

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
July 20, 2021 – 5:00 PM
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: Cheri Lewis, Carl Schwarz, Robert Edwards, Breck Gastinger, Andy McClure, Ron Bailey, Tim Mohr

Members Absent: James Zehmer

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

Pre-Meeting:

There was a discussion regarding a painting on 5th Street and Water Street. Mr. Gastinger did feel that there were more questions, given the painting possibly interacting with the architecture.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 5:32 PM.

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.)

Mr. Gastinger moved to approve the Consent Agenda. (Second by Mr. Bailey). Motion passes 8-0.

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-07-01

854 Locust Avenue, Tax Parcel 510092000

Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District

Owner: Kaitlyn and Alan Taylor

Applicant: Ashley Davies

Project: Garage construction

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-07-02

734 Locust Avenue, Tax Parcel 510073000

Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District

Owner: Kathleen D. Free

Applicant: Barbara Gehrung Project: Carriage house alterations

C. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-07-03

743 Park Street, TMP 520052000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Amita Sudhir and Aaron M. Freilich

Applicant: Zach Snider, Alloy Architecture & Construction

Project: Remove metal siding and repair/replace original wood siding; storm window replacements

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: c1892 District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing R.H. Wood House, constructed in the Victorian vernacular style. The City’s 1970s survey describes this house as an outstanding example of the Shingle Style popular in the 1880s and 1890s and one of the most distinctive structures on Park Street. (It also refers to the exterior clapboard siding that is now concealed by aluminum siding.) COA Request is to remove the existing aluminum siding and trim to expose original wood below. Then, as needed, repair existing or replace with cement board material. (This work excludes the 2014 addition.) Additionally, the storm windows on the original house are to be removed and replaced. Staff recommends approval of the requested COA, but only after a discussion of the anticipated unknowns and establishing reasonable parameters for addressing them. The goal of this project is to expose and rehabilitate the original trim and siding on this house. Should the condition of those materials limit or even preclude that goal, the intent is to replicate the existing (install new) to an extent that is reasonably possible. However, the condition and even the dimensional details of the historic siding and trim and to what extent those components even remain cannot be known until the aluminum siding and misc. flashing are removed. Staff recommends the BAR allow the applicant to move forward with removing the metal and allowing an evaluation of the underlying materials, and with that to apply reasonable conditions that allow the rehabilitation and/or replacement of those materials. For example, that the salvageable wood siding be retained and used to the extent possible. In the event that only a portion of the siding can be salvaged—and in lieu of having walls with a mix of new cement board and salvaged wood siding--the BAR recommends the salvaged material be re-used on complete walls, prioritizing the front elevation. Once the aluminum is removed and the underlying conditions assessed, the applicant will consult with staff about the extent of old and new material to be used and where, with the understanding that staff may request guidance from the BAR. For any new siding, the applicant proposes a cement board product, which the BAR has approved for other applications, with the condition that the smooth side will be exposed, no faux grain. Should the existing trim not be salvageable, particularly any profiled components, the applicant will consult with staff regarding the new material to be used and to assure that the new matches or is appropriately similar to the existing, relative to dimension and profile. Again, with the understanding that staff may request guidance from the BAR. More specifically, the BAR should discuss whether any replacement materials should replicate the existing (custom material, if necessary) or if it is acceptable to use available materials that have similar dimensions and profiles. For any replacement trim, the applicant proposes a product from Boral (www.boralamerica.com), which produces several lines of synthetic materials. (Staff requested that the applicant provide information regarding a specific product.) The proposed storm windows are not specified, but they will be powder coated (white) aluminum, which is consistent with the guidelines. In approving the CoA, relative to the storm windows the BAR may apply the following conditions (from the design guidelines):

- Storm windows should match the size and shape of the existing windows and the original sash configuration. Special shapes, such as arched top storms, are available.
- Storm windows should not damage or obscure the windows and frames.

Zach Snider, Applicant – The big concern on our end at this point is that if the existing siding is not salvageable that we have a clear path forward that doesn't require waiting a month for the next BAR meeting. That's our primary concern. Our intention is to do everything we can to salvage existing siding without having to redo all of it. If we do need to replace it, the easiest and best path forward would be to go forward with a smooth fiber-cement product. It remains to be seen what is under some of the flare details between the two stories. If we can match that with something off the shelf, I think we can. For the trim, the product that staff referred to is the lower all true exterior. That also has a smooth side that we prefer over the faux grain.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – If you take out the siding and you have some damaged areas, how would you handle the damaged spots? Do you take everything off?

Mr. Snider – If we are looking at more of a patched scenario, we're going to be replacing sections of board that need to be replaced with a similar material. I am assuming that it is a pine clabbered siding or some other wood. We will just patch in some marine grade epoxy and filler. We're pretty good at doing that piece by piece. I expect there is going to be some of that on the trim. From what I can see in some of the places where the aluminum is missing, it looks like there are exposed rafters on some of the eaves and some flakey paint on the underside of the roof. It is going to be some patching in, replacing, and filling in as much as possible.

Mr. Schwarz – If it ends up being a complete loss and you want to put fiber-cement up, do you remove what is underneath or are you putting fiber-cement over what is underneath?

Mr. Snider – I would remove what is there.

Mr. Lahendro – It is awfully hard to make decisions about something we don't know. That's what we are being asked to do. As far as I am willing to go, you can replace anything that's severely damaged that you find underneath the aluminum siding in kind in terms of appearance. You could use the fiberglass product. The appearance has to be the same. To do our job best, it would be to remove all of the aluminum siding, do a survey of what you found, and come up with a plan with how you're going to replace the damaged material you found. Hopefully, you're going to find some really interesting things in some of these detailed areas. We just won't know until you start to take off the aluminum siding. I would be interested to know what the historic paint colors were. I can't imagine it is just a white building. I am wrestling with this one. I get the feeling I am being asked for approval of something that I don't know what I am approving.

Amita Sudhir, Homeowner – Our intention is to keep the historic appearance of this house as much as possible. If we don't want to have to use cement board siding, we would like to avoid that. We don't want to run into a situation where we take everything off and everything underneath is a 'total disaster' and we have to come back to the Board to wait another month. We're potentially looking at leaving our house through the winter with nothing covering it. As the homeowners, we don't want to run into

that situation. Our intention is to preserve the nature of the house. We bought this house because it is a unique piece of architecture in the city. We're removing the aluminum siding because we think it needs to be done from an aesthetic standpoint. We would like this functionally. In order to proceed with removing it and feel secure that we can protect the house and finish the project, we would attempt to match what is underneath as exactly as possible.

Mr. Snider – If we pull the siding off and learn a lot about what is here and it is much different than our expectations, I have no problem with coming back and making sure that our intention is acceptable. The timing of it is a little bit of a practical hurdle for the project. The removal of the siding is going to go fast. The original siding is going to be exposed in a matter of days. We can then get to work on restoring it. That could happen in the next couple of weeks. We're looking at another 3 or 4 weeks of nothing if we can't come up with some way to approve a path forward.

Mr. Werner – Because things have been nailed into that old siding, it was pretty smashed up. There were parts to use. It would have been a lot of small pieces. What we did was remove everything. We were able to get it off site, clean it up, and go back. I don't know if that was in the plan. It seemed from an efficiency side of things, that's one thing that extends the project a bit. Things are being done. I don't know that's in the plan or if you thought about it.

Mr. Schwarz – If you remove the siding and what is underneath is not salvageable, would you be comfortable with staff coming out and administratively saying you can take it off. Jeff, are you comfortable with making that call?

Mr. Werner – I am. I think it was less concern about the flat material than a profile material. That's where it gets a little tricky. Siding hasn't varied that much. If it is something I am not comfortable with, I will be honest with Mr. Snider as well.

Mr. Gastinger – The concern is in the trim and in the details. What the owners want to do here is exactly what we would hope owners would do with historic homes. We have had this timing issue in the past. I don't see why we can't approve something along the lines of what Mr. Lahendro said. We set our expectations. If they run into conditions where it is not possible, we can pick up that conversation with staff and determine whether or not a return to the BAR is required.

Mr. Mohr – Technically, this is a repair. That's a repair and maintenance. It's really a question of how extensive the repair is. That is a judgement call. It wouldn't surprise me if there was some shingle variants as well. I would fully expect to find something of that nature as well. Some of the things might be very easy to match. I would anticipate that some of it will have some problems.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Lahendro – My passion for doing what's right here is because this is such a rare building. This is an extraordinary house. You own something that is very special in this area: a shingle style house. Hopefully, it was 'gift-wrapped' about 50 years ago and you are going to find these wonderful things underneath of it from the original house. That's why I want to be careful and cautious. I am comfortable with the way Breck phrased where staff can come out in a field visit and make some decisions. I am not trying to be difficult. It is only because this is a great building.

Mr. Schwarz – Is there anybody that is adamantly against what they’re proposing?

How do we craft a motion that does this and gives us a little bit of protection? The idea of having staff come out and take a look at it after all of the siding has come off is agreeable. Is that OK with you, Mr. Snider?

Mr. Snider – That’s fine with me. Jeff shared with me what he did with his project. That was a slightly different restoration than we are talking about doing. I don’t think my clients are interested in going as far as the insulation. This is more of an aesthetic of making this house the way it is supposed to look and accept that it is an old house. As long as the conversation remains limited to aesthetic architectural review questions and not about the integrity of the performance/how we decide to patch and make these changes/improvements, I am OK with that.

Mr. Schwarz – The call is mostly if something is to be removed and discarded versus repaired. Does that make sense to staff?

Mr. Werner – I know that not at all of this can be saved. There may be some details in there that we aren’t expecting. I am perfectly comfortable with this and will help find a solution.

Mr. Schwarz – I think we are on the same page with that. Is there anyone on the Board who would have a problem with replacing damaged items with similar profiles but a more modern material?

Mr. Werner – I know that cement boards are fine. That other material the applicant spoke about is also OK.

Mr. Schwarz – If it was a profiled trim board, they would use the barrow product you were talking about? We’re good on the storm windows. As long as the storm windows follow our guidelines, we’re good as long as you follow those guidelines.

Motion – Mr. Gastinger – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for ADC Districts, I move to find that the proposed exterior alterations at 743 Park Street satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with the following conditions:

- **That material discovered beneath the siding be replaced to match the scale and appearance when painted**
- **Proposed storm windows should match the size and shape of the existing windows and the original sash configuration.**
- **Storm windows should not damage or obscure the windows and frames.**
- **Owners and contractor shall consult with City staff regarding any damaged materials prior to demolition**

Carl Schwarz seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-07-05

350 Park Street, TMP 530109000 and 530108000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: City of Charlottesville and County of Albemarle

Applicant: Eric Amtmann, Dalglish-Gilpin-Paxton Architects [on behalf of Albemarle County]

Project: New courthouse building (at Levy Building)

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – 350 Park Street *Year Built*: Levy Building 1852, Annex c1980 *District*: North Downtown ADC District *Status*: Contributing 0 Park Street *Year Built*: N/A, parking lot *District*: North Downtown ADC District *Status*: N/A. The Levy Building is Greek Revival, constructed with brick laid in American bond with a Flemish bond variant. Three stories with a hipped roof, three-bay front, heavy entablature supported by monumental stuccoed pilasters on brick pedestals, crosette architraves, and brick water table. CoA request for construction of addition to the Levy Building and new construction related to the new City-County Courts Complex. While this is a formal CoA request, the applicant has acknowledged that this meeting—and, possibly, subsequent meetings—will be treated as an intermediate review and that no formal BAR action will be taken. However, by consensus the BAR may express an opinion about the project as presented. (For example, the BAR may take a non-binding vote to express support, opposition, or even questions and concerns regarding the project’s likelihood for an approved CoA. These will not represent approval or even endorsement of the CoA, but will represent the BAR’s opinion on the project, relative to preparing the project for final submittal. While such votes carry no legal bearing and are not binding, BAR members are expected to express their opinions—both individually and collectively—in good faith as a project advances towards an approved CoA.) This is an iterative process and these discussions should be thorough and productive. The goal is to establish what is necessary for a final submittal that provides the information necessary for the BAR to evaluate the project and to then approve or deny the requested CoA. In response to any questions from the applicant and/or for any recommendations to the applicant, the BAR should rely on the germane sections of the ADC District Design Guidelines and related review criteria. While elements of other chapters may be relevant, staff recommends that the BAR refer to the criteria in Chapter II--*Site Design and Elements*, Chapter III--*New Construction and Additions*, and Chapter VI – *Public Design and Improvements*. Of particular assistance for this discussion are the criteria in Chapter III:

- Setback, including landscaping and site improvements
- Spacing
- Massing and Footprint
- Height and Width
- Scale
- Roof
- Orientation
- Windows and Doors
- Street-Level Design
- Foundation and Cornice
- Materials and Textures
- Paint [Color palette]
- Details and Decoration, including lighting and signage

Also, the criteria under *Public Buildings and Structures*, in Chapter VI

- Public buildings should follow design guidelines for new construction.
- New structures, including bridges, should reflect contemporary design principles.

Staff recommends no formal action, except to defer this matter. (With an applicant’s request for deferral, there is no calendar requirement for when the application returns to the BAR. In the absence of an applicant requested deferral and the BAR defers it, the application must be presented at the next meeting.)

Eric Amtmann, Applicant – We will defer action on this. We’re bringing this forward to you today to really start the conversation and keep introducing you to the project. We have been before you twice. We want to keep those lines of communications open. We have been through conceptual design. We

have the scope of the project figured out. We're approaching a schematic design package at the end of August. We're getting a little more specific.

Steve White, Applicant – Staff gave a pretty good overview of the bounds. We have East High Street to the north, Park Street to the west, East Jefferson Street to the south, and the Jessup House with Seventh Street to the east of that house. Jessup House is not in the bounds of the site. The Redlands Club is not in the bounds of the site. Those are privately held. It's part of the context. We are renovating and rehabilitating the Levy Building. We will be doing façade restoration, roofing restoration, and the architectural embellishments. There is a hyphen and an annex that is currently there to the east, which was built in the 1980s. That is going to be removed as part of this project. It will be removed shortly before construction starts. The addition has a hyphen that abuts the eastern side of the Levy Building.

The Circuit Courthouse is the only courthouse in America where three US Presidents practiced law. It has that history to it. It is part of our American Heritage that we all share. Any move we make with architectural improvements and embellishments is done very thoughtfully. We looked into some of the history in and around Swan Tavern and the downtown environment.

This is the pattern language of these historic buildings. Things to note include the four columns/three bays organization of each of these; each in their own interpretation and style whether it is Greek Revival or some sort of Corinthian Order in a Georgian pattern language.

We did an exhaustive review of the urban edge of views of the site, views from the site, the site topography, landscape, solar orientation, and traffic patterns. There are others that we looked at.

This site plan is a good orientation plan for you to see how the massing elements come together. The program for this building is nominally 50,000 to 55,000 square feet. The primary purpose is the General District Courts for both the County and City. The primary space for both of those is the courtrooms. The courtrooms are really driving our design. It's that large element. It is mostly those two large courtrooms that serve the citizens of Charlottesville and Albemarle County. It also houses elements such as the judge's chambers, an entry portico, and ancillary services that service the courts. That's where a lot of the other modulated elements would become 'saddlebags' that are adjoined to the primary courts building elements. The Levy Building is about 2900 square feet. As a footprint, it is about 8,700 square feet as a three story structure. There is a hyphen element that recedes where the 1980s building abutted into it. We don't know all of the fabric that was lost. We found some of it. Our inclination is to abut it at a similar juncture so not to expose the fabric that has been removed. As you move to the right, that 'saddlebag' is essentially highlighting the judge's chambers. It also is the scale and the proportion of the Levy Building in terms of width and height. We have the courts area. As you come around, you have the Redlands Club and that entry element portico. We have essentially taken that element and pulled it back off the road by about 40 to 50 feet. We have created an entry element for the visitors of the courthouse.

This is the ground floor plan. You can see that courtyard that is south of the Levy Building. We have the entry portico, which is symbolic, not only of the courts, but also reminiscent of the history of courts in this campus of court buildings. The first floor is administrative and clerical spaces. The second floor is a peek of the arrangement of the courts. The courts are driving the shape of the building. They're organized symmetrically around the entrance. Wayfinding is simple and intuitive.

Mr. Amtmann – This slide is marked updated. All of the slides that have the red color are mainly interior plan changes. They may have effect fenestrations. We want to give you an updated plan. They don't largely effect the exterior setting that we are presenting.

Mr. White – We added dimensions to that plan. You can see where the saddlebag on the north has about a ten foot setback on the curb line. We tried to pull back a little bit to give some relief. That pedestrian way is very narrow. The Levy Building really encroaches into that. It's not a very pedestrian-friendly portion of that street. We were attempting to slightly ease that by pulling back. The driveway entry for the below grade garage has the curb cut there. It would go down about 9 feet from the elevation on the street. That return piece is attempting to be close to the Jessup House. There is acknowledgement of the fact that the Jessup House is back there. There is a small gesture there to address that relationship. If we come around to the courtside, you can see the dimensions there. It's about a 50 by 70 foot space, which will be a very comfortable pocket park. To the south, we have about a 7 foot setback from the curb line, giving you some space there for a pedestrian way. All of the public access to this building will be strictly from that plaza. We're not going to be asking anyone to be accessing these ancillary streets to enter the building.

At the top, we have a mechanical screen wall. That's what is depicted there in that box.

Looking at iconography and the importance of tying the building to place and function, we looked at buildings that are part of the cultural heritage of Charlottesville and Virginia and to the judicial system at large in the United States. The three images at the bottom make some reference to courthouses in the most recent past (15 to 20 years) that have acknowledged those proportions and relationships to create symbolic entry in a sense of civic gravitas without the embellishment of a particular style from history.

Looking at the proportions of, not only the porticos, but also the end bays, there was a 1870s addition to the original 1803 building. The end wall has a very nice vertical proportion to it. This general district court will be part of a civic place filled with several courts within a block of each other. Having a pattern language that readily identifies them as being related is really important. They look like they were meant to be together.

This is our first rendering of that plaza space. You can see relationship of the pieces. The building is a two building structure, which is lower than the cornice line of the Levy Building. It holds up the Levy Building in an appropriate way as being a cultural landmark and an important to your city. It also fits in nicely with the scale of The Redlands Club.

Elliott Rhodeside, Applicant – Court Square is a really beautiful place that is distinctive because of the buildings and the landscape of beautiful hardscape. On the site we are working on, the buildings that you see here are framed by existing brick sidewalks and brick parking areas. Our goal is to develop a design and a language that enables the context to flow into the complex that we're designing. The landscape architecture consists of preserving and enhancing the brick sidewalks that surround Redlands and Levy and flow into the court building. There are several highlights of the landscape. One is the curved blue stonewall, the accessible ramp entrance on the southwest side, and steps leading up to the plaza on the northwest side. We have created a focal point area that is framed by the blue stonewall. It's an elliptical shape that is framed by the wall and the two benches and further framed by the double trees on both the south and north sides of the plaza. There is a new a brick wall that defines the southern edge of the plaza and gives the plaza space from Redlands. After a lot of studies, we have integrated the plaza with the Levy Building by bringing the paving up to the face of the Levy Building. In the next slide, you will see more of the specifics of the layout. You have the brick sidewalk. The primary materials are brick paving, blue stone trim, blue stonewalls, wood benches atop blue stone

bases, and the plant material, which consists of the four trees that frame the plaza and plantings on the sides. It's a very simple, uncomplicated design. Through the form of the ellipse, it integrates the public realm of the sidewalk with the entranceway into the building. It creates a place for gathering and court-related activities that will hopefully be a beautiful addition to the whole court square complex as well as downtown.

The next slide shows the circulation pattern, the sidewalks around the complex, and handicap accessibility (a key determinant with the determination of the elevation of the plaza as well as the building). Because the sidewalk slopes from a high point at the southwest corner of the site down toward High Street, we are able to come in at grade. We make up grade when the grade is lower with the series of 4 to 5 steps that come up to the plaza. The building is accessible to the public.

The next slide shows in more detail the simplicity of where handicap accessibility is and where the entranceway to the building is located.

The next slide is two sections. One is north-south with the Redlands plug to the Levy Building with the new building between the two. We have been judicious with the use of trees. We're using honey locust trees that are open and filter the view of the building but don't obscure any of the three buildings that frame the plaza. The bottom section shows the small change in elevation from the sidewalk cross section through the plaza, the ellipse to the portico to the entrance to the new building.

Mr. White – These are hybrid slides. This view here is looking at the area that will be the future plaza. It gives you a good understanding of Redlands and Levy. With the next slide, we tried to get a similar angle there to imagine that and enliven the landscape. One thing that is important to us with this portico design is that we portray an open and accessible government. The one way the architecture can do that is that we have large sections of glazing once you get beyond column elements that will allow you to see the activities that are going on in the lobby and movement up and down the atrium space. When people come in the morning, they will come through that central door. They queue on the inside. If there is overflow, they do have the shelter of the portico. This is west facing, which is contrary to having large light. We have added these screen elements to buffer some of that when the sun starts to drop in the sky in the afternoon. We're also using it as an architectural element to highlight the three bays out of the five as a gentle nod back to the circuit court, which is a three bay entrance.

Mr. Rhodeside – The paving of Court Square is predominant, strong, and memorable. We had explored with the team of the palate of materials. We are recommending the use of brick and blue stone since they're part of the existing series of open spaces on the block and across the street to make the plaza and the open spaces flow visually and physically from the public realm into the space to create a warm and welcoming plaza and have all of the elements relate to the entranceway to the building. We have done that subtly. The trim around the ellipse embraces several of the columns and orients toward the building entrance.

Mr. Amtmann – As compared to the Downtown Mall, they are very similar in terms of the width; roughly 65 feet and bounded on the north and south by a 2 ½ or 3 story building. If you're trying to visualize what that space feels like, it is proportionally very similar to the Downtown Mall. On the mall, the two rows of trees are clustered more towards the centerline. They're roughly 15 feet apart in the center. You have more space on the two sides down the alleys. Here, the trees are roughly 12 feet from the edge. I hope that helps to understand the scale of the space. It is somewhat tight.

Mr. Rhodeside – We did a lot of different sketches and options. The simpler the solution, the better the scheme was/is. We have utilized the elliptical blue stone paving. It's at the same grade as the brick

as a place of focus and a place to bring all the elements of the space together. There aren't that many elements to use that and the blue stonewall as a curving gesture of warmth and openness and bring one into the courts in a comfortable way.

Mr. White – We were looking very closely at the cornice lines for Levy. You can see that several elements are born out of either the column capitals or the lower part of the entablature to bring that together.

To the north, High Street was a big concern in terms of it being crowded and the relationship to Levy. You can see the articulation of the saddlebag of the judge's chambers. The way we created a two story order, which is lightly dimpled with pilasters to make reference to the building it is next to in a very small gesture. You will also see that the hyphen connection to the Levy Building just touches the bottom portion of the freeze of that entablature to re-establish the cornice. The cornice line is broken. You have the driveway going down the slope. We have a large tree at the Jessup House on that corner, which will help screen that vehicular entrance. It will be just for judges and transport of detainees but not for public use.

With the east elevation, the Jessup House will be in front of you. You can see the modulation and articulation of the fenestration along that east façade. This is the elevation of the north façade. Here is the south elevation. You will see that area adjacent to the Redlands Club was very close to that site. We don't have any fenestrations along those two walls given the proximity to the property. Where the fenestration touches the ground plane are exit stairs. You can see how that gesture was slightly dimpled as well. You have a symmetrical bookended fenestration element to the right and a very narrow articulation of that corridor and stair. That also occurs on the north.

We took the fenestration of the second floor windows and created a transom above that. The intent there is that we can get light from that higher elevation and get it into a clear story into the courtroom. We do have a penthouse screen wall. We will likely be doing that in some sort of metal panel. It will be greyed out to fade away with the skyline as you see it against the sky.

We're illustrating this wall in brick, limestone, or cast stone trim. There are three brick samples. We're in the process of making a half dozen blend boards using a range of bricks in different percentages. We're looking at Norman brick, which is a little different from the rest of the buildings on campus. We're trying to be the same but different. With the color of the fenestration going to a dark bronze, which has a nice institutional feel, looks good with the brick. It isn't the repetition of the straight up Georgian white trim that everyone is expecting to see in buildings in this area.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – You mentioned limestone as a material. Where was that going?

Mr. White – There are areas where there is some trim elements that are over some window heads or between the transom light and the windows on the second floor. We have also explored some bands at the base. There aren't any limestone bands at the base. We certainly would like to have that as an option to do a cast stone for some of those elements.

Mr. Schwarz – On the south side, on some plans it looks like there is some green space. On other plans, it looks like you have bricked all the way up to the side of the building. Is there an intent for landscaping there? Is there room for landscaping there?

Mr. Rhodeside – I think it is too small for softscape. I think it should be hardscape going right up to the building. It is the kind of space that will get destroyed in a year or two and be a money pit. I think the sidewalk should go right up to the building.

Mr. White – In contrast, we do have some planting beds on the north side and some bio-retention going on.

Mr. Amtmann – That parking lot to the south of the Redlands Club is the Redlands Club property. That's not a buildable area in this project.

Mr. Gastinger – It sounded like there was a decision made to avoid fenestration in that area near the parking area. It seems like it could be a scary place surrounded by building and no windows. It seems daunting. Can you explain more about the approach to that?

Mr. White – Some jurisdictions lessen this. Washington DC actually does this in the urban core. It's a fire code issue if you're within a certain number of feet; there's no fenestration. Our program is so full so as not to sacrifice the rest of the facades and layout. That area does not have the setback needed.

Mr. Amtmann – The International Building Code, as adopted by the Virginia Construction Code: unprotected openings permitted within 5 feet of an interior lot line. The Redlands Club is a nice, quaint, little building. Suppose it burns down in a fire and somebody builds up to the property line. You have two buildings within 5 feet of each other.

Mr. Lahendro – The operative word is 'unprotected.' You could put openings there if you put a sprinkler head or fire shutter on the openings?

Mr. Amtmann – That is correct.

Mr. Lahendro – It is not like you are prohibited in putting openings there.

Mr. White – That's not my understanding. It's a property line. I am happy to entertain a code discussion if we wanted to bring our code consultant onboard and look at that.

Mr. Lahendro – I only bring it up as is because I don't think it is foreclosed; only if it's important to the Board.

Mr. Amtmann – It is also worth noting those are public restrooms. We would have windows into public bathrooms, which is not a great situation to have. Those were positioned in that location in response to allowable fenestrations.

Mr. Mohr – Looking at the lighting, I don't know if you admire the lighting there now in that general district. I am wondering how you expect to relate to it. Personally, I would rather that you didn't. I don't imagine there is any way you're not going to be addressing the district lighting in that immediate area.

Mr. Rhodeside – We have looked at lighting in the context of the site. We have bounced back and forth between utilizing the lights that are of that area as well as the alternative of using a contemporary, simple light. At this point, we're thinking that simple a streamline with an appropriate light with something to tell would be more appropriate here. The historic light wouldn't be horrible. The clean lens of the plaza and the building and not having too overly ornate lights in this space is a preferred solution for my design perspective.

Mr. Amtmann – There are two existing pole lights on the sidewalk at Park Street. One is at the corner of the Redlands Club and one further north by the Levy Building. The one by the Levy Building will most likely need to be relocated. It's right in front of the steps that go up to the plaza. It's not in the best spot. Some discussion will have to be made as to those two pole lights, which are clearly in the public domain of Court Square. It masks the rest of the pole lights in the neighborhood. They're in the public right of way. Maybe they stay to be what they are. The lighting in the public plaza has tended to have material reference to the materials. It's the same way we are doing paving but to be in a more transitional, contemporary style as with the same moves with the façade.

Mr. Rhodeside – I would not change the lights in the public realm. If they have to be moved, they have to be moved. I was talking about the two lights in the plaza.

Mr. Amtmann – You have some details for those lightings that we really didn't have a chance to discuss. There are some details that have been developed that we haven't really discussed yet.

Mr. Mohr – I find the lights around Court Square to be some of the most horrendous in town. The lamping is just terrible. It's probably about 5000 Kelvin. The reflectors are ridiculous. I fully expect what you are going to be doing is something more in the 2700 to 3000 range. How does that all work together with the rest of the campus? It's going to stand out being decidedly different.

Mr. Rhodeside – We haven't spent a huge amount of time on it. I see three different types of lighting in the plaza area. One is the light that imitates from the lobby and possibly from the portico. That would be the predominant lighting in the plaza. The second would be the additional pole lighting. We have recommended two pole lights: one between each of the pairs of trees on the north and south side of the plaza. We're thinking light would be integrated into the bases of the two benches. We haven't really detailed the curved wall. There could be lighting there. I would love to have a wash of lighting over the paving that imitates from the lighting of several sources. There's a nice warm light washing over the brick surface.

Mr. Mohr – Because you have indirect lighting, I suspect it will be most focused in that immediate area. It is unfortunate having to deal with the lighting that is currently in place.

Mr. Rhodeside – That's a thoughtful comment. That's a much larger issue than what we can deal with.

Mr. Lahendro – I would ask what the designer's thoughts are about the design of the columns for the entrance corridor.

Mr. White – We have not yet detailed those. The intent is that they be elegant and slender with the intersections being well addressed in the way the column meets the ground plane, the way column meets the portico roof in those intersections; not in an overly articulated way but in a simple and elegant way.

Mr. Lahendro – Material-wise?

Mr. White – It likely will be some sort of metal. Ideally factory-finished, nothing field painted.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – It is a “shoehorn” into this property. My office is across 7th Street from this property. Thank you for trading the public plaza. I was on the BAR the last time we built a courthouse in Charlottesville: The Juvenile Domestic Relations Courthouse. I begged for a little bit of public space in the front. Those two or three steps in the front aren’t really steps. They were collapsed into nothing. There needs to be a public space where people can meet their counsel, meet their families, and relax. That’s a really nice space. I love the programming and the hardscape that you have done so far. The bluestone is beautiful. The low walls are really well done. That’s a great public gesture. I appreciate that you have made this new courthouse subordinate in height to the Levy Building and corrected the hyphen at the High Street side. It’s not jutting into the historic cornice. That’s a great thing that you have done. Thank you for stepping back this building on the High Street side. Walking along the Levy Building right now is tricky. It’s about 2 feet wide there. I wonder what you can do about the façade on the East Jefferson Street side. By code, there can be no fenestration. Can there be more detail? Can there be more interest there? From what I can tell, it is 50 feet long and two stories high. For the City of Charlottesville, that’s a huge plane that doesn’t seem to have much articulation or interest in it. I wonder if there is something you can do to reflect the Redlands Building or some utilitarian building on that side.

With regards to the columns on the new courthouse building, I like the two story height of the columns. I just don’t know what the columns are. You have this ample cornice that looks historic and these skinny columns. I am not encouraging you to create a classical capital there. I just wonder if there is something we can do that will share some language that we have on the Levy Building next door. You’re always going to look at those facades together. This is a great first iteration. It’s very exciting.

Mr. Amtmann – Both of the governments should be commended for making good decisions to allow the height of the building to be what we’re showing and for that public plaza to exist. For each of those options, there was another scheme with a different solution that was three stories above ground and had the plaza on the Jefferson Street side as opposed to the Park Street side. The city and the county have been very good leaders in making good decisions to allow that design to be possible.

Mr. Mohr – Given that there’s 5+ feet between the property line and the edge of that wall along the Redlands Building, is there room to put a planter in there and grow something along that wall?

Mr. Rhodeside – I think we shouldn’t do that. I understand the questions and thoughts about the blank wall. Because of the restrictiveness of the space, there could be really beautiful plantings growing up the wall. I doubt the maintenance capability to really take care of it. Because of the narrowness, the plan shows three feet, eight inches between the edges. There is really so little land there. I think it is better treated architecturally and straightforwardly rather than getting into plantings at that space.

Mr. Amtmann – The details that are shown in that elevation may not have been prominent enough as they were displayed in the sketch. It picks up on the monumental order on the north and east elevations

where we have the window infill between pilasters. That bay breakdown of rhythm of space in breaking down that horizontal distance into a series of bays may not be shown as well in that drawing. That definitely could use some development.

In response to the comment about green scape on that side, maintenance is a separate question. If we were to consider something like a green screen, an example you might be familiar with is the UVA parking garage on Culbreth Drive. They have a green screen on that elevation facing University Avenue. That takes less than a foot. There are ways to do it. That's a conversation that needs to happen. Those vines need to be maintained and trimmed back and kept out of the building. That's a different question. An architectural solution is a possibility. That and the portico need more study.

Mr. Mohr – It is well off the street. I would like to follow up with what Ms. Lewis said about the front portico. I can see balancing it a little more in terms of the materiality of it where that would speak to the masonry of the old buildings without getting into any kind of derivative or traditional language as opposed to doing steel columns.

Mr. White – I did notice that about City Hall. It is that mid-20th century slender, limestone column. It may be beneficial to close it out. We will go back to study this.

There are these light dimples that are about 2 to 4 inches. The cornice line runs through that transom divider line and you have these vertical bays. That runs around both of those sides. It's not a blank wall. It is like a shelf that comes out as a very thin screen portico element. It's not that heavy piece.

Mr. Gastinger – I am concerned about the perspective that most people will have coming from Court Square where we see two of those walls on equal dimension without windows and creating a bleak space. It stands in pretty stark contrast to the ample and beautiful space that is created at the entrance to the building. It's a little jarring. I don't think green screen or vines or planting is very viable there. It's a south facing façade. Everything is going to get fried on that brick. Hopefully, we can find some other ways of bringing some humanity and scale to that space.

Regarding the portico, I like the slenderness of the columns and the way the building transitions to a more contemporary façade, while nodding to its surrounds. To me, it is how that awning attaches to the building. There are some sketches in here where it feels more like a separate architecture. That seems a little bit more believable. Other drawings show the portico as only four bays coming out. When it is pulling directly out of the cornice, that's where it feels "weird." When it seems to be a detail of a plate of the cornice, the architecture changes to a different detailing. There could be a way that façade separates itself not trying to resolve everything with that same cornice line.

I am concerned about the tree on High Street. It seems almost inevitable that tree in front of the Jessup House is going to be removed. It's going to have to be a retaining wall within feet of that tree. That would be a pretty significant loss for that property and for the streetscape. It is still be shown in some of the renderings as a mitigating factor for that garage entrance. That's something to come to terms with and figure out how to resolve.

In some of the renderings, I feel the foundation of the building is being articulated. It might be on the verge of being under represented or not in proportion with the way the cornices are articulated. The cornice is quite significant. It looks like that foundation is getting really thin or not having the same level of details as the other significant attention to the foundations in the other buildings around Court Square. I don't know if it needs a water table or limestone detail. It does seem like it needs some thickness or some variation from the façade.

To the plaza, which I think is successful. It really does demonstrate an openness. There is a humanity to that space that is possible. That's the intention that is legible. We can get there. I do worry that the back trees really seem to be in conflict with those back two columns. They might be too close. I don't know if the trees could shift closer to the street and participate in the street a little bit more. Or if two larger trees would be successful than trying to get the four in there. In both cases, I want to make sure we provide ample soil volumes so they can really succeed.

That seat wall on the street could be well used if it detailed well. I encourage you to approach it with the same kind of humanity that you have for the plaza. The surface is something that you can sit on. I worry that it might be glaring hot most of the time. If not wood, a stone detail that is comfortable to sit on for both sides. Those two brick walls are "undercooked" in these renderings. They could run the risk of a little bit clunky in trying to mitigate a lot of different brick everywhere.

Mr. Rhodside – Those were really good comments. I am glad that you brought up the tree at Jessup. We will look into that. It's not on the property. It is a significant tree. I agree that we should try as hard as possible to save it. I think the curb and the hardscape has probably limited the amount of root growth in that area. It might be possible to do some protective, preventive root pruning of the tree before construction. Adapt the tree in order to do what is needed. We started with three trees on either side of the plaza. Two are about 22 feet apart. We were using the four trees as a framer of the ellipse, having one on either side makes me concerned. I understand what you're saying. I feel we have the right number. We've been working hard with Steven's team on the right type of tree and size of tree. I definitely feel strongly that trees are needed in the plaza.

Mr. Gastinger – Some of the renderings make me wonder if those outer columns are that necessary. They're obscured pretty significantly. There was already some discussion about nodding to the three bay.

Mr. Rhodside – We have also explored moving them. We're concerned about north to Levy and a little bit south to Redlands. It's a process that will go through in the next phase of the design.

Mr. White – We have had that discussion internally about the three bays versus five bays.

Mr. Mohr – I would like follow up on the entablature on top of it. It does seem superfluous and may be fighting the portico a little bit. It's really about those tall thin columns holding that slim entablature. There is nothing implied behind it.

Mr. Lahendro – I am comparing the courthouse site with the Levy site and the new courthouse. While the design inspiration has focused in this presentation on the columns, the real character of the existing courthouse complex are the trees. In this downtown area, you come to the courthouse, it is some buildings in the midst of trees. It's like a park. That's the real significant character; more than the columns. That's what surprises me about the design schematic that we're seeing. It's the sparsity of plantings, trees, and having pedestrian experiences along Jefferson and High. There's not even a window at eye level. You're looking at blank walls right next to you. There are no trees along those pedestrian ways. Some of the other commissions I am on are really concerned about creating an important pedestrian experience. I understand you have more square footage you have to cram into this site. It really does not capture anything of the character site wise of the existing courthouse complex. I don't understand why there aren't canopy trees and more plantings. The plantings in that out cove between the Levy and the courts are there to keep people from going into this dead end area. It's a defensive mechanism. It's not there for appearance. I am really surprised with the lack of plantings and

how unconnected it is with the existing courthouse complex. With the columns, I would love to see something slender, modern, and stainless steel designed to do what it needs to do. I love the historic progression between the buildings and the columns and something that transitions to a modern expression.

Mr. Schwarz – I need to agree with a lot that has been said tonight. You have nailed the massing. I am worried about Jefferson Street. It's already a bad street. It has one tree on it. I am not sure this really improves it. If there was any way to get another foot or two out of the building so you can put a tree on that street that would help. You shared your floorplans. It makes it pretty clear that stuff isn't easy to shuffle around. You have two very large courtrooms in there. The third story mechanical penthouse is going to be a feature. It's big and tall. It's going to show up. I would rather see you put a small third story on the building and lose a little bit of the footprint than keep it all at two stories with this giant, mechanical thing on the top. If there was some way to shuffle the square footage, that would be beneficial. I agree with what has been said about the columns. You have a good idea. You have a very traditional, very old, and very historic site to deal with. You want to do something contemporary. You're trying to do two things at once. I don't think you are successful in doing two things at once right now. It might come down to the detailing. People have already said this: the way that the entablature of the portico meets the large entablature of the building seems a little strange to me. It looks like you are putting a very traditional cornice around the building. I am imagining a thin metal piece for the top of the portico. I am not sure how those two come together. The monumentality of the building/the two story stacked windows feels like a good idea. It's a public building. It should be monumental. If you look at the context in all of the other buildings on the site, they read more like large houses. They're much more residential in their massing and fenestration. In comparison, it would be like The Lawn. Jefferson's buildings are very residential appearing. You get to the south end of The Lawn, those newer buildings were designed to be more monumental looking. They do this two story in one story form. The proportions just don't mix well. They have stuck out to me as being uncomfortable with the way they're proportioned. If you look at other buildings around town that do the same thing, they were architecturally (at the time) austere and out of context. The only guidelines that I can point to would be for context. You're creating something that might be a little too severe for the site. I am struggling with that.

Mr. White – We have been looking at Georgian 12 over 12 divided lights, double hung type thing with brick between; not vertically pilastered out. This was the next iteration. I really appreciate your thoughts. I don't want to create something that is too harsh on the site.

Mr. Amtmann – Most of the buildings you referred to are of a smaller scale. They're dealing with these issues. The buildings aren't so big yet that they couldn't have been overcome with a different architectonic language. Look at the County Office Building (Lane High School). It does have some moves on it, aside from the front portico. There are some windows on the north side that are set into the brick that are multi-stories tall where there are some more monumental moves aside from the front portico. That's a pretty successful traditional design on that building. We're trying to do something that is a little more sophisticated than just multiple repetitions of a small scaled element in a planar façade. It is a big building.

Mr. Schwarz – It is worth pursuing. I am throwing out a word of caution. Be careful with it. It is coming off as rather severe in my interpretation of it. I am not telling you to go completely traditional. If you wanted to do a more contemporary building, you could. What I am struggling with is that you have a historic mashup going on right now.

Mr. Mohr – How about McGuffey? You have a series of large windows and you have more residential windows. It's broken up more.

Mr. Schwarz – It doesn't read as turning two stories into one.

Mr. Mohr – The large center windows do stack. They're not set back in.

Mr. Schwarz – The Monticello Hotel does that monumental scale. It also has a lot more richness of material. I am not sure this project is going to achieve that. I don't think you want to go that traditional. It did strike me as making the elevations rather severe.

Mr. Mohr – It is very hard for the court square to come back into this area given the tightness of this street.

Mr. White – We do have ten pounds and a five pound bag for sure.

Mr. Lahendro – The one place you invite people to is that recessed plaza. The way it is designed now doesn't capture any of the character of the large canopy trees that is across the street.

Mr. Rhodeside – I wish we had the space to do that. The landscape across Park Street is gorgeous. There's a huge amount of soft land soil to enable the trees to grow really tall. We're planning to do connected pathways to get as much good environment for growing the trees. The space is really tiny.

Mr. Lahendro – It is the same size and width as the Downtown Mall. There are two rows of oak trees down the center of it.

Mr. White – There is no sense of entry along the center of the Downtown Mall. That's not the point of the Downtown Mall. Here we have a civic structure that bookends that space. It would be inappropriate to put trees in the center of that space.

The buildings when they were built did not have big trees. That has happened because it has been 200 years. That is something to consider. In a postcard of the building prior to 1935, the trees are starting to mature. They're not nearly as dense as they are today.

Mr. Lahendro – The original courthouse started off with a portico and columns. The honey locust will never get large.

Mr. Schwarz – The honey locust is the same species scattered around the perimeter at Court Square? There are various tree wells in front of the Monticello Hotel and down the side street that runs into the historical townhouses. Is there a way to squeeze in some planters in the sidewalk?

Mr. Rhodeside – We would have had the building further from the back of the sidewalk. Had the sidewalks been wider, we definitely would have planted trees in the sidewalk. There just isn't the room. There just isn't the room on Jefferson or High or Park to do street trees given the current footprint of the building and the width of the existing right of way to do it. We could remove the parking between Redlands and Levy and plant street trees there.

Mr. Schwarz – It would certainly help if there wasn't a parking lot crammed in that courtyard there.

Mr. Rhodside – If those parking space were removed, there could be street trees planted along Park Street.

Mr. White – It would be very appropriate to designate those on the south as handicapped/public parking so that someone can get into the building.

Mr. Schwarz – I thought you were talking about buying the parking lot from the Redlands Club.

Mr. Rhodside – We will keep looking for opportunities. Based on the footprint of the building and the width of the sidewalks, it's a real challenge.

Mr. Mohr – If you pulled away some of the parking, you could get some trees on the street.

Mr. Werner – If there are questions and ideas within the public right of way, Eric and I can communicate that up. We do have a cross jurisdictional project. Can we table anything outside of the parcel and focus on the design?

Mr. Schwarz – The concern has been stated.

Mr. Bailey – I like the design better than a lot of you do. If we're doing more white columns with brick buildings, I am against that. I would like for something to be a little more in this direction that we have here. I would like a contemporary building as opposed to something that recapitulates something that was built 150 years ago. We have these fantastic historic resources there. It should be something that says we are moving forward. I am favorable to this design. It can obviously be tweaked.

Mr. Edwards – I agree with the consensus from tonight's discussion. I agree with Breck in terms of scale. What jumped out to me at first was the lighting. I am very familiar with Park Street and the lighting.

Mr. Amtmann – The best questions or comments have come on the issues that we have grappled with the most. Steve and I have gone back and forth with sketches about what the portico looks like, what it is made of, and how it is detailed. Design is a process. We have looked at the pedestrian walls right to the edge of the sidewalk and how to articulate those. We will try to make it as pedestrian friendly as we possibly can. Those are the two biggest issues. Elliott and his team have focused on the materiality of Court Square and that overall site plan we have been looking at, trying to show the public plaza as parts of Court Square with its materiality and the contextual materials. We're going to modulate those traditional materials in the paving in the low walls and let it grow up to a more contemporary building. The ground plane is a little more contextual. Those are all the items that everyone has commented on tonight. Those are the challenges we are trying to solve. All of the comments have been spot on. We'll go back and look at some of these things and take it through another iteration. We'll be back in 2 or 3 months when we're ready to give the next round of developments. We have what we need. We have looked at 4 or 5 different iterations of trees in that public plaza. It's a balancing act between having a canopy that you have underneath that provides security and visualizations. We're designing a secure facility here. There are some other standards we need to adhere to. All of the comments will feed back into that design iteration.

Lance Stewart, Albemarle County – I really appreciate the comments. It's been helpful to hear so many opinions that are so informed about what is happening downtown and the context. I was struck by the comment on possibly removing some of the street parking on the front façade of the building in order to potentially accommodate some street trees. I am leading up to an open question. It doesn't

have to happen now. If there's anything you think that the county and city might work on together, explore potentially to expand the bounds of the site to achieve something important. If you don't have an immediate answer, maybe work through staff to make some suggestions about how we might really frame this historic building that is here another 100 to 200 years from now in the way that it could be. If there are things that we can explore to be able to do that, I am more than willing to do everything we can to work with city staff to talk about what the potential impacts might be.

Mr. Mohr – With what Jody said about the trees, you could bring the building out to the street. I think it would start to engage the other side of the street. The lighting is part and parcel to the same thing. It is outside of this project's purview. Given that these are LEDs, it will take a long time to replace the lamps inside of those fixtures. I don't have a problem with the fixtures. It's the lamping. I think Jody's intuition about those trees is right. There has to be some connection across Park Street.

Mr. Schwarz – As they're going through more iterations of design and developing this more, is it safe to say nobody would be opposed to more contemporary features being added in if the building became less traditional? How do people feel on that?

Mr. Bailey – I would prefer more contemporary.

Mr. Lahendro – I would also prefer more contemporary. It complies with the Secretary of Interior Standards for historic renovations next to historic buildings.

Mr. Mohr – It would lighten up the heavy elevations.

Mr. White – That's helpful to hear. We were attempting to strike a balance. This is not a building that is its own. It is part of a campus of courts. I want people to intuitively know they're in a courts complex. I appreciate the comment. If we go that direction, we're always going to be looking back. Does this building still belong to this place? That's very difficult needle to thread.

Mr. Werner – With Beth Israel and the security down the street, we have seen the reality of our times and how it effects design. Courtrooms are very important places in how they're designed. You have to do it right. You have to make the inside right. We have two jurisdictions working on this. If you all are comfortable with it, our guidelines to facilities like this encourages it to be different, new, and contemporary. I think that's within the design guidelines.

Applicant moves to request deferral – Mr. Gastinger moved to accept deferral (Second by Mr. Schwarz). Motion passes 7-0.

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

D. Discussion Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 16-11-01

401 Cherry Avenue, TMP 290150000

Owner: Gateway Terrace Partners, LLC

Representative: Doug Stafford, Griffin-Stafford Hospitality

Project: Repairs to stucco

- Staff gave a brief introduction to this project.

- This is a repair and maintenance request, which could include some possible changes to the exterior.
- Mr. Stafford gave a brief introduction on the project.
- The hotel was purchased in January, 2018.
- There was a thorough review over the property and discovered that the stucco was problematic from an aesthetic perspective.
- An investigative forensics inspector was hired to do some cuts into the stucco and the exterior drywall. There were no issues in the areas that he inspected.
- There was no moisture found.
- According to the owner, the main issue is the aesthetics of the building. It does not look that good.
- The BAR questioned the owner of the hotel regarding the project. The owner of the hotel answered the questions over the appearance and the use of EIFS.
- The owner has a very good plan for completing and finishing the project.

6. Dead trees on the Downtown Mall

- There are two dead maples on the Downtown Mall that need to be addressed.
- There was a discussion of what could be done with the two dead trees.
- There is no direction from the BAR regarding what to do with the trees. If the trees are dead, they can be removed. Nothing should be placed in these spots without BAR approval.

E. Other Business

7. Staff Questions/Discussion

F. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:53 PM

