

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[April 16, 2019] – 5:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers - City Hall**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). After presentations by staff and the applicant, members of the public will be allowed two opportunities to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. The Chair will first ask for questions from the public, then from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to ask questions, and up to three minutes to comment. Comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

PLEASE NOTE THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATUM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2

Members Present: Justin Sarafin, Stephen Balut, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Mike Ball, Tim Mohr, Jody Lahendro, and Emma Earnst

Staff Present: Jeff Werner, Camie Mess, Kari Spitler, and Sebastian Weisman

Mr. Mohr called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

None.

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

- | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Minutes | [March 13, 2019] | February Make-Up Meeting |
| | [March 19, 2019] | Regular Meeting |

2. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-04-04
1102 Carlton Avenue
Tax Parcel 560086000
My Properties, LLC, Owner/Julie Coiner, Applicant
Solar Panel Additions

3. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-04-02
134 10th St NW
Tax Parcel 310156000
Shannon Worrell, Owner/Applicant
Replace Loading Dock Door

Balut. Balut moved to approve the consent agenda. Lahendro seconded. Approved (6-0-1, with Mohr abstained for the minutes only).

C. Deferred Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-14-07

608 Preston Place

Tax Parcel 050108000

Psi Chapter of Sigma Chi Fraternity House Corp, Owner/John Matthews, Applicant

Sigma Chi Renovations and Addition: Lighting

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: The building was constructed in 1929 and is a contributing structure in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. Last month the BAR approved some modifications to the planned building renovations and some site landscaping features including fencing. Additional information was requested on the proposed exterior lighting, which is being presented this evening. Staff recommends approval and recommends that all exterior lighting, including the LED lighting mounted lights should have warm color temperature less than 3000K. Any exterior lamp that emits 3000 or more lumens shall be a full cutoff.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Mohr: The wall packs have controls with a motion sensor and a light detector on it, but are they on all night?

Ms. Erin Hannigan: No. It detects the motion and takes 3 seconds to warm up, it will be on for 5 minutes and then it will ramp down in 5 minutes. It is for security purposes.

Mr. Mohr: Did the specified compact florescent in the hanging lamp in the front entrance specify color temperature? Is it dimmable?

Ms. Hannigan: It is actually an "A" LED lamp.

Mr. Mohr: So the applicant is putting in an LED "A" lamp and there are two bulbs in that fixture. An "A" lamp is an imitation of an Edison bulb.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: It is vastly approved.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed lighting plan satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that

the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the specification for the hanging pendent as described during the meeting (Type A LED blub.) Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

Earnst arrived at the meeting.

D. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-04-03

713 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520056000

James and Cordelia Gelly, Owner/W. Douglas Gilpin, Jr., Applicant

New Garage/Apartment Accessory

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This is for both the demolition of an existing garage and the proposed construction of a new garage/accessory apartment unit. The main house, c1861, is among the city's oldest remaining buildings. The brick garage behind the house is not original to the house, as the concrete foundation, brickwork, and extant window moldings suggest it dates to the early 20th century. The garage is shown on the 1929 Sanborn Maps, however maps prior to 1929 did not include this area. The garage is not mentioned in City surveys completed in the 1970s/80s, nor in the 1980 NRHP historic district nomination of this area. However, when the city adopted the North Downtown ADC District, the garage was included as a contributing structure. The request is to demolish the existing, 18 ft. x 18 ft., single story, brick, single car garage and to construct a new 30 ft. x 24 ft., two car, two story garage (loft space above) with a single story, 26 ft. x 10 ft. conditioned storage space and a single story, 10 ft. x 10 ft. garden shed. It is important to note that the design has been revised since the BAR looked at it in the initial discussion and initial submittal. The garage has been shifted slightly uphill towards Park Street and the footprint has been reduced, as the 10 ft. by 26 ft. segment designated for storage has been eliminated. The outdoor equipment shed has been moved up tight with the garage. On the proposed demolition for the existing garage, while locally-designated as a contributing structure, the garage is not original to the main house and it was likely built 50 to 60 years later. The design and materials are utilitarian, are not unique, and have no noteworthy design features. The demolition of the garage is compatible with the BAR Guidelines for Demolition. Staff recommends a condition of approval that prior to demolition the applicant will provide staff with a sketch plan and photographs of the existing garage to record its existence. Relative to the proposed new garage, during the March 19, 2019 preliminary discussion the BAR indicated support for the design of the new garage but expressed concern about its width and orientation. It was suggested that it not compete with the main house from the front or rear in location, scale, or design. The BAR should discuss if the proposed design addresses the questions and comments that were raised. The BAR may also request additional details and information including renderings, photo-simulations, etc. if necessary to evaluate this application. Staff also recommends that this be addressed in two motions, one to approve or deny the demolition of the garage and one to approve or deny the proposed new building.

Applicant, Doug Gilpin: Represents James and Cordelia Gelly, who are the new owners of the home. The massing was made smaller and then after being on the site last week and looking at the landscaping, we decided to move the 26 ft. x 10 ft. area to the present house and we reduced the footprint significantly. We were also able to place front right corner of the proposed garage in the exact location of the present right front corner of the present garage the way it stands, which allows for plenty of clearance for a hackberry tree on the property line. This means we will not be cutting into the roots of the tree at all. It also allows them to nestle it into the notch area in the back where there is a sewer easement across the property. The footprint of the building is now 30 ft. x 24 ft. deep with the 10 ft. x 10 ft. appendage for the garden storage in the back. On the images shown regarding the 2nd and 3rd elevations, the center section of the image can be disregarded because they are gone and it has been coupled together. It fits beautifully on the site. Regarding the demolition, it is about a 1920s garage and there are cracks in the foundation and cracks in the bricks themselves two bricks thick. The roof structure is sagging and the sliding door hasn't moved in several years. There is a window and access door on the north side that is also inactive. We are requesting removal of that building to replace it with the new structure. The new structure will have board and batten exterior siding and the materials for the trim work will be a composite material, which will be painted. The roofing material is from a company called Enviroshake and they have a composite shingle that replicates the character of a wood shingle roof. A wood shingle

would be great to put on the building but it would be replaced in about 15 years. The other alternatives would be to possibly use a fiberglass asphalt shingle roof or a prefinished metal roof, but the concern with that is that it doesn't have the patina of a copper roof or roof that is being considered for the main house. The Enviroshake material was chosen on the standpoint of brightness and keeping it low key. We are discussing colors at this time and would like to do a paint color analysis of the main building to see if the house was originally white in color. It might actually be a cream color, which would then be used in the outbuilding. Globally we are looking at a warm light gray for the garage outbuilding with a cream trim and dark green doors.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ball: It is a remarkable difference that fits well and it's great that the footprint was moved back to where the old one was because that drop does help. Do you have an idea of what the elevation change is going to be?

Mr. Gilpin: The present building is about 16 or 17 ft. in height and this building is going to be about 23 ft. in height, which is under the 25 ft. maximum.

Mr. Schwarz: Speaking of colors and finishes, with the semi-solid stain finish will you see the green coming through?

Mr. Gilpin: Possibly. We are still looking at all of those avenues. We'd like to do a sample panel on the site that is two-sided so you can see it in the sun and shade at the same time. The colors may need to be tinkered and we would want the BAR to review the colors at an appropriate onsite location before painting begins.

Mr. Ball: Have you narrowed down the material for the garage door?

Mr. Gilpin: A manufacturer hasn't been determined, but it would be a painted finish and the general appearance would be what is drawn. A wood door is not preferred because it won't last.

Mr. Ball: What are the shed doors going to be?

Mr. Gilpin: The two doors going into the garden shed are going to be fiberglass and will be painted.

Mr. Balut: What is the window material?

Mr. Gilpin: They will be pella architect reserve clad units that are paint finish and are dependent on what colors are selected.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Colette Hall: Resides at 101 Robertson Lane and the land is contiguous with the property in question. The house is a magnificent structure and there aren't any feelings about the garage, as it is old. There was a meeting about this property in March but notes that she didn't receive notification of it. It is good that they aren't going to take down the Hackberry. Are they going to take down other trees, which means that the garage would then be seen more than it does currently? There are multiple trees in the backyard and there used to be over 50, many of which were taken down by the previous owner. It is great that they are making it smaller because it would impact the visual site from her property. Going onto the second floor there is going to be a metal stairway and metal is loud. It would be much better if it was a wooden staircase. What are they planning to use the second floor for? It is noted that it will be an apartment, but a neighbor noted that she didn't see any plumbing. If it is going to be an apartment it has to have a water source and if it is going to be entirely different from the people who live in the main house then there will be more traffic, noise, light coming through the windows, etc. Lastly, the architect mentioned an addition to the main house. It is a historic property, so we would hate to see that happen.

Mr. Mohr: Notes that matters of use are not under the BAR's purview and R1 zoning allows for accessory dwelling units so they can build it by-right.

Mr. Lahendro: Notes that the floor plan on the second floor is public material and shows a bedroom, kitchenette, and a toilet so plumbing is involved.

Mr. Werner: Notes that the proposed addition to the main house would be addressed in a separate review. Extensive restoration of the house is planned with some modifications possibly on the rear, but that will come back to the BAR as a separate item. Letters are only sent out to property owners when an action is taken and last month's review was only a preliminary discussion with no action taken.

Mr. Gilpin: Regarding the stairs, it is a metal stair and we want to keep it as light as possible visually. Safety is also a factor and it is an open gridded tread system with open risers to make sure rain, snow, etc. doesn't accumulate on it. Additionally, a more contemporary approach was taken rather than a historically appropriate styled Italian 8 set of set of stairs. In terms of sound, it will not be an issue. It is not an apartment house where you would have people going up and down the stairs and it would be very infrequent from the standpoint of people going up them.

Mr. James Gelly: Regarding the tree, there is a smaller, younger hackberry tree that likely will not be able to be saved because it is in the footprint of the proposed garage, but the objective is to save as many trees as possible. The concern is to conserve as much of the landscape as possible, which includes the trees.

Mark Cavit: People are concerned about the size but it sounds like they have reduced the size of it, which is good. Hopefully it is reduced sufficiently enough. Hopefully the drawing being proposed will architecturally fit into the style for the area. Hopefully some screening will be done in the way of trees and bushes as well.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Werner: On the site plan provided, there is are maple and mulberry trees on the rear of the property but no other vegetation or trees are noted for removal. The BAR could request or make a statement that no other trees are being removed and that they submit a more detailed site plan showing where vegetation is if that is a concern.

Motion: Lahendro moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC Guidelines for Demolition, I move to find that the proposed garage demolition 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. The applicant should provide a sketch plan and photos of the existing garage Balut seconded. Approved (8-0).

Mr. Mohr: Notes that now the BAR must consider the COA for the garage itself.

Mr. Gastinger: The changes have been very positive. The building holds together better, it is more appropriate with the site, and it is in keeping with the neighborhood and with the style of the house. The only element that sticks out is the scale of the window in the dormer facing the street. It is probably picking up on some of the proportions of the larger window above the main house, which is almost the scale of an entire door. It seems out of scale with the garage doors and the other fenestration on the building. One recommendation might be to reduce the scale of the window.

Mr. Ball: Notes that he did not notice it before but agrees. On the metal stairs, noise tends to be a factor of gauge and support. Metal stairs in a straight run of this length tend to bounce a lot and can be annoying. With more support and the right gauge, noise shouldn't be an issue.

Mr. Lahendro: Regarding the upstairs apartment, it has a mother-in-law type of apartment and won't have the kind of use that might be feared by others.

Mr. Gilpin: Regarding the large window, the pella software does not have an arctop window that looks good. If you look at the construction drawings, it does have an arctop window that mimicked the character, so it was much softer. The ones from the preliminary drawings are what will be utilized.

Mr. Werner: The March 19, 2019 drawing from the preliminary discussion drawing is what we are looking at. More specifically, we are referring to the window as presented in the drawings dated April 12, 2019. The window on sheet BAR 2, elevation 1 will match what is presented in the preliminary drawings. For the record we are referring to Mr. Gilpin's drawings dated April 12, 2019, sheet BAR 2 elevation #1. The BAR should also clarify that this is the amended final review materials as submitted on April 12, 2019. There is a revised book and the three pages of drawings, which were BAR 1, BAR 2, and BAR 3 dated April 12, 2019, as well as the amended bound version and specifications dated April 12, 2019.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC Guidelines for New Construction and Additions I move to find that the proposed new garage 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 on 4/12/2019

- window over the garage doors to more closely match the window shown in the applicant's Preliminary Review packet, dated 3/11/2019, page 13, Schematic Garage Sketches, East Elevation the preliminary discussion with the arched top
- recommendation for heavier gauge metal and extra support on the stairs

Lahendro seconded. Approved (8-0).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-04-01

600 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 290007000, 290006000, and 290008000

Heirloom West Main Development, LLC, Owner/Alan Goffinski, Applicant

Mural

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This is a COA request for a mural to be painted on the west side of 600 West Main Street. The James Hawkins house was built in 1873 and is known as the Hawkins-Perry House. With an addition it later became the Midway Market. The application is by the Bridge Project of Charlottesville and the mural is proposed by a South African artist, Faith 47. In her words she describes this piece as a conceptualized design that accentuates the architecture of the building and contributes a subtle sense of magic and majesty to the West Main Street corridor. The BAR should discuss if a mural is appropriate in this location. The mural guidelines are rather broad and this is not a discussion about the art itself.

Applicant, Alan Goffinski: We believe that the form of the imagery is an exquisite compliment of the shape of the wall. Rather than addressing the entire wall, the mural overlays colors and design elements over the approved wall color and leaves plenty of negative space in order to account for maintaining the architectural elements of the building. Care was taken to design a mural that would look appropriate alongside the existing foliage on West Main Street, but we do know that the trees may or may not stay in the long run so we wanted to be sure that the mural could stand alone strongly either way. We believe that the mural is congruent with the cropping and the appropriate considerations made for past murals to allow for the shape of the building to stand alone by itself and not be obfuscated by harsh lines or drastic design elements. We believe that this mural will be a beloved fixture along West Main Street and it will be a bright addition to the corridor and that it has a nice historical relevance to the area as well.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Balut: What is the expected life of the mural?

Mr. Goffinski: We typically use paint that has a 30 year color lock technology. We put a mural up to stay and last forever, but ultimately we leave it in the hands of the building owner to own. We also understand that things change over time.

Mr. Ball: Is there specific preparation that you are doing to the existing paint to be sure the mural doesn't flake off with old paint?

Mr. Goffinski: There is no preparation that we are doing, but the building has been slated to be repainted and the color design has been approved. The fresh coat of paint will be the base coat that the design will be overlaid on. The artist's process has a transparency affect and it isn't a hard stark image. It will be primed and ready to go when she arrives on site.

Mr. Schwarz: There is a lot of work going into this but it looks like it might be put on a wall that might not be visible for a long time. What made you choose this location?

Mr. Goffinski: We were contacted by the owners and there are always risks like that when a mural is put up. We will enjoy it while it lasts and remember it when it's gone.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Jeff Dreyfus: Tonight we will be speaking about the property adjacent to this one and if the owners can, they would like to determine if there is a way that the mural might be a part of the next project. There is no guarantee that this will happen, but it is seen as something that could be a public amenity and the hope is to design with it as part of the next project.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ball: Likes the location and it is fun to see back there. It's better than just a plan painted wall.

Mr. Schwarz: Notes that this is perfectly appropriate and is beautiful, but the hope is that we get to see it for a while.

Mr. Mohr: It has also upped the game in terms of sophistication. It is intriguing and would be great.

Mr. Balut: Notes that he is in favor of the project and the mural and the bar has been raised by the design. It is very appropriate and it has been articulated well.

Mr. Gastinger: It meets the guidelines very clearly and as a citizen it will be a beautiful and powerful addition.

Motion: Gastinger moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and Public Design and Improvements, I move to find that the proposed mural satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Ball seconded. Approved (8-0).

E. New Construction

7. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 19-02-03

0 Rugby Road

Tax Parcel 050047100

West Range Castle Dango, LLC, Owner/ Isaac Miller, Applicant

New Construction

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: 0 Rugby Road is vacant parcel in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The request is for construction of a three-story, 12-unit housing facility located above an underground parking garage. The building will be composed of two distinctly different architectural blocks: the front section facing Rugby Road will be of a traditional design intended to compliment the adjacent 513 Rugby Road, and the rear section that is connected by a brief hyphen will follow a more contemporary design. The BAR looked at this in a preliminary discussion in June 2018 and again during the March 13, 2019 meeting. There was general support for the scale and massing, however the questions and concerns were focused primarily on the central bay of the front elevation, the roof line of the front building, and the conflicting designs of the front and rear buildings, whether or not they should represent a hybrid of the two styles, be distinctly different, or be different yet related. In comparing and contrasting the various design approaches, three terms were frequently mentioned: color, materiality and connective-ness. Regarding the entry, the design has been revised so that the pediment, two-story columns and upper balcony are removed and replaced with a simpler, single story portico with columns. The roof line of the front building is now flat with a simpler cornice. Regarding the two designs, there is still variation in materiality, but the colors are no longer contrasting and there are design elements that, while materially different, connect the two buildings. For example, the line of the brick water table is continued on the rear building; the line of the ornate front cornice is reflected in a simpler, but aligned cornice feature on the rear building; and the three bays of the rear building's west façade, while asymmetrical, reflects the main façade on Rugby Road. The BAR should also consider the appropriateness of the proposed landscaping and lighting elements, particularly in how they contribute or not to resolving the contrasting building designs. At the prior meeting there were questions about the site's accessibility. The BAR review does not include establishing access and that matter is being addressed with the Site Plan review.

Applicant, Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects: Notes that the cornus was re-detailed and there is a proportioning system that was used for the front façade that is often used in this style of building. The relationship between the front and the rear originally took an approach of contrasting the styles. In the submission, we addressed breaking down the scale of the building. The rear building is continued to be rendered in a more straightforward way with a more modern detailing. We changed the color to begin to relate to the front portion. We didn't want to make them too similar because a similar style would have emphasized the size of the building. The stucco base takes its reference from the 513 building next door. In addition, the driveway has been changed and reduced the planting to allow for the visibility that was mentioned during the last discussion. In terms of the lighting fixtures, historic lighting fixtures will be used on the front and more contemporary fixtures will be used on the rear of the building. If you look at the precedents of some of the other multi-family historic buildings in the surrounding neighborhood, there is a tendency to break down the vertical scale of the massing. We didn't want to do that literally, but we wanted to distinguish the dimensions with darker frames and break down the scale and wings of the building. We also take the approach that if we build good neoclassical building in the neighborhood, they will fit in for a longer period of time rather than something that is quasi historic. That is why we went with the robust detailing on the buildings.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Mohr: With the addition in the back, is there anything limiting the proportion of them?

Mr. Wardell: We didn't want to make them literally the same proportions, which is why we went with the dark frames.

Mr. Lahendro: The landscape is delightful, especially getting rid of things that make it dangerous for pedestrians and vehicular traffic. This application meets the guidelines.

Mr. Ball: Regarding the central portion with the 4 windows upstairs, is that because of layout?

Mr. Wardell: The main middle floor has a hallway that goes back to the internal circulation and the space is taken by lateral units.

Mr. Mohr: The flat elevations speak better to the proportions.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

John Freudenthal: Notes that he is the owner of Quality Structures in Charlotte, NC. The Director of Real Estate has very specific opinion as to the quality and style of the design of the building. He is actively involved in this, as well as the other stakeholders, businesses, the neighborhood, and the students. There is a desire to be market relevant and we want to develop these facilities to build and hold. Standing the test of time and being an attractive facility are very important.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz: In every iteration we have seen of this it has gotten more refined. It has been cleaned up and simplified and it is an improvement. There aren't any concerns with the guidelines for this application.

Mr. Mohr: The elevations speak to it much better than the renderings. There is a sense of proportion and it is going to sit very comfortably. The contrast could be a little softer, but it is not a highly critical part of the building. The flat roof works very well and makes it a very mature building.

Mr. Sarafin: It is drastically improved and it is highly appropriate for the site. The way it communicates with the residential scale fits in very well and it is mature. It is refined and the attic is great and the flat roof works.

Mr. Gastinger: The application as a whole is more complete and cohesive and the entrance way is nicely proportioned with the façade. The colors of the brick that are used within the façade with the change in brick is odd.

Mr. Mohr: The key is to look at the front flat elevation because the relationship with the hyphens makes the central piece work well there.

Mr. Lahendro: It is a more restrained, more dignified building and it is quirky with the two different colored bricks, but that speaks to the fact that it is 2019.

Mr. Wardell: We didn't want to do that in an overt way, but rather to whisper it in.

Mr. Ball: Notes that he is not sold on the flat roof but it doesn't go against the guidelines.

Motion: Sarafin moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed new construction satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Schwarz seconded. Approved (8-0).

8. Preliminary Discussion
503 Rugby Road

Applicant, Erin Hannigan, Mitchell Matthews Architects: This is for the Kappa Gamma Gamma sorority and the goal tonight is to determine if it is in scale. The location is in the Venable neighborhood and it is within the University Circle Venable Neighborhood ADC District, but it is not a contributing structure. It was built in 1979 and doesn't have any characteristics from the street elevation that make it very notable. Some of the neighborhood scales range from 2-3 levels up to 5 levels. A parking lot takes up the majority of the back of the site and the cars are parked at the back of the property line. The majority of the addition will be on the first floor and the new conceptual site plan changes the entrance location with an accessible entry on the side. The roof of the building is comparable to the adjacent property and the landscaping is overgrown because the tenants are not fond of the building. They would like to have a larger dining room, study areas, and more bedrooms. We would be changing it drastically, but we are working with an existing structure so there are certain limitations that we are tied to.

Mr. Balut: How would you describe the style of the building and how did you come to that?

Mr. John Matthews: It is a more transitional design in general, but all of the members were involved in the study and referenced their own house and wanted a grand southern house. They wanted something that looked like a large home for their members.

Mr. Lahendro: The reason is it noncontributing is because it was done long ago and if it were done today it might be a contributing structure. At the time of construction, it was a very interesting building and it is disappointing to hear that there is no appreciation for it now.

Mr. Matthews: It is also about the floorplan, as it is horrendous. The building is functionally insufficient.

Mr. Gastinger: If the building had never existed and the new one was being proposed, would it get approved? It seems a little too vertical in the window elements and there is an odd gap of space between the second story and the upper story. The proportion of the brackets aren't doing anything and there is a lot of additional work that can be done. For a well ordered façade on that street, in the abstract it makes a lot of sense, but does see where Mr. Lahendro is coming from.

Mr. Schwarz: As far as massing is concerned, it is shown well with the elevation diagrams. It would fit well right there and there is nothing alarming to worry about.

Mr. Matthews: If the sorority has a functionally obsolete building, what would you like us to try and accomplish? What would you like us to come back with in terms of modifications?

Mr. Lahendro: You say it is functionally obsolete, but the only difference you've made externally is the change in the central door. The side door and most of the walls are being kept and a lot of different things are being done inside the building to make it functionally work for them that we don't see. Why couldn't you do that with the building that is there?

Ms. Hannigan: Currently there are 6 rooms/bays across the front façade and that makes the bedrooms on the interior such that between the two custom-size beds smaller than a twin size, there is a 2'4" isle way between the beds. This isn't even enough for one person to pull out their dresser tucked under the bed and the other person to get out of bed. Instead of 6 bedrooms across the front width of the building, we are completely modifying the interior and changing it to 5 bays across the front. That is a major modification that totally changes the rhythm of the window placement from the existing.

Mr. Lahendro: You have the opportunity of putting fenestration wherever you want it because it has the appearance of a continuous lintel. The point is that just because you want 5 bays doesn't mean you have to do an Italian 8 revival building, which is what this looks like. You are creating a false historicism by changing it to an Italian 8 building. Notes that he has a personal connection with this building, but there are other BAR members of a different opinion.

Mr. Werner: The guidelines relative to noncontributing structures essentially say that you are getting a new building and you have to determine if that fits within the neighborhood.

Mr. Ball: Notes that he likes the look because we don't have a lot of transitional Italianate architecture here. Unfortunately we might lose the details that make it great like the Juliette balconies, floor to ceiling window doors, brackets, etc.

Mr. Schwarz: There have been a lot of things built like this built within the last 10 years.

Mr. Mohr: If this was a new building, would we approve the demolition of the existing building?

Mr. Ball: Yes.

Mr. Werner: Notes that the renderings can be misleading and this is brick if it helps at all.

Mr. Mohr: Once you do the brick you wouldn't have to do the pilaster corners either.

Ms. Hannigan: The pilaster corners are because we are working with existing pilaster corners.

Mr. Schwarz: It would be interesting to see a diagram of old overlaid on new because it looks like there would be so much brick surgery and it's amazing that you are keeping any of it.

Ms. Hannigan: That is why we are painting it, because it going to be brick surgery in certain conditions, especially in the front elevation. The north elevation is about 99% intact with what is there and the south elevation is about 85% intact.

Mr. Balut: As far as the historical significance of the building goes, Ms. Mess did a great job with the demo review by articulating each line and it could be a great process to go through to see if the architecture was significant, the defining features, and if there are other buildings like this. That could address the questions for the BAR in a way that we feel confident in proceeding with, in essence, the elimination of the building.

Mr. Mohr: It has to be treated as fundamentally a demolition.

Mr. Schwarz: Because this isn't a contributing structure, they could tear down the building if they wanted to. No matter what they do to it, it would basically be a new building. It would be useful for us if we ever decide to reevaluate our district for contributing structures, but we are legally bound to look at this as a new construction as opposed to a rehabilitation to something historic.

Mr. Werner: If you are looking at this as essentially a new building, then the guidelines move more towards whether or not it fits into the district.

Mr. Balut: There is something handsome with what is being presented and it is important to have diversity, but when considering whether or not it is compatible with the district it is important to know what the design intent was trying to accomplish. What is the unified design language that you are trying to design? Would you call this Italian 8? What is the overarching binding idea that you are trying to accomplish?

Mr. Matthews: The goal is to create a building that is appropriate for the street, but one that also fits the functional goals of the sorority, which is paramount. Many of the things the things that have come up are all functional responses. We are happy to keep coming back with different iterations to try and address some of the concerns and get it as close as possible to an appropriate solution. This is more of a classical modernism building because some of the classical elements are there but a more modern interpretation of those. The primary focus was on the internal function and adjusting that skin to meet the function. It is an aesthetic response to a functional request. They also have a robust budget and we expect everything that that we show will be built.

Mr. Balut: We are reviewing the aesthetics rather than the functional aspects, so the internal function isn't as much of a concern. It is understandable that you are trying to accomplish many things and accommodate many desires, but how does a modern classical style translate to the detail of the railing, for example? How does your stylistic goal translate to the smaller details? It would be great to see it presented in a way with a holistic, stylistic goal that you are aiming to achieve because it would be more convincing and show that it is a unique character that would add to the neighborhood.

Ms. Hannigan: We are still in a conceptual design and we will take those comments into consideration when we bring something back to the BAR.

Mr. Schwarz: This has your firm's signature all over it and although it has been reinterpreted, it looks like a lot of things that have been done before. You've made your own style in some of the previous work that has been done, which is evident here.

Mr. Werner: There are two things to consider here from the guidelines, one being that when designing new buildings in a historic district, while there is an overall distinctive district character, there is a great variety of historic building types, styles, and scales throughout the district in subareas. Additionally, the residential infill component where new dwellings that are constructed on the occasional vacant lot within a block of existing historic buildings set back, spacing, and general massing of the dwelling are the most important criteria that should relate to the existing historic structures, along with residential roof and porch forms.

Mr. Mohr: We aren't mandating a style and we are asking for scale more than anything. Ultimately we are trying to make sure it plays well with the neighbors. Mr. Lahendro's concerns relate more to what constitutes a contributing structure and unfortunately right now this one does not. Our attitude has to be more towards whether or not it makes sense in context.

Mr. Gastingner: The building is in line with the spirit of our Guidelines as written. While we may still have discussion about particular details, it is well grounded in that regard.

Mr. Balut: Reiterates that the scale and approach are quite handsome and it is going in a great direction.

Mr. Sarafin: Per the Guidelines and appropriateness, it is on the right track for being appropriate with the street. He notes that his first reaction was similar to Mr. Lahendro's opinion and perhaps we can create a condition to include measured drawings and photographs for the archives because it is a locally significant building.

Mr. Gastingner: This isn't just a UVA thing. In other college towns fraternity architecture is trying to out-classicize each other and modern architecture hasn't found a way into changing how those organizations present themselves.

Mr. Lahendro: It's also a general lack of appreciation of international style building, but there are some movements that are coming in trying to acknowledge the importance of them.

9. Preliminary Discussion

612 West Main Street

Applicant, Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects: This is more of a philosophical question and a process question. 612 West Main is the University Tire site that will be developed by the same team that is building 600 West Main Street. We are going to request an SUP for increased density. This zoning district no longer allows increased height as part of an SUP. The current density is 43 units per acre and this site would by-right be 20 dwelling units. With the SUP, 120 dwelling units per acre would be 55 dwelling units. The question before us is what is required by the zoning ordinance of the BAR in the instance of an SUP. If the zoning ordinance says we can build it and we still have to go for a COA for 20 units, how far do we have to go to be able to fill that same box with 55 units? The ordinance says that when the property that is subject to the application for an SUP is within a Design Control District, City Council shall refer the application to the BAR for

recommendations for whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the District. Because it is in a Control District, we will have to go through the COA process anyway. However, it's hard to design a detailed elevation if we don't know what we are going to be allowed to put in it. Do we design a building for 55 units, not knowing if we are going to get that at the end of the process? In this particular instance, the use and having to work within the already defined limits of the zoning ordinance, so how far should we go? To expect that a developer would fund a very long and expensive process without knowing if they will get the increased density, what is reasonable?

Mr. Sarafin: The Guideline that talks about SUPs and having the BAR consider use is confusing because we don't do that.

Ms. Mess: There is a specific part of the Guideline to make sure that the use will benefit the general public somehow.

Mr. Sarafin: In this case if you are talking about 20 vs. 55 residential units, in terms of design we are talking about the same envelope. You either get the SUP or you don't and then you design a 20 or 55 unit façade for this, which comes to the BAR.

Mr. Schwarz: It is a formality, but it could also be an opportunity for the applicant to test us on what kind of massing the BAR would be okay with approving. It would be important to ask about the complete build-out version before going through the entire SUP process. It's more about how much you want to hear from the BAR before going into the SUP.

Mr. Sarafin: Agrees and states that that is more important than the distribution of fenestration on the façade for a 20 vs. 55 window building.

Mr. Mohr: It has more to do with the massing implications of the higher density. The parking thing is frustrating because the Guidelines clearly state that we shouldn't have parking entrances on the main streets and we have done it everywhere.

Mr. Dreyfus: How can you not have parking on your property without trespassing someone else's property?

Mr. Mohr: You'd have to have a local solution brokered by the City to make that happen. Parking has just been something that we've had to wrestle with in terms of what it does to street scale.

Mr. Dreyfus: Agrees, but unfortunately it's a requirement we are backed into as designers. There is a slight hope to connect to the parking garage below at 600. There are many complications associated with that but it would be great to do that.

Mr. Mohr: In this case you have a long enough street level that you could make a hyphen or break the block in two. With bigger projects, the whole review process needs to be tailored differently so it acknowledges that larger projects have to go in phases and we have to be able to provide assurances that going forward it works.

Mr. Dreyfus: Ultimately the BAR has the trump card of not granting the COA and if you don't want the massing that is presented as the first meeting after the SUP is granted, it is no different than working through that process before. It's a process question and there is considerable risk involved for an owner if they don't have the knowledge density wise. In this instance, it seems like the City is asking for increased density so we are ready to go through the process of working with the BAR, but as an owner it makes sense that they want to have the assurances.

Mr. Schwarz: We can make it clear in our motion. As a formality we have to recommend the SUP to the Planning Commission and then to Council and we could say that the density is fine but that we want to look at massing in our recommendation.

Mr. Dreyfus: To be clear, we have to submit massing and elevations and a site plan. We aren't trying to get out of it, but the question is how far that should go.

Mr. Balut: There is a good chance that everyone is going to approve the increased density. Assuming that that happens, the BAR can offer feedback on the massing that will be very helpful before getting into fenestration. If you bring in massing models first, you could get really good feedback on them.

Mr. Dreyfus: So if the submission made next month has some concept of massing, as broad or generalized as it is, we might have the opportunity to get the recommendation from the BAR to the City Council that the use is not detrimental to the district, which is all that is required. We would get some feedback so that when we come on the next round, we are one meeting further into the process.

Mr. Mohr: The use parameters are pretty low bar. It's mostly things like no parking on the first level. From a form based code standpoint, he is more interested in defining plate heights and that sort of thing rather than what is going on inside the walls.

Mr. Lahendro: The mixed-use component of what is being shown here is just as important. Retail on the first level and a high activation between the sidewalk and the first floor is just as important as the residential.

Mr. Sarafin: As long as you aren't proposing putting apartments or parking on the street level, the public use component and the BAR recommending an SUP for use demonstrates that it is acceptable. What happens from floor 2 and up isn't as important, except for seeing how it is expressed architecturally on the façade.

Mr. Balut: It is unlikely that the BAR would approve anything close to this long building and it will require some give and take on the front. It's really important that when you do the calculus for those 55 units, understand that a significant amount of the chunk will likely be taken away in order to achieve that.

Mr. Dreyfus: We have started that process, but we don't want to churn too much time and money on something that we don't know is going to be allowed density-wise.

Mr. Lahendro: It may be helpful to revisit some of the reasoning behind the Planning Commission's change of zoning on West Main Street. Previously there was a change in zoning from the north to south side and it was then changed from west to east of the bridge, which is because the character of the two sides have changed. There is more of the historic character still left on the east side and that character is more modest in size and scale than what the west side has become. The height and pattern of building plays into creating breaks in the long blocks, which was very important to the Commission.

Mr. Werner: With the SUP process, the BAR can make recommendations like not having an apartment wall but instead to have a very active, permeable street. They become more than the Guidelines and you don't have to have the design to make recommendations.

Mr. Dreyfus: The two existing contributing structures that are part of 600 West Main actually sit forward of the required setback for this new building, which is exciting and there will be variability.

F. Other Business

10. Pre-Application Meeting – 218 West Market Street

Mr. Dreyfus: 218 West Market Street is also being considered for redevelopment because they received a conditioned demolition permit for the building. If we were only looking for the increased density we would already have the basis for how to frame that. The question is then if we were to come for a height increase, what kinds of things are important and critical to address up front?

Mr. Schwarz: The context north of Downtown is different from south of Downtown so it would be really important to see the building.

Mr. Mohr: Thin and tall is fine. The landmark is pretty successful from a massing standpoint because it allows light and air around it and it isn't a block. Height is pilloried unfairly and it really has to do with overall massing and too much street frontage.

Mr. Lahendro: Materiality is also important.

Mr. Balut: The massing is in context, as well as scale and there are many things you can do to augment scale. It doesn't have to be developed fully but it would be helpful if the strategies that you want to incorporate to assist with the goals for scale are incorporated at least at a basic level.

Mr. Lahendro: It's also important to see what it does for the community, for the City, at the street level, amenities, and activities. It needs to be part of the community at the street level.

Mr. Mohr: Many successful residential districts have nodes where it expands to have a café. Working that kind of second layer detail into the streetscape would be really nice to do with the bigger chunks.

Mr. Gastinger: Because there is such an odd mixture of properties and scales of building, we will be looking at what other future development pressures there are in that block. Many of them are protected buildings and some of them are historic.

Mr. Dreyfus: All of them are protected buildings and that is definitely the next logical question to look into.

11. PLACE Report, Tim Mohr: PLACE did not hold an April meeting. He notes that he met with the putative lighting group. Some of the members helped write the original dark sky code for Albemarle County and the City kind of adopted it, but there were things that were done to it by both the City and County to undercut its effectiveness. The group is trying to tackle that again and they are working with the Downtown Business Association to look at relighting the Downtown Mall, as well as looking at doing lighting under the bridge. Hopefully we can get enough critical mass to address the bridge and the mall in general.

12. BAR Guideline Work Session – April 18, 2019 – NDS Conference Room; 12:00-2:00pm

13. Other Business – Jeff Werner

Jeff Werner: City Manager Mike Murphy has authorized the removal of the tree in front of Westminster Presbyterian Church with conditions. Additionally, staff is looking for guidance for two potential applications. 872 Locust Ave is in the Historic Conservation District where they are doing tree removals and a new garage, among other things. There is brick wall in front that they would like to breach in order to have a walk from the sidewalk. The question is whether or not staff can review this administratively or if it need to come before the BAR.

Mr. Gastinger: These look like significant changes.

Mr. Schwarz: Ms. Miller typically prefers the opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Werner: They are asking to fence the back area with a 4 ft. fence. It is more serving as their residents and they want to create some privacy.

Mr. Mohr: The BAR looked over the shoulders of the applicant's house right down the road when they were doing their backyard so we should have something to say about this.

Mr. Ball: Would taking down the trees be administratively approved?

Mr. Werner: We are still learning, but these aren't street trees and anything not seen from the road could probably be administratively approved.

Mr. Werner: Additionally, there is a new juice place being renovated and the applicant would like to put a folding window in that folds outward in the existing opening. The frame would likely be bronze and there aren't any ADA or code issues, as it is rather compact. There is an eight week lead time when it is ordered and they can get it within a 70 VLT. If it goes to the BAR, it will squelch their construction schedule. Because this appears to be reasonable, could it be administratively approved?

Mr. Sarafin: It seems to be acceptable.

Mr. Mohr: It seems like people would run into it, which is the main concern.

Mr. Werner: The applicant spoke with Zoning and there weren't any issues with it. He is trying to open it up to the mall and create some accessibility of air.

F. Adjournment: 9:15 p.m.