

City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
February 17, 2014  
Basement Conference Room - City Hall

Members Present:

Melanie Miller - Chairperson  
Tim Mohr – Vice Chairperson  
Carl Schwarz  
Candace DeLoach  
Kurt Keesecker – Planning Commissioner  
Whit Graves

Absent

Justin Sarafin  
Laura Knott

Staff Present:

Mary Joy Scala

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

C. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes January 20, 2015  
Mr. Keesecker move to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Ms. DeLoach, motion passes 5-0-1, Mr. Graves abstaining .

New Items

- 5:40
2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-02-01  
1532, 1534, 1536 Virginia Ave  
Tax Parcel 090123000  
Jeannie and Roger Davis,  
TRUS, Owner/ Mitchell/Matthews Architects, Applicant  
Demolition of 1532, 1534, 1536, Virginia Avenue

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner, gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report on behalf of the BAR. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish all the buildings. The BAR does not consider what the possible new use of the property would be, only whether or not the buildings merit preservation.

John Matthews, representing the applicant, noted that the buildings are not in good shape.

Tom Romer, 1530 Virginia Avenue, adjoining property owner. He said the cottages do contribute to the fabric of the community. He said he has owned his building about the same length of time as Mr. Davis. He said the building up the street had a quaint appearance, which is gradually being lost with CBS's new building. He stated there is a core of buildings dated from the early 20th century that reflect the combination of neighborhood and student mix that make up the street today. He said it would be a shame to lose the cottages, particularly if there is enough square footage of land behind the cottages for a new building. He is hoping there will be some restraint on razing the three buildings and having a combination of old and new together to maintain the street appearance today.

Mr. Schwarz said he agreed with staff's opinion that to lose these three houses in a row will significantly alter the character of the streetscape. There will not be anything left to indicate that there were single family homes on the street. Someone in the past felt like this street is worth preserving. He said to eliminate these three buildings will change the street too much. This will make it easy for other single family homes to disappear.

Ms. Miller said she agrees with Carl that the scale of the building is important and they may not be so attractive now, but they could be attractive again.

Mr. Mohr stated that there is an issue of precedent with these buildings. He said one of the reasons they are deteriorating is because they haven't been taken care of. He said he didn't feel they were anything special in terms of the individual buildings but does feel there is a scale issue. He said the problem with demolition is we have no way of evaluating what's going on after the building is cleared.

Ms. DeLoach agreed the older properties add to the streetscape.

Mr. Graves commented that he has no problem with the demolition of the three houses.

Mr. Keesecker said he feels that the scale is easily recognized as something contributing to the quality of the street, but not real crazy about how they are related to the street themselves and that there was this gap between the street and the house itself. The relationship to the street was weird. There is a quality about the footprint but the relationship to the street is not a high quality worth preserving.

Tim Mohr stated that the one at the far corner does relate to the street. Maybe that's one way to keep the timeline is to say perhaps that house stays put on the corner and the other two go ahead and demolish.

Mr. Schwarz said there is a certain history on the street that if you demolish the three small modest houses there will be no more history of small modest houses on that street. There is no reason a large scale building cannot be built behind small houses.

Mr. Matthews said the point about scale is well taken, but they will continue to deteriorate until they fall down. He said if you asked the neighbors they would say they are glad to see them go.

Ms. DeLoach said this is a perfect opportunity to sell to someone who would love to restore them.

Mr Schwarz asked about the issue of deferred maintenance.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, Ms. Miller moved to find that the proposed demolition of 1532-1534-1536 Virginia Avenue does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC district, and that the BAR denies the application because the proposed demolition did not meet the demolition standards and guidelines, seconded by Mr. Schwarz the motion passes 5-1; Mr. Graves opposed.

- 6:00            3.      Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
                         BAR 15-02-02  
                         611 Preston Place

Tax Parcel 050112000  
Scott and Christine Colley, Owner  
Exterior changes

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner, gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report on behalf of the BAR. This is a thoughtfully and sensitively planned and thorough application. This charming house will continue to be well-protected. The applicant should advise the roofer not to use any vents on the ridges that would appear institutional. Otherwise, staff has no comments.

Christine Colley, the property owner, said the bulk of this project is interior work and maintenance. The roof is in bad shape and we have lived through a 100 year old roof with our present home which we are in process of selling and we know how much damage can be done, so perhaps we are a little anxious to get that replaced. The other item we will show is the cap or hat on the chimney to reduce the amount of water that runs down in the interior of the flue. We have completed taking off some of the old boards in the downstairs rooms and there is a lot of foundation damage that has to do with water. The focus of the renovation is on the foundation. We are trying to find places to put duct work in order to put in a modern heating system. In fact, the complexity is growing as we work on the project with the contractor and it is now uncertain if we will be able to afford thermal heat well as we stated in the application, instead of a standard heat pump arrangement with the heat pump behind the house. Another challenge is taking out a 1969 kitchen and putting in a 2015 kitchen.

Ms. DeLoach asked the age of the roof that is there now?

Ms. Colley said it is in similar shape of a roof she replaced a few years ago that she thinks was about 90 – 95 years old. She said it has a lot of deformation on the surface, flaking of paint, and just an old metal roof. She said it pre-dates the previous owners of the house.

Ms. DeLoach she would like to see the roof preserved.

Ms. Colley stated there is an area near the back where the gables come down, and there are a couple of places that tends to traps debris and doesn't run off the building well. There is one area that needs significant repair and this is why we are asking about replacing the roof because if we can possibly afford it, we would rather put that money into replacing the entire roof with a modern form of standing seam.

Mr. Keesecker asked if the rear and front portion of the driveway going to be brick.

Ms. Colley said the present driveway has pea gravel on it. It comes up at quite a slope from the street and runs into a gate with a fence which has a gate in the middle and that leads to a side entrance terrace that enters into an addition that dates back to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. This is a little square that joins with the main block of the oldest portion of the house in front of it and the 20<sup>th</sup> century addition reaching back into the courtyard. She said this is the entry everyone uses. There are two front doors that do not open and close with keys. There is a huge sliding bar it is not practical to put a normal lock and security in there so they go in and out the side door. She said the driveway slopes down on one side of the house about 3 feet so there is a significant amount of water that tends to flow into that uphill side of the house and the driveway has built up and needs to come down in order to get the water flowing away from the foundation and help preserve house.

Mr. Schwarz asked if they were changing the roof joists; the structure of the porch?

Ms. Colley stated No, they are not planning to do anything to the joists, they seem perfectly sound.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations and for Site Design, Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed exterior

changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with advice to put glass inside windows instead of outside, repair instead of replace roof, and preserve the icehouse as well as possible. Seconded Ms. DeLoach passes 6-0.

6:20

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-02-03  
214 Lankford Avenue  
Tax Parcel 260001000  
Asa R Eslocker and Joanna A Jennings, Owners  
Rear addition

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner, gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report on behalf of the BAR. Enlarge a bathroom, gable porch roof, replace a door, match existing cedar lap siding and metal roofing.

Mr. Martinez, from ARKE design-build, represented the applicants. He said this is a growing family that is in need of an additional bathroom. He said they are trying to keep everything matching the existing as much as possible. They are also putting a roof over the present terrace and not going outside the footprint of the building.

Ms. Miller asked what is different about this versus the original submission.

Mr. Martinez said the windows in the front shifted to match the new floor plan and the side elevation of the house shifted by about a foot.

Mr. Mohr asked how much of the house is original before it was added on to.

Mr. Martinez said it was a long rectangle with stone foundation. There was an addition that made it an el, then a porch with later addition. It seemed like there were multiple additions. The foundation we are bearing on is cinder block and concrete footing, no stone.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the roof drainage.

Mr. Mohr said he didn't see any problems from his point of view.

Ms DeLoach asked about the location of two windows. She said there five different-sized windows on the back elevation.

Mr. Martinez said they could try to make them more consistent.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, Mr. Graves moved to find that the proposed new rear addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Mohr, passes 6-0.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-02-04  
608 Preston Ave  
Tax Parcel 320014000  
King Lumber Partners, LLC, Owners/ Mark Green, Applicant  
Renovate historic structure: demolish shed, add a fire escape,  
refurbish and paint  
Exterior brick re-open brick windows

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner, gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report on behalf of the BAR. The proposed changes will make a very positive contribution to the Preston Avenue streetscape. In 2008 the windows were proposed to be Jeld Wen Premium Wood, double hung, aluminum clad, in color Chestnut Bronze. The applicant should confirm the type of new windows and doors that are being proposed. The BAR may or may not wish to review future signage.

Mr. Mohr: Quick question. Does the added metal building fall under the BAR's purview?

Ms. Scala: Yes. It is an individually protected building so the entire property falls under the BAR's purview.

Mark Green the applicant does not have anything to add to the staff report and thanks staff for their diligence on the report.

Mr. Schwarz: How much demolition is taking place in order to make the new doorways on the stair tower in the warehouse building? Are you enlarging openings or do these openings already exist?

Jeff Bushman: Technically yes, although we are not making the opening any wider. Some of the openings are currently old windows, some of which have been bricked in, so in those windows the brick would be taken out and the sill would be dropped to floor level.

Mr. Schwarz: Is the ground floor opening already that big?

Mr. Bushman: Yes, there are some odd openings in there having to do with things people have done in the past to get a passage between the two buildings.

Mr. Bushman added that this project is a tax credit project, and they company has applied and received Part II approvals from the National Park Service, and are headed back with an amendment to add the external fire escape, but other than that they have approved what you are seeing today.

Mark Green: We have been on a preliminary basis to the tax credit open house last month, and on a preliminary basis they thought this was a good idea. In the previous project the stairway was located inside the building, and in order to do that we had to cut through the fabric and we did not want to do that.

Ms. Miller: So you are going with the old application that got approved?

Mr. Bushman: The old application with the added amendment to change the stair, yes.

Ms. Miller: In this application you show a painted sign, are you planning on painting the sign with the different colors?

Mr. Bushman: Yes, we are planning on having a painted sign. Everyone seems to like the painted sign idea, however, it is a little dependent on the tenants who go in there, but the idea with the light versus the dark on the front of the building, is that would be the location of the sign. On the plan it is the band of white in between the two windows on the second floor.

Mr. Keesecker said there are two handrails, one to the outside of the fire escape and is the other directly connected to the brick facing of the building?

Mr. Bushman: I should note that the fire escape is a little steeper than what is normally allowed, but we have discussed this with Tom Elliot, the code official in NDS, and he has given us permission to make a slightly steeper, old style fire escape.

Mr. Keesecker: Another question, the size of the bridge itself that connects the stair tower how is the width of that bridge determined? Is it a code determined piece? Big enough to gather on?

Mr. Bushman: It is the smallest bridge that makes sense; it is determined by the configuration of the stair and the elevator back there with that tower in order to give people some room to maneuver by the door. I cannot remember the exact width of the bridge, but it is square. Also, the entire building is set up on a sprinkler system, so it should not be used as an area of refuge.

Ms. Miller: Are there any other questions from the board?

Mr. Mohr: I guess we should ask what are the windows are since that is something Mary Joy asked about.

Mr. Bushman: The windows are, as previously specified, 6 over 6, wood windows, and we are following the Park Service and the Department of Historic Resources guidelines which ask for wood windows. It is clad with the color that was included in the proposal packet. The annex windows are mill finished aluminum that matched the store front.

Mr. Mohr: This is a very nice project.

Ms. Miller: Do you think eventually there will be a site plan, like landscaping?

Mr. Bushman: I think there will be but since the recession hit this project, we are coming back with an incremental approach. We are looking at getting the renovation done first and then potentially looking at the other aspects, like a site plan.

Mr. Keesecker: If there is a way to support the hand rail without drilling into the wall, I think it would look really neat and that would be a way to speak to the difference between the old and the new systems.

Ms. Deloach: Did the DHR approve just the sheet of glass in the openings where there were doors?

Mr. Bushman: Not only did they approve it, they pretty much suggested it. There were never windows there, so nothing to replicate. He said that every single window is a different size, we are trying to get a standard window module that be modified with the brick molding, which would be barely visible.

Ms. Deloach: The windows on the back look nice, were they all filled in?

Mr. Bushman: Yes they were all filled in, there are no new windows.

Ms. Deloach: The air between the modern building and the historic building is so much nicer than butting right up to it.

Ms. Deloach: I have one final question, the proposed elevation on page 17, you have a person on the second floor, is that really going to be where they can walk out?

Mr. Bushman: Yes that is the bridge.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and for New Construction and Additions, Mr. Graves move to find that the proposed renovation plan for the King Lumber Building satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted seconded by Mr. Mohr, motion passes 6-0.

#### D. Deferred or Previously Considered Items

Ms. Miller reminded everyone that the next item, 1106-1108 West Main Street, was deferred by the applicant; due to weather issues they could not be at tonight's meeting.

8:00            6.        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 on behalf of the BAR. The applicant is asking for final approval. Next steps for the applicant will be site plan review, and City Council will hold public hearings regarding the closing of First Street and the sale of the property.

Mr. Powe said he would focus on 4 items, 1) building setbacks, 2) the grandstair, 3) the lighting 4) lighten the top.

Mr. Schwarz asked Mr. Powe if he did a study on the brick upper portion without the piers extending.

Mr. Powe said we did the 24 foot spacing first, and it felt like a 1960's motel. It was a long expression of a balcony rail like the Cavalier Hotel.

Ms. DeLoach asked are there dividers between the apartment terraces?

Mr. Powe said yes, there are three possible ways to do it.

Mr. Mohr asked what strategy would you use if people have plantings.

Mr. Powe stated we looked earlier about having a planter and we lost that opportunity. We can use a sizeable planter the same height as the balcony rail between the two sets of terraces. The planters will be the width of the piers.

Mr. Keesecker questioned how many travel ways are into the garage?

Mr. Powe said they are studying that now. This phase will either have 2-3 lanes at the Water Street entrance. It is also a service entrance for the trucks, so will not go away even if the public entrance is moved to Second Street SE with the second phase.

Mr. Keesecker asked if the color on the curtain wall on the plaza side has been lightened up a little bit.

Mr. Powe said yes. They are trying to get a soft, baked enamel gray (battleship gray), but the more readily available color is clear anodized aluminum.

Mr. Keesecker asked whether the low wall along South Street was necessary.

Mr. Powe said he would look at that.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the east façade, why it looks dark where the brises soleils are located. Will they serve a purpose on an east façade?

Mr. Powe said they will have some benefit but mostly will look good. We are not using them on the brick facades.

Mr. Keesecker said in the best scenario you would have the development of the east side mirror the west side, and they would frame 1<sup>st</sup> Street. I'm wondering if the tops should step back.

Mr. Powe said that would be a major imposition; it destroys two rooms.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the last remaining pier at the top of the stair. Have you looked at options for simplifying the pier/ elevator/ stair massing?

Mr. Powe wants a sign there visible from the Mall. That would be a goal, to bring the band across from elevator to something other than a pier for the sign.

Ms. DeLoach asked if he looked at the whole building in the limestone (cream) color.

Mr. Powe said he would like that, but Mr. Woodard, Mr. Schwartz and others wanted the base differentiated.

Mr. Keesecker said he thought two colors added richness and a better pedestrian experience. He used the Battle Building as an example. The Planning Commission talked about the relationship of the brick base to the smaller brick buildings around it.

Mr. Keesecker likes the light fixtures, but he would omit the ones at the bottom of the stairs.

Mr. Schwarz would like to see another pass at your elevations; the mullion pattern is very irregular – is that intentional? In some cases the horizontal banding does not align turning the corners, for example from South Street going into the Plaza. These details need to be figured out. What can we approve tonight so you can move ahead with construction documents?

Mr. Mohr said the top looks a little too crenelated.

Mr. Keesecker agreed the changes to the upper floors are well done. He wants to eliminate the two lights at the bottom of the stairs. The other lights along 1<sup>st</sup> Street are good. He does not want a barrier along South Street. The east wall on 1<sup>st</sup> Street might look better without brises soleils.

Mr Schwarz agrees the brises soleils are not needed on the east elevation at 1<sup>st</sup> Street.

Ms. Miller said we need an updated package.

Mr. Graves said at some point and time we have to trust the architect to do his job. He said the BAR is demanding more of Mr. Powe than we have demanded of our other applicants as far as level of detail and what we expect to see. He said he agrees on receiving a packet that is 100% that we can sign off on what we want. We need to approve a set of documents that we are comfortable with and require him to have the same information that we require from other applicants, which is not construction documents.

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 guidelines, and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the final details as submitted, seconded by Ms. DeLoach.

After a lengthy discussion, the BAR approved (6-0) the building perspectives with elevations and details to come back to the BAR to confirm the design intention:

1. Handrail along Water Street;
2. Remove brick pillar at top of stair;
3. No brises soleils on east elevation;
4. Modify top of building to minimize crenellations;
5. Terrace dividers;
6. Remove two light poles at bottom of stair;
7. Explore options to remove entry barrier to plaza from South Street;
8. Landscape plan;
9. Lighting plan;
10. Signage plan;
11. Confirm final materials, windows, metal colors;
12. Elevation drawings to show corner details resolved.

- 9:00            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

Ms. Scala, Preservation and Design Planner, gave a verbal summary of the Staff Report on behalf of the BAR. The applicant is now requesting final approval of the mixed-use buildings. The material palette has been revised to eliminate brick and cast stone; the color scheme is more simplified and subdued; the Commerce Street elevation has been made more similar to the rest of the building. The Main Street parking level (screening fence) comes closer to the two historic buildings.

Mr. Atwood, the applicant, commented on the revised mixed used and he ready to go to the next page with this project.

Mr. Schwarz asked about the dimensions of the shading fins.

Mr. Atwood said they are 8 inches deep and the length is mainly a suggestion. He will come back with an actual building section with those articulated, based on what lighting folks will tell us; this is a huge waste of exposure.



Ms. Deloach said the colors don't look like they match up.

Mr. Atwood presented the colors but suggested having a meeting to discuss the colors.

Ms. Deloach stated the colors printed from the computer don't match the original colors.

Mr. Atwood said we have eliminated three colors, one material and tried to tone down the colors we had. He said we don't have any more brick but he thinks those colors are the correct ones.

Ms. Miller asked about the dark blue spandrel glass.

Mr. Atwood said we like that particular element because the building is linear, a long piece and has big spans, we are required to camouflage some of the spans and the elevation itself without going to basic stucco; would rather use a colored spandrel glass.

Mr. Mohr asked the logic behind not bringing the stairs back and not making it more tiered.

Mr. Atwood said the logic was in the July submission he introduced a 6 foot wide tiered urban garden and there was long focused conversation at that time with an individual who teaches at the architectural school and didn't show up at the last meeting that basically said no we don't want that. They said what we want is an urban garden that is centered or close to centered in your project. He said it is appropriate now for the urban courtyard. You can see the garden from Commerce Street and if you walk down Commerce Street Commerce it's tight and it's urban, linear and very determined. He said to break one piece back is not the right solution for the street.

Ms. Miller said in the previous meeting we had talked about putting some trees or other plant materials between the historic building and the proposed building.

Mr. Atwood said he made a commitment to Mary Joy that they would move the parking mass back 8 feet and show the landscape plan.

Ms. Miller asked the size of the tiny retail space.

Mr. Atwood agreed it is 527 square feet.

Mr. Keesecker asked about relationship of the stair that leads from the park courtyard to Commerce Street and its relationship to the garage opening and their proximity to each other. Is there any consideration that the stair would be on the opposite side of the courtyard, better aligned and have a direct path from West Main to the garage?

Mr. Atwood said we intended to place it closer to the garage opening. He said a commitment was made to open the garage up for some Sunday use and some other uses for people that needed it.

Mr. Keesecker asked if either one made the Jefferson School more or less visible from West Main or more visible.

Mr. Atwood said if we adjusted it and moved it over; it would make the Jefferson School more visible.

Mr. Schwarz commented on the way the stair split the mass of the building on Commerce Street makes it more equally toward the middle versus having a big long bar.

Mr. Mohr said the stairs are in the right place.

### Public Comments

Sandy Carroll lives in the community, and has concerns about the project being bit more of the type of construction that we saw going up with the Flats and the big hotel, the big boxy buildings that seems tragically out of character with what she fell in love with about Charlottesville when she purchased property here and why she was so excited to live here. The Jeffersonian spirit, the architecture and this building and she totally emphasized with the BAR's challenge. She said she realize the size of the building has been approved. She stated there is a really nice spirit evolving in the neighborhood, not a lot of Jeffersonian going on West Main Street; there's some industrial rehab, but this building just feels like it falls in between those two definitions of character that we don't quite have the sense of history that we all love about

Charlottesville and we don't have any of the funkiness of that particular section of West Main. She said right now it seems very overwhelming of the neighborhood.

Andrea Douglas, African American Heritage Center, said she commended Mr. Atwood on listening to some of the things that were said before. But she feels things have gone into an opposite direction. Her personal sensibility is a building such as you have developed. But if you think about the character of the landscape and where that building resides, and the potential for the building over not just two or three years, this parcel of property has a far more important piece of importance than some other properties. Her advocacy is not to come and say I hate your building but to say the harshness of the squares that reminds us of the original massing seems to have been returned. She said there has to be somewhere a medium in that design.

### BAR Comments

Ms. Deloach said she agrees with the neighbors. We are asking for better design however it is not our job to try to make the architect come to us with a perfect design. She said she is struggling with it also.

Mr. Mohr said the most delicacy and details is the glass box portion of it. The other portion of it is these heavy frames made like a mal- like idiom from the 70's. He doesn't see them as urban. One thing that appeals to him about pushing the façade back if nothing else it exposes the corner of the big box of the building. It also means that the street scape coming down to a curb. The whole thing should be part of the building. On the street level, the facade up until you get to this big heavy frame, is interesting and looks like it's going somewhere. But the frame just seems like a monumental scale that is not correct. The glass façades are more successful for him than the introduction of the masonry or the cladding. He said the frames are repetitive patterns that are at the same times are frenetic and busy. He said he is all for colors and vibrancy. The palettes seems okay judging by the color chart. But it seems busy and also heavy.

Mr. Schwarz stated the front and back are definitely more equivalent. It is a huge step forward in making Commerce Street more active. It reads as a whole more than before. The MCM panel is playful and fun; references an automotive dealership.

Mr. Keesecker said the glass tower is more successful than other building. It's a question of pedestrian scale and detail. Commerce Street has a module that's small like the blue building.

Mr. Atwood said he does not want to defer. He said he wants a vote tonight.

Mr. Schwarz said he wants to clarify that the building needs a base or we are getting just a big glass box. He also feels the upper residential stories are successful.

Mr. Graves said both of the projects they have looked at this evening have struggled with the bases. It seems like we don't like any of the bases so he doesn't know what the architectural answer is for the base. He likes that they both read as comparable elevations, two separate buildings with the courtyard in the middle. His opinion is the blue box is the only thing that throws him off on the base of the building. The other one maybe reads too long, but the blue box seems like it is stuck there, otherwise he thinks the bases are fairly successful.

Mr. Keesecker noted the glass façade is pulled back four feet from the frame on Commerce Street.

Mr. Mohr would like the taller building to come down to the street and not be interrupted.

Mr. Schwarz said keeping the stair where it is makes the garden more of a place – it forces you to zig-zag through.

Ms. Miller asked for suggestions to get to the next step.

Mr. Mohr said he has more of a problem with the residential building, and the heavy aggressive frame on the West Main Street building.

Mr. Atwood said it is not your job to design my building. This is a neighborhood building- more colors, more details, more spontaneous. We have tried for one year to meet everyone's needs.

Most of the neighbors are happy but they are not here.

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 buildings does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines, and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR denies the project as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Keesecker, (5-1) (Mr. Graves opposing).

Ms. Scala asked for a reason for the denial.

Generally, the project was denied as submitted because:

1. The exterior skin is not compatible with Commerce Street and West Main Street;
2. The scales of the elevations on Commerce Street and some of the details on West Main Street are not compatible with the historic buildings;
3. The intermediate levels of the residential block are not compatible with the project and district (The rhythm, patterns and ratio of solid to voids should relate to, and be compatible with adjacent historic facades);
4. This was a proposal for a final approval that seemed unresolved

10:00 E. Other Business

10. PLACE Task Force update – Tim Mohr

The PLACE committee met on February 12 with the following topics:

1. Dan Frisbee gave a presentation on Storm Drain Art;
2. Parks gave a presentation on plans for an entry node at the end of Rugby Avenue where the proposed pedestrian bridge will cross the RR tracks;
3. A place-making summit was discussed;
4. Officers were elected: Mark Watson, Chair; Fred Wolf, Vice-Chair; Tim Mohr, Secretary;
5. Two new members were appointed: Andrew Mondeschein, multi-modal consultant and Jim Self, CATS.

10:10 F. Adjournment 10:12 p.m.

- The Chair asked how the BAR could submit objections to the curved metal fence constructed without BAR approval along the RR at Chancellor Street and the Corner area.
- Ms. DeLoach asked about the appeal process for a BAR decision.
- Mr. Mohr noted that PLACE has asked to get in front of decisions to sell City property.