

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
June 19, 2018 – 5:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers - City Hall

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, chair, Carl Schwarz; Mike Ball, Stephan Balut, Justin Sarafin, Emma Earnst, and Tim Mohr

BAR Members Absent: Breck Gastinger

Staff Present: Jeff Werner; Camie Mess, Tim Lasley, Carolyn McCray

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)
No matters from the public.

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 May 15, 2018 Regular Meeting

The minutes were taken off of the consent agenda because they were not able to be circulated to the BAR before the meeting. Earnst moved to accept the consent agenda (946 Grady Avenue; 401 Cherry Avenue) seconded Balut, motion passed 7-0.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness
BAR 16-11-01
401 Cherry Avenue
Tax Parcel 290150000
Cherry Ave Investments, LLC, Owner/Steven Von Storch, Applicant
Amendments to COA

Approved on the consent agenda (7-0).

3. ~~Certificate of Appropriateness (deferred by applicant before the meeting)~~
~~BAR 17-06-02~~
~~315 East High Street~~
~~Tax Parcel 330067000~~
~~City of Charlottesville, Owner/ Scott Hendrix, Applicant~~
~~Amendments to COA~~

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-09-02
946 Grady Avenue
Tax Parcel 310060000
Dairy Holdings, LLC, Owner/ Wendie Charles, Applicant
Amendments to COA

Approved on the consent agenda (7-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-06-03
115 Altamont Circle
Tax Parcel 330122000
Tree Removal, Owner/ Alice L. Gore and William B. Hunt III, Applicant
Removal of Red Maple

This was removed from the consent agenda.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Balut: Are you planning on replacing that tree with another tree. If yes, can you tell us what that tree is, and where it will go?

Applicant: We would like to put something different there, maybe a red oak instead of a red maple.

Comments from the Public:

No comment from the public.

Comments from the Board:

No comments from the board.

Motion: Miller 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 tree removal satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions

- The replanting with a large shade tree conforming to the Charlottesville Tree List
- The tree have a caliper of no less than 2 inches
- The tree be planted no less than 4 feet from the curb

Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

C. New Items

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-06-08
853 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 31-169, 31-170
Potbelly Sandwich Shop, Owner/ Landmark Properties, Applicant/ GPD Group
New outdoor café, new storefront louver, Seasonal patio cover and heaters

Leanna Andryscio (with GPD Group): The applicant would like to have an outdoor dining option that would be seasonal, and to close off a portion with clear vinyl, that would be able to be removed. This does not impact the architecture of the building in any way.

Questions from the Public:

There were no questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: On A-0.2 you have an air intact louver showing up on the front of the building. Is that a mistake?

Andryscio: Yes.

Miller: There is no clarification on the visibility of the vinyl curtain? Such as how it attaches.

Andrysc: It will be non-permanent.

Balut: Do you mean the whole patio cover would be completely removed A-0.3 patio closure.

So you would have the frame work only in winter, probably six month out of a year.

Andrysc: Exactly. The framework would be minimal, and the curtain would come down during winter. The framework would remain.

Ball: How long do you think this would be up?

Andrysc: Probably at least six months out of the year, November thru April.

Ball: Have you researched any other options other than vinyl?

Andrysc: We have not. That seems to be the best insulating material at this point.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: I have no problem with the application except for the vinyl curtain, I think it detracts from the building and once it gets approved we have no way of enforcing that it only stays up during the denoted time frame.

Mohr: If it is going to be semi-architectural, I would rather see roll up garage doors, or something like that. I guess that is something the building owner would have to be addressed. If it is the intention of that space to be multi-use over time, than I would rather see if be more permanent.

Ball: The opening are rather big, but you might be able to find something like a storm window that you can clip into place for six months out of the year. Vinyl just doesn't wear well over time, UV rays effect it, and it tends to wear poorly.

Schwarz: In the motion we need to make sure that is adheres to the original SUP as well as the final approved site plan.

Motion: Motion: Mohr moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Cafes and Tents, I move to find that the proposed new outdoor café and new storefront louver satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition that the use of the outdoor café space complies with the conditions of the Special Use Permit (SP-13-08-15) and the Final Site Plan [for 853 West Main Street, *The Standard*].

The BAR moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral on the proposed seasonal patio cover [vinyl curtain].

Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness
BAR 18-06-02
714 Locust Avenue
Tax Parcel 510069000
Front Porch, Owner/ Rashard Dacus
Applicant/ James Robertson (Robertson Renovations)
Porch replacement and construct canopy

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Questions from the board.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

No comments from the board.

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 front porch and canopy satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0.)

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-06-05
510 East Main Street
Tax Parcel 53006700
Bank of America ATM, Owner/ 510 Partners, Applicant/ Stanley Hill
Addition of 24 hour ATM, storefront modifications, new signage

Applicant, Stanley Hill, the issue is there is a landing at the door that is pretty steep and the applicant is trying to figure how to fix it, without changing the storefront.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Mohr: What is the color rendering on the light fixtures? I am just asking that the light level be kept down and the color temperature be in the 3000 range.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Balut: I think [Tim] Mohr asked two good questions, and if we clarify that we should be ready to go.

Motion: Mohr moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, Public Design, and Signs, I move to find that the proposed storefront modifications and signage 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 the following conditions:

- All light fixtures are less than or equal to 3000 color rendering index (CRI)
[Note: As this is a 24 hour ATM facility, BAR condition applies also to the interior lighting at the ATM lobby relative to its visibility through the glass storefront.]

Sarafin seconded. Approved (7-0).

9. Certificate of Appropriateness
BAR 18-06-09
501 Park Street
Tax Parcel 530012000
Hospice of the Piedmont, Owner / Griffin Cottrell, Applicant
Landscape and site elements

The applicant is an Eagle Scout, and his project is to create a memorial garden with stone benches, mulching, and some planting inside.

Questions from the public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Miller: Can you tell us about the plantings?

Applicant: There are a couple of hydrangeas on the corners, as the gateway through the garden. All of these plantings won't spread and are low cut, so they won't block the view to the house, specifically the fountain grass will not spread and will stay put.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: Read [Breck] Gastinger's comments, since he could not be in attendance.

Applicant: Is open to moving the plants to the outside of the oval, and will plant in scale with the home.

Miller: Do you have a maintenance plan.

Applicant: It is part of my project to care and maintain the area.

Balut: I am happy to approve the application as is. I understand Breck's comments and I think they have a lot of merit, but I think having the plantings on the inside of the circle also has a lot of merit. I think having the plants on the inside creates a softer environment within the hardscape.

Schwarz: I agree.

Ball: Agrees with the comments.

Motion: Balut 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 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 recommendation that the applicant speak to the landscape architect on the BAR, Breck Gastinger, for recommendations on plantings and design. Sarafin seconded. Approved (7-0).

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 18-06-04

105 3rd Street, NE

Tax Parcel 330232000

Stage Left Café Project, Owner/ the Paramount Theater, Applicant/ Mical Tawney

Applicant, Mathew Simon, Director of Operations and Programming at the Paramount. My only question is do I need to take it away every day or can I leave it out if I have two events back to back days?

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Miller: Do you need the rail for ABC purposes, even if you aren't selling alcohol?

Applicant: From my understanding we need the rail for ABC purposes.

Sarafin: Just to clarify, there are no changes proposed to the storefront at this time.

Applicant: Not at all, just the railing. It will act as a seasonal outdoor space for us.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Balut: I think the proposal is completely appropriate. I would be in support of the rail being there all the time, if the applicant desired.

Mohr: So how do you make sure the chairs stay put?

Sarafin: That was my next question.

Applicant: It is no different from Rapture.

Miller: In a small space the sketched up rail will look busy, so you might be able to simplify it. If that design does change just make sure we get a digital copy of it for the official record and BAR Archive.

Motion: Balut moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Cafes I move to find that the proposed café space satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the understanding if the design of the rail changes that the applicant will submit that change to staff administratively for the BAR archive. Schwarz seconded. Approved (7-0).

The BAR noted that once they are done using the space for the season that they store the railings in the alleyway of the property.

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-06-01
404 East Main Street
Tax Parcel 280046000
New Dominion Bookshop, Owner/ NDB Land Trust/ George B. McCallum III and David W. Kudravetz
Trustees, Applicant/ Carla Edwards
Window replacement

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board

Schwarz: It is amazing how big the windows are on the back, and some of the panes are definitely handmade, they have all sorts of bubbles and things. It is obvious two of the lower sashes are warped. Is the outside completely rotten? If not, why replacing all of it, instead of the individual sashes?

Applicant: It is visible on the inside as well. The sashes are in horrific condition, and need to be replaced.

Schwarz: I am wondering if it is a possibility to replace one sash, but rehabilitate the rest of the window.

Applicant: The owner is hoping to replace the window since it cannot be seen by the public, so they don't have to worry about the maintenance on this large scale piece.

Mohr: What is your plan for the mull caps in that large window assembly?

Applicant: They would be made to match the existing. Everything will be milled to match existing. These windows should be notably repaired not replaced.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: [Reads through the window guidelines] To me it is fairly clear that these windows should be repaired rather than replaced.

Schwarz: I don't think anything can be done to fix the warped ones. I think some of the glass is really old, so whatever we end up deciding, please do not trash the windows.

Earnst: I think repair and not replaced is the most ideal situation. In the back, I understand it is not visible from the street, but we have a guideline that specifically says for windows in the rear of the building, follow the guidelines in the beginning of the chapter. To me, that makes it clear.

Miller: In an ADC District, all sides of the exterior fall under the BARs purview.

Schwarz: However we end up deferring this or conditioning this, I don't think you will be able to repair the whole thing.

Earnst: I think it could be treated a little more like front, where they are replacing specific panels.

Ball: I have a question about the front: How is the sash that is going to be replaced going to match the existing?

Applicant: It is being custom made to match, everything identical.

Motion:

Part I: Schwarz moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral.

Part II: 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 and rehabilitations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves only the application for replacement of the front window sash. Ball seconded. Approved (7-0.).

12. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-05-06
801 East High Street
Tax Parcel 530194000
Core Knowledge Foundation, Owner/, Applicant
Roof replacement (change of material)

Linda Bevilacqua, President of the Core Knowledge Foundations, motivation for seeking replacement is the slate is currently a hazard to the public. The applicant is asking to use the metal because it is less expensive than replacement slate, since they are a nonprofit the cost involved with replacing the slate is a concern.

Samantha Hanna, Customer Service Representative

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Mohr: Does it have a combed ridge or a vented ridge?

Applicant: I have images of the roof if you need them.

Ball: Is it a vented attic?

Applicant: What does that mean? I think there is a vent at the top.

Schwarz: The metal roof was replaced in the 1990s, so it is a modern metal roof because of that it probably doesn't have a ridge cap on it.

Miller: [Reads the roof guidelines]

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: My memory of when we last approved metal to replace a slate roof he thought it was because the roof could no longer bear the weight of the slate. We have approved the synthetic slate recently. The guideline says replacing a roof matching the original materials as close as possible. The metal portion has always been metal because it was added on after the original house was built. It is tricky because the guidelines say not to change materials, but this is a non-profit.

Ms. Bevilacqua: I love this house, I am the person that applied for the historic designation of the house many years ago.

Sarafin: The metal seems appropriate and it is cost prohibitive.

Schwarz: When we make this motion can we say the roof is already half metal, which is why we approved changing the material on this specific roof.

Miller: That is a great idea, just make sure the pan width and height are the same as the existing metal roof.

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 roof replacement changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the conditions:

- That the seams and ridge cap be hand crimped

- The pan and seam height be consistent with the existing standing seam metal roof that is on the addition, and the color match the existing standing seam metal roof.

Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0.)

The BAR noted that this motion passes due to the fact that portions of the existing roof have previously had standing seam metal roofing installed.

13. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-06-10
1501 Gordon Avenue
Tax Parcel 050078000
Edgar J. Gunter, Owner/Peter Gunter, Applicant
Edgar Gunter wanted to be in the city, turning into rental property.
Screen Porch Addition to the back of the house

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Balut: Could you clarify where the brick wall is that is not in this picture?

Gunter: It is right in front, it is a retaining wall along Grady.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: I understand you want to have the roof of the porch to be at twelve feet. My concern is that a twelve foot roof will meet the brick wall right at the window sills, so I would want you to lower that at least eight inches, to allow flashing, so the water can drain properly and not rot out the window sills.

Schwarz: So the deck itself will also look like the neighboring deck. Tim confirm for me, since the deck is two feet above the ground, they do not need pickets?

Mohr: That is correct.

Miller: Was the supplemental information added to their on line application archive and if not, can it be.

Werner: It was added.

Ball: I don't think it is going to be visible, so I am not concerned about that. There are not many details here, but it sounds like you are going to match what is next door.

Werner: Yes, the applicant wants it to look like his dad's deck [next door.]

Miller: We try to work with applicants, and we have to require equal standards of detail across applications, and we don't have that level of detail here. It seems like we have a comfort level among the board because they are doing a mirror image of the deck next door. We will need the applicant to turn in a cut sheet for the door and final information of exact materials so the BAR Archive can be kept up-to-date.

Mohr: An accurate set of photos to reference about what is going to be built would help and holds the applicant a little more accountable.

Sarafin: Some more documentation would help.

Miller: Also, a word of caution, if it seems like it will deviate, the BAR would need to get looped in to that change instead of after the fact.

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 addition 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 with the following conditions:

- Submit to staff a cut sheet for the new door and accurate set of photos of the neighboring existing porch from all sides
- The porch roof/wall joint will be 8” below the sill of the [existing, 2nd floor] window.
- Any deviations from the submittal to be turned in to staff for the BAR archive.

Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

The BAR noted that this motion passes because the applicant is replicating a neighboring porch and deck [at 1503 Gordon Ave.] without deviation.

14. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
 BAR 18-06-06
 513 Rugby Road
 Tax Parcel 050053000
 Pi Kappa Alpha, Owner/ West Range Castle Dango, LLC, Applicant/ BRW Architects
 Enclosure of porches, replacement of windows, repainting of trim, repointing of brick

Architect, Bruce Wardell, as mentioned in the staff report the majority of this work is maintenance. We have been trying to get the applicant to apply for historic tax credits, since all of our work will be done to that standard, but have not been successful. The two major issues are the windows and the two enclosure porches. We are planning on the addition of the double hung windows and the paneling to be in accordance with the standards of the Secretary of the Interior, and will be added in a partition inside, so they can be removed without damaging any of the existing historic fabric of the building. The benefit is it will provide some additional interior living space, and will drastically improve the relationship between this building and the sorority next door. There is no change anticipated to the site.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: For the window replacements you are requesting, are you replacing just the sashes? The frame and the casing? Or is everything going?

Wardell: The most aggressive would be replacing the frames and the sashes.

Ball: Is the middle window in the back two double hungs stacked?

Applicant: There is a wide double hung, above a single with a double hung below it, with a panel in between.

David Zimmerman: I don't think those windows have been used in years.

Sarafin: It sounds like you are replacing it in kind, has that concept been run by the tax credit folks?

Wardell: My understanding is when you are doing this type of replacement, matching is what they want.

Werner: How do you plan on keeping the muntins narrow?

Mohr: I think they are matching the profile, there is just more depth to the glass. The profile looks exactly the same.

Applicant: This manufacture can make whatever custom muntin you want, it is a serious upcharge, but we believe it is worth it.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: Half question/half comment about the stair window, in the elevation it looks like one solid window. Is that an error?

Applicant: That is an error that should be corrected.

Mohr: On the side of the porch you have a generous light size that is a different proportion than the front of the house's twin double hung windows.

Wardell: The spacing on the left porch is different than the spacing on the right porch, between the columns. We could try three windows on the side, but that makes it look very busy and dense.

Mohr: Since it is a new piece of the house, I was wondering if you could come up with a different muntin approach all together.

Applicant: We were trying to use all historic profiling.

Mohr: I was just thinking that since this is a modern take on a sun porch you should try to bring in those components, to make it more light and airy.

Applicant: The one rule we used, is set by the corner column.

Mohr: It is a lovely old house.

Miller: Went through the guidelines and pointed out which pertained to the project. She is against the windows being fixed.

Balut: I would be in support of replacing the windows, and am in support of this application.

Miller: Will there be any landscaping improvements to come?

Applicant: Yes, on the adjacent property.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, and New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed renovations and porch enclosures satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines 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, with the following stipulations:

- For replaced windows, keep and repair the window frames and casings [exterior trim] in place.
- The rear [basement level] doors being replaced with windows, the opening shall be retained with panels infilling the space below the windows.
- The front and rear light fixtures will be submitted to staff and circulated to BAR for approval.
- The rear windows [center of elevation at 1st and 2nd floors] at the interior stairs will remain as double-hung windows. [If replaced, the new will match the existing.]
- Recommend at the porch enclosures the investigation of other window configurations—decision being left to applicant's discretion.
- Recommendation to repair existing windows [wherever possible], rather than replacing.
- For windows that must be replaced, they must be replaced in-kind.
- Front door should be repaired, and if not, should be replaced in-kind.

Balut seconded. Approved (6-1, with Miller opposed).

D. New Construction

15. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-08-01
230 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 280001000
Brands Hatch LLC, Owner/ Fred Wolf, Applicant
New Construction – Final Details

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the board

Schwarz: Are the ramps definitely going to be there?

Wolf: Yes, for accessibility reasons.

Balut: Similar issue with the tapered stairs, is there going to be a yellow painted color, if is there going to be some way around that?

Wolf: We are hoping that it will not be the case.

Schwarz: Maybe it can be a contrast with a slightly different color or finish.

Ball: Why did the trees move off the steps?

Applicant: We wanted to create open up the gallery and make it a stronger line. There was also a desire, from past meeting with you all, about the courtyard to have more plantings.

Ball: How big will those trees get?

Applicant: 45-50 feet Honey Locust.

Mohr: What is the program intention for the niche with the wood doors in the Carrytown building?

Applicant: Those are fruit stalls. The intention of the courtyard is to have tables and chairs out there for seasonal dining.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: [read Breck Gastinger's comments]

Mohr: The underside of the bridge is light from the ground up so you are not getting any light directly at you.

Applicant: Correct. We tried to avoid any down lighting.

Balut: Are there going to be grills around the trees?

Applicant: We are working on that detail.

Balut: Is that courtyard going to be pervious to storm water?

Applicant: Yes, it will be. It will include a hydro tech system.

Ball: I agree with what Breck was saying about the entryway [via email], but it would be nice to have something that softens the area.

Balut: I agree. I appreciate the view shed that you are keeping open, but I do think there are some areas on the west side that could keep that open, and still be softened up.

Ball: Getting rid of the trees is not a bad thing, because it allows the public to see that you can walk through that area.

Schwarz: I generally have a problem with up lights and this seems to have quite a few up lights.

Ball: What is the storm water control in this plaza?

Applicant: It is a cistern.

Balut: I think the design is quite elegant, simple, and understated. It creates a very fertile environment that is flexible, which I think you were trying to accomplish. Formally it is quite successful.

Motion: Mohr moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, New Construction, and Public Design I move to find that the proposed revisions satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the suggestion that landscape design add more trees to the mall end of the courtyard. The resolution of the tree grates needs to come back and be circulated for BAR review. Request that applicant assure that visibility issues along steps and edges will not later result in/require the installation of safety marking (for ex. yellow tape). Earnst seconded. Approved (6-1, with Schwarz opposed).

16. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-11-03

200 2nd Street SW

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

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

New Construction

This was a long discussion about this project that can be heard at:

http://charlottesville.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1304 3:56:38-5:35:50.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

No questions from the board.

Frank Hancock: Is this approved by a site plan process?

Square footage to market vendor, around 28,000 square feet, they have more than what they have 25,000.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Gastinger: He cannot support this project, nothing suggest that this is nothing to suggest hardly fits the market program. A lot of unknowns and what is the public left with this proposal. Not improving the public interest.

Ball: great things with the plaza, details, built in benches, it is a massive building, 101 foot ht. So far past it here, northeast corner even at the northwest corner 1-7.2 inches. Well past supposed to be passed by code.

Schwarz: confused by what he saw, he is not seeing it in these rendering. Presented a brick that doesn't look like what is in the rendering. Plaza has come a long way, the shade structure is getting close.

Mohr: the railing glass and perforated glass panel. Flats have pattern is a panel.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, New Construction and Additions, and Public Design I move to find that the proposed Massing, and Site Design and Elements satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted for massing, and site and landscape design. With the following items to be submitted for review at a future BAR meeting:

- more details for the plaza design, specifically regarding the paving and the trellis/shade structure;
- further investigation of the Water Street and 2nd Street SW elevations for pedestrian scale, specifically on the base.

And a request to investigate introducing elements of the plaza trellis/shade structure into the upper stories of the building [for example, at the balconies].

Mohr Seconded. Approved (4-3, with Miller, Ball, and Earnst opposed).

Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, New Construction and Additions, and Public Design I move to find that the proposed Massing, Elevations, and Site Design and Elements satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted (or with the following modifications...) seconded Mohr motion passes 4-3 (Melanie, Ball, Earnst voted no)

17. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 18-03-01
843 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 310175000
Kim Dabney, Owner/ Clark Gathright, Applicant
Proposal for new three story office building

Staff report given by Jeff Werner

Jim Grigg, Architect: said he worked with owner to revise scheme, keeping features such as precast concrete and glass, while creating scale and massing that are appropriate within the district and guidelines. He said we are not here for a final approval, just trying to find approach for city and owner. Haven't really thought about street trees or landscaping. I believe that this building is appropriate within guidelines.

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

Schwarz: I think you've done what was asked, the door right off of the street, modulation breaking down to the pedestrian scale, and given transparent glass. He is concerned material to be precast concrete white, white on West Main Street will get really dingy. Steer clear from white concrete, and the street trees not what he is dealing with. It is modern, you showed a traditional format, and the massing is about the same. He can see this working.

Mohr: What is the street setback?

Mr. Grigg: 10 feet setback.

Mohr: And the two punch outs are at 10 feet?

Mr. Grigg: Yes.

Mohr: I think that the basic massing works better than the previous. I am still unsure about the wedges of the floor plates, and that language, it seems unresolved. It is a much more urban building than before. I would like to see more imply details on drawings.

Miller: I want to apologies and committing a meeting with you all, and I had to leave for work un-expectantly, and thank you Tim [Mohr] for standing as the second BAR member at that meeting in my place. I think that the building achieves a number of things in the guidelines such as the parking lot being located behind the building, it has a street wall, it achieves urban infill, and it respects surrounding structures. The windows are a huge improvement from last time, but there is still too much glass, and vertical expression of windows are encourage, as where your windows are horizontal. Agrees that white will become unattractive overtime, and will require heavy maintenance.

Ball: I'll echo the comments about the windows and doors. I like where you've gone with the base, but the glass takes away from the historical aspects of the building. Maybe if model was more realistic it could be represented building. Not a lot of visual interest, feels like a blank wall. I worry about what it will feel like.

Sarafin: This iteration doesn't turn its back on the street. It is more engaging than the previous iteration

Miller: Thinking of a precedent, the building where there was a pizza was white metal panels when it was a garage.

Schwarz: I think the precedent for this building is the Battle Building, which has a solid base, but is mostly glass above the base.

Mohr: But there are more contrasting materials and colors, and doesn't.

Ball: I don't mind the horizontal aspect of the building.

Mohr: I think the scale of the building is more fitting of those down the street, rather than the ones up the street. I feel like the schematic needs to be about how the building is detailed

Schwarz: I am interested to see how the spandrel glass will look on this building. It will make a difference.

Mohr: This has a lot of a jewel box character.

Balut: I appreciate the modulation and three entrances on the street. I understand the idea of breaking own the massing, I feel like this building would be better if it was taller in the context of West Main. It is so schematic, and it looks like a suburban office building, now it seems too suburban and lacks detailing. Functionally, I think the building should have some retail space if possible, making the ceiling height higher. How tall is the ceiling height?

Mr. Grigg: 16 feet

Balut: That is good, and is appropriate for retail. I don't find anything remarkably off-putting or incompatible with the guidelines, I just would like for it to offer more intrigue and urban feel. It does not feel unique to the context. I think the precast concrete color is a big part in that. I agree that white would be regrettable.

Mr. Grigg: Largely that is a result of the glazing. This is the first time the board has seen this, and I am looking for the agreement that this tri partied approach is appropriate for this district. The owner wants all glass, and most historic buildings have punched windows, making this ok in this context.

Mohr: Would it bust your program if you went up one more floor?

Mr Grigg: It would be more of an economical concern, and that there is room for a lager building behind this. The owner would like to build this building in honor of her father in law, who was raised on this site.

Miller: There seems to be general support for the concept, but the architect should be clear as to whether the concrete color is a defining feature, because there is not a general consensus of the white paint.

Ball: I am not totally against the white concrete. I am just unsure about both the glazing and the white concrete. I don't think that they will work together, but they might would work either or.

Schwarz: I would not be ok with the white, but it would be so much more interesting if there was another material. It is going to look really gross, really fast.

Ball: I guess I am thinking about it as an old bank building, but maybe I am envisioning it wrong

Miller: Any other potential red flags?

Sarafin: I understand the desire for all glass, but I think there should be more exploration with window to wall.

Schwarz: I am ok with the glass.

Balut: The glass is not the issue, the combination of the precast and the glass. It could be fine, it is such an early level. I have more problem with the precast than the glass.

Sarafin: There is a severity in the symmetry, would breaking it up feel more like an additive. It is rigid.

Mr Grigg: As soon as you're not punching upper floors, it is not going to look like a traditional building. I would much prefer an asymmetrical design, but it is only a hundred feet long.

Schwarz: I appreciate the way the proportions are classic. It feels comfortable to me. The recessed doors are awesome.

Mohr: The white concrete is dematerializing. The Battle building has more texture. You don't need marble columns, but they have weight, and something we are all used to. The concrete feels very plastic.

Balut: Another problem is as a building, it doesn't offer much to the pedestrian. If building embraced asymmetry, and pushed back some, it would be in keeping for West Main. It is lacking pedestrian space in addition to programmatic spaces.

Miller: We could approve the massing.

Mohr: Push back the center to create a courtyard space would be nice.

Schwarz: I disagree with pushing the building back.

Mohr: Don't push back the whole building, just the center.

Miller: Asymmetry may not work in this particular situation.

Mohr: I think they can run with this massing

Ball: I like the idea of stepping back the center. It has classical proportions, and maybe a portico could even be added.

Balut: If the right bay were to go back 10 feet, then the front façade has some depth to the pedestrian.

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, move to find that the proposed massing and proposed glazing (in-concept) of the Office Building satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district. Additionally, the BAR would like the applicant to investigate stepping back portions of the building [from the street] and the BAR strongly recommends the applicant investigate and change the building's materiality. Mohr seconded. Approved (6-1, with Ball opposed).

10:10 18. Preliminary Discussion
BAR 18-06-07
0 Rugby Road
Tax Parcel 050047100
Zero Rugby Road, Owner/ West Range Castle Dango, LLC, Applicant/ BRW Architects
New Construction

Miller: This is a preliminary discussion for 0 Rugby Road.

Bruce Wardell, Architect: These are more conceptual and diagrammatic. We are looking at building an apartment building with 12 units. The property drops 20 feet from Rugby Road to the end of the site. The scale of the building is larger than surrounding properties. Materials could be wood or stucco on the wings, we do not have the opportunity to emulate the porch next door [513 Rugby]. The access to ZBT, 0 Rugby, and 513 are all accessible from one access point, making some cross property agreements for parking. Parking will be underneath the structure. Grading down to get sunlight for the floor below. This is a large scale building, but has a small presence from the street. The structure has a traditional center with contemporary edges.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Miller: Has the city never relented the step back of the parking

Mr Wardell: Staff was willing to interpret the front yard as 25 feet from the front line. They would not let us get four more spaces to the ten foot line. Yards are both vertical up and vertical down.

Miller: I would be happy to write a note of support.

Mr Wardell: The intent is to trap the cars in the back, so they will inherently get used less.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: I feel like the sides could be pushed back a little more.

Mr. Wardell: It sits back about a foot now.

Sarafin: Maybe it could be pushed back asymmetrically.

Mr Wardell: The house can't really move forward due to the hard edge of the surrounding properties.

Sarafin: Maybe you could wade it off to the side. The symmetry is so regular, if it came off of one side, and went back further?

Mr Wardell: We have used about every square inch of our building. We have angled the building to gill the 25 foot setback at the rear.

Mohr: It might read lighter if the slots were developed more like spandrels, and treated more like a wall. They might relate to that central glass.

Sarafin: Yeah, they may be a little too prominent.

Miller: When you develop a landscaping plan, maybe you could implement some large trees to help hide those flanks.

Mr Wardell: We want to redo the center piece in more detail.

Schwarz: I think it generally works [mixture of architectural styles] in context of the street, I think the traditional piece should be traditional, and the contemporary piece remain contemporary, do not have any middle ground. It would be good to review other entryways.

Mr Wardell: We did not want to mimic the style of 513 Rugby. We copied dimensions, and began to push and pull.

Miller: It would be a joke to mimic the style.

Mohr: You could do a funky and fun façade

Ball: Shift the house over to one side of the property, making it more asymmetrical, giving it more of a feel that this building is an addition to the street as a whole.

Mr Wardell: This form could be moved anywhere on the property

Sarafin: It would feel more like an addition

Ball: It feels like a traditional form with clamps.

Balut: It feels more of a modern building with a colonial classical façade. I hate to see this building be a contemporary box with a traditional façade. It would be more interesting to do this neoclassical building in an abstract way.

Miller: Could some underground parking get expanded?

Mr Wardell: I don't know if we could do that in the side yards. Widening it wouldn't give us extra parking. We are at our maximum unit count without an SUP. Initially we thought we would do three stories, but it created form issues.

E. Other Business

10:40 19. PLACE report – no place report

F. Adjournment