

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[February 19, 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 VERBATIUM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2

Members Present: Carl Schwarz, Jody Lahendro, James Zehmer, Sonja Lengel, Breck Gastinger, Tim Mohr
Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner, Sebastian Waisman
Pre-Meeting

There was a general discussion regarding the new items and COAs on the agenda for this evening’s BAR meeting. Jeff Werner provided the background of the different applications that are going to be discussed in the BAR meeting.

Mr. Gastinger did bring up one of the items on the consent agenda.

Meeting was called to order at 5:32 PM by Mr. Mohr. Mr. Mohr assumed the chairmanship due to his seniority on the Board of Architectural Review. The bylaws state that the most senior member of the BAR take the chairmanship for the meeting until a new chair is selected. Mr. Mohr was the most senior member of the BAR present.

No selection of a new chair or vice-chair will be made when all members of the BAR are present.

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 January 22, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Lahendro moved to approve the minutes with one correction in the minutes from the last BAR meeting in January. Motion passed 5-0. Mr. Mohr abstained, since he was not in attendance at the January BAR meeting.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-02-04

425 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 320177000

Quirk Charlottesville, Owner; Danny MacNelly, Architecture Firm, Applicant

Hotel signage

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-02-07

1115 Hazel Street

Tax Parcel 510080000

Cynthia Wall, Owner; Kenton Trimble, Trimble Enterprises, Applicant

Side Addition

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-02-05

581 Dice Street

Tax Parcel 290063200

Sean and Bridget Walsh, Owner/Applicant

Shed construction

Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the remainder of the consent agenda. (Mr. Lahendro seconded) The motion to approve the consent agenda was approved 6-0.

C. New**5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-02-01

108 – 110 West South Street

Tax Parcel 280101000

West South Street, LLC, Owner; Christie Haskin, Woodard Properties, Applicant

Tree Removal

Jeff Werner, Staff Report - Year Built: ca. 1922 – 1923 District: Downtown ADC Status: Contributing. 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. Request for CoA to remove two maple trees straddling the parcel line between 108-110 W South Street and 200 W South Street. (Note: The submitted arborist letter addresses only the maple tree at the street. Identified as tree #4 in the applicant's submittal.) In addition to the applicant's submittal, please review staff photos of the subject trees in the appendix of this staff report. (The submittal indicates two trees—identified as #2 and #3—that are to be removed per BAR review in August 2019.) Should the BAR decide to approve the proposed tree removal, the board might consider recommending the planting of new trees and recommended and appropriate species from the City's Master Tree List. Additionally, the BAR may consider separate actions for each tree.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

None

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – I find the application pretty convincing in totality of the four trees. The maple towards the front is probably the only one that might have been planted intentionally. It's in pretty poor condition. I thought the silver maple in the back might be in better condition, but the arborist report was pretty convincing. Considering the amount and number of trees being removed, I think there should be a recommendation for exploring the possibility of planting. If space was available, I think that it would be appropriate to recommend additional plans for canopy trees to be located on site. I would that four trees would be possible.

Mr. Mohr – Were those power lines slated to be buried? It makes that location pretty problematic

Mr. Schwarz – I agree with Mr. Gastinger. I find it unfortunate because it is the only street tree on the street. I think that if a tree has been butchered like that, it still has an aesthetic value. I also recognize that it's compromised because it is rotting.

Mr. Gastinger – Can we pose that as a question to the applicant of what the possibility for other trees on the property might be?

Ms. Haskin, Applicant – At this point, we are willing to explore the approved list and work with our neighbor to come up with a good solution. Aesthetics are definitely going to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Lahendro – The Tree Commission puts out information about, not only recommended canopy trees, but also understory trees for places that have utilities above. You might check their website for the recommendations.

Mr. Schwarz – It sounds like we are going to approve the trees coming down. Are we going to make it contingent that they are going to put them back?

Mr. Mohr – I would be more inclined to say recommendation. We haven't seen any site plan improvements for this site. It's been all about the building. Are there any doors or is there a pathway going down the side of it? The trees are in such bad shape. I can see them coming out. I could see that we would request a future plan that would include a site plan. That's going to have to be in concert with the people on South Street. I would think that we would have a motion that they return at some future date with a site plan suggesting how they would re-populate that area with trees and vegetation. I don't think it's a contingency. I think that it's a request.

Ms. Haskin – We understand the contingency. Is it possible to remove the trees and come up with a site plan?

Mr. Mohr – Yes. We are going to do it as a contingency.

Motion: Mr. Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed tree removals satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC

district and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following recommendation: • That the applicant work with the adjacent landowner and come back to the BAR at a future date with a landscape plan that addresses the loss of vegetation and recommends the replacement of at least four trees on the site, two of which should be from Charlottesville’s Master Tree List for Large and Medium Deciduous Trees. Jody Lahendro seconded. Approved (6-0).

Mr. Schwarz – Would it possible for that site plan to be something that they could submit and be on the consent agenda as a part of this application?

Mr. Werner – I will do as we have done in the past. I would bring it to the BAR for the record. There may be a requirement that if it’s a site plan change that the BAR would look at it. You have expressed that you would like to see a plan to put trees back.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-02-02

109 East Jefferson Street

Tax Parcel 330194000

Christopher and Kaitlyn Henry, Owner; Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects, Applicant

New entry gate

Tim Tessier, Applicant – We are talking about 109 East Jefferson Street. We are looking to replace the gate that is existing and that you see in the photos. The request from the owner was to come up with something that provides a little bit more privacy. In some of the other photos, the service entrance and the service gates are of the same design of what is on the front.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Is the intention to make the front walk usable again? It’s currently barricaded.

Mr. Tessier – I believe so. I think that there are planters on the steps. This would turn into an official entry.

Mr. Schwarz – The design appears fairly transparent. Is that accurate? They look like it might be 1.5 inch vertical posts with the wider space in between.

Mr. Tessier – That’s correct. We envision it just as you see it in the drawing.

Mr. Gastinger – I am guessing that the intention is to have the standing position be closed rather than open?

Mr. Tessier – Correct.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – I am struggling with this a little bit. We do have a guideline that fences in the front yard can be no more than four feet. I am trying to look at the past history of this site. It does not appear that the hedge ever came to the BAR. It's the one in the front along Jefferson Street. I don't know if you know the history of that.

Mr. Tessier – I don't believe that we have discussed it in our office or with the owners.

Mr. Schwarz – You have done the previous application.

Mr. Tessier – I think that was there remained from what was there before.

Mr. Schwarz – When this was approved, I know that there was discussion that it was good to have privet hedge there to hide the fence. I am not sure there was any discussion about the privet hedge becoming ten feet tall. It's a fairly hostile sidewalk. It's unfortunate when you look at pictures from the past and see what it looks like today. The design is very nice. It would be improvement to get rid of the planters on the steps and be able to see the front door from the street. I think that you would be able to see through the gate. I am still struggling with the whole idea of having a 6 foot wall, which is the lowest point of that gate. If your client has bought a house downtown, he would be proud to cut the hedge down to an appropriate size.

Mr. Tessier – We noticed the staff comment about that. I think that there is flexibility for trimming and shaping the plantings that are there.

Mr. Werner – This gate opens out into the sidewalk. Without line of sight and some awareness, a collision is easy to imagine. If this was lower, that doesn't become an issue. There is a question of it extending out into the public realm.

Mr. Mohr – Isn't the gate, when open, flat against the wall?

Mr. Tessier – It projects farther than the hedge. It projects maybe a foot maybe 14 inches.

Mr. Gastinger – I think the design is elegant and a good addition generally. I think that it has been designed in scale with the existing hedge at the height that it is now. I have been wondering whether lowering it to a height that would allow the hedge to also be maintained at a more in keeping with the spirit of our guidelines, if that would destroy the proportion of it. It is very tall. In the drawings that show human figure, it is pretty large scale for a 5 foot wide sidewalk.

Mr. Mohr – It seems that you could probably bring it down a foot and still have the sense of a soaring arch. The house is extremely vertical. I think having a vertical gate makes a great deal of sense. In terms of its relationship with the house, it makes sense. You can experiment with shortening it.

Mr. Gastinger – That was the dimension that I was looking at. That would allow the hedge to be maintained at a 6 foot level. The top portion is always going to be a little bit lighter. It might be a huge improvement for the site.

Mr. Mohr – It would help with that street scale. Dropping the gate considerably and leaving that way up there, you lose the purity of your design. I think that the design is appropriate for the house. I think that you could lost some height. I hear what you are saying Mr. Schwarz with regards to the height of the hedges

Mr. Schwarz – What is not showing up on the drawings is an arborvitae hedge that I am not sure ever got approval that runs right behind this privet hedge. Eventually, that will be an even taller wall. It does seem that there is a definite desire to wall off this house from Park.

Mr. Mohr – I would like to see you drop it a foot and see how that works. Then hold the height of the hedge from here on out.

Mr. Tessier – I think that would be acceptable. We would have some discussions with the client about how much privacy is provided by the gate. I think that we could work with losing a foot on the height of the whole assembly.

Mr. Lahendro – I like the design in the way that it picks up the ellipse and the fan light at the front door. We have guidelines and we work very hard to engage the public. I agree with the other members of the BAR with the strong recommendation to reduce the height of the hedge.

Mr. Mohr – How old is that hedge?

Mr. Schwarz – The privet has always been there. It went in after all of the other site improvements were put in. The last application that this project saw was in 2011. They don't look very old.

Mr. Mohr – I think that a reasonable compromise is dropping a foot. I think that it would be problematic to get the bottom of that down to 4 feet. It compromises the verticality of the architecture. If you come down more than, you are going to have issues. It would be interesting to see what the approved hedge height was when the house was built.

Mr. Schwarz – There is a fence buried between the privet and arborvitae and that came up. The idea was that the hedge would obscure the fence.

Mr. Mohr – It looks pretty close to six feet relative to the sidewalk. We are concentrating on the gate. We will request that the hedge be brought down with the gate

Motion: Mr. Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed gate 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 following modifications: • That the gate structure be reduced in height by around 12 inches • That the adjacent hedge be maintained at a height of 5 to 6 feet, measured relative to the base of the gate structure Jody Lahendro seconded. Approved (6-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-02-06

751 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520049000

Patrick Tennant, Owner; Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects, Applicant

Side porch removal, new window, new exterior cladding

Jeff Werner, Staff Report - Year Built: 1904 District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing
751 Park Street is the only frame Colonial Revival dwelling on Park Street. The two-story, three bay house is

oriented east towards Park Street and has a porch that spans the façade. The building has an impressive classical cornice and an asymmetrical slate roof: its primary hipped volume is interrupted by several gables, dormers, and extensions. The house was built for William J. Keller, a prominent shoe merchant in Charlottesville. December 2009 - BAR approved (7-0) a CoA to demolish existing rear [west] and side [north] porches, window and door replacements, site work, and railing and lattice. June 2010 - BAR approved (8-0) a CoA to demolish the existing rear [west] porch, rear porch addition, aluminum window replacements, new shutters, railing, and lattice. CoA request for the removal of a porch and stair on the north elevation, replacing the door on the north porch with a new vinyl-clad window, and replacing the siding with painted fiber cement lap siding. Cut sheet not provided for the new window. The BAR received a 2009 application to make alterations to the building's exterior, including removing the north porch and replacing its door with a window. The BAR approved this application unanimously, and staff recommends approval of this scope of the project. The applicant also proposes replacing the house's aluminum siding, and presumably the original wood siding underneath, with fiber cement cladding. In 2010, when aluminum siding was removed to make way for a new west porch addition, the original siding was uncovered but had considerably rotted. As a result, the original siding was replaced with the same fiber cement cladding now proposed for the rest of the building. The submittal does not indicate whether or not any existing wood siding remains, and if it does, whether or not that will be removed or left in place. The design guidelines recommend the repair of deteriorated wood siding and to replace only when it is beyond repair. Staff recommends further investigation to the original siding's condition before its wholesale replacement. While enough old siding for all facades may not be salvageable, consideration should be given to reusing original material on complete facades where possible. Additionally, should the new siding be installed over existing wood, the BAR should request clarity on how the siding will fit dimensionally with existing trim elements. Regarding the demolition of the north entry and stairs see below staff's review of the City's standards for considering demolitions.

A. The historic, architectural or cultural significance, if any, of the specific structure or property, including, without limitation:

1. The age of the structure or property; Staff: The addition existed as early as 1929. Staff assumes it is original to the house, but cannot confirm.
2. Whether it has been designated a National Historic Landmark, listed on the National Register of Historic Places, or listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register; Staff: 751 Park Street is listed as a contributing structure to the Charlottesville and Albemarle County Courthouse Historic District (104-0072). VLR 1980. NRHP 1982. However, the district survey has not been updated and it is unknown how the prior alterations or the proposed would impact the current designation.
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: The house is unique in being the frame Colonial Revival dwelling on Park Street. Staff has not determined if it is unique within the City.
5. Whether the building or structure is of such old or distinctive design, texture or material that it could not be reproduced, or could be reproduced only with great difficulty; and Staff: The requested demolition is for a component of the house. While the house is unique, a covered, side entrance is not and, with proper documentation, this element could be easily replicated later, should that be pursued.
6. The degree to which distinguishing characteristics, qualities, features or materials remain; Staff: While the historical record indicates—in a plan view—that a covered, side entrance at this location, staff cannot determine if the materials and design are original.

B. Whether, and to what extent, a contributing structure is linked, historically or aesthetically, to other buildings or structures within an existing major design control district, or is one (1) of a group of properties within such a district whose concentration or continuity possesses greater significance than many of its component buildings and structures. Staff: This house is relatively unique to Park Street.

C. The overall condition and structural integrity of the building or structure, as indicated by studies prepared by a qualified professional engineer and provided by the applicant or other information provided to the board; Staff: Unable to determine.

D. Whether, and to what extent, the applicant proposes means, methods or plans for moving, removing or demolishing the structure or property that preserves portions, features or materials

that are significant to the property's historic, architectural or cultural value; and Staff: The existing elements will be removed entirely.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Tim Tessier, Applicant – We are definitely looking to have that side entrance removed based on the prior application. That's the first goal. The siding question is one that we acknowledge. It may require some more investigation. I know when the work was done at the back porch, the wood that was discovered there was in really poor condition. That wood was removed and hardy siding was put back in place. Our starting position would be the old wood siding. If there is any, is likely in poor shape. We would take that off and go back with hardy plank. I think there are challenges with going on top of wood siding with hardy plank. I think the manufacturer asks for a smooth, solid surface. Furring strips could be used, but you have pushed the face of the siding beyond a lot of the trim elements. In the order of priority, we first want to look at that side entrance and make sure that can be removed. There is a powder room behind that door. A door would not be wanted. If that's acceptable, we could talk about the siding issue. We don't want to get into an exploration project where we start quantifying the siding. The cost would start to skyrocket.

Mr. Mohr – The other windows on the house are wood framed or aluminum clad?

Mr. Tessier – They are vinyl clad.

Patrick Tennant, Owner – We wanted to keep the existing style of window.

Mr. Gastinger – Do you know if the exterior walls are insulated and if that's going to play into the siding question?

Mr. Tennant – I have been in the house since 2009. We did inject stuff into the walls. The windows are double glazed. It's much more energy efficient.

Mr. Schwarz – Are you going to put corner boards on?

Mr. Tessier – We would likely put on corner boards just to resolve those corners.

Mr. Zehmer – Can you explain which area you have already replaced with the hardy plank?

Mr. Tessier – The part is at the back of the house. If you have the staff report, it would be the last photograph. It's the porch on the right. If you have our set of drawings, you can see a close up on page 7 with our photos. That's a really good representation in the bottom left corner.

Mr. Zehmer – And the condition of the wood was all shot?

Mr. Tessier – It was rotted out. We could not use it.

Mr. Zehmer – Was the original side the same proportion and size?

Mr. Tessier – I believe that it was.

Mr. Werner – That could be ascertained with looking at what is underneath and identifying the condition underneath.

Mr. Zehmer – It seems that the cyber cement siding that you installed was intended to match the aluminum siding. If we are moving forward, wouldn't we want to match the historic?

Mr. Lahendro – I think that we need to know what the historic siding is. I don't see that it would be an incredible hardship to take off a 5 by 5 area and do some probes on different sides of the house to find out a.) what kind of condition it is in and b.) what it looks like. I would not be surprised that the rear of the house would be more deteriorated the other areas or the other elevations of the house. It would not be that difficult to go out and do some probes to find out.

Mr. Tessier – The existing siding is aluminum. I am imagining a scenario where taking off a 5 by 5 chunks is going to be difficult to go backwards and get it back.

Mr. Lahendro – Why do you need to get it back if you are going to replace the siding?

Mr. Tessier – I think the owner would rather leave everything that is there. If it becomes an operation to explore and taking pieces off.

Mr. Tennant – The original motivation for doing this is that it is time to get rid of the porch. It doesn't have any reason for being. I am not sure that it ever really did. I spent a lot of time discussing with my neighbor. We couldn't work out why that door was there anyway.

Mr. Lahendro – Even without the powder room inside of it? It doesn't make sense as having an access to the open stair hall?

Mr. Tennant – There is now a powder room under the stair now. It didn't make any sense before. The southwest corner was set up for service. There was a service stair, room, and entry. The only reason that we could think there would be an entrance on that side of the house was the owner didn't fancy walking around to the front. My feeling was that this might be an opportunity to get rid of the horrible aluminum siding and replace it with something that would improve the look of the house. I don't believe doing this will make a difference to the livability of the house or to the value of it. Given that we are coming back to the BAR to get permission for the removal of this porch, it seemed like a good option to explore the idea.

Mr. Lahendro – I disagree with the removal of the porch. I think that the porch has a very good reason for being on this service side. It's the access for off the road. It's a street elevation. The porch is ornamented. It was clearly designed to be a feature and facing the street. It's elaborated and the original owners were proud of it.

Mr. Tennant – It has the access from the side street. Now that the house has been reconfigured with this entrance on the back that is the access from the street now. We actually move the door into the center of the house. It's not tucked away in the back. It's a very good entrance. It's a much better entrance.

Mr. Lahendro – Just because you re-arrange things in a modern sense doesn't mean that we can start taking off the historic things that don't matter anymore. It helps understand the house historically and how it developed. In the future somebody may want to take that powder room out and restore that entrance to the hall.

Mr. Gastinger – Is it the porch or the door that is the bigger issue?

Mr. Tennant – It's the porch.

Mr. Zehmer – You were talking about livability of the house. How does removing the porch improve the livability of the house?

Mr. Tennant – It's a porch going nowhere because the door is now shut.

Mr. Gastinger – If the door was the issue, we have had situations where we have left a framed opening in place that's reversible.

Mr. Lahendro – I would be fine with that

Mr. Mohr – It would be interesting to know from a framing standpoint whether the door was there. When you take that siding off, you can find out what is going on behind it.

Mr. Tessier – I think that it would be acceptable to explore the siding in this area.

Mr. Mohr – That might reveal the fact that you have a wider weather. You would have to decide whether to take the aluminum off or not. When you said the insulation, is it spray in?

Mr. Tennant – I think fiberglass.

Mr. Mohr – I am also wondering about the aluminum and whether that's causing any moisture problems in the back of the wall.

Mr. Tessier – It's possible. Especially when the house was not insulated.

Mr. Mohr – You still end up with a dew point right behind it.

Mr. Zehmer – In terms of an exploratory probe, you may be able to remove that corner piece without having to remove a huge piece and get a view behind it.

Mr. Tessier – If it's really starting to quantify how much siding is OK, that's the exploration that owner would prefer not to have to do.

Mr. Mohr – If you are doing any kind of modifications, that's going to give you a clue what's going on there.

Mr. Werner – Removing is something needs to be done ahead of time. The corner board is one question. I have seen in Charlottesville where it's two. You would likely have a clue to that as the siding was removed. I am curious about the trim condition where the curved face comes into the flat. Is there a piece there? If I could just offer that and any requirements. Maybe there are some unseen conditions. If the hardy plank is installed, it reflects what is revealed when the aluminum is removed. That will tell you the corner condition and the trim condition.

Mr. Mohr – You have two inside corners and the bay window.

Mr. Werner – You can stipulate that whatever goes back in, it represents what’s revealed.

Mr. Tessier – When you say the bow meets the flat, I do think there is a trim there for the aluminum. Are you saying you want to see what happens underneath the wood siding?

Mr. Werner – I am just offering a recommendation as far as the siding is concerned. As far as the siding is concerned, the BAR may consider a condition that those trim conditions replicated what is exposed when the aluminum is removed.

Mr. Mohr – It’s not going to mimic the rest of the aluminum trim. When talking about the aluminum, are you going to have to take it up to the roof?

Mr. Tessier – That’s the discussion I am thinking about.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – I have some issues with the pertinent guidelines for rehabilitation. I feel that those guidelines speak to keeping the porch.

Mr. Lahendro – I concur with the guidelines and feel that they are applicable here. This is not the main façade of the house, but it’s an important façade of the house, facing the side street. The drive entrance side of that street, not only for family, staff, and service vehicles, this was an ornamented porch that was elaborated to celebrate someone coming into the house. It connected with the stair and hall center structure in the house. I believe that it’s an important historic aspect of the house.

Mr. Gastinger – I would just add that the choice of having that curved façade on this rear back corner underlines the point that it was an important façade. There was considerable amount of craft and design placed towards this façade.

Mr. Lahendro – That curved façade appears to be part of the original dining room.

Mr. Zehmer – On the question of siding, I think we would like some more information about the original siding, in terms of its shape and condition.

Mr. Schwarz – This does not appear to have the support from the BAR.

Mr. Mohr – It does appear to be the way we are heading. How do we feel about replacing the door with the window?

Mr. Lahendro – I am fine with that. As long as we can keep the existing door frame and infill it with the window.

Mr. Mohr – The door is off center because of the stairs. That seems like a legitimate location. It does imply that the door has been there.

Mr. Werner – The options are to defer this until next month. The applicant can request a deferral, and they can bring it back when they choose. The BAR can take separate actions citing the demolition. If the BAR denies the application, it is appealable to Council. Those are the four options.

Motion: Carl Schwarz moved to accept the applicant’s request for a deferral. Jody Lahendro seconded. Approved (6-0).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-02-03

409 Ridge Street

Tax Parcel 290135000

Miles Hingeley and Ashley Morse, Owner; Jeff Bushman, Bushman Dreyfus Architects, Applicant

Two-story porch addition, new shutters and dormers, new roof

Jeff Werner, Staff Report - Year Built: 2004 District: Ridge Street ADC Status: Contributing (Note: The original house, the Dunkum-Spooner-Brown House, c1842, was destroyed in 1994 by a falling tree. However, the current house is still identified as contributing. In any event, regardless of the year built, the parcel is within an ADC, and any new construction or alteration to an existing structure is subject to BAR review.) Request for a Certificate of Appropriates in an ADC District for: alterations to the rear (west) elevation including construction of a 2-story addition and porch; and construction on the side (north) elevation of a single-story mudroom/entry. In the context of the existing additions at the rear and side, to the 2004 brick house, staff finds the proposed work to be consistent with the character of the 2004 house. In addition, the house 401 Ridge Street (Feb 13, 2020) 2 roof will be replaced with standing seam metal, which will be also be installed on the new work. The brick foundation of the house is continued for the additions and the proposed painted siding is consistent with the existing additions, distinguishing them from house itself. The application clearly communicates a sense of the project’s scale, materiality, and general appearance, which staff finds consistent with the design guidelines. However, the application lacks several specific details, including door and window cut sheets, drawings of the new operable shutters, and detailed drawings of the new porch, stairs, and railings. The building is not historic but the BAR might request further details to better understand the project. Should additional information be requested, staff recommends deferral of this request until the March 2020 BAR meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Jeff Bushman, applicant – It’s partially maintenance and repair. The existing deck is falling off. The roof is leaking. We are fixing some things, including the front stair. The plan is to do some modifications and make it suitable for a growing family that likes the outdoors, hence the big porch. The other intention is to take this house, and make it more attractive and more beautiful.

Mr. Schwarz – Did you have any responses to some of staff questions?

Mr. Bushman – The existing windows are double hung. The existing shutters are at the lower end of builder quality. We are going to the shutters off and make them traditional. It’s very conservative modifications. In terms of the new windows, we haven’t picked exact make and model. Our intention is go with energy efficient and clad aluminum white on the exterior. The detailing is traditional brick mold.

Mr. Gastinger – In the backyard, there is a second set of site walls and another lower stair. Is that existing?

Mr. Bushman – That will all be new. There is a separate landscape project, which is not drawn here. That second set of walls is important to us because we are trying reduce the height of the back stair to the back garden. The porch actually steps down from the primary level of the house.

Mr. Gastinger – It makes a lot of sense. It's more of an issue of documentation so the city has a record of site plan changes.

Mr. Gastinger – The connection of the rear roofline with the existing roofline seems like it's going to be tricky, figuring out how to deal with the overhang and what that intersection looks like. Do you have any further thoughts about that?

Mr. Bushman – Our intention there is clear. The overhang on the porch is bigger than the overhang on the house. We are attempting to line them up as much as we can if not precisely. There is some roof water that we have to deal with there. We are building a notch to catch the roof water and putting it into a drain pipe at that notch. The other design detail that is not clear is that the first floor is 2 feet bigger towards the back than the upper floor. If you look at the existing condition, the original design have a planned addition on the back. We are trying to clean that up. On this elevation, the lower level is actually interior space. The upper level is exterior space.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – In the review guidelines for additions, attachments to existing buildings should not use the same wall plane. If you were to squeeze the width of the addition, would that help the roofline issue?

Mr. Bushman – I think that it would be exactly the same. We recently added a few feet to the addition to improve the proportions of the dining room. Our approach to the cornice line has been consistent. The profile of the cornice is different. The size, shape, and dimensions of it are different.

Mr. Schwarz – I don't think that we should be looking at the additions guidelines. I think we should be looking at new construction. It's a new house with an addition. It's not like we are adding onto anything historic. That's how I am reviewing this.

Mr. Mohr – I find it a stretch for it to be considered a contributing structure. I don't understand how it's a contributing structure. It just doesn't bear the scrutiny.

Jody Lahendro moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find the proposed additions satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC District, with the following modifications: • The applicant will submit window cut sheets to staff to confirm they adhere to our guidelines. • The applicant will submit drawings of the rear yard steps to staff to confirm they match what was discussed at the meeting. Carl Schwarz seconded. Approved (6-0).

9. Preliminary Discussion

612 West Main Street

There was no preliminary discussion on 612 West Main Street.

C. Other Business

10. Staff Questions/Discussion

20 University Avenue

Received a notice from this insurance company threatening to cancel the insurance on the historic porches. This was a temporary fix. Has to create some kind of railing for these two porches. Staff asked BAR what recommendation or suggestion on how to address this. Owner wants to do something as minimal as possible and permanent. A couple of suggestions were iron pickets and planters. Staff urged the owner to explore other options. The suggestion from the BAR is that it is black and medal.

Property behind the Jefferson Theater

A noodle shop is going into a property behind the Jefferson Theater. There are two cable supported awnings. Both of the awnings are in really bad shape. The question was whether an L shaped awning be wrapped around the property. The recommendation from the BAR was to see if the awnings could possibly be repaired.

Mr. Mohr brought up the lighting issue and the dark sky ordinances. Sean Tubbs starting to speak with a lot of people. There some people in county government seem to be receptive to this. The city does have a lot of crosswalk and lighting issues. Mark Skyler has been hired by the Downtown Business Association to look at decorative lighting strategies. They are trying to deal with a way to deal with lighting on the downtown mall.

There is the need for ability to see the city in 3 D with regards to zoning and the comprehensive plan. It's the only way that the residents are going to see the implications of the zoning codes.

The historic marker was removed from Court Square. Somebody installed a version of the marker. There was a lengthy discussion with the Historic Resources Committee regarding the new marker. The HRC wanted to have some kind of elevated plaque at that location where slave auctions had occurred on a temporary basis until something more permanent could be installed. Markers will be moving forward with markers being placed on light poles. Those will be coming in front of the BAR in the upcoming months.

BAR chair and co-chair

11. PLACE Report

Nobody from the BAR attended the most recent PLACE meeting.

D. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 7:45 PM.