

MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Work Session Meeting
January 5, 2017 – Noon – 1:30 p.m.
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room - City Hall

BAR attendance: Melanie Miller, Chair; Carl Schwarz, Justin Sarafin, Emma Earnst (left at 12:45).
Staff: Mary Joy Scala, Reid Saunders. Public: Bill Emory

1. Call to order 12 p.m. by Melanie Miller, Chair.

2. Work Session: Proposed changes to Historic Conservation District ordinance and guidelines

Comments on and changes to the Historic Conservation District guidelines and ordinance by BAR members and staff were compiled and presented.

Scala: The Historic Conservation District ordinance and guidelines should be barebones. The first change to the ordinance is specifying that new buildings and structures only need approval if they require a building permit (sheds over 256 sq ft) and if they are visible from city streets that abut the lot.

Sarafin: “Visible from abutting city streets” is really great language to encompass corner lots and double frontage lots.

Schwarz: 250 square feet is a really big shed.

Scala: Using another size would be arbitrary, and that big of a shed would have to be in a back yard and would probably not be visible.

- We should add in fences and walls into the ordinance since there are guidelines about them, but maybe not hedges since we are on shaky ground reviewing vegetation.

Sarafin: It undermines less restrictive nature to have vegetation reviewed.

Miller: Perhaps use the same “abutting city streets” language for walls and fences.

Sarafin: Our only concern with trees is in ADC districts.

Scala: We only care about large, character defining trees, but not for Historic Conservation Districts.

- Under demolitions, it doesn’t matter if it is in the rear, again use the same language of “visible from abutting city streets” to cover visible demolitions on corner or double fronted lots.
- Take out review for paint color, and add in a section about painting unpainted brick.

Sarafin: We should take out the paint color section.

Miller: There is a fundamental difference with unpainted brick.

Scala: You can replace windows and doors without review, but we should add in that review is needed if the size and shape is changing.

- Roof and siding section is difficult because I have always reviewed it under demolitions.

Miller: Roofing and siding should be in there—in the Martha Jefferson district slate roofs have been replaced with asphalt.

Scala: Replacing slate and standing seam metal should be in there, maybe not siding.

Schwarz: Siding is more noticeable.

Sarafin: Maybe replacing roofing and siding shouldn’t be demolition because that can seem confusing.

Scala: Just write in that it needs review.

Sarafin: There are arguments in other locality ADC districts about roof material because of the financial burden.

Earnst: There is also a residential v. commercial implication.

Scala: It is only standing seam metal I am worried about since there are alternatives to slate.

Miller: It doesn't hurt to have it reviewed.

Schwarz: Omit trim and shutters, just review the big stuff

Scala: The last thing on the ordinance is to add administrative review provisions.

- Leave the demolition guidelines as is.
- Change title of building location and remove number 3 because it is covered elsewhere.
- Under height and massing add in accessory building guideline.
- Multi-lot should maybe just be "larger buildings."
- Under building form, it says roof forms should reference the neighborhood, but what about flat roofs.

Schwarz: Just add in that contemporary forms are permitted.

Scala: Use language that other roof forms are appropriate when contextually appropriate.

- Building openings language is tricky around vertical orientation.

Sarafin: "Should be oriented vertically" is arbitrary, other window forms can be fine.

Scala: When would you want horizontal windows?

Miller: Maybe just soften the language around the windows to make the orientation less critical.

Sarafin: Just say "which are generally" oriented vertically, to tip off the convention but not say that it is required.

Scala: Under materials and textures remove the word "forms" and maybe don't specify colored glass.

- Roofing and siding, if you want to review them then there needs to be a guideline on it.

Sarafin: Say retaining historic materials is encouraged, then say what is discouraged.

Scala: Retaining historic materials is encouraged, if that is not possible then replacing with like materials is preferred. Then specify what you don't want.

Sarafin: Start with what we ideally want and don't want, it is good to be clear.

Scala: We'll remove the paint color section and add in a part for unpainted brick.

- Walls and fences, add in "if visible from abutting city streets" language.
- How to address rear yards when a taller fence height may be appropriate.

Miller: Maybe just say if the rear fence is visible don't exceed 6 feet.

Scala: Or just have the front height specified since the exceptions will be rare.

Sarafin invites remarks from Bill Emory, a member of the public.

Emory: The Historic Conservation district should protect poor people and vernacular character, not just high style. The more you can strip down the guidelines the better, they should be simple and short. HC district should be more for old style vernacular and Martha Jefferson and Rugby should really be ADC districts.

Sarafin: We should see the final form of the ordinance and guidelines, then go back through and remove parts with this in mind.

Emory: The Blue Ribbon Commission is setting up the HC district to be a protection against gentrification. If it is used this way then you can't make people replace or upkeep expensive materials. Conservation should keep the original residents there too. The language also isn't clear that encouraged does not mean required.

Schwarz: This is the wrong tool to prevent gentrification.

Emory: But it is the only tool to prevent demolition in older neighborhoods.

Sarafin: Maybe we need a preamble to define what encouraged means.

Emory: Roofing and siding will catch people's eye.

Scala: We aren't just thinking about homeowners, we are also thinking about developers—and we cannot distinguish the two in practice.

Sarafin: The intent of the district is just to review demolition and additions.

Miller: We just allow people to do what they want in practice though.

Emory: The guidelines should reflect the practice.

Schwarz: Maybe ditch the roofing and siding and only watch it for new construction.

Scala: Maybe we should mark this section for further discussion with everyone.

Sarafin: What is the spirit and goals of this district and what guidelines achieve that?

The work session was adjourned 1:30 p.m.

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
January 17, 2017

Location: Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room and Basement Conference Room

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller; Carl Schwarz, Corey Clayborne; Stephen Balut; Justin Sarafin; Whit Graves

Members Absent: Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Emma Earnst, (Landscape architect slot unfilled)

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner, Camie Mess, Assistant Preservation Planner, and Reid Saunders, Preservation Intern

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No comments made

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes

December 20, 2016	Regular Meeting (Not available yet)
January 5, 2017	Work Session on revisions to Historic Conservation District ordinance and guidelines

Motion: Sarafin moved to approve the Jan 5, 2017 work session minutes. Schwarz seconded, and the minutes passed 3-0-3 with Graves, Clayborne, and Balut abstained because they were not present at the meeting.

C. Previously Considered Items

Schwarz recused for this item

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-01-01
200 2nd Street SW
Tax Parcel 280069000, 280071000, 280072000, 280073000, 280074000, 280075000
Market Plaza LLC, Owner/ Powe Studio Architects, Applicant
Perimeter Landscape Revisions

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Greg Powe, the applicant, spoke:

- 1) There is a guideline that requires a 5-foot root barrier around any gas line, however, they have compromised with the utilities company for a 3-foot barrier. Because of this compromise they needed to modify the tree species they are proposing, from a maple tree to a century gingko tree.
- 2) Crosswalk: change from brick to the standard urban city crosswalk, which is yet to be determined
- 3) Introduction of two more bike racks

4) Addition of a patio entrance near first floor commercial space from lower grade

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

No comments made.

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Graves thinks the revisions are appropriate.

Miller applauded Powe Studio Architects for working with the city on find an adequate replacement for the trees.

Motion: Graves moved to find that the proposed revisions to plantings and hardscape details satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines, and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the changes as submitted. Sarafin seconded, and the motion passed 5-0-1, with Schwarz recused.

D. New Items

3. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-01-01

301 East Jefferson Street

Tax Parcel 330204000

Congregation Beth Israel, Owner/ BRW Architects, Applicant

Temple addition

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

Bruce Wardell, the applicant, spoke: the applicant wants to add two additional stories for adult learning classrooms; a rooftop terrace divided into two levels, a lower terrace above the window and a top level even with an adult meeting room.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Miller asked about the changes that were being made to the proposed openings of the building, specifically, the windows.

The butterfly roof is not at the same slope as the existing roof, correct?

Balut: What material would those windows would be?

What was the inspiration for the butterfly roof?

Is the translucent marble considered glazing? Is that why insulation is not an issue?

Schwarz: Did you have a view from the back corner? What is that going to look like?

Graves: Where will all the mechanical equipment go?

The large overhangs draw a lot of attention in the drawings. What is their purpose?

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: The geometry of the roof lines is troubling to her, she feels like the angles take away from the original structure.

Schwarz: He does not have trouble with the shape of the butterfly roof, but does with the depth of the overhang. What would happen if you put horizontal louvers on the glass?

Graves: He thinks there are some neat ideas, and he is general supportive of an addition up there, and he would like to see more details.

Sarafin: He agrees with Graves and is supportive of the idea of an addition, but would like to see more details. He is concerned with the amount of overhang and the shadow caused by the butterfly roof, if it were more translucent and somewhat disappeared it would be interesting. He is curious to hear other solutions and ideas about different types of roofs.

Balut: Understands the poetic gesture of the butterfly roof, but with how they are designed now the overhangs overshadow the rest of the design, instead of being light and secondary in the design. Especially on the west side of the building. He thinks it competes with the original historic structure. Maybe look into the idea of a louvered overhang. That being said, he believes the massing of the building is good.

Since this was presented as a preliminary discussion no motion is necessary. General comments were: massing approach is strong; a simpler, prefer a more transparent addition; prefer a more contemporary box that does not compete with existing design; overhangs are the most competing element; butterfly angle should not be different from the existing gable angle; concerns with NW corner: raising the narrow addition too high (existing proportion is striking) and impeding on sanctuary.

NOTE: During discussion of the next item, the BAR was asked by City Manager's office to move the meeting from the NDS Conference Room to the Basement Conference Room, due to an overflow crowd at the concurrent City Council meeting in Council Chambers. The remainder of the meeting took place in the Basement Conference Room.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-01-05

615 Lexington Ave

Tax Parcel 520170000

Lyall Harris and Francesco Ronchetti, Owner/ Dan Zimmerman- Alloy, Applicant

New Construction- Artist's Studio/Apartment, Carport, and Screened Porch

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Dan Zimmerman of Alloy Construction, the applicant, spoke:

- 1) Apartment on the bottom will be ADA accessible for the individuals moving in
- 2) European style courtyard with a carport

3) The materials of the addition takes its cues from the original structure.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Schwarz: In the application, it says the cedar will be stained. Does that mean sealed? Same question with the pressure treated wood.

Also, just to clarify the enclosed stairs will be used as bike storage, correct?

Clayborne: How far along in construction are you?

The building permit was granted in September, and we have been building since then.

Miller: Mary Joy do you know when the postcards were mailed last year to notify property owners that they are located within a historic district?

Balut: What is the building height?

Is the eave height higher than what is found on the primary structure?

Applicant: It is about 12 inches higher than the existing eaves. He has discussed with the zoning administrator. A discussion ensued about the specifics of the zoning code, specifics which can be heard on the tape.

Schwarz: Just making sure the windows will be cut out of the sheathing on the top layer

Comments from the Public:

Denis Mason: It is a big structure, where will the mechanical structures be put?

Bruce O'Dell: This does not meet the scale, view shed, or characteristics of the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District.

Mark Rylander: immediately adjacent neighbor to the project. His primary concern is the massing of the structure and how those calculations transfer from the zoning codes to the conservation district guidelines. He would like the BAR to discuss defining what it is appropriate massing in specific mathematical terms.

Comments from the BAR:

Mohr: Mary Joy read the e-mail statement he wrote.

Miller: Wants the BAR to look at the application as a new structure instead of something that has already been built.

Clayborne: Wants to point out that the applicant seems to have gone through the proper channels to get the approved addition.

Schwarz: Think that more additions like this needs to be added in the neighborhood. He believes it highlights urban living, which is what Charlottesville is heading towards. Also, after looking at what has been built he feels like it fits within the neighborhood, and that this is how Kelly Ave should develop.

Sarafin: What we are asking ourselves is to what degree does the BAR interpret the conservation

district guidelines as far as zoning is concerned. He agrees with Mohr and Miller and thinks that this project is out of scale, and he would not have approved it had it come to the BAR.

Balut: I agree with what Schwarz said, he believes that many areas in Charlottesville have additional secondary structures that are massed and built similar to this house. From a massing standpoint, he does not find it obtrusive to the point where it does not fit the conservation district guidelines. He does sympathize the public who commented on this application, but thinks a few well-placed trees in the landscape plan will go a long way.

Miller: She thinks that this structure violates the massing guideline (both in mass and height) as far as a conservation district is concerned, and that it does not fit within the characteristic of the guidelines. She thinks that the application should be denied, and the applicant should appeal the BAR's decision to City Council.

Graves: Wants to state he would have approved this application had it been reviewed by the BAR before construction. He also feels, that since this application fell through the cracks and was not reviewed by the BAR in the beginning it is not the fault of the owner.

Motion: Clayborne moved to find that the proposed accessory apartment/studio, carport, and screened porch addition satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Schwarz seconded, and the motion passed 4-2, with Miller and Sarafin opposed.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-01-02

103 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 3302550200

Virginia Pacific Investments LLC, Owner/ Kevin Schaefer, Applicant

Mezzanine and Rooftop Terrace

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Kevin Schaefer of Design Develop, the applicant, spoke.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Clayborne: Are there any exterior light fixtures?

What kind of glass will you be putting in?

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: I think it is a great project and a great way to activate Main Street. I think if you lowered the meeting ceiling height to the parapet it would be better, but overall it is a great project. I also think the light fixtures are appropriate.

Balut: I think it is good, and I agree with Melanie, the glass railing is less conspicuous.

Schwarz: My only thought is to have the glass railing going around the entire structure – should the glass rail wrap around the green roof?

Motion: Graves moved to find that the proposed roof terrace addition 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 application as submitted. Clayborne seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-01-03
416-418 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 290012000
Main Street Association LLC, Owner/ Greg Jackson, Applicant
Roof replacement

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

Greg Jackson of Topia Design, the applicant, spoke.

Questions from the Public:
No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:
Balut: Will there be gutter and downspouts?

Comments from the Public:
No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:
Miller: Read Emma Earnst’s e-mail, she is not opposed to raising the height, but she would like to see a different roofline, because she feels the hiproof line takes away the commercial characteristic of the district. She believes stepping back the second story might help.

Graves: Thinks that the roof line needs to change, because the hip roofline does not fit within the guidelines.

Clayborne: Agrees, and would like to see a flat or shed roof.

Schwarz: He also agree, and would like to see the specifics of the gutters, because how you [the applicant] described them, they seem very large. It needs to look a bit more industrial and should fit in with the rest of the structures, which is not what the current roofline does.

Balut: Adding the additional height matures the building. He agrees with everyone that the hipped roof does not jive with the rest of the complex, but he would like to point out that the flat roof would not look like what the current rendering is, and it will add a thickness to the profile of the structure.

Motion: At the applicant’s request for a decision rather than deferral, despite the BAR’s encouragement for the applicant to request a deferral, Graves moved to find that the proposed new roof addition does not satisfy the BAR’s criteria and guidelines and is not compatible with this

property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR does not approve the application as submitted, specifically because a hip roof is not compatible with the historic building and the historic district. Balut seconded, and the motioned was denied 6-0.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-01-04

1517 University Ave

Tax Parcel 090081000

Sheetz Rep: Thomas Columbus Jr, Tenant/ Natalie Feaver Profile AI, Applicant

Exterior Modifications

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

Natalie Feaver, the applicant, spoke.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Balut: Just checking you are putting the door back where it is currently located, and not where the historic door was located, correct?

For this application what specific storefront are you asking us [the BAR] to approve?

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: She likes the projects, but requests that they keep the wooden door. The red awnings are appropriate, but she thinks they clash with the brick and would see if it were possible to change the color.

Schwarz: Agrees with having a wood door, in the metal store front.

Balut: Would prefer the muttoms be white, because he thinks it is a way to unify the façade.

Motion: Balut moved to find that the proposed exterior modifications satisfy 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 as submitted, with the friendly request that the door be solid wood without the banding, and strongly encourages the muttoms be painted white. Schwarz seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

Graves left the meeting.

E. New Construction

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-08-05

NW Corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Ave (William Taylor Plaza Phase 2)

Tax Parcel 290147000, 290146000, 290145000

Cherry Ave Investments LLC, Owner/ Management Services Corp., Applicant

Landscape Plan and Final Details

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report. In the staff report staff asked if the applicant could coordinate the landscape with the hotel site plan on the east end. The hotel site plan shows a brick site wall at the plaza, which borders this property and on the Phase 2 site it shows two red maple trees and a storm water device in the rear corner that do not match up with the proposed hotel site plan. Staff has been working with the site plan coordinator for Phase 1 and would like to point out that there are discrepancies between what is in the site plan and what has been proposed on the Phase 2 landscape plan.

Stephen Von Storch, the applicant, spoke he said they will make sure to coordinate the final site plan of the hotel and the landscape plan, so the two items match.

Questions from the Public:

Mr. Erdwurn: I would like to hear more about the landscape plan and what is being proposed. I am concerned as to how their landscape plan is implemented versus what is approved. Does the City have any authority to enforce the landscaping plan? Also, your elevation and landscape plan don't match, on one you have four trees and one shows eight. What is the number of trees going to be?

Scala: Yes, it is a zoning violation if they do not build what has been approved.

Schwarz: If it is on the site plan, yes, that can be enforced. If what you are referring to is an advertisement, then no.

Sarafin: I agree, that amounts to a zoning violation.

Miller: It looks like Steve is going to answer your second question about the different number of trees seen in the packet.

Applicant: The four trees do not show the Phase 1 street trees, we are just showing the cut away so you can see the rest of the building.

Questions from the BAR:

Miller: Can you tell us how you came to this design?

Applicant: We put together various iterations, looking at different wall conditions along Ridge Street, and we thought it would be particularly important to have some structure, some retaining wall, some elevation between the street side and the building given how close the structure is to the street. Given this is a residential property and there are some bedrooms, right close to the street, we wanted to create some space.

Applicant: What I just handed out is the elevation with proposed lighting. You can see the little dark spots along the Corten wall are proposed lighting, and the next page has a section of what that lighting would be once it is put into the wall. We thought this would be a nice tasteful and elegant way to light the side wall, without a lot of down or up lighting, staying completely dark sky compliant. The last page shows they cut sheet of that proposed lighting on the wall and then the sconce on the building itself.

Miller: So these are the only two lighting fixtures around the building?

Applicant: That is the current proposal, yes.

Sarafiin: What is the height of the Corten wall?

Applicant: We have been trying to figure that out, currently 19 inches is the minimum at the sidewalk and we are keeping the wall level to the middle of the sign. At the lowest end of the site it is 20-24 inches tall. The sidewalk is sloping, so it is a little bit taller toward the corner of the hotel.

Balut: The top of the sign is not level, so there is only one step down, correct?

Applicant: Correct.

Schwarz: So the tree is Phase 1, which is why it says by others?

Applicant: Correct, the hotel is in charge of putting in the 9 street trees.

Balut: Where is the river run stone? Where is that on the site plan?

Applicant: If we do it that will be in some of the planting areas, if we decided to not do all ground cover, in the shaded areas, those areas would be river rock and planters.

Balut: Right now it is not shown, so it is not being reviewed.

Miller: And then these pavers that are shown, where do they go?

Applicant: That is the concrete, so the walks into the building.

Balut: The sidewalk will just be a regular sidewalk.

Applicant: Yes, it will be city standard.

Comments from the Public:

Applicant: One of the few comments we got from the community was there was too much lighting coming from the inside of the building out, so this design is trying to take the light fixture out of the equation. Keeping in mind that these are residences and not wanting the lighting to turn it into a commercial strip.

Mr. Erdwurn: I still don't get the count of the trees; they don't seem to add up within the different drawings.

Applicant: That is because you are not looking at the latest. I just handed this out to the BAR, and it has 9 street trees across the front.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: I can start off. I like the Corten, I like how it raises the beds up, and that helps with the mass of the overall building. I would like to see a more varied and developed design, not just grass and ferns with some bulbs. And even though the species of service berry and sweet bay magnolias that are chosen are great choices, what we had talked about during the development of the design was something a bit more significant to help with the massing of the building, especially on the side near the hotel.

Applicant: Maybe we could go with a sub canopy tree, it could be a bit risky that close to the corner of the building, but we can look into that on the corners, so the trees scale down the building. The reason we chose these trees was because they are flowering trees and are directly in front of windows. So we wanted them to be a nice filter without completely blocking the street side, but still providing a light screening. The reason for the grasses was because there needs to be sun in order for the grasses to flower, and the canopy trees would not allow for that to happen.

Miller: Can you do some shrubs mixed in? Because that is a long walk of grass.

Applicant: That is not up to me, we would have to talk to the client about that. It is primarily because it is not a lot of square footage.

Schwarz: I think the idea of the grass is really beautiful, I guess I am worried about what if there is a spot that gets too shady, what happens then? I don't think it will look so great if it becomes uneven, say after 5 years.

Applicant: I would say since we are involved, if it does become uneven, we would replace it with something nice. Your proposed client for this project, will make sure of this.

Balut: Will there be an irrigation system?

Applicant: No, we try to go with plants that are native species, so there is no need for irrigation system.

Balut: I think it looks good. I like the simplicity of it, it looks well thought out to me, and it works well in the context and scale. I think it looks nice.

Clayborne: I like the light fixtures. I really don't have a green thumb, so I can't comment much on the landscape.

Miller: I am glad to hear that is what you are thinking about for all around the building [as far as lighting].

Schwarz: Quick question on the other packet. Did we talk about the paint on the gables in the back? Did that come up? I thought we talked about it.

Applicant: The direction we had was that that attic story as you turns the corner, [Tim Mohr's thought was] both of those pieces should have a darker attic story, and he suggested stucco, which we looked at, we just thought it was not very convincing.

Schwarz: No, that looks great; I am talking about the two middle triangles.

Applicant: I don't recall those gables being part of the conversation.

Balut: We are not taking any action on this packet tonight, correct?

Scala: They are asking for approval of their landscape plan.

Schwarz: One thing I would like to see, since we had the question about the hotel site plan and this landscape plan is one plan with both things on it. That would be really good to see, and that might help inform what trees go on the south side of the building. I think the plan is fantastic, but as a formality we really need to see the two plans together as a whole.

Sarafin: At least where the two meet at the corner.

Applicant: Is that even possible with two developers?

Charlie Armstrong: The Phase 1 application is a separate application, I think this landscape plan needs to stand on its own. We don't have any control or involvement with their plan.

Miller: It is just hard for us to approve, if there are some details up in the air.

Balut: Was the site plan for the adjacent lot approved with that brick wall and stairs as currently shown, so basically you are just running into it with a Corten wall.

Applicant: Basically we are just asking for our Corten to turn the corner.

Miller: I also think, no matter what, we need a final plan that gives definitive details we expect from all other applicants. This can be turned in administratively, since nothing is being changed. Also, make sure the garage lights are low light, and also screened where necessary.

Motion: Schwarz moved to find that the landscape plan for the proposed new residential building satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the landscape plan as submitted and asks that the applicant give consideration to the trees on the south end of the building, and approve administratively a final plan with every tree with its species, what lighting fixture will be used for the porch balconies, and more details on the Corten wall (approve with the Corten wall turning the corner) and the BAR wants to see a Phase I site plan to match this plan in the area of the plaza. Clayborne seconded, and the motion passed 5-0.

F. Other Business

9. Recommendation: Revisions to the Historic Conservation District Ordinance and Design Guidelines.

Miller: The BAR received a letter from Bill Emory where if the BAR has the ability to specify roof changes it might cause problems for the lower income families in the area.

Scala: Tonight I am asking you to approve the language of the ordinance changes, and the language for the conservation guidelines. What will happen next is the ordinance changes need to go to the Planning Commission to add in their recommendation, and then to City Council. After the ordinance changes are approved, then the language of the conservation guidelines will be sent to City Council to approve.

On January 5th, 2017, five of the BAR members met to discuss the language and changes to the ordinance and guidelines. Scala proposes guideline 3 under building and materials should be taken out so as not to confuse people.

Schwarz made a motion to recommend to City Council approval of the Historic Conservation District zoning text amendments as presented, but striking Sec. 34-34(f) , and approval of the Historic Conservation District guidelines, striking Guideline #3 under Building Materials and textures; and to add a recommendation to refer to the Secretary of the Interior Standards in the Introduction. Sarafin seconded and the motion was approved 5-0.

Miller: asked if staff could send a letter to Council and NDS that we need these problems [i.e., 615 Lexington Avenue] identified before they become problems.

Miller made a motion to request that the City identify a process to flag building permits that are proposed in any historic district [ADC, Historic Conservation, and IPP's]. Clayborne seconded and the motion passed 5-0.

10. PLACE Report

No PLACE report because Tim Mohr is out.

G. Adjournment 10:00pm