

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[October 15, 2019] – 5:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers - City Hall**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). After presentations by staff and the applicant, members of the public will be allowed two opportunities to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. The Chair will first ask for questions from the public, then from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to ask questions, and up to three minutes to comment. Comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

PLEASE NOTE THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATUM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2

Members Present: Breck Gastenger, Carl Schwarz, Tim Mohr, Melanie Miller, Mike Ball, Justin Sarafin

Members Absent: Jody Lahendro, Emma Earnst

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Sebastian Waisman, Jeff Werner

Pre-Meeting

Items discussed in the Pre-meeting included the Paramount adding a wall so that the homeless cannot sleep in the main entrance of the Paramount.

There was also discussion of the vacancies and those that will not be re-applying for the open BAR positions.

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM by the Chair.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

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 | [August 20, 2019] | August Regular Meeting |
| 2. Minutes | [September 17, 2019] | September Regular Meeting |

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-10-06
500 McIntire Road
Tax Parcel 330001100
Nob Hill, LLC, Owner/Steve von Storch, Applicant
Exterior stair replacement

A motion to approve the consent agenda was made and seconded. The motion was approved 6-0

C. New Items

4. Special Use Permit Application

BAR 19-10-02

167 Chancellor Street

Tax Parcel 090126000

Alpha Omicron of Chi Psi Corp, Owner

Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, LLC, Applicant

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – The structure was built in 1915. This large, five-bay, two-and-a-half-story dwelling shows elements of the Colonial Revival style; details include: brick stretcher bond, hip roof with one hip roof dormer, two-bay front porch with piers and full entablature, and entrance with three-lite transom and sidelights. April 25, 2018 – (BAR 17-11-02) BAR approved the application for general massing, concept and composition with details and the SUP recommendation to come back for BAR review. The COA for that expires this month. In speaking with applicant, they would like to have that extended. Request for Special Use Permit for setback variances on new addition to fraternity house. 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, 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. 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 the Corner 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 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 Corner 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., 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. The BAR previously approved the general massing, concept, and composition of the proposed addition, with the understanding that approval of architectural details and an SUP recommendation would later be necessary. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council.

Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, Applicant – I would like to expand on the entitlement process to review to date. We submitted a preliminary submission on October 31, 2017 to the BAR, which attempted to accommodate this desired expansion, primarily through a vertical expansion through the use of dormers. Per the BAR review, this expansion changed the façade of the Chancellor Street and our attempts to retain the historic characteristics of the front porch were overshadowed by these dormers in the stair tower addition. We agreed that the historic defining characteristics should remain, including the low hipped roof, the historic dormers, the front porch, and the three sided asymmetric bump out. At the direction of the BAR, we focused our areas of expansion towards the intersection of Madison Lane and Chancellor Street. The revised design of this edition more legibly separated itself from the historic structure while complimenting the massing, fenestration, and material palate already established by this historic structure. On March 27, 2018, we re-submitted to the BAR for massing and concept approval. As mentioned, the revised design garnered a 6-0 unanimous approval for massing and concept during this April BAR meeting. Since that time, the project became more rooted in reality, we took about 18 months off for a fundraising effort. As staff mentioned, we would like an extension on that COA due to the 18 months of fundraising. With the fundraising complete, we have begun the Special Use Application process again, which has prompted this third review by the BAR. Since the April, 2018 meeting, little on the project has changed. The overall approach of leaving the defining historic characteristics found along Chancellor Street intact and separating the massing of the new addition from the original structure remains as submitted. The fenestration material palate and the Madison Lane front portico remain the same as well. There are two differences with this submission and the previous submission. The first being the side porch coming as a Phase 2 addition once more fundraising has been secured. The second difference is the elimination of three new inactive dormers that were proposed on the new addition previously just do funding constraints. They were inactive dormers. This will not be the final review. We will come back to you with the final materials. I would like to talk about whether this project will have an adverse impact on the district. We believe that the proposal in front of you positively impacts the district, even given the request for setback variances. The use is in keeping with adjacent uses as well as the City of Charlottesville comprehensive plan, which outlines this site for high density residential. Given the challenging corner lot condition, the house has the opportunity, and the client has the desire to address both street fronts. Because of this opportunity, the projects celebrates and preserves the historic Chancellor Street façade elements in keeping with the existing found in adjacent structures along Chancellor Street. Simultaneously, the proposal responds to and harmonizes the existing

building elements found in adjacent structure found along Madison Lane. Furthermore, the removal and the replacement of the marginal of the 1980s edition additionally improves the structure for both facades. The proposed addition will captivate and engage the corner for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The proposal also has data, which outlines even with the new addition, the project will be below that precinct average. The project is within the massing and the scale of the district. To continue to improve the conditions of the property, the proposed site plan offers to extend the sidewalk to the intersection of Chancellor Street and Madison Lane. Currently, there is no sidewalk at this location. Pedestrians are forced to walk in the street. Existing overgrown landscaping will be removed and replanted with new street trees, improving pedestrian safety, visibility, and the overall look of the parcel. To further complicate this entitlement process, this parcel is under the purview of an existing special use permit from 1987 and is linked to the 165 Chancellor Street parcel. This existing special use permit already allows the fraternity or sorority use up to 33 beds over the two houses and setback variances. We are amending the existing SUP by separating it into two. We are not requesting to change the use and the density. We are requesting additional setback variances to accommodate this new addition, which has been separated from the historic structure towards the intersection with Madison and Chancellor. It is important to note this existing structure steps outside the allowable setbacks, so this additional variance request is not without precedent. On October 4th, we held a required community meeting, which was held at the existing house. We had one member of the community attend, Stewart Hornsby, who was acting as a representative for the Center for Christian Study. We are requesting the BAR recommendation to move ahead with our special use permit as well as that extension on the certificate of appropriateness.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – We only have the site plan. It doesn't show any setbacks that you are trying to change. Are the variances for the footprint shown in the site plan? Do you have a setback line?

Mr. Schafer – The existing setbacks are shown in that dashed line. We get to within four feet in a couple of the new corners of the addition. We would ask for specifics in those four feet locations or we would ask for the footprint. The site plan is currently under preliminary review. It has been submitted. We are asking for a setback relief to do that addition.

Mr. Schwarz – It is basically to match the footprint that is in here.

Mr. Bell – How tight does the setback get?

Mr. Schafer – This is the closest that we get in this location. We are about four feet

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sarafin – It is such a unique site. We will have the good fortune of two 25 front foot setbacks on the corner. Recalling the conversation about the evolution of the massing and the design to give some anchor to both streets with this one structure felt positive. The setbacks as defined are arbitrary. I am in favor of extending the COA and in favor of approving the SUP.

Ms. Miller – What makes the setbacks unique is that they are elevated from the sidewalk, which matters less with the pedestrians that are walking by.

Mr. Bell – The setbacks are not being used anyway. I don't know if we tie in our allowance of the bigger zoning to the specific building in the design. Does this set a precedent that the zoning could be used for something else?

Mr. Schwarz – It is just setback relief. I was going to recommend asking for setback variances versus locking in the footprint.

Mr. Werner – What was looked in 2018 and 2019, the footprint has not changed at all. There is a plan in the application that shows the proposed footprint. Once the plan is approved, it cannot step outside of that. In your motion, you can cite the footprint as indicated.

Mr. Schwarz – We have only given them general massing and scale approval. While I was content with the design, someone might suggest a tweak that moves something. We are stuck with this. I don't want to slow this down by complicating it.

Mr. Gastinger – We are not on the zoning. We are only concerned if this has an adverse impact on the district.

Mr. Mohr – It is within the context of the COA.

Mr. Werner – That was reviewed with the understanding that there was a Special Use Permit application. The COA from 2018 was with this specific understanding that was part of a Special Use Permit that would be coming back. To reference back to 2018 does put the BAR on very good footing.

Ms. Miller – We should vote on what we have.

Motion

BAR Member Justin Sarafin moved to recommend that based on the general design and building footprint as submitted the proposed Special Use Permit for 167 Chancellor Street will not have an adverse impact on the Corner ADC District, with the understanding that the final design and details will require future BAR review and approval and that the BAR extends the Certificate of Appropriateness from April 2018. BAR member Carl Schwarz seconded. Approved (6-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

108 – 110 West South Street

Tax Parcel 280101000

West South Street, LLC,

Owner; Christie Haskin, Woodard Properties, Applicant

Exterior door and window alterations

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – It was constructed in the 1920s. The former H. H. Hankins Warehouse is a two-story, three-bay building and is clad in stucco. Piers divide the bays on the north elevation. The fenestration has been considerably altered on all elevations to accommodate different tenants and uses. Evident on the building's south and west elevations, historic warehouse doors and windows have been removed and new openings created. In August, you reviewed a separate CoA for some window changes on the west and south elevations. Request for CoA to alter fenestration on north, west, and south elevations and repair stucco. Applicant proposes to improve exterior architectural character and increase the amount of natural light that reaches the interior. On the primary (north) elevation, new glazed wood doors would be added in all three bays with signage installed above each. On the west elevation, several windows would be added or altered. Most notably, the elevation's four Palladian openings would 108 – 110 West South Street (October 15, 2019) 2 be replaced with windows and a two-leaf door. On the south elevation, facing the train tracks, four new windows would be added on the first floor. The BAR previously approved four singlelite windows on an upper floor. This submittal expands on the drawings reviewed at the August 2019 BAR meeting. Given that the windows and doors have been considerably altered and do not contribute to the building's historic character, staff finds that the proposed new windows and doors on all elevations are appropriate. For the proposed signage, the BAR review is for the concept only, as signs require a separate sign permit. This isn't changing anything you approved in August

Christie Haskin, Applicant – We did some investigating on the interior of the building. We found that the heights of some of the lentils are different. It is not anything major. We did make some minor alterations, according to the new information. We have been in contact with Dominion regarding the meters on the front, and we are waiting for their approval. Since we are recessing the entrances and doorways, we have a new area where we can put the new meters.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sarafin – Are the windows the same windows in the last application?

Ms. Haskin – These windows are going to be solid wood, with wood construction.

Mr. Schwarz – Your new drawing shows the door dead center under the window. Is the intention to have the door centered under the window?

Ms. Haskin – Correct

Mr. Schwarz – Would it mess up the interior too much if the windows in the back lined up with the windows above them? It does look a little odd.

Ms. Haskin – For the interior, we were proposing that they were closer together. We can take it into consideration.

Mr. Mohr – I find the little square ones on the second row. Are those at eye level?

Ms. Haskin – Those were previously proposed. Initially, we had them connected to the existing windows. It was requested that there be some space in between them. We were concerned about putting more openings structurally. We decided to continue with the same size windows below them. We can have more light, and visibility.

Mr. Mohr – Where are they relative to the floor?

Ms. Haskin – They are about six inches above the floor.

Mr. Mohr – Where is the top of that window?

Ms. Haskin – About 4.5 feet off the floor. The upper windows are 5 foot, 6 inches.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sarafin – The west façade is funky as it exists now. This does look more normal for the type of building that it is. I see noting problematic with what is proposed here.

Ms. Miller – I think the front is more of an improvement. I do think that the back is a mess.

Mr. Sarafin – It is an odd façade, and I would imagine the program is really dictating more of your window configuration and what is looking on the exterior.

Mr. Mohr – There could be some better ways to do it.

Mr. Werner – I don't recall the windows being aligned in the center. Is that a double hung window? Because these lights are situated along a street, there are very specific regulations relative to glare. I wanted to make sure that lighting complies with concerns about glare on a public road. The biggest concern were where those 4 windows went. We were happy about the west elevation. There were windows on the west façade that were changed out.

Mr. Bell – The changes on this one are the recesses on the front and the windows on the back.

Mr. Mohr – I could see adding more double hungs and putting a double hung upstairs. Leave the old square windows. You would have a more regular façade. You could have operable windows as well.

Mr. Schwarz – I really do want to see those bottom four windows re-aligned and I would be Ok with everything else.

Ms. Haskin – The new doors and the sidelights are Masonite. All of the windows are Anderson.

Mr. Bell – Is there a reason that the windows in the back were not aligning?

Ms. Haskin – I believe that there may have been an existing lentil back there. I would have to clarify again.

Mr. Sarafin – The last application had some images that showed that or hinted at that.

Ms. Haskin – We were pretty sure what the front of the building looked like. We weren't sure about the rear of the building. We struggled to find images of the rear of the building.

Mr. Gastinger – I am OK with the application that has been submitted. This is the rear façade against the tracks. The windows are going to be clearly not original. The oddities of that rear façade rather than trying to rationalize the whole façade.

Mr. Sarafin – The structural concerns are going to dictate where they go.

Motion

BAR Member Carl 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 door and window 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, with the submitted sheet to amend the front elevation, with the requirement that the light fixtures be full cut-off, dimmable, and color temperature to not exceed 3000 Kelvin, that the fixture and lamp be fully compliant with the City's light regulations, and that the applicant will resubmit cut sheets for the windows, doors, and light fixtures. Justin Sarafin seconded. Approved (5-1, Melanie Miller opposed).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

121 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 330261000

Walters Building, LLC, Owner; Tim Burgess and Vincent Derquenne, Applicants

Paint Exterior

Staff Report, Jeff Werner - The Walters Building accommodated numerous tenants in the early twentieth century, including a furniture store, a hardware store, and a china store. Later in the century, the building housed a Piggly-Wiggly grocery store. The pressed-brick building has storefronts on both its south and west elevations, standing three stories tall at the front and dropping to two stories in the rear. Traces of old signs painted on the south façade are still visible. Request for CoA to repaint two-story portion of the subject building. Repainting and other improvements are associated with the building's rear tenant space. Painting will encompass the areas already painted on the north and west façades. On the west façade, the painted area will surround the existing Smoke Brake Vapes storefront. A light grey paint will accentuate brickwork. The applicant will install a black, exterior light fixture above the rear west elevation door and repaint the existing door and window below. A sign will hang from an existing sign 121 West Main Street (October 15, 2019) 2 mount, adjacent to the entrance. A yellow triangle will be painted from the light fixture to the door and sidewalk below, imitating the illumination of a street lamp. A similar paint effect is proposed on the north elevation, with an illuminated streetlamp, a moped, and a business sign painted on the brick. Staff asked for initial opinions about the project during the Staff Questions portion of the September 17, 2019 BAR meeting. The BAR had no reservations about the project, but did specify that the proposed paint design not extend onto the public sidewalk. The proposed location does not appear to interfere with or obscure any historic elements or architectural features of the historic structure. Given that the proposed paint only extends onto the rear parking lot, and since this wall has painted masonry, staff finds the painting appropriate. For the proposed signage, the BAR review is for the concept only, as signs require a separate sign permit. For exterior lighting fixtures, the BAR has required that the light fixture be full cutoff and that the lamping be dimmable with a color temperature not to exceed 3,000 K.

Tim Burges, Applicant – The image is the clear inspiration for the concept.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – Is a real light?

Mr. Burges – That was the conversation. It was the last thing that staff had recommended. There does exist a light right now, but you cannot see it. There is an awning in the way.

Mr. Bell – Are there no measurements painted on there?

Mr. Burges – No. That image is when it was an old fish market. It is a dull blue-grayish color.

Mr. Gastinger – The intent is to paint both sides?

Mr. Burges – We will be painting the whole annex.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Paul Wright – The art is much younger than the rest of the building. This would be a fantastic additive to that area. It would be a great asset to the area

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Would there be brick repair when doing the painting?

Mr. Burges – Yes. We will touch up those holes next to the AC.

Ms. Miller – This will be interesting and fun. It seems appropriate, since the building is already painted.

Mr. Sarafin – It will liven up that spot.

Mr. Schwarz – You can't paint the sidewalk. I think that it is perfectly fine if you paint the asphalt.

Motion

BAR Member Carl 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, with the requirement that the light fixture be full cut-off, dimmable, and color temperature to not exceed 3000 Kelvin, and that the applicant will resubmit a cut sheet for the light fixture. Breck Gastinger seconded. Approved (6-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

414 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 280049000

Virginia Pacific Investments, LLC, Owner Kevin Burke, Parabola Architecture, Applicant

Roof mezzanine addition

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Built in 1896, this substantial brick structure was built concurrently with the neighboring building at 410 East Main Street. The two buildings had coordinating architecture, but a 1914 fire damaged the west building (410 East Main) and its façade was subsequently rebuilt. 414 East Main Street is a three-story building is clad in pressed brick and has a wrought-iron balcony extending above the storefront. A heavy, projecting cornice on the parapet crowns the façade. Request for

CoA to construct a rooftop mezzanine addition for third floor apartment. The addition would be clad in grey, standing-seam metal with a large, north-facing window. The addition would be set back from the north elevation so its profile almost entirely recedes from being visible from the mall. The proposed addition is largely obscured from being visible from the mall. Only the top of the addition's profile would be visible when viewing the building directly across the mall, and would still likely be inconspicuous due to tree cover. The addition may be more visible when approaching the building from the east or west along the mall, but the proposed mezzanine does not overwhelm the building in scale and is clearly identified as a modern addition through materials. Staff recommends approval of the COA.

Kevin Burke, Parabola Architecture, Applicant – Everything that staff mentioned was part of our designed intent for this project. In adding this mezzanine popup (about 180 square feet), we checked very carefully with visibility from the Mall. Coming from the East, it is actually not visible from the Mall because of the stair popup on that side. From The Nook, you can barely see above the cornice. From the West, it is not noticeable. Our intention is to explore metals non-painted, weathering, self-healing metals, or a historical reference. The main thing that we added was copper as a consideration as we are working through some of the detailing.

Carrie Burke – This idea of rehabilitating old buildings is something that struck us as how to bring this older building into a more contemporary use of it. It maintains its integrity, historically and into the future. We worked closely with the code officials to hone on what we could do with this mezzanine. It is down to the foot of getting the egress and the square footage for the mezzanine. A more loft like apartment with this mezzanine space could actually help this be more like the European model

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

None

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – I think that it is perfectly reasonable. It hits the guidelines on a number of points. Copper would be an interesting material there.

Mr. Mohr – When the copper goes on and is shiny, it will be interesting to see what that looks like. It hits the nail on the head in terms of guidelines. It's a really great project.

Mr. Bell – I don't mind the visibility of this either. It's really neat to add something above the building.

Mr. Mohr – The Paramount could have done that design parameter half way. It would have been better than what they ended up doing. I like this being adventurous and still discrete.

Mr. Schwarz – The fiber cement is an either/or. Is it a budget thing?

Ms. Burke – We have been talking with some contractors, and it is a very compact addition. We hope that the minimal square footage will enable the owner to be able to afford a more enduring long term maintenance material. It could be copper or zinc. We just wanted the space to explore. Our goal will be, in the spirit of maintaining the integrity of the building and for our owner to have a quality construction that doesn't require maintenance, especially in difficult places. That's our goal going forward. We wanted to state that intention with the material palate. What you approve matches what the permit set represents.

Ms. Miller – Is there exterior lighting in the back?

Ms. Burke – We haven't gotten far enough to do that. We are very much in alignment with cutoff and neighboring glare.

Ms. Miller – For the application to be full, we need the cut sheets for the windows and cut sheets for exterior lighting.

Mr. Schwarz – I would like to see the submission of elevations showing where the different joints are located.

Motion

BAR Member Carl 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 rooftop mezzanine addition 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, with a very strong preference for metal exterior, and should the applicant select a fiber cement material, the applicant should resubmit elevations to the BAR, and the applicant should resubmit cut sheets for windows and exterior light fixtures. Breck Gastinger seconded. Approved (6-0).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

605 Preston Place

Tax Parcel 050111000

Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP, Owner/Collins Engineering Applicant

Parking Lot Expansion

STAFF REPORT

Staff Report, Jeff Werner - Also known as Wyndhurst, 605 Preston Place was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city. It is a typical 2-story, 3-bay, double-pile white weatherboard-clad house with Greek Revival details. Request to construct a 20-space, permeable paver, parking lot in the rear yard of the historic structure. Permeable pavers will match those used for the parking surface at 608 Preston Place, across the street. The color of the proposed ECO paver will be Harvest Blend. The parking lot will have a flush, concrete curb that follows the Preston Court Apartment's property line. Near the entrance to Preston Court will be low, brick seating walls capped with bluestone. New plantings will be provided. New plantings will provide screening. Two cedar trees, previously planned for removal, will be retained and the entrance of the parking lot has been shifted north in respect to the existing drip line of these trees, as well as an existing oak tree. The entrance to the parking lot will be on the western side of the property and egress from the parking lot will be on the eastern side of the property. Site lighting has been added to the plan for safety. A wooden fence will run along the northern property line, matching the existing wooden fence in the front yard along the north property line to the limits of the western property line. Staff finds the request appropriate since the proposed parking area is appropriately screened and is placed behind the historic structure. Additionally, staff finds the number of trees proposed in the landscape plan appropriate to accommodate for the loss of tree canopy, and that the preservation of the two cedars addresses the BAR's concerns over their removal. Regarding the 36 inch oak to remain, staff recommends that the BAR consider a condition of approval that requires the applicant to consult with a licensed arborist to establish—and implement—stringent measures to protect the tree during construction. Such steps might include the installation of rigid fencing to limit—if not preclude—traffic within the entirety of the tree's dripline. This is going through a site plan review.

Richard Spurzem, Applicant – I brought six other renditions of this plan. We have been on this for about thirteen months. After the June meeting, I did meet with the neighbors, and spent some time on the site with several of them. We decided to move the entrance a little further to the north to save the two cedar trees and the large oak tree. That did result in the loss of several parking spaces. It was a concession that we were willing to make. The neighbors said that 'one way in, one way out,' was important to them. The traffic would not be going around the complete circle of Preston Place. That is what we have arranged here. I think that it's at least intensive for this property that we could come up with.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Lisa Kendrick – As you are driving down Preston Place, there had been a rock wall. I had thought that the rock wall was going to be replaced that would have been on the side of the parking lot. I did not hear that. Most of Preston Place does have a rock wall, extending down and around it. I wanted to be clear on that.

Richard Spurzem – There is a rock wall along Preston Place in this area. There are parts of it in good condition and parts in not so good condition. The cedar trees are actually pushing the wall outwards. At the entrance, the rock wall would be taken down. The rock wall on either side would be retained. We were going to retain the stone wall on the other side too.

Lisa Kendrick - Balance of rock wall on both sides would be a good idea. If a sidewalk goes in that side of Preston Place, those trees are going to have to come down, which is horrible.

Richard Spurzem – We are putting in a waiver for that as part of this site plan. If the city requires a sidewalk, those trees are history. The brick was the ceding wall where the exit is.

Willem van Dijk – The last time that I was here, I had requested that a wall be put up to give me some privacy in my home. I have been living in this place for the past four months. In those four months, 15 or 20 construction workers have shown up at 6:55, and stand five feet from the bedroom window. I am not excited about the construction going on. There was a comment made by a neighbor that there was not a care for green space. The contractor had basically said that they did not care about that. This is one of the last green spaces in the town. If we put down a parking lot, it is not going to turn into green space again. The six of you have the ball in your court. I think that it would be ridiculous to allow this to happen. The stones that my neighbor noted are gone. They were removed to allow the CATs to get into the construction site more easily. Does the Board know of parking lot that has been turned back into green space?

Mr. Gastinger – I think that it is pretty clear. It is going to be a parking lot and stay a parking lot.

Willem van Dijk – This is one of the last standing homes from this era with green space available. The green space has been turned orange due to the construction site and the mud. If restored properly, this home would be one of the last places in the town to have green space. We should not turn it into a place for metal boxes for college kids.

Elizabeth Turner – I believe that there are two errors in the application. It is applying for an expansion to a parking lot. There was never a parking lot there. The application says that the proposed parking lot is going in the back of the house. It is not the back of the house. The back of the house is pressed up against the property line. This house has two beautiful faces. One is a porch and the other is a beautiful and elegant façade. The windows on the façade are elegant. They are proposing to take away half of the terrace, all of the steps, and leave no green space/no buffer for this structure. It is a structure that should be protected by the BAR and should be respected by the neighborhood.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Are the light fixtures on a pole? How tall is the pole?

Richard Spurzem – It is two heads and 12 to 16 feet in height.

Mr. Mohr – Are the heads canted?

Richard Spurzem – No. They go straight down.

Mr. Mohr – Why is the in-lane so wide?

Richard Spurzem – That is for fire-rescue. They wanted a 20 foot access.

Mr. Gastinger – There is not a 20 foot access to the site. Access to the building is from the three street sides. Didn't you remove all of the fire escapes from the building?

Mr. Mohr – Is there a fence that addresses the headlight issue?

Richard Spurzem – There is the existing fence in the front that goes all of the way to the back along the property line.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Lisa Kendrick – The twenty parking spots does not solve the problem of traffic. Before the property was sold, they had a parking lot. It has been separated. They're trying to get rid of all the grass in the grassy knoll that goes with the historical home to solve the problem. It does not solve the problem. There are going to be so many students living there. There is still going to be a rush to find a parking spot. To destroy the property around the historical home that gives you gracefulness and elegance is unsettling to me that this would happen. There may be other ways to solve the problem, rather than destroy this green, diminish the elegance of this historical home. We want to lessen the use of cars. There is a bus stop right off of Grady Avenue. Students are likely to park their cars and use the bus, bike, or walk, rather than driving. To have offsite parking is not unthinkable. The view from these apartment buildings is going to be this parking lot rather than this grassy knoll. It is diminishing our neighborhood. It enhances this whole community. Everyone, who came tonight, are homeowners. We take care of the land. We are good stewards, and you're going to put up a parking lot because it is more economical. It is a historical neighborhood and designated for a reason.

Paul Wright – I am going to address the design of the parking lot. My largest concern is the pass through to eliminate traffic. In this design, one of the big problems was the trees, which has been addressed. I know that some of you have a concern about the frontage of the house, but that ship sailed in 1929, when they built the building in front of it. As a design, the pass through and the trees have been addressed. On this side is the fire hydrant, and they would not be pulling on that side anyway. They put a fire hydrant on the other side of the street, which is where they would go. I support the design.

Willem van Dijk – We are creating parking lot for twenty cars, and it is costing our street three spots. Three spots are not available now to be given up with the 15 people, who have already moved into the finished part. They park all the way up to 625. This is a twenty foot cut being taken out of our street, which is twenty feet where we can't park. (Addressing the applicant). You should sell the home to somebody, who cares about the green space in the city. Honestly, it is an embarrassment.

Elizabeth Tuner – I thought of one more mistake in the application. It is the comparison with Wertland Street. Wertland Street is a street of beautiful homes that have been turned into dormitories, rooming houses, yards paved over, and a dangerous place totally student ghetto. The comparison in the application, was to the parking areas on Wertland Street. The last time that I looked on the City of Charlottesville website, we have a different historic overlay than Wertland Street. There is no precedent for a parking area with more than twelve parking spaces, even with beautiful pavers. We are asking you for less paving, fewer parking spaces, and more green buffer for the historic structure. We are asking to maintain this historic overlay. We are at a tipping point, and we are asking you for help. There is an onslaught of students coming to live in the Preston Court Apartments. They are going to overrun us. We are asking you to stop, to preserve, and to help.

Greg Kendrick – I appreciate the changes that have been made since the last time, which includes the saving of the trees. The canopy of the trees does add to the character of the street. We are trying to keep some kind of flow of traffic from the backside. This is the cleanest way to do this other than making the entrance two way. Those are solving some significant issues there. We are asking you, the Board of Architectural Review, to hold this property to the full standard for such a historic property. With regards to green space, our trust is in you to hold. I would be willing to yield as to what that looks like. Since the last meeting, there has been major excavation to put in a drainage line right next to these trees. We are concerned that major root damage may have been done to these trees. It seems that would be something that you would be looking at. Fences were put up. The number of parking spots is a trivial item in the big scope. I wonder if the parking is significant when eighty residents are not going to have a parking spot.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Whether a parking lot goes on this is a question that we need to deal with and that we can grapple with. I will just cite from the code that allows us to our actions. It asks to review whether or not the proposal meets the specific standards set forth in the design guidelines. It also asks whether or not the proposal is compatible with the historic, cultural, or architectural character of the district in which the property is located and the protected property that is the subject of the application. We are thinking both in terms in protecting the architectural character of the neighborhood, the site the subject property is on and the building itself. For many reasons, I was opposed to this project before, and I think any of the design changes are really just, in my view, are just sharpening the lipstick on the pig. It's really a question whether or not a parking lot belongs here at all. I really think there is no single piece of evidence that this fits any of our guidelines as it relates to the protection of architectural and historic districts. There are a couple of pieces that I would to reference in particular. This is the very beginning of our guidelines on site design and elements. The relationship between a historic building and its site landscape features and other elements in the property boundary all contribute to a historic districts overall image. Site features should be considered important part of any review by the BAR. In addition, I want to add a comment that is from the Secretary of the Interior's standards, which our guidelines reference. In their recommendations for building site, they discourage placing parking areas adjacent to historic buildings where vehicles may cause damage to the buildings or landscape features or when they negatively impact the historic character of the building site if landscape features and plant materials are removed. The comments that have been made today both by the public and what is discernable from the materials is that the construction of this parking lot is going to have irrevocable change to the entire Preston Place neighborhood. That lawn serves to provide some setting to the historic structure. The garden entrance is an important element that has been discarded and that green space provides some buffer between the large scale element of the Preston Court Apartments and the smaller residential scale neighborhood. I can't see anyway that you can reshape a 24 stall parking lot in this yard and make it fit our design guidelines. Moreover, I have not seen an inkling of intention that has tried to meet our guidelines.

Ms. Miller – When I was looking at the guidelines, generally we're to consider the effect of the proposed change on the historic district/neighborhood, the impact of the proposed change on other protected features of the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls, and walks. Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation, or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure on the site, and other things. Locate parking lots behind buildings to be perfectly fair, this building is a little unusual. When they built the apartments, it altered what became the front and the rear of the house. There is no way to build behind that house. Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic buildings, avoid excessive curb cuts to gain entry to parking areas, and select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to the historic setting. I don't think that a 12 foot tall light fixture is appropriate to a neighborhood. The reason that I am on the BAR is because I live in a historic district. I am representing homeowners theoretically, and I live across the street from a parking lot. It used to have two historic homes in it that were torn down so that we could have a parking lot. It was initially screened, and the owners of the parking lot changed. The screening is dying. The neighborhood would have been better served to keep the houses there. This is a little different because it is green space. Parking lot adds value, and I agree with the neighbors' comments. It such

a small amount of spaces with what is really needed. It is not worth the cost of it. Destruction of the rock wall is problematic that we have diligently sought to protect other parts of the city. We made the city build one back, where they have taken it down. It is a little concerning to hear about the rock wall that may have already been taken down during the construction. In looking at potentially moving the house, it sounded like an insane idea. The more we thought about it, it an individually protected property and maybe it did make sense, and it is oriented and facing towards the street. The Board has been willing to work with the applicant. I should commend the applicant. I do think that this application is a lot better than the first attempt. For me I don't ever see a way where it is ever going to make sense.

Mr. Sarafin – I would just add to that just acknowledging that after the proposal to move the house. The applicant decided to work on the house where it sits. That certainly was a preferable action. I do tend to agree with you, Melanie. We have readily worked with applicants over the years. The current applicant tried to accommodate.

Ms. Miller – I should also mention that this is an individually protected property. It was like a mini historic district. Those properties in particular, the city has recognized it as something really special. It is not just a piece of a greater thing that is important to the city.

Mr. Schwarz – The last time I told you guys that as far as parking lots are concerned, it's a really nice parking lot. I can see that everyone is in a really hard place. The neighborhood, no matter what, is going to end up with cars on their street. No more on street parking for the residents, regardless if you build this or not. This should have been a preliminary discussion before you even starting working on the apartment building. I have a feeling that you are going to be in a really bad place if you don't have any parking. Twenty spaces for how many residents. I don't know what your numbers are. This has become a really bad situation for everybody. In terms of zoning, this house has two fronts. You are building a parking lot in a front yard. You are screening it quite well. It is still a very large parking lot in a front yard on a residential street. I am not sure that removing five spaces has done much to mitigate that. I appreciate you trying to narrow down the egress to ten feet. I really think the ingress would have to be narrowed down to ten feet. Maybe that is a conversation with the fire department and us. Places have gotten involved with the fire department before. There is stuff that has been brought up that just does not make sense. You can gain a lot more green space by eliminating that ten feet of ingress on the entry drive. I don't think that I can fully support this. You guys have made a valiant effort. It is still a very large parking lot in a front yard.

Mr. Bell – I agree with that. The lot is the historic house. The parking lot is completely designed on the lot that goes with the historic house. Unfortunately, the historic house had a giant apartment building built in front of it. I can't imagine any other residential historic property where we would allow a giant parking lot to fill the entire lot.

Mr. Mohr – The only place where that occurs is behind those houses on Park Street.

Ms. Miller – I think that this is worth pointing out. That when somebody lives in a historic district, it is a bummer. They have to come to the BAR with their changes that they want to do their house. They are kind of giving up their own rights. The tradeoff is that things like this come up, we stand up and protect them.

Mr. Sarafin – The parking is going to be an issue no matter what. That is true of the entire neighborhood. That is almost city-wide. A parking lot is a lot more difficult to restore to a previous condition or gets replaced by a building.

Ms. Miller – It seems that the application does not have enough support this evening and generally in favor of all applicants doing a deferral. In this case, that is almost a deceptive thing because I don't think that this project has support. They have done everything that they can do that we asked them to do last time.

Mr. Mohr – What was the Board’s feeling if you basically make it an access where it picks up those three or four spaces per moving? Is that something that is viable? Ninety percent of the lawn and terrace is still there and have some way of passing through. The green is running down to the road. You are still acknowledging that this building has a lot of people and a necessity for drop off. In places like New York, that is something they do and the parking is off site. You don’t have internal site circulation and for functional use. There is the number of people in this building. It seems that they need a district wide approach to parking, regardless of this parking lot.

Mr. Schwarz – I might see a ten foot drive. I don’t know how you get into the building if you are in a wheelchair. I see that you have an ADA space. You are probably going to need a few more.

Ms. Miller – The main building that needs parking is so close to the street on three sides that would allow for some of that moving.

Mr. Mohr – It is a narrow street.

Mr. Gastinger – There are any number of ways that this site could be developed and be respectful of both the building and the contexts and the neighborhood. I don’t think that they are anywhere close to that. Maybe someday it’s architectural. There certainly are ways that it can be done. I don’t want that to be a takeaway that this site can never be touched. There are definite ways that it can be developed in a much more sensitive way. Maybe some that you are talking about is possible if you take into account the site context and the neighborhood.

Mr. Mohr – Right now it is just a big lump in the middle of the site. There is no sense of it being a driveway. A lot of it is given away to circulation because of the configuration of the parking lot. That terrace is coming off the house.

Ms. Miller – The issue with the fire department is completely ludicrous. Any sort of entry into the site is going to be a problem. That is not the applicant’s fault.

Mr. Schwarz– If the applicant wants a deferral, let him have it. If the goal is a parking lot, I am not sure how we are going to be satisfied. Last time I thought maybe he would figure out some way that he would make feel like this is less of an impact. The more I look at it, I am not sure.

Mr. Mohr – When we were originally talking about possibly moving the house and doing strategies like that, there was also discussions about basically doing an underground structure and that the sense of openness and the bulk of the green space remained intact. I would have to assume that is completely unattainable from a budget standpoint.

Mr. Schwarz– None of trees would be there anymore.

Mr. Mohr – You would be starting over. If you move the old house, then what is the position for that? Is that how you come into the parking lot area? It would have required a whole lot of architectural ledger to get around to pull it off. Regardless, this doesn’t do it and doesn’t get us anywhere. The question for Richard. Is it better to say ‘no,’ and he can appeal this? Is it better for him to defer it?

Mr. Sarafin – To accept a deferral leads one to believe another iteration of what we are looking at might acceptable or appropriate. This is fundamentally at odds with the guidelines that, that isn’t the case. I don’t think that is the right route

Mr. Mohr - Let’s not lead him on.

Mr. Gastinger – We can choose to take a vote. We don’t even have to accept a deferral.

Mr. Mohr - Is there no way forward with this? Is there a solution based on what he has here?

Mr. Schwarz – I don't think there is a way forward, but if the applicant wants a deferral, let him spend some more time figuring it out. I agree with you guys. If it is going to be twenty car parking lot, we are going to end up in the same place.

Mr. Mohr – That is why I was asking for something more like an access road in the back of the building with 5 or 6 lots for parking. Is the scale of that seems like something like that can work on the site?

Mr. Schwarz– Anything that a moving van can get into would be problematic.

Mr. Mohr – It is a series of kinks. If you are just running like that with parallel parking, you can get a vehicle into there.

Mr. Sarafin – Where would you enter?

Mr. Mohr – You would have to modify that entrance. You wouldn't kill the cedars. The truck would have to come around this way.

Ms. Miller – I don't see why the truck couldn't pull up on the street.

Mr. Mohr – I am just being devil's advocate. Is there a minimum that can be done there or is the conclusion no vehicles should be behind the building?

Mr. Sarafin – This is a lot of activity on the back side/the courtyard side. This small space between the two structures really is service area. It really can't help but be service area at this point. Do you let it be that and preserve access to the house to the west? Do you preserve that as open green space and just let this be a service corridor up close the courtyard side? It would make sense on access with the house to have that with the landscape intact. That is what you would want to keep that context, the terrace, and the site lines.

Ms. Miller – It is pretty tight no matter what.

Mr. Schwarz – Maybe we are delivering something that we shouldn't be. Mr. Spurzem, would you like a deferral?

Richard Spurzem – No

Mr. Schwarz – I think we have our answer.

Jeff Werner – I will read straight from the city code. A decision may be appealed to City Council by the applicant or any aggrieved persons by filing a written notice of appeal within ten days of the date of the decision. The statements that have been made so far in the discussion can be cited and that they are certainly valid. There is no deed in the motion in the denial to restate everything. The opportunity would be for the applicant to appeal to Council. We would prepare a report and they would have a hearing. A decision by Council can be appealed to the Circuit Court. Your input is valued. The BAR can make the determination ultimately how the site is used relative to the zoning. You raised a really good point by what the extent of a parking lot is required relative to what fit in a landscape. Is that all clear in the motion that you make? The audience and applicant are clear on what comes next.

Motion

Mr. Gastinger - 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 parking lot expansion does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this Individually Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR denies the application. (Miller seconded. Motion passed 6-0.)

D. Other Business

There was a misunderstanding by Laura Fjord regarding an item on the consent agenda that was approved at the beginning of the meeting. After presenting the situation to staff and the BAR, staff was able to resolve the issue regarding the item on the consent agenda with Laura Fjord.

9. Presentation of LEAP Program

Susan Elliott – Climate Protection Manager for the City of Charlottesville. actions and services that are needed to reduce to greenhouse gas emissions are affordable, accessible, and available. People are aware of the different actions and services. City Council enacted a new greenhouse reduction goal of 45% by 2030 and carbon neutral of 2050. We are a little less than halfway there with those goals. In terms of emissions, the residential sector makes up about 30% and the commercial sector makes up about 29%. There is going to be a lot of activity with both sectors if we are going to reach that goal. We are working with LEAP to develop an energy action guide targeted towards residential and commercial properties within the design/control areas.

Jeffery Justice – Simple actionable items that a homeowner can take. There would be a delineation between items that would need BAR approval vs items with city staff vs items that homeowners can do. This guide would serve as a template for action that homeowners, commercial owners, or occupants can take of historic properties. I have started a literature review. I have looked at the National Park Service, city code, and the Department of the Interior standards. I am also going to review academic literature. The goal is to improve the efficiency of these historic properties. My three areas of focus are going to be interior lighting, HVAC, and the envelope. The main focus in the envelope is going to be interior changes both seen and unseen, such as crawl spaces and attics. I will be using the literature to provide documentation and precedent. Heating and cooling provide the lion share. Recommendations for homeowners and commercial owners might include things such as programmable thermostats, insulation, and envelope improvements. I am not going to be recommending anything with exterior lighting.

10. Staff Questions and Discussion

Paramount Theaters: Planters and rooftop additions

Consensus from the BAR is that The Paramount can add the planters and need to speak with zoning. The BAR did express that the gate across the entrance to The Paramount was hostile and encouraging of the behavior.

11. PLACE Report

Adjournment at 8:30 PM