

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
October 19, 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, James Zehmer, Carl Schwarz, Ron Bailey, Jody Lahendro, Breck Gastinger, Robert Edwards, Tim Mohr

**Staff Present:** Patrick Cory, Joe Rice, Jeff Werner, Robert Watkins

**Pre-Meeting:**

The Pre-Meeting started with a brief discussion for the Preservation Awards led by staff. Staff did go over the awards from previous years. There was a discussion of possible candidates for Preservation Awards for 2021.

Staff went over some of the staff questions including the garage door at Hill and Wood Funeral Home. Members of the BAR recommended a dark color that doesn’t make the garage door stand out.

The BAR went over a sidewalk in front of a house on Park Street. The BAR is willing to review the sidewalk as part of a formal Certificate of Appropriateness Application in a future meeting.

Staff introduced 123 Bollingwood. The BAR would like a formal COA submission.

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

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

**Joey Conover** – I am speaking about 110 and 114 Old Preston Avenue, which is on the Consent Agenda. The applications speaks for itself. Staff was very helpful in finding some old photographs. That was exciting for me. I emailed you with a link with some more historic photos. I went down to the Historical Society and found a few photos. Hard to get good resolution on them. With most of them, you can see part of the building. I am open to answering any questions you have about our application.

**Mark Kavit** – I would like to see the BAR involved with the Future Land Use Map. I have seen input from you. Input from you is very important. Most cities feel that old buildings are important to the character of s city. Last Tuesday, I watched the end of the Planning Commission meeting when Commissioner Stolzenberg tried to water down the protections of the ADC Districts. I hope that you will not allow this to happen by voicing your concern. Preservation Piedmont has written a letter that I

hope that you have seen. One of the commissioners is a member of Preservation Piedmont. She can maybe share the letter. This past Spring, I had a conversation with Commissioner Stolzenberg. I live on Altamont Street and have spent the last 13 years restoring my house. He told me that my block is the model what they hope to achieve with the FLUM. Why is this block marked for higher density than the rest of North Downtown? The BAR needs to become involved in this matter. This block should be the same as the rest of North Downtown. I am concerned for the entire North Downtown area.

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

1. BAR meeting minutes from April 20, 2021
2. **Certificate of Appropriateness**  
BAR 21-10-01  
109-111 West Water Street, Tax Parcel 280013000  
Downtown ADC District  
Owner: Mall Property, LLC  
Applicant: Ali Sevindi  
Project: Install roll-up doors in two storefront openings
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness**  
BAR 21-10-05  
110-114 Old Preston Ave, Tax Parcel 330278000  
Downtown ADC District  
Owner/Applicant: Joey Conover  
Project: Install door at building entrance

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

### **C. Deferred Items**

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness**  
BAR 21-05-03  
605 Preston Place, Tax Parcel 050111000  
Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District  
Owner: Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP  
Applicant: Kevin Riddle, Mitchell Matthews Architects  
Project: Three-story apartment building with below-grade parking

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – *Year Built: 1857 District: Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District* Also designated an Individually Protected Property *Status: Contributing* Also known as Wyndhurst, 605 Preston Place was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city. It is a typical 2-story, 3-bay, double-pile, weatherboard-clad house with Greek Revival details. CoA request for construction of apartment building, including parking, landscaping and site improvements. (Note: The following is a **summary only** of the project scope. For specific details or clarification, refer to the applicant’s submittal.)

- Walls: Brick with copper panels.
- Flat roof behind low parapet. Metal scuppers boxes and downspouts

- Parapet cap: Metal. Color: Pantone 4287C or sim.
- Rooftop mechanical units screened within brick parapet
- Doors and Windows: Marvin Ultimate Clad Exterior. Color: Marvin *Bahama Brown*, similar to Pantone 439C. (Atrium entry door color: Pantone 4101C or sim.) Hardware: rubbed bronze.
- Shutters: Metal, bi-fold, operable. Color: Match Marvin *Bahama Brown*, similar to Pantone 439C.
- Balconies and railings: Metal (rectangular rails, round pickets). Color: Pantone 4287C or sim.
- Decking at balconies: Black Locust boards, clear finish. (Applicant has noted the deck boards will be spaced to allow drainage.)

#### Lighting

- Type A. Sconce (parking): Lithonia Lighting, WDGE2 LED P3
  - o Dimmable available, CT 3000K, CRI 90, BUG 1-0-0
- Type B. Wall light (parking): Lightway Industries Inc, PDLW-12-LED-11W
  - o Dimmable available, CT 3000K – 4,000K, CRI 80
- Type C. Step light (path): Eurofase Lighting, 31590-013
  - o Not dimmable, CT 3,000K, CRI 80
- Type D. (Omitted.)
- Type E. (Omitted.)
- Type F. (Omitted.)
- Type G. (Omitted.)
- Type H. (Omitted.)
- Balconies: No exterior light fixtures. The applicant noted that the balconies are shallow and ambient lighting from the interior will be sufficient.

#### Color Palette

- Clad windows and French doors: Marvin *Bahama Brown*, similar to Pantone 439C. (Atrium entry door color: Pantone 4101C or sim.) Hardware: rubbed bronze.
- Metal railings and balcony frame: dark gray, Pantone 4287C or sim.
- Black Locust balcony decking: clear finish

#### Landscape and Site Work

- Two (2) mature Deodora cedars will remain.
- Construction will require the removal of five (5) trees:
  - o One (1) 36” Ash (Submittal includes arborist letter)
  - o Three (3) 8” Dogwood
  - o One (1) 10” Maple
  - o Note: The 18” tree noted on the plan is no longer standing.
- New plantings:
  - o a. Three (3) Blackgum (*Nyssa Sylvatica*):
    - At the east side of Wyndhurst
    - Note: On the City’s Tree List
  - o b. Five (5) Thornless Honeylocust (*Gleditsia Triacanthos*):
    - On the south, to the rear of the Preston Court Apartments
    - Note: On the City’s Tree List
  - o c and j. White Fringetree (*Chionanthus Virginicus*):
    - While not on the City’s Tree or Shrub lists, White Fringetree is identified as being native to the central Virginia. (In 1997, the Virginia Native Plant Society named it the *Wildflower of the Year*.)
- <https://plants.sc.egov.usda.gov/home/plantProfile?symbol=CHVI3>

o d. Appalachian Sedge (*Carex Appalachica*):

- Groundcover typical at planting beds
- While not on the City's Tree or Shrub lists, it is listed as native to central Virginia.

• <https://plants.sc.egov.usda.gov/home/plantProfile?symbol=CAAP5>

o e. Dart's Gold Ninebark (*Physocarpus Opulifolius*); Alternative: Smooth Sumac (*Rhus Glabra*):

- Hedge at driveway and above retaining wall at driveway/parking entrance.
- Note: In lieu of the metal planters on the all, the plantings will be at the top and hang down over the wall as they grow.
- Both on the City's Tree List

o f. Pipevine (*Aristolochia Macrophylla*) and Woodbine (*Clematis Virginiana*).

- Climbing plant intended to spread and cover wall at driveway/parking entrance
- Note: While not on the City's Tree or Shrub lists, Pipevine and Woodbine are both listed as native to central Virginia.
- <https://plants.sc.egov.usda.gov/home/plantProfile?symbol=ARMA7>
- <https://plants.sc.egov.usda.gov/home/plantProfile?symbol=CLVI5>

o i. One (1) Tulip Poplar (*Liriodendron Tulipifera*):

- At driveway
- On the City's Tree List
- Alteration to the (west) stone patio at the existing house
- Path: Concrete
- Patio: flagstone paving.
- Low walls: fieldstone with bluestone caps
- Electrical transformers to be screened.
- Parking: below grade, accesses from west via Preston Place
- Driveway wall: fieldstone with climbing plants—incl. Woodbine and Pipevine.

o Note: The previous design indicated a metal rail at the top of the wall, which is not shown on the current drawings; however, it will be installed if required by code.

## **Discussion**

### **Regarding historic designation**

#### **Local**

This property, including the house, was first designated by the City as an IPP. When the City later established the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, Wyndhurst was incorporated into the district.

#### **State and federal**

Wyndhurst is listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places as an individual site (<https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/historic-registers/104-0048/>) **and** as a contributing structure to the *Rugby Road-University Corner Historic District* (<https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/historic-registers/104-0133/>).

### **Regarding prior BAR actions**

In October 2019, the BAR denied a CoA to construct a parking lot at this site. December 2019, upon appeal, City Council upheld the BAR's action. The following summary may be helpful. (The formal record begins on page 299 of:

[http://weblink.charlottesville.org/public/0/edoc/794415/AGENDA\\_20191202Dec02.pdf](http://weblink.charlottesville.org/public/0/edoc/794415/AGENDA_20191202Dec02.pdf))

In denying this CoA request, the BAR cited the ADC District Guidelines for Site Design and Elements (Chapter II). The BAR noted the direction provided in the Introduction (section A): “The relationship between a historic building and its site, landscape features, outbuildings, and other elements within the property boundary all contribute to a historic district’s overall image. Site features should be considered an important part of any project to be reviewed by the Board of Architectural Review.” The BAR noted that the request conflicts with the provisions of Parking Areas and Lots (section F), including: “4. Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic building sites.” “8. Provide screening from adjacent land uses as needed.” And “10. Select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to a historic setting.”

The BAR cited guidance from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties [aka Secretary’s Standards], which are included by reference in the ADC District Guidelines. Specifically, from Alterations and Additions for a New Use (page 146), the Secretary’s Standards recommend against “Locating parking areas directly adjacent to historic buildings where vehicles may cause damage to buildings or landscape features or when they negatively impact the historic character of the setting if landscape features and plant materials are removed.”

The BAR cited sections of the City Code for Historical Preservation and ADC Districts. Specifically, Sec. 34-271 - Purposes: The City of Charlottesville seeks, through the establishment of its several historic districts and through the protection of individually significant properties, to protect community health and safety, to promote the education, prosperity and general welfare of the public through the identification, preservation and enhancement of buildings, structures, landscapes, settings, neighborhoods, places and features with special historical, cultural and architectural significance. To achieve these general purposes, the City of Charlottesville seeks to pursue the following specific purposes:

... (2) To assure that, within the city's historic districts, new structures, additions, landscaping and related elements will be in harmony with their setting and environs[.]

### **Staff Recommendations**

If approval is considered, staff recommends the following conditions:

- Requiring that all lamping be dimmable, if that option is available with the specified light fixtures, the Color Temperature not exceed 3,000K, and the Color Rendering Index is not less than 80, preferably not less than 90.
- Underground the new electrical service.
- During construction, protect the existing stone walls and curbs within the public right of way. Provide documentation prior to construction. If damaged, repair/reconstruct to match prior to final inspection.
- Recommendation [to the city traffic engineer] on the proposed driveway width.

No site plan has been submitted for the proposed new work. During the site plan review process, it is not uncommon to see changes that alter the initial design. In considering an approval of the requested CoA, the BAR should be clear that any subsequent revisions or modifications to what has been submitted for that CoA will require a new application for BAR review. Additionally, the 1920 and c1965 Sanborn maps indicate this site has been undisturbed for at least the last 100 years. The City’s Comprehensive Plan recommends that during land disturbing activities in areas likely to reveal knowledge about the past developers be encouraged to undertake archeological investigations. Additionally, the Secretary’s Standards, as referenced in the Design Guidelines, recommends that archeological resources should be protected, with mitigation measures should they be disturbed. A Phase I archeological level survey would be appropriate at this site.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I do wish that there was something about the comments made at the last meeting. I have trouble remembering. I am more interested in what was said the last time we saw this. It has the most relevance for what we're seeing tonight. I would ask the applicant, as they present this, to point out those things that have been changed since the last meeting and if any changes were made as a result of comments made by us.

**Ms. Lewis** – My question was about comments from neighbors and the public about the preservation of Wyndhurst (the historic structures itself). I wondered if staff could possibly address the duty of a property owner to maintain the building. It is relevant to this application.

**Mr. Werner** – If a property within a historic district or an IPP (Individually Protected Property) is determined to be detrimental to the character of the district, there are provisions the city can use to cite the owner with a zoning violation. The BAR could initiate that. I would meet with zoning staff to issue a letter making recommendations. I have not had to deal with that. It would take a little bit of research for me to know the steps and responses. I know that this house had been approved to be moved down the street. We would have to say what we are citing them for or what the issues are that are causing it to have a detrimental effect on the historic character of the district and on the site.

**Kevin Riddle, Applicant** – I want to emphasize the significant efforts that we have been making along this process to start and maintain a conversation with everybody in the neighborhood. It has been going on for some time beginning after that formal meeting we had with you back in September, 2020. As the design has progressed, we have hosted multiple meetings with the neighbors: October 29, 2020, January 25, 2021, and January 27, 2021. We have exchanged numerous emails with neighbors and concerned citizens with Preservation Piedmont. After the last BAR meeting, we held another meeting on August 25<sup>th</sup> on site that was attended by neighbors to further discuss the project. We have made a robust effort to initiate conversation with interested parties to keep the conversation going. I believe that we have a pretty comprehensive understanding of the neighbor's differences with our proposal. Where we haven't addressed components of their critique, it is not for a lack of listening. It mostly boils down to differences in the strategies that we prefer when designing a new building in an older neighborhood.

In the last meeting, we proposed a building with a primarily stucco exterior. Several members of the BAR didn't support this choice. We have returned to an earlier variation that we presented 4 or 5 months ago that is clad in a red brick veneer. Many of you expressed reservations about the stair in the previous version being open on one side. The stair is now enclosed. The entry remains prominent with a copper structure replacing the open recess. Mr. Lahendro pointed out several of the proposed walks and adjacent site walls could endanger the two cedar trees. Those trees are very important. We have relocated the north-south walk to be several feet farther away from the nearest cedar. We've eliminated a low site wall that was previously shown along the west edge of that walk. That walk is simply one at grade. There won't be the kind of significant disturbance with the foundations for the wall. There was also an east/west walk that previously extended from the building's entrance down to Preston Place. We've eliminated that walk. We realized the presence of the trees there near Preston Place are so close that introducing a new city sidewalk on that side of Preston Place wouldn't be practical. That walk we had previously shown going out to the street would have terminated where the paving is. We already have an existing sidewalk that runs along the north side of the Preston Court Apartments. That can be used and that allows for a pedestrian connection to the proposed building with a lot less disturbance to the site. In the last meeting, James brought up the potential to re-orient the building with the entry facing south instead of facing the street. It was pretty late in the meeting. We weren't able to respond to that comment. We have studied a lot of variations on this proposal. Among them, we have considered the implications of a re-oriented project where the new apartment building would have a

parent if not actual frontage adjacent to the Preston Court Apartments. Accompanying this idea, we felt it was vital to pull the south wall off the proposed building so it would align with Wyndhurst. If we didn't do this, the perception of a new frontage shared with Wyndhurst would be lost. The west building elevation along Preston Place would also become harder to proportion without that recessed entry that we currently have. However, this alignment with Wyndhurst would severely reduce the overall size of the building. To compensate, we considered what the outcome would be if we added an entire story to the project. We realized, not only this would introduce new objections about building height, we would have to introduce an egress stair. That would effectively nullify any 4<sup>th</sup> story gains. Programmatically, this solution didn't come together. In the previous meeting, several members observed that more space between the proposed building and Wyndhurst would benefit the project. We moved the east wall of the apartment building two feet farther away from Wyndhurst. That leaves a terrace that is more than 15% deeper than what it was with the last design. In August, Breck noted that it was unlikely that the elevated recessed planting boxes we proposed in the driveway wall would actually support plantings through the winter. We took that advice and we have eliminated them. We now propose that pipevine would be planted along the top of the north driveway wall. It could be allowed. With it being a stone wall, it has the potential to be a fairly handsome wall even if it is rather tall. The planting developing over time would only enhance it. When the plantings are immature, it will still be a nice feature. Breck was also concerned about shagbark hickories that we had proposed and that they may not thrive in this setting. Instead of hickories, we now propose thornless honey locusts. They occupy a row south of the proposed building.

## QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

**Elizabeth Turner** – Where is the view from the north side of the proposed apartment building? That is the view from the house that is next door. I don't see it. We don't see the proximity of the house next door. I see a lot of drawings that relate to the Preston Apartments. I see some drawings that relate to Wyndhurst. That is not quite clear. Do the drawings account for this apartment building next to a house? The second question has to do with the proposed grading between the Preston Court Apartments and the new proposed building and the house to the north of the apartment building. I am interested in the grading in relation to those properties and runoff. Have they accounted for runoff? How are they mitigating that landscaping and grading? I am concerned about that in relation to the preservation of the trees. One of the walls has been removed. I want to know how they're digging and what they're doing with the runoff.

**Mr. Riddle** – Ms. Turner was asking about a perspective view looking down Preston Place from a vantage north of the project. We don't have a perspective view in this package looking that direction. We do have elevations. We have two elevations. One that is fairly expansive that does include Wyndhurst. We thought that would be sufficient along with multiple perspectives that we show, including one that does show from the east side with Wyndhurst in the foreground and the proposed building in the background. Regarding issues with the site and runoff, those are issues that we will end up resolving with the civil engineers as the site plan develops.

**Mr. Werner** – This project will require a site plan review. No site plan has been submitted for the proposed new work. During the site plan review process, it is not uncommon to see changes that alter the initial design. In considering an approval of a requested COA, the BAR should be clear that any subsequent revisions or modifications to what has been submitted for that COA. If the site plan alters what was approved, they would have to resubmit a new BAR review. The drainage questions and tree protections are handled in the site plan. If there are conditions about where things are being put and kinds of trees, those will be incorporated into the site plan. You do not review drainage issues.

**Larry Goedde** – I have a question about the preservation. What is the status of Wyndhurst relative to this building? On the maps, they are shown as being a single parcel. The developers have insisted that Wyndhurst is separate. There is this development they're putting up. We really don't know what the condition of Wyndhurst is. We have heard that the roof is leaking badly. We've wondered if the building is being let go. Isn't the historic building part of the parcel that is being developed? Shouldn't it be a major consideration in any design that is being proposed? It looks like it is being overwhelmed by a proposed new building?

**Paul Wright** – Currently, there is a massive amount of trash that sits in open cans on the tree protection line between the two properties. I would like to know how trash is going to be addressed by the building. Is there any place on this design for the parking of scooters and bicycles?

**Mark Kavitt** – I am trying calculate the number of units that have been approved for the future land use plan to know what we have. How many units will this project bring online?

**Lisa Kendrick** – If you're in that building at 625 Preston Place and looking towards the new possible building, how close is it and what is that going to look like? I am just down the street. The massiveness of the building is interesting to me. When Mr. Riddle was talking about predominantly brick, does that mean the front or the sides? When he said predominantly brick, I wasn't clear on what that exactly means.

**Mr. Werner** – 625 Preston Place is (if looking at the street map), the apartments on Grady are to the south. Wyndhurst is on 605 Preston Place and is on the parcel on the east side. 625 Preston Place is directly above that.

**Mr. Riddle** – We have not been involved in any evaluation of the existing structure of Wyndhurst as part of our task. What we're bringing to the BAR is a presentation of a new building. I am not in a position to talk about Wyndhurst and its condition. Regarding trash for this particular project, we have set aside an area within the parking level where the trash totters will be kept through the week. Regarding trash for the Preston Court Apartments, that is out of our purview. Regarding bike storage, we haven't identified areas for bike or scooter storage. That is something we may potentially find space for that. We don't have the number of units finalized. Our obligation is to make sure we stay within the density limit that the city zoning allows for. The elevations make it fairly clear that there is a lot of brick on the exterior. There is copper cladding on the new entry enclosure. It is a largely brick building. The distance between the proposed building and 625 Preston Place is a little over 29 feet.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Gastinger** – Can you explain more about the brick patterning that is visible in some of the perspectives? I noticed that there are two brick samples that are also shared as part of the details. Can you explain the intentions there?

**Mr. Riddle** – To add some variation and a bit of character to the building. We thought some expressive brickwork could be useful. In the west façade, we are showing bricks laid with slightly projecting headers in the vertical line of a number of the windows. Up at the parapet wall, we are showing a brick screen where there are deliberate voids. We thought it might be a helpful way to break up the wall there and to add some visual variation to allow a little bit of seeing through. The walls will be sufficiently solid that the mechanical equipment can still be concealed. We're proposing a mix of those two brick types by Meridian. We can provide samples in the future, if necessary should the project be approved. They are readily available.



**Mr. Gastinger** – Those bricks will be mixed. It will be an even mix. The tonal change is textural and not a different colored brick?

**Mr. Riddle** – We have attempted to be as accurate as possible with the illustrations. We're not intending that there would be one brick set aside for the headers on top of the rest. It is intended to be a random mix. We thought those colors would be complimentary and keep the palate from being as quite as redundant as it might with one type.

**Mr. Mohr** – In the previous version, we talked about reducing the throat of the driveway as it came to the street. I am not seeing that. I am curious what conclusion you came to there.

**Mr. Riddle** – We are proposing that it could be as narrow as 18 feet if the city is OK with that. That would not be an extremely wide drive here. It was a clearance that that the owners were comfortable with. There is still a potential option there if it was necessary to bring it down further. We thought 18 feet was a comfortable width considering the number of cars served by this project.

## COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

**Christine Colley** – My comments concern the architectural guidelines for control districts. The idea that new infill in residential areas should relate in footprint and massing to the majority surrounding historic dwellings. The guidelines suggest that sympathetic materials is one tool that designers can use to reduce the visual impact of the mass of new buildings. New material choices for this submission are more in tune with the surrounding buildings. The sympathetic materials are not used to address the fact that the mass and spacing created on the lot are very different from that of the surrounding properties. The historic district is open, airy, and green. In this submission, built forms, building, driveways, walkways, parking surfaces, and other hardscape fill most of the lot. Green and open spaces are minimal. The spacing of the proposed building in relation to Wyndhurst is tight and jarring. The effect of the new building is to obscure Wyndhurst rather than to relate it to the open respectful way that other buildings in the historic district relate to their neighbors. The building of Preston Court Apartments did Wyndhurst no favors. The design crowds Wyndhurst to the extent that the views of the older house from the street are fleeting. The architectural guidelines seem to clarify and give examples of how new buildings can relate to and respect the character of a historic district. Doing entails a great deal more than choosing surface materials from a list of those visible in the district.

**Lisa Kendrick** – It is the same building we keep seeing over and over with a few tweaks to it. I do appreciate the openness that the applicant has had with asking for input. It works both ways. We have given multiple ideas and suggestions. I appreciate you hearing us. It is also mutual in that we are willing to give you input and feedback. When I look at this building, I see that it does not contribute to Wyndhurst. We just heard that Wyndhurst is not even being considered in this project. This whole site is a historical site. It has not been subdivided. Wyndhurst should be considered in the development of this new building. It does not contribute to the historical neighborhood. It is too large in mass and scale. We have seen this architectural firm do beautiful work that is cohesive and supportive of this community in the fraternity that they just renovated. This building that you are proposing on the Wyndhurst historical site does not reflect the talent that you have to make this historical site more beautiful and outstanding. I have sent multiple pictures of ideas to you. I just want that recognized. There has been feedback. It's the same building. It is a loss of greenspace. The greenspace is part of the historical site.

**Genevieve Keller** – I am speaking as a member of Preservation Piedmont. Preservation Piedmont has reviewed the Preston Place submission at the request of some of the neighbors. Our comments are consolidated from reviews of several members of our board. We certainly appreciate the adoption of the brick exterior. That helps the new infill building to recede and embraces a more familiar material palate. It fits better with the adjacent historic buildings. The open brick on the parapets is fuzzy if not necessary for air flow around the mechanicals could possibly be eliminated. Brick like the brick on the adjacent Preston Court Apartments would enhance the project further by adding more material quality. The subtle detail of this proposed brick is appreciated. The brick color and metal pladding color are not quite a red clay brick and green. They're close enough to read as part of the entire composition of the three buildings. We also paid attention to fenestration and shutters. Please ensure shutters are required as a condition of approval so they are not eliminated at a later cost cutting phase. The fenestration, as shown, is appropriate and should be retained as a condition. The new drawings show a connection between the two sections of the building, as well as a defined entry way. We find them both to be significant improvements to the building design. Enlarging the door in the portico would enhance the project. There is still a great difference of 14 feet from top to driveway at the bottom. A planter at the base and the plantings shown in the landscape plan help reduce that visual impact. There are still guardrails around the retaining wall of the drive down. The stone base and retaining wall seem appropriate. **Mr. Schwarz read the rest of the letter from Preservation Piedmont into the public record.**

**Paul Wright** – Lack of information about Wyndhurst condition is reminiscent of plausible deniability. Its historic preservation is in peril. I would hope the BAR would address that. Trash from Preston Court will be on this property. It is forbidden by this board. Approve a design that does not permit other buildings' trash on it. There's no way to address that. The lack of horizontal lines make the massing read as a slab and in need of different bricking details. The screening at the top invokes a sense of 70s architecture. UVA and the surrounding areas have strived to eliminate it with severe consequences. None of it exists. It has little relation to the overall neighborhood. The architect has done fantastic projects. I am aghast as to why I can look across the street on University Circle or up Rugby Road and 'defy' anyone to say that these were designed by the same people. Those buildings are historical, have modern details, and fit within a historic design context. The only people, who will help us, is you. If you don't insist on it, this is what we will get. This is the 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> time we have looked at it. There is no better detailing. Only the BAR can help us. I hope tonight you will do that.

**Larry Goedde** – I have been to most of the meetings with the architect. The architect simply ignored our comments from the beginning. The architect insisted from the beginning that this has nothing to do with Wyndhurst. It has everything to do with Wyndhurst. What they insisted from the beginning is that it is a by right design. Every time this was brought up, the neighbors asked about the historic district and the adjacent historical building. The response was "that's not our concern. We're doing this by right." The Board should really consider this question. Wyndhurst is shown as being part of this parcel. What is being proposed clearly overshadows the historical building. It blocks it out completely from certain angles. This is something that needs to be considered. It is out of scale. I agree with my neighbors in their comments.

**Elizabeth Turner** – I want to speak about the footprint of this building. It remains largely unaltered. The desire to maximize profit and to ignore the historic structure is a fatal flaw in this design. We need to consider scale. Referring to chapter 3 of your guidelines, which has to do with a structure not overwhelming the surrounding properties. 625 Preston Place is virtually ignored in this latest submission. That hole that comprises the driveway into the parking garage is a wall that abuts that property. We need to consider scale. We need to respect Wyndhurst, which is derelict property. The roof is rusting through. The building is leaking. The fastest way for a building to go down is to let the

roof go. It's a crime. I would encourage you to be vigilant about considering the whole parcel. We're counting on you to respect the historic district and enforce the guidelines that are on the books.

**Jean Hiatt** – I agree with a lot of the things that people are saying. I thank you for unanimously declining the August submission for the design of this building. The action did provide the time for the architect to go back to the drawing board, consider some recommendations, and create a building design that more thoughtfully respects this property and the Preston Court Apartments. Out of concern for the homeowners living nearby and the significance of this historic property, the best scenario would be to leave this piece of land open as part of the Wyndhurst landscape. Because of regulations in our current zoning law, the property owner has a right to construct a building. It is important to work towards a satisfactory design for this proposed structure. I was pleased to see that Mr. Riddle includes a connection between the two sections of the building. That is a significant improvement to the building design. I strongly recommend the new doorway and portico be enlarged. The entrance door appears to be the same size as the nearby ground window. That small size is counter to the doorway being a significant focal point of the entranceway. I appreciate the drawings incorporating windows with divided lights. That design reflects the windows in the nearby historic buildings. I hope the divided lights and shutters will be retained. The removal of the balconies would be a plus for the neighborhood. People hanging out on balconies would likely impact the nearby neighbors' peaceful enjoyment of their homes. Please consider changing the design to show more of a distinction in the brickwork between the main façade and the foundation and the main façade and the cornice. Please include a requirement the developer adhere to Dark Sky Guidelines with shielded light fixtures. I am concerned about the current state of neglect of Wyndhurst Manor House.

**Richard Crozier** – I support what Ms. Colley had said. She said it articulately. The proposed building is too big.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Werner** – Per the ordinance for the ADC Districts and IPPs, in considering a particular application, the BAR shall approve the application, unless it finds the proposal does not meet the specific standards set forth within this provision that would be within the Design Guidelines established by the Board or the proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural, and architectural character of the district in which the property is located and the protected property that is subject of the application. Those are the reasons for denial or approval. In any statement of denial, you are required to establish why the denial was stated. Following approval of an application by the BAR, any aggrieved person may note an appeal of the BAR decision to City Council by filing a written notice of appeal within 10 working days of the day of the decision. If you (BAR) were to approve this, anyone who wishes can appeal that decision to City Council. However, there is fee for that. That is part of the BAR application. There's a form to fill out. At the end of that 10 days, there is no opportunity for appeal. Should the BAR deny an application, the applicant may have the same opportunity to file an appeal with the fee and application. On any BAR decision, there is an opportunity for appeal to City Council. There's no deadline for when something goes to Council. If the BAR denies something and the City Council upholds that denial, the applicant or property owner can appeal that decision to the courts. If you approved this, it is appealed to Council, and Council upheld the approval, that appeal to the courts is only available to the applicant and landowner. I just want to make sure everyone knows that you make decisions. You are not a legislative body. Your decisions are appealable to Council. That's available to both sides of this argument. What you decide, if somebody disagrees with it, is not final. There is 10 days in which to take that action. I am citing from the City Code Section 34-286, City Council Appeals, Section 34-285, Approval or Denial of Applications by the BAR relative to the

BAR conditions for approving an application from Section 34-284, BAR Review and Hearing. Those are the options that available so that everyone knows going forward regardless of the BAR decision.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Can you explain the site plan process? I believe there is an opportunity for public input. Is that the case with this? Does this count as their public meeting?

**Mr. Werner** – I know that there is public comment during a site plan. There is less discretion involved. There is more of a checklist involved. People can raise issues at any time. People can make comments to city staff. There is less discretion. I would look at a site plan from the design review. Mine would be to look at what you reviewed, what has been submitted with the site plan, and if they align. If they don't align, is it a significant enough issue that it should be brought back to the BAR?

**Mr. Schwarz** – It give some people an opportunity to understand. They can ask the site plan reviewers how that is going. Those would be opportunities for people to get a little more information.

**Mr. Werner** – You can ask where the trash cans will be stored during the week. It can be a condition that the trash cans be stored in that underground space or inside those doors.

**Mr. Zehmer** – In terms of the setbacks, is that applied to what is above grade? This driveway is right up on that property line to the north.

**Mr. Werner** – That would be addressed during the site plan. That is a zoning question. The fact that it is underground, it is not in your purview. It would be something in the site plan that the zoning administrator would review it.

**Mr. Mohr** – I believe the driveway has to be 3 feet off the property line. I am not sure where the retaining wall qualifies. I think that is the guiding principle.

There seems to be a lot of distrust from the neighborhood about scale. That's the one thing I am not reading here. If I look at this in the city map, Preston Place and Wyndhurst are large buildings. I see it as being a mediating presence between Preston Place and the smaller buildings. Wyndhurst footprints are very similar. The massing is different. It does a pretty good job of starting to break the scale down. One thing that is of interest to me is that by making the primary entrance off the pedestrian side street between Preston Place and the new structure, the entrance relationship is curiously backwards. If you flip the building, the way the notch works, that is a more appropriate way to approach the building. I realize that doesn't quite work with the setback angle. It is something to note.

The building has a notch right now. If I was to look at the plan, I would say its primary approach is either head on or from the north. If you were to mirror it or flip it the other way, the entry sequence makes more sense to me than facing Preston Place. Your stagger works better once you start having your entrance come from Preston Place. This does have some other issues in terms of the setback. The wider sidewalk should be facing down. It is more of an observation. It seems more counter intuitive. It is picking up the line of the street. That's why the setback works like that. The capture of the L seems a little bit backwards given the primacy of the walkway. I don't have a solution for it.

I think having the centerpiece collected together in a closed fashion is more successful. I would be inclined to say that I would rather see the bulk of that the same color as the windows and the copper highlights accentuate the canopy and the front door. It is more recessive. It reads a little 'funny' to me relative to the other metal on the building. I agree with the comment from the Piedmont Preservation Alliance about the screened brick. It seems a little gratuitous. I do like the idea of using the hand

molded brick. That really softens things at a street level considerably. I don't have an issue with the massing. I don't have an issue with the scale of it. Eighteen feet is better. I would much rather see something like twelve feet at the entrance. You can get a tree in there. That would soften that entrance a little bit more. A peninsula or something like that would pinch the entrance itself. It is not a high traffic area. That would be a more appropriate move from a scale standpoint and help create a little more separation from the house to the north. That two feet does make a difference between the two buildings. Whatever we do, there needs to be a commitment from the developer about properly maintaining and really taking care of the house next door. That's part and parcel of this.

**Ms. Lewis** – I wanted to thank staff for the three elevations and different perspectives reflecting the three submittals from the applicant. That was really helpful. That was extra work considering the agenda we have.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Fringetree is a fantastic plant. I am concerned about its proposed location flanking either side of the Wyndhurst entry. That is a tree that can get 12 to 20 feet tall. It would substantially obscure that façade. I like the way it is depicted in the elevations. Something more in the 6 to 8 foot range would be more appropriate for allowing the reading of that house. I worry that it is going to 'bury' Wyndhurst a little bit.

I fully support the undergrounding of power. Given the locations of the power poles and especially in proximity to the Deodora Cedars, any undergrounding should be coordinated with tree protection. I don't want there to be an accident there.

I agree with the public comment about some of the architectural detailing. Shutters were mentioned. This project has a nice combination of materials and detail. That is something we all expect and we need to continue to carry forward as part of our approval or vote on this project.

I am also sympathetic with the condition of Wyndhurst. Given that this is part of the project property, I am supportive of whatever means we have at our disposal to ensure that the integrity and the water proofing barrier for that structure is intact. I do see them as combined projects even if Mr. Riddle's firm has not been hired for that part of the renovation.

This project has come some distance. It began with an appropriate approach to mitigating the scale between some difficult and nuanced circumstances. In the end this is a project that is actually properly scaled. What they have proposed breaks up the mass in a way that is appropriate to a residential neighborhood. It will give more consistency to that street elevation. The materiality is one that is appropriate. There are projects that should be a little more forward in their aesthetic. This one is smart to actually be quiet and recede. I especially appreciate the views looking at Wyndhurst with the project in the background. On SK 382, the darkness of the brick and the texture of the brick actually sets Wyndhurst out in a nice and elegant way. The brick detailing on the parapet did actually break down a little bit of the mass. It was an interesting addition.

**Mr. Lahendro** – The most immediate historic context for this new building is Preston Place. I don't know how we can ignore that. Preston Place and its connection to the residential neighborhood is awkward. It made an 'orphan' out of Wyndhurst. It was poorly conceived in terms of its location in the neighborhood. I have no problem with the design. I like that it is a little more modern. It is not trying to replicate Preston Place. It is changing its detailing. It is being quieter. I like these setbacks as the building goes from south to north. That is appropriate. It reduces the apparent scale and massing of the building as you're going down that side street. I like the detailing, copper, and the brick screen in the parapet. I don't have any issues with any of that. The only thing I would ask for is that as much

separation between the property to the north and this property. If we can get enough separation to get in some larger plantings, I would love to see that. I can support what I am looking at.

**Ms. Lewis** – I don't have an issue with the massing. I do appreciate that the applicant pulled the building two feet off of Wyndhurst to give some space and respect there. The fenestration reflects the residential scale of apertures elsewhere on the street. The building also meets our guidelines. There are also buildings and similar outdoor spaces up and down Preston Place. The removal of a center sidewalk to reduce the disturbance to the front yard, especially the Deodoras, is a good move. There really is no sense of a sidewalk that will only lead to a one way street. This improves pedestrian circulation by leaving it south and joining it to the hardscape of Preston Place Apartments. The change to the brick and materiality, making it two tones, will make this façade rich. It will compliment other properties on the street. The primary one being Preston Place Apartments and other properties. The change to brick is one that is familiar with the material on the street. Generally, I am very pleased that the buildings, which were looking like separate buildings with a Motel 7 stairway in the middle, have been joined with the copper pladding. The entry way that has been created satisfies our guidelines. With regard to Wyndhurst, it should be a condition of our motion that the owner be required to maintain Wyndhurst. If there is any indication and complaint, the city will follow up within 30 days of receiving such a complaint from any neighboring owner or member of the public about the condition of this property. I understand it is outside of a Certificate of Appropriateness application. I agree with the neighbors, particularly Ms. Kendrick, who did note that this does impact a very historic structure. We can't let it be, by dereliction, destroyed.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I meant to thank the public for the observations about Wyndhurst. I would ask that the BAR consider asking staff to initiate legal inspections that are allowed to make sure that the Wyndhurst is not being demolished by neglect. We need to protect Wyndhurst.

**Mr. Riddle** – The owner has assured us that there is a misunderstanding about the condition of the roof that it is definitely not leaking. He does truly intend to restore the house and to preserve it. That is the intent. It is not for it to fall by the wayside.

**Mr. Zehmer** – The staff report with the three images comparing the submittals was very helpful. The divided lights was one of the biggest improvements that was made. It is also supported by Ms. Hiatt in her letter. It would be nice to try to make a condition to ensure that is retained along with the shutters. That really does add to the residential appearance. This has come a long way. I can get behind it.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If it is in the application, we approve it. We want it to be there. If it comes out, we want to hear about that. I appreciate all of the changes that have been made. You have done everything that I have asked for in the last meetings. Your detailing is subtle. It is clean. It is still contemporary. It also has a residential scale and residential feel to it. It helps this project tie itself back into the neighborhood much better. There has been a lot of suggestions tonight. I don't know how we are going to write those down. While I agree with some of them, I would be willing to approve this as is with some of the conditions that staff had put in the staff report. We need to figure out from everyone else whether that is approvable. Which of these conditions do we need to put on it? With the house, I don't know how we can attach that to our motion. If there is concern for the house, we just need to make sure staff gets on that and confirms the condition and whether it is something that is a zoning violation or not.

**Mr. Mohr** – On the lighting front, I can't quite read the schedule. With those wall packs, what is lumen rating on them?

**Mr. Riddle** – Lumen per lamp is 2,600.

**Mr. Mohr** – Are they along the wall?

**Mr. Riddle** – Yes. If you look at page 29, you can see a garage view of those on the wall. You can also see a couple that are called out along the driveway wall outside.

**Mr. Mohr** – Are these going to be controlled or dimmable?

**Mr. Riddle** – I don't if we plan for them to be dimmable. They are intended to be motion activated. We're glad to consider a condition of approval some re-evaluation of those lights. We might seek an alternative if the particular fixtures called out here don't quite fit into the guidelines. Do you see them falling out of what is prescribed?

**Mr. Mohr** – I am nervous about their lumen output. You are in a pretty dark neighborhood with a lot of trees. You actually need to see in there can be pretty low. I would worry about light pollution. Somebody mentioned Dark Sky. We don't have a particularly good handle on lighting code at this point. The owners of The Standard went through some 'pain and suffering' on the West Main lighting. I would like to avoid that. One way to do that is if you have a dimming package on these, you can fine tune it even to the season. It seems that would be advisable since we don't want to draw attention to that underground area. I would prefer to see you are able to control the lighting level.

**Mr. Riddle** – This particular fixture does come with a dimming option.

**Mr. Mohr** – It did look like it. You have it mounted low. You also don't want that to read as a light well, particularly in that scale of a neighborhood.

**Mr. Schwarz** – That is one of staff's recommendations that all lamping is dimmable and the color temperature not exceed 3000K in the color rendering and not be less than 80, preferably 90.

**Mr. Werner** – Lighting is reviewed as part of the site plan. That is an opportunity where I double check.

**Mr. Mohr** – Having the dimmability and the flexibility would be good.

**Mr. Bailey** – In looking at the staff recommendations, could we put the recommendation for a 12 foot driveway as opposed to an 18 foot driveway?

**Mr. Schwarz** – We should recommend a width.

**Mr. Werner** – That would be like what you have at Oakhurst. A recommendation that the city traffic engineer consider allowing flexibility. That would be the motion there.

**Mr. Riddle** – Our concern is that if it is unlikely that the city engineer would be OK with it, can it be a condition? Are you hoping to apply leverage to the decision from the city?

**Mr. Werner** – By code, the BAR can make a recommendation. You are able to use it in working with them. It is in the code to be applied in historic districts where there are constraints like this. There are reasons for the BAR to make the recommendation. That's all they can make. There still may be an issue the traffic engineer can't make the change.

**Mr. Mohr** – How does everybody feel about the brick as selected? Preservation Piedmont suggested hand form brick. I like that idea. I didn't hear anybody else second it.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I like it. I am not going to vote against what they have.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I feel the same way. There is certainly a financial implication.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Some of the other conditions that were talked about tonight were the Fringetrees in front of Wyndhurst, modifying staff's undergrounding of power; make sure it is done so with tree protection, pinching the driveway further, and the pierce brick. Are we OK with that?

**Mr. Werner** – There is also a recommendation about archaeology. It can't be a requirement. It does fall within something that you have recommended for sites of this nature.

**Mr. Schwarz** – The other thing that staff had recommended was protecting the existing stone walls and curbs in the public right of way, provide documentation prior to construction, and if damaged, repair or reconstruct to match prior to final inspection.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Several of us mentioned some concern about window condition at Wyndhurst.

**Ms. Lewis** – I would support a condition that would say that the city cannot issue the Certificate of Appropriateness until a building inspector has inspected Wyndhurst. That's the best we can do.

**Mr. Werner** – I am not going to touch this. Relative to maintenance issues, there is a provision in the code that allows us to cite property owners. The zoning administrator and I can have a conversation about it. Honestly, I cannot advise you on how to incorporate that into a motion.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If we were to put that into the motion and the city had a problem with it, would they strip it from there and the rest of the motion would stand?

**Mr. Riddle** – The owner has informed us that his plans for Wyndhurst are being reviewed by the Department of Historic Resources. I don't know if the information or evaluations that come from that could be useful in the motion that you are making. I don't have information about the schedule when an evaluation would come from that body. It is currently being reviewed.

**Mr. Werner** – In circumstances like that, I administratively review projects that have rehabilitation tax credits associated with it. The tax credits are not always applicable to all work. Is there something else that we can bring to the BAR? There has been a couple of those that we have looked at. I am not aware of anything. There is an agreement with the owner on what is done and how it is done and what is associated with it. It may not be everything. I would have to see that. I can't comment on that.

**Mr. Schwarz** – How many people would require Ms. Lewis' motion amendment to be part of an approval for them to vote for approval?

**Mr. Lahendro** – Would we say the same thing by making a motion saying that we direct staff to do what is legally possible to be sure that Wyndhurst is not being demolished by neglect? There are ordinances against demolition by neglect. I would ask staff to find out what is the mechanism for making sure it is not happening. The review by the Department of Historic Resources is happening as a result of it being a contributing member or a historic resource and what will happen to it if



development happens. There is no condition a survey being done. The issue of a leak in the roof and the building undergoing deterioration is not going to play into the DHR work and what they are doing right now.

**Ms. Lewis** – If we are considering imposing a requirement of a phase I archaeological survey on land that hasn't been inhabited for 100 years, I don't know why we can't send our own city officials out to look at a building. This is a city cost. This is what they're supposed to do. I find it a lot less burdensome and a lot less troublesome legally as far as imposing something that is out of our purview or is burdensome on the applicant than I do with an archaeological survey. I would still like to see the survey. I would have liked to have seen the applicant offer that. Sending our own building officials out to look at a structure, with the permission of the owner, as a condition of this Certificate of Appropriateness seems very reasonable to me.

**Mr. Gastinger** – The project has been presented as full in its documentation that the site plan wraps Wyndhurst. The perspectives include images of Wyndhurst intact. We are voting for approval of this building as a complimentary structure to an intact Wyndhurst. It is reasonable to assume to ensure that is the case.

**Motion – Carl Schwarz moves – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed new construction at 605 Preston Place satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following modifications and recommendations:**

- We require that all lamping be dimmable, if that option is available with the specified light fixtures, the Color Temperature not exceed 3,000K, and the Color Rendering Index is not less than 80, preferably not less than 90.
- We recommend undergrounding the new electrical service in a manner that protects existing trees
- We require that during construction, the applicant must protect the existing stone walls and curbs within the public right of way. Provide documentation prior to construction. If damaged, repair/reconstruct to match prior to final inspection.
- We make a recommendation to the city traffic engineer that the proposed driveway be 12 feet wide or as narrow as possible
- We recommend that a smaller statured tree or shrub be selected from the City's Master Tree List for the site of the currently proposed fringetrees in front of Wyndhurst
- We recommend that all archaeological resources be protected and documented, and a Phase 1 archaeological survey be conducted
- We require that City staff will follow up on concerns over the condition of Wyndhurst and determine if there are zoning violations.

**Ron Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).**

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

#### **D. New Items**

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

BAR 21-10-03

485 14th Street, NW, TMP 090034000

Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District

Owner: Hoo House, LLC  
Applicant: Greg Winkler, Kurt Wassenaar  
Project: Phases 2 and 3 - Renovations and rear addition

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Year Built: 1920 District: Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District Status: Contributing (garage in rear is non-contributing). Four square, Colonial Revival residence. CoA request for Phases 2 and 3 of a three-phase project. (CoA for Phase 1 approved in April 2021.) The applicant has requested that the two phases be evaluated and considered as a single CoA request. Phase 2 includes removal of the existing rear stairs and construction of a two-story addition. Phase 3 includes a two-story addition onto the Phase 2 addition.

Note: Phase 1 included the planting of new street trees and minor site work. The rear garage is noncontributing, removal did not—or, will not--require BAR review.

Phase 2 (paraphrased from April 2021 narrative)

Replace the rear/porch with new addition.

- Rear elevation of the phase II addition will be fully encapsulated as a part of phase 3.
- Hardie Plank siding is intended to distinguish the existing house from the new addition and be consistent with the historical manner in which these additions have been traditionally completed in similar buildings nearby.

Phase 3 (paraphrased from April 2021 narrative)

Add two additional units to the building, per the maximum allowed by zoning.

- Work follows the general size and proportions of the existing house except it is brick of a familial but contrasting color. The massing at the building setback lines on the Gordon Avenue front and is intended to be typologically consistent with the existing house but of its time. Window treatment will be consistent with the existing front house building.

### **Materials for Phases 2 and 3**

- Brick (Phase 3 only): General Shale. Color: *Old English Tudor*. (Mortar color not specified)
- Siding: Hardieplank. Color: *Cobblestone*
- Trim: Hardieplank. Color: BM HC-108, *Sandy Hook Gray*
- Roof: Timberline asphalt. Color: *slate*
- Gutters and downspouts: Not specified
- Windows: Pella Architect Series, 1/1, double-hung
- Doors: Not specified
- Porch deck, columns, ceiling (Phase 2 only): Not specified
- Balcony rails (Phase 3 only): Not specified
- Landscaping: (See landscape plans in Appendix) Phase 2 retains a 6” cypress and a 18” locust; however, these will be removed in Phase 3.
- Walkway: Not specified
- Exterior lighting: Not specified
- Location/screening of mechanical units and utility boxes: Not specified

### **Discussion and Recommendations**

The BAR should consider the building elements and details necessary to evaluate the project. Renderings and schematics communicate mass, scale, design and composition; however a complete application should include details and specific information about the projects materials and components. For example:

- Measured drawings: Elevations, wall details, etc.
- Roofing: Flat, hipped, etc. Metal, slate, asphalt. Flashing details.
- Gutters/downspouts: Types, color, locations, etc.
- Foundation.

- Walls: Masonry, siding, stucco, etc.
- Soffit, cornice, siding, and trim.
- Color palette.
- Doors and windows: Type, lite arrangement, glass spec, trim details, etc.
- Porches and decks: Materials, railing and stair design, etc.
- Landscaping/hardscaping: Grading, trees, low plants, paving materials, etc.
- Lighting. Fixture cut sheets, lamping, etc.

Staff recommends that additional information and material specifications are necessary for a complete review and formal action; however, the general design and materials, as presented, are not inconsistent with the design guidelines. With that, while staff recommends this request be deferred, the BAR should discuss the project, as presented, and express any modifications, if necessary, and request the specific information that should be provided when this application is resubmitted.

This project will also require a site plan review. Because that process may result in changes to the proposed work—landscaping, building footprint, parking area, etc.—by deferring this application any necessary changes can be incorporated into what is resubmitted for the BAR design review.

*Regarding a deferral:* The BAR can defer this request, which would require the applicant resubmit the in time for the November 16 BAR meeting. Or, the BAR can accept the applicant’s request for deferral, which allows the applicant to choose the timing of any resubmittal.

Additionally, it should be made clear that a CoA has an 18-month period of validity, which, if certain conditions are not met, can be extended for reasonable cause and at the applicant’s request. (Refer to Sec. 34-280 for the specific conditions applicable to the period of validity.) The requested CoA would apply to Phases 2 and 3 as presented, so the conditions for the period of validity apply to both. For example, if Phase 2 is initiated, but work on Phase 3 is delayed and the period of validity conditions related to Phase 3 are not met, a new CoA would be required.

Finally, Sec. 34-277(a)(2)—below--requires that demolition of the existing rear porch be addressed as a separate CoA, not with the CoA permitting alterations. Staff erred in not making this distinction. Deferring the current CoA request will allow that matter to be properly resolved.

**Sec. 34-277. - Certificates of appropriateness; demolitions and removals.**

(a) No contributing structure located within a major design control district, and no protected property, shall be moved, removed, encapsulated or demolished (in whole or in part) unless and until an application for a certificate of appropriateness has been approved by the BAR, or the city council on appeal, except that:

(2) Where the moving, removing, encapsulation or demolition of any contributing structure or protected property will disturb or affect fewer than twenty-five (25) square feet, total, of exterior wall, roof or other exterior surfaces, such activity shall be deemed an alteration subject to the review process set forth within section 34-275, above.

**Kurt Wassenaar, Applicant** – This is an update of Phase I that you approved back in April. We have successfully found a company to restore the windows. Those are now being completed. There were no new windows added to the building. The existing windows were restored. We were able to save the ceiling wood, which is a B board trim. That’s being saved and restored. There was some question about the deck material for the front porch. That is being replaced with wood. There’s some structural damage underneath that. We’re replacing that with wood. There was a suggestion/requirement that we replace the railings with the railings that were done down the road at a similar project to this. We’re following those guidelines. I don’t believe there are any items we had on prior conditions that have not

been addressed by us. It has been consistent with your recommendations and goals. I think we have everything done. We did have a survey of the site done. We are completely within the survey boundaries in our zoning envelope for all of the building parts. I don't know if there are any issues where the building is outside of anything. It would not change from the zoning envelope. I think everything you're seeing is within your purview and not a zoning related issue relative to the building envelope. The existing backyard structure is pretty close to collapse. We did look at trying to work with it. It is really gone. We are planning on taking it off and using it as a link piece. I don't know if there are any outstanding issues on the existing Phase I piece.

With Phase II, there are some code-related issues of the existing house that need to be addressed. They conform under the existing building code. They're really not up to code standards that the owner is comfortable with. The Phase II part is a two story addition. It does include a rear fire exit and a rear fire stair, which is conforming to the current code. That was a safety issue we wanted to address as well as providing a living space for the 2 four bedroom units that are on the two floors of the existing building. There is a front porch on the existing Phase II building. This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. It is a common bathroom, living room, etc. We have finished construction drawings for these projects. We're happy to provide the full drawings. (Next Slide) This is the proposed Phase II side elevation from Gordon Avenue. We're just trying to work with the typology of the building. You had requested that we shift the eave line in the rear section to distinguish it from the original house. We shifted the colors on that to more properly contrast the existing trim and roof with the existing house with the new addition. (Next Slide) This is the rear Phase II addition. It faces the alley. There are parking spaces in front of the house. We did not show all of the plantings in front of this with these renderings. There are plantings that go along the base of that. (Next Slide) We're just trying to follow the basic geometry and typology of the existing house. (Next Slide) This is a street view. We're just trying to fit in with the existing houses and the buildings around it. (Next Slide) This is the view from the alleyway drive in with the Phase II configuration. We have parking along the back. We're proposing a standard curb. The alley is gravel now. We will pave that back parking area. We do have back racks, which offset two of the parking requirements on the zoning. (Next Slide) This is a side elevation from the entrance of the alley looking at the back of the house. You can see two entrance doors. The door on the left is a door into the main floor of the ground floor unit of the existing house. The door on the right is the door to the stairway that goes up to the upper floor addition section. (Next Slide) This is the back of the Phase II addition. (Next Slide) This is oblique corner from the adjacent house looking at the backyard. There is quite a bit of yard there. (Next Slide) These are the specifications of the windows. These are the exact same window type on the project that we did down the road. These are consistent with the similar addition we 3 years ago up the street towards 17<sup>th</sup> Street. Roofing is hardy plank siding. We picked the trim colors to match your recommendations on the contrast you had asked us to provide. These windows are one over one double hung windows.

With Phase III, the current plan of the owner is to build the second phase of the project right now. We're working quickly to get the first phase done for January occupancy. We would proceed onto the Phase II work. I am aware of the validity period of the BAR approval. If the Board sought to extend this for us to save your workload down the road, I would certainly be happy to have any extensions you're preparing to offer on this. There is a high probability that we will build it within the envelope of the current approval. This is the view from Gordon Avenue looking at the addition. We adjusted the building to fit the recommendations you have given us in April relative to the offset between the buildings. The door that you see is the door to the ground floor of the rear addition section. The stairway that you saw in the Phase II addition serves the upper floor apartments. There's no other entrance door. (Next Slide) The new addition essentially wraps the existing Phase II addition. It is completely encapsulated by the Phase III work. It is on two floors. (Next Slide) This is the Gordon Avenue elevation. The end of the porch is cut off by the new addition. It effectively joins that stairway

that you saw. It is effectively wrapping the end of the Phase II addition and encompassing that stair piece. (Next Slide) This is the rear elevation. We're trying to do a little bit more long-term harmonious design. It will be the permanent solution to the design down the road. It has parking within 4 feet of the back of the building. (Next Slide) This is the elevation from the adjacent house. It is the connector piece on the other side. (Next Slide) This is the same oblique view from the alleyway looking across at the house. With the meeting in April, we took careful notes and tried to do everything you advised us to do. We agreed with the consensus opinion of the Board. We have been consistent with implementing the recommendations of the Board at that time. I hope that we're coming to you with what you had asked us to do as completely as we could make it. (Next Slide) There are some nice trees across the back. We're saving those. Staff mentioned that there were trees that we're removing. Most of those are not survivable trees. They're old and damaged. If they had been something we thought that was worthy of saving, we would have tried to do that. They're not viable trees. They have been badly banged up by cars, kids, and everything else. (Next Slide) This is the material palette. We picked a contrasting brick color at the recommendation of the Board.

As you know, city utilities are a mystery in places. Our contractor is excavating to try to find all of those, which is why we haven't yet submitted a site plan. As soon as we are successful in identifying all of the utility pieces, we will be submitting the site plan.

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from the Public

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – The windows show some heavy jams. Is that a graphical error?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – Yes. The windows are the same that we had approved in the prior addition.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It's more the brick mold that goes around them?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – We can give you additional detail that will match. We also modified the eave line to drop it a little bit so that the rooflines don't conflict. They don't portend that they're emulating the existing house.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Can you describe the two back, little balconies?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – Those are just flat balconies with a railing that the doors open in. They're not protruding beyond the edge. We're within a foot of the zoning envelope. We're just trying to provide a nice living room experience off that backside of the building.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Are they wood that is painted?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – It will be a metal railing.

**Mr. Gastinger** – You described a difference in the brick color. I sense a color difference in some of the renderings. Would you describe more about how they would compare/contrast?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – We have dealt with this with the National Park Service guidelines on not trying to emulate or duplicate the color of the existing brick. The general rule is that we want shift the color enough that it looks different when you see it in various light conditions. That's the goal. I think we

did that. If there's a question about that, we can certainly refine the design intent. The samples that we provided to you do that relative to the existing brick color. We just got a new color rendering that is going to give us a better ability to match the brick colors without having a problem with that. It's been hard to get those exactly right because of the lighting and the variation of the existing brick that has aged on the existing house. The design intent is that it be a contrasting red brick that is different from the front house brick.

**Mr. Gastinger** – It looks like a little bit more brown and lighter. How would you describe the difference? We just have the renderings.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – The palate of the back of the house that we were working with was to try to go to more of a lighter color because of the mass of the building. It reduces the visual mass in that alley corner. It is obviously a subjective call.

**Mr. Gastinger** – With Phase III, there are a number of plantings that are suggested in the renderings. Will we be receiving a planting plan?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – Yes. That's going to be part of our site plan submission.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – My one concern is the change in colors. It is obviously going to be new construction. Even the brick will obviously be new brick. You are just continuing the roofline. I know our guidelines are picky about breaking the roofline. You are recessing the roofline. I am not sure the change in colors was necessary.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – We were following your suggestions. We thought it wasn't a bad suggestion. Whether we got the colors right or contrast right, I am open to suggestions from my colleagues. It's pretty open ended. The National Park Service Guidelines want there to be a differentiation. What that means is really anybody's guess.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I feel it is impossible to evaluate the brick with the perspectives. Relative to color, they're washed out. It is hard to tell. We know, from the existing photos, that is a really rich, red brick. Seeing the two photos of a brick panel against existing, I can be swayed either way. The project is very straightforward and appropriate for the context. It just needs a little more detail, seeing the landscape plan, and some clarity about the brick intentions.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – We have this new color emitter technology that we can actually do a map of the exact color frequencies of the existing brick. We're limited in terms of what is available in the market place. We can come back to you with a review of the sample boards of what the actual color is. We may be able to get some of the brick as we do the demolition of that little chunk in the back and present that to you.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If still stuck with COVID issues, you can also drop off a sample panel.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I think it is impossible to match the existing bricks. You come as close as you can. It will be distinct enough to be able to tell that it is a later addition. I agree with Karl about making it

deliberately different. That does worry me. I would say to get as close as you can. It's going to be different.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – That's a subjective comment. I am hoping to consider the Park Guidelines to lead us in the direction of doing something that is contrasting so you don't mistake the old with the new. This is such a small building on an intimate scale. If you want us to match, we can certainly do that. The shifts in the rooflines are enough along with the difference in construction.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I guarantee you that the mortar joints will be different. There is so much that is going to be different even if you try to match it exactly. It's going to read as a different building.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – We have never succeeded in matching these things on historical restorations very well. In general, I favor a contrast than a badly matched attempt.

**Mr Lahendro** – Putting a brown brick addition on a red brick building bothers me.

We're being asked for a COA approval for Phase III? I am worried about improving something that we know that the windows are shown to be wrong. Some other details are wrong on the packets we have received. Is that what we're being asked to do?

**Mr. Schwarz** – Staff has suggested that we defer this. It does need a little more information. It needs a landscape plan and some lighting.

**Mr. Zehmer** – A deferral would be for Phase II and Phase III?

**Mr. Schwarz** – Correct. We should have a good conversation. When the applicant brings it back, he knows exactly what he needs to do to get an approval.

**Mr. Zehmer** – I want to be considerate of his schedule. If he is coming back next month and trying to get Phase II complete by January that might be tough.

**Mr. Lahendro** – Would it help if we went ahead and voted on a COA for Phase II?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – It would. That would avoid the brick problem.

**Mr. Werner** – There are some details to know what we're getting. It would be helpful. I am putting that out there to cover my bases. I think that it would be wise to split these up. That would help them. There is an investment going on in this expansion. Saving \$125 on making this application is probably the best idea. It would be fine for you to evaluate it and make it clear that you're approving only Phase II. There still might be some clarification points that you want to address.

**Mr. Mohr** – It seems to me that we should hold it to the same standard we ask of other people. There's nothing here that is going to be a problem. The applicant already has the construction drawings. As long as he shares the eave detail, column detail, and fascia detail, we're consistent with how we treat other people.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I would ask that staff be clear in what the applicant is lacking.

**Mr. Werner** – It is always a struggle from a design review. Renderings are really helpful. Renderings can illustrate but they're not construction drawings. I have had things come in where renderings look

like the picture. That's not what it was. I look at this and see a porch detail, porch ceiling, porch columns, and porch flooring. We have done awnings on the backs of buildings and asked for a section through how those are attached. It comes back to us.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – If you want to make approval of the construction drawings for Phase II, we're happy to do that. We're close to be able to do that. It would be helpful to us to not to defer to November because of our construction schedule if possible. I respect the wisdom of the Board.

**Mr. Werner** – We have a porch that is a prominent feature. I want to make sure we have gone to great length in discussing column details. Is there something going on here that needs to be expressed and articulated when it comes in, I am not "catching hell" for it?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – Let us provide you with construction drawings of what it is. We'll do that as part of a conditional approval.

**Mr. Schwarz** – We can't have staff administratively approve anything unless it has been fully described to us. We can say that staff can confirm what we discussed in the meeting has been achieved and has been met. If we're going to approve this Phase II, we're going to have to pick out some of these details in this meeting right now. Everyone is going to have to feel comfortable with you verbally telling us. For example, the porch columns appear to be round Tuscan columns. Is that what we're seeing? Are they wood?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – They're wood, square columns because they're a secondary column from the front porch.

**Mr. Schwarz** – Is there any exterior lighting?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – Yes. It is recessed lighting. The ceiling of that would be B board. The deck below, on the porch is a wood deck similar in type and construction to the front porch deck.

**Mr. Mohr** – How does the building meet the ground at the porch and along the siding edge? Is that brick or concrete?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – It is a concrete sub-piece that sits there. The front of that edge will sit up on it. We will match the windows from what we did in the other project that you have already approved. We can give you a detail on the fascia and soffits.

**Mr. Mohr** – The corner boards look wide. Is that how it is going to go?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – It is a narrower one consistent with the width of the hardy plank.

**Mr. Zehmer** – What is the porch floor?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – The porch floor is wood.

**Mr. Schwarz** – The corner boards will be about 6 inches. Is that correct?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – That's correct.

**Mr. Werner** – We have entablature on the front porch. We have a porch ceiling. That can be a guide.



**Mr. Wassenaar** – We're going to follow that. That's the intent.

**Mr. Lahendro** – As it has been pointed out, this is to be distinguished from the historic part of the building. We're not looking to exactly reproduce the front porch. This is a secondary porch. Simplify the details that give the character without exactly matching.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – The proportions need to be familial and consistent with an appropriate proportion with the front of the house.

**Mr. Schwarz** – We have the lighting and porch construction. We have a better understanding of the trim boards. It will be a concrete foundation that will be exposed underneath the siding underneath the porch.

**Mr. Mohr** – There needs to be freeze to the window heads. On the old house there is the jack arch and the freeze board? The rendering implies it is doing the same thing.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – That is correct. In Phase II, there is no brick. We would include a detail for that in the Phase III submittal.

**Mr. Schwarz** – With Phase II, you have a wide freeze board above the top of the windows. Is that the intent?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – That is correct.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am trying to get you to verbally describe any of these questions. That's the only way we're going to be able to approve this tonight. We're teasing out things. Can you describe the eave? What type of soffit is going up there?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – It is going to be a hardy plank flat. The existing house is a Philadelphia Gutter. These gutters are going to be regular, aluminum gutters.

**Mr. Mohr** – Set on a flat fascia at one by six?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – That's correct.

**Mr. Mohr** – The windows in Phase II are down by a flat casing that makes up the difference of that jack arch to line up?

**Mr. Wassenaar** – That's correct. I can see this either way. I thought this was more appropriate. It's really a secondary part of the typology of the building. It is more modern of its time.

**Mr. Mohr** – I was wondering about taking the freeze board down to land on the casing lengths for the new part and have a distinction between how the window heads are handled.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – My preference is what we have drawn here. I can see it the other way if that was important.

**Mr. Schwarz** – For simplicity and if we are going to vote on this tonight, we probably want to leave it as he has drawn it.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – I see the Phase II piece as a separate part of the building that is secondary to the main house. I don't know if it needs mimic the detail on the brick part of the building.

**Mr. Schwarz** – If we voted on this tonight, it would be without a full landscape plan. We understand what trees are going and staying for Phase II. Are we comfortable with that?

**Mr. Gastinger** – I am comfortable with that. It doesn't seem that there is any new proposed plantings or demolitions as part of Phase II.

**Mr. Werner** – I understand that it is being expressed verbally so there is a record here. I am trying to envision this. It's good. It's difficult to not have a piece of paper. Two years ago, unless it was an administrative review, decisions could not be deferred to staff. Things had to be addressed completely. Things seem to make sense at the moment.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – I spent a decade on the Board.

**Mr. Gastinger** – I don't think there is much objectionable in the proposal. We're spending way too much time on this project.

**Mr. Wassenaar** – It is a simple building. It is not that complex of a building.

**Motion (Phase II) – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that only the proposed Phase 2 alterations and construction at 485 14th Street NW satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District, and that the BAR approves the Phase 2 portions of the application, as has been verbally confirmed in this meeting. Those items include: • The porch will have wood square columns, with a beadboard ceiling, a wood deck. • There will be a concrete foundation. • The corner boards will be approximately 6" wide, to be consistent with the siding. • There will be a fiber cement soffit and a standard aluminum gutter. • There will be a tall frieze board above the window heads. • The only exterior lighting for Phase 2 will be in the ceiling of the porch, and will be dimmable, will have a color temperature that does not exceed 3000 K, and will have a color rendering index of not less than 80, preferably not less than 90. • The color of the siding and trim should match the paint color that is on the original house. Mr. Lahendro seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).**

## **6. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR 21-10-04

310 East Main Street, TMP 280041000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Armory 310 East Main, LLC

Applicant: Robert Nichols/Formworks

Project: Facade renovation

**Robert Watkins, Staff Report** – Year Built: 1916. In 1956 the north façade was reconstructed. The existing north façade was constructed in 1982. (The south façade may have been at this same time, staff will confirm.) District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing (Note: When the district was established, all existing structures were designated *contributing*.) CoA request for alterations to the Main Street (north) and Water Street (south) facades. The proposed work will alter the 20th century facades.

## Discussion and Recommendations

The original, 1916 facades no longer exist. The proposed alterations will replace the contemporary facades constructed in the 1980s. The November 1980 National Register nomination of the Charlottesville and Albemarle County Courthouse Historic District does not include this address, nor do any of the building descriptions for this block match the current design. Unless the building [the facades] are of exceptional importance, it does not meet the 50-year threshold necessary for consideration for the National Register.

<https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/historic-register/>

A Property that can be Nominated for Listing in the Registers should:

- Have achieved historical significance at least 50 years prior to today and/or is of exceptional importance; and
- Is associated with at least one of the following:
  - o An important event or historic trend;
  - o A significant person whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented;
  - o An important architectural or engineering design; or it represents the work of a master; or it is a distinguishable entity although its components may lack individual distinction;
  - o Has the potential to answer important research questions about human history (most commonly these properties are archaeological sites); and
- Retain physical integrity through retention of historic materials, appearance, design, and other physical features.

There are two questions for the BAR to discuss:

1. Do the existing facades—together or singularly; as part of the mall or as a single structure; and due to age, design, architect. and/or other factors—contribute to historic character of the Downtown ADC and should they be protected? (Emphasizing that an ADC District is a City designation, and not dependent on state or national designation.)
2. If the facades are to be altered--together or singularly—are the proposed changes consistent with the ADC District Design Guidelines?

Additionally, due to the unique nature of the existing facades, the BAR might consider applying components of the design standards for both *New Construction* and for *Rehabilitation*.

The applicant has not specified the glass to be used. The BAR may request that information or address it as a condition of approval. In the Appendix is a summary of BAR's July 17, 2018 discussion re: Clear Glass.

**Robert Nichols, Applicant** – This building has two facades. It is one the few through buildings on the Mall. The owner of the property has come to us to replace them for performance and technical reasons and to give the building a better presence on the Mall. We're presenting two full facades: Water Street and East Main Street. Both faces of the building have that familiar proportional rhythm that shows up on the Mall; a narrow component that is associated with circulation and entrance into the building, particularly the entrance to upper floors. A wider bay is dedicated to (at the street level) display of retail merchandise and goods. Both of these facades are working with those proportions. With the Mall side, one of the conditions that is going to remain in place is that elevator that creates the circular context shaft that's been made of glass. We're doing away with that enclosure and shape. The elevator is where the vertical circulation is taking place in that building. We have worked on keeping that as a vertical element and proportional element on the Mall façade. We're between the old Hardware Store and the Annex to the Bank of America building. I have described the A/B vertical proportion associated with the elevator and the storefront/retail function and the occupyable office space. That is being conceived as a relative straightforward masonry/brick frame with a large aperture at the ground that is creating the vision and the passage with a double height aperture above where the two occupied floors are. There is a painted metal condition that divides the larger opening. To the left of the retail display is the entry to the retail area and the entry into the building proper and vertical circulation.

Street numbering signage hangs in three dimensional lettering from the ‘header’ on the underside of the second floor. The brick is going to be a worn grey color. We don’t have a selection yet. I don’t have a sample. To resolve the relationship with the neighboring building, we have a ~6 inch recess and 8 inches in width of the recessed panel in brick that will allow the corners of the neighboring building to be expressed and to avoid a continuous plane of the adjacent brick with the new brick. The vertical shaft condition is receiving a decorative treatment of charcoal and fabricated aluminum. What we’re currently working with is we’re looking for a density of ornament there. What we’re showing is a collection of rhythms and patterns using steel and ideally would be a bronze. We’re trying to see if we can get the effect we want using not much of it. It will be cost effective. This is not fully resolved. It is likely we will bringing you something that is fully resolved/resolution at another meeting.

With the Water Street side, we have done a lot of work on Water Street. We think of it as a slightly ‘grunter,’ heavier duty version of what is happening on the Mall side. This is the back end of those buildings or light industrial or warehouse storage buildings. We have developed this façade. Aside from the brick panels that bound the façade, the infill is all conceived of as an industrial metal profiles. That allows us to increase the glass size. We’re interested in getting as much daylight in here as we can. We have a very narrow building and a very deep floor plan. We’re paying close attention to daylight. We can’t illuminate this whole building. We have solar and glare issues. We have faced those before. We have strategies on the interior addressing that. This façade is largely about a lighter, metal structure that is creating these frames for relatively large apertures. We have a similar proportional strategy. We have a vision up above that narrow bay. The detail that I am showing here is that we’re intending to handle spandrel conditions with a coating that creates diffusion in the glass. That’s going to be the source of concealing the structure and the fire stop behind those horizontal bands.

This is the floorplan at the Mall level. It goes a little bit deeper than the purview of the BAR. It may help you understand what is happening. You can perceive some depth there. You will pass into the public way once you cross that threshold.

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from the Public

## **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Zehmer** – You have shown the address. Can you have the same address on both sides of the building?

**Mr. Nichols** – I am not sure how they handle addressing. We need some identification for wayfinding on the Water Street side. I don’t have any clear idea what the rules are if that is just a backdoor. The intention is for it is to help people find it. If that means it changes, we can bring signage clarification.

**Mr. Werner** – The primary issue with the posting address is for 911. There are things that you have to follow. I would suggest looking at the style of the lettering and numbering. There might be some signage on the window or door. When it comes in, it would be something you looked at. All of the signage requires a separate permit.

**Mr. Mohr** – Are you rebuilding this entire building in this volume?

**Mr. Nichols** – Yes. There’s going to be some interior work. It’s really incidental partitions.

**Mr. Mohr** – When you talk about lighting, no skylights or any kind of roof scape?

**Mr. Nichols** – At the moment, no.

**Mr. Gastinger** – Can you describe a little bit more about the fritting strategy? If I understand it correctly, it is just in the spandrel. That is what is shown on the left side of page 5. It would not be the kind of opaque tone that's suggested in the rendering.

**Mr. Nichols** – It is not the full glass that is opaque. If we're looking at page 5, the spandrel in the narrow portion above the street number is where the floor assembly is. That is concealed by opaque metal. On the other bays, there will be a transition to the frit.

**Mr. Gastinger** – In the rendering on the Main Street side, there seems to be some different tonal values to some of the glass panels. That's not any fritting?

**Mr. Nichols** – No. Those would be uniform. For uniformity, you can refer to the panel on the left.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – I can't find anything in the guidelines that would specifically bar us from approving this. There are still some things that need to be worked out. Unlike a residential project, there's a lot of commercial construction. There is still a lot of unknowns. I would love to see a wall section. You're showing a lot of depth. It would be nice to know how much depth is there and how these things are being put together. That would give you some time to figure out the artistic piece on the elevator. My recommendation is going to be to ask you to defer this. I see no reason that I would deny it.

**Mr. Gastinger** – It is really elegant. I like the approach. The elevator forced you into really nice vertical proportions and taking it to the rear façade. Those are pretty successful.

**Mr. Mohr** – For your solar control, and not just the relationship between the two façades, but on the south façade, you can maybe pick up some cues or elements from the elevator façade and repeat those in the back. That might be a way to address the fact that it is south facing. That's why I was asking about skylights; thinking about ways to bring in light to the center of the building and carry that language through.

**Mr. Nichols** – Are you talking about application on the Water Street façade in that narrow bay?

**Mr. Mohr** – I am thinking there might be a way to take it to another level but also be able to control sunlight.

**Mr. Nichols** – Do you have an interest in density ornaments?

**Mr. Mohr** – Yes with depth in the façade. That's a façade you can see that façade from a number of different angles. That façade gets pounded with sun. You have an intriguing language starting there. It gives you some depth of feel for your façade on the south side but also deals with solar control.

**Mr. Lahendro** – I have no comments or objections to what is being proposed.

**Ms. Lewis** – I am generally supportive of this project. I don't find the current building contributes at all to the ADC District. That's a threshold question we're asked to address.

**Mr. Nichols** – In addition to some modeling and drawing, we will get some physical brick samples to your hands. I will talk with staff about how to do that.

**Mr. Schwarz** – I am glad that you focused us on the gray on that application.

**Applicant requests a deferral – Motion to Accept Applicant Request for Deferral – Mr. Schwarz – Second by Mr. Gastinger – Motion passes 8-0.**

Ms. Lewis did leave the meeting.

## **E. Preliminary Discussion**

### **7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (HC District)**

1615 East Market Street, Tax Map Parcel 110005000

Woolen Mills HC District

Owner/Applicant: Jennifer and Lemuel Oppenheimer

Project: Construct residence

Note: Oct 6, 2021, owner requested prelim discussion in lieu of CoA review

- All of the preliminary discussions are within Conservation Districts and there is no requirement for a preliminary discussion.
- With a Conservation District, staff has a lot more latitude for administrative review. Staff is allowed to do this by ordinance.
- Staff introduced this application to the Board.
- The applicants have subdivided a parcel on East Market Street. Easier to add a new house versus adding additions to the existing house.
- The spacing with the neighbor to the east might be a little slight. Not much to take issue with this project.
- The only thing missing was a list of materials.
- Mr. Gastinger brought up the need for a site diagram. Mr. Gastinger also thought that the house looked appropriate and was within the Guidelines.
- Mr. Gastinger was curious about the spacing and setbacks when compared to the rest of the neighborhood.
- The applicant is currently working with an architect on this project. The house will come up to the 25 feet and not so close to our neighbor to the east.
- The applicant did have a question regarding solar panels. Staff did address the applicant's question with solar panels. Solar panels are not a problem within Conservation Districts.

**Mr. Schwarz moves to authorize staff to perform administrative review for this project. Tim Mohr seconds motion. Motion passes (7-0, Lewis had departed meeting).**

### **8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (HC District)**

700 Locust Avenue, Tax Map Parcel 510066000

Martha Jefferson HC District

Owner/Applicant: Eric M & Galia Mann-Hielscher

Project: Construct outbuilding

- Staff introduced the application to the Board for a preliminary discussion.

- This application can be approved administratively through current City Code. There were some questions regarding components of the application.
- Applicant was eager to listen to feedback from the BAR.
- Mr. Schwarz did ask about the plywood color. The applicant is going to be using cedar.
- The applicant is willing to do whatever is asked by the BAR to do on the construction of this outbuilding.
- Mr. Gastinger brought up how close to the street this outbuilding is going to be.
- The existing garage is going to be demolished to make room for the new outbuilding. It is non-contributing.
- The fence is going to remain. The new building is going to have an enlarged footprint
- Mr. Mohr thought that the exterior to the new outbuilding was confusing. He thought that the brick was strange.
- The applicant is planning to use cedar paneling on the exterior.

**9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (HC District)**

1804 Chesapeake Street, Tax Map Parcel 55A141000

Woolen Mills HC District

Owner/ Applicant: Emily and Anthony Lazaro

Project: Construct addition

- Staff introduced the proposed project to the BAR for feedback and suggestions. Staff would have no issues reviewing this project administratively.
- The applicant doesn't have a material list due to the prices of materials.
- The timeline for construction was Spring, 2022.
- Cedar does fall into the guidelines for the exterior.
- Members of the Board agreed that this project is a Consent Agenda item on a future Agenda or have staff administratively review the project.

**F. Other Business**

Staff Questions/Discussion

- Board is going to vote on a new Chair and Vice-Chair for the BAR at the November BAR meeting.
- There is a lot going on in the town. There are a lot of planters popping up on the Downtown Mall.

Garage Door at Hill & Wood

123 Bollingwood

Preservation Awards

Update on Administrative Reviews

Brief Discussion on ADC District Guidelines

PLACE Update

**G. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 PM.