

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
January 20, 2021 – 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, Jody Lahendro, Carl Schwarz, Tim Mohr, Ron Bailey, Andy McClure, James Zehmer
Members Absent: Sonya Llengel
Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Jeff Werner, Robert Watkins, Joe Rice
Pre-Meeting:

Staff went over the different items on the agenda for the meeting.

There was a concern about the railing at Beth Israel. That issue was addressed and resolved by staff. There was also discussion regarding the 125 Chancellor Street COA Application

Staff went over the ivy on Market Street. The ivy is going to be on the building.

Staff did go over the front porch reconstruction on West Jefferson.

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Comments from the Public

B. Announcement of BAR Preservation Awards

The Announcement of Preservation Awards was delayed until the BAR meeting next month.

C. 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. BAR Meeting Minutes – September 15, 2020
2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 21-01-01
3 Gildersleeve Wood
Tax Parcel 110019000

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

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-01-02 (Demolition)
125 Chancellor Street
Tax Parcel 090137000
Alpha Tau Omega Holding Corp., Owner
Khanh Uong, Design Develop, LLC, Applicant
Rear addition and site work

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – This is 125 Chancellor Street. This is a request because there's a demolition of a portion that is large enough that the demolition is treated under a separate Certificate of Appropriateness by the BAR. We will first be discussing the demolition request, which is for the portion at the rear of the house. The BAR will have to take action on that. That is followed up by the discussion for the proposed new work on the house. Both will follow the same steps. There may be people that wish to speak tonight. You can choose which application you would like to speak. This is a COA request for 125 Chancellor Street. This is a COA request for the demolition at a rear wing of the house. This house was constructed in 1898. It's a Victorian style building. It features several Lake East and Queen decorative motifs such as the mock half timbering and the front Gable and brackets beneath the overselling front eave. There was an addition to the rear, in addition to what is there. It was constructed around 1952. There is a garage in the back northwest corner that will be removed as part of this project. However, that is non-contributing and the BAR won't be taking action on that. In my discussion of this construction, a new addition will extend the use of the historic building. With that work, it will facilitate the building getting some much needed rehabilitation and repair. The historic rear wing is likely original. However, extension alterations would be necessary to incorporate it into the proposed rear edition. Just to be clear, we're talking about a new addition. That work requires the removal of the 1952 addition and this rear wing that we believe was original. In lieu of using the existing wing to connect the house and the addition, constructing a wider hyphen will more effectively and efficiently meet the fraternity programmatic needs. What they're looking to do is not have an addition that's just access to a small hallway, but something that's incorporating the larger house. The staff supports the approval of the COA request and recommends the following as condition: they provide for the BAR archives documentation of the rear elevation. That would be just a sketch of all the sides of it, including some photographs and the measure of elevations and floor plans. Design Build established our standard with what they did over there on Virginia Avenue. They're familiar with that. I did go through the criteria for demolition and offered my answers on each of the questions. If you have any about that, we certainly can refer to it.

Khanh Uong, Applicant – We are requesting to remove this rear portion. We did look at it initially to see if we can incorporate. However, there's a couple limiting factors that preclude us from being able to do that. One: With the second floor of that rear addition, the extension is 16 inches lower than the rest of the second floor. It steps down. For us to be able to keep that, that requires a lot of restructuring, removing the floor Joyce, raising the floor and then by that time, the head height will be affected. The other limiting factor is you have to add this parking lot in the back that has to meet city standards. With all the drive aisles and parking lots, it really encroaches on how much area we have in the back to add

this addition beyond just the setback. Unfortunately, we're hoping that we can take it down and then add an addition on the back that complements the front. Since it is on the rear, it's not really seen from the street. Taking it down won't affect the historic character of the remaining building as much.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – Since this is a partial demolition, guideline A6 is the only one that directly applies to a partial demolition, which addresses any remaining features. Are there any other guidelines that we have that will give us some guidance in a partial demolition?

Mr. Werner – This references question A6. The criteria for a demolition doesn't separate out the entire building or part of the building or a little bit of the building. The way I looked at it was given the three sides that will remain and the unique features of this building, would removing this roughly 8X15 piece on the rear see a significant loss or deterioration of the character. I didn't see that we would. There is nothing else. This is what we have to refer to.

Mr. Mohr – It does seem that there are actually two levels to the demolition here too. The porch is more about reconstruction because it is in bad repair. It's not being obliterated.

Mr. Werner – I looked at the porch reconstruction as part of the demolition COA. With the demolition COA, I was singularly looking at the rear. That's how I was approaching it.

Mr. Schwarz – The difference is the porch is being rebuilt.

Mr. Werner – We're not removing it and moving on.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – Since they have to take the porch down and rebuild it. At the time, a little forensic exploration when you do the siding to see if there is any indication of the original attachment to the building. It bothers me having it project out. It feels one gable should be primary. The porch really competes with it. It seems out of scale to me.

Mr. Werner – We do have information that acknowledges that this porch was reconstructed. The Sanborn Map support that. There is acknowledgment in the historic survey of that difference in character and style. It appears to have been done very early in the 20th century. It certainly is not original, but it certainly is old.

Mr. Gastinger – I think we're talking about that in the next application.

Mr. Mohr – I was thinking more about if it is coming down at the same time as the rest of it, I would just request that there is some attention paid to if they find something.

Mr. Bailey – Strictly speaking, it is not part of the demolition we are considering?

Ms. Lewis – It is being demolished. I agree with Mr. Mohr. That porch is being demolished, unless the applicant is telling us they're leaving significant features of it. It seems like it is being changed quite a bit.

Mr. Schwarz – This is a technicality that we are arguing over. We can talk about it once we get past this. The demolition application only concerns the back. Staff has put the porch into the next application. It is being rebuilt in kind. We don't have approve it as a demolition. If we want to talk about it now, you guys are free to.

Mr. Bailey – Why don't we deal with the demolition part first. We will get to the porch in the next COA, which is coming up later.

Ms. Lewis – My concern is that there is a demolition being done to the porch. It is fine that it is not discussed here. We can talk about the demolition of the rear. There is demolition being done and it should be discussed. There should be a separate vote to demolish a very historic feature on this property. There should be two separate votes. One for the addition and one for the demolition of that feature.

Mr. Schwarz – Because it is being rebuilt in kind and they are trying to tell us that they're going to rebuild it exactly as it is. It's a "different animal." It is like replacing a roof or replacing a window. It is just a different procedure. It is a demolition but it's going to be replaced exactly as it is.

Ms. Lewis – Is it exactly? It's in poor condition. I hope that it is not being replaced with the same materials exactly as it is. I don't think that is the intention of the applicant. I do think there's a demolition and our guidelines don't actually say that an exception from a demolition is where something is being replaced. It's not a window or a simple feature. It's a significant feature that is being demolished. I think we're entitled to look at it along with the replacement that is being presented. I agree with Mr. Mohr.

Mr. Gastinger – I don't think it limits our discussion of it at all. I think the way the applications have been presented, we should get past this point and bring it up in the next discussion.

Mr. Schwarz – We have a procedural thing that we should probably discuss soon.

Motion – Ms. Lewis - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, I move to find that the proposed selective demolition at 125 Chancellor Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in Corner ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following condition:

• Provide for the BAR archives documentation of the rear elevation (all sides of the historic rear wing), including photographs and measured elevations and floor plans. Ron Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-01-02 (Demolition)
125 Chancellor Street
Tax Parcel 090137000

Alpha Tau Omega Holding Corp., Owner
Khanh Uong, Design Develop, LLC, Applicant
Rear addition and site work

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – This is the second COA for 125 Chancellor Street. This COA request is for the new addition and renovation rehabilitation of existing house. There is some related site work involved. The house was constructed in 1888. It is a contributing building in The Corner ADC district. The BAR held a preliminary discussion of the proposed work back in November, I will note that the existing garage in the back corner is not contributing. They are removing it. That's not being addressed in this COA request. The proposed improvements and materials have been laid out in the site plan and are in the staff report. One correction is that there had been discussion of possibly requiring city ADA review. There was discussion of possibly requiring an ADA accessible ramp in the front. That has been addressed. It won't be necessary. The ADA ramp on the side will facilitate those requirements. Much of the preliminary discussion in November focused on the front porch, particularly its origin. I note that we reviewed the available information. While the current porch is stylistically different from the house it does likely date to the early 20th century. From the 1996 THR reconnaissance level survey, the porch may have been rebuilt. Originally, it was probably stylistically in keeping with the house. The present Colonial Revival porch, the one we see now, appears to be the same size as the original. It was probably added in the early 20th century. There are some notes I've made about what we should be primarily focusing on. The work and repairs that are proposed are always welcomed in a building. I know that there is some aluminum siding involved. Some discussion on that is necessary. I offer five points. If the COA is approved staff recommends a consideration of these conditions. One that the cement board siding on the addition would be smooth, no full grain. I saw in the photos a tremendous amount of old wires, conduit, boxes, phones, cables, etc. that would be removed to the extent that they're no longer being used. There's a lot of excess vegetation at the site. I don't necessarily want to see it bush hogged. There are some selective cleaning up that could be done. There appears to be a metal fence front along that that low wall that does show up in historic photographs. You would probably like to see that retained. There's trimming and pruning there. I think probably one or two invasive trees are in there. This goes to what Mr. Mohr was talking about. When the aluminum siding is removed, it would it would be nice for the BAR record to have photographs of what is below. This would not be for us to say. "Hey, we want you to make it look like that." If that is being removed, it is an opportunity to get a snapshot of possibly what that original material looked like. I think that the comment was made about recording existing conditions at the front porch, in any sort of selective demolition.

Khanh Uong, Applicant – There are a few site issues that we would like to discuss with you. The low fence on the front and the low wall. We had mentioned the city requiring a new hydrant and the location effect on some of the wall.

Kendra Patrick, Applicant – We received comments after our last submission with it showing a fire hydrant and the removal of a small portion of the wall. They are now also requiring that the new water meter be placed behind the sidewalk. That will also need public utilities in and around it. The wall can't be within that easement. It's looking like a span of about 15 feet where the wall will need to be removed or jogged around all of the utilities. Before it was just this small area. It's now growing. I would like to know how we should address that if it is worth maintaining the wall or removing it entirely.

Mr. Gastinger – What is the nature of that retaining wall in the front? Do we have any pictures of it without it being covered up in vegetation?

Mr. Uong – Maybe in the city’s historical survey, there was one fuzzy photo that showed it.

Mr. Werner – It appears to be just a low concrete, covered wall. It is not dissimilar to what we have seen in other places. It is very low.

Ms. Patrick – It only holds about a foot of dirt. It’s not so much necessary. It’s for aesthetics.

Mr. Uong – At the last meeting we did focus a lot on the porch. We know the original porch was different and probably better in scale in proportion with the house. We have no documentation of what it looked like. With historic structures, you shouldn’t make something up. It’s probably better that we know what is here now. This is all rich in the 1920s. We can recreate that in time. The Board has expressed that they like the original version, which is closer to the house. We don’t feel it is right to fabricate something since we don’t know what it looked like. On the south elevation, there were some comments regarding the addition and its elevation to try to make it a little more playful. We did address that. We created double hung windows, so it has the same proportions as the front of the house with the shutters. We also block the blinds down closer to the front of the house. We also separate that rear addition porch away from the house. The scene between the two houses reads more clearly. There is a clear change between old and new. Those are the major changes that we addressed from the last meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Question from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – The eave line of the addition looked like it was above the roofline of the original house. On some of the other renderings, it looked like it was lower. I wanted clarity on where it is going to end up.

Mr. Uong – The renderings are accurate. I think it is a little deceptive because the addition is pushed back from the other face. It brings it down.

Mr. Schwarz – You said that there is going to be a 15 foot length area of the wall that has to be moved. Does it have to be moved a couple feet into the property? How wide is the easement that you need to avoid?

Ms. Patrick – It would probably be seven to ten feet. The utilities would have to be a few feet back from the sidewalk. You would need a 5 foot easement around the utilities. The utilities have to be 5 feet apart from one another.

Mr. Schwarz – I noticed that you put in some new trees that don’t currently exist. I was excited about those. Will they still be part of the design?

Ms. Patrick – The trees will be part of the design.

Mr. Lahendro – Going back to the front porch, it is a later change but it is still historic within the period of historic features. It does need to be preserved. Would the applicant please describe what they are planning to do with this porch? What is being proposed for the porch?

Mr. Uong – The last time we presented we mentioned that we have a 3D laser scanner that helps us document distant additions. We have scanned the porch and we have all of the details. We are going to try to replicate it as closely as possible. However, off the shelf materials right now may be different. We might ask the Board if we have to replicate it exactly the way it is. Can we purchase new pieces that closely resembles what is there as possible? For most of the railing, we are going to go with wood painted railings. However, the columns, just for structural integrity and longevity, we are proposing a fiberglass structural column.

Mr. Lahendro – You're implying that you're going to take it all apart and take it down.

Mr. Uong – We went out there with our structural engineer. He deemed it as not safe. It's pulling away from the building. It is structurally not sound. The wood is rotted.

Bob Pinso, Applicant – Time has not been kind to this porch. There have been really ad hoc additions and variations. The subfloor is rotted. The Joyce work is coming apart. Somebody went underneath there and tried to jack it up. The design was only a single staircase. There is evidence of somebody trying to figure out how to solve the problem. It is not in great shape at all. There is a turning point where trying to create a safe environment and giving the Board what they are looking for. The pieces are really in rough shape.

Mr. Lahendro – When was the building occupied?

Mr. Pinso – It is currently occupied.

Mr. Lahendro – I am really astonished that this is supposedly in such a condition that you have to dismantle and take this entire porch apart in a building that's occupied now and being used. Instead of carefully trying to peel back the layers and taking off the trim and verifying that there is significant damage, have you done the probes to know that the structural system is completely gone?

Mr. Pinso – I wouldn't say completely gone. There is enough evidence around the perimeter. There are open areas where rot has formed. The soffit is dropping. The decking material is not original and in really rough shape. The columns are rotted in certain areas. There is a general perspective of how do we get this back and make it safe and recreate what is already there. This is subjective. From our perspective, it's in really, really tough shape. If that is the approach that you would like use to take and be more surgical about it and try that methodology, I don't know where the tipping point is and where we come back to you with what we found. It's hard to take something apart to the level where you can actually see all of the issues without getting approval to move forward. We would be open to whatever you suggest.

Mr. Lahendro – I am looking at the three columns on the right. They don't seem to be anywhere near as damaged as the corner column, which makes sense. It's more exposed on the corner. I would approach this by starting to selectively pull out the pieces that are severely damaged, taking some of the fascias off, the moldings off, and getting under the floor and looking at the structure under the floor. It is a historic feature. It should be repaired. Those elements that are severely damaged can be replaced, which means wood. The moldings shouldn't be similar. They should match what is here.

Mr. Uong – I think we understand your viewpoint. Unfortunately, it is hard for us to do exploratory work right now when the building is occupied. That's why we went with this strategy of recreating it. However, if the Board approves we can build around. Once the building is unoccupied, we can start doing selective demolition, exploratory work, and more investigative work to determine what is feasible with the goal of retaining what is there and what is needed. If it comes to the point where it's

not salvageable and we have the structural documentation. Do we come back to the Board and figure out a new game plan?

Mr. Lahendro – Don't give in so easy. There is still the rest of the Board that will want to make itself known. I would rather hear the applicant tell us how the process is going to respect and preserve those features of the porch that are not damaged and replace those features and re-attach the structure to the building, to repair in kind, and to make it safe. If we knew that, we wouldn't require you to come back every time you find something that you didn't expect. It's the process that I am more concerned about. I would much rather do it that way than for somebody to tell me that it is procedurally easier to tear it all down and build a new one and replace the features in fiberglass.

Mr. Gastinger – If this was a restoration project, I don't think it would be subject to our review?

Mr. Schwarz – I think you might be right. Since we have a thorough review process in the city, I am wondering if you guys are certain that you're not going to be required to put taller railings in. I don't know what the railing is on the upper level. I think you have it drawn at 3 feet. The lower railing is at 42 inches.

Mr. Uong – I think residential allows three feet.

Mr. Schwarz – It's in the commercial building code. It's not a single family or townhouse. I think you have to follow the commercial codes.

Mr. Uong – I think there was an exception in there for R3.

Mr. Zehmer – It lends itself to repair more than replace. If you're repairing it, you can repair what is there. If you replace it, you may have to bring it up to code.

Mr. Pinso – We would be under the rehab code. It is grey area. If you take it down, you should bring back that portion. If the top railing is rotting, you can't put it back. I think that's an issue we probably need to figure out.

Mr. Mohr – It looks like the drawings are calling for PVC shutters. What is on there right now?

Mr. Uong – Those shutters are metal.

Mr. Schwarz – Is the PVC going to be hollow? Or is it a solid cross section?

Mr. Uong – I would assume that it is solid. It's not very thick.

Mr. Schwarz – When we have approved foam materials, it's the hollow extrusions we tend to shy away from. It's the same thing with the vinyl windows. If it's a solid section, we tend to be a little more lenient.

Mr. Pinso – We are showing solid sections.

Mr. Zehmer – With the two gable ends, the historic house will be infilled when the rear original part is demolished. The two gable ends that face over the top of the hyphen roof, do those have windows onto the hyphen?

Mr. Pinso – They are not.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – Given the discussion about the porch, I do think it looks better with one set of stairs. Is there a precedent that is telling you that you can make it one rung and have the porch on the left?

Mr. Uong – The historical photos in the survey show a single rung. There is infill between those two left columns.

Mr. Lahendro – Clearly the steps and railings are modern.

Mr. Uong – You can tell that the landing was expanded to accommodate the new rung. We will also be moving that extra landing.

Mr. Mohr – It does actually appeal to me that the shutters are picking up the accent color from the gable. It seems to draw that detail down into the house having that color repeated rather than having them be the same color window.

Mr. Pinso – That would be fine with us. I would like to re-render it just to make sure. If we're using the new color on the siding, we want to make sure that didn't stand out. We would have to check with our clients. That whole siding is all blending. That color is not original. It is part of what is imbedded in the aluminum siding.

Mr. Mohr – The one thing that does seem successful is that the detail up at the top being the accent color is picked up by the shutters. It does help draw that detail down and tie it into the house. It is hard to tell from the historic photos. It looks slightly darker. They are so grainy.

Mr. Schwarz – Since it seems like this is necessary, I am frustrated with the City on this. I don't understand why they have to move the water meter. It sounds like it would be better to not have the wall or to interrupt the wall as opposed to pulling it back to get away from the easement. You would have to regrade the grass. Can the meter be in the grass?

Ms. Patrick – The meter will be in the grass.

Mr. Schwarz – Theoretically, you could have the lawn come down to the sidewalk. The meter would be somewhere in there and the wall would be missing.

Mr. Bailey – Do the other houses along that street have a wall as well? Is this something that this particular house has?

Mr. Werner – Most of them have a wall of some kind.

Mr. Schwarz – There used to be more stone walls on this street. At some point, some of them were rebuilt as concrete. They were rebuilt so long ago, we even considered those to be historic. This might be scored to look like block.

Mr. Mohr – Did I miss something that the water meter couldn't undercut the wall and put the water meter in the yard? They're read by radio.

Ms. Patrick – This is something we were told by city utilities. The wall must be removed in that whole area. We tried asking if the water meter could be put in the sidewalk in this case. They said 'no.'

Mr. Gastinger – It is so frustrating that the city is putting us in that position. This really isn't a wall. It shouldn't be removed if we are protecting the fabric of this neighborhood. It's a stupid reason.

Mr. Schwarz – The ramp thing is really disturbing. That's obviously not required.

Mr. Mohr – What are they referring to as far as the water meter is concerned? Are they pointing to a specific regulation?

Ms. Patrick – The water meter has to be upgraded because of the upgrades to the building. The fixture counts require a bigger meter.

Mr. Mohr – I was wondering more about what would generate the clearance demand. Where is that standard coming from?

Ms. Patrick – I looked at their standards and design manual. It is not very clear. It actually says the 20 foot easement around each utility like this. In the past, they have approved 5 feet. I would have to ask exactly what they are referring to.

Mr. Pinso – What we would be willing to do to help is to try mock up something. We're trying to do the right thing and make sure that the right amount of review is put on this. If we drew something and some alternatives, you guys could support us.

Mr. Mohr – I just love that a water meter deserves ten feet of clear space. The telephone pole is allowed 6 feet in the middle of the sidewalk. It is so inconsistent.

Mr. Lahendro – The Board could support you in terms of noting that the wall is historic. It's part of the historic features of the site and the building. The building code does allow for waivers for certified historic buildings. You can ask if a waiver couldn't be obtained in recognition of the historic wall.

Mr. Gastinger – It's important to note that it is an important feature of the neighborhood. Every property on that side of the street to Rugby Road has a low retaining wall.

Mr. Werner – There is the ADA. We currently do not have an ADA Coordinator. There was a lot of default to conservative interpretation. The thing about the wall is that I thought it had more of something to do with the fire hydrant location. I just found the letter from city utilities. It says to "please show the new water meter behind the sidewalk and in the front yard. The city will need the new PUE for this as well." I don't know what a PUE is. "Due to the high curb present in this location, the meter needs to be moved back into the grass area so that it can be constructed properly. We can discuss further via email or phone if needed." I always thought this was necessary for the fire hydrant. If they can put it in a slab at grade behind the wall, that would be something worth having further conversations. They are not unreasonable. The question for them would be whether that meter can be installed at grade and the wall kept in place.

Mr. Mohr – I don't understand it. The meter wrenches are pretty long. It doesn't make any sense to me.

Mr. Schwarz – I think the thing in the Standards and Design Manual that we fought over for so long is the fact that they don't want to have any private construction over top of any public utility. Serving that meter will be going under a wall that will have to be purposed. They don't want to have to worry about being responsible for rebuilding a wall.

Mr. Werner – That is what I have heard as well.

Mr. Mohr – It doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Schwarz – This is part of what was argued when the Standards and Design Manual was approved. It was a big argument. We lost some battles.

Mr. Werner – Trying to think of a way to detach from this issue specifically. One thing I would recommend would be that if there does have to be a "jog" in the law, then you could reconstruct something that is similar. The city says "we understand this." The applicant could take this out of this request and treat it later. There is a lot going on at this site. I am not sure that we can resolve this tonight. I would like to find a way to move forward. Part of the BAR review here is to give the COA to allow the site plan to move forward. There is some choreography here that isn't perfect. A COE for the remainder of the project and this matter can come back in a separate request. It might not let the site plan be finalized. It does allow the designers to move forward in developing the construction drawings for the rest of the project. If that helps, that's how I would like to see it broken up. I can reach out for some clarification. We have a lot of different people who have been talking. It is a lot of different people providing information on this. Let me pursue this further and if you all are willing to move forward with some type of comment. From the applicant end, come from saying "we would like to move forward and remove this" at your request so that it is not some condition to deal with later. That allows the rest of this to exist separately in another COA.

Mr. Pinso – That makes perfect sense to us. We will fight the good fight. We will run into somebody who says that we can't do that. We can illustrate things. There is nothing like a good diagram or alternatives.

Mr. Schwarz – You are OK with us separating this portion of the site plan from the rest of the project?

Mr. Pinso – Unless it is a bad idea. I don't think we can give a definitive. I would rather move forward and get some kind of blessing on where we are so that we can move that part forward.

Mr. Werner – Resolving that corner would be a separate COA and another application.

Mr. Schwarz – When we make our approval tonight, let's make some kind of statement that this wall is historic.

Mr. Zehmer – Can we recommend that they remove the ivy and repair the fence?

Mr. Werner – It is in the conditions. I have that in there as things that are recommended.

Ms. Lewis – I just wanted to talk about the guidelines for rehabilitation in particular for restoration of existing features on the property. There are several that pertain to this application, particularly the

proposal to replace existing shutters with PVC and to rebuild the columns in the front, which I assume are wood with fiberglass columns. From the rehabilitation guidelines, Section B, Guideline 5 – Restore as many elements as possible particularly materials, decorative details. Guideline 11 – Avoid materials where they never existed. Section C, Paragraph 20 – Address shutters in particular. Shutters should be wood and should be mounted on hinges. There is some language after that would allow for wood composite. I don't see any PVC or other materials called out in the guidelines. Section D, Guideline 5 – Do not strip porches of historic materials and details. That is the purview of our Board.

Mr. Bailey – There is also under that porch guideline, Guideline 4 – Replace an entire porch only if too deteriorated to repair or is completely missing. Design is to match as closely as possible. We really do need to know if it is too deteriorated.

Mr. Uong – Our strategy is to repair it. Should we find that it is beyond repair, we will come back to the BAR.

Mr. Lahendro – At the same time, I am fine with replacing the stair and the railings to what you show in your proposed design. I do want to commend the architects for making the changes to the addition on the back. It looks much better now.

Ms. Lewis – I was about to thank the applicants for that too. You responded to our comments from the last meeting. It's quite attractive too.

Mr. Gastinger – I support the project especially with the changed attitude towards repair and restoration on the front porch, fighting the good fight on the side wall on the front, and with the more detail in the landscape plan. I think the architectural additions are elegant and appropriate and in accordance with our guidelines.

Ms. Lewis – We're approving PVC shutters and fiberglass columns? I just want to make clear that everybody supports this but me. They're announcing that they will repair the porch. I haven't heard anything about materials.

Mr. Uong – We can investigate wood shutters. We just picked that for longevity and maintenance.

Mr. Lahendro – Can we depend on the porch being repaired in kind for materials and features of appearance?

Mr. Pinso – Absolutely. Our assessment was too light in relationship to preservation. It is in tough shape. It wasn't us trying to say it was an easy decision. It was just so bad. We are cumulatively thinking about the safety issues and all of the things that we are going to find. That's different than what we have found. We are re-committed to saying let's re-check our assumptions and come back. We will have a much more cumulative understanding of what the problems are. We will present those problems and ask for a way forward. If the columns are completely rotted, what would you like for us to do? Those discussions will be had as a way forward.

Mr. Lahendro – I think that is fair. The way that it is presented now is we're replacing it without really knowing that it requires to be completely replaced. That's for us as the Board to approve. We need to see evidence that it is too far gone to be repaired.

Ms. Lewis – I was really impressed with the 3D heat scan that you showed us. I have no doubt that front corner is sinking. There are other conditions that make it tenuous. That doesn't mean all of the

architectural details there are tenuous. Structurally, you're right. It's not in great shape. It may not be safe for the students that are coming back. I am trying to distinguish between a condition that you definitely have identified that we don't doubt is there. What could be preserved is a 100 year old porch. I noticed that the sunburst brackets are being preserved. If those are in bad shape, I would hope that they can be rehabbed or replicated. They seem to be in OK shape. I can't support the PVC shutters or fiberglass columns. I would support the approach you have adopted to see what can be repaired. I don't feel the applicant has to come back.

Mr. Werner – The way I have been interpreting the BAR tweaking the scope is that if the applicant acknowledges it, this element has been revised or moved. That happens all of the time. That revision is incorporated into the motion. If something has to come back later, clarify that and remove it from the scope.

Mr. Zehmer – On the porch, it seems that there is a downspout missing adjacent to that corner column, which likely has a lot to do with the condition. I am assuming that you're going to address stormwater management in the restoration. I would encourage you to not let the condition to get worse and put a corrugated pipe as a temporary fashion to get the water away from there until you are able to start construction.

Mr. Gastinger – I am wondering if we could approve the application and not approve the removal of the historic sidewall. If they can come up with a scenario that works with the city, they have the approval they need. They don't have to come back to us rather than separate applications.

Mr. Schwarz – Looking at the guidelines, the shutters, in general, should be wood. The existing shutters are metal. In some circumstances, appropriately dimensioned painted composite materials. That's why I was asking if these were solid sections or hollow. What we have been trying to avoid is the cheap vinyl things you can buy at Lowes. If it is a PVC solid section of PVC trim, we allow it quite frequently. That's what I am reading this as. My concern is that if they put up wood, in five years it is going to be rotten and unpainted and starting to sag again. The longevity of doing something that's not wood appeals to me in this instance.

Mr. Lahendro – Can PVC be mounted on hinges?

Mr. Schwarz – It does need to be painted. Make sure you can put a dark color on that.

Mr. Mohr – Fiberglass might be better than PVC. I empathize with Ms. Lewis' point of view. They are wood windows.

Ms. Lewis – Avoid materials where they never existed. With regard to Mr. Schwarz's comment on this being a fraternity house, it is not undergraduates that maintain a fraternity house. Every fraternity house is not owned by the undergraduate members. It is owned by a house corporation or in a lot of cases they are owned by the universities or colleges. I don't think there is an exemption in the guidelines. I don't think we have the leeway to look at economic circumstances of different applicants under our guidelines.

Mr. Schwarz – In the past, the fraternity houses have looked pretty awful.

Ms. Lewis – No disagreement with you. I have been looking at these houses for a very long time. I don't think our guidelines allow us to select who can maintain something. If it's low income housing

but in a historic house, we may feel bad imposing more expensive materials that are more costly to maintain.

Mr. Schwarz – I am disagreeing with your reading of the guidelines. I think that it is allowed. It is permitted in certain circumstances.

Ms. Lewis – Is PVC a composite?

Mr. Uong – There is PVC and PVC composite. They are both solid.

Mr. Zehmer – We have allowed composite slate shingles on roofs in this district as opposed to requiring Buckingham slate.

Ms. Lewis – I would point out that composite slate is allowed in our guidelines. It is specifically called out as a material that is permitted.

Mr. Schwarz – It says it here. In some circumstances, composite materials may be used.

Mr. Werner – The best example was the Chippendale railing that was installed. It was a composite material that they used for that. It was something that Mr. Schwarz had recommended. There is a composite material that is solid. There is extruded vinyl. There is a distinct difference in how the materials are constructed. The BAR has allowed that.

Mr. Mohr – At a very minimum, it really needs to be a paintable surface. It should be something that is designed for paint. You get that imperfection of a hand painted surface. In terms of your perception, that gets it a long way towards being a wood shutter and what you see. These are wood windows. It has to be up there with maintaining those components.

Mr. Werner – I would strongly recommend the motion referred to the conditions that I inserted. I do agree with Mr. Gastinger's suggestion about addressing the water meter. I think that is sufficient as well.

Mr. Gastinger – We have the issue about the change relative to the front porch. We have the shutters. We have the side wall. Is there anything else?

Mr. Schwarz – With that side wall, their drawing shows it jogging around a fire hydrant. I think that's going to be a given no matter what. I am willing to concede that we can approve the drawing as submitted but not what they have described with the water meter. They would still be interrupting that wall. I think that they're going to have interrupt it at least for the fire hydrant. Or we don't approve the wall. I think we're going to be stuck with that fire hydrant.

Mr. Pinso – If you approve that wall as it is, we are going to fight the good fight. We're going to do the due diligence. We're going to show different versions of it. We will do our best. We are going to make it the best we can. We would like as much freedom as possible to do it.

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 alterations, repairs, and new construction at 125 Chancellor Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in Corner ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following recommendations:

- **The cement board siding on the addition and aluminum siding will be smooth, no faux grain.**
- **Remove from the exterior walls unnecessary wires, conduits, and related boxes.**
- **Clearing of vegetation from the front (sidewalk) wall and metal fencing.**
- **Trimming and pruning of remaining vegetation and removing invasive plants.**
- **When the aluminum siding is removed, provide for the BAR record photographs of each elevation.**
- **Shutters on the project should be wood and not PVC, and be the same color as the accent color in the front gable.**

In addition, the BAR supports the project's approach of repair and restoration of the porch. In addition, the BAR recognizes that some elements of the porch will be reinstated given the documentation that has been prepared.

The site wall is approved as drawn, but the BAR recommends the applicant work with the City to minimize any required demolition or reconstruction of the wall.

Jody Lahendro seconds. Motion passes (7-1, Lewis opposed).

The meeting was recessed for a three minute break.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-01-03

801 Park Street

Tax Parcel 470020000

Daniel G. Krasnegor and Kristin H. Jensen, Owners

Megan Taylor, TimberStone Landscape Design, Applicant

Landscaping

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – This is a COA request for a landscape and hardscape plan. This is the Trevellian-Tennyson House. It was constructed in 1893. It is in the North Downtown ADC District. It is contributing. It was originally more elaborately detailed than it is now. It's a Queen Anne style house with a steeply pitched roof with tall chimneys, large dormer windows, and crusting at the ridges. It has been described as one of the most elaborately decorated homes on Park Street. It's been to the BAR twice for some renovations, particularly in February of 2017. The BAR approved a series of exterior renovations which were recognized by the BAR with a 2020 Preservation and Design Award for the rehabilitation of historic structure. The application before you this evening is a COA request for a conceptual master plan for plantings, patios, walkways, pools, and a parking area on the side street. We originally talked about not having any trees removed, but there is a small apple tree at the front sidewalk. They do hope to remove that. It will be replaced with the two serviceberry trees with one on each side of that walk. The BAR should discuss the applicants request for the option work at the front walk. That's something that they've specifically asked about. The intent is to correct the riser heights at the steps. It also provides an opportunity to better align it with the front of the house. The fact that it is concrete and not original to the house certainly is old but not original. The plan as it has been submitted as is to some extent conceptual. There is some detailed information in there. The applicant has provided some of the addendum sheets to establish the types of materials that are going to be used. This is a large scale project and this isn't going to be tackled all at once. They wish to establish some parameters that they can move forward with it. If they have to adjust something we've given a range of things that can be used. Staff is recommending approval of the COA. I've stated five conditions that I think cover the basis for allowing them to move forward with what's conceptual. There is a wood deck in the rear. There is a proposed shed. They are excluded from this and would require separate COAs at

a later date. The only thing I would add is the patio or this proposed pool area is actually depressed down into the grade. Instead of having a pool with a big wall around it or a fence, it's allowing a continuous appearance of being open from Park Street back. The pool would be built at a much later phase. If it happens or when it happens, the goal is to incorporate some self-closing cover. That does not require the large fences that that we see in other situations. I think it is an excellent solution. It is depressed into the landscape and not elevated above it.

Megan Taylor, Applicant – I will go over the existing conditions and the property goals. As you can see, this survey was done back in the fall. We had the built conditions surveyed, the mature trees surveyed, and the grade between the house and the rear detached studio, and the grade where the proposed pool might be located. There aren't discernable landscape features other than the one front walkway connecting the front porch to the sidewalk on Park Street and the sidewalk connecting the porch to Park Hill Street. The overall goals for the property include an overall masterplan starting with any smaller planting projects. The overall goals for the property are to revitalize the landscape, revitalize the existing circulation and create new circulation, and to create private outdoor spaces. With revitalizing the landscape, the intent is to maintain the open park light aesthetic along the Park Street frontage and to create more private intimate garden spaces starting from the front plane of the house and moving back to the rear of the house. With revitalizing the circulation and creating new circulation, both of the existing walkways have entry steps. Where the risers are uneven, they can be hazardous to navigate, especially the steps on the sidewalk. Both walkways are also narrow and we are proposing to have them widened. The front walkway is cracking and settling in several places. There is grass and weeds growing into the joints. New circulation is needed from the off street parking area on Hill Street to the rear entrance of the main house to the entrance to the studio. The rear entrance to the house is used on a more regular basis. The entrance to the studio would be used for visiting family and guests. The final goal of the property is to create private outdoor spaces. There are no programmed or delineated outdoor spaces. Low retaining walls are needed to create these spaces due to the sloping grade. With the use of plantings and walls to create and define the private spaces, the homeowners will have the ability utilize the extent of their property as desired. This is a conceptual plan. The first phase would be the front yard plantings, the English garden, the front walkway, and the Park Hill walkway improvements.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Thinking about existing trees in the front yard, are there other additional trees that didn't show up on the survey on the north side of the lot?

Ms. Taylor – There are some smaller trees. I believe there is a willow oak and a couple other trees that were saved. I believe that there was some clearing done when the renovation work happened on the house. On the area that was cleared on the northeastern side of the property, there were some trees that were saved. A couple of trees are not on this survey.

Mr. Gastinger – They seemed to show up in the street view.

Ms. Taylor – That apple tree just to the north of the front walkway seems to be dying. That would be the only tree that we are proposing to remove.

Mr. Werner – The street view that is on Park Hill is a 2012 image. The Park Street view is more current.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – The strategy makes a lot of sense. The only thing I would like to see are some more street trees. That part of Park Street going up the other side is the leaf treed part of the street. The house has the scale to handle some big trees down near the front. It would enhance the park like setting.

Ms. Taylor – Are you suggesting understory trees as well as larger shade trees?

Mr. Mohr – I am thinking large shade trees. The expanse and the openness is nice. I think having some large scale trees will take some time. Where some of the smaller houses were built in the 1970s, they really annihilated most of the bigger trees that were there at one time. Trying to fill in those trees would be nice. A good part of Park Street is shaded.

Mr. Gastinger – That aerial photo from the 1930s is quite telling. There were larger trees on the property. A few of those might be already underway with the smaller trees that don't show up on the survey. The newer proposed trees are smaller, understory. I think some consideration for some smaller canopy trees would be welcome as it relates to the neighborhood.

Ms. Taylor – There are overhead utility lines on that side of the street. We could propose planting some of the larger trees a little bit further back than some of the typical street trees.

Mr. Gastinger – That would be fine and we could leave some difference to finding a location to those. I think the design is really elegant and appropriate. For the early phases, I think we have more than enough information to give some approvals. I do want to speak about the concrete wall and stair. Clearly the stair has some safety issues in the way it has been constructed. I probably recommend or prefer keeping the location of the stair and path where it is. I don't have an issue with adjusting and reconstructing the width or allowing for the newer material. The rest of the plan seems, if not including walls, future fencing, pool, or the deck, is an excellent direction in keeping with the house.

Mr. Mohr – The survey implies that the walkways end at the porch.

Mr. Schwarz – I went up and down Park Street. There is one other stair and concrete wall that is similar. It is down south of Lyons Court. It is pretty far away. I was trying to figure out if this was a character defining feature along Park Street. Walls are a character defining feature. We have stonewalls and brick walls. It seems so odd that it is such a tiny stair. It is crooked and not lined up with the front porch. It makes no sense with the house. I would be willing to say fix it and make it right.

Ms. Taylor – The wall is hardly a wall. It is maybe 9 or 10 inches tall. If there are changes, it would be the entire length of that wall.

Mr. Schwarz – If you want to rip up the front steps that would be OK. If the homeowners would like to put in stone along the whole wall, they can offer that.

Mr. Werner – The next house down is that 1860s house. It even has the curved walls. There are two more going towards Farrish. Trying to determine where exactly that wall falls before they start tinkering with it, some of these are within the city right of way. There was a big discussion of these walls and whether to retain them and what to retain. Ms. Taylor, does that help you with where they were as far as fixing the risers?

Ms. Taylor – I think the risers on the sidewalk are more important to the homeowners. That gets used more frequently, especially with guests. The riser height on those steps is actually greater than the riser height difference on the front walkway steps. It would not be critical to them if those concrete risers remain the same at the front. The concrete wall would remain the same. The only thing that would change on the front walkway would be the width and the paving material. I think a greater importance should be set to be focusing more on the sidewalk steps.

Mr. Werner – If a motion is made, an alternative request from the applicant was that it was stated clearly in the motion.

Mr. Schwarz – A quick comment on the suggestion on adding some street trees. You mentioned the power lines. It looks like it is all communication lines that run along that sidewalk. I could be wrong. In the past, we had this idea you could grow street trees over those. That might be a false assumption. It would be worth investigating if you go with our recommendation to put in some street trees.

Mr. Mohr – I would second that. They are nowhere near as aggressive where the com lines are located.

Mr. Gastinger – I would like to not characterize them as street trees but characterize the recommendation as for canopy trees. I think there is something to be said for the composition of different views for the house. Generally, it is getting larger canopy trees in there. There is not a consistent street tree along that section of Park Street.

Mr. Lahendro – The Tree Commission has recommendations for appropriate canopy trees in the city. I suggest taking a look at that.

Mr. Schwarz – Staff's recommendation was that all of the trees be on the master tree list. We need to exclude the fruit trees from that. They will never find fruit trees on the city master list.

Mr. Gastinger – I was curious about that recommendation. Is that to give more flexibility?

Mr. Schwarz – The idea was to let them finish the design and not come back to us.

Mr. Werner – If they prefer something different, they have a parameter to work with. Good call on the fruit trees. I didn't realize they are not on the list. From a traffic calming design perspective, opening areas and closed areas and traveling from one area to another helps with that engagement with the road. The guidelines do get into height recommendations for proximity to utility lines.

Mr. Lahendro – Are we in the discussion period? My opinion is that I see the need for the owners to have private spaces. I think the design is very skillfully done to provide that. It looks very attractive. It is thoughtful. I am entirely for the conceptual design.

Mr. Schwarz – Do we have anyone opposed to what they have requested for the front walkway.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that proposed landscape and hardscape plan at 801 Park Street satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following conditions:

- **That canopy trees be considered slightly set back from the street**
- **New trees and plantings will conform to the City’s Master Tree List (dated October 2016) and Master Shrub List (dated February 2004), with the exception of fruit trees shown on the plan**
- **Paving materials and walls will conform to the precedent images provided by the applicant.**
- **Proposed walls will not to exceed a height of 4-feet above grade at any point on the outside face, as viewed from Park Street and as viewed from Park Hill.**
- **As work progresses the applicant will work with staff the planned work to assure it is consistent with the CoA, with the understanding that revisions may require BAR review.**
- **The CoA excludes the proposed shed and wood deck, which will require design review and a separate CoA.**
- **That the BAR favors either Option 1 or 2 for the front steps to the sidewalk**

Mr. Schwarz seconds the motion.

Motion passes 8-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-01-04

301 East Jefferson Street

Tax Parcel 330204000

Beth Israel Temple, Owner

Kurt Keesecker, BRWArchitects, Applicant

Entry renovations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – I spoke briefly at the Pre-Meeting. The only question that we had left was the resolution of that railing. Your addendum covered. That strips out the language that I had offered in a way to condition it or have further discussion.

Diane Hillman, Applicant – I'm president of Congregation, Beth Israel. I am speaking tonight about the entry door security upgrade. The events of July and August of 2017 were felt throughout our community, but in particular, Congregation Beth Israel with both the KKK and the Unite the Right rallies. We were located between the Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee statues. We were literally in the middle of the fight among the opposing forces. We experienced these events in a very unique and troubling way, one that I never expected to see in my lifetime, the rise of open aggressive anti-Semitism. We realize that life in our community has changed and that CBI needed to protect itself as never before the events. The events here and later in Pittsburgh reinforced our belief that we needed to be proactive, and to provide both physical and process improvements. In the last couple of weeks, we've understood that the great growth of racism and anti-Semitism and intolerance in general have grown even more than we ever expected. This project is a timely one. It follows on the project that you approved two years ago and that has been implemented at CBI, the addition of a fence and other security upgrades in our courtyard. In an effort to provide adequate security, we have been supported with assessments by The Department of Homeland Security and the Virginia Department of Emergency Management. We've received funding from FEMA for the current project that we are contemplating. Bruce Warrdell Architects and Karim Habbab have both been working on this project

with us. The current conditions are that our sanctuary doors at the top of the steps on Jefferson Street are over 100 years old. They currently open inwards, which potentially impedes exit in an emergency. They are a weak point. They're very difficult to secure against unauthorized entry. They're also very leaky, whether it be cold or hot air that comes streaming in those very old doors. We plan to replace the doors with recessed outward opening doors that will be similar in design of the building in the early 1900s. They will be framed with metal door jam and soffit. We will extend the landing and railings to enhance safety. Both of the courtyard entry doors, the Jefferson Street door, and the Third Street door have resulted in the thermal instability. There's a lot of sunshine in the courtyard door and a lot of damp and cold on the Jefferson Street door. They're warped so that they do not close and secure properly. We are going to be replacing those doors with doors that are better. They will close properly behind people as they enter the building. In addition, we'll be providing enhanced security glass in and around the doors so that people from the inside can see what's happening and whether anybody is coming in. Finally, we will be adding electronic surveillance. Right now, we can't visualize visitors to the sanctuary. If you're serving as an usher and you want to let in only people you want to let in, it's very difficult. You can't see who's at the door. We'll be adding an audio visual screen at those doors and additional enhancements so that the office can see who is coming to each of the other two doors and decide whether to let them in. That is really the sum total of the project. We hope that the Board of Architectural Review will consider these improvements with an eye to both security and architecture improvement. We've worked hard in partnership with BRW architects to develop an attractive, historically appropriate and secure plan to continue to protect Congregation Beth Israel, and its entire community of worshipers, students, and visitors.

Karim Habbab, Applicant – As you can see here, these are some existing photos in the beginning of the booklet. This shows the sanctuary doors as they are now. I want to reiterate that these doors that are on there are not historic. We don't know exactly when they were installed. It was likely in the 60s or 70s. Those are the doors that we want to replace. This is an estimate of where we're adding a new step to this landing. You can see that the edge of that tape measure is where the new step is going to go. It's going to extend all the way back into where the doors are and slightly into that vestibule. There are some clearer drawings later on in the booklet. That's the interior. When you go into those sanctuary doors, that's what you see on the inside. These two are the other two doors that we're talking about: the Third Street entry and what we're calling the Jefferson Street doors or the lobby entry. This is a historic photo of what we believe could be the original historic doors at the sanctuary, which are not what is there now. You can see the design of them. Starting with the Third Street door, Diane mentioned the grant to upgrade the security and update the doors. On the left hand side is our sketch of what the new door would look like. It will have those glass panels at the top to increase visibility. When you're leaving the space, you can see who's on the other side of the doors. The design itself takes its cue from that black and white photograph you saw with the paneling. For the Jefferson Street entry, they're kind of a different animal on this side of the building. It is part of the newer addition that was built by BRW Architects. The design for those doors references the Gothic arch. On the right hand side, you can see that arch and those windows. We're referencing that design element into the new design of those doors and adding all of the glass paneling. You can see through the doors as well when you're exiting the building. With the sanctuary doors themselves, this is the existing plan on the left hand side. The way it is now is that the landing itself is inadequate, where you have the doors open inwards and you have a bunch of little steps. As you open the doors, there are some original pictures in the beginning of the booklet that show that condition. Our proposal, for egress reasons, is to have those doors open outwards. In order to do that, we have to recess the doors, add a step, and create that landing depth so that we can have those doors open outwards and have people safely exit that building. I will say there was a recent addition inside the sanctuary space that has another egress door from inside there that opens outwards for an emergency exit. This door is still used for occasions. It would be beneficial from a security standpoint that they open outwards. The design of those doors is a direct recall back to that

historic photograph with the paneling. With the railings, we were thinking of how to modify the historic railings. We decided it would be better to leave those alone. Since we're pouring a new concrete landing at the top there, cleaning up all those little steps that exist there, and making the new landing, we can install new railings at that landing to satisfy the height requirement, since we're adding a new step and raising that level. With the materiality of the doors you can see this as our precedent palette. With the next picture you can see some schematic renders of what that recess could look like. Since we're pushing the doors back that created this, we saw it as an opportunity with these larger jams to reference back to the materials used in the ecclesiastical doors in big cities. It is this bronze material. In this case, we were thinking of that as the material to go on as the panels and the soffit of this recess, while the doors would be mahogany wood.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Kent Schlussel – I'm the chairman of the Congregation Beth Israel Safety and Security Committee. Since 2017, we have had four different safety and security inspections of our building and emergency procedures. Two of these inspections have resulted in written reports and two were recommendations verbally. The written reports were done by Department of Homeland Security about the secure communication network, SCM. SCM is a North American Jewish Federation organization. It has been authorized by DHS and FEMA to conduct security assessments. The verbal reports were done by Charlottesville Police Department in 2019. SCM last month was asked to review our proposed plan on the doors. I've also talked to the FBI and the State Police about the doors. All these reports were concerned about the physical security and safety of CBI building. We have done several things inside the building and outside of the building. The most noticeable was a courtyard renovation. We thank the BAR for approving this renovation. We will continue to improve our safety and security of CBI. All the inspectors noted the doors, especially the doors leading to the main sanctuary, as a problematic issue with safety and security. FEMA agrees with the analysis concerning the doors for the building. We were successful obtaining grant money, as Diane Hillman has stated previously. All the doors need to be replaced to improve both our safety and security procedures. As you can see from our request, I believe this will not only enhance the video of the building, but improve both safety and security of the building. I urge you to approve this plan.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – Do you have the original architectural drawings for the building?

Bruce Wardell, Architect – We have some drawings that were done ten years prior to the addition in 1992 to 1994. We have those drawings. I am not aware of original drawings of the building. We have done existing drawings of the building.

Mr. Zehmer – I appreciate your intent to replicate the original front doors and looking to see if there is a way to match some of the molding profiles and details for those doors. Maybe there is some other trim in the building that might lend some clues.

Mr. Lahendro – It appears that the limestone step that is there now outside the door. Is it being proposed that is going to be demolished and replaced with concrete that is going to be part of the extension?

Mr. Wardell – If we look at the entire stairway, it is a patchwork of different materials. The stairs up to the bottom landing are one kind of concrete. The stairs from the bottom of the landing up to the top of the landing are another kind of concrete. The sill into the door itself is a kind of stone.

Mr. Lahendro – One of your drawings calls it out as limestone.

Mr. Wardell – It probably is limestone. What has to happen is that has to come out to the edge for the landing.

Mr. Lahendro – It appears to be part of the original fabric of the building. It would be a shame to demolish it to create monolithic concrete step.

Mr. Wardell – There might be a way to detail an extension of this and perhaps even in limestone. Once we move this sill and we recess the doors inside by the three feet for each panel, we now have a surface that we have to treat that is an exterior surface. We end up with this band of stone here with a surface inside and a surface outside that are something else. As we are looking at this, we thought that patchwork that would create this part piece of this landing. We wanted that to be homogenous. As you raise the issue of the kind of original piece of this, there might be a solution where we can keep this. I am not sure the height of it is going to be exactly right. It is a puzzle. Our initial proposal was to make it a homogenous surface.

Mr. Lahendro – I understand the complications. I am sure this existing limestone has some slope to it. It might even have some wear in the center of it that makes it not a straight line. Hopefully, you understand my point that this is original fabric.

Mr. Wardell – The ideal concept and the technical solutions don't work. We will know more when we pull the threshold up and know what is in the framing. It might be possible that we could layer this thing from the front, middle, and back and make all of them work together. If we can do that, I think that would be a wonderful solution.

Mr. Gastinger – This portion of the concrete is going to be exposed to the side and I am just making sure that it is going to be held back from the edge of the stair. We also have enough clearance between that pedestal and the new riser.

Mr. Wardell – We will probably put pavement in the concrete to match it a little more closely with the old concrete. You can see that this top landing is different than the top stair. The orange line is about where the new slab would be. It would be exposed to the side. It would be held away. The new railing would be anchored in the new concrete.

Mr. Mohr – Is the bronze liner going to weather?

Mr. Wardell – We are going to let it weather. If you go around to the larger cities, many places of worship have these bronze doors that have the patina on them. There is a manufacturer that will shape those panels. That bronze will have that shape to it. We will let it weather.

Mr. Mohr – You are going to impress a panel in that? That is actually not going to be a modern arch. Its color and the wood door are going to be in the same family contrast wise.

Mr. Wardell – The mahogany and the bronze will approach each other. We will have it for a year or two being pretty bright.

Mr. Lahendro – I presume the panels in the jam will be aligned with the panels in the door?

Mr. Wardell – That is probably right.

Mr. Mohr – With the door where the arches are, is that in the new part?

Mr. Wardell – That is in the 1994 addition. The 1994 addition referenced the arches in the original sanctuary.

Mr. Mohr – The doors that you built in there were straight paneled.

Mr. Wardell – They were all horizontal.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – This is one of my favorite additions within Charlottesville. I think that you did a fabulous job with this. I understand what you are doing with the front doors. The one door that I am less comfortable with is the changing of the rectangular door to that gothic style of door. I like the door that you have. I understand that you have to put some glass in it. I like your original design better.

Mr. Schwarz – As far as the guidelines are concerned, I think the door replacements are fine for the new addition. I think the door replacement for the sanctuary is an exception to the guidelines. I think it is an understandable exception. I think you have executed it really well. I am in favor of this application. Your railing solution was very simple. I appreciate what Mr. Lahendro was saying with preserving that limestone threshold. I wonder if there is some way that threshold would indicate that you have changed things from what was original and being able to still see it might be an indication that this door used to be flush with the façade. It is now an indication of the change.

Mr. Mohr – Isn't the tough thing with that is that you have to extend that step?

Mr. Wardell – We are extending it on both sides. On the inside, we have to get enough depth of substrate to get some kind of stone or masonry surface. It is an exterior surface. We have to waterproof it. We have to do that without making a dam. We have to get the waterproofing out. If we are going to preserve it, we have to figure out how to make that a non-movable joint, where it doesn't expand and contract. There is some solution that when pull up the rug and the floor. We're happy to bring something in front of you when we come up with some crazy idea.

Mr. Mohr – If you have some kind of reference of the threshold that takes care of that aspect. I don't see how you solve it going the other direction in terms of that piece of stone and adding another piece of nosing to get another foot. That part seems to be problematic.

Mr. Wardell – You are backing yourself into the same solution that we came to and that is monolithic for the whole thing. Unfortunately, it is a process of elimination. I am not excluding trying to solve the problem. Some of it may be how that seal is anchored into the rest of the building.

Mr. Habbab – Another issue is the edge of that seal is not high enough for the code to add that step. It slopes steeply from the threshold of the doors down to the edge of that seal. If you build that and go back, you would be going down to hit the edge of that limestone seal.

Mr. Zehmer – The biggest challenge is waterproofing it and preventing water from getting in. You mentioned potentially adding some security cameras and devices. I didn't know if that is something the BAR normally reviews.

Mr. Schwarz – We probably should. They are the type of thing that appear.

Mr. Zehmer – With working at the University, we try to position them looking back towards the doors so that it is not front and center.

Mr. Wardell – Mr. Habbab, you have a proposal from the people and you have talked to them about that in their proposal?

Mr. Habbab – We met onsite today. I think we will have an intercom with a camera on the side of one of the jams so they can see who is at the door. That feeds into a screen on the interior side of the door.

Mr. Werner – It is installation into the masonry. My key concern is that you don't bore into the brick and be discrete with your junction box. We don't have that in the guidelines. That would be the recommendation.

Mr. Zehmer – The applicant can do something that fits in well with the building and it doesn't detract from the architecture.

Mr. Mohr – You can use a remote camera with a fiber optic cable.

Mr. Bailey – Would that not have an intercom capability?

Mr. Mohr – The problem with the intercom aspect is that you have to have a panel for somebody to understand that there is an intercom. Once it becomes an intercom, you don't have much of a choice. You have to have a panel for somebody to address.

Mr. Gastinger – I support the project as it has been detailed. I think it is a really elegant solution to an unfortunate problem in reality. I think it is important in thanking Congregation Beth Israel for their continued commitment to taking issues of expansion or further protection and turning in an elegant design solution.

Motion – Mr. Lahendro – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed entrance alterations at 301 East Jefferson Street satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Tim Mohr seconds: Motion passes (8-0)

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-01-05

116 West Jefferson Street

Tax Parcel 330183000

Jefferson Street Properties, LLC, Owner

Gordon Johnson, Peter Johnson Builders, Applicant

Porch reconstruction

The applicant was not available at this meeting. The BAR moved onto the next item on the agenda. After a brief staff presentation on this project, the BAR moved to defer this project.

Motion to Defer - Mr. Schwarz (Second by Mr. Gastinger) Motion passed 8-0.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-01-06

408 East Market Street

Tax Parcel 330183000

408 East Market Street Condo Owners Association, Owner

Robert Nichols, Formwork Architecture, Applicant

Exterior alterations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – This is a COA request for 408 East Market Street. This building was constructed in 1946. It is in the downtown ADC District. It is contributing. Anything within the downtown ADC District, Council designated as contributing regardless of the age or historic nature. However, this one now is 74 years old. It would be eligible for inclusion in the National Register district. What you're reviewing is a request to paint the exterior. There are some false railings above the main entry on those windows on the second and third floor. Remove those false railings. There are fabric canopies that will be removed and replaced at the center entrance with a metal awning. Somebody is going have to tell me the difference between a canopy and an awning. There are planters at the entrance that will be replaced with new plantings. The planting is going to include a Boston ivy intended to cover the walls on either side of the entrance. The paving in front of the public aggregate exposed concrete will be removed and replaced with bluestone pavings. In the discussion, there were some questions that you all had asked. The applicant has provided that information. There's a section to the canopy which we circulated. The Ivy tent is to cover the walls. There will be no railing. The painting above the window set back will be painted. Anything that's brick will be painted. Staff sees no issues. There was a question about some of the shading that appeared where the blue and the gray. That is all one color except the brown on that upper story is roofing material, but the brown above each of those six windows that will be painted blue, and then all the same color. All of the components proposed staff recommends approval of. We did suggest that the BAR have some discussion about the Ivy. There are four criteria from the facades and storefronts section of chapter three that we thought might be helpful in that discussion. We discussed this earlier evening, prior to the meeting, so that answers all the questions from our end.

Robert Nichols, Applicant – My office has been asked by the condo association to help them get caught up with the preferred maintenance. That includes some addressing some style preferences and appearance preferences. We have prepared for them a masterplan responding to their request that covers quite a number of components of this building. Several are not being shown in this application. They expect them to be phased out over a long period of time. In the future somebody will be back to you to continue discussing and looking for approval for more extensive work on the side courtyards. The only approval that is being sought is the bit of bluestone in front of the entryway and on the two towers. There is nothing on the surface of the two flanking courtyards that we are asking about in this application. For funding reasons, things are being spaced out over a number of years. In the scope that we are talking about now, they might need to execute it in two phases. In this image, we are showing the paint on the exterior, the big surface is painted, the change in canopy, and the introduction of a painted aluminum one with integrated signage. We are also showing the demolition of the two raised planters on each side of the door and the bluestone paving. That is the scope that we are seeking approval for. I think that it is pretty likely that it will happen in two chunks that will include the paint/canopy and the work on the ground to get rid of the planters and start to bring that bluestone

terrace to the exterior. In the staff report, the issue of ivy was raised with the ambiguity in the guidelines. Both in our own projects and also seeing many applications come before the BAR where vegetation comes up. There used to be some at the synagogue. The question of how to view that as part of a design proposal when the permanence of it might be less reliable. We are wary of relying on vegetation that way. We have taken steps in talking horticulturists and looking at other projects where there has been successful use of ivy in this way. We feel pretty good about this. This is a Boston ivy. It tends to be more cooperative than an English ivy. It doesn't find its way into masonry joints or window jams. It is also very resilient and a quick grower. The main thing we have going for us here is the northern exposure will keep us from getting overheated and baked as the planting is starting to take hold. The owners of the building are very enthusiastic about this design and they have eagerly planned in their financial planning maintenance to anticipate some work to keep it looking good and keep it within its bounds. It is intended to remain on those two flanking towers. The canopy is currently on the front where it has some supports. It is essentially supported on four corners. We were interested in having less shade with less obscuring of the building and not having fabric to be a component of the façade of the building. Those are the criteria that have led to the current proposal. The overall construction of that is explained in the section that staff had asked for. The lettering on the signage is not clearly defined. Our assumption is that component would come back before staff as a sign application. There are a number of precedents that caught the eye of the client and the designers in our office. It is pretty to find a lot of nice precedents for that.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – The intention is to maintain the two willow oaks on either side of the building? Is that correct?

Mr. Nichols – That is correct.

If we could look at the elevation again, I want to make sure that clarification in where we applied paint color. It is on the second story on the captured panel above each sliding door. Within that zone, we're showing that dark bronze color. It is intended to show painted metal. That's an error on our part. That's a brick panel. It doesn't have any metalwork. That would be painted the dark blue color.

Mr. Bailey – We're talking about the two central towers and the awning. We're not talking about the other sides of the building at this point for painting.

Mr. Nichols – The painting would be comprehensive as shown in the renderings. That's the only thing that would be touching would be the facades on the wings, demolition of the fabric canopies, awnings on those sides, more work happening in the center with that canopy, and the demolition of those "false railings" in front of the fixed glass.

Ms. Lewis – You are not proceeding with the bluestone in front of the recessed areas at this point?

Mr. Nichols – That's correct. That's not part of this application.

Ms. Lewis – It appears to be on the plans we received.

Mr. Schwarz – The bluestone will go in front of the front door, but not in the recessed areas?

Mr. Nichols – That material we are showing is intended to emulate a current aggregated panel.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – Over the front doorway, with the name of the building, is the existing to remain or is that being replaced? Does that fall under our sign guidelines?

Mr. Nichols – That's captured within that bit of the design that I will come back to the BAR in the form of a sign permit application. It is not determined how the building wants to identify itself.

Mr. Schwarz – That goes to staff to review those.

The color seems great. What you are doing cleans this up nicely. I am fine with the Boston ivy. I think that is beautiful with Boston ivy growing on brick. My concern with the Boston ivy is that it is going to require a tall ladder/cherry picker once or twice a year. We need to expect that this ivy, once it is fully established, is going to start reaching out from the center bay. One solution would be to put a cable system on the brick and find something that doesn't cling to the brick. I am OK with the idea of the ivy on the brick with the understanding it may go a little 'wild.'

Ms. Lewis – The wire strategy was attempted at Congregation Beth Israel. It really never took off. I loved the idea as a way to screen that fenestrated wall and add privacy. I was disappointed as well as the congregation.

Mr. Schwarz – I thought that it took a long time.

Mr. Mohr – I think having the ivy take over a good chunk of that building wouldn't be a bad thing. It is mostly a question of maintenance. It is less aggressive than American ivy. It is at the owners peril in terms of maintaining the building. They have to make sure that it doesn't start growing into places that it shouldn't be. It is modern brick and modern mortar.

Mr. Gasting – I am fine with the proposal of the ivy. I think it is a reasonable response. I am curious if you're providing enough soil volume for the amount of ivy that you have coming up from the length of wall that you have shown. It is very narrow. I don't think you will get the effect of what is shown in the renderings. I think it will be much more erratic in its growth pattern.

Mr. Nichols – Is it solely a function of soil volume or in general in the best of circumstances?

Mr. Gasting – Both. It doesn't look like there is any soil volume on the side of the tower. I think the conditions in those corners will be quite different than where there is a bit more airflow and sunlight. That will happen at the top as well. I think the proposal should stand on its own with the color whether or not the ivy is successful or not. I think either way it still meets our guidelines. It is a big improvement for this building.

Mr. Mohr – I definitely agree with Mr. Nichols about the transformation of the NGIC Building. Painting that a dark color made an enormous difference. I don't think it is quite as critical as this one. It is a street wall. I think it will be elegant.

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Gastinger, is the switch grass going to live? It is shady back there.

Mr. Gastinger – It is north facing. I think that it will be all right.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed exterior alterations at 408 East Market Street 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. Tim Mohr seconds. Motion passes (8-0).

E. Other Business

9. Preservation and Design Awards

Dairy Central – Adaptive Reuse and Rehabilitation of a Historic Structure and New Construction Design

Cork Hotel – Adaptive Reuse and Rehabilitation of Historic Structures and New Construction Design

801 Park Street – Rehabilitation of a Historic Structure

First United Methodist Church – Rehabilitation of the Historic Steeple and installation of steeple illumination

10. Staff questions/discussion

Update on Comp Plan re: Outdoor Lighting Plan

Coordinate work session for Preservation Plan

Coordinate work session re: Lighting

11. PLACE Update

F. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:16 PM.

