

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
November 17, 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: Cheri Lewis, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, James Zehmer, Ron Bailey, Tim Mohr, Sonja Lengel, Jody Lahendro
Members Absent: Andy McClure
Staff Present: Jeff Werner, Brian Wheeler, Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins
Pre-Meeting:

There was no Pre-Meeting due to a miscommunication with the Communication Staff.

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 PM by staff.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda
No Public Comment

- 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. August 18, 2020 BAR Meeting Minutes

Mr. Gastinger moved to approve the Consent Agenda. (Second by Mr. Zehmer) Motion passed 8-0.

C. Deferred Items

2. **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

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – 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. February 2020 – BAR accepted the applicant’s request for a deferral. Request CoA to allow removal of the porch, stairs and entry at the north elevation, replacement of the entry door with a new, vinyl-clad window, and, where indicated, replacement of the aluminum siding with painted, wood lap siding. In 2009, the BAR unanimously approved a CoA for alterations to the building’s exterior, including removing the north porch and replacing its door with a window; however, in the subsequent work, the north porch was not removed. The design guidelines recommend the repair of deteriorated wood siding and to replace only when it is beyond repair. Applicant proposes to use salvageable material, to the extent possible. Regarding the demolition of the north porch, stairs and entry see below staff’s review of the City’s standards for considering demolitions. Should demolition be approved, staff finds that the submitted drawings and photographs provide adequate documentation for the BAR record. Note: Clarifications per discussion with the applicant.

- The existing downspout at the porch roof will be extended down to grade.
- See the note on sheet 3 of the drawings. At the east side, where the porch roof extends beyond the corner, the aluminum siding will be repaired similar to the condition on the west side.

Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects – Our request differs from when we were in front of the BAR last February in that we are not looking to remove the siding on the rest of the house. We have decided to focus the request only on the demolition of the existing side porch. As staff noted, it was approved in 2010. At the time, the cost of it was too great to do the rest of the work that was being done on the house. At that time, one of the neighbors, who wrote in support of this application noted that porch had fallen into disrepair and was not used. This has been something that’s been new to Mr. Tennant’s ownership of the house. The overall idea here is removal of that side porch. We will talk about some of the reasons behind it. With it being removed, there is a stair landing just below this window. The smaller window beneath that landing has a powder room back there. The idea would be put that in a vinyl clad window. With the house’s existing as it exists, it has aluminum siding on it. When we start to remove the porch, we’re going to be exposing some material underneath there. The question of how we patch and repair that came up. Our proposal would be the entire area that is dashed red, which is between the large protruding bay and the area on the left, would be re-sided with wood. When we take the aluminum siding off, we don’t know what the condition of the wood underneath it will be. We will salvage as much of that as we can. What we can’t, we will replace with wood of the same dimensions so that we can come back with lap siding. The same would be the case on this other side elevation. We would propose not just a small patch, but the entire area on that side of the house to go back as wood. There is a small area where the roof intrudes on the bow front slightly. We would hope to be able to salvage enough of the aluminum siding to be able to patch that area seamlessly. That is the request. There are a couple of reasons that we have come to you again. Since that time, we have had a structural engineer review the condition of the structure. The report was attached to some supplemental information we provided you with. His determination is that the porch is structurally unsound, not usable as it is, and it would require complete reconstruction. The other reason that we’re here to talk with you is the belief that this porch wasn’t necessarily original to the house. We do understand that the Sanborn maps from 1929 shows a porch in this location or an appendage in

this location. It's not definitive on whether or not that it existed when the house was constructed in 1904. The railings on the front of the house have classical detailing. The railing and the ballestrod on the side porch, which is more Victorian, is seemingly a different era. This is a very odd intersection with bow front of the north side of the house intersecting the cornice of the roof, quite inelegantly. It just seems to have been an afterthought. The interior railing of the house relates closely to the front of the house. The structural engineer's report recommends any work needs to be complete replacement.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – Was there any indication that there was a door under this current landing and stairway that would have accessed the basement?

Mr. Dreyfus – No. In this elevation drawing, we do show an existing window that is there. It certainly appears to always have been a window, not a doorway. There is a doorway right around the corner on the side of the building.

Mr. Bailey – That porch cannot be seen from Park Street. Is that correct?

Mr. Dreyfus – That is correct. It sits within the crook of the building here. There is a very large shrub right here blocking that view.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – When we first reviewed this, I had some questions about the necessity of removing this piece and what role it might have played in the history of this structure. Given the added information, I feel that it gives us a bit more cause to approve it. The care with which they are approaching this project will lend itself to longer term sustainability for the building as a whole.

Mr. Lahendro – There was some question about the historic connection of the porch to the house. There were some members who thought that it was historic. It has been there since 1929, which makes it historic. Was anything done to help protect it/put a tarp over it so it wouldn't continue to deteriorate over the past year?

Mr. Dreyfus – Nothing was done. As one of the neighbors pointed out, she called it derelict condition before the tenants bought it. Nothing had been done in that regard to protect it.

Mr. Lahendro – I disagree completely with where this is going. This is an important porch. It's historic. The gentleman, who built this house, lived here until the 1950s. There was no major change to the building in the 1920s. We know, by the Sanborn Maps, that it's been here since the 20s. It faced the side road. It was an important part elevation of the house as bowed window of the dining room on that elevation indicates for that side. Not doing anything to protect it in the meantime is called demolition by neglect. This should not be torn off. It is

convenience and it is important to the original layout of the house and to the entrance to the house. It violates our demolition guidelines and it should not be taken off.

Mr. Mohr, did you visit the site?

Mr. Mohr – Yes, I did visit the site.

Mr. Lahendro – Is this porch not salvageable?

Mr. Mohr – I think that it is salvageable. I think that this is the conundrum of older houses in general. It starts out as a colonial and ends up as a Queen Ann. I know that wasn't the case with this particular house.

Mr. Lahendro – I am not trying put you on the spot, Mr. Mohr. I am questioning the engineer's assessment. I have salvaged far worse things than this before.

Mr. Mohr – It is not unsalvageable.

Mr. Lahendro – I completely disagree with the engineer's report. I was wondering, as a professional builder and architect, what you thought about salvageability.

Mr. Mohr – I think that it is salvageable.

Ms. Lewis – I don't support demolition because of the poor shape the structure may be in. I support because I don't feel that this porch is a significant, important part of the district. Nor do I think that the features are special or notable compared to all of the other significant and notable features on this property. This house is important. There is a lot of things that are unique about it. It is the only colonial revival that is made of wood. I do not believe this porch is original. We do know that in 1929, there was some sort of structure there. From the Sanborn Map, there are no stairs shown. What kind of structure was there? We know it was either a slate or tin roof, according to the Sanborn Map. We know that it was one story. This landing is actually one and a half stories off of the ground. I would support demolition of this because I don't think that this landing and stairs show any significant features that relate either to the property it is attached to nor to the district. I do think that cornice jutting into the bow siding tells me that it was a later addition. I just can't believe that any architect or builder would have built this very attractive property and structure would do that. I don't think it is original. I do think that it is old. I don't think it is notable. I would support demolition of it under our guidelines.

Mr. Mohr – It is vestal. It is on a secondary street. It doesn't enhance the building in anyway. Duly recording it certainly and making it clear that it was there. I think it is important to the timeline and the house to acknowledge that it was there. I don't feel that it is intrinsic to the historic integrity of the house, but having it recorded is. Once we work around handicap access with biometrics in 20 years, are handicap access points going to become historic? I don't think so. There is an overlay of just pure functionality to this. I think that it is interesting, but I don't think it is critical. We want to encourage people to take good care of their houses. We are going to make them "jump through hoops" to something that seems arbitrary. I understand where Mr. Lahendro is coming from. This is a judgement call. I don't think this is a "sword worth falling on."

Motion – Ms. Lewis - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed exterior alterations and demolition 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 clarification that the siding where the porch cornice meets the exterior wall be restored, as noted in the most recent materials submitted by the applicant to the BAR before the November 2020 meeting. Ron Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (6-2, Jody Lahendro and James Zehmer opposed).

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-11-01

731 Locust Avenue

Tax Parcel 510026000

Roberta Bell Williamson and Elizabeth Mary Meyer, Owner

Michael Pleasants, Applicant

Roof Replacement

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – Year Built: 1917 District: Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District Status: Contributing. Two-story, two-bay, hipped-roof, stucco-finished dwelling has central cross gables with boxed cornices and returns. A hipped-roof porch encompasses the entire facade and wraps around the north elevation. The porch is supported by simple Tuscan columns and balustrade. The main entrance is the north bay of the front facade. A two-story addition and attached screened-in porch are located at the rear. CoA request to replace existing standing-seam copper roofing on the house as follows:

- Main portion: Replace with standing-seam, painted metal. Color: TBD—likely forest green, dark grey, black, or similar natural/ earth tones.
- Back portion: Replace with asphalt shingles. Color: Similar/complimentary to metal roof.
- Eave mounted gutters and downspouts replaced as needed. Color: Gutters to match roof or fascia; downspouts to be white.

Within Historic Conservation Districts (HCD), a CoA is not required for alterations that are not visible from abutting streets. With that applicable here, staff recommends approval of asphalt shingles on the *back roof* of the house, as noted in the graphic above, which includes the rear portion of the *main roof*. Relative to the request that the BAR consider allowing asphalt shingles on the entire roof, staff notes that when the district was established, the Martha Jefferson neighborhood identified standing-seam metal roofs as one of the architectural character-defining features to be preserved.

Note: The guidelines for projects within a HCD are, by design, less rigid than an ADC District or an IPP. The HCD overlay is intended to preserve the character-defining elements of the neighborhoods and to assure that new construction is not inappropriate to that character, while minimally imposing on current residents who may want to upgrade their homes. Within the existing HCDs are buildings and/or areas that might easily qualify for an ADC District or as an IPP; however, in evaluating proposals within HCDs, the BAR may apply only the HCD requirements and guidelines.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – Do we know when that rear addition was added to the building?

Michael Pleasants, Applicant – I believe that it was in the 1980s.

Roberta Williamson, Owner – The house addition in the back was added in 1995. The porch off of that addition was added in 2002. This will be the fourth time the roof has been replaced. There was very little roof left on the house. There were gaping holes in the roof. We put a roof on the house. That had to be replaced when the addition was built in 1995. It was in shreds. It was blamed on the maple trees. The roof that was placed on the addition in 95 was replaced with the porch addition because everything leaked. I wish that Mr. Pleasants had brought some of the pictures of how the roof has leaked to the inside of the house since the last replacement.

Mr. Gastinger – The staff report says that it recommends asphalt shingles on the back roof of the house, which includes the rear portion of the main roof.

Mr. Werner – I may have left a note in there inadvertently. There is the rear triangle on the main roof. I had suggested that if it helps with your budget, you can asphalt that. I left that in the text. I changed the image. I didn't change the text.

Mr. Zehmer – Is the intent and desire for asphalt on the back roof and standing seam on the main roof?

Mr. Schwarz – The application is for what is shown on the screen. The applicant just wants to bring up the question in case we would be OK with doing the entire roof in asphalt.

Mr. Mohr – Mr. Pleasants, aren't asphalt roofs the ones being trashed by the tree?

Mr. Pleasants – The trees are not the concern. It is the poor quality installation on the roof. It is supposed to be a double locked standing seam metal roof. It is a single locked standing seam metal roof. In numerous locations, there is wall clutter finding its way into the house. The main culprit of this is just poor craftsman quality.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Is there anybody that would be amenable to the asphalt on the entire roof? It is pretty clear that standing seam metal roofs are part of this. I checked the Conservation District guidelines that are not just for Martha Jefferson. It said under building materials: long lasting durable and natural materials are preferred including brick, wood stucco, and standing seam metal roofs. The language is all "should, encourage" and things like that.

How about asphalt shingles on the rear roof? Is there any further discussion we need to have? I don't think the guidelines actually specify the hips and ridges. We do like them to be not large and chunky. I don't think that is in the guidelines.

Mr. Mohr – Copper is a late 20th century fixation on the part of Charlottesville and Albemarle County.

Ms. Williamson – That is what the roof was originally.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including architectural character-defining features for this district, I move to find that the proposed roof replacement, standing-seam metal on the main roof and asphalt shingles on the rear roof, 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 a mere suggestion that there be no chunkiness in the ridges. Breck Gastinger seconds. Motion passes (8-0).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-10-02

230 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280001000

Brands Hatch LLC, Owner

Frederick Wolf, Wolf Ackerman Design LLC, Applicant

Water Street gate

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – This CODE Building project initially encompassed multiple structures at 215 West Water Street, 218-220 West Main Street, and 230 West Main Street. The site is now a single parcel, 230 West Main Street. Except for the preserved façade of what had been 218-220 West Main Street (constructed in 1901), the entire project is new construction. This CoA request was on the October 20, 2020 agenda. Prior to the meeting, applicant requested it be pulled from the agenda; however, staff has retained the initial BAR number, 20-10-02. CoA request to install a street-level, metal gate at/near the Water Street entrance to the CODE Building’s inner courtyard. (Note: This CoA request is for a separate CoA, not an amendment to the CoAs approved for the CODE Building, BAR 17-08-01). The most recent, similar request was the installation of security gates at 500 Court Square (The Monticello Hotel), which the BAR approved in January 2019. In April 2004, the BAR approved a CoA for security gates in the brick arcade along North 1st Street for the First United Methodist Church (101 East Jefferson Street). For both projects, staff presented the design guidelines for *Walls and Fences* [from Chapter 2 – Site Design and Elements], which is applicable for this request. Additionally, staff suggests the BAR refer to the design guidelines for *Street-Level Design, Materials & Textures, and Details & Decoration* [from Chapter 3 - New Construction and Additions]. Staff requested that the applicant provide detail on the gate, including dimensions of the rails and pickets, proposed color/finish, and information on the gate hardware. If the BAR approves the design as currently submitted, staff recommends a condition that the gate’s details be submitted for the BAR record. Note: The gate will likely require an amendment to the Site Plan, including reviews for compliance with zoning, building code, and public safety requirements. Regardless of BAR approval of the requested CoA, construction of the gate will be subordinate to the requirements of the approved Site Plan or its subsequent revision, if required, and/or the requirements of the Building Permit. In the event that those reviews significantly alters the approved design, design staff may require BAR review of those changes.

Fred Wolf, Wolf Ackerman Design – We have taken and run this past Brian Haluska (City Planner), who said that there would be no site plan amendment required. I have worked closely with Francis Vineyard in making sure that we understand the implications from a building code standpoint since this could impact egress. We made sure that we had that covered. This has been a tremendous project. We have been moving along at a good clip and everything is going

very smoothly. One of the great things that we were excited about in this project was the owner's willingness to commit to such a site amenity for the building but to also be shared with the community. We did not design this space to close it off. We want it to be used. We want it to function the way that we had hoped. We love the fact it could improve connectivity between the Mall and Water Street. It has all types of great benefits to the project. Security has always been some concern on this, particularly when you open up an exposed private site to public traffic, particularly late hours and after hours traffic. We have been thinking about different ways we can tackle this. As we got further into the design and construction documents, we have consultants, who have been working with us on a number of things including security consultants. We have talked about how we manage traffic in and out of the building and how we manage traffic on the site. Their suggestion was that it was important to have as a preemptive measure a way to limit the passage through the site overnight and after hours. It is our goal that this would be built and installed and never closed. We won't know until this is open. This is going to be a new kind of space. It is a new kind of building. From time to time, if it is needed, for the owner to have the flexibility to limit passage through their site was important to them. They have committed that on any given day, the gate would be left open. If it was to be closed, as part of some process, it would certainly be open during the hours when people would be downtown, using the Mall and socializing. It is not just work hours. It would include after hours when people are using the movie theater and going to dinner. The other thing that is important to know is that the character and tenants in this building know that it is not going to be a typical 9 to 5 office building. It has a variety of tenants doing different types of business. Many will work late into the evening into early in the morning. As a matter of the building functioning for its own users, that can't be closed. We took this approach realizing that the Mall is a very special streetscape and we did not want to put anything physical there. We felt like putting something at the Water Street edge would be a successful way to provide a visual deterrent to signal to somebody that passage through this space is not permitted when that gate is closed. We will probably have some type of signage down at the Mall. It seemed like a reasonable way to make limit the passage through the site after hours and hope the owners feel comfortable. They will be able address security concerns with people being on their property. We do have a few gate details as well as the panic hardware, the perforation, and the color chip. The gate will match the color of the metal plating of the building, which have been previously approved. The goal is for this to be discrete. The previous scheme was too much for everyone to tackle on the engineering side. It is a steel structure, painted, There is a cross lateral brace that happens on the panels and the caster underneath to take the load off of that.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – With the signs that you would put up on the Mall, do you have any thoughts on what that might be?

Mr. Wolf – I don't. We are working with Gropen. They are doing a signage package. I assume it will have something to do with that. I don't even know if it is needed. It may be a temporary sign that is put out there and taken down. I don't know if it would be permanently affixed to anything. It could be something as simple as saying that the park is closed. It will something that tells people this semi-public space is now closed if not a tenant of the building.

Mr. Gastinger – Our capacity to really effect a long term operation is pretty limited or non-existent. If we were to approve this, that would keep either the current owner or future owner from also closing this gate and never opening it. Would there be?

Mr. Wolf – I would let the owner speak to that. Given the value of that space and the importance that the owners placed on that as one of the amenities, Jeffrey and his team see as an amenity that they are creating that is an urban gesture back to the city. I can't imagine that there would ever be a desire for that. It is just not in the spirit of what we have done. The fact that there could be a need for it is probably highly limited and questionable. It would be virtually impossible to go back later and try to retrofit this in versus build it in and engage with the structure now that we have. It actually makes more sense to put it up now and simply never use it than to try and come back and retrofit it in. In an ideal world, it will never be shut. If we find that we have an issue, they need ways to be able manage that as part of their private property. What we are trying to do is to make something that as transparent as it could be while achieving what they need to achieve so that we do not disrupt or lose the visual connection and the transparency that we have through that space. We had a long discussion about why you would want to do it on both ends. Doing something like this on the Mall side was certainly not in the spirit of what we were doing. Doing it on the Water Street side next to our service elevator and our loading dock and our garage entrance seemed like that if there is a back or a more service oriented side to the building, this was the side that made sense to try and tackle the problem and achieve what we could by sending that visual signifier/clue to somebody, who is a pedestrian in the Mall. It is a more subtle way of telling somebody that they can't go in there.

Mr. Schwarz – You said it would be difficult to install later. Is it possible to install the attachment points now and the gate later?

Mr. Wolf – It may be. We're embedding the vertical posts so they are flush with our clating, which is brick on one side and metal on the other. We have two different details there. That post goes down and it will have a plate that goes into the structural deck that is below the pavers. That portion of the design will not be visible. It is going to have a serious base plate. It may be possible to do something like that. From the owner's perspective, if they determined somewhere down the line that they do need to close it overnight, I am guessing they probably won't. They would like to have the opportunity to be able to do that as opposed to wait the several months. Given the space, it is a generous space. It is 21 feet wide. There is room to work. Working in that space will be a lot easier doing it now before all of the pladding is up and the pavers are in. Then you are trying to put weight on the pavers. Our goal and the hope is to do it now.

Mr. Bailey – Do you have any idea what kind of security monitoring they are planning to do? Is it going to be permanent or guards?

Mr. Wolf – They do have some cameras. There is video monitoring. They are going to have some security detail overnight. From a management standpoint, I don't know if it is 24 hours a day. They will certainly have somebody there.

Mr. Zehmer – What is the thinking behind using the perforated aluminum for the personnel doors?

Mr. Wolf – The reasoning is to prevent somebody from reaching through and being able to grab the panic bar, disengage it, and open the gate from the Water Street side and walk in. Those doors do have to work as exits. Anybody that is in the courtyard space needs to be able to get out without any special effort. It is a common issue with gates.

Mr. Zehmer – I almost see to one side or the other with the door. You can stick your arm through the large gate and “trip it” that way.

Mr. Wolf – Where you activate that is going to be biased towards the side where it latches. With the spacing on the pickets, you would have to get your hand through and around. I feel where we have it now, it would be difficult for somebody to come back and get enough leverage to operate from that.

Mr. Zehmer – Do you have a sense of what the casters are going to be made out of? It is more of a maintenance thing. I could see this thing over time leaving a marker, cutting a groove in the paving.

Mr. Wolf – Our structural engineer has said that the diagonal bracing is going to do enough work that he felt comfortable it could hold up that corner without the caster. It may be something that will go away. There are casters that have a spring mechanism so that they are able to adjust a little bit with slight variations in elevation. That would certainly help. I was worried about trying to give the structural engineer some help by putting that out there. It is probably going to have some type of high density rubber on the wheel.

Mr. Gastinger – Because of the panic bar, you really can go through this any time of day.

Mr. Wolf – That is true. You need to be a ruler follower and see the sign on the Mall saying that the courtyard is closed. What it does prevent is somebody coming from Water Street in at the top and cutting down. It is necessary byproduct of the building code that we can't lock that space off unless the building was closed. Rather than test that, we decided to build in what we thought was the appropriate level of egress.

Mr. Mohr – It is fundamentally a sign saying ‘stay out.’ It is an obstacle

Mr. Wolf – The only way it would become an obstacle would be if we had something on the Mall side. With geometry and the spirit of the Mall, it did not feel appropriate.

Ms. Lewis – We have a pretty on target guideline on walls and fences. If street front walls and fences are necessary and desirable, they shall not exceed four feet in height from the sidewalk or public right of way. I think we have a sidewalk restored there and it is a public right of way. Even if we say that this is a side or rear yard, that height is still limited to six feet. From what I can tell, this is nine feet high, which is double the amount our guidelines would allow. If the applicant could tell us, why we should ignore that guideline.

Mr. Wolf – The overall height is ten feet, six inches. The door is at nine feet. Part of what is driving the height of this thing is the scale of that opening, which is rather monumental. We have a first floor level, which is 17 feet tall on the Mall side. There is a lot in the things that we have done internally to the building that start to make a four foot gate, not only impractical for the limitation of somebody moving through the space, but seeming out of scale with the rest of the building. A four foot fence or gate might make sense as a distinction between a yard and a

sidewalk. If somebody wanted to jump over that, they would jump over it pretty easily. I did not view this as a fence. When I look at other gates that we see, they are typically taller than four. When you think about service alleys, I had never thought of it as a fence.

Mr. Mohr – I would call it an architectural element. A fence is not a part of the building. This would be like taking St. Paul’s Cathedral and making all of the doors feet higher. The scale thing is really an issue there. At the First Episcopal on First Street, Madison designed the iron gates into the side yard. I think those are eight feet. It was treated more as a doorway than a fence function. It was directly attached to the building. I would be inclined to interpret this more in the realm of a door than I would a fence.

Mr. Werner – At Court Square, the idea of an enclosure does step away. I think that the idea that gates and fences more fits with what the material is, the shape, and how it fits in there. I would agree that these types of circumstances, filling the opening has been allowed. That is what I see in the BAR record and what you have done at Court Square.

Mr. Zehmer – By definition, fences usually don’t move. This is on hinges and has casters. It is intended to move and be functional.

Ms. Lewis – We don’t have a guideline that goes to moveable gates or security gates.

Mr. Mohr – Ms. Lewis, I think that it is a valid question.

Mr. Schwarz had a technical issue during this part of the meeting. Mr. Gastinger took over as Chair until Mr. Schwarz rejoined the meeting.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – When you look at the plan view of this, I think the fact that it is held back from the façade of the building, makes the height not as much of a problem for me. It would be up in your face if it was right at the façade at the opening. The fact that they have held it back acknowledges that it keeps that as an opening when seen from the street.

Mr. Mohr – One option would be, if you wanted something that didn’t appear, you could technically put in rolled out nord with doors on it. You wouldn’t get the height in it.

Mr. Wolf – I think that might have been the owner’s presumption that is where this would have gone first. Because this opening is directly adjacent to the garage opening, this wanted to be treated differently. I didn’t want those two things to come off too similar. The ones that typically that have a man door in them are not aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Mohr – I agree with the decision. I was just curious. The door heights is usually compromised by the panel breakdown.

Mr. Schwarz rejoined the meeting after having some technical issues with his computer.

Mr. Lahendro – Considering that the sole purpose for this gate is security, it could have been a whole lot worse to provide just a solid door for security. I am very grateful that the architect and the owner have decided to do something that is attractive and expensive and compatible with the design. I am very pleased with what they are suggesting.

Mr. Gastinger – I am going to disagree. I don't support this as it is. When we were reviewing this building at the beginning, we were very appreciative and recognized the immense contribution that the passage through this building was going to make to the city. That accessibility to that public courtyard and passing through to Water Street was something that was always applauded at every presentation. If there was some way to know that this was something that was going to be used after 2 AM, I think we might all have a different feeling about it. We really have no way of knowing how this could be used by future owners or with the assurances of the current owners. It would dramatically impact the visual character of Water Street. The Water Street façade is already pretty. Throughout the review of this building, we were concerned about its scale and its severity. We weighed that against some of the elements of the building like the passage through and liked how it stepped down to the Mall and the courtyard. In lieu of really good guidelines that give us something to go on related to security fencing, I think this is something quite different. We look at some of the guidelines that we do have about the impacts of proposed changes on the site, adjacent buildings, structures, public space. This says something that is quite cold and off putting to our public spaces. I do think it is designed well to be very minimally impactful and open. We just don't know when that will be. I have concerns about it.

Mr. Schwarz – I completely agree with Mr. Gastinger on this one. It is not that I don't trust you or the applicant to want to make this open as much as possible. We have no control over that. We have no control if the project is sold in the future. During a time of night when the street is probably at its scariest, this fence could potentially be closed or the gate would potentially be closed, making that street even more forbidding, when having a big opening right there would go a long way to making this street feel more active during those late hours at night. There are some examples around town where we have approved gates. There was a gate approved at First United Methodist Church for their playground. The difference is that those other spaces where these have been approved are clearly private spaces or they are clearly utilitarian service spaces. This is clearly a public space or intended to appear as a public space. It is not a place where you would expect to find a large gate like this. I don't think it qualifies for an exception to our guidelines. Ms. Lewis made a good point on the guidelines that she read off. It violates the spirit of those guidelines quite significantly.

Ms. Lewis – When I was last on the BAR, we also approved the sally port that is next to the Levy Opera House. We approved the gate at the back of the Albemarle County office building on High Street. They created a sally port there to transport detainees. We have looked at these before and have applied the fence criteria. I think the fence criteria here is applicable because it is private space. The owner could close this forever and it will be a fence. There are no guarantees about hours that it will or won't be open. I tend to agree with my colleagues. It is not so much about the materials and what it does. It is really about the lack of pedestrian flow and the promise of this application. I am looking at minutes from the August 15, 2017 meeting that was just a preliminary discussion. They wanted this space to be open up to the sky and celebrate it more on Water Street. You have a street wall on Water Street that is prettier. If I find this closed, I have to go around the block. I do think our guidelines go to flow, pedestrian use, and connectivity. I think this gate flies in the face of that.

Mr. Wolf – One of the precedents that we looked at when we were talking about this was another public space in New York. Pele Park in New York has a large gate at the entry. It is a pocket park with a beautiful grove of trees and a wonderful water feature at the end of the back wall. It is an example of a public space that is controlled in some degree by the ability to close it at different times. That was a precedent. The details that we were looking at for how the gate could function. I hear what everyone is saying. I genuinely feel that this is an important amenity and one of the great aspects of the project. We are very proud of the connectivity and the openness. I believe that it is our client's intentions not to subvert what was a considerable move to leave that much space unbuilt and create that semi-public space. I fully understand the desire to try and control movement and passage through what is still private property for them. At one point, we thought that could be done more with manpower and staffing. There could be times where you might need to be able to have some more robust way to limit passage through. That is what is in thinking behind this. It's not to them to come take away for what is a very sincere urban gesture to begin with as a pocket park off of the Mall.

Mr. Lahendro – Since this building first came to the BAR, our culture's view of security has changed. We are now putting up planters around the University to keep cars from running into statues. There is a different attitude. I am assessing and evaluating this application in light of that kind of attitude and caution that is now going into how we think about our public spaces. That is unfortunate, but it is a reality.

Ms. Lewis – Mr. Lahendro, is there a guideline that addresses security issues that gives us a little boost on that? Is there a historic guideline that you could point to that allows us to add it to a feature like this based on security?

Mr. Lahendro – Not that I am aware of. It is all so new.

Mr. Schwarz – I think our ordinance does have language about public necessity. If you want to take that somewhere to apply to this, I think you could.

Ms. Lewis – It seems like a private necessity to me.

Mr. Werner – I am going to look in the Secretary's Standards to see if there is anything that addresses. We have things that have changed. Our guidelines are written to the extent of sign aesthetic, the visual aspects of a private space. We do have guidelines for parks and public facilities that we can control. This is a private space. I did add the street level design and hopefully that provided some guidance. This is something where it is not clear. What does it do visually? What does it achieve/not achieve as far as an aesthetic related to this building and to this design?

Motion – Mr. Zehmer - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements and New Construction 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. Jody Lahendro seconds. Motion passes (5-3, Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger, and Cheri Lewis opposed).

The Meeting was recessed for five minutes.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-11-04
946 Grady Avenue
Tax Parcel 310060000
Dairy Central Phase 1, LLC, Owner
Robert Nichols, Formwork Design Office, Applicant
Modify window/door configurations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1937-1964 District: IPP The former Monticello Dairy building was designated an IPP in 2008. The original central 2-story (5-bay) portion of the building, and flanking one-story (7-bay) portions are dated 1937. The east side addition (7-bay) was built in 1947/1964; the similar west side addition (6-bay) was built in 1959. Request for CoA to modify the NW corner of the building as follow:

- At the north elevation: Reconfigure an existing storefront entry and an existing window. (Reuse the existing, swapping their locations, with the associated alterations to the masonry openings.)
- At the west elevation: Replace an existing storefront entry and install a new storefront entry at an existing opening. (The lite configuration of the new differs from the existing; however, the configurations still align with the adjacent windows.)

At the end of the staff report, I looked at it in context of what had been approved for these elevations and whether or not this significantly changed anything. On the 10th Street side, there is a door with a panel being replaced with a full height door and maintaining the alignment of the lights. I am not concerned with that change. This isn't replicating anything original. There is the one original window that is still there on the far left. The intent was to align the lights, the windows, and the doors with that. I am OK as far as my recommendation with that. On the north elevation, there was the question about creating a new masonry opening and patching up one that had been there. As far as the alignment goes and using the original material, I am OK with that. You had asked about the changing of the masonry opening. I can't offer an opinion on that. It is probably subject to what the interior use proposed for this. That might be guiding some of this.

Robert Nichols, Formwork Design Office – My office is working for the tenant of this part of the building. This request and this idea to make this adjustment is born of the interior program that we are working. That was all absent when the design development of the building took place and all of the work went into that design and getting approval from you for the current state of the approval. Our desire is to change where we have passage. This is situated in such a way that it reinforces the programmatic layout that is happening on the interior of the building. To the extent that you have reviewed profiles, materials, those parameters would be maintained and duplicated. The door system that is in place and relocated. That is new construction, new material. The windows are original. They have been given a good look from a window contractor. They're good candidates for relocating those windows. Those openings have good quality storms on the interior. That material would be switched over. My institutional knowledge of the development of the design is a little bit outside of my scope of recollection or involvement. Joshua Batman is the project manager of this. He is with Stony Point Development.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

No Questions from the Board

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – It seems rationale to me. It is staying within the rules of the game with that part of the building and making it functional and not violating the basic tenants of the aesthetics of it. I don't see any issue.

Mr. Gastinger – This project has been exemplary in a lot of ways for the way that they have adaptively reused and rehabilitated the structure. Everything that is being proposed here is in concert with the spirit that it was restored in the first place.

Motion – Mr. Mohr - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed door and window changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the request as submitted. Cheri Lewis seconds. Motion passes (8-0).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

612 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 290003000

fHeirloom West Main Street Second Phase LLC, Owner

Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects, Applicant

New construction of a mixed-use development

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1959-1973 (concrete block automotive service building) District: West Main Street ADC District Status: Non-contributing April 16, 2019 - BAR discussion. June 18, 2019 – BAR recommended approval of Special Use Permit for additional residential density, that the redevelopment will not have an adverse impact on the West Main Street ADC District, with the understanding that the massing is not final, and must be further discussed, and [will require] a complete full design review at future BAR meeting(s) and propose the following conditions [for the SUP]:

- Garage entry shall not be accessed directly from the building's street wall along West Main Street;
- The building's mass shall be broken down to reflect the multi-parcel massing historically on the site, as well as the West Main Street context, using building modulation;
- The building and massing refer to the historic building.
- The Holsinger Building be seismically monitored during construction;
- There shall be pedestrian engagement with the street with an active, transparent, and permeable façade at street level.

Note: On October 7, 2019, Council approved the SUP. January 22, 2020 – BAR discussion. CoA request for construction of a new, four-story mixed-use building. (The existing service station is a non-contributing structure; therefore, its demolition does not require a CoA.)

Note: At three prior meetings (see above), the BAR discussed this project with the applicants, satisfying the statutory requirements for a pre-application conference per City Code section Sec. 34- 282(c)(4). This application is a formal request for a CoA and, per Sec. 34-285, the BAR must take action within sixty days of the submittal deadline. At this meeting, the BAR

may defer the item to the next meeting; however, at that next meeting, only the applicant may request a deferral. Absent that request, the BAR must take action to approve, deny, or approve with conditions the CoA. I have a lot in here for the discussion. It follows the language that we have used for 125 or 128 Chancellor. I have added a list of recommendations for criteria that you might want to refer to. The applicant provided a list of the goals that the applicant would like to get out of this meeting. There is acknowledgement across the board that you are not voting on a COA tonight. It is certainly within your right to do so. If the applicant requests the deferral, the applicant can come back when they are ready. If the BAR defers this to the December meeting, it would have to come back next month.

Mr. Lahendro – In the interest of full disclosure, I do need to state that I provide pro bono preservation advice and guidance to the adjacent landowner, First Baptist Church. I do not believe that I am receiving no financial payment for it and have no financial interest in that relationship. I believe that I can be a part of this discussion.

Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus – The applicant is going to request deferral. This is in the spirit of receiving input as we continue to develop the project. There was a hiatus since our January preliminary discussion. Simply trying to get a better grasp on COVID issues but also budget and building size. I think we have narrowed down since then. We went ahead and applied for the Certificate of Appropriateness so that everyone knows we're serious about the project moving forward with it. We do expect a bit of back and forth before we will ask for a vote. Tonight is really to bring some of you up to speed on the project for the first time but also to let you know the direction that we are taking the design and soliciting your input so that ultimately all of this is in the spirit that we when do come to a vote, we will have incorporated your input in a way that is acceptable by the time we get to that vote. Knowing that the BAR is no longer doing partial approvals, we really want to get this whole thing right.

I will run through the presentation that we have provided you. I also have a few additional slides. Design never stands still when you're on a schedule. There's a little bit more project development that I can explain to you. I will try to touch upon the things that we are hoping you can comment on tonight. You obviously will comment on everything and we do encourage that. We would like to touch on building massing, elevations, material options, color scheme, and some details.

The building owned by the Church is on the corner. There is an alley that is owned by the Church between the site and the Church. It is not on the property of 612 West Main Street. The property does directly abuts 600 West Main Street. Adjacent to it, are two contributing structures: what was once a mini mart and the Blue Moon Diner. Further down the street is an ABC Store and a commercial building on the corner. Directly across the street is the Albemarle Hotel. To give you an understanding of the building envelope that we are allowed to work with from the zoning ordinance. This building can only be four stories tall. The first floor has a 15 foot minimum required height. Four floors up, the fourth story has a required step back from West Main Street. There's a required ten foot setback for the entire building from the property line from the sidewalk. At the fourth floor, we need to step back ten feet. The angle that we are required to step back on the rear of the property. This is simply the envelope we are allowed to work within. It also abuts to the east an internal courtyard for 600 West Main Street. This side of the former mini mart is painted by a well-known artist. That was approved by the BAR some time ago. You can see the ten foot setback from property line on the ground floor to the third floor. We are also showing the ten foot required setback on the fourth floor. There are going to be 41 units in the building. Here is the Sanborn Map from 1920 showing some of the properties

that were here. You can see the Baptist Church and what is now the Blue Moon Diner. The red is the footprint of what is now being proposed. Our clients, as they think about the image of the building, the feel of the building is very different from 600 West Main Street. The idea is quiet and calming. On the interior, it is very serene with a bit minimalism to it as we go forward. This also begins to suggest the type of color scheme that we are thinking of. As we prepare a preliminary site plan, a little bit more of the specifics are here. You can see the mini mart building and the inner courtyard for 600 West Main Street. We do hope to connect to that internal to the building. We are honoring the ten foot setback along the property line here. We start to see the building façade here. We step back at about 28 feet from the property line here plus another three feet from the mini mart building. We have about a 30 foot wide plaza. This is intended to be the entry for the residents. The intention here is that the whole first floor front of the building is going to be retail, except for this portion. This setback will be the entrance for the residents. These are intended to be individual rental apartments, not condos. The building is not abutting the mini mart. We are not crossing the property line. We are exposing this portion of the mural, which is the majority of the mural. That portion, which is on the step back, is much less important to the composition as the whole. The thought is that we will have a landscaped area here for the residents to come through; not walled and not gated, but setback from the street. We're thinking that there will be a water feature in there. We have a long way to go with the landscape design. This is the intention at the moment. We are also thinking of a planter along the street can allow siting, leaning against as people walk along. Having limited entry areas through that planter to try to help focus on certain areas of the building. The whole lower first floor front part is intended to be retail. There will be a complete retail presence there. There will be a small service entrance on this side for deliveries and move in. The south portion of the ground floor is going to studio apartments. It is retail with this corner for the lobby entry for the residents. With the lobby entry for the residents being here, the hope is that we will also connect with the interior courtyard at 600 West Main Street. The two facilities can share amenities and residents can come and go within the courtyard.

Ways to allow permeating the planters here, the intention is not to provide an open front on the entire thing. That would feel like a very large gap in the urban fabric. Trying to hold the edge with landscaping along the property line and then setting the building back. We're in conversations right now about perhaps making the planter less deep in certain areas so that we might be able to accommodate some outdoor dining along there. It really is not the intention at the moment for this to be outdoor dining. This is more landscape area. You can see some of the images and precedence we are thinking about for the water, the plantings. Even a large stone bench at the center as a place for people to hang out. Some of the materials we are thinking of for the planters.

A section through the building describes a little bit of what I was talking about regarding retail on the ground floor stretching back probably two thirds of the distance. Because of the height of the ground floor that is required, we're working on actually putting loft apartments in the back with some really nice views. On the south side, it steps back considerably. These units will get incredibly deep to bring light into this spaces if we try fill this whole volume. What you see here in terms of the buildable area, the grey zone above is what is allowed for apartments and a stairwell elevator, which we are going to have to have. That's not really a part of the building massing. We are not building to the property line on the south. We have 5 foot 6 setback. It has a lot to do with the fact that the railroad tracks complicate construction considerably. By staying back 5.5 feet, we are not having to cross the property line and deal with the bureaucracy of building within the railroads right of way. We do have a parking garage here. There is no entrance to the parking garage from this property. There is a parking

garage at 600 West Main Street. The parking aisle is right down the center of that basement. We intend to take advantage of that and grade through the basement level to connect the basement parking of 612 West Main Street to 600 West Main Street eliminating one of the concerns that the BAR had with the large garage door on this Main Street elevation.

Some precedent images that we are looking at include simplicity, quiet as we can, a rhythm to it. As we look at some of these, a color scheme begins to emerge, neutral tones, perhaps dark colors, and a lighter color. We are not there yet. We are drawn to the drama of the dark openings within the lighter framework of the building. You can see the idea of the planter in front of the building that has an intermediate zone. We're creating multiple spaces along the sidewalk for the experience, not just the passerby, but perhaps people in the retail space. These stone are well out of our budget. Stucco is an option. We also start to see some examples that are done in lighter colored brick. There is a simplicity to the layout of the windows and the openings. The light colored brick would be ideal. Light colored brick is out of our budget. Within our budget is brick and stucco for the main materials, both of which we like. If we were to do it in brick, we would like to paint the brick. That's a point of discussion we would like to bring to the BAR. Red brick, which is obviously, the cheapest thing you can find in Virginia because there is so much of it is not what we are going for here. We would like to paint the, which is not part of the guidelines. We prefer it over stucco because of the texture the brick can provide to the exterior walls. Entry doors for the residents and some of the service areas right on the street so that we get a sense of solidity to these. On the right is a simple courtyard or space that is nicely landscaped and leads to the door for the residents. We are not intending a gate in this instance prior to getting to the residence. This is more for the idea of the courtyard right off of the sidewalk. A number of months ago, you saw some studies from us about the front elevation and how to break it down, ways we were beginning to think about the massing. Of those, this sketch rose to the top for some of the BAR members because of the modulation of the building in ways breaking it into 2 bay, 3 bay, and 4 bay modules along the street with the step back at the 4th floor. We were thinking, at the time, of setting back that area that would be the resident's entrance. We preferred to have resident's entrance set back in the landscaped area.

Where are we now with the development and the thinking of the building? This probably describes much of what we are looking at trying to break the building massing down into components here and here with a center portion that is set back about one foot, four inches. You can see the 4th floor terrace, which is ten feet back from all of that. Even further back, you can see that entrance portion to the residences. We're looking at a very open, glassy retail area. It is not intended for one retailer or five retailers. That is yet to be seen. It could be broken up to as many as five, perhaps more if we needed to put the demising walls down the center. I don't think that is the idea. Calling some attention to the door for the residents setback a bit, this is the part of the building with the mural. You can start to see the color palate beginning to be a light colored material, whether that is brick or stucco with the darker surrounds. You can begin to see how some of the patterning might happen with the windows; just a regular rhythm of windows across the front for the residential units. Operable windows on the lower portion for each of these, emphasizing the view out. We are also thinking that we would like awnings over the retail openings. Whether or not those are canvass, painted steel is yet to be determined. You can begin to see we are differentiating the setback portion of this façade a little bit differently than that on the street. Thinking of some way we can define the entry to the residences is pretty quiet but staying within the rhythm of the rest of the façade. You see it further with 600 West Main Street in the distance as well as the mini mart and the Blue Moon Diner. We begin to see how the planter might break at certain points to allow for entry into this zone where there may

be some seating for outdoor dining, perhaps even some bike storage. We're beginning to think that it is going need to happen behind the planter. We're beginning to think about landscape and how it can enhance the architecture itself. Vertical trees along this façade can help define some more of that rhythm of the smaller units along the façade itself.

As we move back a bit, we want to look at it in context scale wise relative to the church, the annex building, and then stepping it up to 600 West Main Street, with this being the portion of the building that is closest to the street. Behind there are the terraces of ten feet behind. Much further back, that piece. With the framing, this is the piece that comes forward that we're trying to modulate, not just with the indent of the building, but also perhaps the pairings of windows and groups. If we continue around the side of the building, I think it is going to be a straightforward west elevation. Not many openings in that. We have plot line issues. Hopefully within some of those openings, we will have a little bit of glass at the end of interior hallways. In terms of some of the details, the windows may be a dark steel that comes forward of the brick or stucco surface by about two inches to help frame the opening itself and to give some relief to the façade. Another way we might surround the openings is a very simple brick detail; turning a brick sideways and projecting it an inch or two from the façade of the building itself to frame that opening a little bit differently on the portion that steps back from the street. We might even pick up on that with the openings for the residential terraces above. A little bit of a detail is the black/dark surround for the mostly glass façade for the retail and awning to provide cover as people come in. This is very preliminary as well. As we go around to the back, you can see a very regular rhythm of windows. This is a residential building. We do anticipate having some balconies on the back. This is not necessarily where they are going be or how they are going to be. What you do see here are those lower portions that are the loft studio apartments and get higher glass as we go further forward. That's about 5.5 feet from the property line. Above, we have terraces for those on the third floor. One of the things we are going to incorporate into the building is a green roof on this portion. It is going to allow us to not have to put in the large stormwater pipes along the street that we would have to otherwise. This is one of the measures that we are taking for this building in order to have less impact on stormwater system and the utility system as we go forward. It is a very simple regular back to this.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – I do have a question regarding the back of the building. You are bringing in the parking from the other building?

Mr. Dreyfus – That's correct.

Mr. Mohr – It is hidden from sectional view at this point? Those windows seem awfully short given the double heights space?

Mr. Dreyfus – This was something we put together this afternoon to try to explain at least the massing as it's going to work. The parking garage is below those lowest windows. It's maybe the top four feet of the parking garage. The garage is above the grade at the location. We don't intend to expose any of that.

Mr. Mohr – This goes back to the West Main Street tree issue. You have vertical trees here. I presume that we're going to have something much larger in front of this building ultimately.

Mr. Dreyfus – I am presuming that you are correct. Because we don't know the future of that. We are not planting where the tree would ultimately go. If the planting and the planters changes in the future, we can react to whatever the city does. That plan has not been finalized. It's hard to know what might be planted here or where.

Mr. Gastinger – Could you describe how you're interacting with that plan or if it's possible at future presentations to share what is planned in that section so we can better ascertain what the interaction with the planters and the street could be?

Mr. Dreyfus – Absolutely. I would be happy to bring it to you at the next iteration. It's very fuzzy. There would be a great deal of conjecture but happy to bring the last version of that street planting plan when we come back.

Mr. Mohr – Aren't there four stories at the forward section of 601?

Mr. Dreyfus – It is six stories in the back, five stories here (left side of the building), four stories here (middle of the building), and three stories (front of the building). The building steps up.

Mr. Mohr – It does have a four story element on the street?

Mr. Dreyfus – Yes it does.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – With regards to massing: how long the street façade is broken up with regards to massing and fenestration and how the building steps back from the street for the residential entrance next to the mural.

Mr. Lahendro – I have some concerns. I don't feel like the street façade has modulated well enough to break up that mass. It reads because of the same colors, because of the repeating of the same fenestration units across the front; it reads too monolithic as a single building to my eye. That center section sitting back a foot gives enough distinction between the units. When the units are all articulated and have the same materials, this looks like to me a monumental institutional building with the vertical piers looking like columnar to me. I don't think it is as successful as I had hoped for bringing a memory of row buildings on this part of Main Street. I have concerns about that.

Mr. Mohr – I find it altogether too horizontal in its ultimate expression, which is the reason I was asking about height. It seems fundamentally to be a long horizontal building. What is successful about the building next door is that it brings a thin façade forward that plays in the same scale or footprint as the rest of the buildings on the street. The other thing that concerns me is the lack of color or certainly some vibrancy is a problem for me. What is a pretty lively street in terms of color and texture, everything is feeling a little dull for me. It needs some more

life. I think there needs to be more verticality and a greater attempt to push and pull the façade to give it some sense of a smaller rhythm that we are currently looking at. I think it is really unfortunate that this didn't come first. This could have easily culminated a parking entrance for the whole complex at a scale where it could have been really modulated. I have always found it problematic in the small façade of the other part.

Mr. Lahendro – The planters look like barriers to me between the building and the sidewalk. I worry that the planters have some impact upon the size of the trees being planted. We're replacing some really lovely large canopy trees in this area. They are being cut up by the utility people with their chainsaws. They are significant trees. I would hope that we will be trying to put back something larger and provide the kind of planting for that.

Mr. Gastinger – I feel that the landscape, through the planters, does feel very token at the moment and not really contributing to a sense of scale or to better use by the pedestrian or the public. That's where some context with West Main could be useful. I just want to point out that this rendering is trying to do the best to put the sun in a position where you're getting a little bit of shadow. That must be 7 in the morning on July 21st. Being the north façade, it has to work that much harder to have the kind of push and pull to really feel like there is enough depth within that façade to create that vertical rhythm that we have been talking about. Almost every part of the day, this is not going to have a lot of sun on the façade. Shadow lines are not going to be that pronounced. The use of color with the depth of the window mullions are really critical. Maybe using color more between the pieces might be one way of further modulating the façade.

Mr. Zehmer – I had a thought that came from Mr. Werner's question about our ability to allow for painting brick. If it is stucco, then I guess they can paint it. If they want to use brick, are they allowed to paint it? You could potentially paint these different row houses different colors. That would certainly break up the façade.

Mr. Mohr – I always thought that painting had to do with historic surfaces. New brick, have at it.

Mr. Zehmer – I did look at the new construction guidelines. It says that brick is the most appropriate material for new structures. Thin set brick is not permitted. On the next page, where they talk about paint. It says do not paint unpainted masonry surfaces. That has been referenced to existing masonry surface.

Mr. Werner – The guidelines are recommendations and not ordinances. I have always made that distinction. I would be very comfortable recommending that the BAR, under the circumstances, to paint the new masonry structure.

Mr. Schwarz – On the subject of massing, I am a little torn. I look at your elevations and I find it elegant. I want to think to what we currently have in Charlottesville. If you look at The Flats versus The Standard, the Flats has a very monolithic elevation. For some strange reason, The Standard is infinitely worse. It has a little street module that is a different color, material from the one next to it and the one next to it. There is a lot of depth of the façade. It's terrible. It doesn't work. I want to be a little cautious. If we tell them to just paint modules on it, or change the height of one versus the height of another, we have to be careful.

Mr. Mohr – I think The Flats are successful because they are vertical. My only real issue is where it came to the railroad tracks. They should have punctuated it. This is a code limitation. It should have gone up another two or three stories. Another example being the Cherry Street Hotel. It is just that flat little box at the corner. They should have just built a different building at the corner.

Mr. Schwarz – I just want to bring that up as an example.

Mr. Mohr – I think color can be introduced not like they did at The Standard, maybe the canopies are an opportunity. It doesn't have to be this. It can be all done in a quiet way. I think the other building is grim. It was fine for the back part. I think the front part needed to play better with the street with alleys and cacophony of colors. It is part of the character of that street. We can't get too refined. I think they can still keep it quiet. I think it needs to have some color to bring it to life particularly at the retail level.

Mr. Schwarz – I had a lot of hope for it. When I saw it on paper, I thought it was going to be good. What has been built is pretty awful.

Mr. Gastinger – Since you mentioned The Flats, the setbacks in the notches of The Flats look to be a least ten feet. It has been different than what is being proposed here.

Mr. Mohr – I think The Flats would have been way more successful if they had actually broken through the center. They had almost gotten there at one point. There is a courtyard in the back. That would have made it much more a collegiate compound.

Mr. Schwarz – In my understanding, that for the building massing, there seems to be a want for more modulation, both vertical and horizontal. Is that what I am hearing?

Mr. Lahendro – There is a difference between the west side of West Main Street, west of the bridge and the east side. The Planning Commission, a few years ago, changed the zoning to recognize the fact that the buildings on the west side of West Main Street are like The Standard and The Flats and the hospital. They're larger. The hotels are larger buildings generally. The east side of West Main Street have more of the historic row buildings. That was the character that we're trying preserve on the east side. The particular design here might be perfectly appropriate for the west side of West Main Street. I don't think it is on the east side.

Mr. Schwarz – I am not saying we should modulate it like separate buildings. I want us to be careful when we do it. I don't know what lessons we can learn from The Standard. I think we need to learn some lessons from it because it didn't work.

Mr. Lahendro – I think there is a huge difference between The Flats and The Standard. It just a wonderful setback with The Flats with the large trees. The storefront is completely open. There is more engagement with the sidewalk. That's what I am hoping for this building also.

Mr. Mohr – The Flats is an altogether better urban building. On page 8, I find that center fenestration to be more in scale that makes sense. Where the Tom Ford elevation, which seems to be the direction you are heading, feels more like Fifth Avenue in New York to me.

Mr. Schwarz – Let's do window surrounds. That's one of Mr. Dreyfus' topics that he wanted to talk about.

Mr. Mohr – The devil is in the details. I think, conceptually, there is some nice ideas there. For me, it's more about the massing and how the windows are specifically treated. I think that could be very nicely handled. They're heading in a nice direction with that. For me, the mass of the building feels too horizontal. Someone like Jimmy Griggs' experiments with that building on West Main reminds of that right now. It's just a little too horizontal.

Mr. Lahendro – I am having a little trouble understanding you saying that it is too horizontal when I am seeing it as being too vertical. Are you talking about the whole block itself being the same height along the street?

Mr. Mohr – More that I am reading those big blocks. I would rather they were maybe in half. I could also just see them as simply taller. When Mr. Dreyfus was outlining how the trees worked, that rhythm starts to work. The building really doesn't have that rhythm.

Mr. Dreyfus – The one thing that I would want to interject is that it can't be taller. We have had our limitations on street façade height.

Mr. Mohr – If you had a frame up there that carried it, but it was open, is that possible?

Mr. Dreyfus – That's something zoning is loathed to weigh in on at the moment. We have been asking this question.

Mr. Mohr – It does have that little bit of that frame length language going.

Mr. Dreyfus – We're trying to push that.

Mr. Schwarz – If you look at that elevation, it looks like the top of the third floor is about midway or close to the fourth floor at 600 West Main.

Back to windows, any other comments on the idea using the dark metal surround or a simple brick detail or stucco detail. Any comments on the precedence?

Mr. Zehmer – I have question about the function. You said the horizontal lower sash extrapolate. Would it slide up or slide out?

Mr. Dreyfus – It would be an awning that pushes out and hinged at the top so that it flips out. Screens would be on the interior of the building not the exterior.

Ms. Lewis – I feel that the surround has too much detail at this point. I think the massing meets our guidelines. I know that there are constraints under the SUP. I like the programming. I like the fact that it is stepped back from the main mural next door. I feel that I am looking at Neiman Marcus building at Lenox Place in Atlanta or Highland Park in Dallas. It looks like it's a retail building that should have a lot of asphalt around it. Instead, it was plopped down on West Main Street. I am not being disrespectful to the applicant or his representative at all. I actually do like the palate of the building, the direction of a very clean looking palate. I agree that West Main has gotten some color. The color doesn't bother me. I feel like the huge scale of the retail store front windows is really different than much of what we see. It would be the largest building with windows on the ground floor around here. I am looking at our guidelines on construction. There are actually a lot of guidelines for new construction on West Main. One

of the guidelines is human scale, which includes balconies, porches, entrances, store fronts, and decorative elements. If the floors above the ground floor are residential, how about some balconies. This is a street. How about some street engagement? I don't feel this building has any street engagement. This is a significant pedestrian corridor for us. It's the most important corridor in this city. It connects the University and the downtown business district. To use some of these elements at the street level to reinforce elements seen elsewhere in the districts, such as cornices, entrances, display windows. Human scale is in two different guidelines that are under height and width. It is specifically applied to new construction. We don't know whether these retail spaces would even have entrances off of West Main. We have been told about the door into the residences. I really don't see any doors on those store fronts. I am assuming each of them would have a separate entrance and be separate spaces and not be accessed from within. I am back and forth on the planters. I am not certain whether they are there as a security measure and to guard against these glass windows and what is within them or whether they are trying to engage with the street as the applicant has said. There will be a presence, space there by itself. I don't know how the building references any part of any historic district. I personally like the building. My last comment is to commend the applicant's representative. This is a really great package of information just telling us historically what is involved with the SUP, giving us all kinds of elevations, giving us lots of information about the building envelope and what is permitted in your programming. This is a great example of a very thorough submission.

Mr. Schwarz – I look at your precedent. I look at the building. I do think there's a really nice elegance to it. I like it. Ms. Lewis makes some really good points. With big store front windows, it seems that is what we want and what the zoning seems to be calling for. If there was a form based code, I am sure it would support that. I am struggling with all of the big picture items on this. I am going back to the windows. I think your precedence for those and the ideas for how to details those are great. My concern is that you can't afford a light colored brick. I am worried that you won't be able to afford the details you are showing. That's for you to prove to us. That is a concern of mine. This comes out being a lot less rich in detail. The simple details are expensive details unfortunately. If the richness goes away and the simplicity becomes even simpler and just plain flat, I think it is going to be completely unsuccessful.

Mr. Mohr – I would like to see them spend the money on the window detailing and save the money by painting the brick.

Mr. Schwarz – If that is how it balances out, that's great. I want to make sure we're not going to get into one of those value engineering cycles where we start off with something that's great. We then slowly chip away at it until it isn't.

Let's go to materials. Brick or stucco exterior, painted brick, and a question of using thin brick on the fourth floor terraces. I am going to add that while our guidelines do not allow thin brick, we have allowed it. The Code Building is clad in a thin brick veneer. It's not glued to the building.

Mr. Dreyfus – The only thing that I would like to add in that regard is the reason why we are thinking about it on the fourth floor is purely weight and structural issues. Thin brick doesn't have to have mitered corners. There are pieces that allow you to turn the corner properly. It's good to know that it has been used. In this instance, it is purely a weight issue.

Mr. Mohr – It's there because it is a qualitative issue. You have something that addresses the qualitative. I wanted to touch on something that Ms. Lewis was saying. Part of what makes that

whole lower story seem a little off putting from a scale standpoint is that the planter solution seems suburban. I think that's part of it. I think the planters do have to go away. The trees are great and an Italian classical sense. I also don't see them as playing well with the street trees. I think that whole sidewalk scene needs to be re-thought.

Mr. Bailey – I would be totally against the planters. I think it needs to be opened entirely and put in canopy trees along the street to make it friendlier.

Mr. Lahendro – In thinking about The Flats and The Standard, I would hope the materials used on the front of the building would also carry around to the back of the building. It is a little discouraging at The Flats to see a bunch of cheap clapboards on the backside.

Mr. Mohr – The Flats also have it on the higher levels as well. It gives a false façade.

Ms. Lewis – To Mr. Mohr's objection to this being too horizontal and my objection to that ground floor look.

Mr. Gastinger – I think that could help. I think there are probably several different ways it could be done and still maintain the elegance that you are going for. The last thing we want it to feel like is a really cheap suburban row house building. I did just want to note that it is helpful to see the context of the adjacent buildings. The street view reminds me of the pretty sizeable historic structure on the north side of the street. It is actually going to have the same plane. It is also a painted brick building. It's a building you don't always see because the trees often obscure it. It does have some interesting lessons that might speak to a public and more of an inviting public approach to the historic fronts along this street edge.

Mr. Schwarz – I am going to add on the subject of materials that although I would love to see an unpainted light colored brick, painted brick would be far superior to stucco just because of stucco means EIFS. I would want to see something hard and durable on the ground floor. I don't know if there is another masonry products that you could look at.

The other items on the outline include elevations, rhythm and scale of the openings on West Main, rhythm and scale of the openings on the south façade facing the railroads, the west façade, the window surrounds, and the neutral color schemes.

Ms. Lengel – I would like to talk a little bit about the cornice line. It seems like you might be adding a thin seam to emphasize the cornice line and the verticality of the piers. Is that correct or is that something from the sketch up model that created the rendering?

Mr. Dreyfus – That's probably more of the sketch up model. One of the details we're thinking about is if we have the steel surrounds, the cornice may actually be a projecting piece of steel that comes out through 3 or 4 inches from the buildings. We hadn't really thought of that line. It reads as pronounced here. It may be a control joint. It wouldn't be as pronounced.

Ms. Lengel – I guess that I would like to see some more emphasis on that detail.

Mr. Mohr – And the parapet is basically a railing too?

Mr. Dreyfus – That's correct. I don't want to belabor any points. I am happy to hear anything else. This has been very helpful.

Mr. Zehmer – You mentioned that there is a service entrance for the commercial shops on the west end facing Main Street.

Mr. Dreyfus – It will be set back within the façade. We don't intend to have a service door right there on.

Mr. Zehmer – I assume that leads to a hallway that connects.

Mr. Dreyfus – That's correct.

Mr. Zehmer – The reason I bring that up that I am curious if we will have a lot of delivery trucks parking in that alley trying to unload.

Mr. Dreyfus – That won't be allowed. Deliveries will be on West Main Street.

Mr. Schwarz – Do you feel that you have gotten a good summary?

Mr. Dreyfus – What I heard was more verticality, massing along this portion of the building, Mr. Mohr's concern about horizontality, the stated detail is out of scale on West Main Street, material-wise, the devil is in the details, how to bring more life onto West Main Street with balconies or other variations that will allow some engagement, the planters are more of an impediment than they are an invitation into the retail.

Mr. Mohr – I think that if you take the planters away, some of the glass area has no bigger than what you see on the plats. The uncommon is completely glass all of the way around at the first floor level. Part of that is that it is hard to understand entry sequences or anything because the planters are obscuring everything. I would be curious if your perception of that changes once you see it without the planters. There are some other parts. That is further up West Main too. Maybe that is the way Mr. Dreyfus gets a little more vertical rhythm out of this. Some of the facades are more hunched openings versus the retail level.

Mr. Dreyfus – The other thing that I missed was the introduction of some color and street trees being more of the public realm and not necessarily related to this building.

Mr. Schwarz – It's really good to have all of this information at this point. In the future, as this progresses, I think staff gives you a little extra time to submit information. That would allow us to review it ahead of time and cut back the presentation.

Mr. Dreyfus – **Request to defer application to a later date – Carl Schwarz moves to accept the applicant's request for a deferral. Tim Mohr seconds. Motion passes (8-0).**

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-11-03

117 Altamont Circle

Tax Parcel 330123000

Viewmont Associates LLC, Owner

Elaine Oakey and Lucius Bracey, Applicant

Roof replacement

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –Year Built: c1915 District: The North Downtown ADC Status: Contributing This 2-1/2 story, brick, Colonial Revival house has three bays, a central dormer and standing seam metal hipped roof with built-in gutters. The painted wood cornice features modillions and dentils. The single-bay front porch has Doric columns, the central entrance door has a fixed transom. Request for CoA:

- Replace in-kind the existing painted standing seam metal roof,
- Remove existing built-in gutters and downspouts and install half round gutters (roof-mounted) with round downspouts
- Remove two brick chimneys and cover openings with new roofing.

One of the chimneys is at the front next to the dormer. Another is to the rear on a portion that is an addition. I have included the scope of work in the discussion. I went back and looked at the BAR record since 2012. The current design guidelines were adopted. I found six specific instances where the COA request where five were approved and one was denied. The design guidelines recommend that chimneys be retained, if they contribute to the style and character of the building. Of the similar houses (with front dormers) on Altamont Circle, including towards High Street, only the two immediately east of 117 have a similarly located chimney. It is not prevalent characteristic of this style.

John Epperly, Applicant – What I would like to add regarding the chimneys is the functionality. The one on the front is right in the valley of that dormer, which contributes to a very vulnerable detriment to the sustainability of the roof long term. It is able to be flashed. In the decades to come, when this starts to have some issues, that’s probably where it is going to start. Being that the chimneys are no longer functional, we think it is in the best interest of the roofing system to go ahead and remove them.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – Are the chimneys tied to fireplaces?

Elaine Oakey, Applicant – They’re not functional.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – There are three pieces to this. I suggest we break it up into three pieces. The first one is replacing the existing painted standing seam medal roof. I can’t imagine any issues with that.

Mr. Werner – I have the criteria attached for rehabilitation on roofing. Mr. Epperly is very familiar with what we require.

Mr. Epperly – It is going to be a double standing seam pre-painted roof. The seams will be same on center as they are right now. It will all match up.

Mr. Schwarz – Removing the existing built in gutters and downspouts and installing half-round gutters with round down spouts.

Mr. Mohr – It does make me sad. It is pretty common. I understand why.

Mr. Schwarz – The two brick chimneys. Any strong objections to both or either of them?

Mr. Lahendro – I don't think the chimneys are significant character defining feature of the buildings. It is not the way they are designed. I don't have any problem with them.

Ms. Lewis – They are bizarre.

Mr. Zehmer – The only comment I would add is the fact there are three houses in a row that do have that very bizarre chimney coming up through the dormer lends itself to saying that they were probably built by the same builder. It does tell a story. I don't think it's worth holding up this application for that request to take them out.

Mr. Gastinger – I appreciate the historic photo that was included in the landmarks. It just highlighted that the downspouts were painted a darker color, more in keeping with the brick. Only the top parts were painted the trim unlike they are currently painted where the trim leaks down the entire corner of the building. I think that would be a friendly suggestion.

Ms. Oakey – As it long as it makes sense to Mr. Epperly, that's fine.

Motion – Mr. Gastinger - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed replacement of the roof, gutters, and downspouts and removal of two chimneys satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Bailey seconds. Motion passes (8-0).

The Meeting was recessed for five minutes.

E. Pre-Application Discussion

8. 125 Chancellor Street

Tax Parcel 90137000

Alpha Tau Omega Holding Corp, Owner

Khanh Uong, Design Develop, LLC, Applicant

Rear addition and site work

- The house in the heart of the fraternity and sorority houses of the University of Virginia.
- The house was purchased in 1995 and there have not been many repairs done to the house since the purchase.
- The fraternity is looking to expand and do repairs to the current house.
- The siding of the house is currently aluminum siding.
- There was an addition to the house in 1950s by the previous owner of the building.
- There is access to the house from a side alley in addition to the Chancellor Street entrance.
- The front corner of the house has recently settled.

- The proposal is to remove the rear portion of the house, a back garage, and two trees in the backyard.
- There is an SUP for the site that requires 7 parking spots.
- The plan does double the size of the building footprint on the site.
- Two small trees will replace the trees in the back and three street trees will be added to the front of the house.
- The first floor will remain the same and the rear portion will feature a break room and a kitchen for the fraternity.
- There will be four bedrooms and attic space in the back addition.
- The front porch is nor safe and the proposal is to rebuild the front porch.
- The proposal is retain the trim work of the house.
- There was a discussion between the BAR and the applicant regarding the project. The following topics were discussed between the BAR and the applicant:
 - Mr. Mohr brought up the size of the front porch.
 - The applicant did have a structural engineer look at the porch. According to the applicant, the porch was in poor shape.
 - There was much discussion regarding the front porch between the applicant and the BAR.
 - Staff did remind the applicant to properly document everything that is to be altered or changed on the existing building.
 - The applicant intent is to refurbish and maintain the windows and to replace the shutters currently on the building.
 - The new siding on the house will be Hardie Plank Siding.
 - There was support from the BAR for the massing of the project. Ms. Lengel did mention that the addition did seem top heavy.
- Members of the BAR did provide some suggestions and recommendations to the applicant that could improve the project.
- The applicant did summarize that the project is going to be rehabilitation on the front part and differentiation is on the back part.

9. 1001 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 100050000

M&J Real Estate, LLC, Owner

Ryan Perkins, Kimley-Horn, Applicant

Exterior alterations

- Staff provided a brief introduction to the BAR on the site project.
- The applicant introduced the project for this site, which did include a mural proposal that will enhance the neighborhood for this Starbucks pickup store.
- The applicant intends to use the artist Justine Cady from Baltimore to paint the mural for this Starbucks pickup store.
 - This artist has done murals for over Starbucks locations.
- The applicant did provide a rendering of the mural of the bright energy and how it will come alive.
- The applicant also provided improvements to be made to have bike traffic and bike parking in front of the store with up to eight spots for bikes.
- There won't be any pictures or images that promote coffee or the selling of coffee in the mural.

- There will be an illuminated sign above the front entrance on West Main Street, another sign in the store, and another sign on the far right corner of the west façade facing 10th Street.
- The BAR and the applicant had a preliminary discussion regarding the bike rack, materials, retaining wall, and the mural on the side of the building.
- The chairman and other board members expressed excitement regarding this project.
- The BAR provided recommendations and suggestions for improvement for this project. Some of the recommendations included:
 - Addressing the front windows and the painting of the windows.
 - Staff reminding the applicant that the community is going to provide feedback for the project.
 - Widespread support for the mural on the side of the building structure.
 - The bike parking being an excellent idea for this site.
 - Vegetation and planters would be ideal for the sloped grade coming down from the retaining wall.
- There was a discussion regarding the guidelines on murals and that the guidelines don't recommend murals.
- There was a brief discussion between the BAR and the applicant regarding the windows and the painting of the front windows.

F. Other Updates

10. Staff Questions/Discussion

Plan for continued CoA discussion

Pen Park Update

BAR Training – explain requirements

- Staff did go over the possible options and opportunities for BAR training.

Preservation Awards

Coordinate work session for Preservation Plan

Coordinate work session re: Lighting

11. PLACE Update

- There was no PLACE meeting.

G. Adjournment

The Meeting was adjourned at 11:08 PM.

