

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
November 21, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, chair; Tim Mohr, co-chair; Justin Sarafin; Stephan Balut; Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger

BAR Members Absent: Corey Clayborne, Emma Earnst, Whit Graves

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala and Camie Mess (late)

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.

No matters from the public, not on the agenda.

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 October 17, 2017 Regular Meeting

Motion: Schwarz moved to approve the October 17, 2017 minutes with spelling corrections. Balut seconded. Approved (5-0-1, with Mohr abstaining).

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-07-01
425 2nd Street NE
Tax Parcel 330085000
James E. and Lynn K. Garnett, Owner/ James E. Garnett, Applicant
Proposed Landscape Plan

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant spoke, I think this just boils down to the type of maple, and I am told that chalk maples are not native to Virginia. I am told from the nursery that if we were to get a chalk maple it would be about the thickness of a pencil, in a one gallon bucket, and would be larger than the paper bark in about 30 years.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

No questions from the board.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Gastinger: I think everything you have submitted here is well within our guidelines and it also fits within the residential landscapes of 2nd Street, all of these plants are quite common. I think the bulk of the discussion would be about the maple and I would like to modify the comment in the staff report that the previous suggestion of a Chalk Maple was not seen as a replacement for the Silver Maple as they are quite different in scale, as is the Paper Bark Maple. Both of those would be in the 20-30 foot range eventually. While all of these are certainly viable in our guidelines, I would like to point out there is a preference in our guidelines for larger shade canopy trees where they are permissible and make sense, so if you are amenable to a larger species of maple (i.e. a Red or Sugar Maple) that could be a good addition. Other possibilities are an upright Japanese Maple that could compliment the other Japanese Maple in the yard.

Garnett: What about the one on Hedge Street? It is very close to the house.

Mohr: That might be a very good Japanese Maple location.

Gastinger: There are hundreds of varieties, but I think an upright Japanese Maple will be in the 20-25 foot range eventually. A Paper Bark Maple would also work there.

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 proposal changes to the landscape 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, with the friendly suggestion to switch the tree species to either Sugar Maple or Red Maple in front, and either Japanese Maple or Paper Bark on Hedge Street. Balut seconded. The motion was approved (6-0)

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

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 presented the staff report.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: Does the addition step back five feet?

Boyd: Yes, it does. We can set it back at 7 or 9, whatever you might wish. One thing that is not mentioned was the purpose of this story, and the added elevator, is it allows the residents who are coming in off of Second Street to access this spot without having to use the stairs.

Gastinger: Could you speak to the color selections?

Boyd: In our prior presentation we were encouraged to add color; we are not married to those particular colors, but we chose colors that we thought would wear well. We can always paint instead of having the fiber siding.

Balut: What was the impetus of going to the shed roof from the flat roof?

Boyd: We were trying to match the slope, it doesn't have to be a shed roof, but we thought that was more interesting.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Balut: I will start by saying I like the addition, I like the color, I think it pops well, and it helps make a distinction between the old house and the new appurtenance looking apartments on the top. I think they are humble in form and shape, and are nice little nodes that take advantage of a space the previously wasn't being taken advantage of. Thank you for providing the line of sites, and it is a nice little project.

Mohr: I think it is playful, and the colors are playful, and it livens this roofscape that was dull to begin with, so I am fine with it.

Sarafin: I support the application as submitted. It activates 2nd Street a little bit more, so I am supportive of it.

Schwarz: I wish they were something other than fiber cement, but they are fun and simple, I don't have any concerns.

Miller: I agree, but I do think we need to see detailed drawings just like we require from other applicants (i.e. the cut sheets of the windows and that kind of thing), for due diligence.

Gastinger: I agree with almost everything that has been said, I think the project is probably fine as submitted, but I do disagree a little bit with the color scheme, particularly with the orange for the most visible volume. Everything else fits into the roofscape, and that seems to stick out, I would maybe switch the colors, so it wasn't so loud, but I might be the only one that feels that.

Mohr: It reminds me a little bit of the old yellow box that was on top of live arts.

Miller: I am fine either way, we could leave it up to the applicant, and there are enough people supportive of the original scheme.

Mohr: The other thing I would say is if you have any light fixtures in the overhangs, we would like to see cut sheets of those as well.

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 new additions 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 except the BAR wants to see final details and drawings to be approved administratively, and cut sheets on the windows and lighting. The location of two colors (green and orange) may be flipped. Sarafin seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

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 presented the staff report.

The applicant, Bruce Wardell, gave a brief presentation discussing the major changes made to the project.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: What is the Ecostar (roofing material) made out of?

Wardell: Recycled tires.

Balut: You are only using this at the rear, correct?

Wardell: Yes, only in that one location.

Miller: Are there any other questions?

Gastinger: Are there any updated site plan discussions? Or are you planning on coming back with an updated landscape plan?

Wardell: The larger site plan is under the guise of a larger project. I think we are planning on adding one new tree, in front of this building, but we haven't identified it yet.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: I can start; at the last meeting I felt this entire project violated our first guideline for additions. Since then it has come to my attention, that train stations are typically owned by the municipality of where they are, this is not the case in this instance. That means moving the restaurant out would not be logical. Moving on, I agree with the applicant that painting the brick is appropriate, in order to differentiate the old from the new. I feel like the project meets the guidelines.

Schwarz: I feel like you have taken bits and pieces of language that is there and it fits the guidelines. The way that you have differentiated it, makes it feel like an entire ensemble, and that you can tell the history of the building, it goes together really well.

Mohr: I think the added nature of the building lends itself quite nicely to the project. It works for me.

Sarafin: The only thing I would say is in the window motif that is repeated, the detailing in the new windows will be more spare. I think this is the right interpretation.

Wardell: Yes, there will be a color differentiation.

Mohr: Also, am I wrong that the proportions are slightly different?

Wardell: Yes, it is slightly different.

Balut: I will just add, I think you have made some great improvements to the job, and you have taken the comments that were suggested, and have turned it into a nice composition. I agree that painting it, in this case, is the right thing to do. I think there could be more differentiation, but that has already been voiced. The massing is appropriate, the way you have detailed it with the fenestration, and how you have borrowed logic from the older building ties it into the entire ensemble. One comment that Mary Joy made, which I agree with, is the garage door in the back that is white, I would change that color to terracotta or brick color.

Gastinger: I agree with everything that Stephen said, the only detail that stuck out to me as a bit odd, was the cornice or rather the non-cornice on the small triangular glass sitting room that is track side, didn't feel quite resolved where it turned the corner.

Miller: How thick would the mortar joints be?

Wardell: My first guess would be 3/8", but they would match the coursing of the existing.

Miller: Our guidelines specify that artificial slate is acceptable, so I would think that we can leave that up to the applicant to decide, although real slate would be preferable.

Motion: Balut 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 new addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following stipulations: both garage doors shall be painted a similar or the same color as the brick, and the roof may be either real slate or synthetic slate. Schwarz seconded. The motion passed (6-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-08-09

510 17th Street NW

Tax Parcel 050064000

Zeta Beta House Corp of Gamma Phi Beta Sorority Inc., Owner/ Garrett Rouzer, Applicant
East Elevation Addition and replacement of window sashes

Mary Joy presented the staff report.

Garrett Rouzer, the applicant, spoke and said in regards to the windows they decided to keep all of the existing windows. If anything we are going to move forward with interior storm sashes. So the windows are no longer part of the scope.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Schwarz: So the siding is going to match what is on the new addition, correct?

Rouzer: The existing is wood siding with a 4 ½" reveal, we decided to cheat the reveal a little bit and stepped that up to a 6". We would also like to use the hardy siding, so there will be two different materials that will hopefully complement each other. There is a jog on the north side of the building that we are using to differentiate the new addition of the building from the old. On the south elevation where we have a flush condition, we are going to install a corner board mid span, in order to differentiate between the two. At this point we are intending to move forward with casements instead of double hung. On the north elevation we show double hung windows if those would be acceptable, just to differentiate, but it would be our preference to use casement on the new addition.

Schwarz: On the roof it looks like you have the gutter as opposed to the built in Philadelphia gutter.

Rouzer: Correct, we will put a stop to create a smooth transition from one to the other.

Miller: Do we need to see a roof plan since it is a large addition?

Schwarz: I feel like I got it.

Balut: Yes, I understand the dimensions around the roof.

Mohr: It is a little unusual not having plans to go with it, but I do understand what is in play and what isn't.

Rouzer: We also adjusted the east elevation based on your comments; we tried to make the back porch less formal, based on the comments from the last meeting.

Balut: Just to clarify, you are proposing to go to all casements on the addition right now? At least for all the new windows?

Rouzer: That is correct.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: I think you did what we asked for last time, the differentiation is subtle, but it is there, the addition seems to make sense to me. I have no concerns.

Mohr: I could see even bumping up the weather boarding on the addition.

Rouzer: I already bumped it up from 4 ½” to 6”, the next size up if I were using manufacturing sizes are 7 ¼”.

Mohr: Just wondering, because that would make the change a little more dramatic.

Schwarz: The back is currently an addition to the original structure. There already is subtle difference between the addition and the original and I am not sure you want to make an additional change, from the existing addition to the proposed addition. Does that make sense?

Mohr: Yes, maybe it should be a consideration instead of a stipulation.

Balut: I agree with that. I will say from what I am seeing I think you have made enough of a distinction between the mass, proportions, and fenestration, I think it all looks fine. I think the encasement windows are a little strange, but I understand the attempt to differentiate and be more contemporary. I somewhat reluctantly approve that.

Miller: Do other people have thoughts on the encasement versus double hung?

Gastinger: I don't have any strong feelings. I agree with the other comments made, I think it is a nice submission. I feel like it is worth having a plan on record with this submission, but that could come afterwards.

Scala: You need a site plan for the permitting process.

Miller: If you could e-mail it to Mary Joy or Camie Mess that would be helpful so it could be connected to the archives we keep.

Motion: Balut moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Additions and the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed addition (but NOT the window replacement) satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is 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 with the request that you submit a digital site plan and floor plan to staff. Mohr seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

D. New Items

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-11-04

413 Ridge Street

Tax Parcel 290136000

Jeffrey Erkelens, Owner/ Jeffrey Erkelens, Applicant

Partial Demolition and Proposed Rear Elevation Changes

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Jeffrey Erkelens, the applicant, wanted to clarify a few things. He wants to strip out the asbestos siding to see what is under there. It is a bit vague on the schematic, because I do not know the detailing underneath the siding. Also, the reason I took the internal gutter off the back, was because I felt if I was pulling off the entire roof, and replacing it, it would just be a lot simpler to not have that one internal gutter. Unlike the rest of the house, I don't think it is a defining characteristic on that single gable in the back. Also, on the Oak Street side I made a mistake, I didn't actually want to

put casement windows there, I wanted to copy the windows that were on the main house already. This is also new to me, so I wanted to hear your feedback, especially with how you would like to see the different additions on the back

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Miller: The application says you are a maybe on tax credits, are you going to go for that?

Applicant: I am for it, unfortunately the amount of money I would have to spend, and I would meet the federal standards but not the state. So right now that is a no.

Sarafin: As far as putting together a package...

Applicant: Yes, I went down to Richmond and met with them. I think we are going to focus on not destroying the original building that leaves it sort of open and still look at the budget. The representative said they could credit my hours.

Miller: Is this your residence or investment?

Applicant: Definitely an investment, it is such a large lot. I have already started the process of dividing it into two plots. I'm curious about coming back once it is subdivided to maybe do an infill SUP. It's R2 so basically get three units on each lot.

Miller: There are two lots?

Applicant: It is a large lot zoned R2 and by right you can subdivide it into two R2 lots. If I can convince my family we will move there. I have no intention to ever sell it.

Balut: Just to clarify, as far as the windows, the only casements will be on this elevation that you have provided for us and maybe the south side?

Applicant: The casements will be on that rear elevation. There are three windows on north side somewhat. The two down low, both are in cinderblock foundation, wood from the 50s. The one closer to the rear, is all dry rot. The other one is right above a bathtub. For continuity, the window above that, double hung, so I would like to replace all the windows. The two windows that face Oak St. would be to national historic standards.

Mohr: What's this ceiling doing in here?

Applicant: It is a tall ceiling.

Mohr: I would think that you could be a little more adventurous there if you wanted to. You have great views that direction yes?

Applicant: Okay, you would be open to additions?

Mohr: Yes, over here you can make this more modern or however you want to occupy the house. You can play with this and make the house more open to the outdoors. We would be open for you coming back for comments on that.

Miller: Right, because it could change when you pull the siding off. Does it seem more successful to pull those windows off?

Mohr: That could take some more thought.

Gastinger: I don't see any issue with pulling the fence down.

Applicant: At this point, I'm just going to stick with it until I come back with the SUP application. The old section of the house has wood in incredible shape; I'm just curious about a stain on the wood and not paint on the outside. Do you prefer paint or stain on the outside?

Comments from the Public:

[Can't hear because the Greg Jackson did not come up to the mic to speak]

Comments from the Board:

Miller: It may be interesting to see another color besides white. I think it depends on what you do to the other portion of the house.

Sarafin: I think your overall approach to it is great. It's great that you have met with DHR folks in Richmond and are thinking about tax credits. Great approach.

Applicant: I build new homes and this is out of my comfort zone and that excites me.

Miller: It looks like there is enough work to do especially if your hours count towards the total.

Schwarz: What do you want to do with the foundation? Strip it or paint it white?

Applicant: I just had a feeling that if I am painting the house and the front is not painted that the contrast would be really pretty. What do you do when the newest addition is cinderblock, do you just paint that?

Balut: Yes, it helps to break down the mass.

Schwarz: Do we want him to paint the front if it is not already painted?

Applicant: If it's not already painted then I don't want to.

Schwarz: I don't see any issue with removing the internal gutter on the back. Are you just going to put in a new exterior gutter and a downspout?

Applicant: Yes on the other side there is an old fashioned half round gutter.

Schwarz: What do you guys think about the overhang?

Applicant: I'm just going to wait on that.

Schwarz: Basement windows, repairing those?

Applicant: Yes but I need to pull them out and put them back in.

Schwarz: So everyone says that you are fine, so if you want to come back in with a more developed plan for the back elevation.

Mohr: And how he wants to handle the exterior, the chimneys and asphalt.

Schwarz: Usually we have Richard Spurzem usually preserve the siding.

Miller: Approve what he has submitted.

Mohr: Cross that bridge when we get to it.

Applicant: I think that all the siding is in tremendous shape with the exception of one corner of the old house. If you are potentially open to me changing some of the siding on the back, I thought that I could potentially pull some of that old wood and bring it around.

Schwarz: Just let us know, where the HVAC units will go.

Applicant: Do you have a preference, on the rear or on the north side where the neighbors can see them?

Schwarz: How does that work?

Scala: It is supposed to be five feet from the side yard. You want them to be placed where they are not totally visible to the street.

Miller: It is pretty open in the back; they could be done on the north side. Might work.

Schwarz: You will submit something if you end up doing something?

Applicant: I would like pull out the chain link fence.

Schwarz: If you put in a driveway, give us a drawing.

Applicant: Would you be open to those two windows on that oak creek side?

Miller: Because it is a replacement vinyl window now, that is what you are talking about?

Applicant: Yes as well as the one below it. I would prefer it be wood.

Miller: Do you have the window sample here?

Gastinger: I don't know if that rear window requires the same level of detail that is a part of the original house.

Applicant: The window that was in there before definitely matched. This one is 7/8ths and I think 5/8ths would be better.

Miller: We do allow aluminum.

Schwarz: Definitely 5/8ths.

Balut: So you would be doing that before you did the rear elevation, is that why you are asking?

Applicant: Yes, just anything more on my plate is helpful.

Balut: I think that the elevation as proposed, I encourage a design that is worthy of the beauty of the house. The design you have now is quite simple and there is something that can be done to compliment the house.

Miller: Any more questions?

Applicant: Sure. One more thing, the handrail is an iron that is rotted out, can I just replace that?

Miller: Yup.

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 changes including two window replacements on the Oak Street side [rear addition] satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the rear elevation to come back to the BAR for approval at a regular meeting, and any additional site work to come back. Balut seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-11-01

511 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 320174000

Main Street West, LLC, Owner/ Greg Jackson., Applicant

Updated Design for Rooftop Deck and Enclosed Kitchen/Bar

Camie Mess presented the staff report.

Applicant: We have changed to have three windows in the hallway area instead of four. I am not sure if I am asking for three or four windows, I am just asking your opinion.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Mohr: Will the green wall continue to go up?

Applicant: Yes.

Gastinger: Is that what is already there?

Applicant: Yes.

Miller: Can you summarize the changes.

Applicant: Yes. We think the changes are better. We have moved the mechanical equipment, and screen it with a wood color. The shape of the shed roof has become more normalized, as a rectangle shape. The porch has turned into a covered circulated hallway, with windows, which opens up the circulation for the porch area.

Balut: On the porch area you have it rendered as painted white with cream windows? Is that what it will look like?

Applicant: Yes, that is correct; the cream matches the existing windows on the other building.

Balut: With the three versus four windows are they the same height?

Applicant: The three windows are a bit taller, to match the railing height.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: I think it is an overall improvement, especially with normalizing the shape of the shed roof.

Balut: For me personally, I like the four better. I think they are both appropriate. The four breaks it down into multiples.

Mohr: As a counter to what Steven [Balut] said, what would you think about one window? And then the three, just because it would seem lighter and more airy. I could see dropping the window to the floor.

Gastinger: I fall into that camp. The simpler the better.

Schwarz: As far as I am concerned all three options you are describing are appropriate. I feel comfortable with you picking.

Applicant: I can always pick it and then run it by you.

Sarafin: I like the three windows in the bay, it feel more open.

Mohr: I think it is up to you once you start constructing it to see what fits into the design.

Applicant: One thing to note, what is currently in the proposed building is three. Three repeats itself in the new proposed structure.

Miller: Any of the window plans would meet the guidelines.

Motion: Schwartz 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 changes to the roof addition 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 applicant's choice of window configuration to come back to staff for approval. Balut seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

8. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-11-02

167 Chancellor Street

Tax Parcel 090126000

Alpha Omicron Corp, Owner/ Kevin Schafer, Applicant

New Addition

Camie Mess presented the staff report.

The applicant, Kevin Schaffer, expanded on the staff report, with details of the project. Applicant spoke, about the history of the fraternity, and how they came to acquire that specific building, and why they are requesting these specific design changes. The setbacks they are exploring focus on three main areas: stair tower bump outs, madison lane front porch addition, and the expansion of the addition. Paul Wright discusses the need of the project and expands on the history. These changes allow us to maximize the space without increasing the footprint. It allows us to improve sprinkler systems and other systems that are relevant to be altered to more modern. Design development and design intention- this site is not only a piece but also the anchor that ties culturally and holds responsible for the area.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Miller: So are you proposing to demolish the current addition, and replace it?

Applicant: Yes. It doesn't match the rest of the building.

Balut: When was the addition made?

Applicant: In the 1980s.

Miller: Would you be removing the tree on Madison Lane?

Applicant: No, we would not remove that tree.

Gastinger: I have a question about setbacks. If the existing structure is not within the current zoning setbacks, do those become the new setback lines?

Applicant: That is not our understanding, but that is a great strategy.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: The historic entrance was on Chancellor Street, and this current design flips that, and I think that destroys the historic integrity of the structure. The new changes destroy the historic ties.

Anything you do with the façade jeopardizes the relevancy of the relation to our guidelines.

Schwarz: I agree. To completely modify the old front is the problematic part for me.

Applicant: We wanted to keep the characteristics that the city identified as historically significant.

Gastinger: I have a couple thoughts about the Madison Lane façade, the issue for me is not so much addressing the additional façade, and in my mind that addition on the Madison Lane side could be treated in a more contemporary fashion, that way it is not historically confusing.

Applicant: We looked at that, but then that does not fit in with the pedestrian experience that is Madison Lane, the social context of that. We looked at a modern type, but it interferes with the walking experience.

Miller: I think Breck is right, but I also agree it is the less important side. I have more of a problem with the large dormers on the Chancellor Street side. I understand the need for an egress there, but maybe moving it.

Mohr: I think all the energy goes towards the current addition and along the façade.

Schwarz: You have a wraparound porch, and you have basically cut that off. It looks like you have lost any sense of history.

Mohr: Doing that takes away any sense of scale.

Balut: While I am sympathetic to your design difficulties, I agree with my colleagues that the changes you have proposed to the Chancellor Street elevation, they completely destroy the historic fabric of that structure, which was a residence. As far as the Madison Lane side, I appreciate the difficulties you are having, and I think you have addressed those successfully, but I think that you should address that addition in a more contemporary fashion. Focus on maintaining the Chancellor side.

Schwarz: It might be important to add, assuming you get your setback; I have no problem with the Madison Lane side.

Applicant: As far as defining what is important, and a no go line, do we draw it from that entire porch, because we would have trouble fitting in the program needs for a fraternity.

Mohr: I think if you keep that corner intact, you will be more successful. Just back off that corner.

Sarafin: I would like to add some comments on the Madison Lane side; I have some problems with unifying the front of the façade. I see keeping the two main volumes on the Madison Lane side, sort of assuming the additions come off and you completely re-work that. In terms of how to express that entry, I think there might be some other examples that might offer some guidance. I wonder if incorporating the addition overflows a little bit on to the Madison side. I would be interested to see what a single story full width porch would look like. It would still be an additional entrance without focusing the attention on the Madison Lane side entrance.

Miller: Also, remember it doesn't have to be symmetrical. Asymmetry is a character defining feature of the current house. Maybe there is a way to make it look alluring and grand and inviting, making Madison a little more primary.

Mohr: You can also take some que's from other Greek revival buildings. You do have that other building there, so you might be able to make an argument to give you more room to maneuver.

Applicant: Okay, I think we understand. The Chancellor side is more off limits, and the Madison side is more available to change. Also the addition is free to work with.

Mohr: I think that you can play with the asymmetry.

Miller: We are supportive of something happening here.

Mohr: Be nice to the old house.

Sarafin: Hopefully, we have helped you prioritize what we view as what is important in this structure. Not an easy site to work on.

Applicant: Question about the stairway. The most important part is the stairwell. I'm curious, is the proportion of the wrap around porch absolutely unmovable? Or can it be moved slightly?

Balut: It would seem that however you treat the new addition would be able to incorporate that stair tower.

Applicant: Well that would violate the things you just told us about?

Gastinger: Could you rotate it this way?

Applicant: I don't understand.

Gastinger: We feel that it would be okay to extend the addition to that column. But we are not talking about extending the porch. Another thing to note, it might be that the stair can slide or the stair changes orientation with the expansion we are talking about.

Balut: There is some room for movement but not a whole lot.

Miller: Maybe it fits the style of the front, so that they are not divorced.

Sarafin: To make sure that each façade relates to the other somehow.

Miller: Everyone is fairly open, get in touch individually, we are here to help.

Motion: This is a preliminary discussion, so no motion is necessary.

9. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-09-02

946 Grady Avenue

Tax Parcel 310060000

Dairy Holdings, LLC, Owner/ Wendie Charles, Applicant

New Additions

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant's spoke about the specifics of the design that was submitted. We have not proposed any changes to what we have proposed.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Miller: On the office side, when it kicks out, what is the thinking on that?

Applicant: Trying to get a little bit of geometry change and perspective team.

Balut: The ally street, I'm wondering, when this street becomes a real street down the line, what are your thoughts?

Applicant: That is one of our main areas for traffic circulation. We are treating it as a secondary street. We are going to activate it with a good material.

Mohr: For Phase II, is the maximum height for that 50 ft. as well?

Applicant: We are not sure; the city is redefining how they figure out by right height for a building.

Comments from the Public:

Phoebe Stevens: I have a comment about traffic in this area, and how are you going to address that, especially around rush hour. What would be the impact and how are you addressing it?

Applicant: We are doing traffic studies, and are working on addressing these problems. We are very careful on how or where we are bringing in access. We are having community meetings, we had one last night. Very informative and very positive.

Comments from the Board:

Sarafin: I am supportive of the windows...

Gastinger: I agree, I am in support of that removal. I appreciate the strategy as a whole. I want to focus a couple comments on that. I think the window strategy is a good one, especially around the corner. However, keeping that central door operable would be preferable, for the program of the build. I would look toward a fairly simplified planting palette that helps with the buildings horizontality. I really like the stepped ramp, is there any way to get that to the central bay so that it's not perhaps waylaid by the tenants occupation, to make it as useful as possible. The other component I want to discuss and this is in reference to the horizontality of the building, is the roof terrace. I wonder if there is a way to flip the roof terraces with some of the green roofs.

Applicant: As you can see from the roof plans that are hard to do with the changes of elevation of the roofs. We have been sensitive to that. To the east, that's a different level. On the west, there are two level changes. We looked at terrace areas, but with all the changes of elevations it is difficult. The good news is that the owner is here for long term and he will hear what you have said.

Gastinger: To continue with my comments, you asked us specifically about the signage, the text signage is a bit loud and is it not keeping with the standards. I think where the words are located now are too close to the prominent architectural features. Perhaps move the sign perpendicular and lower. The larger mural, I'm not opposed, but the one precedent image that gives me pause, is that I would hate to see this for a historic dairy sign that is kind of weathered. That is my personal preference.

Applicant: I hear you, but I am not sure where else to put it. We will look at that.

Gastinger: Just thinking out loud you could bring them closer to the doors.

Mohr: More like a secondary sign.

Mohr: I have a code question, I like murals, but if they add that mural, are we going against our painting brick guideline?

Scala: Yes. A bigger concern, a sign question in precedent question. I would think that in a building this size, you would want additional signs.

Sarafin: So should they be looking at that as mural and not signage package?

Miller: Maybe the back doesn't have to be painted.

Applicant: Some of you will not like it, but if the sign is faded, there is going to be less impact on the brick. We will continue to talk to you about this. To identify what this is, I'm hearing a bit of a conflict. There are no other dairy buildings like this, please mull that as we continue. We have to get some kind of brand that identifies it. Our challenge is how we get that.

Miller: What if you took the sign off of the top of the building and put it on top of the retaining wall?

Applicant: That is an option. I would ask you to consider what a graphic may be then. We hear you.

Gastinger: Driving around that area currently, the current signage is not necessarily in the best place for those businesses.

Applicant: Our intention is not to have a buildup of people stopping to clog traffic to look at the sign.

Schwarz: We fought for UVA's battle building to move their sign down, so we will probably not be going back on that precedent that we set.

Balut: The most elegant thing of this building is the original façade, and its simplicity of the original form of the building. The roof top gardens and terrace are a great use of that space, in keeping with the simplicity. Everything else is perfectly rational and elegant. I like that you added one extra one to throw asymmetry in. All that strategy is perfectly sound. I think the way that you are proposing rooftop gardens is a great use of space and you are doing a great job.

Schwarz: I am going to focus on some of the details. I love wedge steps, but I don't think they will be approved, because I don't want them colored in yellow paint (like at the flats). You have an image of a green wall here; attach a trellis so that it is not supported by the brick. I don't want to see that alley become a major thoroughfare with cars. If you could do something design wise to encourage to only turn towards tenth street. I would be curious to know more about the additions you have on the roof. Window scheme is perfectly fine and maybe even reuse the windows that are coming out.

Applicant: This is meant to be very light and airy.

Miller: I agree. The additional demolition is appropriate. Also I think that the addition is done really well the way you kept the corner and the brick ribbon that comes around the back. I like the one story additions being light and airier.

Mohr: I'm not against the painted brick. We need to see a comprehensive shot at it. The office portion, which down the line is going to be the high point of the sight. I like the way it looks now, but it could be enhanced if it was a little taller.

Applicant: Mary Joy, are there any catch all's that we haven't discussed?

Scala: Lighting, materials.

Applicant: We are seeing if we can do copper or zinc wrap on the project.

Schwartz: You can always talk to us before for feedback. Please email us.

Balut: We are happy to review it. Clearly you all can put together a nice set.

Applicant: I'm just trying to find what are the triggers that might kick something.

Schwartz: It would be nice for you to have some sort of confidence of your site plan.

Motion: This is a preliminary discussion, so no motion is necessary.

E. New Construction

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-08-01

230 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280001000

Taliaferro Junction LLC, Owner/ Fred Wolf, Applicant

Ice Park Arena Redevelopment

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Fred Wolf, the applicant, handed out supplemental packets which show more 3D rendering to better understand the massing. Explained how the massing has not changed drastically except for over the gallery, which they moved to add more natural light into the gallery. Reiterated the fact that he would like preliminary site approval, so they can move forward with the design under the current zoning regulation. He went on to describe the massing and design details that are site specific and massing specific.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Balut: I am curious about the opening into the buildings on the mall and Water Street.

Applicant: The lobby is down at the corner that book ends the entrance to the gallery space opposite Carrytown tobacco. The way the building is organized, the land form and landscape are moving up which allows you to see a diagonal piece that moves up that landform. That is the hobby for the building, more like a hospitality lobby than and office lobby. That is one connection. If you turn the page and go to level 2, there is another lobby for the occupants, but can be transformed into a useable public space. Up at the Water Street, there is another lobby that is an open space working concept, and also serves the auditorium space...;

Balut: So there is not entrance along the Omni side?

Applicant: Correct.

Schwarz: On Water Street, what is the sidewalk width? I know there is an existing pinch point, does that still exist in your plan.

Applicant: Currently yes, that pinch point does still exist.

Schwarz: You aren't submitting any green space outside the building, correct?

Applicant: Correct, because the lower floor is all a courtyard that is surrounded by glass.

Balut: How public will the courtyard be?

Applicant: During business hours it will be open to the public to move around in, after hours, probably not. To encourage movement overlap, and to encourage people running through the building to meet one another and make connections. I think the owner will look into some sort of security because there are a lot of different businesses in there operating at different hours.

Miller: This is a statement and question: I think the massing is definitely moving in the right direction, especially on the mall side, but this [shows water street] rendering is worrying to me.

Applicant: I don't think that is a good rendering of our project. That was the reason I wanted to bring back the plans to you. It tends to give the illusion that there is a vast difference between those two and I don't really think that there is.

Miller: There just doesn't seem to be much relief.

Applicant: The other thing that I want to point out, a point in the study, when we were looking at openings that were fairly narrow, obliquely, that's going to start to collapse those things. A bias towards glass is beneficial. I agree, we have other things to produce and work on in that façade.

Balut: To clarify, on that section, what is the additional height added by the appurtenance?

Applicant: It is 13 feet to the roof of the appurtenance.

Balut: So that would be 113 feet, which is 15 feet taller than the adjacent building.

Applicant: Correct.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: I think the street through is infinitely better. The façade studies are helpful, even if the massing models are a little scary. I think the evolutions of those models are moving in the right direction.

Schwarz: I am very concerned about the Water Street elevation. You are constrained by zoning by that sidewalk. I would say that I would support you in obtaining a twelve foot sidewalk to get trees in there. It's a very vertical orientation and I would like to see layers to the mass. The courtyard would be absolutely magical, it makes total sense.

Balut: I agree with Carl, it is a lot, but it is consistent. I think the massing is extremely successful, while providing a public thoroughfare, I think the courtyard is going to be really nice, I like the way you utilize the step terraces, generally the massing is effective. I the 113-foot height on the south side is quite large, but I think that is mitigated.

Mohr: You have to think that that wall will be punctuated by something on that corner. I think the punch through of the street really works.

Gastinger: I think the path through the building is going to be really exciting to the life downtown. And I look forward to seeing how that evolves. As far as the massing is concerned, I continue to be very supportive. I think it is a nice balance for a lot of different factors, everything from urban to architectural... general approach to the skin that is wrapped throughout, which calls for some kind of relief from that repetition. The horizontal striation, while it does do a couple things, I think it might do you a disservice to make the building appear larger. Is there room in the scheme to treat each one quite differently? I think the one on the mall side is quite successful.

Mohr: [Gestures to drawing] starts to talk about scale breakdowns, and I think it is very promising.

Balut: For example that Water Street mass could be broken down into three different masses by treating the building skin in a slightly different way.

Applicant: I think we are looking into difference in materiality. As you move, we are looking at these things statically. How does it move and change? There is no question, we have a long wall. We are trying to think about ways to be able to have breakdowns in certain units that is still a part of a larger floor plate.

Schwarz: I would like to see some step back on the Water Street side that might help with the large wall.

Applicant: I think I said this last time, that I like you can look all the way through the space, and you get this layering experience that is happening at the street and pedestrian level, while you are looking through the building.

Miller: ... Another thing I like is the little stripes of lighting coming up through the pavement.

Applicant:

Miller: Overall, I think the massing is incredibly acceptable, interesting, and successful, while also deferring to the mall (the more significant) side. The question is, is the massing there that we can approve the massing tonight.

Mohr: I think it is, and I think Carl's comments about the step back falls under façade design and not massing.

Applicant: As per the opening discussion, is this enough for a preliminary site plan?

Mohr: We did take landscaping into account when looking at the Blue Moon massing COA.

Balut: Which drawing has the most information about the courtyard?

Applicant: I would say the axon combined with the cut away sheet.

Motion: Balut 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 massing satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the massing only as submitted, provided it complies with zoning regulations, and the schematic site plan. Mohr seconded. The motion was approved (5-1, with Schwarz opposed).

F. Special Use Permit Recommendations

11. Special Use Permit Recommendation (SUP)

BAR 17-11-05

517 Park Street

Tax Parcel 530009000

517 Park, LLC, Owner/ Kara Gloeckner, Applicant

Special Use Permit for additional residents

Mary Joy presented the staff report.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

No questions from the board.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: No applicant was at the meeting.

Motion: Miller moved to make no recommendation on the special use permit to allow more than 8 residents (to 12) in a group home due to no exterior changes and no additional information to evaluate any impacts that fall within the BAR's jurisdiction. Balut seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

12. Special Use Permit Recommendation (SUP)

BAR 17-11-03

200 2nd Street SW

Tax Parcel 280069000, 280071000, 280072000, 280073000, 280074000, 280075000

Market Plaza LLC, Owner/ Keith O. Woodard, Applicant

Special Use Permit for additional residential density

Mary Joy presented the staff report.

The applicant gave a brief presentation.

Questions from the Public:

There were no questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Gastinger: What are the SUP stipulations for the City Market stalls?

Applicant: There are many different documents that these discussions take place and we are trying to work through those since each is different.

Mohr: Is the loading dock on the same plane as the plaza?

Applicant: No it is 5 or 6 feet below this, we on working with Parks and Rec on this. This is just one access point though.

Mohr: It will have an industrial use most of time? Did you consider getting rid of the saw tooth? Are you using solar shades?

Applicant: We will be using clear glass, not solar shades.

Miller: We have a guideline of a minimum of 70 VLT. Building on Tim's question, what is the maximum height for a truck in the loading area?

Applicant: A small box truck.

Balut: Just to clarify, as far as the previous market plan. Is this a legal requirement or a preference?

Applicant: A preference.

Mohr: What caliber of tree do you envision going on top of the plaza?

Applicant: We have not picked the species, but we have grown trees that are 20-25 feet.

Comments from the Public:

Robert Mousamer: I am concerned about the height. I think the developers are trying to pull the wool over our eyes. Second, if there are residential units on top level that does

not count as an appurtenance, it counts as a residential floor. I forgot to say that I hope this development moves forward, but not in this way.

Ludwig Kuttner: I own the building to the north and I support the building, because right now it is a dirty parking lot. I am hoping a building like this will be able to create enough tax revenue to create affordable housing and show the Charlottesville is moving forward. Charlottesville needs more housing and more businesses, I think this building creates these possibilities.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: I have no problem with the increased density, I think it makes sense. The height problem is a conundrum and I am not really sure how to go about looking at that? I do like that you closed off the second street corner. Also, I like looking at darker colors, especially higher up.

Miller: To be something we work on.

Gastinger: I like the color exploration of the darker colors. However, since I am new to the board, I do not know how the previous discussions have gone, but I don't think that the city market works in this area. Currently, the market paths are 20 feet and they are packed, there is no way that the public can move through 10-foot paths.

Balut: Can I ask you very quick, what the current spacing of the market?

Applicant: They are currently 16 feet.

Schwarz: Can I ask you something about the plaza. It appears that this is a ramp to separate...how are you dealing with the slopes of the plaza and the surrounding. What am I seeing there?

Applicant: Generally, the whole plaza slopes at two percent to the southeast. We need a steeper ramp on the southeast side.

Miller: I just don't see how the market functions in this space. I think they should chalk it on the parking lot and then try it for the holiday market. This could be a mitigating factor on our SUP.

Mohr: This is a numbers question, with the additional floor your DOA is 83? Minus the floor where does that lend you?

Applicant: The representatives feel as though they have the data to analyze.

Schwarz: It would be important to know that the massing that we are looking at is actually a realistic massing that zoning would approve. It would be nice to know that what we are looking at is realistic.

Sarafin: I need clarification, so on the table right now is the SUP the increase in the number of units. Is this we are approving the increased units with the design changes to come back to the BAR or is the number of units predicated by these design changes. If we support this increased dwelling units, will we be locked into the massing.

Motion: Mohr moved to find that the proposed special use permit to allow increased density (from 60 units per acre to 83 units per acre) for the redevelopment of 200 2nd Street SW into a mixed use development including the City Market will not have an adverse impact on the Downtown Architectural Design Control (ADC) District, with the proviso that the BAR will want to review the height of the building in the context of massing and its street context when the project comes back for a COA. The BAR recommends approval of the Special Use Permit with this proviso, subject to the usual BAR review. The BAR also notes we are concerned about the functionality of the City Market, realizing the applicant is working with the City, but it concerns us. Sarafin seconded. The motion was approved (5-1, opposed by Miller).

G. Other Business

13. North Belmont Neighborhood National Register Nomination

Sarafin moved to find that the Charlottesville BAR recommends the North Belmont Historic District as proposed to be listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Gastinger seconded. The motion was approved (6-0).

14. PLACE report

Tim Mohr gave a PLACE report with the following main points:

- A person from Roanoke, who now works for City of Chicago, spoke regarding public engagement.
- PLACE was taken through the 3D modeling effort done for the SIA, which was somewhat anti-climactic. There needs to be someone working on it that understands graphic and architectural oversight, because right now that is not a part of the proposal; it was put together by GIS guys. It is not accessible to the public yet.

15. Downtown Parks RFP – update provided

H. Adjournment 12:30 AM