

Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
August 18, 2015

Location: City Council Chambers, Charlottesville City Hall, 2nd Floor

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller, Members Carl Schwarz, Kurt Keesecker, Justin Sarafin, Laura Knott, Wit Graves, Emma Ernst, Candace DeLoach, Staff Mary Joy Scala, Margaret Stella (Intern), Camie Mess (Intern), Carolyn McCray, Clerk.

Members Absent: Tim Mohr

Call to Order: the meeting was called to order by Chair Melanie Miller at 5:30 p.m.

- A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes)  
Mark Kavit – 400 Altamont St: requested better notification by the BAR. He brought in a sign from Albemarle County to show what offices are doing statewide to inform the public about local governmental meetings. He feels that the City of Charlottesville needs to do a better job of notifying people about upcoming BAR Agenda items. He also distributed photos of murals he liked from a town in Ohio.
- B. Consent Agenda
1. **Minutes from July 21, 2015 were deferred to the next meeting.**
  2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-08-06  
102 1st Street North  
Tax Parcel 330245100  
First and Main LLC, Owner/ Keith Woodard, Applicant  
Installation of low clearance structure at 1st St NE Entrance of First and Market Parking Lot.  
**This item was pulled from the consent agenda and considered at the end of this meeting.**
- C. Deferred or Previously Considered Items
3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from July)  
BAR 15-07-01  
900 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 10007800  
AT&T Mobility, Owner/ Shannon Kraiger (Velocitel), Applicant  
Remove existing antennas and replace with new.

*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. The platform will have a fourth concealment wall, designed and fabricated to match the existing walls that were originally manufactured. It will be SSV with a brick appearance. The one-sided screenwall will have an approximate panel linear footage of 9'x7' with a panel height of 10'. The screenwall support structure will be FRP and steel baseplates only, the steel finish will be galvanized.*

*Staff has nothing new to add until the requested information has been submitted.*

**The BAR accepted the applicant's request for a deferral motion by Ms. Knott, Seconded by Mr. Schwarz, motion passes 7- 0. The BAR is requesting correctly scaled drawings and a photo simulation from West Main Street. The City attorney's office via Mary Joy wanted to make sure the applicant understood the fast moving federal regulations for antennas and how a deferral would affect their timeline for the project.**

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from July)  
BAR 15-07-03  
700 Harris Street  
Tax Parcel 35013200  
Randall Leach, Owner/ Martin Chapman, Applicant  
Canopy replacement

Staff noted that at the July meeting the applicant requested to replace the canopy and entry components. The BAR was not supportive, so the matter was deferred. Now the applicant's plan is to rehabilitate the entry. The applicant will bring information to the meeting, but the plan is to repair the aluminum, and to replace the glass block with similar, but clear, glass blocks. The applicant will also bring a landscape plan, stair profile, and handrail details.

Staff previously administratively approved concrete work that would make this front entry accessible.

#### Questions from the Board

Ms. Knott asked is the sheet metal rusted.

Mr. Chapman said looks like sheet metal, it is bent somewhat and because there is not a vent around the perimeter, that it is causing some oxidation, it heats up and gets condensation and so he thinks that's what is occurring here.

Ms. Knott said it is bent and looks like a pattern of the two sheets with diagonal patterns.

Ms. Knott asked about the handrails. She asked what the regulations are going to be for ADA.

Mr. Chapman said because there is no fall protection, the grade that is adjacent to the stairs is right there so you are not 30 inches from fall and rail can be 36 inches and the top rail can work as your hand rail.

Ms. Knott said that is not what she is talking about. She is asking about the extension on the top and the bottom that are required by ADA. She said that is her question for him to look into.

Ms. Miller asked if they had attempted to clean the existing glass blocks since the last meeting.

Mr. Chapman said he didn't think they'd been cleaned at this point and time. He said that is something they spoke about today, whether they would go with the preferred option that we indicated as clear. They are having some second thoughts about that.

#### Comments from the Board

Mr. Sarafin said this is definitely moving toward restoration of what is there, and is great. He does not have strong feelings about the clear or glass block but feels it is going in the right direction. He

asked if he had pulled the canopy off yet to know exactly what is needed. Definitely headed in the right direction. Much appreciated.

Mr. Chapman said no.

Ms. Knott is really excited that you going to try keep that feature; it is really cool. She commented on the landscape plan, she thinks it needs some fine tuning. A couple of things she noticed is that the eight serviceberries are medium size trees, and are jammed in a space that is not really appropriate for them.

Mr. Chapman said we really want to show and present this as a concept and obviously we need to talk with the building owner to see what is appropriate and we would like to replace anything in kind. So again, if the trees are over-sized for that entrance, crape myrtles are always an option and were discussed last time.

Ms. Knott asked why do you want trees there, for shade or?

Mr. Chapman said shade mainly. There will be some seating on either side for people to come outside at lunch time.

Ms. Knott said this is a southern exposure.

Mr. Chapman said exactly.

Ms. Knott had a comment about the St. John's wort that is shown at the bottom of the slope. She said because this is in an industrial complex and is pretty straight forward, pretty functional with the exception of the entrance, she would like to see the planting line a little less baroque than what is shown there. She said you can extend the line of the ground cover bed that surrounds the trees straight down the hill and I think the owner would have less trouble maintaining that very complicated pattern of edging. You will get less erosion when the slope drops down. She would like it looked into a little bit more. She thinks the hydrangeas are appropriate or you could possibly do two serviceberries and have pretty good shade from those.

Mr. Schwarz asked about using metallic paint.

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, Mr. Sarafin moved to find that the proposal to alter the entrance satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with notes to landscaping to come back administratively, seconded Ms. Deloach, passes 7-0.**

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from June)  
BAR 15-06-04  
853 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 31017000  
Kevin Riddle, Applicant/Blake Hurt, Owner  
South façade renovations to brick veneer, addition of canopy and paved terrace

The applicant proposes to renovate the south façade of the existing brick (formerly Safeway) building, with the addition of a canopy and paved terrace space on West Main Street. The building is located approximately 18 feet from the West Main sidewalk.

- Replace brick façade and small existing windows with storefront.
- Replace mulch groundcover with masonry pavers.

- Plant 3-4 new trees and if possible preserve the two existing trees.
- Build a low bench wall at the back of the sidewalk along the south boundary line.
- Build metal and wood structure to partially shelter the exterior space.
- Screen existing transformer with tall wall.

In June the BAR accepted (6-0) the applicant's request for deferral. The BAR was generally supportive, but requested additional details, such as lighting, signage, materials, and landscaping plan. The applicant has included these details in the August submittal packet; however, the BAR might wish to see a more detailed landscape plan.

Mr. Kevin Riddle, Architect brought some sample materials. They are replacing the Bradford pear trees with better trees.

#### Question from the Board

Mr. Schwarz asked what are the materials on the top of the seat wall; and will there be a finish on it?

Mr. Riddle said we are proposing that there would be some sort of wood bench that would be added to the top of the wall so they would not be sitting on rough brick. We are using a clear finish, a varnish that would be very durable.

Ms. Miller said at the last meeting you said this might be a remodel in place for at least 10 years, is that the thinking.

Mr. Riddle said yes it is.

Ms. Miller said in the packet there are 3 different trees proposed. Have you figured out which one you want to go with or are you using any of the three.

Mr. Riddle said he wanted to talk with the board about that and to see if there might be some latitude in making the choice or must he decide on a particular species.

Ms. Knott said she is curious why aren't you just covering the whole roof solid and why are you opening up the space now.

Mr. Riddle said even as we considered the trees would be replaced it seemed like a nicer environment under there where you would have some visibility to the sky or to a tree canopy above as the trees are growing and maturing.

Ms. Knott said regarding the seat wall along the front, it would be a concrete wall with a facing on it and it would require an excavation down a couple of feet.

Ms. Miller said with the three different choices do you have any idea what the height might be on these 3 types of replace trees within 10 years.

Mr. Riddle said the yellow wood or the lace bark elm are going to be small to medium size trees. The black gum can potentially be larger, and we want it as a possibility because it has fall colors and it's an urban tree. These are planted about 10 feet off of the south face of the building. He doesn't know how tall they will be in 10 years.

Ms. Miller agrees that Bradford pear is not the best most awesome tree for the reason you say but have thought about leaving them and doing an epée decking or something that is 4 inches high? Because then you get the shade instead of having these little trees.

Mr. Riddle said the difficulty there is the level of the proposed terrace is higher than the interior floor level so there is going to be some need to raise the interior floor level to match it and we feared having to come up above the root structure sufficiently to protect the trees might add another eight to twelve inches. The roots are partially exposed and they are on the high end of grade over at the east side as opposed to the west and so it felt like it was going to bring the interior level up quite high and as far as the shade goes there are the two big zelkova trees and they are certainly going to contribute to keeping it at more of a feeling of mature canopy there than would be otherwise.

### Comments Board

Ms. Knott said she is fine with removing the Bradford pear because they are messy and dropping seeds. She doesn't think the zelkovas are going to make it because of the wall unless particular efforts were made for a post footing. She said we don't know what is happening out here because of the Main Street Plan working with some unknowns and I don't know that it might be smarter to remove them, and not work around them and eventually kill them in the end and start over or eventually start over. She said in the narrative you said you have been coordinating with the Main Street plans. She asked how does that work and what does he see happening to the front of the building.

Mr. Riddle said we had not thought that we should provide replacement for the trees that are there now because we are hopeful that we can protect them and not disrupt the ground around them enough that they would die. He is not sure about anything else regarding the corridor study that we should be taking into account for this property. He asked Ms. Knott if she had anything else in mind. Mr. Riddle said in making this addition we are trying to preserve the character of the street and in planting new trees we had hope that we would be contributing to shade there.

Ms. Knott said have you thought about honey locust which is a nice urban tree with small leaves and can create a nice lacy canopy, and really fast growing.

Ms. Schwarz said it's a great way to engage the street, he thinks it's pretty exciting. He said his only concern is the 2 inch caliber trees and it seems like someone could break one pretty easily but I am not an expert on that.

Mr. Sarafin and Ms. DeLoach said there is much improvement.

Ms. Knott said this is very exciting and this spot needs much improvement

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Site Elements, Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the proposed façade renovation and new outdoor space 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 with a more detailed landscape plan as well as specific tree choices to be circulated to the BAR for administrative approval, seconded by Mr. Sarafin, motion passes 7-0.**

D. New Items

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-08-01

220 West Market Street  
Tax Parcel 330277000  
Light House Studio, Owner/ Fred Wolf, Applicant  
Proposed 2nd Story Addition to Vinegar Hill Theater's west side facing Old Preston Ave.

The applicant proposes a two-story addition to the building's west side facing Old Preston Avenue.

The addition includes a sub-grade and ground level studio space, two stairs, an open porch at ground level, and a roof terrace at second floor level. A new canopy will be added to the existing entry on Market Street. A skylight will be added to the roof.

### Board Questions

Ms. Knott said usually if someone is going to cut down a tree and ask for some sort of mitigation, and we have a place like this where there is no place to do mitigation, considering this is a right of way, could there possibly be some kind of collaboration for this applicant to mitigate on the right of way and would that planting plan come back to us for that. So what can we do to mitigate the removal of the Magnolia?

Ms. Scala – Maybe the tree commission could weigh in on that.

Ms. Knott asked about the parking lot which had been used by Vinegar Hill when it was in operation.

Mr. Wolf said he thought it had been used by Vinegar Hill, but people tell him that it's parking that people never really understood. The adjacency of the parking lot right next to this appears attached but it is not. He said they have been encouraging them to talk to the city to see how this issue could be beneficial.

Ms. Knott said she was just curious to see if this had been a conversation.

### Public Comments

Mark Kavit said he is representing North Downtown Residents Association (NDRA) and we do feel this is a nice addition to the community and support this plan. We ask that the board be sure that the material and design is within the guidelines.

### Board Comments

Mr. Sarafin said this is a great improvement for this site as designed and planned.

**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 addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with changes dated 7.28.2015, and request that the applicant work with the City to address the adjacent right of way, seconded by Ms. Earnst, motion passes 7-0.**

Mr. Keesecker arrived at the meeting.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-08-02

408 Park Street  
Tax Parcel 530117000  
Pric2e Holdings, Owner/ Jill Trischman-Marks, Applicant  
Removal of all front concrete curbing and part of left front concrete walk. To be replaced with granite curbing and install underground piping to extend downspout drain.

408 Park Street recently underwent a building renovation using tax credits. They now are asking BAR approval to improve the street front of the property.

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to:

- (1) Remove part of the existing walkway leading from the City sidewalk to the secondary door on the left side facing Park Street, which is confusing to customers. The door, stairs, and part of the walkway that leads to the side of the house would remain.
- (2) Remove the entire concrete curbing along the front property line adjacent to the sidewalk, and replace with a granite curb.
- (3) Install underground piping to extend downspout drain to City sidewalk through 4" hole in granite curb.
- (4) Proposed new landscaping (boxwoods, pieris, hellebores, periwinkle, and hydrangea).

### Board Questions

Ms. Miller asked if the applicant had considered the possibility of a potted plant at the entrance on the left side porch that would make it clear that it's not an entry door, instead of removing the sidewalk.

Jill Trischman-Marks: The area to remain would still be concrete to the left of the steps and there was going to be a plant to the right in the ground to balance the pot on the concrete.

Ms. Miller said just put a potted plant on the front porch on the left side or something to make it clear that this is not a main entry so you won't have to rip up the sidewalk.

### Public Comments

Mark Kavit said he is representing the NDRA. He saw early this week on TV Bob Fenwick made a comment concerning the character of Charlottesville. We need to get serious as to what is the character of Charlottesville and what makes it unique. He thinks this block emphasizes the quarter rounds, and putting granite would drastically change the look of the block. Initially he was thinking the concrete should remain, but after thinking about it, the concrete is in bad shape and if we have an occupant/owner that wants to change that concrete out, maybe it's the time to do it, but he thinks the quarter rounds should remain. If any block needs the quarter rounds to keep the character of that block, it's this one. He said Ms. Miller's comments about the potted plant are a good solution because you never know later on down the road what some tenant might do, so maybe it would be a good idea to keep the sidewalk in place. He had a concern about the drainage.

### Board Comments

Mr. Sarafin said what he would recommend is a replacement in-kind of what's there. He does not have strong feeling about removing the secondary sidewalk and that could happen with the replacement of the curbing and yes he feels strongly that that element should remain and the applicant's earlier decisions as well.

Ms. Knott said she thinks the quarter round curbs should be saved or do a replacement in-kind. We just asked a previous applicant that very thing down at the rock church on 2<sup>nd</sup> and High Street and they have found a contractor who says they can do it. There are some issues with the curb. I think there's an awkward intersection where it meets the main walk into the building. I think if it's going to be redone that's an opportunity to do something - do an end that's a little bit more, not just like it is chopped off and that goes for the other end next to the bank. There is a nice example at the South Street Inn; they have the same curb and a nice example of a return at the end of the curb where it smoothed down and wraps around.

For the walkway removal, she hates to sever the traditional pedestrian walkway. She has no problem with the walkway but would like to see perhaps some indication of a pedestrian connection such as a very simple rectangular stepping stone with ground cover in between; but to keep the pedestrian connection to indicate that it is a minor entrance, or put a planter in front of the stairs. She is concerned about the Pieris choice; it seems like a larger shrub. It grows to 4 feet in height and it would perhaps have a tunnel effect.

Ms. Miller said she looked it up also and it said 4-5 feet height and another said 6-8 feet high.

Ms. Knott said we have one on site that is a maximum height although it might be of a different variety. She said she would rather see something lining the walkway that is fairly low. She is also looking at the guidelines that refer to plantings and vegetation. One says to use trees and plants that are compatible to existing plants that are in the neighborhood. She is sure that there is some Vinca in the neighborhood but on that side and even further north along the block most everybody is using English Ivy. There is English Ivy growing successfully on the site so that seems like a possible option although English Ivy is sort of a pain because it gets on the trees that have to be maintained. Ms. Knott said a white flowering Vinca might be nice and work better with the color of the building. She also recommended using plants and trees that are indigenous. Vinca is not indigenous but neither is English Ivy and she doesn't think any ground cover we have is indigenous. She said just to point out in terms of the guidelines, the review guidelines say to retain historical paving or curbing and then match replacements in design, color, texture and tooling.

Ms. Miller added another guideline, which is to avoid variation in sidewalk and curb materials so if the quarter rounds are retained, it would meet that guideline to retain, replace or repair.

Mr. Schwarz agrees with Laura on the sidewalk you want to eliminate. Maybe it would be nice to mark that it did exist even if you have to walk through some sort of ground covering or pavers, it might be less inviting than a nice clean sidewalk.

Mr. Graves asked are the curbs segmental or pre-cast pieces that are set in place or are they poured in place. Looks like something that is separated so it doesn't look like it a pour in place. Pour this with a city mix so that it would match, or match what is there. He has no problem.

Jill Trischman-Marks said the contractor she spoke to talked about pouring in place. She said based on the way it is deteriorating, it looks like something was placed on there and it is separating from the side walk it is sitting on.

Mr. Graves said are we expecting them to pour (the curb) with the city mix or new sidewalks to come, is that the intent. He said we need to define the scope of what it is going to look like since new concrete will not look like the old concrete.

Ms. Knott and Ms. DeLoach said it should match what is there, the historical color.

Ms. Knott stated that a conservator can do an analysis to determine the aggregate mix and even possible where the aggregate came from. It is possible to match an in-kind.



Ms. Knott said we need to give the contractor the correct guidelines to know what our expectations are and how to replicate concrete mixes from the technical bulletins. She said it is OK to strike a line with the sidewalk to create an even edge. She said the curbing should not be tinted – the aggregate mix gives color. It should have the same finish and scoring.

Ms. Earnst said she thinks the difference in the concrete is very minimal and if the reason why we are retaining it is for historic purposes it makes sense to try to restore the historic color as well.

Mr. Keesecker said it seems like the answer that comes about for this particular property would find some precedent for the rest of the properties on the street at some point in the future. As much as it's possible we should want to go with the historic mix.

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, Ms. Miller moved to find that the proposed left front walkway removal, and replacement with either blue stone or slate stepping stones or similar; and the landscaping changes with the exception of the plants along the existing stone paver walk (which revised plantings will be approved administratively) and the quarter round concrete curbing to be replaced in-kind with aggregate so that the finish project matches as closely as possible to the curbing that is removed (with same finish and scoring; OK to strike a straightened line with the sidewalk), and the underground piping to extend the downspout drain into the yard, not to the sidewalk, that these changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves this application as submitted with the changes made, seconded by Mr. Sarafin, passes 8-0.**

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-08-07  
225 East Main Street  
Tax Parcel 330233000  
Jim Cheng, Owner/ Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects, Applicant  
Remove paint coating from Main Street and 3rd Street façade to restore and preserve structural integrity of the existing brick veneer.

Kurt Keesecker recused himself. Margaret Stella presented the staff report.

The applicant, Bruce Wardell, is requesting to remove the existing paint coating from the West Main Street and 3rd Street NE façades to restore and preserve structural integrity of the existing brick veneer. Testing indicated that the paint is acting as a vapor barrier trapping moisture, causing significant deterioration of the bricks. The proposed paint removal system is chemically based, with two applications required over a period of two weeks.

Bruce Wardell said this is a preliminary step to find out what shape the building is in. The building is in trouble. The original architect said in 1991 this building was decertified. We just need to get the paint off the building.

Ms. Scala said she would not go by that information and she has never heard of the decertification before. She said it may be true but she would not rely on it.

#### Board Questions

Ms. Knott asked if that paint was applied in 1991.

Mr. Wardell said he doesn't know but his assumption is that it probably was but he doesn't know that for sure.

Ms. Knott asked if anyone had done a paint analysis and was it originally a painted building.

Mr. Wardell stated that there is evidence underneath this layer of paint, which comes off like rubber and there is evidence of other paint underneath on the original bricks.

### Board Comments

Mr. Sarafin said it looks pretty straight forward and like necessary work but he is curious to see how this turns out with the paper trail you've found and he is interested to learn more about that. He also said hopefully you will find that it won't affect you and you will be able to use tax credit. He is fully supportive.

Ms. Miller stated she agrees, and the guidelines say to clean masonry only when necessary to help prevent deterioration, which is clearly happening and do not use abrasive cleaning methods such as sand-blasting, excessive high water washes etc. and these actions meets our guidelines. She said if you are going to re-develop it to the Secretary of the Interior Standards you might as well get tax credits for it.

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Mr. Sarafin moved to find that the proposed changes 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 Ms. Knott, passes 7-0-1, with Keesecker recused.**

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-08-08

422 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 280052000

Virginia Pacific Investments, LLC, Owner/ 5th & Main Holdings, LLC; Commonwealth Skybar, Applicant

Metal and translucent panel cover for top of existing Skybar.

The original proposal for this tent-like addition came before the BAR October 15, 2013 and was approved. However, the building code prevented the tent to be constructed as approved, because the building was not sprinklered for fire protection. The building has now been fully sprinklered, and this proposal has changed slightly from the previous approval. The applicant still wants to leave a designed steel framework in place and have clear panels that may be attached in cold weather. This structure is arguably not a tent, and may be reviewed as an addition to the building.

In staff's opinion, this structure is complementary to the building, and will continue to function as a festive addition to the east end of the mall.

Rick Baker, representing the applicant, said we have determined that it wouldn't work because of rain and snow and because of the wind load on this street. We have found this product with a high rating and meets the requirements as a permanent structure, as well as it is a whole lot stronger. It has a built in guttering system to handle the water. The water will flow on to the roof as it does now and the existing drainage system will take care of that. From a snow load standpoint this is a whole lot safer than what we had originally proposed. We cannot have a flat span.

## Public Questions

Rebecca Quinn said she is catty-corner across the mall from this and doesn't know if it's in the BAR purview but this is a lively joint. Her question about the cover is because it is rigid; is it going to be noisier inside which tends to mean the music gets louder which means it will be even louder all across the mall. She said she feels the noise is an overall impact across the mall.

Mr. Baker said in some respect this would be fixed and reduce the amount of noise especially in the off season when there will be a clear vinyl side walls and will keep noise in. In the front section the question will be which way does the sound reflect now? He said he thinks there may be a way to help in the top part to actually add some sound absorption to help remedy that. He said we want to be good neighbors.

## Board Comments

Mr. Sarafin said it seems like the questions and comments that have been asked reflects that we need to see a bit more exploration of this material and canopy; and the different forms of this application could take in how it relates to the building next door and relates to the pitch of the side, and the one on the left.

Ms. Miller said it looks like everyone is in favor of the direction you're going but we maybe need a little information more information to flesh it out. We can defer this to the next meeting or you can ask for a deferral which will give you flexibility to come to the next meeting or five meetings from now.

***Mr. Sarafin moved to accept the applicant's desire to defer, seconded by Ms. DeLoach, passes 8-0.***

Ms. DeLoach left the Meeting.

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-08-03  
1000 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 100068000 and 100070000  
University Station, LLC, Owner/Campus Acquisitions Holdings, LLC,  
Applicant, Window Revisions

This application outlines the owners' request to modify from aluminum to vinyl the materiality of the existing approved windows at the interior north and west elevations. It is ownership's intent to show that due to the facades' distance from right-of-way, and product selection, that this modification has no bearing on the elevations previously approved by the BAR.

Ryan Doody, representing the applicant, said they are here to own and operate these buildings for the long term and to be a good neighbor and we do not want to sacrifice the quality and performance of our buildings. We are open to look at alternate locations - Roosevelt Brown, and the south side against the railroad tracks are certainly open for discussion.

## Board Questions

Mr. Keesecker asked if the color would be the same and the profile in the same place and if the general depth does not change the planes.

Mr. Doody said yes the color would be the same, the general depth the same as well. The vinyl is not identical but very similar.

Mr. Sarafin asked what kind of difference is there in life expectancy for these windows.

Mr. Baker said quality performance specifications are identical according to manufacturer's specifications.

### Public Questions

Mark Kavit said during his years of owning a small business it is his understanding and observation that vinyl over time deteriorates and does not hold up as well as the aluminum clad. His basic concern is how's this going to be 10 or 20 years from now. He said what he has heard is that the vinyl is not going to maintain itself as well as the aluminum clad.

### Board Comments

Ms. Miller read the Guidelines for windows for new construction. She said she is not supportive of changing the windows to vinyl.

Ms. Miller and Mr. Schwarz said they cannot support this because vinyl doesn't stand up as well.

Ms. Earnst said the profile is very different and the vinyl doesn't fit in the context of the building so she can't support it either.

Ms. Knott said she can't support it either. Another reason is in the profiles you have provided, the designs are very different.

Mr. Sarafin said for this prominent site and the length of time it will be here he can't support the use of vinyl on any facades. In looking at the two profiles they are remarkably different.

Mr. Graves said our guidelines are pretty clear about the vinyl. He said he didn't feel as strongly against the vinyl as some of the board feels, but he does feel more strongly against the two different windows on the same building especially when you can see them standing on the front of the building on both sides at one point. That would be the one thing he has an issue with.

Mr. Doody addressed the board on how he is still building the same building as he proposed and according to our guidelines the vinyl windows are discouraged. It doesn't say they are not allowed. He said while the profiles are not exactly the same they are both flat profiles and he disagrees that this is going to be visible from the right of way nearly 100 feet plus away linear dimension, not to mention vertical dimension. He thinks it's quite ridiculous to assume as you will.

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Ms. Knott moved to find that the proposed modification to the north and west elevation windows does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR does not approve this application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Schwarz, motion passes 7-0.**

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-07-02  
1413 ½ University Avenue  
Tax Parcel 090075000  
Tiger Investments LLC, Owner/ Clark Gathright, P.E., Applicant

Replace existing wood windows with new wood windows with double glazing and fabricated to match the existing windows.

The applicant, represented by Clark Gathright, is requesting to replace all the existing wood, double-hung windows located on the second floor, a total of 18 windows, and wood trim with new wood, double-glazed, simulated divided lite windows fabricated to match the existing window dimensions. The window units will be field measured and custom-fabricated by Pella. The profiles of the exterior trim and wood sills will be matched with custom millwork.

### Board Questions

Ms. Miller asked had he seen the guidelines for window replacement.

Mr. Sarafin asked on the main façade there is the double hung with side lights and so the proposal is to repair along that side where that detail appears. Elsewhere is that something that you would be able to replicate where it shows up on the side and rear elevations or would those maybe be candidates for repair if the last on the secondary elevations were replaced.

Mr. Gathright said the window (N) on the back looks like those on the side with a wood arch detailed not the arched glass. But we are looking at standard rectangular units with exception of the front entry that does have a bit of an arch.

Mr. Sarafin said there is one on the front (C) and there is something on the rear elevation (N) seems like it is the same thing.

Mr. Gathright said it is a rectangular window unit with an arched trim piece above it whereas window (C) has arched glass. They are a slightly different animal.

Ms. Knott asked in looking at window (P), that looks like a door. If that may or may not be a replacement, she is wondering if the proportions of the windows that you will be shortening would more closely resemble the portions of the lights in that door.

Mr. Gathright said will replace that with a double hung window (O).

Ms. Knott said her question is the proportion of the lights in that opening. Would the replacement windows be proportionally more like that because you would have to squish everything down.

Mr. Gathright said the door has a fairly deep bottom and we are looking at coming up about two brick courses and maybe taking about an inch out of each pane.

Mr. Schwarz said so you are not going to try to come up above the membrane.

Mr. Gathright said yes, about a 1/3.

Mr. Schwartz asked is window (J) where you would want it.

Mr. Gathright said yes that one is higher and shorter and it is okay. The one that is second from the far left over there.

Ms. Knott said would the replacement be proportioned like window (J).

Mr. Gathright said they will all get squeezed up and generally have the same number of panes.

## Board Comments

Mr. Schwarz said it looks like the interior of the windows have a little profile to them, were you selecting the one that doesn't have the interior profile.

Mr. Gathright Craig said he was primarily focused on the exterior. He said this is not the right dimension sample.

Mr. Schwarz said the proposal to fix the ones on University Avenue and the east window that is so exposed, and to replace the others and raise the sills; that makes sense to me.

Ms. Miller read the guidelines to the applicant that is very clear. She said she cannot support this application although she is supportive and excited about the changes to the middle building of the police sub-station.

Mr. Sarafin said the only place he has pause with this is on the rear elevation where the sills are below the lower membrane level. He said he could imagine that the conditions are not a good situation and detrimental to the building overall.

Ms. Knott said she really likes what you are proposing, keeping the front windows are great. She is leaning towards approving the replacement of the north elevation above the roof. She feels there should be an alternate approach to that and the thing she is concerned about is the appearance of the windows inside. She concerned about the preservation of those windows, even if we ask them to go into to storage someone will throw them out eventually. She said is it possible to pull the membrane, or a couple of instances where the membrane could pulled up to just below the lowest light that would be adequate for keeping the water out. There may be other instances where that is not going to work. There might be a couple on the western end of the northern elevation; it may not work there. She would like to see that examined a little bit closer for at least the ones where you could kind of do that.

Mr. Keesecker said the two sides of the scale are on the table and Mr. Sarafin's points related to the term, the life span of that sill detail weigh against the reading of the Guidelines, and these are the two things in the air. He said it would be great if there was an awesome detail like Ms. Knott just suggested where everything could be had. He is not sure whether that detail exists because if it did he probably would have done it already.

Mr. Graves said he thinks everyone has done a good job on stating both sides of it. He thinks the front elevation is great to restoring those windows. He is supportive of the replacement on the rear and he will sway with the wind on (H, Q, & R).

Ms. Earnst said she absolutely agrees and appreciates the restoring of the front. The rear is troubling and the guidelines seem very clear, but doesn't feel they are not taking into consideration the full story of what is happening with this building. She is not sure how we deal with that. She said she would side with being okay in replacing the rear if we were certain there was nothing else that could be done. She would defer to the architects on that one.

Ms. Knott said the building on the north side was obviously constructed after this one was built, and before there was a BAR so, now with that being said, if there is nothing else to be done I think. We perhaps have to work with the condition that the BAR has no control over when it happens. She said window (J) could stay and maybe she could support having the others replaced.

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the proposed window**

renovation satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application to repair the windows A-H; and to replace the remaining windows, raising the sills above the membrane, and to repair window J and request to see an elevation drawing to be circulated for administrative approval of the replacement windows in relation to roof (existing and proposed), seconded by Mr. Sarafin motion passes 6-1, with Ms. Miller voting against.

12. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-08-05  
511 1st Street North  
Tax Parcel 330001205  
City of Charlottesville, Owner/ Public Utilities, Applicant  
Above ground water vault

Recently Public Utilities had installed, without BAR approval, an above-ground vault for 3" water meters to serve the Charlottesville Towers condominium building at 511 North 1st Street. The reinforced concrete vault measures 11'-7" x 6'-1", and is 6'-6" deep, and is partially buried on private property owned by the condominium association. The new vault replaced a previous vault located under the City sidewalk on North 1st Street. City staff then told Public Utilities they needed to apply for a certificate of appropriateness.

Staff noted three major concerns:

First, the project was undertaken without first consulting with the BAR or NDS, thereby possibly narrowing options.

Second, the unsightly utility is located in the front yard of a property in the North Downtown ADC district. A private property owner would not be permitted to install a mechanical unit or accessory structure in the front yard. Such units are permitted only in the side or rear yard with minimum five foot setback and specified screening.

Third, this type of large vault installation could be repeated, as a standard, all over the City.

In order to make this installation comply, it would have to be placed flush with the ground. Leaving it above ground would not conform to setback requirements, and would be very difficult to screen. This mulched area was originally intended as a landscaped area to help screen the parking lot. Even if the vault is placed flush, having a large underground vault there precludes landscaping in that immediate area.

The City should adopt a policy regarding the placement of these large units, whether they are proposed in design control districts or not.

Public Utilities has suggested three options: (1) Landscaping only; (2) Cut the sides to be at-grade, then install a new top; (3) Lower the entire vault.

Tripp Stakem, representing Public Utilities, said that the City, as part of water conservation, identifies large meters to quantify the water being used by the customer. This is one of those situations where the original condition was a small vault located underneath the sidewalk and we didn't have the ability to test the meter in place. We discussed it with the Condo Board and this is what was agreed to in return for the easement. Except it is a little higher than we planned. If the vault was placed lower, then it would be sitting below grade at the back end, and the installers told us what will happen is the water will run in the vault and over time you will have stagnate water in the vault. Tripp Sacrum said this has been used in the City of Charlottesville for 15 years. Most of the time for new development to have these flush with the surface. We have learned a lot about this.

Emma Ernst noted that the Preservation Piedmont board, which she sits on, sent a letter regarding this application, but she was not present at the meeting when the letter was discussed.

### Questions from the Public

Mr. Kavit questioned what triggered this installation to be a BAR concern? Could it be put under the sidewalk?

Rebecca Quinn Said it is a huge size- does the Utility seek to minimize? Was a smaller vault considered? Why can't a smaller vault be used?

An unidentified man asked the cost of the three options.

Mary Sherrill asked if Option 2 would affect the warranty.

Mr. Stakem said the manufacturer would oversee the changes to options 2 and 3.

Malcolm Bell, a neighbor, noted it was originally placed two feet higher.

Pat Carlson, a resident of Charlottesville Towers, spoke.

Helena Devereux asked if the vault is put two feet lower, will there be a drainage problem?

Mr. Stakem said no.

Mr. Kavit asked why Option 2 or 3 was not used in the first place?

Mary Sherrill asked who is picking up the cost.

### Comments from the Public

Rebecca Quinn said please resist the temptation to relax the level of scrutiny of your review for 1) an after-the-fact request 2) a project by a City department. She said she believes one of you on the planning commission said City departments need to get permits and approvals as well and you need to enforce that. Just like any project that has a clear adverse impact on historic district you need to require that they demonstrate what is not possible to avoid. We need a meter there so they can't completely avoid it. The next step is unavoidable but mitigation can be done. I wasn't really encouraged by staff's response that it's this size because it's this size. They did not really tell me why it needed to be this size. I walked by the site the day they installed this and asked someone who appeared to be a crew chief about the size. I was told the vault was about twice the size it needs to be. She said that guy may not have full awareness of all of the requirements and maybe he doesn't have to get inside to do the maintenance. That order of magnitude stuck with me. The memo from the city utility says the current standard specifies concrete vault. That is true, but it doesn't say anything about size. We really need better evidence that it is the minimum necessary size. I am disturbed that an on-the-fly recommendation from the manufacturer could have been a lesser installation to begin with. Plus that gives the City's project inspector a whole lot of authority or maybe the guy was tone deaf about being in a historic district which is disturbing by itself. I appreciate the options; I don't think the first one should be acceptable, it is hardly mitigation. To maintain what is proposed there, a slope, mulch already washed away exposing dirt to erosion and sediment run off. Option three to lower the vault, the drawback is two days without water for the Towers. We all know what going without water but two days is really not that long and that is his quote. What is really, really long is all the residents on that street have to live with this thing sticking up out of the ground forever. If there is



an option to lower the vault that opens the door to also considering is there a smaller structure that could fill bill. Together she thinks that would go a lot further.

Mark Kavit said he is representing NDRA: he has heard from quite a few people concerning this matter and quite a bit of feedback. He said what he can gather the project was mismanaged a little bit and the Department of Utility thought they were exempted from meeting any kinds of standards on this project. The president of the Towers Association said he was going to send an email with their concerns whether the email was sent he doesn't know. He mentioned Genevieve Keller's letters and feels that Option three should be looked at. Option one there really is not enough room for landscaping: if you put bushes and trees in there and eventually they will grow out and will be blocking the sidewalk. Maybe it should be moved to another location. He said he heard the vault was way much larger than it was supposed to have been.

Pat Carlson said her first concern is the cost and city has done a wonderful job installing the water services. Seventy-five of us are very appreciative of that kind of service. In the fact that we would start over seems like a waste of tax payers money. I don't know if any of you have driven by, but the photograph presents it in a very different light then if you saw the whole thing. The vault sits next to a driveway enters the parking lot and in the other side of the driveway there is a structure that are two brick beams and a sign for that which is similar size to that so there is almost symmetry for it. That structure is surrounded by ivy and azalea and kind of nestled in as I think this one would as well. As far as installing the vault of the fly when you have seventy-five people without water you really don't have time to go back and ask for a different piece of equipment to hold the thing you are trying to install and she thinks the city does a beautiful job of landscaping but if we took option one and allowed the city do what they requested I think we could make it quite attractive and certainly it has not been objectionable from anybody who lives there or the people who leased, donated, or deeded the land to the city.

Malcolm Bill wanted to comment on what Mary Joy Scala said. Had any of the people who live on the street in private houses proposed to put something like this in their yards this distance from the street they would surely would not have been given permission to do so. This is a very conspicuous object. The quarter round coping that separates the slope from the sidewalk actually was put in at the same time as the one that continues that same molding along our property in fact it was probably put in by the same people. In fact it is an indication that the slope of the Towers is the same slope that we have in our yard. The solution seems clearly that the city should not be held to a different standard from which it holds its citizens. He said he would not object to having a section of the quarter round molding cut out and then put back and if a smaller vault could be put in the sidewalk where the original vault was it would seem to him to be the best solution. He said this is a difficult problem, but he hopes that the solution can be one that satisfies the criteria of the design control district. He said the people objecting to it are the people who live on N 1<sup>st</sup> street, walk up and down the sidewalks and visit each other. The people who accepted it are the people who actually gave permission for this for their own convenience.

Genevieve Keller 504 N 1<sup>st</sup> street, directly opposite from this property. She said we are here because of oversights, miscalculations, omissions and in other words this was all a one big mistake well intentions as it was, it was a mistake. It is not in accordance with the BAR guidelines, it violates the spirit of our zoning ordinance and it would not be allowed for a private project. Screening is not enough, and cutting the bunker down would be ridiculous. We could have had citizen involvement from the beginning but we didn't. First street residents individually and small groups worked successfully with city staff to figure out acceptable solutions to relocate and increase the number of fire hydrants after we realized what was going on, but we were not consulted first, we had to figure that out for ourselves. If we had not been nosey, we would have lost 4-5 parking spaces on our street, one that has very little on-street parking. If we had known about this above ground vault we would have work hard with the city early in the process to avoid where we are today. The city has now offered a simple compromising solution to undergrounding

the vault if the BAR asked them to, and preservationists and neighbors find that to be reasonable under these circumstances. Since they have offered please take them up on their offer and do that or perhaps option #4 which has come up tonight if that can be worked out has an acceptable solution. This has been a long dirty dusty process. We started talking about this back in March and now it is August and I certainly understand if some of the Tower people want it to be over and I would like it to be over too. In order to do that is to instigate our whole summer of inconvenience. It's like living through a major renovation in your house with all of the sawdust and the sheet rock and then you find out that the boiler does not fit in the basement door, so you just leave it in the living room and put a pot in front. The shaded green hill side and the set back of the Tower allow it to recede into the background of the streetscape. The tower was already there 30 years ago when the Keller family moved to this street. Our street was only half-jokingly referred to as architecture street because the number of architecture faculty and A school graduates who moved to the street to rehab historic houses. Visitors are still attracted to the street today. We have a number of architectural tours, people come with the City's guide book, parking to go downtown for various venues, walkers and runners are on our street all of the time to say nothing of the people who live on the street. North 1<sup>st</sup> street along with 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Park Street, Ridge Street and a few others really illustrate the architectural history of our city. First Street is extraordinary with its range of architectural styles from transitional Federal Greek Revival through Gothic Revival, Italianate and Colonel Revival to bungalows, mid-century ranch houses and yes, evens this late 20<sup>th</sup> century high-rise apartment building across the street. The legacy of the historic trend of zoning in inner city neighborhoods R-3. The rest of us are now R-1S. It is kind of an anomaly in the neighborhood but part of our history and showing that transition and that is just fine. So on 1<sup>st</sup> Street we've got it all. We don't need this new mausoleum interrupting the green space and redefining our street edge. The streetscape is what makes it all work. This variety of eclecticism on our street. I ask you to call a vote for option #3 and let's get on with bring out street back to normal. She said she believes these are high bids and think the work could be done quicker, I hope so, and that the water could be re-routed even un-metered for a couple of hours so that the Tower residents could have a minimum of disruption. But if this doesn't work, I would be so neighborly to lend them a shower or give them a drink of water if they call me.

Lisa Robertson said she is here to try to take a middle of the road position. She said she disagrees a bit with the assertion that Public Works has to obtain a certificate of appropriateness before installing any utility. With that being said, she totally agrees with the proposition that we have City Council-approved guidelines that specify standards that have to be met by Public Utilities whether they are in the right of way or private property adjacent to the right of way. Those standards talk about landscaping being required. Landscaping is not optional. Standards also say that the utilities facilities will be underground where possible. She said it says a lot about Public Works that this is the first time in decades that anybody has understood that this is the type of vault that surrounds these large water meter facility. She said we should accept Utilities' representation when they say most of the time they are able to get these underground or so close that you cannot notice them. She said one of the best results of this process will be an understanding that a lot of these are not in the right of way but there are a lot of them that is going in and Public Works isn't mismanaging and they are trying to do what they are supposed to do which is get them underground wherever possible which is the wording of the design guidelines. This is surely an upsetting thing to pop up across the street from your home and we should not spend too much time on the issue of what they should have done. The man at the site did what he thought he needed to do in accordance with what the manufacturer recommends in hind sight. Maybe what needs to happen is Public Works sit down with staff and identify the 50 or so utilities that they may need to install. Give Mary Joy and the Board an idea of which of those will be in a historic district and possibility do a better job of trying to predict which ones are going to fit in the space that they have to work in and which ones are not. She encourages everyone to focus on finding the best solution for this one that does meet the guidelines.

Colleen Davis said at the last board meeting they discussed all of the options that Tripp proposed and we thought that Option #2 was really a compromise for all of the people involved. There are people who oppose this and people, like our board, who really aren't bothered by it. She said she has no problem with it. She understands the historic concerns on the street but we just felt that Option #2 was a good compromise between all of the different opinions involved in this.

Mary Sherrill said she wanted to comment about the board meeting she shared with Colleen was the fact that maybe we could entertain the arts in place kind of thing maybe this could be a platform so we are not throwing good money after bad. That is a really big price tag to change from between landscaping and removing the hold thing. She said maybe we could put a retaining wall or barrier that could hide it or make it disappear.

### Board Comments

Mr. Keesecker asked if the standards and design manual that the development community follows with new site plans, does Public Works use the same manual for their projects. Does it include a profile standard for an above ground water meter vault? He said it needs to go underground.

Mr. Stakem said it does not specifically address an above-ground vault. He said the standard is below ground, fully flush.

Ms. Knott said she agrees with Kurt and would not mind looking at another development Option #4 if it could be developed a little more. She doesn't think that Option #3 is going to work. When you are depending on vegetation and soft material to screen something it's going to die or erode and eventually there will be a corner of the vault sticking out. It will never really be quite right. She would like to see it lowered and under the sidewalk if possible.

Mr. Schwarz agreed with Ms Knott. Wants it to be under the sidewalk or parking lot, a flat surface. He questioned why the applicant thought it was so undesirable to have it further back on private property. It bothers me that I will vote to spend more money to do it right.

Mr. Sarafin said, looking at the integrity of the streetscape, it cannot stay where it is.

Ms. Miller could support Option 3, 4, or 5 (under sidewalk or parking lot).

Mr. Stakem said he wants to investigate putting it under the sidewalk and asked if it could be approved administratively.

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the installation of an above-ground water meter vault does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR therefore denies Option 1, an above-ground vault, and wants Public Works to investigate an Option 4, as described by Laura Knott, to locate the vault beneath the sidewalk; these plans (regarding the removal/replacement of historic curbing at back of sidewalk) would be circulated and approved administratively. If and only if Option 4 is not a viable option, the BAR requests an official explanation as to why it doesn't work, and then they approve either Option 2 or 3 at Public Works' discretion, seconded by Mr. Sarafin 6-1 (Laura Knott voting no).**

Break at 9:57; Convened 10:07

13. Recommendation Regarding Special Use Permit Amendment  
200 2nd Street SW

Tax Parcel 280069000, 280071000-280075000  
Market Plaza LLC, c/o Keith Woodard, Applicant  
New Urban Mixed-Use Development

Carl Schwarz recused himself

A special use permit for Market Plaza was approved by City Council with conditions on December 1, 2014. Since then the BAR has approved the design, and a site plan has been approved. Also, City staff and the applicant have proceeded with negotiations for the sale of the property to the applicant, and have identified inconsistencies between the contract for sale and the special use permit resolution of December 1, 2014. Therefore, certain amendments to the special use permit conditions have been proposed.

The BAR is being asked to make a recommendation regarding the proposed amendments to the special use permit (SUP), and to make comments regarding any impacts to the certificate of appropriateness already approved on that site.

Greg Powe, representing the applicant, said he is in the final stretches of the project. The final outcome addressed how best to operate and secure this. The City is in agreement that the applicant can own the plaza; the lease agreement is how the city can use the plaza on market days and a specified use and days to use indoor space, add in how many times that is requested, 12 events a year. The only issue that impacts him as a designer is that the language for amenities, such as water feature being replaced with willow oaks. There are some minor differences on the building.

After discussions regarding the elimination of the water fountain, adding a 16 foot walkway and a handicap access to the elevator the Board finalized the request with a few other provisions.

**Ms. Knott moved to recommend that the proposed amendments to the special use permit conditions previously approved by City council on December 1, 2014 for the redevelopment of 200 2nd Street SW into a mixed use development including the City Market, regarding the elimination of the water feature and the provision for 16 foot wide pedestrian walkway and handicap access by elevator, will not have an adverse impact on the Downtown Architectural Design Control (ADC) District, and the BAR recommends approval of those portions of proposed amendments to the special use permit, but the BAR has no comment on the remaining portions of the amendments. The BAR requests that the Planning Commission and City Council review other aspects of the document that concern the transition from public to private plaza space and implications to operations (usage and access, viability of the City Market) and impact on the district and the BAR asks for review (of drawings and details) of the new centerpiece and pedestrian access, seconded by Ms. Earnst, motion passes 5-1-1. (Ms. Miller opposed, and Mr. Schwarz recused)**

14. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-08-06  
102 1st Street North  
Tax Parcel 330245100  
First and Main LLC, Owner/ Keith Woodard, Applicant  
Installation of low clearance structure at 1st St NE Entrance of First and Market Parking Lot.

The applicant is seeking approval to add a low-clearance structure at the parking lot entrance off 1st Street North. The purpose is to keep trucks from unloading in the lot, and from cutting through the lot.

All metal will be painted black. The sign colors will match existing signage. The sign will be removable and the height will be adjustable.

The design of this structure has been coordinated with the design of the lighting and signage on the site.

Keith Woodard said we thought there would be more shade on the lot if we added a series of trees, crepe myrtles were chosen around the perimeters and some in the middle. Also it would make maintenance and circulation better.

#### Public Comments/Questions

Mathew Hall asked whether alternative materials other than black painted metal been considered because a low clearance structure seems to me not to have a lot of precedent in this area of the City, and potentially would be an eyesore across from the park and among some really nice historic buildings that are mostly brick. He is not sure of the necessity of this proposal at all, but if it is necessary, what other designs might have been considered.

Mr. Woodard said to replicate the light fixtures seemed the most appropriate design direction, rather than the white vocabulary of the pavilion pay structure. We used the black metal to match the light features.

Mathew Hall said he lives in the building and parks in the parking lot and has not seen an issue with a lot of truck traffic and I am in and out of that lot several times a day and I haven't really witnessed that. Do we have any type of numbers or specific information that has led to this specific action in terms to how much truck traffic and issues were really seen or complaints that are being lodged?

Mr. Woodard said we don't have any specific statistics on that. We have had a lot of problems with noise and truck drivers arguing and trucks blocking people in. It's been problematic quite often.

Mathew Hall is very concerned with this project without really understanding the degree of necessity and he thinks it's going to be an eyesore in that area. That is a very nice area right now across from Lee Park and the building I live in and the building adjacent are lovely. He said this structure is going to look industrial and look very unsightly. He urged the BAR to defer this proposal for further review and understanding.

#### Board Comments/Questions

Mr. Schwarz said he cannot speak to the parking or truck issues and he has no concerns and think it fits in pretty well with what is currently there and thinks it's a good design.

Ms. Knott said this is a nice design and a reasonable request.

Mr. Graves said he has no strong feelings one way or the other. He said he would approve it based on keeping trucks out of a private lot.

Mr. Keesecker asked if the size falls within any purview related to the sign ordinance.

Ms. Scala said the signage is really restrained.

Ms. Miller asked how certain are we that trees are going to be put in..

Mr. Woodard said we intended to put those in last Spring but got delayed with other projects but this fall for sure.

**Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, Mr. Sarafin move to find that the proposed low-clearance structure at the First & Market Parking lot satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Schwarz, 6-1 (Ms. Miller voted no).**

E. Other Business

Preservation Awards

- Mary Joy thinks that Eugene Bibb deserves commendation for her historic surveys of the Charlottesville area.
- Justin recommended 1218 Preston Avenue, the renovation that was done between Rugby Road and Cabell Avenue, and
- Snooky's Pawn Shop "the peacock building" at 102 East Main Street.

Ms. Miller gave a PLACE Design Task Force report. Harvey Finkel, of the Charlottesville Police Department, made a CEPTD presentation of how to make a building or space safer through design. PLACE was interested in this in relation to the ongoing lighting study.

The BAR requested a work session on windows (change window guidelines, define clear glass VLT).

F. Adjournment: 11:40 pm

Board of Architectural Review  
Special Meeting - Minutes  
August 19, 2015

Location: City Council Chambers, Charlottesville City Hall, 2nd Floor

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller, Members Carl Schwarz, Kurt Keesecker, Justin Sarafin, Laura Knott, Whit Graves, Emma Ernst, Candace DeLoach, Staff Mary Joy Scala, Margaret Stella (Intern), Camie Mess (Intern)

Members Absent: Tim Mohr

Call to Order: the meeting was called to order by Chair Melanie Miller at 5:30 p.m.

A. Matters from the public

1. Arlene Sweeney, 418 5<sup>th</sup> Street SW: She had asked Ms. Scala for information on how to dismantle a very old house and move it to another place. She asked if she has to go by the rules regarding moving her home to a certain historic neighborhood, how can a hotel (even if it's outside the historic district) which adjoins her property be built there. The hotel would make her house look foolish to be lost in the sea of commercialism and she would like to take it down and move it to another location. Why is she subjected to these rules and other people don't seem to be.

Mary Joy Scala said Ms. Sweeney's property is an Individually Protected Property. It is not in a historic district so it does sort of stands alone. It is designated because it is important and old. The zoning there was probably established quite a while ago and it just recently has come to the point where it is ready to be developed. It is kind of a shock where that happens. City Council thinks it's an appropriate location for this use, they approved the PUD (planned unit development) and the BAR is charged with trying to make sure it fits in with the character of the Ridge Street historic district.

It requires a lot of maintenance. There is always something that has to be done. She is working with Mr. Gilpin to get brick repair and other things probably totaling 10,000 – 15,000 dollars. This is ongoing all of the time.

Mr. Sarafin said the first hurdle is should the house be moved at all. He said to move it would more detrimental to it than letting it remain on its original site.

B. New Items

1. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 15-08-04

NW Corner of Ridge St. and Cherry Ave.

Tax Parcel 290145000-147000, 290149000-151000, 290157000

Charlie Armstrong, Owner/ Cherry Avenue Investments LLC, Applicant

Proposed new construction of a Marriot Hotel on the NW corner intersection of Cherry Avenue and Ridge Street

The current owner is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for Phase One of a new mixed-use Planned Unit Development on the corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue. The proposed project will be built on a total of 2.9 acres.

In addition to the applicant's BAR submittal, "Received June 30, 2015," staff has included a correct and updated copy of the PUD approval from July 20, 2015, "Approved Plan." That packet includes the ordinance, amended proffers, and drawings such as Existing Conditions, Land Use Plan, Phasing Plan, and Matrix of Permitted Use Types.

Two phases are proposed, the 2.4 acre Cherry Avenue Phase (Phase One) and the 0.4 acre Ridge Street Phase (Phase Two). Since the developer is choosing to develop the Cherry Avenue Phase first, the plan stipulates that existing trees in the Ridge Street phase shall remain undisturbed until site plan approval has been granted for the Ridge Street phase, except invasive species may be removed.

Phase one includes a proposed hotel, parking, and the arboretum area. No residential units are proposed in Phase One. Phase Two may be residential or mixed use.

Because this project is for new construction, it requires a preliminary discussion by the BAR before a COA can be approved. The BAR is asked this evening to provide preliminary comments to the applicant regarding the proposed design:

- The new hotel is a four-story building. On the first level there is a rear entrance with a porte cochere to a lobby, and a pedestrian entrance from Cherry Avenue that leads into a dining room. On the second level there is an interior swimming pool at the east end, adjacent a plaza at the corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue. The third and fourth levels are all guest rooms. There are two levels of parking under the building, accessed from the rear.
- In addition to the garage parking, there is a surface parking lot below the level of the future Ridge Street buildings. The proffers state that a minimum of 60% of the total project parking will be accommodated in structured parking under the buildings. Parked cars may not be visible from Ridge Street.
- The arboretum must occupy at least 25% of the site, with public access during daylight hours.
- The Phase Two area must provide an effective buffer from the surface parking lot.

Staff noted that it is important to read all the proffers and notes included in the "Approved Plan."

Staff has included emails from Paul Josey with the Tree Commission, requesting large canopy street trees on 40 ft. centers; and from Lucia Stanton, requesting a professional archaeological survey of Tax Parcel 290157000, located in the SW corner of the PUD property, and believed to be the location of the Allen Hawkins family burial ground. An abutting neighbor requested a fence (not solid) around the arboretum to prevent trespassing.

The BAR may wish to review the site plan, which proposes a fence around the arboretum, and other details not included in the BAR packet.

The proffers provide dollars to be spent on pedestrian improvements at the intersection of Ridge and Cherry, not necessarily a landscaped median in Ridge Street. The BAR previously voiced strong support for this amenity.



The BAR should require that clear, accurate, and detailed drawings, including final architectural designs, building materials, colors, and site/landscaping design shall be submitted for the final COA. All the drawings should be consistent. Color renderings that show all the actual proposed materials and colors are needed for all elevations.

The BAR should focus their review on this site as a major gateway to the City, and whether the design will also function well in the neighborhood context. Unfortunately, there is no way of knowing if or when Phase Two will commence. Previously the plaza served as an important transition and connector between the architecture proposed along two streets. Now the major architectural feature facing the intersection is the side elevation of the hotel.

Important aspects are: building materials, the plaza design at the corner, the pedestrian access to the hotel from Cherry Avenue, how the building generally addresses street level design, the interim plan for the Phase Two landscaped area, and the overall site design, including arboretum layout, retaining walls, auto and pedestrian circulation, and landscaping.

Staff has included some drawings from the previous approval. There is no reason that the same quality of design and materials cannot be expected on this new project.

The applicants made their presentation.

#### Public Questions

Lena Seville, 808 AltaVista Ave.: She was at the site plan conference earlier today and when we asked about the fence around the arboretum we were told it was 3 or 3 ½ feet tall, so a friendly fence and they said yes. She said today she is hearing even taller than 5 feet so she would like to know just how tall the fence is.

Charlie Armstrong said the fence is there due to the request of a neighbor so they are very flexible to its design and height.

Antoinette Rodes, 406 Oak Street: In 2006 when Southern Development had a very different plan on the table for the same site, one much less smaller and less intrusive and also involving the same entrance and access points on Ridge and Cherry. The city engineer said in a preliminary site plan said they would have to build a deceleration turn lane all the way down Cherry and Ridge to the turn in and I am curious about that having vanished and I am sure he had a reason for saying that. There is no indication of that here.

Charlie Armstrong said it could be on this plan. That is a site plan issue and the site plan has been submitted to the city and we are waiting for any comments from city planners including traffic engineers.

Adriane Truluck, 805 Raymond Road: Asked how tall is the retaining wall in the back and if there an up to date and accurate tree survey showing all of the large trees that are currently standing on that site and showing how this plan overlays that. Also, considering other issues, like the fact that the older vegetation that you are talking about for an arboretum, which she has questions about that term, as

well as being used for this kind of situation. How much shade and how much of an impact is that going to have on those trees.

Charlie Armstrong said the retaining wall is in the 20 foot range. There is a tree survey and it is in the site plan. The construction including the wall that is adjacent to the arboretum is all outside of the drip line of those trees so it won't disturb the root system of those trees. A lot of survey and design was done to achieve that.

Kenneth Martin, 222 Lankford Avenue: He looked at the last slick rendering of that site and noticed that there was not one rendering of any of the turn-of-the-century existing structures anywhere near that building. It is totally out of context and that is what I want you to concentrate on and that is what Council wants you to do also. He is very happy that he did not come down here this morning at 10:30 because he would have been ill all day long. When he looked at the building, at first he thought someone was trying to copy what was done at Ridge-McIntire and said that was not designed in context of the Ridge Street historic district which is early 1900, or your Victorians or your Arts and Crafts. He said looking at it architecturally it looks like a dormitory. He wants you think about college dormitories and then go back a take a look at that picture. It's a dormitory that he would not want to live in. Or is it some type of school building. The design that they have come up with all the glass and the forces that have no architectural interest whatsoever do not fit in with Ridge Street. He would say it fits in more with the Flats. They put up these boxes and took a rectangle hole punch and went down the line and hole punched windows in there and this is what that is, and a few glass things at the top and there is absolutely nothing on Ridge Street that faintly resembled that building. He has nothing to say about the materials because he really doesn't care. Ridge Street has brick but it also has stucco and it use to have a few clabboards, one apartment building there that was built in the 1970's and there are 4 ranch style homes. He said he really doesn't see a need for a plaza there either. He said he would take pictures of Ridge Street himself so you can see the character and put there building in with the surroundings that are there now.

Dede Smith, 2652 Jefferson Park Circle: said because of the height of the retaining wall, are there more strict guidelines. How can it be hotel rooms and not residential, why those two are not considered the same things. Are there guest rooms under-ground. She said you call the Cherry Avenue the front but the entrance is from the other side. Can one enter from the Cherry Avenue side or will it be locked.

An architect with BCA Architects said we are currently working on the 3D model of the site and its context and will be shown in future renderings and drawings. It has some of the similar architectural qualities as the 2009 PUD such as banding, the two masses, the breaking of the masses and the recess façade at the top of the building. We were not looking at other buildings around to do that. He said there are code requirements for a railing at that elevation and we meet those for what we are proposing. There is a public pedestrian entrance here from Cherry into the building and he can't speak to whether it will lock or unlocked. There is an overhead canopy there and it does front on Cherry. The building is accessible to pedestrians on all four sides. He wouldn't classify these rooms as underground but we did create a small area way here. The arbor is below the grade line but we still maintain exterior windows there for those rooms. The floor level for those rooms are really just a couple feet below the grade elevation so they will have the sunlight and air but yes the floor level is below the grade of Cherry and it is a function of the slope of Cherry.

Kristin Cleveland, 511 Ridge Street: she is asking about the vehicular access to Ridge Street, it gets backed there in the morning and in the evenings and difficult to make left hand turns. She wants to know with the traffic study, is there going to be right turns only or if left turns are going to be allowed. Is extra widening going to happen to allow for turning lanes or a light or what is going to be happening there? The commercial area was shown in the plans as about 3 parking spaces about 30ft. by 20 ft. and it hasn't shown up on any of these renderings as to what that access would be in terms of the commercial space would be accessed by the pedestrians and if there would be any additional commercial space beyond that 30ft. by 20 ft. area.

Charlie Armstrong said the entrance on Ridge Street does have turning movement restrictions both in and out as established by the traffic engineer after a traffic study was done on the site. The traffic counts for this use are significantly lower than what that traffic study first assumed because it assumed the highest traffic volume commercial use that could be here for the site. A hotel is a significantly lower traffic so it is possible that the traffic engineer could relax those restrictions since right now it has right in and right out only during rush hour and somewhat looser restrictions during not so rushed times. Commercial space came up a bit later in the design process so it has not been fully vetted. It is something that everyone wants to do on that corner to provide that best interaction on the Cherry Avenue level so when we bring back more detail next time that will all be fleshed out, but we just don't have all of the answers to that right now.

Marilyn McDonald, 506 Ridge Street: Will the building be enough below the grade where the hill goes down where I won't see much of it. Will she wake up in the morning and be frightened because of a giant building there or will it not be that noticeable from the houses on Ridge? Why does it have to be so big?

Charlie Armstrong said there are an 8 foot sidewalk and an 8 foot planting strip shown on the site plan and some additional space between the sidewalk and the building so we could scale that off the site plan to show exactly what that is, so it's relatively close to what it really would be. This rendering comes out of CAD drawings that are taken from that site plan. It is representing that as closely as the computer could. As far as seeing it from her house, she is at the other end of the block on the opposite side of the street, it is likely that she might see the Ridge Street elevation but doubtful that any of the Cherry Avenue side would be visible from anywhere on Ridge Street side.

Stan Sweeney, 418 5th Street SW: said we did not see any drawings with our house which is the second oldest house in Charlottesville and they have put more money into it than you could imagine. When you do historic projects you are doing preservation. Do you have to accept what is brought to you do you. He is embarrassed by Charlottesville. UVA would not allow that to be built. Why didn't they do anything to reference the community that it is trying to be part of? This is designated by the Department of Resources as the Fifeville-Tonsler Historic project. How are they addressing that or did they address that. Maybe you can just destroy the history of Charlottesville, maybe that is the intent. He said you do not have to accept that plan or maybe you do.

#### Questions from the Board

Ms. Miller asked where does the Fairfield Inn fall within the Marriott brands.

Donald Meagher, Fairfield Inn Suites with Marriott: It is called the selection service brands of Marriott which are Town Place Suites, Fairfield Inn Suites, Residence Inn, and Courtyard by Marriott Inn and Hill Suites by Marriott. It is not a full service Marriott like you may see in the larger downtown cities like a Renaissance or a JW Marriott but it is called the select service. It is similar to the Courtyard but not with the full service aspect that the Courtyard has.

Ms. Miller asked would you consider Courtyard and Residence Inn to be above Fairfield Inn.

Mr. Meagher said not from a quality standpoint or a finish standpoint but from a services standpoint. Courtyard might be a little higher because they provide more services; Residence Inn might be higher because it provides more space such as the full service kitchens in each one of the guest rooms.

Ms. Miller asked are you going for what level, silver, gold or platinum?

Krysta Aten-Schell, with the applicants, said the prototype is a LEED certified as a base. They are hoping to reach higher than that and reach to a Silver level.

Mr. Keesecker said the language says the condition related to LEED certification leads him to believe that this project would not be listed on the USGBC website as a LEED certified project, but that you could satisfy the terms of the condition by having an opinion of the LEED certified professional state that it would meet the requirements and was built to the requirements but does not necessarily mean the marketing value of being able to have that listed as a Charlottesville building on the LEED website would not be there.

Ms. Aten-Schell said that is up for discussion still and there are further meetings and we would take our directions from what they are interested in.

Mr. Meagher said it is being designed and built to the standard of LEED certification so to take the next step to get certified the important part is done. The sustainability is there.

Ms. Miller asked it two vehicular entrances are required by zoning.

Charlie Armstrong said yes the approved PUD plan does required two vehicular entrances in the approximate location that they are shown.

Ms. Miller asked if roof top mechanical be needed and if so where is it.

Applicant said we currently looking into and developing the schematics for the mechanical systems. They currently have not been located, not to say that there won't be anything on the roof, but if we do we will show that in future drawings and renderings.

Ms. Miller asked (in the animated picture) do we have detail or a rendering that shows the barrier between phase one and phase two for instance if you are standing in the parking lot of the phase one project, or if you are standing on the sidewalk of Ridge Street with only phase one having been constructed, what does that look like to the parking lot.

Applicant said the rendering did not show it as clearly as they would have liked but the intent is when Phase One is completed that Ridge Street view of the parking lot is obscured by the vegetation that is there. There are some invasive species that should be removed and would be most likely at the end of the project. Any old growth they would want to maintain there certainly and if there would be a shielding issue I am sure we could mitigate that with some lower growth approved plantings.

Ms. Miller said the interior space is not necessarily in our purview, but inside the lobby will the desk be right off of the porte-cochere entrance or how the doors are going to operate. Based on her own staying at your property, her assumption would be all of the doors would be locked with exception of the porte-cochere, except for if you have a room key.

Applicant said you would have public entrance during day-light hours, maybe have a 10 pm when those doors would be locked with a key card only access to the area, but open to the public throughout the day.

Ms. Miller said has there been any consideration about moving the third story completely from the Ridge Street side kind of giving a setback at the highest point at the front of the building so it would just be a two story more similar to the houses in the historic district (lower the height on Ridge Street).

Applicant said we could possibly pull the stair tower back into the façade and keep the whole front façade on Ridge at two levels. That is something we could look into, it changes the floor plan and the schematics. We will look into it and it definitely is a good piece of advice.

Ms. Miller asked is it possible to remove Phase two imagery from anything we are looking at since we are really focused on Phase one at this point.

Applicant said yes it is possible, you are referring to the water color thing. In the future we will remove those.

Ms. Miller asked is that a stream at the lower edge of Cherry Avenue.

Charlie Armstrong said it is classified as an intermittent stream by the Army Corps of Engineers on their maps and they have issued a permit to do this construction on top of a portion of it and behind for drainage.

Ms. Miller asked do you anticipate hotel guests arriving on bicycle.

Applicant said the bicycle space is under the LEED space and is based on FTE which is fulltime employees or occupants. This leans more toward the employees of the building who would arrive that way. Certainly it is possible that people could arrive that way but she doubts it.

Mr. Sarafin asked where is the commercial space, and how that will street engagement take place on the SW corner.

Applicant said that commercial space will be at the lowest level of the parking garage but it is not developed in the project yet so it is not shown to be developed but it would include this space here. We have engaged here at the plaza and tried to engage with the entrance and into that lobby space with the canopy and the store front. As we move down the space these two levels are mainly those parking

garage spaces so engage with a public access point those spaces are not necessarily in the best interest. We did not find it worked well with the program inside that space with the parking garage.

Ms. Knott said why you are not completing Phase Two with Phase One at the same time.

Charlie Armstrong said there are not any tenants identified for Phase Two. He said when they went to City Council with this request over the last few months and one of our requests to them was to allow phasing of the project in exactly in the manner it is shown here. The hotel being Phase One and future residential and mixed use in Phase Two.

Ms. Knott asked where is the bus stop located.

Charlie Armstrong said that is flexible. They have proposed it to the City at the direction of CTS. He said right now it is shown on the site plan on Ridge Street at the approximate location of an existing bus stop that is there now. There could be another or an alternate on Cherry Avenue if desired or something we want to talk to the traffic engineer about because of people cresting that hill and a stopped bus might not be the best place. Temporarily, Ridge Street is where we are showing it but that is flexible.

Ms. Knott said you have worked really hard to become equivalent to a LEED certified project, have you looked into the new site certification program sustainable site initiative.

Krysta Aten-Schell said we are familiar with that particular rating system. It has not yet been discussed as a design team but I think if it is something the board would be interested in hearing about further we could certainly go back and take a look at it might apply to this project.

Mr. Schwarz said describe to him what the arboretum is going to be like and how will it be used, is there a fence, will it be policed or will you kick people out at night and how will the door to the plaza function. Is the turn lane going to chop out the green space in the right of way on the side of Cherry.

Charlie Armstrong said it will function a lot like a public park but will have daylight hour restrictions. There are some provisions in what City Council approved for some reasonable restrictions so it won't become a campground. The program for this is to remove a lot of the undergrowth which is invasive a lot of it is bamboo and preserve all of the larger trees 6 inches or greater so you will have the shade and canopy in that quiet space. The topography rolls reasonably gently so you have trails through there with some crushed stone or mulch with plank foot bridges so you wouldn't need a rail. There will be two ways in and out; one is off of Cherry Avenue one that starts there at the vehicular entrance and another one off of Ridge Street paralleling that vehicular entrance. There will be a third entrance right in the middle of the site down some stairs down the retaining wall so that hotel guest can and other occupants of the Phase Two space can easily access it. The door to the plaza will be keyed access because it does lead directly into the hotel area. The plaza is a semi-public space and we open both to hotel guest and the public as well as any user or public using future Phase Two space.

There is room for a turn lane and it will make it narrower plus a street tree strip and a sidewalk both of those would still be wide but it might narrow the space between the sidewalk and the building so you would lose one of those green spaces.

Mr. Schwarz said the renderings looked like Crepe Myrtles, so what are you anticipating putting on Cherry. He asked about the building setback on the front, 0 feet, are you at 0 feet to the property line or is that a typo.

Charlie Armstrong said there are some restrictions to what can go there because of the large power lines directly above on that street frontage as a three phase power circuit, two circuits that run right across there. It would have to be something that tapped out at 20 feet or so we are not going to put Oaks in there, so we would put large canopy trees on the Ridge Street side in addition to some ornamentals.

Mr. Schwartz asked Kurt Keesecker what is the Planning Commission intent for Cherry Avenue, is it meant to be an urban corridor is there an intent that the City has for that.

Mr. Keesecker said he cannot speak with any expertise of what the intent is. Cherry Avenue has its own mixed use corridor but not as developed or robust as some of the other ones. He said there has been some question about how it is articulated and kind of fleshed out over time and he is not sure that has been resolved.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the elevation to get a sense of pedestrian engagement on Cherry Avenue. Could you tell us about the sill heights of the windows on that façade or are they above or below one's head as one travels down sloping sidewalk.

Applicant said that would be scaling the door, a 7 foot high head to the door coming down the site this window would be about head high and this one above head height and each window would have sort of the same sort of relationship to Cherry as these. You would be able to look in, we have created these openings here and openings to the parking garage level heights into that space and this is to be developed further to that corner with that commercial space. He cannot speak to this. He said these are at the scale of the pedestrian sidewalk and then up here more toward Ridge he believes everything is at or below these windows you can see or actually with that airway that we discussed but they are actually below grade.

Mr. Keesecker said are they actually below grade. Would it be unfair to say that half of the windows sills on the on the Cherry Avenue façade are above his head as you proceed down that 275 foot façade. He asked the design team what is their interpretation of this condition #3. How did you interpret that.

Mr. Armstrong said some is architectural and some is land planning. The restriction is for non-residential uses. A hotel use is a commercial use that meets that part of the restriction. The ground level access on the Cherry Avenue front is a much more difficult one to accomplish due to the grade of Cherry Avenue. So we have to pick points in the architecture that meets that grade along Cherry Avenue. The plaza seems to obviously do it at the center point on that level and does it at the next level down and then down at the parking level at the corner and that is how that came about and because that was identified as an area where we were

not meeting that condition. We can solve that by adding some commercial and pedestrian space there at that corner.

Mr. Keesecker asked about the mechanical not on the roof or not on the ground but not on that mono-slope. Are you considering through wall units that are typical in some hotels. How are the SIA elements folded in?

Applicant said we currently working through the schematics for the mechanical systems. They currently have not been located, not to say that there won't be anything on the roof, but if we do we will show that in future drawings and renderings. He said that is another thing we are working through currently.

Charlie Armstrong said the SIA was added at Council's request during that process after the Planning Commission saw it and the intent from the request was that it would resemble the rendering that Council had seen previously in 2009 and people thought that meant the SIA intent that specifics are height and setbacks at a certain height which this does meet.

Ms. Knott what is the concept for the detention pond and what happens to the existing stream.

Mr. Armstrong said that in the back, the storm water management is bio-filter system and it has a detention basin for volume and he believes the detention basin just controls volume and does not stay wet and he will confirm that. It also has a bio-filter that controls stormwater, runs through the soil media picks up all of the particulates, and some large percentage of the nutrients to meet the new TMDR requirements for the Chesapeake Bay. So storm water leaves the site slower and cleaner that way. It will have a planted surface on either side and mulched with wetland species because the bio-filter does have an inundation period and it can dry out so there is special species that go in there.

Ms. Miller said she noticed the property line comes to the edge of the driveway of the first house, so this will be a new driveway next to their driveway.

Mr. Armstrong said the plan is to have a shared driveway there so they could use our joint access to get to their parking lot just in the rear, a gravel lot behind that part of the building. We would like to avoid two driveways next to each other.

Mr. Sarafin asked about an archaeological survey for the SW corner.

Mr. Schwarz asked about Plan B if they find remains.

Mr. Armstrong said the next step is subsurface investigation. Everything so far has not ruled it in. There are two areas where remains could be relocated if necessary.

### Public Comments

Antoinette Roades said she has been campaigning for years to have the graveyard located. She insisted the graveyard is not located in the area where Armstrong wants to investigate. She also said they failed to do that but they should have done that, according to everything I know about the site, it's entirely possible that the Hawkins' family bones can end up underneath a damned storm water detention pond. She said the William Taylor Plaza project has only been made possible due



to a sale of two formerly City-owned parcels to Southern Development, and she would want that sale to be conditioned on an investigation.

Dale Ludwig said the project is in a great area and I think it will clean up the whole area.

Marilyn MacDonald said we don't want a revolving set of strangers living in our neighborhood.

Kenneth Martin said there is absolutely nothing on Ridge Street that resembles that building.

Lena Seville said it is not fitting in with the character of the neighborhood and doesn't live up to Charlottesville standards. She said if you (BAR) would reject this, it would send a real message to City Council that the Planning Commission and the BAR rejected this.

### Board Comments

Ms. Knott said here is an urban site with a pedestrianized urban neighborhood on the edge of it. She said the proposal is suburban. She is not seeing the pedestrian engagement and experience being addressed or honored along Cherry or Ridge Street. There is something missing along Cherry, people have commented on the blank walls and the fact that nothing is really happening. She said walking down that sidewalk would be unpleasant. The plaza is at a very unpleasant intersection and she can't imagine sitting outside in this plaza and relaxing while traffic and trucks go by. The design of the plaza doesn't look very public to her, the way it is graded it looks like a concrete bathtub. She said at the end of the building was an opportunity to put in some type of retail like a coffee shop; a layered public/private engagement opportunity. She does not love the materials at all especially the very tall rusticated base which is too deep and creates a dead zone along that wall between that and Cherry. She does not love the brick panels and thinks they are a big mistake and they should go away and be replaced with real mortared brick. She does not like the retaining wall in the back. It will make a horrible entrance to what should be a public amenity and connected to Tonsler Park if it's being offered as a public amenity. She said some exchanging of programming should happen there, some sort of crosswalk and some kind of interaction with the public experience. The building is not responding to the site in any rational way- it is being forced to step down and relate to Cherry Avenue in an awkward way. She does not love the project yet.

Ms. Schwarz said he agrees 100% with Ms. Knott. A very suburban building – this corner is too important for a vacant use – missed opportunity guidelines call for activity along street level- we cannot control zoning but this feels like a residential use. You need to make it not feel like bunch of bedrooms. Thin brick is not allowed. Is there a local example of the proposed material/ It is designed to be seen far away – how will the corners work?

Ms. Miller read some of the guidelines as they are related to this project. It is incompatible with the character of the district. Needs to be compatible with the site and the design control district. Look at the impact on the neighborhood. New infill should relate in footprint and massing; use sympathetic materials. Should not overpower adjacent buildings. Height and width- vertical expression. Reinforce human scale. Does the Fairfield inn meet ADC district guidelines for materials? There would be an adverse effect on the historic district to remove two trees for the new entrance on Ridge Street. Show existing buildings for context in future drawings- entrance to Ridge is problematic due to relationship to historic district and removing the sycamore tree.

Mr. Sarafin said this intersection and the presence of whatever is built here is an important statement. Massing and scale is important – he appreciates the 2-3 story reduced scale at east end, but the site lines as you approach – whole expanse is in one view- visually part of the Ridge Street district; incompatible scale down Cherry.

Ms. Ernst said we have made the point that the context is just missing and perhaps that's a reflection in part to the way the drawings are presented and will be remedied when we see it again. She doesn't see architecturally or archaeologically how its responding to what is going on in the neighborhood at large. She said 1<sup>st</sup> floor hotel rooms feel awkward as a pedestrian walking by.. The materiality and proportionality are off. Dislike having the pool on the plaza- cruel and awkward. The arboretum placement in back does not draw people in.

Mr. Sarafin said it feels like an inward-looking project. Main entrance is on back side. Pool speaks to lack of engagement.

Mr. Keesecker said he agrees with everyone and what they have said. He discussed non-residential uses on the ground level- 1<sup>st</sup> floor storefront windows would provide visual relief. The SIA recommends below grade parking recommended for new development.

Ms. Miller said it would helpful to see the following:

1. An example of a Fairfield Inn incorporated into other neighborhoods in historic districts;
2. To see Fairfield Inns not Courtyards;
3. A lighting plan with the nighttime renderings (exterior);
4. All mechanical units and their screenings included;
5. All drawings need to be 100% accurate, floor plans, elevations; Match elevations and renderings;
6. Don't included the planting strip in the median if it is not being done; Phase Two, and don't include drawings from the perspective that seems impossible based on the current building;
7. Do include historic homes that are adjacent, power lines, fire hydrants, age of trees, people for scale, the location of dumpsters;
8. Cut sheets for exterior lights and higher grade materials.

Mr. Schwarz said not to design a historicist building, but it needs to fit the context.

Ms. DeLoach said it should be respectful of surrounding buildings.

Mr. Armstrong said he appreciated everyone's comments and they're exceptionally thoughtful. He asked them to consider the detailed zoning plan that has a lot of requirements. He said they have some pretty serious constraints that they have to operate in to produce the zoning as well.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Schwarz, seconded by Mr. Sarafin, motion passes 7-0.

D. Adjournment 8:45 p.m.