

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
September 19, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, chair; Justin Sarafin; Breck Gastinger; Stephan Balut; Carl Schwarz; Emma Earnst; Corey Clayborne (late)

BAR Members Absent: Tim Mohr, co-chair; Whit Graves

Staff Present: Scala, Mess, and McCray

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)
Mark Kavit, 406 Altamont Street, read a written statement pertaining to the Monticello Dairy project, about a public meeting that was scheduled for Sept. 16th, which was cancelled.
- 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 | August 14, 2017 | Regular Meeting |
| | August 15, 2017 | Regular Meeting |

Motion: Schwarz moved to approve the August 14, 2017 and August 15, 2017 minutes. Gastinger seconded. Approved (5-0-1, with Sarafin abstained).

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-08-05
419 East Main Street
Tax Parcel 530062000
Holly Ridge, LLC, Owner/ Clifford H. Fox, Applicant
Window Replacement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Cliff Fox, the applicant spoke and said that the balances on both of the windows have failed.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Schwarz: Is the 7/8" the only option for the muntin pattern?

Applicant: No

Gastinger: Is there any documentation about the original light pattern prior to 1980?

Applicant: I think the windows had been changed, and I have not done any additional research.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: Considering they are 1980 vintage, I see no problem in replacing them. I think we should condition it with we prefer a 5/8" muntins, if available. Also the glass needs to be clear (VLT 70 or more).

Sarafin: Are there preferences on the color? I like the coconut one.

Miller: I agree with staff that any of the three colors are appropriate. Also, since we have a number of window applications, I would like to add I am supportive of this application because these windows are not original.

Applicant: We are going to try and match the color as close as possible to what is there.

Motion: Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed replacement windows 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 application as submitted with preferences of 5/8" muntins (if available in this window product), not to use tinted glass (VLT 70 or more is permitted), and the BAR is supportive of all three color choices. Sarafin seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-06-05

632 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520114000

Kaitlyn Marie Henry, Owner/ Rick Uhler, Uhler and Company, Applicant

Front Porch Addition and Window Replacement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Rick Uhler, the applicant, spoke and reiterated that the owners would like to have the porch on the front of the house.

Questions by the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions by the Board:

Sarafin: In the design presented, are the additional columns replicating the form of the two original?

Applicant: Yes, we will replicate them exactly.

Gastinger: It appears from the drawings that the front portico is extended. Are the two pilasters in the drawing staying?

Applicant: Yes.

Balut: You are pulling the pediment forward, are you going to reuse that or rebuild it?

Applicant: We would like to rebuild it, exactly as it is.

Balut: What is the current material of the raised entry?

Applicant: Right now it is bluestone. The new front porch would be wood.

Balut: What about the steps?

Applicant: It is also bluestone, and those would stay.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: Reads guidelines for porches. While I appreciate the applicant wants a porch, I think the guidelines are clear and a porch is not appropriate for this structure. I would request you block the window from the inside, so it still looks like a functional window in the exterior.

Schwarz: To add on that, our guidelines make it almost impossible for the addition of a porch. The proportions of the beams are weird and the distance between the columns are not proportionally correct. You are using classical elements, but they are not proportionally correct.

Balut: I agree with the sentiment and the desire for the front porch, but I think our guidelines are very clear, that the addition of a porch does not comply with several of our guidelines, so I cannot support a front porch. However, in this case I could consider removing the window, because it adds to the already existing asymmetry of that elevation. I think the better course of action is to do exactly what the guideline says which is to keep it, but have it be non-functional.

Earnst: I agree with what has been said previously. I like the idea of the porch spanning, but the exercise reveals it does not work, and I am sorry for that. Regarding the window, I think it makes sense to treat it as it is and to follow what the guidelines say.

Gastinger: I would like to note that the reason the guidelines are there is because it is a historic structure, that talks about when it was built, and redesigning that façade changes that story. This porch simply does not fit with the character of this house. For me, making the porch addition appear completely new, so there was no way to confuse the historic entrance, might be a possibility.

Schwarz: One thing that might help is find some precedent for porches that have been expanded.

Balut: I wonder if you might think of creative ways to create shade, because it seems most of the problem is with the roof line. Part of the problem is maintaining the historic façade with a porch.

Sarafin: I do not feel strongly about the window. If it is filled in I think a reveal makes sense.

The applicant requested a deferral for the front porch.

Schwarz moved to accept the applicant's deferral for the front porch. Balut seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

Note: The applicant agreed to repair, rather than replace, all the windows in the original part of the house.

Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed window removal on the north side of the original house satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the request, with the caveat that the brick (infill) is recessed. Sarafin seconded. The motion was approved (5-1, with Miller opposed).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-12-03
1600 Grady Avenue
Tax Parcel 050110000
Neighborhood Investments-PC, LP, owner/ Henningsen Kestner Architects, Inc, applicant
Revised Landscape Plan

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Richard Spursman spoke.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

No question from the Board.

Comments from the Public:

Jeremy Kaplan: I think the ginkgoes would do better.

Comments from the Board:

Gastinger: Sweet Bay Magnolias were one of my suggestions in the last presentation, and given there was a design intension to wrap that block with magnolias this was a compromise that kept some of the textures and flowering characteristics, while still trying to achieve a little more openness and airiness to the block. I am in favor of the plan as submitted.

Sarafin: Very generally, over the years we have talked a lot about this property, and it is nice to see real attention being paid to the landscape here.

Miller: I was going to add, I think the ginkgoes would be better because I think it would be better to have a street tree instead of keeping the texture, relooking at it maybe if we could change the left side sweet bay magnolia to a ginkgo, since there is more walking activity towards Grady Avenue.

Schwartz: I like the ginkgoes because they will eventually be an overarching street tree, and it would be nice to have them all be the same street species.

Gastinger: I would like to point out that the sweet bay magnolias are planted in close proximity to the building and if you are planning on putting in a ginkgo tree, you will almost have to put in vestigios ginkgo, which I do not think is the tree or the look everyone is imagining. All of them would be appropriate to our guidelines.

Balut: I think I am happy to approve it as submitted.

Earnst: I agree, it is fine as submitted.

Motion: Gastinger moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed landscape plan satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Earnst seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

D. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-09-04

327 6th Street SW

Tax Parcel 290188000

Ryan L. Rooney and Kevin G. Badke, Owner/Chris Crehan, Applicant

Window Replacement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Chris Crehan, 331 7 ½ Street, is here on behalf of the home owner. As far as I can tell, all of the windows from the previous application, all of the windows on that house have been replaced at some point in time with wood sash and vinyl inserts. So the original window framing is in place. With the house settling over time, because of the way they replaced the windows, they have actually become inoperable. I think this is both an aesthetic improvement and a functional improvement.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Schwarz: If you re-frame the window, will the wooden trim go back exactly as it was?

Applicant: Yes, it has to. The advantage of reframing the windows is the trim can once again become prominent as opposed to the stucco.

Schwarz: So it won't make the windows smaller?

Applicant: No.

Clayborne arrived.

Miller: Are you also working on the roof.

Applicant: Shakes head no.

Balut: Is it your intension to match the trim as closely as possible?

Applicant: Yes, I think the bigger problem is finding a uniform trim for the house, since currently the trim is all different. I have no problem replicating the beaded detail.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Gastinger: I am thankful for getting to know a little bit more about this house and the investment that is going into it.

Schwarz: I think since all the windows have been replace and/or currently missing, I do not see a problem with new windows. From what you have described it sounds appropriate. I think it would be interesting to see what the original windows looked like.

Applicant: The big debate is whether to go with the more cottage style six-over-something, versus what was originally there which was probably a two-over-two pattern. I think a two-over-two pattern would solve most of the problems on the house, the only place it would be slightly awkward is the two windows above the front porch.

Schwarz: So you think in the pictures we are seeing, the windows have been replaced?

Applicant: I wouldn't have thought so, but it is hard to tell. After working in Fifeville a lot of these houses were put together by people of modest means, grabbing what they could. It is tough to say whether that was something redone in 1930 or if it was original.

Balut: What exactly is the plan for the windows?

Applicant: I am thinking two-over-two, so the windows are uniform, except for the two windows over the porch where I might go with a four-over-four.

Schwarz: If the six-over-two, found in the 1980 pictures are the original windows, then even though it is quirky, I think that pattern should be kept.

Balut: I think it is appropriate to replace the windows. I think replacing them all to be consistent throughout the house is great, you seem to have great knowledge with what you are doing and working with them, so thank you for your detailed presentation. I would say to pick the most dominate trim style and then use that for the rest of the house to create uniformity.

Schwarz: There are some windows in the back and the side that looked like they were pinched in to support standard size windows. Will those be expanded back out?

Applicant: To my knowledge those were framed to those sizes, so that is in fact the original size of those windows.

Miller: Is it a preference to install the new windows prominent to the stucco.

Sarafin: It sounds like the applicant is very knowledgeable about the vernacular architecture in Fifeville area, and I support this application as submitted.

Miller: I do have some concerns about the roof, and I would like the applicant to come to a future meeting to discuss that, because I think it is outside admin approval.

Motion: Balut moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed replacement windows satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the clarification that all the windows will be consistent in trim (pick a trim from the existing windows and then match that around the house, keep the one-over-one at the front right elevation, and all the other windows will be consistent in glazing (there is a consensus of two-over-two), except for the two windows in the front door, which should be four-over-four. Sarafin seconded. The motion was approved (7-0).

The Chair had concerns about the roof replacement, and requested that the applicant appear at a future meeting to discuss.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-09-08
632 Preston Place
Tax Parcel 050124000
JRB Preston Place, LLC, Owner/Robert Berndt, Applicant
Window Replacement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Robert Berndt, the applicant, spoke. He made one correction, the larger windows upstairs are 8-over-1, to replace the smaller downstairs windows with this would make the proportion wrong, so they are requesting a 6-over-1 window.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Miller: How does the window wear, does it change color?

Applicant: Not it is fiberglass not vinyl, so the color doesn't change. It is restorable as well, so if 50-100 years from now you think the color has faded, you can paint it.

Schwarz (to Mary Joy): Should this property be surveyed and included?

Mary Joy: It was probably just overlooked, it is quite a large district and the property is far back from the road.

Miller: Do you have any kind of survey for the original windows?

Applicant: No, we don't.

Miller: Have you thought about repairing any of the original windows on the second floor?

Applicant: No, because we were looking for continuity.

Comments from the Public:

Christine Colley , 611 Preston Place, neighbor, read the two public written comments (Beth Turner (630 Preston Place) and her own) that were e-mailed to the BAR, which stipulate some of their concerns with replacing the windows in this brick colonial revival house. An additional comment that should be pointed out is when the old wavy glass is being replaced; the new glass creates a much different look (i.e. in the shadow lines and reflection)

Comments from the Board:

Miller: Read out the window guidelines. She would be fine with replacing the bottom windows which are not original, but would be for replacing and repairing the original windows.

Balut: Just to be clear you are proposing to replace any window that is not original, but to repair the original windows, unless it can be proven (with a comprehensive survey) that the windows are beyond repair. This makes sense to me, I know that continuity is important, but our guidelines are clear.

Clayborne: I guess I am the odd guy out, but I do support the application. I do not think you should be penalized for wanting to be energy efficient. Also, I am familiar with the product, and fully support it.

Miller: Often times the window itself is not causing energy inefficiency; it is the structure around the window, so if you take the window out and repair the structure then old windows can be just as energy efficient as new ones. One of the things we could do is approve the replacement of all of the windows on the bottom floor, and then the applicant can defer the second story windows and come back with a survey, the BAR can make its decision based on that survey.

Schwarz: I agree. You can return with a survey if you think there is no possible way to repair the window, but in my experience, with this particular board, that is going to be a tough thing to argue.

Gastinger: I am in complete support of the lower window replacements. The thing that makes it muddy for me is currently it is considered a non-contributing building in the district.

Clayborne: That was a factor for me as well.

Earnst: I want to see a survey before I am comfortable voting on all of the windows.

The applicant requested a deferral in reference to the second story windows.

Balut: I would like to point out if you chose to repair the windows, exactly as they are, then you will not have to come back in front of the BAR, since that is considered maintenance.

Motion: Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed replacement windows on the basement level satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road- University Circle- Venable ADC district, and that the BAR approves the replacement of the

basement windows as proposed (Marvin Integrity windows and the 6/1 muntin pattern.) Balut seconded. The motion was approved (7-0).

Sarafin moved to accept the applicant's deferral on the upper level windows. Balut seconded. The motion was approved (7-0). If the applicant chooses to repair, rather than replace, the upper windows, that may be approved administratively.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-09-09
1111 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 100055000
University of Virginia Medical School Foundation, Owner/Linda Weldon, Applicant
Basement Window Replacement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

No questions from the Board.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: She is asking to replace 1985 windows, I see no issues.

Sarafin: I am in full support of this. It seems like basic maintenance.

Miller: Also, the original windows were not there to begin with.

Balut moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed replacement windows satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Clayborne seconded. The motion was approved (7-0).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-09-03
Coal Tower (East Water Street)
Tax Parcel 570157A00
Choco Cruz, LLC, Owner/LPDA, Applicant
C&O Row Park

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Jessica Mauzy with LPDA, the coal tower is an important part of the park, but it is also separate from this project. In the future, I know the developer is going to come in front of the BAR to discuss the coal tower and the building behind it, but that is not tonight.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Balut: It is interesting to see you before the building people. Are you trying to establish the plantings in the park?

Applicant: We are just very prompt.

Schwarz: When did all the metal come off the tower? Is that something that should have happened.

Mary Joy: That came off when the tower was designated. It came off because they had problems with people climbing up there.

Gastinger: I have a question about the green tone. I assume it is lawn.

Applicant: Yes.

Miller: This area that says reclaimed railroad track and plan view. That is really just railroad tracks with sidewalk in between.

Applicant: Yes. We don't have any evidence that the old railroad tracks are still there.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Clayborne: It seems like it will be a neat space.

Gastinger: I agree the landscape will bring a lot to the space, and allow people to enjoy the structure more safely. A couple of additional comments I have are 1) accessibility, and getting down into the space; 2) safety with the gravel under the swing pad. In general, I think where the plan is the most successful and exciting is where you have used material that are within the context of the coal tower, such as the Corten, the gravel, the concrete, the reuse of the train tracks. It is where that logic breaks down for me that I would urge you to continue to look, for instance the lawn looks quite quiet in this rendering and I think that could end up looking quite manicured and I think that could clash with the industrial feel and that roughness. That clash carries over into the planting palette as well.

Applicant: It is split into two terraces, there is the upper level which has both structures on it and then the back structure has a wall. The idea is this park is for the residents who live on either side, so they have entrances in both the front and the back. They can access the park, by going out their back doors. We originally thought it was going to be a dog park, but decided it would be more useful as a throughway for the residence.

Balut: Could you clarify the types of trees you are thinking about using?

Applicant: The owner asked for a conceptual plan, but then when I came in and spoke with Mary Joy, she said we would have to be a bit more specific about the plantings, so we came up with some very broad ideas, like where shade gardens needed to be, where it would make sense to plant trees. They requested some plants that would indicate seasons, that is why we decided to plant some of the perennials, and bulbs that create more color. As far as the trees, we used the large symbol for the shade trees, because we haven't figured out the precise grading yet.

Balut: I think the concept is great, but we need more specifics before we approve the COA.

Motion: Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed landscaping plan in concept satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this individually protected property and that the BAR approves the application as submitted in concept, but would like to see specific details such as plants species, location, lighting, and signage (if included) to come back to the BAR at a later date. Sarafin seconded. The motion was approved (7-0).

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-09-05
1400 Wertland Avenue
Tax Parcel 090074000
Fourteenth Street Mall, LLC, Owner/ Alberto Namnum, Applicant
Storefront Alterations

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Sarafin: Will the can lights remain?

Applicant: Probably not.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Sarafin: It would be nice to have a window in that building. I don't think there is a window in that space.

Applicant: I think we are also doing skylights. They have a permit for the interior work, so that has already been approved.

Miller: I think we should have been part of that approval.

Applicant: They may not put them in.

Sarafin: It is probably the only place left in Charlottesville where you could go into and not know it was day time.

Schwarz: We do need to see the light fixture at some point.

Gastinger: I think it looks good and makes sense. It resolves the corner.

Motion: Sarafin moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed exterior alterations satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Rd-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with lighting fixture details to be circulated by email for administrative approval at a later date. Earnst seconded. The motion was approved (7-0).

10. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-09-07

118 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280016001-009

M&O Corporation, Owner/ Jim Boyd, Grimm and Parker, Applicant

Rooftop Additions

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Motion: The applicant is requesting a preliminary discussion, so no motion is needed.

The concept seems appropriate, and additional views have been provided, which are helpful.

If the BAR is fine with this proposal, the applicant could prepare final scaled drawings for approval.

11. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-09-06

810 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 300002000

Allan H Cadgene, Owner/ Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects, Applicant

Union Station Expansion

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Bruce Wardell, the applicant, spoke. Two things, there is a modification, which is the rooftop will not be an outside terrace or deck. Amtrak does not lease outside second story decks. In terms of configuration of the back corner of the site (where the baggage claim is), there are certain requirements Amtrak has to accommodate the second train scheduled to come in sometime in the next year or two, which is linked to the improvements to the station. There is a minimum square footage of area that needs to be available, and the land we have available to us is very limited. There is a property line in front of the station, there is a setback from the rail line on the south side, and in terms of respecting the historic character of the existing station we didn't feel like it was appropriate to put anything on the north or east side of the building. We have accommodated the additional waiting area by a second story and an elevator, in order to make that space accessible. So you can see we are limited in the ground area to put that square footage. We would like to meet all of the suggestions from staff, but we a little cornered in space for the site plan.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Sarafin: The area that forms the triangle off to the west, that is off limits correct?

Wardell: Yes. That is also remote from the station.

Miller: Is Wild Wings Café a tenant of the same owner? I was wondering if based on our first guideline for additions where it says attempt to accommodate it in the original building.

Wardell: He has a tenant in the original space.

Gastinger: When you mentioned you no longer needed the guardrails. I can see why on the hyphen that is much improved, however, on the train side that guardrail helped mitigate the scale difference between the one story and two story. I was wondering how you are going to approach that?

Wardell: That little piece is making up the required square footage. We were dealing with it as a glass edge, as a very detailed modern piece. We might detail that channeled cornice, and make it very heavy. I think we would try to preserve the transparency of that piece, which helps reduce the scale of the main hall we are creating.

Gastinger: Can you tell us a little more about the minimum square footage. Is that a numbers game with Amtrak versus a true functional space.

Wardell: I can tell you anecdotally the station is currently significantly overused. There isn't a place for people to wait, there isn't a baggage handling area, there are some long term needs that the train station has. Specifically for the second train there are standard allowances for certain areas that allow for certain levels of passenger traffic. It is linked to the projected usage of that second train. So those square footages are linked to the projected passenger traffic.

Gastinger: Is there any further site plan review that Amtrak is undertaking in terms of pedestrian flows to the tracks, or to and from the building, or consideration of other covered areas or waiting area?

Wardell: We have done an accessibility study for the entire Amtrak site. Amtrak has done a comprehensive accessibility analysis of what areas around the station didn't meet accessibility standards. We turned that into a preliminary document that looks at the type of investment it would take to meet those standards. There are some larger scale studies that are being done in relationship to how that property is developed that could change the way the station is used, but that is way down the line.

Schwarz: On the spreadsheet you have some zeros, is that because certain spaces were combined?

Wardell: The zeros are things that don't occur in the current station (on the left side). Where the zeros occur on the right side is Amtrak coming back to us and saying they don't actually need those functions.

Clayborne: Is the existing parking adequate?

Wardell: Yes, I think there are 84 spaces that are allocated specifically for the station.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: I know we can't suggest the owner evict a tenant, but it would be great to just turn this back into a train station. There is a perfectly good (square footage wise) train station that exists, which happens to be used by a restaurant. If Amtrak is going to pay for the addition, they could also pay for the renovation.

Wardell: The key is Amtrak is not paying for the addition. They said we need all this extra space, but cannot pay anymore rent. So the funding for the expansion to the train station is searching for other funding sources.

Schwarz: So the primary motive is to keep Amtrak?

Wardell: Yes, the Lynchburg to Washington line is one of the heaviest used lines on the east coast, that is why a second one is coming in.

Miller: To your point, whoever is paying for an addition could also potentially pay for a renovation.

Schwarz: No one is going to do this out of charity, Amtrak is going to make money off of this, Alley is going to make money off of this.

Wardell: Right, but this discussion is not about the appropriateness of the addition. This discussion is a strategy about how the city negotiates with Amtrak. The scope should be about architectural appropriateness, not about leasing a space.

Schwarz: Right, it just goes back to that first bullet point that Melanie mentioned in our guidelines for additions under function and size, which is, “attempt to accommodate needed functions within the existing structure without building an addition. Also, limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building.”

Wardell: We have a train station, which is a specific function. There is a building next door which has a different function, which is not a train station. To suggest that the other building become a train station is not meeting that requirement.

Miller: Except for the fact that, that was its traditional function. It is actually surprisingly unaltered from that picture in 1916.

Wardell: But that is not a discussion about the proposal that is in front of you.

Gastinger: Is it the same owner?

Wardell: Yes.

Schwarz: Moving on from that, even though it is a valid point as to whether an addition is even permitted or appropriate. My comments about the addition that is in front of me, it seems to draw a lot of attention to itself, and it is not differential to the existing train station. It is a nice design, but it has a lot going on that does relate to the train station. I know you are trying to follow the guideline of not copying the historic fabric, but you have a neoclassical Romanesque temple type building, then you have your glass and steel modern portion on that. None of those relate back to any of the forms on the existing train station, except for the brackets.

Wardell: Given the volume we need to accommodate, the intent was that addition which was done in the 1990s, was that we would then bring a third building using the same language of having three volumes connected by one story hyphens. So that is how we tried to fit it into the existing context.

Schwarz: With the change in material and change in architectural language it seems like too much change.

Wardell: Is it the scale of the window?

Schwarz: The full arch on it for one, and the detailing. It just seems too different from the rest of the complex.

Gastinger: Some of what you are seeing Carl, I see as a bit of a distinction, which makes it clearly not part of the original assemblage. I find the composition of the façade on the east side, quite nice. I like the play of depth of the façade of a fairly simple structure, which provides a welcoming and much improved waiting space. The comment I would make is, I think there needs to be a greater site plan consideration. The flows have always been awkward and weird in my experience, it is not always clear. For this new waiting room, a consideration of the south façade is critical. That entrance is going to be Charlottesville’s front façade. I wonder if it could stretch further along the façade, just to create clarity for the passengers getting off the train.

Miller: Does the train from Lynchburg to Washington go under the bridge, or come from both directions?

Wardell: That train goes north to south.

Clayborne: The only comment I have is, is if there was a way to give the new baggage claim a little more importance, since you have the entrance to Wild Wings and the two entries to the Amtrak station, maybe just evaluate that a bit more.

Wardell: I agree having a bit more detail on that is more appropriate.

Gastinger: Would it be possible to put the baggage handling door on the west façade?

Wardell: Maybe, we could look at that.

Gastinger: If that could happen you might be able to bring more light and welcome-ness into that façade, that currently is pretty blank.

Clayborne: Does the elevator run have any impact on the skylight?

Wardell: No, I do not think so.

Miller: This doesn’t have any bearing on the addition, did the north/south tracks move over time?

Chip Boyals (member of the public): Not to our knowledge. To clarify a couple of things, this is an increase of about a train and a half. The existing Lynchburg to DC train will begin running to Roanoke on Halloween. So there will be an additional capacity on the current train for the riders from Roanoke. Sometime soon, there will be a totally new train that runs from Lynchburg to DC. Then there is the Chicago train that I think runs three times a week which is the only train that uses that other track.

Schwarz: Since the baggage area has to have that many square feet, could it wrap in back of Wild Wings?

Wardell: Theoretically it could, but we felt putting in in the corner would violate the integrity of that building.

Schwarz: It just seems to me that I would rather stick it on the back rather than seeing it in the front.

Wardell: If we are distinguishing that south elevation it might help to treat that with a different material or different texture, so the volume of the new addition gets broken down.

Gastinger: Can it have a window?

Wardell: It is possible, but we have to run these changes up the food chain to Amtrak, but that is not a bad idea.

Miller: Would there ever be any thought of having a covered platform?

Wardell: There is, but that is a whole separate funding source and jurisdiction. There is an entity that covered both the tracks and the platform, the Department of Railroad and Public Transportation. There are discussions about the whole southern platform which began because the platform needs improvements because it is not handicap accessible. The jurisdiction happens at that property line, same thing on the north-south tracks.

Gastinger: Do you have any more information on the long-term need? Is this boxing us into a corner, or is your addition expandable?

Wardell: We have done some larger scale studies of the area, and this sites relationship to Main Street. The timing and relationship of the timing and the function of this station and any additional development that happens on this site is so speculative, we need to focus on what this thing is. When I say short term, I mean 20-25 years, not 5-7 years.

Balut: The massing is appropriate, it contributes to the overall composition of buildings. I think it is quite harmonious. I especially like that funky glass corner, and that helps reduce the scale from the tracks. I would prefer if the baggage on the north wall could come back a few feet, because currently where it is coming up flush, I think that is the worse place that could be. Ideally it wouldn't protrude at all. It becomes quite interesting as a collection of buildings and forms, one thing is the roof pitch on the existing buildings are all shallower than what you are proposing, and I correct on that?

Wardell: The roof pitch on the addition matches the roof pitch on that little projection on the entrance of the existing station.

Balut: I see that, maybe there isn't a good way to resolve that. When comparing it to the neoclassical gable ended structure of the original building, your roof pitch looks steep. To me the difference in pitch looks funny. I also agree with Carl in the sense that I appreciate you took the brackets over into the new addition. I like the semicircular arch alone, but it is in contrast with the existing shallower swooping arches (the dominate arch element), and it doesn't create a symbiotic relationship between the old and new.

Gastinger: I have one other comment about the west façade of the second story, at the end of the gable, across from the big arch window. We think of that façade as not being that visible, but depending on where you get off of that train that could be quite prominent. I wonder if in that space you could use a mirror treatment. I also wonder what possibilities could be opened up if the break room, baggage claim, and stairs were flipped. This would create some windows in the break room, and make the baggage claim more interior. That might help with the southern façade and some of its uses.

Wardell: Yes, but then you need to flip the elevator and cut out some of that glass area. We were trying to extend that glass portion.

Schwarz: I am going to agree with Breck and you, I think extending that glass area will help, because the back is a little chopped up some. I wonder with the brick forms if you don't try and match the older forms of the building, but instead try to make those more contemporary.

Wardell: We had sketched that, and we could look at that again, but we were nervous about making it a modern addition. We wanted to make the appendage that still exists disappear. We felt it was risky to do a modernish type of building in this context.

Schwarz: I feel the brick will stand out as new and then you also have the new language with the glass and steel. I am just thinking out loud...

Wardell: What is your opinion about the unpainted brick?

Schwarz: Our guidelines say specifically say not to paint brick. That is why I am saying to try and figure out a way to avoid the brick all together. That portion is what is bothering me; it is close, but not quite.

Wardell: I hadn't thought of stucco. Perhaps it could be detailed in a way that the mortar almost matches the brick, so as to create a more homogenous appearance, which is closer to the other two buildings. That would also make it feel like a more modern design, but we might make those final decisions with sample panels on the site.

Balut: If you could find a more natural grey clayish brick, that way it would have the same material and texture, but with a more modern feel.

Miller: You do lose most of the texture of the brick with it being painted.

Earnst: For me personally, I do not think the brick is the right choice. There is over 100 years difference between the old building and the building you are adding on. I would like to see something totally different. There is brick and white trim, and then the new pieces are these black steel looking things. They are decorative elements, but you can see how they relate to each other and the neighborhood. I wonder if you could play with something that is a little more industrial, that fits better with the railroad. You are doing that with the glass piece on the back.

Balut: I agree, if you find the brick isn't working go with something more contemporary.

Sarafin: Keep some of the forms, but mix it up with materiality. I am trying to reconcile the round headed arch in the new waiting room, I actually really like it, it looks like a Roman bath window, and it recalls the real historic train stations. I really like that, but the round head is jarring when looking at everything else, the historic photograph, the 90s addition, everything has a flattened arch. The rendering show the upper level window on the original train station (north and south facades), which is now the restaurant, as being round headed, but if you look in the photographs you have a Palladian window with an extra fan light over the top. Without being pedantic, I wonder if that kind of arch treatment rendered in some different materials might tie this together a bit better with the existing architectural vocabulary.

Wardell: What I am hearing form the comments is that this larger volume's details should more closely relate to the other larger volume's details and let the little train station be what it is in-between those two, and let the two volumes mimic each other.

Sarafin: When I say the 90s piece I am referring to the single story corner piece in the foreground.

Schwarz: I am curious; does the detail of the mouse-tooth course (where the bricks are at a 45 degree angle) go around the entire complex? I am not sure you need to keep that, but it is not something that you picked up. This is one of the preexisting simple details that occur around the entire complex.

Motion: This is a preliminary discussion, so no motion is needed. The proposed addition is well designed and appropriate in scale and materials, except for the addition to the baggage handling area.

The front wall of the baggage/handling addition should be pulled back behind the façade of the former Union Station façade, and preferably also behind the front façade of the Amtrak Station. The width should be pulled back so it does not cover the front façade of the Amtrak Station, nor the rear façade of the former Union Station.

Staff noted the front wall of the baggage/handling addition should be pulled back behind the façade of the former Union Station façade, and preferably also behind the front façade of the Amtrak Station. The width should be pulled back so it does not cover the front façade of the Amtrak Station, nor the rear façade of the former Union Station.

Schwartz noted the addition is not deferential to the historic building.

Gastinger said greater site plan consideration is needed- where do you enter the building? The west façade of 2nd story should match east façade because it is visible from trains.

Balut said massing and composition of buildings is appropriate. Noted roof pitch differences; no good way to resolve. Agreed with CAS that arch is a “near miss” should be shallower to match segmental arches over windows.

There was discussion how to articulate the addition so it is distinct from rest of building. Perhaps gray brick with matching mortar. Mousetooth detail on existing building was discussed.

The owner should be asked if the original Union Station (now Wild Wings) could revert back to a station use, eliminating the need for an addition.

12. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-09-01

946 Grady Avenue

Tax Parcel 310060000

Dairy Holdings, LLC, Owner/ Chris Henry, Applicant

Partial Demolition

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Motion: This is a preliminary discussion, to orient the BAR to the whole project. If the BAR indicates that they will approve the demolition, then the applicant will proceed to develop the plans. In any case, the dairy should be well-documented by the applicant, with photos and measured drawings, prior to demolition. The BAR asked if the small house on Wood Street could be documented.

This was a combined discussion with the next item on the agenda. The BAR did not have a problem with the proposed demolitions of roof appendages. They said to look into maintaining the building corner on rear east side so that you can tell where the building ended. Ration new openings on 10th Street – look for old windows to reuse.

13. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-09-02

946 Grady Avenue

Tax Parcel 310060000

Dairy Holdings, LLC, Owner/ Wendie Charles, Applicant

Additions

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report. Mary Joy stated the original central two-story portion and the flanking one-story portions are dated to 1937 and the additions being presented tonight are the

most important pieces in the development because their designs will frame and enhance the older building.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Chris Henry, Stony Point Design Build, said this is phase one of a multi-phase project, and we'll be back here many more times. This is kicking off the rehabilitation of the existing dairy building for what we think will be an exciting mix of new retail and a new office space.

Lee Quill: from Cunningham Quill: In the rehabilitation work, we can bring this building back so people think about it a little bit differently and we are reshaping suburbia and positioning the western frontage with a mixed used project. This project has a real potential for putting this building back into the forefront of Charlottesville. The first phase would include two additions, one of which would encroach on the protected portion of the property. The second would be three stories tall, with a parking garage below. We do a lot of historic adaptive reuse in the Washington region, and we're very excited about working down here. The Monticello Dairy was built in 1937, and parts of it have been deemed individually protected property.

The request is to demolish a second-story addition that was built in 1959, as well as the parts of the building that are not covered by the properties designation. This site offers the City of Charlottesville a unique opportunity to retain a building of historic significance, and reposition the site's mixed-use infill redevelopment as a catalyst of sensitive infill development along the Preston Avenue corridor and the northern edge of 10th & Page Neighborhood. The applicant explained how the existing second floor office space will be restored and expanded with new contemporary steel and glass additions to the east, west, and south. The deck at McGrady's will be removed.

Two restaurant spaces will be built in the first phase. A skylight atop what used to be the dairy's cold storage room will be refurbished. I think that will be an amazing feature and will bring light back into the building. There is a large vehicle repair shop on West Street is also part of the property but is not slated for redevelopment at this time. He said on the top and on the back, we're adding office space. The whole first floor is going to be retail. Mr. Quill said future phases will step down in size as they approach smaller structures in the 10th & Page Neighborhood.

Gastinger: I have no issues with the roof tops removals.

Miller: Neither do I.

Balut: This is a really exciting project, and it's clear you have already put a lot of thought into it at the very beginning and your approach seems very considerate and ambitious and creative.

Schwarz: The way you were slicing the back off the 1947 portion, if you are only building to the edge and not coming all the way out maybe that could be interesting. There's a lot of fear, and there's nothing the neighborhood can really do a lot about this project, but there's a lot of fear.

Applicant: We will keep the corner of the old building and turn it back.

Michael Day: We have been looking at the advantage of how we can get this office building snuggled up to the back of the building. We know we can take off the back of the building but

there is not going to be a lot of that fabric left because of how much of that masonry has been removed. You may be only looking at 10-15 feet of brick wall on the corner versus we can take that off and replicate that corner again and it allows us to free up a lot of what we will do from an office standpoint, and from the size of the footprint we can get a good circulation for a working office.

Schwarz: Take the wall back and take everything you want, but leave that little fin on the wall.

Applicant: Having the building come back turn the corner with the original corner and then stop so the corner is retained.

Gastinger: Keep the entire façade on that street.

Day: We may try to maintain a little sliver from a width and proportion standpoint and it may not work visually and architecturally, we may want to play with just how thick that needs to be and how it is impacted when we put our addition. You can see where the line of the architecture of the proposed is going through stories so having that little lip come onto the architecture is something for us to study.

Applicant: We will bring you some thoughts on that so you will have something to react to.

Schwarz: You will end up with the sliced off end of historic fabric.

Applicant: We do a lot of visual modeling, 3D modeling, and actual physical modeling.

Gastinger: It is hard to feel too precious about that rear façade that has been covered up and not been part of this experience, but I agree that poling that corner does suggest how large that building was originally.

Applicant: If we think of something else that makes it look weird and strange, we will bring that forward and ask what you think about this. Again we are concerned that a dialogue has been formed by this body.

Gastinger: Are you anticipating that would also be the entrance to the lower garage since there is a ramp there.

Day: No we are not. We are using that as an opportunity just to bring more entrances into the site and maintaining that entrance allows people to get down to the basement area as well. I put in an elevator core so circulation is centralized.

Applicant: On the corner we have the north/south access and the east/west access, with the north/south being the main pedestrian connector. We are bringing the office addition on the back so that the historical building will stay intact, which we will use as the food hall. The residential and office addition is which have a more modern design, will be on the top and the back.

Schwarz: This doesn't show up on your plan, but I assume at some point the little house on the site is going to be demolished. We have no control over that, but he thought he read that it was the manager's house from the dairy. I hope before you demolish it, you would allow someone to document it.

Applicant: We will dig some more and see if there is something there. If you have to take away something that has been altered document as much as we have right now so that you can have for the archives.

Schwarz: Preservation Piedmont does that document before demolition.

Sarafin: Although as part of this project we would ask you all to document it.

Ernest: You will probably have better equipment.

Day: These parapets represent load bearing elements, and we want to preserve as much of the interior as possible. We will take advantage of the load bearing walls, and incorporate them into our new design.

Applicant: It's been added onto so many times and altered in so many ways over years. There are some interesting conditions inside. In the entry area is the old building as it was, and opening up the second floor, so the first and second floor would get more height, which would bring more light to the entrance area, potentially creating a sitting area inside.

Balut: Have you looked at the foundations to access how well they can handle this additional load?

Day: We have geo-tech reports, structural reports to test all of the foundations in addition to do borings out at the site. We know we have multiple slab elevations on the inside of the building we are looking at and how to re-enforce and stabilize. The structure engineer that we have been working with is working with us on Caton's Walk and has 21 years of experience.

Schwarz: For better or worse, once you guys have enclosed it, it is fair game and you might have issues with it.

Balut: That is just a kind of back of the whole mess right, they are defining characteristics and you are sensitive to that. Programmatically if you feel there are some adjustments that have to be made, that is fine, but preserving the fabric of the old building as much as possible for the sake of telling the story and maintaining the narrative is crucial.

Gastinger: Are you guys going after tax credits?

Henry: No, we wouldn't be able to build an office building.

Miller: You wouldn't be able to build an office building, but you could potentially restore the dairy part.

Scala: It is not listed

Applicant: This is a chance to put this building back into the forefront of Charlottesville for people to say wow; we are not just going to tear things out.

Gastinger: Would you describe where the entrance to the parking lot is planned.

Applicant: The entrance to the parking is coming in right off the alley

Day: Explained the parking [difficult to hear because he did not speak into the mic]

Applicant: Wants to fed back of the idea of taking out bay one and bay five, the end bays of the entry pavilion and creating a glass double door; major entrances into the front areas converted back to a more pedestrian scale, where people can sit. These doors would mimic the large glass areas and leave the clear storage above it; it's about 7 or 8 foot.

Balut: Feels this is an exciting project. The teams approach seems sincere, creative, and ambitious and he is excited to be part of it. However, the guidelines state the front of the building is to be maintained as much as possible, but in thinking back to the holistic way you are approaching this, you are really trying to maintain the integrity of this building in such a strong way. Since there are already openings and if they are articulated in a way that if you re-create those main entrance in a way that is shown here and if you create those entrances in a way that they are subservient to the original integrity of that main entrance and kind of minimalist in glass and you are not changing the openings and he thinks it's perfectly appropriate for what you are asking for and it's clear you all have a really good sensitivity to what the board is expecting. I think it can be successful. I don't have a problem with moving things on top, because they are small minor appendages and I don't think they are defining characteristic elements of the integrity of the building. However, could more research be done to clarify that there is nothing significant about those buildings.

Scala: When it was designated as a individually protect property we referred to that map that showed the dates of the black and white drawing, it was determined just looking at the building trying to decide what was the most important part of it they just decided to keep the front part and the side wings. They are all different dates but are all kind of similarly designed so that is why the back part was not in our purview.

Balut: Do we know if there is anything significant back there?

Scala: This drawing is pretty definitive and has all of the dates, the back parts might be as old as some of the lower parts, but they are not included in the designation.

Balut: Thank you for clarifying that; so in recapping the roof, demolition and the back, I think the little sliver you were speaking about cutting out, a good point about maintaining the corner to help tell the story of the original structure. If there is nothing special about that corner; and you have a convincing argument about why it wouldn't work architecturally he would be happy to consider it but from a general standpoint, Schwarz is exactly right.

Applicant: We are taking a look how retail works in this. We are going to request additional openings, he wants to flag that and ask for your feedback obviously we know that if you don't have to put a door in, then what do you do. We are planning on moving the deck and we do have one door going into the lower level on the east side which is a little low right now, it's a short door and we may have to raise that for egress coming out of there and we will be sensitive in that area. On this side, on wood, if the hall is running through we are look at potentially putting in a door with an opening with a stair down to this new pedestrian area here so you can get right into the hall on the main concourse of the drum east west. Here we have to be sensitive to how we do it but, there were a number of other doors put in over-time and he thinks you have advised on that but anything else you might have to say we will be careful on that side on what we do and of course we are not going to blow the whole thing out. When we are looking on the West Street side, that is the area where some of the windows have been bricked in; where the trees and the beautiful planter things are. He is wondering in the pavilion piece it turns back, on the far side there is a little bump out, then some windows that are bricked up, kind of a mess on that side, and we want to clean it up. That is the brewery side and what guidance would you give us or what possibility to open up a couple of those windows to get a larger area that might open up onto 10th Street not talking about opening big gaps in the front on Grady and Preston cause that is a predominate façade.

Sarafin: When you say saying openings are you talking about expanding existing openings, previously infilled openings, or both.

Applicant: Both. You could take the door right there and the window to the left and combine that into a larger opening which would allow for indoor and outdoor space. Are you familiar with Commonwealth restaurant and how it openings up and has the terrace? We are thinking something along those lines.

Gastinger: My thought is taking the entire project as a whole and the way you have held back the massing helps reinforce this. You have pushed the façade forward again in a way and given it new life. The building volume is so simple in that the building structure is so utilitarian that it has been punctured, closed up, and opened again and it's kind of the nature of that building. He said the front can take that kind of façade flexibility as long as you articulate the openings, so it is not to be confused with earlier front door. He finds the entrance to be compelling and appropriate.

Miller: I agree. Thank you for your sensitive treatment of this. Where you are proposing to make the doors on the first and fifth bay might be interesting to try to do something that is frameless so that the glaze area is taking up the same amount of space it is now.

Schwarz: Give us a good proposal and we will look at it.

Sarafin: From a distance you read the two-story columns and what the details of the openings tied from the central door sort of disappear in a way that I think we are very open and flexible to if done sensibly how that would work. Are the windows the same size as the front? We have had some experience with the 3 notched windows. When this space was redone we specified that those original windows needed to stay, one was in tough shaped, but whoever was doing the work on the windows found someone locally and the end result was really good. The windows on the east section were replaced before this property was designated an IPP.

Miller: We definitely consider the windows a character defining factor.

Sarafin: As far as doors versus windows, ingress and egress, someone made the point that expanding some of the façade can take it back and there are alterations and he thinks that is really true. The building needs to fulfill its new use.

Miller: The first set of the first, second, forth, and fifth bay don't look like they were replaced in the same proportion.

Gastinger: This building has not had the appreciation is deserved because of the dismal nature of the front landscape. It's informative to see the historic photos and understand it was once a logical approach to the building. It absolutely makes no sense in contemporary Charlottesville. I am glad you are attending to that. Not only is this at a critical intersection for the city, but it is also

important for setting the tone for future development on Preston Avenue, which has a different character from the other corridors. It makes sense that it should be different from the Downtown Mall and West Main Street. He sees the way the building was developed with the kind of quiet nobility that seemed appropriate to dairy, simple and straight forward. When looking at the developing the landscape plan, keep that quiet simplicity.

Balut: The parking garage that you are showing right now, if you could consider the continuation the same precedent that you are making here on this block, perhaps consider using it like we have downtown with mixed use retail on the first floor to better activate the street level.

Clayborne: It was a great presentation, one of the better ones he seen in a long time. Thank you for that. This is not so much design issue, but make sure you dialogue with the communities, especially 10th and Page. That will be vitality important in the success of this project.

Balut: For phase two: What is the by right building maximum height for this zoning?

Applicant: Fifty feet

Day: [Didn't speak into the mic]

Balut: Phase four: the height of the parking garage

Applicant: Four or five stories.

Balut: You have done a great job in keeping this modest; you have deferred to the existing massing and structure of the building, and the design is very sensitive to the context of the building.

Applicant: Thanked everyone and Ms. Scala

Schwarz: There is an awful lot of fear in the neighborhoods, be sensitive to that and aware of that.

Chris: [Didn't speak into the mic]

Motion: This is a preliminary discussion, so no motion is needed. The applicant has only submitted massing drawings at this time. The BAR should comment on whether the proposal would meet the Design Guidelines. In staff opinion, the addition is well-located in relation to the building façades and street frontages.

The precise height of the first addition in relation to the central portion of the former dairy building would be important, especially so that the addition would appear deferential to the existing building. How the first addition is designed to attach to the existing building is also important so that they would not share a roof or cornice line or wall plane. The proposed contemporary steel and glass materials will help differentiate old from new.

Any future additions to the rear of the site would fall under Entrance Corridor review, rather than BAR review. However, the additions being presented tonight are the most important pieces in the development because their designs can serve to frame and enhance the older building.

E. Other Business

14. PLACE report

Since Mohr was not at the meeting there was no PLACE report.

F. Adjournment 10:30pm