

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
July 21, 2015
City Council Chambers-City Hall

Members Present:

Melanie Miller
Carl Schwarz
Kurt Keesecker
Justin Sarafin
Laura Knott
Wit Graves
Emma Ernst
Tim Mohr
Candace DeLoach

Staff Present

Mary Joy Scala
Margaret Stella-Intern
Camie Mess-Intern

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

- A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes)
No one spoke.
- B. Consent Agenda
1. Minutes June 16, 2015
Motioned to be approved by Mr. Mohr seconded by Mr. Schwarz, 6-0-3 (Knott, Graves, Earnst abstained)
- C. Deferred or Previously Considered Items
2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from May)
BAR 15-05-03
400 West High Street
Tax Parcel 330154000
Walker's Legacy, LLC, Owner/ Carolyn Polson, Applicant
Remove trees and replace with other species

This applicant is seeking approval to remove three volunteer Black Walnut trees (8", 14", 19") and one Mulberry tree (with two-8"forks) growing along the north property line abutting a public alley-way that connects West High Street/Altamont Street with McIntire Road. At the last BAR meeting, the BAR approved removal of a dead Live Oak tree in the front yard, which has been removed. The original intent was to replace it with another Live Oak.

The justification for the plan to remove the trees is that the trees are tangled in electric lines, and pose a danger to guests from falling limbs and walnuts.

The applicant intends to keep a 5" Maple, 3" Plum, and a 20" non-fruiting Mulberry along the same row of vegetation. The applicant's plan also proposes additional plantings,

including Arborvitae and Fosters Holly, which the City Arborist had recommended instead of the originally planned Leland Cypress.

The Tree Commission has made additional recommendations, to which the applicant is agreeable.

Since the last meeting, the applicant has had prepared a measured site plan with existing and proposed tree locations and fence and utilities, as requested by the BAR. The plan confirms that the Walnut trees either straddle the property line, or are on the applicant's property. The double Mulberry proposed to be removed is in the alley area.

The applicant's plan was reviewed by the Tree Commission for recommendations. They have submitted two photos and a plan that recommends replacing one of the proposed Fosters Holly with a canopy tree, and also recommends adding a replacement canopy tree near to Altamont Street, which could replace the dead Live Oak that was removed from the front yard. Recommended replacement canopy trees are Scarlet Oak, American Elm 'Valley Forge' or "New Harmony" or a Willow Oak. Staff recommends this plan as recommended by the Tree Commission.

Carolyn Polson, applicant, bought in a black walnut to show the size. She said this is the size for early in the season and later in the fall they are twice this size. When walking on the ground it is easy to turn your ankle on them. She is thankful to the Tree Commission and the arborist for their recommendations to replace the Foster's Holly with canopy trees.

Board Questions

Ms. Knott asked who drew up the plans.

Ms. Polson said Frank Cox landscape architects.

Ms. Earnst wanted to clarify what was being discussed; she thought that the Live Oak that was removed from the front yard was being replaced with two canopy trees, which was not in fact the case.

Ms. Polson said no, this was not the case, and if that happened neither tree would thrive

Public Questions

Mark Kavit said he is the adjoining property owner and has two points of concern. He is asking for an appeal if this application is approved. He said Ms. Polson is not the property owner and therefore this request should in fact come from the city. The other question is about who actually owns the land. He said the land might be privately owned, and he is in the middle of a title search to figure out if this is the case. He was also the one that got the Tree Commission involved, to see what their advice was and what they recommend. He is also concerned about the tree in the front area and if it is going to thrive because of the fact that there was a Black Walnut in that location. Other landscaping that has been planted there did not survive. He is glad to see the Mulberry is going to be left. He stated that years ago there were even more trees taken down. He is concerned that the Black Walnut tree showing to be 14 inches in diameter; it is actually 32 inches in diameter; it is a massive walnut tree. He would like to save the walnut tree because the shade it provides keeps the cooling cost of his house to a minimum. He asked the BAR to consider a requirement for some bushes to soften the asphalt and give less of commercial look to the property.

Ms. Polson said the bush Mr. Kavit was speaking about was poison ivy.

Ms. Miller said we will take action tonight based on the statement from the City Attorney. If it is appealed, at least we will have taken action.

Mr. Mohr asked if the Willow Oak will work where Black Walnuts had been growing.

Ms. Knott said she didn't know.

Ms. Knott commented on the design. She said a lot will not work; the Fosters Hollies are enormous. She said if there is a holly, there should be a smaller variety like Nellie Stevens, or plant the holly on the outside of the fence. She said the Arborvitae will not grow in dense shade. She is glad the applicant wants to replace large canopy trees, and also supports that the applicant wants to screen the area. She said there is an electric line that runs where the trees are and that is why she suggested a smaller tree. She also wants them to think carefully about the electric line there. She thinks a Redbud or another smaller native tree would be fine. A smaller native tree would have a larger canopy than an evergreen shrub.

Mr. Mohr said if you plant a hedge, put it outside the fence, to soften the edge to the public, and plant trees on the inside of the fence. It is hard to see the design intent in the plan.

Mr. Mohr said the Black Walnut is not an ideal street tree and the location of the trees is unfortunate.

Ms. Miller said she does not support large trees unless the replacement trees are large.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, **Ms. Knott** moved to find that the proposed tree removals with a one to one replacement of the walnuts with large canopy species as indicated by the arborist's [Tree Commission's] redlined version of the site plan and replacing the mulberries with the appropriate medium canopy tree from the city list, satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with these changes. **Justin Sarafin** added, with the understory or small scale planting scheme to come back to Mary Joy, to be circulated administratively, seconded by **Mr. Keesecker** the motion passed 9-0.

Further discussion clarified that the BAR requests two medium canopy tree from the City of Charlottesville's list (to replace the two mulberries) and three large canopy trees of any of the species indicated by the Tree Commission on the plans they provided to the BAR (to replace the walnuts). The Tree Commission recommended either: Willow Oak, Scarlet Oak, or American Elm (Valley Forge or New Harmony),

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from April)
BAR 15-01-03
313 East Main Street
Tax Parcel 330229000
Charles Kabbash, T/A 414 Associates, Owner/ Joe Benny, Kilwin's of Charlottesville, LLC, Applicant
Demolish and reconstruct storefront-final details

Bill Bailey represents Kilwin's of Charlottesville. The architect, Paul Tasel, was also present. The applicant wishes to reconstruct the storefront in order to allow for product production and display. The existing storefront and some flooring will be removed. The existing cornice will remain. The existing sign panel will be replaced with a new three-panel detail with signage proposed in the center panel. As requested, the panel sizes have been modified to better relate to the paneling under the storefront window. The proposed awning fabric is Sunbrella "Burgundy." Six gooseneck lamps would illuminate the wall sign. The paneling detail under the storefront window is the same as in the previous application. The double door entrance will be moved closer to the mall. The

side entrance to the second floor apartments will be moved from the interior location to directly access the mall. The doorway is now flat (not arched) on top, as requested.

Board Questions

Mr. Schwarz asked if we approved the gooseneck lamps.
Mr. Bailey said yes you did.
Ms. Miller asked did you consider a smaller size tile.
Mr. Bailey said they can consider a smaller size.
Mr. Sarafin asked if the intent is to use the existing bracket for the blade sign.
Ms. Deloach questioned the panel above the double door.

Board Comments

Mr. Keesecker said this is a non-standard store front, and to have some fun with the door handles.
Mr. Schwarz would like to see a nice, even illumination with light fixtures and wants to see it again administratively after the fact. Also, he wants them to keep the wattage subtle.
Mr. Mohr said with the way the lights are arranged, right at the break, centered in the break the lighting will be strange.

The BAR had expressed concern previously that the substrate for the paneling was plywood that is currently warping badly. This needs to be addressed. The storefront should be refaced with a more stable material, or possibly stuccoed over.
The BAR had also requested a drawing to show how the hanging sign (and lights) would be positioned in relation to the awning. That still needs to be resolved.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Mohr** moved to find that the proposed façade demolition and reconstruction satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, seconded by **Mr. Sarafin** 9-0 motion passes with the following addendums:

- (1) administrative review of the light fixture selection, wattage, and placement;
- (2) consider a more adventurous tile plan (with administrative approval if you reconsider the tile);
- (3) consider more creative door handles, rather than stock design.

D. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 15-07-04
103 8th Street NW
Tax Parcel 320147000
Union Station Partners, LLC, Owner/ Greg Jackson, TOPIA Design, Applicant
Renovation of windows and doors, awning signage, paint and trim

The applicant is requesting approval for alterations to the existing structure. This plan utilizes the shed-roofed wing off the north side as an addition to the original structure.

- New exterior trim and paint

- New clear anodized aluminum storefront windows and door, in existing openings, except the front/east elevation window header is to be raised to enlarge opening and align with door height
- New clear anodized aluminum storefront double doors with sidelights and transom, in existing openings
- New wall sconces
- Add a metal awning
- Add a new sign

The staff report noted that the changes are appropriate and attractive, and will add activity to this street.

Board Questions

Mr. Sarafin asked has staff reviewed the signage for scale.

Ms. Scala said they will bring in a sign application when they are ready.

Ms. Earnst stated in the photo it looks like a piece is painted onto the roof.

The architect, Greg Jackson said that was the gutter. They would like to bring the gables back out and build up what was lost.

Ms. Miller asked about the potential intended use.

Mr. Jackson said he did not want to keep the garage door there because it is going to be an exercise business. We are weighing the cost and thermal use.

Mr. Mohr asked if there is more than one tenant and the strength of the gable. The canopy is fighting the gable.

Mr. Jackson said it serves as a main entrance and seems like the facade needed something to pull it together.

Board Comments

Ms. Knott said it is a big improvement.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, and for Site Design, **Mr. Graves** moved to find that the proposed renovation of windows and doors, awning signage, paint and trim satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines 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. Keesecker**, motion passed 9-0.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-07-01

900 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 10007800

AT&T Mobility, Owner/ Shannon Kraiger (Velocitel), Applicant

Replace existing antennas and redesign stealth enclosures

The applicant proposes to remove and replace three existing antenna concealment chimneys, which are currently 4x4x8, with three new chimneys at 6x6x13. They wish to install three new LTE antennas, three new RRUs, three new DC2s in the new chimney. Applicant wishes to reinstall six existing RRUs and three existing DC2s in new chimney. Install one new FC12 on existing platform and install new RBS 6601 and four new breakers in existing flexent cabinet.

Dan Costello, representing Velocitel, gave a brief application history. He said the antennas need to be above the parapet. The brick will be matched to the building. He said a fourth wall will be added to the equipment platform.

Board Questions

Mr. Mohr asked if it needs to be vertical and not horizontal.

Mr. Costello said definitely it would have to be vertical.

Ms. Miller asked if the signals can penetrate brick.

Mr. Costello said it cannot penetrate brick. The stealth material is like fiberglass.

Board Comments

Mr. Mohr said this looks more promising than what was seen to date. Looks like a utility chimney.

Mr. Sarafin said it sort of looks like the south wing of dependencies at Monticello, when the chimneys were replaced with utilitarian stacks; there is a good precedent for this.

Mr. Keesecker seemed to be faced with a series of these accommodations that are falling on top of the prominent buildings. This is a weird thing to be sticking up on the building. You should try to make it look intentional, and push it back from the parapet so it's less visible.

Mr. Costello said the engineer is trying to place it as back as far as he can.

Mr. Schwarz said they need scale drawings and a picture presented administratively and elevation showing a full top of the building.

The pertinent Telecommunication Facilities section of the zoning ordinance that was adopted in 2003 states:

Sec. 34-1073. Facilities by district.

(a) Within the city's historic and entrance corridor overlay districts:

(1) The following shall be permitted uses: antennae or microcells mounted on existing communications towers established prior to February 20, 2001; attached communications facilities utilizing utility poles or other electric transmission facilities as the attachment structure; and other attached communications facilities if such other attached communications facilities are not visible from any adjacent street or property.

(2) The following shall be prohibited uses: attached communications facilities where such facilities are visible from any adjacent street or property, and communications facilities utilizing alternative tower, monopole tower, guyed tower, lattice tower and self-supporting tower support structures.

(b) Within other zoning districts of the city, the permitted communications facilities are identified within the use matrix for the applicable districts. Facilities other than those identified within the use matrix for a particular district shall be prohibited.

Staff commends property owner and designer for creating a more aesthetically appealing concealment chimney, and for following antenna guidelines. However, staff has several concerns: The height of the platform shield wall is not mentioned in the drawings. We would like to see it stated along with the material of the stealth design and trim.

Mr. Dan Costello asked for a deferral.

Ms. Miller motioned to accept the deferral, seconded by **Mr. Graves**, motion passes 9-0. The BAR would like to see a final structural drawings; plans with elevations; and photo simulations.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-07-02

1413 University Ave.

Tax Parcel 090075000

Hunter E. Craig, Tiger Investments LLC, Owner/ Mark Stanis, Applicant

Exterior renovations, bringing the façade back to its original state.

The applicant is proposing to return the exterior façade back to its original state with three half-circle windows. The door will remain in its current location in the west bay; the historic photo shows an entrance in the east bay.

The proposed use is a joint Public Safety Sub-Station for Charlottesville Police Department and UVA Police Department. The most recent use of the building was Freeman-Victorius frame shop, which has moved to the Eloise/Oakhart Social complex on West Main Street.

There is a note on the drawing regarding demolition of an existing pilaster. That pilaster is not original, but appears to have been added to accommodate the renovations for the current storefront. The plan is to remove it back to the original masonry opening. It is located at the top clerestory window, and does not extend down as far as the main storefront glazing.

The applicant said proposed awning will be similar to the adjacent Natty Beau retractable, canvas canopy. Color options are:

First choice: Beige and white stripe

Second choice: Solid beige

Third choice: Solid brick/dark red.

The only signage will be on the glass near the entrance.

Board Questions

Ms. Miller said regarding the leaded squares, asked if it would be possible to match the squares in the center bay at Qdoba.

Board Comments

Mr. Mohr said it seemed to be appropriate, a great thing for that end of town. It had more modern windows.

The applicant asked about colors of the building and the awning.

Mr. Mohr said the striped awning was more celebratory.

Ms. Knott said she like the beige and green awning. The applicant noted those were used on Garrett Hall.

Ms. Miller said we could allow some flexibility.

Ms Knott said it is beautiful; she could support it.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Keesecker** moved to find that the proposed façade renovation satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with recommendation that the awning should be dark green and beige stripes similar to Garrett Hall, or some flexibility as appropriate, seconded by **Mr. Sarafin**, motion passed 9-0.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-07-03

700 Harris Street

Tax Parcel 35013200

Randall Leach, Owner/ Martin Chapman, Applicant

Replace existing: entry canopy, entry door with new aluminum framed glass door and sidelights to match existing window frames. Raise sidewalks and concrete stairs to ADA standards.

The applicant proposes to alter the south entrance of the 1947 addition. Staff had previously administratively approved concrete work to make the entrance accessible with no change in appearance.

Willi Scribner, an architect with SMBW Architects in Richmond, represented the applicant, Indoor Biotechnologies, Inc.(IBI). They are requesting to replace the existing canopy and open up the entry to acknowledge the significant change in vibrancy and activity of the new high-technology lab use now inhabiting the main floor. They are proposing a pre-fabricated canopy, attached with two tie rods. The original canopy was strutted to the building but those struts were compromised and would have to be replaced at the least.

Board Questions

Ms. Knott asked if the applicant had a landscape plan.

The applicant said no; they intended to replace the shrubs in kind.

Mr. Mohr noted the verbage in the submittal did not match what they are now requesting. Me. Scribner said he took responsibility for that change.

Mr. Keesecker asked how does water move off the top of the canopy

The applicant said there is a tiny outlet on other side.

Ms. Miller said the glass block is covered over, has this wall been modified, is this a current picture.

He applicant said it was taken today.

There was discussion about the door.

Ms. Knott asked about the fluted aluminum pilasters. Mr Scribner said they now propose not to keep them.

Mr. Chapman offered to answer questions about the use of the building. He noted safety issues with the doorway. The walkway is narrow; widening it will allow Fed Ex to make

deliveries more easily. They want to make it more accessible because there is a gallery in that side of the building.

Board Comments

Ms. Miller said it could be restored. The inside space looks phenomenal. The existing entry is much more interesting than what is proposed.

Mr. Mohr asked about the condition of the glass block. The fineness of that detail is very nice. There is detail the rest of the building does not have.

He said putting a modern glass door is appropriate but can do a little mix and match. The brick bands are great; they relate to canopy. If the objective is to keep the historical part of the building, then the entrance is a signature item.

Mr. Sarafin agrees with the comments, and said regarding the walkway, if you take the width out to the outside edge of the glass block to go down to the sidewalk, you gain a lot.

Amy Kilroy with Artisan Construction said they put up the drywall from the inside, once they moved into the structure, and the inside wall has taken a beating. It has small broken up offices, so the south elevation on inside was very chopped up. The glass block is still murky in current condition.

Mr. Graves did not think the glass block was original and commented on the mortar joint in the picture. The colors don't really match.

Ms. Miller is supportive of the canopy being replaced in kind, and the glass block. The pilasters are important. The door is really interesting and perhaps could save it.

Ms. Knott like to see the canopy stay, either attached to something else or replaced in kind to match, and would like to see an investigation of the glass block and the brick below it to see if it replaced something. She asked is it possible there were two clear lights there; we need more information, and would like to see the door frame restored. I could see replacing the door but keep the transom configuration. She supports the widening of the stairs. Need to see a landscape plan for that.

Mr. Scribner noted their obligation to give the client a safe door.

Mr. Schwarz said the door surround and canopy style needs to look new to be successful; does not age well. Repair may not give a good result.

Mr. Sarafin said to keep the door surround, then glaze where the block is. Pick up the aluminum treatment, almost replacing in kind, maybe re-envisioning it.

Mr. Mohr said it could be a modern door but the use of aluminum speaks to the specific time frame. Things do accrue, if they have been there long enough. The glass block looks terrible it's deteriorating. The fine grain of entrance would be lost with new storefront. Requires further research. Same thing as Coca Cola entrance with detail and fluting. As far as the sidewalk and stairs he has no problems with that.

Ms. Knott said we need to see the hand rails and stairs details Or, just say it will match what's there.

Mr. Sarafin said this was a cutting edge entrance at the time it was built.

Ms. Miller read from the BAR guidelines which all pertain to this application. She feels we should follow the guidelines.

Ms. Miller said it looks like this is headed to a deferral.

Mr. Mohr suggested allowing them to move forward on the concrete work. We want the applicant to revisit the door and canopy. We want history of the glass block. The door is free game- do whatever you want. We are fine with concrete work.

Ms. Earnst is basically on board with what Tim said. Replicate the trim on side pilasters. Not sure about door. The glass block should be replaced or restored if original. I want to see that we can restore or recreate as much as possible.

Mr. Graves disagrees with fellow board members. He feels that it does not have a lot of connectivity, and was in favor of the application but he would like to see the new brick removed and filled with some sort of glazing. Because of this he does not have a lot to add to the conversation.

Mr. Keesecker said new materials replicating old details is best.

Mr. Schwarz said he is open to something more interpretive. A basic storefront is not quite enough.

Ms. Deloach likes to see as much of the original remain.

Ms. Knott wants awning and door restored or replaced, a different door as long as the pattern of the door stays, if glass block was put in at a later date, was replaced, no problem with replaced with clear light. She can support the concrete work as proposed, but wants to see the details of the handrails and a planting plan.

Mr. Sarafin agreed, he asked if the 1947 addition was included in the IPP considerations. The aluminum canopy and door surround are the defining features of this, replication of those elements or replacement in kind are appropriate. This is more based on the condition of what's here, what can be reproduced if possible. And glaze the rest. We need to see the glass block and what the story of that is.

The applicant asked for a deferral. Can we come back with different options?

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, **Ms. Miller** moved to find that the proposal for the handicapped accessible entrance and other concrete work satisfy the criteria, but with the handrail details and stair profile to come back for administrative approval (to be circulated among the BAR). For the remainder of the application, the BAR accepted the applicant's request for deferral, seconded by **Mr. Mohr**, 8-0-1 (Graves opposed).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 15-07-05
109 2th Street SE
Tax Parcel 280026100
Main Street Associates, LLC, Owner/
Jason W. Owenby, Jack Browns Charlottesville, LLC, Applicant

Add shade sails over current patio space

Jack Brown's restaurant seeks permission to add shade sails over its patio in the 2nd Street SE right-of-way. Two triangular sails are proposed, each 15 ft. x 12 ft. x 9 ft. The proposed material is deep red, high density polyethylene. The sails would be attached to existing poles and hooks currently used for café lights.

Ally Toro, the applicant was there to answer questions.

Public Comment

Rebecca W Quinn asked if the existing hooks carrying lightweight lighting will resist wind going through the area.

Ms. Toro said we are looking for a contractor to create a structure to deal with the wind.

Board Questions

Mr. Mohr asked if it is transparent.

Mr. Knott asked if it is shiny? I see you have a plan sketch - how does it relate to the building? Are the sails attached to the building and how do you attach the sails?

Ms. Toro said it is not a shiny material, it is matte, and they are attached to the front of the building. To the side left and right of the glass block there is a cable that runs across there.

Ms. Knott asked if you can draw it on that drawing and hand it out and do you have an engineer.

Mr. Mohr suggested having a structural engineer look at it.

Ms. Toro said yes someone that is approved by the landlord.

Ms. Knott asked about the lighting. The applicant said they would be under the sails.

Mr. Mohr asked what time of the year are they are going to be up and how will they define it. He asked whether your intentions are to have it up all year.

Mr. Keesecker confirmed the sails are approximately 15x12.

Public Comments

Rebecca Quinn stated it is one thing to talk about anchoring it to the building, but of course it is a triangle so it's got to be anchored somewhere else. The examination of structural load needs to be (assuming there is a vertical pole there) holding up the outer edge and the whole thing needs to be looked at. She is not happy with the vague answer and she thinks it fits more with the umbrella policies and those uses and they are not allowed to stay up and open all the time. They get blown around as well. Things like snow load - look at whether it would affect it in the winter. She said you should look for more restrictions on time and perhaps that is in the umbrella policy all ready. Is the concrete barrier city property, so perhaps the city engineer should take a look at any structural loading the vertical that is attached to that concrete just to assure us that our property is protected from any damage that might occur as well.

Ms. Toto said it is attached to a building, it is not a transient like an umbrella, but this doesn't mean that it shouldn't have a season condition.

Board Comments

There was discussion whether the sail is an umbrella, awning, or tent.

Would we make it an awning opposed to calling it a tent?

Ms. Miller said it provides shade and coverage from the rain.

Mr. Sarafin said it is conceived of specifically for this application. There's hardware, it's mounted and designed for this particular space.

Mr. Graves said he likes these sails. Does it go to the Building Official for a building permit? How does this location have sails and we don't have them in the middle to the mall? Does it set a precedent? I think it's OK on the side street.

Mr. Schwarz said there are rules in the building code about tensile structures attached to buildings, related to fire mostly.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending, and Cafes, **Mr. Graves** moved to find that the proposed shade sails [awning] satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with the final details for wall connections and posts to be administratively approved (and to be circulated among the BAR), seconded by **Mr. Schwarz** the motion passes 8-0. (Ms. DeLoach left the meeting before the vote.)

Ms. Miller asked staff to pass the details around just for the BAR's information.

E. Other Business

9. **West Main Street Streetscape – Discussion**

Mr. Mohr said, the PLACE committee suggested a pilot program to deal with immediate issues like parking. The biggest problem is buy-in and mistrust of change.

We still need to visit Form Based Code (FBC) or a finer grain to our code, and what we think is appropriate are at polar opposites.

Ms. Miller confirmed the staff recommended a lower height zoning for the Amtrak site.

Ms. Knott said the reason she asked this to come before us is because she really feel that the BAR should be reviewing this type of thing, although we are not asked for a certificate of appropriateness this is an historic landscape in our city and is an historic district. It is really strange that we have not had an opportunity actively to be involved in this even though we do have people on the committee, which is good. It is unfortunate that this cannot be an official review and felt the BAR needed to talk about it more. She said if you look at the key points, the reason for the proposed streetscape plan, opportunities created for art and heritage education; establishing gateways to gathering to places; she said she didn't see that in this plan. Points from the three public meetings the first one is to celebrate history, she said she doesn't see that in this plan. In the City Council agenda it says the street lacks cohesiveness and coherent image and thematic

idea that ties the street together, she said she doesn't see that in this plan. The only way the master plan addresses the history of the three neighborhoods that this passes through, is by stating we could put some plaques up. Ms. Knott said she find it outrageous. Even the graphics of the plan didn't bother to show the change of paving at the intersections to indicate some sort of – that this is a place or a neighborhood – showing special parts of Charlottesville. It's a transportation plan and that is not what we asked for. It is too bad that the BAR is not officially asked to comment or have meaningful input.

Mr. Mohr said similar to zoning, the BAR is asked to pass judgment on things that don't correspond with our point of view. Need to take a more regional approach to the street. Getting the BAR's input would make a lot of sense. There is a West Main Steering Committee and that is an unwieldy group. Mr. Mohr said the BAR wants more involvement. I would like the BAR to have a work session with PLACE and the Planning Commission. At the last PLACE meeting we brought up there was a lighting study that Mark Schuyler and I went on a tour with consultants. The VA code calls for a much more sophisticated way of looking at lighting than is being exercised by this study. The BAR could write a memo to PLACE expressing our desire as a group asking for a work session regarding West Main Street Study.

Mr. Schwarz said this plan is still very schematic and still details to be worked out.

Mr. Mohr said it is conceptual. It is focused on parking and drainage.

Ms. Knott said placemaking is tricky.

Mr. Schwarz said the plan is allowing placemaking to happen.

Mr. Mohr said interest groups like the bike-ped committee are driving it too.

Mr. Schwarz said the committee considers it a compromise better than what exists.

Mr. Keesecker said Carl is right, the plan creates a sandbox; the character of the place comes out of that.

Mr. Keesecker said there were three speakers, Ian Lockwood, Jeff Speck, and a third one. A plan like this serves the purpose to establish an outline. It underpins the City's intention to implement. Utility work needs to happen all at once. Place making will happen privately; planners cannot make it happen. Business owners have to make it happen.

Mr. Schwarz said it would be useful for us to have more involvement.

Mr. Keesecker asked if RFP's include a plan for staging public projects?

Ms. Miller discussed the water meter vault on N 1st Street. This was a topic brought up in the PLACE meeting by Ms. Keller.

Mr. Schwarz asked about open houses, perhaps twice a year, for the public to meet informally with the BAR, and for contractors to find out what they can or cannot do.

F. Motion by Mr. Schwarz, seconded by Mr. Graves 9-0 to Adjourn: 9:40.