

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
June 16, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.  
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to the June 16, 2020 Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Due to the current public health emergency, this meeting is being held online via Zoom. The meeting process will be as follows: For each item, staff will make a brief presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, after which members of the public will be allowed to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to speak. Public 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. [Times noted below are rough estimates only.]

**Members Present:** Mr. Lahendro, Mr. Mohr, Mr. Schwarz, Mr. Zehmer, Mr. Gastinger, Ms. Lengel, Mr. Bailey

**Staff Present:** Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeffery Werner, Joe Rice, Missy Creasy, Alex Ikefuna

**Pre-Meeting:**

There was a brief description over the selection of the new Chair and Vice-Chair.

There was also a discussion regarding attendance at the PLACE meetings.  
Staff did go over the logistics and planning of the Zoom features for the meeting.

**A. Election of Chair and Co-Chair**

**Mr. Mohr made the motion to elect Mr. Schwarz and Mr. Gastinger as Chair and Vice-Chair.**

**(Motion was seconded by Mr. Lahendro. Motion passed 7-0)**

**Mr. Schwarz was elected as Chair and Mr. Gastinger was elected as Co-Chair**

**B. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

None

**C. 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 February 19, 2020 Regular Meeting.** (March, April, and May meetings were canceled.)

**Motion made by Mr. Gastinger to approve the consent agenda. (Motion seconded by Mr. Mohr). Motion passed 7-0.**

## D. Action Items

### 1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-03-01 (previously noted as BAR 19-09-03)

503 Rugby Road

Tax Parcel 050052000

Epsilon Sigma House Corps of Kappa Kappa Gamma, Owner

Erin Hannegan (Mitchell Matthews Architects), Applicant

Building renovations – revisions to approved design

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** - Year Built: 1980 District: Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District Status: Non-contributing. BAR approved CoA (8-1, Lahendro opposed) for renovation of existing building. CoA request for modifications to the design approved in September, 2019. They are: Replace the brick veneer on concrete retaining wall with painted stamped brick formwork, Reduce height of Dining Terrace site wall adjacent to the parking space to 4' in lieu of 5', Replace concrete pavers with scored concrete at dining terrace, Replace the bluestone pavers in the sunken front yard along the site wall with grass, Replace the bluestone paver walkway with crushed stone in North side yard; Porch to remain as bluestone, Pave all parking spaces with asphalt in lieu of concrete, Removal of (10) L-2 step light fixtures, Delete the pergola over the lower side terrace, Delete/defer pergola over Kappa beach, Proposed as an add alternate to retain, Delete (2) sets of shutters from West elevation (back of building), Delete (2) sets of shutters from North elevation (side of building), Modify South facing window wall to raise sill of windows at 2nd floor lounge, Substitute asphalt shingles for standing seam metal roof, Proposed as an add alternate to revert back, Add window at House Director unit entry porch on front East elevation, Add mechanical louver, required for ventilation, under overhang at rear West elevation, and At Parlor terrace, replace low wall at the railing. Staff didn't have any issues. The Design Guidelines discourage but do not prohibit use asphalt shingles. The shingles are dark in texture, which is consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff is recommending approval of these requested revisions.

**Erin Hannegan, Mitchell Matthews Architects, Applicant** – Like most projects these days, we are facing budget issues. We have attempted to address our budget issues with some changes that we don't feel modify the overall intent of the project. It doesn't change it significantly enough to go against the guidelines. The minor changes that we are asking for can be discussed. I heard staff mention that you would want to discuss the shutters. The thinking behind the shutters is that the West and North elevations are really part of the addition. Most buildings on the street only carry shutters on the front façade. If they do carry shutters on more than one space, it might be the front. The majority of the buildings are missing shutters on the other faces. That goes for the contributing properties within the larger district as well as the University Circle sub-district. The 16<sup>th</sup> item that we didn't list on this sheet was about the wall being replaced with a railing. We actually ended up going back to the wall instead of the railing. That one can be stricken from the list.

### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

**Mr. Schwarz** - I do have a question about replacing the brick veneer on the concrete retaining wall. That was intended to be a white brick?

**Ms. Hannegan** – That’s correct.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You’re not going to be painting red brick against concrete?

**Mary Wolf, Applicant** – The first six items relate to our work. The idea is to paint the stamped brick white like the rest of the house. There would be a brick coping on top of the wall that would be real brick. That would be painted as well. Previously, it was a painted brick wall.

**Ms. Hannegan** – To clarify, it was a painted brick wall in the previous proposal. We have changed it to a stamped concrete wall still painted.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Can you describe a little bit more about the extent of that wall? There is also a low wall in the front yard.

**Ms. Wolf** – If you look at number one on this list page, on the north side of the building, along the property line, it extends from a brick pier at the end of the front terrace. It goes over to the property line. It goes all of the way down to the area labeled bike/walkers. Where it butts into the pier, it’s very low. You would see the top of it there. That would be a natural brick cap. When it returns to the property line, it starts to get higher. It steps down midway. There are planters at number 5. That is one elevation. You go further down the property line, it stops. The wall is about, at its highest, is about 6 to 7 feet high range on the north side of the house.

**Ms. Hannegan** – We’re not changing the elevation of the wall from the previous proposal. It’s just the material.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Gastinger** – In some cases, we might be concerned about stamped concrete. In this case, I am satisfied that it’s in the back of the house. It’s not going to be as visible because of the painting. It’s going to be hard to distinguish from some of the other materials on site.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I agree because this was a white painted brick. If it was a red brick, I would have had a problem with it. As it is, I have no issue. Reducing the height of the dining terrace site wall adjacent to 4 feet from 5 feet: Does anybody have concerns with that? Replacing the concrete pavers with scored concrete at the dining terrace? Replacing the bluestone pavers in the sunken front yard along the site wall with grass? Replacing the bluestone paver walkway with crushed stone in North side yard; Porch to remain as bluestone? Paving all parking spaces with asphalt in lieu of concrete? Removal of (10) L-2 step light fixtures?

**Ms. Hannegan** – Just to clarify, it’s not removal of all of them.

**Mr. Mohr** – Where are they in the plans?

**Ms. Hannegan** – The ones that we have removed were in the dining terrace under the bench around the perimeter of the dining terrace.

**Ms. Wolf** – The dining terrace and the wall on the front lawn is the number 4 area. We just reduced the number.

**Ms. Hannegan** – It is page 33 of the packet.

**Mr. Mohr** – There are a few taken out in the front. The bulk of them are around that stairwell.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Deletion of the pergola over the lower side terrace?

**Mr. Gastinger** – I don't know how much it is worth dwelling on it. The façade that is left when this pergola is removed is fairly stark for, what I think, is a pretty prominent side of the building. That pergola provided some relief. Without it, that door feels pretty secondary on the escape hatch that it is. I am curious what the other thoughts are on the Board.

**Mr. Mohr** – There is a tree to the southwest of that stair. How big of a tree is that? I would think that would actually do a fair amount of softening of that façade if I am not mistaken.

**Ms. Wolf** – That is the idea. There is a power line. Ideally, we would love to get a taller tree there. We have a medium sized tree. It would be a 20 to 30 foot tree, which will help with that elevation from street level.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Is this door an emergency egress door or will it be an actively used door?

**Ms. Hannegan** – It is an emergency egress door. It's coming down the stair tower. It doesn't have hardware to allow entry at that point. It's only really an exit. Certain doors have access control on them. That is not one of them. Students are not going to be using that one as a primary entrance.

**Mr. Schwarz** – While I personally agree with Mr. Gastinger that those look a little empty there. If this had been presented to us in the beginning, I would never have noticed that it was missing. Personally, I am OK with the change.

**Mr. Mohr** – I think the tree would mediate a good bit of that concern. If the tree does get substantial, it does render the pergola mute. I agree with Mr. Gastinger that it does have a stark look. Given that it is back from the face quite a bit and you have a planting bed and the tree, I don't think it is a critical loss.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Knowing that it is a door that is not going to be entered from the outside, you almost don't want to call attention to it. I could almost see it being painted white with the frame white to blend in with the wall.

**Ms. Hannegan** – That was the intent. We can certainly change it that way if you would like.

**Mr. Gastinger** – That would be nice. All of the apertures are really careful and have fenestrations associated with them.

**Mr. Schwarz** - Delete/defer pergola over Kappa beach and proposed as an add alternate to retain? Delete (2) sets of shutters from West elevation (back of building)? Delete (2) sets of shutters from North elevation (side of building)? Modify South facing window wall to raise sill of windows at 2nd floor lounge?

**Mr. Mohr** – Given that the shutters are being deleted, I just wonder whether the shutters shouldn't exist on the Rugby Road elevation for that bump out just to be consistent. I know that it's facing Rugby Road. It seems a little strange. On the other hand, I don't think that anyone is going to see it.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I would prefer to keep them all.

**Ms. Hannegan** – I think that the massing of the adjacent building is going to block the view to the two in the rear that we were deleting on that north face. We didn't think it was going to have much impact to have them there to begin with because that's so far back along that side elevation. That elevation does break plane with the corner that is closer to Rugby. We kept them on the front mass of the building. It feels more like the original structure. That northwestern corner is the forsets we're moving. I think that it is consistent with some of the character of the neighborhood where additions are carrying the shutters like the original mass of the historic building.

**Mr. Mohr** – I was wondering why lose the shutters on the Rugby road side on that same bump out. I am looking at page 11. Since that bump out is back, should you delete those two shutters on that one window to be consistent?

**Ms. Hannegan** – If you would like for us to take that additional pair away, we can.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I think that it makes sense.

**Mr. Bailey** – I agree with the notion that you might as well remove all of the shutters. I think that is a more consistent look. The ones that they wanted to delete are essentially not going to be seen by anyone anyway. If you want to remove all of them, I think that's a great idea.

**Mr. Mohr** – Just to clarify, do you mean on the addition, Mr. Bailey?

**Mr. Bailey** – Yes.

**Ms. Hannegan** – We failed to see that one was included. The pair that we are talking about are above the new window that we have added. Since we don't have a visual on the screen, we are looking at page 11 at the top right image. There is a window added at the base of the building. The extra pair that we would be removing is the third floor directly above that.

**Mr. Werner** – You're treating that front portion as a building itself. Treat that the same throughout the additions to the rear and treat separately.

**Mr. Schwarz** - Substitute asphalt shingles for standing seam metal roof? The guidelines definitely are fuzzy. They don't rule out asphalt shingles. The just say to use a dark color if you use them. I would be inclined to accept this.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I agree. It's not a prominent roof.

**Mr. Schwarz** - Add window at House Director unit entry porch on front East elevation? Add mechanical louver, required for ventilation, under overhang at rear West elevation? It sounds like the only two points of contention were the deletion of pergola over the side terrace. We suggested that the applicant would paint the door white to match the brick. Does that satisfy you, Mr. Gastinger?

**Mr. Gastinger** – That's fine.

**Mr. Schwarz** – For the shutters, it was to remove the one set circled on page 11

**Motion – Mr. Mohr: Having considered the standards set forth in the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and for Site and Design Elements, I move to find the proposed design modifications satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District and the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following modification:**

- **Eliminate the shutters at the Rugby Road façade of the addition bump-out, on the third floor.**
- **Paint the egress door off the bike terrace to match the building color.**

**Mr. Gastinger seconds. Approved (7-0).**

## **2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 19-12-06

1532–1536 Virginia Avenue

Tax Parcel 090123000

Roger H.B. Davis, Jr. & Jeanne S. Davis Trustees, Owner

Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, Applicant

New Residential Buildings

**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. 1536 Virginia Avenue Year Built: c1920 Status: Contributing Note: Structure to remain. February 2015 - The BAR denied the proposed demolitions of 1532, 1534, and 1536 Virginia Avenue. August 2019 - BAR approved demolition of 1532 Virginia Avenue and 1534 Virginia Avenue. November 17, 2019 – Preliminary discussion on this proposal. December 17, 2019 – BAR accepted applicant request for deferral. CoA request for construction of a four-story, 20-unit (64-bedroom), residential building with a partial below-grade parking area. 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 December 2019 BAR meeting. Some of the discussion items from the December meeting included questions about the parking area, moveable benches, and EIFS design. **Note on CoA:** The BAR cannot issue partial approvals in considering a CoA request. If the BAR determines that additional information or clarification is necessary, staff recommends that the applicant be asked to consider a deferral. **Note on Site Plan review:** Staff notes that the review of the Final Site Plan will

not be complete prior to the BAR review. Any subsequent design changes as a result of the Site Plan process may require further review, at a later date, by the BAR.

**Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, Applicant** – I want to recap a lengthy process that has led to the submission in front of you. Demolition permits for 1532 and 1534 Virginia Avenue was approved ten months ago in August, 2019. Following that approval, our team wanted to bring the BAR into the earliest stages of the design. We presented our initial plan and preliminary discussion at the November, 2019 BAR meeting. The feedback that we received at that time was positive and several members of the BAR commended how our design incorporated many cues from the ADC Design Guidelines to provide a cohesive and holistic project. While they noted the need for more detail, the BAR expressed appreciation for breaking down the scale into two separate building forms. They appreciated the very dynamic roof form, the use of recess on the exterior balconies, the further breakdown on mass and scale by varying the surface plan of each façade, the introduction of a masonry base, the reduction in blank walls through change in materials and appropriate amounts of glazing, the orientation of the project towards the street, and the approach to maintain the rhythm of the existing street wall. With the BAR's warm reception to our design, we elected to formally proceed toward a formal submission at the following month's hearing in December. Prior to that December submission, we listened to the recording of the preliminary meeting several times in an effort to further distill the BAR's comments. In short, we felt that BAR offered great advice in the preliminary meeting. We took it to heart as we prepared our December submission. At our first formal hearing, we were again encouraged by the positive discussion. There were some outstanding details requested by BAR members' but it seemed like a COA for massing and scale would be awarded, which was common practice with complex projects like this one. At that meeting, city legal staff stepped in to forbid the use of partial COAs. That led to this project having the distinction of being the first projects held to a difficult or different approval process than in previous years. The BAR members gracefully navigated these new rules with the following amendments in the motion for the deferral. Mr. Schwarz moved with the understanding the BAR is comfortable with the massing, the general material palate, and the general site design but the application is still lacking in detail and specificity. The BAR would like to approve the applicant's request for deferral and Mr. Lahendro seconded the deferral motion. This formal submission in front of you is addressing the outstanding questions of specificity and detail to garner our COA tonight. This project also has the unfortunate distinction of being one of those submittals delayed by COVID-19. While we would never expect you to grant approval prematurely due to a pandemic, we do want to express to you the severe impact of the delay. As a project, it will be marketed primarily to students aligning the completion of this project with the start of school year calendar is absolutely critical. I would like to review some of the exact quotes from the previous meeting minutes to illustrate how they have been addressed. In this submission, we have endeavored to answer the typical condition exterior details and provide more specificity beyond the enclosed materials as requested. Our proposed material palate can be found on page 10 of the BAR booklet. More information on the specified windows and exterior doors can be found on page 11. Typical details including our sills and headers at the brick base on page 12 and the lap siding on page 13 can also be found on sheets 83.3 and 83.4 in the submitted drawing set. We have specified aluminum trim for the lap siding, corners, and sills and j trims at header, which all show up in our renderings as well. Beyond those typical areas, BAR members requested additional detail on the construction materiality and the specificity of several of the exterior elements, including the railings, the central stair, the pergola, and the exterior decks. In response, page 14 of the BAR booklet diagrams the construction of the

exterior decks. Page 15 illustrates the construction of the front pergola. Page 16 has the drawings and renderings articulating the construction about the central stair and typical railing construction. Page 17 describes the construction of the central breezeway. There were also questions on the exterior lighting, which has been specified on pages 18 and 19 of our BAR booklet. Cut sheets for each fixture and the lighting plan have also been provided in this submission. Mr. Mohr had specific comments about exhaust vent locations, citing the work on Main Street as an example of a successful massing with unsuccessful exhaust vent locations. Page 21 in the BAR booklet as well as elevation sheets 82.1 and 82.2 show how our exhaust vents have been properly placed and organized in such a way to be hidden from view as much as possible. There was a question about the roof and the location of mechanical equipment. Mr. Lahendro noted that there was going to be rooftop equipment and parapets hiding that equipment, which was very different from the drawings he was looking at, at that time. Page 20 of our BAR booklet deals with the location with these rooftop units. Sheet 81.5 in the drawings shows our roof plan. No units will be visible from the pedestrian point of view. Renderings found on pages 22 through 25 in the BAR booklet demonstrate how the overhang and the angle of the roof hide these mechanical units. Mr. Schwarz asked about eave thickness and the perceived thinness. Eave details have been provided on pages 12 and 13 of the BAR booklet. With regards to the landscaping, we heard several comments about the importance of the street trees and fielded some questions on the plant species selection. Mr. Gasteringer advised that plant selections are OK, but 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. Mr. Schwarz echoed that and there needs to be shade trees along the street. We have revised our landscape plan. We substituted the former Princeton trees for much larger London plain trees. We had red maples in the planters at the site stair. They have been substituted for service berry trees. The boxwood shrubs, in the front courtyard, have been substituted for rows oakleaf hydrangeas. In the rear of the building, swale plantings have been refined to promote bio-diversity. Overall, the revised landscape plan responds to each of the boards' comments and creates a much better project. We're really pleased with how the front courtyard continued to develop. Beyond the previous comments from the Board, staff has pointed three additional areas for discussion in their report. Regarding the parking area, parking is all below grade and minimally visible. The additional consideration has been given to the existing swale in the rear will provide a dense and diverse palate of shrubs, bushes, switch grasses, screening both the interior garage and headlights from the rear of the site. That rear of the site only faces the railroad tracks in a steep grade up to Chancellor Street. Regarding the moveable benches, we felt the simple aesthetics of the movable concrete bench would help create a boundary of the courtyard, while engaging the pedestrian on Virginia Avenue. This staggered pattern reinforces the rhythm of the building façade and provides relief to the oakleaf hydrangeas. If the Board prefers to eliminate the benches, the applicant would accept that preference. We feel the elements are an asset to the pedestrian experience and not a detriment. Regarding the EIFS on the upper floor walls, we have previously discussed this, we're happy to readdress it. Our previous discussion centered on the fact that the EIFS have improved over the years. Even though EIFS is still a discouraged material, this may be an appropriate solution here. If the new Board is uncomfortable with EIFS, we are happy to offer a smooth fiber cement panel as an alternative. We could match the joints shown on the elevations by using 4 X 10 panels. We would suggest a low profile recess trim and suggest painting both the trim and the fiber cement panel in the Benjamin Moore early morning mist, which is specified on the EIFS. The fiber cement panel could prove to be a better choice from the durability perspective. We hoping that whatever material the Board would prefer in this instance. One of the



comments I should address is the driveway side. There were some questions about that from a previous meeting. We have a shared 20 foot access easement in that location with the adjacent lot. We have minimum driveway and access aisle widths that must be maintained. That driveway is about 22 feet, which extends onto the adjacent property for a couple of feet. We believe that's the best location on the site for a vehicular access drive. It gives us the most side yard setbacks to that adjacent structure. This is a one way street and much of that side elevation will be blocked from pedestrian view by the adjacent structure at 1530 Virginia Avenue. The drive aisle will be no wider than it is today. I will encourage the Board to consider the quotes from the previous submittal made by members of the previous Board. Mr. Saraphin mentioned that the changes that we made from the preliminary discussion are successful. The transition to the small house with the stairs is a good way to solve that. Mr. Ball had stated overall the massing looks really nice.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

None

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Mohr** – I don't find EIFS to be problematic, given that it's on the upper floor. It's not going to get damaged. I really don't have an issue with insulation on the outside. I guess I would prefer the smoothness of stucco as opposed to having it broken up with a whole bunch of joints. You do have to expansion joints with the EIFS. It seems a little daunting to have the building come down to the asphalt. There is a partial contributor to that as well with the neighboring property. I don't know if there is a solution to the driveway. The courtyard in the front works a lot better than it did before. I appreciate the fence management. I think that actually did the trick. I think that really works. I think the mechanical equipment is not an issue given the profile of the roof. The building, scale-wise, does a good job of relating to the street. My only real question is the driveway. I am not sure there is a solution for that.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I have a question about the wood material in the front courtyard and front terrace.

**Mr. Schafer** – The front parking garage extends into our front setback a little bit. We're going to have about ten feet of a deck above the parking garage. That creates a nice front patio for those ground level units. That's where those precedents come from in the landscape precedence. That's really the only place where it is used. It's functional there. It helps with drainage to allow that to be a deck.

**Mr. Gastinger** – That's a composite material how high above the concrete slab below?

**Mr. Schafer** – Four inches. It will be on 2 X 4 sweepers

**Mr. Gastinger** – Generally, I am supportive of the project. I think it's a development that has been thoughtful. I always appreciate how you take careful consideration of past comments and for our guidelines. The only question I have is regarding that material. While I think it can be used, especially in that 'front yard,' we do have a guideline regarding paving materials. It suggests that you use traditional paving materials. I do have some

concerns about how weather over time and the front setback. I wonder if something, more proven and consistent with other ADC Guidelines, should be considered.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It's the same material that you are using on the balconies, correct?

**Mr. Schafer** – That's correct.

**Mr. Gastinger** – You have noted hydrangea in the landscape plan. It could be a good selection. You would want to make certain to get a cultivar that is going to be small in stature if keeping with the renderings. If you were to get the species, it could be 8 to 10 feet tall.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I appreciate your preparation. It was a great presentation. I appreciate the rooftop units being set back from the eaves. I don't if they would need a railing from a safety standpoint or maintenance of those units.

**Mr. Schafer** – As long as a mechanical unit is not within ten feet from the edge of an eave, a railing is not required. We have done things before where we have painted a yellow stripe on the roof to prevent it. We have set all our mechanical units away from that ten feet to avoid having to install a railing.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I see the hatch on the one building. I don't see it on the other building.

**Mr. Schafer** – That other side has a walkway that is adjacent to that roof eave. You can put a ladder up against that eave and not require punching through the roof.

**Mr. Mohr** – I was looking at the light fixtures again. The digital package that's specified, is that something we have?

**Mr. Schafer** – We submitted cut sheets with each feature. I believe that it was part of our package.

**Mr. Werner** – I know that this is part of the site plan review as well.

**Mr. Mohr** – The model, as far as light distribution, looks promising. Some of the things like the wall pack can make me a little nervous. Is there some degree of control on the exterior light fixtures?

**Mr. Schafer** – I know that we submitted cut sheets. The city has spill over requirements that we must meet. I will have to work with our lighting consultant.

**Mr. Mohr** – This is still a neighborhood. Having the parking lot on all of the time would be detrimental. Controlling the light coming from under the building would seem important. The bulbs and the fixtures look fine to me. With regards to the garage lighting, you might want to have control features on it.

**Mr. Werner** – The specificity that you just got into would be a condition of a COA. It would not be staff review. The building permit plans would have to comply with that. That is an avenue to consider.

**Mr. Mohr** – It would be good to have the cut sheets.

**Mr. Schafer** – A condition of the COA would be something that we could consider.

**Mr. Mohr** – Looking at the model, there is the potential for this being a spaceship at night. That's all residential and there's not a lot of lighting there.

**Mr. Schafer** – I do understand the consideration. I do think that the renderings might be a little disingenuous about the landscape. There is also street lights on the street. It's a fair point.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Did you explore any kind of screening for the rooftop units?

**Mr. Schafer** – We did. It just proved to never be visible. It was adding screens to a roof.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I am convinced that you won't see them from Virginia Avenue. Would you might be looking right into them from Chancellor Street?

**Mr. Schafer** – We have walked the site many times. One of the things that we have studied has been the view from Chancellor Street. As Chancellor Street turns the corner right there, there is an 8 foot tall black fence that is completely covered in ivy for 6 months out of the year. You have a really deep barrier with the railroad, who doesn't keep their landscape in the most pristine condition along there. In one of our submissions, were renderings at that corner. I actually shot through the fence. I wanted to see what it would be like. It's a long ways away. I think that we are still higher with this building at the Chancellor Street elevation. I think that you are looking at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows. Page 24 of this presentation gives you a pretty good sense of that elevation at Chancellor. We felt that the screens became unnecessary. It would be really challenging to screen those units from Chancellor Street.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I believe you that the mechanical units would be visible. In this case, if we were to approve, this would be the exception. If you have an 8 story building that has mechanical units centered on the roof, the developer will say that they are not visible. There are places in the city where they are clearly visible. For me to approve this would be making an exception. With the renderings, the mechanical units are modeled in every single one. A lot of your views are above the streets. It appears that they would be hidden from the pedestrians in all cases. I really appreciate all the work that went into this packet. It's really complete. The wall sections are very helpful. From your perspective views from the staircases, I learned something. I really appreciate all of the effort that you put in there. I do not think fiber panels have been done successfully in the city. I think that EIFS would be a much better solution for that. It is definitely not the same material that we think of in the 90s. I think that this is great.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I would echo Mr. Schwarz's assessment. I am very grateful to the applicant for taking our comments seriously and addressing them and being thorough in considering them and resolving those issues. I am quite satisfied with what I have seen and I can support it.

**Mr. Bailey** – It looks like a great project.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Are there any thoughts on the Board about the in grade wood? This might be one of the first times we have approved something like this in a control district.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I really like it architecturally and how it reflects the balconies above and continues that theme down. I just like it architecturally. I don't have experience with this particular kind of application and detailing.

**Mr. Bailey** – It is very aesthetic and it works very well with the project. I don't see any problem with it.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am less concerned about its proximity to the grade because it will weather the same as the balconies would in that case. My only concern is that the main entry way, with TRECS, is going to be walked on very frequently. Mr. Schafer, can you speak to that?

**Mr. Schafer** – TRECS has project examples of commercial projects where it has been used on outside decks on restaurants. It comes with a warranty. There are examples of applications in high traffic areas.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I think it works really well to help reinforce the grade change. It makes it feel like a bridge or porch to get over to the building. It really helps set the building back from the street.

**Mr. Mohr** – It is an enormous improvement over what was there. I like that it extends the language of the decks and stairs into the building.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I am fine with it as designed. It's helpful since it is unusual per our guidelines for us to have that conversation.

**Mr. Mohr** – In this application, it is convincing.

**Mr. Werner** – If there is a contemporary design, it maybe does deserve a different look. It's probably something that we can better express in the guidelines. I made a note of it.

**Motion: Mr. Mohr - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the proposed residential building on this property satisfies 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 modifications:**

- **select a cultivar of hydrangea that can be maintained at 5 feet or shorter**
- **provide a control schematic for the exterior lighting (including the garage)**

**Carl Schwarz seconds. Approved (7-0).**

### **3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-06-01

416-418 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 290012000

A. Cadgene & G. Silverman, Trustees Main Street LD TR, Owner

Greg Jackson, Applicant

New roof and fenestration

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** - Year Built: 1941 District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing In 1929, the parcel appears on a Sanborn map as the site of the R.F. Harris & Co. Machine Shop and Foundry, with a foundry building and several sheds. In the 1950 Sanborn map, the footprint of the current building appears and is identified as “Auto Sales and Service.” The building retains much of its original commercial character when it was constructed as a car dealership, showroom, and sales lot. **January 17, 2017** - At the applicant’s request for a decision rather than deferral, despite the BAR’s encouragement for the application to request a deferral, the BAR denied (6-0) the applicant’s request for a new roof addition, specifically because the hip roof was not compatible with the historic building and the historic district. **July 18, 2017** – The BAR approved (4-2, Gastinger and Schwarz opposed) the applicant’s request for a new roof addition, with the stipulation that the applicant submit color renderings for the BAR to approve, prior to the COA being issued. This application is a resubmission from a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness, approved in July 2017. An extension to the CoA was granted, but it still expired in January 2020, before a building permit was issued. The applicant proposes replacing the existing flat roof and roof monitors with a new sloped roof and new windows. This project was previously reviewed and approved by the BAR in July 2017, but the CoA expired in January 2020. The applicant has resubmitted the project for a new CoA. Staff attached minutes from the BAR’s 2017 discussion of the project at the end of this staff report. Because the BAR previously approved this project, staff recommends approval.

**Greg Jackson, Applicant** – It has been a long time for this project in the earlier COA and afterwards. We ran out of time before the permit was issued. It’s coming back up and that’s where it is. Everything seems to be fine in Neighborhood Development, except for a property line issue the owner needs to address in the COA. At that meeting, it seemed like everybody felt perhaps the colors could be darker. This proposal attempts to do that, to set it back more for the building. With the roof, there are different approaches to that. With this proposal we also show more context. If you look at the proposal and see the other roof forms, the West Main Street side is proposed to be flat or behind parapets. There are large scale, multi-lots buildings should have a much grooved line to break up the mass of the design using gable or hipped forms. There are several reasons for doing this roof form. In creating a thought that states the interior with the trusses to create a more interesting space, but also to keep of low visual line on it. In the proposal, we showed it at six feet. You really don’t see the roof that much from most of the pedestrian experience. Since then, there have been a couple of buildings down the street that can look over it. Our mechanical is placed where the other mechanical is on that roof behind it, which would be the Galleria of the Main Street Market area. I think it was approved 4 to 2 at the time. The two that opposed happen to be the only two here today. Mr. Balut at the time said “I feel that the proposed design is compatible with the guidelines. The original volume of the building is not being touched and it is still identifiable. The addition on top is different enough to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. It is utilitarian in aesthetic and use, the vaults lend to the utilitarian logic. The fact that the building is being preserved, the cap is intact, and the details are utilitarian (like the mullions on the windows) addresses all of the concerns we have raised as a board. I feel like it is appropriate, it’s funky and utilitarian and overall compatible with the site.”

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

None

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Mohr** – I am fine with it. How high is the lower gutter? If I looked at section two, it looks smaller to me than what it is in the drawing.

**Mr. Jackson** – We need the room for the sloped gutter so that everything goes around the corners to the back. We want a little bit of volume.

**Mr. Zehmer** – On sheet 145 of the packet, it shows a detail of that. It shows a 10 x 10.

**Mr. Jackson** – It used to be bigger.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Are the colors that you are proposing are not actually represented on the 3D view? The roof is supposed to be a dark brown.

**Mr. Jackson** – Yes. It's not that accurate. We tried to put the exact color. I even have the dark bronze for the aluminum store front. I can add that for specifics. It's quite a bit darker than what you are seeing in the document. At the end of the meeting, the sentiment was to make it darker and tone it back a little bit. That the direction we are trying to go. It's hard to be perfect.

**Mr. Mohr** – Are you also playing with that parapet color?

**Mr. Jackson** – Yes. That had been discussed. One member of the Board had thought that it should be lighter and tie in more with the building. A week ago, I had sent those renderings around to Mr. Mohr and Mr. Werner. We decided to keep it the same color language as new. It's a new cap where the existing was. The lights were over the parapet. They're similar but they're coming through the building.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Is the current parapet concrete or clay? It's hard to tell from the street view.

**Mr. Jackson** – It is metal. It's what is shown.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I would prefer and think it would be cleaner if it remained the colors associated with the historic structure. The color of the materials of the addition rise to the height. I did vote against this project previously. Anything that can be done to set that back or by differentiating that materials so that it has a clarity on what is the addition and what is the new structure is a benefit.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I think that I am going to maintain my vote to not approve this. I know that you have worked with a lot of the members of the BAR a couple of years ago. It sounds like you have been working with a few of the members now. This project has been through many iterations. I still find it foreign to what is going on there. There is a lot happening on this property. It seems to make sense that you can add something different. The form does not feel compatible with what is currently there. It could some of the things that you are decorating it with. I am maintaining my vote there.

**Mr. Bailey** – I think that it looks pretty good. It maintains the industrial, commercial character of that building. I think the addition works very well for that. I do think that it fits

the context of West Main Street very well. I think that it will improve the experience of walking down that street. I am definitely in favor of it.

**Mr. Mohr** – I am thinking about the color of the parapet line. It's too bad the parapet wasn't terra cotta on the top. That would make this distinction much clearer. Wherever you make the break, it's hard to make that break. I think that it's weird for the glass, unless you do something with it, to make it significantly behind that. I think having that parapet be a different color is more like a lid on top of it. It seems to me that it's quieter and draws attention to itself if it is all the same color.

**Mr. Schwarz** – The glass is set back It is set back far enough it would read as somewhat, but it's obscured by all of the vertical and horizontal fins. I don't remember how we got to that point.

**Mr. Jackson** – I believe that it came from a desire to have more articulation. With that much glazing, we wanted to have some solar control as well, primarily on the south, east, and west. It's not oriented directly in the cardinal directions. We get some morning sun coming in. We did offset the façade to make it asymmetrical with that in mind. There are elements that are serving a purpose. I think the shadows, with the setback, are going to darken it quite a bit more than what could be shown.

**Mr. Mohr** –To make it more recessive, you get the 3 horizontal lines and the verticals with the glass. It feels recessed because of it. In terms of this building, it is a new way to terminate it. It doesn't bother me. It's definitely a different language than what is going on below. That is obviously new. Ideally, it would be back more. I don't think that is possible. I don't have a problem with the roof form. I think it does have a quasi-industrial sense, which seems appropriate to me. I don't have an issue with it. I don't think it will be detrimental at the street level.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I do want there to be a strong distinction between the historic building and what is done on top. Formwise, it pretty much does that and the fenestration does that. To reinforce that distinction through colors, depth of colors, setting it back as much as we can will help reinforce that distinction.

**Mr. Mohr** – It comes down to what you do with the top of the parapet. Is it something as simple as painting it that burgundy color. Does that cap it?

**Mr. Lahendro** – I think it needs to architecturally be a part of the historic building. It needs to read as part of the historic building.

**Mr. Mohr** – That's also keen to what Mr. Gastinger was saying about that piece. Maybe the thing to do is that other horizontal line gets picked up.

**Mr. Zehmer** – If you look at page 143. They have shown the previous colors. The previous colors image shows that top of the parapet white and relates more to the new roof. I actually like the idea of painting it the dark red to tie in with some of the bands lower down in the building. I also agree with the industrial nature of the roof. Defining that top band really helps separate the old from the new.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I think that purple would be fine too.

**Ms. Lengel** – I think a burgundy band at the parapet will help separate the old from the new and make it more of a distinct break.

**Mr. Mohr** – You read the band of brick for first and the roof second.

**Mr. Bailey** – I think that is a good solution.

**Mr. Jackson** – That’s an interesting development. When I sent the rendering a week and a half ago showing the band being lighter, we hadn’t thought about that actually being the reddish-burgundy being the highlight color of the building that would snap it out. It might actually be quite nice. It has the color down below with the canopy element. That might be something that is really interesting. It’s not necessarily what was there. I think that it would lend that building to stand on its own more and allow the other building to be different.

**Mr. Werner** – I looked at what was presented in 2017. The renderings in 2017 had this baby blue thing. My caution is to be very specific in the motion with that band. Refer to the page number and be specific on the detail.

**Mr. Zehmer** – The top of the parapet is shown as being the same as the wall color.

**Mr. Schwarz** – This is where my first question comes up. Page 145 shows the color they are specifying. They don’t match the renderings really well. We need to make it clear. The dark brown, in my renderings, is showing up like a dark brown. The roof is supposed to be a dark brown color, according to the application.

**Mr. Zehmer** – It doesn’t matter what the colors are. The top of the parapet of the original building should match in color with the belt coursing that separates the first and second stories.

**Mr. Schwarz** – When you guys make a motion, you’re going to specify that the top of parapet matches the belt coursing. The rest of the colors should look like the renderings or should they look like the 4 colors that have been called out on the materials page?

**Mr. Mohr** – The roof is so much darker. That dark brown doesn’t look like any of the renderings.

**Mr. Zehmer** – As long it’s something that signifies something that is separate from the original building is what I am focused on.

**Mr. Jackson** – The intent is for them to be as it is written in the color swatches. I had a hard time with the roof in the renderings. That’s stuff that we actually need to source.

**Mr. Mohr** – You couldn’t do the roof in the same color?

**Mr. Jackson** – Possibly. It just becomes all different shades of grey. I think that the intent was to have the roof be that dark bronze.

**Mr. Mohr** – The real contrasting elements in the roof system should be fairly subtle. The fundamental contrast to the old building should be strong. Making that parapet band red



would help that a great deal. If the roof is super dark relative to everything else, it catches the light differently. In the field, maybe have a sample of those that can be looked at to confirm it. I don't have any problem with grey. I just wonder about the dark brown. The windows make sense. The renderings really don't speak to that darker color.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Everything above the parapet should be the same, dark color. The more you vary the colors in that area, the attention you bring to it. The attitude ought to be more trying to have it disappear.

**Mr. Jackson** – I will look at what is available with the roofing material and go towards dark grey and circulate that. I don't think there is any attachment to that.

**Mr. Mohr** – Can the windows be a similar dark grey? Is the darkest color that bronze color?

**Mr. Jackson** – A lot of the windows are coming out black these days with the black trim. I can also look into that. This bronze sample is pretty dark.

**Mr. Mohr** – Mr. Lahendro is right. The more hermetic the top is, the better it separates from the building. That's really the objective here. If you did do the red line, that would be a significant division right there.

**Mr. Jackson** – The existing didn't really offer anything as exciting or interesting as that. It's not original. Parts of the whole project make it greater. It lends back to the building where it wasn't getting much help. I don't know if it would have worked without something above it. If you just had that color up there, as a termination point. Given that there is something above, it helps contain that existing building.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Do you feel that band of coloring needs to wrap the building?

**Motion: Mr. Zehmer - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed new roof and fenestration 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 with the following modifications:**

- that the top of the original building's parapet be painted to match the belt coursing of the building itself around the complete perimeter of the original structure
- that the roof structure have a monochromatic finish, as specified as RAL 7012 Basalt Grey in the applicant's submittal.

**Jody Lahendro seconds Approved (5-2, Carl Schwarz and Breck Gastinger opposed).**

#### **4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-06-02

525 Ridge Street

Tax Parcel 290147000

Ridge Street Plaza LLC, Owner

Stephen von Storch, Applicant

Revised landscape wall material

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Year Built: Under construction District: Ridge Street ADC District Status: Non-contributing Four two-story dwellings were historically situated along Ridge Street, just north of present-day intersection with Cherry Avenue. These houses were constructed before 1907, according to Sanborn Maps, but were demolished in the second half of the twentieth century, when Ridge Street was widened and rerouted to lead into 5th Street SW. After the houses were demolished, the intersection remained a wooded empty lot. **October 18, 2016** – BAR moved (5-3, Balut, Miller and Earnst opposed) to approve the massing and scale only of new residential building. This was not a COA. **December 20, 2016** – BAR approved (6-2, Balut and Miller opposed) CoA for elevations, colors, materials, and product specifications for new residential building. **January 17, 2017** – BAR approves (5-0) the landscape plan, requesting that the applicant submit a final plan with a tree list, lighting fixtures, and Corten Wall details for administrative approval. The BAR also requested an updated Phase I site plan to match the Phase II landscape plan in the area of the plaza. The BAR previously approved a Corten steel wall to enclose planters by the entrance of the new building. The applicant now proposes the street wall to be constructed of formed-in-place concrete, similar to retaining walls found on adjacent properties along Ridge Street. Staff finds the proposed concrete wall appropriate to the ADC and recommends approval.

**Steve von Storch, Applicant** – (Had technical issues with his microphone and entered the following into the Zoom chatroom.) Not much to say.

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

None

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

**Mr. Mohr** – This is way more appropriate than the Corten anyway. The Corten is the odd man out. The concrete is fine.

**Mr. Gastinger** – What is the maximum height of the wall?

**Mr. Von Storch** – It varies from 18 inches to 30 inches. (Entered in Zoom chatroom)

**Mr. Gastinger** – I don't have any issue with it.

**Motion: Mr. Lahendro - 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 concrete wall satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.**

**Tim Mohr seconds. Approved (7-0).**

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

##### **5. Staff Questions/Discussion**

Letter to VDHR re: support for Burley HS nomination to VLR/NRHP

Will be on the agenda for the September meeting.

Tenth and Page Survey

Survey was conducted successfully.  
Going to be reviewed by the State Review Board.  
Consultants have submitted photographs and survey reports.  
Hope that we can continue to engage the Tenth and Page community.

**F. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 PM.