

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
June 17, 2008  
Minutes**

**Present:** Fred Wolf, Chair  
Syd Knight, Vice Chair  
Amy Gardner (arrived 5:16 p.m.)  
Brian Hogg  
William Adams  
Michael Osteen  
James Wall  
Eryn Brennan  
Rebecca Schoenthal

**Also Present:**  
Mary Joy Scala  
Francesca Fornari, Asst. City Attorney

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

Mr. Jeff Dreyfus sought preliminary comments for some renovations to 407 Altamont Circle. The owners wanted to lighten up the front porch. They also wanted to widen the existing garage with deck to one and a half car size and have a screened porch and deck above. Mr. Hogg wanted to know if this was the original porch. Mr. Dreyfus said it was not clear. Mr. Wolf noted most porches typically had wood floors; Mr. Dreyfus stated they would be putting a new wood floor with wood skirting on the brick base. Ms. Brennan suggested the applicant do some research to find out the original configuration of the porch. Mr. Hogg suggested if the brick porch posts weren't original, he would be willing to look at changing them. Mr. Wolf stated simply matching other houses on the street was not justification for a change; however, if the porch was not original, then what had been drawn and shown seemed reasonable. Mr. Wolf felt the skylights shown on the back should be kept to a lower profile.

Mr. Emery, of 501 Park Hill, stated he had intended the meeting at which the Board had listed proposed individual landmarks. He agreed with the Board that McIntire Park was a landmark and should be listed. He stated it deserved and merited being individually listed. However, he also noted that additional work was needed to come up with a strategy that would allow for demolition review to avoid the disappearance of buildings not yet listed.

**B. Consent Agenda**

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application|**

**BAR 08-06-05**  
**316-318 East Main Street**  
**Tax Map 28 Parcel 42**  
**Mike Stoneking/Octagon Partners**  
**Add Louvers to underside of front canopy**

**Mr. Knight moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the vote by acclamation; the motion carried unanimously.**

**C. Conservation District Ordinance -- Questions for staff**

Ms. Scala stated consideration of this had been deferred from the May meeting as Staff had suggested changing the ordinance to limit the district to just demolition and review of demolition and new construction. Staff had added proposed guidelines related to materials and color as they might be an issue with new construction. The Zoning Ordinance definition for contributing structure would be amended so it would apply to the new Conservation District as well as the ADC District.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if there was any way to walk through districts or streets whose surveys were out of date to prevent demolition of something which would now be considered contributing.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that the demolitions of contributing structures would be the only ones reviewed. Ms. Scala confirmed that.

Mr. Wolf stated the matter would be revisited at the end of the meeting.

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from April 15, 2008)**

**BAR 08-04-05**  
**512 North First Street**  
**Tax Map 33 Parcel**  
**Paul St. Pierre, Applicant/ Mark and Barbara Fried**  
**Install ornamental steel fence**

This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Referred back by City Council)**

**BAR 08-03-07**  
**509 Second Street NE**  
**Tax Map 33, Parcel 18**  
**Allison Ewing, Applicant**  
**Mark and Barbara Fried, Owners**  
**New Construction of House and partial demolition of site walls**

Mr. Wolf noted this item's original Certificate of Appropriateness was appealed to City Council. City Council has referred it back to the Board of Architectural Review for guidance and additional information. He stated Ms. Fornari would explain what she believed was within the parameters of the Board based on this unique situation.

Ms. Scala suggested having Ms. Fornari speak first as she was up to date on the latest information from the applicant. Ms. Fornari stated the applicant should speak first because it would simplify the procedural points if they were willing to defer the additional details which had been brought for this meeting.

Mr. David Toscano, Esquire, was present on behalf of Mark and Barbara Fried. Two Certificate of Appropriateness Applications had been presented for this property in March: for the demolition of stone walls and for the design of new construction on the site. The demolition application had been approved 7-0; that action was not appealed. The new construction was approved on a 6-1 vote; this action was appealed to City Council. A hearing was held May 5, 2008, at which time Council chose to defer taking any action. Mr. Toscano stated his understanding that the applicant was charged to come back with something that better explained and improved the relationship of the house to the street. No guidance was given on how to get to that point, but there was discussion about engaging the BAR to seek advice and counsel about the appropriateness of ideas the applicant had. Mr. Toscano stated there was no direct deferral to the BAR. Mr. Toscano stated that, legally, City Council had no power to defer and send an item back to the BAR. The applicant does welcome the Board's input on figuring out how to relate the house to the street. Mr. Toscano stated a new application had been filed for this meeting; however, given the confusion of the procedural posture of this, the applicant was asking for the Board's input on what Council was asking for directly. Mr. Toscano explained that the architect for the project would present their ideas about relating the house to the street. He stated they would then defer the application which is before the Board so that Council can hear the appeal in finality and dispose of it.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that the Board would look at the details which were in response to the previously given COA while providing an opinion but not a vote on the issue as it was raised by City Council. Mr. Toscano stated the applicant would prefer the Board not look at the details at this time but only at the changes made as to the relationship of the building to the street.

Ms. Fornari stated the Board's job was simplified now. City Council approved a motion to defer and request that the BAR, applicants and neighbors meet to discuss how the building can better relate to the street, have a more human scale, and make it more street friendly by a projection or porch on the ground level. Ms. Fornari continued that, with the applicants' deferral, the Board should focus on providing City Council with the information the motion requests.

Ms. Cheri Lewis, Esquire, was present on behalf of the neighbors who had brought the appeal. She stated they had not been told the issues would not be discussed at this meeting. Ms. Lewis stated the Council minutes had not been available to her clients; however, a DVD of the motion was that the scale of the building with relationship to the street and the neighborhood should be considered. She stated a number of factors had been named: human scale as well as architectural features Mr. Huja wanted to see incorporated and confirmed by the BAR. Ms. Lewis stated the

neighbors were not told until 4 p.m. that they would not be able to address the Board. She thought that out of fairness the discussion should happen as well as out of deference to what City Council has asked of the Board. Mr. Wolf stated there was an opportunity to be heard and they could address the Board. Ms. Lewis thanked Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Wolf cited the minutes of the 5 May meeting of City Council in which Mr. Huja said "he does not agree that size is a major factor. He said his major concern is context to the street and how it relates to the neighborhood. He said he is not sure it meets the human scale at the street level. He said issues still need to be revolved and he thinks it would benefit from one more review by the BAR. He suggested porches or projections to break up the front of the building. He urged Council to defer so that Council, the BAR and applicants can work more to improve the project." Mr. Wolf then read from the motion made at the 5 May City Council meeting in which Council "made a motion to defer and request that the BAR, applicants and neighbors meet to discuss how the building can better relate to the street, have more of a human scale, and make it more street friendly by a projection or porch on the ground level."

Mr. Wolf noted that Council's decision put the BAR in an unusual position.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. She stated several letters had been received from abutting owners and interested parties. The matter should be treated procedurally like a regular application.

Ms. Allison Ewing, the owners' architect, explained what had been done to address the concerns of City Council. An at grade porch had been incorporated into the design. The opening in the stone wall had been increased. An overhang was incorporated into the entry. The sun shading louvers had been removed as had the gate. Currently the site has nine cars on the street; however, the applicant would rather have a garden and porches seen on the pedestrian level.

Ms. Erin Russell, the landscape architect, stated the main structural feature of the garden was the low stone retaining wall which will be detailed and use the same stone as the front elevation. The wall will range in height from three and-a-half feet high to one foot. The existing parking lot will become a street level garden. The landscaping materials will be primarily salvaged from the walls and paving that will be demolished to make room for the home. The planting bed was a woodland landscape with ferns, mosses, and woodland perennials. Trumpet vines would be planted along the concrete wall.

Mr. Adams wanted to know about the deciduous trees which were proposed. Ms. Russell stated they could grow to 30 to 50 feet tall and would appear quite dense in the summertime.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Daniel Bluestone, of 501 Parkhill, wanted to know if there was a site plan which showed existing mature trees. Ms. Ewing stated the survey did indicate the larger trees on the site and they would be happy to provide that since it was not in the packet.

Mr. Fred Schneider, of 506 Second Street, wanted to know if the planted pergola was still planned. Ms. Ewing stated they had decided to remove that from the proposal. Mr. Wolf wanted

to know if it could be reintroduced into the plan. Ms. Ewing stated she would have to discuss it with the owner.

Ms. Penny Bosworth, of 622 Farish Court, stated the drawing reminded her of Wall Street in New York City. She wanted to know the dimensions of the buildings. Ms. Ewing stated the side yard setback was five feet. Ms. Ewing was unsure of the height, but thought it met the 35 foot height limit.

Mr. Brent Nelson, of 707 Northwood Avenue, wanted to know if there were any site sections to show the relationship of the proposed house to those on either side or across the street. Ms. Gardner stated she had asked for those at the first meeting and had not been provided with those. Ms. Ewing stated a site section had been provided in the packet but she had not known it was supposed to include houses across the street.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know what changes had been made in response to the questions besides the addition of the patio, a wider break in the stone wall, and the elimination of the gate at the driveway. Ms. Ewing stated the sun shading louvers had been removed, the security gate has been removed, a front garden has been provided, an at grade porch was incorporated into the proposal, an overhang at the front entrance was proposed, detail was provided in the recessed areas, detail of the water collection had been provided, the seating wall at the street, and the garden and stone terraces.

Ms. Schoenthal wanted to know if the wall was flush. Ms. Ewing stated it was set forward.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what had generated the change in the color palette. Ms. Ewing stated that had been requested at the last BAR meeting.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know what had prompted the change to the roof of the projecting bay and the roof of the tall portion of the house. Ms. Ewing stated the tall portion was not changed. She also stated the Board had not liked the intersection of the front bay with the rear tall roof, so they had chosen the solution which was the most consistent with the architectural language.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if there were brackets under the eave. Ms. Ewing stated they had been removed in response to some concerns from Mr. Hogg about simplifying the details.

Mr. Adams wanted to know how the current figure compared with the original proposal. Ms. Ewing stated there had been an initial cut of about 1,000 square feet.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Kristen Suokko, Chair of the Charlottesville Community Design Center, stated they had never questioned the BAR's design expertise, the value of infill development, green building, nor the applicants' commitment to being a good neighbor. However, there were questions about how the original Certificate of Appropriateness Application had been approved. Based on the

Guidelines, they had never imagined a building of this size could be approved in this historic district. She stated scale and size are absolutely fundamental to the question of the relationship of this project to the street and the human scale of the project making it well within the Board's purview to think about those issues. She cited the Guidelines description of First and Second Street -- narrow streets, small to moderate scale, broad mix of styles, porches, metal roofs, one and a half to two stories, generally shallow setbacks, and spacing with some variety landscaping -- and reminded the Board this is what they were charged to protect. Scale and size of the entire project need to be considered. By building to the maximum footprint allowed, even though the design picks up some elements of the original house and garden that are there, the size precludes any sharing of those elements with the street. The Guidelines on scale also refer to surrounding historic dwellings, neighboring buildings, and character of the subarea. Ms. Suokko felt the townhouses were not an adequate justification for the size of this building. By not considering the scale, the Board is setting a precedent that ensures they will have to consider this issue in the future.

Mr. Fred Schneider stated the neighbors had been concerned with the BAR's review process in that early on the Board had not received information that would give a comparative basis for this proposal with other buildings in the neighborhood. He provided the Board with copies of the missing information. Mr. Schneider noted that the largest house on the 500 block is quite significantly smaller than the proposed building; the proposed building is approximately twice its size. The proposed building is three times the size of the average building in the 500 block. The neighbors also feel the Board, in not having this information when speaking with the applicant, was not able to provide adequate guidance as to what the appropriate size or scale of the proposal would be. Mr. Schneider also expressed concern that the Board had no way to factor in size related to existing historic resources in the historic district. A building of excessive size would make it difficult to make other relationships possible within the district.

Ms. Gail Foster, of 504 Second Street, stated the neighbors cared deeply about the ambiance and the character of the historic district and were opposed to erecting a building that was this much larger than the other houses in the neighborhood. She stated 65 of the residents of First, Second, and Third Street had signed a position supporting the neighborhoods' concerns.

Ms. Rhoda Cohen Surath, of 507 Second Street, stated the neighbors were concerned that if this could happen so easily on Second Street, one of the most lovely streets of the Downtown area, they wondered what else could happen.

Mr. Brent Nelson reminded the Board of a 1995 property which had been considered for demolition at the April, 2008, meeting and the comment by a Board member of "Was that actually approved by the BAR?" He explained that house had been grossly oversized for the lot.

Ms. Penny Bosworth stated she had moved downtown at a time when nobody wanted to live there. In 1979 there were very few restrictions. She informed the Board there were charming small houses and cottages on the east side of Second Street. She stated the future of downtown could be seen in the pedestrian and bike traffic. She felt they had a responsibility to protect the downtown they loved.

Mr. Daniel Bluestone wished the Board had pushed a little harder to ask the applicants to do more than they had. Part of the character of this site has been the terrace gardens. The massing of the building could be reconfigured so that part of the garden could continue. He thought the mass of the house could have been deployed much more sensitively in relationship to the street.

Mr. Bill Antholis, of 502 Second Street, expressed his concern that the construction project treated the street as a back alley. The north block of the house and the canyon driveway to the big wall contributed to the back alleyway effect. He stated a neighbor had had an arborist check the trees on site and they were all fine.

Ms. Pamela Friedman, of 517 Second Street, NE, stated she had not liked the first design. She thought the new design was lovely.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Schoenthal stated the main concern seemed to be size. The question was whether the three issues could be brought back to jibe with size.

Mr. Wolf thought the comments should relate to how the building relates to the street, how human scale is addressed at the ground level, and the walkability and street friendly quality.

Mr. Hogg was willing to accept that the size was the size the BAR approved. It seemed the project had lost its bearing. The architect's efforts at responding to the comments received from the Board, Council, and the neighborhood made the building no longer hang together. The effort to respond eliminated any sense of scale from the facade. The new porch was a dark void at the ground floor with no articulation of any sort. Every scale giving device has been removed from every window. The neighbors raise an important point about how the buildings interact with the sidewalk and road. Mr. Hogg stated he had voted to support this the first time and had had some buyer's remorse since then.

Mr. Knight appreciated Mr. Hogg's comments and agreed with them. He stated he had several issues and concerns with this proposal including the general solidity and monolithic quality of the ground floor. Many of the changes relate to the apartment rather than the main living space. Mr. Knight stated the landscape contributed to the sense of separation from the street. He thought the Yellowwoods would create a wall. The woodland landscape was not compatible with creating a landscape which would be compatible with the context of that street and other yards along there. Parking seemed to be one of the major sticking points. The desire to have as much parking as there is was driving the design to an extent that is not conducive to a good relationship to the street nor pedestrian fellowship.

Mr. Adams stated there were some good sized facades on First Street. He expressed concern about the size of the window and stated there was no other house in that area of town with an 8 foot tall by 24 foot long glazed opening on the street side. Mr. Adams stated there were clues to take from the neighborhood which would help bring the building into a human scale. He thought the beginning of the landscape was successful.

Ms. Gardner stated she was the only person voting against the motion when it had been before the Board earlier. She regretted not having been more vocal or persuasive at the time. She felt the architect had worked very hard at hearing the neighbors and arriving at design elements that would mitigate the size and make it more friendly. Ms. Gardner felt they had not done their job adequately. She felt the building did not pass the guidelines. The proposal seemed incompatible with the cultural and architectural character of the district. Without being able to discuss the size and how it relates to human scale, she did not feel there was a lot to talk about adding porches or projections as being street friendly. She did not think the proposal was compatible nor would it be until it was reduced in size.

Ms. Brennan appreciated the neighbors' analysis. She agreed with earlier comments, especially about the monolithic quality of the building. She expressed concern about the landscaping although having the garden was an improvement over having parking.

Mr. Wall agreed with Mr. Knight's comment about the cars driving this project. He thought it seemed like two separate projects. He felt the upper portion seemed more friendly.

Mr. Osteen did not see where this was a massively out of scale house. The closer the house came to the street, the more of the garden was preserved and the house on First Street was preserved. He said his big issue was that the design was difficult to maintain while responding to every comment. Mr. Osteen thought the idea of the low wall was totally appropriate. He felt some of the details were a little fussy.

Mr. Wolf agreed this had gone backwards in an attempt to respond to so many different comments coming from so many different directions. He preferred less some items from this iteration, particularly roof lines and eaves that seemed to connect the two pieces. Porches are a means to ingress and egress; however, due to the internalized stair, these seem more like balconies. He wondered if there was a way to have an external stair to a porch leading to entry to a house. The accessory unit porch needs to become more of an entry. The spaces need to be engaged which is an important part of how the street level is or is not developing at this time. The use of divisions or muntin bars to divide the panes, breaks the scale of the openings down that relates to the human scale. Lowering the roof level and distinguishing it from the sloped roof behind lends scale to the mass. Mr. Wolf thought the architect had successfully made a two story piece and a three story piece. Mr. Wolf felt the house did fit. He thought there had been a skillful attempt to mitigate the size of the house to the point that it may not match precisely what else is there but it does not so exceed the neighbors that the Board would need to take issue with it. Mr. Wolf felt the Board could give guidance but was not in a position to redesign or design the project for the applicants. He felt more could have been done to address Council's concerns.

Mr. Toscano asked that the submission be deferred so that the proposal could be taken back to Council.

Mr. Wolf suggested that the Board did not need to make a motion and that City Council could use the comments as they saw fit.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess at 7:59 p.m.



Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

### **E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 08-06-01**  
**410 East High Street**  
**Tax Map 59 Parcel 39**  
**County of Albemarle**  
**Replacement of masonry arches**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last seen when there was a request for a sally port to be added to the County Office Building next to the old County Courthouse. This is an extension of that request. The applicant seeks approval to remove and replace two masonry arches and casts located over a pedestrian access way between the 1939 County Office Building and the new sally port project. The intent is to match the existing design and materials. Brick and mortar samples were submitted. The arches are original to the building. There are two remaining original arches. They are not character defining. The proposal respects the original design and materials.

Mr. Michael Fraitis, of Albemarle County General Services, stated the arches were in bad disrepair and were a safety hazard.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the chamfer being done on the concrete beam was consistent with what was there. The consulting engineer stated it was.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the brick matched the existing. The applicant stated it matched as best as they could find and that it did match the sally port.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed removal and replacement of two masonry arches and caps satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called for a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.**

### **F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 08-06-02**  
**1533 Virginia Avenue**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 17**

**Brian Roy, Applicant/Beta Pi of Sigma Pi Alumni, Owner  
New windows, request to waive railing requirement**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant requests approval to replace all 19 windows in the original structure. The proposed sash replacement windows would be wood windows with nine over nine simulated divided lights manufactured by Marvin, Lincoln, or Jeld-Wen. The City Code official has confirmed that the railing will not be required on the front portico as the applicant had originally thought.

Mr. Brian Roy stated the windows had taken a beating over the years. He stated they wanted the replacements to be in the same shape and look as the existing windows.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Wall wanted to know if the sample window was the proposed window. Mr. Roy stated it was not, but that the sample was as close to the proposed as he could find for display purposes.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if all of the windows were original. Mr. Roy was not sure.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Adams felt a jamb drawing of the existing profiles and windows would be helpful as well as a jamb drawing with the replacement sash.

Mr. Wolf suggested the applicant use Marvin as there was a precedent for its approval by the Board.

Ms. Brennan suggested that the windows be looked at and any originals that were not in need of replacement be left.

Mr. Wolf suggested using the putty profile which mimics the way the old glazing would have looked.

**Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Site design and elements and Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following condition being that the Marvin sash kit is used with the putty profile on the muntin bars. Mr. Wolf suggested a friendly amendment that the applicant could come back with details of one of the other two manufacturers that could be approved by Staff. Mr.**

**Knight accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.**

## **G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 08-06-07**

**636 Park Street**

**Tax Map 52 Parcel 113**

**Blake and Jennifer Greenhalgh, Owners and Applicants**

**Exterior and landscaping changes**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC District. The applicant proposes several changes: add black wood louvre shutters on all the windows which will fit the windows, but the applicant prefers not to hang them; the rear porch will be enlarged, covered, and screened; garage doors will be replaced with painted wood, multi-paned windows and a door. Site changes proposed are: a soapstone patio added to the rear yard; existing walkways changed from concrete to soapstone; a new walkway to connect the front and rear yard; removal of the boxwoods lining the front walk; removal of two pine trees and one ginkgo tree from the rear driveway; and the asphalt driveway will be replaced with stone pavers. The three trees in the rear yard are quite large and distinctive. Staff suggested root pruning the ginkgo rather than removing it.

Ms. Jennifer Greenhalgh explained the fireplace was moved to the end of the porch to meet the fire code.

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the ginkgo was a male or female specimen. The applicant did not know. She explained the root systems of the ginkgo and the pines were encroaching upon the driveway and the garage and in some spots were above ground. She stated she had been informed that root pruning the trees would mess up the structural stability.

Mr. Wall wanted to know why the applicant did not want to hang the shutters. Ms. Greenhalgh stated it was due to cost.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know why the applicant wanted to remove the boxwood. Ms. Greenhalgh explained they were huge. She stated they would be removed and planted elsewhere.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Hogg stated he would defer to Mr. Knight on the trees, but everything else looked fine. He stated if the house were older, he would feel more adamant about the shutters.

Mr. Wolf felt the shutters should look as if they could be operable rather than just screwed into the wall.

Mr. Knight had no qualms about the project architecturally. He had no qualms about removing the large boxwoods. However, he did have qualms about removing the trees. The value added by the trees, not only to that property but also to the historic district, outweighed the value of a driveway that does not. He agreed the root pruning would not work. Mr. Knight stated there were enough alternatives to the driveway, he would not approve removing the trees. He suggested using a fine aggregate type of paving, like stone dust, which would allow paving up to the top of the roots thereby driving right across it. Another option would be working the pavers around the root. Ms. Greenhalgh asked if she could still remove the pines as she was worried about liability issues should they come down in a storm. Mr. Knight agreed the gingko had more value than the pines. He suggested the applicant consider some sort of screen replacement for the pines.

**Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Site Design, and New Construction and Additions, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the condition that the gingko remain and that the applicant explore other suitable options for the driveway material and return to the BAR with that information. Ms. Greenhalgh stated she had provided Staff with a stone paver option. Mr. Knight stated the Board would like a little more certitude on the proposal and suggested the applicant submit the pavement material and pattern to Staff for approval. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.**

#### **H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 08-06-04  
107 West Market Street  
Tax Map 33 Parcel 176  
Blake DeMaso  
Window Replacement**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This structure, built around 1910, is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. It is currently occupied by Blue Ridge Outdoors Magazine. The applicant is requesting to replace all the windows with replacement sashes to improve energy efficiency, functionality, and appearance. The preference is for Pella aluminum clad Precision Fit windows; an alternate would be Pella wood Precision Fit windows.

Mr. Blake DeMaso explained the windows were very inefficient and as an environmental magazine, they tried to do everything possible to be as environmentally sound as possible. He stated it was hard to secure some of the windows and there were gaps in others. He stated they would maintain the same light patterns.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that this was a sash replacement and not a full replacement. Mr. DeMaso confirmed that it was not a full replacement. Mr. Martin Pugh explained the Pella Precision Fit system. Mr. Pugh stated these windows had been approved for use in Washington, DC, near the Capitol, Old Town historic Alexandria, and in Arlington County.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf stated he wanted to see a jamb drawing. He also expressed a preference for wood rather than the aluminum clad.

Ms. Brennan agreed that wood would be better.

Mr. Adams agreed there should be a detail drawing of a jamb section of the window in situ.

**Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Replacement windows satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following condition: that the head, jamb, and sill details drawn to scale at one-half inch and dimensioned are submitted for administrative approval to Ms. Scala who will then, if she is uncomfortable approving it, can circulate it via E-mail to the Board members who can raise any concerns that they have at the time, otherwise she can approve it that way, and that the windows will be wood windows. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.**

#### **I. Preliminary Discussion**

**BAR 08-06-03**

**226 South Street**

**Tax Map 28 Parcel 94**

**Limehouse Architects, Applicant/Oliver Kuttner, Owner**

**New addition, excavate driveway**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing vernacular structure built about 1900. The applicant is requesting preliminary discussion on a proposal to create an access way to the rear yard for parking purposes. The existing driveway would become 6'5" wide at the narrowest point between the building and the retaining wall on the property's west boundary. A new one-story frame addition is proposed to be added to the west side of the existing building. Alternate means of access to the rear yard should be investigated. The proposal presents an odd condition.

Mr. Gate Pratt, of Limehouse Architects, was present on behalf of the owner. He explained there were seven houses on that side of the street between South Street Brewery and Midway Manor.

Every other house had access to the rear for parking. The backyard is functionally landlocked and adjacent land owners will not grant easement.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if the house could be moved. Mr. Pratt stated they had not considered that.

Mr. Hogg stated this was an idea that he could not support regardless of how it was designed.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the addition was solely an idea to mask the driveway. Mr. Pratt stated it was.

Mr. Wolf stated this proposal created issues for the property line.

Mr. Adams thought if the intent was to redevelop the whole property, then moving the house was a good idea and would be warranted.

Mr. Hogg stated anything being proposed was a massive intervention on this property for three parking spaces with which the Board would have problems.

#### **J. Conservation District Ordinance -- Discussion and Recommendation**

Mr. Hogg expressed concern that moving on a designation was like tacking a tear-me-down sign to the properties. He felt part of the survey would need to include identifying what the individually eligible buildings were in any district proposed for a conservation district and list those individually as the conservation district was designated so that the most important buildings in these lightly regulated districts were protected from alterations over which the Board wouldn't otherwise have some jurisdiction.

Ms. Scala asked if the Board wanted to schedule a work session to discuss the matter further. Mr. Wolf suggested it be at the start of the next agenda.

#### **K. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

There were no matters from the public.

#### **L. Other Business**

##### **Mall bricks**

Mr. Wolf stated there had been a lengthy presentation and discussion at City Council on 16 June. The City was leaning towards using a 4x12 brick. Mr. Wolf stated he had sent an E-mail expressing his beliefs that there were certain fundamental things about the Mall and its character, texture, and pattern, one of which was the brick dimension. He felt the City should stay true to that aspect.

Mr. Adams stated he would like to see better drawings from MMM including real paving patterns. He also felt the old designs could be altered at the cross through roads.

Mr. Wolf thought there could be an introduction of granite in lieu of the concrete.

Mr. Knight noted the Board had done more thinking about the central elements of the original Halperin design as to which elements were indispensable versus which things might have some leeway for change and evolution.

Ms. Rebecca Quinn, of 104 Fourth Street, stated that when in talking with MMM, one of the things they had explored was not just taking the brick to the dump. She noted the most expensive part of the project was not the material; it was the labor.

Mr. Knight noted there were lots of options and lots of engineering to be debated and suggested this was not the place.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if there was any validity in putting this down in a letter to Council.

Mr. Knight reminded the Board that they had asked them to come back with more information, which they were obligated to do.

### **M. Adjournment**

**Mr. Adams moved to adjourn. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:05 p.m.**