

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
December 21, 2021 – 5:00 PM
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Due to the current public health emergency, this meeting is being held online via Zoom. The meeting process will be as follows: For each item, staff will make a brief presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, after which members of the public will be allowed to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to speak. Public comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

Members Present: James Zehmer, Carl Schwarz, Cheri Lewis, Ron Bailey, Breck Gastinger, Jody Lahendro, Robert Edwards, Tim Mohr

Members Absent: Andy McClure

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner, Remy Trail, James Freas

Pre-Meeting:

James Freas, the new director of Neighborhood Development Services, joined the BAR meeting to be introduced to the BAR.

Staff sent out information about the Belmont Bridge and if the BAR had any questions regarding the slip joints of the Belmont Bridge. The BAR was given an update regarding the Belmont Bridge and the slip joints on the Belmont Bridge. Mr. Gastinger expressed disappointment in this process with the Belmont Bridge.

There was discussion on Rugby Road. There was discussion regarding the Rugby Road COA application. Ms. Lewis brought up the guidelines for the neighborhood with Rugby Road.

The chairman had a question for Mr. Freas regarding changes being made to the final site plan after the COA has been issued. The chairman wanted to bring it to the attention of Mr. Freas.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Public Comments

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

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from May 18, 2021

2. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 21-12-01

112 W Market Street (The Haven), TMP 330254000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: First Street Church Project, LLC
Applicant: Kathy Garstang, Building Goodness Foundation
Project: Garden

Motion by Mr. Lahendro to approve the Consent Agenda – Second by Ms. Lewis – Motion passes 6-0 with one abstention (Mr. Gastinger)

C. Deferred Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 21-04-04
517 Rugby Road, TMP 050046000
Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District
Owner: Alumni of Alpha Mu, Inc
Applicant: Garrett Rouzer/Dalgliesh Gilpin Paxton Architects
Project: Alterations to fraternity house

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –Year Built: c1910 District: Rugby Road - University Circle - Venable Neighborhood ADC District Status: Contributing. (The house is also a contributing structure to the *Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District* - VLR 1983, NRHP 1984.) Constructed as a private residence. 2-1/2 story, Colonial Revival. The house features a symmetrical, three-bay front façade with a hipped roof and a front, hipped dormer with latticed casement windows. On the side (south) façade is a two-story bay, on the front (east) facade is a center bay, distyle porch with attenuated Roman Doric columns and a hipped roof. The entrance door features geometrically glazed sidelights and an elliptical, fan-light transom. In the 1964, the house transitioned to its current use as a fraternity house. The City's 1983 historic survey notes the siding is wood shingles, which were installed over the original, weatherboard wood siding. Per the applicant's 2014 submittal*, in 1987, both layers were removed--including the corner boards and trim--and replaced with the current Masonite siding. Additionally, the applicant noted: the windows were originally 2 over 2—some have been replaced; the originally open south porch was enclosed with 8 over 8 windows; the wood shingle or slate roof was replaced with asphalt shingles; and the southwest chimney was lowered and capped. CoA request for front porch extension and reconstruction, the addition to and rehabilitation of the existing house, and the related sitework and landscaping.

Existing

- Existing chimney to remain
- Existing frieze board to remain
- Replace siding with exposure (6") to match that of the existing, non-historic Masonite siding.
- Replace corner board to match existing non-historic
- Repair existing windows: Applicant's note: Existing windows date to mid-twentieth century. Replacement sashes were installed c.2014 or later. Anticipated repairs in place will only include weather sealing, painting, and limited wood restoration as required.
- Existing skylight to remain
- Repair existing security lights
- Shutters on East Elevation will be repaired and reinstalled with their current inoperable function. Shutters on other elevations have previously been removed and will not be replaced.

- New gutters and downspouts: Ogee profile painted aluminum gutter, rectangular painted aluminum downspout.

Front Porch

Applicant's note: Annotated photos document existing historic and non-historic conditions.

Submittal drawings illustrate both detailed existing historic condition, and new condition with distinguishing details.

- New metal roofing on existing non-historic entry porch roof: Prefinished (painted, *Charcoal Gray*) standing seam metal roof with traditional appearance to seams and hips.
- Porch addition with metal roofing, railing, columns and entablature with details to differ from historic
- Historic porch columns, architrave and frieze to remain
- Porch ceiling (additions): Cementitious bead-board ceiling
- Gutters and downspouts: Ogee profile painted aluminum gutter, rectangular painted aluminum downspout.
- New brick pier (match existing brick)
- Historic front door, transom and sidelights will remain.

Rear Addition

- Remove existing stair, projection and dormer.
- Roof: New asphalt shingles to match existing non-historic
- Siding: new, 7 1/4" exposure cementitious siding and corner board. (The exposure will differentiate the addition from the existing house, which will have a 6" exposure.)
- Panels at rear elevation: cementitious flat panels with flat trim.
- Doors and windows: New aluminum clad windows. Pella Reserve.
- Trim: New rim board.
- Cornice: Existing cornice has frieze board below the bed molding. New cornice on the addition will omit this frieze board for distinguishing characteristic.
- New brick foundation (match existing brick)
- Stairs: Wood, painted.
- Railings: Metal, painted black.
- Gutters and downspouts: Ogee profile painted aluminum gutter, rectangular painted aluminum downspout.

Lighting

- Driveway facade door lighting fixture: Progress Lighting 5" cylinder. Dimmable, CT 3000K, CRI 90.
- Social terrace lighting fixture: Standard flood lights. (120W PAR-38 lamping is available that is dimmable and with CT 3000K.)
- Recessed lighting fixtures: Iolite LED. Dimmable, CT 3000K. CRI 90.

Note: [from applicant]: Building-mounted security lighting has been moved to lowest position possible that provides adequate area illumination for pedestrian safety, while remaining above pedestrian reach height to prevent tampering.

Site

- Terrace and patio: Brick walls with blue stone pavers
- Retaining wall (with steps) at front yard: 24 - 30" +/- height. Fieldstone wall like existing.
Alternate: CMU/concrete wall with stone facing, pending final wall height.

Landscaping

- New tree at front yard: Black gum tree
- Hedge at front yard hedge and at rear patio: Buttonbush
- Front walk plantings: American sweetshrub
- Hedge at side yard: Winterberry holly

Discussion and Recommendations

BAR should rely on the germane sections of the ADC District Design Guidelines and related review criteria. While elements of other chapters may be relevant, staff recommends that the BAR refer to Chapter IV—*Rehabilitation*, and Chapter VII--*Demolitions and Moving*.

As a checklist for the preliminary discussion, the criteria for Additions in Chapter III:

- Function and Size
- Location
- Design
- Replication of Style
- Materials and Features
- Attachment to Existing Building

The BAR should also consider the building elements and details necessary to evaluate the project. Renderings and schematics communicates 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.

Regarding the front porch: The house was constructed c1910. The 1920 Sanborn Map (below) indicates a porch of a similar size and location to the existing; however, in 1915 (photos below) the porch roof was flat with an upper railing—the columns and entablature appear to be the same, if not similar. The prior design essentially replaced the existing porch, extending it across the façade. The current design retains the existing columns (full and engaged) and entablature as a discrete element, separate from the porch extensions on either side.

BAR should discuss the extent that the details and features of the new are differentiated from the existing—columns, railings, entablature, ceiling, etc.

In the design guidelines for porches (Section D in *Rehabilitations*) are three specific recommendations that should be applied here:

1. The original details and shape of porches should be retained including the outline, roof height, and roof pitch.
4. Replace an entire porch only if it is too deteriorated to repair or is completely missing, and design to match the original as closely as possible.

7. Do not remove or radically change entrances and porches important in defining the building's overall historic character.

Staff note on suggested motions:

Applicant informed staff they plan to complete the construction documents in April 2022 and initiate construction by June 2022. This project has at least three separate *components*: the front porch, the addition to/rehab of the existing house, and the related site work/landscaping. If there are elements of a component that require clarification and/or further submittals, but the other component(s) are acceptable as submitted, staff suggests approving what is ready and omitting from the CoA what is not. A requested CoA cannot be approved piecemeal. Components cannot be approved, with others deferred for consideration under the same application. However, the latter can be omitted from the approved CoA and resubmitted later as a new request, requiring a new application and fee.

BAR should consider the following conditions:

- All lamping for exterior lights will be dimmable, have a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and have a Color Rendering Index of not less than 80, preferably not less than 90.
- The cementitious siding, trim and materials will be smooth, no faux grain.

Eric Amtmann, Applicant – With this first slide, I would like to start with going briefly through the various periods that we have seen the building in and make a clear distinction so we all have the same understanding of the existing historic versus existing non-historic to the period of significance, which we are calling early 20th Century circa 1915. Staff touched on that with the shingles as being one of those items. The top left photo is circa 1915; built roughly in 1910. What we can see there is a slate shingled roof as evidenced by the lead hip-caps, horizontal siding, and corner boards. You can see that there are 41 rows of siding in this existing historic condition. You can see, on the south side, there is an open porch within 5 years of being built as well as shutters on both primary east façade and north façade. You can see a **distyled** center bay entry porch with a low slope, most likely close to a flat roof with a balustrade, saturated tarp paper for the roofing material, possibly flat seamed metal. We can't tell from the photograph. We can see that it has a very low slope and a railing from the front column connecting to the house. We know that it has vertical pickets. Those are the significant existing historic conditions. Moving to the top right photo (circa 1983), the corner boards and siding were completely obscured with a shingles overlay. That's what previous reports say covered the previous historic siding material. Today, those shingles are gone. The siding underneath is existing non-historic Masonite. The corner boards do appear to be historic. If they're repairable, we would certainly like to keep them in their existing position. You can see from the front entry porch retains its **diestyle** configuration. It appears to have close to the historic entablature up through the cornice in place. The roof has been removed and replaced. You can see the peak of that hip comes almost up to the windowsill. The porch on the south side has been enclosed. It appears that gutters and downspouts are close to their original historic configuration. Down and to the left, we have siding in place, which is non-historic, shutters remaining on the east elevation, which is the entry elevation (non-historic). The windows have also been replaced. With the existing windows, I can't tell you what was there in 1983. We do know that the double hung, two over two windows that are there now are not the historic windows. They were also not replaced with sash replacements as proposed in 2014, the last time this project came before the BAR. Sash replacements with the existing, non-historic frames was approved. That work was not done. We still have the mid-century windows and will be proposing to repair those in place. There are some details regarding the entry porch. I have photographs that are detailed photographs. The understructure (the floor, the flooring) are existing non-historic. There are various conditions of historic and non-historic. In our proposed elevation, we're proposing to retain the historic center bay porch in place and adding rings. There would be distinguishing details so that we're not copying the historic conditions.

Next Slide

In the center part of the house is the historic existing footprint with the enclosed to the south. The purple areas are areas of proposed new construction of covered parking area and terraced to the left and open/uncovered terrace to the south. In that same area, those cross-hatched red areas are selected removals of existing non-historic additions. The blue areas on the east elevation on the entry side would be the proposed porch extensions. You can see the dystyled columns and the half rectangular pilasters (all historic) engaged to the east wall. We would be proposing to add half engaged pilasters of different profiles and round columns at the outside corners.

Next Slide

The bubbles distinguish all the specific materials. With landscaping, we have a city plant list with items called out as appropriate. There are some existing steps that lead up to this center entrance, which will be reconstructed with retaining walls as well as a second new sidewalk instead of steps slightly to the south and a retaining wall rebuilt between those two stairs. There is an existing tree to the left of the driveway. It is the biggest tree in the front yard. It is in good condition, and it will be retained. On the southeast corner of the house, there's a new tree. That tree is no longer there. We will leave it for questions if anybody has questions about the detail. If you see the two arrows on the plan, it is a split plan. We're showing the first floor, which is one story higher to the east on the entry side. To the west, it is the lower floor.

Next Slide

These are existing condition photographs. There is an aggregation of various conditions of that porch. We have treated lumber, balustrades, decking, and treated lumber floor joists all dangerous states of disrepair. In the lower right, that's the existing set of steps and the non-existent retaining wall.

Next Slide

The top left photograph is the northeast corner, which shows how the driveway goes down towards the west side of the site and the lower level. It also shows views from adjacent properties. With the two at the bottom, you can see existing, non-historic secretions on the back. We're certain that these are non-historic. The brick and the mortar are clearly a later period than the main house. On that second floor, the intersection of that little roof and the historic cornice would not have been done that way. It is clear an afterthought of a later addition.

Next Slide

This slide shows the areas to be removed.

Next Slide

The main thing to focus with these renderings is the change in details that provide information for the viewer of what is historic and what is non-historic. Speaking to just the main house, there is an existing breeze board, which shows in the historic photographs. That has been recreated. It exists in its historic condition along with the corner boards. We would retain that. There's no trim board or rim boards at the bottom. As you move around to the north elevation, you can see the two conditions side by side. The existing historic is on the left and the proposed on the right with changes in the siding spacing. You can also see the changes in the molding profiles and locations.

Next Slide

What is in blue is the existing historic columns from the bases up to the capitals, freeze, and bed mold in some locations. On the south side, the bed mold has been removed and replaced with a piece of crown molding of a different profile. The proposed area is flanking left and right.

Next Slide

You can see on the left (south) where the 14 is. That's the new dormer on the back with siding parallel to the roof. That would have a 3 over 3 windows. The number 3 dormer is on the right (the historic condition with its horizontal siding). There are changes in profiles and siding that indicate it is subtle. It's enough for DHR and Interior Secretary Standards for distinction of historic and new.

Next Slide

Photo documentation of front porch. Existing column base is on the left. The non-historic replaced above the bed mold condition is all new structure and trim above the bed mold. Same thing for the pilaster attached to the house.

Next Slide

The drawing on the left is the field measurements of the existing conditions. That would be for the center bay. We're proposing to construct for the left and right flanking bays detailed on the right. The existing is Roman Doric simplified. The profiles aren't elaborate. We're proposing to have the new details more in line with Tuscan order. You can see the difference between the attic base on the left and the Taurus base on the right as well as decking and capital differences and changes in the moldings on the architrave and bed mold.

Next Slide

There is also detail for the section for how we would do the railing. This appropriate for a mid-century addition to an early 20th century porch. On the left, is the wood railing. The detail on the right is the metal handrail, which you get around the southwest side of the terraces.

Next Slide

With the light cut sheets, the down light goes over the lower-level entrance door. The wall or soffit mounted security lighting is indicated in various locations all along the rendered elevations. We have them as low as we can get them to minimize light throw onto adjoining properties but high enough to light the area that needs to be lit and out of the reach range of tampering. Those are the recessed ceiling lights above the parking area.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Eric Edwardson – I am from the Alumni Corporation Board. I just wanted to let you know that I was here.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – On the first plan that shows the demolition, it looks like there are a couple of windows shown as being removed. I didn't see those being removed from the elevations. I am just wondering if you could speak to that. Are those going to be removed?

Mr. Amtmann – They'll be removed and replaced with new units to match the rest of the new units that are going in on the first and second floors and up in the attic level. That's all embedded with the new construction, except for the porch on the south. On the lower level, those need to be doors that go out to that covered terrace area. The flanking windows are shown as relocated.

Mr. Zehmer – There's one on the north side at the driveway?

Mr. Amtmann – That's at the lower level. I am not sure why that is shown as being removed. That's a small coal hopper window.

Mr. Zehmer – The diagram shows those as being non-historic?

Mr. Amtmann – That's correct.

Mr. Zehmer – Is that the just the sash that is non-historic or the opening itself?

Mr. Amtmann – In the first and second floors or the ones that are being removed?

Mr. Zehmer – The ones being removed.

Mr. Amtmann – They are all non-historic. That lower level is reconfigured.

Mr. Schwarz – The street shrubs are awfully tall. Is that intentional to let them get that tall? Google said that those would be about 13 feet tall in front of the front porch. With the button bush, it would be 6 to 12 feet tall along the street. Is the intention for those to get to full height?

Mr. Amtmann – No. They need to be maintained down at the street level to around 5 feet, maybe 6 feet. Foundation plantings next to the porch need to be 3 feet. We don't want those over the floor when we have about 28 inches of vertical there.

Mr. Gastinger – You referenced the retaining wall on Rugby. I didn't see a material list or height. I don't see much information about that in the documentation.

Mr. Amtmann – Staff and I did discuss that. I guess it didn't get into what was submitted on record. We will do either a block or concrete retaining wall with stone facing or just a stone wall. The intent would be to have it be rounded field stone that looks like it is natural to that area. The reason I don't say it is a reinforced concrete wall or stone wall is because I am not sure how high it is. We need a structural engineer to detail that. It's not going to be an engineered self-stacking, non-mortared wall. The intent is for it to look like a field stone retaining wall.

Mr. Gastinger – That would be a stone cap as well?

Mr. Amtmann – Not with a cap like you think of as a ledge stone. It's just the rubble wall up to a mortared top.

Mr. Schwarz – With the front porch roof, you mentioned when you were looking at the historic photographs that the current roof goes up to the underside of the windowsill. Your drawings show it a little bit lower and labels it as a historic roof to be reroofed. Are you intending to lower the slope of the roof?

Mr. Amtmann – No. We wouldn't be changing the framing unless it needed to be changed.

Mr. Schwarz – It will match what is existing?

Mr. Amtmann – The existing non-historic roof framing will stay where it is and be repaired in place if necessary.

Ms. Lewis – You're saying all of the windows on the back of the house are not original?

Mr. Amtmann – None of the windows surrounding the house, to my knowledge, are historic. They have all been replaced roughly mid-century. They have aluminum sash liners and glazing compound conditions that are not historic. It is not glass from 1910. I can't speak for sure about the frames inside the walls because we haven't torn them apart. We're not changing them except on the east elevation where they have become embedded within the new construction addition. They're going to be repaired in place.

Ms. Lewis – They're going away on the backside of the addition. Do you think the placement of the windows is original?

Mr. Amtmann – I think they're slightly different sized. We have zoomed in on the siding spacing. We know where the tops and bottoms are. You count off 41 courses in the existing photograph. You do the same on the historic photograph. The windows don't line up. I think they have moved subtly from the historic condition. We're not changing them.

Ms. Lewis – What about the door? Is that thought to be original on the back? Is there a transom that has been painted over? What is that detail?

Mr. Amtmann – I am honestly not sure since we were planning on that being within the new construction. We haven't surveyed that door closely.

Mr. Mohr – With the security lighting, how do you envision that being used? Is that just because there's a security situation? Are those things are going to be on all the time?

Mr. Amtmann – A little bit of both. I want to show the distinction between the lighting that is already there and what elevation it is at. Above the Delta Sigma Phi letters, there's some security lighting up there by the downspout and on the other corner, southeast corner in the same location. Those are all the way up at roof level. We will be keeping those in place and repairing if necessary. Everything else is proposed to be new. We have a situation here where there's a lot of pedestrian traffic at night, after social events, or coming home late from the library, Parts of this building are out of sight, hidden from view of the street, and in secluded areas with no site line. That's why I am calling them security lighting. We can have them motion-activated if that's something the Board feels strongly about. There would be periods during a social event where they would be turned on and left on for extended periods of time. Around the other three sides, we have them basically at one floor level above where the ground level is; not all the way up at this very high roof level where you get a lot of light wash

spreading further than it needs to. We're trying to keep them down low so it would be just lighting in the walking areas below.

Mr. Zehmer – On the front porch, you were discussing the existing porch's Roman-Doric columns and the additions being Tuscan. I do think you have been successful to retain that center section. I am worried about where the entablature from the two wings crash into the original porch. Are those entablatures the exact same?

Mr. Amtmann – That is the same height. It would intersect well but not be a molding profile. It is basically a flat distillation of the curved molding.

Mr. Zehmer – All of the other elements line up?

Mr. Amtmann – That's correct. That mold and the crown mold would. Similar effort was taken where the rail intersection is around the two bases. We're trying to get that bottom rail to rest in there with the profile on the attic base so it can be coped in without chopping up that base or having an awkward connection.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr –The spotlights concern me. At the very minimum, it seems to me that they ought to be footed. There are glare bombs without any kind of shroud on them.

Mr. Amtmann – We can certainly do that.

Mr. Mohr – That is an antiquated lighting system. Doing something to reduce the amount of light spray and making sure they are really pointed down makes sense. They're probably more effective up high just for the simple reason you can make them point down. The house is a little below the street.

Mr. Amtmann – The existing security lights are up high at the roof level on the entry side.

Mr. Mohr – I would rather see a strategy of down lights rather than something that is on the house projecting away from the house. The other thing I wondered about is the pitch on the shed to the left. What is the pitch on that side?

Mr. Amtmann – I am not sure. It is existing. I haven't measured it. It is shown the way it exists. I can't tell you exactly what the slope is.

Mr. Mohr – It looks flat. What about putting a flatter pitch on the two wings so that you get some sense of the prominence of the center section rather than having the same slope?

Mr. Amtmann – That's a good idea. We would be amenable to that, and the roofing material could accommodate that as well. We have 4:12 slope on it right now. That painted standing seam metal roof can accommodate down to a 2:12 slope. That's a good suggestion.

Regarding the security lighting, I'd suggest the Board consider making a note in their approval that final fixture be approved administratively. We can certainly accommodate that.

Mr. Lahendro – I’m concerned about the two different columns. I’m curious what the Board members think. I understand the intent to have some subtle differences between the two so that you can tell which one is original and which one is later. I worry that instead of a deliberate decision to make a subtle difference, it is going to look more like a clumsy mistake in trying to match something. I prefer a simple square column for the porch extensions and leaving the Doric original columns for the original porch as a distinction between what is new and what is historic. This is the one thing that bothers me: the necking being different.

Mr. Amtmann – That’s an interesting comment. We looked at a couple of different schemes that considered square columns there with simpler profiles to them. We thought it looked too weak and that there was too much of a distinction between the two. With the change in the roof slope now also indicating more of a distinction, it is going to have a lighter feel above that entablature. I think that might be a good idea; more distinction that’s clearly differentiated is not as a bad match.

Mr. Lahendro – I would like to know what other Board members think. Am I making something up? Is this a concern of anyone else?

Mr. Mohr – That’s a very good point. I think that you’re right about the roof making those two more of a line. I can even see if you were worried about the sense of scale, even doing a corner condition where you have three columns if you wanted to make it more distinct and make them square. That would create enough of a distinction from how the corners turn with the old house (round columns) versus three square columns.

Mr. Amtmann – We sketched and looked at where the new cornice or the new entablature is hanging on the historic entablature where that T intersection is. We had another column there. It looked like paired columns at that center bay. It was becoming too much. We took it out. With more slender members, we would revisit putting that column back there as well which brackets both of those side bays instead of just letting it hang off the end.

Mr. Mohr – If you reinforce that corner that would really get the distinction between how one turns the corner.

Mr. Gastinger – I still have a concern. I can’t support the extension of the porch generally. I don’t think our guidelines support it. I don’t think that is in the spirit of the Secretary of Interior Standards. In particular, number 7 of section D: “Do not remove or radically change entrances and porches important defining the building’s overall historic character.” From the historic photos, this has been defining from its construction. I don’t mind the extension of the paved surfaces that are existing there or remaking those into something that is safer. I would also just note that in prior Board review, according to the staff notes, that in 2014 enlargement of the decks that might have been proposed at that time was deemed not appropriate. Otherwise, I am supportive of the project. The approach in the back makes sense. I don’t have too much concern about that. I do feel that this is quite a big change to the historic structure.

Mr. Schwarz – I do feel there are enough questions about this porch that we need to separate this COA between the big addition and the porch so that you get a chance to look at the columns, look at the roof slope and bring it back to the Board. It might be important to see, before you do that, how many people on the Board would be supportive of that porch.

Mr. Zehmer – If we go down the road of adding roofs to the side porches and that is something we want to accept but there is going to be changes in slope and changes to the columns, I think we would like to see it again in front of the BAR. I would support possibly approve the rear addition and ask them to bring the porch back.

Mr. Gastinger – Is there's anyone ready to approve the porch as documented tonight? I don't think we will be there. Let's set that aside and see if there are any other questions related to the rear addition or any other comments related to the rear addition or the site plan.

Mr. Schwarz – I had a comment about the site plan. With the plantings along the street, if it is a solid line of hedges, treat it like a wall or a fence. Five or six feet tall is too much for me. If it can be a species that can be lower, I find it problematic to say that it will be cut lower. It never happens. Once it is tall, it is forever that way. I don't if that is something we can request on this or not.

Mr. Gastinger – Button bushes are a little tricky. It is not a particularly robust shrub.

Mr. Mohr – I find the decks going off more incompatible with the house than the porch wings. They seem like real anomalies to me. It does make sense that the building is continuing to evolve to some degree. I understand Mr. Gastinger's point. The porch can be done in such a way. It would be one thing if this was an absolute architectural gem. It is a nice house. I think it can take some modification over time without compromising the character. The low decks don't do it for me.

Mr. Werner – The last time you looked at a hedge, it was 128 Madison Lane. They were adding a continuing hedge around it. You all had made a recommendation that the front hedge be maintained at four feet or lower, any side hedge be properly maintained at five feet or lower. It was a recommendation. If I recall, the conversation was one of the enforcement. I do believe that if you establish a height as a condition of approval that allows us to have something to fall back on. I don't think it's outside the possibilities of what you all can establish as a condition.

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Gastinger, I don't know what a button bush is.

Mr. Gastinger – Button bush is a native shrub. It is a good species. It's found in the woods in damp areas. It doesn't have a huge track record as a particularly robust hedge in the city. I would strongly recommend to the group that they consider something that is going to be more robust and deal with the foot traffic and the conditions on that busy corner. I do like the recommendation of keeping it maintained at four feet or lower.

Mr. Schwarz – For precedent, when Chris Long was doing his house on Park Street, I know we held them up for at least three meetings because of a hedge that he wanted in the front. We finally got them down to a boxwood that was short. He proceeded to plant something behind it that was about ten feet tall.

Mr. Amtmann – We're not interested in trying to circumvent the requirements or desires on this. We're trying to add landscaping that's an improvement to the neighborhood. We're open to all kinds of suggestions.

Mr. Gastinger – It sounds like there's general support. I haven't heard any strong concerns about the rear addition. The kinds of conditions that I have heard relate to the ones that the staff have already recommended: shrouds on security lighting, the retaining wall at Rugby to be field stone or field stone clad wall, and the recommendation of the hedge at the street be maintained at four feet or lower.

Mr. Mohr – Do want motion detectors on the security lighting so it is not on all night? That goes back to the city having a lighting ordinance. Light pollution is an issue.

Mr. Werner – The retaining wall at the front yard with a 20 to 30 inch height with field stone wall similar to existing alternative: concrete wall with stone pending final wall height. It's in the staff report as an option.

Mr. Amtmann – Would it be better for the applicant to remove consideration of the porch from this application to be presented in a new application at a later date so it doesn't have to be declined in this motion?

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the demolition and addition to and rehabilitation of the existing house, specifically the rear addition and the related site work and landscaping at 517 Rugby Road satisfy the BAR's criteria and are 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 conditions or modifications:

- **That the applicant will submit a substitute fixture for the yard security lights that will include shrouds and motion detectors.**
- **All lamping for exterior lights will be dimmable, have a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and have a Color Rendering Index of not less than 80, preferably not less than 90.**
- **We recommend choosing a smaller shrub species more suitable for being sidewalk adjacent and that it is required to be maintained at a height not to exceed four feet.**
- **The cementitious siding, trim and materials will be smooth, no faux grain.**
- **That the retaining wall at Rugby Road be a fieldstone or fieldstone-clad wall.**

Mr. Lahendro seconds the motion.

This motion does not address approval of the front porch.

Motion passes 8-0.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 20-11-03

612 West Main Street (also 602-616), Tax Parcel 290003000

West Main ADC District

Owner: Heirloom West Main Street Second Phase LLC

Applicant: Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects

Project: Construction of a mixed-use building

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1959-1973 (concrete block automotive service building)
District: West Main Street ADC District Status: Non-contributing. CoA request for construction of a new, four-story mixed-use building. (The existing service station a non-contributing structure; therefore, its demolition does not require a CoA.) BAR recommendations (June 18, 2019) as incorporated into the Special Use Permit (SUP)

- **Garage entry shall not be accessed directly from the building's street wall along West Main Street o SUP item 1.e: [...] No direct access shall be provided into the underground parking from the Building's street wall along West Main Street.**

- The building’s mass shall be broken down to reflect the multi-parcel massing historically on the site, as well as the West Main Street context, using building modulation; and
- The building and massing refer to the historic building.
- o SUP item 2: The mass of the Building shall be broken down to reflect the multi-parcel massing historically on the site, as well as the West Main Street context, using building modulation. The Building and massing refer to the historic buildings on either side.

The Holsinger Building be seismically monitored during construction;

- o SUP item 4: The Landowner (including, without limitation, any person who is an agent, assignee, transferee or successor in interest to the Landowner) shall prepare a Protective Plan for the Rufus Holsinger Building located on property adjacent to the Subject Property at 620- 624 West Main Street (“Holsinger Building” or “Adjacent Property”). [...]
- There shall be pedestrian engagement with the street with an active, transparent, and permeable çade at street level;
- o SUP item 3: There shall be pedestrian engagement with the street with an active, ransparent, and permeable façade at street level.

Jody Lahendro – In the interest of full disclosure, I have my office in the Holsinger Building next door, The First Baptist Church. While I have a wonderful view of the construction that is going to start to happen next door. I have no financial interests or connection at all to the project at 612 West Main Street. I feel that I can participate in this discussion without any partiality

Jeff Dreyfus, Applicant – We are looking for design approval of the project tonight. We hope to begin construction in April of 2022. What I will try to focus on tonight is landscape and hardscape. That has evolved a bit since the last meeting. We have a lighting concept that we would like to review with all of you. I would like to touch upon the brick for the exterior. At the last meeting, there was a request for a number of technical details, which are now in the package that you all have, specifically related to thin brick and how it will be attached to the building and detailed questions such as railings, which are also now in the packet.

Next Slide

What you see here is a plan of the ground floor of both 600 and 612 West Main Street, the new project. This is here in the event we start talking about the façade. The east side of the building will be exposed in the courtyard of 600 West Main Street. It also gives you an idea that the two buildings will be connected via that existing courtyard. We have yet to work out the details of how the paving might change within the courtyard. That will happen so we have access to the new building.

Next Slide

You start to see some of the exterior details. We do have to close the space on the far left. On the new building on the right side (600 West Main Street in the light gray), there are some mechanical units. That will remain between the two buildings. There will be a small fence that will hide those mechanical units from view on both sides. You will see that the window surrounds, the windows, the railings, and this fence are all shown as being a light bronze. This comes across as way too gold throughout the presentation. We’re happy to come back with physical examples of the items for a final review.

Next Slide

With the building elevations, I don't believe there's anything new. We still have the majority of the façade that comes towards West Main Street broken into the two masses that come forward with hyphens between them. Stepping back further is the fourth floor and the entrance to the residential component of the project.

Next Slide

As we get further into the details, I can talk about the brick. At the last BAR meeting, we had some images of our first pass at brick. Concern was expressed that what we were showing was too institutional and a little too much like school cafeteria, almost a glazed brick. The color was a bit more like concrete. Since that time, we have identified another brick that we like very much. It is a much cleaner brick. Unfortunately, because of the supply chain, we are probably three to four weeks out before we will have a sample panel done for final review and approval. We're working as hard as we can to get that completed. That sample panel will have a number of conditions in them representing what we're talking about tonight. On these drawings, you will see that we identify five different types of brick. Brick #1 is called Monarch Brick. It's actually twice the length of the standard brick. It's as thin as the standard brick. The two elements that come forward will be the Monarch Brick. The joints will be standard concave joints. What we're looking to do here is a very quiet and relatively smooth surface. Another one of those bricks is a thin version of the Monarch Brick. That's brick #5. It is the same brick visually. Technically, it's a different thickness. That brick will be used above the windows in those two portions of the building that come forward. The hyphens will be a standard modular brick. It will have a raked joint. We're looking to emphasize the horizontals. We will also have angled bricks within that. You'll be able to see that further into the presentation. That is so those panels recede. It will also be used on the residential entry. At the residential entry, there is going to be a plaster wall. It will be the one material that is smoother than anything else on the façade. The textured brick will be used on the hyphens, the residential component in the back, and on the left hand side (the east elevation of that residential lot) as it faces 600 West Main Street's courtyard. The rest of the building will be standard modular brick with concave joints, whether thin or thick. Those are the various brick types. The 3-D representations may be the easier place to look at all of them. Knowing that the brick is a crucial component of this, there are samples we are having made and will be done to represent all of the various conditions, including the brick surrounds that we're showing around each of the windows.

Next Slide

This is the elevation facing 600 West Main Street. It is all textured modular brick for this façade.

Next Slide

For glass, we are specifying that the glass on the entire north façade will be 70% VLT per the guidelines. That will be in both the retail and the residential components. All of the facades are going to be lesser for energy efficiency.

Next Slide

This is the south façade facing the railroad tracks. As we have discussed, the brick wraps the bookends. We have EFIS exterior insulation system. It essentially looks like stucco on the rear façade. It will be a color that will come close to matching the brick. The railings will be the light bronze.

Next Slide

This is the elevation facing the alley between us and the Holsinger Building to the west. You can see the hyphen on the far left. The textured brick on that will dive into the standard modular brick on the remainder of the building. It is a setback between those two elevations.

Next Slide

This is a close up of the retail on the lower level and the residential on the upper level. These are the first three floors. You can see the Monarch Brick The surround on the retail ends will be metal. You will see that more in the 3-D representations. The railings will be a horizontal bar on top. We're not going to be seeing attachments on the sides. The railings themselves are half-inch round rods. They will be irregularly spaced. The elevation is so highly regulated.

Next Slide

What we wanted to show here is how the thin brick will be attached to the building as much as the standard brick. The brick that we will be proposing comes with corner sections. When thin brick turns the corner, there are sections that are fabricated so that the brick looks like a standard brick thickness from the side. It won't appear to be wallpaper. This is a section through the north façade showing retail, residential, and the step-back for the upper terrace on the fourth floor.

Next Slide

This is a detail through the residential entrance with a sloped ceiling with thin brick on the ceiling sloping down to the glass entry of the residential lobby.

One thing that has changed is that we just learned that we will have a green roof on a portion of this building. We were anticipating that was on the south elevation as you can see on the far right. The terraces just above the ground floor level would have a green roof off the terraces themselves. Unfortunately, we were just informed that we need to move it to the rooftop for purposes that are more technical. There will still be a green roof here. We hope, in the future, to have a rooftop terrace. There's not a plan at the moment to provide access to the public. The green roof will be up there and is being planned so we don't preclude a rooftop terrace in the future.

Next Slide

Some of the details are showing more of the thin brick, where we intent to use it, and calling out some of the details of the brick that surrounds the protrusions around some of the windows.

Next Slide

On this page, you do start to see what we are proposing. This is a photograph of the brick that we anticipate using. You can see on the second image that is the pattern we are proposing for the hyphens and the residential block that sits back from the street. One point of reference for the brick we're talking about is that it is not as light as the brick that was used on the Quirk. This is a little darker. We have a sample of that to show that to you once the samples are up. We're looking for more of a cream color that has a bit of grey in it. The plaster for the walled residential entry.

Next Slide

This is talking about signage for both the residential component and the retail components. Our proposal is that for the residential, the signage would be slightly offset of the wall. Above the five retail entries, would be the signage for the individual retailers. It would be applied to the metal panels. They will not be backlit. With the lighting concept, we will talk about how the signage for the retail would be lit. We are well under the city's allowed maximum signage.

Next Slide

The planned mechanical units will not be seen from the street from any angle. They're set well into the middle of the building. You can see where the rooftop terrace might be going in the future. At this point, there does not appear to be any need for screening of these units.

Anne Pray, Applicant –

Next Slide

I want to go through some of the few changes we have made to the plan that are some subtle shifts. The plan should look familiar to everyone at this point. In the residential and tree area, we have straightened out the garden plan to allow for the curve of the residential entry to really read as something more special and unique to the whole surrounding. That garden plan has gone from the senioous form to the more straight lines coming into the building. We are now specifically calling out the street trees. There were some questions about that the last time. We are calling out those trees. We have also added in two handrails at the end of the plan. To the far left, you can see those. In general, we have more specific callouts for materials here. We are calling out the plain grey concrete surface along the front of the building and the concrete pavers in the residential entry area. The plan should read as pretty familiar.

Next Slide

In the conversation last month, there was some questions about the existing conditions. One question was about what type of trees are there now. The trees are zelkovas. You can see in the plan the one with the green center is going to stay. That is just beyond our property boundary and closer to the retail store. We have these five zelkovas along the frontage that will go.

Next Slide

You can see in the elevation a couple of the changes. The four trees as required, the shifts in the garden plan allowing for the curve to read a little bit more clearly at the residential entry, and the handrails at the end. The metal planters on the far right did grow slightly. We have a little more planting area in that planter.

Next Slide

We are trying to identify and get clearer about the intent with all of the subtle elements that are making up this landscape: the bike rack, the handrail, one of our planters has a bench on it. We're looking at a wood product to use for that, concrete pavers. The planter color will match the windows and the rails. There's a little bit about the tree canopy and the planting in the courtyard, which we are looking to make that planting be about greens and textures and not a lot of color there. We're looking to use the planters to get more vibrant color going along the street but trying to project that kind of calm presence with the plantings.

Mr. Dreyfus –

Next Slide

The lighting concept is to allow those two elements, the two blocks closest to West Main Street to move forward by not emphasizing them, allowing the interior lighting to move closer to the street. Part of the BAR's guidelines are to bring as much life to the street. Our concern about how they're lighting those two blocks that move forward would be that we might be obliterating the actual activity in the lighting coming from the residential units. We have a multilayered lighting scheme to try to allow the vitality/activity of what is going on within to actually liven up that part that is closest to West Main Street.

Next Slide

This slide is the overview. With the following slides, they will address the individual components. We are not suggesting this light will be yellow. These were part of the lighting concept presentation to us about how and where we would be putting lights. We have 3000K as the light sources. This is just to represent where it will be. Each of these individual components will be able to individually be dimmed. I would suggest those two columns at the far right on the hyphen and besides the residential entry; we would be able to dim those down individually. The overall scheme is to light the residential entry sign for the residential entry back from the street. There will be a little downlight in that vestibule. The rest of the light will be coming from within the building. The hyphens and the residential entry block would have light coming from the ground. Those two hyphens and residential component are going to have a textured brick. The point is to really emphasize that as we graze it with light from below.

The fourth floor terraces will not have lights on the building. You can see a little glow on the fourth floor. That's going to be light reflected off of the paving on those terraces. There will be some lighting in the railing/cornice. On the backside of it, we will be putting a little light on the ground surface. There won't be any lights on the building. On the building, the remaining element would be lighting of the retail signs in each of the bays. That's the only light within the larger elements that comes forward. We're really highlighting retailers' signage at night as it is seen from West Main Street. The final element is that there will be some lighting in the sides, within the planters, to throw some ambient lighting on the sidewalk.

Next Slide

Some of the types of lights that we're looking at include the linear light. You can see the purple dashed line up at the cornice. That is on the resident's side of the cornice lighting down. That's the linear light at the top right. The next light is light that we will be using that will be within the retail headers/lighting the signage and over at the residential component throwing light down on the walking surfaces. That fixture to the right would be inside the planters. The light at the bottom would be in the ground throwing light up onto the two hyphens and over the residential component.

Next Slide

The light patterning on the top right would be for the retailers and how the light would be seen on the retailer façade. On the bottom right is how we would be grazing the textured brick and the hyphens.

Next Slide

In the residential components, you can see the downlights. We will be using the lighting for the 612 sign. It will probably be a ground-mounted light nearby. You can some ground-lights putting a little bit of light (edge of the planting bed) on the path towards the residential entry.

Next Slide

The other thing we wanted to note here was that part of the reason we designed the building the way we have was not to cover up the mural on the side at 600 West Main Street. We wanted to keep that. We want it to be an element of experience walking down Main Street. The lighting of that will be very soft and intended to give it a glow so it does have a presence at night.

Next Slide

The views speak well for themselves. We tried very hard to model texture brick in the locations that it will be. It's hard for that to come across in some of these renderings. I believe the massing of the building reads clearly in terms of where we will have color, how we will have color, and overall massing and street presence.

It has been a long road for all us. While we don't have a final brick selection and you saw the first lighting presentation of a lighting concept, we would like to ask for approval conditioned on final approved brick color and pattern. If there are issues or concerns and if we need to come back regarding lighting, we're happy to do that. With two members of the BAR leaving after this meeting, we would hate to lose the continuity. With an attempt to begin construction in the early spring, we don't have time to lose.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Mohr – You mentioned color. I am not seeing a lot of color. I am seeing lighter tones in the building next door. The only color I am seeing is the bronze in the plantings. Is that correct?

Mr. Dreyfus – That is correct. We have had this discussion before. Our hope is that we will get it with planter boxes on the railings. As I have said, that is not entirely within owner's control because of maintenance issues.

Mr. Gastinger – You said that the brick panels will be forthcoming. Is the strategy with the way the textured pattern is to be created with one edge of the brick tilting out? Is that still the plan?

Mr. Dreyfus – That is still the plan.

Mr. Gastinger – I am curious how much relief you're thinking about getting or hoping to get with that. Is that being filled with mortar on the back side?

Mr. Dreyfus – When it is laid, it will be filled with mortar in the back so the backside of the wall is a continuous surface. We don't want water sitting back there. In terms of the depth of the furthest brick or furthest out-corner of the brick, my recollection of the sample panel was that it was an inch and a

half. It will be represented on the panels. We have done some panels. Until we get the right brick, we did not want to send anybody to Allied Street. It would have been a futile effort. It will be represented in those. I suspect that it is going to be an inch and a half. Two inches might be a little bit of a stretch.

Mr. Lahendro – Does that mean the head joints are going to be wider there? Or is the brick going to be cut so that the head joint is consistently the same width?

Mr. Dreyfus – The head joint will consistently be the same width.

Mr. Lahendro – With the number of street trees, how were four street trees decided upon?

Ms. Pray – The four is based on the city requirements for canopy coverage and street frontage. I believe there were more trees there because they were fronting a parking lot.

Mr. Lahendro – Is that the minimum? Could more trees be added?

Ms. Pray – We meet the requirement for the number of trees. We exceed the canopy coverage by almost four times the amount based on that site plan calculation. If we looked at adding another tree, it would likely happen on the far right hand side of the building as we look at that elevation. The team has always talked about the trees as far as looking forward to the West Main Street project. They show four trees in that area. We worked back and forth with that number as well.

Mr. Lahendro – It looked like to me that they were paired. I thought that had something to do with the architecture of the two prominent bays. Is that not the case?

Ms. Pray – The layout is in part to work with the architecture.

Mr. Lahendro – A tree could not be added in that gap between the two pairs?

Ms. Pray – I do not believe so. If there was really a discussion to be had there, you could discuss shifting that second group of trees on the right hand side one bay over and maybe adding a third tree to the right. We're trying to create the continuity down and address that space in the middle and leave it open. In looking at the right hand side and if those two trees were to shift one section over, you could potentially get a third tree in on that right hand end. The issue becomes that door on the end is an egress door. We're looking to make sure that stays pretty clear. The idea is that it is not going to be broken up by anything. This layout worked well with the building and met all of the requirements.

Mr. Lahendro – I was just imagining live trees evenly spaced along those two prominent sections, just evenly spaced there. In thinking about the pedestrian experience of going down the street and having continuous canopy coverage.

Ms. Pray – How the trees relate to the building, the spacing on them does allow for a tree to go there in the middle to create that equal spacing that you're talking about. It could create another level of experience for the pedestrians. We would be open to discuss it if that is something people are thinking about more as we look at the evolution of the building.

Mr. Lahendro – I appreciate the architectural connection. It probably would not be picked up by the average pedestrian. They would be more appreciative of having the continuous canopy coverage.

Mr. Mohr – I realize that this has a lot to do with the West Main evolution. One thing your lighting plan doesn't really address is how the sidewalk gets lit.

Mr. Dreyfus – There will be street lights.

Mr. Mohr – Do you know what the distribution of those is likely to be?

Mr. Dreyfus – That is located on a civil plan that we have.

Mr. Mohr – I was wondering how they relate to your tree locations.

Ms. Pray – The team is actively working on that layout. I know that Whitney had a call with the civil engineer last week. I believe they discussed this. At one point, we really weren't sure what jurisdiction it was going to be on. I do know that we're actively trying to figure out who gets to make that call.

Mr. Dreyfus – Whitney is saying that we can propose the location of the lights.

Ms. Pray – We would work to make that work out with the trees.

Mr. Gastinger – I'm not sure what the division of labor is between what you do and what the city will be in charge of. How are those tree pits going to be constructed?

Ms. Pray – I don't have enough detail right now to provide a good answer. I can tell you, based on my own path, I would really push to get the best possible tree detail going here. We are looking to make sure these trees are going to thrive. We want this to become an environment and not just a façade. We would like it to be active as much as we can make it. There is a condition here with the space of the sidewalk and the curb. The real benefit can come in the depth of the pit and what happens underneath the sidewalk. I really be pushing to make that detail a good one.

Mr. Schwarz – Do you know where the power poles are going?

Mr. Dreyfus – Currently, the power poles are not scheduled to be relocated. We will temporarily relocate the power across the street as we did at 600 West Main Street. Right now, Dominion has control over all of that. There isn't any plan to redo those. They're not in our purview.

Mr. Schwarz – Do you have a drawing that shows where they currently exist?

Ms. Pray – I think they are right in front of that third tree. There is one in that picture.

Mr. Schwarz – The trees currently work around those?

Ms. Pray – Yes. We're talking about things being buried. There's a little back and forth on that.

Mr. Schwarz – When the power lines were supplemented for the adjacent property and moved around, a lot of the trees on this property got a 'haircut.' One of the healthiest zelkovas on Old West Main Street is directly across the street in front of the Albemarle Hotel, does that face a similar fate? Is that going to be trimmed back?

Mr. Dreyfus – I don't think anyone of us can answer that one. I can't speak for whatever the power company is going to do.

Ms. Pray – It falls into so many different purviews; Dominion, West Main Streetscape, or the City of Charlottesville street trees. I really want trees on Main Street.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – The light that you're putting on the railing to shine down on the terrace will not continue across the gap?

Mr. Dreyfus – That is correct. It would only be on that portion of the upper balcony that is solid.

Mr. Mohr – You talked about laminating the façade with the residential use. It would also seem that there ought to be some sort of lighting strategy for backlighting all of the commercial glass along the street level. At nighttime it maintains its light on the street. It seems to me that is pretty critical during the active hours of the street.

Mr. Dreyfus – Just so I am clear on what you're suggesting. You're suggesting that there be some sort of requirement for lighting that the retailers light their store from within at night even when they're closed.

Mr. Mohr – At least directly behind the glass display, something that dissolves the glass and gives it some sparkle.

It seems to me that the scale of the entrance is intriguing. It feels like it ought to read more like a two story move. When I first saw it, it felt too much like the scale of a garage opening. It didn't emphasize that entry condition. It's more a matter of how you handle the verticality of that. It seems to me the lower two floors ought to read as a piece of that. I think the scale of it reads a little funny to me as it currently exists.

I am concerned about color. Signage and things like that in the windows will certainly help.

The best image in describing the building (page 63) is where you get a read of the sense of the frame and how the window outlines work. The front entrance needs to be bolder.

Mr. Schwarz – With a big building on West Main Street, there are always reservations. There are always going to be things that we want to see that are improved and better. We can continue with an iteration over and over again. This façade has a lot of depth to it. That's great. I haven't seen a project yet come before the Board that has this much depth and detail in it. As far as I am concerned, you have done a very good job with the building. I know that I picked on you a lot for the color of the neighboring building. That was graphite. With this lighter color scheme, that doesn't bother me as much. It does seem more in keeping with Main Street. My only concerns are the trees. I don't know where to fall on that. We're going to be stuck with what we're going to be stuck with. Unfortunately, City Council didn't want to give us a revised West Main Street. We can only spend so much money. I don't know how we're going to handle your brick samples and color samples. We will have to figure that out. We can't partially approve something. I would be ready to vote on approval for this building with some additional conditions. I am going to ask for a condition on the trees.

Mr. Gastinger – Getting these trees to be successful is really critical to the city and to the success of this building. For me, this is a species that should do well and if they're healthy will get considerably larger than they're shown in the renderings. For this building on the north side of the street, I would rather have four really good, healthy trees than five miserable ones. I say that to encourage every method possible to get them as much soil volume or connected soil volume to those trees on Main Street so they do thrive. If they did, they will come very close to getting that continuous canopy.

The brick is the main material of this entire building. I am supportive of this project. It has come a great distance and can be a really great contribution to the city. Getting that brick is so important. I do feel uncomfortable having such an important piece be so unproven. What could that review really mean? We have been put in situations where we have reviewed samples after approval. The brick order has already been placed or there's no time in the construction sequence. What real capacity would we have together with the architecture team when reviewing those samples? What is appropriate within the way our ordinance is written in a way that we can review items after Certificate of Appropriateness has been given?

Mr. Dreyfus – No brick order has been placed and no brick order will be placed until we get a vote from the BAR that this brick is acceptable. We're not going to play that game. We don't intend to. Approval of the design contingent on final approval of the brick seems reasonable. I don't know if that is possible given the guidelines or the rules. We are working hard to get samples done. It would be our intention to set up a variety of times when members of the Board can come and meet at the Allied brickyard and look at them together. We are ready and willing, as soon as they're there, to meet with all of you as soon as we can to discuss and review them.

Mr. Mohr – We are in extraordinary times right now. We have to grant some degree of flexibility for that very reason. Building materials right now are so ridiculously difficult to comprehend.

Mr. Gastinger – Related to the mockup, if there is a way to also mimic or study the up-lighting, I really like the lighting strategy of emphasizing the hyphens and that texture. It can be absolutely incredible or jarring. I am thinking of the sharp angles and uplift. It can be a bit much. I think you will find that pretty quickly when the mockup is made. I hope that what you're imagining happens.

Mr. Dreyfus – We can use the mockup to test the number of options there regardless of the programs that we and our lighting consultant can use. It would be much better to test it before it goes into the ground and get that angle right.

Mr. Zehmer – With the brick, did you mention the mortar color?

Mr. Dreyfus – The mortar is going to be as close to a match to the brick itself as we can get. We're for the portion that comes forward. We really want that to be very quiet. We're not looking for contrasting mortar. We will be raking that same color mortar in the hyphens.

Mr. Mohr – With the lighting, given that you're dealing with very specific colors and very specific objective in terms of how you're going to shadow it, it seems to me that we might want to grant you some flexibility in terms of the exact color range of light. The same goes for the plaster. I don't know if that is going to have any kind multi-valiant surface to it.

Mr. Dreyfus – That wasn't the intention at this point. It is a relatively flat, very simple surface in contrast to the brick. This is sitting within the textured brick wall.

Mr. Werner – I know the question was raised about what I thought. Given the situation with the sample panel, I understand that collaboration is necessary. When it comes to how all of you should make a decision, the answer I would get from the City Attorney would be if it's not something that you can approve, then don't approve it. If there's something you want to see in order to approve it, then request that. As far as direction from the city, I can't provide a straight answer. This is one of the challenges we have. We have a set of design guidelines and we're really talking details. There's that push and pull of whether conceptual drawings and renderings of more value than a detailed drawing. The challenge you all have: Is this building conceptually what you are looking for? You have a list of things that come from your recommendations to Council for a Special Use Permit. Those are what you identified as really critical. They were broad. As far as looking at a sample panel, I would be clear on what it is you're hoping to see, what is too far, and what is not far enough so that the sample panel is expressing what all of you are interested in looking at first. Second, when that sample panel is ready, what actions are you all looking to make? Are you looking to possibly say that's not what you had thought and start over? Are you looking to make collaborative adjustments to what is presented?

Mr. Gastinger – In this case, we're not trying to evaluate options. Mr. Dreyfus and his team have bent over backwards to try to show what this building will look like. I don't think anybody is confused about that. We have everything except for the actual material. We could vote on the material that has been presented with the stipulation that a review of a panel conforms with what was presented tonight. I think that is what Mr. Dreyfus and his team are asking for us to do. That framing maybe limits the concern about having some kind of contingent. It is an approval. If the Board felt on reviewing the sample panel that it didn't reflect what was presented tonight, we would ask that it be submitted as a change/modification to the approval.

Mr. Bailey – Would that be a formal vote next month? How would that work?

Mr. Gastinger – Only if there was a change and if we felt that it was not what was presented.

Mr. Schwarz – In the past, we have said staff will review something to see if it conforms to what has been described to us. In a sense, we are doing that again.

Mr. Dreyfus – There is a material that is shown and called out in the documents that you have. If you're approving it based on that and if we need to come back with something else, we would have to come back and request a change.

Mr. Schwarz – Is it fair to say that it is the texture that everyone is concerned with? Or is it the material?

Mr. Werner – You approve things all the time with conditions. What happens is that those conditions are met. I review the construction drawings. I will not sign off on a building permit. We have that check. When you all are very clear in what you want, what am I comparing it against? It is this helpful to have the discussion. I don't want to go through what we went through with panels next door at 600 West Main Street. I don't want to run afoul of the process.

Mr. Gastinger – We're looking for color and textures, consistent with what has been presented tonight, and the texture of the textured panels is sufficient to create the distinction between the hyphens and the masses in the way that the project has been presented.

Mr. Mohr – We're just trying to confirm that what is in front of us now matches the physical versions

Mr. Werner – I just want to make sure when you go out there and look at it and if there is any question on that, the default to the applicant and his team is they must do the following.

Mr. Zehmer – If it is reasonably in accordance with what they've submitted tonight, they are good to go. It has to be very different. We can't nitpick a sample panel that is the material that they're proposing tonight.

Mr. Mohr – I would not be expecting the applicant to be advocating for that. We're getting into a much greater detail with this than we do with a lot of projects. That is also because we trust what the applicant is saying. There is some professional courtesy here that we believe what he is attempting to do. He just has to confirm it.

Mr. Gastinger – I feel that we can be really close to a motion here.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed new, mixed-use building at 612 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted per the drawings dated December 17, 2021 and included in the BAR packet, with the following conditions:**

- **With the condition that the BAR needs to see a sample panel of the brick to confirm its color, texture, and that there will be sufficient differentiation between the various portions of the building**
- **That street trees are a necessary component of this project's certificate of appropriateness, and that the certificate of appropriateness for the entire project is not valid without them. Should at any time the trees need to be removed or the species changed, the applicant will be required to return to the BAR for an amended certificate of appropriateness.**
- **We recommend that you consider back-lighting the retail windows to provide illumination at night.**

Second by Mr. Mohr.

Motion passes 8-0.

The meeting was recessed for 5 minutes.

D. Discussion Items (No Actions will be taken)

Preliminary Discussion

540 Park Street, TMP 520183000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Jessica and Patrick Fenn

Applicant: Ashley LeFew Falwell / Dalgliesh Gilpin Paxton Architects

Project: Addition and alterations

- Staff presented the project to the BAR. Staff gave a very brief overview of the project that is being proposing for North Downtown.
- The pool house is a contributing structure. City ordinance requires that it be brought before the BAR since it is the demolition of the pool house/a contributing structure.
- The applicant presented what the project was going to include. The project was a new pool house and a new addition on the side of the house.
- The applicant presented the footprint of the new pool house.

- With the landscape, the plan is to renovate and upgrade some of the hardscape on the property. One of the entrances from Park Street is to be removed.
- There is going to be an upgrade to the paths and creating a landing in front of the house.
- The applicant presented the material list and the appearances for the new addition to the site of the house.
- The BAR provided feedback and suggestions for the applicant regarding the new proposed project of the new pool house.
- The BAR was supportive of the project.

Possible Discussions

200 West Main Street Alterations

E. Other Business

Belmont Bridge – wall update

Staff Questions/Discussion

Preservation Awards

Breck Gastinger moves that the BAR grants the following awards this year:

- **Best Rehabilitation of an Historic Structure**
743 Park Street
- **Special Contribution to the Cultural Landscape of Charlottesville**
Memorial to Enslaved Laborers (University of Virginia)
- **Best New Site Construction in an Historic District**
301 East Jefferson Street (Congregation Beth Israel)
- **Outstanding Individual Achievement**
400 Rugby Road (Westminster Presbyterian Church)
- **Important Preservation of a Significant Neighborhood Structure (or Building)**
415 10th Street NW (Church at 10th Street NW and Grady Avenue)
- **Preston A. Coiner Preservation Award**
Mary Joy Scala

Jody seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).

F. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 PM.