

City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
January 20, 2014  
Basement Conference Room - City Hall

Members Present:

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

Absent

Whit Graves

Staff Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Melanie Miller called the meeting to order at 5:35.

- A. Matters from the public not on the agenda
1. Mark Kavit 400 Altamont Street – he was concerned about the decision the Board made a few years ago when the City came before the BAR and wanted to redo some sidewalks, and some corner concrete that was on the edge of property. The property was on 100-102 High Street, and the board said the City had to maintain the same standards as a private individual would be required to do. The decision the Board made was that if the concrete was demolished it had to be replaced with the same type of materials had to try to match as best as possible. He wanted to remind the Board of the decision made a few years ago.
- B. Blighted property request for comments – 610 Ridge Street. The Chair asked for public comments, then moved the item to the end of the agenda.
- C. Consent Agenda
1. Minutes December 18, 2014  
Mr. Schwarz move to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Ms. Knott, minutes passed 7-0.
- D. New Items
2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-01-01  
418 5th Street SW  
Tax Parcel 290161000  
Arlene D Sweeney, Owner/ W Douglas Gilpin, Applicant  
Add front porch

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner, gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report on behalf of the BAR.

Douglas Gilpin represented the applicants.

The proposed renovations are appropriate.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, Mr. Mohr move to find that the proposed new front porch satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this individually protected property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Sarafin, motion passes 7-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-01-02  
120 W High Street  
Tax Parcel 330184000  
William Blodgett, Applicant/Christ Episcopal Church, Owner  
Demolish Concrete Curbing and Memorial Garden Site Work

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report on Demolish Concrete Curbing and Memorial Garden Site Work on behalf of the BAR.

William Blodgett from the Christ Episcopal Church presented the application. He said they are requesting a certificate of appropriateness for work that has already been completed, which includes demolishing the historic concrete curbing, taking down a large tree, and the construction of a memorial garden with surrounding landscaping and gravel path. He said they had a site plan review and approval with the City of Charlottesville in order to relieve drainage problems found on site. He said their request was to replace the concrete curbing with individual stone blocks. In addition they would like to add a gate and possible lighting to the memorial garden. He apologized for not knowing that he should make application to the BAR.

### Board Questions

Ms. Knott – asked where the gate design came from.

Mr. Blodgett answered saying we met with the families and they commented on it and gave the comments to the metal designer.

Ms. Knott - asked if the planting design was based on what was previously planted there and what was previously there?

Mr. Blodgett said a huge hydrangea was planted there.

Ms. Knott confirmed that the new design was not based on the historical plan.

Mr. Schwarz asked about the curbing.

Mr. Blodgett – stated it's pretty minimal; their intent was to take it to the corner and end at the corner.

Mr. Sarafin – looks like a recent repair to the corner. So you would end at that corner?

Ms. Miller asked if there was a complete drawing. Did you know you were in a historic district?

Mr. Blodgett said no, not until he talked with Mary Joy and looked at the website.

The civil engineer was not attuned to that; nor the landscape contractors.

Melanie - Did the site plan include removing the trees? Did NDS approve this?

Mr. Blodgett said yes they did.

Ms. Scala said her plan does not show the tree to be removed, nor the concrete curbing.

Ms. Miller said we are trying to determine how this came about.

Mr. Blodgett said Brian Haluska said to notify the city before you cut through the sidewalk.

Ms. Miller asked what sort of security is planned on the side of the memorial garden?

Mr. Blodgett answered they had already installed high tensile fence which will link up with the rear gate.

Mr. Schwarz asked about the plan for the front drain (junction).

Mr. Keesecker asked about the space behind the gate, how is it used as part of the memorial garden?

What would be the effect if the gate was moved back to the second pilaster?

Mr. Blodgett said it would be a transitional space.

Ms. Knott – asked about the memorial garden, if they are burying ashes?

Mr. Blodgett replied they had been burying ashes directly in the ground for years now. There is a brass plaque on the wall with names.

Mr. Keesecker asked staff if the quarter round curbing was a City design or private?

Ms. Knott thought it was a Victorian design.

Mr. Keesecker asked if the new stones were laid in mortar?

### Public Comments

Mark Kavit – commented that he stopped by the project and spoke with the foreman before the quarter rounds were demolished and made the foreman aware that this was a historic district. He then went into the church office and made them aware of the historic district. He feels that there was sufficient notice that this matter needed to come before the BAR and that this was a historic overlay district. He got the opinion from talking to people there that they didn't care.

Jim and Susan Neale – 100 West High Street he is speaking to the quarter round that was damaged, and removed, and replaced back with the stones before you. He said he approached this issue from an aesthetics point of view. He said the stones look a lot better. It's more in keeping with the exterior of Christ Church than the quarter round. We have quarter round in front of his house that is damaged and it detracts from his house and the work he's done. He thinks it's a great improvement.

### Closed the Public Comments

### Board Comments

Ms. Knott said she believes that you can reproduce quarter rounds and asked him to explore them more with other contractors. She said she would like to see an option other than the granite, which are more residential in character and not appropriate in this location. She also reminded him that she was not there to design his garden. She would like to see an exploration of other options that are not set in a dry mortar and that have a more permanent base. She said she wanted him to speak to other contractors about getting an extruded curve like that. She said she had mixed feelings about the planting plan. She said what you had there originally was very appropriate for a Gothic style Church, heavy evergreens and the two symmetrical Spruce were very appropriate. She said if you are going to change the appearance of the front of the church that you would change the other side to match. She said she would like to see an expansion of the planting design. She also noticed in the photograph of the existing garden there is an image of the base of the gate. She is not clear why one foundation of the gate is in the path and other is in a mulch bed.

Mr. Mohr agreed with Mr. Keesecker that the gate should be back at the other pilaster instead of the front. He said the church is in the romantic mold of a Gothic church with the big old shrubberies that used to be there, so he feels like the formalistic hedge and the pea gravel fights that and he would rather see the courtyard expressed as a new thing back at the courtyard, and have a general path and much more randomly or organically planted. He said it has that sinuous curve so clearly they were trying to play that path game when they did it. This seems antithetical. He said losing the curbing was unfortunate. The scale of the granite curving now is way too tiny and not appropriate to the church, the church is made out of nice, heavy stuff. The planting with the hard corner is most objectionable.

Mr. Sarafin questioned the durability of the as shown the granite curving if it's just dry laid, with things like shoveling and plowing snow, people picking one up and just tossing it, just wondering if there are practical concerns with how it is done right now.

Ms. Knott stated she would like to see some alternative to that on a heavier scale or some other kind of material.

Mr. Sarafin commented that the quarter round is a loss and if that can't be replaced then alternatives to the granite can be explored, but we would have to see the treatment for what other types of granite or block you would use, but to continue that treatment west, he doesn't think it would do good things for the overall landscape design. If we lose this west side curvilinear edge that forms part of the entrance to the church

but also the edge for the sidewalk and the edge for the sidewalk on Second. Admittedly there hardly any grade or elevation to the curbing on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. He stated it should be resolved on 2<sup>nd</sup> and not be left that way. He said in driving around before the meeting the quarter round or similar manifestations of it, whether older or newer, these really ring the blocks around north downtown and the church is sitting within the context of this block. The church is not fully, completely defining this corner on High and Second. This curbing that you find throughout North Downtown, it's buildings within a block context that unifies the entire North Downtown, and to treat the church and corner with something other, when the west side is still there, remains, hopefully it could be repaired, it's serviceable. He laments the loss of the east side; if other options should need to be explored then he agrees with Ms. Knott that a different scale of block, or a more resolved design to treat this whole corner. This is a major, very visible intersection in North Downtown.

Mr. Schwartz said he worked across the street when they took the tree down. He said it was shocking to see the tree come down. But he said he did not have concerns with the landscape plan. He thought it to be a vast improvement. He said maybe when it grows a little more it may alleviate some of the issues some of the other members have and maybe not and I am not a landscape architect but feels that it is a much neater, cleaner composition now. It is sad that High Street had a tree canopy at one point and in some sense the Spruce tree was contributing a large presence. He said now it seems like the hole is more gaping in the street canopy on the High Street with one of few that don't have power lines. He said he is always pushing street trees and had you presented this to us before the fact he would have insist that you replace the spruce you took down. He asked if the gate was transparent. He said he has no problem with the gate. He doesn't think it will be visible and he thinks when the greenery grows up some more it will be soften and become a very nice space. The curb is everywhere around North Downtown. It is really an historic fabric of High Street and all of North downtown. There are granite curbs but they don't look like this so he agrees with the rest of the Board on that. He said he finds it hard to believe that it can't be replaced. He said the email the applicant sent did not say it couldn't be replaced; your email said it would be expensive to replace it. He said he would like the applicant to replace the tree he took away. He said a Witch Hazel is not a tree, it is a shrub. You have a vacant street lawn.

Mr. Keesecker said he agreed with most of what has been said. He thinks the gate should be moved back. If this location is needed for the memorial garden, then he would need to understand better what the gate would look like from High Street; some visualization.

Ms. Miller said she finds it hard to believe that if they could make that curbing in the 1920's that it would be impossible now? So, it would be great to investigate. She said she would like to see a larger tree. The witch hazel has a mature height of 12-15 feet and she would like to see something more significant to the scale of the building than a small tree. She stated they needed to see a full plan of what you are seeking approval for, tensile fence, the gate with measurement, a drawing, if there is changes to the other side of the church and a whole detailed package of information.

Ms. Knott – said we have notes about lightning, is there lighting on the site?

Mr. Blodgett – said no we do not have lighting yet. He said he is working with a lighting distributor and he has identified a very small sensor that can be imbedded in a small piece of wood or trim. The next idea is to get some small LED technology to put under the eaves. There is no flat area before you get into stone to mount something. Now we are hunting for a small LED type fixture that could be controlled by a controller and this is not for ambiance; this is for security. These will only come on if someone comes in after dark. He also stated that the tree had to be removed because of the roots. He said everybody in the church said how wonderful it was to open up the yard. He said they did not want another large tree there because of the roots and they did not want a liability again. To put in another large tree would block the memorial garden entrance.

Ms. Miller outlined deferral options.

Mr. Mohr said he wanted the gate moved back.

Mr. Blodgett said the foundation for the gate cost \$15,000 and he did not want to move it.

Ms. Knott said to summarize, there are several points listed in the guidelines:

1. Encourage the maintenance and planting of large trees on private property along the street fronts, which contribute to the "avenue" effect.
2. Use trees and plants that are compatible with the existing plantings in the neighborhood.

3. Retain existing trees and plants that help define the character of the district, especially street trees and hedges.
4. Replace diseased or dead plants with like or similar species.
5. Discourage modular block wall systems or modular concrete block retaining walls are strongly discouraged, but may be appropriate in areas not visible from the public right-of-way.
6. Retain historic paving or curbing.
7. If something is destroyed, reuse parts to replace it if you can.

Ms. Miller – asked the applicant if he was requesting deferral.

Mr. Blodgett - requested a deferral.

Mr. Sarafin moved to accept the 3 months deferral, seconded by Mr. Mohr, motion passes 7-0.

#### **4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 15-01-04

1001 W Main Street

Tax Parcel 100050000

Mark Green, Owner/ Design Develop, LLC, Applicant

Exterior renovation including new window/door opening

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report.

She said the Applicant, Mark Green proposes to create a design that would unify the building, while giving a nod to its historic context. The goal is to provide functioning commercial, retail and service space for the growing surrounding context, while still allowing the historic aesthetic to be legible.

#### Questions from the Board

Mr. Schwarz asked if there will be any modification to the parking lot or touching the building.

The applicant said no.

Ms. Knott asked about why is it not a full window.

Mr. Green said there was a discussion with a potential tenant about having a kitchen in that area where they would not have the glass any lower and that plan changed so we would be able to lower that down.

Mr. Keesecker - will the reveal pattern on West Main Street be replicated or smoothed over?

Mr. Green -said those panels have been removed and will not be replicated.

#### Comments from Board

Mr. Schwarz - A vast improvement of the building and he doesn't see anything in the guidelines that should be changed. He said he feels it's somewhat a missed opportunity, looking at the other examples of service stations, this looks like a very expensive 7 Eleven. I think it is the full service parking lot.

Mr. Mohr – said the building is a great improvement and it looks great, putting in some plants would be nice.

Ms. Knott said the paving wraps around the corner, is it your plan to keep it all the way down there at the edge of the property.

Mr. Green said on the 10<sup>th</sup> street side? One of his tenants is discussing putting in some decking and potted plants. He said the tenant do have a desire to activate the streets more and provide more life. You will see subsequent applications from the tenants, at least for signage.

Members of the Board agreed that this is a great improvement, and simple solution to unify the three buildings.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and for Signs, Awnings, Vending and Cafes, Mr. Sarafin moved to find that the proposed exterior renovations 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 as submitted, seconded by Mr. Mohr motion passed 7-0.

## **Preliminary Discussion**

BAR 15-01-03  
313 E Main Street  
Tax Parcel 330229000  
Charles Kabbash, T/A 414 Associates, Owner/  
Joe Benny, Kilwin's of Charlottesville, LLC, Applicant  
Demolish and Reconstruct Storefront

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner stated this is a preliminary discussion. to decide if the applicant, Joe Benny of Kilwin's of Charlottesville, should be able to demolish the existing storefront of this contributing structure. The applicant wishes to reconstruct the storefront in order to allow for product production and display. The board must weigh whether the existing storefront is historically significant enough to require preservation.

Bill Bailey a realtor, introduced himself and Joe Benny of Kilwin's. He said the existing storefront would not work for the intended purpose. He further said the ambiance and beauty of this product is partly comes from watching the fudge being made. He said they want to move the doors closer to the front.

Mr. Benny told the Board about the Kilwin's product.

### Questions from the Board

Mr. Keesecker asked if they have an architect who would understand the architectural context.

### Comments from the Public

Mr. Kavit noted in southwest Virginia everything is starting to look the same. It is important to retain Charlottesville's character.

Charlie Kabbash, owner, said we are not demolishing the storefront; rather, we are remodeling it. He asked if anyone has an objection to straightening the windows out.

### Comments from the Board

Ms. Knott said she cannot see the whole building so it is hard to imagine.

Mr. Sarafin said the word, demolish, gives pause but adjusting the configuration and keeping the rest of the façade – I see no issues. He clarified that reworking under the signage board would be acceptable.

Mr. Mohr said the façade is not remarkable.

Mr. Schwartz agreed and said he sees no problem in making the changes in everything currently encased in blue and cream.

Kurt Keesecker said that Kilwins' design team would have to address the integration between old and new on the Downtown Mall.

The board agreed to consider a formal application to reconstruct the storefront, to be heard at a future meeting.

## **D. Deferred or Previously Considered Items**

## **6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 15-01-05  
617 Park Street  
Tax Parcel 520186000  
Chris and Megan Long, Owners/Rachel M. Lilly, Applicant  
Adjust approved retaining wall and fence; add new fence

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report. She stated last summer the BAR approved a new rear addition, and certain changes to the site, including shifting an existing parking area (accessed from a joint alleyway) closer to Wine Street, and adding a new fieldstone wall and new painted wood fence in the rear.

Additional changes to the approved plan include: (2) a request to reposition a portion of the wood fence to allow less impact on the roots of an existing Oak tree; and (3) a request to apply stucco finish instead of stone to approximately 21 feet of the wall. The wall would retain a continuous stone coping.

Finally, (4) the applicant is requesting new fencing to replace an existing wire fence, to be located 2 feet south of the north property line:

- A six foot high painted wood board fence painted Charleston Green, like the approved rear fence, from the NW corner of the property to a location opposite the NE front corner of the house.
- From that point, a 3'6" high wrought iron fence will extend to the same type of fence already approved along Park Street.

Rachel M. Lilly, Applicant, gave a brief summary of the retaining wall and the new fence.

Fred Payne Attorney stated that he representing the Whites and they are very happy with the resolution. He said the problems with the first plans have been resolved. The Whites are very happy to have the Longs moving in. He asked the BAR to approve this so the Longs can move in ASAP.

Ms. Miller said in the staff report it stated the fence is 6 feet tall and in the drawing it is 6'10".

Ms. Lilly said it is 6 feet.

Mr. Sarafin said it all seems entirely reasonable.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed wall and fence changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, seconded Mr. Sarafin, motion passes 7-0.

**7. 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, New Construction; Mixed-Use Residential

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report.

Mr. Keesecker: Will the balcony railing be the same railing that is found around the side of the building?

Applicant: It will be the same railing in the sense that the profile at the top is the same, but the pickets get replaced with a sheet glass

Mr. Mohr: It seems that the lighting found around the skirt of the building will be sufficient, and that the up-lights are not a necessity.

Applicant: The preference for the up-lights is rather than having a light source shine directly at you, the up-lights will reflect off the soffit and illuminate the area.

Ms. Deloach: Can you explain the purpose of the textured and smooth cement board? Will you be using both?

Applicant: For the façade we did not want it to look like a patchwork, but we also did not want a homogeneous façade with only a single shadow line, created by the leading edge. By mixing the smooth and textured board in the same color you begin to get a shift that makes the façade look like it is made out of a natural material with differing grain and texture, that when the light hits it would give it a subtle shift. Rather than try to do that with two colors which we feel would be drastic and begin to give it a patchwork appearance, this gives it a subtle difference as the sun moves and hits the textured tiles giving it a more natural appearance.

Ms. Miller: Are there any questions from the public?

### Public Comment

Mr. Kavitt: Does this building wrap around core lab? I just want you to be aware of how important it is that traffic not be blocked because they are dealing with time sensitive blood.

### Closed Public Comment

Applicant: We understand completely. Dan Rancosky, the Director of Design and Development has had two meetings with UVa staff since we were at the December BAR hearing, so things are moving very well. I have a 500% more understanding of what the issues are and we are moving forward. The good news is, in respect to 11th Street that is probably our third frontage in terms of priority, both during construction and after completion. Any new issues and items that come up with regards to the core lab, we are going to work with workers and staff to resolve them.

Ms. Miller: For the sake of minutes, even though the microphones do nothing in here, can everyone be sure to speak into the microphones for the record.

Mr. Keesecker: It looks like the glass in the windows are frontloaded on purpose toward the outside of the building, within the jam of the window itself. You are swallowing up the glass plane and the siding plane into almost the same plane. So there is virtually no recess at the window openings on the façade facing Roosevelt/Brown.

Applicant: Correct.

Mr. Keesecker: The offset in materials on West Main between the masonry, clay, and red terracotta material, and siding, what is the difference in those two planes?

Applicant: Currently minimal.

Mr. Keesecker: So that reveal shows there is a gap between the two materials vertically? How does that work?

Applicant: We wouldn't jam the two materials together, so yes, there would be a vertical break metal strip channel that would keep the two materials about an inch and a half apart. But the planes will be pretty close. And we are aware that the window profile and how it was positioned in the jam was an issue coming out of the December hearing. That front loading detail, for a higher quality modern storefront like that tends to be a more typical construction, and we have a couple means that we can do to create more of a shadow line. One of which we have used in the past, is adding a fin material that would be applied around the outside of the window, but you can leave the glass in the current position, and then this striping would create a slightly projecting shadow box. Let us call that Option 1. Option 2 would be more of a traditional jam extension which is part of the window assembly itself. We are not 100% ready to commit to that because of the detailing involved, but it is a product available to us as a product. If that is a critical piece in how you all feel the window needs to set then we can certainly progress in that direction.

Mr. Keesecker: I hadn't resolved it personally; I just thought I would ask.

Ms. Miller: Any other questions from the board?

Mr. Schwarz: I have a question the ramp, that isn't really a ramp, as a landscape feature I found it interesting, but when I realized this last go around that it wasn't a ramp, is it just a landscape feature? It



just feels somewhat odd to me to have. Am I reading that right that there are five steps and a couple spaces in there?

Applicant: I think the comment of it is not a ramp; it is not an accessible pass.

Mr. Sarafin: Oh, it's not?

Mr. Schwarz: I don't think so.

Ms. Knott: No it's not, there are too many stairs.

Applicant: To make up that grade I guess wasn't possible, so the addition of steps allowed us to make it possible. We all have a connotation in our mind that when we see a ramp it is usually for accessible purposes, I would call this a hybrid landscape element; it is serving as retaining for the earth that is there, but also a pedestrian experience to get you up at a different access point to the building. Some of the seating that is up there too, we talked about in December, is a place where you would have a different experience as opposed to if you were up on the terrace, you could be a bit more immersed in the landscape. Is that clear?

Mr. Schwarz: Yes, I understand it now

Mr. Mohr: The primary, the easy, access is sort of up the stairs and up. This pathway is an alternate pathway that could never be a code compliant ADA ramp.

Mr. Keesecker: Speaking of that seating area, the seating area that faces Roosevelt Brown, how wide is it from the part where the step are and over? 8 or 10 feet?

Applicant: I would say it is between 12 or 15 feet.

Mr. Keesecker: If I understand the plan correctly, it does not line up with the breeze way, it is over next to the stairs that led up to the back of the building. One other question while I have you on that plan, the dash line (on plan A200C) that goes along the Roosevelt/Brown façade and then goes back on an angle on West Main. That is the line of the upper level, so that is the line we get for the soffit.

Applicant: That is correct.

Mr. Schwarz: Do you have an answer for the need to screen the parking garage? And Mary Joy while he is looking, I understand the regulations say the mechanical equipment cannot be seen, is that from the street or is that from anywhere?

Mary Joy: I am trying to remember, I am not sure it specifies. I think it says from adjacent properties or something. So if it is situated in the center of the roof and there is no way that you can see it that would be one thing, but if it visible from the street or something, that is another.

Applicant: regulations are written says that the parking shall not be visible, that is where the screening comment comes from. How is that upheld? How do we address that from a design standpoint? Is that perfectly perpendicular from the street? Whereas, you can have an open curve cut that is maybe a center loaded drive aisle? I know in the 11th Street Parking Garage, there are multiple curb cuts coming in there and you can see the parking lanes. Is that acceptable for us so long as we are screening the part that would be in front of the parking itself or parking stalls? We would have an open curb cut without screening at the ingress/egress?

Mary Joy: You can certainly have an entrance, is that your question?

Applicant: No, I understand that. I guess I am saying the fact that it says you cannot see the parking, if you get a slightly oblique view, you will see inside. So I am wondering if that is okay.

Applicant: On the plan here there is an entrance that goes from 11th Street into the drive aisle and we have screening on either side that screens the parking. Obviously the curve cut where the drive lane is cannot be screened, but these planters that flank the drive aisle are intended to screen the parking stalls from 11th Street. That is maintained because this is retail parking, so the people coming out of here are not regular occupants as the residents would be. We have also separated the traffic that would be coming in for loading and trash from that in and out retail traffic. We are screening the parking using the planters between the parking and the 11th Street pedestrian walkway.

Mary Joy: What about from West Main? I mean you can see into your parking from West Main, correct?

Mr. Mohr: Over that parking lot.

Applicant: I do not think you will see our parking through their parking.

Mary Joy: Theoretically that is what you are showing. There is nothing there but columns along your property line.

Applicant: Yes, correct. Is this our property line?

Mr. Mohr: That is the building line.

Mr. Schwarz: That plan, it is not the current plan is it?

Applicant: It is. Will not quite, it is missing the steps. This stuff [gestures somewhere on the plan] is not current; this is from a previous configuration.

Mr. Schwarz: Okay, will where is the trash yard going?

Applicant: The entrance is here [gestures to plan] along this line. This is the curb cut that comes into the trash and loading area.

Mr. Schwarz: I am just trying to make sure I know what the most current plan is; this set of documents shows a slightly different configuration of the trash enclosure.

Applicant: Yes, I am sorry this is from a previous presentation. I brought this up solely to talk about the screening of the parking on 11th Street.

Mr. Mohr: So you would, as you are going down 11th Street, be able to see obliquely into the parking structure, correct.

Ms. Deloach: It is not really screened.

Ms. Miller: Right

Applicant: That is Dan's point if I am driving along here at some point I am going to see the parking. We have a planting here, but I am not sure if it is possible to take the parking out of every view, but it is certainly screened from the street.

Applicant: Right, so my point being is that is really the only way to read the intent of the code. If you take a literal interpretation at curb cuts and other corners and such.

Ms. Miller: Just to be clear, I do not think anyone is concerned if you are entering the parking garage and if you can see in it from the entrance. It is more what you can see from West Main and 11th Street of the side of the building where the parking structure is. Is that right?

Ms. Deloach: Yes.

Ms. Miller: So is that something you are going to address differently?

Applicant: We can, I guess I would be interested to see if there is any regulation written in the code that we can begin to address that from, such as distance from the street since we are coming through another lot. Are you saying the oblique view as well, when you adjacent and 45 degrees from our lot? There are a couple different ways that you can look at it. The building as it currently is, it is essentially hovering over that with the columns coming down, so it is open air, which is one of the considerations, since it is a parking area and is designed to be naturally ventilated. As of now there are no provisions for visual screening from there, so I would be curious to know: number one from a guidelines standpoint how is it written so if we need to address that, how we could, and number two, what is the specific opinion of board, whether it is beyond any regulation or not. So you can address that.

Ms. Miller: Okay.

Applicant: I don't know if the view from West Main is an issue, it is so far away and it is sloping and the foreground the [other property] has their own landscape. They are going to have cars, so the issue becomes the view from 11th Street on those oblique views. How do you even manage that?

Mr. Mohr: Where your trash pickup is located, if you needed the screen it could be five foot screen going down the one side and the cars would be gone.

Applicant: Yes, that is what I am trying to get at, is there a need for that?

Mr. Mohr: I do not see that you would have to go the full way around; I see how that would destroy the idea of the floating aspect of the building.

Mr. Sarafin: I am wondering what is there now.

Mr. Mohr: It used to be tracks.

Mr. Sarafin: Will yes. I guess this hard line defining the core lab properties, what does this view look like?

Mr. Mohr: It is just a parking lot.

Ms. Miller: It is just grass there isn't it?

Mr. Sarafin: Is there any context there?

Applicant: If you go to page 2.4 picture # 1, cuts just a little bit of it next to the Patton Mansion, there is a low brick wall that hides a ramp that goes into the Core Lab. I believe there is a large screen and landscape material for their emergency generator that sits in that vicinity, and there is definitely planting bed and there is a pine tree there.

Applicant: That is true I think they have retaining at a couple different levels there too. I was in town last week and walked down their stairs, almost directly down it is that sidewalk that you see just to the west of Patton Mansion that continues down and I want to say there is probably in between six and eight steps, six and ten steps, something like that, which gets you down closer to grade towards the 11th Street side of our site and then that transitions around the corner and then that becomes the plinth that there generator sits on so there is definitely so grade there. What that leads me to believe me to believe know, from looking at this photo and from memory, is that the parking lot and thus the plantings are going to be placed at a level that is higher than our at grade for parking.

Applicant: There is a survey on page 2.9 that also shows that planting beds that are part of the Core Lab wall.

Applicant: Oh yeah, so there are more steps than that even.

Mr. Mohr: You are not showing this building on the other side, or is that a temporary construction building?

Applicant: That is a temporary construction trailer. And they have a fence currently along that.

Mr. Mohr: Right, right. So right now, that obviously blocks any view of it from that side.

you all envisioning that those become what kind of retailer

Applicant: Community type retail uses fast casual food service for convenience, not convenience store per say, but small market style. We would like to support the uses above it, not full the fire.

Ms. Miller: What type of square footage are you looking at for those retail spaces?

Applicant: I think grand total, what is in the darker blue, over to the right, I think that is 6,000 and change square feet, so we are showing them speculatively broken up.

Applicant: I want to say about 6,000 on the podium level and then the portion that stepsdown between the community room and the garage entry is close to another 1,000.

Ms. Miller: So I might be reading it wrong, but in the parking are there ten retail parking spaces?

Applicant: That is correct.

Ms. Miller: That seems crazy, I mean to have 6,000 or 7,000 square foot of retail, you are going to have more than ten employees, right?

Applicant: The employees, I believe, are different in the calculation.

Ms. Knott and Ms. Miller: [That is even a small amount of parking for] ten customers. I would hope would be in 7,000 square feet.

Applicant: The property is in a parking modified zone, so it suggests we are trying to get away from cars and vehicular traffic. There are concerns at UVa, that UVa is so close that the goal is not to add more parking. I think if anything the goal would be to limit the parking farther from a sustainable standpoint, long term vision of the city.

Applicant: I think the long term focus of the pedestrian retail and certainly the residents of this building, certainly allows for the rare circumstance of someone driving by wanting to stop in quickly, and those spots are there for them, but it is definitely more pedestrian oriented.

Applicant: I think what we have heard from the West Main Street Streetscape Study, there is this concept that the parking along West Main will not become so congested by UVa restrictions on their parking lots, for instance Stacey Hall across West Main or the garages on weekends, that is will not be restricted like it currently is to permitted UVa employees. So we would hope that happens as part of that study and we would hope that the city could work with UVa to make that happen to support the overall street.

Ms. Miller: Yes, I get it, and we are not the zoning regulators, but it is concerning to me how you are going to rent to space to a good vibrant retailer when you are like, "Hey, you get four parking spaces allotted for your retail."

Applicant: I think that we give a breakdown of code versus provided. I think it serves as good guidelines. You know we have been to every corner of the country and we never have any desire to be either under parked or over parked, which is an easy thing to say, but a hard thing to do. We have become pretty good at targeting what the reality of the situation is, and when you look at us, we project wise, say 35-40 small projects over the last six years we average 0.4 per bed, this is talking about from a residential standpoint. I think that the retail, we don't always have this much square footage either, it tends to fluctuate. I think that the calculations allow us to hit what the reasonable overall is; I don't know how ridged planning would be as far as us blurring the distinction is between retail and residential there, so we come in here because of our location to the hospital and to campus and all the bicycle parking. We are over parked from a

residential standpoint. I don't know if we can open that up more to retail. We can certainly do that in the temporary standpoint, I would not be apprehensive about that. I just wonder if the code requirements say spaces per square foot or unit whether they would up hold it every moment, or if we could use that ability of learning on the fly after we have realized the building and adapting the spaces to that

Mr. Mohr: As an aside, I know part of the West Main Study which Erin was alluding to, is they figured out there are some 6,000 parking spaces in that general neighborhood. In truth, if it is managed the potential there is to actually be over parked. So that becomes [a question] as if the formula works okay for them, but I think in terms of that region there will be plenty of parking. As you said the emphasis is to get away from the use of cars there. So I guess I would not worry about it, but I understand your point.

Ms. Miller: We don't want it to end up being a giant lobby that no one uses. The whole point of it activating the street is to have a successful retailer and unfortunately, despite all our hopes and dreams, we are still in America and people don't walk great distances when they are shopping and buying things. Anyway, we are still four spaces short, so I guess that has to be addressed before this all gets done.

Applicant: Yes, the planning staff is taking a look at that right now. The first time with the SUP, we actually came through the BAR the first time with that ratio and we were short at least that and there is a buyout value that is a financial offset that can be used to take care of that. We are not using that as a crutch to get us through very many, it is just a need based thing based on the footprint of the building.

Mr. Mohr: Is there parallel parking going down Roosevelt/Brown on your side?

Applicant: No.

Mr. Mohr: Okay, that should be taken into account.

Mr. Keesecker: Have we always been looking at images that have included the aluminum railing system on Roosevelt/Brown? Or were there images with more glass and those railings earlier on? I am trying to remember. I would like to hear from people who are more landscape and urban design, I don't know if a line of railing that long will seem solid from the corner of West Main and Roosevelt/Brown, then it starts to go over our heads, and there are two planes of it, one at the retail level and one up at the other level. I just want to know how we got that.

Applicant: I think most recently we have been showing the picket railing, the first go round for sure, and we had the tiered area showing glass rails.

Ms. Knott: Yeah, there is not that much. 4.9 have glass, but that is the only place it shows up.

Mr. Schwarz: No that is the bike building. I think there was glass a long time ago.

Ms. Knott: I am not really excited about the pickets, especially where you have the tiered seating there. If you are on the bottom seat it is like you are in jail. It doesn't really activate the street so much as it collects trash. I would like to see a different solution. There are different ways to do it, you can look at glass or you can also step back and have a shrub boarder so you do not have to have the railing. That is another alternative that makes it a little bit friendlier.

Applicant: It is a good point, and you are talking about its ability to function as a viewing platform.

Ms. Knott: Right, so you have that picket, and then you have the picket up the stairs, and then picket at that level as well, so you get two or three layers of pickets going on there.

Mr. Keesecker: To build on that a little bit, I think it would be interesting if the garage opening and this element for the viewing carried the same weight. That is why I was asking how big it is, because for that length of façade I think you have got whatever that garage opening is, 24 or 30 feet, and compared to that this seating space seems dainty. If it takes on some of the qualities of that one on 11th Street, the one on the highline, that would be pretty awesome, but that is elaborate.

Applicant: Are you talking about the scale of this?

Mr. Keesecker: Exactly. The breezeway is there, it is an opportunity. I don't know how many times I am going to sit and watch cars go by on Roosevelt/Brown, but I guess maybe one day I will have a spare afternoon, and that would be a great place to do it. I like it as a way of animating that long façade at the street level so we don't have the same answer all the way from one end to the other.

Mr. Mohr: And the earlier variance where there were the big steps did the wrap-around underneath the over-hanging portion, where the pool was, spoken to that.

Mr. Keesecker: It did, but it kind of strung it out even more, I think this is a little more subtle that out and back city ramp that keeps coming back to that one point, just makes that one point more interesting, but I think the stairs would have to be something else, a little more powerful.

Applicant: Yes, there is the convergence of all of that stuff.

Mr. Keesecker: It is all coming together right there.

Applicant: I think that is a good point. So look at the scale of that and then the treatment of it at its perimeter either by, as you are suggesting, I think it is a 30 inch horizontal, that would eliminate the need of a guard there either by a planter or the use of a glass rail.

Mr. Keesecker: A particular concern on the railing is the little residual railing that is up towards West Main after you get past that awesome glass thing that is the bike storage, there is this little orphaned railing, at least it looked like that in the plan.

Mr. Sarafin: 4.9 on the December 2014 plans. You almost want to see the glass continue.

Mr. Keesecker: Something like that.

Mr. Mohr: Or even a wall. [Echoed by Mr. Sarafin and Mr. Keesecker]

Mr. Mohr: So I guess we are sort of sliding into the comments.

Ms. Miller: Yes, so is there anyone remaining in the public that would like to make a comment? Okay, carry on.

Mr. Mohr: So I had a comment. I think the West Main elevation that is sort of the head piece, is getting its identity back, but it is still seems a little weak to me. And I realize that you have the functional considerations of your retail space, which Melanie is protecting for you, but I am just wondering about pushing that glass line back to at least so the columns are forward on that end, so you have more of a sense of porch. And I don't mean to just keep harping back on the older version, but it had a pretty dramatic sense of floating and inviting you in when there was more overhang in the front section.

Applicant: This is that dotted line.

Mr. Mohr: Right so that glass line was behind the columns, it felt more like a porch.

Applicant: Behind these columns?

Mr. Mohr: But I realize that that is square footage, it just doesn't seem to have the same punch as it currently exists.

Mr. Keesecker: I think that floating building is moving in the right direction as well, but it seems like the floor level on the street is very similar, or within a certain degree, of the other floor levels. Is there a different in floor levels on the street to the residential floor levels?

Applicant: Yes, the ground floor is different.

Mr. Keesecker: From that image they look similar.

Applicant: It is probably because you are reading the wall in that dimension. The grade is really here and that is going back. I think ground floor is around 12 to 13 foot range there and the residential is in the 8.9 to 9.0 range, something like that.

Mr. Keesecker: 12 meaning floor to ceiling?

Applicant: Yes.

Ms. Miller: Is there any room for greater height there?

Applicant: So with the redesigned building there is a change in construction type that comes with it.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Ms. Miller moved 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 project, subject to the following building details to come back to the BAR for additional review and approval: the outdoor seating to align with the breezeway, the final color for fiber cement panels, cut sheet for the storefront windows, additional information of the roof top, resolution of garage screening, the final proposal for the railing, and clarification on the lighting, , seconded by Mr. Mohr, Motion passes 7-0.

## **E. Deferred or Previously Considered Items**

### **8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Final Details)**

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

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report. The applicant is asking for final approval, including grand stair design, building details and materials, signage and lighting details, site plan, City Market stall layout plan, landscape plan and paving plan. The BAR should pin down final details. There are inconsistencies in the packet, which should be clarified. The final location of the secondary stairs needs to be confirmed. A comprehensive signage plan may be submitted at any time for BAR, then City Council approval. A final landscape plan is required to be submitted as part of the final engineered site plan. More details are needed.

Greg Powe, applicant, made a presentation. He is asking for approval with some exceptions. We will revisit First Street and the stairs, the exterior wall conditions; we have no detailed wall sections. We will talk more about the site, specifically the site on market day, the landscape, new materials, the solar shading.

He discussed:

- Water Street projected 3 story elements, articulated in 30 feet wide bays, windows on 10 ft. pattern;
- Nutmeg and crème brick;
- Canopy images are flawed;
- Second Street: Two story 20 foot module with same recess details, same sidewalk planter walls;
- Mezzanine level introduced over event space;
- Rendering is not showing correct limestone color;
- Coming into the plaza: roll up glass door, totally closed on not so nice days; that's the base with same datum carried around;
- Tower: cream color on Water and Second Streets, more conventional masonry wall with 3 building blocks: floor to ceiling living rooms with slab edge; typical bedroom with operable punched windows, and a balcony recessed back 4 feet and forward 5 feet, 9x11 room; pilaster expression;
- Typical relationship brick face and typical window, only a little recess, few affordable solutions.
- Two terraces 12 foot room, module, concrete slab edge, rather than a curtain wall.
- Curtain wall overlooks the plaza, entire inside base, floor to ceiling glass, with a panel that caps the slab edge
- Brise soleils need to be detailed;
- Important that the grand stair ends at this point – we have a 30x 50 foot welcoming area, and the stair don't want to go any further into that. There are 3 runs with a landing in between. Wider 12 foot stair plus balustrades; lighter than the all brick solution.
- When one arrives, one of four options as a pedestrian: Go up on plaza; go to elevator, then plaza; go to car; or bypass all.
- The mall is 6 feet lower than the plaza;
- View based on (Knott) question, from RR tracks looking north; virtually at street level, a foot and 1/2 above South Street, doesn't obstruct the view. These poles to support tents do encroach into the 30 foot right away;
- Signage: consider two approaches: a blade sign with floating letters and back lighting;, take advantage of the horizontals with sign banding;
- Decided to re-introduce the columns around plaza; cantilever a sign scaled to read from the mall;
- Proposing floor-to-ceiling glass with desk height horizontal; brise soleils; clear brushed anodized aluminum; clear, low-e glass; two colors of brick;
- The entry canopy detail, pergola on a portion of the roof; brise soleils about a meter span;
- Tent structures with arched supports; Center circulation aisle and two stalls;
- The fountain was pulled in, mall 4x12 brick, complementary color 4x8 ; flamed granite;
- How market works: General loop circulation, 10 foot wide aisle, very tight, try to make it 12 feet. Will till keep the 10x10 pattern, go-to line to set up the tent. We are shading the circulation for the customers;

- A variety of stall conditions: 10 x 10; 10 x 18; 10x30. The center piece is the market space, not parking. Market operators feel a majority want 10x30 stalls to merchandise it. Intent is to unload then go park. Free parking in the garage.
- Indoor space has 18 stalls, 10 x 10 and 10 x 18; expansion potential, 20 stalls, beyond edge of plaza;
- 104 stalls on plaza;
- Landscape: three conditions: water weir, bio filter system, have water flow through on raining days, are on a 30 foot rhythm; seat walls help transition slope also on 30 ft rhythm;
- Lay-bys for temporary drop offs;
- London-Plane trees, Sycamore- like trees, Red Maples on 2<sup>nd</sup> street, Swamp White Oak;
- Planting in the bed are designs planting with a natural feel, native plantings; Some real perennials;
- Brick pavement, no-slip fountain surface;
- South Street can be closed off on market days; Granite border like the mall, similar in color; planter walls with stone cap;
- Would like to integrate some public art;
- Typical splash fountain with programmed jets and lightning;
- Solar shading over circulation aisles;
- We didn't cover signage and lightning details; tents will be uplit so they glow; need sections through the wall conditions.

### Questions from the Board

Mr. Schwarz – asked the condition from South Street, where is the entry?

Mr. Powe said, an ADA for first 30 feet, you go down about 60 feet, see a 2<sup>nd</sup> entrance at grade, slightly raised on South Street;

Mr. Mohr asked where the vehicles enter the plaza. What the logic in having underneath the staircase open. Is there another stair under it?

Mr. Powe said no, that was an alternative to a comment that the banister felt heavy because it had a limestone cap. He discussed the stair with Mr. Mohr.

Ms. Knott asked what will happen about the oil drips on the plaza.

Mr. Powe said truck will have a drop pans under the engine. He said the City is going to depend of the developer to maintain the plaza. It will have to be steam cleaned regularly. He said the oil is a concern, but if we could eliminate the truck parking around the fountain that will help with his biggest concern. He is disappointed because he wanted capture and recycle the plaza water. He said it is not roof run off it is a parking lot because of one morning a week.

Ms. Knott asked if he is working with Water Street Studio, how they plan to maintain a bio swale condition on the north side of the building because typically water loving plants prefer to be in the sun.

Mr. Powe said they have assured him that the plants they have selected for the swale are able to take the water and limited sun light.

Ms. Knott said concerning the material that forms the planters, about the material disconnect between the planter walls and the building itself. She commented on pulling the brick out into the planter walls.

Mr. Powe said that is a Waters Street proposal that the retaining wall be concrete. He said it makes sense to be concrete if you thing of a street curb and you step down these beds of water weir makes sense. The sidewalk will be brushed concrete. The planters next to the building, were originally thought to be brick with a stone path, they picked up the concrete theme. He said it is fine to make it brick.

Ms. Miller asked are you satisfied that the market people have worked out the details, like what time the trucks have to be on the plaza, and if the condo people will be unhappy.

Mr. Powe said we do not operate the City Market. We are building a fabulous Plaza that is gifted to the City for them to operate the market. We have been in dialogue with the market people, we have had one focus group where all market vendors were invited on a Saturday where we had about 30 vendors. We had a focus group the last week of the competition. Mr. Powe said it has not happened yet where the city market folks are leasing the adjacent parking lot. He has requested to have a focus group with the vendors. The market people are very nervous. The overall scheme is working. The city market staff is good but the market vendors are worried.

Mr. Powe said they have been showing glass balcony rails, when you are inside you can see down and out. When you are down and looking up you can see any and everything that is dumped and stored on the terrace. An alternative is a punched stainless infill panel instead of a glass panel. The disadvantage of these is cleaning these is not practical but they will only be cleaned twice a year. Both a maintenance and looking-in issue with glass panels. He asked the Board's thoughts on metal panels.

Mr. Mohr said if you do the horizontal one it goes quite well with the lines in the building.

Mr. Schwarz said he is curious to what it would do to the brick side? He is feeling it may be too heavy or opaque.

Mr. Powe said, when the sun hits it, glass would look opaque as well.

Mr. Mohr commented that the drawings imply more of a zinc color. He said on the south side is very bright aluminum. He also said he would feel more comfortable if the top three stories would take on the language of the back of the building which emphasizes the horizontal lines more. The top is looming over the buildings on Second Street. He is also concerned about the open corner at the street level, 2<sup>nd</sup> and Water's Street. He said just because it bring the mass of a big building down to the street, and the buildings we are relating to are all small.

Mr. Powe said he like for the corner buildings to be really solid and because of the projected base he didn't want the building to feel as if it is sitting on top of a platform. He wanted it to come down to the base. It is also the corner office of the executive suite and our coffee shop.

Mr. Schwarz - wants to see details of brise soleils. He said the reason he keeps fighting these perspectives is because, in looking at the corner, he feels he is seeing some modeling mistakes. The way the brick intersects that glass is not symmetrical on the corner and the detail on either side of the brick where the crème band comes down is treated differently on either side and I don't know if that is intentional or a modeling mistake. We need to see elevations. Your column grid didn't line up it and it forces you not be fooled by the prospective. You need both.

Mr. Mohr said the brise soleils is a great idea; just make sure they are happening everywhere.

Ms. DeLoach stated she want talk about the size of the columns at market level.

Mr. Powe stated they are currently sized is to be the same size as all the pilasters around the plaza and it squares off that space, it picks up the same height and the same dimensions, it completes the room. They were there originally and we took them away when we were asked by the tree people to put in trees on the plaza, so he just put them back and there hadn't been any comment about until they re-appeared. If you don't like them, say so.

Ms. DeLoach said the columns are not doing anything.

Ms. Knott commented that the columns were to be used for lightning but we didn't know about these pilasters.



Mr. Mohr pointed to some drawings of the grand stairs.

Mr. Schwartz suggested enclosing the space below the plaza, for example, filling in the base of the stairs.

Ms. Knott does not like the solid baluster and she does not like the glass.

Mr. Mohr said something should be done where the stairs meets the deck. Stainless is much better to use on the stairs, not glass.

Mr. Schwarz said he supported the columns. He said the perspectives may be doing them an injustice.

Mr. Powe discussed the idea of using pole lights instead of columns.

Mr. Keesecker asked if we had a conversation about emphasizing vertical elements on the west side of First Street. The more we talk about our eye going to plaza, he thinks the stair will bring people to the plaza. He is afraid of non-market days, what the attraction will be? The purpose of the First Street passage on non-market days would be to move people from the Mall to the other parts of town. If something happens on the east side, it could be completed.

Mr. Schwartz does not mind the columns because they define First Street. He asked about seating along the west edge of the First Street right-of-way.

Mr. Powe said we can do poles with lighting fixtures. He does not want to lose a quarter of the tent structures.

Ms. Knott does not like bringing the Mall brick down here. She said this is our warehouse district, not the Mall. She can see a totally different approach here – like a road trace laid lightly over, which implies something else, memorializing.

Mr. Mohr likes the fixtures that Keith Woodard used in his parking lot on 1st and Market. We need something on that side of the street. Very elegant.

Mr. Powe – So we have consensus with ten foot light pattern, and eight tents, and no towers.

Mr. Keesecker – Could you limit trucks to parking on South Street?

Mr. Powe said no because the fire department needs access.

Mr. Mohr said the brise soleil will soften the metal and glass facades; brick is not needed.

Ms. Miller said there is a lot to be resolved; this feels more like a preliminary discussion than a final approval meeting.

Mr. Powe was very disappointed in the outcome of tonight's meeting but he had to defer. He will come back with a more final solid site plan including the following a lighting plan, signage, revisit the top, needs input on the glass interruptions on the top terrace, location of the mechanical units and trash areas, and the access directly from First Street coming from South.

Ms. Miller suggested finalizing a list.

Mr. Keesecker asked for resolution on the upper floors. Most of the conversations have been all brick or banding. Wondering if you considered a brick tower that wraps around three sides, break down the building to look like four buildings instead of 30 foot module on first floor. For example, use glass all the way up in the center bays on Water Street.

Ms. Miller suggested talking about it outside this meeting.

Mr. Mohr said above the stepback, it gets heavy. Lighten up the top with language from the back to come to the front. Get rid of the breaks.

Mr. Sarafin agreed, saying then you would not have a brick side and a glass side.

Mr. Powe agreed to a deferral and asked for a list.

Mr. Mohr said: to study the top; close in the stairs; light fixture solution for going down the street; quiet down the paving brick selection (not the Mall brick); planters on Water Street should be brick; like the perforated railing but we need to see final; brise soleils detail; may also be a solution for the inset panels at parking garage; use Keith's light fixtures; overall lighting vocabulary; resolve funkiness in how the columns are modeled (need elevation drawings).

Mr. Sarafin asked for fewer, but accurate drawings.

Ms. Miller moved to accept the applicants request for a deferral, seconded Ms. Knott, motion passes 7-0.

## **9. Special Use Permit Recommendation**

100 E Water Street  
Temporary Farmers' (City) Market

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner, said the BAR is being asked to make a recommendation regarding the proposed special use permit (SUP). Market Plaza, LLC has requested a SUP to allow a farmer's market (City Market) to operate as a temporary use on this site.

Before City Council takes action to permit the proposed use, they must consider the BAR's opinion whether there are any adverse impacts to the Downtown ADC district that could be mitigated with conditions.

Mr. Woodard asked if he could use the same lights here and was told yes, subject to staff circulating a plan for BAR review.

Mr. Mohr move to find that the proposed special use permit to allow a farmer's market (City Market) as a temporary use (for 3 years as advised by the Planning Commission) will not have an adverse impact on the Downtown Architectural Design Control (ADC) District, and the BAR recommends approval of the Special Use Permit, seconded by Ms. Knott 7-0.

## **Blighted Property Request for Comments – 610 Ridge Street**

Ms. Scala presented a staff report.

Preservation Piedmont submitted a letter in favor of the City's plan.

Mr. Schwarz agreed as a BAR member, but not as a private citizen.

Mr. Mohr moved to recommend the proposed plan to City Council. Ms. DeLoach seconded. The motion passed (7-0).

**F. Other Business** - There was no PLACE update since the PLACE meeting was cancelled.

**G. Adjournment 12:00 p.m.**