

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
April 19, 2022 – 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, Ron Bailey, James Zehmer, Robert Edwards, Jody Lahendro, David Timmerman

Members Absent: Breck Gastinger, Andy McClure, Clayton Strange, Hunter Smith

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

Pre-Meeting:

There was a discussion regarding the Levy Building demolition COA extension. The County was not sure that they could follow with the archaeology of the building prior to demolition. There was the thought that the grave for Jack Jouett was possibly buried on the site.

Ms. Lewis did bring up that she had worked with two of the applicants for COAs. She does not believe that she needs to recuse herself from the COAs when they come up on the agenda. Ms. Lewis will provide a disclaimer prior to the discussion about those COAs.

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Comments from the Public

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

1. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-04-01

864 Locust Avenue, Tax Parcel 510093000

Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District

Owner/Applicant: Elvira Hoskins

Project: New accessory structure

Motion to Approve the Consent Agenda – Mr. Bailey (Second by Mr. Lahendro) – Motion passes 6-0.

C. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 22-04-02

500 Court Square, TMP 530096000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: 500 Court Square

Applicant: Brannan Boze, Smartlink (for T-Mobile)

Project: Install gas pipe for roof-top generator

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – *Year Built*: 1906, renovated 1936 (Originally the City’s U.S. Post Office)
District: North Downtown ADC District *Status*: Contributing. CoA to install exterior gas pipe to rooftop generators. (The November 2021 CoA approved the generators administratively, with gas service to be run inside the building. However, installing the gas pipe on the exterior requires BAR review.)

Discussion

The Design Guidelines do not specifically address conduits and piping; however, the guidance is generally to consolidate and screen equipment and utilities and to locate them where least likely to detract from the character of the site. At the ground level, the service is in the rear parking area, where other mechanical equipment is located. Screening is not necessary. Where installed vertically on the building—a span ten stories plus the parapet—screening or fully concealing the assembly would likely be more visible than a painted pipe installed at an appropriate location. Staff suggests two options:

- Mounting the pipe as close as possible adjacent to a downspout; specifying which, if not as proposed by the applicant, and on which side of the downspout, if there is a preference. (below, left)
- Mounting the pipe as close as possible into the vertical corner between the first and second downspouts

The rooftop and the generators are concealed behind the parapet.

The intent is to paint the pipe and anchor brackets. The BAR should approve or recommend an appropriate color allow for staff to make a determination. (For the Main Library, the CoA included a condition that the conduits be painted a color close to the existing brick, to be approved by staff. For that, staff circulated color samples with a recommended selection, which the BAR informally expressed support for.)

Dan Wilson, Applicant – This is a landlord request. This is our proposal to satisfy them. Everything that was presented on the application is pretty straightforward.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Bailey – This will be going up the back of the building?

Mr. Watkins – Yes. It would be facing Market Street.

Mr. Lahendro – The details that I have seen are for applying a pipe on a flat wall surface. I didn’t see a detail for tucking it into a brick corner. Does that mean it can’t be done? Is that another detail?

Brian Law, Applicant – We can get additional clarification. It would virtually be the same technique. It would be tucked back into the corner as closely as possible.

Mr. Lahendro – The strut is a foot wide. It looks like the pipe is centered on the strut. That is six inches from the corner?

Mr. Law – We wouldn't necessarily have to go with a one foot piece. We are utilizing an inch and a quarter gas line. We can utilize a six inch strut. We just need enough to anchor into the brick itself as well as the clamp that attaches to the inner strut and the pipe itself. I don't see the need for a full one foot piece.

Mr. Lahendro – Can you anchor it into the mortar joints and not the brick?

Mr. Law – It would be the mortar.

Mr. Lahendro – Why the south side? It seems to me that the south elevation is a more prominent elevation than the east side because 5th Street is a frequently walked street going back and forth between The Mall and The Courthouse. I can't remember when I have ever seen the eastside of this building. The south side is something you see when walking up and down 5th Street and from Market Street. What do other Board members think about that?

Mr. Timmerman – That's a really good point. I can't think of the last time I have been able to appreciate that building from that perspective. It is probably because you're looking at the east side. Where can you actually get a good vantage point of the east side? There's not that block or expanse that you can back up from the building like you can on the other corner when you're in the Park and it gives you a clear sight line. That's a really good point. I was thinking the same thing.

Ms. Lewis – Does the applicant want to make any comments or respond?

Mr. Wilson – I believe that we need to go on this side of the building due to where the actual gas main is and where we can get access to that.

Mr. Law – That's correct.

Ms. Lewis – I am not in a position to argue with the applicant about engineering things. I am looking at the image on Appendix 1 that shows the rooftop and generator. It looks like you could take it around that east side. You're heading in that direction. I appreciate that once you get to that lower addition, you're going to have to navigate that. It almost seems like you could go straight down the side of that building or rather than going over its roof and down.

Mr. Lahendro – I see that the gas line is originating at the southeast corner. Why couldn't it go east as easily as it goes south?

Mr. Werner – There are photographs further along in the appendix. On the south elevation, we are dealing with some things that are on the side of the building versus introducing something new on the east side. I don't know if they're working off a big cherry picker or hanging something over the side. I don't know what the accessibility is on that side. When I was looking at and thinking of options, I left that out thinking there is nothing there now. Let's not add to it.

Mr. Bailey – I actually agree with staff on that. If you put it parallel to those gutters, it could get lost. If you put it on the east side (there is nothing now), it would obviously be adding something that wasn't there before; perhaps more prominent.

Ms. Lewis – In our materials, there is a really good picture of that corner with the HVAC garden in the addition. There are certain conduits that are coming out of the 300 Court Square Annex (the building next door to it). That may preclude these gas lines going there.

Mr. Law – From a construction standpoint, either would be viable. Obviously, closer to the downspout would be better for concealment. That's why we chose to stick with that.

Ms. Lewis – It does appear as we get up to the parapet wall, the building is wider. When you come over the roof, you have to "hug" the building. You have to do some turns there. I am curious how the applicant is going to handle that condition. You probably don't have right hand 90 degree turns in a gas line. Would there be a subtle turn that would allow it to have the building or would you just come over the wall and drop straight down, which would leave these lines far out from the building? It would make it more prominent and a lot less appealing.

Mr. Law – We would "hug" the building as closely as possible. If it protrudes off, we wouldn't keep that space off the following ten stories all the way down. It would "hug."

Mr. Timmerman – On Appendix 1, there is the image of the red line going up and a little diagonal. I don't know if that diagonal was intended on showing that condition. I also wanted to confirm that it is just one line and this isn't one line of many future lines that are going to be installed. I was curious about how many anchors there were working their way up.

Mr. Wilson – With the red line question, that is to show how the building comes out. It will be a straight run. There's not going to be a weird angle at the top. It is also a single line.

Mr. Law – It is a single line. That diagonal is just to see where it lands. That will actually flow on the backside of the parapet and on the rooftop itself. It won't be visible at all from the ground.

Ms. Lewis – Was there a question about how many struts/holders will be down this ten story building?

Mr. Lahendro – There were two details. One says every eight feet and the other one says every ten feet.

Mr. Wilson – It is every ten feet.

Mr. Zehmer – It is a steel pipe. Is it going to be grey if it is not painted?

Mr. Law – That's correct. Honestly, it will be black, not likely rust. It will rust if it is not painted.

Mr. Zehmer – Aren't you required to paint them? Is it required to paint them after the meter?

Mr. Law – It is a safety yellow in traffic areas. Safety yellow would not be required next to the buildings.

Ms. Lewis – The color would be black?

Mr. Law – That's correct. In its natural state, it would be black and ultimately rust.

Mr. Zehmer – You’re proposing to paint to match adjacent surfaces?

Mr. Law – That’s correct.

Mr. Bailey – By adjacent surfaces, do you mean those downspouts?

Mr. Law – That’s correct.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – I tend to agree that the south side actually makes sense if it is able to be tucked up really close to the downspout. You already have a bunch of vertical interferences on that side of the building. This would be introducing something new on the east side. If it can be tucked in and painted to match the downspout, I feel that is a pretty good answer.

Mr. Bailey – I agree.

Mr. Timmerman – I am wondering if an alternate would be if you went that route, instead painting it the color of the downspout, if you found a color that is more consistent with the brick so that it disappears more. The color of the downspout goes up and above that one on the corner. You’re going to see it.

Mr. Zehmer – That would be fine. If you can find a red or brown tone that is a decent match, it would be fine.

Ms. Lewis – (Staff) on the application we recently had on the library, did we specify brown because the brick was more brown?

Mr. Werner – We had said that we will look at the colors in the field. The assumption had been something similar. When we went out there and looked at what was close to the brick, it didn’t work. That brown that I circulated, does dissipate into the background. The masonry here is a little different on a different side of the building. I would tend to say something that is not bright/red. When you try to match up something, it ends up being worse. Something that is flat and uniform would be preferable to artificially trying to make it disappear. The option for that would be to give me the ability to look at options. If I need some feedback on it, I will circulate it. We can do it by an email check. I have no problem with that.

Mr. Edwards – I agree with what everyone else has said; either go black or try to match as much as possible. In my first month with the BAR, we had a similar case where the applicant tried to paint using a color that was pretty close to the brick as possible.

Mr. Wilson – We are good with these comments and questions in terms of painting. We’re happy to go with whatever the Board recommends.

Mr. Lahendro – How close can you get it to the downspout?

Mr. Wilson – We can tuck it right in next to the downspout; basically touching.

Motion – Mr. Bailey – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City’s ADC Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed gas pipe at 500 Court Square satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the condition that the pipe be mounted immediately next to the downspout on the south elevation and that the color will be submitted to staff for approval. David Timmerman seconds motion. Motion passes (6-0).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 22-04-03
707 West Main Street, TMP 320156000
West Main ADC District
Owner: Starr Hill Properties, LLC
Applicant: Orhun Bartu Dikmen
Project: Storefront window replacement

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: c. 1925 District: West Main ADC District Status: Contributing

707-709 West Main Street is a 6-bay, 2-story duplex commercial building constructed in 1925. A wide cornice runs across the top of the storefront and divides the building’s two stories; six compass-headed metal sash windows overlook West Main Street on the second floor. A.G. Carter purchased and developed the building in 1925 on what had previously been a residential site. Carter also developed the neighboring building, 701-705 West Main Street. The subject building housed furniture stores for much of the twentieth century.

Application

• CoA submittal dated March 29, 2022. Elevation and plan drawings for new storefront window. Detail drawings of window sill, jamb, and head. Photos of existing storefront. Material sample for metal window frame.

CoA request to replace storefront glazing with operable, 5-leaf metal-framed folding windows and install a metal-framed, fixed, single-lite panel in the opening adjacent to the entry.

Discussion

Staff identified two properties in ADC districts with retractable storefront windows, both are roll-up windows: 1397 West Main Street (Boylan Heights; no record of BAR review) and 109-111 West Water Street (Otto Turkish Street Food; CoA approved October 2021).

Historic survey forms identify this property and the neighboring building at 701-705 West Main Street as the best-preserved stretch of historic commercial buildings on West Main Street. At the subject building, the storefront glazing itself is modern, but other elements that encompass the storefront retain good integrity; including the prism-glass transom and pressed-metal cornice above the transom; the entry recess, doors, and door trim; and the low stone-faced walls below the glazing.

The Design Guidelines offer clear guidance for alterations and rehabilitation of storefronts. See staff responses to each guideline below under Pertinent ADC District Design Guidelines: B. Facades & Storefronts.

The BAR should consider if the proposed 5-leaf glazing pattern and the added visual thickness from the inserted frame will impact the building’s historic character.

As designed, the frame of the operable window is wider than the frame of the fixed window—see below. The windows are not on the same plane; however, the BAR should discuss if this an issue or not.

The submittal does not indicate if the bronze corner post will be retained or replaced. (See component #3 in the photographs below, under Facades & Storefronts, item 4.) BAR should discuss this detail. For example, if replaced, with what and what are the dimensions. Note: It is uncertain if this a structural component—supporting the transom above—or only a glazing component.

Innovation and flexibility allow the City's downtown corridors to compete with suburban strip malls. At times, the City's preservation goals might seem at odds with efforts to maintain and increase commercial activity. In evaluating this request, while we cannot conclude the existing storefront is too deteriorated to save, staff suggests the following might be helpful (from NPS Preservation Brief 11: Rehabilitating Historic Storefronts, see the Appendix):

Where original or early storefronts no longer exist or are too deteriorated to save, the commercial character of the building should nonetheless be preserved—either through an accurate restoration based on historic research and physical evidence or a contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color and texture of the historic building. The sensitive rehabilitation of historic storefronts will not only enhance the architectural character of the overall building but will contribute to rejuvenating neighborhoods or business districts as well.

If approved, staff recommends the following conditions:

- Glass have VLT of not less than 70%.
- Any original, metal components that are removed will be retained on-site and labeled, should a future restoration be considered. (Refer to comments under Facades & Storefronts, item 4.)

Mr. Lahendro – (Robert and Jeff) You all agree that the elements that are being proposed to be replaced with the storefront are original. They're historic?

Mr. Werner – If you look closely at the photos, it looks like there is some small pieces of crown mold. Yes and no. It appears to be (by in large) yes of 20th century materials. I don't know if it is 1920s materials. Given the similarity of the storefront adjacent to it, my sense is that this is primarily original material, which is original glass. We know that because the glass got smashed.

Mr. Lahendro – That was my assessment spending some time with it this afternoon. It is the same kind of bronze stops that are used with the prismatic transom matrix. It is the exact same types of trim and corner mullions that are used in the mirror image store on the other side. They appear to be the historic materials.

Orhun Dikmen, Applicant – We are here to apply with all of the regulations of the city and our proposal plan. We will coordinate to make sure we are following all of the city rules. The reason that we are changing our glass is that there were cracks with installation problem on the corner. We had to change it. We decided to make it folding glass. We don't want to change any frame. We are just trying to make new glass. After the pandemic, people will want to sit outside. That is why we want to change the glass. We want to make folding glass.

Cliff Fox, Applicant – I am the property manager. I have been working with the property owners for the past twelve years. They are supportive of the change. We have read the staff report. We understand some of the concerns. Some of the bronze trim is in substantial disrepair. I don't know if Mr. Lahendro had a chance to look at it closely. It has been drilled multiple times: Either taking it down or replacing it.

Gokhan Dikmen, Applicant – I have been doing business in Charlottesville. In this project, I am supporting my brother. We are in the process of preparing a new place for them. We originally are

from Turkey. Since we are coming from the Middle East, we love the old and historical. We want to preserve that and not to mess with the historical pieces. In this project, there were a number of cracks in the corner. The place is a beautiful, old restaurant space. Unfortunately, they didn't have an outdoor space. With the pandemic in the past two years, giving the option to the customers and giving some fresh air and outdoor feeling, it is one of main things driving the restaurants. I was lucky that my restaurant survived. I have a huge indoor space and a huge outdoor space. In this case/place, my brother didn't have that chance. We came to the idea of changing this window piece is two pieces, five folding pieces. We have different examples around the city. We are working with the Dodson Glass Company. Everything is explained in the application. Nothing is going to change; only that glass. When there is good weather, it will give people some fresh air.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Bailey – You said that there are cracks in the current window. Can you describe that?

Mr. Dikmen – It might be from before. In the pictures, there are plastic pieces there. We had to replace that window. While they were moving some pieces inside, the cracks got bigger. We used plastic pieces temporarily there to keep that air inside. Next to the door, there is a piece there. It is a fixed piece of glass. It also has cracked glass in the corner. That will be replaced.

Mr. Zehmer – You're just proposing to replace the window at 707 but not proposing to replace the window at 709, which is the same building but the other side of the entrance?

Mr. Dikmen – That is correct. We're only replacing 707.

Mr. Timmerman – I see some drawings of the window frames. Is there a drawing of what the window frame would like in the actual building?

Mr. Dikmen – Yes.

Mr. Werner – There are elevations showing the window in the submittal. There are frame details.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Email from Carl Schwarz – Encouraged members of the BAR to walk the front of the storefront. Inserting a folding window might be impossible if removing the bronze frame. Storefront is historically important

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – I see that as one building unit. Having an accordion/folding window on one side and not the other side would be very asymmetrical to the façade. It would distract from the historic character. I don't think that I can support this application as it is submitted. However, I might venture a recommendation that the applicant might consider; some large pane like sliding window that would maintain the center mullion. That might be a solution to provide some fresh air while maintaining the historic look. That can maybe be placed behind the historic bronze frame.

Mr. Timmerman – What is being proposed is quite a bit different than what we’re looking at. What is there now, while not in good shape, there is something special about the transom, prismatic effect? When you look at any of the photographs, particularly the black white picture (1996), you get a really good view of the whole composition of it. What stands out/makes it special is the (architecturally significant) profiling that happens everywhere. Everyone is one piece. There is really a fineness that is the articulation of the frame up above and down below. The proposed substitute has a much thicker frame. It would start to break up this wonderful expanse of glass underneath the transom in a way that I find to be detrimental. Doing it on one side and not doing it on the other side would detract from the overall effect of the building. I do appreciate what you are trying to do here. Your intentions are good. There is likely an alternative that will work. You have to think about it much harder and explore it more deeply. Whatever that proposal is, it is really important to see the drawings (not just the windows), but the windows in the space; understanding how thick the frame is above and down below, also understanding exactly how that works within the walls. A wall section of that is pretty important. When we do approve it, we know what we’re approving. I would hate to approve a window assembly and when you get into it and you start looking at the constructability of it, you come to the realization that it is not what the proposal is.

Mr. Lahendro – I did spend some time looking at it. There is damage to the bronze trim. I believe that it can be repaired. I have known of similar kinds of trim to be repaired in the past. It is a distinctive design. It’s done to maximize the views from the street and what was a furniture store for both of these buildings. The same owner/developer did the corner building to the west. It also has that really interesting prismatic glass transom in the square matrix. There’s a style that is continuous. It says something about the history of the development of the three buildings together. I find the storefront design to be distinctively interesting. It is historic. It would be inappropriate to change one side and not the other side when they mirror each other so well. It is something that I really can’t support.

Mr. Bailey – I am intrigued by James’ idea of large, flat panes of glass so that it can be sliding and that you could mirror the exact look to what it was before and provide fresh air. That would be a way to go in that direction to achieve both goals Mr. Dikmen would like to do and maintain some of the character other members of the Board are worried about.

Ms. Lewis – I find the folding doors really interesting. We have seen them elsewhere. In this setting, it is a full window. When we get these accordion windows, the window will be more prominent on the street side than the historic storefront. I feel it is a little subordinate to the historic storefront in that plane to these operating windows and what they may look like. That’s one of the reasons why several members agree with Mr. Zehmer’s suggestion that holding that plane and having moveable windows that would move vertically, they wouldn’t break that historic storefront plane. It might be a lot more compatible with our guidelines.

Mr. Werner – It sounds like there is possibly some options to explore. The way to do that would be you request a deferral. That bumps it to whenever you have something to bring back; probably need to meet with Dodson and float some of these ideas. That would be me offering a recommendation to you. The BAR could defer this. In that case, it would have to come back in May. By an applicant requesting a deferral, you control the calendar. If the BAR does it, we would have to see this again in May.

Ms. Lewis – it looks like the majority doesn’t support approving this. What would you like to do here?

Mr. Dikmen – We can work on it to make sure that it will look historical. We can interact with the same color right now. We will work on it to not change the historical view. For the safety, we have to do it. That glass has to change. That’s why we are doing that. It is a big cost. We are trying to do a new

restaurant in Charlottesville. We need to change the glasses. If you have any requirements, we can work on it.

Mr. Fox – What they are asking you to do is decide whether you want to defer the application and bring it back once you have made the changes that they seem to want. They don't want the accordion door. They want a sliding window or something close to that. They are particularly concerned about the asymmetry. If you walk on the north side of the street (if you go back to the 1996 photo), it looks like three storefronts; not two or one building. I would task the BAR with that. Even from the south side of the street, it is the photograph that helps that read as one building. You're going to have to change your window to get it approved.

Mr. Dikmen – The BAR earlier mentioned the 709 part. If we do the same with 709 (folding glass window), would the project be accepted?

Ms. Lewis – Would any member of the BAR be supportive if they did the other side of the door opening with the accordion windows? (Mr. Bailey and Mr. Edwards were supportive). You need four people to approve that. You're a couple short of that if we were to vote on that. You can take a deferral. You would go back, collect comments that we have given to you, maybe redesign the moveable windows in a way that we have discussed, and see if it is feasible to do the other side as well. Maybe come back next month. If you could work with Dodson, you can get some plans back to us. Staff will help you. Informally, I can't imagine a member of this Board that doesn't want to see this happen. The accordion doors are not going to be passed tonight.

Applicant requests Deferral – Mr. Edwards moves to accept applicant request for deferral (Second by Mr. Bailey) – Motion passes 6-0.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness (HC District)

BAR 22-04-04
313 Steephill Street, TMP 55A135000
Woolen Mills Village HC District (contributing)
Owner: Sara and Brian Shullaw
Applicant: Robert Nichols, Formworks
Project: Porch rehab and side addition

Ms. Lewis – I have previously represented these applicants on a legal matter. It was unrelated to the application before us tonight. Under the Virginia Conflict of Interest Act, I don't believe that I have a conflict. I think that I will be able to participate. I wanted to note that. I don't have any stake in the outcome of this. (Statement on Conflict of Interest)

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – 313 Steephill Street Year Built: 1897 Status: Contributing. Two-story, three-bay, framed dwelling, hipped-roof and two prominent cross gables. Façade features boxed cornices and returns on each of the cross-gabled side bays. Front entrance is in the middle bay. House has an altered, two-bay, shed-roofed front porch, with one remaining, original, squared column with inset panels and a molded base and cap. Front door is located under this original portion of the porch, surmounted by a pointed arch and framed on each side by three sidelights. Each of the façade's other bays has a 1/1 double-hung replacement window with pointed arch trim. The house is weatherboard on a brick foundation. The roof is asphalt shingles. CoA for alterations to enclosed front porch. Extend on the north side with the rear portion being an enclosed addition. (Note: The 1920 Sanborn Map shows the open porch. If not original to the 1897 house, we know it dates to before 1920.)

Discussion and Recommendations

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

Referring to the staff comments (below, under Building Scale), the BAR should discuss the extent to which the porch extension and enclosed addition are perceived as additions. With that, if necessary, the BAR should discuss if the design should be differentiated further or, possibly, less so, should that differentiation result in additions that appear incompatible with this house and the character of the HC District. For example, (see below) is it more important the box cornice have two profiles, thus distinguishing new from original or be continuous, thus appearing visually and architecturally compatible?

The goal is to differentiate old and new, and the modified siding contributes to that expression; however, for a porch expansion within a Historic Conservation District, staff suggests the result of continuity with certain elements (roof material, roof line, cornice, screen framing) is preferable to a subtle—or not so subtle--attempt to distinguish the old from new.

Re: the original exterior walls and porch ceiling enclosed by the front addition. The window siding, trim, railing, etc. were removed with the prior alteration and no longer exist.

Re: the porch entablature on the north side (see below), which will be enclosed by the expansion, the applicant noted it will be removed, that the within the screened enclosure there ceiling rafter will be exposed rafters and painted white, in order to create some height.

Robert Nichols, Applicant – I will say one thing about the stair encroachment. It is an existing nonconformance. It has been documented on many surveys. It is part of the conversation that the owners have had with the city about the disposition of the street. They are the only residence on the street. It is not really maintained by the city. It is an existing nonconformance. There is going to be some new treads on that new stair where the encroachment exists. The setbacks are also nonconforming and have been there for a while. They match the average of their neighbors. In terms of the addition, I don't have much to add. Staff referred to a conversation we have had over the last few weeks. I haven't brought a project before the Board that falls under these criteria/Historic Conservation District. I am feeling my way through what the framework is and what guidelines matter here. Staff has been helpful in that regard. In response to some questions of staff about what is old and new and whether there is a distinction between the two, I wondered if we were missing an opportunity to mark the new versus the old. At a moderate distance, the porch is intended to look unified as you look across the façade of the building and you see the existing construction. I submitted a second design (the one we see here). That design lines up a structural heavier column that you see in the front screen assembly. It aligns that column with the position of what would have been the original column on that porch. It marks the edge of the enclosures seen above. In that allocation of space, the organization of the bays, it recreates that proportion and marks that footprint of the original porch. We're content with the appearance of that. My client was less enamored of it when I told her about our idea. Staff hadn't asked for that. When I started thinking about the old versus the new, I suggested this. I thought it might be helpful. Since it was my client's preference for the previous design, just to refer to that for a

moment. Our first pass at that design had divided that front panel of the screened porch into three primary equal structural bays. Each of those bays was divided into an equal pair of screening panels for ease of construction, screen width, and ergo manic comfort and proportion. Even though that organization of the façade of the screened porch is quite regular in its pattern, it has a non-corresponding alignment with the corner of the house and a non-corresponding alignment with the original porch. This was a regular pleasing pattern coming across the front. It had no bearing and no memory of the original condition. The pattern that we submitted subsequent to this creates an irregular layout of the screen panels and structural columns on the front and ‘nods’ to the proportion size and literal position of the corner of that porch. I am content with it either way. I can certainly understand my client’s perspective. It strikes me as more dignified to have the regular spacing and the two heavier structural columns dividing that the length of that front porch. From the north, the porch turns the corner and is about 8.5 feet wide. That’s the thickness that is being added to the side of the building. Midway, it transitions to an interior closed space. There is a kitchen back there.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Lahendro – Do you know if the corner post is still within the existing infilled porch?

Mr. Nichols – I know that it is not. If we were to look back at those older images, the porch was (at its corners) supported by matching columns. One is still existing on the left. It is quite a large one. There is nowhere near enough room for that column to be concealed in that new construction. Every other trace of the old porch trim is gone. You can see the quality of the exterior windows. It was put there. It is consistent with that newer construction throughout.

Mr. Lahendro – The ceiling is gone?

Mr. Nichols – That’s correct.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Email from Lewis Schultz – The proposed design extends beyond the property line. Hope this is discussed at the meeting. The BAR does not have purview over zoning and setbacks.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Lahendro – There is a building code requirement that siding must be at least eight inches from the grade. Is that still correct?

Mr. Nichols – That is still correct. It would be code compliant. There is also a fairly exhaustive planting plan that goes with this.

Ms. Lewis – It looks like from the existing photos that the foundation is actually of stucco or brick with stucco applied over it.

Mr. Nichols – That’s correct.

I may not have been clear as to what I would be asking for. Perhaps it is within the tolerances of design review like this. If in the Board's mind, either of those screen panel and structural layouts from the front porch are acceptable, it would be a pretty terrific thing to be able to offer (amongst the stakeholders) a choice.

Mr. Werner – The ordinance allows a lot of flexibility in the conservation districts. One of the provisions is that a project that has been reviewed by the BAR (if something changes), I have the ability to review that with BAR's chair consent. That's an avenue that certainly is available. Conceptually, if any specific details that you (BAR) want to address, I can approve those. That would be within consultation with the Board chair.

Motion – Mr. Lahendro – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Historic Conservation Districts, I move to find that the proposed alterations and addition at 313 Steephill Street satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Woolen Mills Village Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves either of the two designs put forward by the applicant tonight.

Mr. Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (6-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-04-05

1901 East Market Street, TMP 55A149000 and 55A150000

IPP and Woolen Mills Village HC District (contributing)

Owner/Applicant: Jon Fink

Project: Rear addition

Ms. Lewis – I previously represented this applicant before the BAR. I don't have a conflict under the Conflict of Interest Act. I don't have any involvement in this current application. I don't have any stake in the outcome. I will participate unless somebody has an objection to me doing so. I haven't had any discussions with the applicant about this matter. My representation ended a long time ago.

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: c1835, Pireus Store District: Individually Protected Property within the Woolen Mills HC District Status: Contributing to the HC District
(Note: While within a HC District, IPPs are reviewed using the ADC District Design Guidelines.)
The Pireus Store building is a two-story brick structure with a gable front and a Victorian porch. The building was constructed by 1840 to house a store for workers at the nearby textile mills. The store was converted to a house after 1875.
CoA for a rear addition, extending a prior addition on the original, c1835 structure.

Discussion

The BAR offered comment on the submitted materials at the March 15 BAR meeting. A summary of the discussion is provided here:

- BAR members are concerned about too many competing design languages and competing forms that take away from the historic structure
 - o A joint, break, or hyphen between the earlier (2000s) addition and proposed addition might be a better transition
- Because of the proposed addition's site at the end of the house, new construction will create a long plane. The addition should manipulate the roofline and wall material to break up this long plane.
- BAR members ask purpose of dormer without window.

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.

At the time that this staff report was written, the applicant has reviewed the March BAR meeting video but has not submitted additional drawings. Given that the applicant was not present in March, staff recommends that the BAR use this time to clarify any concerns or recommendations regarding the project.

Jon Fink, Applicant – I did serve on the Planning Commission with Cheri Lewis in the early 2000s. I did have some legal matters that she represented me on. This is many years ago. I am fine with her not recusing herself. We have had no contact about this application. I know her to be very impartial.

We loved and appreciated the comments on the initial set of drawings that we submitted to you. We came back with this. If the BAR would choose to, we would love this to be considered tonight.

Andres Pacheco, Applicant – We carefully went through the comments that you made. There were smart comments. What you have in front of you addresses all of them, if not most of them. The understanding that this addition is needed creates the space that Jon needs for his house. We were not sure if we were continuing the roof or breaking it. Suggestions were made about bumping up or down or creating this addition and making it clear where the new addition starts and the old addition ends. The deck/porch at the end was maybe trying to do too many things. We decided to keep it simple. This addition has a smaller footprint than the design that you saw in area and simplicity to be built. This view is the view facing the street. The second level is at the same level of the street. There are some trees that actually screen the whole façade. There was a comment about the dormer with the window. I thought it was spot on. With this approach of keeping the roofline simple and making the whole mass the hyphen, we don't have to worry about that. It is actually in the master room. It is an area where we don't want a window for privacy issues or the sun getting into the bedroom.

Sheet 2

Here you can see the before and the after. In the top right, you see the approach that we have towards the east. We added a cover. There was a comment about maintenance and how durable the structure was going to be. Jon has access to really cool wood. He was going to make it happen with the right wood. With this way, we don't have to worry about that. It is way more functional and flexible.

Sheet 3

Here is another view going to the north. To the north, we do want a window in the third level. In order to create a three story structure, we are using the trick of putting the bedroom inside the roof. We raise the roof a little bit. At the same time, we achieve the minimum height that we need inside to make the space in the third level usable. That dormer facing north does have a window. There's a little bit of space and light coming from the north. That's one of the easiest to shade and screen.

Mr. Fink – Our housing needs drove this program. My son, currently living Thailand, is going to join us. He is 12 years old. There is a good chance our 22 year old stepdaughter is going to come from Zurich and consider graduate work here. She is visiting with us now. We really do have space needs. This is what drove this entire design.

Mr. Pacheco –

Sheet 4

This is the plane elevation from the south and the north. You can see on the left the elevation facing the street. Those trees represented here are robust trees. They are screening the whole façade. To the north, you can see the addition with the dormer.

The last sheet contains the floor plans. The floor plans are very simple. The ground level is in the top left and the two bedrooms. The middle floor is the top right. The middle floor is the main level. It has the kitchen and dining room and a deck. The third level is the master bedroom hidden under the roof structure. There is going to be a closet to the south.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

No Questions from the Board

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Timmerman – I am heartened to see more consistency going on in the design. There might be a little more to go. I think there was a comment made in the last meeting about the project where there was almost too much variation. I am still seeing that to a certain extent. An example is the porch on the right hand side. The rendering appears to be showing this natural wood that is off on its own with everything else. I am a fan of contrast. I feel the contrast needs to have a very serious effect and counter effect. When there are 4 or 5 materials working its way across the sod, like the historic fabric of the old glass window with the hyphen in between, (makes sense thinking of the old project where you had the glass and an addition that was harkening back to the original house), I want to consolidate

that palate. You need to ponder that a bit more. I like the roof. There's a bit more of consistency going on with that versus the straight up that was shown before. I am wondering if there are two levels of roof that happen. I am falling back on my thoughts about how to create a consistency to enhance the contrast between the old/historic and the new. I wonder if there is a way to take your new ideas and encapsulate that second addition as a way of creating a more cohesive addition/new additions and renovations from the past 20 years that somehow compliments and sets off the historic.

Ms. Lewis – I do want to hear everybody's comments on this. We do have three options here. I realize that these materials came to the people who have spoken a little bit late. Our options tonight would be to approve, to defer to May, or to defer and specify as a Consent Agenda item. If there are a number of modifications we are asking for, we probably wouldn't want our motion to actually successfully place on the Consent Agenda. We would want to have an opportunity to look at those. We could deny the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Bailey – It is a simple, clean, and elegant design. It enhances the situation of the original building itself. It doesn't detract from it. It offers more space for the family to grow. It functions as a modern frame for the older building itself. It is pretty clean and nice. I wouldn't change it very much.

Mr. Zehmer – I like the improved roofline. It goes well with the original house and the early additions. I would be supportive of either of these. If we wanted to do a one month deferral so that other members could get some answers to the material questions, I would be fine with that too.

Ms. Lewis – The applicant has probably noticed that we're six instead of nine members tonight. A deferral could mean that it is reviewed by three people. We may be very favorable.

Mr. Edwards – This is fairly new to me. I would be ready to vote on this tonight.

Ms. Lewis – Can I see a show of hands of members ready to vote favorably on this tonight?

Mr. Lahendro – I find that the forms are far more compatible between the historic (the first addition) and the newest addition. I can support it because of where it is relative to a historic house. It is not competing with a historic house on a major street. Consequently, I can allow more leeway for personal likes/differences as a result. I can support it as it is now.

Motion – Mr. Bailey – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City's ADC Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed alterations and addition at 1901 East Market Street satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other Individually Protected Properties in the City, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted in the drawings dated April 19, 2022.

Mr. Lahendro seconds motion. Motion passes (6-0).

D. Other Business

Staff Questions/Discussion

- 310 East Water Street – Mr. Nichols does plan to return to the BAR in May for the COA approval. Mr. Nichols did go over the changes that have been made to the project. Members of the BAR provided comments and questions for Mr. Nichols regarding the changes that have been made with the project.
- 413 Ridge Street – Staff received a call to extend the fence around the front yard. The fence was approved by the BAR. The BAR had no objections to the new fence.

Courts Expansion – Levy Site Demo COA extension

- There was staff and BAR discussion regarding extending the COA for demolition.
- Staff asked the BAR to acknowledge the extension of the COA and the BAR expressed goal to continue the archaeological work on the Levy Building. City staff will be in contact with Albemarle County, the other landowner of the property.

Mr. Lahendro moves to acknowledge that the BAR strongly supports archaeological excavations at the Albemarle/Charlottesville district courthouse site.

Mr. Timmerman seconds motion. Motion passes (6-0).

E. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:18 PM

