Watkins, Robert

From:Watkins, RobertSent:Thursday, January 23, 2020 11:27 AMTo:'cak608@cs.com'Cc:Werner, Jeffrey BSubject:January BAR Action - 300 East Market Street

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-01-02 300 East Market Street Tax Parcel 330221000 Charles A. Kabbash, Owner/Applicant Single-story enclosure at rear (south) elevation

Dear Charles,

Please find below the action taken for the above-referenced project at last night's Board of Architectural Review meeting:

Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed rear addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the friendly recommendation that the applicant cleans up wires and utilities in the rear alley, if possible

Bailey seconded. Approved (6-0-1, Gastinger recused).

For more information regarding this certificate of appropriateness and the length of its validity, please see City Code Section 34-280. Validity of certificates of appropriateness.

Have a great day!

Robert

Robert Watkins Assistant Historic Preservation and Design Planner Neighborhood Development Services PO Box 911 Charlottesville, VA 22902 (434) 970-3398

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT January 19, 2020



Certificate of Appropriateness Application BAR 20-01-02 300 E Market Street

Tax Map Parcel 330221000 Charles Kabbash; Owner/Applicant Single story enclosure at rear (south) elevation



Background

Year Built:c1920-1930District:Downtown ADC DistrictStatus:Contributing

300 East Market Street is a two story, six bay, Flemish-bond brick building with a decorative brick and stone cornice, and a flat roof. (Historic survey attached.)

Prior BAR Review

None

Application

• CoA submittal dated December 18, 2019. Application form. Wall section and floor plan of proposed enclosure. Photos of existing conditions. (Six pages.)

CoA request for the construction if a single-story, framed enclosure with a shed roof within a small inset of the rear (south) wall. Enclosure to be approximately 7-ft x 8-ft and will accommodate additional kitchen space. Roof to be asphalt shingles. Siding to be HardiePlank. One existing window and brocks below to be removed to accommodate interior access. No exterior opening on the enclosure.

Discussion

The proposed addition is within the inset area at the rear/back of the building. A narrow, gated walk space—less than 6-ft wide—separates the building from an adjacent, two-story structure. Because of the size, simplicity, and location of this enclosure; that it is clearly differentiated from the existing; and that it can be removed later with minimal impact on the existing building, staff recommends approval of the COA, but with the consideration of the following as conditions:

- The window and bricks being removed should be marked and retained, allowing their later use should this enclosure be removed and the exterior wall restored.
- The applicant has not indicated paint color. The BAR may want that specified.
- In the photographs provided, the rear elevation has an abundance of wires, cables, phone lines, and conduits that, arguably, are no longer necessary or even live. Removing *what can be removed* and repairing the subsequent holes would enhance this building.

The Rehabilitation chapter of the Design Guidelines includes a section addressing the *Rear of Buildings*. From the introduction for this section: "The area behind commercial buildings is <u>often forgotten and neglected</u>. This area may be a utilitarian space for deliveries and storage of discarded goods. However, in some cases the rear of the building may provide the opportunity for a secondary entrance, particularly if oriented to a public alley. <u>The appearance of the back area then becomes important to the commercial district and to the individual business</u>." [Emphasis added.]

Suggested Motions

Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed rear addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted...

(or with the following modifications/conditions...)

Denial: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed rear addition does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and for the <u>following reasons</u> the BAR denies the application as submitted.

Criteria, Standards and Guidelines

Review Criteria Generally

Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that, in considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

- (1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and
- (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:

(1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;

- (2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;
- (3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;
- (4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;
- (5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;
- (6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;
- (7) Any applicable provisions of the City's Design Guidelines.

Pertinent Design Review Guidelines for New Construction and Additions.

P. Additions

- 1) Function and Size
 - a. Attempt to accommodate needed functions within the existing structure without building an addition.
 - b. Limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building.
- 2) Location
 - a. Attempt to locate the addition on rear or side elevations that are not visible from the street.
 - b. If additional floors are constructed on top of a building, set the addition back from the main façade so that its visual impact is minimized.
 - c. If the addition is located on a primary elevation facing the street or if a rear addition faces a street, parking area, or an important pedestrian route, the façade of the addition should be treated under the new construction guidelines.
- 3) Design
 - a. New additions should not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.
 - b. The new work should be differentiated from the old and should be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- 4) Replication of Style
 - a. A new addition should not be an exact copy of the design of the existing historic building. The design of new additions can be compatible with and respectful of existing buildings without being a mimicry of their original design.
 - b. If the new addition appears to be part of the existing building, the integrity of the original historic design is compromised and the viewer is confused over what is historic and what is new.
- 5) Materials and Features
 - a. Use materials, windows, doors, architectural detailing, roofs, and colors that are compatible with historic buildings in the district.
- 6) Attachment to Existing Building
 - a. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to existing buildings should be done in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the buildings would be unimpaired.
 - b. The new design should not use the same wall plane, roofline, or cornice line of the existing structure.

VIRGINIA



HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SURVEY FORM

| Historic name | |
|---|--|
| County/Town/City AI BEILADI E Louis | Common name PROFESSIONAL BUILDING |
| County/Town/City ALBEMARLE /CHARLO | TESVILLE |
| Street address or route number 300 - 302 E | MARKET ST. |
| USGS Quad CHARLOTTES VILLE - EAST, VA | |
| Original owner | Architect/builder/craftsmen |
| Original use | |
| Present owner | Source of name |
| Present owner address | Source of date |
| - | Stories |
| Present use OFFICES | Foundation and wall const'n |
| Acreage | |
| | Roof type |
| State condition of structure and environs | |
| | |
| State potential threats to structure | |
| Note any archaeological interest | |
| | |
| | |
| Should be investigated for possible register potentia | 1? yes no 🗹 |
| Architectural description (Note significant features | of plan structural system and interior and autorion documentia |
| taking care to point out aspects not visible or clea | I from photographs. Explain nature and period of all alterations |
| | |
| BRICK (ENGLISH BOND) 2 5 | |
| COLORIDI CONDICE | TORY; FLAT ROOF; 6 BAY. |
| - CATAL REVIVAL C. 1901 | 0-1930 |
| IN IST. EAST. BAY. BIR - | ASH WINDOWS ON IST + QND |
| STORIES | TOM WINDOWS ON IST + QND |
| STORIES. Decoration back + stone | comice. |

Interior inspected?

Historical significance (Chain of title; individuals, families, events, etc., associated with the property.)



SANBORN MAPS: 1886: DRUGS 1891: DRUGS

File no. 104 - 73 B Negative no(s). 50 64 - 20



Board of Architectural Review (BAR) Certificate of Appropriateness

Please Return To: City of Charlottesville Department of Neighborhood Development Services P.O. Box 911, City Hall Charlottesville, Virginia 22902 Telephone (434) 970-3130

Please submit ten (10) hard copies and one (1) digital copy of application form and all attachments. Please include application fee as follows: New construction project \$375; Demolition of a contributing structure \$375; Appeal of BAR decision \$125; Additions and other projects requiring BAR approval \$125; Administrative approval \$100. Make checks payable to the City of Charlottesville. The BAR meets the third Tuesday of the month.

Deadline for submittals is Tuesday 3 weeks prior to next BAR meeting by 3:30 p.m.

| Owner Name Charles A. Kabbash Applicant Name Charles A. Kabbash | | |
|---|--|--|
| Project Name/Description Kitchen Addition - Comm. Parcel Number | | |
| Project Property Address 300 E. Max (cet St. | | |

Signature of Applicant

Applicant Information

| Address: 30 8 E. Market St Apt E | I hereby attest that the information I have p best of my knowledge, correct. Signature | provided is, to the | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Property Owner Information (if not applicant) | Charles A. Kebbash Print Name | 18/18/19 Date | | |
| Address: Email: Phone: (W) (C) | Property Owner Permission (if not applicant) I have read this application and hereby give my consent to its submission. | | | |
| - | Signature | Date | | |
| Do you intend to apply for Federal or State Tax Credits for this project? Description of Proposed Work (attach separate narrative | Print Name | Date | | |
| Description of Proposed Work (attach separate narrative if necessary): <u>Small addetion</u> to <u>building</u> at 300 E. Market St. Plans Aytached. | | | | |
| List All Attachments (see reverse side for submittal requirements): Two 8/2×11 Sheets - 2 Floor plans | | | | |
| For Office Use Only A | roved/Disapproved by: | | | |
| Received by: Da | e: | | | |
| | nditions of approval: | | | |
| Date Received: | | | | |
| Revised 2016 | | | | |





ŕ





