

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
January 22, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.  
City Council Chambers - City Hall**



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

**PLEASE NOTE THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATUM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT**

**[http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)**

**Members Present:** Carl Schwarz, James Zehmer, Jody Lahendro, Breck Gastinger, Ron Bailey, Anderson McClure, Mike Ball

**Members Absent:** Sonja Lengel, Tim Mohr

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

**Pre-Meeting**

There was a general discussion regarding the property on Lexington Avenue and the demolition of the garage. There was also discussion regarding the guidelines on Conservation Districts. There was also discussion of the other COAs that are being presented to the BAR during this meeting.

There was also discussion regarding an executive session in the coming months.

**Meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM by Mr. Schwarz (Most senior member of the BAR). Mr. Mohr, the Vice-Chair was not in attendance for this meeting. The bylaws state that the most senior member of the BAR in attendance run the meeting.**

**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**

December 17, 2019 Regular Meeting

**Mr. Lahendro made the motion to approve the Consent Agenda. (Motion seconded by Mr. Gastinger) Motion passed 7-0.**

## C. New Items

### 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-01-01

223 West Main Street; Tax Parcel 33023400

Labace, LLC, Owner; Tony Labace, Applicant

Replace storefront

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing. 223 West Main Street is believed to be a c1864 addition to neighboring 225 West Main Street, which was constructed in the 1821 and one of the oldest buildings in the City. Alterations over time have left only fragments of the original structure. The existing storefront is believed to date to the 1970s. CoA request for the replacement of the c1970s commercial storefront. New frame to match the existing, which is clear anodized aluminum, with similar window and door configurations. New storefront will be straight, returning to an earlier wall alignment visible on the floor slab. The plywood sections will be replaced with flat metal panels. Staff recommends approval of the CoA with the condition that the glass be clear, preferably with a VLT of not less than 70%.

### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

**Mr. Zehmer** – Is the intent to replace the whole storefront?

**Jeff Werner** – It will be all of the way across the storefront.

**Mr. Schwarz** – How is this going to be constructed? How is it going to work at the top and at the bottom?

**Tony Labace, Applicant** – Tiel Construction in the site plan should have that in your packet.

**Jeff Werner** – The applicant is not pursuing this immediately. What would be helpful would be a shop drawing of when you go forward. At this point, it is not cast in stone. The question for the BAR is whether the applicant can contact some people, and get some cost estimates.

**Tony Labace** – I do recall talking to the construction company. The panels will match and everything that goes with it.

**Mr. Lahendro** – What is to finish on the frame?

**Tony Labace** – It is what you see in the picture, only 60 years later.

### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

**Mr. Gastinger** – I don't have any issue with this in principle. Seeing those shop drawings and having some confidence in the final design and that it's matching the intention that we are imagining.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Are the horizontal openings at the top glass too?

**Tony Labace** – No. From the header down to the plywood metal frame is where the glass is going to be.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Metal panels in that very top, horizontal element?

**Tony Labace** – Sure.

**Mr. Zehmer** – It's currently plywood that matches the plywood below.

**Tony Labace** – I was going to try to do it this winter. I just put in a \$20,000 sub-zero freezer in. I am going to wait until next fall. At that time, I am certainly happy to come forward and present.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am fine with the concept. I would like to see how it is finally designed. You clearly don't know at this point.

**Tony Labace** – We had several options. My original thought was all glass, except for the bottom part. That's a steel header up top. The glass is going to go underneath the steel header. Do you see where those lights are back there? That's all steel.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Is it right up against that curtain wall?

**Tony Labace** – It is.

**Mr. Ball** – No changes to the awning or lights?

**Tony Labace** – No.

**Mr. Schwarz** – There are many different things that you can do that would be perfectly fitting with our guidelines. I want to know what you intend to do. You can move forward with confidence thinking you are going to achieve something. If you get a shop drawing, submit it to staff. Staff can put it on the consent agenda.

**Jeff Werner** – That was the goal. We could let him move forward with getting some costing for this. A deferral and a shop drawing submission for the consent agenda.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Does that give you the confidence to proceed?

**Tony Labace** – Sure. I am pretty open about it. Part of the problem is that espresso window is plexiglass. It has been plexiglass for 14 years. The two panels by the door were plexiglass.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It is better for you to request a deferral. That gives you an infinite amount of time to come back to the BAR. If the BAR imposes a deferral, you will have to come back next month.

**Tony Labace** – I would like to request a deferral.

**Deferral: Applicant requested a deferral pending the final details with the contractor. Mr. Gastinger made the motion to accept the deferral (Mr. Lahendro seconded). Motion passed 7-0.**

### **3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-01-02

300 East Market Street; Tax Parcel 330221000

Charles A. Kabbash, Owner/Applicant

Single-story enclosure at rear (south) elevation

**The applicant did not show for this Certificate of Appropriateness Application. Mr. Gastinger did recuse himself from the discussion of this Certificate of Appropriateness Application. Since the applicant was not available, the BAR moved onto the Staff Questions and Discussion and the other actionable items on the agenda. After going through the other items on the agenda, the BAR did return to this Certificate of Appropriateness Applicant.**

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Year Built: c1920-1930 District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing. 300 East Market Street is a two story, six bay, Flemish-bond brick building with a decorative brick and stone cornice, and a flat roof. CoA request for the construction of a single-story, framed enclosure with a shed roof within a small inset of the rear (south) wall. Enclosure to be approximately 7-ft x 8-ft and will accommodate additional kitchen space. Roof to be asphalt shingles. Siding to be HardiePlank. One existing window and bricks below to be removed to accommodate interior access. No exterior opening on the enclosure. The proposed addition is within the inset area at the rear/back of the building. A narrow, gated walk space—less than 6-ft wide—separates the building from an adjacent, two-story structure. Because of the size, simplicity, and location of this enclosure; that it is clearly differentiated from the existing; and that it can be removed later with minimal impact on the existing building, staff recommends approval of the COA, but with the consideration of the following as conditions: • The window and bricks being removed should be marked and retained, allowing their later use should this enclosure be removed and the exterior wall restored. • The applicant has not indicated paint color. The BAR may want that specified. • In the photographs provided, the rear elevation has an abundance of wires, cables, phone lines, and conduits that, arguably, are no longer necessary or even live. Removing what can be removed and repairing the subsequent holes would enhance this building. The Rehabilitation chapter of the Design Guidelines includes a section addressing the Rear of Buildings. From the introduction for this section: “The area behind commercial buildings is often forgotten and neglected. This area may be a utilitarian space for deliveries and storage of discarded goods. However, in some cases the rear of the building may provide the opportunity for a secondary entrance, particularly if oriented to a public alley. The appearance of the back area then becomes important to the commercial district and to the individual business.”

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

None

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

None

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

None

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

**Mr. Bailey** – I don't see any problem with the addition. I would be curious about whether we would like put conditions on removing the wires without the applicant here. I would like hear what the applicant would say about that.

**Mr. Schwarz** – As part of the motion, we can recommend that the applicant try to clean up those things.

**Mr. Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed rear 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 the friendly recommendation that the applicant cleans up wires and utilities in the rear alley, if possible. Mr. Bailey seconded. Approved (6-0-1, Mr. Gastinger recused).**

#### **4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-01-03

712 Lexington Avenue

Emily Umberger and Pradeep Rajagopalan, Owner

Jeff Dreyfus, Applicant

Front porch and rear wall alterations, garage demolition, new accessory building

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – 712 Lexington Avenue is a two-story, two-bay hipped roof brick dwelling. The house is also a contributing structure in the Martha Jefferson Historic District. House: Year Built: 1916 District: Martha Jefferson HC District Status: Contributing Garage/Shed: Year Built: after 1920, prior to 1929 District: Martha Jefferson HC District Status: Contributing. Request for Certificate of Appropriates in a Historic Conservation District: • Front porch: Construct a mudroom entrance. • Rear elevation: Remove existing window and install new door with transom. 712 Lexington Ave (Jan 16, 2020) 2 • Demolish the existing garage: 11-ft x 32-ft singles story building clad with corrugated metal panels and a hipped roof with asphalt shingles. Applicant provided photographs to show the deteriorated conditions of the structure. • Construction of new accessory apartment structure: 15-ft x 38-ft single-story building with a low deck with railing at the entry and a standing-seam metal, gabled roof, 16'-8" at the ridge. Support piers to be concealed with Corten panels. Siding to be stained, vertical cedar panels. Windows and doors to be single-lite. This property is in a Historic Conservation District where the design guidelines are, by intent, less stringent than for those of an ADC District. Porch and rear wall alterations: Staff recommends approval. (Details for the rear wall alteration [window-to-door] are not shown; however this is at the rear of the dwelling. Staff recommends that applicant provide as-built drawings for BAR archive.) Garage demolition: In the Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines section below staff summarizes this request per the criteria in demolition guidelines for Historic Conservation Districts. Note: For approved demolitions the BAR has typically required documentation of the structure. New Structure: Staff recommends approval. If it is helpful, or even necessary, staff suggests that the BAR consider separating the action on the alterations and addition from any action on the proposed demolition. Otherwise, approval for all can be addressed in a single motion. Additionally, in the event of a denial, it is important to note that the BAR's decision, within ten days of that decision, may be appealed to City Council. The age of the structure or building; • Staff: After 1920 and prior to 1929. The garage is not shown on the 1920 Sanborn Maps, but is shown on the 1929 maps. 2. Whether it has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places, or the Virginia Landmarks Register; • Staff: This property is within the Martha Jefferson Historic District (VLR 2007. NRHP 2008.) The dwelling is listed as a Contributing structure, not the garage. 712

Lexington Ave (Jan 16, 2020) 4 3. Whether, and to what extent, the building or structure is associated with an historic person, architect or master craftsman, or with an historic event; • Staff: N/A 4. Whether the building or structure, or any of its features, represent an infrequent or the first or last remaining example within the city of a particular architectural style or feature; • Staff: N/A 5. The degree to which distinguishing characteristics, qualities, features or materials remain; • Staff: Evidence suggests that footprint of the structure may have been extended in length. It cannot be determined if the hipped roof configuration or the corrugated panels are original—or historic—components. 6. Whether, and to what extent, a contributing structure is linked, historically or aesthetically, to other buildings or structures within the conservation district; and whether the proposed demolition would affect adversely or positively the character and continuity of the district; • Staff: Rear outbuildings fronting on alleys or, in this case, accessible from the street by side driveways are common within the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District (MJHCD). While not linked to the original house, the shed was identified as a contributing structure for the local district designation. Per the MJHCD map, 36 garages and outbuildings were designated contributing structures. Of these, 11 are located close to the street; three are accessed from an alley; the remainder located to the rear of the dwelling and accessed by an extended driveway. The garage at 712 Lexington Avenue is located 15-ft from the rear of the house, 115-ft from Lexington Avenue (to the front), and 125-ft from St. Charles Avenue (to the rear). From a sample of 12 garages in the MJHCD visible with Google Street View there is no pervasive or typical style, design, or materiality. Materials include wood siding, plywood panels, metal panels, stucco, and brick. Most roofs are gabled; a few are hipped. Roofing is either metal panels, asphalt shingles, or standing seam metal. Some have windows; some do not. The garage at 712 Lexington Avenue has no defined architectural character; as such, within the MJHCD it is neither unique nor typical. 7. The overall condition and structural integrity of the building or structure, as indicated by a study prepared by a qualified professional engineer and provided by the applicant (may be waived if primary residence of applicant); or other information provided to the board; • Staff: The applicant has provided photographs and a brief narrative. The photographs indicate extensive termite damage in some areas; however the photos show conditions at only four locations within the garage. 8. Whether, and to what extent, the applicant proposes to preserve portions, features or materials that are significant to the property's historic, architectural or cultural value; • Staff: The garage will be removed in its entirety. 9. The public necessity of the proposed demolition and the public purpose or interest in buildings to be protected. Staff: Demolition of the garage is not a matter of public necessity. The garage is locally designated as a contributing structure to the MJHCD. In the VLR and NRHP listing, many outbuildings were not considered contributing. However, during the HC district process, the Martha Jefferson community sought such designation in an effort to preserve these structures.

**Jeff Dreyfus, Applicant** – As staff noted, we submitted some additional information on the condition of the shed. There is also additional information on the accessory structure since the submission. There aren't major differences, but I can point them out. The front portion is information regarding the condition of the shed, and the back is an update on the design of the accessory unit. In terms of the structure, we do want to remove it. It occupies a pretty prominent spot in the yard for the family, where they conduct most of their outdoor activities. It's in very poor shape. We did find termite damage in about four locations. We don't know if that is active at this point. The structure was built in two different stages, sometime after the original house was built. If you look on page 16.2, you can see a diagram on the top left, where that change took place. It's very obvious in the construction of the foundation. It's concrete foundation closer towards Lexington and concrete block farther away from Lexington. That is also evident with the interior of the building. It was clearly not built for habitation and wide enough for one car. It's not insulated. Doing a structural report did not seem of real value at this point. There is no indication that it's going to fall down. The structure can't be renovated. We tried to renovate for the purpose of building the additional structure. It's just too narrow as a studio

apartment. The siding of the structure is continuous across the two foundations. It would seem to indicate that it is not original siding. The hipped roof on the front of the building appears to be original by looking at the framing. Things are falling apart.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am seeing studs at 6 foot on centers. It wouldn't stand up for inspections. It was not built to be a permanent structure.

**Jeff Dreyfus** – The modifications to the original house were addressed in the original application that was submitted. The house was added onto in 2015. Wolf-Ackerman did the rear addition with a screened in porch. In the original house, you can see the powder room that was an infill at a later time. There is an original window. We are hoping to remove the powder room and original window, and keep the arched opening and take the opening down to the ground. You can enter the house, and walk straight through to the screened in porch. On page 9, you can see a photo of that window. We would simply keep the jack arch and take it down to the floor. The other modification to the original house is on page 10. The first floor is very lean in square footage, and we worked very hard to figure out a way to include a modest mud room. Our proposal is to take over a portion of the front porch and keep the columns. There is an engaged column up against the brick. There is a free standing column on the north side. We would like to keep those and infill between those and infill between the column and the brick façade on the front. We would propose panelized wood. We will need to work on the color of that, assuming that is an accepted solution to the BAR. We want to contrast the later modification of the house. Windows would be clad windows, probably dark. There are stepping stones up to the front of the house. There is an orange-yellow color to those stepping stones. We thought of pulling that into the color scheme. We are going to need to work carefully in getting the color right so that it doesn't clash with the red brick. The mudroom would be entered on the side of the building. If we go to the accessory structure, it would best to refer to the packet that was just handed out. The structure is near some very mature trees. We are trying to save those trees by putting the building on eight pilings. We are doing this to disturb the roots as little as possible of the adjacent trees. We will probably lift the skirt so that water can continue to flow underneath the building. The structure would be a natural finish with cedar siding. We are building to the required front yard setback on St. Charles Street. We are hoping to have a standing seam metal for the roof. We would use that same material on the box window that faces towards the house. The other difference is that height has grown a little bit. Not having headers over the doors and windows does create some structural issues. We have taken the doors and windows down to seven feet. We have added 18 feet from the base of the siding to the peak of the roof. We have pulled the stairs into the deck, so that they are more free floating.

**Mr. Schwarz** – What would the rest of the Board think about breaking this up into separate motions?

The members of the BAR did decide to break up the application into three different motions. The three motions are the Front Porch Alterations and Rear Elevation Alterations, the Garage Demolition, and the Accessory Structure.

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

None – Front Porch Alterations and Rear Elevation Alterations

None – Garage Demolition

None – Accessory Structure

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

##### **Front Porch Alterations and Rear Elevation Alterations**

**Mr. Gastinger** – Are you proposing to move the front column forward?

**Jeff Dreyphus, Applicant** – We are going to need to move it slightly forward, so that it's coplanar with the front of the building.

**Mr. Lahendro** – The walls for that infill mudroom appear to be intersecting the main house where the quoins are. What will do you do with that detail?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – In an ideal world, we are able to scribe it to the wall and water proof behind it in case some water comes through. I don't have an alternative at this point. It is something that we are going to have to work through with the contractor. Keeping the coins are an integral part of the architecture. We would like to leave the brick the same inside and outside of the mudroom.

**Mr. Zehmer** – What are currently exterior walls will become the interior walls of the mudroom. We are encouraged not to paint un-painted brick. Do you know if the intention is to paint that?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – Our intention is put drywall over it. It will require some furring strips and drywall attached to it. It would preserve the brick for the future.

**Mr. Zehmer** – The steps that would lead to this seem to encroach on the driveway. Does that cause concern?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – Not for the owners. They really don't drive farther than that right now. The intention is to not use the garage in the future. Access to the yard is much better from St. Charles.

### **Garage Demolition**

**Mr. Lahendro** – Does the applicant feel that the termite damage is significant enough jeopardize the structure of this building?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – I would like to say 'yes.' It's been standing there for a long time, and I don't know how long the damage has been there. The good answer would be that it is compromised. I just don't know.

### **Accessory Structure**

**Mr. Ball** – Are you using the gravel and French drains?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – We are using the gravel and French drains.

**Mr. Ball** – Will there be an HVAC?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – It will likely be a mini-split on a wall. We have not located where that will go. I don't want to hang it on the back of the building.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Should the BAR consider an alternative for the roofing material?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – We can come back and ask for that modification. I am not ready to make a proposal of what the material will be. If shingle would be an acceptable alternative, we would certainly like that an "add on" to the motion. I hadn't really thought that through. In terms of ventilation, we are not assuming that there will be ridge vent on this. It's not going to be dramatically different in any of the details.



**Mr. Lahendro** – Are there exposed rafters on the inside?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – Probably not. We are hoping to get a little bit of shape to the structure. We are trying to do it economically. There is a lot of work that would have to go into doing it that way. It's intended to be a secondary space. There is pretty good slope to this site.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Does the neighbor, who called, have concerns about the height?

**Jeff Werner** – It wasn't necessarily concern or alarm. They asked where they were in relation to the existing trees. The trees will remain. He just asked how tall it was.

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

None – Front Porch Alterations and Rear Elevation Alterations

None – Garage Demolition

None – Accessory Structure

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

##### **Front Porch Alterations and Rear Elevation Alterations**

**Mr. Zehmer** – Is there no way to leave the column where it is?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – We would have to lose 18 to 20 inches in the mudroom. It's definitely a need that we have to fit the minimum program that they are trying to get into this mudroom.

**Mr. Lahendro** – The reason that you don't have the mudroom in the back screened in porch is because they are wanting access from the driveway side?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – It's the side that the driveway is on. One of the nice things about the mudroom in this location is that it brings the family through the traditional entry hall of the house. The entry hall is quite spacious. Moving the mudroom to the back would have the family coming in the backside of the house. The family prefers using the front.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Did they feel that they really needed a mudroom?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – Yes. They felt that it was meet their minimum needs.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I don't have much of a problem with the application as a whole. This particular corner really does bother me. I have a hard time supporting it. For building materials and textures, selection of materials and textures for a new building and additions should relate architecturally to the Charlottesville locality and should be compatible and complimentary with neighboring buildings. For openings: Window and door patterns and a ratio of solids, wall area to voids of the new buildings should be compatible with the contributing buildings in the surrounding area. I don't have any problem with the modern addition that was put in the back. After being on site, this is really close to the street. This is a prominent part of that front of the house. I have a real problem with the proportion of the windows and the materiality of this infill.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am going to take this from a different direction. Because this is a conservation district and not an architecture control district, it's a tiny addition within a porch. The main front porch still exists and that's part of the guidelines. You are not adding anything to the massing of the building. It doesn't visually overpower the existing building. The portion that bothers me the most is the

materiality. Having the clear stain on the wood paneling is not in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood. It's not compatible with the other buildings. For me, that's only part that I have trouble with. This meets the guidelines.

**Jeff Dreyfus** – In terms of material, are there other materials that you would think more appropriate. We are open to that. We had our own internal discussions about that and felt that the preference of the BAR was to make this distinctly different. Nobody on the client side or the design team feels that we have to have it this way.

**Mr. Schwarz** – For me, an opaque finish. There are some dark accent colors, and I could see that being successful. I want something that is not going to eventually turn grey and mildew.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am more troubled by this clearly varnished wood in an untraditional pattern fighting with the rest of the architecture. I don't see that they are compatible.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I agree and I have that same concern, especially with a wood finish that is partially very exposed and partially protected. I feel that it's going to look like a very inexpensive infill. I worry about the durability of that finish in this condition. An opaque finish would certainly help. A darker color that would recede would address some of my concerns with the front wall being coplanar with the front of the house. Having the definition of the coins and the back of the column line. I am in support of the approach, and I find it appropriate and in accordance with the conservation district guidelines.

**Mr. Ball** – Did you explore a little addition on the left side via that door?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – We get so close to the property line, that there is nothing that we can do.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I noticed that door now. Access to the first floor is blocked now because of the toilet.

**Jeff Dreyfus** – We couldn't find a more elegant way to get a toilet in there. If there was an addition, we would have to relocate the half bathroom. An addition on the side of the building would be very small in scale to the house.

**Mr. Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed front porch alterations and the proposed rear elevation alterations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves this application as submitted with the following modification: • That the architects explore a different material finish that allows the front porch addition to visually recede and that this material be submitted for staff approval. Mr. Bailey seconded. Approved (6-1, Mr. Ball opposed).**

### **Garage Demolition**

**Jeff Werner** – I did receive a phone call from a neighbor asking about the height of the structure in the rear.

**Mr. Bailey** – Would they demolish this building no matter what happens with the rear structure?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – Yes, they do. It's of no use, except for bike storage

**Mr. Ball** – I have no problem with removing this. The picture shows extensive termite damage. It's amazing that it's still standing with very little sheer structure. I think that it's weird that it was placed on the list of contributing structures.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I think that there are garages and outbuildings that are worthy of being preserved, but not this one.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It's not evident from far away that it's been added onto. This is not the original garage.

**Mr. Bailey moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed demolition of the existing garage satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Lahendro seconded. Approved (7-0).**

### Accessory Structure

**Mr. Zehmer** – The views showing the buildings over on St. Charles have the grey weather boarding in a horizontal orientation. Was the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood considered?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – Aesthetically, we prefer the vertical. It's better in the weather. We are trying to go for a very clean look. Horizontal does not weather as well as vertical. It seemed like enough to us. It's quite a varied streetscape along that road.

**Jeff Werner** – St. Charles is not part of the Martha Jefferson Conservation District, nor are those houses on the opposite side of this.

**Mr. Bailey** – It seems to me that this additional structure is trying to mirror the more modern addition of the back of the house as well. It does seem to be compatible.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I find this to be a really reasonable and elegant addition in its modesty and form. I think that it makes absolute sense.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am supportive of it. You have created a modern addition within a traditional form. That makes it compatible with the rear of the house and the other houses around it in front of the house.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I struggled with the materiality a little bit. The cedar house on St. Charles is not contributing. There are very few buildings in the district that actually are clad in wood. It doesn't always age the best. The guidelines do say that sustainable materials are preferred. I think that the wood is going to be far more successful with the standing seam roof than an asphalt shingle roof. I don't want to offer the option of asphalt shingles roof.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I would like to encourage the applicant to go for the standing seam medal.

**Mr. Bailey** – What would be the difference in cost between the two?

**Jeff Dreyfus** – I would say more than double the cost. I wish that I could give you a number.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I think that we could vote to approve it as submitted. If the project needs changed to that calculation, they can always come back for an amendment. I also appreciate the sensitivity to protecting the canopy in that neighborhood.

**Mr. Ball** – I think that it's going to be much nicer. I think that it's going to capture the vision that you are going for. I do believe that it's a beautiful vision.

**Mr. Lahendro moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed new accessory structure satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Bailey seconded. Approved (7-0).**

### **Preliminary Discussion: 612 West Main Street**

Jeff Dreyfus presented on 612 West Main Street. Jeff Dreyfus worked closely with the BAR on 600 West Main Street. This was just a preliminary presentation of what 612 West Main Street (University Tire) is going to look like.

These are the some of the highlights of this presentation by Jeff Dreyfus. The first was to pursue a special use permit for the piece of land. Height was not an option for this piece of property. Height was limited to four stories. The BAR recommended to Council that increased density would not have an adverse impact. There were several conditions that were proposed. Jeff Dreyfus went over some of the conditions that were proposed by Council. This is very different from 600 West Main Street. The ground floor will be retail with residential on the floors above the retail floor. Main entry for the residents will be on the sidewalk. There will be a secondary entry for residents on the backside of the "pocket park." The hope is to have a restaurant near the "pocket park" that could activate or take up the "pocket park." There is a great opportunity. The hope is to be back in front of the BAR next month. The idea is to get the reaction and feedback from the BAR.

There was a discussion among the BAR members and Jeff Dreyfus providing feedback and constructive criticism for the applicant on the plan. Members of the BAR each provided their concerns for the applicant. Jeff Dreyfus did leave with a good idea of what improvements need to be made on the project going forward.

### **5. Staff Questions/Discussion**

- New members introduction
- Introduce new members again in the February meeting for those watching on Channel 10.
- CoA Discussion, schedule executive session
- BAR Vacancy
- Commercial property owner in an ADC district or business owner in historic structure.
- Election of Chair and co-chair: It was decided to elect a chair and co-chair at the executive session before the February BAR meeting.
- Quirk Hotel Signage: Will be on the February meeting agenda for COA on the BAR meeting. There are only five signs that would be presented to the BAR. There was brief introduction by staff what would be on the COA application.
- Fence at 401 Ridge Street: Construction of a 6 foot fence right at the house and jump to 7 feet in two places. Create some enclosure. There was also concern over the height of the fence.

There needs to be a good reason to exceed the 6 feet as stated in the guidelines. Some of the BAR expressed concern regarding the height of the fence.

- Shed at 513 Dice Street: Will probably come in February. A couple would like to put in a shed on this property. There followed a discussion regarding this possible shed on Dice Street. Need to know the specific details of this shed on Dice Street. The details include drawings, trees, fences, neighbors, materials, etc.
- Tree removal at 108-110 West South Street: This is to remove two trees against the foundation of the building. The BAR recommended that the trees be kept. The property owner will need to bring it back in February.
- Admin Approval of 713 Park Street: The owners are working with another architect. The owners are going to be able to save the garage. They did alter the rear porch design.
- Preservation happenings: (none reported)

## **6. PLACE report**

Roundtable discussion on PLACE's role, goals, and objectives.

## **D. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 8:06 PM.