

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
September 15, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.  
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to the September 15, 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:** James Zehmer, Cheri Lewis, Carl Schwarz, Jody Lahendro, Andy McClure, Breck Gastinger, Tim Mohr, Sonja Lengel, Ron Bailey  
**Staff Present:** Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner, Joe Rice  
**Pre-Meeting:**

There was a brief discussion on 1112 Park Street. There is need to stay “within the lanes.”

There was a brief discussion regarding matters from the public.

There was a discussion regarding the COA application for 128 Chancellor Street.

There was also a discussion regarding the Preston Place application in the preliminary discussion part of the agenda. Mr. Gastinger provided a summary to the new members of the Board on the history of Preston Place.

**The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 5:30 PM.**

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

No Public Comments

**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.)

**Mr. Gastinger moved to pull the Coal Tower from the Consent Agenda and approve the Consent Agenda as amended. (Second by Mr. Mohr). Motion passed 9-0.**

**1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-09-01  
418 E. Jefferson Street, TMP 530040000  
Downtown ADC District  
Owner: 418 E Jefferson Street, LLC

Applicant: William Adams, Train Architects  
Renaissance School--replace five windows

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-09-02  
534 Park Street, TMP 30126000  
North Downtown ADC District  
Owner/Applicant: Seth Liskey  
Fence at side/rear yard

**C. Pulled Item**

**3. Submission for BAR Record**

BAR 18-07-04  
0 East Water Street, TMP 570157800  
IPP  
Owner: Choco-Cruz, LLC  
Applicant: Ashley Davies  
Interpretive signage for coal tower

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – There was a comment at the last BAR meeting about having it off center on that concrete panel. There may have been some preferences on the two materials for the sign. We're accepting this into the record with the BAR recommendation and request that the sign be this.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from the Public

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Ms. Lengel** – I am looking through the guidelines. They deal more with signage for a store. Can somebody direct me to where the guidelines talk about that?

**Mr. Werner** – This is a public space. It is a space within this development. I used the pertinent guidelines for public sign improvements. New plaques should be discretely located. It should not obscure architectural elements. There will be some fencing there. The BAR could want it on the fence. At the last BAR meeting, the comment was that it was fine on the wall centered between the two piers. I would suggest that it be posted at eye level.

**Ms. Lengel** – I don't have a preference where it is located.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Zehmer** – From the orange fence back to the coal tower, I am curious how much distance is there. If that is going to be planted, that might end getting a goat path where people might want to walk up to the plaque to read it.

**Mr. Mohr** – I know that there was a site plan for this. It is being developed as a little park. The more appropriate place might be inside the structure, rather than cluttering up the outside wall. It would nice to see a site plan in conjunction with this. It is out of context there. There should be something more deliberate about the placement.

**Mr. Watkins** – I think there was a site plan submitted for last month’s meeting when lighting was also being reviewed.

**Mr. Zehmer** – There was going to be a bocce court in the middle of it.

**Mr. Werner** – Water Street is at the bottom. The round circular structure is the elevated coal tower. The bocce court is inside there. What you have there are some are some low plantings and some street trees and a sidewalk.

**Mr. Mohr** – It is a very unclear plan. Is there any more information?

**Mr. Schwarz** – We did see the photograph with the sign on it last month. Why did we not talk about this last month when we had this information?

**Mr. Zehmer** – She didn’t actually have the images of the plaque.

**Mr. Schwarz** – We couldn’t approve it. We said that we would put it on the consent agenda. We had the site plan last month. We really should have talked about this last month and discovered these issues. We are bringing things up and the applicant is not here, which is unfair.

**Mr. Gastinger** – We have enough information on what this sign looks like. I think this sign would work on either side of that concrete wall. I would be comfortable with approving that tonight.

**Mr. Werner** – When looking here, it would be around the corner?

**Mr. Gastinger** – On the left or right side.

**Mr. Bailey** – I agree with Mr. Gastinger. I think that he is right.

**Mr. Gastinger** – The paved surface is going to be about 2 to 3 feet from the walls. I don’t think there will be an issue with people reading it.

**Mr. Werner** – I didn’t know what the final grade was relative to that image. That wall is about 8 to 10 feet tall. It would be center line, eye level, and to the left or the right and not centered on the wall. That would probably be sufficient.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I like the aluminum with the stainless steel option better. It’s more appropriate for the industrial context. I imagine either could be argued to be within our guidelines.

**Motion – Ms. Lewis - 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 signage satisfies the conditions of the CoA approved on September 18, 2018 with the**

**direction that the sign be located at eye-level at either side of the primary concrete wall, not at the center, and the BAR expresses a preference for the stainless steel or aluminum option.**

**Tim Mohr seconds. Consent agenda passes (9-0).**

#### **D. Deferred Items**

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

BAR 17-11-02

167 Chancellor Street, TMP 090126000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Alpha Omicron of Chi Psi Corp.

Applicant: Kevin Schafer, Design Develop, LLC

Exterior alterations and addition

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner – Year Built: 1915 District: The Corner ADC Status: Contributing**

This large, five-bay, two-and-a-half-story dwelling shows elements of the Colonial Revival style; details include: brick stretcher bond, hip roof with one hip roof dormer, two-bay front porch with piers and full entablature, and entrance with three-lite transom and sidelights. CoA request for a proposed addition and alterations, including site work and landscaping, to an existing fraternity house. Applicant submittal:

- o Design Develop drawings Chi Psi Lodge at 167 Chancellor Street, dated 25 August 2020: Cover through sheet 15.

- o Design Develop email and addendum drawings, 8 September 2020: sheets A1 (Elevation Behind [west] Portico) and A2 (Rake Trim).

Staff recommends BAR discuss and clarify the roof flashing details. Otherwise, staff recommends approval of the CoA.

**Kevin Schafer, Applicant –** We want to thank you for the thoughtful comments, feedback, and direction that you provided at the last meeting. We took all of your comments to heart in this revised package. We have presented a proposal in keeping with the design direction that we have been given by our client and the direction we have received from the Board and in keeping with what we all want on this site, which is a building that represents and coexists with the precinct at large. We understand the design imperative for the detailing and the general application of the forms to be in keeping with the agreed upon look and feel of the neo-classical features found in the district, particularly along Madison Lane. We hope that, in this package, you will find a more coordinated documentation set that further develops the details in accordance with these previously approved concepts and massing. In terms of the development of the details, we wanted to assure the Board that the list of items discussed in the last meeting have been addressed. Pages 4 and 5 of this resubmission booklet provides a summary of these revisions on each street façade, based on the comments we received from the Board at the last meeting. These revisions include lowering the proposed second floor windows to reveal the full brick trim. We have added a decorative brick header at all of the first floor proposed windows. We have enlarged the Madison Lane entrance door to match the adjacent window header height. We have added copper valley and ridge flashing and copper j trims on the roof. We have retained the historic front door on Chancellor Street. We have added boxwood shrubs to screen the HVAC equipment that is on Chancellor Street. We are also submitting additional details around the porticos and the side porch. We have added appropriate application of classicly and contextually inspired ornament trim and finishes that adhere to the standards set

by the rest of the District and the rest of Madison Lane. We do appreciate the Board's comments at the last meeting. We look forward to reviewing this resubmission.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Gastinger** – Can you describe what was included in the supplement?

**Mr. Schafer** – There were two requests for supplemental information. The first one was an elevation cut through the portico on Madison Lane. The other was some clarifying questions on the gable roof trim details.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Did you look at Eco-star synthetic slate? You seem to hone in on tightly on the one brand. I was just curious what the reasoning behind that was.

**Mr. Schafer** – It was a combination of working with our contractor, his roofing sub-contractor, and the dealer. It was based on budget, looks, performance, and a variety of things.

**Mr. Mohr** – Looking at page 8, I am puzzled how the portico hits the roof. That cove molding looks like it dies before it hits the roof. It looks like there is more going on than what is in that drafted sketch above it.

**Mr. Schafer** – That is a reference showing the alignment of the columns.

**Mr. Mohr** – It seems like the geometry is a little awkward. That might be more of the model than the actual work out detail.

**Mr. Werner** – Are you talking about page 8 on the bottom where the cornice trim returns as a dormer coming into the roof?

**Mr. Mohr** – The relationship to the way it hits the roof and the other eaves seems a little odd. I understand what is driving it. I am just wondering if it makes sense to pull that thing down a little bit and have that header lower. There is something weird about it.

**Bob Pineo, Design Develop** – Part of the geometry of it is we are trying to tie into the Chancellor Street. What we are trying to do is, not only create a fun room, but also be true as much as we can to the primary relationship between column and tabature. We are trying to strike that line across and make the trim boards fit with the bottom of the board that aligns with the top of the window. That's our design directive. Proportionality based off of columns and the tabature and how that whole thing feels. This is just a subjective part of this. We did spend a lot of time in the precinct trying to understand more about the rules. I know that Mr. Lahendro knows those neo-classical rules. Even in the rules, there's a lot of nuance. While there are rules, there is also application of those rules relative to context and design issues. That's the world we are trying to figure out. We are trying to synthesize all of these things. There are rules. There is proportion and reasonableness. What we are trying to do is to find a reasonable synthesis of all of these in the best way that we can. We did study this pretty extensively. The rules are important and fundamental. Buildability is another part. There is some level of unresolvedness

of some element or another. It's pretty relevant in the district that other designers have spent that energy to figure out where we are in the same boat. We have spent a lot of time and effort.

**Mr. Mohr** – There is certainly a lot of intention going on. The entablature for the house proper is quite a bit less bold than on the porch. It seems a little strange that the eaves crashes into the middle of the band rather than picking up the code line.

**Ms. Lewis** – On page 4 again, you showed gutters from the roof to that level. Does the gutter run behind the portico? Does it die at the portico? Will you have a problem with water trying to penetrate to a “carpenter’s dream?” What happens with that gutter?

**Mr. Pineo** – It dives into that portico. The valley flashing from the roof takes that water out.

**Mr. Werner** – The solution is to pull that pediment back down so that valley at the back of the roof there comes right down to the gutter. You pull that trim detail down. It is a little bit of a ‘flashing headache.’ How do we finish that? How do we terminate it? The solution would be to pull that pediment back down in line with the eave.

**Mr. Schwarz** – There is a lot of precedent for doing that. There is an example on Madison where the bottom of that pediment is actually below the tops of the windows. If you look at Montpelier, it does that as well. The bottom of the roof is level where you have a portico much deeper than the facial board.

**Mr. Zehmer** – If you look at sheet 10 at the central photo, it's not a pedimented portico. It's a flat portico. That is what we are talking about. Where the top of the entablature of the portico is in line with the cornice going around the building.

**Mr. Schafer** – That does address the unique condition that we have here where the windows on Chancellor Street are bumped up against that. That would require dropping that beam around the portico pretty significantly below the top of our window header.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You should look at the building directly across the street for this one. They do that.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I think that Mr. Mohr was really getting at the root of the problem. It is that we are tearing the cornice line from the original house all around. That's what is really causing the challenge of putting a neo-classical entablature on a colonial revival house. If we were to pull the portico down and out, that would result in something to solve that issue. It causes other problems.

**Mr. Pineo** – The primary issue here is that we're taking an elevation from the Chancellor Street side and trying to pull the rest of the building altogether. That entablature is a datum. That datum is set quite low. One of the things that we're trying to do is to create a pulse of energy in the front portico and in the side porch. There is an energy based in the middle of the building and on the side of the building. The rules are very simple on the other sides. Although they are articulated more, I think it would be disappointing and anti-climactic to lower that portico because the room above it and the height of the columns is a steeper price to pay for that. These are solutions to existing issues. It is in a brand new building across the street where everything is up to the designer's discretion. We're also working with context and trying to pull all of the pieces together. In my opinion, it's a bigger evil to drop all of that to make the portico

less of a statement than to rectify that eave. The precinct does a lot of creative solves using the neo-classical language, but it isn't that prescriptive. There are examples of it. Part of the character is that's dealing with specific design issues. Resolution of those design issues are not in the textbook. They are part of the language of designers.

**Mr. Mohr** – I think that it doesn't have to be lowering the portico. It's weird that it is landing in the middle of the flat face of the portico. I don't think there is an easy solution to it. The geometry is driving it from the other side. Looking at the side elevation on page 15, it is like the roof wants to go up 6 or 7 inches. I understand why you don't want to do that. It is slightly odd geometry. I don't see any immediate way to solve it.

**Mr. Pineo** – Are you talking about raising the roof of the portico or the roof of the main building?

**Mr. Mohr** – I was talking about raising the roof of the main building. I think that gets very problematic. It looks like it could go up 8 inches where it clears the flat band of the header carrying the portico roof. I don't think there's any easy way to do that.

**Mr. Pineo** – The tough part is the hipped roof. They dictate the spring point of the framing.

**Mr. Mohr** – It feels a little weird to me. I don't know if you can put some sort of block or plaster there. There might be a cleaner way to resolve that. I think it is weird for it to slam into it there. It's not going to make or break the building.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am trusting that everyone is looking to preserve the historic door and lights. The way this note is written, it allows the historic lights and doors to be replaced to its new stuff that matches the original. I would like to see the note changed to "Preserve the historic frame, lights, and repair as required."

**Ms. Lewis** – I was going to raise the Chancellor Street side. I completely concur. These were my comments from the last time. A replacement is a demolition. I don't see the applicant asking to demolish any of these historic features on this side. I think that they should be preserved. The word "transom" should be inserted as well. We had a long discussion about this at the last meeting. I know that the applicant has been responsive on a lot of details in bringing this back. That's one I feel strongly about. I think that other members do too.

**Mr. Schafer** – I think that we can clarify that note just by "absolutely preserve the frame preserve the door, preserve everything that we can." The lights there have already been replaced. The side lights are not historic. The door itself is much rotted and it is in bad shape. I talked to the owner about this. They're going to preserve the door, preserve the frame. There is no desire to demolish it. There are some things that have not been maintained. There are somethings that are in pretty rough shape currently.

**Mr. Lahendro** – The things that are in rough shape need to be preserved and repaired. Lights that have been replaced or were done badly or you have to replace them, I would prefer to see them replicate the appearance of the original.

**Mr. Schafer** – I have no desire to change the frame, the side light, the configuration of it, and the transom. The owner is very aware of the historic front door and that it needs to be retained.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It sounds like they are OK with preserving what can be preserved on the Chancellor Street side. Is anyone dead set on changing the portico? This is a new building that we are looking at.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I feel that the applicants have done almost all of the things that we have asked for with the couple of comments that have already been made. I am supportive of the project. I think we are going to decide if we need any more clarifications.

**Mr. Lahendro** – When you align the architrave of the portico with the building itself, you have to lean down to get a view.

**Mr. Zehmer** – If the portico could be brought out further, that might help. It is basically putting a portico on colonial revival building. That’s a challenge. You have done a nice job responding to all of our comments from the last meeting. I do appreciate that.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am pleased to see the alignment between column and entablature closer to the rules. The rules were created around the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century. There are lots of exceptions to the rules. I am fine with the current state of the design.

**Ms. Lewis** – I wanted to thank the applicant for their work on the Madison Lane profile in adding a little bit of interest on that side. The brick jack header on the windows and the water table really adds a little bit of interest to that side and makes it less out of the form book and refines the look. I can only imagine how much work has gone into this through the many times you have appeared before us. It really is a nice result.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I wish we had talked about this portico before. I feel it wouldn’t be right to hit you with it. I think you have done a wonderful job.

**Mr. Mohr** – I think that the portico is ten times better than what it was last time.

**Motion – Mr. Zehmer – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, New Construction and Additions, and Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed alterations and addition satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following modification:**

**That the note on page 5 of the submittal concerning the entry on the Chancellor Street side be changed to the following – preserve the profile and dimension of the existing door, frame, lites, transom, repairing and replicating elements of that entry.**

**Ms. Lewis seconds. Motion passes (9-0).**

## **E. New Items**

### **5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-09-03

1112 Park Street, TMP 470050000

IPP

Owner: Margaret Sherman Todd

Applicant Paul Josey, Wolf Josey Landscape Architects

Driveway



**Mr. Mohr and Ms. Lewis recused themselves from this discussion due to a conflict of interest with this project.**

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner** - Year Built: 1884 District: IPP Status: N/A

Historically known as the Finch-McGee Cottage, when constructed it marked the northern extent of residential development along Park Street. The two-story wood house is organized into three bays, with the northernmost bay projecting forward. The building incorporates in a picturesque arrangement a range of features from various styles popular during the period. Its character-defining features include the steeply pitched gables, first-floor bay window, veranda supported by Tuscan columns, and a roof balustrade crowning the veranda. No previous BAR reviews. Request CoA to construct a new driveway, with associated landscape alterations. Existing gravel drive is at the north the property line. New driveway and entrance will shift south, off the 1112 Park Street (9 Sept 2020) property line. The existing turn around at the house will remain. New to be paved with a crushed stone, ending at a concrete threshold at the road. Work will require the removal of a 24" white oak and a 6" crab apple. The oak will be replaced. New landscaping will also include native shrubs and groundcovers, and at the north parcel line a 4-ft tall wood picket fence, painted dark gray. Staff recommends approval; however, the following clarifications and conditions should be discussed:

- All work within the public right of way must be coordinated with/approved by the City of Charlottesville.
- Tree protection and/or actions to mitigate damage to the roots within the dripline for the following: At 1112 Park Street, the 21" red oak, the 20" tulip poplar and the 12" tulip poplar; at 1122 Park Street, the 30" tulip poplar.

**Paul Josey, Applicant** – The project includes a driveway re-alignment, shifting the existing driveway between two and seven feet from the existing driveway's location further south. It would also be a new 4 foot fence just off the property line, as well as new plantings on either side of the fence. This came about as a result of the current conditions along the property line. This is a historic property. The current owners are considering downsizing and looking at potential for real estate impacts to this driveway. With the current driveway condition, there was a large wood pile a month ago. It has been there for a long period of time. It's been covered with an old metal roof. There's a number of cars that park on the side of this house. The access from the applicant's property is an actual drive onto the property. They park on their property. One of the cars is actually projecting into the property. The goals of this project is to establish a bit more definition to the property line and provide a new approach to this IPP property and how you access the front drive. It will also improve the property value. There is a 24 inch white oak that is impacted. You can it in these images here. We had looked at preserving this tree in the process. We did not feel comfortable that we could truly save the tree. We proposing removing it. In looking at the other trees, this site has a number of terrific mature canopy trees throughout the site. The primary one is a very healthy 42 inch white oak. The canopy is being encroached upon by this 24 inch white oak. There is also another 21 inch northern red oak that is on the property as well. The canopy is also in competition with this tree. By removing this one tree, there are benefits where you are reducing the competition for the 42 inch white and the 21 inch northern red oak. With the nearby properties, you have a mix of trees with the houses. With regards to the proposed design shifting that roadway, the hatch in blue is where the existing aggregate will be removed and restored to a planter. The grey area is where there is an existing aggregate driveway. We are actually using that aggregate surface and we are adding to it. We're not doing any excavation into the critical root zones or structural root zones in this area. Our goal is to reuse as much of the existing drive as possible. We have

elevated grades in this area. This shows the 24 inch white oak being removed. This will improve the longevity of this 21 inch wide red oak. There is a small crabapple being removed. There is a concrete apron on Park Street that is being proposed. This is also elevated to reduce impact to existing roots. We are going to replace the missing canopy. There is a new white oak being replaced here that will grow under these oaks. This will fill in the next generation of oaks on the property. The fence that is being proposed is a 4 foot wooden picket fence. This is cedar painted a dark grey for the vertical pickets. The tops are slightly angled to keep moisture from collecting on the tops of the fence. We are not excavating into these root zones. We are restoring the existing aggregate zone. The goal is to protect the existing trees. There is some potential impact at the edge of the critical root zone that we have mapped. We are cutting into the slope where that existing oak is. While there would be competition with the oak we are removing, there is potential for roots in this area. Up to 30% is the typical impact that you can provide without any implications to that tree. These trees are in healthy condition. We would propose to do this work once the trees are dormant to reduce any possible impacts.

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Gastinger** – Could you please clarify the position of the proposed new fence?

**Mr. Josey** – It is replacing an existing fence that straddles both lines. It looks like it is right on the property line. We're keeping it about 6 inches off the property line.

**Mr. Bailey** – Do you have a photo of the current fence?

**Mr. Josey** – At the beginning of the presentation, you can make out the fence. It is a mix of aging wood pickets and metal wire.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Is there any concern with the type of equipment you will be using to excavate as far as weight on the tree roots?

**Mr. Josey** – It is really the excavation and the cutting and tearing of roots that is problematic. The areas that we are proposing to remediate and restore the plant beds. We're really going to remove the top 2 inches aggregate. We're not impacting any of the roots.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Since we read into the record the messages from the Cantors, I think it is appropriate that we also know the staff response to those messages. That would be helpful to fill out the record.

**Mr. Werner** – I spoke with the Cantors last week. We are sympathetic to their concerns. The IPP is within the boundary of the property owned by the applicant. The purview of the BAR is how this request conforms to the design guidelines that we have. There is nothing in the guidelines regarding another party accessing the property. The BAR's evaluation has to be anchored in those design guideline principles. It could be as simple as a request to construct a fence on their property line. I cannot imagine, that within the guidelines, that you would be able to deny that. The result would be the closing off of this driveway. There are things that are quite simple that would be easily approved. If there is something in the design guidelines that

raises a concern about the landscaping, the fencing, and the treatment of the trees and landscape, that is all that the BAR can focus on.

**Mr. Schwarz** – From Mrs. Cantor’s email, it sounded like she had recently spoken to the applicant. Are you aware of any proposed changes to this design?

**Mr. Josey** – I believe that they are regularly speaking to each other about different options in this. The Cantors do have about 70 feet of right of way along Park Street. There is not a major grade issue. Access is very feasible and available for them. You could also have a full turn around in their front yard.

**Mr. Werner** – What is going on next door is not an IPP. You need to focus on the design guidelines relative to this request.

**Meeting was recessed for five minutes for a member of the public could speak in Comments from the Public.**

### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Mr. Watkins read the comments from Allen and Ginny Kanter into the record. They provided comments on the landscaping. They had several concerns about the landscaping shown in the plan. The concerns included access. The proposed driveway removes access to two parking spaces. The rights to access would be denied with the driveway changes. The second concern was mobility issues. The proposed plan would present mobility issues for Mrs. Cantor. Trees are a third concern. The proposed driveway would cause possible peril to two large trees. The roots under the current driveway could be permanently damaged. There is hope that some accommodation can be reached.

Mr. Watkins also read into the record the medical conditions of Mrs. Kanter that could be effected as a result of the proposed landscaping plan.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – We do have an application before us. We are legally required to act on this, unless the applicant’s representative would like to make any changes. We should act on this according to the guidelines. I am hoping that communication can continue between the applicant and the neighbors. We are legally bound to act on this.

**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 driveway and associated landscaping satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this IPP, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Bailey seconds. Motion passes (7-0-2, Cheri Lewis and Tim Mohr recused).**

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

BAR 20-09-04

128 Chancellor Street, TMP 090105000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: University Christian Ministries

Applicant: Tom Keogh, Train Architects

Rear addition

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner** - Year Built: c1926 District: The Corner ADC Status: Contributing Rectangular form, three-bay frame shingled swelling with Craftsman and Colonial Revival stylistic elements. Constructed as a dwelling, the house was occupied until 1969 when it transitions to other uses. Since the 1980s it is served as the Center for Christian Study. CoA request for a proposed three-story addition of approximately 10,500 square feet (3,500 SF per floor) at the rear of the existing structure and alterations at the front entry terrace. The BAR should discuss if the submittal provides the information: a) requested during the August 18, 2020 Preliminary Discussion, and b) necessary to evaluate the project. While the submittal clearly communicates the design and composition, it is lacking many details and specifications. As such, staff believes this submittal is incomplete and recommends that BAR action be deferred until a later date.

**Tom Keogh, Applicant** – We were in front of the BAR in August. What I took away from that meeting was that there was some questions about the retaining wall, the materials, questions about windows details, and more questions about the front entry. We did talk about lighting and how we were going to approach the lighting. We communicated that it was going to be handled very subtly. We resubmitted a package in September, which addressed those comments. We included images and renderings of the retaining wall from the east side. We included the windows details for the various conditions with the hardy panels and the shingles, what the flashing was like, the size of the trim (which was intended to match the existing trim), and some more information on the front entry. We got some additional questions about the flashing, the kind of lights, and products. We put together a supplemental submittal that was sent out yesterday morning, which would be the basis for what we would use tonight to answer your questions. If you would like us to go on the record with the design intentions, Mr. Sherman will give you a brief discussion of that.

**Bill Sherman, Applicant** – It's already in the record with the preliminary presentation. In the supplemental package, we did make a slight revision to the height of the retaining wall in lowering the concrete height and having a wood guardrail to match the construction that you find elsewhere on the property. With respect to the design presentation, we did not include in any detail at the August meeting the front area that was added in response to a desire to respond to the need for more outdoor gathering space. We have developed that as our design in our presentation. That allows us to enclose and contain the garbage cans and really clean up the front and the curb cuts across the front.

**Mr. Keogh** – In that front entry area, we suggested concrete pavers for the finishes. We are now proposing that we will do that front entry in brick pavers on a sand bed.

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

No Questions

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

**Mr. Gastinger** – I have a question about the front area. It will be impermeable and almost fully mineral. It is removing all green space. I am curious if you are running into issues with it. It certainly raises some issues related to the neighborhood.

**Mr. Sherman** – We have been working with our civil engineer with respect to the permeability of the brick, which led to the change in building material. To soften that ground, there is only one tree in the existing area. There are two asphalt parking spaces on either side. The only green is a fairly well worn lawn and a few small bushes in the front. We would be proposing a planter that. We are retaining planting and the tree in front of the house on the left side. We are trying to increase the aesthetic presentation of the front to the street by replacing the paving of those parking spaces. We are providing an area for students to gather and for the mission of the institution to spill out and be visible to the street on the front.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It looks like the retaining wall in the back comes down to a historic stone wall. Does it come down on top of that? Is something else happening there?

**Mr. Keogh** – The stone wall will remain. Our wall is coming down about a foot behind it. We will be protecting that during the construction. Our retaining wall is designed with all of its footing going west. There is no footing on the biker area or undermining the stone wall/ Its going to be careful construction. The intent is for the contractor to protect that wall during construction. That elevation drawing is the stone wall running in front of the concrete wall. To the right of the stone wall is the remaining grade working down to the existing parking.

**Mr. Schwarz** – On that back elevation, there is no store front. It is going to be the Marvin Windows. How are you accomplishing the Spandrel panel through there? Can you fiber smith panels with fiber smith battens that look like the window trim?

**Mr. Sherman** – Exactly. It will be a continuation. We are doing that in the area of those elements of the back where it is clad in the shingles to distinguish the kind of paneling that we have there from what you find back on the other volume where you have the fiber smith panels that reveal construction. It will look like it is fully integrated but the trim detailing on the windows.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You did make light selections. Do they show up in plans where they are going? I think you had some bollards.

**Mr. Keogh** – No, they don't. The notion about those light selections is that we were using bga as the basis of design. There is a horizontal wall mounted light in that we would be using along the retaining wall to illuminate that walkway around the perimeter of the building. The bollards would be primarily up the south side of the building. There is a series of stairs that descend from Chancellor Street down past the building to the parking area. About two-thirds of those stairs are in place. One-third is fully functional, the second third is falling apart, and the final steps aren't there yet. We're going to rebuild those steps. They would have the bollards. There were some ceiling fixtures. In the lower level plan, coming out of the parking garage, there was a soffit area above. There will be down lights inserted in those soffits to illuminate the exits to meet the code for exit lighting.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You have an LED strip light?

**Mr. Sherman** – That was to be a recessed light that we will be using in the ceiling of the garage. It would be a recessed light up there meeting the minimum standard.

**Mr. Keogh** – To avoid of anybody looking into the void of the garage, you will be seeing a light fixture mounted on the garage ceiling. The exterior lighting and the impact of the lighting

on neighbors are high concerns. We want to see the light where the light should be and not see the fixtures.

**Mr. Mohr** – Will it be controlled or dimmed out at night?

**Mr. Sherman** – The goal will be to provide the minimum code requirement for lighting and to have it illuminating at that level at night.

**Mr. Mohr** – I was thinking more about a relatively unused parking garage can be quite a light bomb.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am wondering if it would be helpful for the applicants to go through the supplemental materials submitted yesterday if there are any questions from Board members or a need for additional details.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Did everybody on the BAR receive the supplemental submission?

**Mr. Keogh** – **Roof New addition:** Flat (Low-Slope); White EPDM New Bathroom addition south side: Asphalt shingles to match existing, existing flat roof: Black EPDM  
**Cornice/Coping:** Metal; color to match façade color below coping **Gutters/Downspouts:** New addition: internal drains with scuppers; no gutters and downspouts New bathroom addition south side: new gutters and downspouts to match existing **Siding:** Cedar shingles with 6” exposure painted to match the existing cedar shingles James Hardie Aspyre Reveal Panel System; NOM 2’x8’ panels painted Benjamin Moore Light Pelham Gray; see color elevations for example **Trim** Flat trim; painted white **Flashing:** Metal; white to match window frame/trim **Soffits:** James Hardie Soffit Panel; painted to match cedar shingles **Rear Retaining Wall:** Smooth metal formed concrete with formwork joints; natural color **Guardrails:** Horizontal wood boards to match north stair, painted to match existing **Windows:** Marvin aluminum clad wood windows; white cladding **Window Wall:** Marvin structurally mulled window system-glass and panel infill (no spandrel glass); white cladding **Glass:** Clear glass to match BAR standards **Doors** Marvin aluminum clad wood doors; white cladding **Front Terrace Pavers:** Sand set Brick Pavers (formerly concrete pavers and changed to address drainage and aesthetics). BAR Comment Responses 1) Roofing [at addition]: See outline exterior material specification. 2) Gutters/Downspouts: See outline exterior material specification. 3) Cornice: Capped parapet wall. See outline exterior material specification and attached supplemental drawings for additional information. 4) Siding and Trim: See outline exterior material specification. 5) Doors and Windows: See outline material specification and attached product literature for additional information. a. Which openings are storefront and which are Marvin windows? All glazing in the project to be Marvin clad windows. Storefront/curtain wall windows have been replaced with Marvin’s structurally mulled window system. b. What are the lite arrangements for the windows? No muntins / divisions are being proposed for the windows; see exterior elevations for additional information. c. Colors for window and storefront components? See outline exterior material specification. 6) Soffits material: See outline exterior material specifications. 7) Parking Garage: a. Ceiling material: 5/8” exterior gyp sheathing b. Wall material: James Hardie Aspyre Reveal System to match exterior c. Lighting: Recessed fixtures to meet code minimum light levels 8) Concrete retaining wall at rear: See attached sketch with elevations (north and south ends) and outline exterior material specification. 9) Front Terrace and Landscaping: a. Benches tables and chairs? “Fine Concrete”; see attached product literature for additional information. b. Concrete pavers: Front terrace ground material has been revised to brick pavers. Pattern to be determined. c. Trash enclosure:

Horizontal wood panels similar to north stair enclosure. See photo on sheet 16 of September BAR submittal and attached supplemental drawings for additional information. d. New wood deck: to match existing wood deck on the north side of the building. e. Planter boxes: Custom by “Fine Concrete” f. New sidewalk and driveway apron: to match existing. g. Lighting: Minimum required to illuminate egress paths – low wall mounted or bollards h. Manhole (front entry): cast iron 10) Exterior Lighting: See attached “basis of design” product literature for additional information a. Ground level exits from parking garage: recessed downlights in soffit above b. Perimeter walk around new addition: low in wall mounted lights for a walking surface c. South exit way: bollards.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Mohr** – I think the solution to the front of the house strikes me as being a very successful way to approach that. It is so broken up right now as a gathering space. It’s more of a public space. I think that was a great change. I think softening up that concrete also makes sense from a scale standpoint.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I think the project continues to be a really elegant approach. I don’t have any concerns about the building. We have gotten the information that we have asked for and should be able to improve it in that way. I do have concerns about the Chancellor Street landscape. I don’t mind the spare aesthetic of the paving and the benches. When navigating down Chancellor Street, it still retains that residential character. There is very little to no precedent that I can see of the entire front lobby being paved. We have so many examples of very small front yards being used in urban ways but still finding a method to use small hedges or plantings to break that paved surface and break down the scale of the planting defining the yard. That could be useful here. I worry about the concrete planters in combination with the extensive brick paving. I think it would be a bad precedent for this street.

**Mr. Mohr** – The issue for me there is the fact that it is dominated by having to park cars up there. I think softer surfaces would be nice.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Where the cars are going is not changing.

**Mr. Gastinger** – It’s not changing, but that’s how they have chosen to use their property.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I agree with Mr. Gastinger. I have to admit that the scale is a little bit deceiving. It looks very large on the plan. In looking at the pictures of the site, there really isn’t a lot of yard there. To add some greenery is going to cut into your gathering space you have designed out there. A part of me wants to see the benches be hedges instead. That hurts the program you are trying to design. It is a lot of hardscape for a street. The other properties have some sort of hedgerow or something to break it up.

**Mr. Gastinger** – There are properties on West Main Street that have very small setbacks that also have seating in front and small plantings.

**Mr. Bailey** – Is the front yard going to be boarded with planters?

**Mr. Sherman** – We are showing planters perpendicular to the house that are starting to make three rooms out of the front. I do understand Mr. Gastinger’s concerns. We are trying to find a way to balance that issue by retaining the tree, introducing the planters, while maintaining as much space as we can for the use and visibility of the use to the street. If it is something that you want us to move, we will continue to study and make alternative proposals.

**Mr. Gastinger** – My concerns could be alleviated with an addition of a planting along the street and even bringing the benches and seating inboard two feet. It might be enough to get a little bit of separation and reduce the glare of those hard surfaces.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I am always in favoring of adding more green when you can. I am satisfied with the design and believe that it complies with our guidelines.

**Mr. Bailey** – I agree with Mr. Lahendro on this one as well.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You have done a really good job of answering all of our questions. As a matter of protocol, we have held up other projects. We can give you a vote of confidence that the Board is on board with that. A plan that shows where you are putting the lighting/bollards would be useful. I don’t have any doubts that it will be acceptable. You will need it for the site plan process.

**Mr. Zehmer** – A thin strip along the sidewalk of some sort of planting would keep open visibility to the front yard but also provide intimacy to the front yard.

**Mr. Mohr** – You have answered our questions clearly. I could some more softness to that front courtyard. I like that you have unified it. You could introduce some more green to the front of it. What is going on with street trees in that general area? You have a big tree. Is there anything across the street? I was curious about the level of shade there.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If there are any large trees, it is on the borders between properties.

**Mr. Zehmer** – It looks like a locust at the head of the parking area.

**Mr. Keogh** – There is no intention to take down any of the trees at the front of the property.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I want to make sure everyone has a chance to look over the supplemental packet. We can hopefully avoid any surprises.

**Mr. Bailey** – The only thing that I am hearing people are concerned about is the treatment of the front yard. Is there a way to go forward with this with some recommendations?

**Mr. Schwarz** – We want to have a vote that expresses confidence in this design and a recommendation for modifications to the front. It can’t be legally binding. When it comes back, we might be able to put it on the consent agenda without any major changes.

**Mr. Mohr** – The only thing at issue is alternate ways to handle the front. Do we do a straw poll?

**Mr. Schwarz** – Staff can do a roll call. The roll call would be on a general consensus that we find this design meets the guidelines and the information presented in the supplemental packet



meets the guidelines. We would like to see a revision to the front that introduces some more vegetation.

**Mr. Werner** – This is a BAR deferral or applicant deferral. It’s not an approval.

**Mr. Schwarz** – In the past, we voted for the applicant request for a deferral. We added some language that we generally supported the design. Is that acceptable?

**Mr. Werner** – A deferral from the BAR means that it comes back next month.

**Mr. Sherman** – I would like to request a deferral.

**Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Accept the applicant’s request for a deferral, and in accepting that request for a deferral, the BAR wants to express that they find the design concept and details presented in the packet and supplemental packet received to be in accordance with the Design Guidelines, and the BAR would like to see further details on the front yard design concept.**

**Mr. Lahendro seconds. Motion passes (9-0).**

## **7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 20-09-05

1619 University Avenue, TMP 090102000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Sovran Bank

Applicant: Brian Quinn, Milrose Consultants

Bank of America exterior lighting

**Staff Report, Jeff Werner** – Year Built: 1959 District: The Corner ADC District Status: Contributing. This one-story Classical Revival brick commercial building was built as a bank branch in 1959. It is characterized by a projecting half-octagon porch, fixed 35-light windows, and a hipped roof. Request CoA for the replacement of exterior lighting. BAR may want to establish conditions for the proposed tree and vegetation trimming, including a requirement that any work within the public right of way be coordinated with the City. Application indicates the light fixtures will have lamping with a Color Temperature (CT) that does not exceed 3,000K; however, the fixture cut sheets indicate that none of the fixtures are available with 3,000K lamping. With presentation prior to the BAR meeting of up-to-date catalog specs/cut sheets for each fixture indicating that the lamping meets the BAR’s criteria (a Color Temperature not to exceed 3,000K), staff will recommend approval. In the absence of that information, staff recommends that this request be deferred.

**Ryan McGrath, Applicant** – There is not a whole lot to talk about with going over the design. It’s a program the bank has started a couple of years ago in upgrading existing light fixtures. Your concerns are the 3000K and the cutoff lighting.

**Josh Waggoner, Applicant** – We have used the 30K lighting on numerous projects. They have 30K available in the cut sheets. We were able to get in with a representative at Creed. We do have those 30K cut sheets. It is available in our lighting package for the security of this bank.

The main talking point leading up to this meeting was the colors of the fixtures and whether they were available in 3K or 4K. Our cut sheets did say 4K. We specified 3K. It is good that we have the 3K fixtures on the cut sheets to now use on the more recent projects.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Mohr** – The CRI doesn't seem to be that hot. Do they have something better than 70 CRI?

**Mr. Waggoner** – The 70 is the minimum on one of our base fixtures. It goes up to 80 to 90 CRI with the 3000K fixture. The coloring index is 80 for the 3K fixtures.

**Mr. Mohr** – Looking at the plan, where those two USA wall packs are, is that the ATM?

**Mr. Waggoner** – There are 3 SA 2s right there. We tried to strive for ten foot candles within a five foot radius of an ATM for safety around the ATM.

**Mr. Mohr** – The ratings on those are pretty good?

**Mr. Schwarz** – Are those going under the canopy that is there?

**Mr. Waggoner** – There is a canopy over the ATM with a metal grate underneath it. We are removing the metal grate and putting the fixtures underneath the canopy and an additional fixture on the corner of the building. Our compliance are goes a little bit around the edge. We would like to light all the way around.

**Mr. Schwarz** – With the tree trimming part of this application, were the trees reviewed on site? Or are the numbers you recommended for how high to trim them up based on light elevations?

**Mr. Waggoner** – We did a 3D scan of the entire site for our design. We have exact heights. We have added the two trees back in the front of the building we were previously removing. We have added those back in. We are now just trimming heights. The highest was 15 feet. That tree is specifically above 40 feet. We are recommending that the canopy up to 15 feet so that people can see around the ATM and walk on the sidewalks.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It seems that with some of the trees, the leaves are pretty high up. Some of the lower branches are below that number.

**Mr. Waggoner** – We are just trimming them up so that it is all uniform.

**Mr. Schwarz** – There are large branches that support the main portion of the tree that start low. The person, who does that, is not going to know the difference between small branches that block light and a large branch that supports the bottom third of the tree. The numbers that you have indicated for how high to trim the trees is what you want.

**Mr. Waggoner** – We scanned the entire site. We know how big these trees are, how wide their spread is, and how much we can trim them up without damaging the tree.

**Mr. Schwarz** – You are going to leave the crepe myrtles that are at the frontage? Are those getting trimmed at all or are you leaving them as are?

**Mr. Waggoner** – If we were to trim them up, we would basically kill the tree. It is definitely not our intent. We are leaving those out of scope for the time being

**Mr. Gastinger** – Can you confirm that the R1 fixtures are existing floods?

**Mr. Waggoner** – R1, R2, and R3 are canopy fixtures that are being removed. R3 are wall fixtures that are existing are being removed. All R1 are non-full cutoff flood fixtures facing up.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Are they new or existing?

**Mr. Waggoner** – They are existing.

**Mr. Gastinger** – They are not changing at all?

**Mr. Waggoner** – The R1s are existing to be removed.

**Mr. Mohr** – All of your lights are from above. You don't have any light bollards?

**Mr. Waggoner** – It is strictly pole lights, wall lights, and canopy mounted fixtures.

**Mr. Mohr** – Do you have any examples of other buildings that you have lit using a similar strategy?

**Mr. Waggoner** – We do Bank of Americas all across the country. I can get that to you.

**Mr. Mohr** – When you say that you are modeling this, are you doing a lighting model or is this strictly a spatial take on what is in your way?

**Mr. Waggoner** – We built everything up on site to spec, heights, tree heights, and slope. We built it in. We have a color rendering of the site will look like at night with the fixtures that we have built in. We also included renderings in our design. Those renderings are actual light renditions.

**Mr. Mohr** – Do we have any of that, Mr. Werner?

**Mr. Werner** – I didn't see any renderings.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It sounds like you have updated the landscape plan. Was that something you created internally? Was that intended to be sent to us?

**Mr. Waggoner** – We got comments back prior to this meeting regarding the property line ordinance. We have decreased it down to 0.5, which is less than desirable.

**Mr. Werner** – This has been going through the site plan review process. There has been a lot of things back and forth. I focused on making sure that we understood the need for 3000K and dim ability.

**Mr. Mohr** – It sounds like they are taking a more sophisticated approach. It will be interesting to see that.

**Mr. Waggoner** – I can send you a sample site that we have done before. We will make sure that you get the renderings from our most recent version so you can see what the lights will do onsite.

**Mr. Mohr** – You have different materials, different heights, and the wealth of light fixtures that are out there now. Being able to judge is not such an easy thing to do.

**Mr. Waggoner** – When you see our most recent design, it has two separate candle pages. One is at 3 feet above grade. The one at full site grade is the one we are most concerned about.

**Mr. Schwarz** – What we are seeing is the final thing that the city is looking at with the final site plan.

**Mr. Werner** – What we are able to determine here, with having design professionals on the BAR, will help staff wrap up the other two sites. The site plan has the light fixtures as we have been requesting. The only discrepancy was with the catalog cut sheets. What has been reviewed by others and what they have seen, is that nothing has changed. They have the right numbers on the drawings. I hadn't really picked up any landscaping, other than the tree trimmings.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It was just trimming. It sounds like it is a little less trimming than we were seeing in our drawings.

**Mr. Werner** – We have the qualifications of the team on the phone and their familiarity with this. We have a lighting ordinance with the City of Charlottesville, which was written for incandescent bulbs. The ordinance hasn't caught up with the technology. With the BAR and the Entrance Corridor Review, we are able to establish conditions that address that visual aspect of it. The next component of it is that understanding if glare should become an issue, there be a commitment from the property owner to work with us. First and foremost is getting to that 3000K and dimmable fixtures. It sounds like we are there. I am comfortable with what they have produced.

**Mr. Waggoner** – We are trying to stay away from dimming because we don't want the lights to go dim in the middle of the night and have somebody do what they need to do. We dim inside the compliance area and the motion sensor doesn't pick up somebody hiding, we have completely disregarded what we are trying to accomplish with this site. If we were to dim, it would have to be outside of the compliance area. That is something we have done before and it is something we can do again. Inside the 50 foot compliance area, we try to stay away from that. We don't want any dimming of the lights.

**Mr. Mohr** – The key issue there is that you don't have such bright light there that just outside of the compliance zone that somebody can hide? Your actual lighting level isn't an extreme.

**Mr. Waggoner** – We would take a 50 foot grid around each exposure and specifically light two foot candles. It is generally five feet in front of your face. That's our main concern when we light four banks. We are trying to make it as even as possible.

## COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

**Mr. Schwarz** – When I look at the fixtures, it would be helpful to see the renderings. Looking at the fixtures on the website, I can see how they are not going to cast any light to the sky. It does not appear that the LEDs are shielded in any way horizontally. There is a lot of checking fixtures. It seems that some of the fixtures have pretty extreme number of lumens coming from them. My reference is an incandescent bulb. It looks like your wall packs are equivalent to a 150 watt bulb, which it is not out of the question. Some of the area lights appear to be five time more lumens than that. My concern is that there is a lot of light coming out of these fixtures. Your goal is security. Although this is not a residential street, it is a historic street that has a residential quality to it. It's across the street from UVA. There is a park across the street that is not brightly lit and a lot of trees. My concern is that the security lighting on this is going to be much more than what is currently there. It is going to feel very out of character. I struggle to find any way to quantify that.

**Mr. Waggoner** – When we have run into similar situations before, sometimes our LED fixtures aren't aesthetically pleasing compared to other historic fixtures you have seen before. We modeled our fixtures by looking at the surrounding area. We did notice a pole fixture across the street, which looked very similar to our fixtures. We generally modeled our fixtures around that. We can change our fixtures up. All of our fixtures are full cutoff. We can add shields. They will be on the LED pods on the fixture. You won't have this big shield on the back of the fixture like you are used to seeing. That two foot candle is our top priority when designing sites like this.

**Mr. Mohr** – I think some of them have 4600 lumens.

**Mr. Waggoner** – Our area edges gets up to 22,000 lumens. Wall fixtures go up to 6000 lumens. There is a big difference in lumen size and the size of the fixture and what we are trying to achieve.

**Mr. Mohr** – The biggest issue there is glare. Seeing the modeling would be great.

**Mr. Waggoner** – The highest glare rating we have on this site is G3. That's in the middle of a parking lot.

**Mr. Werner** – You have the property line all along University Avenue that is essentially the city line. The lights across the street are on the University property. A cohesive, comprehensive lighting plan for the entire city would be great.

**Mr. Mohr** – I think it would be fabulous if we could see some of the examples and some models.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am still 'hung up' on some of the trees. There are some big, old trees on this site. When someone tells a contractor to 'limb them up,' how is that going to look?

**Mr. Waggoner** – We are not looking to hack up any limbs. It is strictly foliage that would be blocking the light.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I don't know how we are going to move forward. There might some more information that we could receive with this.

**Mr. Werner** – It would be helpful to know where things stand on the site plan review. We have the clarification of 30K. We have that. They're not comfortable with the dimability. You have the ability to assert something. You can ask for an evaluation once the fixtures are installed. The other thing is make sure the kind of information you want and what form would be helpful.

**Ms. Lewis** – Would the applicant be interested in deferring with the thought that they would come back with the things that we have asked for?

**Mr. Waggoner** – We will request a deferral.

**Mr. Schwarz** – One thing that would be really helpful would be pictures of night time installations of these lights. That would go a really long way.

**Mr. Waggoner** – I can put together a power point presentation showing a similar site. We will get some daytime and nighttime photos of before and after. You can see the effects of the lighting we are trying to produce on site.

**Mr. Schwarz** – We are not trying to picky on this. We have been burned before on lighting design. It is something that we are really cautious about.

**Mr. Werner** – This is an excellent opportunity to get it right. From a staff viewpoint, I can't express the number of calls and complaints that we get. We need to have some ability to address it up front.

**Motion: Ms. Lewis – moves to accept the applicant's request for a deferral, with the request that before future review, the BAR would like to see some photographic examples of nighttime and daylight photos, as well as before and after installations of these fixtures at other banks, and the BAR would like to see renderings of this project, and a revised tree plan with updated information.**

**Mr. Zehmer seconds. Motion passes (9-0).**

**Meeting recessed for five minutes.**

## **F. Preliminary Discussions**

- 8.** 605 Preston Place – New apartment building.  
IPP and Rugby Road/University Circle/Venable Neighborhood ADC District  
Kevin Riddle, Mitchell Matthews Architects and Planners

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No Comments

### **SUMMARY OF PROJECT**

- Recently a surface parking lot was proposed.
- New proposal is an apartment building located to the west of Wyndhurst.

- There are parking places supporting the new apartment building relegated to the site interior.
- Proposal of a connection that runs along south of the site to access the parking.
- It will be designated for one way travel and would reduce vehicle traffic.
- The street could rejuvenate and strengthen the perception of Wyndhurst's original frontage.
- Not involved to move the earlier proposal to move Wyndhurst or introduce surface parking.
- The introduction of a new building will address the problems of earlier efforts.
- This would provide more housing close to the University.
- There is potential in this proposal to animate the site.

### **SUMMARY OF BOARD COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

- Something that can be considered.
- Interested in seeing how this project moves forward and could enhance the neighborhood.
- Questions about the parking and the north yard. Parking spots 7 and 8 encroach very close to the building.
- Cautious about the under sides of parking areas and very bright lighting with the parking area.
- Not sure about the grades on the other side of the building.
- This is far more appropriate than what was previously proposed.
- Staff went over the review of the previous COA application that was denied in October, 2019.
- The previous proposal did nothing to enhance the Wyndhurst frontage.
- Two trees are going to be retained.
- You would enter and exit from the north drive.
- The parking under the building would be entered from the south.
- There would be a 25 foot setback for the front yard.
- There was a concern about the distance between the proposed building and the Wyndhurst building.
- The basement windows are going to stay where they are.
- The guidelines are friendlier with a building versus a parking lot.
- There was some concern regarding the massing that was raised by several members of the Board.
- There was a straw poll regarding this proposed project and whether the project could gain approval from the BAR.
- The project is better than the previous proposal for this site and it is better than moving the house.

9. 106 Oakhurst Circle – Renovate existing residence, construct addition.  
Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC District  
Patrick Farley, Patrick Farley Architect

The applicant was unable to attend due to internet and technical issues.

### **SUMMARY OF BOARD COMMENTS**

- There was a discussion regarding whether this would qualify as the required preliminary discussion, since the applicant was not able to join the meeting due to home internet issues.
- After much discussion, it was agreed to provide feedback for the applicant.
- There was a concern about having a road through the front yard and the amount of pavement that is required for the project.
- There was also a concern about two trees that are going to be under siege in this project.
- The new landscaping would be a good tradeoff with the removal of one of the trees.

- It was recommended that the applicant submit a COA for an upcoming meeting.

## **G. Other Business**

### **10. Staff questions/discussion**

#### Hartmans Mill Road

- Old Nemo Property
- 1880s farmstead
- Shed behind the main house – extremely deteriorated
- Encouraged the owner to apply for a COA for a demolition
- Owner would like to do some expansion on the main house – shed is in the way

#### Multi-Step Review Process

- Projects, at one time, did get multiple COAs
- Not legally good to have multiple COAs
- Working towards a document that would be circulated
- BAR approval is required for final site plan review
- It was decided that the pre-meeting at the next meeting be the time to discuss this multi-step review process

### **11. PLACE Update**

PLACE is going through a self-review.  
Andrew Mondeschein is the new chair.  
PLACE is not doing much right now.

## **H. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM.