

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
December 16, 2014
City Council Chambers-City Hall**

Members Present:

Melanie Miller - Chairperson
Tim Mohr – Vice Chairperson
Carl Schwarz
Candace DeLoach
Justin Sarafin
Laura Knott
Whit Graves
Kurt Keesecker

Absent

Brian Hogg

Staff Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Melanie Miller called the meeting to order at 5:30.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes)

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes November 18, 2014

Motioned by Mr. Sarafin, seconded by Ms. Knott, minutes passed 8-0, with two edits from Ms. Knott.

C. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)

BAR 14-12-01

525 Grove Avenue

Tax Parcel 540013000

Deborah Lawrence and Clement Tingley, Owner/Clement Tingley, Applicant

Two story addition to the left side of the property

Ms. Miller recused herself.

The applicant is requesting approval for a 10 ft. x 21 ft. two-story addition in the south side yard of the existing house. The new addition does not exceed the height of the existing house. The siding material will be Hardiplank or equal painted white to match the porch.

The foundation will be masonry, textured to simulate stone and match as much as possible the cast stone of the main dwelling. It will be painted orange to match the main dwelling.

Gutters will be half-round to match existing. The roof is a hip form of standing seam metal to match existing. The proposed addition requires BAR review under the conservation district ordinance because it is located wholly or partially to the side or front of an existing building.

In staff opinion, the proposal is a simple, attractive addition that meets the guidelines. One suggestion would be not to paint the proposed new foundation the same color as the main house so that the new work is differentiated from the old. Leaving it unpainted masonry would prevent detracting attention from the distinctive material of the main house.

Mr. Tingley said he was concerned about what it would look like if the foundation wall did not match the main house. He wants something better than a smooth cinderblock. The same color with minimal surface.

Mr. Sarafin said he did not think the applicant would try to replicate the pattern of the house, but could paint the same color. Smoother is preferable.

Mr. Mohr said go with a smoother surface, you have to put a sealer to keep moisture out, keep the color in the same family.

Mr. Keesecker said look at prairie stone. It lays up like a brick but is more like a veneer.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions in Conservation Districts, Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed new addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modification: the texture on the foundation will be visibly different from that of the main house. The BAR also made a suggestion to try to align the window heads or sills of the addition with those on the main house, seconded by Mr. Keesecker; motion passes 7-0-1 with Ms. Miller recused.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Taken out of order)

BAR 14-12-03

900 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 100078000 and 100073000

Midtown, LLC, Owner/Hampton Inn & Suites, Applicant

Patio re-model

The applicant proposes to improve a rear patio area as follows:

- The existing concrete patio will be replaced with pervious brick pavers.
- The existing wood screening fence around the emergency generator will be replaced with a brick screening enclosure.
- The patio space will be defined with new brick columns and walls.
- A new painted; fiberglass pergola will be constructed to screen the view of the generator from above, and will extend over a patio seating area. The pergola and the generator access doors will be painted a brick color.
- An enclosed gas fire apparatus will be installed within the seating area. A small metal roof to match existing will be added over existing laundry vent enclosure.
- Light fixtures to match existing will be added to the patio area.

The proposed patio changes are appropriate.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending and Cafes, I move to find that the proposed patio

changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application 8-0 as submitted.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-12-06
514 Valley Road
Tax Parcel 110077000
Development Management Too, LLC, Owner/ Lane Bonner, Applicant
Raise rear dormer and chimney

The applicant proposes to increase the ceiling height in the upstairs bedrooms by raising the rear dormer by two feet. The stone chimney will also be raised in height by two feet with a stucco extension. The front dormer will be replaced/moved to the right with new windows added. The materials will match existing.

Raising a dormer above the roof is an odd design, but this house has already been heavily altered. The existing chimney is the nicest feature, and the proposed extension is appropriately designed. Staff has no suggestions.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, Ms. Miller move to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst Circle/Gildersleeve Wood ADC District, and that the BAR request a final drawing to be circulated (with revisions suggested at meeting, such as widen the roofline of the shed dormer) to the BAR by staff for final BAR approval, seconded by, Mr. Mohr motion passes 8-0.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-12-04
1329 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 100007000
University Mews Bank Associated LP, Owner/Garrett Rouzer, Applicant
Renovation of existing storefront

The proposal is to alter the west side storefront of the duplex. It appears the applicant proposes to remove the west corner of the building, replace it with an unknown material, move the storefront forward, and replace the metal storefront with wood. More clarification is needed. The BAR may wish to have a preliminary discussion, and if the proposed changes are reasonable, then ask the applicant to request deferral to submit better drawings.

The survey notes that each storefront is framed with a massive aluminum architrave, and has a wide recessed entrance loggia.

Mr. Schwarz asked if it was a clear finish.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, Mr. Graves moved to find that the proposed storefront changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this contributing property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with bronze metal storefronts and door opening designed to building code, seconded by Ms. Knott motion passes 8-0.

E. Other Business (Taken out of order)

Awaiting the next applicants, the BAR had Tim Mohr give his update on the PLACE task force. The BAR had questions about the Chancellor Street/ RR fencing at the Corner.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Preliminary Discussion)

BAR 14-12-02

1000 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 100068000 and 100070000

University Station, LLC, Owner/Campus Acquisitions Holdings, LLC,

Applicant, Dan Hrankowsky; Erin Hannegan

New Construction; Mixed-Use Residential

The BAR should have a preliminary discussion at this stage, or may decide to approve the massing and general site layout, with specific details to come back to the BAR for final approval.

The L-shaped building has been reduced in height to a total of 66 feet above West Main Street with six stories. The number of residences has been decreased from 246 units with a total of 644 bedrooms to 128 units with a maximum of 365 bedrooms.

The amount of parking spaces has also been lowered to 134. A rooftop pool has been moved to the lobby level.

The proposed building has 2 levels of underground parking accessed from Roosevelt Brown Blvd; and a ground floor with retail, lobby and parking accessed from 11th St SW. There are now 5 levels of residential, and a rooftop level with mechanical units.

The Roosevelt Brown Boulevard frontage has the garage entrance shifted further north toward Main Street. It still has a community room, retail space and bike storage. The pool has been moved to the lobby level.

Dan Hrankowsky, representing the property owner, introduced the project.

Ms. Erin Hannegan gave a brief description of the site context.

Mr. Scott Erdy, architect, representing the applicant, made a presentation about recent changes to the design not included in the BAR packet.

Ms. Knott asked for clarification on the use of materials. The applicant responded that one level had gray wrap masonry back – integrating it around the corner and the massing is the same.

Ms. Miller asked how students would access the site. The applicant responded, whether you create a path or not, it naturally sets up goes toward 11th street and the short cut will be taken.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the relationship between the glass on the façade and the Patton Mansion, which seemed related.

The applicant said he would like to get the scale up and figure out a way to have more glass.

Mr. Mohr said the original scheme was higher.

Ms. Deloach does not like the red brick on modern building.

Ms. Miller asked if the first floor height is the same. The applicant said, two feet shorter; right about 15 feet.

Mr. Keesecker stated the site wall comes at an angle and comes across at some height. Does the wall allow the building to be accessed from that important intersection, or does a person have to make a choice to go up or down? The applicant suggested a break for steps to allow access to resolve the issue.

Mr. Keesecker also has a concern about the brick – changing to brick façade from Roosevelt Brown to West Main. Also look at the depth to the window- need shadow line, otherwise a flat facade. The applicant said they will use color and light to break it up.

Mr. Keesecker also recalled the animation of the (dubiously) natural area wedged between the tracks and the building – was there some seating required under the special use permit? The applicant said they will look at it.

Mr. Schwarz asked is there a threshold where Council needs to review it again. Staff said it should meet all special use permit conditions.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the parking area the entrance being so close to the corner of West Main- sight lines and steepness are concerns. The applicant said the curb cut is existing. John Matthews said they were involved with a previous hotel design. VDOT asked them to put corner cut, curb cut were approved 19-20 years ago.

Mr. Keesecker pointed out it is a City street now; VDOT will not review. He liked the old garage entrance scheme.

John Matthews said it would be a challenge to move garage further down Roosevelt Brown.

Mr. Erdy will look at it.

Public Comments

Kevin Fox, 195 Lankford Place, Administrator for the University Medical Center, is speaking on their behalf with concerns regarding adjacent Core Lab building. Still have three concerns: traffic flow on 11th street during construction; vibration due to construction – sensitive diagnostic equipment; and air flow in and around Core Lab.

BAR Comments

Mr. Mohr – front of the building and relationship to West Main Street had more integrity before.

Mr. Schwarz suggested a benefit of the garage entrance/ retail space location is that West Main activity extends down the street at night. It will be nice to have more activity down Roosevelt Brown as a potential positive.

Mr. Hrankowsky - The further from West Main Street, the less viable.

Mr. Schwarz is happy the way it is; Mr. Keesecker would prefer that the entrance is moved.

Mr. Mohr said one time they thought about having a grocery store. The applicant said it would be a smaller market scale.

Mr. Sarafin said the solution moving the entrance from the awkward spot adjacent to the railroad bridge, folding vegetation over, grounds it and thinks it is a good improvement.

Ms. Knott said she like the new transition is a very sleek view, it is maintenance free.

Mr. Keesecker said the work that you've done on Roosevelt Brown, however it ends up, is going to be one of those streets that we're going to be able to take people to show that we're moving towards a pretty cool vision for Charlottesville.

Ms. Miller asked if the terra cotta the same as the brick.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Mr. Sarafin move to find that the proposed new building satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the massing and general site layout only, with the details and next version of drawings to come back to the BAR for final approval. Seconded by Ms. Knott motion passes 8-0.

D. Deferred or Previously Considered Items

- 7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Final Details)**
BAR 14-07-03

501 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 320175000, 320176000, 320177000, and 320178000
The Sutton Group LLC and Andrew Levine, Owner/ Bill Atwood/Southern Cities Studio,
Applicant
New mixed-use complex construction

The applicant is now requesting final approval of the mixed-use buildings.

Massing:

The western building (with public parking accessed from Main Street, residential units with private parking accessed from Commerce Street, and with commercial storefronts on Commerce Street) is 5 stories high from West Main Street; and 6 stories stepped back from Commerce Street. This building is setback about 6 feet from the [Eloise] building to the west, and is setback from the historic structures, 15 feet from 503 West Main Street; and about 20 feet from 501 West Main Street.

The eastern building (with office use and private parking accessed from Commerce Street, and with a commercial storefront on West Main Street) has the same number of stories, plus a 16 foot high appurtenance level that covers 2,981 sq. ft., or 25% of the roof area of 11,927 sq. ft.

The two buildings are divided by a 34'-5" wide space with 20 ft. wide access way from Main Street for cars and 8 ft. walkway for pedestrians. A landscaped walkway continues through the site to a stairs leading to Commerce Street. Additional landscaping is shown around the two historic structures that will remain.

Two levels of private parking are accessed from Commerce Street. A smaller, public parking plaza is accessed from West Main Street level.

The massing has been approved. The applicant is requesting final approval of the design: the materials, articulation, windows and doors, wall sections, and general site/landscape plan. Because this is new construction, the BAR will also eventually review the signage.

The following items are needed:

Actual material/color samples board (will be brought to BAR meeting);

A more detailed site/landscape plan and lighting plan (both will be submitted with the site plan).

Mr. Atwood seeks a discussion on the materials at this meeting. Mr. Atwood would like to have BAR discussion at the next meeting. He is intending to support workforce housing. We will have public parking. He said they will be managing parking with several spaces for the public.

Questions from the Public

Andrea Douglas Director of the Jefferson School African American Heritage Center, said the project feels West Main-centric. Wonder about the articulation of storefronts on Commerce as related to articulation on West Main and wonder about centrality of building and if it deserves a greater balance?

Mr. Atwood said Commerce Street needs to be protected to minimize movement. We have a traffic study and when finished we will appear with the traffic study. The shift to housing greatly reduces the number of trips per day. Commerce Street is slower in scale than West Main.

Ms. Douglas said her question was not about traffic. They are interested in making Commerce Street attractive to foot traffic. Asking about the weight you place on Commerce Street streetscape relative to West Main Street.

Questions from the BAR

Mr Schwarz asked about a canopy on the West Main building.

Mr. Keesecker asked if the shading fins are aluminum. The applicant said yes, in two colors, charcoal and bone.

Ms. Knott wanted to clarify , she said the site plan does show a streetscape on Commerce equivalent to West Main. This needs to be carried over to other drawings. She wants to know is it in progress.

Mr. Atwood said we need to handle more foot traffic on that street .He agree the streetscape needs to be worked on. He said we have not finished the public space yet and that will make a different.

Ms. Miller confirmed there are four storefronts on Commerce.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the depth of the retail spaces.

The applicant said, no more than twenty feet.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the number of parking spaces and orientation of the stairs.

Ms Miller asked about the number of cars coming out on Commerce Street. She said the site plan and landscape plan don't match. She asked if the retail spaces would have a bathroom.

Mr. Sarafin at what point will they actual see a more detail streetscape on Commerce Street.

Mr. Atwood said they are moving back the priority to colors, metals, soft colors.

In the end the outside treatment is a BAR issue.

Mr. Keesecker said what about the east façade that faces the telephone building. The applicant said the façade is on the property line. They have developed a window is normal window and it has to be minimized.

Mr. Keesecker asked if the stucco was real. The applicant said it would be 3 coats of stucco.

Ms. Knott asked about the windows indentations.

The applicant said they don't want windows there – it is reflecting the Morse code of the building itself.

Ms DeLoach asked about the windowless areas on the front.

Public Comments

Brad Worrell 216 6th street,

1. Related to the commerce streetscape-posing a challenge, even with the two-toning of the brick – echoes the Sprint building down the street. Looks like the back side of the building.
2. The egress onto Commerce street and offer for us to see the traffic study, had discussed all ingress off West Main Street and this is a major concern for us.
3. People do drive, in a neighborhood with 26 single family residences, 6 duplexes, 4 businesses and one church. There is ample traffic and this will double this. The neighborhood people are concern that this is a problem for us.

Andrea Douglas Not sure response to vernacular on Commerce Street is appropriate. Interest is the kind of treatment on West Main causes a more interesting and active walk space. Concerned about perforations in the buildings. Nothing in the design convinces me this will be a safe zone. Need same detailing one sees on West Main Street. Keep equal weight on West Main Street and Commerce Street with central axis. How do we activate Commerce Street? There is a lot of opportunity. We need to cause the design to articulate an equal balance on north and south sides. Buildings to the west are articulated much better.

Ms. DeLoach thinks the applicant has put as much thought to the Commerce side as to the West Main Street side.

Liana Arias – Residents did not want a garage opening facing 5th Street. Thinks Andrea is right; it could be more appealing. Need more walkway room. Make people feel welcoming and warm.

Charles Taylor - a county resident, in favor of variety and believe his design is suitable and appropriate for the spaces involved.

BAR Comments

Some BAR members echoed Ms. Douglas concerns, and other were critical over the materials being used, and Atwood agreed to submit new drawings. They were asked to approve the materials and design for the project, but Atwood deferred when it appeared the BAR would not grant approval. The project's scope has changed and will now feature residences where office space had been envisioned.

Mr. Sarafin West Main buildings currently turn their back on Commerce Street. He argues that they all need to thought through and elevated, but main point is talking about hierarchy in materials. Concern about treatment of Commerce Street.

Mr. Schwarz - His mental image of Commerce Street is not that inviting, but it could be. It lacks life, like what's there. Maybe widen storefront windows. Also, the materials need to be re-visited. A lot going on. Would expect a certain richness but all divided up - it is a collage of very different things that do not relate to each other. That could help break down the size of the building, but not well executed. He feels like you are using a post-modern ideal that is inappropriate for this location.

Mr. Sarafin said the project has made great strides, we approved the massing. That was relatively successful, but maybe needs to be more unified. You have wonderful glass and steel section, maybe scale is correct on Commerce, need to elevate the materials on Commerce and unify a bit.

Mr. Mohr asked if the stair could be pushed back to create a lower courtyard space.

Mr Sarafin – you are underestimating the value of the Jefferson School. A courtyard would activate Commerce Street and make it available to West Main.

Ms. Knott said what is missing in the process in developing the West Main design, it passes through a number of communities and does not recognize those communities. Go directly across to Jefferson School using the stairs. She said the thing disturbing her is the articulation of the store front plans: the disconnect between the glass and steel building, and the faux 19th C commercial buildings on commerce Street. Need more honest use of materials. Copings are weird. Get away from automatic response to context.

Mr. Graves disagrees. He said the West Main is one commercial building, there is not a lot of contact on West Main, and the structure is identical. We are only talking about the 3 store fronts.

Mr. Mohr made suggestions about simplifying the gray zones on the east and west facades.

Mr. Keesecker after parking counts determined, concerned about views of retail spaces from west on Commerce. Consider making retail spaces deeper. No one necessarily wants more parking at expense of retail on Commerce. Share concerns on east facade- too much going on.

Ms. DeLoach said she would like to see the palette quieted down. The Commerce Street side needs some attention to details. The windows need to be aligned with the doors. She said there's too much going on, too many different materials and too many different colors.

Mr. Schwarz around the stucco frames wonder if it could stronger if there were all two levels of store front.

Mr. Sarafin the intent to warm it up on the Commerce side, urge you not to be restrained on a more traditional material.

Ms. Miller there is a parking garage on the West Main Street side.

Mr. Atwood said he struggled with Commerce. It is still the back and he made a pretty good effort. Architect by nature, tied down so anchor line and go with it. There have been a lot of things happening. He is saying we now need to get there with these conversations. He didn't come for final.

Mr. Atwood request a deferral.

Mr. Schwarz motioned to approve his deferral seconded by Mr. Sarafin.

The BAR had a discussion of the current design. They wanted to see more details on the landscape plans; made suggestions to reduce the number of materials and colors; make the design more unified; address the fenestration (add more glass) on the east side of the building – do not like the “fake” windows” nor the stucco frame around 6 openings; a suggestion to eliminate the different materiality (gray zones) on the center part of both the east and west sides of the office building; make the Commerce Street storefront more current, widen the storefront windows, do not like the dated details; there is disconnect between glass /steel buildings and faux 19th c. storefronts below; the project massing is relatively successful and scale is correct on Commerce Street but needs to be unified; suggested creating a small courtyard space in front of small storefront to east of stairs on Commerce; need a greater response to Jefferson School; in general the materials are fine, brick brings warmth, but simplify them; there was concern that there is not enough depth and square footage in commercial spaces on Commerce Street; design project so that most of parking accesses W Main Street.

The BAR accepted (8-0) the applicant's request for deferral to revise the drawings.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-12-05

100 East Water Street

Tax Parcel 280062000

CPC Inc., Owner/Skyview Parking LLC, Applicant

Install two pay stations plus shelters; re-stripe parking to accommodate

City Market (temporary location)

The applicant is seeking approval to install two pay stations (the same as approved by the BAR for the lot at First and Market); and to re-stripe the parking lot to accommodate the City Market. A new 24-foot wide, two-way vehicular entrance will be added on South Street.

Keith Woodard said the purpose is to re-stripe the parking lot to accommodate the City Market for 3 years, with a few specific needs such as electric, a second entrance, and to change the diagonal parking spaces to perpendicular spaces. This will allow us to use the lot for a staging area when we start on the Market Plaza. This also requires a special use permit. He said they are proposing to add an additional entrance on South Street.

Mr. Mohr said in the long term it would be better to have the entrance coming off parking garage and not the corner because it complicates the corner.

Mr. Woodard agreed with Mr. Mohr that's where it should be and the next plan will have that.

Mr. Schwarz asked the age of the structure on 1st and Market parking lot.

Mr. Woodard said about 5 years.

Ms. Deloach how do you plan on using this for construction holdings if you are going to be using it also as a City Market.

Mr. Woodard said the current amount of space the city market is 75% of what this parking lot is and it is 39 feet on the western side which would become a staging area.

Ms. Knott said the western aisle and parking spaces.

Mr. Woodard confirmed.

Ms. Miller said on the 1st Street side.

Ms. DeLoach asked how it will work if you are entering where the holding area will be.

Mr. Woodard said that entrance will be used for the staging area during the construction and that point we would only have one entrance but we would try to stage it so the second entrance could also be used by the market and the construction.

Public Comments

Joan Motay said she is a vendor at the City Market. She said she was not aware of this design that had been chosen until this afternoon. She asked if this parking lot the existing parking lot or the parking lot that is going to be used while the plaza is being constructed.

Mr. Mohr said it might be nice to make the kiosk out of steel tube columns and a very simple canopy with less detail, longer life span and easier to maintain.

Mr. Schwarz said the one on Market looks like it's made out of wood and looks pretty bad.

Mr. Woodard said the maintenance has been neglected on that but he does think 3-5 years. He said there's a lot of merits to having them all look the same.

Ms. Knott said she is fine with the whole thing. It's not a permanent structure and the layout will probably see change again eventually and having the two entrances is really nice.

Mr. Woodard stated that having a second entrance will relieve some of the pressure on Water's Street.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, Mr. Keesecker move to find that the proposed improvements to the 100 E Market Street parking lot satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with a recommendation to the Planning Commission that an entrance on 2nd Street SE (opposite the Water Street parking garage entrance) be considered in lieu of the existing entrance on Water Street, seconded by Mr. Graves, motion passes 8-0.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Massing and scale)

BAR 14-09-01

200 2nd Street SW

Tax Parcel 280069000, 280071000-280075000

Market Plaza LLC, Owner/ Powe Studio Architects, Applicant

New Urban Mixed-Use Development

The BAR is being asked to review the latest plan, based on the SUP with conditions approved by Council on December 1. The applicant is asking for approval of massing and general site layout, with final details to come back to BAR at a later date.

The applicant has focused on seven areas of further study, pp. 5- 23:

- First Street - Stairway retained; water feature removed; elevator moved to the side.
- Building base – Changed to one brick color and more consistent design.
- Building corners – Glass corner at Water/2nd Streets retained; balconies have been pulled back.
- Residential terraces (South Street) – metal spine removed and interior volumes added.
- Second Street/plaza connection – A third entrance has been added on 2nd Street to serve the event space.
- Plaza character- Tents, trees and water feature will be in place on non-market days; smaller tents added on market days.

- Curtain wall alternative – brick grid façade added on plaza side.

The BAR should consider the recent changes to the overall building and site design. The BAR should discuss and determine whether the proposed design meets the ADC district standards and guidelines, and whether it is consistent with the character of the Downtown ADC historic district. The BAR may recommend design changes, but should adhere to the SUP conditions of approval if possible.

Page 7 of the approved conditions list specific items for the BAR's consideration. The BAR should address them all. It appears that the vertical piers along South Street have been replaced with a seating wall.

Ms. Scala stated those conditions are important because the design should abide by them. She said one of the conditions is that at least three entrances or openings to the building should be on Water Street, Second Street Southwest and South Street.

Mr. Keesecker said he thought the intent of the Planning Commission was to have South Street and Second Street appear on market days to be as porous as possible to replicate the conditions of the current market. Another condition was that trees be included on the public plaza, but that was not supported by the BAR.

Ms. Knott added the trees won't grow much and they won't look right on the parking structure. She said trying to force the trees is not going to be good for anyone in the long run.

Ms. Knott said she thinks First Street should remain open. She said she is not convinced that the First Street design reinforces the historic layout of a street that has been in that place in Charlottesville since 1763.

Mr. Powe said the First Street sidewalk would be a simple concrete one because he and Mr. Woodward might one day develop the CPC lot.

Mr. Powe said depending on the timing of a potential phase two, that may never be built, but It's quite possible we might start a second phase as soon as we get the market operational.

BAR members said they wanted more information about how the market would operate and whether the existing vendors are on board.

Public Comments

Joan Motay said she is a vendor at the City Market. She said she was not aware of this design that had been chosen until this afternoon. She said it seems to her as far as fitting in with the historic district and the buildings, this building sticks out like a sore thumb and she is wondering what are people are thinking. She was wondering why you want a glass and steel building right in the middle of a historic district. She asked why nine stories get approved. It seems very incongruous with what's already there. She understands that it is a very valuable piece of property and everybody wants to make the best use of it. She said the design seems so modern and so out of place. She said the cream colored brick seems to soften the steel on the glass but still I was shocked when I saw this design.

Mr. Powe said he will replace all 102 vendor stalls.

Ms. Motay asked where will vendors park their vehicles.

Mr. Powe said there are some parking spaces on the plaza or park for free in the garage and the city market folks are talking about operating a shuttle off the two side streets to bring you up to the plaza and we will be having a very detailed meeting with the city market folks.

Ms. Motay asked if the private parking lot going to be incorporated into the whole plan or just remain as it is.

Ms. Miller asked if the windows work and will there be air conditioning because on the hottest day of the summer you will want to be indoors.

Mr. Powe said one change made to the design is that storefronts will no longer be included on Second Street Southwest. Instead, there will be a mezzanine level. He said you can't make every street be a main street and you can't spread retail in this town to be fronting every single street. The main retail frontage is on Water Street. He said a block of First Street will close to vehicular traffic, and (Woodard and Powe) we have leased land owned by the Charlottesville Parking Center that will allow a wider passageway. People will climb a "grand staircase" to get to the plaza.

Ms. Miller said I don't care what it is as long as the users all think it works. She stated I would encourage anyone who is a vendor to get involved sooner rather than later. She asked how many vendor stalls will be available in the new structure as to what is available now.

The BAR members also told Mr. Powe that they want to see a slightly wider staircase, a detailed landscaping plan and other modifications.

Mr. Powe said they are hoping to break ground on the project sometime during 2015 and the pair said they plan to facilitate the market's move to a temporary home on the CPC lot. They also got design approval for two parking pay stations to accommodate the South Street entrance, as well as a new one onto South Street.

Mr. Woodard stated there is this period of transition for two or three years, and we've been able to get a long-term lease on the adjacent lot. He said they will add electricity on the site, an amenity not currently possible at the existing City Market.

Mr. Woodard said he wants to keep the existing entrance on Water Street, but BAR members encouraged him to move it to Second Street Southeast so it would face the entrance to the neighboring parking garage.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Mr. Mohr move to find that the proposed new building satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the massing and general site layout as submitted; and the applicant shall return to the BAR with further approval for the design details of the entrance and stair area, and including: a comprehensive signage plan, detailed landscape plan; "plaza layout" plan including site amenities and furnishings; window specifications; building and paving materials; wall sections; lighting; and location of mechanical units and trash areas; and the BAR unanimously supports the curtain wall on the plaza side of the building [rather than the brick grid]; therefore, the applicant should also look at eliminating the brick horizontal sections above the balconies in the upper levels on the Water and Second Street elevations; and the BAR does not support trees on the plaza, seconded Mr. Schwarz, 8-0.

F. Adjournment 11:55 p.m.