

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
October 17, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

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

BAR Members Absent: Tim Mohr, co-chair; Corey Clayborne

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala and Camie Mess

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)
No matters from the public were discussed.
- 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 September 19, 2017 Regular Meeting

Motion: Schwarz moved to approve the September 19, 2017 minutes. Balut seconded. Approved (6-0).

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-08-11
158 Madison Lane
Tax Parcel 090129000
Alpha Chi Omega NHC, Owner/ Kevin Blair, Applicant
Replace Roof Railing

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Kevin Blair, the applicant spoke, and said that picket on the sample piece is just there to hold it together, and it not going to be in the final design, and that it is a solid panel that will be cut out by a CNC router.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Balut: Will this be painted.

Applicant: I would prefer not to paint it.

Miller: But if you decided in say five years that it is pretty marked up and needed paint you could paint it?

Applicant: Yes, but it shouldn't be marked up, it is on a roof that is not an occupiable space, it is purely aesthetic, and can be power washed if necessary.

Gastinger: The photo shows that the posts originally were situated to align with the columns below, and the bay dimensions correspond to the length of the panel of railing as well. I didn't know if you had any additional knowledge on that.

Applicant: I don't, but the measurements and dimensions over the bays and columns should be pretty close.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: It seems about as strong as wood and the aluminum channel in it makes me feel really good about it. I have no concerns

Miller: I agree with staff that the material seems appropriate, especially on a roof.

Schwarz: Just so everyone is clear, it is chemically the same as vinyl, but it is solid as opposed to being a thin veneer.

Applicant: Yes, they call it cellular PVC; they claim it will not yellow with age.

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 new roof railing satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Balut seconded. Approved (6-0).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-08-03

430 North 1st Street

Tax Parcel 330088100

David and Nancy Hughes, Owner/ Outlaw Design Company, Applicant

Street Additions

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Ruth Ellen Outlaw, the applicant and an architect, spoke.

Applicant: The trash can screen is going to be fiber board panel, not cable rail, on all four sides for screening, it will be 3 feet in height. The total enclosure would be 3.5' by 8'. The existing canopy supports are going to stay and be painted. Also, the front doors are going to be replaced, but they are wood with narrow vertical glass panels.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Balut: Is the glazing on the front door going to be narrower than what is there now?

Applicant: What is shown on the drawings is the proposed door configuration. It is a privacy issue, the current door is full light, and we want some transparency because of the strong access through the center of the house, but we do not want it to be so exposed to the street.

Miller: What changed about the addition on the back from the last time?

Applicant: It is the same footprint, and same exterior materials, with the exception of the cable rail sides, which we are now proposing as stained wood screening. On the hyphen, that screen would align with the top of the existing window on the south side. We are adding a window on the south

side that is an existing window that we are just relocating to the addition. It will be the same height as our new window sizes, because our new window sizes match the existing window sizes.

Miller: Is the trellis new this time?

Applicant: No, that was there before.

Gastinger: Is there a stain color that has been selected?

Applicant: Yes, charcoal grey.

Balut: Is the penthouse new?

Applicant: No, that is existing; we are residing that though, and repainting the roof.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Sarafin: I think it is a great improvement from the previous iteration. I really appreciate that you are preserving the axiality on 1st Street on the front. To me that preserves the symmetry and design intent, with nicer materials than what is there. Overall, I think it really looks good.

Miller: I would agree it is a huge improvement, but I do have some concerns. I think the trellis on the back with the addition of the horizontal wooden fence (for lack of a better word) makes the whole thing seem massive, as opposed to the cable railing which disappeared. I also have a little bit of concern about the widening of the walkway at the front door.

Gastinger: Could you be more specific about which portions of the wood screens concern you the most?

Miller: I think they are fine in general, although the hyphen is questionable. Mainly around the sides of the addition around the sides of the trellis, I think the same privacy can be achieved with some strategically placed plants or something similar.

Applicant: Is it the height or solidity of it?

Miller: The solidity.

Sarafin: As far as the widening to create more of a porch space, because it is symmetrically done, to me that is keeping with the design intent and is making it a more occupiable space. I think preserving the majority of the run helps to keep that design intent intact, and in fact how it frames the doors and shutters on the side is actually quite nice.

Gastinger: I feel that move makes the shutters make a little more sense. I think that is a good change. The only suggestion I have for the front façade is if the trash enclosure could get taller to allow the shutters to have a similar relationship to the top of that piece and the rail they slide onto in the front of the house. As far as the volumes on the back, the addition is sufficiently in the rear of the house and it will not have a visual impact on the view from 1st Street.

Miller: One comment on the front door, I understand the need for privacy, but I think their current amount of glazing is character defining for the house. I wonder if the shutters could be used to provide that privacy.

Applicant: That is the purpose of the shutters, and that would make them less essential with the new door style. I think part of it is being in the house, and realizing how close the sidewalk actually is. Also, if you look at the plan, the site line is right through the main living space.

Schwarz: Would you feel better if the glass was frosted?

Miller: Yes.

Applicant: So keep the full light windows, but frost them from the back?

Miller: Yes, frost them from the back so the window is still shiny from the front.

David Hughes (owner): I have to push back a little bit on the doors. I have gone up and down that street and today every single thing that was going on in that house you could see, since it is only 15

feet off the road. There is simply no privacy. It is true you can close the shutters, and we will probably do that but, we tried hard to find contemporary doors that fit the style of the house, that had less glass than the current door, which I think we did. The glass is still as tall, it is just narrower, so you can still see in, but you cannot see everything, and we think that is fair.

Balut: I will just say a few words starting with the bridge. While the bridge is not keeping with the original design, I think you all have done a good enough job keeping the symmetry, and understandably keeping that strong axis through the center, so as designed I personally don't have a problem with it. I think it would be nice if the doors would stay glazed similarly, but I think what is being proposed is reasonable, compatible with the house, and appropriate to our guidelines. The materials you are using are well selected and look great on the house. I agree with the recommendation about the gate that Breck [Gastinger] gave, but that is very minor. Changing to something that has more opacity on the railings is keeping with what was done before on the bridge, so it is keeping with that precedent. As far as the addition on the back, I think it is well designed and fits with the house. All and all it is a really good design, and I support it.

Schwarz: I would probably approve this as it has been submitted. I agree with everything Steven [Balut] just said. I think the massing in the back is appropriate with our guidelines, and with the number of windows you have in there the opacity of that is not an issue. I do not share some of my fellow board members concerns, I am content.

Earnst: I am also content. I think the swap of the entrance with the opacity of the door changing to become more opaque is transferring the solidity of the former bridge to the door, so in my opinion it is keeping with the original intent. Like Carl [Schwarz] said the back is sufficiently away from the street that it is not bothering me. One thing I was going to mention is I think we discussed the tree removals from the landscape in the previous session, but just to make sure that when you resubmit the landscape plan to include replacements for those lost trees. Otherwise, I think it is great, and I am completely fine approving it.

Motion: Sarafin moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and for New Construction, I move to find that the proposed new additions and modifications to original house 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. Balut seconded. Motion was approved (5-1, with Miller opposed).

Graves joined the meeting.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-08-13
506-512 Preston Place
Tax Parcel 050116A00-050116E00
Preston Place Properties, LLC, Owner/Julie Dixon, Applicant
Renovation of building

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Julie Dixon, the applicant, was present.

Questions from the Public

Rebecca Quinn, 104 4th Street, I would like to know where the house is being moved from and where is the axis off the public road? That might not be your purview.

Miller: The house is behind the Preston Court Apartments and the house is being moved down the hill a block away.

Questions from the Board:

Gastinger: Is the rear covered porch permissible with the rear setback?

Applicant: I do not know if a covered porch is permissible on the front or back porch given that the boundary lines are still being determined. The front one is necessary so that is why you see that firm setback on the proposed property line, the rear one might not be able to be covered.

Gastinger: So then would your options be to reduce the front setback or to not include the covered porch?

Applicant: It would be to not include the covered porch. In the last meeting there was some discussion as to whether make that set back 50 or 60 feet, I would love to see it at 50, that way we could include a small porch on the back.

Schwarz: Just to add to that, a front porch can encroach on the setback (a certain distance), but a back porch cannot.

Scala: The setback will be determined based on the houses within 500 feet of the structure, so that is where they got stuck.

Miller: We could include in our motion that our approval is contingent on zoning approval.

Gastinger: Could you discuss the differences between the original and addition?

Applicant: Sure. The floor heights are the same and the most significant thing that we maintained the same was the roof soffit and fascia height, because it can be such a clunky detail when an existing roof has to intersect that soffit and fascia. We went with a differentiation in material use, but still compatible with the original. As well as a more simplified and smaller diminutive window size, that the hierarchy remained clear with having to make the detail of the roof over the soffit and fascia. Everywhere else we tried to make the addition more submissive to the original house, but that was the one thing we held firm on.

Sarafin: The lower roof height helps as well.

Applicant: The east additions are odd, but I am glad that the round piece is going to come with the house. I think they add a lot of personality.

Sarafin: They are interesting, and I am happy they are coming along.

Applicant: When we met with the house movers they actually said that they were tied in structurally and could be move with the house.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: I think the way you differentiate the old from the new is very successful. It is subtle, but it is just enough that someone should be able to tell it is a new addition. I have absolutely no concerns. It would be sad not to have a back porch; I hope you all can figure that out.

Sarafin: I am really supportive of the application. I think the addition off the rear is unique and yet totally appropriate. I like the central nave, side aisle thing, like a little country church. It is interesting. I am supportive.

Earnst: I think it looks great. I am glad that the East additions are moving and they are adding a little something. I think the back looks lovely. It looks great.

Balut: I agree with my colleagues. I think you have addressed the differentiation well, the massing is appropriate, you have kept the roofline down, and the strategy of making the smaller windows, combines together to be just enough and it is very successful. I think it looks good and that it is a very interesting project.

Gastinger: I would like to note that while I was not supportive of the building moving from its original location, that I think the additions and renovations are wholly appropriate. Will there be a landscape plan at a later date? I look forward to seeing that. I think that it would benefit from being

at the 50 foot setback line. I do not know to what extent that can be achieved, but I think if the landscape plan could acknowledge the movement of the house from its original setting that would be great to see.

Miller: Maybe we can include our preference for the 50 foot setback in our motion.

Balut: Was there evidence of shutters on this house before?

Applicant: The answer is we don't know we have not done any of our existing conditions drawings. I would imagine there were shutters there given the age of the house and the exposure.

Motion: Schwarz 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 renovations 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 application as submitted. The BAR would encourage zoning to look into the 50 foot setback, because the BAR believes it would be a more successful design with a back porch. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

5. Discussion 1:01:05
327 6th Street SW
Roof installation

Mary Joy Scala present information on the installed roof.

Eric Washington (applicant), William Jefferson (applicant), and Ryan Rooney (owner) introduced themselves. They said they can definitely change the roof and gutters on the tower.

Miller: One thing we were discussing on site was it will look better once it is finished, and we are also only requesting that the tower roof be changed, not the roof on the larger structure.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Gastinger: Is the color in real life consistent with the grey that was chosen?

Applicant: Yes

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Applicant: They come in pre crimps sheets, but they don't make it flat because that causes the metal to crinkle.

Miller: Also, with the porch roof, you can't even see that from the street. You need to literally be standing on the neighbor's stone wall to see it, so it makes sense to me to let that one go.

Schwarz: I agree, they need to do whatever they need to do to make it water proof.

Applicant: My request would be exactly that, because the water damage in the house is extensive.

Sarafin: It is great to see all the work that is going into preserving this house. I haven't had a chance to go and look at the roof situation, so I will not comment on that, but I trust my colleagues on the board. I would hate for work to have to be redone here, so my question is what is the best compromise?

Balut: I feel exactly the same way, I was not able to go and see it in person, but the recommendation from the board member s is sound and I am supportive of their proposal. As long as the owner and roofers feel they can get that flat pan on the tower then I am comfortable, and it seems like a reasonable compromise. As long as the gutters are in line with the style of the house, and it sounds like you are proposing half rounds, without seeing the property, I think everything that has been proposed sounds good.

Earnst: I agree.

Scala: I just want to be crystal clear that the Philadelphia gutter on the tower will stay, and the half rounds will go on the gable part of the house and the front porch.

There was no formal motion, but Schwarz stated:

- We would like you to re-clad the tower portion with a flat seam and keep the Philadelphia gutters on that portion.
- We encourage you to put half round gutters on the rest of the house.
- You can rework the porch roof to shed water as needed.
- We are okay with you leaving the current standing seam roof on the rest of the house as installed.
- The metal on the tower will match the standing seam in color.

D. New Items

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-10-03

619 East High Street

Tax Parcel 530112000

Court Square Condominium Association, Owner/ Robert Nichols, Applicant

Enlarge previously diminished masonry openings

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Robert Nichols, the applicant, spoke, with one clarification, we are going to open up the opening labeled B and C, but the current entry labeled A is a weirder one. As you can see from the unusual horizontal brick, under the arch, there are steel lintels holding them up. It is our desire to correct that as well, but until we get a building permit to do some more aggressive demolition inspection, we will not be able to tell the relationship between the beam, lintels, and the horizontal brick lines.

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:

Miller: It seems perfectly appropriate and an improvement that is needed. Either option that you chose on the door will be appropriate.

Sarafin: Yes, entirely appropriate. If the arch above the door can be dealt with that would be great.

Motion: Graves moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed changes 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. Schwarz seconded. Approved (7-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-10-04

222 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 280037A00

Williams Pentagram Corps, Owner/ Michael R. Williams, Applicant

Window Replacement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Michael Williams, the applicant, spoke and discussed the current deteriorated state of the current window. He passed around an example of the current cladding and also of the failed muntin.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: The SDLs are listed at 1 1/8', do those match the existing? They look a bit thinner.

Applicant: That information is from Gaston-Wyatt, they did all of the measurements. And I told them I wanted a replica window, which they said they could do. My question if you approve the window replacement, is can I order the stock window, which could be done faster at less of a cost, or do you want the custom window?

Scala: I wondered if the aluminum clad window coloring would match the coloring of the side windows.

Applicant: It matches the current paint color of the window trim on the front façade, which is different from the trim on the side wall.

Balut: What color are the windows on the side?

Applicant: Off-white

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: It is deceptive because on the inside it looks nice, but on the outside the sub straight of the window is shot. I am not even sure how you would get up there for maintenance, you would probably have to get a ladder and then close the bank. It seems like you would want something in there that would last longer, because the current window that was put in has a design flaw. I would like to condition our motion on you re-verifying the muntin size, and that what you are proposing [for muntin size] is the closest match to what is currently there.

Gastinger: In this instance I have no issues with the smaller central style. Given it is a singular window that is not original building, and its height above the ground, I think it is reasonable and I support replacing it.

Miller: I typically read a whole lot of guidelines, but I think the applicant has made a good case showing us that the wood is past repair (you can piece it apart with your finger nails.) I also agree

with Breck [Gastinger] that the smaller central window style is appropriate for the same reasons. Furthermore, I agree that aluminum clad is appropriate for maintenance.

Motion: Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed window replacement satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application for the aluminum clad window with the standard size central muntin, we just ask that the applicant confirms the size of the smaller muntins and what the best match is to that. Sarafin seconded. Approved (7-0).

E. New Construction

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Conservation District)

BAR 17-10-02

128 Franklin Street

Tax Parcel 560114400

Franklin St, LLC, Owner/Kent Dougherty, Applicant

New Construction: new single family detached home

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Paul Kent Dougherty, the applicant, was present.

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: Thank you for putting the site plan together, it helps. I have no concerns, they encourage metal roofs and you put one on the porch. I think it is great.

Balut: I think you have successfully broken up the massing, and that it is perfectly appropriate for this design control district and the neighborhood. There are a lot of things about it that are small and quaint and perfectly appropriate.

Gastinger: I think the design is appropriate, but I had two comments: 1) I think the proportions might be a little bit better if the roof pitch was a bit steeper; and 2) The relationship between the front door and the mid room window seem to be a bit slammed together, even though it aligns with the window above.

Applicant: I appreciate those comments. We had a couple versions with that steeper pitch, and I don't know why we decided to leave that. I did have a question. If we decide to go with a 12/12 pitch or figure out a way to move that mud room window to the left, and have some alignment there how do we get those approved? Do we run those by [Mary Joy] Scala?

Balut: Generally speaking if we approve something and you make changes, we would require you to submit those to Mary Joy, and if they are minor changes she may approve those administratively, if they warrant being reviewed by the board, she might send them out to us. Sometimes we can preemptively add those changes into the motion.

Applicant: As I mentioned in some of the e-mail, there might be some small changes, so I wouldn't want to burden you all with 30 little preemptive changes.

Balut: In that case, I would resubmit.

Schwarz: Really quick, as a request, please do not put a fence taller than 3 ½ feet in the front yard.

Applicant: There is no fence planned.

Motion: Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed new construction satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Earnst seconded. Motion was approved (7-0).

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Conservation District)

BAR 17-10-01

132 Franklin Street

Tax Parcel 560114500

Morningstar Development, Owner/ Ray McGrath, Applicant

New Construction: two-story house with basement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Paul Kent Dougherty represented the owner.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Gastinger: Has there been any discussion on how that differentiation is going to occur?

Applicant: No. We submitted what we did because the owner is very interested in being to build and would like to pull building permits. He may carry on as is. I do have a quick question, we are pricing metal roofs, and it is a snap lock. Would you all like to know about that material or is that something we can just role with.

Miller: I don't think we get that specific with a conservation district.

Scala: So the main difference is the seams?

Balut: Yes, the standing seam is slightly larger than a regular hand crimped standing seam roof.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Gastinger: I think it would be odd to see these similar plans with different roof pitches.

Motion: Sarafin moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed new construction satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

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: materials, massing, and design approval

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Applicant presented a short presentation.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Gastinger: How does the process to remove the street tree and have valet parking coordinate with the current West Main Street Streetscape improvement project?

Scala: I think that would be handled through the site plan review.

Schwarz: The trees on Commerce Street, are they Sentry ginkgos or spreading ginkgos? Would you be averse to spreading ginkgos back there?

Gastinger: Sentry and it would be too tight.

Applicant: We want them to be more columnar, we don't want to block that view.

Schwarz: The lighting on the house showed string light outside the porch, am I to assume those will be underneath the porch of the house?

Applicant: Yes, they will be underneath. The rendering is wrong.

Miller: The lighting all seems nice and warm, is it the intention that the lighting on the roof be a cooler color?

Applicant: No that is just the rendering.

Schwarz: What is your plan for the windows on the east façade?

Applicant: We are leaving that to the developers to solve.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Graves: I really like how this engages the Commerce Street side, we spent a lot of time talking about the, and the fact the neighborhood is not here now, is probably a good sign in that engagement. I am generally supportive of the massing, the scale, the site plan, and the materials so far. I think you are headed in a nice direction.

Miller: I agree completely. I think this is a fabulous project and the materials are great. I think when we do provide approval it is better to know at this point if you are going to want to change materials. Overall, I think the lighting is beautiful. The interior, although not our purview, looks fun. We just need to double check the VLT on the glass.

Applicant: We will do that.

Sarafin: I think the massing changes are improvements, the material palette is great. My only red flag is the glass, and making sure we get that cleared up. The level of tint has been a huge deal on some projects before, so we want to make sure we are all on the same page with that. It looks like it is going in a great direction.

Balut: I agree with what has been said, you have all done an outstanding job on design. I like the new massing as well it adds an intrigue to the front in a unique way that benefits egress and shading

with the design. The landscape is very well thought out and considered from the historic perspective, and I think you are capturing that essence of the historic houses well. I think the lighting strategy is great, however, I am a little concerned with the amount of up lighting you have, but it seems you have thought about that, so just be mindful of the night sky ordinance. Overall, it looking like a wonderful project.

Applicant: I think we only have two that are not shining up into something, so we are trying to be mindful of that particular ordinance.

Schwarz: I do think as the ginkgos grow on Commerce Street that it could take a lot to light those, so just be aware of the fact that it is a residential street. Also, we did get an e-mail from one of the neighbors about parking. Since West Main is going to continue to keep developing, and that leaves the status of parking unknown, if you are building a big building and could put parking underneath it, why not do it? So in the future we are not stuck with a lack of parking.

Applicant: We are looking at it as we are providing more parking than what is necessary, so we are not interesting in building a structure that we do not need.

Miller: We normally make comments about privet hedge, but that is surrounded by cement, so it will not become invasive.

Schwarz: Just keep it trimmed.

Gastinger: I am excited to see this addition to West Main Street, the project as a whole is elegant and exemplary. The Main Street elevation seems to be a little out of date with the step back for the entry, and that will have an impact on the way that façade reads. I am also interested in seeing how that will interface with the up lighting. I am also supportive of the massing changes. Generally, I think the landscape plan is elegant and thoughtful, and brings a meaning that is reflective of the context and the architecture. I only have three comments: 1) is the coordination of the street tree; 2) keep in mind of the soil volumes you have in the narrower spaces for the ginkgos on Commerce, I would hate for you to have two nice ones, a half dead one, and a dead one; 3) keep in mind that this is a planting plan we will use as an example for other projects on West Main, and because of the I would consider using something other than a privet hedge.

Schwarz: I would like to see the front rendering with the colors you all have chosen.

Miller: Mary Joy do you have any additional concerns?

Scala: I still think you need to take a closer look at the historic buildings (i.e. how will the sleeping porch be reconstructed?) As far as the hotel itself, it seems like that is pretty complete, you would need to see the glass and we would need to get the appurtenance question resolved. Just go down the check list and see if you have any additional concerns.

Motion: Miller 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, contingent upon zoning compliance, the massing; materials; warm, dimmable lighting; and landscape plan of the proposed building satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with these properties and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the massing, materials, lighting, and landscape plan only as submitted with the following modifications: that there's consideration for the soil volume of the ginkgo adjacent to the parking garage on Commerce Street, consideration of an alternative to the privet [hedge on the front elevation of West Main Street], and coordination with the street scape project along West Main.

In addition, the applicant should provide the following details for review and approval in order to receive a final certificate of appropriateness:

1. Historic building details, including exterior stair details
2. Site furnishings
3. Glass specifications with a physical sample
4. Window and wall sections

5. Signage
6. Final information on mechanical units.

Sarafin seconded. Motion was approved (7-0).

F. Other Business

11. PLACE report; given by Melanie Miller

Melanie Miller attended the PLACE meeting in Tim Mohr's absence, and gave a report:

- They discussed comp plan updates, that are overall on track
- A lot of discussion about design charette with Grimm and Parker about Friendship Court update
- Some discussion about Long Range Planning Position that is next on our agenda
- Talked some about accessory dwelling units
- 3D modeling project (on something similar to sketch-up), that has started and the Level 1 version is existing, but there is no way that the public can access it. This is a project that is definitely moving forward though.
- Schwarz would like to reiterate the need to have a meeting with Public Works, PLACE, and BAR all at the same table to discuss lighting, street signage, crosswalk design, street furniture, etc.

12. Discussion: Long Range Planning Position

There was a brief discussion about City council's recent consideration of this position.

G. Adjournment 9:10 pm