

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
September 16, 2008
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair (arrived 5:10 p.m)
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
William Adams
Michael Osteen
James Wall
Eryn Brennan

Not Present:

Amy Gardner
Brian Hogg
Rebecca Schoenthal

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Knight, in the absence of the Chair, convened the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Jeff Dreyfus, of Bushman Dreyfus Architects, stated they had almost completed the King Lumber site plan but were having problems with the previously approved parking and dumpster layout. He stated they had proposed moving the dumpster to the side yard and screening it with a screen similar to the site wall along the sidewalk to the facility. He explained that Ms. Scala could not approve it without the Board allowing her to approve it administratively.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC AND THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if there was a location further back on the site for the dumpsters. Mr. Dreyfus explained there would be logistic problems with getting a trash truck back into the site.

Mr. Wolf joined the meeting.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if two dumpsters in the front yard of a property in the Entrance Corridor would prompt Staff to think it needed to be revisited at the Entrance Corridor Review Board. Ms. Scala stated this was within the BAR's purview.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth in the City Design Guidelines, moved that the Board grant Staff the right to review this change in the application administratively. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-0-1; Mr. Wolf abstained from voting.

Mr. Knight relinquished control of the meeting to Mr. Wolf.

B. Consent Agenda

- 1. Minutes** -- July 15, 2008 and August 19, 2008
- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 08-09-01
19 Elliewood Avenue

- Tax Map 09 Parcel 90
Eric Kelley, applicant
Add two murals to front and side wall
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 08-08-04
1417-1425 University Avenue
Tax Map 9 Parcel 76
CVS Realty Co./Calverton RBO, Applicant/Anderson Realty Partnership, Owner
New side entrance (replace window with door and canopy above)
4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 08-09-03
422 East Main Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 52
Obama Campaign Office, Applicant
Add mural to front of the building

Mr. Wolf stated item 1 would not be on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Knight stated he would like to discuss item 4. Ms. Brennan stated she would like to discuss item 2.

Mr. Osteen moved approval of the consent agenda. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for discussion of item 2.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a new coffee shop in a 1920s vernacular structure. It was converted to commercial use in the 1970s. The Zoning Administrator determined the large "P" could be considered a mural. The front of the building has the large, decorative P and the name of the coffee shop. On the side the plan is to put a long mural and no other text since a wall side is only allowed on one side. Staff feels the painted murals on stucco are complementary of the subject property and other existing buildings in the area.

Mr. Eric Kelley explained the mural would go from the front of the building to the back door.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC AND THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know the difference between a mural and a sign. Ms. Scala thought the difference was with the addition of text. Ms. Brennan stated she had looked up the definitions and a mural was painted directly on a building while a sign was a public display board bearing information or advertising.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan thought the lettering, in order to be consistent with the Guidelines, should be specified as to size. She expressed a preference for color palettes 2 and 3, with a stronger preference for 3.

Mr. Wolf agreed with his colleague on the color palette.

Ms. Brennan, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the two proposed murals satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, as long as the side signage Para Coffee is within the stated 12 inches height painted on the walls and that color palette 2 or 3 be chosen for the front mural and that the BAR approves the application with those conditions as submitted. Mr. Wall seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report for item 4, 422 East Main Street. The sign was brought to the City's attention by the television news media. The City required the applicant to remove the sign and file an application. If the BAR approves the application, the mural will be rehung without the text. In Staff opinion, the mural is appropriate in color, material, and size as a temporary mural.

The applicant was present but had nothing to add.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know what size this was. Ms. Brennan noted the dimensions were on the application.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf stated he was struck by point 12 in the Guidelines with respect to other signs. He thought this might serve more as a temporary banner. As a sign it would exceed the size allowances.

Mr. Osteen noted the word temporary had been used to describe this and wanted to know if there was a definition of how long it could be up. Mr. Wolf thought it would not be up beyond the election. Ms. Scala explained that in a historic district a temporary banner could be up two months prior to the event, but could only be ten square feet.

Mr. Wall wanted to know if the text would be painted over or if it would be removed. Ms. Scala thought the intent was to paint it out.

Mr. Knight stated he would not consider this as a permanent sign. It did not meet the City standards for temporary signs because of its size. He thought it was not well carried out and was not consistent with the nature of the historic district. Given the political atmosphere and the fact that it is an overtly political sign, he would not be in favor of approving this.

Ms. Brennan expressed concern that this would be opening a Pandora's box allowing others to post 90 square foot signs of McCain.

Mr. Osteen stated this was an active dynamic living city and this would be there a short time to acknowledge an event which was relatively infrequent. He stated he would relish a 90 square foot McCain sign on the other end of the Mall temporarily. Once the text was off, he thought it was the same mural the "P" was in the prior matter. Given this was temporary, he stated he would have no problems with it.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if they could set a date for it to come down. Ms. Scala did not know the answer to that legally. Mr. Osteen noted two months was associated with a temporary, so he thought two months through the election and then removing it.

Mr. Wolf stated he was willing to support it as he thought of it as a banner and considered it to be temporary.

Mr. Osteen moved approval of the proposed mural to be hung at 422 East Main Street on a temporary basis two months from the day that it passes. Mr. Wall seconded the motion. The motion passed, 4-2; Mr. Knight and Ms. Brennan voted against.

**C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application – Deferred from August 19
BAR 08-08-01
201 East Water Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 31
Minor Family Hotels, Applicant
Canopy modification**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the August meeting, the Board failed to approve a motion to approve the concept of lowering the canopy to a more functional height with all details of lighting and where the canopy meets the building to come back for approval. Then a motion passed to defer until the September meeting. The applicant is requesting approval to redesign the Water Street canopy. Since the August meeting, the canopy has been redesigned with a transparent cover of one-half inch laminated glazing panel system at the same lower height. It is attached to the building with two main steel supports over the entrance. Lighting consists of two wall sconces internally lit with fluorescent lamps as well as two recessed metal halide down lights over the entrance doors and 20 metal halide down lights that are located in the canopy. The proposed design is lower to protect patrons from weather. The dimensions of the canopy are similar to the approved design. The down lights are preferred to the previous submittal that had internally lit canopy lights. A photometric plan was submitted. Per the Zoning Ordinance, the maximum foot candle level to spill into public rights of way is one-half foot candle at the property line; this did not meet that rate.

Mr. Lee Danielson, the project developer, was present on behalf of the applicant. He explained the original design had been based on a hotel in San Diego. The current owner did not think that design looked appropriate in Charlottesville.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought clarification as to why the light levels were chosen especially in regard to the City's requirements on spillage. Another representative of the applicant who did not identify himself, stated if it was important, they could certainly have the lighting designer pick a more appropriate fixture. Mr. Danielson explained that Water Street was in a transition right now and having such little light does not promote the general welfare of safety for a number of people.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall stated he could understand lowering it as far as weather protection. However, he thought the transparency of the canopy would be like losing light.

Mr. Wolf stated it felt like very different architectural language in this piece. He expressed concern that the canopy was taking on a postmodern quality. Mr. Wolf stated he was comfortable with lowering the canopy but there were detail issues with which he was uncomfortable. He thought how the street was lit in relation to the neighboring buildings was important.

Ms. Brennan felt the original canopy design should be lowered. Mr. Danielson noted the canopy had not been well discussed with the original proposal and he knew it would have to come back. He noted the ownership was vehemently opposed to the other canopy.

Mr. Knight expressed concern that the Board was not seeing the same building that was approved four years previously. He had compared the original proposal to the current and saw a lot of changes. He wanted to know when all of the details would be coming back to the Board. He expressed concern about granting approval on what issue in isolation without considering the entire design.

Mr. Osteen felt this canopy looked inappropriate to this building.

Mr. Wolf sought a consensus of the Board as to their opinions of lowering the canopy with detailing to be resubmitted. Mr. Osteen thought that was a good idea; the transparency which had been introduced made it more acceptable to him. Mr. Wolf thought he would support lowering it as well. Mr. Adams thought the lowering looked better. He expressed a desire not to see this lit up like a gas station. Mr. Wall was comfortable with the lowering and he thought the transparency helped it. Ms. Brennan was also comfortable with the lowering.

Mr. Osteen noted he was less inclined to approve the application at this point.

Mr. Danielson wanted to know how to streamline the process so the project could move forward.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if lowering the canopy would give the applicant the wherewithal to make structural changes. The applicant thought a decision needed to be made today.

Mr. Wolf stated his understanding that the Board was moving toward a decision to lower the canopy. They were also moving toward a decision on the detailing of the canopy. He suggested a meeting outside this venue to sit down with Staff and one or two Board members to go over it. Mr. Danielson stated they were going by the letter of the law. He thought they were providing a great project. He stated they would work with the Board. Mr. Wolf suggested that perhaps the rendering included with

the application had not been done accurately. Mr. Danielson expressed concern about delays due to the need to order materials.

Mr. Wolf suggested a conditional approval for the notion of moving the canopy down conditioned on details related to its structure. Mr. Knight stated he could see a situation where they could approve it subject to administrative staff review of the details that would come back.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed request to lower the canopy satisfies the BAR criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the lowering and the general size of the amended canopy with the stipulation that further detailing on the canopy and the lighting associated with it be resubmitted for staff review and approval. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Ms. Brennan thought there was a lot of discrepancy between the two designs and wondered if the Board could require a meeting to discuss the discrepancies. Mr. Wolf thought there were some minor parts which could be discussed. Mr. Knight stated he would modify the motion to request that the applicant meet with Staff and up to two members of the Board to discuss the details of the entire building as well as the details of the canopy. Mr. Adams seconded the modification. Mr. Wolf called the vote by acclamation; the motion carried unanimously.

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR-07-08-10
Downtown Area
City of Charlottesville
Downtown Wayfinding Signage -- Gateways signs and pole revision**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Board is being asked to give final approval to the City gateway and Mall entrance signs as well as being asked to approve a revised pole design for the pedestrian/vehicular signs. The change in the signs is related to the need to use a breakaway pole. When the gateway signage was previously discussed in 2007, the Board expressed a preference for a brick or stone base which was described as Albemarle-type stone as opposed to a non-native stone. The gateway designs more closely relate to the previously approved signs. She stated Mr. Neal Currie was present to answer any questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know how the wall signage of the pedestrian signs would affect a building's signage. Ms. Scala stated it would not count towards the building's signage.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the pole for the gateway signage was fluted. Mr. Currie stated the drawing made it appear they were fluted but stated the Board could condition approval on them matching the poles for the other signs.

Ms. Brennan sought clarification of the height for the ground mounted poles. Mr. Currie explained the height would have to be a minimum of the ADA required height, which he believed to be 7 feet.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight thought this was a well thought out sign system. He expressed a preference for the fluted poles, but would accept the straight. He wanted to see more information on the posts and stone base of the gateway signs. He wanted to see dimensions of the base. He thought the Board had discouraged the use of the dogwood embossing of the signs and wanted to see them removed from the gateway signs.

Ms. Brennan thought landscaping had been suggested and wanted to see more information on it.

Mr. Adams expressed a preference for the wall mounted signs. He stated he was okay with the aluminum dogwood on the signs.

Mr. Osteen stated he was comfortable with the straight pole. He thought the keystone at the top was out of scale and unnecessary. He suggested the stone needed to be designed, selected, and specified.

Mr. Wall thought the applied dogwoods were fine. He wanted more detail about the planters for the entrance signs. He favored the wall mounted signs but thought there were applications for the pole mounted signs as well.

Mr. Wolf thought the support posts on the gateway sign seemed overly ornamental. He would eliminate the red accents on the gateway sign.

Ms. Scala thought all the signs still had the applied dogwood. Mr. Osteen thought the others were like a silkscreen. Mr. Knight thought the aluminum dogwood had been taken off the Downtown pole signs. Mr. Currie stated applied vinyl dogwoods were on a variety of signs, but the aluminum cut out was only present on a few Downtown maps and wall mounted directional signs. Mr. Knight stated the minutes from the August, 2007 meeting show Mr. Adams suggesting they lose the aluminum contrast on the back and the motion which followed stated signs were approved as modified; Mr. Knight believed the modification included the removal of the aluminum.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Signs, moved to find that the proposed wayfinding sign designs for City gateways and Mall gateways and the revised pole design satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following requirements: one, that the City gateway sign be resubmitted in light of the comments made with special emphasis given to more information being provided on the stone base, the posts, and any attendant planting; and that the keystone at the top of the pole signs be reviewed for either rescaling or removal; and, further, that the Board clarify the issue of the dogwood appliques on the previously approved signs. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application BAR 08-09-07

**Walker Street at Altamont Street
Tax Map 33
City of Charlottesville, Owner
Lauren Hildebrand, Director Of Utilities, Applicant
Remove brick stairs and replace with concrete stairs**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The brick stair is located in the vicinity of 117 Walker Street, 119 Walker Street, 410 Altamont Circle and 413 Altamont Street. The date of the stairs is unknown, but they may have been built at the same time as the earlier homes on Walker Street and Altamont Circle which date to 1915. They are located in the City right of way in the North Downtown ADC District. All structures in this area are contributing except 119 Walker Street. The Director of Utilities is requesting approval to remove the stairs in order to install a new 6 inch ductile iron water main along Walker Street. The existing rock retaining wall on either side of the stairs will be left intact. If the Board finds public necessity outweighs the significance of the stairs, Staff recommends the stairs be rebuilt in a similar design in brick and that the brick should be reused if possible or salvaged and given to the nearby residents. In lieu of the existing pipe railing, a black metal railing would make an appropriate handrail. Staff did receive some phone calls from area residents. One property owner would prefer a compromise to reuse the bricks and add a nice handrail. He is not in favor of removing the brick steps and replacing them with concrete.

Ms. Hildebrand stated they had struggled with this area in order to minimize the impact in a very tight neighborhood and still replace the waterline. She felt the retaining wall was more significant than the stairs and was trying to save that.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the applicant had considered rebuilding the stairs in brick. Ms. Hildebrand stated they could and they would be glad to do that. She stated they had researched the existing brick and the majority of it is no longer available.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if they would redo the same pattern. Ms. Hildebrand stated they could do that.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Kim Johnston, of 117 Walker Street, stated the home she was living in was built in the late 1800s; she thought the stairs dated from before that. She expressed concern about something so old and so full of history being taken away. She thought that in the name of history and beauty, improved water pressure was worth waiting for rather than ripping out the stairs.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf had no problem with rebuilding the stairs in brick and a new handrail. He thought improving the water pressure would be a major boon for the area.

Mr. Knight thought it was pretty straightforward. He appreciated the applicant's willingness to save the retaining wall which was more important than the steps. As long as the City would be willing to

rebuild with brick and submit drawings to show the details of the new stairs and railing, he thought they should go ahead.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if anyone thought it would make sense to keep the current rise to run ratio. Mr. Wolf thought the stair had a certain charm in its period. Mr. Knight thought the current rise to run ratio was acceptable.

Mr. Wolf stated he would support allowing the work to be done provided it was replaced with brick that closely matches the wall and keeps the character of the existing steps.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed replacement of the existing brick stairs satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this district and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the conditions that the new stairs be built of brick, black painted metal handrails be included, that the designers make every effort to keep the same rise to run ratio on the stairs, and that details of the replacement stairs be submitted to the BAR for approval. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-03-07
509 Second Street NE
Tax Map 33 Parcel 18
Mark and Barbara Fried, Applicants
New construction of house -- details**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last seen in June when the Board discussed the items City Council had requested. This was approved in March with certain details to return. The neighbors appealed the decision to City Council in May. In August, Council approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction but said the BAR would retain jurisdiction to review and approve additional design details. Council stated they would trust in the good sense of the BAR and are not looking for a reworking of the design. The Board needs to address the details requested by the BAR at the March meeting as well as the removal of the fourth existing tree and any other changes and details not previously reviewed. The design was altered prior to the last Council meeting.

Mr. David Toscano, Esquire, of Toscano, Buck & Tereskerz, was present on behalf of the applicants. He provided the Board with draft minutes of the City Council meeting.

Ms. Allison Ewing, architect for the Frieds, stated significant changes had been made based on the June meeting. She stated the project was better for the input received from the Board and Council.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Gail Foster, of 504 Second Street, was present seeking reassurance that the plan and square footage that she was looking at was correct. Ms. Ewing stated it was. Ms. Foster sought clarification that the door was glass. Ms. Ewing stated it was. Ms. Foster stated the neighbors were very happy with the reduction in size.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought clarification of the location of the fourth tree. Ms. Ewing stated the tree had been missed in the last drawing because it wasn't well marked on the survey.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Fred Schneider, of 506 Second Street, expressed appreciation for the Fried's and Ms. Ewing's willingness to work with the neighbors concerns about size and scale and mass of the building. He thought this would be a positive contribution to the neighborhood.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall stated it had been a long and arduous process, but the end result has been worth it. He applauded the applicants for their patience in keeping with the project.

Ms. Brennan echoed Mr. Wall's comments. She agreed the new plan was much more compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Wolf thought it spoke volumes about the efforts of the applicants and architect that the neighbors took time to come and express support for the proposal. He had no reservations about supporting this application.

Mr. Knight did not have any concerns about the tree as he had assumed it was already gone. He felt all details had been satisfied.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed demolition of the fourth tree as specified satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the demolition application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, moved to find that the proposed revision and details for a new dwelling satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-09-02
108 Second Street NE
Tax Map 33 Parcel 241
Robert R Matheson Applicant
Add main entrance to side building**

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter as his firm had done some work on behalf of the applicant for this application.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The circa 1940 building is a contributing structure. The applicant seeks approval to add a new entrance to the building through a painted masonry wall. The new painted wood doorway with sidelights and transom lights will face Central Place on the Mall. The proposed doorway creates an inviting storefront. The simple design is preferred and is compatible with other properties in the district.

The applicant had nothing to add but was available to answer any questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall wanted to know what would happen to the door on the Second street side. The applicant stated it would remain.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if any exterior lighting was proposed. It was not.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if there would be any spillover lighting. There would not.

Ms. Brennan thought that having it flush with the existing wall seemed awkward and wanted to know if it could be centered or pulled over. The applicant demonstrated on the plans why it must be placed as it was on the plan.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan liked the blending of traditional and contemporary.

Mr. Osteen suggested moving an opening towards center.

Mr. Adams thought it was well within the Guidelines.

Mr. Knight agreed it was within the Guidelines. He thought it could be approved in concept. He was nervous about granting carte blanche when they did not know what would happen when the applicant cut into the wall and how conditions may change. Mr. Knight stated he would be in favor of granting approval subject to suggestions which had been made and ask the applicant to submit any necessary changes after the opening is made in the wall to Staff for circulation among the Board and for administrative approval.

Mr. Adams thought the design intent was pretty clear.

Ms. Brennan, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the condition that once the applicant tears into the wall, he

will come back to Staff with further details or revised plans detailing any changes to the design or construction of the doorway. Mr. Wall seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-09-05
625 Park Street
Tax Map 34 Parcel 77
Ovation Builders LLC, Applicant/Shaffrey, Owner
Add covered front porch, rear addition and terrace and wall**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The house was built in 1902 and is a contributing Colonial Revival structure located in North Downtown. There are several proposed changes. The new work is to match the existing in materials, details, and paint colors. The non-original construction in the back would be removed. The applicant also seeks to add a new one-story addition. The applicant has done a fine job of matching the front porch extension but it may be considered a radical change to the front facade and is not supported by the Guidelines. The proposed demolition of the newer construction in the rear is acceptable. The proposed new addition is well done in terms of scale and materials. Adjacent property owners have contacted Staff and suggested rather than extending the front porch, the applicant could perhaps put a stairway down to the side porch. The neighbor expressed concern about protection of the elm tree on the property.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, stated they were trying to enhance the architecture and tried to replicate things where they could. He stated part of the building was dry rotted and damaged. There was a large American Elm in the side yard and the design of the addition goes to great lengths to preserve that tree at all costs.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know when the sunroom was constructed. The applicant believed it had been added in the 60s or 70s.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the door and window selections had been made. The applicant stated they had not.

Mr. Knight sought clarification of the reason for the brick wall in the back. The applicant explained it was for a private area that neighborhood dogs could not get into.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Dick Howard spoke in favor of the proposal. He complemented the Shaffreys. He stated there were hooks that suggested the original house had had awnings. He stated there had been concerns about the mass of the house, but it had been met by the applicant making the addition only one story.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams thought the front porch addition disfigured what was a pretty significant composition on Park Street. He felt there was more latitude to depart from the formality of the front in the back of the building. Mr. Adams could not support this application at this time.

Mr. Wall felt the house had such symmetry and elegance that the porch was a travesty. He stated he could not support the proposal as it was laid out.

Ms. Brennan agreed with her colleagues. She could not support this as submitted.

Mr. Knight thought the potential for the rear addition was there, but it remained as potential.

Mr. Wolf also felt strongly about the significance of the front porch; the portico piece was a defining character of that elevation. He expressed concern about the number of masses or volumes.

The applicant expressed appreciation for the feedback received. He thought it would be better to defer so he could talk to the homeowner about the work in the back.

Mr. Knight moved that they accept the applicant's request for a deferral. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief break whereupon the meeting stood recessed at 8:29 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

**I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-09-06
220-222 South Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 95
Mike Stoneking, applicant/Blue Moon Rising, LLC, owner
New Construction**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board in March at which time demolition of a 1924 apartment building in the rear of the property was approved. Since that time, zoning has changed from nine stories to three stories maximum. The applicant is seeking approval for general architectural design including massing, shape, fenestration pattern, style, placement, and site layout. The applicant also seeks approval of the design intent regarding materials and colors. They will submit a final single scheme later for BAR approval; a landscape design for the courtyard will also be submitted at a later date. The proposed building is separated from the historic building with a courtyard. The proposed building appears to be six feet higher than the historic building and approximately three times the mass. The materials are a stucco foundation, either cedar siding in scheme A or fiber cement siding in schemes B and C with oxidized steel bands interspersed, natural finish cedar windows, and standing seam copper roof. The applicant addressed all the preliminary comments. The applicant seeks approval for the concept and design intent regarding materials and colors and will come back later with the final.

Mr. Mike Stoneking stated it was important to receive approval so they would know if they could proceed.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams sought clarification that all of the windows would be unpainted. Mr. Stoneking confirmed that all windows were meant to be natural finish wood.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant had a conceptual idea of the landscaping. Mr. Stoneking stated he did not. He stated they wanted the courtyard to serve as a gathering space for people using the conference facility.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Brent Nelson, of 707 Northwood Avenue and owner of a house at 214 South Street, commended Mike Stoneking for his continued relationship with the neighborhood. He expressed his support for the application.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan liked the design. She had issues with the color and striping effect. She expressed concern that the color would not resonate with the overall color scheme in which the building sits.

Mr. Knight also liked the application and thought it met the Guidelines. He thought enclosing the courtyard and garden area would benefit the project. Mr. Knight thought the thin wall gave a house of cards appearance and did not support the mass above it.

Mr. Wall agreed that the building was successful although he, too, had concerns about the thin wall.

Mr. Adams thought if the design intent was for the building and its mass to recede or blend in, it would be better served with a darker color palette with less contrast between items.

Mr. Osteen preferred the natural wood and the way it tied the building to the landscape. He expressed concern about the west elevation and the lack of screening of the HVAC system.

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for color scheme A. His only concerns were related to the west elevation, especially the alignment of openings. Mr. Wolf stated he would support the application in concept with the massing, color, and landscaping to come back later.

Mr. Stoneking explained they were requesting a vote on everything except the color and the courtyard design. He stated they would come back with those later.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed general architectural design including massing, shape, fenestration patterns, style, placement, and site layout and design intent regarding materials and colors satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves those parts of the proposal with the suggestions noted in the discussion earlier, and further, that the applicant return for approval of materials and the color scheme and the landscape design. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-09-04
101-111 East Main Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 248, Tax Map 33 Parcel 251
1st & Main LLC c/o Keith Woodard, applicant
Rehabilitate building facades**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting discussion and guidance, not final approval, to repair the Main Street facade of 101, upgrade the facades of 105 and 111, and repair and stabilize the First Street and rear facades. The buildings will be rehabilitated, making use of federal and state tax credits. After receiving state and federal approvals, the applicant will return to the BAR for final Certificate of Appropriateness approval. The windows will either be repaired or, if allowed by state review, replaced with wood Pella replacement sashes. On 101 the remaining black glass will be repaired and the plywood areas covered with either black glass or substitute material. The metal cornice will be painted dark grey. On 105 the missing boards will be put back and paint the facade temporarily. The proposed new design will coordinate with 101. On 107 the concrete must remain to qualify for tax credits. On 111 a new storefront will incorporate a steel beam and columns with central entrance. A side door and vestibule to go upstairs will be proposed for 111. The rehabilitation of these buildings potentially improves downtown economic development initiatives. Staff has requested additional detail on the proposed facade upgrades and cut sheets for the window sash replacements.

Mr. Greg Brezinski asked that the submittal be considered in two parts. He stated there was a tenant wanting to move into 105 so they were seeking some temporary repairs to the front facade as well as putting in a temporary rear door. He stated they did not want to make promises to the BAR that would be altered by the tax credit application. He stated they would later align the rear door with the requirements of the National Parks Service tax credit application. Mr. Brezinski stated the current proposal was to paint the existing partial mansard roof and bracketing in a grey to clean up the facade temporarily until a new facade is put in.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know where the door would be in the back. Mr. Brezinski illustrated where the door would be placed.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the colors would change later. Mr. Brezinski stated these were temporary colors which would be gone later.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight stated he saw nothing that would raise any concerns as it all seemed to be well within the Guidelines.

Mr. Wolf thought the Nebulous White would be a better contrast color for the front and the soffit.

Mr. Wolf moved to approve the repainting of the existing awning and facade above the awning on 105 East Main Street using the grey as submitted with the color swatch and for the soffit, the underside of said canopy would be the Nebulous White as demonstrated in the paint chip provided to the Board and that furthermore the Board approves the temporary installation of a rear door in the location that is currently described as the window on the rear of the northwest corner of the back facade of the building, and that they find this meets the BAR Guidelines for this property and other properties in the District and that the rear door is the temporary door. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Brezinski then gave a brief PowerPoint presentation regarding the rest of the project.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf sought clarification of whether this was a Certificate of Appropriateness Application or preliminary. Mr. Brezinski explained they were asking for concurrence with the intent of where they were headed so they could proceed with submitting for tax credits.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen thought it was a great project. He expressed disappointment that nothing could be done with 107.

Mr. Knight thought it was very much in keeping with the Guidelines overall.

Ms. Brennan stated she fully supported the project.

Mr. Adams thought the color choices were good. He expressed concern about the proportions of the transoms. He explained Dryvit was not allowed by the Guidelines.

Mr. Wall liked the steel. He thought it was very appropriate for the age of the building and thought it also had a contemporary urban feel.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed restoration and alterations to the facades of 101, 105, 107, and 111 West Main are compatible with those properties and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the general conceptual approach as submitted, supports the applicant's application for tax credits, and looks forward to seeing the details return to the Board in the future. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf clarified that it was clear that the final details and the review of the facades will come back along with the final disposition of windows and doors. The motion carried unanimously.

**K. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-08-03
110 10-1/2 Street NW
Tax Map 10 Parcel 47
CCBW, LLC, Owner
Demolition of house**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The age of the property is significant because it is over 100 years old. Although not ornately designed, it is a vernacular Virginia I house with local significance during that time being built sometime around 1883 to 1893. It is the last residential I house in the West Main Street ADC District. The applicant noted in the written request for demolition approval that the building has been condemned by a Building Maintenance Code official. Condemnation was given due to the property being unfit for human occupancy; the building code requires the owner to maintain the property. The Maintenance Code official found the building to be structurally sound. The house can be renovated to habitable status as a residence or place of business. Staff did not believe the property met the criteria for demolition and recommends against demolition.

Mr. Bill Chapman, owner of the property, stated he had owned the house four years. About a year ago it became known that vandals were getting in there. The property was boarded up, but vandals were still getting in. The applicant had enlisted the police to help protect the property; however, they called the City Code official who then condemned the property. Mr. Chapman stated he was reluctant to renovate it considering what was going with the neighboring properties.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the property was empty when Mr. Chapman bought it. He stated it had been vacated just before he closed on the property at his request since he thought it looked unsafe. Mr. Chapman also stated it was not insurable without a complete renovation.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if it was in danger of falling down. Mr. Chapman stated it was structurally sound.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if Mr. Chapman knew the previous owner had come before the Board seeking demolition approval. He stated he had not known that until Ms. Scala's report.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant had thought about developing it as a tax credit project. Mr. Chapman stated it was not in a state historic district. He added he could not imagine what use it could have. Ms. Brennan stated simple, basic maintenance could keep the building stable until a use could be found.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan stated she could not support a demolition request since it did not meet any of the Guidelines. She felt this was an important last structure in an historic district that was rapidly growing commercial. She expressed a desire to avoid demolition by neglect.

Mr. Knight stated the house did not meet the criteria for allowing demolition. He expressed a desire to see the building kept around and stabilized for a few years until the market changed. Mr. Knight stated he would hate to lose this building.

Mr. Wolf agreed with his colleagues. He did not think there was any way to support demolition since it did not meet any of the criteria.

Mr. Osteen wondered if gutting the house would discourage the vandals.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed demolition does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the lit drink machine in front of Team Tire, behind this property, had been grandfathered in. Ms. Scala stated it had been there.

L. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

M. Other Business

There was no other business.

N. Adjournment

Mr. Knight so moved. Mr. Wolf called a vote by voice acclamation. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:27 p.m.