

BAR MINUTES - Draft
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
[December 17, 2019] – 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 VERBATUM. A RECORDING OF THE MEETING CAN BE FOUND AT http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2

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

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Jeff Werner, Robert Watkins, Sebastian Waisman

Pre-Meeting

The BAR discussed the different parts of the regular meeting. The discussion focused on the COA on Virginia Avenue. The BAR also discussed what needs to be included with the application materials. The BAR did seek advice and suggestions from the City Attorney's Office.

Meeting was called to order at 5:34 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

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

October 15, 2019 Regular Meeting and November 19, 2019 Regular Meeting

Motion to approve consent agenda by Mr. Gastinger (Seconded by Mr. Lahendro). Passed 9-0.

C. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-12-02

108-110 West South Street

Tax Parcel 280101000

West South Street, LLC, Owner; Christie Haskin, Woodard Properties, Applicant

Exterior door and window alterations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – The former H. H. Hankins Warehouse is a two-story, three-bay building and is clad in stucco. Piers divide the bays on the north elevation. The fenestration has been considerably altered on all elevations to accommodate different tenants and uses. Evident on the building’s south and west elevations, historic warehouse doors and windows have been removed and new openings created. Request for CoA to alter previously reviewed fenestration and doors at the west and south elevations. Unless noted, the previously approved alterations will remain in the design. West Elevation, lower level: In lieu of the three entirely new windows and one entry door, re-use the existing TDL doors windows as sidelights for three new single lite windows and the new entry door and transom. South Elevation, lower level: In lieu of two new windows in the center bay, reuse the large multi-lite window from the east bay of the north (front) elevation. Two new double hung windows on outside bays to be 1-over-1 in lieu of 6-over-1. New windows: Marvin Elevate, including windows reviewed in August and October (four single lite windows at south elevation, upper level and two 6-over-6 windows at the west elevation, upper level). Marvin Elevate windows are fabricated with a proprietary, Ultrex pultruded fiberglass material. Discussion: This submittal modifies the alterations reviewed at the October 2019 BAR meeting. Given that the existing/to-be-modified windows, doors, and opening are contemporary alterations that do not contribute to the building’s historic character and that the applicant is proposing to re-use existing material, staff finds that the proposed modifications are appropriate. The BAR may wish to address further and/or clarify two items: • Relocation and/or consolidation of the electrical metering, service connections and conduits at the north elevation. • Details, including glass specifications, for the new entries at the north elevation. (Note: The west and south elevations are not on the street. Staff suggests that recommends that Marvin’s standard glazing is acceptable.)

Christie Haskin, Woodward Properties, Applicant – The only thing that I would like to add is that we did discuss relocation of the meters. We are going to put them inside one of the recess entries on the left side.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Lahendro – The entry door one is not centered on that bay. The applicant has gone through trouble to center the door on the lower level in the middle of the center bay. I am curious why that door is not centered on that bay.

Ms. Haskin – As we were doing construction, we were exploring the interior of the building. There is an existing lintel there. It’s not actually centered between those two columns, which is why we located our entry there.

Mr. Lahendro – Even though there is an existing window with a lintel.

Ms. Haskin – The existing window is only about 6.5 feet wide in a 9 foot width. The lintel is offset to the left.

Mr. Schwarz – There is historic photo from before the most recent façade was built. There is a garage door shifted all of the way to the left with a big lintel above it. I do think that this closely matches it.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sarafin – Completely appropriate for this structure.

Motion: Mr. Sarafin moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed exterior door and window alterations 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 upon submission of cut-sheets of storefronts from the north elevation. Schwarz seconded. Approved (8-1, Miller opposed).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-12-05

430 1st Street North

Tax Parcel 330088100

Austine and George Howard, Owner/Applicant

Extend front entry awning

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Designed and built by UVA Professor Emeritus Robert Vickery, the scale and materiality 430 North 1st Street as a modern addition fit the context of the neighborhood well. The building has a symmetrical brick façade with an axial walkway that is a strong design concept. Request for CoA to extend the front entry awning to match the width of the landing below. Materials and design to match the existing awning. The BAR allowed the entry landing to be widened. The alterations will align the awning with the landing, while maintaining the existing design. (The alteration is consistent with the original design in that the widths of the awning and landing were originally aligned.) Where staff would not support more substantive changes to this building, extending this awning is respectful of the original design and, as a single element, does not represent the initiation of additional, incremental and arguably related alterations.

Austine and George Howard, Applicant – We won’t be changing the design. The integrity of the overhang will be the same. It has to be expanded. When the water comes down from the rain it inundates the entire landing. It’s a safety issue more than anything else. Another consideration is that the awning has deteriorated over the years and needs repair. We have water coming down the underside of the awning right now. We are talking about maintaining the exact width, the exact materials, including the copper, Right above the door is a trap for shutters. The shutters are the exact width of what we are asking for in the extension of the awning. We have maintained the integrity of this house throughout the construction. We have not deviated from it.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – I was curious if you are planning on reusing the suspension rods.

Mr. Howard – It will be the same rods. We asked the architect if they would be strong enough. He said that they would be.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – It seems entirely appropriate to me and it makes a great deal of sense.

Mr. Gastinger – I am in full support of this. I ask that the width be noted somewhere.

Motion: Mr. Balut moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed alterations to the front entry canopy 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. Mohr seconded. Approved (9-0).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-12-01

17 Elliewood Avenue
Tax Parcel 090089000
CKW, LLC, Owner; Chris Kabbash
Applicant Second-floor addition

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – 17 Elliewood Avenue, originally a dwelling, has a 3-bay front façade and center entrance. The shedroofed side addition was added after 1913, but prior to 1920. (Survey does not address the date of the rear, single story addition, except that it was not original.) CoA request for a second floor rear addition of approximately 6-feet by 10-feet. Wood siding and trim to match or be similar to the existing; to be painted to match. Existing window to be reused in new wall. Shed style roof will be extended from existing; asphalt shingles. Gutter and downspout to match existing. Staff recommends approval of the CoA.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – The new roof is listed as being 2 and 12 slope and extending from the existing roof. It can’t be contiguous with the existing roof. Is it coming in underneath?

Mr. Kabbash – There is enough height for it. It’s not going to be much of a slope. There is a lot of space in the roof space. We are going to do a roof on the first floor bathroom. There is enough space to have a second floor bathroom. There is enough height and space for two bathrooms.

Mr. Gastinger – You are not planning on running the pipes out of the back wall?

Mr. Kabbash – All of the plumbing is on that wall

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Miller – This seems perfectly acceptable to me. It would be helpful to have more flushed out drawings, so we can be sure what we are approving. I can support the application as is.

Mr. Schwarz – There is going to have to be a building permit drawing. That can be submitted to staff. As long as that matches what is described tonight.

Mr. Gastinger – Is there no intention of having any windows in this bathroom?

Mr. Kabbash – There will be a window

Mr. Lahendro – Will the window align with the window below?

Mr. Kabbash – That’s what I was thinking. I like it better lined up with the middle.

Motion: Mr. 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 rear addition satisfies the BAR’s Design Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Corner ADC District and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the condition that the new roof intersects the exterior wall below the existing roof. Earnst seconded. Approved (9-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-12-04

128 Madison Lane

Tax Parcel 090139000

Omicron Chapter House Society, Owner; Jeff Riley, UVA Foundation, Applicant

Proposed Hedge

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Initially constructed as St. Peter’s Society Hall, it was purchased in 1912 by the Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity. The 2 ½ to 3 story, Georgian revival, brick building has a full height portico and a metal roof. The south wing addition was designed by Stanislaw Makielski. The house is one of the oldest properties on Madison Lane and contributes to the unique streetscape of the area and it also symbolizes student life at UVA. CoA for the planting to a ligustrum [privet] hedge along the north parcel line; from the existing hedge at the front to a point TBD near the house. Height of new hedge to be maintained at 5’-0”. Staff recommends approval of a 5-foot tall, vegetated hedge at this site; however the BAR may wish to address the species, location, and dimensions of the hedge. Species: Ligustrum is common in Virginia, easy to grow, tolerates dry condition, and is ideal for a hedge screen or border. However it can become invasive and may not be suitable as a landscape plant. The Design Guidelines are silent on specific plants and the City’s Mast Tree List does not mention ligustrum. The BAR can deny the request; recommend an alternative species; or require that the new match that of the existing front hedge. (Staff is unable to determine the species of the existing hedge.) Location: Applicant has not specified the extent of the proposed hedge—how far along the property line from the front hedge. The BAR may want to establish a specific location. Height and width: Applicant states the hedge will not exceed 5-feet in height, which if not revised would be an element of the CoA. The Design Guidelines do not address plant dimensions; however, if helpful, side yard fences should not exceed 6-feet. Relative to the width, the BAR may wish to establish a maximum.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

None

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Miller – I think that privet is a bad idea for any applicant. We have encouraged other applicants in the past to select something else. I think that it's bad in a fraternity house environment.

Mr. Gastinger – It's very difficult to condition the height of a hedge. It's not going in at that height and it's not going to achieve that height for some time down the road. It does look like it is a privet hedge. This is a plant that should be discouraged. It's not good to be planted in residential landscapes. It is highly invasive and it can cause maintenance trouble for the applicant and neighbors down the road. Given that 70% of the hedge is already the privet, we have had a few cases like this where we have approved continuing with the same species. If the applicant has some flexibility, we should encourage them to pick a different species. They should think about a longer term plan for replacing the other existing hedge. There are some pretty tough Chinese and Japanese hollies that are less invasive. Does the rest of the board feel if it's approvable as is or if we would work with the applicant to suggest some other species.

Ms. Miller – Mr. Gastinger's list is long enough and has enough variation in it. The applicant would have plenty of good choices if we gave approval with the condition of picking one of those other species. I appreciate the applicant putting this forward. A lot of things like this happen without coming in front of the board.

Mr. Werner – Mr. Riley is very familiar with process and he is very amiable to suggestion. The rationale for this is separation from the neighbor and their treehouse. This is a physical barrier preferred over a fence.

Mr. Schwarz – I am not bothered by to a point TBD near the house. If the hedge goes all the way back, I don't see a difference. Our guidelines do say a fence should be kept at four feet in the front yard, and I would like to apply this to solid hedges. In this case, I don't think a five foot hedge would be a problem in this instance. I don't have an issue with them keeping it at five feet.

Motion: Mr. Gastinger move having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed hedge satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted provided that the applicant selects on of the following alternative species: leathery fibernum, bayberry, boxwood, Japanese holly, American holly, and Chinese holly and the BAR recommend the front hedge be maintained at four feet or lower and any side hedges on the property be maintained at five feet or lower. Seconded by Mr. Schwarz. Approved 9-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-12-03

110 – 112 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 280023000 Jefferson Theater Holdings, LLC, Owner; Kelsey Cox, Element Construction

Applicant Entrance Alterations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request for the replacement of an excising, painted wood, full-lite door an existing door at the mall level entrance with a frameless glass door. This entry provides access to upper floor rooms and is not a component of the original theater entry immediately to the right. This doorway and frame are projected from the wall due to the limited access to the adjacent, historic ticket office and to provide

required clearance for the stair landing immediately inside. Neither the built out frame of this door or the glass facade of the ticket office belongs to the original building façade, though they have been intended to replicate an older condition. The new, frameless door will attach to the existing painted ceiling and mosaic floor. The transparent door will be cohesive with the existing glass that covers the ticket office and would highlight the original facade and stairwell inside the door; these are currently obscured. It would more elegantly accommodate the existing ceiling and showcase the mosaic tile floor as it terminates into the staircase. The brass hardware provides a texture that references the tarnished brass hinges and pulls on the adjacent three stained wood, full-lite doors leading into the theater. The existing door is not historic. Replacing it will not alter the adjacent historic components. Its replacement is not intended to re-introduce or replicate a lost historic component. It is rehabilitation, not preservation or restoration. The Design Guidelines and the Secretary's Standards acknowledge that rehabilitation may introduce new elements, but with the provision that they not damage or destroy materials, features or finishes that are important in defining the building's historic character. Removing the existing and installing something new and different is supported by the Guidelines. The question is whether or not a frameless glass door in this location is appropriate. Per the Secretary's Standards, when a historic storefront is missing, the alterations should be compatible with the size, scale and material of the historic building. The Design Guidelines for Facades and Storefronts recommend that new elements respect the character, materials, and design of the building, yet are distinguished from the original building.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Where this comes out, are there areas that are going to have to be patched? What is your thought about on anything that might show now that you are missing a partition?

Mike Ball, Element Construction, Applicant – We don't know yet. The existing wall is still there. We haven't been able to tear that out. Our goal is to utilize any existing holes, minimize destruction of the tile, and use what has already been damaged.

Mr. Schwarz – If there is tile missing, would you grout over that?

Mr. Ball – It's going to be a "go as we see it." There is a lot that we cannot see without taking out that wall.

Mr. Gastinger – Why is the swing the way that it is and the pole bar on the right seems more convenient and functional?

Mr. Ball – I don't know why. I don't know if there is a better way.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Balut – I like the strategy. I think the clear contrast and simple elegance are nice. I like the idea of matching the brass fittings. It looks good.

Mr. Schwarz – You have acknowledged that something has to change from the appearance. I feel that we should give direction or some options if there is infill. I trust the applicant to do the right thing. I think that it's important to set some parameters.

Mr. Sarafin – There is still a lot I don't understand about this. There is still more exploration that needs to be done.

Mr. Ball – My leaning would be to grout in anything that is missing, rather than trying to replace it. My experience with old buildings is that matching tile is virtually impossible. It would be better to honor the old tile.

Mr. Sarafin – If it works with the situation, the door swinging the other way would be more convenient. Whatever the header and threshold situation is to be determined. In concept, it's a sound approach.

Motion: Mr. Balut moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed door replacement satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the request that if any changes are made, these changes be submitted to staff for review. Lahendro seconded. Approved (8-0-1, Ball abstained).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 19-12-06

1532–1536 Virginia Avenue

Tax Parcel 090123000

Roger HB. Davis, Jr. & Jeanne S. Davis Trustees, Owner; Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, Applicant
New Residential Building

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – This 0.76-acre parcel on Virginia Avenue is within the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC district and has four existing structures. Three are to be razed: 1532, 1534, and 1538. CoA request for construction of a four-story, 20-unit (64-bedroom), residential building with a partial below-grade parking area (26 spaces: 22 below building; outside) Plan includes site work and landscaping. The existing house at 1536 Virginia Avenue is to be retained and is incorporated into the landscaping plan. BAR should discuss if the applicant has adequately addressed the questions and comments from the November 17 BAR meeting. The UMD (university medium density) zoning consists of areas in the vicinity of the University of Virginia campus, in which medium-density residential developments, including multifamily uses, are encouraged. (See Section 34.350 et al) BAR should discuss if the proposed site and landscaping plan are consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff comments: • Plantings: Proposed trees and boxwood are on the City's Tree List. • Walls And Fences: Low wall shown on plan and elevations. Wall cap and brick mortar are not specified. • Lighting: No site lighting is shown or specified. • Walkways & Driveways: Material not specified. • Parking Areas & Lots: Located below street level building and at rear. Screening for parking spaces may be needed, specifically related to vehicle headlights and any interior lighting. • Garages, Sheds, & Other Structures: No outbuildings shown. Trellis design and materials not specified. • Utilities & Other Site Appurtenances: Mechanical equipment and utility connections/metering are not shown. Locations should be specified and adequately screened. BAR should discuss if the proposed setback, scale, massing, dimensions, orientation, design and materials are consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff comments: The adjacent and nearby structures vary greatly in age, size, style and setback, while predominantly residential in nature. There are both simple and elaborate, one- and two-story dwellings, multi-story apartments and fraternity/sorority buildings. Information is lacking for some materials and

elements—see the building materials list above. While the renderings are helpful, more detail may be required. EIFS is proposed for the upper floor walls; however the Design Guidelines discourage its use. (The use of Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS) is discouraged but may be approved on items such as gables where it cannot be seen or damaged. It requires careful design of the location of control joints.) Signs Staff comments: No signage is shown in the submittal. All signage, even with BAR CoA requires a separate Sign Permit. In the past, for some new construction projects the BAR has, in reviewing a CoA request, granted partial approvals for specific components—landscaping, massing and scale, lighting, etc. Should that be considered here, given that the CoA request is for the entire project as submitted, staff recommends that the BAR instead consider a deferral.

Kevin Schafer, Project Manager, Applicant – The submission in front of the BAR is the latest iteration of a complex project. The goals are to address the comments of the BAR that we heard in the preliminary discussion. We went back to the recording of the preliminary meeting and listened to the comments several times to distill the essence of the BARs questions and concerns. It became apparent that the majority of the comments revolved around the connection or interaction of the proposed building to its context. From the previous discussion, consideration needed to be given specifically how the front courtyard interacted with the street, how the proposed building mitigated the change in scales with the adjacent context along Virginia Avenue, and how the project would be viewed from Chancellor Street. We began to address some of these considerations through a more thoughtfully composed landscape plan. We sought to bring complexity to the front courtyard through layering a series of site elements. In this case, a bench height seat wall, a hedgerow, and street trees to create distinct boundaries between the public walk, the semi-public courtyard, and the private residential building. Along Virginia Avenue, we see several different approaches to the treatment of the front yard. The adjacent and nearby structures vary greatly in age, size, style, and setback. Given this variety of conditions along the street, it became important to create something that was more site specific and address the individual needs of this proposed project. These needs compelled us to screen the building through shrubs and canopy tree plantings in lieu of ornamental grasses previously shown. To create a boundary to establish a semi-private front courtyard zone through the introduction of an 18 inch wide, a 24 inch tall bench height seat wall and to layer these interventions to screen the proposed structure, bridge the scale change between the pedestrian and the building, and to form a boundary between the public and private. The site walls create a dynamic pedestrian experience along the street by stepping back and forth in direct relationship to the building’s exterior balconies. We began to test some of the ideas discussed during the preliminary review. These ideas ultimately proved to be a visual block, in what was previously intended to be a void. That void is significant and important in reinforcing the rhythm of the existing street wall. Filling the void with a site structure seemed to detract from the overall concept. A more appropriate way to bridge the gap in the scale was to take cues from the front treatment of the courtyard. We are proposing a site stair that mitigates challenging grade differences between the street level and the parking level, while providing a pedestrian route. The comments from the board seemed positive. The board appeared to appreciate the breaking down the scale into two different building forms, the varying roof form, the use of recessed exterior balconies, the introduction of a masonry base, and finally maintaining the rhythm of the street wall. Many of these strategies, in adhering to the ADC guidelines remain the same. We do appreciate the dialogue that has occurred with the board on this project. We felt submission at this time was prudent. It is beneficial to have continued to discussion and re-assurance that the project is being developed in the right direction. We do want to be respectful of staff in not introducing new information in the meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Can you explain how you wish the windows and the window plane relate to the exterior envelope of the building?

Mr. Schafer – That goes back to the EAFS vs stucco question. The windows will be set at the edge of our structural framing.

Mr. Mohr – How thick are you thinking for the EAFS insulation?

Mr. Schafer – Probably two inches.

Mr. Mohr – Is the adjacent house driveway the way to their backyard?

Mr. Schafer – There is a shared access easement.

Mr. Ball – Have you thought about gutters?

Mr. Schafer – There is potential that all of the rainfall is handled with internal gutters.

Mr. Ball – Where would the HVAC be?

Mr. Schafer – On the top of the roof.

Ms. Miller – What is the purpose of the sidewalk?

Mr. Schafer – The underground parking is in the front setback. What you are seeing is the top of the parking garage

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – There are a lot of material questions. We have asked for a wall section for project this big. One of the things that I am concerned about are the roof thickness. With EAFS, you need exterior insulation. It's a commercial building. There are a couple of areas on the roof where you are going to have a gutter.

Mr. Gastinger – The plant selections are OK. They may be deployed in the wrong spots. The trees in the front yard are going to function to break down that scale and bring it down to the scale of the pedestrian.

Ms. Miller – Trees in the front going over the street help give it the feel of a more tight intimate space. There is more work to be done with the massing. The overhead picture does show how this building compares to other buildings in the area. The addition of the seat wall and the hedges in the front are nice.

Mr. Mohr – I like the stair idea. I am struggling with the driveway side. It's a sea of asphalt. That's a site issue. I don't have a problem with EAFS.

Mr. Sarafin – The changes that you made from the preliminary discussion are successful. The transition to the small house with a stair is a good way to solve that.

Mr. Mohr – I think that the courtyard works a lot better. The inter play between the planters and the hedges is a nice touch and very pedestrian oriented until you get to the driveway.

Mr. Lahendro – I was feeling pretty good about the design. It's a transitional area and it's changing. There is going to be rooftop equipment and parapets hiding the equipment. That's very different from the drawings that I am looking at. I don't know what to trust. I would like to see what that looks like.

Mr. Ball – I think that the massing is nice. The parapets do worry me a bit. I am worried about how the stairs are going to interact with the house to the right. Overall, the massing looks really nice.

Ms. Earnst – The massing is in a really great place. The bigger concern is the approach on the driveway side. There is some work that you can do of softening that piece. You have done a great job describing the massing.

Mr. Balut – You have done a great job with this presentation. It is on its way to being a very successful project. There could be a little more sympathy with the neighbors by reducing in volume, especially with the house on the right. That's a minor concern. Setting the courtyard back is really nice. You do have the pedestrians in mind. Screening of the rooftop units is a very important thing. You have done a really good job

Mr. Schwarz – Once you take away those two houses, the context is going to change. The context is completely different. This building can fit in as a much larger building. There needs to be shade trees along the street. That's going to help this building tie into the neighborhood better. I would like to know about the siding that you are proposing.

Mr. Schafer – We are proposing digging that drainage swale that's existing. That does allow for more opportunities between the stair and the existing house. It is a hardy panel that is a finishing technique that is applied to any of those products to make it look like wood. Regarding the parapets, the pitch would occur, and there would be a flat roof behind that pitch. A vote for massing and scale is no longer on the table?

Ms. Miller – Apparently not for this meeting. Hopefully, we can come up with a way that is helpful for everybody involved.

Mr. Schafer – I think that you can understand the challenge that puts us in with five new BAR members next month. We have had two preliminary discussions. Overall, it has been very positive feedback. It's hard to weigh the gains.

Mr. Schwarz – Myself, Mr. Mohr, Mr. Gasting, Mr. Lahendro, and maybe Mr. Ball will be here next month. If could vote for it tonight on massing approval, I would. The site design, in general, is fine. I need to know some more about materials palate.

Mr. Gasting – I wonder if we could create a statement of opinion about the aspects of the project that meet the guidelines and some of the information that is outstanding, would be useful information for anybody coming in.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved with the understanding that the BAR is comfortable with the massing, the general material palate and general site design but the application is still lacking in detail and specificity, the BAR would like to approve the applicant's request for a deferral. Lahendro seconded. Approved (9-0).

D. Other Business

8. Staff Questions/Discussion

BAR Discussion on acceptance or part of a COA

Mr. Werner – Went over what the BAR can approve in a COA. The three options for the BAR are approve, deny, or defer.

There followed a discussion regarding the approval of COAs between staff and members of the BAR.

It is important for legal to be at the BAR meetings so that the motions are made correctly

Mr. Waisman did recommend that the BAR go into close session to discuss the legal issues. There would have to be a public notice.

Mr. Schafer, one of the applicants from this BAR meeting, provided perspective from the point of view of the applicant, when applying for a COA.

10th and Page Neighborhood Historic Survey (update)

Mr. Watkins updated the BAR about the 10th and Page survey. At the first meeting, there were a lot of questions regarding the survey. There was a second meeting, and there were some suspicious questions regarding the survey. Those questions were addressed, and the survey is going to start. The second meeting had a much better outcome than the first meeting.

New BAR

Mr. Werner welcomed the one new BAR member, who was at the BAR meeting.

9. PLACE Report

Mr. Schwarz updated the BAR on the recent PLACE meeting. Ms. Galvin gave a presentation on Form Based Code at the recent PLACE meeting. Economic Development was at the last PLACE meeting to go over the parking garage. The option that they are going to go with is closing 8th Street and that it will be three stories.

E. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 7:25 PM