

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
August 19, 2014
City Council Chambers-City Hall**

Members Present:

Melanie Miller - Chairperson
Michael Osteen
Tim Mohr – Vice Chairperson
Carl Schwarz
Candace DeLoach
Justin Sarafin
Laura Knott

Members Absent:

Whit Graves
Brian Hogg

Staff Present:

Mary Joy Scala

The Chairperson, Melanie Miller, called the meeting to order.

Ms. Miller stated that 500 Court Square was withdrawn from the agenda.

She said this is the last meeting for Mr. Osteen and many thanks for 8 years of service to the BAR and he will definitely be missed.

- Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mark Kavit, 400 Altamont Street, representing himself and the North Downtown Residents Association stated people are not properly notified of this type of meeting i.e. BAR/Planning Commission. He said he spoke to City Council last evening that people are not aware of things going on. He said going forward some of the items on the agenda in his opinion should be deferred because the neighborhoods were not informed.

- Consent Agenda

Mr. Osteen motioned to approve the Consent agenda minutes, with item #2 (114 Oakhurst Circle) pulled off the consent agenda by Ms. Knott, with the motion seconded by Ms. Knott. Ms. Miller, Mr. Mohr abstained, motion passed 5-0-2. Items approved on the consent agenda were: #1 July 15, 2014 minutes, #3 1001 W Main Street, and #4 106 W South Street.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-08-04
114 Oakhurst Circle
Tax Parcel 110022000
Nancy J Haynes, Trustee, Owner and Applicant
New landscaping and tree removal

This applicant is seeking approval for new property landscaping, which includes removal of two large Norway spruce and some smaller trees. The new landscaping plan lists plants to be saved and plants to be installed. In addition, the drainage will be improved by correcting downspouts and eliminating low spots.

The arborist notes that two large Norway spruce being removed have the potential to cause structural damage to the house in the very near future, as they have outgrown their space. Also, with these trees removed, the other trees in the yard, including a large white oak and a Japanese maple, will be able to have the proper light and space to grow.

The staff report recommended that the proposal to remove two large Norway spruce and to rehabilitate the yard landscaping is reasonable. The landscape design and details of the landscaping phases are appropriate.

This application was pulled from the consent agenda for further discussion by Ms. Knott. After discussion it was clarified that a smaller tree would be planted in place of one of the two Norway spruce to be removed.

Ms. Knott agreed that the Norway spruce is planted too close to the house and that the tree on the left is clearly hidden by the white oak, so the effect of its removal would be minimal. She asked that once the trees are removed, that the applicant considers a larger tree for the corner instead of a red bud.

Ms. Haynes clarified that the replacement tree would be a "Black Dragon" Cryptomeria, not a red bud, and that it would be larger than a red bud.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, **Ms. Knott** move to find that the proposed tree removal and landscape plan satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC district, seconded by **Mr. Osteen**, the BAR approved the application 7-0.

- C. Projects in non-compliance – no report.
 - D. Deferred or Previously Considered Items
5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (holly hedge, only, deferred from July)
BAR 14-06-02
617 Park Street
Tax parcel 520186000
Chris and Megan Long, Owners/ Russell Skinner, Applicant
New rear addition and site changes

The staff report recommended that the applicant has made an argument to retain the 8' tall holly hedge along Park Street. Even though the BAR normally prefers the house to be visible from a public right of way, given the current conditions found on Park Street and the placement of the front gate in the plan, which allows a glimpse of the front door, the addition of this tall hedge matches the neighboring houses.

The type of hedge should be agreed upon. Boxwood is recommended, because it is a slower growing hedge with the ability to be shaped throughout its entire life.

Mr. Kavit spoke first asking the height of the boxwood---they could be 20 foot high.

On this particular house, there was a little sign [notice posted] on the door instead of the larger sign typically displayed and indicated that there were some people concerned about not being able to attend the meeting.

Mr. Schwarz agreed with assessment of Park Street. He said there are three properties with solid hedges and that they do not contribute to the historic character of Park. Many of the other properties have landscaping that is very park-like with open lawns and permeable plantings. Mr. Schwarz said he cannot support a solid hedge and that potentially, the hedges will have a significant negative effect on Park Street if this is allowed.

Ms. Knott said she agreed with Mr. Schwarz, that the character of Park Street is not one of green walls of hedges. She stated that we are responding to this one again and it is still not compatible with the character of Park Street. She stated she cannot support the 6 foot high hedge because the total height would be 9 feet from the sidewalk.

Ms. Miller said that she lives two blocks away from Park Street and feels very sympathetic to the applicant but she said they have never had hedges and that the street traffic is not really that loud, that they do not need that much protection from street noise. She shared that she had looked up the word "hedge" in the dictionary and learned that it means a "fence or boundary

formed by closely growing bushes or shrubs.” She indicated that she would not be able to support this because we do not allow fences as tall as the proposed hedge.

Mr. Osteen asked about 6 foot height - would that be enforceable if the hedge exceeded that?

Mary Joy said it would be like any other zoning violation. The City would need to know how it is measured - Is it 6 feet from the ground or the sidewalk?

Mr. Osteen stated that he was sympathetic to the applicant and believes there could be a park-like hedge and he would support 6 ft. boxwood.

Mr. Sarafin asked is there a way to approve it? He pointed out that, as Ms. Knott stated, the BAR has considered this for the third time.

Mr. Osteen made a motion to allow a 6’ high English boxwood hedge, seconded by Ms. DeLoach. The motion failed (3-4).

Ms. Miller made a motion to deny the application for 6 ft. American boxwood, seconded by Ms. Knott. The motion was withdrawn.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, **Ms. Osteen** moved to find that a boxwood hedge with a mature height not to exceed 4 feet satisfies the BAR’s criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, Seconded by **Mr. Mohr**, the motion passed 7-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from July)
BAR 14-07-02
401 E Main Street
Tax parcel 053059000
East Mall, LLC (Charley Lewis), Owner/ Molly Lapekas,
Applicant
Café changes: brown metal surround; wood tables

Staff recommends the applicant should make the enclosing fence black, like all the other café enclosures on the Downtown Mall. The metal elements that are part of the fence – black light poles and trim on the planters- should also be black.

Mr. Schwarz said it looks very good, and he will support the fencing but only if the rest of the board would consider changing the guidelines.

Mr. Sarafin said it really stands out as different from all of the black and that it does not match all of the others [on the mall]

Mr. Mohr said everyone else had to do black on the mall. He said he would be sympathetic if it was dark bronze; the brown color is problematic to him because it is not what everyone else has been forced to do.

Ms. DeLoach said it looks better than some others on the mall.

Ms. Miller said she agrees with Ms. DeLoach, and agrees that it does look almost like black.

Ms. Miller said they would still have to follow the guidelines for the high top tables.

Ms. Lapekas said they can change the high top tables to black.

Ms. Knott said the black was the color for the mall street furnishings from the 1970s. The applicant did not provide most of the furnishings that the BAR approved, and she would not support this proposal.

Mr. Sarafin said black is the design for the mall.

Mr. Schwarz finds the table less problematic than the fence. He will support leaving the tables with wood tops

Mr. Osteen said it looks really good and think that it would be a good? Combination and he would accept it.

Mr. Mohr said he did not have a chance to discuss it before hand and he did not know how other people felt. Mr. Mohr said he just wants it to fit with the other outside café designs.

Mr. Sarafin said that approval of the brown color would set a precedent.

Mr. Osteen does not think anyone else would try to set a precedent following the same process.

Ms. Knott said she does not think it should be approved and the BAR should be fair and consistent, and she cannot support it.

Mr. Schwarz said that the BAR does make exceptions, but there is black furniture on the mall, specifically designed to be consistent with the black fixtures and furniture.

Mr. Sarafin said can it be painted instead of shipping it back to Mexico.

The first motion made by **Mr. Osteen**, seconded by **Mr. Schwarz** to approve the changes failed (3-4).

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending and Cafes, **Ms. Knott** move to find that the proposed changes to the café details satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this contributing property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application EXCEPT the color of the perimeter hardware: café fence, metal planter trim and light poles, which may remain until the end of the current cafe season (later clarified by the BAR to be January 1st) when they must then be changed to black, seconded by **Ms. Miller**, motion passed 6-1.

E. New Items

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-08-02
1022 Grove Street
Tax Parcel 230038000
Crestline Investments, LLC, Owner/ Jeff Easter Remodeling,
Applicant
Addition and Partial Demolition

The applicant first proposed a rear addition, but it did not meet the rear setback requirements, so he re-submitted a plan to rehabilitate the house. He is not proposing any changes to the footprint of the house.

The house is in rough shape, but is representative of the typical historic housing of this neighborhood, and has a charming scale. The BAR should discuss how the applicant should proceed if he is not able to straighten the leaning house. Must he return to the BAR for a demolition request?

Removing the rear chimney will not adversely affect the character of the house.

Perhaps the center portion should be stuccoed as it was originally. Because the rear addition is fairly recent, it could be covered in board and batten to differentiate.

Jeff Easter, the applicant and owner said the house can be saved. They put a new foundation under it, a new first floor, footing and putting the second floor back as it was. He said there were no windows on the one side of the house which is the kitchen. He said he would like to put a window over the kitchen sink.

One concern was made from the public to the applicant that the house does not have gutters on the sides and the water sheets over into his yard when it rains. He also commended Mr. Easter on a job well done.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Demolition, **Mr. Osteen** moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property, with the following modifications: a window to be added in the kitchen with drawings to be submitted to staff for administrative approval: and the third volume in the rear to be sheathed with board and batten, seconded by **Mr. Sarafin**, motion passed 7-0.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-08-06
West Market Street Retaining Wall
Tax Parcel edge of 330174000 and 3301742A0-
3301742Q0
McGuffey Hill Owners Association, owner/
Charlottesville Mural Project, Applicant
Bike Mural

The applicant proposes to cut back existing overgrowth, power-wash the concrete wall, potentially repair the masonry cracks where the mural would be applied, and to paint a mural on the existing concrete retaining wall in one of two color schemes.

The applicant would also maintain the painted area of the mural, including covering potential graffiti, repairing minor cracks, and cleaning.

Staff recommends the more muted of the two color schemes. A mural in this location, facing West Market Street, would be highly visible to passing traffic and pedestrians. The proposed painted mural would be compatible with the public art on display at the McGuffey Art Center. The mural does not attempt to obscure or alter the existing utilitarian concrete wall. The subject matter, diverse bicyclists, is generally appropriate.

Mark Kavit, a resident of Altamont Street, said it was indicated to him that the notification was not done properly and there was an error on the Neighborhood Development Services' part and the larger white notice sign was not done because of the Fry's Spring situation using up all of the signs. He said he had pictures to show that there were no signs of any type put on that piece of property. Mr. Kavit asked the applicant who requested the mural and of the McGuffey Association made the request. He also asked if there were in other considerations given to other designs. Mr. Kavit said there was no input from the public in choosing the design for the mural.

Alex Hancock asked if this is going to be the permanent design for the mural the next hundred years or will it change often.

Ross McDermott, Director of the Charlottesville Mural Project, said the mural should have a 15-20 year life span, which is the life span of the paint before it would start to fade.

Mr. Hancock stated that, for people walking, hiking, biking and driving by, he would like to see the mural changed more often than 15-20 years. He would like to see a mural with different diversities of what Charlottesville is all about and feels that bikes have become a continuous thing in the city. We need to take in account how some bikers don't pay attention to the rules.

Mr. Osteen asked if there was a background paint color that is uniform on the entire wall.

Ms. Knott said she will support this in a lighter color palette.

Mr. Sarafin said he would like for the wall to remain the wall and not white washing it to cover it but to let it remain as is.

Ms. Miller supports the mural and the lighter touch to the trimming of vegetation.

Ms. DeLoach said she likes the idea but is not sure about trimming the greenery. She said she likes the long greenery as it shows that it's been there a long time.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Public Design and Improvements, **Mr. Osteen** moved to find that the proposed painted mural satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with encouragement of other points made by the BAR (lighter color palette; trim greenery with light touch; reverse direction of bicyclists), but no absolutes, seconded by **Mr. Schwarz**, 7-0 motion passed.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-08-12
852 West Main Street
Tax parcel 300003000 and 300004000
Charlottesville property I, LLC, Owner/ Ryan Bourke,
Applicant
Revised board and batten design

The applicant is seeking approval (after the fact) of a revised board and batten design. When the exterior of the building was inspected recently for the Certificate of Occupancy, it was determined that the as-built batten design on the Hardie panels varied from that approved by the BAR in February 2013.

The upper front (north elevation) design is most apparent, since it faces West Main Street, and was intended to create a cornice effect. More horizontal battens could be added, but the extra vertical battens already installed would prevent it from looking horizontal. The final, darker paint color will help to make the battens less visible.

Mr. Schwarz said from West Main Street he couldn't see it so as far as he is concerned he didn't think it would make a difference.

Ms. DeLoach asked if this was a mistake on the contractor's part or did he know what he was doing and just didn't relay it to the general contractor?

Mr. Bourke stated that the contractor did know what he was doing, but he doesn't think he was trying to deceive the initial plan, but it did not match with the original in comparison as you can see.

Ms. Miller said she would be willing to accept the battens in the wrong place if they could do an extra thorough job with the punch list because these things need to be fixed now or they will never get fixed.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, **Ms. Miller** moved to find that the revised batten design satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and the BAR approves the application, with a request to pay additional attention to detail on the punch list as the building is completed, seconded by **Mr. Mohr**, motion passed 7-0.

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-08-01
12 Elliewood Avenue
Tax parcel 090088000
Youn Soon Lee, Owner /Stephen Lee, Applicant
New front patio and paint building

The current owner recently removed the shrubs in front of the structure, in preparation to install a small patio.

The owner is requesting approval for the addition of a new flagstone front patio area. This patio addition will fill the seven (7) feet of depth between the building and the City sidewalk, and will be twenty-five feet long, the width of the porch. The white rail was removed from the front of the porch, but will be replaced.

Since the shrubs have been removed the applicant intends to flatten out the dirt area so it is level with the existing sidewalk. There will be three (3), 4 by 4 wood posts, located at the front of the flagstone area nearest to the sidewalk. These

posts and the addition of enclosing chains will be used to create a partition between the dining area and the passers-by on the sidewalk. The applicant also seeks approval to paint the building with a dark green and white color scheme, which he has already done.

Ms. Knott asked questions about the proposal, saying that she couldn't see how the flagstone patio would work on such a steep slope.

Mr. Lee stated that he would hire an engineer to figure it out.

Ms. Knott asked if the BAR was to approve the paint color and noted that the columns should be white or a light color, instead of the dark green and that the paint scheme should relate to the rest of the building, which is yellow with white trim.

Mr. Schwarz said the paint didn't bother him as much and he thought it was sort of fun.

Ms. Miller stated that the green patio color clashed with the yellow house color.

Ms. DeLoach said the columns would need to be re-painted white as are most columns in the historical areas.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Additions and for Site Design, **Mr. Schwarz** moved to find that the paint colors as they are satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted seconded by **Ms. Miller**, the motion failed 3-4.

Mr. Sarafin moved to accept the applicant's request for a deferral (for no longer than 3 months) to make a proposal for an entire color scheme, landscaping, and deck option, seconded by **Mr. Mohr**, the motion passed 7-0.

(If the applicant chooses to go back to the way it was, then at the least the applicant must repaint the building white, and submit a landscape plan to replace the shrubbery that was removed).

The BAR took a five minute break.

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-08-03

427 Park Street

Tax Parcel 530023000

Price-Poore House, LLC, Owner/ Jay Knipp, Ilex

Construction, Applicant

Partial demolition, new rear addition, parking lot

This property is being rehabilitated for office use.

Staff gave a report that listed the following items that require BAR review:

1. Demolition of rear screen porch;
2. New two-story rear addition;
3. New window opening in existing building on basement north side;
4. Site clearing and grading to construct new rear parking lot with alley access;
5. Install operable shutters on front;
6. Paint colors: Black forest green roof and shutters; Black front door; Lancaster white trim; Coastal fog addition siding.

The new addition will have brick pilasters and base; painted Hardiplank siding with 5" exposure; Marvin clad casement windows with SDL's and Azek casing; Azek pilasters above brick pilasters; Azek cornice with copper gutters; membrane roofing. There will be a new outside stair (unspecified material) on the north side of the addition.

The new parking lot will have 13 spaces with permeable pavers (Eagle Bay Aqua-Bric). Many large trees will be removed, and replaced with 16 American boxwood; 12 English boxwood; and 2 sweet gum.

The new window opening should be discussed. The BAR may want to hear more about the window restoration and brick re-pointing. The material/color of the proposed new exterior stair should be specified.

The parking lot requires a site plan review in addition to BAR review. The BAR should comment on the proposed landscaping, particularly the one new sweet gum in the front yard.

Mr. Schwarz asked Meghan Murray, one of the owners of the property if she was required to have this many parking spaces.

She said no, but there are 15 offices in the building and there are only 13 spaces leaving them two (2) spaces short.

Ms. Knott noted that this lot is possibly the last green space in this block. She asked the applicant to consider getting a landscape architect involved to look at the planting plan.

The BAR in general liked the plan to restore the house, and the building addition, but thought the parking lot needed revisions. They wanted to hear what VDHR would accept as part of the tax credit package.

Ms. Murray requested deferral.

Mr. Osteen move to accept the request for a deferral. The BAR encouraged the applicant to provide less parking, save more trees, and narrow the entrance to parking. They suggested a native ornamental tree for the front yard, seconded by **Mr. Sarafin**, motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Osteen said they need to confirm the tree canopy. The applicant said a Silver Maple in the front yard would be replaced. Ms. Knott said a sweet gum is not appropriate. She suggested a redbud, or other ornamental.

12. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-08-05
409 East High Street
Tax Parcel 530033000
County of Albemarle, Virginia, Owner
Old Jail Fencing

Staff presented the report. This applicant is seeking approval for the installation on an 8' tall security fence along a 40' section of wall on the east side of the facility. The County's intention is to keep the fence in place while corrective options are developed and repairs are completed.

A recently completed engineering study has indicated a potential safety issue posed by falling brick. The purpose of the fence is to keep pedestrians approximately 3' from the wall.

The County is proposing to install an Amopanel welded wire fence. The proposed color is "Charlie Brown" and the fence is similar in appearance to the fence installed behind the City's Circuit Court building.

A structural report with recommendations regarding the wall was received in 2006. It is not known if those stabilization measures were ever accomplished by the County. Staff has not received the recent engineering study referenced by the applicant. However, the applicant has said that the proposed fence has been recommended by structural engineers for the public's safety.

While the fence may keep the public safe from falling brick, and the wall safe from vandalism, the larger issue that needs to be addressed is the structural integrity of the entire wall.

The proposed fence material was recommended by staff, rather than the applicant's earlier proposal to use chain link. A similar gridded wire fence material was successfully used by the City for a nearby installation behind the

City Circuit Court building.

Michael Freitas represented the applicant. He said he would send a copy of the recent structural report.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, **Mr. Osteen** moved to find that the proposed fence satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the historic district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, seconded **Mr. Schwarz**, motion passed 6-1.

13. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-08-04

1600 Grady Avenue

Tax Map 5 Parcel 110

Preston Court Limited Partnership, Applicant/ Lynn Hall
Ward, Owner

Remove 2 trees

Staff presented the report. In November 2013, the applicant requested to remove six trees: three Southern magnolias, two remaining tulip poplars, and one ash, in order to correct an ongoing problem of water infiltration into the basement units of the Preston Court Apartments building. The tulip poplars and ash face Grady Avenue; one Southern magnolia faces the east side of Preston Place and two Southern magnolias face the west side of Preston Place.

The plan was to remove the trees, then re-grade the site to provide positive drainage away from the building toward the street.

The applicant also wanted to replant trees to look like a Makielski drawing that showed fastigate trees along the frontage; and to add a low fence.

At this point, the applicant wants approval to remove only two trees: the ash and one Southern magnolia (#2 and #3 on the attached plan).

Staff noted that the Neighborhood Planner, Ebony Walden, said a grading plan and landscape plan are needed showing the proposed grading, the sizes and species of the trees to be removed, and the sizes and species of the trees proposed to replace them. Because this property is zoned R-3, tree canopy and other site plan landscaping requirements must be met.

Staff noted that the City's Civil Engineer, Marty Silman, said if the land disturbance is under 6,000 SF, then a full blown site plan is not required by him, but if they are going to tie any kind of a pipe system into the City's system in the street, then he would require that they send a sketch and description of what they are doing

At this point, there seems to be an impasse. The property owner is unwilling to have a grading/drainage plan prepared. Even if the BAR was willing to approve removal of the two trees, the R-3 zoning requires certain plans to be approved before tree removal and grading may occur.

Staff suggests that the BAR vote either yes or no on the two trees, and allow the application to move to the next step in the process. If yes, then staff will inform the Neighborhood Planner that the applicant may apply for a site plan amendment. If no, the applicant can appeal to City Council.

Barbara Lucas said they have decided to reduce their involvement in removing the two trees. She said the ash has severely damaged the sewer pipe.

Ms. Miller said she cannot support this until the BAR receives a plan from the applicant regarding what is happening next after the removal of the two trees.

Ms. Knott agrees with Ms. Miller that this plan has been asked for several times and having the plan is the BAR requirement.

The majority of the BAR stated they cannot support this application.

Mr. Schwarz asked the applicant did she have a plan or has she considered having a plan to have the trees removed.

Ms. Lucas said she does not have a plan.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, **Ms. Miller** moved to find that the proposed removal of two trees (ash and Southern magnolia) does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties (did not submit the requested grading and landscape plan) in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, seconded by **Ms. Knott**, that the BAR denies the application as submitted (7-0).

15. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-08-09
123 Chancellor Street
Tax Parcel 09014000
Lambda Gamma of Chi Omega House, Owner/ Rouzer,
Applicant
Partial Demolition and new porch addition

Staff presented the report.

- The applicant is requesting demolition of the rear garage, one of two chimneys; and the rear stairs.

- They plan to repair the existing slate roof.
- They plan to add two new porches with stairs in the rear and side rear; and to replace the secondary front entrance and transom located on the front porch with a window. There is no other planned window replacement. However, no plans have been submitted for these improvements, so they will have to come back for approval.

The BAR should decide if the rear garage, rear stair, and chimney may be removed.

The applicant should return to the BAR with actual drawings for the two proposed new rear porches, and the specifications for the new window.

Ms. Knott asked why the applicant wants to remove the chimney.

Mr. Rouzer said there is no functioning fire place and chimney and the roof needs to be repaired so the question is whether the BAR feels the need to keep the chimney since it's falling over anyhow.

Mr. Schwarz said he would accept demolition of the chimney.

Ms. Knott said is the chimney an original feature of the building and she thinks the chimney should stay since it is a contributing architectural feature. She said she would not support the demolition of the chimney.

The BAR consensus is to keep the chimney.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, **Mr. Sarafin** moved to find that the proposed demolitions of the rear garage, and rear stair, satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application accepting the repair to the chimney and not to demolition, seconded by **Ms. DeLoach**, motion passed 7-0.

16. Preliminary Discussion
BAR 14-08-11
811-817 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 320148000
Hi-Starr Ltd. Partnership, Owner/ John Matthews, Applicant
Addition within air rights

Staff presented the report. The applicant is requesting a preliminary discussion of a proposed addition to 817 West Main Street. The proposed building would house a restaurant with outdoor terraces on two floors, with a covered rooftop

terrace at the third floor. Two design options are presented. The building will occupy an “air right” property.

The applicant is requesting a preliminary discussion. No motion is needed.

Discussion only – the BAR consensus was generally in support of the proposed addition, either option. They liked that the addition was set back to expose the historic building, and that the design related well to the Drewery Brown bridge.

17. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 14-07-03
503, 501, 425, and 421 W Main Street
Tax parcels 320175000, 320176000, 320177000, and
320178000
The Sutton Group, LLC, and Andrew Levine, Owners/
Southern Cities Studio, Agent, Applicant
New mixed-use complex

Staff presented the report. The applicant has had two preliminary discussions, and is now requesting approval of massing.

Demolition of two contributing buildings, a small barber shop at the rear of 425 W Main Street, and the Atlantic Futon buildings at 421 W Main Street will require BAR approvals.

Since the last review, a pedestrian walkway has been created between the historic building at 503 West Main Street and 505 West Main Street (Eloise), which is important. Also, commercial storefronts have been created along Commerce Street. It would be nice to be able to see Jefferson School from West Main Street looking through this site.

Mark Kestner, representing Bill Atwood, said they are asking for preliminary massing approval, which would give them license to design the elements of the building.

- Schaffer Sommers had many questions concerning the additional parking that has been added to this new proposal.
- Tomas Rahal had concerns regarding the traffic on Commerce Street.
- Liana Arias spoke on the concerns from the neighborhood regarding their quality of life after having this massive building.
- Mr. Kavit asked Mr. Kestner had he attended any of the West Main Street plan meetings and asked Mr. Kestner if he's aware of any of those plans.

- [Owner of Orzo] stated he is in favor of the project, which will bring people downtown to shop, dine and walk on West Main Street. He said this new building is good for his business, as well with the 100 parking spaces, which will bring additional revenue for the neighborhood.

Mr. Mohr finds the massing to be problematic.

Mr. Osteen said he didn't see any of the past ideas incorporated in this application at all. A massing study would help him to agree with it, but as of now it has not been convincing. He said there are levels of parking projecting out beyond the residential mass, which are totally inappropriate. He also said he sees no attempt to address demolition of the two buildings and what they are now.

He reminded them of the historical presence of the two houses and why they don't deserve to be demolished. Mr. Osteen feels that previously he spoke about incorporating the two structures and if this had been considered maybe he could have supported some of the massing.

Mr. Sarafin said the buildings should be broken-up into the street, and the scale where the building meets the street could be a good guideline for Commerce Street.

He said, like individual structures, like pieces with urban stairs with a street thru it.

Ms. DeLoach said this application is not being sensitive to the neighborhood or the historic buildings.

Mr. Sarafin move to accept the applicant's request for deferral, seconded by **Mr. Mohr**, motion passed 7-0.

F. Other Business

18. Opportunity to Comment
Fry's Spring Historic District - Nomination Report for Virginia Landmarks Register and National Register of Historic Places Register and National Register of Historic Places

Staff presented the report. As a Certified Local Government (CLG), the BAR was being asked to comment on the proposed nomination.

Alex Hancock, a resident of Fry's Spring neighborhood, said the map that came out in 2010 did not include his property. He said he has no interest in being a part of a historic district. He said he does not want a historic district overlay for his property because he doesn't need any more restrictions or hassles to change the paint color on his house or to cut down a tree

Ms. Miller commented to Mr. Hancock this is for National Register of Historic Places and would give him zero hassle.

Ms. Miller moved to find that the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review recommends the Fry's Spring historic district as proposed for listing on the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Seconded by **Mr. Osteen**, motion passed 7-0.

19. PLACE Task Force update
Mr. Mohr encouraged everyone to attend the ongoing West Main Street meetings. West Main Street continues to be a challenge. The PLACE committee, at their most recent meeting, also discussed how to organize the annual report.

Mr. Sarafin reminded everyone of the upcoming Preservation Virginia annual conference October 26-28, with review board training.

Mr. Schwarz noted that he had talked with Susan Elliott with Cville Solarize project.

G. Adjournment – 11:35 p.m.