

**BAR MINUTES**  
**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE**  
**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**[December 18, 2018] – 5:30 p.m.**  
**City Council Chambers - City Hall**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). After presentations by staff and the applicant, members of the public will be allowed two opportunities to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. The Chair will first ask for questions from the public, then from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to ask questions, and up to three minutes to comment. Comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

**PLEASE NOTE THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATIM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT [http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)**

**Members Present:** Justin Sarafin, Stephen Balut, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Melanie Miller, Emma Earnst, Tim Mohr, and Mike Ball

**Staff Present:** Jeff Werner, Camie Mess, and Kari Spitler

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

None.

**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** [November 20, 2018] Regular Meeting

**Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the consent agenda. Earnst seconded. Approved (7-0-1, with Mohr abstained)**

**C. Deferred Items**

- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
**BAR 18-11-01**  
**128 Franklin Street**  
**Tax Parcel 560114400**  
**Sam Monfort, Owner/Applicant**  
**New Construction**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This is a vacant parcel within Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District. The BAR granted the CoA last month with conditions, for which the applicant would like to request to amend two of them. Applicant would like to amend the CoA condition to allow front porch roof to be constructed per their submittal, as the design intent is to align the porch roof with the overhand of the house roof. There are other houses within the HC with the front porch roof extended beyond the sides of the house. Applicant would also like to amend the condition to allow Hardie shakes on the front pediment, as they believe the Hardie product is suitable and will achieve the design intent. Both the shakes and the Harding siding will be prefinished with the same color and notes that the use of genuine cedar would require additional costs for installation and maintenance. Lastly, applicant would like to remove the recommendation to paint cedar on the porch, as they prefer the natural color. Staff recommends approval of these requests, as they have demonstrated that within the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District there are examples of similar roof extensions and the use of unpainted/unstained cedar. As for the Hardie shakes, the regulations and guidelines for projects within this district are less rigid than those of an ADC district by design.

**Applicant, Sam Monfort:** Prefers the Hardie shakes and believes it would be a good alternative to some of the other shakes they've seen. There are other properties that are installing the product right now and notes that they look very nice. Notes that he cannot distinguish between the materials, especially if there are 20-30 feet in the air. In terms of the roof edges, the applicant simply likes the way that it looks and because the house is on a narrow lot, having the roof pop off would broaden the appearance of the house. States that the cedar columns would bring a lot of warmth and would prefer to use that

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Ball:** Asks if Hardie is the specification and if there are photos of other houses with the extended porch roof

**Mr. Monfort:** Confirms. The photos were supplied within the amendment application

**Mr. Ball:** Notes that the shed roof is an odd condition and from other projects, he does not think it looks historic

**Mr. Monfort:** Understands the desire to keep things in a particular design and notes that it is just an aesthetic preference to do the shed roof

**Eric Robertson, Smith & Robertson:** As far as the front roof goes, notes that there is not enough lead time to change them because they have been ordered already. Adjusting to a different shape roof would financially impact the applicant

**Ms. Miller:** Asks when they were ordered

**Mr. Robertson:** A few weeks ago

**Mr. Gastinger:** Is the truss all the way out and supporting the edge of the roof?

**Mr. Robertson:** That would be an extension of the ledger board

**Mr. Ball:** In theory, the applicant could either not do the extension and keep it inside, or just not use a few trusses and do a stick frame him

**Mr. Robertson:** Absolutely, but there is added cost for labor

**Mr. Gastinger:** Asks if the siding on the side elevation is coplanar with the siding of the building

**Mr. Robertson:** Yes and all of the trusses would be used. If there was a change in the roof size, some would have to be discarded. Notes that if the roof ends on the same plane, the porch itself would have to be skinner because the overhang required for the porch is a function of the porch

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** Notes that she was in favor of all of the suggested changes but doesn't know if they make an enormous difference. Thinks that it can always be painted later, so that portion is not fundamental to the success of the project, but does not think the shed roof is the way to go

**Mr. Mohr:** It is a Conservation District so it doesn't seem like a scale question, but rather a details question

**Mr. Sarafin:** Given the looser guidelines for a conservation district, this fits within an appropriate realm within mass and scale and would be in support of the application as resubmitted. We can offer advice or comments about what it could be, but it does meet the requirements of the Conservation District

**Mr. Mohr:** Feels as though it is idiosyncratic, but doesn't think it affects the scale of the building even though it looks odd

**Mr. Balut:** Agrees that it is eclectic and although he does not prefer it, it adds to the eclectic nature of the neighborhood and it is within the confines of the guidelines

**Mr. Werner:** Notes to keep in mind that the similar house to this one is a contributing structure of the district and it was there when the survey was done so there is precedent

**Mr. Schwarz:** Still recommends painting it because it could look very cheap very quickly, but it is ultimately the applicant's decision

**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 requested amendments to November 20, 2018 COA satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and

other properties in the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the request as submitted. Balut seconded. Approved (6-2, with Ball and Miller opposed)

### 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 18-08-02**

**310 4th Street NE**

**Tax Parcel 330205L00**

**Great Eastern Management, Owner/ Henningsen Kestner Architects, Applicant**

**Renovation and addition of square footage and patio area**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** The building was constructed in 1998 and is a contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC District. Application is requesting renovation of the existing building and construction of three story additions at the east and west facades (4<sup>th</sup> Street NE and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street NE, respectively). The proposed materials include new lighting that will be dimmable and recessed can lights in the porch ceilings, all new glazing to be clear glass with the glass in the existing fenestration to remain, new roofing on the east and west extensions and at the infill section that will match the existing roof, brick walls and columns, stone/pre-cast foundation and column bases, and mortar joints to match the existing, and new metal railing to match the existing that will be painted white. Staff believes these details are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, however the fixture selection for the recessed lighting is less important than including conditions related to lamping and glare.

**Applicants, Chris Henningsen and Caitlin Shafer, Henningsen Kester Architects:** The anchoring of the building has changed so it doesn't feel like it is on stilts and it has been dropped just over two feet. Brick coursing has been added over the garage that adds to the landscape of the building and the landscape has been added to the renderings as well. As for the garage elevation, the spacing of the columns have changed and the half wall has been added to mimic the ramp side, which frames the entrance better and draws the attention away from the garage opening. Lastly, all of the new glass on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> street elevations will be clear and the glass on the High Street and East Jefferson Street would be clear where the patio infill is. The clear glass would have a 70% VLT and a 34% VLT for the existing glass.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** On the rendering of 4<sup>th</sup> street, is there a large tree nearby?

**Ms. Shafer:** That is a large existing tree in front of the bank parking area

**Mr. Gastinger:** Does not believe that is on the property. Asks if the trees on High Street are going to remain

**Ms. Shafer:** All of the plantings will remain but they are adding to it

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

**Mr. Mohr:** The heavier base and the brick helps the projections quite a bit and looks more grounded

**Mr. Ball:** Agrees and thinks this adjustment has helped a lot

**Mr. Mohr:** Asks if the column on the corner could be turned

**Ms. Shafer:** It can. They would be hesitant about sight lines but, it could be done

**Mr. Gastinger:** Notes that Mr. Mohr would just like to get it in proportion so it looks more even

**Mr. Schwarz:** Would you do the same thing to the porches up above?

**Mr. Mohr:** No because those would be comprehended as squares

**Mr. Gastinger:** Agrees and thinks the proportions are better than in any previous renderings

**Mr. Schwarz:** Notes that is better, but the applicant is taking a background building and making it a foreground building. Thinks Court Square is precious because there aren't that many historic areas in the City and it currently has a park-like feel that would not be there any longer with this prominent building coming out. Notes concerns with the synagogue on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street because by pulling the building closer to the street, it would turn 3<sup>rd</sup> Street into an alleyway. However, notes appreciation of the idea to get residential downtown and activating the building

**Mr. Sarafin:** Thinks the applicant has addressed everything that was discussed in the last meeting and is in support of the application

**Mr. Ball:** The 4<sup>th</sup> Street side shows renderings of large trees but the 4<sup>th</sup> Street plant pallet shows the canopy trees going right into the building. Do we know how much room there is from the curb to the building?

**Mr. Gastinger:** Comments that it will be a very tight area because the trees are essentially in a similar plane as where they currently are, but if you imagine the building out at the level of the sidewalk, it would be very close. They can grow at that distance but they will shoot out into the street to get light, which could cause long term issues for maintenance

**Mr. Gastinger:** Are there power lines on that side of the street on 4<sup>th</sup> Street?

**Ms. Shafer:** Does not think there are any power lines

**Mr. Mohr:** Understands the issues with Court Square, but it looks like it is treated more of a street wall instead of a series of monumental blocks. There is an appeal that it is something that would move in and out and will provide transparency because it will offset some of the porches. Wonders if it is a richer façade than it was before

**Mr. Schwarz:** The new porches will extend out 12 feet

**Mr. Mohr:** Right now it is not a very inviting building and making it bigger might seem a little counterintuitive, but it might have a little more life as a wall instead of a series of boxes like it is now

**Gastinger:** Thinks the planting pallet looks reasonable and appropriate for the space available. Shares concerns about the viability of the trees on 4<sup>th</sup> Street and the façade does seem to rely on the mediating scale of the trees to be successful

**Ms. Miller:** Are there any recommendations to alleviate that?

**Mr. Gastinger:** The dimensions would be needed to determine that and would like to know if the intention of the landscape architect was to select more of an upright variety or if there was something particular in mind

**Mr. Ball:** It is difficult to tell how much was being required from the original submission in the 1990s, but it seemed like it was intentional. Having viable trees in the location seems like a good idea

**Mr. Gastinger:** States that most of the brick walk is usually vacant

**Mr. Balut:** By making this a residential area, it will complement the area and making more of a human presence in scale. Right now there is no engagement with the community and likes the addition of the balconies. Agrees that the more street trees that can be accommodated the better and would encourage as much landscaping that can fit

**Mr. Ball:** Believes that the building has a great design, although the street trees are important on 4<sup>th</sup> Street

**Mr. Henningsen:** Notes that there will be room, he just has to allow for it

**Mr. Gastinger:** Shares concerns about the handicapped parking that is in the garage entrance and asks how that works

**Mr. Henningsen:** Historically that space was not a parking space, but rather a delivery space. It is now a handicapped spot that was requested by a lawyer in the area and they made it for him. The space is currently in use

**Mr. Schwarz:** The bar over the garage door is a 7 foot clearance. When it is renovated, is van clearance going to be needed?

**Mr. Henningsen:** They will be grandfathered into the building structure that is already there

**Mr. Miller:** Asks if there is an elevator inside the garage? If so, couldn't there be a handicapped space inside and let the existing handicapped space be a more enhanced landscape?

**Mr. Henningsen:** Yes, there are elevators on every floor of the garage and there are handicapped spaces in the garage. However, an 8 foot clearance is needed for a van

**Ms. Ernst:** States that the changes that have been made have vastly improved the building but the glass is still concerning because 34% is not ideal

**Mr. Sarafin:** The building has come a long way over the years and the porches and clear glass should make it seem more residential and increase activity

**Mr. Schwarz:** Notes that if there are concerns regarding the trees, it should be mentioned and made clear in the motion

**Mr. Henningsen:** Notes that there is about 10 feet of space from the trunk to the curb, which is 5 feet off the building façade

**Ms. Miller:** Asks what the mature height of the tree would be

**Mr. Gastinger:** It would be in the 30-40 foot range, given proper conditions

**Motion:** Mohr having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed renovations and additions 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.

- The column on the southwest corner of the garage [entrance] should be widened to match the dimensions of the other garage column [Staff note: This refers to the south face of this column; that it should have same width as the west face.]
- The BAR would like to see an additional planting plan with an emphasis on street trees, specifically 4<sup>th</sup> Street, to be brought back to the BAR
- If/when glass is replaced after its lifecycle is complete, the new will meet design standards for clear glass.
- Work with the city to protect the street trees in the city's right of way.

Sarafin seconded. Approved (6-2, with Miller and Schwarz opposed)

**Mr. Werner:** Clarifies that in the future, a lifecycle related replacement of the original glass should be clear.

#### D. New Items

##### 4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 18-12-03**

**550 East Water Street**

**Tax Parcel 530162300**

**550 East Water LLC, Owner/ Robert Nichols, Applicant**

**Addition of overhead canopy**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This application is regarding an addition of overhead canopy at the northwest entrance in the Downtown ADS District. The request is to install an aluminum-clad 8' 6" by 4"-4", cantilevered canopy over the entrance at the northwest corner, which will match the Water Street main entrance canopy. The underside will be metal and painted white. The canopy edge facing Water Street will have a signage panel with painted, dimensional letters illuminated from above by recessed, dimmable, LED lighting strip. Additionally, the applicant stated that the canopy sign lighting will have a color temperature of 3,000k, a 60 degree beam spread, 5" diameter, 1506 lumens with a black trim color. Staff finds that the canopy is appropriate for the Downtown ADC District and appropriately conforms to the existing building's architectural concept and materiality. Notes that the BAR can only

approve the signage in concept and the applicant will submit an official sign permit to zoning in order to receive sign approval.

**Applicant, Robert Nichols, Formwork Design:** Comments that in further conversation with the sign maker, they may go in a direction of a channel sign so the lighting would be different. Rather than lighting the objects/letters from above, the light would come from behind the letters to create a glow behind them. Ideally, if the Board moves to approval, both options would be seen as an acceptable alternative if it were to go that route. Notes that the signage was proposed as a monument sign originally and after this submission was prepared, the client requested expressed interest in having both conditions. This current submission does not show these two things together, which is also something to consider.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Mohr:** If a monument sign is used, would the logo be repeated?

**Mr. Nichols:** It was important that the signage didn't break the plane in front of the building and it's looming the visibility and presence

**Mr. Mohr:** Could you do the monument sign in lieu of the lettering on the canopy?

**Mr. Nichols:** No, as they are interested in both. Prefers that if only one option was acceptable, he would favor the canopy sign

**Mr. Gastinger:** How will they be shedding water? Is it drained internally?

**Mr. Nichols:** It would be caught and taken to the cavity in the wall

**Mr. Balut:** Asks where the monument sign would be located

**Mr. Nichols:** It would be perpendicular with the building

**Ms. Mess:** Notes that by zoning a monument sign is not allowed in the Downtown ADC District

**Mr. Werner:** Clarifies that the monument sign that was shown in July would have letters on a plate, but if it changes to something illuminated from behind, it cannot be internally lit

**Mr. Nichols:** Notes that it is not translucent and would have a pleasing result

**Mr. Gastinger:** The rendering illustrates a challenge with a new proposed walk to the entrance because of how narrow it is and asks for clarification on what the planted space up against the building is. Notes that it should either be removed or be more robust

**Mr. Nichols:** It is the bit of existing planting that is currently there



**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Ball:** Thinks that the canopy looks good and fits the building well

**Mr. Sarafin:** Agrees that the canopy looks great whether or not it has signage on it or not

**Mr. Nichols:** Asks for options on the signage type for the lighting, as the current proposal shows an opaque lettering from behind

**Mr. Gastinger:** Thinks it would be easier and more elegant to use that approach

**Mr. Werner:** Zoning may interpret the concept differently, it will supersede what the BAR decides

**Motion:** Schwarz having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending and Cafes, I move to find that the proposed canopy and, in concept only, the proposed signage (as submitted or with channel lettering) 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. Earnst seconded. Approved (8-0.)

**5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 18-12-01**

**209 2nd Street SW**

**Tax Parcel 280077000**

**Rose Jean LLC, Owner/Timothy Burgess, Applicant**

**Roof Replacement**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This is request for a roof replacement of a building constructed in 1880, the Watson House, which is within the ADC district. It consists of three bays, single pile, with a medium-pitched gable roof, central gable facing the front of the house. Sitting on a low foundation, the front porch is topped by a low pitched hip roof supported by four Tuscan columns. All roof elements are covered in standing-seam metal, lined with Philadelphia gutters. The request is to remove the two brick chimneys, which are deteriorating and functionally obsolete, and replace the standing seam roof to match the existing. They would also like to eliminate the Philadelphia gutters and add eave mounted gutters. The new roof will be a Kynar 500 metal roof product, matching in-kind the roof on the adjacent twin building. Repairing historic masonry elements is preferred over removal, but the chimneys are not prominent architectural features and have deteriorated. The deterioration often extends below the roof line and repairs can be more extensive than repointing the visible chimney. Staff recommends approval, as the replacement is appropriate.

**Applicant, Timothy Burgess:** Would like to eliminate the chimneys and notes that the buildings have a longstanding relationship. There is an alley between them and according to the deed, they have the right to bring them all the

way across the alley. When the 213 building was acquired, the chimneys were already set up this way. The roof was replaced in 2008 with the same material, which was approved with the gutters. Notes that the chimneys are in bad shape internally.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Gastinger:** Would like more information on the shape of the chimneys and the cosmetic/structural issues

**Mr. Burgess:** Inside, there is a lot of damage and the previous owners had vented the water heater and boiler through the chimney and it wasn't properly capped so it is a fire hazard. The patchwork above is also not in good condition

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** Thinks it is great news that the Philadelphia gutters are being kept even though it's more work because they look a lot better and is probably more functional as well. Thinks the roof replacement is appropriate but would like for it to match exactly what is already there

**Mr. Gastinger:** Is pleased that the applicant is taking care of the two buildings and notes that the chimneys are a very distinguishing part of the structure and understands that it is also unique to have the chimneys in that location

**Mr. Schwarz:** Shares concerns that the chimneys cannot be salvaged as existed and if the BAR makes the applicant keep the chimneys, they would have to be rebuilt regardless

**Mr. Ball:** It is possible to rebuild the chimney and would love to see the chimneys kept because they are a nice feature of the house. However, they are falling apart it doesn't make sense to keep them. Would like to see people bring items to attention before they are at the point of deterioration

**Mr. Sarafin:** Removing them and putting a new roof on wouldn't preclude them from adding the chimneys back at some point if there was a desire

**Mr. Mohr:** Asks for clarification that they are woodstove chimneys, not fireplaces

**Mr. Nichols:** They are not working fireplaces

**Ms. Miller:** Were there mantles in the floors below?

**Mr. Nichols:** There is one mantle left. It would have been four rooms and four working fireplaces, but there is only one now

**Mr. Ball:** Is there a furnace vent going up the chimney now, and where would that go?

**Mr. Nichols:** It would go in the back room if it is kept, but that decision hasn't been made yet

**Ms. Miller:** Agrees that the chimneys are interesting and it would be better to keep them, however they are deteriorated so it would be an unreasonable request to not allow removal

**Mr. Mohr:** Asks if they would be taken down to the fireplace on the second floor or would they be fully removed

**Mr. Nichols:** The plan is to remove them all the way down

**Mr. Sarafin:** Asks if there is any value in taking the chimneys down into the attic as far as they are compromised and just capping them. Is there damage all the way down, or can the structure stay there below the roof and have it capped off in the attic to be dealt with in the future?

**Mr. Ball:** Typically, the floor systems are built into the chimney so it would get very messy if it is brought all the way down. They are usually left in the attic

**Mr. Schwarz:** Once they are under the roof, the BAR can advise them, but it's not our decision

**Mr. Nichols:** Notes that in his experience with the structure next door, there was no value at all

**Mr. Mohr:** Suspects that you'd have to take one whole half of the chimney off and all the fireplaces get realigned because it's not a big enough chimney to leave something in there

**Motion:** Balut having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including ADC Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed chimney removal and roof replacement 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 clarification that the Philadelphia gutter be restored.

**Earnst seconded. Approved (7-1, with Gastinger opposed)**

**[Staff note: Applicant's submittal noted the Philadelphia gutters would be restored. Clarification noted because staff report inadvertently stated they would be removed.]**

Earnst left the meeting.

## **6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 18-12-02**

**405 Altamont Circle**

**Tax Parcel 330113000**

**4m & Dice LLC, Owner/Jeffery Lanterman, Applicant**

**Exterior painting, roof replacement, and dormer addition**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This request is to construct a dormer on the side or south elevation of the existing roof. The dormer would have two wood, awning windows to match the existing window and trim at the front dormer. The exterior would be stucco with an asphalt shingle roof. They would paint the exterior of the house, dormers, shutters, trim, porch stair and porch flooring. The stucco walls would be Benjamin Moore Historic HD-26 *Monroe Bisque*, flat. The windows, trim, columns, rails, etc. would be white semi-gloss, the shutters would be black semi-gloss, and the front porch would be natural with the stairs having black treads and white risers. They would also replace the existing asphalt shingles with GAF Timberline Natural Shadow asphalt shingles and copper flashing. The applicant has provided photos of four nearby houses that have similar side dormers and the proposed roof shingles and paint colors are appropriate. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

**Applicant, Jeffery Lanterman:** No further comments; Mr. Werner sufficiently summarized the application

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Ball:** In regards to the side dormers in the photos, did you see a lot of examples where there was only one side dormer, or was it symmetrical? Thinks it looks a little off balance

**Mr. Werner:** There were some with one and some with two. It's possible they would be added later, but it's difficult tell

**Mr. Lanterman:** Notes that he considered both, but there is a chimney on the north side of large mass. Although it's not symmetrical, there is a bit of balance. Notes that two could be considered, but that was the reasoning for only having one

**Mr. Mohr:** What is driving the size of the new dormer?

**Mr. Lanterman:** The further it goes up, the less wide it can be without interfering with things. The one on the west elevation can be wider because of there is no headroom under that one

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Schwarz:** Notes that dormers tend to be added to incrementally add space to a house. The guidelines may discourage them, but it is a historic method of adding space. Having a dormer on only one side isn't bothersome, but notes that the gutters should be copper if copper flashing is being used

**Mr. Lanterman:** Notes that the gutters are aluminum and are going to be replaced with copper

**Mr. Werner:** Notes that the dormer is actually larger on the front than what the presented sketch shows

**Mr. Balut:** Is rather fond of the asymmetry and that it is a little higher, as it adds a unique quality of the house that is eclectic. Is in favor of the application

**Mr. Mohr:** Is curious about the size of the trim and how the proportions are going to play out. From an architectural perspective, it would be beneficial to get a more detailed view of the structure to be reviewed

**Mr. Lanterman:** It would probably start with the window size and then mimicking the corner board depths. The scale of the trim would match and the depths would be similar

**Mr. Mohr:** Would like to see the structure drawn to scale to see exactly what it looks like on the building and know that it wouldn't look out of place

**Mr. Sarafin:** Feels like there is unanimous support for the concept, but would also like to see a more detailed drawing of the dormer that is drafted to scale

**Mr. Lanterman:** Would like to defer the application until a more detailed view of the structure can be produced

**Mr. Miller:** Moves to accept the applicant's request to defer

**Motion:** Miller moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Schwarz seconded. Approved (7-0).

The full discussion on this item can be found at:

[http://charlottesville.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=2&clip\\_id=1335](http://charlottesville.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1335)

Gastinger recused himself for the next agenda item.

## **7. Preliminary Discussion**

**400 Rugby Road**

**Tax Parcel 090005000**

**Westminster Presbyterian Church**

**Requesting guidance on repair of existing, historic brick wall, and removal of existing tree  
(which has caused wall collapse)**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** This discussion is related to the proposed removal of a street tree that has significantly damaged a section of the historic brick wall, and to reconfigure and reconstruct a larger section of the wall. The church was constructed in 1939 and is within the Rugby Road ADC district, as well as being listed on the state and national register. It is modeled after the 1755 Abington Anglican Church in Gloucester County, Virginia. The brick wall itself is cited in the National Register nomination and staff feels strongly about retraining and protecting the wall. However, the wall does lie within the city Right of Way. Staff is coordinating with engineering on how to resolve *who-does-what*, so the intent tonight is to focus on the design and not the parcel boundary.

**Applicant, Sanford Wilcox, Church Administrator:** Would like to get input from the BAR before an application has been submitted. Shares concerns of safety to the public and appearance of accessibility. The wall in the center is

leaning and the crack is growing, and the tree is in decline. After completing survey work, they realized that the tree was not on the church property. There is concern about the wall falling and it is bulging out into a heavily traveled sidewalk so that there is only a 2' clearance. They would like to remove the center section of the brick wall, remove the tree and do a slight grading to eliminate some steps. In the center section, the architects suggest adding brick where the wall would be removed and add a bench between the two sets of stairs, as it would alleviate problems regarding sloping frontage. At the top, they would like to cut the wall off so that sidewalk could continue around, making it ADA accessible. Trees were also planted a few years ago in anticipation to keep the tree canopy replacement strong.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Mr. Ball:** What kind of trees were planted?

**Mr. Wilcox:** The replacements were elm trees

**Mr. Balut:** What is the purpose for the demolition of the curbed wall?

**Mr. Wilcox:** That is to provide an ADA accessible sidewalk because there is currently no easy way for them to come in. As for the tree itself, the electrical companies have cut the canopy out on the side and UVA has also noted concerns about limb drop along the sidewalk as well

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** Does not see any problem removing the part of the wall as long as the detail is put back in

**Mr. Mohr:** Has a problem with changing the configuration of the wall and it would be a mistake to change that. The tree is more problematic and asks what shape the tree is in currently

**Mr. Wilcox:** The tree is in decline and they are trying to be prepared. Tree work is constantly being done, as things are always falling from it

**Mr. Mohr:** Notes that the wall is in eminent failure mode and looks like it's about to crumble

**Ms. Miller:** Asks if the crack has been getting worse or if it has been this way for a long time

**Mr. Wilcox:** It has been a concern for many years but within the past two years it has gotten worse

**Mr. Schwarz:** If the church is almost 80 years old, the tree is likely about the same age. It would be a shame to remove and replace it. In order to remove the tree, the wall should to be rebuilt with as much of the original brick as possible. It would have to be very carefully done to ensure it doesn't look like someone sawed off the wall

**Mr. Mohr:** Preferably, they would rebuild the weathered end, fine-tune it, and try to put it back piece by piece

**Mr. Sarafin:** Asks where the engineer stands on the project

**Mr. Werner:** The engineering staff originally suggested doing a boundary line adjustment to include the tree on their property, but the boundary line goes pretty far back. They would like to know what the church plans to do before they can comment on it. The default would be to say to remove the tree and repairs are made to the wall to keep its original intent. The next step would be to rework the entrance how their designers have suggested, which is where the BAR needs to consider how far to leave the opening to the sidewalk

**Mr. Sarafin:** Thinks the BAR needs to know more about the wall to see what the original design intent. It is a hugely important feature and if the tree is problematic, he would like to see what the options are for removing the tree and how to excavate it best, while keeping the brick wall

**Mr. Mohr:** The wall makes the church look charming

**Ms. Miller:** Thinks it should be replaced with another tree since that was the original intent

**Mr. Sarafin:** Appreciates what has been done to salvage and replicate the intent, but notes he could not be supportive of it before seeing that removing the tree and repairing the wall was not possible

**Mr. Mohr:** Even if the wall had to be straightened for legal reasons, the individual entrance is a key part of the character of the wall and of the building and does not support cutting through the middle of it

**Mr. Balut:** Proposes that the curved wall be mirrored and bowing towards the church, rather than bowing out into the sidewalk

**Mr. Werner:** It looks like Board Members would like more information on the historic nature of the wall and that they do not prefer the current idea proposed

**Mr. Schwarz:** Would like to know if there is an extra wide bike lane across the street or another means for pedestrians to use

**Mr. Werner:** Notes that the applicant is intending to do the right thing even though part of it is not on their land, and needs an advocate to help them with the process. Prior to a submittal, design work is probably not needed, but that questions from the engineering department are in order

**Mr. Wilcox:** Asks if the wall needs to stay where it is or if it can be moved

**Mr. Sarafin:** The BAR would prefer to keep it where it is, or if it gets rebuilt that it would be rebuilt where it stood. They are not in support of sidewalk width determining the how the wall will be preserved. They are also not support of cutting off the end in order to make it ADA accessible and would suggest looking for another alternative. Notes that it is admirable of the applicant to take such action even though it is not on their land

**Mr. Werner:** Would like to find out who should submit the application because it is the City's tree. In terms of replacement, the church has a design but they would not be the applicant, so it would be a two-step process.

#### **8. Preliminary Discussion**

**608 Preston Place**

**Tax Parcel 050108000**

**Amendments to the 2014 COA**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner:** In August of 2017 the BAR approved additions and renovations to the existing Sigma Chi fraternity house. The applicant is contemplating some modifications to the rear elevation and would like to hear input from the BAR on how to proceed

**Applicant, Erin Hannegan, Mitchell Matthews Architects & Planners:** Notes they would like to build over the existing foundation wall and would replicate the language of additions over time by switching the materials from the brick to a lap siding on the second floor. The new roof that would be added would be asphalt shingle. All of the materials would match what was previously approved. They would like for the proposed changes to be on the consent agenda and would like to know if any additional material is needed to demonstrate the changes.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** Notes that it would be inappropriate to add a project of this scale on the consent agenda

**Mr. Gastinger:** Asks if the landscape plan from 2014 is still valid and planning to use? Have there been any changes to the planting plan?

**Ms. Hannegan:** The only changes to the site plan relate to the stairs coming out of the north side and the extension of the walkway to meet the stair in the back. There are no proposed changes to the planting plan that are different from what was previously approved and the phase 1 landscape has been installed

**Mr. Gastinger:** Would it work to have the stair come out into the driveway?

**Ms. Hannegan:** They would need to do more work to determine that, but there would likely be a 12 foot wall between the stair and the parking space

**Mr. Schwarz:** Was the wood fence in the front previously approved? There have been issues with unpainted fences in the front yard

**Ms. Hannegan:** Doesn't think that fence is in the front yard, but would need to look into that further. It could be a holdover from the previous rendering

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**



None.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

**Ms. Miller:** Asks if there is any way to put some of the equipment on the side of the retaining wall so it is hidden from the street. Notes that it would be better to move it to the back where it is less visible. It is also preferable and less expensive to leave the window as is and paint the cabinets from the inside black so that the window is still there and maintains an opening in the house

**Ms. Hannegan:** It is already existing

**Mr. Werner:** It would be helpful to have a corresponding photo between the existing and the proposed changes

**Mr. Ball:** Appreciates that the electrical was put on the drawings and recognizes that it would be difficult to move and it is behind the stoop

**Mr. Schwarz:** Would like to know what material is being proposed for the back stair and notes that there aren't any big issues with the proposal

**Ms. Hannegan:** They would use painted wood

**Mr. Mohr:** Thinks that this addition is a more cohesive and details approach

**Mr. Ball:** Agrees that it seems more cohesive

**Mr. Sarafin:** Asks when the CoA would expire

**Ms. Hannegan:** Understands that it is good until 2021

**Mr. Gastinger:** Notes that some of the species can be invasive and some of them would not be preferred, so there may be some alternatives that are preferable. Generally, thinks the suggested changes are appropriate but notes concerns about how the stair in the driveway will be resolved

**Ms. Hannegan:** Asks if the BAR would prefer for the stairway entry to come out the side rather than the front

**Mr. Gastinger:** It is preferable for it to come out the side and understands why it is being proposed that way, although still concerned about how it interacts with the drive lane

**Mr. Balut:** Notes that cut sheets on the windows might be helpful to be consistent with other applications, as well as providing cut sheets on the lighting, bulbs and shingles if there are any changes to those. Shares concerns about the stairs but trusts that a solution can be had for that and thinks that in general, the proposal is looking good

#### **E. Other Business**

**9. PLACE report, Tim Mohr:** No report, was not in attendance

## **10. 854 West Main Street – Dummy Cell Antenna**

**Mr. Schwarz:** Went by the location and it looks like a stainless steel tube. Because the flats are a modern building and suggests using it as a test case. Suggests notating in the motion that it worked for this specific instance and if someone wants to add more they would need to update their concealment plan. Notes that it did look nice

**Ms. Miller:** They want to install the dummy in a much more visible place so it was easier to view. They are interested in installing real ones on the backside of the building

## **11. BAR Guideline Worksessions**

**Mr. Schwarz:** Suggests meeting on the third Thursday of each month

**F. Adjournment: 8:42 p.m.**