

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
August 18, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Due to the current public health emergency, this meeting is being held online via Zoom. The meeting process will be as follows: For each item, staff will make a brief presentation followed by the applicant’s presentation, after which members of the public will be allowed to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to speak. Public 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. [Times noted below are rough estimates only.]

Members Present: Jody Lahendro, Carl Schwarz, Cheri Lewis, Breck Gastinger, Rob Bailey, Tim Mohr, Andy McClure, James Zehmer
Members Absent: Sonya Llengel
Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner, Joe Rice
Pre-Meeting:

Mr. Lahendro notified staff that he will need to leave the BAR meeting five minutes before 7:00 PM for another meeting.

There was also a discussion regarding the lighting of the new Belmont Bridge. There was a discussion with staff whether there would be an action with the Belmont Bridge.

Mr. Mohr also reported on the August PLACE meeting.

There was a discussion regarding codified lighting and making a recommendation to Council.

There was also a discussion regarding the items on the Consent Agenda

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Genevieve Keller – Support of Burley High School. It’s very timely that this be done now. It’s an excellent nomination. I would like to see the football stadium be included as a contributing feature. The football field has been altered with the addition of the track. Burley had a grass terraced stadium. It speaks to the spirit of the place. The football team at Burley High School was one of the best high school football teams in the state of Virginia.

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.)

**The item for 0 Water Street, the Coal Tower, was pulled from the Consent Agenda.
Mr. Gastinger made the motion to approve the Consent Agenda (Second by Mr. Lahendro).
Motion passed 8-0**

1. June 16, 2020 BAR Meeting Minutes
2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 20-08-01
401 Ridge Street
Tax Parcel 290273000
Owner/Applicant: Andrew Jenkins
New fence
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 20-07-07 422
1st Street North
Tax Parcel 330100000
Owner: NONCE, LLC
Applicant: Julie Kline Dixon, Rosney Co. Architects
Exterior alterations and addition

C. Deferred Items

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 17-11-02
167 Chancellor Street
Tax Parcel: 090126000
Owner: Alpha Omicron of Chi Psi Corp.
Applicant: Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, LLC
Exterior alterations and addition

Jeff Werner, Staff Report - Year Built: 1915 District: The Corner ADC Status: Contributing 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. The BAR previously reviewed and approved the project's general massing, concept and composition. For this submittal, the BAR review should focus on the materials and details, and their application and use on the previously approved form and massing. During prior meetings, the BAR discussed the extent to which the additions and alterations should be differentiated from what will be retained and how there were no obvious transition lines to work with. (For example, the existing cornice line and profile will be continued on addition.) The BAR suggested that the elements and character of the Chancellor Street elevation be retained, with the significant transformation focused on the Madison Lane elevation, which is reflected in the current submittal. The BAR also requested that existing windows be retained, to the extent possible. Eleven existing windows and the existing door and sidelights at the east entry will be retained. Staff reviewed with the applicant the matter of new roofing versus retain sections of the existing. The existing slate roof is over 100 years old and has been poorly maintained. Given the complexity of the new roof plan and the extent to which the existing, removal of the existing slate and replacement with the synthetic slate is a reasonable request. However, the

BAR may wish to discuss this further. The existing metal roof on the porch facing Chancellor Street is in very poor condition. It has deteriorated and in some places it has been patched. It is a reasonable request. The BAR should discuss the existing hip/ridge caps and ledge flashing and to what extent those elements might be retained/replicated, if at all. For new construction, the use of EIFS and fiberglass-reinforced plastic is discouraged. However, these materials have changed since adoption of the guidelines (2012). The BAR should discuss if these materials are acceptable.

Kevin Schafer, Applicant – The renovation of 167 Chancellor Street has had a lengthy process prior to this submission. I would like to point out, per the Charlottesville Special Use Permit process, a Certificate of Appropriateness has already been granted for this proposed project for general massing, concept, and composition. This COA was first granted in April of 2018 with a unanimous approval and was renewed in October. Additionally, we have a unanimous approval from the BAR in October that affirmed the project did not have any inverse or adverse impact on The Corner ADC District. It allowed us to move forward into our November 12th Planning Commission hearing for our Special Use Permit, which was approved unanimously 6-0. In December, the SUP was unanimously adopted by City Council with a 5-0 vote. A preliminary site plan was approved by the Planning Commission on the July hearing consent agenda. This will be our ninth public hearing or community engagement meeting over three various boards, councils, and commissions. The feedback has been overwhelmingly positive. The focus of this submission is for final detail and material approval. The proposal remains mostly unchanged from what was approved in April, 2018. We have eliminated four proposed dormers on the new addition, partly due to budget constraints and partly to the appearance of competing with the existing historic dormers, items identified by the City of Charlottesville as defining characteristics of the historic Chancellor Street façade. Window proportions have been improved in this revised submission. An excavated basement that occurred under the proposed side porch has been removed for this final proposal. One of the main comments from our Certificate of Appropriateness for massing and concept was for street trees to be incorporated into the landscape plan. In response, we have added a total of seven sweet gum trees and organized a lay on each street facade. Sweet gums are on the Charlottesville master tree list under the preferred species for large canopy trees. Any single red maple marks the corner also on the preferred species list for medium canopy trees. It was mandated by the Board that the new addition needed to distinguish itself from the historic Chancellor Street façade. It needed to be legible as a new construction addition. We took every instance to subtly call attention to the differences in construction. We're providing a cohesive palate of simple materials found readily in The Corner District. A red brick, modular in size with a paper cut finish is the dominant proposed material. The mortar is a beige that is well suited for this brick. The proposed modular brick would distinguish itself subtly from the existing brick, both in size and color. The original brick on the 1915 structure features oversized brick, as it was constructed before nominal brick sizes were introduced. The color of this proposed brick is slightly darker and features slightly more color variation as well. It complements the historic brick nicely. The eaves color is a few shades lighter than the mortar color but in the same family. All trim, columns, and railings will be painted a subtle white to match the exterior windows and doors. All existing historic trim, including eaves, windows, columns, and railings will be scraped and painted to match the proposed trim. The windows are a high quality Windsor brand aluminum clad window. The 6 over 6 grilled pattern is comprised of 7/8th inch OG grills and a spacer bar is included in between panes of glass to more accurately portray additional divided light window. A 3.5 inch exterior brick mold has been proposed on the windows to further emphasize the subtle

differences in construction. If you take a look at the side by side elevation, you can see the existing historic windows is nearly flush with the face of brick. The existing historic structure is comprised of a three width load bearing masonry wall. The windows are installed close to the exterior creating a deeper interior cell. The new brick will be a veneer on wood stud walls. It will have a much deeper shadow line recessed around the windows. We're introducing this brick molding to emphasize and acknowledge the difference in construction, while still keeping up the colonial revival style. One of the defining historic features of the ground floor windows on Chancellor Street is the curved arch header. We discussed the possibility of jack arches or other decorative header treatments for the new proposed first floor windows. We have presented a steel lintel that allows the historic arched windows on Chancellor Street to remain distinguished. A jack arch or other decorative brick header appeared to muddy the façade, introducing a third header condition on a relatively small scale building. This steel lintel allows for a simple, clean symmetrical façade on Madison Lane, taking cues from a Neo-Colonial revival approach. It could otherwise be crowded with 9 decorative header treatments above the windows. We have introduced pre-cast concrete sill elements in all of the new windows, which echo the scale and treatment of the wood sills found on the historic windows. It is still able to differentiate itself through a material change. Considerations have been given to the depth of the pre-cast cell. What is being proposed is slightly thinner than the typical pre-cast cells so not to overwhelm the historic wood sill. A lot of consideration was given to the roof. Several staff comments for discussion revolved around this area. We evaluated retaining parts of the existing roof. We evaluated salvaging the roof for reuse. Ultimately, we proposed an entire re-roofing with the Bellaforte composite slate for several reasons. The existing roof is in poor condition. The roof is over 100 years old. The hip and eave flashings are weathered and rusting. Maintenance is a challenge. Disturbing the shingles leads to breaking or detachment from the roof. Several areas have already gone through patching. Tying a new roof into the existing roof is challenging. There are only three relatively small sections of roof that could retained undisturbed. We had concerns about keeping a section of the roof intact during construction. We felt full roof replacement would provide a more appropriate, cohesive appearance. The composite slate is resistant to fading, rotting, cracking, pests, and is fire retardant. The 12 inch by half inch thick tile is lighter than the slate. It allows for more of the historic roof structure to remain without reinforcement, while providing a more water proof and more water resistant roof. Regarding the comment on the subject of re-introducing the metal ridge caps, I spoke to the manufacturer. They have told me that it is possible to use a bent metal flashing. The system is designed to work within those. It's an idea that we are happy to implement if the Board feels it's appropriate. All materials have been selected for durability, longevity, and low maintenance considerations in mind. While the historic house features painted wood facia, we are proposing five quarter smooth hardy trim boards that are rot resistant and will maintain an appropriate appearance for a longer time. We have selected aluminum clad windows instead of wood. All of this is echoed in our qualm and railing selections where high quality materials have been selected with an emphasis on low maintenance, longevity, and durability. The portico columns are the major focal feature of the Madison Lane façade. We deliberated and selected an endurastone column that is manufactured by Pacific Columns. Information on these columns can be found in your booklet. The endurastone column is a one piece fiberglass reinforced polymer column. RFP is pound for pound is impervious to rot decay, insect damage, and is fire retardant. It's a column infused with marble dust to improve the texture and feel of the column. Each column will be delivered in one piece. It will be field sanded prior to installation. It will be painted with a primer and painted to match the rest of the proposed trim. The product does have galleries online. We believe that it is a sharp looking product.

It's not an off the shelf product that you get at a local hardware store. It's an elevated selection we feel is worth the investment to get the look, feel, and durability that is required. Smaller versions of this same column have been selected for the side porch as well. The porch railing is a durable component system that features integrated bracket attachments to the proposed columns, aluminum inserts, and all top and bottom rails for stability. It is compliant with the IBC, which expands up to 10 feet in length. The exterior material is a weather resistant cellular PBC and a smooth finish. It has a 25 year warranty with virtually no maintenance required after installation. We have appreciated the BAR's direction throughout the process.. This guidance has pushed the project to retain the defining characteristics of the house facing Chancellor Street, while encouraging all expansion to occur along Madison Lane and towards the intersection of the two roads. This concept is echoed in our details, which focuses on separating and distinguishing the new construction techniques and assemblies from the historic house. The proposal has the challenges of addressing the context on two streets, while also being a recognizable new construction addition with subtle differences in the treatment of our details. We believe we have made the distinction legible but have continued to respect and respond to the adjacent contexts on both sides.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Lahendro – Looking through the drawings I am seeing that you're replacing the door on the Chancellor Street side and the side lights in the transom. Why?

Mr. Schafer – That door is in pretty rough shape. The glass has been replaced. The wood is pretty beat up. There was a desire to get a consistent look in the new doors both on the Madison Lane side and the Chancellor Street side. That was the approach being directed from the owners, who would like to see new doors there. They feel that front door doesn't really represent the new addition or the quality of it because it has been in better shape.

Ms. Lewis – You are retaining the side lights? If you could go through what is being designed there, it's in a shadow.

Mr. Schafer – The side lights would be replaced with new side lights. It's the same door that is happening on the Madison Lane side as well. The arch opening would be retained and the door itself is 8 feet tall.

Ms. Lewis – The transom is going away?

Mr. Schafer – That is correct. It would just be the 8 foot door.

Mr. Zehmer – On some of your sheets, the door is called out as existing, but it is not the existing door. That might be where we're getting some confusion. The renderings show it as a door with glass in it. The elevation drawings show that, but the notation says 'existing.' There is no notation on any of the plans or anything that says replaces door.

Mr. Schafer – There was an existing tag that was erroneously shown.

Mr. Lahendro – Page D-2, the demolition drawings shows that everything within the masonry opening being removed.

Mr. Schwarz – I wasn't sure if this was a typo. It sounds like it was an error in the drawings. You have a door schedule sheet A.5.0. In the big drawings, this is door type D-2 that you're going to put in there?

Mr. Schafer – I believe so.

Mr. Zehmer – On the existing door on the Chancellor Street side, the photographs show a pretty large kitchen exhaust vent. In the new design, it relocates the kitchen. Is it going to be a commercial kitchen or is the intent going to be a residential use and does not require a commercial exhaust vent? If it does, it would be something that would be visible at the roof.

Mr. Schafer – It is not a commercial kitchen. There is not a large cooking facility. There is a residential scale kitchen. The existing exhaust vent was there when the house was a commercial catering company.

Mr. Mohr – The older house has wood sub-sills on the windows. I am not catching them in the elevations. Is that just an oversight?

Mr. Schafer – The windows sills will be retained. They will be scraped and painted. They're pretty thin. They're maybe two inches. That might be why they are hard to discern from the drawings. They're definitely going to be retained. The existing windows are going to be retained along the Chancellor Street side. If the desire was to retain the historic front door that would be something we would comply with and understand why, this being the historic façade side of things. If that was something the BAR would like to see, we would be willing to retain that existing door.

Mr. Mohr – When I look at the street elevations, the projection for those wood sills is relatively substantial. They do definitely show up.

Mr. Schwarz – Of the new trim and columns, are the columns and railings going to be painted? Or is this a pre-finish that comes in?

Mr. Schafer – The columns will be painted. They come unfinished. The FRP with the marble dust will get field sanded before installation. They will get a primer and two coats of paint. The railing will get painted to match that trim as well. It is able to take paint. It's a material that is appropriate for painting.

Mr. Schwarz – I have seen the molding up on the roof of the addition. I have heard the contractor say that it doesn't have to be painted. All of the nail holes, sealant joints, and everything else are going to be covered up?

Do you have a color picked out for the pre-cast sills?

Mr. Schafer – Yes. That color will match the mortar.

Mr. Schwarz – Is that a beige color?

Mr. Schafer – Yes. It's going to be a sandy beige color.

Mr. Zehmer – I have a question about the massing. Can I ask a question about the depth of the portico as a detail?

Mr. Schwarz – Ask your question. I am trying to figure out what we can do about it.

Mr. Zehmer – Was consideration given to making that portico deeper? It seems rather shallow. Street setbacks might define the front edge of the portico. If that's the case, consideration can be given to have the front wall set back a little bit in that center section to stagger the side a little bit?

Mr. Schwarz – I think that gets in the territory of massing.

Mr. Schafer – We were pushing up the front setback challenges that we were up against. We did get an SUP for relief with the setback variances. In the booklet, we have a diagram that shows just how extreme some of those setbacks are. That was the consideration. We were asking a significant amount of reprieve. It's a significant front porch. It seems tough to continue to encroach on that front setback. We are at 8 feet on the front setback. It was approved in the SUP. It is supposed to be something like 25 feet.

Mr. Schwarz – With the trim profiles that you are showing on the new portion, which is more accurate? The section or the elevations and the 3 D renderings? I am assuming the section is more accurate than what you are intending to build.

Mr. Schafer – The section is more accurate. Which part?

Mr. Schwarz – It is mostly at the portico. Your trim profiles are different. It looks like you have simplified and deleted some pieces that were showing up in the renderings. If the section is what we're working from, I can bring it up again in the comments. I just want to confirm which one we are voting on tonight.

Mr. Gastinger – Are you referring to the trim of the porch pediment?

Mr. Schwarz – Yes.

Mr. Schafer – That section would be the guiding one. I don't think there is that much variation.

Mr. Schwarz – It is enough that it is important.

Mr. Gastinger – In some earlier renderings, there have been a water table or another delineation at the base of the building. It seems that there is no differentiation now. What was the thought there?

Mr. Schafer – The structural foundation wall aligns with our structural framework wall. The simple background building from the portico was the intention there.

Mr. Schwarz – The renderings show what are existing air handlers on the Chancellor Street side. Are they remaining there? Is that what I am seeing? Is that going to remain there?

Mr. Schafer – The existing air handlers are on the Madison Lane side. They are moving to the Chancellor Street side. That is their new location.

Mr. Schwarz – Is there any intent to camouflage or screen them?

Mr. Schafer – We can certainly screen them with some boxwoods or shrubs.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – Am I correct that staff asked you to consider having a hipped flashing and a metal band around the base of the roof?

Mr. Schafer – That's correct.

Mr. Mohr – In terms of differentiating this addition from the existing house, the existing house is rendered? It has very simple curved arches. The Madison Avenue side seems to be playing to this colonial language. It strikes me that part of that differentiation as reading more commercial than colonial to me. I have problem with the change with the backdoor. The front door is grand enough. It's not even picking up the window line. I would expect that the porch construction and trim would actually pick up the heads of those windows. That would be integrated. It seems a little stuck on the porch. There needs to be a greater intensity of detail development on that part of the building. It is more public. They are playing that sort of historic game to begin with. My inclination would be to up the ante. It's not a modern version of a Georgian or a Colonial building. The brick is a little mean in the way it is currently expressed.

Mr. Schwarz – If you are going to do something classical, you need to go all the way with it. If you simplify and try to modernize, it's going to look like a cartoon. It's going to look dated as soon as it is built. I think your renderings, as far as the trim is concerned, were doing a better job of showing a richness of detail than your sections show. I think the cove profile you picked is inappropriate to this design. I would ask that you reconsider. Look at what you have rendered in the 3 D views and take that back into the sections. You're calling out fore or fore trim everywhere. What is detailed in the sections, although labeled as that, looks thinner than that. What we are approving is what we see. Make sure that you are certain what is on those drawings. If you look at the pediment, you have an OG probe file on the elevation directly below the pediment. You have flipped that around on the detail section. Little details like that go a long way in making this look right versus looking a little awkward. The viewer is going to look at not understand why it doesn't look right. It just doesn't look right. It looks like you deleted out the trim in the freeze board on the elevation. What you show in your renderings is a much larger piece than the little rectangle you tacked on the details. You need to go back and look at the details on this. If you simplify everything so much, it is going to look like a cartoon in the end.

Mr. Lahendro – There is a misunderstanding with the language of this Georgian architecture when you look at the end columns. That line of the fascia should align with the emphasis of the columns. That is the shaft itself. The Tuscan Capital protrudes beyond the edge of the fascia.

Mr. Mohr – It should turn the corner just like it does in the section. This is feeling more Georgian and more traditional detailing. That pediment is definitely confused. It needs a more robust expression of what it wants to be. The portico is pretty bold. Everything else is too flat for distinguishing it from the old building.

Mr. Lahendro – I would recommend calling out Isaac Wares book. It would be very helpful with this design.

Mr. Zehmer – In terms of the window treatments, every other house along Madison Lane, aside from the Greek revival, does have a keystone that gives a higher level of detail at the windows. It's on the right track. Don't be scared to embellish a little bit.

Mr. Mohr – It seems that it needs to be a little more 'joyful.'

Mr. Gastinger – The upper floor windows do feel jammed up against the pediment. They don't allow the trim profile to go around the top of the window. Relative to the porch at the end of the building, the lattice work is right out at the corners of the piers. It seems like there needs to be more relief there. If they were pushed back a little bit to allow the pier to be present, it would also show that the columns don't really align well with the piers. It seems like they might need to be moved inboard ever so slightly to feel like they're related. The elevation at the end of the building shows that well. That translates all the way up to the second story balusters. From a landscape point of view, I think the trees and the tree selections are good. Thank you for making that consideration. On the Chancellor Street side, there are three sweet gum that are adjacent to the street. There is one in the yard. That one tree might be well to be a different species, since it's not in line with the others. It might be a chance to bring some additional identity and scale to that façade.

Mr. Zehmer – On the south side of the portico, it looks like that is overlooking a basement entrance. My guess is that we're going to need a railing along that south side of the portico. We would want to see what that would look like. If it wants to be just black and metal and go away or do we want to make it more formal where we have balance on the other end of the portico? The north end of the portico doesn't have more than a 30 inch drop. It wouldn't be required there. That's going to need to be resolved. I prefer the approach of restoring and retaining the Chancellor Street façade doorway.

Mr. Schafer – That's something that we can definitely work with. Does the Board have a preference on the railing? Is there a preference?

Mr. Schwarz – I think that you want it go away on the ground level.

Mr. Zehmer – I tend to agree.

Mr. Schwarz – I want to talk about the roof. I looked at the tiles that you proposed. All of the pictures that I looked at on the manufacturer's website the in-condition where you have a gable. It was a very odd condition where it looked like you either had to fold the shingles

down over the gable or they had to have a large metal piece right there to hide the in-condition. I would recommend you confirm what that in-condition needs to look like. If there are other synthetic slates out there that will end at a gable end, I would recommend finding one that does. I could wrong about the ones that you picked. That was all that I could find on the internet from that type. We should discuss how much of the existing metal trim on the roof should be retained throughout the rest of the project. It's a fairly deep piece of metal at eaves of the existing roof.

Mr. Mohr – It seems like a significant part of the character of the original house. Having gutters extend past it does seem a little strange. At the very minimum, it should have the coat flashing. The medal pads are a little weird when you have half round gutters at the end of them.

Mr. Schwarz – I tend to agree with you, Mr. Mohr. They keep the ridge hip flashing, but don't keep the pans down by the gutters.

Mr. Zehmer – I agree with that.

Mr. Schafer – Would you anticipate that being the medal as well?

Mr. Mohr – Yes. The only gable in the whole thing is the front porch. It would be pretty important to have a good end detail for that.

Mr. Schwarz – Are we all content with the windows? It sounds like the only concern is that door that was chosen for the pediment side, the Madison Lane side. Mr. Mohr, did you say that needed to be grander?

Mr. Mohr – It seems to me that it's weak. It ought to be a much bolder and grander door. It looks like a back door. The fact that is shorter than the window heads is even worse. The thing with the porch is you have quite a bit of head above the window. You're only reading that when you're in the porch and coming underneath all of those windows. You can get a lot of expression with that door. That door doesn't have enough presence. The porch just sets up this bold language. I think it needs to work its way through the rest of that façade.

Mr. Schafer – With it being that high, is that something you go to with a transom above that door. Is that more appropriate to echo the language happening on Chancellor? We have some concerns about getting a door that high.

Mr. Mohr – It looks like you have a pretty high door on the second floor. How tall is that door?

Mr. Schafer – I think they are all eight feet.

Mr. Mohr – The main door looks like it is seven feet.

Mr. Schafer – The ceiling height is higher there.

Mr. Mohr – A transom would certainly be one way to do it. The building is so 'regular.' I would rather see the door the same height as the windows. It should be a bolder door that says 'front door.' Right now it looks like a back door, especially given the scale the rest of

the windows on the floor. It would be a more expensive door. You're setting up that game to begin with. I think you should follow through with it on the door.

Mr. Bailey – Are you saying that transom would work there? That would also mirror the transom now that is being retained at the original door in the back?

Mr. Mohr – I think the door will read as too short relative to the windows. I think the door wants to be taller than the windows.

Mr. Bailey – The transom doesn't get that proportion for you?

Mr. Mohr – I don't think so. The door is too short. It looks like it should have a grand door. The door up top looks grander than the door below.

Mr. Schwarz – One of the things that might help us study this better would be if you gave us an elevation with the columns and a section through the porch.

Mr. Mohr – That would address Mr. Gastinger's comment about the windows appearing to have a lid on them in the elevation. They actually have the same band height above them as the rest of the windows on the second floor.

Mr. Schafer – Could we talk about that a little more in depth? The existing historic windows' header is right at the bottom of that trim piece. We were aligning the header of our window with that. It seemed appropriate from my perspective. Are you saying that they should drop?

Mr. Gastinger – They have very minimal trim. The trim wraps all of the way around. It appears from your sections that this side trim piece doesn't go around the window. It doesn't wrap all the way around with the head. I was thinking about all of the windows on the second floor. It seemed squeezed up against the pediment.

Mr. Mohr – I really don't have a problem with having the wide header that captures the legs. That never bothered me.

Mr. Schwarz – I think what Mr. Gastinger is saying that the windows have the wide casing. If you look at the section, it doesn't show up on the second floor window.

Mr. Schafer – The intention there was to be three and a half inch brick mold that does not go above the trim line. The windows can shift down to give it a little breathing room. We're trying to align door heights and header heights. We just have to be careful with how we align that door trim as well.

Mr. Schwarz – You have that brick mold casing that goes around the door. I am looking at the elevation. It does seem odd that it is not wrapping atop of the windows.

Mr. Zehmer – I get what you are saying about the historic windows. They go right up to that freeze or band board line. Those being single light windows, they are clearly different. They stand alone as part of that early building. I don't think anybody is going to be confused with these two windows.

Mr. Schafer – That’s a change that we can definitely make.

Mr. Zehmer – It does look like that you do show a railing on the first floor of the portico. It’s more similar to the balcony railings. It could maybe be more subtle.

Mr. Schafer – Revising it to make it disappear is appropriate.

Mr. Mohr – Is the only exterior lighting the lanterns? There are no recessed lights in the porch ceilings?

Mr. Schafer – We are keeping it pretty simple with those exterior lanterns.

Mr. Mohr – How about the walkways?

Mr. Schafer – None proposed.

Mr. Schwarz – Any questions for us, Mr. Schafer?

Mr. Schafer – We have some great feedback and good direction. The comments make sense. We’re happy to re-visit the Chancellor Street door, the roof flashings, bring in some decorative brick elements, and tidy up the details.

Mr. Schwarz – As you’re putting these things on, use your judgement.

Motion: Mr. Gastinger – approve the applicant’s request for a deferral.
Jody Lahendro seconds. Motion passes (8-0).

D. New Items

5. Submission for BAR Record

BAR 18-07-04
0 East Water Street
Tax Parcel 570157800
Owner: Choco-Cruz, LLC
Applicant: Ashley Davies
Interpretive signage and lighting for coal tower

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – This is not an approval. There are two components: The lighting and the lighting fixtures. The other piece is on the marker. What is the manner of the plaque? Where will it be located on the site? Those would be appropriate things for you to take action on. My recommendation would be to accept the lighting per my motion. You would just eliminate a narrative marker. We could talk with the applicant about getting that information at another meeting.

Ashley Davies, Applicant – I just got the mockups this afternoon. I had them do a more traditional bronze plaque and something a little more modern and more industrial looking. I plan to bring those back to you next month so that you can take a look and see what we prefer.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

No Comments

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 proposed light fixtures satisfy the conditions of the CoA approved on September 18, 2018. Tim Mohr seconds. Motion passes (8-0).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-08-02

854 Locust Avenue

Tax Parcel 510092000

Owners: Kaitlyn and Alan Taylor

Applicant: Ashley Davies

Garage demolition

Jeff Werner, Staff Report - House: Year Built: 1903 District: Martha Jefferson HC
District Status: Contributing Guest House: Year Built: c. 1920 Status: Contributing Garage:
Year Built: 1954 Status: Contributing The property contains an imposing two-story painted-brick dwelling, constructed in 1903 for John S. White, a real estate lawyer. A one-story auxiliary building is situated immediately to the rear (east) of the house. The building mass is comprised of a frame guesthouse, built around 1920 according to DHR records, and an abutting concrete-block garage. The guesthouse portion of the auxiliary building may have originally been constructed as sleeping quarters for servants; the 1910 Census entry lists two Black servants in the household: Susie Miller and Clara Wood. Request CoA for demolition of the detached guesthouse and garage located behind the house. The age of the structure or building; • Staff: The 1920 Sanborn Map (below) indicates here a two-story, wood framed structure identified as a dwelling. (In 1920, the address was 876 Locust Ave.) The applicant's research 854 Locust Ave (Aug 4, 2020) 3 indicates construction of a single-story structure in 1954. It is staff's opinion that the 1954 structure the garage addition on the east side of the earlier structure. The adjoining shed-roof structure may date to the garage addition or later. 1910 U.S. Census: John S. White is the head-of-household and listed with his wife, Hettie, their son, John, a brother-in-law, Rives Wolfe, and two servants, Susie Miller and Clara Woodson.* 1920 U.S. Census: John S. White is the head-of-household and listed with his [second] wife, Alice, and a servant, Mardine[?] Young.* 1930 U.S. Census: John S. White is the head-of-household and listed with his wife, Alice, and a servant, Rosa Fountain.* *It is impossible to determine who resided in the small dwelling, but it is reasonable to assume that it was occupied. Whether it has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places, or the Virginia Landmarks Register; • Staff: Applicant is correct in that the property and structures are not individually listed; however, they are listed as contributing structures within the Martha Jefferson Historic District (VDHR #104-5144), which is listed on Virginia Landmarks Register (2007) and the National Register of Historic Places (2008.) 1.c. 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: Not applicable. 1.d. 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: Not applicable. 1.e. The degree to which distinguishing characteristics, qualities, features or materials remain; • Staff: Without a physical examination, it is difficult to determine what remains of the early guesthouse or of

the 1954 garage addition. 2. 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: Staff agrees that visibility from Locust Avenue is obscured, at best; within a HC District not being visible from a public right of way typically excludes a project from BAR review. However, this guesthouse and garage were identified as contributing structures for the HC designation. As such, the BAR must review requests for demolition. Per the MJHCD map, when the local district was established, 44 outbuildings and additions were designated as contributing structures. Of these, 21 were garages, at least four have been razed. Seven with no description, at least one has been razed. Six secondary structures. Three sheds, at least one has been razed. Two guesthouses. One each of the following: addition, kitchen, porch, smokehouse, and stable. Of these, we have photos of 31 structures. 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. At 854 Locust Avenue: The guesthouse is a small, salt-box style cottage set on a masonry foundation and clad with wood siding. At the south elevation is a low porch with the entry. The garage (attached to the east side of the guesthouse) appears to be constructed of cinder block with wood siding on the south elevation. Both structures are simple and unadorned. For both, photos from 2011 indicate the shingle roofing was replaced with standing-seam metal and a garage door added to the north wall of the garage. At the guesthouse, the locations of the first floor windows and the entry door have been altered. (The 2011 BAR submittal indicates extensive alterations to the interior of the guesthouse.) 854 Locust Ave (Aug 4, 2020) 5 3. 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; however the photographs show only the south elevation. The applicant acknowledges that the condition and/or structural integrity is not in question. 4. 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 guesthouse and garage will be entirely removed. 5. Any applicable provisions of the city's conservation district design guidelines. (From the HC guidelines for demolitions: 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 guesthouse and garage are locally-designated as contributing structures to the MJHCD and also in the VLR and NRHP listing. (They are connected and appear on the maps as a single structure.) If approved, consider a condition that prior to demolition the applicant will submit documentation of the structures, including photographs and measured drawings.

Mr. Schwarz – When this district was formed, residents made a point of picking these outbuildings. Is that documented anywhere?

Mr. Werner – That has been anecdotal. What I heard from a former of the BAR and those that have asked for demolitions in the last two years, is that they know what the community wants. I do know there was discussion on what recommended as contributing. Those same structures listed on the registry be listed as contributing for the historic conservation districts. That's what elevates it. It is listed as contributing.

Mr. Bailey – Do we have anyone from the public who will be speaking on this?

Mr. Mohr – Are there any of those older houses from the early 1900s that are IPP protected on Locust Avenue? Or are they all part of the Conservation District?

Mr. Werner – I don't believe there are any. There are the questions listed in the staff report. As I learned more about this building, I looked at the transformation. It is not the same building that was constructed in the early 1900s.

Ms. Lewis – I am looking at the photographs from the 2011 application. The siding and the profile of the building. I think that this was altered in the last decade. I am shocked at what I am looking at. This was greatly altered by the previous owners. It looks that the application didn't really address much, except for adding a dormer.

Mr. Werner – I agree. There is a story to this cottage that's really interesting. I don't know if that's still represented in what exists. What has been the mitigating factor in this is to take a good hard look at those changes. If this was within a historic conservation district, what is being retained? What would be that argument for it? The story is interesting. I am not sure the building retains to the character that goes with that story.

Ms. Lewis – It is like we are committing demolition on mischief. The mischief is what the owners did almost a decade ago. The small window in the photograph of existing conditions tells me that it was living quarters. It is the size of a small window you would insert. Inserted windows were in spaces where people lived. I would like to know from the current owners and the current applicant's rep to what extent any of this exists. Does the owner have any idea what is behind the walls? I agree with staff that it has been altered beyond anything that would look like it contributes to anything or would tell a story.

Ashley Davies, Applicant – The stated purpose of this district is to identify and preserve buildings with special historical and architectural significance with the collective character and quality which serves as important visible reminders of the heritage of the city. In our review of the criteria necessary for the BAR to consider this request, we believe the accessory structure, as it exists today, does not contribute to the collective character of the district, nor is it an important visible reminder of the heritage of Charlottesville. The primary structure is a highly visible part of the character of the neighborhood, representing a specific time frame and type of architecture. The historic survey documentation for the property describes the Victorian architecture of the 1903 home in great detail. The Taylor family, as the newest owners of the property, are active stewards of the historic resource and important feature of the Martha Jefferson neighborhood. Over the years, there have been a variety of accessory structures in the rear yard of the property that have been constructed, expanded, adapted, and demolished to suit the needs of the homeowners over time. This adaptation is inherent to secondary structures and allows for some flexibility, while protecting the form and character of the main house and primary historic resource. The accessory structure under consideration is located directly behind the main house and currently serves as a guest house and storage space. The structure is over 170 feet from the public road and sidewalk in the private backyard area of the property. Any visibility of the structure is limited by distance, mature landscape, and the home itself. The structure is one of three accessory structures that have been documented with the property. All were marked as contributing to the district. Two were demolished following approval by the BAR in 2011. The 2011 BAR approval also included extensive changes to the guest house. The City

of Charlottesville assessor listed the guess house as being constructed in 1954. While Sanborn maps show the structure has been in this location prior to that time. The size and shape of the structure has been altered on numerous occasions. The structure has been enlarged over time to double its original size. Some additions have been demolished. The interior was completely demolished for modernization in 2012. That modernization also included removal of the chimney, new windows, new siding, a different type of roof, a new roof dormer, and porch columns. No traces of any historic element of the structure remain, other than the general location on the property, which is private.

With regards to your question Ms. Lewis, I haven't seen anything beyond the BAR application. I don't know about the availability of those. From what I could see, everything was gutted and redone at that point.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Bailey – From the old photographs, there are some charming cinder block that has been painted there. Is that what I am seeing there? The footprint of that cinder block building has been retained as part of the structure.

Mr. Werner – The house was built in 1903. In the 1950s, there was this cinder block structure added to the east side of it. That structure got an opening punched in it. It became a garage. That seems to be the life of that. There were four structures there. All we have left is this cottage and this 1954 garage.

Mr. Mohr – It is slammed back up to the old house. There are architectural reasons for wanting to move or demolish it. It seems pretty obvious. They have a huge yard. The reasoning behind it makes sense to me. That cinder block is where the gate is now right next to that little window.

Mr. Gastinger – This is one of those projects where they didn't need BAR approval to add onto it. It's only coming to us for the demolition. Looking at the demolition plan of 2011, there is not much remaining. I appreciate the story. I don't know what we are preserving.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – I think that it had an intriguing history. It has been pretty much wiped out. We are in a historic district. It's not visible from the street. It doesn't threaten the timeline. It does certainly compromise their access to the backyard as it currently exists. Architecturally, I don't see any strong reason to keep it. Historically, I don't think there is much left. The damage was done. They aren't the ones, who did the damage. When the damage was done, it was well before it would have even come under our purview. I think it's too bad to lose the story of it.

Ms. Lewis – I did note that the application for demolition supported demolition of the cinder block addition in front of the structure. It said that it would restore the façade, which includes the tiny window partially visible from the street. It is partially visible from the street. This was part of the application for individual designation with the state and national registers. The structure has some history. If there was no support for that at the time of the application, it would have not been included. My concern is developing a policy where we are promoting owners to alter things and giving an excuse to demolish them because there is nothing left of their architectural features. I do support the application.

Mr. Mohr – The more common thread is demolition by neglect. That’s the one we run into the most.

Mr. Werner – It’s a footprint with some old studs.

Mr. Schwarz – If the city is serious about wanting to keep these out buildings, a historic conservation district is not the means to do it successfully. When I review things in a HDC, it’s all about the streets. The impact on the district as a whole versus each individual property. Since this is so hard to see from the street that one reason makes it easy for me to say that it meets the criteria for demolition. You can add onto it. There is not much left of it. If they want to add an addition to the back of the house, they could. Whatever is in that addition, they could tear it down. We have no control over it. I don’t know what the mechanism would be. If the Martha Jefferson District really wants to save these outbuildings, we need to figure out a different plan.

Mr. Mohr – With some of these grander houses, we’re surprised about the windows. That really surprised me that it was an IPP house to begin with. That’s the more interesting thing about Locust Avenue. There are a lot of houses there that I would have said qualify as IPP properties and they’re not.

Motion: Ms. Lewis - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions in Historic Conservation Districts, I move to find that the proposed demolition 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 with the following condition:

- **Prior to demolition the applicant will submit documentation of the structures, including photographs and measured drawings**

Motion passed 6-1

Meeting was recessed for five minutes.

Mr. Lahendro left the meeting prior to the discussion and deliberation of the COA application of 854 Locust Avenue.

E. Preliminary Discussion

7. 128 Chancellor Street

Tax Parcel 090105000

Exterior alterations and addition

- There was introduction by staff on what a preliminary discussion looks like for the new members of the BAR.
- The idea is to work the project towards COA approval from the BAR.

- In the past, the BAR has expressed support for things in the past.
- This is a new change in the process of COA approval for the BAR and formal action.
- The BAR can take a straw poll regarding certain elements during this preliminary discussion.
- There is a good checklist for the applicant to work from regarding COA application.
- In the 1920s, there was an addition that doubled the square footage of the historic building.
- There has been work for this project the past number of years on this project.
- The design maintains the residential feel versus an institutional feel.
- The addition is located to the rear of the site.
- This addition will not be visible from Chancellor Street.
- It will front on the parking area on Elliewood Avenue.
- The current building does have several features that are going to be retained and preserved.
- The larger addition to the back will include two larger rooms – a meeting room and a library.
- The south side of the new building will bump out and will include some meeting rooms.
- Materials are going to be the same from the front to the back.
- There is going to be a clear differentiation between the old and new building – will continue to maintain the character.
- The building sits at the level of the parking area. A retaining wall will be built to address drainage of the building.
- Immediate neighbors were notified about this project.
- The site plan is currently under review with the city.
- There were comments made by the members of the BAR. The comments were positive and the applicants received good feedback from the BAR.
- There was an open discussion between the BAR and the applicants about possible issues going forward with the project
- There was a straw poll with members of the BAR. There is good support from the BAR regarding this project.

8. 418 East Jefferson

Five additional windows

- Staff checked with BAR about adding to the September BAR Consent Agenda.
- The Renaissance School wanted 5 operable windows where the existing windows are not operable.
- There were no issues with the 5 additional windows being on the BAR September Consent Agenda.

F. Other Business

9. Belmont Bridge Update

- Ms. Janiczek provided an update to the BAR on the Belmont Bridge. The summary of the presentation and update are summarized below.

1. Retaining Wall Striations

Attached plan sheets 13(2A) to 13(2C) display the proposed panel layout of the three retaining walls, how the striations will be cut at the two pedestrian underpasses as well as the SW staircase and how the striations will be wrapped at the corners. Plan sheets 13(2D) to 13(2I) provide details on the 35 panel variations, their dimensions, and striation relief. Sheet 13(2J) provides further details on the corner detail and its mitered corner. These plan sheets reflect the direction provided by BAR and will be used to evaluate the Virginia Department of Transportation's Approved Wall System, Category A to be selected and submitted by the contractor.

2) Special Provision for the Retaining Walls

Attached is the Special Provision for the Retaining Walls that the BAR requested to provide advisory review. This Special Provision supplements the plan sheets and provides additional requirements that must be met for the City to accept the Retaining Wall – submittals, material/construction requirements, mockups, et cetera.

3) Overhang at the Knuckle

The BAR has requested the overhang at the knuckle be reviewed to 1) reduce the perceived heaviness of the beam and 2) visually separate the beam from the parapet. The following measures have been taken to achieve the aesthetic effect requested while maintaining the overhang's structural design:

- Added a mask wall at the west end of the pier/overhang to hide the ends of the beam (Sheet 9 – face of mask wall, Sheet 10 – Section C)
- Extended the deck 3" beyond the backwall on the pier/overhang to create a shadow line at the joint between the parapet, deck, and backwall (Sheet 15 – Transverse Section Span a)
- Added a taper to the south face of the columns at the pier (Sheets 9 and 10 – shows 3" tapers of each pier)

These details have been added to the attached Enhanced Pedestrian Access Structure plan sheets as noted above.

4) Lighting Plan

Kimley Horn has confirmed that the pole lights, KIM Lighting Ouro LED, have a minimum 80 color rendering index. This detail can be confirmed on Roadway Plan Sheet 8(2A).

Updates to the Plans

As the plan set has been refined, certain adjustments have been made in response to changed, existing conditions or due to other technical issues (such as items no longer being manufactured). These changes are outlined below and illustrated in the attached plan sheets.

1) Lighting Along Water Street

The City has recently replaced existing lighting along the south side of Water Street, east of the bridge with the current residential lighting fixture contained within the City's Standards and Design Manual. This lighting will be extended further west on both sides of Water Street under the bridge for a total of nine fixtures. The fixture specification is located on plan sheet 8(2A) and their locations can best be seen on sheet 8(4-2).

2) Lighting at Downtown Transit Station

The Transit Station has its own lighting fixture on the northern side of Water Street, west of the bridge. One of the existing fixtures needs to be relocated and it was proposed to add one other, new light fixture further east to meet photometric measures on illumination. We have coordinated with the Facilities Department to ensure the current, replacement fixture is specified on sheet 8(2B).

3) Lighting with existing Pedestrian Underpass

The existing Pedestrian Underpass will be extended to the east which will require the addition of 2 new light fixtures. When contacting the manufacturer, we were notified the existing fixture is no longer in production. Kimley Horn was able to identify a similar fixture, a we-ef QLS420, which is shown on sheet 8(2F). The project will add two of these fixtures and replace the existing twelve fixtures to ensure a cohesive appearance within the tunnel.

4) Mezzanine Lighting

Previously, the light fixture being used within the staircases, the SPI Eco Effect EEG11953 found on sheet 8(2D), was proposed for the mezzanine. To improve illumination and reduce the number of light fixtures by 15, a new light fixture, the Tryg Exterior Wall Elegant, also shown on sheet 8(2F) is proposed at the locations on sheet 8(4-2).

5) Bridge Pier Lighting

The locations of the previously approved light fixture to highlight the bridge piers have been finalized and are shown on sheet 8(4B).

6) Landscaping

The Tree Commission reviewed the landscaping plans one additional time and requested as many large, shade trees as possible – particularly along South Street. The project team was able to add a few additional shade trees by adjusting the location and size of some trees which also required the adjustment (reduction) of shrubs and groundcover proposed. The species of landscaping proposed within the project remains the same as previously reviewed plans. Landscaping plans can be found on sheets 12(3) to 12(5).

7) Bollards

Previously, bollards were proposed in a semi-circular arrangement. After speaking with the bollard manufacturers, it was determined the bollards need to be installed in a straight line to properly protect against collisions coming from the side/off-center. Bollards can be seen on sheets 3, 4 and 5.

- Following the presentation by Ms. Janczek, there was a discussion with questions and answers between Ms. Janczek and the BAR regarding the Belmont Bridge update.
- Staff recommended that the BAR go through the four conditions from the COA approval of August, 2019. The BAR and Ms. Janiczek went over those four conditions.
- The BAR discussed the different elements of the Belmont Bridge. They did go over the different sheets of the Belmont Bridge plans.

- The final bridge plans have been approved by VDOT. Waiting for FHWA to confirm and agree with VDOT.

2. **Staff Questions/Discussion**

Charlottesville Coal Tower

- Staff went over with the BAR the display on the Coal Tower.
- BAR agreed to put on the Consent Agenda for the September BAR Meeting.

Letter for Burley School NRHP Nomination

- Staff went over the letter with the BAR.
- The State Review Board is meeting on the 17th of September.
- Burley School is going to be added to the Virginia landmark registry and the National landmark registry.
- The designation means a tremendous amount to the Burley School alumni.
- The BAR did concur that there should be a specific reference to the terraces and the landscape.

Daughters of Zion Cemetery

- Identification of 641 graves through the use of Ground Penetrating Radar.
- The thought was that there was only 300 graves.

Review of multi-step approval process

- There used to be incremental approvals.
- A year ago, the City Attorney said that there should be only one COA for each project.
- Staff have been drafting a different approach to COA approvals.
- This is going to be presented to the developers and applicants. There needs to be trust between the BAR and developers.
- The BAR and staff discussed what the new COA approval process will look like going forward into the future.
- The BAR is going to review the proposed process for approving COAs and the new procedures. The BAR is going to meet at prior to the monthly BAR meeting next month to go over the COA approval process and procedure.

G. **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM

