

Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
October 20, 2015

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

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller, Vice-Chair Tim Mohr, Members Laura Knott (arrived late), Carl Schwarz, Kurt Keesecker, Justin Sarafin, Whit Graves, Emma Earnst, Staff: Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner, Camie Mess, Preservation Assistant, Carolyn McCray, Clerk, and Margaret Stella, Intern.

Members Absent: Candace DeLoach

Call to Order: the meeting was called to order by Chair Melanie Miller at 5:34 p.m.

- A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)  
No one from the public spoke.
- B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. Minutes

September 14, 2015 Work Session  
August 18, 2015  
August 19, 2015 Special Meeting

Motion by Mr. Schwarz to approve the consent agenda seconded by Mr. Keesecker, motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred or Previously Considered Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from September)  
BAR 15-09-09  
Garrett Street/Ridge Street Bridge  
Carrie Rainey, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner  
Landscape and Hardscape Improvement

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

Staff recommends the proposed plan with the lower fence height along the railroad. The private landowner may prefer the taller fence along their property. Parks and Recreation was amenable to the additional landscaping, but noted they still prefer less shrubs and more grass.

Carrie Rainey, Design Planner, represented the City as applicant.

There were no questions from the public.

Board Questions

Ms. Miller asked have you thought about putting trees along Ridge Street.

Ms. Rainey said they did think about it, but the only way to make it possible to get canopy would be to build up the land on that side which would not be feasible given the utility line running through the parcel and there would be a great deal of cost.

### Public Comments

Leah Watson 204 Ridge Street – said this morning she received a copy of the City Police report from 2006 regarding the problems at the end of the street. It is far beyond just trespassing on to our property; it is a public safety issue. When we went before city Council last year the landscape design was partly designed to deter that activity. She said her concern is the buildup of the grassy area is going to invite loitering and the same kinds of activities. The report recommends low shrubs and a clear sight line picture up to the stairs so that the police officers approaching up Garret Street can see what is going on in that area.

From our standpoint, the only concern we have with the design is the curvature of the access to our property. We would like to move our driveway 15 feet closer to Garrett Street so we can get into our yard and access to parking in the front yard. Our property is zoned commercial and residential and that would be consistent with the adjacent property with the width of their driveway. We would like to move it 15 feet closer to Ridge Street so they not have to do the demolition of the existing road. Our driveway would come off of that, so it would be a less expensive project. There are a lot of utility lines in that area so you would keep the existing hardscape street and our driveway access would move 15 feet closer to Ridge Street otherwise, we are going to have difficulty getting in and getting street plowing and other services to our area. It would be less expensive and consistent to our driveway access that our adjacent property owner has. Another thing is trying to minimize the grass, she said that is what maintenance prefers but they have problems maintaining the grass as it is. She said low shrubs would be preferable.

Mr. Keesecker moved to find that the proposed Phase 1 landscaping and fencing improvements satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, and the BAR approves the proposal as submitted, with the following comments: the last Crape Myrtle shown (as it moves toward the corner of Gleason and Garrett ) could be removed at staff and designer's discretion if the police want it for better visibility, the species of Crape Myrtles along that one side of the driveway could be changed at your discretion for better visibility; the lower (5 Ft) fence height is approved [in both locations]. The BAR asked if this could be considered Phase 1, with Phase 2 extending the sidewalk down at a future date [to connect with the existing sidewalk on the north side of Garrett Street]. Mr. Schwarz seconded. (6-1 with Miller opposed).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from August)  
BAR 15-08-08  
422 East Main Street  
Tax Parcel 280520000  
Virginia Pacific Investments, LLC, Owner/ 5th & Main Holdings, LLC;  
Commonwealth Skybar, Applicant  
Metal and translucent panel cover for top of existing Skybar.

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

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 sprinkled for fire protection. The building has now been fully sprinkled; 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.

The applicant came before the BAR in August and is returning as requested by the BAR with options for an asymmetrical gable roof.

Mr Rick Baker represented the applicant.

### Board Questions

Mr. Schwarz asked are two of the options the same, 1A and 1C looks to be the same.

Mr. Baker said 1C has a 10-12 pitch on the right and 1A has an 8-12 pitch. The 10-12 is a little steeper. He said either one keeps it below the height of the adjacent building. They are the same overall height but it would make sense that one is higher than the other. He said the height only changed 3 inches.

Mr. Baker said the side roof does not come all the way to the mall, the sides stop at the end of the hard roof. When the front part is retracted the whole entire front is open. He said even with the side and the front, the whole front corner is still uncovered which is about 120 a square feet left open.

Mr. Baker said in the beginning it will be manual and slide on tracks and in the future, determining whether we open and close it a lot, then we would have a solution made so you wouldn't see it. It would be hidden up under the canopy. It would open and close like a commercial screwdriver garage door opener. He said the decision to use the manual option is in part the cost. To motorize it would cost more money and we wouldn't open it all winter and the motor part would not happen before spring.

Mr. Mohr asked if someone could explain the offset pitch logic.

Mr. Sarafin said regarding the symmetrical gable form, the previous packet had some other rendering that we felt had a strange presence and almost residential reference on the mall and the suggestion was to try some asymmetry there. They needed a certain pitch for snow load and the like so we asked for a different treatment there.

### Board Comments

Mr. Mohr said when I think of industrial language and roof monitors you do have solutions that are usually more dramatic than that. It seems a little forced to him. It's just a simple gable form and he doesn't have any problem with it being symmetrical.

Mr. Schwarz said he likes the asymmetrical; the off center seems to work better with the building.

Mr. Graves said he likes the asymmetrical but would approve either way.

Mr. Keesecker said he agrees with either one, asymmetrical or symmetrical.

Mr. Mohr moved to find that the new metal and translucent panel cover for the top of the existing Skybar 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, with the [roof] point of the offset to line up with the pole below, and some relationship between the geometry below and the location of the break point in the ridge [Mohr's drawing circulated]. In the event the applicant decides to motorize the roof cover, the BAR wants to first see details, which can be approved administratively. Mr. Sarafin seconded (7-0).

D. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-10-04  
200 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 280010000  
William S Banowsky, Jr, Owner/Violet Crown Cinema Charlottesville, LLC,  
Applicant  
Change to approve new materials

Bill Banowsky said he regret that we are taking the time of the BAR tonight to deal with this after the fact. We did not have good processes in place and they failed us. To deal with these things as they came up and we were surprised as the owner as well as you have been.

T.K Architect – Patrick Carpenter – the canopy helped us to understand why we had to increase the height. That design was more of a signage type of sign. Slope toward the sidewalk or internal drainage. Glazing color, change was to meet code, a certain performance. The store front color looks more silver than iron ore. Store front configuration – 2 panes sealed with sealant. The frameless door have a lot of problem with air leakage, Jeff Williams with Charlottesville Glass, changed it to a typical framed door.

Board Comments

Mr. Keesecker Most of the changes seem drastic in the context of what was originally approved, not necessarily in context of what our guidelines say. The only one that seems directly opposed to what our guidelines call for is the color of the glass. Even the canopy depth, it is different than before, and we can make our own judgments as to whether it is appropriate or not. He didn't know if anyone else read them as he did.

Mr. Schwarz said he wouldn't have approved this at first. The misalignment doesn't bother him but it's the material that bothers him. He said he is inclined to approve it.

Patrick Carpenter we have to account the slope for the drains, two slope pieces, and the design is the best solution we could come up with it.

Mr. Sarafin said it is really lacking contrast; this cove area inset in the gray bricks. getting lost with that type of direction.

Ms. Miller said this is a big mess. You went out on a limb. We did say we are getting really nice glass and special panels, it is not what was presented.

Mr. Mohr said the glass is the biggest issue.

Ms. Miller moved to find that the following proposed design 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 following changes as submitted:

1. The entry doors on the west side, at the center at the restaurant, and at the entrance are approved as built;
2. The window wall system which has been changed to storefront is approved as built with an exception to be detailed on the east side on our not-approved list;
3. Movie poster holders are approved as installed;
4. Purple sign lighting as installed.

In addition, Ms. Miller moved to find that the following proposed design changes do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR did not approve the following changes [as built] with revisions to come back to a future meeting. The BAR's intent was to handle the items not approved not as a denial, but as a deferral until the December meeting.

1. The Hardie panels – the BAR requests a change in finish with higher contrast, different texture, and much lighter [color];
2. The marquee depth – the BAR wants to see alternative trim or other detailing in order to lighten the appearance;
3. The [tinted] glass shall be a clear glass;
4. The smaller transom on the east side lower window shall be revised [to match upper window];
5. More information in the form of a rendering for the request for paint color on 2nd Street.

The BAR also said their recommendation was for the City to grant a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) Mr. Schwarz seconded. (7-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-10-02  
1309 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 100016000  
RAAJ Charlottesville Owner, LLC, Owner/ Roger Hughett, Applicant  
Upgrade antennas and relocate equipment on roof in new stealth enclosures  
She did not give her name -

#### Board Questions

Mr. Schwarz asked if it is going to be solid or louvers made of out that stealth material.

Applicant said the louvers were made out of that because we are going to have to have air flow.

Keesecker screen wall is more solid, replace metal just in front antenna location It will not stick up above the screen wall. Screen wall was already approved.

#### Discussion and Recommendations

Mr. Graves moved to find that the plan to add five antennas and to screen all eight antennas and to screen the equipment on the roof satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Mohr seconded (7-0).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 15-10-07

1511 University Ave

Tax Parcel 090078100

Amorgos LLC, Owner/College Inn, LLC, Stuart L. Rifkin, Applicant

Storefront renovations: new storefront moved inward to create larger outside seating area; add new wood patio deck.

The historic survey says the current storefront replaced the original in 1946. The proposed storefront changes are appropriate because storefronts are often modified, while the building surrounding them stays the same. The BAR should verify the colors for the exposed brick wall and the sign panel.

Staff does not recommend the proposed wood deck. University Avenue is a major thoroughfare with a lot of pedestrian traffic. A deck in this location would set a precedent for the University Avenue businesses. Decks have been permitted on the side streets downtown, due to the extreme slopes, but not on the Downtown Mall itself.

Board Comments

Ms. Miller said it's a nice improvement.

Mr. Mohr said he is in favor of the storefront changes, but not the proposed deck.

Mr. Mohr moved to find that the proposed storefront demolition and reconstruction satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC District, and the BAR does not approve the deck but the BAR approves the building [storefront changes] as designed. Mr. Sarafin seconded. (7-0).

8:27 five minute break until 8:32

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-10-01

1835 University Circle

Tax Parcel 060069000

Shannon Worrell, Owner/ Mike Stoneking, Applicant

Addition of 415 sq.ft. 2nd floor recreation room atop existing garage

Mr. Keesecker moved to find that the proposed new garage addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Schwarz seconded. (6-1 with Miller opposed).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-10-06  
134 10th Street NW  
Tax Parcel 310156000  
CCBW, LLC, Owner/Mike Stoneking, Applicant  
Alterations to two openings on south façade, construction of an ADA walkway

Mr. Sarafin moved to find that the proposed alterations to the two openings on the south façade as well as extending the walk-way to meet ADA regulations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Mohr seconded. (7-0).

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 15-10-03  
Lee Park – 101 E Market Street  
Tax Parcel 330195000  
City of Charlottesville, Owner/ Doug Ehman, Parks Division  
Manager, Applicant  
Repairs at Lee Park, concrete work, retaining wall and masonry, repair stairs  
4 park renovation, not re-placing retaining wall, repair the retaining wall.

Although this work could be considered maintenance, the age, significance and prominent location of the park, and its walls, trees, and walkways, warrant the BAR's scrutiny of the proposed repairs. Staff commends Parks for the careful planning.

Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the proposed Lee Park improvements 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 the proposal as submitted, minus the replacement of the wall at the Linden tree.  
Mr. Keesecker seconded. (7-0).

E. New Construction

Ms. Knott entered the meeting

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from September)  
BAR 15-09-05  
425,501,503 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 320175000, 320176000, 320177000  
William H. Atwood, Applicant/The Sutton Group, Owner  
Massing and elevations approval for a new mixed use development.

Following a lengthy discussion, architect William Atwood asked to defer consideration of his Atlantic project in the 500 block of West Main. The project previously had been approved but Atwood came back with a version that is on less land than before.

The Atlantic project is being reviewed at a time when West Main's zoning allows for buildings to be constructed up to 60 feet tall by right. That would allow Atwood's building to be five stories on the West Main side of the street and six stories above Commerce Street.

The city is considering rezoning the street to lower the total height to 52 feet at that location.

The Atlantic also would incorporate two historic buildings that are on the site. Parking would be available on three levels, with entrance from West Main and exit onto Commerce.

Mr. Atwood said the size of his building was appropriate given the presence of other tall buildings in the area. We picked this site because we are about 50 feet from a 60-foot building and now we're about 140 feet from a major building at the Marriott, and we think we're very compatible.

However, neighbors said they think the new building would destroy their community.

#### Public Comment

Pat Edwards, a Commerce Street resident, said, "What happens on West Main Street doesn't stay on West Main Street," and it is spilling over into the communities and the neighborhoods. If there's anything anybody can do in this city to save us, we plead for that because a building that huge, I can't even fathom it.

Mr. Atwood asked for a deferral.

Mr. Mohr moved to accept the applicant's request for a deferral, Mr. Keesecker seconded. (8-0)

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from August)  
BAR 15-08-04  
NW Corner of Cherry Avenue and Ridge Street  
Tax Parcel 290145000-147000, 290149000-151000, 290157000  
Cherry Avenue Investments LLC, Owner and Applicant  
Proposed new construction of a Marriot Hotel

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.

The BAR previously received 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.



The BAR should focus their review on this site as a major gateway to the City, in addition to the neighborhood context, and whether the design meets the pertinent design guidelines and is compatible with the Ridge Street ADC historic district.

Important aspects are: massing and scale of articulated building design, quality 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 on both streets, the interim plan for the Phase Two landscaped area, and the overall site design, including arboretum layout, retaining wall, auto entrances, pedestrian circulation, and landscaping design.

Staff suggests addressing the massing, general site layout and building materials. The first step would be more detailed building elevations, cut sheets for windows, lighting photo-metrics and fixture cut sheets. A landscape plan prepared by a landscape architect is needed for the whole site. The site plan should identify locations for a trash dumpster, electrical transformers, and any mechanical units on the roof or on the ground, and how they will be screened.

### Board Questions

Charlie Armstrong said that has been a struggle because one goal competes with the other because there is a goal to maintain complete invisibility of the parking that is behind that Phase 2 area until it is developed into its final state. The other is to move the invasive species and there is a lot of bamboo in there. He said it could be left as is for now, with the bamboo which is absolutely invisible without any modification to the Phase 2 areas at all. There aren't more than maybe 6 or 8 trees of 6-8 inches larger in that area. The rest is small under-story trees and bamboo. The question is to leave that stuff or remove the invasive. Removing the invasive would mean we would need to plant some additional trees to obscure the parking behind it. So that is the decision and we are open to either right now, the bamboo with this phase the project would be boxed in by the travel way so it couldn't escape any further which accomplishes the same thing as removing it but we are open to suggestions on that.

Mr. Schwartz asked how do you remove the bamboo and keep the existing trees.

Mr. Armstrong said it will take a lot of time and will require going in there with a lot of hand work to remove it multiple times hand work, and the only success way that he has seen is to put elbow length gloves on and paint it with herbal side.

Ms. Miller asked would these renderings be accurate that you are not going to propose any type sign there it's just a driveway in.

Ms. Knott said you mentioned breaking up the apparent height of the retaining wall, doing basically two level comparisons with the walk way, between the two levels.

The RESPONSE - NOT USING THE MICROPHONE

Ms. Knott said she doesn't see the planting he is referring too on this sheet which is SP-13, do we have the planting plan for that area.

The RESPONSE - NOT USING THE MICROPHONE

## Public Comments

Pat Lloyd, Ridge Street Neighborhood, she sees a lot of struggle with new material and maybe things you haven't seen. She encourages you to take your time with this, look carefully and closely at what you are seeing. She asked have these materials been made public for everyone.

Dede Smith 2652 Jefferson Park Circle stated she wants to be sure the plan for the arboretum is the same one that City Council approved. She asked whether Phase 2 is going to be owned by this hotel chain. Has there been any conversation about underground utilities along Cherry Ave.

Mr. Armstrong said there has been conversation with this Board about the underground utilities. It is an intensive endeavor and would involve properties up and down Cherry Avenue and on the other side of Elliott for several hundred yards in order to accomplish with this project. It's in the 100's of thousands of dollars and we don't know if it has 6 or 7 figures on it. Phase II will not be owned by the hotel. We will be retaining ownership of that to the developed later under a separate program. The arboretum is the same in size and scope with some minor differences in the trail alignment based on staff comments during site plan phase from rezoning until now.

## Board Comments

The BAR members asked for a different landscaping plan; and to consider using different colors. They also sought refinements to entryways and to how the building looks on Ridge Street.

Ms. Miller said it seems that everyone's in agreement that this is moving in a positive direction but maybe we're not quite there yet.

Mr. Keesecker said based on what he is seeing, they have approached it successfully especially with the terraces along Cherry Ave. He said he is encouraged that does not try to mimic a house and he likes the materiality. Looking at the footprint of this facade along Cherry Ave and its relatively sufficient setbacks in plan so that façade will be articulated with the additional of the terraces, he said it will be a fairly rich pedestrian experience. He said he is encouraged by what he is seeing and maybe there are some details to work out around the main hotel lobby entrance. It seems like a little too much down played for his taste but it's an architectural thing not a massing or scale.

Mr. Schwarz said he agrees with everything Mr. Keesecker said.

Staff suggests addressing the massing, general site layout and building materials. The next step would be more detailed building elevations, cut sheets for windows, lighting photometrics and fixture cut sheets. A landscape plan prepared by a landscape architect is needed for the whole site. The site plan should identify locations for a trash dumpster, electrical transformers, and any mechanical units on the roof or on the ground, and how they will be screened.

Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the proposed new construction, including massing, and general site layout generally satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves only the massing and general site layout, with the following

modification: that the applicant look at the lobby entryway and the corner at Ridge and Cherry, and continue to explore color. Mr. Mohr seconded (8-0).

Mr. Graves recused himself from the next item and left the meeting.

12. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from September)  
BAR 15-10-08  
550 East Water Street  
Tax Parcel 530162300  
Neal Sansovich, Owner/ Andrew Baldwin, Applicant  
New Mixed-Use Complex

#### Public Questions

David Myatt said the community sent three letters and hoped you had an opportunity to look at them; one from the NDRA, Emily Johnson and one signed by a number of community members.

David Thomas, 500 Court Square, said he understands the applicant is seeking a formal approval for massing and his question is on what basis can the BAR issue formal approval for massing divorced from a general approval of the certificate of appropriateness. He said if it can be done, can it be done with an application that is incomplete and does not meet all of the requirements of section 34-282D including the mention of materials, 3 dimension drawings, scale drawings and otherwise. Has the BAR received all of the materials required for 34-282D because he inspected the public file on Friday afternoon and have seen a number of things for the first time today despite the requirement for the application to be submitted 21 days before a hearing? The question is has that been done. He said in comparison to what the board has considered in agenda items 10 and 11, can the BAR issue formal approval to massing without the scale drawings to show the actual mass, not the renderings and in which the views are complete, for instance a view looking from the western direction over the King Building. It's studiously avoided in all that's been submitted and does the BAR have a concern that there is a reason that every directional angle has been shown except looking over top of the King Building and what that means for the massing of the project, from the western view, the view in which is likely to be approached by pedestrian.

Ms. Miller said regarding question 10 and 11, the way we operate is the complete packet doesn't have to meet all of the requirements until the COA is approved. We only require the documents that are applicable for each stage at the time. She said to provide a non-legal reason, it's just because it makes no sense to require an applicant to come in with a construction set of documents that when you might not approve the general mass at all.

#### Board Comments

Ms. Knott said she felt like they have done a beautiful job.

Mr. Mohr said the experience of this building is a skinny thing. That view beside the rail road track, is an intriguing sight, crazy little place, quite wonderful, that is where some of the coolest things happened. It has resonated with everybody. Time moves on and it is an interesting building, near a poorly placed transit center. It may still have some issues, parking that is not our purview. It is a skinny building in a wedge of a spot. He would rather err on the side of adventure. It is an interesting project.

Mr. Keesecker said he tends to agree with Tim, trying to understand the corner downtown and the Holsinger he tried to imagine several times, from a distance to make a nice gateway into the stretch of Water Street. He is in favor of the massing.

The applicant is requesting massing approval. The BAR should decide if the massing is appropriate, so that the applicant can proceed in the design of other elements.

Since the last review, the applicant has included north and south elevations as well as expanded elevations to show its relation to the buildings on either side. The BAR should focus on how the new construction interacts with the buildings on either side as well as the streetscape and pedestrian experience of East Water Street. The proposed design minimizes the impact of the garage openings, and includes along Water Street entrances to two commercial spaces, and a stair egress door.

In staff opinion, this building has a relatively small footprint, compared to surrounding buildings. The zoning ordinance is a bit unclear on how height is measured, but the intent is to allow for variation in grade only. The current design correctly shows the maximum height called out to be 70 feet, measured to the flat roof, although the scale on the drawings is incorrect. The BAR should ask to see the west elevation included with future plans.

Ms. Miller said it makes no sense to require an applicant to come in with a construction-ready set of documents when [the BAR] may not even approve the general mass at all.

Mr. Mohr said he does not understand why people don't feel like it goes along with the two old buildings on either end of it, but at the same time it is a skinny building on a little wedge of a spot

Mr. Sarafin agrees with Mr. Mohr.

Mr. Keesecker moved to find that the massing of the proposed new mixed-use complex satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the massing only, as submitted. Ms. Knott seconded. (7-0-1 with Graves recused).

F. Other Business

The Chair asked about the timeline for the balustrade replacement at 500 Court Square.

G. Adjournment 12:45 a.m.