

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
July 21, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review. Staff will introduce each item, followed by the applicant’s presentation, which should not exceed ten minutes. The Chair will then ask for questions from the public, followed by questions from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. For each application, members of the public are each allowed three minutes to ask questions and three minutes to offer comments. Speakers shall identify themselves and provide their address. Comments should be limited to the BAR’s purview; that is, regarding only the exterior aspects of a project. Following the BAR’s discussion and prior to taking action, the applicant will have up to three minutes to respond. Thank you for participating. [Times noted below are rough estimates only.]

Members Present: Cheri Lewis, Carl Schwarz, Ron Bailey, Breck Gastinger, Andy McClure, James Zehmer, Jody Lahendro, Tim Mohr, Sonja Lengel
Staff Present: Robert Watkins, Patrick Cory, Jeffrey Werner, Joe Rice
Pre-Meeting:

There was a discussion regarding the removal of item #1 on the consent agenda. There was also discussion regarding the motion for the consent agenda.

The monthly BAR meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM by the chairman

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.)

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the consent agenda with the removal of Front Railing at 430 N. First Street. (Motion seconded by Mr. Zehmer) Motion passed 9-0.

- 1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 20-07-01
119 W. Main Street (Bizou)
Tax Parcel: 330260000
Owner: Walters Building, LLC
Applicant: Tim Burgess
Fence at rear of building

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed fencing 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 following conditions:

- Fence height will not exceed 6'- 0".
- Fence will be either painted or have an opaque stain—color to be submitted to staff prior to application.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-07-02 105

E. Main Street (101-111 E. Main Street)

Tax Parcel: 330248000

Owner: First and Main Charlottesville LLC

Applicant: Christie Haskin/Woodard Properties

Install door at window opening

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed window removal and new door installation 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 following conditions:

- Applicant to retain and store the existing window and metal grate, should the opening be later restored.
- The existing masonry opening—width, height and arch--is not altered other than below the existing window.
- Provide to staff for the BAR archives cut sheets on the proposed door, side lite, frame, and hardware.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-07-03

120 Oakhurst Circle

Tax Parcel: 110025000

Owner: Tenth and Main, LLC

Applicant: Bill Chapman

New driveway and parking

Motion: 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 parking area, landscaping and site work satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

430 North First Street Discussion and Motion

Mr. Gastinger – This project had received approval in July, 2018 for a series of modifications. At the time, the railing did not receive much conversation. The railing design that was proposed and submitted in the drawings was relatively straight forward vertical picket. It was identified as a steel guardrail. The Board approved the project. One of the specific requirements was to come back and provide some details on what that railing would look like. To my knowledge, we never received it until the railing that is shown in the photos was constructed. This is exactly why the BAR wished to see the details of the railing prior to construction. I doubt the constructed design would have

been approved as it is wholly out of keeping with the modern style of the house. I cannot approve the motion, which essentially gives our rubber stamp on the design as constructed.

Mr. Mohr – I would agree with Mr. Gastinger in this regard. What is the next step?

Mr. Schwarz – The first thing we need to do is see how many people on the Board would like to see it come back to us. Or we can start with a motion for approval for it. I am personally OK with it as it is. I have been reviewing this project all along as new construction. It's not completely in the style of the house. I don't think it violates our guidelines.

Mr. Bailey – I agree. I don't think it violates the guidelines. I think it is a fairly modern design and it fits the neighborhood.

Mr. McClure – I am also OK with this.

Mr. Zehmer – I think it is fine.

Mr. Lahendro – I am a little confused. What is the part that the railing was there and the railing that was put there after our meeting? Is the new one the one on the street elevation? Or is it the railing that is perpendicular to the street elevation?

Mr. Gastinger – It's the Chippendale ridge railing.

Mr. Lahendro – I would like to see it come back to the Board.

Ms. Lewis - The difficulty is that a denial means that the applicant has to demo. It's a harsh penalty. I am not clear why this is being brought to us two year after. There was a condition of staff approval. A little more history. I don't know whether we as a Board didn't act on something or something fell through the cracks. I am not sure that I would deny because it's a pretty harsh penalty on the applicant and the owner. If they didn't bring something back, I would be more inclined. I just don't know the history. I have been asked to vote on these before. The ramifications are pretty tough. If they bring it back and it's not approved, it means they have to demolish and rebuild. Can somebody speak to what has happened between 2018 and now?

Mr. Werner – The best way to think about it is in terms of is if this was before the BAR, does this look appropriate or not? That's one side. Three months ago, there was an evaluation how COAs were approved. There are no partial approvals. This doesn't fit entirely into that. This is where everything was approved, but bring this back and show us what it is.

Mr. Gastinger – I don't think that is the issue. They built something completely different from what they submitted.

Mr. Werner – The fact that it was in place. It seemed the easiest way to remedy it was that I can offer it for the archive. This is what they installed. If there is a decision to request that they re-submit, I didn't want to say 're-submit' and have the Board say why are we having this discussion. This is the best course of action. It would be to ask them if it was brought in and denied, it would be appealable to City Council. If Council denied the appeal, it would be appealable to the courts. The action is not final as far as the BAR making someone tear something down. They would have options available to them.

Mr. Lahendro – The background to my opinion that it should come back to the Board is that what was presented during their initial COA meeting with the Board was a very simple and clean design that was compatible with the existing design. What has been put in is a very assertive design that has a lot of character to it and should have come to the BAR. It certainly is not a simple, compatible design with the existing railing. This is very different. I think this should have come to us. We told them that it should come to the BAR, but it didn't.

Ms. Lewis – Hearing that chronology, I would be in favor of the applicant re-submitting again.

Mr. Bailey – I am a bit puzzled by this. I understand that it's about the design that was submitted. As I understand our remit, it's supposed to be whether or not it is in character with the neighborhood. It isn't that intrusive to me aesthetically. Bearing in mind what Ms. Lewis said earlier about re-submitting and saying that it has to be torn out, it seems like a pretty bad penalty for something that is not that egregious.

Ms. Llengel – Can you walk me through the process if they re-submit? Then we debate what they have already done and whether or not they have to take it down.

Mr. Schwarz – Preferably for me, I would like to that now versus have them occupy time in another meeting. If we have 5 people, who don't see a concern with this railing, we move on. If there are five people, who are concerned with railing, this definitely needs to come back to the BAR.

Mr. Lahendro – Part of the re-submittal is to understand the genesis of this design. I don't know that I would vote against it necessarily. This is a very assertive design. I would like to know what the reasoning is behind it so that I can make an informed decision.

Mr. Werner – They had a photograph of some old porch almost 1950s metal porch corner that they had contemplated using. It was up in the air about what they were going to do.

Ms. Llengel – I think that they should re-submit.

Motion: Mr. Lahendro – The BAR does not accept this submittal for the BAR record and requests that this be submitted for BAR approval. (Second by Mr. Gastinger) Motion passes.

The applicant will need to resubmit.

C. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-07-05

320 W. Main Street

Tax Parcel: 290018000

Owner: 320 West Main LLC

Applicant: Robert Nichols/Formwork Design

Exterior alterations and signage

Jeff Werner, Staff Report - Year Built: c1890-1900 District: Downtown ADC District
Status: Contributing Constructed as the Sparks-Garrett House, it has been converted to

commercial use. The stuccoed, framed structure is T-shaped with Victorian detailing in its wide frieze, cross-gabled roof with overhanging eaves, and now enclosed porch with turned posts and bracket detailing. Enclosed front porch (west side): • Remove vertical siding, aluminum storefront, and windows at front porch enclosure (nonhistoric). • Remove fabric canopy. 320 West Main (July 16, 2020) 2 • Between the columns install columns install Marvin triple-gang casement windows with transoms • Install new entry doors with transom aligned with adjacent windows. Front elevation: • Remove six double-hung windows (two at the first floor bay, three at second floor) and replace with Marvin double-hung windows with two-over-two lite configuration (per historic photographs). Building Exterior: • Paint wood trim: Charcoal grey. • Paint stucco: Med/dark grey. • Paint windows and doors • "Fish-scale" wood shingles at pediments to be retained. Roofing: • Existing asphalt shingle roof to remain • Existing copper half-round gutters to remain Site Work: • Remove metal railing at entry and install new. • At west side of structure, install steel swing-gate with cutout signage at top. • At the sidewalk, install a monument sign. • At entry terrace, install 18" x 42" bluestone pavers over concrete slab. Removing an outdated and inappropriate enclosure of the front porch. Ideally, it would be left open, but the proposed is an improvement and does not remove or conceal historic elements. Double-hung 2/2 windows to be replaced: The existing windows do not match those visible in the 1980 photo in the submittal. New signage will require a separate signage permit. Staff recommends approval within the following conditions: • New Marvin windows [and doors] to be wood or aluminum clad. Applied muntins are acceptable and must be appropriately dimensioned. If insulated glass, there will internal space bars aligned with the applied muntins. • Any exterior lighting the lamping will have a Color Temperature not to exceed 3,000K, preferably dimmable, and will comply with the City's "Dark Sky" ordinance. • Applicant will provide to staff for the BAR archive cut sheets for the doors, widows, and any exterior light fixtures. This is a monument sign, which are not normally permitted on West Main. They are allowed for structures that have been residences converted into commercial use.

Robert Nichols, Applicant – We're not adding anything to the house. Most of what is happening here is getting caught up with the conditions that have degraded over time and had repairs that weren't up to the significance of the house in the historic district. We have been taking off applied finishes, particularly what has been covering up the porch, repairing existing wood trim and stucco, and fish-scale wood shingles. In terms of new design elements, that's concentrated on the front porch area and the terrace out front. We are not able to give up the volume and floor area of the porch as interior space. One design goal was to make legible the perimeter of the original building itself versus the way things are now on the building. It reaches one distorted volume. Our intention with the openness that we are trying to achieve and the kind of stickiness infill is to get that portion of the building to read as, if not an open porch, a nicely enclosed porch. Both sides of the entry walkway are somewhat planting beds and we are going to clean them up. The one on the left, as you face the building, will remain a planting bed and be cleaner. That tree that is shown is existing. On the right hand side, there will be blue stone pavers. It's just an outdoor area that is available for seating. At this point, there is no particular occupancy for the interior of the building. The gate shown between our building and the Comcast building will be wide open during business hours. It will be closed during the evenings. I submitted cut sheets for the windows and highlighted the profiles and cross sectional details that we anticipate having on this project. We're looking at aluminum clad window and the double hungs.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lengel – Are the windows on the porch the types of windows that, when opened, you almost can't see them? Will they be opening so that you will be able to see them from the outside?

Mr. Nichols – They're outswing. They would open to the exterior. We don't know what occupancy will be on the inside in that unit.

Mr. Lahendro – With the front porch infill, what is the material below the windows and between the windows behind the post?

Mr. Nichols – That is a stucco to match.

Mr. Lahendro – It would match the historic stucco of the building itself.

Mr. Zehmer – The original porch columns are all being retained?

Mr. Nichols – All of the material that is shown there is currently in place.

Mr. Zehmer – When I look closely at the newspaper article photo, you actually have two over one. I think that they are two over one instead of two over two. You might consider that if you want to try to match the historic window appearance.

Mr. Nichols – On the second story of that middle image, I guess that was the one adjusted to two over two.

Mr. Zehmer – I think that is the Venetian blinds showing through. You have a really strong vertical mutton on all of the windows on the upper sash.

Mr. Nichols – When you at that 45 degree bump on the left hand side of the first, it looks very much like that.

Mr. Zehmer – The ones that are there now are clearly not original. If there's a way to match what was historically there, I would support that.

Mr. Nichols – The goal, with the window configuration, is to get back to what was there. We're certainly not too far past that decision.

Mr. Lahendro – In the landmarks survey from 1979, the survey calls them two over two windows.

Mr. Zehmer – I did see that.

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Zehmer, are you saying that they are three over two or something like that?

Mr. Zehmer – I think they're two over one. I read that on the landmark survey. I agree that is what it says.

Mr. Werner – It appears to be two over two.

Mr. Schwarz – There is definitely a line down the middle. Is it the Venetian blinds?

Mr. Zehmer – I guess that is what I am encouraging: A little bit more of a deep dive to dig some more historic photos.

Mr. Nichols – There is also some store window action going on there.

Mr. Mohr – Possibly a bug screen on the lower half as part of the store window. This could also help disguise what is really going on behind it.

Mr. Lahendro – I noticed in that photograph that there are spindles between that horizontal bar above the brackets of the historic porch and the underside of the cornice. I don't see it on the renderings. Are they still there?

Mr. Nichols – They are not still there. I had seen those as well.

Mr. Lahendro – It would look really good.

Mr. Zehmer – Those old photos have a railing down at the bottom half too.

Mr. Mohr – The one thing that seems a little odd to me is the introduction of that stucco in that glass wall of the glazed in porch. It seems a little counter intuitive to me. I think the glass and the playing with the columns. It feels odd to me for stucco to be in there.

Mr. Nichols – I agree. It fights against what I said what our strategy was to delineate the boundary of the original volume or the internal volume. If we were to change that, we would go to a tight wood trim that is painted. It would be filling those remaining panels.

Mr. Schwarz – That looks like two over two to me.

Mr. Mohr – I would be surprised given that they're even that they wouldn't be two over two. If they were more of a cottage home, they would maybe two over one.

Mr. Zehmer – I have seen them both ways. This is looking more like two over two. The Landmark Survey says it.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – It seems a little counter intuitive. It all reads nicely together. If I go down to the next level, it is weird for stucco to be behind the spindles.

Mr. Nichols – I would be willing to agree to change to wood. If we could make that part of a motion, I would be happy to go along with that.

Mr. Schwarz – Does anyone have any concerns with the project that they think violate our guidelines? Is everyone in agreement that it would be preferable to have wood as opposed to stucco for the infill of the porch?

Motion: Mr. Mohr - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Work, Rehabilitations, and Signage, I move to find that the proposed 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: o That wood be used instead of stucco for infill of the porch, with the proposed color scheme remaining o That the two-over-two windows have simulated divided lites o Any exterior lighting, limited to a small light on the monument sign and stake lights for the terrace, will have a Color Temperature not to exceed 3,000K, preferably dimmable, and will comply with the City’s “Dark Sky” ordinance.

Motion seconded by Mr. Lahendro. Motion passes 9-0

5. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-07-04

518 17th Street NW

Tax Parcel: 050066000

Owner: Charlottesville VA House Corp – Alpha Phi

Applicant: George Stone

Replace slate roof

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1900 District: Rugby Road- University Circle-Venue Neighborhood ADC District Status: Contributing. This rambling Victorian house was constructed for Randolph M. Balthis in 1899 and remained a single-family dwelling until at least the 1970s. The two-story house has weatherboard cladding, a steep hipped roof, and a wraparound verandah. Request CoA for removal of existing slate roof and replacement with imitation slate shingles, matching the shingles used on south addition approved by the BAR in December 2011. Flashing to be copper, with valley exposure to match existing. (Ledge flashing at the gables to remain.) Ridge and hip caps to be bent shingles. Internal gutters will be abandoned, replaced with eave mounted, 6” half-round gutters and 4” round downspouts. (Gutters will be attached to the roof sheathing; the existing cornice profile will remain.) New gutters and downspouts to be aluminum, painted white. No work proposed for the porch roof or on southern addition. Shingles: Per the Design Guidelines, artificial slate is an acceptable substitute when replacement is needed. Applicant has expressed that repeated efforts have been made to repair leaks, however problems persist. In lieu of continuing the in effectible spot repairs, the roofer recommended replacement of the entire roof. With replacement, the use of simulated slate is less expensive than new slate. Gutters and Downspouts: The BAR has approved CoA requests to remove internal gutters and replace with eave-mounted. Applicant proposes painted aluminum (white), matching the current downspouts and reducing the visibility of the new gutters. Staff recommends approval of the CoA, with the following conditions: (See the attached images.) • Match the existing dimensions of the exposed valley flashing.

- Ridge and hip cap profile to match or be similar to the existing profiled, metal cap. •
- Install new downspouts at same locations as the existing

John Epperly, Applicant – We are trying to make it go back exactly the way it is, with the exception of the gutters. The Philadelphia Style gutters are obsolete at this point. Going with a shank mounted to the substrate gives the strongest style of install for going with the synthetic slate.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – Is that light colored copper on there with the slate?

Mr. Stone – It is galvanized metal.

Mr. Mohr – Do you have any concerns about putting copper in the valleys with aluminum gutters?

Mr. Epperly – They're not going to be in contact with each other.

Mr. Lahendro – I am curious about the built in gutter. This looks unusual to me for a built in gutter. Is it just above the crown molding on the farthest part of the eave? There is a sheet metal fascia behind it that goes to a step-out for the slate roof.

Mr. Epperly – From the very edge of the roof, it comes up about eight inches. That is just covered with metal. It is essentially a 2 by 4 standing on end that is mounted to the roof. That is all wrapped with galvanized metal. It goes underneath the existing slate.

Mr. Lahendro – It is a Philadelphia Style gutter.

Mr. Werner – I called it an internal gutter because if you're coming about Philadelphia gutters.

Mr. Lahendro – I just want to make sure that in the final change, that we keep that strong shadow line there below the Philadelphia gutter. I wish I could see a detail on how that is going to be done.

Mr. Werner – At the overhang?

Mr. Lahendro – Above the overhang.

Mr. Mohr – As soon as you get rid of that 2 by 4 that stands up and that skirt below down to the dripline, you are going to lose that and you're going to have to a gutter sitting in front of your crown. You lose that detail. The slate has to come all of the way down to the drip edge at the top of the crown.

Mr. Lahendro – We are going to lose that horizontal shadow line that is very prevalent on the elevations. Is there any creative way to still have the slate come down to that line and

have sheet metal below there to still give that horizontal line instead of taking the slate all the way down to the top of the crown? It concerns me.

Mr. Epperly – It essentially would be reworking the Philadelphia Style gutter. If you're going to keep that, you're not going to be using the half round gutters. Water is not going to get to them. That is a stopping point. That's the existing design.

Mr. Lahendro – The half rounds are going to be down there. That's the top of them. That space in between that I am trying to preserve.

Mr. Epperly – With our proposed design, that's going to go away.

Mr. Lahendro – That's a concern for me. I am not sure how the rest of the Board feels.

Mr. Mohr – This has always been one of the conundrums about Philadelphia gutters. We definitely allow it. If there is a failure, it gets into the wall, which is why people don't like them. It does look like that it is outside of the wall. There is a longevity issue or a maintenance issue. On the other hand, you have ruined the crisp line to the eaves. I could see advocating keeping it on the front elevation/public elevations. It may not be visible from the street. I understand why they want to do it.

Mr. Lahendro – I understand it too. It adds a distinctive character to the exterior elevation, that strong horizontal line.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – We have the gutter concern about maintaining the horizontal line in the Philadelphia gutter.

Mr. Mohr – One compromise might be to have an extended drip edge that mimics the transition from the slate to the outside edge of the roof. It would actually pull that up and hold the slate back. You would dispense with the 2 by 4 standup, but you would still have an eight inch panel. The last row of slate would stop 6 or 7 inches above that.

Mr. Epperly – That would essentially admitting the first course of the new slate.

Mr. Lahendro – It's almost similar to the wash within that gable end.

Mr. Zehmer – Is that also getting replaced? The color would match because you're going to paint the copper.

Mr. Epperly – That's been painted a different color.

Mr. Mohr – Is the starter course on the slate a double? That has a little bit of shadow to it.

Mr. Schwarz – I think that this opens up some complications. We are now going to have copper touching the aluminum gutter. Is there anyone on the Board content with this as proposed? I would approve it. We do have a precedent for replacing Philadelphia gutters with half rounds.

Mr. Bailey – I agree.

Motion to Approve: Mr. Gastinger - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed roof replacement satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road- University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following conditions: • Match the existing dimensions of the exposed valley flashing. • Ridge and hip cap profile to match or be similar to the existing profiled, metal cap. • Install new downspouts at same locations as the existing. Cheri Lewis seconded. Motion passes (7-2, Jody Lahendro and Tim Mohr opposed).

6. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-07-06

411 1st Street N

Tax Parcel: 330107000

Owner: Andrea and Reidar Stiernstrand

Applicant: Julie Kline Dixon/Rosney Co. Architects

New door at window opening

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1882-1889 District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing. The George-Makris House was likely built as a rental property sometime between 1882 and 1889. Compared with neighboring houses of similar scale on the block, the subject building has fewer architectural embellishments. The two-story, three-bay brick house is situated on a high basement and is fronted by a wood porch with Victorian trim. Request CoA for removal of existing basement window and installation of entry door. • Relocate existing window to center door opening. Infill with new brick below. • Relocate existing door to south window opening. • From driveway to door, construct stone steps/landing and new stone retaining wall. • Reconstruct wood porch stairs to accommodate new access to basement entry. • Install new light fixture. Note: While the drawings indicate swapping the existing window with the existing door, the applicant would prefer to leave the door in place and install a new door in the window opening. This opening is at the primary and is being modified to accommodate accessibility for an elderly relative. If the applicant preference is approved, staff recommends the following conditions: [Staff concurs with the applicant’s preference.] Remove only the proposed window and install a new door in the opening. Leave in place the existing door at the center, below the front porch. • Retain and store the existing window, should the opening be later restored. • The existing masonry opening is not altered other than below the existing window. • For the exterior light fixture, the lamping will have a Color Temperature not to exceed 3,000K, preferably dimmable, and will comply with the City’s “Dark Sky” ordinance. • Applicant will provide to staff for the BAR archive cut sheets for the doors, windows, and any exterior light fixtures.

Julie Dixon, Applicant – The issue really is the desired use of that lower level of their home for an aging relative and ease of transition getting the relative in and out of the house, which can't happen comfortably under the porch, as it is currently configured because of the lack of head height and the transitions being challenging. They can work very easily with the door in the existing masonry opening. When you brought up the cut sheet question, one pressing issue is that door and its exterior material. It will remain uncovered. I don't think a solid wood door, which would be our preference, would work successfully there unprotected from the weather. I don't know if the BAR has a history of approving a clad door on the exterior façade like that. That's a fair question we need to wrestle down in terms of that door cut sheet if the new use for that masonry opening is acceptable. The preferred door would be a marvin clad door uncovered. Ideally, we would like it to be half glass, similar to the one that is there. When I originally submitted to staff, we preferred the idea of reusing the existing door in the new location. I can understand from the Secretary of Interior's point of view why that might not be the preferable solution. If you go to a new door, keeping architecturally is important. Getting additional light in that room would be preferable. A half-light/half wood panel door would be the goal.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – The plans that were submitted show the new door where the window is and putting that window where the center door is. My understanding is that is what the application is for. Is that correct?

Ms. Dixon – In subsequent conversations with staff, we determined that it might be preferable to leave the existing door in place, store the existing window. The only change would be to that existing window. To store the existing bricks and existing window for replacement at a future date is totally acceptable to the applicants.

Mr. Bailey – I have a questions regarding the stairway going to the upper porch. The new door will be behind that stairway. It will be obscuring the new door?

Ms. Dixon – That's correct.

Mr. Werner – The last time, Mr. Lahendro had asked mentioned a section through the wall. The applicant did provide one, which is with the submittal.

Mr. Lahendro – Is there a gutter system on the porch?

Ms. Dixon – I don't think there is.

Mr. Lahendro – I don't see it in the photographs. I think about the water running off the side of that porch roof.

Ms. Dixon – It's hard to imagine that the stairs have held up as long as they have with it.

Mr. Schwarz – There is downspout showing up to the right of the porch.

Ms. Dixon – It's hard to imagine that could hold the water from the other side. There is no sign of a surface mounted gutter. The porch, as you can see, is an oddity, slammed against those windows, where it is required removal of the shutters. They didn't want to get into changing the porch. They felt that it was more complicated to manipulate the porch. I told them that BAR might have more challenges approving the changing of that porch.

Mr. Mohr – Is there a chance that there is a diverter up there that is taking out to the corner?

Ms. Dixon – That could be. There is not a ton of travel.

Mr. Lahendro – Depending on where that downspout goes, it looks like a built in gutter.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – It's a functional consideration. It's down and not in full view. It will hold up and it won't look bad. I think that it's fine.

Mr. Zehmer – According to the plans, they are looking at suppressing the grade to go down to achieve this doorway. Why not suppress the grade, have a few steps down, suppress the grade below the porch, and it gives you better head height?

Ms. Dixon – I think that becomes complicated, not just on the exterior, it becomes complicated on the interior. When you open that door, the bottom landing of the stairway is about 2.5 to 3 feet from the door face itself. It doesn't give wheelchair accessibility to enter and maneuver in the space. It feels like a really complicated path of travel. From the exterior, it adds complication. From the interior, it's complicated.

Mr. Zehmer – You have steps down. How does that make it different with a wheelchair user? If you have steps, doesn't that make it difficult for a wheelchair user?

Ms. Dixon – That's correct. They're just trying to this path of travel as much as possible, not really knowing what they're going to get into as they move into housing. It's her mother. There are steps, regardless. They're trying to make it as easy as possible. The maneuverability of getting under the porch. We're removing that porch base and columns and into that door. There is a lot involved.

Mr. Zehmer – It seems that the columns are out at the front edge of the porch.

Ms. Dixon – The slab would have to be cut out. You have to excavate all of the slab. I am not sure how we are going to do that without damaging the brick.

Mr. Zehmer – You're cutting out to get below grade in front of that window.

Ms. Dixon – There is nothing simple about any of these solutions.

Mr. Bailey – Is the driveway next to the house their dedicated driveway as well?

Ms. Dixon – Yes.

Mr. Bailey – Is that also one of your considerations that the person using that door be taken by vehicle closer to being in that alley?

Ms. Dixon – Yes.

Mr. Schwarz – Does anybody else have any concerns with this meeting our guidelines?

Motion: Mr. Bailey - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed alterations satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following conditions: o Leave in place the existing door at the center, below the front porch. o Retain and store the existing window, should the opening be later restored. o The existing masonry opening is not altered other than below the existing window. o For the exterior light fixture, the lamping will have a Color Temperature not to exceed 3,000K, preferably dimmable, and will comply with the City’s “Dark Sky” ordinance. o Applicant will provide to staff for the BAR archive cutsheets for the doors, windows, and any exterior light fixtures. o That a half-lite aluminum-clad solid wood door be used. Tim Mohr seconded. Motion passes (9-0).

7. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-07-07

422 1st Street N

Tax Parcel: 330100000

Owner: NONCE, LLC

Applicant: Julie Kline Dixon/Rosney Co. Architects

Addition to residence

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: c1870 - 1885 District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing. The Watson-Bosserman House is a three-bay, two-story frame house built in 1870. It is representative of similar vernacular houses built in Charlottesville in the decades following the Civil War. Staff is unable to determine if the rear addition is that seen in the 1896 and 1920 Sanborn Maps, or some part of it. Applicants stated that the sunroom is not. (Note: Sanborn Maps are unreliable for building dimensions.) Staff is not opposed to the addition on this rear wing. BAR should discuss the relocated chimney. It will be angled over into the second floor addition to accommodate a window. No details are provided on the materiality. Should the BAR move to approve, staff recommends the following conditions: • New windows and doors to be wood or aluminum clad. Applied muntins are acceptable and must be appropriately dimensioned. If insulated glass, there will internal space bars aligned with the applied muntins. • Any exterior lighting the lamping will have a Color Temperature not to exceed 3,000K, preferably dimmable, and will comply with the City’s “Dark Sky” ordinance. • Applicant will provide to staff for the BAR archive cut sheets for the doors, widows, and any exterior light fixtures.

Julie Dixon, Applicant – It's really the sunroom addition that is really not an addition. It's a reroofing and changing the windows of the sunroom. I am talking about the south side addition. You have probably noticed in the existing conditions that the roof has an extremely low slope. The interior ceiling slopes with that roof. The windows are a different quality and style than the rest of the house. The windows and their encasements are deteriorating. Off the rear of the house, there is now an exposed deck, partially on the south side and an exposed wood deck on the east side with a spiral stair. The goal is to improve the quality of the sunroom proportions, window type, siding type, and make that look like a wraparound porch secondary to the primary volumes. They need additional space upstairs, which is currently two bedrooms and a bathroom. There was no way to push off an addition in either north or south directions. In the rear, we would have two separate second story spaces if we didn't go up above the existing kitchen. The owners would really like the addition to stay consistent with the existing residence in material and style. The thought is that we replicate siding materials. The windows would be solid wood Marvin. The shutters would be solid wood. The trim details would be slightly simpler than those on the primary façade of the house, but still classic in proportion and detailing. The basement level, which you can see below the sunroom, is actually wood framed. It is vinyl sided. Their thought would be to dress that up because it has so much visibility from the foot traffic and the vehicular traffic on First Street. You really see it when you enter the house. They would like to look like that to look like as a masonry base, even though it doesn't currently. That was the idea of the masonry piers. The chimney exists internal to the kitchen. It's currently a gas fireplace. What we are doing is moving the gas fireplace off to the side. That would be a false masonry chimney to exit the roof off to the side of the window. It would be built by Old Carolina's veneer depth brick. They make it in one inch thick veneer brick that you can apply to maintain the visual appearance of a masonry chimney on the outside. Instead of the deck, they would like to go back with porch roof wrapping around that east façade and then back to the north side to connect to the existing kitchen door. There is an existing north side kitchen door that they want to catch with this porch. The roof on the porch would be standing seam metal. The roof above the new second story wing would be slate or metal to match the one below.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – What is the roof on the old house right now?

Ms. Dixon – I had thought that it was slate.

Mr. Mohr – It is slate on the main body of the house?

Ms. Dixon – It's a little hard to see. I think that we should double confirm that. The valley there looks like slate.

Mr. Mohr – I guess that would be a question. If it is not slate, what is it capable of holding?

Ms. Dixon – You're talking about the new second story?

Mr. Mohr – I was wondering about the old house. Getting some differentiation between the two would be good. It's a pretty common hierarchy.

Mr. Zehmer – Is the intent to reroof the front half of the house?

Ms. Dixon – Not unless it is necessary.

Mr. Zehmer – Is it asphalt shingles?

Mr. Lahendro – I don't know why it matters. It is not part of the application.

Mr. Mohr – I was thinking of the differentiation between the two.

Mr. Lahendro – It's not unusual to have the addition be metal, the front be slate, or something like slate.

Mr. Mohr – If you adhere strictly to the guidelines, this is being handled as a direct evolution of the house. Just looking for some differentiation.

Mr. Gastinger – Can I ask a little more about the fireplace in the back? Is that an insert? It currently does have a masonry chimney. Was it a masonry fireplace?

Ms. Dixon – It was a masonry fireplace. It has a gas insert. It actually had a larger fire box on the basement level. There is an old mantle on the basement level and a big fire box that hasn't been used. It is boarded over now. On the kitchen story, the previous owners had a gas insert instead of logs that they put in there. The owners really use them and like them. They want to maintain that.

Mr. Werner – The house is on First Street. A lot of the houses in this area are rental tenant houses. I suspect, just looking at the old photos, there is a brick base to the rear wing. Maybe that was the kitchen.

Mr. Schwarz – You had said that with the new proposed chimney, you had wanted to use a thin brick?

Ms. Dixon – Yes. If you're familiar with Old Carolina, it is hand pressed bricks. They make a thin brick for applications just like this. You can build out an exterior chimney just supported on the roof trusses.

Mr. Schwarz – I wanted to call that out. I don't think it was a part of our application materials. I do believe that is something we have to grant a special exception.

Ms. Dixon – What I didn't want was that ugly gas fluke sticking out of the roof. It's really me pushing for that and not the owners. I wanted something to house that.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – I think that it is very rational extension of the house. It fixes a lot of the visual noise that it currently has. I do think trying to distinguish it a little bit with simple things like the roof, playing with the weatherboard, and some subtle things. As far as its massing and basic approach, I think it is fine and will be a very nice addition to the house. I would like to see a little more differentiation if there is a way to achieve it.

Ms. Dixon – Like change the exposure on the siding?

Mr. Mohr – Do some little tweaks that make it clear that it wasn't built at the exact same time to the existing house.

Mr. Schwarz – The existing siding is still wood, correct?

Ms. Dixon – That's correct.

Mr. Schwarz – Are you planning on going back with wood for the new siding?

Ms. Dixon – It would definitely be wood.

Mr. Mohr – I don't have a problem with the brick chimney.

Mr. Gastinger – The issue of the chimney is not its material as much as its location. It seems like a very weird spot for a brick masonry chimney to be coming out of a roof. I would rather see it come out of the gas flue.

Mr. Mohr – If it is a gas flue, you have too many angles?

Ms. Dixon – That's right.

Mr. Mohr – If it was the front of the house or a major elevation, I would feel differently about it. It doesn't bother me.

Ms. Lengel – I have a comment about the spacing of the columns. I understand that they are spaced so that the windows are centered. Some of them wider. Some of them are closer. Since it is a historic house, they would never space the columns that way. They would space them evenly. Can you address why you chose to do it that way?

Ms. Dixon – I am not totally convinced that historic houses would have spaced them evenly. When you're inside and outside, not having to look dead-on to a column is a real advantage from the design perspective. This house has a real tree tops feel to it. You know that alley between First and Second Street gets quite low. You feel like you are in the tree canopy. It's going to draw your eye out a lot. My goal was not to impede that view of columns whenever possible. I aligned them with the base that we were given. In a perfect world, I would have redesigned the depth of that sun porch on the south side altogether. That was really not financially viable. It has an awkward depth relative to the rest of the house. We have to work within the existing foundation. We are trying regularize or normalize something that is a little funky that exists.

Mr. Lahendro – Then you end up with one column that doesn't have a brick pier below it?

Ms. Dixon – That’s right. If you added a brick pier below it, you would impede the view from that existing French door. You can’t see that right now. There is no reason you would have ever seen this because none of it is visible from anywhere. It is so far below any street level. I guess their neighbors Second Street, if they are looking down, could see it. It has a final lattice wall in front of that is built all of the way up. You could take that column out. Then you end up with a 14.5 foot span between columns, which also looks a little awkward and unstable.

Mr. Bailey – I don’t mind the design as it is. If you remove that column, it is just taking a different kind of awkwardness. It actually isn’t supporting anything.

Mr. Lahendro – I agree with Ms. Llengel. I would have expected it to be even spaced columns across that back and not a setup on windows or openings within the house itself.

Ms. Lewis – I don’t see any materials submitted. This is quite a large plan of development. Would you come back with materials next time? I am just finding a lack of information with which to approve this. It is much more beautiful than existing. I am not sure about the material selections.

Ms. Dixon – I can give a written description.

Ms. Lewis – I don’t want to infer that you need to defer. We are prepared to support it. It seems like it is mass of information that we haven’t received with your submittal. I would just ask staff how that is going to be handled.

Mr. Schwarz – We can defer. We can’t do any more partial approvals. Everyone would have to be OK with this. One thing we could do is if all materials can be described and put into the motion that is one method we have done before. If it ends up being too many materials, it becomes too complicated. You may not find enough support for that motion. I don’t know if you guys want to give that a try.

Mr. Werner – This is often the case that our preference is for staff to bring you what we have and have those discussions. At the very least, service a preliminary discussion. There are some details that I think could be clarified. There are ways to do that. The best way would be to approve with the requirement that the questions you ask be on the consent agenda for August. That is a condition of approval. Knowing that a building permit could not be issued, all of those conditions are met. It could be deferred. You can continue the discussion next month. You all could opt to go through the various questions and seek to clarify them.

Mr. Schwarz – Maybe we need to quantify what we are missing.

Ms. Lewis – Siding on the ground floor, there is a small section before the windows begin. It has a small window. Around the back, there is siding on the very lower sub-grade level. With the plasters that the columns are made of, we have an answer on the brick. It would be good to know with certainty what that brick is. I would like to know the materials on the railing. I don’t think that has been discussed. With the roof, we know that it is metal. Doors and windows on both levels, there are French doors. There are 6 over 6 on the bottom level. I guess that it is 6 over 6 on the top. They look like they are depicted differently than the ones on the bottom. There is a newly built stair on the back. I would just start there.

Mr. Gastinger – Any proposed lighting.

Mr. Zehmer – Wood shutters.

Mr. Mohr – It would also be good to know what the weather of the siding is. You are going to play with some details. It would be good to know what those might be.

Mr. Bailey – It is started sound like it should be deferred until the list of materials is provided.

Mr. Schwarz – What we have done in the past is deferred something with a vote of confidence saying that we're generally in approval of the application. We need to see the following items come back to us. I have Ms. Lewis' list. With the roof, have we settled on metal? I think that was in your narrative.

Ms. Dixon – Yes.

Mr. Gasinger – I would like to clarify where the proposed second addition roof will hit. It is shown in several different relationships to the existing roof in the drawings.

Mr. Mohr – I think that is an optical allusion. It does actually hit the roof.

Ms. Dixon – I was going to say the same thing. It's a strange thing with the chimney interrupting that drawing. It makes it look like it is higher.

Mr. Gastinger – In the rear section, it's lower. There was one where it looked like it was higher.

Mr. Mohr – If you draw a line, it actually aligns with it.

Mr. Zehmer – With the new chimney on the back, north and south elevations show it centered on the ridge, while the east elevation shows the opposite.

Mr. Mohr – It should be down on the roof more.

Mr. Zehmer – It is an odd chimney because, physically it could never be cut that way. You have a window on the second floor that you are trying to avoid. There is a window on the first floor.

Mr. Lahendro – With that drawing on 83.0, the existing chimney on the right hand side is not drawn correctly. It actually straddles that ridge like the one on the left. I don't know if your gable is the ridge of your addition. Your addition is going to hit the side of it or just below it.

Mr. Zehmer – I would be in favor of Mr. Schwarz's suggestion in a vote of confidence along with asking to come back with the materials. I do like the design.

Mr. Schwarz – With the siding, we would like to know what exposure that you are proposing. It looks like you have called out solid wood for the siding. You have ipe

decking. You have called for the porch posts to be wrapped in solid wood with details to match elsewhere in the house. I don't know if that's sufficient for everyone. I think that works for me.

Ms. Dixon – We have a crown. We have just a small beginning of ipe detail on that porch.

Mr. Schwarz – The pilasters are also solid wood. Railing materials appear not to be covered.

Mr. Laehendro – Are they painted wood?

Ms. Dixon – They are painted.

Mr. Mohr – There is an existing railing and existing porch detail on that front porch.

Mr. Schwarz – We have the doors and windows. We have the new stair, any proposed lighting, new shutters, and the roof peak location.

Ms. Lewis – The mature on the second story addition. We didn't determine what the materials on the main house.

Ms. Dixon – My instinct is that should be metal. If we get up there and it is an architecturally shingle roof on the existing, we will have a whole another situation.

Mr. Schwarz – That would be a good reason to defer that portion. Or have you come back with that.

Ms. Lewis – The last drawing in the submission has them matching. It is certainly not metal. It maybe slate. It looks they are matching. There is a lack of detail here.

Mr. Bailey – What would the new stairs down to the garden be made out of?

Ms. Dixon – Also ipe. I think that is in the written description. Two ipe boards, gapped every tread and same railing profile.

Mr. Schwarz – That leaves for the unknowns: the proposed lighting, the new shutters, the roof peak location, the siding, and the upper roof material.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Rehabilitation, I move to defer the application, and that the BAR generally supports the application, but would like to see the following items come back for clarification: • The siding exposure and profile • The proposed lighting • The new shutters • The roof peak and chimney location • Upper roof material Jody Lahendro seconded. Motion passes (9-0).

8. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-07-08

418 E. Jefferson Street (Renaissance School)

Tax Parcel: 530040000

Owner: 18 East Jefferson Street, LLC

Applicant: Bill Adams/Train Architects
Window repairs and replacements

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1826 (Remodeled 1921) District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing The building is Colonial Revival, brick (Flemish bond), two stories with a gable roof, five bays with a one bay addition. Entrance in center bay within a two-story projecting, pedimented pavilion with wooden facing and a quasi-Palladian window at the second story. Segmental broken pediment over entrance. Mousetooth cornice. Brick gable ends extend above roof line. Two, tall exterior end chimneys forms curtain above roof line. The building was extensively remodeled in 1921. The interior was gutted and converted into a central hall, double pile office complex. The eastern wall (located along 5th Street NE) with its chimneys and curtain and the second floor double sash windows are about all that remain from the original storerooms. Request CoA for the replacement and/or repair of select windows. Applicant requests approval of either one or some combination of three options. Last fall, staff visited the site with the contractor and inspected the windows. Staff concurs that there is substantial and significant deterioration at many of the existing window, particularly those in the original portion of the building. Of the few existing sash [at other elevations] that might match those in the primary elevation, they also warrant significant repair, if not replacement. Submittal summarizes the proposed work at each window and provides details showing how the replacements will fit into the existing frames and compare dimensionally to the existing sash. The BAR should determine if the windows warrant replacement or repair/rehabilitation. If replacement is approved, the BAR should review and approve the color, lite configuration and muntins widths, stile and rail dimensions, and installation details relative to retaining and/or replicating the existing sills and trim.

Bill Adams, Applicant – The Renaissance School and landlord want new windows. The old ones are, in many ways, failing. If you look through the presentation, you can see some photos of rot. There are a couple that have guillotine windows status. The joints and the corners are gone so far that they are holding up a piece of glass. I think that there have been some replacements in the older section of the building. There are some that are without lights. You can see it on the side elevation. This is a good elevation to start with. The original 18th century building is still in brick. That's one type of detail that I would call colonial revival detail from the 20s. The next small segment of building that you can see. That has the same detail. Moving down the street, these are hollow metal windows in the next segment. They are just one over ones with a brick mold. One way of doing it would be to re-condition what is there and replace the sashes that are there. That would be according to this existing detail. There are some unusual things about this. The outer casing is also the stop for the sash. That works well if you are considering a more modern replacement window. We have used Marvin windows on a number of historic projects, including a couple dorms. The idea would be to get something that has the energy efficiency of a modern window as the low e value and still has an acceptable level of detail for the building. It is a commercial/institutional building. The owners would really like to do the replacement windows, instead of putting back the existing sashes. When we have had new replacement sashes milled, then taken apart the existing windows, it has been very expensive. They end up with issues like the original windows had once the sashes dry out in the sun. It ends up defeated a lot of the purpose of replacing the window. They have tried to put interior storm windows in a number of areas to deal with cold air infiltration. At some point, somebody decided to apply silicon sealant all around the windows. That has caused more degradation in the windows. On the backside, they have put Plexiglas over the

windows. A lot of them are pretty far gone. We feel that the elevation on East Jefferson Street is the real primary elevation. You don't see the elevation to the west very much. That's back in the alley. This side elevation is an informal elevation. The school would like to replace all of the windows we have shown here with Marvin windows. Historic preservation is wetted to a certain attitude about window replacement. I would like to think that the front elevation is really the primary elevation. If you do not allow replacement windows on the front, we would rehabilitate or get new sashes into the old windows. The other thing to point out is where they want to fill in this door on the side. That's in a stairwell. That is never going to be an exit from the building. We created a detail that keeps the detail adjacent to it. There is this larger opening. There is a stack bond of infill. That's what we are proposing to fill in that door.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – You have enough window stock to re-constitute the elevations facing Court Square?

Mr. Adams – I don't think the existing window stock is going to fit. I don't think you could raid one part of the building and come up with window that fit on the front. There is too much irregularity. There are a couple of windows on the Court Square elevation that are OK. They have been painted or maybe replaced at some point.

Mr. Mohr – They are probably not being exposed to the weather.

Mr. Adams – The ones to the west get a lot of sun. Those are the ones that are dried out. The joints are gone or loose up at the sashes.

Mr. Schwarz – For your proposed replacement, am I right in seeing a loss of 5/16 of an inch all the way around.

Mr. Adams – That's correct.

Mr. Zehmer – On the east elevation of the 1826 building on the second floor, it looks there are two windows that have later sashes. They not the 6 over 6. Are you proposing to replace those with 6 over 6?

Mr. Adams – Yes. That whole piece, including the next segment, is all of the colonial detail. They would all get the windows with the lights. It's not a true divided light and applied light. It has a spacer bar in it. We have matched the width of the old putty sashes divided lights. On an institutional building like this, there is a lot of detail. The Marvin windows would provide the appropriate level of detail for the massing for the overall effect of the building.

Mr. Lahendro – Are the windows facing Court Square repairable?

Mr. Adams – There are a few that are repairable.

Mr. Lahendro – But not all?

Mr. Adams – The sashes are shot on a few of them. I was able to take a knife and run it right into some of them. Staff asked me about the trim around the window. There may be a few places where there is rotten material. Anywhere there is rotten material, it will be replaced. For the most part, the vertical grain on the trim boards is in pretty good shape. It is some of the horizontal things that have caught water. The sills are mostly in reasonable shape.

Mr. Mohr – How is the woodwork going down the center section of the front door?

Mr. Adams – That's OK. Part of the proposal is to paint all of the trim. That would all be carefully done. That wood in the center part is in pretty good shape.

Mr. Lahendro – Are the transoms and the side lights to the door original?

Mr. Adams – I don't think so. That's not in the scope of this proposal. It's going to stay as is. The transom might be original. The front door is not original.

Mr. Zehmer – That is probably renovation work from the 1920s.

Mr. Adams – This is 1920s. This is neo-classical.

Mr. Gastinger – That entire central bay bumps out. It has the gabled roof. All of that is added.

Mr. Adams – We would leave that alone. It would get treated and painted. The lights on either side is from 1921.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – I don't know if anybody got to listen to the discussion about Court Square's history. It really strikes me that this is architectural contributor to that re-writing of what Court Square was at that time. It is really interesting to think how the facades of this warehouse building were changed to tell a different story.

Mr. Lahendro – It was fascinating looking at the historic photo on 149. Seeing the cast iron gothic entry arch reminded me that the courthouse used to be gothic revival. This arch post-dated the change to putting the columns on it.

Mr. Werner – On the matter of old photographs, we really don't have a lot of photographs of old Charlottesville.

Mr. Lahendro – That strange window on the 5th Street side at the corner corresponds what used to be an open store front area. That was infilled when it was turned into a law office.

Mr. Zehmer – I tend to lead towards option two, which is replacing windows with the Marvin windows and rehabilitating the sashes on the Court Square side.

Mr. Bailey – I think option one is perfectly fine. That proposal doesn't change the way that the building looks. Why preserve windows that are not even original to the 19th century.

Mr. Lahendro – The 1920s are historic too.

Mr. Bailey – It is a building that you are not going to be changing the look of now with the new windows significantly. There is no particular reason to necessarily preserve glass because it's glass.

Mr. Lahendro – Yes. It is the historic material, the wood frames, the paint evidence on those frames, the way that the glass was made, and the materials in the glass. You replace it with something modern, it looks the same. It's not the same. You have destroyed the history of it.

Mr. Adams – They have a mechanical system that would really have operable windows again. That's a consideration. In the newer windows, it would help the mechanical system in the building.

Mr. Lahendro – If you repaired the historic windows to be operable, they would still be operable?

Mr. Adams – Yes, they would. They wouldn't have the u value a new window would have, nor would they hold the same air infiltration, specification that is now required by code.

Mr. Lahendro – We're talking about one elevation, the most historic elevation.

Mr. Zehmer – It is also the north elevation. It probably doesn't get as much direct sunlight.

Mr. Schwarz – Our guidelines put us in a pretty hard place with this. I have tried, for 6 years, to update our guidelines. To me, a window is a functional unit. It does have a lifespan. We need to focus on preserving windows that are a craftsmanship level or a little more irreplaceable than the standard 6 over 6. I recognize that the windows are in bad shape on that north side. The one on the bottom left corner is in bad shape. The ones that are not in bad shape did not appear to have wavy glass anymore. I would be OK with the west side and 5th Street side being replaced. The one over ones are from the 1930s. They are historic. I don't know what we would be preserving there.

Mr. Mohr – Do the second floor windows translate to the first floor windows? Can you mix and match at the first floor level around the corner?

Mr. Adams – They may look uniform. I don't think they are going to be the same size or right fit. When we were measuring, the openings were out a half inch to three quarters of an inch.

Mr. Mohr – I can see the argument for trying to have re-constituted or rehabbed windows at the first floor level and then going to the more modern window on the top where you can't get close to it. You can't perceive the texture.

Mr. Schwarz – How many people would be able to approve option one, which is basically a full replacement of all of the windows? It's four of us. We do need to discuss this much further.

Mr. Mohr – I am good with it. I would like to know that we have looked at all options as far as the old block is concerned. I can even see doing the second floor. The 5th Street side is where you are up close and personal with the windows. It's those three windows. I am not trying to be unrealistic.

Mr. Zehmer – The proposed scope of work, the narrative, and the application says one of the approaches is to preserve as much as possible on the north façade. I think that is a conservative approach that we should take from a preservation standpoint. It is part of their application. We could easily approve that. It would be a different conversation if the application only proposed complete replacement.

Mr. Gastinger – I want to talk more about the cultural legacy. I do feel that this is part of Court Square's rebranding of what was happening in the 1920s. This is the same year that the Stonewall Jackson monument was erected. The courthouse was being remodeled. This is part of a bigger effort within the city. It was an interesting building before. It got totally coopted. It feels really weird to try to go back and preserve those windows that tell a totally different story about what the building was.

Mr. Lahendro – That's an important story to tell. We may not like the change in the 20s. It is history. It is important to preserve for the future and learning from it. It is the same argument that we are going through with the statues.

Mr. Adams – They are not overt symbols of anything in the same way.

Mr. Gastinger – This was some neo-classical building from the early 18th century, when it wasn't.

Mr. Zehmer – The proposal is not to put this back to what it was in the 1820s or make it a completely new building that looks nothing like it did in the 1920s. The windows that are going to be put back mimic what was put in the 1920s.

Mr. Bailey – Part of what you are trying to preserve is the aesthetics of the building, not necessarily every little piece of it. What you want is the same aesthetic experience that people experience with Court Square. Changing the windows to modern windows that look essentially identical to the ones that are there will not change the aesthetic experience. It would help the people who are owning the building run it in a better, more efficient way and make it useful for the people that are living now. People will not make a mistake in history because we changed the windows.

Mr. Werner – Talking about that primary façade, I don't know how much historic material will be retained in those sashes. Are we talking about the preservation of material? Are we talking about the preservation of an aesthetic? If so, what period? Are we talking about the preservation of the dimensions? These sashes are in rough shape. The goal is to rehabilitate these at all effort into rehabilitation or replacement sashes in the existing frame. What is the preservation objective?

Mr. Lahendro – It would be to preserve the material that is still sound and salvageable. Keep it in place and not take it apart, not destroy the fasteners, and replace the material that is severely damaged and cannot be preserved. The things that are replaced are matched in kind.

Mr. Bailey – I agree that we should replace that matches it in kind. It is what these new windows would do.

Mr. Lahendro – I am also matching the historic material that's still in good condition and we're leaving it in place.

Mr. Bailey – The historic material is not in good condition.

Mr. Lahendro – I didn't hear all of the historic material is severely damaged so much that it has to be replaced. I heard that there was a mixture. I am arguing for repairing the windows in kind and preserving the materials that is still in good condition in place.

Mr. Werner – And on that primary elevation.

Mr. Adams – I think you end up with at least half of the sash replaced on the front.

Mr. Lahendro – We would have of the historic preserved.

Mr. Bailey – Would there be any distinction that anyone would be able to tell between the restored windows and the windows that could not be restored on that primary elevation?

Mr. Lahendro – Sure, with the type of paint that is put on it. The materials, the craftsmanship, the fasteners.

Mr. Werner – The primary discussion seems to be on that primary elevation. In lieu of these insertions of a slightly smaller sash fits in the existing frame, all effort will be made to retain the sash.

Mr. Mohr – It would be the exact same design detail. It would fit just like the original. The big irony about all of this discussion is that now with ADC districts, you don't see the fashion of the time rewriting all of the buildings or half the buildings. That sort of behavior doesn't work within the guidelines. It freezes some things in time. This was changed into a federal revival building. That wouldn't happen today.

Mr. Lahendro – With the historic district, you take it out of time, which is unnatural.

Mr. Zehmer – That is our charge per our guidelines.

Mr. Adams – The front part of the building is interesting. It has a theatrical quality. It was made to be a set of some kind to help set up Court Square.

Mr. Lahendro – It was designed to give it a dignity that wasn't there. It was for lawyers.

Mr. Werner – Part of the renovation of Court Square was a lawyers’ building that they tore down. On this primary elevation, that a sash by sash evaluation is made to the extent that the existing sash could be repaired and retained, it should be. To the extent an existing sash is non-viable, then a replacement sash is fabricated to replicate the one that is being removed. It is installed to the existing frame using existing pulleys and weights.

Mr. Lahendro – Can we do a straw vote for number 2?

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Mohr, have you changed your mind?

Mr. Mohr – I would like to see the primary façade preserved if at all possible.

Motion: Mr. Zehmer - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed Option 2 for window repairs and replacements (as specified in the application) satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Ms. Lewis seconded. Motion approves (8-0-1, Mr. Gastinger abstained).

9. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-07-10

506 Park Street

Tax Parcel: 530123000

Owner: Presbyterian Church Ch’ville Trust

Applicant: Karim Habbab/BRW Architects

Addition to Fellowship Hall

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1954 (Fellowship Hall 8th Street constructed in 1986) District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing First Presbyterian Church is designed in the Colonial Revival style and based on James Gibbs’ 1722 Saint Martin-in-the-Fields in London. Request for CoA for alteration and new construction at the First Presbyterian Church. Construction of a three-story addition to the Fellowship Hall, including a new exterior terrace and modifications to the existing driveway. Renovations at the west elevation of the Gathering Hall: Remove four arched windows to accommodate French doors; alterations and new landscaping at the front terrace. Alterations to the Gathering Hall courtyard terrace. The use of artificial turf is unprecedented within an ADC District, however this courtyard is enclosed by surrounding structures and will not be visible from any public right of way. Proposed trees and shrubs are consistent with the City’s Master Tree List. • Paving materials conform with design guidelines.

Bruce Wardell, Applicant – There is a good amount to this application. It breaks down into two major components. The administrative offices have been on the Park Street level in that wing between the sanctuary and the chapel. That connector between the sanctuary and the chapel has been the administrative offices. The church, over the years, has developed this parking lot down on the northeast side. It became very difficult and very convoluted to get people from that parking lot to the administrative offices. In addition, they had an additional need for classrooms and a place to meet and gather before and after services. The fellowship hall is on the southeast side and the sanctuary is on the northwest side of the

property. This proposal, on the interior, creates a new gathering hall in the place where the administrative offices were. The impact on the district is confined on this side to developing an outside blue stone gathering terrace for before and after services. There are a series of round-top double-hung windows that exist along that western façade. The proposal is to take the four central ones and turn them into French doors that would connect the new gathering hall to the exterior terrace. That's basically the impact of the addition of the work on this side, with some new landscaping. There are details further along in this presentation of the actual configuration of those French doors. The proposal, currently, is for changing out the doors, not the round-top windows. The second part of this is a 3 story addition on the northeast side from the 7th Street elevation. It contains new administrative offices on the ground floor. It contains a large teaching room on the middle floor. It contains new junior and senior classrooms on the top floor. It's separated from the 1984 addition on the left side with that new window. We took all of the landscaping away so you can see the configuration of the new addition architecturally in relationship to the north façade of the church. The brick pattern will match. The profiles of trim and cornice work will be consistent with the existing precedence on the existing building. I do want to describe how the configuration of this 3 story addition occurred. Through a series of studies of how we could add to this building, there really was only one location. That location was filling in this empty corner of the "racetrack" connecting the fourth corner of the courtyard. We needed connection up to the Park Street level. We needed entry from the parking on the northeast side. We needed to connect it back into the fellowship hall. Given that this was the only logical location for the addition, it logically required the entry to this addition on the north side of this new addition. It couldn't happen on the 7th Street side because you would be getting crowds of people coming from the parking lots and having that tight clearance along the sidewalk. On the north side, it allowed us to address what has been a very awkward and dangerous connection between the upper parking lot and the 7th Street elevation. In creating this entry on the north side and connecting the new addition to the existing floor levels within the footprint of the building, the grading of the site to that north side indicated that the root system and the conditions around that large ash tree would be very difficult for that tree to survive. We recommended to the church that tree be removed. That's been the subject of a conversation that has come up recently with a member of the BAR. The decision was a technical one associated with the actual construction of that addition and the necessity of that addition being where it is.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – The survey identifies the tree to be removed on the southwest side of the project. Is it magnolia?

Mr. Wardell – It is a magnolia.

Mr. Mohr – A lot of this makes sense to me. I understand the logic of turning that into the gathering place between the sanctuary and the chapel. It does seem that some larger trees would be great. If I look at that north elevation from the parking lot, I was wondering if it makes sense for that bump out to be gable rather than a hip. It seems that it doesn't have some sense of punctuation in helping the scale.

Mr. Wardell – We did have an earlier version where that was a gable. It wasn't a "slam dunk" to take it away. The north side, with a gable, began to compete with the primacy of the sanctuary and that façade. When we are entering in the hyphen, the gable began to communicate a competing message about how you were getting into the building. From the ground level, we wanted to re-emphasize the continuity of that cornice over the choir room addition. We wanted to emphasize the consistency of that cornice coming across on both sides of the hyphen. That was the reason behind taking the gable away.

Mr. Mohr – What is the inverse of where you had a gable running to pick that up so the hyphen doesn't slide through?

Mr. Wardell – That's the reason we continued the cornice line on the freeze that goes along below the attic story. We were minimizing the volume of that. We were nervous of making the gable on that side. We had the gable on the north side for 6 months. We took it away late in the design process. We could go to one of the renderings of that lower entry terrace. That's where you can see what its presence is like.

Mr. Mohr – What about a flat roof?

Mr. Wardell – You could make a flat roof bay out of that and let the main hip be. If you notice on the overall plan at the southwest corner, it mediates that corner. This is the only place where we turning the corner. At the other end of the fellowship hall, it has a hipped roof on it. The gables were on the Park Street side of the building. The hips were on the 7th Street side.

Mr. Bailey – I think that works really well.

Mr. Schwarz – As far as the architecture, does anybody see anything that is competing with our guidelines?

Mr. Gastinger – I think it is very appropriate.

Mr. Lahendro – I think it is well conceived. It blends in nicely with the existing building.

Mr. Schwarz – I think this works well. The windows are far back from the street. It is not on the main sanctuary. I think that is a perfectly timed place to change them out.

Mr. Gastinger – I feel that the landscape plan, as conceived, makes a lot of sense. I don't have an issue with the proposal. I do want to say that this project is taking out at least seven considerable trees. This property does contribute to this neighborhood. The trees going in are smaller in stature. There are two poplars that are proposed. They're in a planting that is relatively tightly spaced. They won't get to the same level of stature as the trees that are being replaced. I think there are other possibilities for replacing the kind of canopy presence over time within the property.

Mr. Schwarz – It looks like with the smaller plantings that you have quantities with them. For the trees, I am not seeing quantities. At the northeast corner at the new entry terrace, am I seeing two red maples and eight London Planes? Is that the extent of the shade trees?

Mr. Wardell – I think that's right.

Mr. Mohr – Lomndon Planes can certainly get big.

Mr. Gastinger – They can get really big. They are placed pretty tightly here.

Mr. Wardell – The number of people that come in and out of the building on the northeast side of the building, both on weekdays and the church services on Sundays, this is where the majority of the people are coming from. The space sequence along that path coming into the building are going to need to accommodate more people. Right now, it is nothing but a very steep, circular driveway. The idea was to make a room that you could come into before you come into the building. That implied the landscaping would be the edge of the space, instead of the middle of the space.

Mr. Mohr – That would mediate that whole question that I had about that one volume relative to the building.

Mr. Schwarz – I recognize that the proposal does take down quite a few large trees. I feel that the applicant is working pretty hard to put them back in a different form.

Ms. Lewis – With regards to plantings in the guidelines, #1. Encourage the maintenance and planting of large trees on private property along the street fronts, which contribute to the avenue effect. I would argue that it is a street tree. I pointed out to the applicant today that immediately two blocks up is an ash tree directly in the back of my building. I wonder if there are a number of ash trees that were planted just a little back from 7th Street. #4. Retain existing trees and plants that help define the character of the district, especially street trees and hedges. There are a number of trees being taken out. There are two other trees that are near this ash tree that are also being removed. I understand the plan of development and the plan of landscaping requires them to be removed, especially this tree, which would be impacted by subgrade demolition to create this new terrace area. That's a lot of trees that are being taken out. The trees, in this property, have been planted to provide shade near the building. It is regrettable. I want to call attention to it. It violates our guidelines. I did ask the applicant if there was an effort made to design around the tree. I didn't get a response to that. I do understand that the church that the tree is going to be removed. They are agreeable to it. A lot of other people are fine with these tree removals. This is a beautiful plan of development and a nice way to augment a nice plant that the church currently has on Park Street.

Mr. Gastinger – I do have concerns about the long term longevity of the tree. It is showing a number of different signs of stress. It's certainly not doing well in its current configuration. I am willing to consider the removal of that tree. I would just wonder if there might be a provision for some other large canopy trees elsewhere in the property.

Ms. Lewis – The church owns the vacant lot directly across the parking lot and across from this new landscaped area. There probably would be an opportunity to provide some shade further away from this new 3 story addition further to the north.

Mr. Wardell – We do have a representative of the church here. The congregation has been a fairly strong caretaker of the trees and landscape around the entire property. If the congregation is willing to do some planting of some replacement trees, I would certainly be willing to take that back.

Mr. Schwarz – There is quite a lot of open space towards Park Street. It seems that the trees are all closer to the building. It would be nice to have a shade tree up by Park Street.

Mr. Mohr – There is not a whole lot of shade once you get to this point on Park Street to the end of the street.

Ms. Lewis – I withdraw my objection. We don't regularly take out trees because of their condition. I would not say that it is in decline. I would say that it is old and compromised. It does provide shade. There is a lot asphalt this church has. In five years when this planting scheme is a little grown out, it is really lovely terrace to either enjoy before going into the building.

Mr. Mohr – You're developing the north end of the building. Is there any chance that can be carried through in terms of development of the parking lot?

Mr. Wardell – We can certainly bring that back into the discussion.

Motion: Mr. Mohr - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed addition, alterations, and landscaping 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 BAR does recommend: o Revamping the site lighting elsewhere on the site to be consistent with the work being done o Add as many street and shade trees as possible to enhance the overall canopy of the city Ron Bailey seconded. Motion approves (9-0).

D. Other Business

10. Staff questions/discussion

LEAP Energy Guide

Tents on the Mall

For the duration of the pandemic, the list that was developed will be enforced.

It is its way through the city management.

Lights at the Standard, West Main

Lighting guidelines do need to be re-examined.

E. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 PM until the August monthly BAR meeting.