

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
September 21, 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: Mr. Mohr, Ms. Lewis, Mr. Schwarz, Mr. Gastinger, Mr. Zehmer, Mr. Edwards

Members Absent: Mr. Lahendro,

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner

Pre-Meeting:

There was a discussion regarding the items on the Consent Agenda and possibly moving an item from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Gastinger had a question about the 209 Second Street application. Staff went over the questions about the application.

Mr. Schwarz had a question about the Preliminary Discussion.

Ms. Lewis had a question about the Gildersleeve Application. Staff did go over the application with the BAR.

The meeting was called to order at 5:40 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. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-09-04

301 East Jefferson Street, Tax Parcel 330204000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Congregation Beth Israel

Applicant: Karim Habbab, BRW Architects

Project: Install lighting at Sanctuary entry

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the Consent Agenda (Mr. Mohr seconded). Motion passes 6-0.

C. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-09-01

209 2nd Street, SW, Tax Parcel 280077000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Same Street LLC

Applicant: Jim Rounsevell

Project: Alterations to existing structure

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Constructed c1880, the Watson House is a two-story vernacular house within the Downtown ADC District. This house--and the adjacent, matching house—feature three-bays, single pile, with a front-facing central gable and a medium-pitched gable roof. Sitting on a low foundation, the front porch is topped by a low-pitched hip roof supported by four Tuscan columns. The roofs standing-seam metal with Philadelphia gutters. The historic survey is attached. Request for a CoA to rehabilitate and renovate the exterior of the existing historic house and the existing rear addition. (The proposed work will modify what the BAR approved Aug. 2019. Staff has attached a comparison.) August 2019 – BAR approved rehabilitation and renovation of the exterior of the existing historic house and the existing rear addition.

Scope of Work

East Elevation:

- Install new entry door. Existing in-swing door is a hazard, swinging into an interior stair landing.

South Elevation:

- At the rear addition, remove previously approved doors and windows.
- Install twin, windows.
- Install two skylights. Velux. Fixed. CFP 6060. (Bathrooms #2 and 3.)

West Elevation:

- Remove window at main house, first floor. Install entry door. Steps and landing to be painted wood, identical to front steps—3-1/2” tongue and groove.
- Remove the single-sash casement windows at addition, second floor and install new, similar to existing.

North Elevation:

- Remove existing, first floor windows (one on main house, two on rear addition). Note: Per applicant’s photos, the main house window has already been removed and the opening bricked up.
- Install at the addition an entry door with steps and landing. Steps and landing to be bluestone.
- Install roof skylight. Velux. Fixed. FCM 2222. (Bathroom #1.)

Existing - General:

- Windows: Repair/renovate existing double hung windows. Existing windows do not function--do not meet Code for egress. Paint white to match existing.
- Brick: Repair mortar, match existing with Lehigh flamingo color mortar. Mortar type N.
- New doors and windows to be Andersen E-series, per Better Living quote #1217826, dated 8/27/2021.
- Velux Skylights (FCM and CFP) per cut sheets provided by the applicant.

Paint:

- o All windows, doors, exterior trim, fascias, risers, porch columns, ceiling, beams etc: Ben. Moore OC-152, *Super white*, semi-gloss, to match existing white on existing windows, fascia, freeze boards, etc.
- o Existing board and batten siding (rear): Ben. Moore HC-168, *Chelsea Gray*.
- o Porch flooring, treads: Ben. Moore AC-27 *Galveston gray*, semi-gloss, with non-slip additive.
- o Porch railings: black. Ben. Moore 2132-10, *Black*, gloss.
- o Brick will not be painted.

- The patio area is yet to be determined and currently not in the scope of work (future). It has not really been designed but a concept was included as a courtesy.
- Existing paving and pea gravel to be removed.
- Existing white wall in back gets Virginia creeper which turns red in the fall. A small water feature to counteract heat island effect TBD.
- Front: Existing dogwoods to remain with new dark green ground cover below, poss. Woodland phlox or sim.
- Garden is honey dust (crushed brown stone a-la- bocce court).
- Patio is bluestone pavers on stone dust. Like next door, new bluestone treads on over decaying concrete for front steps (safety issue-see existing images). Overgrown north side is replaced with bluestone stepping stones to access Bedroom #3.
- A low hedge (<3' high) shields the base of the adjacent building along the Northside.

Lighting: (Not indicated. Notes From the applicant.)

- Exterior lighting for the patio is TBD. All exterior lighting to be 2700K, CRI of 95 or better. All low voltage, low key, landscape lighting. (No exterior flood lights.).
- No wall mounted fixtures other than two full cut-off fixtures at both entries (see cut sheet attached).
- Porch has ceiling cut outs for three 3-1/2" recessed dimmable MR16 fixtures that will light the porch volume. (Contrasted lighting, white trim). All lighting done in consultation with Mark Schulyer Lighting Design.

Discussion

The house was constructed c1880 and, per the Sanborn Maps (see appendix), the single-story, rear addition was in place by 1896. As such, repairs to the existing masonry must be done carefully and use an appropriate lime mortar, relative to the amount, if any, of Portland cement used. Reference NPS Preservation Brief #2: *Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings*.

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/2-repoint-mortar-joints.htm>

The two, single sash casements at the second floor, rear addition are likely sash salvaged from an original, enclosed window; however, the board-and-batten addition appears to be post-1960s.

The existing, first floor window at Bedroom #1 has already been removed and the opening bricked closed, without BAR review and approval. Note: While a historic window, it is possible this is not original to the building. Per the Sanborn Maps (see appendix), the window may have added between 1907 and 1920. (There is not a matching window on the south wall.) Options available for the BAR:

- Accept the change and completed brick work.
- If extant, the original window could be reinstalled; however, due to the proposed use, the public safety code requires this be a fire-rated wall, including the window. As such, any replacement will require a new, fire-rated window.
- Allow the bricked opening, but require it be installed as inset panel, not flush with the exterior wall, thus expressing the change from the original.

Jim Rounsevell, Applicant – With the window on the north side that was bricked in, it is really unclear from the site survey that the north wall is close to three feet. You're not allowed to have any openings that close to a lot line according to the building code. I am not sure that a fire-rated window would even be possible. If the Board decided that they wanted to do an indent there with brick, the south side doesn't have an opening on it. I agree with you about the mortar. In the condition that I found the building, there are some repairs that need to get fixed. I am pretty picky about those things. Where the oven was going to go in the previous submission, there's a steel door that is there. It comes out. The idea was to go back to a window that was closer in keeping to what was original. In this case, I was thinking of toothing in the masonry to match it. If the Board decides it wants a recess there reflecting where the doorframe was, that's fine. With the upper windows, I am 'game' for whatever seems appropriate to everyone. The left one was clearly mismatched from the right one. If we wanted to match that, we're totally flexible on that. Originally the submission had the French doors and two sidelights. As I understand it, the doors would not fit underneath the roof. We're going to have to pry open the roof. As you can see from the photographs, they omitted those doors. In order to meet egress for the restaurant, insert the door where the window was on the west end of the original building. With the front, the proposal for swapping out the door, that's a life safety thing. If you left the door that's there, you're going to 'headbut' somebody coming down the stairs. I don't think it is safe. When you have transient occupants, the door outswing is safer than an inswing door, especially against a path of egress down the stairs. It has to be glass so you can see. With the railings, the existing railings are black metal. The ones on the concrete steps going out of the building will simply be repainted. There's a railing on the south side of the building that is clearly not original. It looks like a kit. Technically, it's not required. There's less than a 30 inch drop off the porch to the adjacent surface. It still might be appropriate to put a railing back there because of the transient occupants. With the railings that go up the new steps onto the porch, we will put the original railings back there as well.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – With the railings going up the steps to the porch (given the height up the porch), those could still actually be handrails instead of guardrails?

Mr. Rounsevell – Absolutely. Going up the concrete steps that could also just be handrails. It is a little 'over-wrought.' In some of the existing photos, you can see the railings.

Mr. Zehmer – Is the front door the original front door?

Mr. Rounsevell – I don't know. I was hoping that staff would know.

Mr. Werner – I couldn't tell.

Mr. Schwarz – With the landscaping side-lighting, is that going to come back as a later application?

Mr. Rounsevell – We had made a first pass on it. I never submitted anything for a landscape plan. I am not sure how this works. I am happy to talk about general thoughts. That will get phased in at a later date. Leave time on materials is awful at this point. If this continues, we will be lucky to have this ready to go by the end of January.

Mr. Schwarz – It would be fine if you separated the two. Once you know what the landscape is going to be, come back with that rather than guessing.

Mr. Rounsevell – Is of any help to go through it very quickly as a precursor?

Mr. Werner – Make sure there's nothing being cut down or being removed. There are no new trees I know of in the back.

Mr. Rounsevell – I don't think there's anything. The dogwoods in the front will stay. The lower ground cover on the front is beat to hell. That has to get 'some love.' The hard surfaces are the same. With this clientele, you have to up the ante. We're not cutting any trees down in the back, supplementing the wall that was previously approved. We're just trying to keep it simple. Mary Wolfe is going to help with it.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – For staff, thank you for doing the elevations comparing the existing and the 2019 approval and what is in front of us. That helped a lot because I wasn't on the Board in 2019. That was very helpful on this.

Mr. Mohr – I would concur with everybody's conclusion. I seriously doubt there was a window on that north elevation. Given that it's a bedroom wall, it makes sense that it didn't have a window. It does seem to me the front door had a little more body to it and might not be as exciting or a truly modern glass door as opposed to something that divides lights. The other option would be keying off the old door where the upper floor panels are glass and solid bottom panel. It just seems the divided light thing feel that it is not front doorish. I agree that it needs to have glass. Functionally, I do get what the applicant is doing. I was thinking the door could have a little bit more personality.

Mr. Zehmer – I believe that I saw that the top two panels are currently glass. Is that correct? I might encourage you all to look at the house next door at 213 to see if those two front doors match and are historic. If so, the likelihood of them being original is higher. I would suggest moving that existing door to the front side of the jam so it can swing out. We already have glass in the top two panels; maybe consider putting glass in the middle panels so it is a little more transparent. It would help preserve the original front door while also achieving the safety goals. I agree that it is more of a reach. I didn't see anything in the staff report that spoke to a guideline about whether or not we allow replacement of front doors.

Mr. Werner – We do/don't. There is so much focus on windows that it feels like doors are forgotten. That's the approach I have taken on this. This is a building that we're going to 'breathe some life back into it. Looking at it over time and pictures that are available, it is difficult to determine. We could do an analysis on the door and make a determination. The idea would be what it is replaced with is appropriate. That would be the key. Is a full light, insulated, glass door appropriate? Arguably, no. It would be a six-panel door. That's where you come down to a situation where there's no right or wrong. The guidelines offer that direction. I don't know if this was original. I can't determine that. I know what was originally there was not a glass door. The option would be, while changing the swing, you all may request this be a six panel door.

Mr. Schwarz – For me, it’s a case of either keep the door/reverse the swing or replace it/let it be. I agree with you Tim. I also feel the divided light does not really violate our guidelines. It’s obviously something new. I don’t know where we fall. Anybody else have a hang-up with this door being removed?

Mr. Mohr – The door is a simple stamp on ownership. Unless there’s a really spectacular door that clearly had history, in my opinion, it is ‘open season’ on the door. My only issue is that I think it should have a little more personality: either be really modern or have more solid in void. It currently reads as a patio door.

Mr. Rousenvell – I am game for throwing some personality at it. My biggest hang-up is the transparency for life safety. If it’s a six panel that has that and the panels are glass, would something like that be OK?

Mr. Mohr – I think it needs to be something with a little more personality.

Mr. Werner – Doors are jammed into entrances and porches. When we don’t know if something is clear, we need to go back to what the Secretary’s standards say. There is no doubt that it is to retain original material. One of the keys here is to maintain existing openings and size. We’re not talking about taking out that frame and transom. Something might have to change with the style. You maintain that existing frame and trim by maintaining that existing transom. When it comes to doors, safety, and access, it gets a little bit more difficult than windows. My deference here would be that the door be retained. Whatever is new goes in there. It stays in the existing frame and opening. That doesn’t change. It even says to retain existing hardware. There is some room for some flexibility here.

Motion – Mr. Mohr – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed exterior alterations at 209 2nd Street SW satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the condition that the landscape plan will be submitted at a future date and with a recommendation that the applicant look into alternate solutions for the front door, either mimicking the existing door but all glass or be a more modern door, and that the trim and casing be retained, while still allowing that the door swing properly. Should the door be found to be historic, the BAR recommends that it stay somewhere on the property.

Mr. Schwarz seconds the motion. Motion passes (6-0).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-09-02

106 Oakhurst Circle, Tax Map Parcel 110005000

Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC District

Owner: 106 Oakhurst Circle LLC

Applicant: Patrick Farley

Project: Modifications to approved rear addition (CoA: December 15, 2020)

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – *Year Built: 1922, District: Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC District Status: Contributing.* Designed as a combination of Colonial Revival and Craftsman styles, this two-story dwelling has a gabled roof, stucco siding, overhanging eaves with exposed rafter ends, a pent roof

between the first and second floor, an interior stuccoed chimney, a concrete stoop, and a central door sheltered by a gabled hood supported by brackets. Triple eight-by-eight casement windows are found on the first floor, while eight-over-eight-sash double-hung windows are used on the second floor and flank a central triple eight-by-eight casement bay window. French doors on the east side lead out to a patio. The house also includes a rear deck and a projecting rectangular one-story bay window supported by wooden brackets on the west end. (Oakhurst-Gildersleeve Neighborhood Historic District.) CoA request for proposed alterations to existing house and a rear addition. Site work to include a new driveway, which will require removal of the south porch and replacement with a shallower version. Note: The proposed addition is significantly scaled-back from what the BAR approved in December 2020. Attached is a comparison of the two. For existing conditions, see information submitted for the October 2020 preliminary discussion.

Roofing

- Addition and existing house to be interlocking metal shingles. Simple design, flat, not ornamented. Color to be dark gray/slate. (Replace existing asphalt shingles on house).

Materials

- Stucco: Smooth finish, “StoPowerwall” stucco system. (www.stocorp.com)*
- Trim: Fiber cement, painted.*
- Doors and Windows (casement): Anderson, aluminum clad wood. White with black exterior trim.* <https://aw930cdnprdcd.azureedge.net/-/media/aw/files/brochures/2020-to-current-literature/e-series-brochure.pdf?modified=20210712191053>

Note: The lite patterns will be as shown on the renderings. For insulated glass with applied grills, the BAE should require internal spacer bars.

- Ceiling at covered parking: Tongue and grooved trim, stained.*
- Low wall: Board-formed concrete wall with stone cap.*

Balconies, Deck and Stairs

- Railing: Wood rail (natural finish) on panels with flat metal bars (painted).*
- Decking/Treads: Composition material. Trim and exposed framing below to be painted.*

Landscaping

- Remove: 6” Crepe Myrtle (front), 6” Dogwood (front), 4” Holly (rear), 40” Oak (rear).*
- New: See Plant Schedule on Sheet A. (Rain Garden, Ferns, Oak Garden, Living Fence/Green Screen, Pollinator Garden.)*
- Hardwood mulch within planting areas.*

Paving

- Walking Path (front): Cut slate/flagstone in aggregate with steel edging*
- Driveway (front): Concrete, permeable pavers*
- Driveway (rear and existing): Crushed Buckingham slate with steel edging*

Exterior Lighting

- Pathway lights: AQ Lighting, 3 Tier Pagoda Pathway Light, LED, CCT 2,700K or 5,000K*
- Soffit lighting: Recessed can lights, TBD*

* No change from December 2020.

Discussion

Staff recommends approval, with the suggested conditions related to the applied grills on insulated glass windows.

Driveway

Previously, the existing driveway (along the north parcel line) was eliminated and a new constructed (along the north parcel line). The project will now retain the existing and use the new to create a loop for access to and egress from the parking area behind the house. City Code Section 34-972(a)(5) allows for the BAR to make recommendations [to the city traffic engineer] regarding modifications in the required driveway entrance widths. Conditions may require some flexibility—for example, as necessary to minimize the removal of the existing stone curbing. Staff is consulting with zoning and will address this more specifically during the September 21 meeting.

Patrick Farley, Applicant – What we’re doing is reverting back to just single-family. Previously, we were going for two family upgrades. There is a photograph of the rear, which has the existing poorly built (soon to be removed) rear deck. The footprint of the addition nearly perfectly fits into that footprint. It is a very small addition. With regards to the roofing, we were previously looking at two things. One is upgrading the existing roof, which is asphalt shingles, to interlocking metal shingles. The rear addition was going to have standing seam. We had the advantage of that “hyphen” that broke the roof forms apart. We had a lot more scale on the addition working in our favor. It’s now really about upgrading, uniformity, and integration. The roof being a smaller area on the rear addition tying into the existing roof seems self-evident. It’s the same material. We’re sticking with the upgrade to the interlocking shingle approach.

We’re hoping to have fully off street parking. Hence, the loop/in and out. That’s the logic behind that site plan change. We still hold to making the landscape planting improvements at the front yard. In the rear, we’re going to scale that back and keep our options open for any future endeavors we might want to undertake on the property.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Can you give us an update on the strategy with the trees in the back? I know that was one of the major site drivers. Have any of the trees been removed? How has the site plan changed your approach?

Mr. Farley – This strategy is much friendlier to the three oaks that are of some concern. The addition is occupying the existing footprint of this deck. Really not impacting the trees. We will be cutting a foundation. There is already disturbance there. We had the arborist, who was here a week ago. The one oak that was already essentially dead would have to be removed. It was just taken out. He did give us some advice around how we can approach, not only the foundation; he will come in and do some aeration, feeding, and nurturing of those trees as necessary. We still intend to do everything we can to protect them and the roots. That’s one of the reasons behind this.

Mr. Mohr – The one not clear to me is the direction of travel. If I was to look at this by the angle of the parking, you’re considering the primary entrance as an added entrance. The concrete grid apron suggests otherwise. The other thing is that it seems pretty common that the primary walk to the front door actually addresses the sidewalk and not the driveway. I would see it might have a spur to the driveway. More than anything, the circulation implied at the front confuses me relative to the implied circulation in the back.

Mr. Farley – We’re anticipating student renters. They’re coming primarily from the direction of traffic; coming in from classes. That is the northern approach to the property. There’s a landscape agenda, where I want to take the bisecting of the yard away and give more back to some plant diversity in that front yard space. The existing sidewalk needs to be redone completely. It’s all busted up. The concrete has been lifted by those oaks. We just want to take a different approach and not even use concrete. The idea behind the grid paver section is to allow more infiltration versus something that is less pervious on that side.

Mr. Mohr – Where the concrete is would be the ‘out?’ That makes sense relative to the other side. I assume you’re not tearing up the existing driveway.

Mr. Farley – We’re essentially extending it down, connecting it to the loop, and improving it with the material. We have a ‘grandfather’ in place there.

Mr. Mohr – Generally, when we were talking about the driveway not cutting in front of the house, I understand what you’re talking about in terms of the landscape. I don’t think a footpath would split the landscape. You would be walking through it. On Park Street, we have generally encouraged people to maintain that connection to the sidewalk. I am not sure that I understand it. It fits with how the house relates to the street.

Mr. Farley – I am favoring a subtle symmetry to make the front porch functional and pliable as a sitting area. It can an entrance off-center. That’s part of what is going on. It’s bringing foot traffic from that side versus down the center to re-imagine how that front porch works versus it being a perfectly symmetrical space that you pass through. The idea is you have a place to sit and enjoy being engaged. The landscaping is more active in terms of having pollinator plants. We’re really trying to emphasize that front yard as a place you don’t just pass through. You can actually enjoy it. There is a little more to the agenda as it relates directly to the redesign of the front porch. I don’t know if that is clear in the information that you have. There’s enough space where a couple of people can hang out.

Mr. Schwarz – I know we can’t rule on program. I would hope you can help me understand about what we have to do in dealing with the city for these driveways. It’s a single-family home you’re going to have students renting?

Mr. Farley – Yes. Nothing has changed. It’s been a student rental home for 30+ years.

Mr. Schwarz – With the last iteration, you actually had separate units?

Mr. Farley – It was a two family. It was six bedrooms. We’re now pulling it back to four, which is the maximum allowable.

Mr. Schwarz – Can you tell us about these interlocking shingles? Was there a spec or something that I missed?

Mr. Farley – Did staff include those references?

Mr. Werner – I can’t remember.

Mr. Farley – We have a contractor onboard. It is a well-known contractor that is good with these kind of projects. There are a number of products. When you go online, you get installer websites, not the

website where the product originates. I am going to rely on whoever the roofer is to work that out. It's the same thing for standing seam.

Mr. Werner – The interlocking metal shingles is a 1920s stamped decorative design. There is a lot out there. You can get a metal shingle that looks like a slate shingle. If there is something you all are not comfortable with on this period of house, maybe that's the way to express it. It's a 1922 craftsman style house. Is there something on here as a type of roof that would not work? We can maybe work from there. Standing seam metal would be fine here. The metal I saw looked flat, a little more mechanical than the full slate.

Mr. Farley – What we're after is that we're assuming the original roof was shingles. There are no records. We're thinking of it more in terms of texture and hue. What is there now is pretty awful. Anything we do is going to be an improvement. If it was slate, why did they remove the slate and put up shingles? Shingles are definitely appropriate. There's plenty of precedent in this district. Shingles is the right texture and color that is befitting of the period and some slate-like hue.

Mr. Schwarz – My concern is that we have had the fraternity one. They wanted to do full slate out of metal. It had some very funny in-conditions. My only comment would be that if we approve this tonight, it's going to be something staff is going to have to look at and say that meets what they were discussing so that there's no really 'chunky' overlap of the shingles wrapping over the rakes.

Mr. Farley – If we were to stick with shingles/the existing materials, but go to a high end of a fiberglass, would that be acceptable by virtue of the fact that it is the existing material?

Mr. Schwarz – I don't think we can deny that. You're replacing what is there. I am not saying anything bad about the metal. It is some caveat for staff to look out for.

With the windows, will they have spacer bars?

Mr. Farley – Yes.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – The addition seems to be a responsible and good approach. As it gets scaled back, it has less pressure on it. It's more in keeping with the neighborhood and the house. Whatever decision led to that, in general, is a net plus. I do have real concerns about the driveway approach and the loop road. Initially when we first reviewed it, it took a bit to get over the parking in the backyard. It was in keeping with the scale of the addition and the overall building. Even at that time, we requested a consideration of moving the path to the other side so that it minimized the amount of paved surface. Looking at the loop road now, it seems very out of scale with both the house and the neighborhood. Looking back at the ADC description of this neighborhood, three sentences refer to the mature plantings and lush character of this small pocket neighborhood. It's like it is not required. I would be able to support an approach that still puts the parking in the rear if it would limit it to a single drive. The existing drive would be preferred. It seems over the top to require a looped drive around the entire house to put parking in the back.

The project had a number of things we were reviewing in the past. We really didn't absorb the small retaining walls and the off-center entrance to the building. Given the stately character of the front of this house and its symmetrical façade, it seems a little 'tortured' to having the walls frame an off-centered entrance. It seems like an odd addition to the front of this great house.

Mr. Mohr – I would second that. My thing about the path curving off is that it seems the pre-car relationship of a lot of these houses was that it went down to the sidewalk. You didn't bring them into the yard. It has this English cottage quietness to it, the way it currently exists in that photo. Having the pollinator garden split in half by a walkway could be a walking path with a lot of green in it. I don't think it bifurcates that space at all. If you want to create more of an outdoor area, maybe there's some seating somewhere in the front yard that's in the middle of that garden. It really counters the effectiveness of that hood and the front door to have that retaining wall sliding everything off to the side and interrupting that front façade. I understand the concept. I don't think it is that kind of space right there. It does fight the architecture of the house. I am not sure that I understand the reason for so much driveway. It does seem like one entrance should serve.

Ms. Lewis – I am supportive of the application and the new addition on the back. The volumes are really nicely handled with the stair coming down. It is more appealing in its reduced shape. My big problem is the addition of the second driveway. One of our guidelines for new construction does talk about the impact of additions or construction on current gardens and landscaping. We're taking a big swath out of this front yard. These driveways may not pass muster on one guideline. It states that driveways can't occupy more than 25% of the front yard between the building line and the right of way. If you at page 91 of the packet, the scale is 'funky.' If you at the back of the property, you can see where the 25 foot setback line is. It would be the setback from the front. If you apply that off of Oakhurst Circle and look at whether these two driveways take up more than 25%. I think these two driveways exceed more than 25%. We can encourage zoning to waive that or give special consideration. I am not quite sure why. The purpose of the reduced addition is to restore this to the R-2 zoning or single-family zoning with renters. I don't understand why the programming requires a second driveway. It seems like it would serve a more intense use. Planning for future use, this is R-2. I don't think these two huge driveways in this small front yard are consummate with single-family. There's another zoning guideline we were sent. The curb-cuts are not to exceed 33% of the lot frontage. That is going to be pretty close. We've already acknowledged some of the historic pavers might be impacted by that. I just can't support this circular drive. I continue to support this application and thank the applicant for crafting a nice addition and endeavoring to be sensitive to the beauty of the landscape, especially in this backyard.

Mr. Werner – I went back and forth with zoning on this. That was one of the questions that the applicant raised about the area involved. Zoning's interpretation, as they applied it, is reduce the setback from the edge of the right of way to the house. When I started scaling and doing the math, one of the problems that our GIS is fairly accurate up to parcel boundaries. This one is off by ten feet. As far as that 25% is concerned, it's close. My slide-rule didn't go that far. With the width across the front, the curb-line is 52 feet. I calculated that width with the 9 foot existing driveway and the new 8 foot driveway would result in 32.6%; less than that 33%. These numbers are all following the fine decimal points. We are looking at the design. Is the design OK?

Mr. Gastinger – I don't think it matters. I don't think the design is consistent with the neighborhood. That's our purview.

Ms. Lewis – The guidelines are there for a reason. They're to limit the amount of hardscape/curb-cuts in a front yard in a residential zoning district. The language of 34-972 says that it is 25% between the

building setback line and the right of way. It doesn't say feet from building. It is not consummate with single-family. It is a lot more hardscape. It does impact the gardens and landscaping in this front yard.

Mr. Schwarz – In reference to your recommendation (staff), even if we found the two driveways to be OK, I would not want to give zoning the flexibility to say “two driveways but they need to be 18 feet wide. We will take two feet off the 20 feet we usually require.” The BAR would set limits. If zoning and the site plan review wants to do something different, the plan would have to come back to us.

Mr. Werner – We have dealt with this with aprons. If the applicant wants to go with one driveway, that would be a new driveway. I would encourage you all to express to the city engineer to minimize the width of that apron, minimize the disruption to the existing stone curbing. It would remain with the conversation to go with two or one that happens to be the new one. If we keep the old driveway and nothing changes, nothing changes. If they add a second driveway or add a new driveway/abandon the original, I encourage you to make some statement about minimal disturbance relative to the apron. No matter what you say, there are setbacks relative to the driveway. The reason I want to be clear about this is because there was a project about a month after I started. I didn't even realize it had occurred. The BAR thought that a driveway was a good idea. Just because the BAR discussed it might be an interesting idea, it was not part of the motion. Even though you can't change zoning, we can still make a recommendation to the city engineer.

Mr. Schwarz – There's a difference between making a recommendation. On some site plans we can say “this is what we are able to approve.” If the site plan process doesn't allow it, it needs to come back to us.

Mr. Mohr – If I was to look at the two driveways, my functional preference would be the lower one. It comes closer to the house. It gives access to the porch. It works with the geometry of getting into the garage. The one closer to the house, on the north side, is the one I would abandon. Unfortunately, it is the one that currently exists. In terms of preference, the new driveway is better than the old one even though it does separate the house from the yard. I think it functions better. I suppose you can change the direction of the cars. Given the use of the house, having that adjacency to that corner of the house, I am assuming it works well with your plan on the inside. That would be my preference.

Mr. Schwarz – My one concern with that would be if that's a new driveway, there will be even more pressure to make it a wide driveway. The 20 foot minimum makes no sense to me and it scares me. It's sitting in our code. I don't know how far they would allow us to wittle that down.

Mr. Farley – I brought this up last year. There was some internal exchange with the city engineer. He basically said they take it on a case by case basis. A 20 foot driveway would make no sense here. That's where we have the flexibility and we can be very subjective about it. That's what I would do especially with that percentage eating into the landscape. One oak would have to go for that to work. I would agree with what Mr. Mohr just said. I am pretty sure my client would want to favor the southern/new entrance. It is safer. You pass by the house. That part of the circle is tight. Coming around, going past the house, and turning in versus the way it works now. It sneaks up on you. It's very dense and comes right up to the sidewalk. You don't even know the driveway is there. The southern entrance does make sense. We're not against the central/retaining the center line entrance. What is there on the plan now is a carryover. That was originally a pedestrian entrance down to the second unit in the rear. We're getting rid of that. We will still have pedestrian traffic that's going to go down that side and come in the backside. It seemed to make sense. I am not hung up on that scheme. It sounds like this is going towards holding onto the current relationship with this sidewalk

Mr. Mohr – You have quite a bit more front yard at that point. There’s certainly nothing precluding some seating area. I think the two driveways imply a different scale.

Mr. Schwarz – Does anybody have any concerns with anything other than the driveway? Do we have any concerns with the house?

Mr. Mohr – Just the retaining walls. That’s it. I’m not worried about the shingles as long you pick something nice.

Mr. Schwarz – We can approve the house. With that approval, the landscape stays the same. The applicant can get a building permit. The site plan can come back to us. We can continue discussing. The site plan will come back to us as a new COA if the applicant is in a rush to get a building permit. We approve the house with no change to the landscape. The landscape can come back to us as a new COA. We can’t administratively approve what we’re discussing.

Mr. Zehmer – You say approve the existing landscape. We approved (December 2020) a change to the landscape and to add the driveway on the south side. Are you saying that we stick with that approval? Or keep what is existing and come back with what you want?

Mr. Schwarz – Keep what is currently in place on the site. I am not sure the old site plan still applies. That plan goes with the house with the addition on the back. It no longer is valid.

Mr. Werner – You can make that statement. The applicant can come in with a prior approval. It’s still a COA for that.

Mr. Schwarz – That would be for the whole project as it was before.

Mr. Werner – This is the part the City Attorney had raised. Don’t amend the COA as a new COA. I don’t think there’s nothing wrong with you all making a statement of this new COA being a replacement of that. Make that clear. The site plan has that with what is submitted to the city. In reviewing the driveway with zoning and the city engineer, if it comes back and it modifies this, go to the drawing again. As it was drawn in December 2020, the parking area in the back was such that it allowed vehicles to do a T turn and come back out. As it is currently drawn, the intent is pull in and park, back out, and continue another way. There would have to be some modifications to the parking lot area.

Mr. Schwarz – I’m not saying go back to the approved 2020 plan. I am saying to leave the ground as it is. Nothing gets touched. That site plan from 2020 goes with a different building than what we’re looking at right now.

Mr. Werner – This replaces what was reviewed in 2020. Whatever comes back to you, there will also be some changes in that parking area in the back. You can account for the front walk. You have clarified that. The landscaping plan, as far as vegetation, nothing has really changed as far as the paved surface goes. As far as the driveway goes, there is some clarification on that.

Mr. Schwarz – We’re treating the landscape plan as a preliminary discussion. We’re going to give the applicant some advice on what we think would be approvable. There are going to be changes that he’s going to have to figure out on his own. He will have to rotate the parking. We will let him do that under some guidance.

Mr. Mohr – He doesn't have to do a lot to the parking. He has a pretty generous apron to begin with. He has the parking underneath the house. I don't think that's such a big deal. It needs to be a separate application. I am agreeing with that bifurcation so that he can keep moving.

Mr. Schwarz – With the preliminary discussion of the landscape, Tim, you're preferring the driveway on the south. Was that the general consensus?

Mr. Gastinger – I could see a successful application with either scenario. I do worry in thinking about student housing. This quickly could become not a 3 car parking area but 5 or 6. With the sensitive vegetation, I would ask the applicant to think about a way that protects and is really clear about where parking is to be located.

Mr. Schwarz – The suggestion is to make the front walkway connect up to the sidewalk?

Mr. Gastinger – Those are two really sensitive trees. I would be cautious about installing a new sidewalk in that area. I would recommend it. It would be consistent with our guidelines and the Secretary of Interior's Standards to maintain the straight walk from the front door to the sidewalk.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Carl Schwarz moves: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City's ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed alterations and new construction at 106 Oakhurst Circle for the house alone, and not the landscape elements, satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC District, and that the BAR approves that portion of the application as submitted with the following conditions: that the window muntins will have internal spacer bars, that the metal shingles should be reviewed by staff and should resemble shingles (staff should pay attention to ridges and details at rakes and eaves), and a strong recommendation that the walls that have been added at the front stoop are not set asymmetrically. The previous CoA granted in December 2020, while still valid, is not valid in pieces. The BAR looks forward to reviewing the landscape plan for this project.

Ms. Lewis seconds motion. Motion passes (6-0).

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 21-09-03

936 Rugby Road, TMP 030144000

Rugby Road Historic Conservation District

Owner: Sharon and Michael Nedzbala

Applicant: Leigh Boyes

Project: Side addition (Note: Covered porch at rear is not subject to review.)

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: c1911 District: Rugby Road Historic Conservation District Status: Contributing Stucco, vernacular dwelling designed by Eugene Bradbury.

Addition

- Roof: Match existing (asphalt dimension shingles) or standing-seam copper.
- Gutter and downspout: Match existing.
- Cornice and trim: Match existing.
- Exterior wall: Match existing. Stucco.

- Chimney: Match existing detail. Stucco.
- Windows: Painted, wood, casement windows. Color: TBD
- Light Fixtures: None indicated.

Request CoA for construction of an addition onto the west south side and a covered porch at the rear. (NOTE: The rear, covered porch will not be visible from Rugby Road or Preston Avenue, due to the elevation and grade. Staff concluded this component does not require a CoA.)

Discussion and Recommendations

Note: The regulations and guidelines for projects within a Historic Conservation District (HCD) are, by design, less rigid than those for an ADC District or an IPP. The HCD designations are intended to preserve the character-defining elements of the neighborhoods and to assure that new construction is not inappropriate to that character, while minimally imposing on current residents who may want to upgrade their homes. Within the existing HCDs are buildings and/or areas that might easily qualify for an ADC District or as an IPP; however, in evaluating proposals within HCDs, the BAR may apply only the HCD requirements and guidelines.

The BAR should discuss the use of an exterior chimney, which represents a new architectural element—the four existing chimneys are interior. Otherwise, staff recommends approval. (See specific comments below under *Pertinent Design Review Guidelines*.)

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

No Questions from the Board

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – I was supportive of putting this on the Consent Agenda given that it should be an IPP. It is in a Historic Conservation District and not in an ADC. The only thing staff asked us to look at the new chimney that is exterior instead of the ones that are interior. The location of it is really not at all prominent to the street-side. Given how the house is situated in the lot, I don't if anybody else could see it. It looks like a very thoughtful addition to this house. I do support this.

Mr. Zehmer – This is a very successful addition. The chimney being exterior actually helps. The width of the addition is inset slightly from the adjoining original portion of the building. By having that step in and having the exterior chimney be different from the original house helps show this as an addition. It works well.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Historic Conservation Districts, I move to find that the proposed addition at 936 Rugby Road satisfy the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Mr. Mohr seconds the motion. Motion passes (6-0).

D. Preliminary Discussion

5. 745 Park Street – Demolition

Year Built: 1957 District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing
Brick, stretcher bond; 1-1/2 stories; gable roof (composition); 3 bays. Detached house, 1950s-60s. Entrance in center bay. Exterior end chimney on north, single ramp. (NRHP listing for the Charlottesville and Albemarle County Courthouse Historic District. VDHR #104-0072.) Preliminary discussion on request to demolish the existing, approx. 35-f x 30-ft, single story, brick dwelling. Owners planning significant and extensive improvements to home. Renovations to existing impractical; razing is preferred.

Note: A CoA is required to raze a contributing structure. Also, a CoA is also required for subsequent construction on or alteration to the site.

Discussion and Recommendations

The BAR should discuss if the proposed demolition is compatible with the ADC District Design Guidelines for Demolitions. As is standard for demolition requests, should the BAR consider approval, pending a formal submittal and request, staff will recommend condition of approval that prior to demolition the applicant will provide sketch plan and photographs of the existing dwelling and site.

While a contributing structure, it must be noted that when the ADC District was established, all but approximately 15 primary structures were similarly designated. This district, including 745 Prk Street) was established in 1991. (It was expanded in 2005 to include the area north of downtown, between McIntire Road and 1st Street North.) Prior to 1996, when establishing an ADC district, it was the City's practice to designate all structures as *contributing*.

Additionally, while this dwelling was constructed 64 years ago and is thus eligible to be considered for possible designation, it is unique only because it is dissimilar in age and style from the houses that characterize this district.

Between Lyons Court and the Bypass, within the ADC District on the west side of Park Street, there are four houses north and four houses south of 745 Park Street. They date from 1840 to 1936; the median year built is 1910. On the east side of Park, not in the district, there are 15 homes, dating from 1946 to 1967; the median year built is 1951.

Prior demolitions in the North Downtown ADC District, which might be helpful.

- 705 Park Street, demo 1920s garage and construct new, CoA approved April 17, 2012.

http://weblink.charlottesville.org/public/0/edoc/622122/BAR_705%20Park%20Street_March2012.pdf

http://weblink.charlottesville.org/public/0/edoc/622121/BAR_705%20Park%20Street_July2012.pdf

- 713 Park Street, demo c1920 garage, CoA approved April 21, 2009.

http://weblink.charlottesville.org/public/0/edoc/790894/BAR_713%20Park%20Street_April2019.pdf

Note: Comments above and in the review below are based on the information provided and are intended for discussion only. Comments and recommendation may change when a formal request is submitted.

- Owners want to make improvements to the house and demolish the house down to the foundation.
- Owners just want to have the flexibility to demolish the house.
- Owners were encouraged to submit a COA application.

- Board members were very supportive of the owners' plans for the improvements that they would like to make to the house.

E. Other Business

Staff Questions/Discussion

- Annual meeting to be held in November – Elections to be held for Chair and Vice-Chair.
- Staff went over the possible return to in person meetings.

Brief Discussion ADC District Design Guidelines

- Staff provided an update regarding the approval of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Following approval of the Comprehensive Plan, the city will begin work on the Zoning Rewrite. Staff asked if members of the Board had any concerns with the Zoning in ADC Districts.
- Staff also asked for their concerns and feedback with the ADC District Design Guidelines.

PLACE Update

F. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 PM