

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
May 16, 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, Breck Gastinger, Corey Clayborne; Justin Sarafin

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner; Carolyn McCray, Clerk

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

5:30 A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

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

April 18, 2017 Regular Meeting

Earnst moved to approve the April 18, 2017 minutes;
Schwarz seconded.

Approved 7-0-2 with Sarafin and Clayborne abstained because they did not attend.

C. Previously Considered Items

5:40 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-12-01

310 4th Street NE

Tax Parcel 330205L00

Court Square LLC, owner/ Richard Shank, Shank & Gray Architects, applicant
Exterior Modifications

Report by Mary Joy Scala

Applicant: Richard Shank, Shank & Gray Architects

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Sarafin: Asked about the painted metal vertical to the ground, does that set on the masonry wall?

Shank: Both metal poles, columns, and post sit on masonry structure, the structures will be modified

Clayborne: How does water drain off the balconies?

Shank: The balconies will be sloped to a tiny gutter it will be gathered and sent into the columns, an internal down sprout.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Gastinger: has concerns on the fin approach, this makes a very large building feel even larger and inappropriate, and the expression the balconies the way that it is expressed on the interior corner without the masonry might feel more in keeping with what it is doing architecturally. He noted the loss of the ginkgoes that will also happen at that corner which will change its relationship to the street.

Miller: Do you know how many ginkgos will be lost with the balcony?

Shank: He does not know the answer to the question.

Miller: In December we talked about the windows have to be clear and there are some concerns about the windows not being clear.

Shank: There is nothing in the drawings to indicate that they are anything but clear

Miller: Asked do they look clear to you?

Shank: stated he has not gone back to study them.

Mohr: said it does look like a film on the inside of the offices

Schwarz: concern that he will want to come back and re-do the windows

Balut: not a fan of the fin wall, but it is within the scale portion of the building and materiality as well. It confines to the guidelines.

Clayborne moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions I move to find that the proposed exterior balconies and lighting 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.

Mohr seconded.

Approved 6-3 with Miller, Earnst, and Gastinger opposed

6:00

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-04-05

615 Lexington Avenue

Tax Parcel 520170000

Francesco Ronchetti, Owner/ Sigora Solar, Applicant

Proposed Solar Panel

Report by Mary Joy Scala

Staff made an error in last month's staff report. The skylights were indeed shown on the drawings for the accessory building, which were approved by the BAR in January.

Applicant: Sigora Solar

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

No questions from the BAR.

Comments from the Public:

Dennis Mason: 621 Lexington Ave., the building is too big and the heat exchanges should be on the side of the building away from the fence, if it is against the fence it will mean there are 4 units in approximately 100 feet, two for the main house and two for this building. He considers it an eye sore. He said he had a family gathering in January his four children were there, they were sorry to see this building. He said he has had people to pass by and express disbelief that this is allowed and it is not just him but other neighbors as well. How is the rain water from the roof handled, reduce the value, and he will have to live near selfish, inconsiderate neighbors, regarding the solar panel, these panels are visible from Kelly Ave. where lots of people walk. These panels will make the building even uglier. He thinks these panels should be denied.

Comments from the BAR:

Schwarz: he has no concerns

Miller: she does not support this

Gastinger: this application meets the guidelines so he is in support

Mohr: he agrees with Breck

Graves: he is in agreement; but the solar panels do have an impact on neighbors

Earnst: as far as the application before us tonight there is nothing that says we shouldn't consider this appropriate.

Clayborne moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed solar panels 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.

Balut seconded. Approved 8-1 with Miller opposed.

6:20

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-05-03

201 West Water Street

Tax Parcel 280012000

Black Bear Properties, LLC, Owner/ Black Bear Properties, LLC, Applicant
Demolition of 201 West Water Street

Report by Mary Joy Scala

Applicant: Black Bear Properties, LLC, Owner/ Black Bear Properties, LLC,

Clark Gathright: appeared on behalf of the applicant. The demolition approval from the BAR really gets the ball rolling in the site view process. We wanted to have the approval to demolish the building before we get started. Gathright said they did not want to get too far into designing the next structure without knowing if they could take this building down.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Clayborne: What is the timing for the demolition as opposed to redevelopment of the site?

Gathright: Approval from the BAR, certainly months out before any construction

Sarafin: Is there a building in between? What is the zoning envelope?

Scala: A little corner, zoning allows six stories by right; nine stories with a special use permit

Tim: Does it have a basement?

Gathright: No

Earnst: Have you done a structural study of the building?

Gathright: No we haven't, I have gone through the building and didn't see anything of alarm structurally

Balut: Are you are undergrounding the overhead wires?

Gathright: We have been in discussion with Dominion Power to underground from the south side of Water's street over to the corner of the building and put a transformer underneath the building and that would clean up the sky line. You might be able to have an ADA sidewalk there.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Tim: This building holds the corner very poorly and he can't see any reason not to get rid of it.

Sarafin: The building immediately to the west looks like it has far more significance on the street than this building

Mohr moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolition and Moving, I 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.

Schwarz seconded. Approved 9-0

Other Business (taken out of order to allow next applicants to arrive)

11. Comments Requested

West Main Street Historic District National Register Nomination
Background

Because Charlottesville is a Certified Local Government, the Charlottesville BAR is entitled to a sixty-day comment period to review the draft nomination and relay any concerns or comments to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR). The nomination will be considered by Virginia's State Review Board and Historic Resources Board on June 15, 2017.

Staff obtained a CLG grant to have this nomination prepared. This is the City's third attempt to have West Main Street nominated, following two failed attempts in 1980 and 1996. It is very deserving of a nomination.

The proposed district, located between the Drewary Brown Bridge and Ridge Street, is significant as the institutional core of Charlottesville's African American community, and as a historic transportation route and twentieth century transportation center. West Main Street is one of the few areas in Charlottesville that is designated as a local historic district, but is not recognized on the federal and state registers. The district contains 50 structures, of which 42 are contributing, and seven are already individually listed on the National and Virginia Registers.

Scala: This is the cultural center of Charlottesville. This part of West Main Street needs to have its own district designation. Of all of the ADC districts this is one that very few areas that is not on the National Registrar as well.

Sarafin moved to find that the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review recommends the West Main Street Historic District as proposed for listing on the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Gastinger seconded. Approved 9-0

12. PLACE Report: Tim Mohr: PLACE discussed defining a new role for long-range planning. PLACE suggested a person in charge of coordinating various departments, so all moving forward together (Economic Development, NDS, Parks, Public Works, etc.) and PLACE is helping to define what that is. 3D modeling is proceeding- update planned next meeting. Matt Trowbridge from UVA presented idea for pop-up projects.

Schwarz: asked what the BAR would think about Art in Place at bus stops. Mohr suggested using the same guidelines as for murals.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-05-04

138 Madison Lane

Tax Parcel 009135000

Epsilon Gamma House Corp, Owner/ Judy Richards, Applicant
Courtyard Renovation Project

Report by Mary Joy Scala

Applicant: Judy Richards

Landscape Planner: Jeffrey Howe spoke on the renovation materials for the courtyard project

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the Public.

Questions from the BAR:

Gastinger: What is the #2 size range?

Howe: 30x30

Gastinger: What is the smallest?

Howe: 12x12

Gastinger: It is a bit misleading in the drawing

Mohr: What is generating that curvy shape around the sides?

Howe: That is the coat of arms

Schwarz: There is a tree in the bottom left corner, is it going to remain?

Howe: That is going to stay

Miller: The four foot tall fence, how far does it go?

Howe: Four sections of fence about eight feet long.

Howe: The odd granite curve stays.

Clayborne: What is the slope of the brick pavement to the house?

Howe: The slope will go away from the house, 3 %, 1 inch per 4 feet

Gastinger: The path lights at the edge of the paving, what height are they going to be mounted at?

Howe: 21 inches, ground mounted

Mohr: Where are the lenses on that? Are they throwing light straight up or straight down?

Howe: Straight down, the owner has chosen these

Mohr: These could also be put on dimmers, yes?

Howe: If it's low voltage yes they are capable of dimmers

Mohr: The danger with LED's is 20 watts or 10 watts can be a lot of light, to keep to a warm light not parking lot blue

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Gastinger : doesn't have a lot of concerns, he notes the path light does not seem in keeping with the rest of the fencing and the installation, it would be preferable from a use standpoint to have it lower to the ground and generally less visible, remove the bar bearings.

Scala: It's like a little sculpture

Schwarz: in the bottom right corner (a note for a flood light)

Howe: that is the anchor. The anchor is 42 inches at an angle

Balut: the picture and the sample are capable with the district and happy to approve.

Clayborne: looks like there's an underground utility heading that way, is it outside its limits

Sarafin: looks like the speck sheets show the fencing 48 inches, looks like you indicated 3 ft.

Howe: across the front is 3 and the gate in the service area is 4

Howe: they are not going to do any fences

Mohr moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed courtyard renovation 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 following modifications: Submit a cut sheet for the floodlight to staff; revisit the path lights in height and scale; The BAR advises keeping color temperature 3,000 K or lower so warm light, and put on dimmer.

Graves seconded. Approved 9-0

5A. Discussion

BAR 16-10-04

401 Altamont Circle

Tax Parcel 330111000

Marianne and Gerry Starsia, Owner/Applicant

Landscape Plan

Applicant : Marianne and Gerry Starsia, Owner/Applicant

Landscape Planner: Jeff Howe

Jeff Howe: as for the curb, I initially sent an email asking if it had to be city mix, yes and we had our guys. There were several gaps in the curb and we were going to repair the gaps. Mary Joy said it needed to be replaced in kind, to him he didn't know what decade we were talking about replacing it in kind, but if it were in the last 3 decades it would have been with the cracks and fishers all the way down and scaling falling off pieces of concrete, so what we decided to do having consulted with some additional masons was to put a lath over the existing, put bonding agent on the curb, wire lath over the whole thing, added bonding agent to the city mix and scrim on roughly 1/2 an inch over top of that. We feel like we have a pretty good bond where a lot of the chipping and broken pieces were and a solid connection where the gaps were and some of the pictures I had showed the guys with a string line completely straight on the back of the curb, but the way the curb follows and is on top of the city sidewalk is not straight. We followed the line that the lath wire gave us and he understands why it looks a little off.

As far as the finish, we did a broom type of finish which makes it look a little more rustic and is not the smooth finish the church has across the street.

Gerry Starsia: The church across the street as a quarter round and we have a half round. He said the back of the round is not covered with the mulch so we are not upping the bed height yet, so less of the back radius is going to show.

Howe: the intension with the drainage is to bring the drainage stone right over to the back of the curb so we will have a significant filter for the water shed.

He said the plants will be planted in a regular soil bed with a two foot buffer and a one foot stone filter.

Starsia: In the application for the porch estimation is where he noted the curb is to be patched.

Howe: There are several large trees on both sides of the porch but stumps and root systems that followed the back of the existing curb. We endeavor to

remove most of those knowing we had to put shrubs in there and some of that definitely didn't help us with keeping the old curb intact.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Gastinger: When doing the curb, did you consider doing a scoring line or cut along the edge to break down the growing piece of concrete.

Howe: If you are talking about the two inches above the sidewalk, that kind of had a mushroom affect. When the lath came down we tried desperately to push it back in there and make it stay and it just wouldn't.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: The revised plan is a big improved and like that you included some green space along the alley and reduce the amount of parking. She does understand the reference to the pain we put the church through across the street, but it is a little different because they had the cobble stone versus a half round, this was a half round and not a quarter round to begin with so she could approve it as is.

Balut: He was not on the board when the other curb was considered so not having any knowledge of that, he finds it to be compatible with the guidelines and will approve it as is.

Schwarz: It looks much bigger and it stands out. That inch all the way around, it seems to have lost its form and it sticks out. The city mix would have been better even if it was pieced in on the whole thing.

Sarafin: In the spirit of what we were looking for, what we see is a good faith effort to try to deal with this. Once it is finished he said it will disappear more than these photos show. It is not that high, and he certainly can't see asking you to re-work it. The porch looks great.

Gastinger: The site plan, the plantings and all of the work is a huge improvement. He is supportive.

Mohr: Are you anticipating new paving on the alley way cause you have an exposed edge that is going to get hammered.

Starsia: The agreement was Belgian block, we'd leave about 1/2 in. thick asphalt which would be a two inch overlay the Belgian block and finish just about flush.

Mohr: Rather than a reveal, is there some way get a vertical edge along the sidewalk.

Howe: It is the part where there's the thickest concrete down at the bottom

Mohr: For the future if we see something that deteriorated then it should just be replaced. It's just unsatisfied.

Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed solutions for the curb and storm drainage satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North

Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Mohr seconded. Approved 9-0

(The following item was taken out of order to allow next applicants to arrive)

7. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-05-02

500 Park Street

Tax Parcel 530131000 and 530131100

First Presbyterian Church of Charlottesville, Owner/ Megan Philippe, Applicant
Proposed new addition and parking area

Report by Mary Joy Scala

Applicant: Megan Philippe

Accessibility issues, no elevators, 3 different levels, thought it would be an idea to expand later in the future.

They are all so different, different options, sanctuary suited for the church, remote from the sanctuary to have more of a connection. Not enough classroom space. We run out of space because the amount of people we have, can we expand the parking lot. Connect the two and not making a drive on Park Street's

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Tim asked (no microphone)

Corey: Option one access to the interior courtyard

Carl: Mitigate not necessary a – border this area from the street, some kind of barrier

Balut: Is all the parking the same, no new curb cut on parking street

Comments from the Public: (Via an email)

William B & Mary Francis Walton: concerns regarding the parking near their front yard property line: Liquor and beer bottles thrown in their yard by people socializing in the parking lot in front of the Carriage House when the homeless accommodations are being provided by the church; headlights shining into our windows; motorcycles starting up late at night after social gatherings ends. Extensive damage to the retaining wall when snow is plowed from the parking lot onto our property. Also, another concern is the pavement and parked cars in plain view in one of our historic neighborhoods. The parking is more suited to areas around the church building itself or in the huge lot between the Carriage House and Eighth Street.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: Her children attended pre-school at this church. She cannot support the parking lot. The existing parking seems wide open and can't envision a great community like First Presbyterian not being able to figure out a valet service or something to accommodate for handicapped people that might be more of a service than even having to park and get out of their cars, this way they can

drive right up. Of the options presented, it seems like option two would be best or potentially even option one if it just had the courtyard where the pre-school entrance is, just doing the third story addition in the small space as purposed in option two, that's what keeps option one, in closing that whole corner in makes that seem too massive. Option three would be a big loss to the programming inside the building because of the lack of light that all of those rooms get by having it open to the courtyard. She went by there today, again in thinking about the parking, just so happens today was a pre-school picnic, and there were tons of kids running around and you don't picture them doing that as joyfully on asphalt. It would still be right up by Park Street where there is a 7 foot high stone wall that you can just fall off of into the sidewalk and she can't see the pre-school using that space. In terms of the addition to the playground space, she understands the need for it and can see how it improved instillation and she knows it gets hot and they were fundraising for retractable awnings. She asked do you think that affects the line of trees that are planted there.

Philippe: Said no we are far enough back that we would be okay there.

Miller: Said she guesses she could be talked into it but then she would wonder if the retaining wall would get too tall and would it have to have a fence on top of it, thinking about all of that great open space, could there be a low fence to keep the kids in would be an awesome playground.

Mohr: What would happen if you re-arranged the whole top of the site and go out the other way with the addition rather than loading up this side all the more do something mirroring that hyphen going the other way and do something to re-route the parking behind the building. Right now you see all of those cars on the side of the church which isn't so great either and having even more cars seems even worst. It would be nice if the church could meander its way in the other direction as well. Programmatically he is not sure how you would pull that off but in terms of massing, it just seems like you could start to throw the parking back and work on the site more. He said some real site planning is in order and flipping the fellowship hall to the other side to see if it works. The sanctuary is historical as well.

Philippe: They were trying to keep the fellowship hall closer to the kitchen.

The BAR had a preliminary discussion so no action was taken. There was a strong preference for Option #1 among BAR members. There was a strong preference not to expand the parking in the proposed location on the knoll. The playground expansion could work provided street trees along Maple Street are not disturbed. There was a suggestion to look at terracing the playground. Other individual suggestions were: to look at the site plan carefully; to explore adding the addition on the north side; use valet parking for HC persons; put playground where parking was proposed; prepare a site section; don't conceal the historical evolution of the building; parking lot would require a strong landscape plan (but site planning more important); move parking lot away from Park Street; review the guidelines for additions and for parking lots.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-05-01

507 Ridge Street

Tax Parcel 290141000

Clay and Kimberly Lauter, Owner/ Clay Lauter, Applicant

Roof Replacement

Report by Mary Joy Scala
Applicant: Clay Lauter

Lauter: He wants to replace the front roof, over the porch because the gutter systems are failing. The Philadelphia gutters are trapping water causing additional rust and leaks throughout the wooden ceiling, which has already been replaced twice. He would like to replace the roof with an advanced roofing system, which includes galvanized steel, standing seam panels (silver in color), half-round, copper bronze gutters, and copper bronze downspouts.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Mohr: Is there a piece a crown molding

Lauter: There is nothing there it's flat nothing underneath the edges

Lauter: The gutter system is directly above this

Schwarz: Is it copper or bronze?

Lauter: Copper being the metal and bronze is the color, its steel that's copper colored. We intend to retain the color of the roof

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Lauter: He saw the historical information that the house was built in 1895.

Clayborne moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed roof and Philadelphia gutter replacement on the front porch roof satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mohr seconded. Approved 9-0.

Break 7:50

Return 7:55

8. 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

Report by Mary Joy Scala
Applicant: Jeff Dreyfus

Jeff Dreyfus, with the firm Bushman and Dreyfus: Everything that we're addressing tonight is everything that needs to be addressed in order to get the approval for the building permit. He presented new windows and new landscape and lighting plans and demonstrated how mechanical units will be screened from view.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Balut: Remind me what the issue was with the lighting on the exterior rails
Dreyfus: the discussion was whether there ought to be lighting on the terrace rails of the new residential units on the north façade and we felt it actually enlighten the façade and from the top of rail but light from below and can control the light.

Balut: I think this is a great project, starting with the fact that you are preserving the two structures on site is great.

Clayborne: In respect to the mechanical screen you said it was 5 ft. but the section says it's 5 ft. from the roof substrate 3 foot 8 plus or minus a few inches and does the rendering take there into account.

Answer: it is 5 ft. from the roof substrate but the parapet is really low. He doesn't have the drawings in front of him but it's somewhere around 4 ft. it is all modeled accurately in the rendering.

Comments from the Public:

No comment from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: Overall, you have given us exactly what we have asked for and you have gone ahead and decided to screen the mechanical units

Mohr: the color sounds rational and the cooler color on the metal makes a lot of sense. He is mostly concerned about glare and overlay.

Miller: Working with a lighting designer is super helpful

Schwarz: the windows on the south façade; we have approved windows in basement on South Street. This is completely against our guidelines but considering this facing a cell phone tower, we have a good reason to give an exception in this case.

Earnst: She is fine with everything and you have addressed all of our concerns

Gastinger: The final finish of the metal panels particularly on the east façade or discussion about looking at some samples outside in the light on site and is there an update on what decisions have been made there?

Dreyfus: We have 4 or 5 different panel specs so we can get some competitive pricing and before a final is selected we will be back here and probably look at it on site with you and even have a mockup of other materials.

Dreyfus: They will return to the BAR at a later time for final approval of signage and lighting

Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Rehabilitations, and for Site Design and Elements, I move 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 the plan as submitted, with the stipulations that the BAR will review the lighting and the final metal finish in the field; signage to come back later; VLT 60 on south side only and VLT 70 everywhere else (the exception was approved because the south, rear façade faces an unbuildable site and no pedestrian activity would come close to it). Balut seconded. Approved 8-1 with Miller opposed.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-05-05

425, 501, and 503 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 320175000, 320176000, and 320177000

Quirk Charlottesville, LLC, Owner/ Jennifer D. Mullen, Esq., Applicant

Demolition of Additions (501 and 503) and Barber Shop (425)

Report by Mary Joy Scala

Applicant: Jennifer D. Mullen, Esq., Applicant

Jennifer Mullen, Roth Jackson firm: The goal here is to give space around 501 and 503 W. Main to allow the pedestrian connection to be the bridge between the old and the new

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

No questions from the BAR.

Comments from the Public:

Brad Worrell, Starr Hill neighborhood, said he appreciated the Quirk's community engagement on the project. The things that are very important to the neighborhood have been already raised and acknowledged, but he added there are still concerns about how the project will affect driveways on Commerce Street. To ease some concerns, all guests parking will be valet to prevent people unfamiliar with the area from driving on the small roads in the neighborhood.

Comments from the BAR:

Gastinger: Concern with the side porch on 501, it contributes to the character of the street and we don't have enough information to determine how important it is to the overall history of the house. Moreover just judging from the site plan it doesn't seem it's demolition is as imperative for the functioning of the project as designed but maybe we'll hear more about that in either a response to this or later. His primary concern is with the demolition, the only other point is while the demolition of Mel's is certainly not a significant building but it does contribute to the character of Commerce Street and historical use as a landscape and an

important commercial district and has been raised at times in our history and to acknowledge the contributions it makes even in its simplicity.

Balut: No problem with the demolition of #4 Mel's and architecturally it is quite benign. 501 and the 1924 addition is a valuable contribution to the house and streetscape. He called it quirky, contributes to the overall aesthetic as you move forward with your design. It is a strong element architecturally. No compelling reason to let go of that. The sleeping porch he likes as well and restoring the sleeping porch not visual from the street, feels fine approving that. 503, the argument of going back to its pureness significance is a strong and the additions that have been made are not very beautiful. Taking that house back to its pureness significance in its quaintness will be quite lovely and will add a lot of charm to the whole project. The only one he is stuck on is the 24 side addition on 501.

Mohr: It's sort of similar to the Blue moon Diner where it's a little bizarre but it is part of the character of that street so there is some merit in that argument even though it is quirky as (Balut) mentioned.

Graves: Having a hard time understanding what is important to the character of this street, like the original single family dwelling structure as the important part or that addition part put on as a doctor's office is more of a commercial use so is it when it was built as a single family home or was it when it was added on to for commercial use along West Main. It looks like to competing front doors. He is generally supportive of the demolition and will follow the lead on the side addition.

Miller: We tested some training modules for Justin, she personally disagreed with it. Preservation Virginia taught you it doesn't have to be the original building; it could be use that it has changed to, right?

Sarafin: Right, sort of following the argument of the importance of the addition of the doctor's office on 501, why wouldn't you think of the two additions on the back of 503 in the same way, an accumulative thing over time. It's tough debating the relative value of these various additions, what is the story we are trying to tell. Is it the appearance from Main St and if that is it then he is fine with everything in the back being taken off. The doctor's office is it about more than that he doesn't have the answer yet.

Schwarz: He came to approve to lopping off the office and he has warmed to the idea of getting rid of the back of 503, on 501 he can go for. But now the doctor's office does tell a history it was a live/work and Main Street evolved from residential to solely being commercial and this was a step in that process. We are not supposed to look at what comes after. There is a lot of pavement in the plan.

Clayborne: Has no problem losing that piece because with the new hotel this site now becomes a campus and is not individual sites that you are evaluating and how they all work together, what is being proposed does it pretty well and he is in favor of what is presented.

Earnst: Agrees with what most people have said so far and do think that the side addition is incredible relevant to the history of that building and understands where Justin is coming from with the ideas of "what is the period of significance" Everything we review, we review from the street, new or old it's what you can see from the road, while it might not be the best approach that's what we have done in the past. She is okay with the rear demolitions.

Gastinger: These are not sites that are important for their originality but this is a neighborhood that in fact, it's the change that happened in this neighborhood that tells the story of Charlottesville and your building is going to be a part of that as well so acknowledging that change over time from residential to commercial to different racial makeup, to the commercial districts that we were built and destroyed, this is a place of flux and there should be room in our assessment to see that.

Sarafin: Room and allowance to evolve. Maybe the one piece because it does contribute to the streetscape with very significant Charlottesville history perhaps it is the doctor's office may be the on unique piece that gets saved.

Miller: said she doesn't love demolishing the back of 503, it could potentially work by demolishing everything but the barbershop she can support the demo behind 503 and the sleeping porch, and keep the doctor's office.

Miller moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, I move to find that the demolition of the (Mel's Barber Shop) structure at the rear of 425 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with these properties and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Balut seconded. Approved 9-0

Miller moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, I move to find that the demolition of the rear additions of 503 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with these properties and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Balut seconded. Approved 9-0

Miller moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, I move to find that the demolition of the rear addition and the re-opening of the enclosed sleeping porches on the west side of 501 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with these properties and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. [The BAR did not approve the demolition of the 1924 side brick addition.]

Balut seconded. Approved 7-2 with Graves and Clayborne opposed.

E. New Construction

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-09-01

425, 501, and 503 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 320175000, 320176000, and 320177000

Quirk Charlottesville, LLC, Owner/ Jennifer D. Mullen, Esq., Applicant

New Construction- Massing Approval

Danny MacNelly: The developers said they want to remove additions that were made after original construction. He said they're not very well done, frankly, and they detract from that original historic character.

Create a flower garden, seasonal garden, creating movement from the back and in the front of the hotel. Concrete curb, hedge, a gate, On commerce, art gallery faces, a series of street trees, along the muse, plantings, a vertical landscape along the edge, special planting of trees.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Schwarz: Looks like you are putting hotel rooms all the way along the sides and don't have a hold lot of setback, when Atlantic Futon is developed is that why you put that parking lot, but we will see windows along the side. Will there windows in the alley space.

Balut: can you tell me what the allowance is for the appurtenance of the zoning.

Answer: you can have 25% or less of the footprint of the building

Comments from the Public:

Brad Worrell, Starr Hill neighborhood: echo favorably comments engagement of the neighborhood, many voices, think that the things that are important to the neighborhood, insistent concern open driveway on the corner. One particular related to the Commerce Street façade. The development team is being thoughtful, less intrusive and important to the neighbor. All valets help the neighborhood a lot. Commerce Street is not a full street.

Comments from the BAR:

Sarafin: The lobby comes through and visually connects and you can actually look right to the to the wonderful slate roof of that original section of the Jefferson School and making that connection of the gallery really does work wonders and actually connecting with the neighborhood and what the Jefferson School does. That is particularly successful.

Balut: This is a great project and you all have done a great job, preserving the structure on site even with the provisions that we made for some demolition. The way that you've sensitively design the building around; and creating the rhythm and loves the idea of using that making one a coffee shop or a hair salon or a small localized for guest at the hotel but for people on West Main engaging it on a regular basis as well as the restaurant You have done a very nice job on the back side by not taking full advantage of the zoning envelope there and being more differential scale of the neighborhood. The art gallery is a perfect thing to do to engage but not overly engage back there. The western walk is a little small and you have already addressed some ways through lighting and vertical vegetarian it's a great path. A secret short cut.

Mohr: Much better than before. Gallery through is pedestrian street, west way opposes some challenges, sense of scale is very well done.

Schwarz: Agrees with everything that has been said and he finally understands what you mean when you say quiet. It works beautifully and hopefully you continue in that same direction. The alley way is a concern for him.

Miller: Said we need to vote on the massing tonight, the precedent images are great, and the existing hotel in Richmond gives us a lot of encouragement that you are following through with good design and high quality materials.

Clayborne: Agrees it will be a successful project and he is familiar with the Quirk in Richmond, been to a few events there and the restaurant is awesome.

Gastinger: About the Commerce Street side in this particular rendering, seems like a fairly fix sandwich above the windows and are assuming that is not on your structure or mechanical in the parapet wall but still seems

Answer: You mean above the windows by parapet above the windows it will probably be a couple feet and by the sandwich another 3 1/2 feet above that and above 6 inches to the deck and then taper it down around the edge.

Architecturally is has been successful. The front façade is quite elegant and in keeping with the scale of the structures he wonders how with that large opening how solar controls is going to happen in a way that it doesn't end up wanting to come back with really dark glass.

Sarafin: This is a massing discussion.

Gastinger: The application is really elegant and a great addition to Main Street is really wonderful how it incorporates and I didn't get to live through the previous innervation. It is very much appreciated how it treats the historic properties and public space. Continue to have engagement with the neighborhood related to Commerce Street and I recommend you take a little neighborhood tour out at the school which will be helpful and they will help you tell your story also. Thank you for the extremely thorough and very clear presentation.

Miller: Thank you for the 16 foot first floor

Sarafin: Full support of the massing, and the back drop treatment on West Main between the two historic houses is appreciated. You are more than capable of working around our indulgence of the doctor's office remaining in order to keep some of West Main's funkiness and it's a good thing to retain and you will work out the site plan around it, but generally speaking he is in full support of this project.

Graves moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the massing of the proposed building satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with these properties and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the massing only as submitted.

Sarafin seconded. Approved 9-0

G. Adjournment: 9:55 Motion by Schwarz, seconded Graves.