In the past we've written special provisions to create guidance to the contractor. In this panel, we would write a provision that the depth of the relief needs to be 6 inches, needs to cover X number of the wall, the size of the panel, etc. and we would find at least 3 manufacturers that could meet that. We would then get a shop drawing that lays out what the panels look like for our review. We could provide you with the material that the manufacturer picked and the shop drawings.

Mr. Gastinger: That is understandable and that's why a drawing is a very useful to have in front of us. We understand there is variation with materials because that happens all the time, but the public has been invested in this project for a long time and it's important to see measured elevations.

Mr. Musarra: At the end of the day this is the effect that has to be achieved and if you go outside of the boundaries, we will put the red flag up and come back in.

Mr. Mohr: There are going to be things that the vendors are going to want to modify and we need to verify it.

Ms. Janiczek: If they fall within our parameters, we need to accept it. We don't have a free rejection.

Mr. Mohr: I'm not thinking about rejection because they have a pretty good idea of what they want. We can say we would like to be a part of that process.

Mr. Brian McPeters: We can't specify legally that the panel has to be a certain dimension or width. I can't create an environment where I eliminate approved vendors for the contractor to

use because he makes a certain size panel. I can't give you a drawing of how the pieces fit together because that's the vendor's job.

Mr. Alex Ikefuna: We can let the BAR have an advisory, but we need some flexibility in terms of procurement because something could happen that the City couldn't get out of, which becomes a huge risk. We need that flexibility.

Mr. Mohr: We'd just like to see what the fruition of that is going to be while it's at the sample level. I'm confident that what they want to do is going to be fine, but it is a tactile and physical thing and you won't just get it from a couple renderings.

Mr. Werner: As with any project that the BAR reviews, when something comes in, I have to review the drawings. There's no real way to have a later check and decision on it. Knowing what my role will be and communicating what you all have said, to the extent that I can, I will adhere to that.

Mr. Sarafin: When the 3 samples come in, what are the criteria for selecting which of them you'll go with?

Mr. McPeters: When we write the special provision, we take the final drawings and advertise for construction. We ask for a price from the contractor for the walls at a square foot price, which is hooked to a special provision we wrote with the specifications. Because it's a VDOT job and has federal funds, the contractor has to use a VDOT pre-qualified vendor to manufacture the panels. The contractor will likely use the cheapest vendor that bids it for him that can conform to the specification. There won't be 3 that come back, we just have to make sure there are 3 vendors for everything. They will create a mock up and when we get to that point into construction, we can invite the BAR as an advisory point. As long as that guidance is general in nature and doesn't constrain the contractor or throw out his vendor, the contractor will work with us.

Mr. Gastinger: Because the aesthetic that you've selected for the base of the bridge, the scale of the individual panel is less important because it's going to be less visual. You should try to be specific in the drawings you give because so much of this is going through the detail of an individual panel. There could be some really clunky outcomes because the elevations haven't been considered.

Mr. Musarra: Another thing we can commit to you is presenting you with a draft of the special provisions and let you comment on it so that any concerns presented this evening are reflected in that document.

Mr. Mohr: The main concern we have is just making sure we're all on the same page.

Mr. Gastinger: Regarding the furnishings, the basis of design is really good. The first alternates are good, but the second alternates seemed to be quite a departure, especially the Innova brand. It would be a shame to end up with that.

Mr. McPeters: At the direction of the City, we are going to try working with the Federal Highway Administration and VDOT to get a finding of public interest, which allows us to sole source the bench, trashcan and bike rack. When we specify an example one in the basis of design, we have to make sure there are two others we could have said. We've done a lot of streetscapes and normally we get the one we specify. However, if we lose the request from VDOT, which the City doesn't decide, that is just to show that we would have to accept one of those three. We are going to specify the one that has been previously endorsed.

Mr. Schwarz: Did you run the alternates by Parks and Recreation? I assume they will be maintaining all of it.

Mr. McPeters: That is the reason why we would request finding a public interest. Unfortunately, whether they approve of the benches or not, if it is deemed an equal than it will be an equal regardless. The basis of design one has been vetted with them in conversations previously and it hasn't changed.

Mr. Schwarz: Regarding how the panels would work, it would be great to wrap the corners and as opposed to stopping and having a blank space where it hits the end of the bridge or ground, it should just continue and die into the ground.

Mr. Mohr: To clarify, is there a way to make it across the bridge and down the stairs onto Water Street no matter what is going on at the pavilion?

Mr. McPeters: That is the plan that we talked to the pavilion owner about tonight. The conversation is something that the City is working on and will have to work out before we go to construction. We seem to be heading in a path that the stairs will allow access.

Ms. Schwarz: We received an email over the weekend from Sarah Pool. Does your design adequately address her concerns?

Mr. McPeters: I was pleased to see her email and all of her things were compliant. The ADA concept throughout this whole project with the unique change that resulted in the knuckle design had a tradeoff, so we got an accessible route that we weren't going to have.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Public Design and Improvements, I move to find that the proposed bridge, lighting and site work 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 with the following additions.

- That the striations will wrap the corners at the abutment, and should appear cut at any obstructions as discussed;*
- That lamping for the pole lights will have a minimum 80 color rendering index (CRI), although 90 is preferred;
- The BAR strongly recommends review of the overhang at the knuckle to reduce the perceived heaviness of the beam, and to visually separate the beam from the parapet;

- The BAR to provide advisory review of the special provision for the concrete panels for the retaining wall system.

Mohr seconded. Approved (8-0).

[* Specifically: A) At the two corners of the south abutment the striation pattern of the panels on the east and west walls will appear to wrap the corner onto the abutment wall under bridge; and B) where the striated wall panels meet the sloped parapet (above), the ground level (at the base), and an obstruction (a different, non-striated element that has been inserted onto or through the vertical plane of the striated wall--for example, the stairs and the bike/ped tunnels) the striation pattern will terminate as if cut, similar to a natural, exposed rock outcropping if cut for a road or bored into for an opening. Note: Refer to slides #3 and 19 of the presentation.]

D. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness (HC District)

BAR 19-08-08

507 Ridge Street

Tax Parcel 290141000

Lauter, Clayton & Kimberly, Trustees, Owner/Sigora Solar, Applicant

Installation of Solar Panels

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: 507 Ridge Street, the Gianniny-Bailey House was constructed c1895, and is a contributing structure in the Ridge Street ADC District. It contributes to the series of Victorian residences along Ridge Street that date to the 1890s. This two-story, two-bay house was originally weatherboard, but has since been covered with stucco. Notable features include a semi-octagonal projecting bay on the front façade, and Eastlake trim on the second story porch. On the property is one of the city’s remaining servant’s quarters. The request is for the installation of a frame-mounted, ground level, solar photovoltaic system. The system will consist of 32 solar panels anchored on a frame in the rear yard. The overall dimensions of the solar system will be 10 feet in width and 52 feet in length. All wiring to the solar photovoltaic system will be buried a minimum of 24 inches. The solar photovoltaic system will be setback from the historic structure approximately 101 feet, and 170 feet away from the rear parcel boundary. The BAR should discuss if screening is necessary in this instance since this will be on the ground and is a utility service. Otherwise, staff finds the proposed solar photovoltaic system appropriate.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: This seems perfectly acceptable. It's way back there and you can't see it from the district.

Mr. Sarafin: Is there any concern about screening?

Mr. Werner: The fact that it's not affecting the structure, it's not a corner lot, no one from the community has offered any concerns about it, and it's reversible makes it appropriate.

Motion: Schwarz 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 photovoltaic system satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Earnst seconded. Approved (9-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-08-09

712 Ridge Street

Tax Parcel 250067000

Reba Godo, Owner/Applicant

Window Replacements

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The Harris-Carter House was constructed in 1922 and is a contributing structure in the Ridge Street ADC District. This two-story, three bay, American Four Square has a low hipped roof clad with standing-seam metal roofing with deep eaves. On the front of the house sits a one-story porch featuring a low hip roof and four stucco piers. The house has a variety of single and double hung windows across the four elevations. The request is to remove and replace the existing deteriorating windows on the 2nd floor only. New windows will be Sierra Pacific H3 High Tech Fusion Windows. The windows are constructed of extruded aluminum, vinyl, and wood. Building Inspection staff examined the windows in question and confirmed that the windows are deteriorating with conditions such as glass beginning to fall out of the window frame and cracked glazing. The building inspector also stated that the condition of those windows are representative of the whole house. Staff acknowledges that the windows are deteriorating, however recommends that the BAR discuss the window replacement. Additionally, if the BAR approves the window replacement, staff recommends that the BAR state in the motion that all windows are to be replaced in kind and match the correlating existing window configuration.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Gastinger: Are they proposing that the storms also be removed?

Mr. Werner: That is unclear. They can be added or removed without review.

Mr. Mohr: Is there a particular reason why they are doing just second floor windows?

Mr. Werner: The person that has the house is doing her best to maintain it and there are things that she isn't realizing that are occurring. There is damage to the eaves, and we are working with her to get some things done that they are able to accomplish.

Mr. Ball: The staff report says that the windows were deteriorating, and the glass was falling out and that the windows are appropriate to replace, right?

Mr. Werner: The property inspector for the City said they were in bad shape.

Ms. Miller: The property inspector has a different lens than our Guidelines look through.

Mr. Mohr: We would have to see a sample because it seems like putting it in there with the jam would just be hiding and possibly adding more damage long term because who knows what's going on with the aluminum siding. It's also just clearly against the way we do things.

Ms. Miller: Part of our Guidelines say that "prior to the replacement of windows, a survey of existing window conditions is recommended. Note number of windows, whether each window is original or replaced, the material, type, hardware and finish, the condition of the frame, sash, sill, putty, and panes." We have some photos and a report, but not a full survey. "Retain original windows when possible. Uncover and repair covered up windows and reinstall windows where they have been blocked in. If the window is no longer needed, the glass should be retained and the back side frosted, screened, or shuttered so that it appears from the outside to be in use. Repair original windows by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Wood that appears to be in bad condition because of peeling paint or separated joints often can be repaired. Replace historic components of a window that are beyond repair with matching components. Replace entire windows only when they are missing or beyond repair. If a window on the primary façade of a building must be replaced and an existing window of the same style, material, and size is identified on a secondary elevation, place the historic window in the window opening on the primary façade. Avoid changing the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows by cutting new openings, blocking in windows, or installing replacement sash that does not fit the window opening. If windows warrant replacement, appropriate material for new windows depends upon the context of the building within a historic district, and the age and design of the building. Sustainable materials such as wood, aluminum-clad wood, solid fiberglass, and metal windows are preferred. Vinyl windows are discouraged." Based on this reading, these windows don't necessarily meet that standard, nor does the suggested replacement. I'd prefer to see the windows repaired. Something needs to be done to the windows and other areas of the house and I'm glad to see that the owner is interested in that.

Mr. Lahendro: Based upon the pictures that were given to us, I don't see the level of severe damage that could not be repaired and certainly not all of them. The evidence just hasn't been presented.

Mr. Ball: Definitely not the trim. There's only one that shows damage to the trim and it's on a main level, which they're not doing anything with.

Mr. Werner: You could choose to defer the application and staff can have a conversation with the applicant to get at the trim issue. I was hoping for more additional information and clarification. My understanding is that the window type is too flashy and not appropriate.

Mr. Schwarz: If the windows are deemed replaceable, a sash pack would be more appropriate than an insert.

Mr. Mohr: This insert looks like they would be taking the nailing and putting it directly on the trim and covering that with aluminum. There's nothing legitimate about it.

Mr. Sarafin: There's just not enough information.

Mr. Tim Lasley: To clarify for the applicant, how detailed would the window survey need to be?

Mr. Schwarz: Unfortunately, the only way we've done this successfully is if some BAR members go out there and look at it, especially with these many windows.

Ms. Miller: It should follow the description listed in the Guidelines.

Mr. Werner: It looks like better photographs and a clearer direction towards a manufacturer is more appropriate.

Mr. Schwarz: Photographs are really hard to illustrate a window because paint hides a lot and you have to touch it to see.

Mr. Werner: It's going to take some access getting in there and having a more thorough conversation with the owner and we can try to arrange that.

Mr. Sarafin: It's a rental so presumably the owner's goal isn't demolition by neglect so there is intent to stabilize it.

Motion: Miller moved to defer the application. Mohr seconded. Approved (9-0).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-08-05

205 2nd Street SW

Tax Parcel 280078000

Chauncey Hutter, Owner/Applicant

Roof Replacement

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This was constructed c1879 as the parsonage for the First Methodist Church at the corner Water Street and 2nd Street. This vernacular Victorian house is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. The two-story, brick house features a T-shaped gable roof, a single-story front porch, and a projecting bay on the front façade. The roof of the building has a steep metal truncated hip roof with a boxed cornice with small brackets. This CoA is to remove the existing standing-seam metal roof and replace rear portions of the roof with 50-year, asphalt shingles and the front portions—including porch and bay window—with standing-seam metal. The BAR should discuss the appropriateness of the roof replacement since the replacement of standing-seam metal roof with asphalt shingles should be avoided per City Design Guidelines.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: Regarding the portion of the roof they are replacing with asphalt shingles, there is a low slope roof in the back that is wide and square. Is that it? Will the gables that for a T-shape stay metal?

Mr. Mohr: It's hard to tell where they aren't doing the standing-seam. It isn't very descriptive.

Mr. Werner: It is not clear.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: I would like to put the Guidelines on roofs on the record. It says, "When replacing a standing seam metal roof, the width of the pan and the seam height should be consistent with the original. Ideally, the seams would be hand crimped. When replacing a roof, match original materials as closely as possible. Avoid, for example, replacing a standing-seam metal roof with asphalt shingles, as this would dramatically alter the building's appearance. Artificial slate is an acceptable substitute when replacement is needed. Do not change the appearance or material of parapet coping." Based on that and the fact that we have limited information, I suggest we either defer or deny the application.

Mr. Schwarz: It is metal, it just looks like a flat roof. We should defer this, so we at least get a drawing that shows which roof areas they are thinking of. If it is what I think it is, I would lean towards being okay with it in this specific instance, but we need to defer it to make sure we know what we are getting. Maybe they can give us more information on exactly what the metal part of the roof is going to be.

Ms. Miller: Just so they recognize there is a difference of opinion, I would recommend replacing as per the Guidelines.

Mr. Mohr: That little part of flat roof isn't the majority of the roof by a long shot, so just doing that part in asphalt isn't going to save that much money. It doesn't make sense and it would be very strange.

Mr. Lahendro: The application is not being clear about what is being requested.

Motion: Lahendro moved to defer the application. Miller seconded. Approved (9-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-08-06

209 2nd Street SW

Tax Parcel 280077000

Same Street LLC, Owner/Tim Burgess, Applicant

Site Alterations and Rehabilitations

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This was constructed c1880. The Watson House is a two-story vernacular house within the Downtown ADC District. This house and the adjacent matching house feature three-bays, single pile, with a front-facing central gable and a medium-pitched gable roof. Sitting on a low foundation, the front porch is topped by a low-pitched hip roof supported by four Tuscan columns. The roofs standing-seam metal with Philadelphia gutters. The request is to rehabilitate and renovate the exterior of the existing historic house and the existing rear addition. For the historic brick house, they would like to paint the unpainted brick in the color Benjamin Moore OC-122 "Cotton Balls and paint the existing windows in the color Benjamin Moore 2130-20 "Deep Caviar. There are no physical changes to the primary façade. As for the rear addition, the paint siding color would be Benjamin Moore OC-122 "Cotton Balls." They would paint the existing windows Benjamin Moore 2130-20 "Deep Caviar," install Marvin Bronze Ultimate French Doors with 2 side lites, install two Marvin Bronze awning windows, and construct a 5-ft x 12-ft walk-in shed and paint it to match siding. The roofing would be a dark bronze metal roofing. They would install an exterior, Marra Forni Pizza Oven and open up an existing window at the kitchen to install a door existing to the proposed garden. Additionally, a CMU wall covered with white stucco has been proposed to enclose the property. The remaining area inside will function as a garden. The fence will be 3 feet in height and 38 feet long. The rear portion of the wall will have a series of perforations. A solid wall of the same material will extend out 9 feet to allow space for trash cans. This allows slightly over 6 feet of entrance into the rear garden/patio space from a parking lot. Staff finds the proposed alterations to the later, rear addition, including the proposed windows and door, pizza oven, CMU wall, and walk-in shed, are appropriate. Staff does not recommend approval of painting the unpainted masonry of the historic house. This house mirrors/matches 213 2nd Street SW. Painting one would adversely impact that intentional relationship. The BAR should discuss whether this is appropriate, and if so, ensure that an appropriate paint is used. The BAR should discuss the appropriateness of the proposed colors, specifically whether painting the historic windows black is appropriate.

Applicant, Caitlin Shafer, Henningsen Kestner Architects: We are proposing the exterior alterations to 209 2nd Street, including painting the existing wood windows and replacing all

windows and doors in the rear additions. We are proposing a dark bronze color to match the newly replaced roof. We are including painting the brick and the additions white. We saw the staff report referencing 213 and 209 being built as a pair and the intent to paint the brick was to distinguish the two and the two restaurants that will be next to one another. There is a draft server with a shed roof canopy on the northside. Lastly, we are proposing a privacy wall in the rear that is 5 ft. high and will be CMU with stucco. We are putting some openings into the wall so that it isn't completely cut off from its surroundings. There is a parking lot directly behind it so we wanted some privacy. The openings in the wall correlate to the uses on the inside and there will be some outdoor seating and a patio area and those openings are more eye level in a seated position. The back of house area where the pizza oven and the door to the kitchen are at has the openings a little higher so it's not quite as visible.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Gastinger: Would the wall have a cap? How would you handle the stucco in those perforations?

Ms. Shafer: We weren't thinking of a cap. We were thinking more of a clean edge all the way around.

Mr. Gastinger: You suggested painting the existing windows and I expect there is going to be some discussion about whether the brick is painted. If the brick were not allowed to be painted, would you still paint the windows the same color?

Ms. Shafer: No.

Mr. Ball: Is there any deterioration to the brick? Any anomalies?

Ms. Shafer: No.

Mr. Ball: So there's no other reason to paint it other than looks.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: I agree with the staff report. I agree with everything except painting the brick and just re-look at the color scheme once you don't paint the brick.

Ms. Miller: We would want to know more about how you want to finish the wall.

Mr. Mohr: Painting the brick unfortunately just runs head on to one of our most frequently cited precedents. You can't reverse it and when you talk about historic structures, you are talking about whether it's reversible. Once you paint brick, it can never go back to being brick so it basically ruins the integrity of the house from a historic standpoint. By National Park Service Standards and most ADC District Standards, that would not fly.

Mr. Sarafin: It's also detrimental to the brick. That brick is very soft.

Ms. Miller: The Guideline is very simple. It says, "do not paint unpainted masonry."

Mr. Gastinger: These houses are paired, and they have a history together. I am sympathetic that businesses will want to differentiate from each other. Perhaps we can give some guidance when landscape is reviewed that there are some other ways to differentiate themselves.

Mr. Schwarz: There are traditional paint colors for the trim that aren't necessarily white that may help differentiate as well.

Mr. Mohr: It just has to be more subtle unfortunately.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed exterior alterations 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 except for painting the brick, with details of the wall submitted for the record. Gastinger seconded. Approved (9-0).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-08-04

200 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280010000

Violet Crown Charlottesville LLC, Owner

The Bridge Progressive Arts Institute, Applicant

Proposed Mural

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: 200 West Main Street is a contributing structure within the Downtown ADC district. The site was originally occupied by two commercial structures, Leggett and Sears, which were combined for use by the Regal Cinema in 1996. Although the façade was completely rebuilt at the time, the Regal Cinema still expressed the idea of the two buildings with different parapet heights. The building remains to house a theater which is known as the Violet Crown. They would like to paint a mural on the wall facing 2nd Street SW. The intent is to contribute "a serene, yet resolute sense of beauty, strength, unity to an architecturally unremarkable wall in the heart of Charlottesville's downtown." Since this wall has painted masonry, staff finds the painting appropriate. The BAR should discuss if a mural is appropriate in this location. The proposed location does not appear to interfere with or obscure any historic elements or architectural features of the historic structure.

Applicant, Alan Goffinski: The wall stands along a primary entry point to the Downtown Mall and is directly adjacent to a CAT bus stop, which is relevant. The wall in its current condition has several layers of peeling paint covering brick. Recent graffiti has been left unaddressed. We believe the proposed colors provide a natural and calming palette intended to be a positive alternative to the current unwelcoming impression. The mural at this site would provide an uplifting first impression to many on the Downtown Mall and will communicate a warm sense of value and inclusion to those waiting on public transit. Conceptually, this mural communicates a powerful truth that the intertwining of our roots is what holds us up and gives us strength to look forward. Furthermore, we have seen a cultural appreciation regarding murals emerge significantly over the past several years and a growing realization of the unique, authentic identity that they contribute to Charlottesville. A mural at this location on the map would help to connect geographically the murals of West Main Street and the areas surrounding it with the growing number of murals popping up in the Belmont neighborhood. This kind of connectivity provides a unique growing opportunity to highlight these unique creative assets with things like self-guided walking tours, bike rides, community events, etc. Additionally, the process for installation of this mural would involve two local painters executing the design. It would be painted directly on the freshly painted and primed surface. If all goes according to plan, we intend to enlist high school apprentices to assist in the painting as well. Not only does this create a valuable opportunity for young artists, but it effectively incorporates a sense of community support and goodwill to allow for Charlottesville to really own the artwork.

Jake Van Yahres: To provide more context for the mural, I designed it and it was donated by my family's tree company, Van Yahres Tree Company. This year marks the 100-year anniversary of the company in Charlottesville and we wanted to give something back to the City in return. My grandfather, Rich Van Yahres, used to be the mayor and he was very instrumental in the Downtown Mall. His office was about a block away from this mural. As an ode to him in the same place, we wanted to share a message about trees and positivity. What many people don't know about trees is that their root structures underground are spread out and they all latch on to one another. Because of that, they grow a lot stronger together. It's almost like joining arms, which is the context behind it.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: You stated that this would be done on a freshly painted primed surface. Are you repainting the entire wall first or just the image?

Mr. Goffinski: Our intention is to give the entire wall a fresh coat of paint and match the exact color. In order to do it right and keep the image lasting for a long period of time, we want to make sure we chip off the things that are already chipping and put on a new coat. The Violet Crown has graciously agreed to cover the expense of the repair to that wall and the base coat.

Mr. Gastinger: Right now, there is a very important, temporary mural there. Does this in the plans for that mural?

Mr. Goffinski: We were involved in supporting that mural as well. It's temporary and has a hard end date sometime in early September, if it doesn't come down sooner due to weather. It will run its course naturally or hit its deadline and we're excited to have something colorful to put up in its place.

Mr. Lahendro: How are you going to take care of the peeling paint and at the same time not damage the brick underneath of it?

Mr. Goffinski: My intention is to hire a specific crew and I assume it would involve power-washing and some light scaping to take care of some of the light chipping that is already occurring.

Mr. Lahendro: I would recommend using a wire brush or a metal scraper so that you aren't damaging the brick when you're scraping the paint off.

Mr. Mohr: Power-washing can also cause some real damage.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: This is appropriate. It's already on a painted surface so there aren't any concerns there. It would be a nice addition to the street.

Mr. Sarafin: This is an exceptional application and it looks great.

Motion: Lahendro moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and Public Design and Improvements, I move to find that the proposed mural satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Sarafin seconded. Approved (9-0).

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-08-01

108 West South Street

Tax Parcel 280101000

West South Street LLC, Owner/Christie Haskin (Woodard Properties), Applicant

Elevation/Façade Alterations

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: Constructed between 1922 and 1923, the H. H. Hankins Warehouse II is a contributing structure within the Downtown ADC District. This two-story, three-bay building sits on a high foundation. The 1984 building survey indicates the side (west) elevation had seven irregular bay and the rear (south) elevation had three bays on the first level and four the second level. The elements that defined the bays, warehouse doors and windows,

appear to have been lost over time. The four six-lite casement windows just below the roofline of rear façade have been retained. On the north, which is fronting on South Street, they would like to remove the non-historic awning and frame. On the west side, they would create two new openings at the rear of the west elevation and install new six over six double-hung windows, similar to the existing, upper floor windows on north elevation. The color would be “Hunter Green.” They would remove two trees due to roots and branches encroaching on the building. Along the south, facing the railroad tracks, they would install four six-lite double hung windows below the four existing windows that would be painted white. They would install over existing stucco 3-inch EFIS that the color would match the existing cream color. All windows will be Andersen 100 Series Single Hung Windows and painted “dark bronze”. Staff finds the proposed new windows on the rear and west façades are appropriate. BAR should discuss the proposed colors. Staff recommends that the existing stucco at the rear elevation be repaired in lieu of adding a 3-inch layer or material to the wall. Adding to the wall will require alterations to the trim and sills of the existing, historic windows. Staff finds the tree removals appropriate in this instance due to the tree’s close proximity to the building.

Applicant, Ms. Christie Haskin: Between the time of our submittal and today, there were a few other considerations for the rear of the building. We were considering a bronze color to differentiate between the old and new of the windows to celebrate that. There was also a bit of water damage on the back and we are proposing to put some gutters around the back. There are three spouts at the roofline so we would extend them down to prevent future water damage. We are proposing that they also be the bronze color to make a continuation of the new material. We are also proposing to eliminate the mullions in the new windows to further differentiate old and new.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Gastinger: Will you be removing the satellite dish?

Ms. Haskin: That is correct.

Mr. Balut: Have you all considered what you are going to do with the window trim details to accommodate the extra depth?

Ms. Haskin: It is proposed for the whole wall, but we would have to look further into how that would be connected at that point.

Mr. Mohr: The windows are inset so it wouldn’t really change the trim detail much.

Mr. Balut: So it could just be a hard corner.

Mr. Mohr: What is the reason for the EFIS on that wall in particular?

Ms. Haskin: It's for insulation and in the interior, there is a clay material and we were hoping to preserve that.

Mr. Lahendro: The terracotta tile units inside were always meant to be plastered and covered up. They were considered ugly and were not meant to be seen. You are covering up the stucco on the outside, which was meant to dress up the exterior. It's just kind of backwards from what the original intention was. Why is it that the owners are concerned to create a big distinction between the new and old?

Ms. Haskin: It's something nice to stand out and it should be celebrated. It should be emphasized.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: We have a Guideline that says that EFIS is discouraged. In addition, regarding masonry, our Guidelines say that "masonry includes brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, stucco, and mortar. Masonry is used on cornices, pediments, lintels, sills, and decorative features, as well as for wall surfaces. Color, texture, mortar joint type, and patterns of the masonry help define the overall character of a building. Brick is used for the construction of building walls, retaining walls, fencing, and chimney. When repairing or replacing a masonry feature, respect the size, texture, color, and pattern of masonry units, as well as mortar joint size and tooling. Do not paint unpainted masonry. Do not repoint with a synthetic caulking compound. Repair stucco by removing loose material and patching with a new material that is similar in composition, color, and texture. Wood clapboards, wood shingles, wood board-and-batten, brick, stone, stucco or a combination of the above materials all have distinctive characteristics. Synthetic materials can never have the same patina, texture or light reflective qualities. Avoid applying synthetic siding. In addition to changing the appearance of a historic building, synthetic siding can make maintenance more difficult because it covers up potential problems that can become more serious. And synthetic siding, once it dents or fades, needs painting just as frequently as wood." Regarding the windows, it says to "avoid changing the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows by cutting new openings, blocking in windows, or installing replacement sash that does not fit the window opening." If we were doing new windows, there is a Guideline that says, "the appropriate material for new windows depends upon the context of the building within a historic district, and the age and design of the building. Sustainable materials such as wood, aluminum-clad wood, solid fiberglass, and metal windows are preferred. Vinyl windows are discouraged."

Ms. Earnst: The EFIS Guideline states that it is discouraged but may be approved on items like gables where it cannot be seen or damaged. It requires careful design of the location of control joints.

Mr. Gastinger: I take all of those Guidelines to heart and yet the openings that are being proposed and the repairs are on very secondary facades that are not architecturally significant. Given the industrial nature of the shell and structure where openings have been placed multiple times in this building's history, I do not feel that substantially takes away from the building's historic character. Any investment in this structure will be an improvement.

Mr. Sarafin: I agree about the new window openings and I like some kind of differentiation. I don't know if bronze or hunter green is right, but I like the concept of it being slightly different. The mullions are fine. Maybe they are the same color and don't have muntins and that is the differentiation. Maybe the color switch is too dramatic, but I like the concept. The EFIS on the rear is a vulnerable area and I could see it getting damaged very quickly and easily.

Mr. Schwarz: We have to recognize that all stucco that we see that is done today is going to be EFIS. Most commercial buildings require exterior continuous installation now and it is a common thing that we're going to see. Our Guidelines haven't been updated in years and this is one thing that is an outdated concern that needs to be dealt with at some point. It's perfectly appropriate and I agree about the muntins and the color.

Mr. Sarafin: Adding downspouts on the south façade is a great idea. The bronze color might be too fancy for this building and it might be a strange move on the track side for this structure.

Ms. Miller: If we were allowing the punched openings, we would at a minimum use the windows that the Guidelines definitely recommend. There are hundreds of options out to use until we get the Guidelines updated.

Mr. Gastinger: This façade has difficult access for maintenance and if a building ever goes in the lot on the other side of the tracks it will be even more difficult. While that might make a good argument for the windows that have been proposed, it also might call into question the EFIS and how much you will be able to keep it up so the integrity of the back wall is maintained.

Mr. Lahendro: I can support almost everything in the application but the EFIS gives me pause. It's wrongheaded. Does the EFIS stop at the opening? You would need to do that at the end of the wall and you will have these awkward joints. Weather will also get behind there. There isn't much historic appearing about the building, but I like the star endplates for the te rods and we're going to lose those. I have a lot of trouble with the EFIS. The proposal is to put EFIS only on the back wall. Why? What does that do for you if you just insulate one wall?

Mr. Mohr: They are thinking about insulating the inside of those walls and not the inside of that back wall. It also means there will be weird moisture travel in those corners.

Mr. Lasley: If we're going to approve the windows, since they are going to be switched to double-hung windows, I would like to have appropriate elevations for the record.

Mr. Mohr: There used to be a warehouse loading door and there were more windows marching across the second floor level so it had a completely different fenestration at one point. My

inclination is to leave the little windows completely and punch whatever you want in the rest of the wall. You should leave those four because that's the only part of the façade that is actually real. The windows are also pretty rough and snugging something modern up to them will look really strange.

Mr. Lahendro: The survey says that the tile walls are stuccoed with white stucco so I guess they did build it with just tile.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed façade alterations 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 with the following modifications:

- **That new windows on the rear façade not come in contact with existing windows;**
- **That revised elevations come back for approval;**
- **The BAR recommends matching window color, but does not recommend the use of muntins in the new windows;**
- **The BAR recommends to reconsider the color of the downspouts in relation to the windows.**

Gastinger seconded. Approved (6-3 with Earnst, Miller, and Lahendro opposed).

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-08-02

1509 Grady Avenue

Tax Parcel 050102000

Pi Beta Phi House Corp., Owner/Mary Kennedy, Applicant

Construction of Side Porch

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This was constructed c1925 and it is a contributing structure within the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. This Colonial Revival, two-story house features a gable roof and a round-arched pediment portico. The house has historically been a residential structure, and currently is the house for Pi Beta Phi Fraternity for Women. The request is to construct a new porch and brick terrace on the east side of the house. The porch would be approximately 26 feet in depth and 41 feet in total length. The brick for the porch and terrace will match the existing brick on the historic structure. The covered porch would have a maximum height of approximately 10 feet. The roof would be a flat EPDM roof. New prefabricated structural columns and trim will be installed and painted white. The porch and patio would introduce five new steps. A connection from the existing side porch to the proposed side porch will be included. The new porch will require the removal of existing double-hung windows and section of the brick to accommodate a new French door system in mid-span of a NANA-Wall System. A brick soldier course exists above the wall system and doors. Staff finds the proportions of the proposed porch and terrace appropriate for the site and affords opportunity on the corner lot facing Grady Avenue and Cabell Avenue. Staff finds the proposal appropriate in concept at this phase. One concern is the relocation of the utilities and mechanical units, which are currently located where the proposed porch and connection to the

existing porch are planned to go. This has not yet been accounted for in plan. The BAR should discuss the overall appropriateness of the porch and terrace. The BAR should discuss the potential use of plantings and other forms of landscaping to buffer/soften the transition from turf to brick.

Applicant, David Kariel: The back part is an addition from 2009 and it is used as a kitchen and dining area. The sorority does group meetings there and they want to be able to expand for those meetings. They aren't able to expand anywhere else on the site. There are a few things that have changed. The NANA-Wall System is going to be changed into two sets of 3 French doors because there's a column down the middle. It will have a flat roof over it, so we aren't removing any windows. It's a brick to match the porch itself and the contractor has suggested using stamped concrete for the lower terrace. We're doing a curve because it repeats the curve at the front porch and there is some historic precedent for the curves.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Gastinger: What is the material of the columns?

Mr. Kariel: It is probably fiberglass, but it could be wood. They look like wood columns in any case.

Ms. Miller: Do you have cutsheets for the proposed windows?

Mr. Kariel: No.

Mr. Schwarz: Regarding staff's question about the HVAC units, what is the plan for that?

Mr. Kariel: We have HVAC in the alcove between the porch and the thought was to put them on the right side outside the dining area. They would go over by the wood fence.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Mohr: We usually ask for window cuts. I don't see anything problematic, but we should have that in the submittal.

Ms. Miller: Agreed. It needs to be fair.

Mr. Schwarz: I would be comfortable saying that they are going to be either wood or aluminum clad wood and it could be approved administratively.

Ms. Miller: We should also have the cutsheets for the record.

Mr. Mohr: What about the specification for the columns?

Mr. Schwarz: I'm fine with fiberglass.

Motion: Gastinger 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 side porch and terrace 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;

- That the proposed window door unit be constructed of wood or aluminum clad wood;
- That specifications of the columns match the existing columns on the front porch, and be submitted for the record;
- That cutsheets of the selected windows be submitted for the record;
- That the revised rear elevation be submitted for approval.

Balut seconded. Approved (8-1 with Miller opposed).

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-08-03

1532 & 1534 Virginia Avenue

Tax Parcel 090123000

Roger HB. Davis JR. & Jeanne S Davis Trusts, Owner; Kevin Schafer, Applicant

Proposed Demolition

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: 1532 Virginia Avenue was constructed c1915, and 1534 Virginia Avenue was constructed c1925. They are vernacular style, one-story frame dwellings with stucco cladding. Both are contributing structures within the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC district. The request is for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 1532 Virginia Avenue and 1534 Virginia Avenue. The applicant has provided justification for the demolition following the Standards for Considering Demolition found on pages 2-3 of the submittal. The applicant has submitted an engineer's report that characterizes the structural condition of both buildings as poor. The report acknowledges the limitations of the investigation and the subsequent findings, however the deterioration identified is not insignificant, nor is the estimated cost of repairs. The BAR does not consider what the possible new use of the property would be, only whether or not the buildings merit preservation. The BAR may wish to evaluate and take action on each structure individually. Should the BAR approve the request, staff suggests a condition that requires the submittal of an appropriate level of documentation for each structure.

Applicant, Kevin Schafer: The submission is for the demolition of two single-story wood framed residents with stucco cladding in the Rugby Road ADC District. This parcel was subject to BAR review in February 2015. What is being proposed tonight has two major distinctions from the previous submittal. At a great expense to the owner, the structure at 1536 has been

renovated and restored and is no longer a part of this demolition permit application. They took great care to structurally rehabilitate the house. With this approach, the modestly scaled vernacular style houses will continue to have a presence and representation on the street. It was also discussed previously that the structure at 1536 had, and continues to have, the best relationship to the street, as it set scale of the street wall for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic coming around the corner from 17th Street. Preserving this house in particular has maintained the presence and scale on the street by being the most visually impactful and thought and care has been given into rehabilitating the structure. The second distinction is the inclusion of the structural report by DMWPV, a locally owned and reputable structural engineering firm. The visual inspection raised many concerns and the report listed each of the structures as poor in condition. Previously submitted demolition permits of contributing structures have been granted at least in part based on failing conditions. Because there is precedent, the structural report that describes these structures as poor is particularly noteworthy. To renovate and rehabilitate these structures is not a small undertaking and is one of which the owner is already aware of through the past experience of 1536. Outside of these differences from the previous submission, the modestly scaled vernacular styled houses are not uncommon in the Venable ADC District. It is an exceptionally mixed district in terms of scales, styles, and uses. The City's Rugby Road University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District survey lists the follow 1 or 1.5 story vernacular styled residences: 203, 504, and 511 14th Street, 200, 201, 329, 343, 410, and 505 15th Street, 1704 Gordon Ave, 1409 Grady Ave, 611 Preston Place, 1410 Sadler Street, 26 University Circle, and 1536 Virginia Ave, which is to be preserved. The structures of these addresses area all found in the Venable Architecture Control District and are noted as contributing structures. If we expand our analysis to the Venable neighborhood proper, the amount of single-story vernacular houses are too frequent to count individually. If we continue to expand our analysis to the City of Charlottesville, we observe houses of this scale and style readily available in nearly all neighborhood, but are particularly frequent in Belmont, Woolen Mills, Fifeville, Martha Jefferson, 10th and Page, Rose Hill, and Johnson Village. Single-story vernacular homes are one of the most well represented residences in the City and these two residences are not an infrequent example within the City. It's important to note that the limitation of underutilized sites within this University medium density zoning forces users into adjacent neighborhoods. There are no known associations with historic persons, architects, master craftsman, or historic events. The buildings do not have significant architectural features and they could be reproduced. The existing 1980s apartment building behind these structures detracts from their vernacular appeal. The demolition of each contributing structure must be considered carefully, and this instance is no different. We agree with the previous BAR motions and feel the retention of this vernacular style and small scale housing must remain on this street to preserve the historic fabric found within the district and the City, which is why our client has extensively renovated the structure at 1536 Virginia Ave. It's equally important to consider the structural conditions report that listed the structures as poor condition. We respectfully ask for the approval of demolition for the structures at 1532 and 1534.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Lahendro: How long did the structural engineers spend inside the buildings?

Mr. Schafer: I'm not sure.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Kevin Lynch: I live at 609 Locust Ave and I have a house on Virginia Ave that is vernacular and built in 1920. I am sympathetic to the applicants because it's difficult to maintain a 100-year-old house that wasn't built intending to last that long. At what point do you stop throwing money at it and do something more substantial with the lot? It's difficult to maintain it and at some point, there becomes a point of diminishing returns. When the historic district was past a few decades ago I was in favor of it. however, since then the oldest house in that neighborhood has been torn down. While I'm sympathetic to the structural condition of this house and what to do about it, I also am concerned with a number of properties along the street and in the neighborhood that are being demolished by neglect. Hopefully you will set a precedent for the street and the neighborhood going forward.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ball: I work with these engineers a lot and they don't typically take things lightly. I've also had the opportunity to be in these houses and I agree with the assessment. It's less rigid than you want a house to be and these properties aren't meant to be more than 100-year-old houses. It comes to a point where a house just runs its course.

Mr. Lahendro: We're losing this kind of housing stock and we're losing the neighborhood little by little. At some point we're going to lose this historic district because there isn't going to be anything left that is historic in it.

Mr. Schwarz: I have the same opinion as when this first came to us. There are three houses right next to each other and they can define the character of that street. They are more valuable as a string of three and there is a character of the street that is created by these three houses. They probably are in terrible shape, but you can fix anything. Demolition by neglect becomes a zoning violation at some point. I can't approve demolishing them, but I could entertain a discussion about how close you could build to them.

Ms. Miller: I give the applicant credit for all that they've done at 1536 and all the time they've taken with all of this. Although one particular house may not be that precious, but the City was trying to have some remaining recognition that this wasn't always a 675-car garage and a bunch of big unattractive apartment buildings.

Mr. Gastinger: I am conflicted. Something that hasn't been acknowledged is that this odd, difficult site is why there are insignificant houses located there. They probably have a lot of moisture issues because of how they are sited, and they are crammed in there. While I am sympathetic to demolitions, in this instance I am conflicted.

Mr. Sarafin: I am conflicted as well. I have appreciation for the work at 1536, which speaks to it most strongly. The other two are very difficult. With the building nearby, everything is paved around all sides of them.

Mr. Mohr: The character of this street was lost a long time ago.

Mr. Schwarz: I don't think it has. I know these houses really well and there is a definite character because those three houses are there. If you were to get rid of the two, the character would be gone.

Mr. Balut: It's a difficult decision but I am not convinced by the remarkable nature of the buildings themselves. There is no notable architecture, builders, function or use of the house, etc., which are very important in preserving the historic value. They offer a contribution to the historic context of the neighborhood, but it's purely based on their scale and presence. It isn't in a remarkable way based on the architecture of the homes themselves in my opinion. There are also signs of the historic nature and value of the neighborhood that won't go away with the loss of these.

Mr. Schwarz: There used to be a lot more houses like this on 14th Street that are now large apartment buildings. You're losing any idea that this used to exist in this area.

Ms. Miller: It's tough having the structural report from a few years ago talk about how all the buildings were in equally poor condition and then now to say that 1536 is fine because they put the work into it and the other two can go.

Mr. Sarafin: They are in national and local districts and chipping away at those is problematic. Should demolition be approved, we need to stipulate that it be documented adequately for the record. I feel strongly that 1536 really preserves the street and the buildings around them take away from it all. However, you'd be losing contributing structures in a local control district and a national district, which is never a good precedent.

Mr. Mohr: The house on the corner held a line and these two are significantly worse examples of their genre. Whatever comes back next needs to play with the scale of that house, at least on its face. It's a question of rejuvenating the neighborhood and learning how to work with the old houses that are remaining.

Motion: Balut 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 1532 Virginia Avenue and 1534 Virginia Avenue satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby BAR Actions August 21, 2019 5 Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition that the owners document the house with plans, elevations, and photographs for submittal with Preservation Piedmont and/or the City. Mohr seconded. Approved (5-3 with Schwarz, Miller, and Lahendro opposed).

Ms. Miller: We couldn't consider what comes next in our vote, but I hope that you consider taking the scale into consideration.

12. Special Use Permit

BAR 19-08-07

503 Rugby Road

Tax Parcel 050052000

Epsilon Sigma House Corps of Kappa Kappa Gamma, Owner

Erin Hannegan (Mitchell Matthews Architects), Applicant

Increase Density

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: Constructed in 1980 following a fire destroying the previous house, 503 Rugby Road is a noncontributing structure within the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. This two-story house reflects Modern architecture and was designed by Johnson, Craven, and Gibson Architects of Charlottesville. The house is constructed of concrete block and covered by an exterior brick veneer. The house is currently used and owned by the sorority Kappa Kappa Gamma. The BAR recommendation on a Special Use Permit (SUP) request to allow occupancy of 37 residents (36 allowed by right) and to allow modifications to the front and side yard setbacks, which would permit proposed building alterations including ornamental features, roof overhangs, and covered porches. The relevant City Code Section is Sec. 34-157(7), that states when the property that is the subject of the application for a special use permit is within a design control district, city council shall refer the application to the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) or Entrance Corridor Review Board (ERB), as may be applicable, for recommendations as to whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the district, and for recommendations as to reasonable conditions which, if imposed, that would mitigate any such impacts. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council. In evaluating this SUP request, the Planning Commission and, ultimately, City Council will take into consideration the BAR's recommendation on whether or not the SUP, if approved, would adversely impact West Main Street ADC district and, if so, any proposed conditions to mitigate the impact. The BAR's recommendations is not a function of how the site will be used or occupied, but an evaluation of the requested SUP relative to the criteria within the ADC Design Guidelines. That is, will allowing increased residential occupancy and the modifications to the front and side setbacks result in a project that conflicts with the Guidelines? Understanding that at a later date the final design must be reviewed and approved by the BAR, staff recommends the BAR find that the SUP will not have an adverse impact on the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. However, in reviewing the SUP the BAR has the opportunity to discuss and offer recommendations on the proposed massing and building envelope, and how it engages the streetscape and neighboring properties, etc. Furthermore, the BAR may request that the Planning Commission and City Council consider including these design recommendations as conditions of approval for the SUP.

Applicant, Erin Hannegan: Last time we were here we failed to convey why Kappa Kappa Gamma is embarking on this renovation to begin with. While the interior is not within your purview, we are changing the front façade because of the request to have larger bedrooms. The existing plan has 6 bedrooms across the front façade and creates accessibility issues. The beds

are smaller than twin beds and they are custom size, so it is very tight. The request was to only have 5 bedrooms across the front, which has allowed us to go to a more symmetrical and balanced classically inspired front façade with 5 openings. Additionally, the building does not have a front door facing Rugby Road, the primary street. Another request is to get a front door on Rugby Road and to put the front porch on the front of the house, which helps dramatically with circulation in the interior and it allows the parlor space to be moved to the side and infill underneath the existing overhang. The addition to the rear allows them to expand their chapter room significantly to seat the quantity of members they have for meetings once a week. We provided updates to the renderings. Our calculations were off on the setbacks because the house itself was supposed to be included in the front yard setback calculation and we hadn't done that. The porch on one of the other houses also creates the front yard setback. It's actually one foot for every two feet in height. The new building is in line with the existing building footprint in the sense that there are three wall sections. here are steps to the front wall that we are adjusting, but we are not intending on pulling the front wall of the building out to the face of the porch. The same is true on the north side of the building. Previously you didn't focus on the massing and scale, as the previous discussion focused on the aesthetic, but I can answer any questions regarding that as well.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ball: What's the difference between the existing house and the new house as far as the structure itself? Is it moving forward or is it just the eaves and porch?

Ms. Hannegan: On the Rugby side, it is a non-load bearing condition, so we have the ability to modify it more. It's the one façade we aren't keeping much of, given the changes in the fenestration.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Karen Dugold: I live at University Circle. This particular building is a close neighbor and I am a member of Kappa Kappa Gamma. I was there when the City leveled the lot on which Kappa was built and the architects designed an amazing house. However, the cost was insurmountable and interest rates were 17%. In turn, the architects tried to put together something to get it built so the girls could live there. Originally in 1979, it took many members aback because it wasn't what they were accustomed to seeing. When the house was built the membership was 50 and it has now tripled. After 40 years, they are hoping a plan can be approved so that they can have a home. They will no longer be questioned by people when delivering mail about where the front door is located. Having room and space is something they are looking forward to.

Holly Mason: I am a member of the Kappa Kappa Gamma House Board and have been a member since 1984. It once reminded me of a Motel 6 building. Tonight, we come to ask for your support and we are very excited about the possibility of renovating this location for two reasons, one being for function. We have vastly outgrown the building as it currently exists.

Secondly, it is not a very lovely building. We would love the opportunity to upgrade it so these women can call it home and be proud of it. It was built at a very difficult time to build and we were grateful at the time to give us a home, but we'd love to do something like this. It's a tough lot and our architect has worked very hard to develop something so we would appreciate the BAR granting the SUP permit and we would be very thankful.

Molly Dunington: I am also a member of the House Board and lived in the house in 1995-1996. The architects have done a wonderful job taking in our vision and enhancing the place where the girls can have a chapter that is functional. Since it was built it hasn't had any renovations beyond upkeep. We have worked hard with the architects to provide a really livable space for the girls. In the mid-90's we were literally sitting almost on top of each other in the chapter room and it is probably a fire hazard. This really enhances the capacity of those areas and will provide great spaces for them to study.

John Freudenthal: I live at 14109 Valentine Country Club Drive in Charlotte, NC. I represent Pi Kappa Alpha next door. We are going through site plan approval right now for 0 Rugby Road and hopefully will have that completed fairly quickly. We are here to support this project and it is necessary. It would compliment the efforts we are trying to put forward with 0 Rugby Road. We have no issues relate to the setbacks that have been proposed. We noticed the step terraces down the sides and we've gone to extreme efforts to have those as well to pull the students outside.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Miller: This is a perfectly reasonable request. It is primarily driven by their odd property line to begin with but it meets the spirit of what the zoning code intended.

Mr. Sarafin: There is no adverse effect to the character of the district with this SUP request. I am in full support of recommending the passage of this recommendation.

Mr. Schwarz: I would like to add a condition to be clear to the Planning Commission that the changes to the setbacks are just for architectural articulation, extended eaves, and a porch. It is not for an expanded mass of the building.

Ms. Hannegan: Because the current setbacks are actually into the existing building, it would be problematic to word it that way.

Mr. Gastinger: My understanding is when you have a non-conforming structure, the setback is where the constructed façade was.

Mr. Schwarz: The back porch is expanding into the revised setbacks, right?

Ms. Hannegan: The back is not encroaching on the rear yard setback.

Motion: Sarafin moved to recommend that based on the general design and building footprint as submitted the proposed Special Use Permit for 503 Rugby Road will not have an adverse impact on the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, with the understanding that the final design and details will require BAR review and approval, and with the condition that the recommendation is based on the general design and building footprint as submitted. Balut seconded. Approved (9-0).

E. Other Business

13. PLACE Report, Tim Mohr: No report.

E. Adjournment: Miller adjourned the meeting at 11:05 pm.