

BAR Work Session  
7/18/2016  
William Taylor Plaza Phase 2: PUD Requirement

Mary Joy: There is actually no staff report, but this is Phase 2 of William Taylor Plaza, the BAR recently approved Phase 1. This is subject to the few PUD development requirements, one of these to note is maximum height in the Ridge Street phase is 40 feet, except if it is within 75 feet of low density, and then it is 35 feet, so that effects the northern most end of this phase.

Otherwise, it says Phase 2, Ridge Street Phase, approximately 0.4 acres should be residential or mixed use, 10-50 residential units, 0-40,000 square feet of commercial and total space of Phase 2 should total 45% of the total site acreage.

Presentation:

- 50 units are allowed, they are proposing 27 units
- The parking that is required by zoning will all be underground
- LEED certified which is a PUD requirement
- 25 of the 27 units will be fully accessible

First, we will look at the setback. When looking at the original retaining walls of Ridge Street, they are all set back about 75 feet. If we follow the original right of way it shows that if this project were to be built before the extra turn lanes and bus stop, the building would have been right in line with that setback. The 75 foot offset, is from this property line and that falls almost centered on the courtyard entry and private courtyard beyond, which separates the central block of the apartments from the north block. So the 35 foot height restriction would refer to this specific block.

The new project puts a landscape strip on the street, except by the bus stop, a wider than existing sidewalk (7 or 8 feet). One of the things we would like to do with this project is put a boundary between the property line and sidewalk so we know exactly what we are in charge of.

All of our apartments will have covered porches or covered terraces off the primary living space, to help carve out the mass of the building. Hopefully, this will bring people out to engage with the street.

Also, Ridge Street has a variety of materials and colors found throughout its structures, and because of that they want to really look at the specifics of design (i.e. materials and colors) so the development does not feel so much like a large project, but is able to be broken into smaller pieces in order to better fit within the ADC district. That being said, they do not want to make every piece extremely different, but hope to be able to use a pallet of materials and colors so some of the variety seen on Ridge Street finds its way into the project.

So today we hoping to give you a better idea of the relationship to street, the height of the project, and the rhythm of the pieces we are expressing that we feel, and we hope you feel, fit within the buildings of the street.

Questions:

Mr. Sarafin: Could we see the view coming in from 64, up 5<sup>th</sup> Street, that intersection approach?

Mr. von Storck: Again here is an example of how the model has not been rendered, which makes this massing feel pretty harsh compared to the Ridge Street side. Internally we wonder if repeating the gables in this direction is helpful to the massing or not helpful. It brings the scaling of the gables around, but it makes this facing feel taller than it actually is.

Ms. Miller: Is the whole project set at 35 feet plus or minus right now?

Mr. Von Storck: Plus or minus, from the sidewalk to the midpoint of the gable is 35 feet.

Mr. Schwarz: I am curious to see what the back side looks like, as far as massing.

Mr. Von Storck: Driving down here the new drive provides access to this building here. Then the arboretum area sits well below the plinth of the hotel and what this project will sit on. The construct for the hotel and the arboretum is part of the prior approval.

Mr. Mohr: So presumably this elevation will be a combination of porches and terraces? Is it a separate bank of living units facing this way?

Mr. Von Storck: It is, what is different about this side, is the living spaces which are here are bookending these private courtyards that are behind the walkway layer. So the four ground level apartments will walk out on to three sizeable terraces and from above the living spaces will have overhanging balconies into those same courtyards. Right now we are not expressing porches or terraces to that western elevation. We are trying to find the right balance of pushing and pulling the building for massing. We are holding it back as much as we can to create some planting areas between the edge of the sidewalk and the building.

Ms. Knott: Does anyone have a copy of the approved PUD?

Ms. Miller: Is the space above the third floor used for anything, or is it just used to compliment the gables?

Mr. Von Stork: The latter

Ms. Miller: So you don't have to necessarily have it that high constantly. Some of the houses on Ridge Street have gables, but they may have valleys in between.

Mr. Von Storck: I think once you are committed to slopped roof and gables, this is pretty much the roof line you get. We can certainly explore to see if some of the gables can come to a hipped roofed and pullback on some of that apparent height.

Comments:

Mr. Schwarz: I was just thinking is there any way that you can play with your roof line to make it appear more like it is two and a half stories, if the third story could be more roof I think that

would help with your massing. The way you are breaking up the building seems to work out well with the lot sizes, and the rhythm of sides are good, but it might be stronger the middle entryway transparent or pulled back to make it appear more like four pieces, as opposed to two house size pieces and the large middle one. The view from the south façade elevation on Ridge Street seems to not stay within the confines of the massing for the district. Marriot worked on their scale to figure out a way to make it fit within the district, and your plan just seems very tall.

Mr. Mohr: It is just so much more vertical.

Mr. Von Stork: I think some of the conversations in the approval stage were hoping the corner of the hotel could have been stronger. I don't know how it came to be.

Mr. Schwarz: I feel a lot of effort was put into the end piece of the Marriot to feel similar in scale to some of the existing houses, and that your project just jumps up from that.

Mr. Von Stork: It is something we can work on. As I said we were wondering internally if it was counterproductive to express these gables. It is really a three story building adjacent to another three story building, it is just the other building is the flat hotel style construction.

Mr. Mohr: Is there any modulation possible with that south wall?

Mr. Von Stork: Yes, we are not against the property line, set back, or building code.

Mr. Mohr: So it could take some windows off.

Mr. Sarafin: It strikes me that this south façade is going to be the most challenging and the most important to get right. I know this is just massing and it is a block and it is not treated architecturally here, but it can't help but underscore some of the scale issues that have been brought up. I thought the two and a half story expression might be good, I am not entirely sure that the gable form is the answer for how to treat it. And if the two and a half story versus three maybe relates better to this end of the Marriot. In any event, where this project engages with this little square, and I am aware it might not literally connect, but it is going to have to work with the corner and the Marriot. This is a very prominent approach and this is going to be really important to get that right. I don't know what the answers are, but I would encourage we look at this relationship between the Marriot on the corner and this end; it could be more jarring than the north end and the preexisting Ridge Street houses. The transition is almost the most important part of this.

Mr. Mohr: I think the scale of the windows is a bit off. It is somewhat like an apartment building, but then it has this house overlay, but the two of them aren't quite coming together. You don't have room to put porches on the front, correct? It needs something that would carry a horizontal line. It is in a funny zone where it really isn't in a house scale, and it is tall. It reads more as an apartment building, and it seems with the cut through that you are trying to make it more with the houses in the districts, is not working. It is too tall.

Mr. Sarafin: I am not convinced the gable motif is going to be your answer, maybe it is going to be that second and a half or third story is set back a little bit. More of a contemporary idiom perhaps a way to get the space without the three level plus gable height. I don't know what that looks like, but it could be worth exploring. (42.20)

Mr. Von Stork: You have to pick a style to go with fairly early on in the project, and we cast our lot that at the end of the day keeping the familiar shapes was better for the street than introducing a new look. I just think this more traditional language will hold up over time. And we are working on trying to find ways to get that half story feel, with the full story we are dealing with. So we will keep working with that.

Mr. Mohr: You might look at something that starts to create a break in that street wall, so it feels more like it is in scale with the other houses down the street. The window arrangement and scale needs works.

Ms. Miller: Can they be behind the brick, so there is a window well where there is privacy on the street and light can still come in?

Mr. Von Stork: We have been thinking about the possibility of peeling away a one and a half story layer, forward to the street, so there is a completely different shifted scale here that is more like a court scale and then having these windows sit a foot and a half back through that layer, as a way to change the scale and add some depth to that façade.

Miller: I like the idea of the transparency between, but I agree something needs to happen in that middle layer where the brick is, to make it more transparent. I get the idea of it meeting the former setback of the original road, and it is unfortunate that there is a lot of asphalt, but I think it would help a lot if there was some way to get some plantings in that area. All of the houses on Ridge Street have front yards, so it is sort of the expected thing. The same thing on that drive, between the last historic house and your first building, I think it is going to be important to make sure you can include some sort of planting.

Mr. Schwarz: Are you able to get windows in those slots between the buildings?

Mr. Von Stork: Definitely.

Ms. Miller: I definitely think the windows have to be the traditional vertical shape, maybe there can be something built in where there are shutters, so you are not necessarily going to get closed curtains all the time.

Mr. Schwarz: Also, if there are windows facing each other they are going to close those off as well.

Mr. Von Stork: Yes, that is a shame. Right now the windows are drawn very traditional; more often than not our sketches in the office are bigger windows, with more modern feeling panes. There is certainly a way within this traditional massing approach to give it a more modern flare.

Mr. Schwarz: I think things like the thicken wall will go a long way in helping this project. The existing residential houses are highly detailed and more detailed you get with this the more it is going to feel that it is keeping with the rest of the structures.

Mr. Von Stork: We will be looking for that balance between variety and still feeling coherent with the other structures.

Mr. Sarafin: Tim's [Mr. Mohr's] comment about a substantial base, I think is a good one, to lend this some visual grounding, and I think it will bring some real gravitas to this corner.

Mr. Mohr: I like the ideas of the pass through, because it gives it a more residential scale, more common to the other buildings down the street, but then the facades don't match.

Ms. Miller: Is there any room for planting in the back?

Mr. Von Stork: Not on our site. We are backed right up to the property line.

Ms. Knott: I still feel very strongly about the setbacks on these buildings, they are fairly close to the streets, but this is so much more nicely modulated along the front. So that these have a much deeper setback, almost as deep as some of the buildings along the street, I would love to see you explore that a little bit more. I would like to see the setback a little more consistent with the surrounding area. I know you have tried to relate the buildings to the surrounding scale, but I think that needs a bit more attention. The guidelines state for the massing to fit within the district, and I think this building overpowers the traditional scale. All of the other structures in the district have a hierarchy of space, going from completely public to completely private, and I do not think that this building does that with the bedrooms right next to the street. It seems like a lot of thought has gone into screening bedrooms that shouldn't even be on the street, so it seems like that needs to be rethought. Although I can't tell you what to do with the interior of the building, it just seems like moving those would solve a lot of problems. I don't really see this building relating to the historic district.

Mr. Von Stork: While we were given this site with almost zero setbacks, you are right that the yard is lost to seven lanes of traffic. So if we would truly have those layers of space which would be wonderful to have we wouldn't have much of a project left, but it is certainly something that we will keep working on.

Ms. Earnst: The first thing that hit me when I looked at these was the elevation at Cherry and Ridge, that intersection just hits you hard. I think that is probably where the most work will be useful. That being said, I think the north side works a lot better. I am a little bit worried about that flat roof in between the two gables there, I don't know how visible that is from the road, but it just looks really out of place. The only other thought I had was if it would help to vary the roof line with the road [referring to Cherry].

Mr. Von Stork: I think that falls into exploring the half story option.

Mr. Mohr: How wide is that sidewalk there?

Mr. Von Stork: I believe it is 8 feet.

Mr. Schwarz: I wonder if there is any way to reduce the sidewalk to 6 feet from the standard sidewalk size.

Mr. Sarafin: Just for my clarification, much like say the SUP stipulations for Market Plaza, we are bound by working within the PUD of the already approved site plan. If we are discussing alterations to the already accepted site plan, that requires more conversations and going back through other bodies. Once again I see us bound by decisions that were made by other bodies, with the best intentions, and yet here we are working within that framework that might not be ideal.

Ms. Miller: That being said, you don't have to build to the very edges of what is allowed.

Mr. Von Stork: One of the mandates that come with a project like this is that all ground floor units have to be accessible. And I always, take that to mean accessible in a practical way. So bringing people up to the elevator as a minimum to the parking for the ground floor immediately presented us the opportunity to make all of the units accessible. Those connections did take up space.

Ms. Miller: Any last questions or thoughts?

Adjourned 6:50pm

Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
July 19, 2016

Location: City Council Chambers-City Hall

Members Present: Chair-Melanie Miller, Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Carl Schwarz, Kurt Keesecker, Whit Graves, Emma Earnst, Stephen Balut, Justin Sarafin, Laura Knott

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala, Carolyn McCray, Clerk

Call to Order: Chair – Melanie Miller calls meeting to order at 5:30

Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

1. Mark Kavit stated that since the last meeting he has been doing a lot of research on fencing. He said a sorority was here trying to find an iron type of fence. He has been researching and googling the different types of iron fencing and googled wrought iron fence. He also spoke with some of the contractors in the area. He said you would be surprised with all of the different combinations that will come up. He said he was more than willing to help get the materials they may need, so it can be replaced. He is more than happy to guide them to the appropriate people that can help them.

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 June 21, 2016

Motion by Mr. Sarafin seconded by Mr. Balut, Ms. Knott abstains. Motion passed 6-1-0.

C. Previously Considered Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-02-06  
1105 Park Street  
Tax Parcel 470007000  
Nicholas Cafferillo & Elaine Alpern, Owners/ Keith Scott, Applicant  
Landscape Plan

The applicant has provided a landscape plan, and details/specifications related to the pools and terraces, as requested by the BAR at the March 15, 2016 meeting.

Mary Wolfe, landscape architect, said they are trying to maintain the character of the house as it is in the current condition. A front yard is mostly canopy trees, along with some specimen evergreens. From the previously approved plan, they are shifting the driveway entrance north for better visibility from the front of the house to the garage. For guest parking they are maintaining existing parking that is near the existing cottage and they have shrunk that in size. For the front yard they are proposing a mix of flowering shrubs, which creates a border that blends in with the neighboring properties. She said they are proposing a 18x41 foot pool on the south side of the house that will sit in front of the new addition to the house. There will be a small garden which is viewed from the historic main house. There are also, multiple layers of buffers from the street. In

the front they are adding specimen magnolia trees to keep the look of canopy. They will also be replacing some of the declining hollies that are currently there. The driveway will be prim and sealer gravel with a long cobble apron of the street, which has been approved. The one wall on the west of the pool will be brick to match the house.

### Board Questions

Mr. Schwarz asked if a fence is required for the pool.

Ms. Wolfe said there will be an automatic pool cover so no fence is needed.

Ms. Miller asked about the holly and evergreens, is the idea that these hedges will be tall enough to screen the pool and parking?

Ms. Wolfe said yes it is to screen parking.

### Public Comments

Lane Bonner, a consultant with MACCA who owns the property in the adjoined rear of this property; fully supports the plan.

The BAR Board members gave positive comments and support.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, Mr. Sarafin move to find that the proposed landscape plan satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, Seconded by Ms. Earnst, motion passes 7-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-03-03  
513 14th Street NW  
Tax Parcel 050087000  
Lane Bonner, Owner/Wassenaar & Winkler Architects, Gregory Winkler, Applicant  
Two Story/Attic Additions – Final Details

The applicant is seeking approval of final three conditions:

- Brick is General Shale Tudor Collection "Old English." A sample has been provided. The BAR's concern was that the brick on the addition would be differentiated from the brick of the original building.
- The applicant removed the ramp to the north and added an ADA lift to the south- saving three existing trees and also removing a door to the north.
- The three trees removed from the rear will be replaced with four Armstrong Red Maples. In addition, there will be five Crepe Myrtles and Boxwood shrubs. (See attached Previous Submittal- June 2016 for comparison).

### Board Questions

Mr. Mohr asked about the revised walkway and if it was done in order to keep the trees north side of the house...

Mr. Winkler said they were moved from the north to the south.

Mr. Mohr asked is it going to be more detailed or designed than what it currently is.

Mr. Winkler said it is just plain and simple at the moment.

Ms. Knott said last time she wasn't present but she did make a note to ask if a landscape architect was consulted for the landscape plan.

Mr. Winkler said yes, Lee Crinlen from Waynesboro Lawn and Garden Center

Ms. Knott said it looks like the plants are not evenly spaced.



## Board Comments

Ms. Knott said looking at the crepe myrtles that they all are pretty good size trees and very close to the adjacent building and they are shown the same size as the shrubs that are indicated on the plan, so the sidewalk needs to be re-thought. She wants to know how big the small planting bed is between the building and the sidewalk.

Mr. Winkler said he believes it is 3 ½ feet.

Ms. Knott asked what is a little leaf box, do you know what species that is?

Mr. Winkler said no, he did not. He chose one from the Charlottesville tree list.

Ms. Miller said she looked it up and it is a common name and is about 5 to 7 feet when it is mature.

Ms. Knott said all of the bushes are too big and planting two crepe myrtles in this strip is not going to work. She said she would like to see a landscape plan come back with a planting scale. The landscape plan comes back administratively with the plant material drawn to scale and organized in a logical way that can be understood.

Mr. Winkler said the crepe myrtles were placed there to try to accent and articulate the building's volume and to try to reflect some of that in the landscape design. If it is too close, they can certainly look for other recommendations.

Ms. Miller said she asked them to do some dense planting to hide some of the volume of the building.

Ms. Knott said this plan needs to come back possibly as an administrative review and she would like to see the landscape plan with the species on it so they know exactly what they are dealing with. She would like to see the designer rethink the locations and scale of the symbols used for the plantings because with the current spacing there are crepe myrtles and shrubs spaced at the same distance and it will not look good.

Mr. Mohr said the ramp is much better than it was and said if it doesn't have to be a ramp, it might be better as a walkway and a set of wood stairs. It could even have a hood on it and make it more architecturally appropriate to the house.

Mr. Balut said as he remembered the ramp would be used for people to move in and out.

Ms. Miller said this ramp is much better than the previous one.

Mr. Balut said he agrees with Mr. Mohr, but when the planting is not shown on the rendering and looking at the landscape plan, he thinks the trees and the boxwoods will be hidden.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, Mr. Mohr move to find that the proposed 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 with the following modifications: a landscape plan, and the detailing of the railing found on the North side of the building, Seconded Mr. Schwarz, motion passes 7-0.

## 4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-07-01  
400 West High Street  
Tax Parcel 330154000  
Carolyn Polson, Owner/Applicant  
Removal and replacement of dead and diseased trees

The BAR approval required replacement of one medium and three large canopy trees, and administrative approval of a planting plan. The applicant is now seeking to have that plan approved. In addition, the BAR approved the removal of a dead live Oak from the front yard. Now the other live Oak has died, and the applicant would prefer not to replace them due to other plantings and limited space.

The applicant's new plan proposes four new trees: a Maple, Dogwood, Willow Oak, and Black Gum, and the applicant also intends to keep a 5" Maple, 3" Plum, and a 20" non-fruiting Mulberry along the same row of vegetation.

When staff circulated the proposed plan by email, there was significant disagreement (See two attached emails). Schwarz suggested moving the Maple and Willow Oak to the front yard, and reversing the locations of the Dogwood and Gum on the alley. Knott suggested leaving the Maple as proposed, but replacing the other three large canopy trees with redbuds or dogwoods located behind the fence. The Tree Commission previously recommended two canopy trees (Willow Oak, Scarlet Oak, or American Elm), one to be located near Altamont Street.

Staff agrees that one large canopy tree could be located near to Altamont Street.

Carolyn McGhee said thought she submitted the plan that board had asked for, and she said she thinks the trees are too big for that space, but whatever the board decides she will do. She requests that she has 6 months to plant them.

#### Public Comments

Mark Kavitt said he supports what she wants to do, and he feels it is appropriate. He asked her to watch out for the black walnut trees because they are poisonous to the soil and will kill the other plant life around.

David Smith, 404 Altamont Street, would like to see medium size trees between her house and Altamont street to buffer the house from the view coming down high street. He states a lot of those houses have trees in the front yard, and that house should as well.

#### Board Comments

Ms. Knott, said she looked at this plan and sees some problems with it in terms of the location and the spacing of some of the plant materials. The location of the black gum is too close to the maple; the willow oak tends to grow out and it's form makes it not a good choice for that space, perhaps replaced it with a small tree, suggesting that she puts a larger tree inside the fence. Soil quality is probably hard gravel. Also, if there is a dogwood it should go inside the fence because it is only about five feet there and the quality of the soil is undetermined, it could also be hard gravel. Coming up the hill there is a dogwood and there is not enough room for that so she would like to see that go inside the fence. The October Glory Red Maple should be moved downhill about five feet or so from the 3 inch plum that was existing. She agrees she would like to see a large tree at the corner, and perhaps the city would think twice about piling snow on top of it. She doesn't feel as strongly about replacing the live oak certainly the one tree on the Southside, there is some space for a small tree on the north side of the porch facing Altamont.

Ms. Miller agrees with Ms. Knott recommendations.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed planting plan satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as indicated on the plan created at this meeting on July 19, 2016, by Laura Knott, and we allow the applicant 6 months to plant the plan:

- Plant a large shade tree directly in front of the house to the right of the front walk, and on the corner of Altamont and the alley
- Shift the October Glory Maple down as indicated on the drawing
- Shift the Dogwood and the Willow Oak inside the fence
- And shift the Black Gum slightly

The overall plan can be seen on a sketch, and it is three (3) large trees, one (1) medium tree, and one (1) small tree. Mr. Balut seconded. Motion passed (7-0)

#### D. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-07-03  
402 Altamont Street  
Tax Parcel 330152000  
Elizabeth Sutphen, Owner/Applicant  
Backyard privacy fence

The property owner wishes to install a privacy fence in the rear yard. The fence will extend from the rear of the house on both sides to the side property lines, then approximately 60 feet to a point between the existing rear lawn and the tree line, then 35 feet across the rear yard. Two gates will be located in the fence on either side of the house. In addition, on the south side of the house the fence will extend along the side property line from the gate to the bottom of the side yard steps to provide additional screening from the neighbor's trash area.

The proposed fence is shadow box-style, with one foot of lattice on top for a total of six feet in height. It is pressure-treated pine that will be painted dark Charlestown Green (Benjamin Moore Tarrytown Green) or dark gray (BM Midnight) within a year of installation. The fence will be located approximately 6-12 inches from the side property lines.

#### Public Questions

Mark Kavit said to the applicant, when you first took this project on you were advised by Ms. Scala to probably contact the joint property owners, were you not?

Mr. Kavit asked the applicant who they plan to use for the contractor to build the fence.

Mr. Kavit asked if the posts will be put into concrete? He said the railing by the steps that would be over on his side of the wall would prevent him for going to trash can.

Ms. Miller told him that was outside of the purview of the BAR.

Ms. Kavit said he is upset because he was not provided information regarding the changes and did not have an opportunity to look at them or prepare for them. He was allowed to ask the applicant to meet with him and the other property owner and one other person to discuss this matter and work something out.

**Elizabeth Sutphen did not participate in these questions. She did not come up and speak into the microphone so we have no discussion from her.**

David Smith – he is concerned that he had no information about the fence and the plan that the BAR saw. He said he could not find the agenda online for the BAR.

Ms. Miller said she was able to find the agenda just a few days ago.

Mr. Smith said that is an excellent example of people who know the website can find the information they need to know and the people who aren't familiar with the website can't. It is not something that is labeled as a link or is obvious if you do not know the website. He would like the fence to be Charleston green. He is concerned about the shed and that it is going to be close to the house, and that the neighbors are going to be looking at an ugly shed. He would prefer the shed be on the edge of the property line. Also, on the north side where is the fence going to be relative to the stone wall that already exists? The stone wall that is already there is maybe 15 feet long and about 3 feet tall. He said 6 feet tall is more than he would like to see. He said 3 or 4 feet is a little short if you are going to keep a dog back there and if you have a dog back there you should have a fence of some variety and he said it was stated that the fence would be the same on both sides which takes care of his concern.

### Board Questions

Mr. Schwarz asked where is the shed was going.

Ms. Sutphen said the shed is going at the back of the property against the fence and the backside of the fence will not be visible to the neighbors, the front side will be visible.

Mr. Schwarz asked is the shed only 6 feet tall.

Ms. Sutphen said yes. She said the fence will be inside our property line, not on anybody else's property and we are not taking down any trees. Although 6 feet seems high, the fact that it has 12 inches of lattice, so it would look more appropriate to the district and less imposing, is the very definition of a good neighbor fence. She asked the board to approve the flat panel design that was in the packet as well as the shadow box, because they are starting all over again. They are having difficulty getting estimates on the fence. So she is asking if they would approve the flat panel and the shadow boxes, both look the same on both sides, and both are good neighbor fences.

Mr. Balut asked if the shadow box was 6 feet tall all the way up to the top.

Ms. Sutphen said yes and she has been very careful about that. When she had a contractor, she said it has to be 6 feet, the maximum heights. According to your requirements.

### Public Comments

Mark Kavitt asked to see the paper work and the letter from the attorney.

Ms. Miller said this application meets six of the ADC guidelines and she is willing to support it and either of the two color choices are appropriate, as well as the two styles of fence. She is in support of the shed and the repair of the steps is not in our purview.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed new fence satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and

that the BAR approves the application submitted (both styles and colors), and approves the repair of the steps and the shed, negating the window replacement (to come back at a different time), Seconded by Mr. Balut, motion passes 7-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-07-05  
420 Park Street  
Tax Parcel 530120000  
Edward H. Bain, Jr., Owner/Applicant  
Red maple tree removal and replacement

The applicant is proposing the removal of a large red maple tree from the front yard of 420 Park Street. Because it is not feasible to remove the stump, the arborist is recommending replacement with a Koura Dogwood no later than fall 2016.

Edward H. Bain the arborist said a canopy is not a real concern, and he has tried to get a back hoe person to come and verify that the stump cannot be removed, but he can't get in touch with him.

#### Board Questions

Ms. Knott is looking at an arborist report on the condition of the tree and is not finding one.

Mr. Bain said it was a brief proposal.

Ms. Knott said she sees a proposal for doing the work but still doesn't see a diagnosis and asked what was wrong with the tree

Mr. Bain said the arborist said the tree is diseased. It was damaged 5 years ago; a big branch fell off and the barks all gone.

Mr. Balut asked if the plan is to cut down the tree and plant the dogwood towards the house.

Mr. Bain said they would have to dig down and do what they can for the root of the soil so the tree will make it. When they replaced it 10 years ago and put in a Black Gum along the wall to the back of the house and it has done very well.

#### Board Comments

Mr. Mohr said it seems a real pity to lose this tree, and he understands the concerns about not getting a backhoe in there but he can also see at least if one is determined they can take chain saws and mattocks and chop it out of there. It can be done and yes it is a lot of labor, but it doesn't have to be done with a backhoe.

Mr. Schwarz said it is unacceptable to leave the tree stump up on Park Street.

Mr. Bain said it is going to be flushed with the ground.

Mr. Schwarz said this tree is such a large feature on Park Street and a Dogwood is not going to be anything near that.

Ms. Miller said she agrees, she brought up a similar problem that she had had in her front yard, they were told the stump could not be ground and they found someone that was able to do it. She can support the tree coming down, as long as it's replaced with the appropriate sized street tree.

Mr. Balut said it would be a lose to the character and quality of the street and the Dogwood would not come close to replacing that character. He said an equivalent species of tree would be more preferable than the Dogwood.

Mr. Mohr said by cutting the secondary roots away you should have enough soil for another tree to start. He said it seems to him that there has to be someone in town with a stump grinder that would be careful and not damage the wall.

Ms. Knott agrees with the direction everyone is going and stated that guideline #5 says replace with like or similar species.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed tree removal satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application to remove the tree but requests that the tree be replaced with a large tree from the City's tree list, in the same location. The applicant will be given a year and a half to complete this, with an extension, if needed, by administrative approval seconded by Mr. Mohr, motion passes 7-0.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-07-07  
Downtown Mall, between 6th Street and 7th Street  
Tax Map 53  
City of Charlottesville, Owner/Department of Parks and Recreation, Applicant  
Move lamp posts & install synthetic tree grates

The BAR and staff understands the need to be practical, and this part of the Mall is not part of the older construction, but there must be a better solution than the proposed plastic tree grates. If the plastic grates are allowed, they should be neatly cut. Other options are metal grates or cantilevered brick. The attached plan by WRT suggested brick surfaces in combination with gravel near the tree, to allow the tree to grow without creating excess space for someone to step into.

There should be an overall Cultural Resource Plan adopted for the Mall, with adequate funding provided, so that Parks Department is not always put in a position of trying to devise an ad hoc solutions.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements, Mr. Balut move to find that relocating four light poles does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and, and we stipulate that Mary Joy and at least two members of the BAR will visit the mall to verify the new lamps will be compatible with this property is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR will approve that new layout administratively after that meeting takes place. Seconded Mr. Schwarz, motion passes 7-0.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements, Mr. Balut move to find that the redesign of ten tree grates does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR recommends that the grates located around damaged or threated trees may be temporarily replaced by plastic grates, for no longer than six months until another solutions is found to replace those grates with metal grates that are similar to the existing grates on the Downtown Mall. The cantilever frames are approved as submitted. Seconded by Ms. Knott, motion passes 7-0.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-07-02  
801 Park Street  
Tax Parcel 470020000  
Daniel Krasnegor & Kristin Jensen, Owners/Michael Savage, STOA Design & Construction,  
Applicant  
Garage renovation work and removal of some trees/plantings around the property

This is the first phase of a two-part application. The first phase includes renovation work to the garage and removal of some trees and plantings. Phase II will include renovation of the main house to restore some historic details, and site improvements.

The applicants are proposing garage renovation work that would include:

- Soffit extensions and a new asphalt shingle roof
- Stucco to coat the existing concrete block
- Two new windows and a replacement door on the East façade
- A new exterior glass door on the North façade (a deck will be proposed in Phase II of the project)
- Replacement garage door in South façade.

The applicant is also proposing the removal of some existing trees and plantings around the property (See page 6 of narrative). A proposal for new plantings and trees will be provided in Phase II of the project.

**Michael Savage didn't speak into the mic.**

The BAR accepted the proposed changes.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Site Design and Elements, Mr. Sarafin move to find that the proposed garage renovation work and tree/planting removals as well as brush along the property line satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the specification to wait until winter, then prune the hollies and save them if possible, per Ms. Knott's comments. Seconded by Mr. Mohr motion passes 7-0.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-07-04  
1509-11 University Avenue  
Tax Parcel 090078100  
Amorgos LLC, Owner/William Adams, Train Architects, Applicant  
Renovation of store façade and interior

William Adams, the applicant wishes to demolish and reconstruct the 1511 University Avenue storefront in order to create an open façade allowing the restaurant program more interaction with the street.

The existing store front will be completely renovated with a new 14 ft. tall storefront door, a three-panel storefront transom atop a steel beam and six-panel Nana wall. In between the new door and Nana wall there will be metal panels on the wall (painted to match the Nana wall.) The parapet height will increase to match the adjacent building to the east. The brick surround is proposed to be painted. The existing lights will be removed. A sign is proposed over the entrance.

A sidewalk café space is also being proposed.

The proposed application raises several questions about the applicants request for a store front renovation.

Because this store front's location is so prominent, the drawings should be prepared with greater thoughtfulness and detail. Staff assumes this was submitted as a preliminary, to determine if the proposed changes would be appropriate.

- The scale of the elements in the store front should be considered in reference to both the abutting buildings and The Corner ADC district as a whole. In staff opinion, the proposed changes are not in scale with the Corner historic buildings.
- There is no reason to raise the parapet other than possibly to elevate the signage, which may not exceed 20 ft. in height.
- Paint colors for the nana wall, the steel beam, the metal coping, and metal panels should be submitted for the BAR members to review. They should also be included on a color elevation or perspective drawing. Regardless of the color palette presented, the ADC Guidelines explicitly state "Do not paint unpainted masonry surfaces," (Chapter 3 N.3) so painting the existing brick is not compliant with these guidelines.
- As far as the outdoor café is concerned, zoning officials will determine its size and capacity, allowing sufficient room for pedestrians using the sidewalk. If the tables and chairs are black or silver metal, they may be approved administratively. Umbrellas may not contain text. The enclosure must be detectable, and must be black metal.

Staff suggests that the BAR make comments and ask the applicant to defer and resubmit.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed storefront reconstruction in concept satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC District, and the BAR approves the application for the following items: the 13'-8" opening height, the painting of the brick, and the general configuration of Scheme B, with the parapet height staying as it exists seconded by Mr. Mohr, motion passes 7-0.

Laura Knott left at 8:45 pm

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 16-07-06  
1000 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 100068000 and 100070000  
Campus Investors C'ville 1000 W. Main, LLC, Owner/Virginia Wilson, Loughridge Construction, Applicant  
Exterior Additions - painted metal rail, perforated metal screen, and wall louver

The applicant is proposing (1) a decorative, painted metal rail surrounding the first level patio, (2) a decorative, perforated metal screen and coordinating painted metal rail at a mechanical equipment location, and (3) the addition of a wall louver at the mechanical room exterior wall.

The patio rail will be painted SW 7020 Black Fox, the screen will match the color of the EW T07 Corrugated Aluminum Panel System, and the wall louver will match the color of the EW T01 Aluminum Window System.

The site plan is included for context.

The screen around the mechanical equipment should be explained a little better.



The café tables and chairs should be black or silver metal unless the BAR approves otherwise. Any umbrellas should not contain text. The patio may have one- 3 sq. ft. sign mounted 5 feet high maximum.

John Wakler – Price Studios screen designs and the railing, patterns out of thin brick.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending, and Cafes and for Site Design and Elements, Mr. Mohr moved to find that the proposed additions satisfy the BAR's criteria, and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and the BAR approves this application, pending administrative review of the existing railing designs, with finished wood table tops [on silver or black café furniture], and the color and detail of the chiller cabinet [and wall louvers] as submitted Seconded Ms. Earnst, motion passes 7-0.

Following administrative review of the railings, the BAR decided that the café railing should match the silver-colored horizontal railings that are installed on the rest of the building.

E. New Construction

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-01-04

512-514, 600 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 290007000, 290006000, and 290008000

The Janice D Perkins Revocable Tr, Owner and Sylvia Braxton,/Jeff Dreyfus, Applicant, New Construction – Final Details

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for “façade review and approval.”

Jeff Dreyfus submitted under the previous owner, Jeff Leveine. A few additional images. Added images to clarify there to help us begin the discuss of color, entrances, 4 foot fences, a handicap ramp up to the Blue Moon. Our goal is conceptual approval of the elevation, that we are headed in the right direction lighting signage and all of those things. Add two appurtenances to the roof. Providing roof top availability to all of the residents. Windows in the east and west elevations, hesitant to do below. Some of the main goals

The BAR did not take action, but made comments:

General

- Great presentation
- Generally, keep it simple.
- Frontispiece needs work
- The box proper is great, but has reservations about the piece that comes forward.
- Needs to be more subtle in terms of scale. Rear building could be graphite but front building needs more life.
- The commercial street front needs more pizazz.
- Front building has a lot going on but lacks human understanding.
- Work on frontispiece- scale more subtle; livelier
- Materials and color
- Too industrial and gloomy for W Main Street; sharp edges, cold materials
- Prefer light nighttime view but not sure it shows what you intended
- Like red Corten; not black; struggling with vertical metal panels; need to warm it up.
- Use darker color where you want it to recede, like on north wall
- Too much contrast; too busy and hard.
- Prefer current blue of Blue Moon Diner, and color of Gabe's buildings on West Main. This is multiple shades of graphite.

- Lean towards #16.2 – less contrast; like razor’s edge between stories; like combination of perforated metal and fiber cement.
- Like it all the same color
- Less contrast reduces jarring effect
- 16.3 version is massive, brooding
- Historic buildings
- The rear building should be a backdrop for the two historic buildings; like use of Corten
- Like historic buildings – creating backdrop
- Windows and rooftop appurtenances
- Open to continuing discussion about vinyl or fiberglass but would set a precedent – prefer aluminum clad.
- Rooftop appurtenances as shown not a problem.

F. Other Business

10. PLACE Report

Green infrastructure work session instead of PLACE meeting

Mr. Mohr also discussed the appeal to City Council by an abutting owner of 550 E Water Street BAR approval

Mr. Schwarz discussed utility conflicts – a challenge to locate trees within utility clearances.

Staff was asked to check on the William Taylor Plaza –the sidewalk width requirement and if a bus pullover in the right turn lane is a requirement.

Also on 200 2nd Street SW- is the site plan different than BAR approval?

1000 W Main Street critique – dryer vents, terra cotta, yellow color

G. Adjournment 10:25 pm