

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
February 17, 2021 – 5:30 p.m.
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly 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.

Members Present: Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger, Ron Bailey, Cheri Lewis, Jody Lahendro, Tim Mohr, Andy McClure

Members Absent: James Zehmer

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeffrey Werner, Joe Rice

Pre-Meeting:

Mr. Schwarz brought up the idea of possibly meeting to look over the guidelines. Mr. Gastinger agreed that a small number of people could meet and review the guidelines.

Mr. Gastinger recently attended a state ARB meeting. He mentioned some of the differences and similarities between the state ARB meeting and the City BAR meeting.

There was a discussion over the different items on the agenda and the consent agenda. There was a discussion regarding the 612 West Main Street project.

The BAR also discussed last minute changes made to the large scale projects.

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Comments from the Public

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. BAR Meeting Minutes – October 20, 2020

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-02-01

511 East Water Street

Tax Parcel 530074000

Charles and Virginia Pinnell, Owners

Dean Maupin, Applicant
Open pavilion at rear

Ms. Lewis moved to approve Consent Agenda (Second by Mr. Lahendro). Consent Agenda approved 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-01-05
116 West Jefferson Street
Tax Parcel 330183000
Jefferson Street Properties, LLC, Owner
Gordon Johnson, Peter Johnson Builders, Applicant
Porch reconstruction

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – This is a project that we had on the agenda last month, and Miss Johnson was not available to join us. We did have a brief discussion about it. I've modified the staff report accordingly. This is a COA request for 116 West Jefferson Street. This is in the North Downtown ADC District. This is formerly the River Come House. It is a Colonial Revival style home that was constructed in 1913. There's a building at the rear. I don't know whether to call it a house or a structure but it is contemporary. I think it was probably constructed sometime in the late 70s, early 80s. The house originally had a front porch. In the photos, you see it. It was removed in 1974. The request is first to reconstruct the front porches as best as possible, given the evidence and information we have available, which is summarized in the report. At the rear of the house, there is a hyphen that links the original house with the building in the back. They are looking to remove that. There are some alterations to the structure that include taking out some windows and adding some doors in the rear. Finally, on the rear of the existing house, where that hyphen is removed, the railing will be repaired to match what is there. We've had a lot of conversations about this and staff has been supportive of it. Reminder that the staff report, the photographs, and the application altogether form the body of this submittal. Make sure that when a motion is made, that if anything needs to be revised or amended, it is correctly expressed.

Gordon Johnson, Applicant – Our intention here is to rebuild the porch as it was originally built and restore the rear decks in the same fashion as they were originally constructed. We're looking to restore the original structure on the front and on the rear.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – The staff had a big long list of descriptions of the things you would match and do. Are you in agreement with those?

Mr. Johnson – Yes. They all looked like they were in alignment with what we're trying to accomplish.

Mr. Schwarz – Your drawings had a built up roof.

Mr. Werner – This is the design process. The “give and take” is what the BAR is good at. When we talked about it last time, Mr. Gastinger was looking on Google and there was a house around the corner that has similar columns. In the old photographs, there is a slightly vague ornamentation at the top of the column. The first item for discussion would be the type of column we’re talking about. As far as the discussion goes, this offers a checklist for you in your conversation with the applicant.

Mr. Schwarz – I see that you have everything illustrated. Are these illustrations all tied to one of your discussion points in the staff report? Do we need to look at both?

Mr. Werner – With the Scamazzi, the curls are rotated at an angle. In the old photograph, there is some ornamentation. You can see it in this image. The question for the BAR is: To the extent of being similar to what we can determine from the photographs, what detail does the BAR prefer for the column capital? I am recommending that we go through this staff report and anywhere I have a note or a recommendation.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – The cornice is going to match.

Mr. Lahendro – I would recommend that the capitals be a Scamazzi Ionic similar to what is at Altamont Circle. Mr. Johnson, you will be limited to what is available on the market. Staff can help you with some of the possibilities for manufacturers that offer Scamazzi capitals. It will be your responsibility to match the Scamazzi capitals so that it is similar in appearance to this and also the proper size for the column and the pilaster. I would recommend that once you find what you want to use, send staff a copy of it. We can leave it up to administrative approval if the rest of the Board agrees.

Mr. Werner – This is to express what we were talking about. For example, the ionic has canvas. This one simply has that band at the top. That seems to be what is there. The idea was that there be sort of ornament at the top and that it not be just plain below the capital. That’s the question for the BAR.

Mr. Lahendro – The necking is that piece there. There appears to be something similar on the historic photo unlike what is at Altamont Circle.

Mr. Johnson – I understand.

Mr. Werner – It is probably more prominent in the engaged pilaster at the rear. You can see that line. For the BAR, is that a detail that you feel is important?

Mr. Gastinger – The comments so far all suggest that we are treating this as a reconstruction. The recommendations from the Secretary of the Interior is that we match the details as closely as we can.

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Johnson, are you clear on what we’re talking about there?

Mr. Johnson – Yes. I understand the details at the top of the column and having them all match and running them by you guys and maybe getting some feedback from you of some manufacturers.

Mr. Schwarz – This should hopefully be through staff. If you provide staff with something that meets the criteria we’re describing, it should hopefully stop with staff. You don’t have to come back to us.

Mr. Werner – The goal is not a \$15,000 custom capital column. I know there is a lot of different varieties and types out there. We should be able to find something that’s available that begins to assimilate that ring at the top.

Mr. Mohr – There’s no issue with Mr. Johnson reaching out to individual Board members for their opinions.

Mr. Schwarz – The next issue on this one was the gutter detail.

Mr. Werner – We have existing trim and cornice on the house. That can be replicated. The next on the list is the railing, the bottom rail, and the pickets. With the profile of the railing and the pickets, we are offering some latitude than on the column capitals. The height conformed to the building code. If there was anything more specific that you wanted to say about the railing, let staff know.

The roof was the discussion and the staff recommendation was to evaluate it as a standing seam metal, acknowledging that some distance below the windows is necessary. The gutter and downspout component of it is necessary. If the applicant had a really good reason for going with the EPDM, now is the opportunity to present that.

Mr. Johnson – We actually meant for it to say standing seam. I don’t think the intent was EPDM. The intent was to replicate what was there. If that is standing seam, that’s what we would do.

Mr. Werner – On the gutter detail, we looked at 201 East High Street. This is where there was the discussion of the built-in gutter. They were not going to go with the built-in gutter. They had originally proposed a flat fascia. There was a request to go without the building gutter but to add a piece of crown that replicated that cornice that had been there. That’s a detail that, if you are all comfortable with, we are recommending for this project.

Mr. Lahendro – Does this crown replicate what is on the main roof?

Mr. Werner – What you see there is the sketch from 201 East High Street.

Mr. Lahendro – What is the photograph on the bottom left?

Mr. Werner – Everything on that page is from 201 East High Street. The only thing that we are referring to is that cornice of the front porch will be replicated, including that piece of crown. I roughly sketched the cornice. That’s the cornice that I approximately sketched in the photographs. There is a piece of a bed mold. There is a fascia piece with a bed mold. The condition here, replicating what was done at 201, it would look like that. The eave mounted gutter would be suspended in front of that crown.

Mr. Schwarz – The goal is to rebuild the cornice as if the internal gutter was still there. Instead of doing the internal gutter, tack a half-round on the end.

Mr. Lahendro – That crown is matching the crown that is on the main roof? As long as we say the whole cornice is matching the main roof from the fascia against the building up to the crown beneath the standing seam, including the modillion blocks. All of that is the same. We’re adding a half-round gutter to it.

Mr. Mohr – Is the upper roof getting gutters?

Mr. Johnson – That currently has built-in gutters that are remaining. We're not doing any work to them.

Mr. Mohr – If this was my house I would do this similarly, because of the rest of the house being like that. This is a premiere element as you approach the house. My inclination would be to remain with the building gutters. Given the quality of the house, that would be preferred to putting the half-rounds. They have compromised the line of the eave. This is just an opinion.

Mr. Lahendro – I support that philosophically. Practically, there is not a built-in gutter that doesn't leak.

Mr. Werner – We are going to have to weigh Mr. Mohr's opinion with future projects. This has been the BAR's tradition of allowing these changes. The next question was the porch flooring. My assumption was that porch flooring was going to be 1 by 4 or 1 by 6 run front to back and not some trek material.

Mr. Johnson – We're trying to replicate what was there. Our intention was some wood decking to match that era. It would be what was in the photo as best as we can. It would be to match that.

Mr. Werner – It would be wood.

Mr. Lahendro – That's what is at Altamont. I would use Altamont as our model.

Mr. Werner – There is a note at the bottom that says "In the event of an unknown detail, applicant should look to the existing condition at Altamont." The trim is clear. I am calling for ceiling board in a simple cove. It should not be anything too fancy. There are no light fixtures proposed. I was going to "open the door" if you had something in mind, we could talk about it.

Mr. Johnson – I don't think we have gotten that far in the design. It would be something simple and straightforward. There would be something over the front door.

Mr. Werner – As far as the rest goes, I don't have a lot of concern for the rear building. I think that comes through in the staff report.

Mr. Schwarz – The windows are builder grade. I just want to know what is going back in. We do have rules about vinyl. What kind of windows are you putting in?

Mr. Johnson – We haven't gotten that far in that design either. They wouldn't be vinyl. I am not even sure if we are replacing all of the windows or just windows where adjustments are made to the attachment. If that's the case, it would just be to match the remaining windows as best as possible.

Mr. Bailey – You're talking about the windows in the contemporary building behind that.

Mr. Schwarz – I think it would be good to suggest that you can match what is existing in style. If the existing windows are vinyl, the new windows should be wood, aluminum clad wood, or should be fiberglass composite. The four things that would need to be submitted to staff are the light fixture, window cut sheets, the railing profile, and the column capital that you would be choosing.

Ms. Lewis – Is there any thought on restoring the shutters to this property?

Mr. Johnson – There actually was discussion. They would like to restore what the building originally had. If you have any input on what that should be, that would be helpful.

Mr. Gastinger – I think the shutters bring a lot to both of the elevations facing the street. It would be great to bring those back.

Mr. Johnson – We will definitely incorporate that.

Ms. Lewis – We should be getting list of materials of the porch from you, the applicant. It is primarily the flooring of the porch.

Mr. Schwarz – That would go to staff to confirm that they are meeting what we discussed.

Ms. Lewis – Are we voting on this as a final submittal?

Mr. Werner – The photographs only offer so much. We're providing a template with the other ones we have. With the flooring, I was getting at that it was wood. As far as the railings, they understand what we are shooting for. That's the next step. When the building permit comes in, I will want to see what they are planning to do. That's the final signoff. I think what we are saying is that the BAR is not requiring a custom, manufactured turning. We're trying to find something of a similar profile of that period and trusting staff's judgement. I think that's appropriate for this sort of thing. I am quite comfortable with this.

Mr. Schwarz – Does anybody have any concerns with approving it per the discussion items. We just have to clarify a few things.

Mr. Werner – I have given specific references to existing components.

Motion – Mr. Mohr – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed front porch reconstruction and exterior alterations at 116 West Jefferson Street 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, with the following modifications:**

- **The front porch will have a standing-seam roof and gutter detail similar to that in the staff report.**
- **That the approval references the narrative, clarifications and photographs included as supplemental in the staff report.**
- **The applicant will submit for staff review the proposed column capital.**
- **The applicant will provide for staff review details on the porch railing and pickets and any proposed exterior light fixtures.**
- **The applicant will provide for staff review cut sheets for alterations to the windows and doors at the rear contemporary addition, with the understanding that the windows will not be vinyl, but may be wood, aluminum-clad wood, or fiberglass composite.**

Ron Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (7-0)

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 20-11-02

612 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 290003000

Heirloom West Main Street Second Phase LLC, Owner

Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects, Applicant

New construction of a mixed-use development

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – This is intended as a continuation of the discussion towards a final submittal towards the COA. We're not there tonight. The applicant is obligated on his end to request the deferral from the BAR. The BAR can only accept that. Lacking a request from the applicant, the BAR would have to take a vote up or down on this proposal at this time. This is a COA request for 612 West Main Street. The address is 602-616 West Main Street. We are referring collectively to 612 West Main Street. It is in the Downtown ADC District. Some people always wonder about that. The West Main District doesn't actually start until further down the block to the west. This is a request to construct a new mixed use building. As I've mentioned before, there's an existing concrete automotive building there built in the 1950s. It is not contributing and it's not subject to BAR review. You all have had a couple of discussions with the applicant. The last discussion was on December 15th. What we've been doing is working our way through a series of the design steps. The applicant has provided graphic information for you all to review and has presented tonight some questions that they would like to specifically get at in the conversation. It doesn't mean you all are only limited to what they're presenting and asking about. That's the “game plan” for this evening.

Jeff Dreyfus, Applicant – We're just intending to keep you informed and give you an opportunity to continue to give us guidance prior to coming to you for official approval. What I'd like to do early in this is hand it over to Anne Pray, who is our landscape architect on the project to give you all a very quick overview, the questions that we sent our comments, any thoughts you all have, questions you have about the landscape, and the hardscape plan. The West Main Street elevation really hasn't changed much from what you all saw two months ago. I'll talk a little bit about some of the modifications that we're contemplating there. You will also see both West and South elevations so that we might get any input from you all on those as we continue to develop them.

Anne Pray, Applicant – I want to speak a little bit about how we are trying to respond to some earlier comments about creating pedestrian engagement and making the building more active at the street and at the same time looking to break down the building mass and making it a little bit more pedestrian and body scale friendly to the street. I'm going to run through the plan design here pretty quickly, but probably work from the north elevation a little bit more so that we can look at that. In scale and in elevation, I think it reads a little bit better. From the outset of the project, this courtyard area has always been an important part of that residential entry of the building, which is one of its largest purposes. We're looking to create an engagement with the mural wall and also look at a way to just slide in a little bit smaller garden experience here with using a water feature, some benches, and some planting and at the same time opening up the courtyard for the entry. You can see one of the devices we're using is this connect with the larger building, a changing material on the ground plane from something smaller at the street to something larger that runs along the whole front of the building to something smaller in the courtyard again. We think that it gives it a little bit sense of place as you come in. We have three planters located along the length of the building. Two of the planters are at the four bay to create a little bit more of a density. We have this more open concept of the courtyard, closing it off a little bit in the front of the four bay side of the building and opening it up more towards the center and middle as we get to the five bay. Using a larger but singular planter towards the end relates the scale back to the earlier four bay in the building. As you run down to the west of the building, we are negotiating with grade a little bit. We have one singular stair that grows into two steps at the end. We have about a foot of grade change, running from east to west. On that side on the courtyard, we're looking to make it as open and as accessible as possible, so that grade does connect flush across to the main sidewalk. It's obviously more accessible for everyone. One of the things I want to point out here that I think is pretty important is that we get into is that we are required to show for trees to plant for trees. I want to talk about the placement of these trees as part of this project that's actually happening. We know that the West Main Streetscape plan shows for trees, obviously not in this location. I think it is problematically in a really different location with the curb line shifting in the future. We are

actually also calling out the bike racks at this point on either ends of the building. You can see that on the west side. I'm using a low retaining wall to hold that space to create that niche for the two bike racks. On the eastern side, we have three bike racks there. The last little part here is that we are exploring the form and the permutations of the planters and how they work. The curvilinear idea is a little bit of a nod to what's happening on the inside of the building and the lobby, as we look to soften some of the edges and the hardness. We're trying to bring that outside in, in a playful way and in a more sculptural way. This is the overlay plan that shows four dashed, pink circles, outboard of the existing curb line. Those are the proposed West Main Streetscape trees. In quantity, it obviously works with what we've got and would just be a matter of coordination. However, the curb line is nearly two feet outboard of where the existing curb line is right now on West Main, which obviously lends us to believe that they're redesigning the whole street with parking and different curb lines and curb cuts. The extent to which we're actually going to be able to negotiate with that positioning at this point is unknown. I'd like to figure out exactly what the expectations are from the BAR as to how we're supposed to negotiate and handle that at this point. Here you can see an elevation. I think we all know the streetscape trees and the trees that we're proposing. Those four trees are really going to be what competes with the overall scale of the building here. Their placement will be working a little bit more symmetrically side to side with each one centered on a major column of the building. The planters bring the scale down to the pedestrian and the body. They work a little bit more to create a little bit of density against the building with your own perception of it as you're walking by. As you look at it, you can see the courtyard space again to the left. That's a much more open experience overall. As you walk by the first bay or the first true building, there's the four bay. That's more broken up with the planters and the trees. It is a more open center, last third, and then a planter on the end, knotting back to the balance of the four bay building preceding it with the open stair on the end and the retaining wall. I think it's important to talk about the water. One of the things about this building is that it does go from this very rectilinear clean facade outside. As you move your way into the building, it becomes a really calm, curvilinear, meditative experience. I think what we're trying to do by the introduction of water is introduce just a small sound and just a small nod to 'you've come home.' It is a little bit chiller and a little bit more common than what you just left on the street. We're trying to set up that choreography from the moment you enter into the courtyard. The articulation of that right now really has a long way to go to get the design done. The idea is that we would be introducing just a small amount of sound of water. Similarly, I think if you look in the next slide, you can see some different precedents. We are playing with the form of the planter. If it might have a little bit more of a batter to the front face how the bench itself could connect in or participate with the planter so that they are overall a little bit more sculptural, but also feel like they can be occupied. With the plantings themselves, I am really into creating a planting design as an important part of the piece. In this case, looking at the building, we actually have a lot of opportunity to use plants as texture and form and create some interesting palettes that you probably wouldn't see otherwise along the street. We'd be really looking to create some identity with making the planters really as big as we can and really get some good planting in there. I've got another image there of the paving precedents and different ideas in scale. I think that paving is going to be very calm, much like the building. We really looked to just maybe two different scales of paving to start to create a break between path and place. With the water base and on the end, there's a very small nod to just a little something different on the street and introducing that idea of calm as you come into the building as resident. I think the next couple slides actually show this in the architectural rendering, if we want to take a look at that. It's nice to see the scale of the existing trees. We get a sense of how big these trees might hopefully become over time. You can see the courtyard and the planters laid out there. This is just obviously from the other end. I think what's nice to see here is actually just the stair. It's just a one foot gray change at that point. It's something we need to deal with and wanted to really keep it as open as possible. Really using a stair as an occupiable moment but to come up to the retail promenade and leaving that little bit of a space on the end for the bike racks. One thing I would say about the bike racks, because this might come up, is that I think it's really just been our experience looking at how they function at 600 right in the front of the building and right in front of the coffee and retail space. I think the takeaway there

really is, it's been kind of problematic to really put them in a place of egress. As tricky as it has been, we are looking to give them their own space and make them noticeable, but not necessarily put them in the courtyard where we're trying to create a more intimate experience.

Mr. Dreyfus – We do intend to have options for greenery along the balcony railings. Whether or not that is owner provided or tenant provided, we do have a long way to work through on that. We do intend to add that bit of color and texture to the façade.

We're really looking for ways to quiet the building down. As Anne noted, the interior lobby of the residential entry is going to be very curvilinear. That is something that we are thinking may actually make its way out to the exterior of the building in a very quiet way next to the front door. We're not ready to talk about that. In trying to quiet the building down, you'll see that we began thinking more about color and texture since our last conversation. The next slide does show how we're beginning to think about the particular elements of the façade. We are intending that the North, West, and East elevations will be brick. We'll talk in a minute about the texture of the brick and the hyphens as we discussed before. We're thinking that the upper levels might be white or off white. We're thinking that the color of the building might be more of a heather brick or a lighter cream color. It's not going to be white. It's not going to be stark white. We know that much. We've got a ways to go. We're exploring brick that can be completely painted or brick that has enough soft color that we like it. We'll be back with more on that. I think what's important to note here is that we do believe that going with a different color on the retail level and ground level helps with the building to delineate what's residential and what's commercial in terms of its scale. It also makes the engagement with the street different from the facade as it goes higher up in the residential area. We're liking this. We don't quite yet know how we want to provide cover at the doors into the retail. That will be something that we continue to develop. You'll also see that perhaps that same darker color, which might be a metal. We're working toward that. That material would probably also introduce itself there on the left at the door into the residential lobby. You can begin to see the curve of that might express itself right in that small area. We're thinking upper windows and doors would be light in color as close match as we can get it to the brick material on the facade and darker down below. We would like to hear if this is an acceptable direction. The railings that we see on the balconies will also probably be light in color. Some of our earlier designs showed pretty soon stark contrast between black or dark bronze windows and doors and railings up above, which were similar to what's down below. It was becoming a little bit too checker boarding for our tastes. That's the direction that we're thinking we're going to go with colors. One thing I would like to note about the hyphens of the façade is that we are still imagining that the hyphens will be a different texture from the main blocks of the facade that move forward. We don't in any way think that the hyphens will be a different color but perhaps a different texture brick. Whether we model the surface or we do something with the control joints, we do want to make it subtly different. They step back, obviously, and they stepped down a little bit. We're trying to keep things related but quietly, different from one to the other. Here, you can also begin to see that the lower level that the darker color on the retail level does do what a number of buildings on West Main Street do. That is to call a distinction between the retail level and the residential levels up above, including on the Holsinger building right there on the right. There's a distinct line drawn there between the ground level engagement and the upper level residential. Here, we're beginning to talk about what the rear elevation will be. This might be a little bit hard to make out. On the lowest level, we have two story studio lofts behind those tall double doors. Those are probably Juliet balconies that can be opened. They speak to the height of that floor elevation. On West Main Street, we're supposed to have close to a 17 foot tall first floor. We're actually taking advantage of that to provide loft units on the backside of the building with living down below and a sleeping loft up above. The next level up has large terraces off of the units and also includes the green roof that we're going to be incorporating in the project. The green roof is down at this level and not on the rooftop. The rooftop may or may not be occupied in the future. We're not there yet. We think this is a great opportunity for us to bring the greenery and the softness of that to the living units on the south side of the building. The bronze

panels that you see projecting perpendicular to the building are simply dividers between the units. For instance, on the second level at the far left, there are three bays of windows and doors that open on to that terrace before you get to the divider. That's one complete unit. After that, there's a two bay unit. That's what those are. We need to provide privacy panels between units. On the upper floors, you can see that there are balconies off each of the living rooms of the various units. The thing that I would like to point out here is that we would like to be able to stucco the upper part of the rear facade in this instance. The building to the right, 600 West Main Street, is metal panels. As most of you know, there are metal panels on the North, West, and East façade. On the South facade, we turn the corners on the South facade with the metal panels. The entire rear of the building is stucco. We want to do the same thing here on the upper three floors of this building. Quite frankly, it's a cost savings that we hope and anticipate will allow us to use brick for the rest of the building. It's not unusual for the rear of buildings in any urban environment is a different material. We would keep it quiet. It wouldn't be distinctly different from the brick. We'd come with whatever colors we're proposing in that regard. On the next slide, might be full elevations. Here you can see the elevations as they currently stand. The hyphens that we've discussed in the previous discussion are in the middle and on the far right. With the next drawing, there is a different texture on those hyphens and also on the residential block that sits back from the street. The next drawing should be the South elevation. As I described, there are upper balconies on the top two floors with terraces on that third floor level, just above the last studio loft balconies. With the next elevation, trying to take the motif from the north facade on the west elevation there on the left. Take the motif of the openings and sizes and continue that to give a bit of order to that facade, which is on the alley adjacent to the Holsinger building. The larger windows are all windows at the end of residential corridors. The two smaller windows there on the far left are within units to allow those to be third bedroom. On the far right, the elevation facing the courtyard of 600 West Main Street and the mass of the building of 600 West Main is dashed in the very dark line there on the left of that drawing. It's a very narrow courtyard. At the end of that courtyard would be doors leading into the lobby of 612 West Main Street. The tenants of both buildings will have access to the courtyard and to the lobby. If there is in the future, a rooftop amenity on this building, the tenants of the adjacent building could enjoy it. I think we've included some of our previous slides that showed ideas of ways that we can treat cheap different textures, different openings, and the windows. The middle right image, the light facade is not unlike what we're discussing, perhaps lighter color for the brick, but a darker color for the retail openings and being different from what's happening in the on the residential up above. As I mentioned in my notes, we'd appreciate any and all comments on the landscape hardscape especially as it relates to what Anne is showing, and importantly, noting that the tree locations relative to what is shown on the West Main Street streetscape project and any comments you have about the facade development, any of the elevations, the colors, materials we're contemplating at this point, and as well as stucco on the south side of the building.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – The plans looks like there is a retaining wall next to the bikes. Is that correct?

Ms. Pray – That's correct. It is shown in the elevation. It is very small. It is only a foot tall and only 8 inches wide.

Mr. Mohr – I was wondering if it matched the height of the planters or not.

Ms. Pray – I don't have it matching the planters. I just kept it a pretty low profile.

Mr. Mohr – I was looking at the renderings.

Mr. Dreyfus – That is the move-in door for the building for all of the tenants. There will be a curb there. There will be safety factors set up so that nothing goes rolling off of that end.

Mr. Mohr – It looked like in the plans there was more of a wall there. It was just a resolution question. It makes more sense that there is a wall there.

Ms. Pray – Initially, we thought about wrapping the stair back to the corner so you could approach the building from that corner. We needed the space for the bike racks. We ended up with the retaining wall to cut in that space for the racks. We have to utilize every inch.

Mr. Dreyfus – Wrapping the stair didn't make a lot of sense. We would be inviting people to step into a private alley. This was to direct people out toward the street.

Mr. Mohr – I was remarking at the absence rather than the presence.

Mr. Gastinger – I wanted to ask if there was any further thinking about the differences in that brick texture. The precedence that you showed at the end of the presentation have quite a wide range. Do you have any more to what you are currently thinking?

Mr. Dreyfus – The next step is going to be offering specific samples to what we are thinking. We're talking with our contractor and their suppliers about what those options are. We need enough of a distinct difference that it is noticeable when you look.

Mr. Schwarz – If the West Main Street streetscape goes forward, are you still required to put in four street trees?

Ms. Pray – We will have to do four trees.

Mr. Dreyfus – It is a requirement at the moment. We are having to live by it. I think what Anne has done works well with the building. We don't have the option of furthering the streetscape plan. We would be putting our trees in the street. If we go to that slide, you will see where Anne has placed the trees precludes the parking pull off areas or anything that they're showing. It would appear to me that we could keep those trees precisely where she is proposing them. The City would have a little less cost as part of that project.

Mr. Schwarz – Suppose the streetscape plan doesn't go forward, are the power lines a problem? It seems that this site has accumulated some new power lines.

Mr. Dreyfus – The power lines are a problem. We are going to deal with them during construction. I don't know if we are going to be dealing with them permanently. We will have to deal with them temporarily.

Mr. Schwarz – I would like your application to include temporary power plans. Even if poles are being moved temporarily, trees sometimes have to come down for temporary movement.

Mr. Dreyfus – We will do that. They are going to be moved across the street. We will be happy to include the temporary power plan as part of the application. We will move the power lines back to where they are. A permanent solution would be undergrounding them.

Mr. Lahendro – With the footprint for the planters, I am trying to understand the significance of this unusual truncated circle shape. It has some relevance to what is going on inside the building.

Mr. Dreyfus – On the interior of the building, the lobby is actually going to be a very curvilinear series of planes with few hard angles. We’re trying to bring that into the residential hallways as a part of the design. Anne’s thought is that we hint at it on the exterior in terms of the planter shape with what is happening on the interior.

Ms. Pray – That was definitely a starting point. We liked the idea that the planters became more sculptural as part of the experience being on the sidewalk. The space between them still feels like inside.

Mr. Lahendro – For pedestrians that don’t live in the building, those shapes would be completely alien to anything they can see on the building.

Ms. Pray – The idea is that it might be captured by them and see something different. I think there is a way they interact with the building too. It seemed to use the planter as an opportunity to be a little more ‘playful’ on the street to soften the building. We are still working through it and what the final shapes will be.

Mr. Mohr – Do they match the material of the window frames on the first floor level?

Ms. Pray – It is definitely a detail question that I am not totally clear on. We still have to have those conversations. I think we would look to create some continuity.

Mr. Dreyfus – One of the things that we have talked about with the shape of the planters is that they are softer. They’re a little bit more inviting. There is a playfulness to them that might invite something a little bit more relaxed on what is a pretty regimented façade.

Ms. Lewis – Is the south façade on the upper floors stucco?

Mr. Dreyfus – I don’t know for sure. My preference would be stucco. It might end up being EIFS.

Ms. Lewis – I would support it on the back. I will definitely support it if it was stucco.

Mr. Schwarz – Building codes require continuous exterior insulation on commercial buildings. In general when we see stucco, it is EIFS. I don’t know if it can be detailed in a different way. That’s something that needs to be fixed in our guidelines. There is no stucco anymore unless it is on concrete.

Mr. Dreyfus – The real difficulty with EIFS is the hollowness when you tap on it. You can get a variety of finishes. We were very successful at 600 West Main on getting finishes on the EIFS that does not look like your standard EIFS. I think it is a matter of the intent of the architect and the ability of the installers to achieve something that’s not just “slathered on icing” that we see everywhere. That will definitely be a part of what we do. It is important that we get that surface right for the tenants of the building. It is not a throwaway material.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – I really like the development of the site plan and the landscape, especially compared to where it was previously. The planters really felt like they were armoring the building or maybe having a very distinct zonation between the public sidewalk and in the walk in front of the retail spaces. I like the way that low step will get used a lot and will be a piece of street furniture. It would be in a more graceful way to make that delineation and make it more subtle. I like the shape of the planters for a couple of reasons. I think that it really does facilitate a lot more East/West movement along the facade of the building. At the same time gets a longer amount of planting area in proportion to the building. I will say though that I do think because maybe perhaps the thinness of the wall and the way that they're rendered in the plan, they do feel a little bit inconsequential or a little bit more like street furniture. There's maybe a balance there. I'm not sure if they either could get just a little bit larger or just beef up just a bit more to have a relationship to this building. There could be another one added. It seems like they're just a little bit sparse currently. I like that. I like the tactic. I like the materiality and the way that they be deployed. I think the material of them being a little bit more of street furniture and not feeling like a constructed built in feature might lend themselves to feeling a little bit more like almost quazi movable part of the street and maybe alleviate some of the fear that Jody might express about whether they really feel like they're a part of the public landscape. With the trees, this is my personal opinion. If we wait for the city to figure out West Main, we will still be waiting. I applaud the tactic to go ahead and put the trees in at the location that works best for this building. At a scale, that also works best for the street. I would hope that you'd consider species that will operate at that street tree scale and really create a high canopy that would make for a really excellent public space below. When the West Main Street project happens in about 30 years, they'll work around these trees. The only thing I would note about that is that we can be thinking about larger trees to make certain in the early planning that ample soil volumes are provided so that so that we really can get the kind of size and scale tree that they would appreciate there.

Mr. Mohr – When the power lines come back, are they going create havoc with those trees?

Mr. Dreyfus – They can and they will. I will say that we are talking with Dominion about the possibility of locating the power lines under the sidewalk. It is in everyone's best interest if we could do it. We all know Dominion moves at its own pace and own schedule. We are hoping that we can do it. I hesitate to mention it. We don't want it held against us in the future.

Mr. Mohr – I agree with Breck about the planters. I like the one with the seat in it. I could actually see just making that a standard feature for all three of them. The other thing I could see doing is that they weren't great in plan but in elevation and extending the plantable area along like the building, it seems to me you could play with the elevation of the edge where it could be like a cone slice or something like that, where it has some more dynamic role to play at a 3d level. I know it's got plants in it. How many times a year are they not doing much? If it has a wandering edge or drives up one side where their playfulness is apparent, not just in plan but in elevation and section. I just fear for dominions behavior.

Mr. Schwarz – I'm going to agree with what's been said so far. I want to see very tall, beautiful canopy trees on West Main. If the power lines end up needing to stay, I think Cova have done a good job of coexisting. Something of that scale would be appropriate if you keep the power lines. My other concern I brought up with the Code Building is that they have sworn to me that we're not going to end up with a bunch of yellow tape on all the on the edges of all the stair treads. I don't know if it's our zoning code. Wedge steps are not allowed. When they show up, they end up becoming tripping hazards. I think they're a wonderful landscape feature. I just want you guys to make sure that these steps and landscape don't become like him covered in bright yellow tape.

Mr. Lahendro – I would concur with most of what I've heard so far. I would rather see that scale, but in a more native tree or one that's on the street tree list that the Tree Commission puts out.

Mr. Schwarz – The other question from staff was to look at the elevations with the understanding that the north elevation is on the right track and the change in the material on the back.

Mr. Lahendro – I would like to talk about the North elevation. This looks better to me than what I'm hearing than what's actually meant. The recessed planes of the hyphens are darker and obviously more recessed. The darkness is a symbol to indicate some kind of texture. What I'm hearing is that the texture that's desired at this point is subtle and not distinctive. I would prefer to see something that's more distinctive in the difference. I think this reads as we had intended or we had stated all along in that we're trying to mimic the scale of the individual historic buildings that are still left on this part of West Main that were here originally. That's my biggest worry about this elevation.

Mr. Mohr – Your end elevations are quite asymmetrical and seem to have a lot of surface development. There's a playfulness in there. It also harkens back to some of those images you showed us from those urban buildings with multiple planes with your precedent images. I wonder if you really start playing with the level of detail in there, so it actually catches more shadow is more idiosyncratic and plays basically a different architectonic game than the quieter or very rectilinear façade. That possibly combined with darker materials but also the fact that we attach more shade and shadow. I think you have some clues in that East elevation to my mind that might enliven and at the same time distinguish those punch backs. I'd like to just quick slide over to the top section of the residential block on the north side, I could see doing that in a completely different like glass. It's much more of your beltline for your parapet runs around. That whole upper piece reads as something that is truly set back and is perhaps much more modern and translucent. That would again help the read of the scale. The brick on top of that feels a little heavy to me. If you put some brace a lay over the upper band of balconies that starts reading is more porch-like. I think it softens up the side of it on the south side. That would start to break it up vertically without really a great deal. You wouldn't be having to modulate surfaces or anything that would give you a scale breakdown. It does start to read as somewhat tower like.

Mr. Gastinger – I am a little concerned about the subtlety and the thinness of the plane of the North elevation. It's not so much the elevation but more that the plan and the perspective views that would come from it. I'm concerned because I think almost every view from a pedestrian point of view or for driving down the road that this is really going to look like a long building because the plan changes are so subtle. As mentioned in the last meeting, the addition of those balcony railings stepping that height down the introduction of some different texture are some good techniques. It's really riding on that line of whether this is meeting that SUP recommendation that the mass is breaking down. It might be useful to include some more oblique perspectives in the package in the future. I think that's how this building will most likely be seen. If the intention is to truly have the brick in the textured brick berry so similar in color, I wonder if a more radical technique like making one of the bays that textured brick might be worth considering. I just continue to look for more depth from the façade. I am just worried that it's getting keeps getting thinner and thinner.

Mr. Zehmer joined the meeting during the discussion of this agenda item.

Mr. Schwarz – Are we all OK with the change to stucco/EIFS at the back? Are we all still on board with the massing? There seems to be more desire for more originality in the front façade.

Mr. Mohr – I like the idea of doing something to make that top appear different. That would actually drive that whole block down lower and you wouldn't feel quite all the peace. To me, it's more like the main

facade is so quiet. Maybe there's a much more intensive brick detail and idiosyncratic treatment of those drop back pieces that makes them taking up a look at some the really wild brick you see on some of the old residential structures in New York where it really has a degree of texture and detail that speaks to maybe the old church down the road or something.

Mr. Schwarz – Are there any thoughts around the darker color around the retail entrances?

Mr. Mohr – I like the idea of the planters relating to it.

Mr. Lahendro – I think it is an interesting idea. I look forward to seeing how it is developed.

Mr. Dreyfus – I thank you all very much. I realize this is a drawn out process. By the time we get to the approval, it is going to be a very short, brief meeting. For us, it feels productive and informative.

Mr. Mohr – Where do things stand on the lighting on 600?

Mr. Dreyfus – We have to make the final adjustment. We will have that done. We are ready for the BAR to go and look at it in the next week and a half.

Mr. Dreyfus – **I move for a deferral – Motion accept to deferral (Mr. Lahendro). Motion to accept deferral passes 7-0.**

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

D. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 21-02-02

636 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520113000

Jennifer and Blakeley Greenhalgh, Owners and Applicants

New fence

Staff Report, Jeffrey Werner – What we have before us is a COA request for 636 Park Street. This is in the North Downtown ADC District. This is a 1950s Colonial Revival style home that was constructed in 1950 by a gentleman named Harry Munson. This is a request before you to install a new fence around the perimeter of the property. It will be set behind existing hedge that's there. We didn't find any issues with it and recommended approval. With fences and particularly along an arterial or primary road like we have with Park Street, I wanted to bring it to the BAR and so I did not recommend it for a Consent Agenda. We see no issues with this.

Jennifer Greenhalgh, Applicant – The wood fence on the left is the one we prefer for a few reasons. One, we plan on eventually doing something to our backyard and we want a privacy fence in our backyard. We would like those two fences to match. The photo that you showed of the front of our house is a really old one. We have skip laurels that are probably 14 feet high. The fence is not really going to be visible. Our neighbor has a wooden fence like this. The apartment two doors down has a more modern wood fence. They use it as privacy for their patios. On the corner of Park and Farrish, they also have a wood fence. We prefer the look of the wood. It is more cost effective. It would be more preferable to our style.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – When you said that you approve this, the staff report says that the preferred is metal. Is that correct? What are you recommending approval of?

Mr. Watkins – When I wrote the staff report, I think either option is appropriate. I found the metal fence to be more appropriate.

Mr. Werner – When I talked with the applicant earlier, these are set behind that hedge. It has grown. There is a good screen. I had offered as a condition that the BAR might request, should the hedge be removed, that changes how this fence might be viewed. That was one of the things I felt was a mitigating factor to what they selected. I offered that as a recommendation.

Ms. Greenhalgh – If for some reason, we have a skip laurel that dies, we will immediately replace it. We love it for the privacy. It tamps down the noise from Park Street. We plan on keeping those.

Mr. Schwarz – Is the intention to paint the fence?

Ms. Greenhalgh – It is. They have told me that you have to leave it for 4 to 6 weeks until you paint it. The intention is to paint it. I would like to paint it the color of our siding. It is something that you have approved before.

Mr. Gastinger – Since we weren't able to see the examples of the other wooden fences that you mentioned, are any of those in the front yard?

Ms. Greenhalgh – Two of them are.

Ms. Lewis – That's not the front yard.

Ms. Greenhalgh – It's in the front yard. It's not on the street side but it is still in the front yard.

Mr. Gastinger – Are any of those on the street?

Ms. Greenhalgh – No. The wood of the apartments are set off from the street.

Mr. Gastinger – That has been more typical. The privacy of fences behind the front façade of the house are wooden. The fences along Park Street are typically rod iron or steel.

Ms. Greenhalgh – You can see how tall our bushes are. The metal is double the cost. You're not going to see them. It is something that we don't prefer. I would really hope that we could do the wood.

Mr. Schwarz – There is a wood picket fence at 717 Park Street right up against the curb. It is a new house on the corner of Lyons Court and Park Street. It is a split-level on the corner of Lyons Court and Park.

Ms. Lewis – It is not four feet. It undulates. They just put it up.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Skip laurel gets us in trouble. It violates our guidelines. A lot of people use it as an excuse to put in their own shrubs that are more than four feet tall on the sidewalk. We have had a number of properties come to us asking to put in a privacy screen right on the street. We can't make you take it down. We do wish that you would cut it shorter.

Ms. Greenhalgh – We actually got that approved through you guys to put that up. That was approved.

Mr. Schwarz – I am looking at the picture from Google street view in 2012. They are tiny. You see these hedges up and down Park Street. Some of them did pop up without full Board approval.

Mr. Mohr – The house across the street has had hedges like that for 20 years.

Ms. Lewis – That's really common in North Downtown. I have lived in the neighborhood for almost 25 years. I do appreciate everything that you have done with that house. I remember what it did look like. You put the shutters on. That front yard was not right. Once you put in the skip laurel in, it really looks great. Everything that you have done has almost restored the house. You have made it very attractive. Our guidelines, which we are supposed to follow, at 11 with privacy fences. Privacy fences may be appropriate in side yards or rear yards that are not visible from the street. It presumes that privacy fences shouldn't be on primary streets. Unfortunately, you have two primary streets. I don't see any other privacy fences up and down Park Street at all, which would prevent somebody at street level from seeing the house. There are some stone walls where you wouldn't see it standing on the sidewalk. You would see it across the street. The engagement of our neighborhood with each other is what makes North Downtown special. The privacy fences are really antithetical, not just in the guidelines, but in the way that this neighborhood has developed. There is a good number of metal fences. You can see right through them. They really don't act as privacy fences. We really don't have fences that wall off the street engagement. That would be around the periphery of the property. I can't support the wooden privacy fence, I could certainly support a 4 foot metal fence. Our guidelines are pretty clear.

Ms. Greenhalgh – On the Evergreen side, are you saying that we can't have wood back there?

Ms. Lewis – The guidelines say side or rear yards. I would think that you can use it on the rear yard if there is any way to differentiate it. It wasn't really clear if you wanted it around the whole yard or just on the street side.

Ms. Greenhalgh – It would just be the front yard. We just got a puppy. We need a fence to keep him in. I don't even want a fence. This is where this has all happened. We looked at doing an electric fence.

Mr. Werner – When we talk about a privacy fence, in my mind, it is something six to eight feet tall and solid. Wood being more the height and the enclosure of it, my understanding from the Board is that wood is not preferred on the perimeter.

Mr. Schwarz – I think we need to discuss this and see if everyone agrees with Cheri. For the definition of privacy fence, I agree with staff. We need to see what everyone thinks. Our guidelines does say to use materials that relate to materials in the neighborhood and to take cues from nearby historical fences and walls. It is true that the majority of the historic fences are metal. I think we need to see where everyone stands.

Mr. Gastinger – Our guidelines really speak about wood picket fences, not wood, opaque fences. I definitely agree with Cheri. I think that the metal fence is consistent and a neighborhood defining feature related to the landscapes along Park Street. I think it would be very appropriate. I support a wooden, privacy fence as long as it was behind the front plane of the house as it faces Park Street.

Mr. Schwarz – Remember, this is on a corner. That was where the question comes in.

Mr. Gastinger – I think the character of the street changes the façade of the house facing Evergreen is a side façade.

Mr. Mohr – I think the fence definition changes at the plane at the front of the house. It becomes a privacy fence from that point back.

Mr. Schwarz – Is there anybody that would accept a wooden, four foot fence in the front yard?

Ms. Greenhalgh – Four feet is an arbitrary number. If it is shorter, is that better?

Mr. Zehmer – More of a picket style fence that has some reverberations to it would be more acceptable in the front. It gets away from being a privacy fence. I agree with Mr. Gastinger and Ms. Lewis that the iron fence would look better and stay in character of the neighborhood in the front yard. A taller privacy fence in the rear would be appropriate. I would be willing to consider more of a picket style fence if wood was desired for the front yard.

Mr. Bailey – A picket fence would work. There is an example of one down the street.

Mr. Lahendro – The example down the street is still a little too opaque. A picket fence that is open and doesn't prohibit views, would be fine.

Ms. Greenhalgh – I will speak with my husband and see about the metal versus picket. If we go metal and four feet, is it OK? If we go picket, should I send an email to staff with a photo of a four foot picket?

Mr. Werner – If you go down to the corner of Farrish and Park, they just did a metal railing on the back of that. I don't know what the cost of that was. I can send that to you. I can send you the guy that did it.

Ms. Lewis – There is also one on Third Street. The one on the corner has a picket fence. They painted it white. There aren't many examples in the neighborhood where people have fences in front yards. It is very small yard. That might be one for the applicant to look at.

Mr. Werner – The other wood fence that we did was at the corner of Hedge and Park. That was approved a couple of years ago. It sounds like this is a deferral while we clarify some things.

Mr. Mohr – At the corner of Fourth and Hedge, there are quite a few picket fences.

Mr. Gastinger – It is important to note that Park Street is a little different than those other streets. It is a different scale of the house. It is a different approach into the city. It is a different set of landscapes.

Ms. Lewis – This is a pretty attractive fence. It would definitely keep a dog out with a little bit more height if it is allowed. It doesn't un-engage the house. It is well constructed.

Ms. Greenhalgh – Either this style or the metal style would be OK? Ideally, I don't want to defer.

Mr. Schwarz – I would be willing to approve a metal fence or a wood picket fence that is somewhat transparent that allows some visibility through it. That picket fence would need to be submitted to staff at no more than four feet.

Mr. Mohr – If there is a four foot fence, should it be in front of the skip laurel as opposed to behind it?

Ms. Greenhalgh – There's not a ton of room. The skip laurels are to the edge of the sidewalk. I don't think there's actually room to get a fence in there.

Mr. Schwarz – I think we have asked for that before in situations on Park Street. In the case of something opaque, we have asked them to set it behind.

Mr. Mohr – My one comment about a wood fence is that the house is a newer house. It doesn't have the same level of details that older houses do. It does have that porch. It does make sense to me that it would relate to the house with a picket fence.

Mr. Schwarz – If we are saying picket, we have offered some examples. We're looking for something that is not full opaque.

Mr. Gastinger – That's too far to not know what this fence is. My proposal would be to approve a metal fence. If the applicant decides to propose a wood fence instead, that we consider that design when we have the detail.

Mr. Bailey – I agree with the direction Carl is going in that we should consider both as a possible COA now, subject to approval by staff looking at the aesthetics of it and not defer this if we can avoid that.

Mr. Schwarz – Maybe we need to make a motion and see who would accept that. Who would be willing to approve a metal fence or a picket fence with the stipulation that both fences are under 4 feet and that the picket fence be not fully opaque?

Mr. Zehmer – I wonder if it is a wooden picket fence, it stylistically relates to the railings on the front porch of the house.

Mr. Lahendro – What bothers me in the way that you phrase it, Carl, is that you say "not mostly opaque." I would say "mostly not opaque."

Mr. Mohr – I think if you pick up off of the existing spacing and design of the house, you have something that you can see through and it relates to the house.

Mr. Schwarz – I agree and like that. It is a railing design versus a fence design, which they might find costly. If we want to hem them on that, we can.

Ms. Lewis – The railing on the balcony is a very tight picket. It would definitely keep a dog out of there.

Mr. Schwarz – I don't know what that would cost versus a traditional picket fence like you saw on the front yard lawns of that crazy intersection.

Mr. Bailey – Do you want them to have a custom picket fence as opposed to going and finding something similar to that.

Mr. Schwarz – This would be custom if we required them to match what is on the porch.

Mr. Mohr – They would have to match the space between the pickets. They are applied to the back of the rail. It is still like a traditional picket fence. You're picking up on the scale of the railing. They might actually use the detail around the gate. That does need to have some rigidity to it.

Ms. Greenhalgh – I would have to have a top cap and bottom cap. I can send staff photos. I am fine with either of those options; either the picket that is similar to our railing above the porch or the metal.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed fence at 636 Park Street 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 either a metal fence per the application or a wood picket fence to be painted, both fences to be under 4-feet tall. If a wood fence is selected, the picket spacing should approximate spacing of pickets on porch railing. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes (7-1, Gastinger opposed).

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-02-03
1331 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 100006000
MKV Property LLC, Owner
Jozo Andelic, Applicant
Exterior painting

Staff Report, Jeffrey Werner – This is a COA request for 1331 West Main Street, which is actually in the West Main Street ADC district that extends down to The Corner there. This is a circa 1965 building. The West main facade features decorative cinderblock on a covered entrance that was original to the building's construction. Back in 2013 the BAR did approve of the exterior painting of the cinder block. There was some cement boards that were painted. The applicant is requesting to paint the brick that you see. This includes the brick on that front wall that you see with a whitewash. They're willing to comply with whatever recommendation that the BAR would have on that. There is some of the non-brick that they'll be painting in a dark gray color. We recommend approval with some conditions. While the design guidelines discourage painting on painted masonry, the building's relative lack of architectural distinction and recent construction date merits some exception. Typically if it's a brick building prior to the 1920s 1930s simply because of the nature the masonry, you don't want to put paint on it. That's not a problem with the paint as far as mechanical properties of the brick. Aesthetically, the owner wants to brighten this up. It's got a little bit of a used back in the corner look. That's caught the intent here. We recommended approval with some strong recommendation that the brick and mortar be repaired prior to any white washing. We want to recommend that they use a mineral paint suitable for painting on masonry surfaces.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Lahendro – When it changes hands and there is another owner and the brick has been whitewashed, what is to keep the new owner from painting it a solid white?

Mr. Werner – Those are legitimate questions. This is where a lime paint and traditional whitewash would be preferable to any paint or product.

Mr. Lahendro – Once it is painted, we cross the line.

Mr. Zehmer – You said our guidelines discourage painting on painted masonry. Is that the exact verbage?

Mr. Werner – “Do not paint on painted masonry.”

Mr. Zehmer – That doesn’t sound like discouraging. It sounds like a direction.

Mr. Werner – I am offering it in terms of the traditional whitewash. I don’t call it painting. The BAR has historically considered the painting relative to the age of the brick as a condition. It is a recommendation. My preference would have been to not paint the front wall. There’s relatively little brick. There’s absolute minimal brick on the building. The wall changed things for me.

Mr. Gastinger – In my experience, it has been very seldom and very few examples when we’ve allowed painting brick. It is in very inconsequential locations or more contemporary locations. This might qualify. It’s pretty awful brick all around. There is nothing pretty distinguishing about it.

Mr. Bailey – To the question of who is going to stop a future owner from painting something else, the answer is the BAR.

Mr. Gastinger – They don’t have to come to the BAR to paint a wall.

Mr. Schwarz – If we approve whitewash, we are approving ‘forever’ paint

Mr. Lahendro – In the future, they don’t have to come to the BAR.

Mr. Zehmer – It becomes painted maintenance masonry.

Mr. Schwarz – The color of the paint does have to go to staff. We approved a complete demolition of a brick façade. The part that remained is now completely painted. We have definitely made exceptions before. If this building came to us for a demolition permit, I think it might have a good chance of being approved. I cannot deny painting brick that I would allow it to be demolished.

Mr. Lahendro – I disagree with that. It is a characteristic, 1960s design. It is perfectly appropriate for when it was built.

Mr. Bailey – Therefore, we should maintain historically, drab, useless architecture.

Mr. Mohr – That’s really the question. Do we collectively believe or is there enough belief that this is an architecturally significant building?

Mr. Schwarz – I think we have voted to demolish much more significant buildings in the past. That is where that comment came from.

Mr. Mohr – The chicken place on West Main is an architecturally significant building. It has a whole lot of character. I wouldn't want to see anything happen to that. Is this building architecturally significant? It doesn't feel that it is well defined. It is a messy picture. It is hard to tell.

Mr. Lahendro – That's a distinctive, interesting, textured, concrete block. It is a great classic 50s/60s design.

Ms. Lewis – It doesn't look the same. I love the look of that photo.

Mr. Zehmer – You also have some plantings in front of that block.

Mr. Lahendro – If the purpose is to make this stand out, it seems that there are other ways to do that besides just painting the brick.

Mr. Zehmer – The sign on the original University Diner could have been a character defining feature. It is not there anymore.

Mr. Gastinger – I think the elegance of that little façade is proportional in its composition. I don't think giving it a whitewash really changes that. If anything, it might make it more legible, given all of the things that have come up.

Mr. Werner – They want to 'freshen' it up. That was the word that they used.

Mr. Lahendro – Put some interesting plants in. Put some colorful umbrellas out in the front.

Mr. Gastinger – Are the planters going to change?

Mr. Werner – Nothing was said about that. There are some problems with the brick. It needs to be stabilized. The planters look like they are tacked on top of this. It is not anything internal. At the back wall, it is interesting and unique. I don't know what is going on. I think they want to do something about the brick. They don't know what. The next step is to whitewash it. We're not here to design it for them. In looking at this, we can mention other things. There are opportunities to request some things.

Mr. Gastinger – If they design a different canopy and painted with a different color, it could be interesting.

Mr. Mohr – I would say that the wood needs to come off of the top of the walls. The one thing that I would wonder about is whether we let them do something with the railing. The railing seems inappropriate to that building. Do you let them do something with the railing and change the paint? The storefront is different than what was there. The unfortunate thing is that they painted the block.

Mr. Lahendro – Let's have them take the paint off.

Mr. Gastinger – If you look at the corner, you can actually see the block. There is some sheet that covers the block.

Mr. Mohr – Maybe the thing to do is to clean the thing up. That underside of that canopy looks like oily, formerly white paint. The canopy is bad. The planters are bad.

Mr. Schwarz – There are a lot of things we can offer them that they can do to this. We have an application for whitewashing the brick and painting. Maybe we don't have enough votes for that. If we don't, we can deny it real fast. I would vote in favor of the application. I think staff's note about the masonry that it be specified in point with Portland cement. I would be willing to approve this.

Ms. Lewis – I am a little in concurrence with Mr. Schwarz. I think the character defining features from the submission aren't there anymore. It's not the same building. The brick is not the predominant material here. It really is a storefront look that was much more interesting several iterations before. I would support this with the caveat that the brick be repaired. There is a lot that can be done here. It's not our job to design for this property owner.

Mr. Zehmer – Where I struggle with it is the wording with our motion. It says that it meets the BARs criteria. The BARs criteria states to not paint unpainted masonry. If you're going to word it that way, I am not going to be able to support it.

Mr. Schwarz – The reason that this could not be on the Consent Agenda is if we do approve it, we need to state why. The 'why' is the exception. My thought on why we even exist at all as a board is because if everyone had to follow the guidelines word for word, staff could handle it.

Ms. Lewis – The brick is a surround. It's not the primary material. That's what I would say. I would feel differently if we had a submission to paint the historic building to the right. It is two stories and has a lot of brick on it. I think that's what our guidelines are going towards. I see the brick as a trim. It was the material used as a trim in a storefront looking building half a century ago. It has lost its defining features.

Mr. Werner – It's a building that's owned by someone. They're leasing it to someone who uses it as a restaurant. It's that struggle of a business that sees a way to liven up the space and the building owners that own real estate. That's some of the tension I suspect here. Having had several conversations with the owner of the restaurant, they're very much open to taking a look behind that wall. If that's just a panel there, that's something that could be removed, I don't have any problem offering people recommendations consistent with revealing the history of the building.

Mr. Zehmer – If you removed that panel of that historic block, the contrast in color between that and the brick is striking. If you painted the brick white, it loses that contrast.

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Lahendro and Mr. Zehmer are “no's.” Where do you stand Mr. Gastinger?

Mr. Gastinger – I would be in favor if the planters are removed, the wall is repaired, and we make sure that wall to the east has a single line to it.

Mr. Werner – You are talking about that panel?

Mr. Gastinger – It looks like there is a missing a top part of the wall. I would prefer the restoration that we have been discussing. That would be in keeping with the original design. Given the application as it is, I would be in support with those caveats.

Mr. Mohr – I do think somebody could go at this in more sophisticated fashion, cleaning the brick, use a darker mortar, do things like that to make the brick come out, and remove the boarding. I think there are options to make what's here work a lot better than it does. I understand what they're trying to do as well. I'm a little conflicted about it.

Mr. McClure – It is a drab building. This will improve how it looks.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having inserted the center set forth in the city code including ADC district design guidelines and moved to find the proposed painting at 1331 West Main Street satisfies the BARs criteria is compatible with this property other properties in the West Main Street ADC district. The BAR approves the application as submitted with the following modifications:

- **We would like to see them remove the wooden planters.**
- **We would like to see them repair the masonry before painting and repair properly using the correct masonry mortar.**
- **We would recommend that they investigate what's underneath the green paneling to see if the concrete block can be salvaged.**
- **The paint should be intended for matte mineral paint or something that is intended for use on masonry.**
- **The exception is due to the secondary nature of the material and on the building and the more contemporary and the more recent brick installation.**

Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion does not pass 4-4.

Motion to defer application to next month – Mr. Zehmer – Second by Mr. Gastinger – Motion passes 8-0.

E. Other Business

7. Staff Questions and Discussion

Railing between Court and City Hall – Security recommendation from the Police Department to keep the alley empty.

Discussion with City Attorney regarding COA process for the BAR.

Set up of committee to review the guidelines – Mr. Schwarz, Mr. Gastinger, and Mr. Mohr will make up the committee

8. PLACE Update

F. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM

