

April 18, 2017

MOTION FOR A CLOSED SESSION

Pursuant to section 2.2-3712 of the Virginia Code, I hereby move that the BAR close this open meeting and convene in closed session for consultation with legal counsel, as authorized by Virginia Code sec. 2.2-3711 (A) (7) for the purpose of:

Consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice, relating to the review of wireless communications facilities by the BAR

Motion by: Tim Mohr, Vice Chair

Second by: Carl Schwarz

Ayes:

Breck Gastinger
Tim Mohr
Whit Graves
Stephen Balut
Melanie Miller
Carl Schwarz
Emma Earnst

Noes: 0

Absent:

Justin Sarafin
Corey Clayborne

April 18, 2017

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

I move that this BAR certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each member's knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the Motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed session.

Motion by: Melanie Miller

Second by: Breck Gastinger

Ayes: Breck Gastinger
Tim Mohr
Whit Graves
Stephen Balut
Melanie Miller
Carl Schwarz
Emma Earnst

Noes: 0

Absent: Justin Sarafin
Corey Clayborne

**Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
April 18, 2017**

Location: Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room and City Council Chambers

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller; Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Carl Schwarz, Emma Earnst; Whit Graves; Stephen Balut and Breck Gastinger

Members Absent: Corey Clayborne; Justin Sarafin

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala, Historic Preservation Planner; Camie Mess, Assistant Historic Preservation Planner; Reid Saunders, Historic Preservation Intern; Carolyn McCray, Clerk

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

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)
No public comments were made.**

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

March 21, 2017	Regular Meeting
February 28, 2017	Work Session

Mr. Gastinger moved to approve the February 28, 2017 work session and March 21, 2017 regular minutes. Mr. Balut seconded, and the minutes passed 6-0-1 with Mr. Graves abstaining because he was not present at the March meeting or the work session.

C. Previously Considered Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-04-04
Downtown Mall
Portions of Tax maps 28, 33, and 53
City of Charlottesville, Owner/ Department of Parks and Recreation, Applicant
Replace existing mall benches

The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing backed single unit chairs that were put in place with backless single unit benches. They have submitted a map showing the location of the 19 benches and researched a backed option as the BAR requested in April 2016.

Camie Mess presented the report

Mr. Doug Ehman gave the report from Parks and Recreation

Questions from the Public:
No questions from the public

Questions from the BAR:

Mr. Schwarz: Are the removed benches in storage?

Mr. Ehman: They are, but they are not in good condition or reparable without substantial investment.

Mr. Schwarz: Is there a reason you cannot put seating closer to the buildings, it looks like the benches are all in the center of the mall?

Mr. Ehman: I do not know, those were moved prior to my arrival.

Ms. Miller: Half were removed in 2009.

Mr. Ehman: Maybe not half, but a healthy third.

Mr. Gastinger: Was there a warranty on the bench seats from 2009?

Mr. Ehman: I was told the benches were special ordered from Germany, and the ability to apply that warranty would be difficult. I contacted the supplier and they said the warranty was on the frame, and the problem we are having with the benches is with the wooden slats, which are all uniquely built with no standardization.

Mr. Balut: What is the cost analysis of a repair versus the cost of backless benches?

Mr. Ehman: The backless benches are much cheaper.

Ms. Miller: Is the fire lane wider than what is shown on the map?

Mr. Ehman: Only on the corners

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public

Comments from the BAR:

Letter from Beth Meyer was read

Letter was also received from Rachel Lloyd

Mr. Balut: The city should take in one of the remaining benches to keep it protected in case it can be duplicated

Mr. Gastinger: I agree with the sentiment of the letter.

Mr. Schwarz: The wood slats are perhaps not vital, but a backed chair is vital. There is not a lot of seating out there and the ones that are out there are used a lot. The department is not well funded so there may never be funding to properly replace the backless benches. Council needs to be the one to make this decision.

Mr. Mohr: There is a lot that needs to be maintained already on the Downtown Mall.

Ms. Earnst: We need to hold the city to a higher standard in maintaining the Downtown Mall.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the proposed [backless] benches 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 denies the application as submitted. Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passed (7-0). [NOTE: Doug Ehman was requested to gather one of the original Halprin chairs and to "hold onto it."]

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-03-04

159 Madison Lane

Tax Parcel 090145000

Jeffrey Gore, owner/Bobby Craig, Arapahoe Architects PC, applicant

Handicapped ramp

Camie Mess presented the report

Evan Mayo spoke and said he misinformed the BAR about the boiler unit. They will need to have the boiler because it has caught on fire before, and this can be used as a throughway, so the exit is needed.

Questions from the Public:
No questions from the public

Questions from the BAR:
Mr. Gastinger: Can you describe the material of the planter?
Mr. Mayo: We had not discussed that.

Ms. Miller: Did you have a plant picked out?
Mr. Mayo: We don't have anything specific picked out, but something hardy, probably a shrub, something like a holly. We are certainly open to suggestions on that point.
Mr. Mohr: Getting out of the basement you'd be going around that bulk head correct?
Mr. Mayo: Correct, the grade slopes down there.

Comments from the Public:
No comments from the public

Comments from the BAR:
Mr. Mohr: This is a half comment; half question: is there any way to pull the asphalt back from the ramp so there can be planting along that wall?
Mr. Mayo: We want to hide the ramp with vegetation, but we want to make sure we maintain the parking
Mr. Gastinger: I don't know that extra planting helps the design.
Mr. Mohr: It is more important to have plants in front.
Mr. Balut: Because those plantings would just be blocked by cars.
Ms. Miller: The light fixture seems like an appropriate scale.
Mr. Balut: A brick planter would be much more fitting, which is what you described.

Motion: Mr. Balut moved to find that the proposed handicap ramp satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the recommendations that the light fixture use a warm lamp (3000K or less), a hardy shrub be put in the planter (preferably one from the City's planting list), and if not a planter, then add curbing to protect plantings, and a wheel stop or other device to prevent cars from blocking access to the handicapped ramp. Mr. Schwarz seconded. Motion passed (7-0).

D. New Construction

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-01-04
512-514, 600 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 290007000, 290006000, and 290008000
Heirloom West Main Development LLC, Owner/Heirloom West Main Development LLC, Applicant
Final Details

Mary Joy Scala presented the report

Jeff Dreyfus, the applicant, explained where the mechanical unit would be put. He also passed out an updated lightning plan.

Ms. Miller: Either we follow the guidelines or change them, for the sake of precedent. Exceptions we've made have already come back around.

Mr. Balut: Examples in glazing would have been helpful. On the back of the building, where there isn't street view, I think it would be acceptable even though there is a hard and fast number in the guidelines.

Mr. Mohr: This elevation is a little more abstract, so from a composition stand point I think the glass change would be just fine.

Mr. Schwarz: The guidelines are guidelines and we are here to allow exceptions and creativity.

Ms. Miller: There are other ways to deal with southern exposure

Mr. Balut: That 19% difference could make for a cleaner aesthetic. It is the transparency at ground level that matters so that it does not become a wall. But we are all agreeing that we would need to see it first.

Mechanical Units

Mr. Mohr: They are quite low, so I am not concerned.

Mr. Schwarz: I am a little concerned because there is no parapet on this building, so anyone above street level would be able to see it.

Mr. Mohr: People crossing the bridge might be able to see them.

Ms. Scala: Our zoning ordinance does say mechanical units need to be screened and even if you can see through them, it still helps them not be so visible.

Mr. Schwarz: I am more worried about views from adjacent projects.

Mr. Dreyfus: We could look into this with a model from other perspectives.

Mr. Graves: Screening could just add another layer.

Ms. Miller: We can defer that then when we get more information.

Landscape Plan

Mr. Gastinger: Your plant choices are good, the choice of native plants is nice. I would also recommend that the elm be a disease resistant native elm and that you replace the blue fescue. I like the design of the planters, but question the durability of the slats.

Ms. Miller: I think we've talked about how it is important for there to be more landscaping because the building is all metal. So the mulch beds might not be enough.

Mr. Dreyfus: Two of the beds would have the existing plants.

Mr. Mohr: The corner should have a tree grate because that is a high traffic corner.

Mr. Schwarz: We need to make the decision contingent on the vine being one that does not cling to brick.

Lighting Plan

Mr. Mohr: I like how much you have thought about lighting; I am glad that it can be controlled, this is very important with LEDs.

Mr. Schwarz: The amount of up lighting concerns me, everything goes up.

Mr. Mohr: If it is done well it should be fine. And since it is controlled we can set up a review process like we do for paint color.

Mr. Balut: It is a good point, by enhancing the light on the smaller buildings; it helps to balance out the lighting of the larger building. A traditional lighting helps balance them, so that the smaller buildings don't get lost.

Mr. Schwarz: Maybe the balcony lights go away.

Mr. Dreyfus: The perforation should catch the light.

Mr. Schwarz: I think it will be hard to set a precedent with this one; I would like to get rid of the balcony lighting, the rest is fine

Mr. Mohr: I think we should give them the okay and then have an on-site review of how they set it—treat it like paint color.

Ms. Earnst: What about the lighting for the mini-mart building?

Repairs

Ms. Miller: Patching the brick and roof. We need to talk about the change from a door to a window on the Blue Moon Diner.

Mr. Schwarz: I like Mary Joy's suggestion (replicating the window above), but I am fine either way.

Motion: Ms. Miller moved to find that the proposed final details satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves as submitted the following items:

- Concrete paving as drawn on the landscape plan
- Lighting approved in concept (We need a final plan and to field test before final approval)
- Rehabilitation specifications which include:
 - o Interior changes and demolitions
 - o Removal of the addition on the second floor of the mini mart building, and other exterior details
 - o Repair of windows, brick walls, and the metal roof on the Blue Moon building
 - o Repainting brick walls that are currently painted and the metal roof
 - o New half-round gutters
 - o Replacement of windows to match existing
 - o New Corten wall on the back of the Blue Moon building
 - o Addition of guard rails as needed
- We are also asking for minor changes to the landscape plan by:
 - o Eliminating the blue fescue
 - o Switching the specified Elm to a disease-resistant American Elm
 - o Adding a tree grate
 - o Verifying the proposed vine twines vs. clings

Further, the BAR would like to defer the following items for further information:

- Glazing [including a sample of the glass]
- Final layout and additional studies for mechanical units
- Bike racks

The BAR also approves the window [in the east bay of house behind Blue Moon Diner] with specifications made to match the window above. Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passed (7-0).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-01

900 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 100078000

Hampton Inn & Suites, Owner/ Janet Miller, Applicant

Hampton Inn Planting Plan Application

Camie Mess presented the report

The applicant made no additional comments

Questions from the Public:

Ms. Rebecca Quinn: Information for this meeting was not available to the public, please speak into the microphone. There is no legal record of the meeting because no one can hear the recording. These are city rules.

Questions from the BAR:

Mr. Schwarz: Are there any modification to the landscape plan?

Applicant: No

Mr. Gastinger read his recommendations which were sent to the BAR members before the meeting

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public

Comments from the BAR:

Ms. Miller: In the future it would be great to have shading on the map

Motion: Mr. Gastinger moved to find that the proposed planting plan 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. Schwarz seconded. Motion passed (7-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-05

230 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280001000

Taliaferro Junction LLC, Owner/ Fred Wolf, Applicant

Demolition of Structure – Main Street Arena

Camie Mess presented the report

Fred Wolf, the applicant, spoke about protection of the adjacent building, there is no intension of demolition before next year, and he wanted to make it clear that they had no begun the design phase.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public

Questions from the BAR:

Ms. Miller: The solar panels on top what are you going to do with them?

Mr. Wolf said we haven't gone that far in terms of planning. I know there are ongoing discussions about other parts of the building and how those might be recycled and repurposed. I have a hard time believing that a project with that value would not be captured and reused.

Comments from the Public:

Rebecca Quinn: Not so long ago Council acted of the Historic Resources Committee which she thinks came before the BAR to designating the part of the mall on the upper end as Vinegar Hill Park. This is an opportunity for synergy between a new design and a new building, to commemorate what happened there. She is asking the owner, architect, and the BAR to factor in this opportunity to contribute to Vinegar Hill Park. She is sure the architects see a creative opportunity to help the City do more justice with Vinegar Hill; the side and along the front are plenty of opportunities. She looks forward to seeing what they come up with.

Marie Chapele, Preservation Piedmont, stated we care very much about the history of Vinegar Hill, demand it is treated with respect and design with the space; incredible strategic site and dignified building, including Vinegar Hill Park.

Mr. Wolf: is excited about the potential for a Vinegar Hill Park, and the comments being made about it and this is something they are exploring between these spots.

Comments from the BAR:

Mr. Gastinger: There is a sadness considered for removal and this is an important place in the city.

Mr. Schwarz: Is sad to see the building go, but hopes it will create a better connection to West Main.

Mr. Mohr: Thinks the site deserved much better connection to Water Street and to the mall. A park would help create this.

However, the applicant should provide a plan describing how the historic building at West Main Street will be affected/protected until the new building is constructed.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz move to find that the proposed demolition 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; seconded Ms. Earnst, motion passes 7-0.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-06
215 West Water Street
Tax Parcel 280009000
Man U LLC, Owner/ Fred Wolf, Applicant
Demolition of Structure – Escape

Mary Joy Scale presented the report

Fred Wolf, the applicant, requesting approval for the demolition of the existing structure so that the property can be used for a mixed use, retail and office project. He suggested the structure, while older is not architecturally significant. The windows and doors are not original, the openings have been modified, and the applicant states that the roof and stucco siding are not in good condition.

Questions from the Public:
No questions from the public

Questions from the BAR:
No questions from the BAR

Comments from the Public:

Ms. Marie Chapele: as a private citizen this breaks her heart to see this building demolished. It might be a utilitarian building, but these older buildings are what makes Charlottesville charming. I echo the comments that Mary Joy said about maintaining the character of the neighborhood and keeping the low profile. This building has been here for a long time, and I think that most people would recognize this building in a photo and remember that it was in Charlottesville.

Ms. Rebecca Quinn: pointed out that City Council recently designated the section of the Downtown Mall outside the arena as the future Vinegar Hill Park. She said I am sure I am not the only one to see an opportunity between a new design, a new building and the intent of Vinegar Hill Park. She asked the BAR to keep this in mind as they consider what replaces the Main Street Arena. This building is squarely on land that was formerly occupied by African-American businesses. I am sure that the architects and the historic resources people see lots of creative opportunity to help this city do more justice to Vinegar Hill.

Comments from the BAR:

Ms. Miller: We are not supposed to think about what should come before it because it may not. One thing I think this plan adds is a public alley/ pathway (from the 1920s Sanborn map) that will be restored, that once connected West Main Street and West Water Street.

Mr. Schwarz: For historic character on Water Street, there are many more buildings on Water Street a bit further down that show it was a utilitarian street. Losing this building will not eliminate the historic character of Water Street downtown.

Mr. Mohr: The Waterhouse building is where the engulfing of the façade was not successful. It surrounds the building and that building is certainly a part of history, but it certainly doesn't feel like that anymore. It does seem like the north edge of Water Street is built up at this point, so I am inclined to go with whatever works better from an urban design standpoint.

Mr. Gastinger: From my point of view the façade and the space in front of it do tell a story, and I am wondering if there is any other guidance short of demolition. The space in front contributes to the landscape of Water Street, and while I am sure there are other architectural solutions that could contribute to the public good, but they are not on the table right now, so it is hard to know how to balance that. Currently, I would need to vote against demolition, but I could be persuaded if there were a site plan in the future that shows reconfiguration of public space that goes back.

Ms. Ernst: I have also been extremely ambivalent about this demolition, as I have shared with Fred. As others have mentioned the significant parts of the property are the utilitarian nature, the stepped façade, and the setback. There is a way that we could request the façade and the setback be retained, but we still don't know what that is going to end up looking like. On the other hand, I worry about precedent; the board wanted the Waterhouse buildings to be retained and incorporated, what makes this different enough that we are okay with losing this building? And what does that say for future projects that come up in historic districts with historic buildings on the register. How do we distinguish? I don't have an answer.

Mr. Graves: I think we talked a lot tonight about setting precedents which distracts from the conversation about the guidelines that we need to interpret. I have thought a lot about this demolition, and I don't think this structure warrants saving. I support demolition.

Mr. Balut: I feel similarly. Unfortunately, when this packet came up, I had a hard time remembering the building as well. I understand the connection to the stepped parapet wall and the setback, which does offer a nice little public space, but I don't think by approving this demolition that is necessarily lost. I know we can't count on anything, but we have heard there is some intention to consider that, as well as consideration to the adjacent project. To me the idea of preserving the façade into the future building is not feasible and would be unsuccessful. I do not feel this is a historic or iconic building of Charlottesville, so I am in support of demolition.

Ms. Schwarz: I will be sad for its loss, but it is not historic.

Mr. Wolf: Just as I said with the other project, there is nothing immanent about this, and the demolition would only happen concurrently with the project. There is no one here that would want to create a hole in the street wall or fabric without knowing there was a corresponding piece to go back.

Motion: Mr. Balut moved to find that the proposed demolition 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. Mr. Schwarz seconded. Motion passed (5-2, with Gastinger and Earnst opposed). [NOTE: The BAR distinguished the context of this building from the historic context of the Mono Loco building].

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-07

615 Lexington Avenue

Tax Parcel 520170000

Francesco Ronchetti, Owner/ Sigora Solar, Applicant

Proposed Solar Panel

Camie Mess presented the report and clarified the skylights are in the structure but the panels have not been.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public

Questions from the BAR

No questions from the BAR

Comments from the Public:

Mr. Dennis Mason: 621 Lexington Ave, spoke: the building is 6 feet from the property line and it's too big and also ugly, the addition of the solar panel would not make it look any better.

Comments from the BAR:

No comments from the BAR

City Council decided the BAR should no longer defer (in conservation districts) after 30 days it will be a COA.

Motion: Mr. Graves moved to defer this COA, seconded by Mr. Mohr, motion passes 7-0.

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-03
301 15th Street NW
Tax Parcel 090094000
Pavilion, LLC, Owner/ Verizon, Applicant
Proposed cell antenna

Mary Joy presented the report

Steven Waller, the applicant, spoke, the proposed cell antenna will not be visible, it is 28 inches long concealed in the corner stone attached communication utilities.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved to approve a COA for BAR 17-04-03, proposing installation of wireless communication transmission equipment on the roof of a building located at 301 15th Street NW, because the proposed installation is architecturally compatible with the character of this property and of the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

- (1) All communications/ transmission equipment, and related facilities, shall be installed in accordance with a coordinated Concealment Plan approved by this BAR. The Concealment Plan hereby approved for this property as follows:
 - a. Communications/ transmission equipment, and related facilities, shall be disguised by, or disguised as, architectural features, fixtures, or building appurtenances. Concealment elements created for the sole purpose of disguising or hiding such equipment and facilities shall be treated, considered and reviewed in the same manner as the architectural features, fixtures or appurtenances they mimic.
 - b. In the aggregate, all architectural features, fixtures and appurtenances shall not exceed such number, and shall be of such massing, type and appearance, as may be compatible with similar features, fixtures and appurtenances on other building(s) within this ADC District. Approval of a concealment element for one installation does not guarantee approval of the same concealment element(s) for all future installations.
 - c. All future installations of communications/ transmission equipment shall be in accordance with this Concealment Plan.
- (2) The current application proposes only one (1) antenna/data node, and related equipment and facilities, to be installed on or adjacent to the roof of the existing commercial building. Consistent with the above-referenced Concealment Plan, this proposed installation shall be installed and disguised as follows:
 - a. The proposed antenna/data node shall be enclosed within a cornerstone installed for the purpose of concealing the antenna/ data node, and placed at the eastern corner of the parking garage structure, at the top of the garage walls.
 - b. The materials of the cornerstone enclosure shall be a color that is a neutral, light color that closely matches the light-grey concrete of the parking garage façade. The cornerstone enclosure shall itself have a height of 3”2” feet or less. No portion of the antenna/ data node shall extend beyond the cornerstone enclosure. It must sit directly upon the garage column and match the cross-section. The equipment cabinet (approximately 24 inches (L) x 20 inches (W) x 11 inches (D)), two remote radio heads, and a diplexer, and any and all other equipment and facilities supporting the operation of the antenna/ data node, shall be mounted on a uni-strut frame attached to the interior side of the existing parapet wall at the top of the garage structure. No part or portion of any supporting equipment of facilities shall be visible at ground level from any adjacent street or property. The equipment will be located below the levels of the sloped roof of the attached apartment building within the mechanical equipment well. The conduit to serve the equipment shall be located on the interior surface of the interior wall and not visible from the exterior.

Ms. Miller made an amendment to switch the word designed by to disguise by in Number 1. Mr. Gastinger seconded the amendment. Mr. Balut seconded the motion. Motion passed (7-0).

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-04

1605 Gordon Avenue

Tax Parcel 050070000

R & I Buildings CO, LC, Owner/ Verizon, Applicant

Proposed cell antenna

Mary Joy presented the report

Steven Waller, the applicant spoke.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved to approve a COA for BAR 17-04-04, proposing installation of wireless communication transmission equipment on the roof of a building located at 1605 Gordon Avenue, because the proposed installation is architecturally compatible with the character of this property and of the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

- (1) All communications/ transmission equipment, and related facilities, shall be installed in accordance with a coordinated Concealment Plan approved by this BAR. The Concealment Plan hereby approved for this property as follows:
 - a. Communications/ transmission equipment, and related facilities, shall be disguised by, or disguised as, architectural features, fixtures, or building appurtenances. Concealment elements created for the sole purpose of disguising or hiding such equipment and facilities shall be treated, considered and reviewed in the same manner as the architectural features, fixtures or appurtenances they mimic.
 - b. In the aggregate, all architectural features, fixtures and appurtenances shall not exceed such number, and shall be of such massing, type and appearance, as may be compatible with similar features, fixtures and appurtenances on other building(s) within this ADC District. Approval of a concealment element for one installation does not guarantee approval of the same concealment element(s) for all future installations. All future installations of communications/ transmission equipment shall be in accordance with this Concealment Plan.
- (2) The current application proposes only one (1) antenna/data node, and related equipment and facilities, to be installed on the roof of the existing commercial building. Consistent with the above-referenced Concealment Plan, this proposed installation shall be installed and disguised as follows:
 - a. The proposed antenna/data node shall be enclosed within a stealth concealment sleeve (“vent pipe sleeve”) installed solely for the purpose of concealing the antenna/ data node.
 - b. The vent pipe sleeve shall be a color that is a neutral, light-gray tone similar to other vent pipes that extend above roofs within the ADC District. The vent pipe sleeve shall not be more than 12” inches in diameter, nor shall it extend more than 4’-5” above the parapet. No portion of the antenna/ data node within the vent pipe sleeve shall extend above the top of the vent pipe sleeve.
 - c. The proposed antenna/ data node shall be mounted on a non-penetrating, ballasted sled placed in the southeastern corner of the roof of the building. No portion of the sled shall be visible from any adjacent street or property, unless it is within the vent pipe sleeve.
 - d. The equipment cabinet (approximately 24 inches (L) x 20 inches (W) x 11 inches (D)), two remote radio heads, fiber optic coupler, and all other equipment and facilities supporting the operation of the antenna/ data node, shall be mounted on a rooftop equipment frame that, itself, is approximately six (6) feet wide and five (5) feet tall. The equipment frame shall be set back at least 13 feet from the adjacent building facades, or such greater setback as necessary to preclude any portion of the equipment frame from being visible at ground level from any adjacent street or property. Conduit for the equipment shall be designed to mimic the existing downspouts on the building.

Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passed (6-1, with Ms. Miller opposed).

12. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-02

1521 University Avenue

Tax Parcel 090082000

Hampton Building Corporation, Owner/ Verizon, Applicant
Proposed cell antenna

Mary Joy presented the report

Laura [Last Name] and Steven Waller, the applicants, spoke won't be visible because it is below the parapet.

Questions from the Public

Chris Hendricks: How much is the sled on the roof of Mincers going to weigh, he said no one had examine the roof

Applicant: Not sure what the weight is of the sled

Mr. Mohr: 360 lbs. total

Mr. Hendricks: worried about the safety of a 100 year old roof.

Applicant: 45 lbs. on each corner of each side

Mr. Hendricks said no one has looked at the roof besides standing on the roof. He said there is only one way to get to the roof and that is locked and he has the key to it.

Questions from the BAR:

Mr. Mohr: do you have a sample of the chimney material?

Applicant: Is it standard brick, they match to the brick that is on the building

Comments from the Public:

Mr. Hendricks said they are adding a chimney to a building does not have a chimney which is obviously fake material. They have altered the pictures: waited until the trees totally came in bloom to hide the antenna. He produced accurate pictures showing the ladder and hoods. He said this is an historic building and they are putting non-essential structure on the roof that weighs 300 lbs. It could damage the parapet and the roof.

Mr. Gastinger moved to deny a COA for BAR 17-04-02, proposing installation of wireless communication transmission equipment on the roof of a building located at 1521-1527 University Avenue, because the proposed installation(s) and concealment feature is NOT architecturally compatible with the character of this property or the Corner ADC District. The nature and placement of the proposed "chimney" is not typical or common within this ADC District relevant for the structure, and is not in keeping with the commercial character of the existing building. The following Standards and Guidelines are referenced:

- Standard #3 for the review of construction and alterations related to the interior standards for rehabilitation [Sec 34-276 (3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant]
- page 25 related to roofs
- page 28 related to building exterior roofs.

Mr. Balut seconded. Motion passed (5-2 with Mr. Schwarz and Mr. Graves opposed).

F. Other Business

13. PLACE Report, none because the meeting is Thursday

G. Adjournment