

**City of Charlottesville**  
**Board of Architectural Review**  
**August 17, 2010**  
**Minutes**

**Present:**

Fred Wolf, Chair  
Syd Knight, Vice Chair  
H. Fairfax Ayres  
William Adams  
Brian Hogg  
Eryn Brennan  
Preston Coiner

**Not Present:**

Rebecca Schoenthal  
Michael Osteen

**Also Present:**

Mary Joy Scala  
Michael Smith (Planning Assistant)

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

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

There were no matters from the public not on the agenda.

**B. Consent Agenda**

**1. Minutes – July 20, 2010**

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 10-08-02  
134 10<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Tax Map 31 Parcel 156  
Stoa Design, Applicant/ CCBW, LLC, Owner  
Add new doorway, uncover windows, move gate

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 10-08-10  
608 Ridge Street  
Tax Map 29 Parcel 264  
EcoReMOD, Applicant/ City of Charlottesville, Owner  
Changes to approved windows

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

There were no questions from the board.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no comments from the public.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Coiner noted that for the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 150 Chancellor Street the use of non-grained hardiplank should be specified.

**Mr. Knight moved the consent agenda as noted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-0. Mr. Wolf abstained from voting on July 20, 2010 minutes due to absence.**

#### **C. Projects in Non-Compliance (no status report this month)**

#### **D. Previously Considered Items**

##### **1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 10-07-08**

**600 Preston Place**

**Tax Map 5 Parcel 109**

**Mackenzie Woolner, Applicant/ Christopher Winter, Owner**

**Extend deck and remove tree**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

The applicant presented his report. He mentioned they would like to position the existing hedge 90 degrees instead of extending the hedge down Grady Avenue.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner wanted to know how much of the existing deck would be removed for the new hedge.

The applicant believed about a foot would be removed.

Mr. Wolf was curious whether the applicant was planning on staining the entire deck upon completion of the addition or just staining the addition.

The applicant responded saying they plan to stain the entire deck upon completion.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner believed extending the hedge 90 degrees across the rock wall would be a good solution for screening the deck. Mr. Coiner believed if the applicant planned to just tack on the addition to the existing deck, safety would be a major concern.

Mr. Knight saw the application as an improvement and something he could support.

Mr. Wolf believed the applicant has made the deck fairly innocuous to the adjacent street.

Majority of board members suggested researching alternative lattices as

Ms. Brennan echoed Mr. Coiner's support and noted her appreciation of staff and all the efforts that have gone into the Conservation District designation. Ms. Brennan asked if the eight identified character defining features would become part of the guidelines and if additions or revisions could be made.

Ms. Scala explained that these are sub-guidelines and that they are there to assist with the implementation of the district. She noted that additional character defining features could be added informally and that the processes were still being established.

**Mr. Knight, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, and for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed deck extension, removal of two trees, new skirting and hedge extension 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 stipulation that the detail for the skirting below the new deck and the existing deck and the stain color be submitted to staff for approval. [Note that because the existing deck already uses pressure-treated lumber, that makes the proposed use of treated lumber more acceptable.]**

**Mr. Wolf seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed 6-0.**

Mr. Hogg arrived.

- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-06-02  
218 West Water Street  
Tax Map 28 Parcel 84  
Atwood Architects, Applicant/ Waterhouse LLC, Owner  
New Construction, Waterhouse**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting final approval for the building design and details except for color.

Mr. Atwood, Applicant, gave his presentation. Mr. Atwood provided easel-mounted renderings of the project as well as a 3-D model. Mr. Atwood provided board members a mitigation packet that referenced changes the board and public citizens had suggested to him in last month's meeting.

Mr. Mark Kestner, a partner of Mr. Atwood, approached the dais to discuss the materials being incorporated with this project. The materials they plan to use will create a clean, simple look for the building.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Knight was curious about the material of the raised planters proposed to go along South Street.

Mr. Atwood plans to use the same concrete as the base.

Mr. Coiner asked about the operation of the gate to the car garage.

Mr. Atwood explained the gate would be pad activated.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Brent Nelson, 707 Northwood Avenue, appreciates Mr. Atwood's attempt to involve the surrounding community more within this project. Mr. Nelson supports the direction this project is going.

Mary Gilliam, 218 W. South Street, echoed Mr. Nelson's opinion of this project. She, too, believes this project is headed in the right direction and she fully supports it.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight left the bench to observe the 3-D model up close. While he was looking at it the model he asked Mr. Atwood if the model showed the garage openings.

Mr. Wolf and Mr. Adams also approached the model.

Mr. Wolf believes this project has improved and is encouraged by the direction this project is headed. He was pleased with the neighbor's response to the project and their current involvement with this process.

Mr. Wolf expressed slight concerns on the use of sto-tucco instead of true stucco.

Mr. Hogg admired the 3-D model for better articulating the massing of the building. Mr. Hogg did, however, express some hesitation concerning the symmetry of the design. He believed the building still looked like a compilation of more than two buildings.

Mr. Adams believes this project needs more improvement.

**Mr. Wolf, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, and for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the massing, materials and general organization of the elevations, and conditioned upon the requirement that further study occur in relation to the central "fin" and the central organizing glass hyphen or bay that separates the two distinct masses facing Water Street; that the BAR receives additional information/detail pertaining to the precise type of window (its construction and details of its cladding and operation); details pertaining to balconies, railings; details pertaining to the precise amount of offset or relationship between planes of like materials, such as stucco, so we understand the degree to which the pilasters versus the infill are differentiated; information related to color of all materials (including a more homogenous approach to the color palette); the design of the steel gate and its operability; and a more substantial termination of the base on the new building.**

**Knight seconded the motion**

**The motion passed (5-1) with Mr. Adams opposed.**

- 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-07-06  
222 South Street  
Tax Map 28 Parcel 95**

**Michael Stoneking, Applicant/ Blue Moon Fund, Owner  
New solar panel array in rear yard**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

Michael Stoneking, the applicant, gave his presentation. Mr. Stoneking emphasized the surrounding neighbors are not pleased with the project or any revisions made to mitigate concerns of the neighbors. The applicant believes this location is blessed with southerly exposure in the rear of the property. Mr. Stoneking believes that placing the solar panels in the rear will not sacrifice the character of the historic district.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

Mr. Stoneking did not know specifically, however, he expressed he is open to any suggestion.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Ms. Brennan asked what specific evergreen trees the applicant was proposing.

Mr. Stoneking did not know specifically, however, he expressed he is open to any suggestion.

Mr. Wolf asked if the size of the panel array was driven by a specific number of panels the client desires or parking spaces.

Mr. Stoneking responded saying the size is to shade the bank of cars currently using this property.

Mr. Adams asked if the design of the beams underneath the panels was a tool to mask the wires.

Mr. Stoneking confirmed that the beams were design as a tool to mask the wires.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

Brent Nelson, 707 Northwood Avenue, believes the proposal is completely out of scale to this specific property and also highly utilitarian. Mr. Nelson believes that for the BAR to approve this proposal would set precedent uncharacteristic to a neighborhood such as South Street.

Mary Gilliam, 218 W. South Street, philosophically does not agree with free-standing solar panels in a historic district.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Coiner believed he could not support this project due to the size of the panel array. He does not believe this project is appropriate for property's location.

Ms. Brennan believes purely based on the design guidelines set forth by the BAR she cannot support this project. She encourages the applicant to work towards making the panel array functional in a way that it could be deconstructed.

Mr. Hogg notes the panel array is substantially smaller than previous buildings allowed on this property. Mr. Hogg reminded the BAR they have approved proposals for this property in this past that have not strictly

adhered to the guidelines of a historic district. He does not foresee any detrimental effect towards the character of this neighborhood.

Mr. Knight does not have any issue with the utilitarian nature of the proposal. However, he is a little uncomfortable regarding the scale of the project.

Mr. Wolf believes the impact of this structure would be minimal to the overall character of the neighborhood. He does not believe approving this structure will uniformly endorse similar structures for any backyard within the city.

Mr. Adams appreciates the applicant reducing the height of the structure and can support the structure in the location.

Mr. Ayres also believed this project would not create precedent for other properties throughout the city. He believed the structure was fairly innocuous to the neighborhood.

**Mr. Knight, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed solar array 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 with the condition that the material proposed for plant material screening come back to staff with the suggestion that the applicant continue to explore ways to visually lighten the array structure, and that the applicant continue conversations with the neighbors regarding plant materials so they reach a mutually agreeable solution.**

**Mr. Wolf seconded the motion**

**The motion was approved (5-2) with Ms. Brennan and Mr. Coiner opposed.**

**4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-05-03  
1618 Gordon Avenue  
Tax Map 9 Parcel 12  
James Boyd, Heyward Boyd Architects PC, Applicant/  
First Church of Christ Scientist, Owner  
Addition**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

Mr. Boyd, the applicant, gave his presentation. He mentioned that a deceased member of the church had donated money and requested a youth center be constructed.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

There were no questions from the board.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg mentioned he was supportive of this addition at their previous meeting and he commended the applicant for responding quickly to the suggestions the BAR had given them before.

Mr. Coiner believed he was prepared to support the addition as well.

Ms. Brennan believed the addition met the guidelines, therefore she could support the application.

Mr. Wolf echoed the preceding comments and thinks a number of improvements have been made.

Mr. Knight also praised the improvements to this proposal. He did express some concern regarding the existing trees on the site and their potential harm during construction. He suggested the applicant contact a qualified arborist to provide recommendations and assistance towards the protection of those existing trees.

**Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, for Site Design, and for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed new addition, new parking and related site design satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition per Syd Knight's comments that an arborist be included to do pruning or structural changes to the existing trees, and to recommend tree protection during construction. Also, the color of shingles are subject to administrative approval.**

**Mr. Hogg seconded the motion.**

**The motion was approved (6-1) with Mr. Adams opposed.**

- 5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-04-06  
301 5<sup>th</sup> Street SW  
Tax Map 29 Parcel 104  
Mitchell/Matthews, Architect/ Michael and Ashley McMahon, Owners  
Shed and addition demolitions, new addition and site work**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

Ms. Roslyn Keese, applicant, gave her presentation.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf asked if the same roofing being used for the additional structures be applied to the original structure.

Ms. Keese confirmed the same roofing would be used for the entire structure.

Mr. Wolf was curious how galvalume roofing would work on original structure's front patio which has a front roof.

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the grade would remain the same.

Ms. Keese responded saying the grade would not change.

Mr. Knight wanted to know the reason behind demolishing the existing fencing around the property.

Ms. Keese did not believe the fencing was necessary and would like to repair the fencing to enhance the look of the property.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the proposed gravel driveway was permitted in that zone.

Ms. Scala replied the property owner would have to abide by city code regarding driveways.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ayres believes the proposed addition overwhelms the original structure and cannot support this proposal.

Mr. Knight believes constructing hedges of fencing along the street edge of the property would create a relief from the activity of a busy street. Mr. Knight also believed the width of the driveway was unnecessary.

Mr. Wolf was approving of the direction this project was going. He also believed the massing of the driveway needed to be addressed.

**Ms. Brennan, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed addition and site design satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions: Hand-crimped galvalume roof to be used on the main portions of the roof [and no commercial ridge vent on either the addition or original structure] , and an alternate material considered for the mansard roofs above the porch and bay window; and a revised site plan that considers an edge (hedge or wall) along Dice & 5th Streets; and size and configuration of paved areas and confirmation of materiality in that area, to be submitted for administrative review in consultation with appropriate board members.**

**Mr. Hogg seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed (6-1) with Mr. Ayres opposed.**

**Mr. Wolf called for a five minute recess.**

- 6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-08-09  
219 West Main Street  
Tax Map 33 Parcel 272  
Giovanni Sestito, Applicant/ Joe Gieck Trust, Owner  
Projecting Sign**



Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know how the sign is going to interact with the awning. He was interested to know if the awning will obscure the view of the sign.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf believed the color fit perfectly well within the standards and guidelines of the BAR.

**Mr. Hogg, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, I move to find that the proposed new projecting sign 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, the revised vertical design and including the bracket.**

**Mr. Wolf seconded the motion.**

**The motion was unanimously approved (7-0).**

**New Items**

- 7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-08-08  
601 Park Street  
Tax Map 53 Parcel 4  
CMB Development LLC, Applicant / Atlas VA I SPE, LLC, Owner  
Exterior repairs, new 18 space parking area, landscaping changes**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

The applicant, John Matthews, approached the dais and commented on the proposed parking lot in the rear of the property. Mr. Matthews plans to keep the existing structure intact while restoring the property to its original state. Mr. Matthews plans to screen the edge of the parking lot to limit disturbance towards adjacent properties.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. John Cruickshank, 324 Parkway St, wanted to know how the applicant planned to light the proposed parking lot.

Mr. Matthews plans to design the parking lot so no light from the parking lot will bleed into adjacent property owners' land.

Mr. Cruickshank wanted to know where the entrance to the parking lot would be located on Parkway Street.

Mr. Matthews referred to the site plan.

Mr. Bud Treakle, 611 Park Street, was curious about what he should expect from Mr. Matthews as this project moves forward.

Mr. Matthews mentions there has been some discussion about constructing an addition to the existing building in the future.

Mr. Treakle was concerned that additional structures would create additional parking spaces.

Mr. Matthews assured no additional parking would come as a result of an addition to the building.

Mr. Keith London, CMB Development, approached the dais to inform the BAR he had been in discussion with Mr. Treakle about an additional five units that would be constructed near Mr. Treakle's property.

Mr. David Heilbronner, 534 Park St, wanted to know the number of parking spaces that had been approved when this property was previously approved for redevelopment.

Mr. Matthews believes the property was approved for 22 spaces.

Mr. Stephen Bolton, 332 Parkway Street, expressed concern over a potential increase in traffic volume if the parking lot entrance is limited to just Parkway Street.

Jackie Lipman, 336 Parkway Street, was curious to know what the target rental price would be for the units.

Mr. London replied saying the apartments would target the middle-income group.

Ms. Lipman was concerned over guest parking and how the applicant plans to address parking permits and guest parking.

Mr. Wolf informed Ms. Lipman that parking would be enforced through zoning administrator and the overall zoning ordinance.

Ms. Lipman was curious about how the applicant planned to screen the parking lot

Mr. Matthews plans to use hedges to screen around the parking area.

Mr. Treakle wanted to know how many parking spaces are required for the property.

Mr. Matthews responded saying 12 spaces were required.

Mr. Cruickshank was curious to know how many existing trees were planned for removal.

Mr. Matthew's response was a few small dogwoods would be removed; however, they plan to plant a considerable amount of trees.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner wanted to know the surface of the parking lot.

Mr. Matthews plans to use asphalt; however, their preference is gravel.

Mr. Coiner asked about the material used to fence the trash totes.

Mr. Matthews plans to convert the fence into a garden wall that will stand 42 inches in height. The wall will consist of brick similar to the existing brick. The wall would also double as a mail drop-off location.

Mr. Hogg asked how Mr. Matthews planned to restore the brick on the chimneys.

Mr. Matthews did not have a specific answer.

Mr. Hogg was also curious about if Mr. Matthews intended to replace any of the columns.

Mr. Matthews did not know specifically. He would have to study the most cost effective approach whether that be replacing or repairing the columns.

Mr. London does not believe any columns need replacing. Mr. London also mentioned this property was currently under review for historic tax credits.

Mr. Hogg expressed hesitation towards approving Mr. Matthew's application due to how broad the application was.

Mr. Adams wanted to know the specifics of the retaining wall Mr. Matthews proposed next to the parking lot.

Mr. Matthews replied saying 12 to 16 inches of segmented wall will possibly be implemented to in the rear of the parking lot where the grade is steepest.

Mr. Adams asked if there would be improvements made to the sidewalks along Parkway Street.

Mr. Matthews believes the sidewalks are in good shape and does not anticipate any possible improvements.

Mr. Adams also wanted to know if there were any handrails near any ADA locations on the property.

Mr. Matthews did not handrails were necessary for this site.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Cruickshank was concerned about parking on Parkway St. and hopes Mr. Matthews limits the number of guest permits allotted to units. Mr. Cruickshank believes pedestrian safety along Parkway should be addressed and how pedestrian safety relates to the proposed parking lot.

Mr. Treacle really appreciated Mr. Matthew's effort to inform him about this project.

Mr. Bolton was curious about the possibility of changing Parkway to a one-way street to address increased traffic volume.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight felt inclined to request the BAR treat this application like a preliminary review due to the lack of specificity presented. He expressed concern over the configuration and detailing of the parking.

Mr. Coiner agreed this application should be treated as a preliminary.

Ms. Brennan believed she could support the application based on the applicant's review for historic tax credits.

Mr. Wolf likes the concept and approach of the application, however, believes details remain that should be addressed more specifically. Mr. Wolf was interested in the possibility of the applicant adjusting the parking to develop a buffer between the parking lot and Parkway St. to mitigate the concerns of pedestrians along Parkway.

Mr. Matthews wanted clarification on the specifics the BAR would like to see on their next application.

The application was treated as preliminary.

**8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
**BAR 10-08-06**  
**105 First Street South**  
**Tax Map 28 Parcel 19**  
**Fabian Kuttner, Applicant/ Terraces Land trust, Owner**  
**Alter steps and walkway**

Mr. Wolf recused himself

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

Fabian Kuttner, applicant and owner of Terraces Land Trust, gave his presentation.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no questions from the public.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the steps would be bull nose brick.

Mr. Kuttner replied all materials used for the improvements would match the existing materials.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no comments from the public.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Hogg believes this is a huge improvement.

Mr. Adams was worried about tapering steps causing a tripping hazard.

Mr. Kuttner contemplated applying yellow or black stripes along the area to prevent tripping.

Mr. Knight believes this application is straightforward and he can support it.

**Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposal to alter the steps and railings satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application in concept as presented, with matching steps and railing, with code issues to be resolved as required by City officials.**

**Mr. Knight seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed (6-0-1) with Mr. Wolf recused.**

**9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-08-05  
320 E. Main Street  
Tax Map 28 Parcel 43  
VHM Corp, Applicant/ Virgil H. Marshall, Owner  
Change 4<sup>th</sup> Street window to door**

Mr. Wolf recused himself.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

Mr. Enoch Snyder, representative of the applicant, believed Ms. Scala made a sufficient presentation and did not add anything.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the masonry opening would remain unchanged.

Mr. Snyder replied saying the applicant was proposing to widen the opening to allow the proposed double door to attract more light into the store.

Mr. Hogg wanted clarification on whether or not the masonry openings on either side of the masonry opening under review open to the retail store.

Mr. Snyder assured Mr. Hogg both openings do not open to the retail store. Only the opening proposed for redevelopment opens to the retail space.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Hogg agrees with Mary Joy that enlarging the double door so that it no longer corresponds with the existing jack arch would be inappropriate.

Mr. Coiner agreed with Mr. Hogg and supports a single-door frame.

Mr. Snyder presented the Board with a sketch-up detailing a single-door frame.

Mr. Hogg believed that if the BAR could accept the revision to a single-door frame, he could move for approval.

**Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposal to change a window to a [single] door satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the amended application for a single door (6-0-1 with Wolf recused) as shown on drawing dated 16 August '10.**

**The motion passed (6-0-1) with Mr. Wolf recused.**

**Mr. Wolf returned to bench**

**10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 10-08-04  
610 Lyons Court  
Tax Map 52 Parcel 78  
Wyck Knox, Applicant and Owner  
Replace slate roof with standing seam, repair porches, remove rear additions**

Ms. Scala gave her staff report.

Mr. Wyck Knox, the applicant and owner, gave his presentation. He mentioned he has already submitted part 1 of the process for historic tax credit and is in the process of submitting part 2. He clarified that he actually requested standing seam roofing and not copper.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Brennan wanted clarification whether Mr. Knox wanted to demolish or repair the existing front porch.

Mr. Knox intends to disassemble the porch, repair the existing structure, and then reassemble the porch to the original state.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Maureen Dean, 606 Lyons Ct., fully supports Mr. Knox's work towards renovating this building.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Coiner looks forward to seeing this project go forward.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the home was listed on the Virginia Landmark Register.

Ms. Scala informed Mr. Hogg the property was listed in the Courthouse National Register District, but not individually listed.

Ms. Brennan thinks it is a great project. Mr. Hogg and Mr. Adams echoed her sentiments.

Mr. Adams expressed reservations on pre-finished roofing because of the difficulty to detail them.

Mr. Knox believes the metal roof option is the best solution to accommodate the Philadelphia gutters.

**Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and for Demolition, I move to find that the proposed roof replacement to standing seam and the demolition of two rear additions satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.**

**Mr. Hogg seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed unanimously (7-0).**

**11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 10-08-03

39 University Circle Unit #3

Tax Map 6 Parcel 85

Stoa Design, Applicant/ Sean and Ladi Carr, Owners

Replace all existing windows

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

Michael Savage, representative of Stoa Design, gave his presentation. Mr. Savage brought samples of all three window options.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know which windows would least discernable from the rest of the windows once replacement finished.

Mr. Savage thinks the two options that would be least discernable are the Pella and Norwood.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Karen Dougal, resident of University Circle, expressed concern over creating a hodgepodge aesthetic to the building.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

Ms. Brennan asked if the windows being replaced were original.

Mr. Savage replied that they were.

Mr. Wolf asked what condition the current windows were in. What is the reason they need replacing.

Mr. Savage stated some of the detail has been lost, however, the windows are not in terrible shape.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if interior casing had to be replaced for Pella windows.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Ms. Dougal believes all the individual apartment owners should collaborate together to replace the windows.

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Brennan is reluctant to approve of the application because there is not enough information documenting the current condition of the windows.

Mr. Wolf believes replacing the windows should be an issue addressed by the entire building.

Mr. Hogg suggested the applicant meet with his client to develop a compelling case about why the current windows warrant replacement. Mr. Hogg mentioned a deferral might be appropriate.

**Accepted (7-0) the applicant's deferral. The applicant should make a more compelling case to replace the windows based on their condition; should try to get a commitment from the building owners to replace all the windows at once with the same type if they need to be replaced; the BAR agreed that a wood sash replacement window (possibly some version of Norwood) and dimensioned similarly to the existing windows, would be preferable to a clad whole window replacement.**

### **F. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes)**

None

### **G. Other Business**

None

### **H. Adjournment**

9:50 PM