

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
May 18, 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:** Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger, Robert Edwards, Cheri Lewis, Tim Mohr, Andy McClure, James Zehmer
Members Absent: Jody Lahendro, Ron Bailey
Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Joe Rice, Jeff Werner, Lisa Robertson, Chip Boyles
Pre-Meeting:

There was a brief discussion regarding the items on the agenda and the Consent Agenda. There was a discussion regarding the statues and whether there should be a public hearing on the recommendation for the statues

A procedure was established on how the statues were going to be discussed and the public hearing with the statue recommendation.

Staff went over the one new COA application on the agenda at Preston Place.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Comments from the Public

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. BAR Meeting Minutes – January 20, 2021
2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 21-05-01
503 Rugby Road, Tax Parcel 050052000
Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District
Owner: Epsilon Sigma House Corps of Kappa Kappa Gamma
Applicant: Erin Hannegan, Mitchell Matthews Architects

Project: Modify approved design – entry light fixtures; trim at sections of south and north facades; screening at mechanical units; fence/wall at NW corner.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-05-02

167 Chancellor Street, TMP 090126000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Alpha Omicron of Chi Psi Corp.

Applicant: Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, LLC

Project: Modify approved west elevation - extend steps to full width of the portico

Ms. Lewis moved to approve (Second by Mr. Zehmer) – Motion passed 6-0.

C. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-05-03

605 Preston Place, Tax Parcel 050111000

Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District

Owner: Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP

Applicant: Kevin Riddle, Mitchell Matthews Architects

Project: Three-story apartment building with below-grade parking

Staff Report, Jeff Werner – Year Built: 1857 District: Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District Also designated an Individually Protected Property *Status: Contributing*
Also known as Wyndhurst, 605 Preston Place was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city. It is a typical 2-story, 3-bay, double-pile white weatherboard-clad house with Greek Revival details. CoA request for construction of apartment building, including parking, landscaping and site improvements. Apartment Building • Walls: o Red brick o Painted stucco

- Flat roof behind low parapet. Copper scuppers boxes and downspouts
- Rooftop mechanical units screened with enclosures o Note: At the building façades, the parapets are brick.

The BAR should discuss the wall details for the non-facade sections of rooftop enclosures.

- Doors and Windows: Marvin Ultimate Clad Exterior, rubbed bronze
- Shutters: Wood shutters, painted to match the stucco and trim
- Stairs and balcony railings: Metal
- Stairs: Metal framing with wood treads
- Ceilings at balconies and stair landings: White Oak boards*
- Decking at balconies and stair landings: Black Locust boards.*

* Applicant’s note: Ceiling and deck boards will be spaced to allow drainage. The balconies are small [shallow].

Lighting

- Type A. Sconce (parking): Lithonia Lighting, WDGE2 LED P3
 - o Dimmable available, CT 3000K, CRI 90, BUG 1-0-0
- Type B. Wall light (parking): Lightway Industries Inc, PDLW-12-LED-11W
 - o Dimmable available, CT 3000K – 4,000K, CRI 80
- Type C. Step light (path): Eurofase Lighting, 31590-013
 - o Not dimmable, CT 3,000K, CRI 80
- Type D. Bollard (path): Eurofase Lighting, 31913
 - o Not dimmable, CT 3,000K, CRI 80

- Type E. (Omitted.)
- Type F. Recessed light (stairs): Lithonia Lighting, LBR6WW ALO1 (500LM) SWW1
 - o Dimmable available, CT 3,000K, CRI 90
- Type G. Recessed light (stairs): Mark Architectural Lighting, SL2L 4 FLP 400LMF
 - o Dimmable available CT 3,000K, CRI 80
- Type H. Wall wash (stairs): Mark Architectural Lighting, SL2L LOP 4 FLP 400LMF
 - o Dimmable available CT 3,000K, CRI 80
- Balconies: No exterior light fixtures. The applicant noted that the balconies are shallow and ambient lighting from the interior will be sufficient.

Color Palette

- Trim and metal channel facias: Pantone 416C or similar.
- Stucco: color similar to Pantone 416C
- Metal railings: matte iron/dark gray

Landscape and Site Work

- Two (2) mature Deodora cedars will remain.
- Construction will require the removal of six (6) trees:
 - o One (1) 36” Oak
 - o Three (3) 8” Dogwood
 - o One (1) 10” Maple
 - o One (1) 18” Tree
- New plantings include fifteen (15) trees:
 - o Three (3) Blackgum (*Nyssa Sylvatica*)
 - Note: On the City’s Tree List
 - o Six (6) Shagbark Hickory (*Carya Ovata*)
 - Note: On the City’s Tree List
 - o Six (6) White Fringetree (*Chionanthus Virginicus*)
 - Note: While not on the City’s Tree or Shrub lists, White Fringetree is identified as being native to the eastern US, from New Jersey to Florida. In 1997, the Virginia Native Plant Society named it the *Wildflower of the Year*.
 - o Appalachian Sedge (*Carex Appalachica*). Groundcover typical at planting beds
 - Note: Not on the City’s Tree or Shrub lists
 - o Dart’s Gold Ninebark (*Physocarpus Opulifolius*):
 - Alternative: Smooth Sumac (*Rhus Glabra*)
 - Note: Both on the City’s Tree List
 - o Pipevine (*Aristolochia Macrophylla*). Climbing plant intended to spread and cover wall
 - Note: Not on the City’s Tree or Shrub lists
- Alteration to the (west) stone patio at the existing house
- Path: flagstone paving.
- Low walls: brick with bluestone caps
- Electrical transformers to be screened.
- Parking: below grade, accesses from west via Preston Place

This property, including the house, was first designated by the City as an IPP. When the City later established the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, Wyndhurst was incorporated into the district.

On September 15, 2020, the BAR held a preliminary discussion on this project. Notes from the meeting minutes are below. The BAR should discuss if the proposal is consistent with that input and whether the submittal provides the information necessary to evaluate this CoA request.

Recommended

- Designing new onsite features (such as parking areas, access ramps, or lighting), when required by a new use, so that they are as unobtrusive as possible, retain the historic

relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape, and are compatible with the historic character of the property.

- Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction that are compatible with the historic character of the site and preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.
- Removing non-significant buildings, additions, or site features which detract from the historic character of the site.
- Locating an irrigation system needed for a new or continuing use of the site where it will not cause damage to historic buildings.

Staff Recommendations

If approval is considered, staff recommends the following conditions:

- Requiring that all lamping be dimmable, if that option is available with the specified light fixtures, the Color Temperature not exceed 3,000K, and the Color Rendering Index is not less than 80, preferably not less than 90.
- Underground the new electrical service.
- During construction, protect the existing stone walls and curbs within the public right of way.

Provide documentation prior to construction. If damaged, repair/reconstruct to match prior to final inspection. No site plan has been submitted for the proposed new work. During the site plan review process, it is not uncommon to see changes that alter the initial design. In considering an approval of the requested CoA, the BAR should be clear that any subsequent revisions or modifications to what has been submitted for that CoA will require a new application for BAR review. Additionally, the 1920 and c1965 Sanborn maps indicate this site has been undisturbed for at least the last 100 years. , the City's Comprehensive Plan recommends that during land disturbing activities in areas likely to reveal knowledge about the past developers be encouraged to undertake archeological investigations. Additionally, the Secretary's Standards, as referenced in the Design Guidelines, recommends that archeological resources should be protected, with mitigation measures should they be disturbed. A Phase I archeological level survey would be appropriate at this site.

Kevin Riddle, Applicant – It is a proposal for a small three story apartment building. We did bring this to you informally back in September, 2020. It has evolved quite a bit since then. The significant changes would involve the parking. Originally, we had proposed a lane that would cross from west to east connecting Preston Place along the southern boundary. We had parking that was partly under the south side of the building. We have changed course. The parking is located under the building. Its access is from a single drive at the northwest portion of the property. You can see where cars can enter the site from Preston Place and park under the building. There are three spaces that are out at the end of the drive. The parking is mostly concealed from view. The footprint of the building and the massing have been refined and evolved significantly since our last meeting. It is a building that is stepped back its northern wing from the southern wing. There's a large stair that accesses the apartments in a deep recess. From Preston Place looking to the west toward the building, what you see appears to be two volumes more so than a single building. There are quite a number of shallow balconies. Since we first brought the project to you, we have had a number of meetings on site. We have met with the neighbors on at least four occasions. We have had this out there. We have been discussing our process with everybody who lives nearby as much as we can. We have listened to the neighbors. We certainly haven't accommodated all of their concerns with the changes here. We tried to address what we can while still keeping the project viable. The two most prominent trees on the site are these Deodora Cedars that are at the southwest. We plan to keep those trees and do our utmost during construction to preserve them. Trash cans will be located underneath the building. There are a couple of transformers that are currently located pretty close to Preston Place. Those will be relocated further in and largely concealed by the landscaping. With the site adjacent to Wyndhurst, we don't plan on doing very much there. There are some plantings proposed. The intent here is to leave it as it was for decades since the

1920s up until recent construction. There is a short lawn in front of it. We do show a modest path of stones that would lead around Wyndhurst and back to a couple of parking spaces at the northeast off of Preston Place. With the materials in the proposed new building, we believe them to be compatible with what is elsewhere in the neighborhood. The illustrations speak for themselves.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Paul Wright – I would like to comment on the balconies. Many of our concerns were addressed. I don't know how it was done based on the drawings I have seen. I would like to know how the concerns about the balconies were addressed.

Mr. Riddle – I explicitly said that many of the concerns were addressed. I didn't mean to phrase it that way. I think I said that we couldn't accommodate all of the concerns that the neighbors raised. We did do our utmost to listen and address them in part.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Has there been any arborist assessment of the 36 inch oak that is on site that is to be removed?

Mr. Riddle – We do have an arborist report. We can pass that along. My understanding is that the existing trees on site that are to be removed are pretty far along. They don't have a lot of life left.

Mr. Schwarz – I am guessing the driveway is about 24-25 feet wide. Have you explored whether there is any way to reduce the width of that at the curb cut?

Mr. Riddle – When I look at the zoning and have a two way travel on a driveway that doesn't have parking on either side, it appears that the city expects 24 feet. If we could reduce that down to 20 feet, I think that would be great and it would be acceptable with this being a small lot. I think narrowing it down would be good. There is still the question of whether city zoning is going to be OK with that.

Mr. Schwarz – I thought it was 20 feet.

Mr. Riddle – We can look at the language and confirm that.

Mr. Schwarz – I think there is language that the BAR can recommend a narrower curb cut. If you could investigate that, that would be great.

I think you are showing the parapets as brick. Is that the intention?

Mr. Riddle – Yes it is. We haven't yet had an opportunity to explore how much from street level you would be able to see those. There are going to be portions of those enclosures that would not be visible from the street. A brick cladding there wouldn't be necessary. There are enough places. If you look at page 17 and our view from the southeast, there are places where the parapets are going to be turning and visible. Continuing to use the same brick cladding in those locations would be pretty important to preserve this appearance. We know that is going to imply some structural work that would not be necessary otherwise.

Mr. Schwarz – With the wood soffits and the wood underneath the balconies, you do intend to drain water through the top surface of the balcony and having it percolate through the undersides?

Mr. Riddle – The little section detail perhaps divulges a little too much with the construction approach. It is a little bit of a place holder. We don't really want water to be dripping through or spilled drinks coming through from one balcony down to another balcony. Our intention is to have that balcony floor covered. I don't think it is going to be spaced. I think we're going to slope that slightly to drain water away from the balcony and not to encourage it to get into the cavity space. Architecturally, our intention remains the same. You will see a light colored wood like oak as the soffit material on the underside.

Mr. Schwarz – The intention is to not have water drips. You're going to have the water drain off the top surface.

It looks like your lighting plan may not be quite coordinated with the final site plan you have. How are those bollards mounted? Are they in the brick wall?

Mr. Riddle – The intention with those bollards is that they would actually be mounted to the surface walk. Presumably, there would be a flexible conduit used under the walk when it is poured. These bollards have a base that can be mounted to the walk.

Mr. Schwarz – That is not a tripping hazard?

Mr. Riddle – They are a little more prominent than a recessed or flush walk. This is based on an early round of discussions we had with our lighting consultant. This is what we are going with for our lighting strategy. I understand your concern that they are sticking out on a narrow walk.

Mr. Schwarz – Aesthetically, they're great. I was curious.

Mr. Riddle – That's one where we'll confront it as we get further in the process. If we decide to go with a different option, we know that if this project was to be approved, we would have to update you if there is a change in direction.

Ms. Lewis – Is the building 36 feet to the parapet?

Mr. Riddle – That's correct.

Ms. Lewis – I know there are members of the public who are concerned about the relationship between this building and Wyndhurst. What is the roofline height on Wyndhurst?

Mr. Riddle – The eaves of Wyndhurst are about 27/28 feet up from the ground level. If you look at the south elevation, you can see the brow that we have there over the stucco portion that extends out is roughly equivalent to the eaves of the house. When you get up to the ridge of Wyndhurst, the ridge of Wyndhurst is actually taller than this building.

Ms. Lewis – Is there a little bit of grade change on that lie from the north to the southside?

Mr. Riddle – Yes. The elevation is noted on the site plan. You can see that along the walk at the southern boundary. We are stepping up as the grades do so that the walk can meet with the landing of the stair that leads down into the Preston Court Apartments courtyard. As you get over into Wyndhurst, it is about four feet when you get to the landing at the bottom of the wood stair. It is about four feet up from what would be a patio area that is adjacent to the south and southeast portion of the new building.

Mr. Mohr – With the wall packs, the ledges, and the A fixers along the parking lot wall, I was wondering if it makes sense to knock those down one temperature range to 2700 and keep your basic lighting package to minimize that going down the driveway.

Mr. Riddle – That sounds fine to us.

Mr. Mohr – I don't think it is necessary beneath the building. The more constant light color and temperature, the better it is from a visibility standpoint.

Mr. Gastinger – It is clear in the synapse between the two volumes there is a lighter colored material. Is that the white oak that we're seeing in that soffit that continues into the interior?

Mr. Riddle – Yes.

Mr. Gastinger – The other question is about the paving material. It is called out in the drawings as a stone paving. The photo looks like a blue stone. The wall cap is called out as blue stone. The renderings are a little bit lighter. Is there a particular thought about the stone choice? Is blue stone what you are proposing?

Mr. Riddle – Yes it is. We haven't picked out a particular stone for the paving on the walks. As this is proposed, it would be similar to the capstones. If we could have a slight distinction so that there was a slightly darker color for the capstone along the walls, that would be nice. We just don't have samples of what we might use for those walks.

Mr. Gastinger – There is an existing, per our previous reviews and the survey, stone patio on the western side of Wyndhurst. What is the condition of that? Are you intending to maintain in place or reuse any of that stone as part of that paved plaza between the two structures?

Mr. Riddle – At the moment, we hadn't planned to reuse any. It is in rather rough shape. It's pretty deteriorated. It's hard to discern. We have yet to do an investigation of that terraced area that you are referring to, to see if materials there would be salvageable. With investigation, we could make a better assessment and decide if some of that could be reused.

Mr. Mohr – One other thing that Carl noted about narrowing down the driveway is whether there was a possibility of getting another tree in there. In the summer, that's going to radiate a lot of heat.

Mr. Riddle – I think that's a good suggestion.

Mr. Mohr – It helps minimize the canyon-like effect.

Mr. Schwarz – A question came in from Ms. Turner. When was the side yard of the only remaining façade of this historical structure carved off as a building lot? What is the obligation of the owner to preserve the historic structure and setting at 605? Is the current owner and developer getting tax credits for this historic property?

Mr. Riddle – That question goes to zoning. It is not related to architecture. It's a lot where this building is allowed. We're not touching the historic structure with this building. We're staying about 12 feet away.

Mr. Schwarz – Is it the same parcel?

Mr. Riddle – It is the same parcel.

Mr. Schwarz – The actual lot hasn't been separated off. Do you know if the owner is going to try to get tax credits on Wyndhurst?

Mr. Riddle – I don't think that is his intention.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Scott Colley – We are concerned about the flavor and the sense of neighborhood as the University encroaches closer and closer into the neighborhood. That wall has been breached.

Christine Colley – This addresses the historic district in relation to the massing, scale, and infill of the new building. If we are serious about having a historic district, it is important to make it financially possible and desirable for buyer to buy, renew, and maintain historic houses. There is no source of money for keeping these houses going. All of you know how expensive that can be. We bought our house six years ago. We spent the price of the house again. If we make the living experience of the area less desirable by high density, high concentrations of students, selling the idea to people who would otherwise be charmed and delighted to be part of the historical preservation is going to become more and more difficult.

Paul Wright – I am opposed to the project on multiple levels. I urge the Board to deny the application. The project will cause meaningful harm to the historical fabric of the district, allow incompatible architecture with little meaningful reference to the protected structure next to it, and significantly eliminate a historical view of a contributing structure for future generations. The 6-0 decision the Board stated that a parking lot was not compatible with the Individual Protected Property. It is difficult to understand how this new proposal would not cause greater harm. I was in favor of that project as I have been in favor of every project in this neighborhood, except this one. Section 34-335 states the purpose of historical conservation overlay district is to preserve buildings of special cultural and architectural significance. The most important part of that is that serves as an important reminder of the heritage of the city. It is hard to fathom how a student apartment that will completely shield the protected property from view as one enters Preston Place does not fail to meet preservation standards on this rule alone. The proposed structure will not be in harmony with scale and character of the existing buildings. The proposed building is out of scale and proportion as it relates to Preston Court Apartments and Wyndhurst to maximize the number of students that can be housed at this site. A shorter height that establishes a stepdown from the Preston Court Apartments would require greater compatibility. The contemporary style of the proposed building emphasizes a colder, harder, and angular characteristic that will not be in harmony with the scale and character of existing buildings in nearby protected properties. The parcel represents a bright line between the University and Charlottesville. Approval will allow further encroachment into a neighborhood that has been fighting to preserve the historical character for decades. I urge the Board to deny the applicant a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Larry Goedde – I want to endorse what the Paul Wright said. I agree with him completely. The building is completely out of scale with the neighborhood. The proposed structure is oriented to the south in terms of what it is picking up on design and materials. From every other direction, it is all two story family houses. It is a variety of different kinds of materials. What is being proposed there is a three story building with these balconies incompatible with the neighborhood. This is an area of small

wooded lots. It is a matter of a couple of yards from this house to the driveway going to the basement parking. The context of inserting this apartment building is a neighborhood of two story residential buildings; not apartment buildings. They are not student apartments. This is a residential neighborhood of mostly professional and retired people. I view it as completely out of scale with the proposed building. The neighborhood is against these balconies. They are a constant source of noise and irritation from the Preston Court Apartments.

Beth Turner – I am not against adding housing units to Charlottesville and the historic district. I am against this proposal. I do not believe it is appropriate. I do not believe it has an appropriate design. The fenestration, roofline, and materials are wrong. They do nothing to compliment any of the other structures. The only structure they want to reference is the Preston Court Apartments, which is out of scale. It is not appropriate to the setting, the historic structure, the cedars, and the historic relationship. It is that relationship with the landscape I want you to think about. The terrace and the house need to be acknowledged. A place can be put for more housing units on that lot if that is what the zoning calls for. The appropriateness, which is your purview, is something we are counting on you to really think about and to acknowledge. The current owner made it clear to us that he was going to build an apartment building there. He was going to move the old house to another lot. He couldn't move the old house. He has chosen to ignore it. He is building this structure that abuts the old house.

Letter from Mrs. Price – There are two qualities that define Preston Place. The first is the variety of architectural styles among the houses and how this variety is held together within a shared approach, the use of setbacks, creative massing, and detail. The proposed building is basically a large 'shoebox.' It may take Preston Court Apartments as inspiration. That building features more complex massing and a wealth of decorative detail. Although the new building should not have the same degree of monumentality or ornament, it has so little more that it is essentially nothing more than a parapet with some typical surface cutouts. I appreciate the attention that has been paid to the landscaping. The design totally ignores the second defining quality of Preston Place: the steep hillside that wraps around. The arrangement of houses, especially on the inside of the street is varied and picturesque. If you look up the hillside westward toward the higher Rugby Road area, the whole effect is that of an Italian hill town. Mitchell Matthews' new proposed building is flat with a strongly defined broad access and imposes a new and large rectangular complex: Wyndhurst, Preston Court Apartments, and the proposed building onto the irregular pictorial arrangement of buildings that is there now. If the new building is to be considered as infill rather than in position, I would like to see a rendering of how it would look next to the property it will abut. I cannot fathom how the new design works either by style or scale at 625 Preston Place.

Richard Crozier – I second the motions of a lot of the other residents. It seems like the wrong thing to do if one considers that the Wyndhurst house is an important piece of Charlottesville history. It is one of the visible reminders of some rather dark Charlottesville history. We should try to keep that thing visible.

Lisa Kendrick – I feel that the house and property is seen as one. It has not been divided. We are losing sight of the house and the grounds around it. For a historical neighborhood, the city has to decide whether to preserve these and stand up for these neighborhoods. We live here and take care of it. One of the reasons he is having great success in renting out the property and wanting to build more for others is because it really is lovely. We stay here and he goes home. You are just adding to the intensity of the student population here. It is happening so intensely. It is hard to take a breath because of this constant noise has increased because of the Preston Court Apartments. They are about to be full. I agree with everything all of our neighbors have said. We are trying to maintain this historical

neighborhood. It has been so hard for five years now. I am asking you to reject this idea that they have presented and come up with some other idea that is more supportive.

Emily Steinhilber – We just purchased our home about a month ago. We have been cleaning up the interior of the home. If this building is built as proposed, that will be our view from the front yard. It will fundamentally change the character of the neighborhood. We have seen in this neighborhood is a close knit community. It is a residential neighborhood. I hope that you will consider that in your decision. I appreciate your service and your decision.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – I have a number of thoughts. I appreciate the commentary from the architects and from the concerned citizens. I agree with some of what both have said. I was opposed to the earlier project that had a parking lot on this site. It seems that the parking area was not sufficiently deferential to the adjacent house, which is very important to telling Charlottesville's early history. It also didn't seem like a use that was necessary and worth the damage that it would do to the reading of that structure. It is possible to imagine a contemporary structure on this site that is complimentary of Wyndhurst and that is relative to the scale of the surrounding neighborhood. There are some aspects of this project that could definitely do that. The materiality and the color that is proposed in the model and the renderings is actually a quiet approach towards this site. It actually recedes quite a bit, especially in its relationship to the very bright, white structure of the historic home. It pops it out. I have some concerns about the scale. I wish I had more information relative to the adjacent 625 and to the adjacent Preston Court Apartments. It does sit in a transitional location within the block. I don't know if we fully appreciate the relationship to 625. I am concerned about the removal of the oak and the way that the drive aisle might be damaging to the experience of the neighborhood. I do think that it is an improvement over what was proposed earlier that had the drive aisle going through the block and it had cars parking near the foot of Wyndhurst. The approach is a better one. I am concerned about the height of that retaining wall and how close it is to 625. I am also concerned that the oak would have to go. It still remains in a lot of the perspectives. It's really hard to tell what the impact of losing that tree is. They have to remove that tree. It is still providing a lot of green in the perspectives. It's a little bit misleading.

Mr. Mohr – I don't have a problem with the materiality of it. I do see where it is problematic in the sense of the massing. It's a full blown apartment building sliding more into the district. That started with the construction of Preston Place. The objections of the balconies strictly facing the side yard towards the house to the north is certainly understandable. I didn't feel the parking lot was an appropriate approach. One question I have is whether the wing to the north should lose a floor. The driveway is problematic in terms of its scale relative to the neighborhood. I assume what is driving that is because it has to be a two lane driveway. They already have enough parking issues in that area. I am torn about it. I understand the logic of more housing. At the same time, it is not really housing that really works with this neighborhood. This is all a series of single bedrooms and shared common space. This is student housing. These are not apartments. That is a questionable item. That is dealing with function. Function is not in our purview. It's about that north edge and whether or not the massing of that should be reconsidered and if there's something that can be done about the driveway. There was an earlier version where the driveway went straight into the building. It does get you the gaping lawn issue. That would allow the green space in the yard to come down. The way the existing Deodoras work along that edge is pretty well. The real issue is to the north towards the smaller building and completely obscuring the Wyndhurst building from that street. It is a mixed bag. This is an area where the zoning is calling for higher density. I am conflicted about how exactly how we're supposed to address that.

Ms. Lewis – I wanted to echo what Mr. Mohr said about addressing the neighborhood comments and our lack of jurisdiction over a lot of those comments. This board looks at the ADC Architectural Design Control District Guidelines. We look at the application in front of us and decide whether the application meets those guidelines. We may deal with zoning issues tangentially. They inform the massing and the size of other forms of the building itself. We don't dictate zoning. We also don't dictate use. That was established when the underlying zoning was up-zoned in 2003/2005 by the city. I think it is university medium density (UMD). I want to acknowledge that it is quite a change in the neighborhood. This board doesn't have a say in all of the objections that the neighbors have voiced even though we may agree with them. I lived on this street almost 40 years ago as a student right across the street. At that time, 632 Preston Place had converted from single-family into a group home/sorority house. It was students. It remains student housing as does 630 Preston Place, as do the fraternities on the far other side. They are directly across from Wyndhurst. Preston Place is one of the most charming places you can live in within the city. The variation of architecture and the preservation level of very old structures make it a really lovely place. Long ago, the zoning was changed. Long ago, multi-family started the intrusion on the Grady side on this block or Preston Place. I would note that although this application places a building there, we're not changing the zoning. I don't think we're changing the use all that much. Students have been in this area for a while. I think there are certain things the applicant has done correctly and done right and may be has done in response to preliminary discussions that may have been had last year or informally. I know that the balconies have been reduced so that there will be no lighting on them. They're basically places that I don't think you could put a chair. They do engage the street hopefully in a good way but not in a way where people are out shouting and congregating in the same way that Preston Court Apartments allow people to do. It is a large building. The massing is something my colleagues have noted. The applicant has done a pretty good job with articulating the building and breaking it down in its design; including those balconies, which break up the massing of the exterior. I do agree that the dark color is a nice contrast with the white clapboard of Wyndhurst. It shows Wyndhurst off as best as a contemporary building can. The applicant has also responded to earlier meetings with us. They relegated the parking to underground. There was surface parking before. I think the neighbors would appreciate that. I do wonder if the applicant might be able to pursue a waiver from the city to reduce that lane that goes underneath the building and see if the 24 feet could be choked down a little bit or down to one lane, considering how few spaces are under there. I don't know how many times you would have two cars enter and exit at the same time. It seems like it could help a little there. I think that is something we could look at so we can make sure that there is a decreased impact on adjoining 625. I would tend to be in favor of this application. I am leaning that way for reasons in the staff report that it really does meet the guidelines. I just don't find anything objectionable under our guidelines.

Mr. Edwards – I don't have much to add. I agree with my fellow members. I do feel that this does meet the guidelines. I hear what the residents are saying. I hear your concerns. It makes me wonder if there has been a dialogue between the architect and the residents. I would encourage you to continue having that open dialogue. This does seem to follow the guidelines.

Mr. McClure – There are a lot of cities that require the neighborhoods surrounding projects to sign off/come to meetings like this to voice their opinion as a group. We're limited in what we can do. In situations like this, it sucks.

Mr. Zehmer – I went over there this afternoon and took a couple laps around Preston Place. I feel that Preston Place Apartments addresses Grady Avenue. I don't think of that apartment complex as part of this neighborhood. It is on the same block. It faces Grady Avenue. It has size in its rear elevation. I do agree that there's a lot of student housing in this general vicinity. There's a fraternity with a new

addition across the street from Wyndhurst. There is some on the other side of Preston Place. It is noted on the Sanborn Map that it used to be called Wyndhurst Circle instead of Preston Place. I think that speaks to the significance of Wyndhurst as a house. I don't necessarily think that blocking the west view of Wyndhurst is a horrible thing. I don't feel it is the primary façade of the house. I think the façade faces the backside of Preston Place Apartments. For the proposed design, I do like the color palates. They draw on some of the earth tones. One of the character defining features of that neighborhood does have an "arts and crafts" feel to it. You do have cottages and houses that are nestled into the landscape around in that area and have softer lines. I think the proposed project is a little bit harsh. My wish would be for something that can fill the need for adding more housing space but something that looks more residential in nature that better suits the neighborhood. Looking at the staff report, the thing that jumped out to me in terms of our review criteria: City code states that in considering a particular application, the BAR shall approve the application unless the BAR finds the proposal incompatible with the historic, cultural, and architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application. I don't feel that this fits in or is compatible with the historic, cultural, or architectural character of this district. I don't think that I would be able to support this. I wouldn't be opposed to something within that space.

Mr. Schwarz – I think this typology is actually fitting for a neighborhood like this. We have examples throughout Charlottesville in some of the older neighborhoods where a three story walkup apartment building does fit into a neighborhood. There are some examples over in University Circle. There are examples scattered around the Rugby Venable neighborhood. I am very frustrated that this is student housing. I wish you hadn't shown the floor plans. It is so clear that is what it is. That's not our purview. I am also disappointed that's what has become of the Preston Court Apartments. It's sad. That's not our purview. I agree a lot with what Ms. Lewis said. I agree with Mr. Gastinger on the materiality. The brick, the stucco, and the color scheme does make it recessive. I think it fits in a residential neighborhood. With the steel on the balconies, I am wavering on that. It's contemporary. It's not something you find in the neighborhood. It's attached to iron railings. That might make sense. I am most bothered by the open stair. If the intention is that it looks like two buildings, I don't think it does it. It is going to look messy and look more like an apartment building. That open stair is not helping the compatibility with the neighborhood. If you just glazed it that would go a long way. I am leaning towards approval with some modifications. I do want to see what you're thinking of with handling the water on the balconies. We've discussed various items. They seem like they're not fully flushed out yet. It would be good to know. When this goes through the site plan, it is going to change. It should come back to us so we know what the implications are. I think your curb cut is significantly wider than any of the curb cuts in the neighborhood. As much as the city will allow, I think you need to reduce it. Mr. Mohr made a really good point about adding a tree right there. One of the beautiful things about this neighborhood is the tree canopy. It is very complete. It would be nice to maintain that. I do appreciate you adding the gum trees adjacent to Wyndhurst. That's definitely a hole in the tree canopy.

Mr. Gastinger – If we don't take action on this tonight, I feel there's just a few more drawings that are necessary to adequately assess the impact of this on adjacent properties. We're just getting hints of Wyndhurst or little hints of Preston Court or 625. I would ask for some longer sections to describe that relationship. It's difficult to do that with some of the materials that are included.

Mr. Mohr – In other parts of the city, we have asked for 3-D modeling to pick up adjacent buildings. One of the things that isn't apparent in the drawings is how much bigger that façade at Preston Place is than this building. It is in a transitional space. Wyndhurst is a pretty sizable building. The building next to it is quite small. The same is true of the white house. You have this major drop off in scale. On the other side of the street, you have this large fraternity with a very large parking area. You have a

number of houses in the immediate vicinity with quite large parking lots. It is trying to maintain that quality in the density of the tree canopy and doing a better job of embedding the building. Whether that means manipulating the height of the left block; that does have some appeal. I can see where it becomes architecturally problematic having one of the blocks taller than the other one. We really can't address use. I think a number of the neighborhood objections run much deeper than what the BAR can address.

Mr. Riddle – The zoning is R-3 for this property. Everything we are proposing, as far as use, density, and size are entirely appropriate and within the zoning regulations. One of the things that has come up a few times is the large tree that is close to the boundary with 625. It was misidentified on the surveys as oak. It is an ash. The arborist who did inspect it months ago pointed out that it is currently dying. It has limbs that are dead. It does appear to be at the end of its life. That's certainly a report that we can include in materials that we subsequently present. With talking to the neighbors, a few neighbors brought up how the discussion can be important. We have had multiple meetings with neighbors. We have met with them onsite. We have exchanged emails with them. Ahead of this meeting, I sent them a preview of our presentation. We have done a lot to keep them in the loop, even though there is a great deal of opposition. With regards to the massing of the building, it is worth pointing out that if you were to build a single-family house or a couple of townhouses on this property, you could build them to the same size. As far as modulating the massing goes, I understand some personal preferences might be for greater modulation. I can imagine a project where that would be interesting and exciting. My question: Is what we are proposing cross a line to being inappropriate or not appropriate? That's a struggle for us to understand how this would be deemed inappropriate for its massing considering what is allowed in this neighborhood and considering what staff mentioned about it staying within a percentage range of heights of nearby buildings. Comments about the building looking harsh are a little hard for us to assess when we are comparing it to guidelines. Somebody mentioned something about wanting to keep a view from the west side of the circle to Wyndhurst. I understand where people are coming from, especially if they're used to having that view who have lived in the neighborhood or walked around the circle for a long time. At the same time, you could argue that empty space that has been there takes a little bit from what could be perceived as a street wall along that edge. This building comes in and fills a space. The interpretation that the Preston Court Apartments belong to Grady Avenue and not to Preston Circle; I don't see that. I look at the Preston Court Apartments and I see three significant facades. They're in the west, south, and east. I see it as a building that participates inevitably with this circle. In the guidelines for this particular historic district, it is noted specifically that Wyndhurst was among two farms that were initially subdivided and sold off in the early 20th century largely for the sake of housing and an expanding university faculty and students. Even though the demographic of the potential tenants in this building are not something that the BAR can address, it is entirely appropriate that there are students living here. There have been students living here for decades.

Mr. Schwarz – Is there anybody who is opposed to a 6 unit, 3 story apartment building here?

Mr. Zehmer – I am not opposed to it. The word that I wasn't using was the word 'inappropriate.' The word that I was citing from our staff report was 'incompatible.' I could support the building here. I feel that it was incompatible.

Mr. Schwarz – You could support it in concept. You would like to see some significant changes?

Mr. Zehmer – That's correct.

Mr. Schwarz – Is there anyone else in the same boat with significant changes? Things such as stepping back the northwest corner. Do they need to completely change the materiality? Is it too big? Is it too close to Wyndhurst?

Ms. Lewis – Not major changes. James' comments were very persuasive to me. I am at a loss to think of one architectural detail of this building that takes a cue from another building on Preston, except for Preston Court Apartments. A lot of the street is vernacular or primitive looking. There are a lot of different architectural styles. I wouldn't want to borrow from all of them at one time. It would be nice if this building reminded us of the other beautiful buildings further down the street. I am persuaded for not a wholesale. That would get me over. I don't disagree with James' objection to compatibility. I do agree that exposed stairway is a little new dorm for me. I can say that because I lived in a new dorm. You have that Motel 6 in the middle. I do wonder if you were able to glaze it or shade it to obstruct that from the street view. There might be a design opportunity in that space for that façade that shields that. I would agree with Carl on that one as well. With regards to the balconies, it sounds like the group is in favor. When I lived across the street at 632, I was in the room that has the balcony on it. Balconies on Preston have been used by misbehaving students. These balconies are modest and they're hopefully not nearly as large as what I was afforded. That's a use reality that this board has no say on this.

Mr. Schwarz – I do think you, Kevin, are trying to put the residential details in there. I think the shutters are a nice addition. You have a contemporary building. It is a nod that there are houses nearby.

Mr. Riddle – I know there are various takes on this. We're going for something that we viewed as just a rather simple building with materials that we do see elsewhere on the block. When you're trying to pick and choose "quotations" from around the circle, it can converge into pastiche in doing that. We wanted to be cautious about incorporating that.

It is a pretty eclectic circle. That is one of its virtues. The Preston Court Apartments coming along in the 1920s really caused a big change. Further circumscribing and diminishing the original presence of the historic house are all of the houses that were built around the circle. It looks like a place where historic fabric is dynamic. Introducing a building that doesn't necessarily be too deferential or take too many cues from what is around it. There is something to be said for that.

Mr. Mohr – Even if this is a single-family house, the way it would get developed, Wyndhurst would be blocked from view from the street edge if it was broken up. It does seem like this is fundamentally an addendum to the original big building. I think having a better sense of the street scale would actually, in reference to Preston Place and the scale of this building, would make for a better argument about the scale of your building.

Mr. Schwarz – I want to figure out how we can tie this up in a way that makes sense. I am under the impression that we're not going to get an approval tonight. I do want to make sure Kevin gets the right direction.

Mr. Riddle – I do believe that the owner would like a vote tonight. If there is a set of conditions that might be attached to this application so that some members could see their way to approval.

Mr. Schwarz – We can do that. That is risky in that we cannot have administrative approvals. We have to either design things tonight or it would be better to defer. With a show of hands, who could

approve this tonight with conditions? I think you're better off requesting a deferral. If you want a vote, you know what is going happen. We don't want to do that.

Mr. Gastinger – I am largely supportive of the approach and what has been designed here. I feel like I need a little more information related to the scales, especially on the northwest corner, the drive aisle, and the retaining wall.

Mr. Schwarz – I want to know what you're going to do with the balconies. I strongly suggest enclosing that staircase. I am not sure it is going to be a deal killer. I think that is really important.

Ms. Lewis – Besides aesthetics and compatibility with the neighborhood, I would think an open stairwell would be a noisy place for neighbors. If the consideration here is to lessen the impact on an apartment building, enclosing those stairs might be a better way of accomplishing that. It might be a nice concession.

Mr. Riddle – Does that get to points about behavior and remark whether it will be noisy or not? Is that an architectural issue?

Ms. Lewis – It is if you can insulate noise from the street. Do we have materials on the stairs?

Mr. Schwarz – It is metal and wood. I liked how Cheri described it. It has a Motel 8 feel to it with the open stair. The connotation that I have seen with an open stair is very rarely done in a way that feels residential or feels compatible with a neighborhood of this type of character. It feels like something that is 'cheap.'

Mr. Riddle – If you look at the west perspective, I am not seeing 'cheap' there. I would be concerned with enclosing the stair with some kind of glazed volume. It might take from the perception you have of these two separate wings of the building. I think it is clearer and crisper in this rendition.

Mr. Schwarz – I don't think you're getting two buildings out of this. It is reading as one with a hole in the middle. It doesn't seem like there is a whole lot of agreement.

Mr. Mohr – I read it as two masses. If you do glaze it in, unless you step it back, it will definitely continue to read as one solid block. You have to get that glass line significantly back behind the corner. Are both facades in plane?

Mr. Riddle – The one on the left/north is back a bit.

Mr. Mohr – Whether it is a glaze or screen, you would have to pull it back behind that.

Mr. Riddle – In the floor plan, the landing is projected beyond the north wing.

Mr. Schwarz – I don't know if the perspective is deceptive or not, it does look very light filled. It looks like there is a skylight in there.

Mr. Riddle – I haven't artificially enhanced that. I know that it is an illustration. There would be lighting in there that would help to enhance this space when people are going up and down the stairs. I think it is proposed to be something that has slightly higher aspirations than just a fire escape.

Mr. Schwarz – You're putting nice materials on there.

Mr. Gastinger – We did recently approve a very similar approach on the Virginia Avenue apartment building. It is for the BAR to decide if that context has an impact on this neighborhood.

Mr. Schwarz – I think that one also had an upper level that was partially open to the sky. For me, I don't know if that would have helped here. I think it is the context.

Mr. Mohr – My concern was that driveway edge and that delineation. I don't think the massing, when you bring in the other building façade, is as big as it seems right now. The building is very front and center as we currently look at it. The building to the left is considerably lower once you starting taking in the aggregate. The one thing that would soften it would be if it had a pitched roof. That's antithetical to the building to the right and to the aesthetics of this building. It is about working on the street edge and doing something about that driveway. Maybe that retaining wall has a planter edge where it spills down. One of the elevations showed vines coming down one side. A lot of this can be handled and starting to bring in some things that make the detailing more residential and less commercial. A lot of that is at the street edge.

Mr. Schwarz – Kevin, you have pretty good support for the project in general with some modifications.

Mr. Riddle – This has been very helpful. Regarding the balconies in the neighborhood, there is opposition to them. They are rather shallow balconies. If we were to eliminate most or all of them, it would create an even greater challenge to potentially incorporating the kind of detailing that would give it a greater sense of scale and give it something of a residential touch, which some people are looking for here. I want to confirm that, among BAR members, that the balconies seem to be OK.

Mr. Zehmer – Somebody had mentioned possibly not having them on the north façade that would overlook right into the backyards of a lot of the neighbors. That is maybe a consideration.

Mr. Riddle – I do see what you mean there.

Mr. Zehmer – Tim phrased it really well in terms of trying out detailing more residential in nature than commercial in nature. I want to echo that. In looking at the view west, with that big retaining wall off of the driveway going down, maybe consider stone. Make that retaining wall not feel like part of the building. Make it more natural. It is worth taking a walk around Preston Place and looking at the other landscape features.

Mr. Riddle – That's a pretty good suggestion.

Mr. Schwarz – It would be nice if you started the site plan process while this is going on.

Mr. Gastinger – I do think that western entrance to Wyndhurst is an important story to that house. Some acknowledgement of that terrace and doorway can be made in the design of that interior space. It is very difficult to see what is happening in there. Whether it is retaining some of that material or reusing that material that would be important.

Mr. Riddle – Based on your comments, we do want to evaluate that terrace more. When we return, we can fill you in more about it.

Applicant moved to defer the application – Ms. Lewis moved to accept the applicant request for a deferral (Second by Mr. Schwarz). – Motion passes 7-0

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

Other Business

5. Per City Council Request: BAR consideration of Council’s May 3, 2021 Resolution of Intent to Remove, Relocate, Contextualize, or Cover the Statues of Generals Lee and Jackson Currently Located Within City Parks

Note: This is intended as an opportunity for the BAR, in its role as an advisory body to Council, to consider and respond to Council’s request.

- Staff briefly summarized the written report regarding the statues of Confederate Generals Lee and Jackson located within city parks.
 - The written staff report will be the formal record.
- The BAR was asked by Council to analyze the intent to remove, relocate, contextualize, or cover the statues of Lee and Jackson and provide comment to Council prior to the Council public hearing on the statues on June 7th.
- The Council intent is to remove the statues as soon as possible.
- Since the statues are not contributing structures in the North Downtown ADC District, the BAR has no purview over the removal or relocation of the statues.
- The BAR does serve as an advisory board to the Council and it is in that capacity that Council has asked the BAR to provide comment.
- Staff provided the history of the statues and the actions and intent of Council with removing or relocating the statues.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

- Mr. Gastinger commented on the role of the Board of Architectural Review as a volunteer board appointed by City Council.
- Mr. Gastinger did refer to the guidelines in his comments regarding the history and the building of the statues.
- Mr. Gastinger referred to the following:
 - **Design Guideline Section 1E, Number 3** – Physical records of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development will not be undertaken.
 - **National Historic Preservation Act** – Properties or structures like sculptures that are primarily commemorative in nature that are designed or constructed after the occurrence of an important historic event or after the life of an important person that they serve less as evidence of that particular person’s productive life but as evidence of a later generation’s assessment of the past. There has been a misconception by some that the statues are historic. They were created to shape the historic narrative. This has been documented by the Blue Ribbon Commission. These statues tell an incomplete history and they tell a false, painful, and damaging lost cause narratives. That would go against the above guideline.

- **Design Guideline Section 1** – Architectural design Control Districts – Detail and point out properties and elements that define the district. In the North Downtown ADC description, there is no mention of Lee Park or the statues as character defining features. In the sub-area of Jefferson Street and High Street West, it makes no mention of Market Street Park, Court Square Park, or the statues as important or character defining features in the district. There is no guidance related to the role that these statues play or contribute in a positive way to the landscape character of the district.
- **Design Guideline Section 2 (Site Design & Elements)** – Does not address statues in public parks.
- **Design Guideline Section 6J, Number 1** – Does suggest existing public art and statues should be maintained. However, public art is preferred that offers a place making role in celebrating and communicating the history and culture of the districts. The Blue Ribbon Commission report already documents the damaging and misleading role of the statues in telling a lost cause narrative. It is meant include some in the community and exclude others. That narrative is not compatible with the contemporary values.
- **National Trust for Historic Preservation** – issued multiple white papers describing support for removal of Confederate monuments from a preservationist perspective. The National Trust supports the removal from our public spaces when they continue to serve the purposes for which they were built to glorify, promote, and reinforce white supremacy.
- Following the presentation from Mr. Gastinger, there was a discussion regarding what Mr. Gastinger presented to the other members of the Board of Architectural Review.
- Ms. Lewis expressed excitement of what could be designed in the parks following the removal of the statues.
- There was a discussion among the BAR members regarding the role of the BAR in crafting a statement to send to Council prior to the public hearing on June 7th.

STATEMENT FROM THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

With careful consideration of our Design Guidelines, with guidance from respected national preservation organizations, and in acknowledgement of the Blue Ribbon Commission’s public process and work to better understand the history and harmful legacy of these statues, we wish to state our strong support for City Council’s intention to remove the Lee and Jackson statues and to temporarily cover and contextualize the statues during a period of time before removal can occur. Furthermore, we look forward to working with a public process to understand how the parks may be redesigned in the future in accordance with our Guidelines.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – (Second by Mr. Mohr) – Send Statement to Council prior to the Council public hearing regarding the Jackson and Lee statues on June 7th. Motion passes 7-0.

6. Staff questions/discussion
Update on revisions to the ADC District Design Guidelines
7. PLACE Update

D. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:28 PM

