

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
May 17, 2022 – 5:00 PM
Hybrid Meeting**



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: Robert Edwards, Breck Gastinger, Cheri Lewis, Clayton Strange, Jody Lahendro, James Zehmer, Ron Bailey, Dave Timmerman

Members Absent: Hunter Smith

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

Pre-Meeting:

The members of the board did get accustomed to the hybrid meeting setup in City Space.

The Chair asked staff if there was anything to share with regards to the Comprehensive Plan. Staff did go over the process for the Comprehensive Plan. The Chair also did ask staff regarding the Albemarle Courts Building and the timeline for construction of the Courts Building. There was discussion regarding the archaeology under the current Albemarle Courts Building.

Staff has recommended that the Downtown Mall be registered in the National Register. Grant applications have been applied for and there will be several public meetings in the month of June. Registering for the National Register will require a maintenance plan for the Downtown Mall.

Members of the Board did go and look at the materials brought in by Robert Nichols, one of the COA applicants. Mr. Nichols did provide a brief presentation of the materials that were brought into the meeting

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Comments from the Public

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

1. Meeting Minutes August 17, 2021

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda – Ms. Lewis – Second by Mr. Zehmer – Motion passes 8-0.

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 21-10-04
310 East Main Street, TMP 28004100
Downtown ADC District
Owner: Armory 310 East Main, LLC
Applicant: Robert Nichols/Formworks
Project: Facade renovations/alterations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1916. In 1956 the north façade was reconstructed. The existing north façade was constructed in 1982. (South façade may have been built at this same time.) District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing (Note: When the district was established, all existing structures were designated *contributing*.)

Application

• Submittal: Formwork Design drawings 310 East Main Street, dated May 2022: Cover; Sheet 2, Context - East Main Street; Sheet 3, Context - Water Street; Sheet 4, East Main Street Views; Sheet 5, Elevator Shaft Decorative Scheme; Sheet 6, Elevator Shaft Decorative Scheme context; Sheet 7, Elevator Shaft Angled; Sheet 8, Elevator Shaft Closeup Views; Sheet 9, Mall Level Plan; Sheet 10, Water Street Views CoA request for alterations to the Main Street (north) and Water Street (south) facades. The proposed work will alter the 20th century facades.

Discussion and Recommendations

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

The BAR last had a formal review of this project at the February BAR meeting. The BAR was generally supportive of the project's design, form and materials, but expressed the following concerns:

- The glass used in the Main Street storefront should be clear.
- Members expressed hesitation over design of screen; not sure what they'll look like.
- Applicant should provide material samples of brick and screen
- Screen provides an appropriate contemporary take on existing materials seen on Mall.
- Applicant should provide visuals that show how proportions of new façade relate to neighboring buildings.
- Window patterns should exhibit more variety
- Members express no objections to Water Street elevation.
- Concern over color of screen; since it's located on north elevation, it won't receive direct sunlight.
- Applicant should submit more detailed information about storefront.

The applicant returned for a brief informal discussion at the April BAR meeting with the new design for the façade screen. The BAR commended the project's direction and was intrigued by the design, but requested material samples and close-up renderings.

Robert Nichols, Applicant – We made a significant transition in our whole strategy and attitude towards this decorative piece that was shown to you in February. Most of my comments that I will make go along with the fact that we have physical material samples in front of you. With respect to color, I have previously been describing the coated metallic materials on the Mall as black. We have been looking for warmth in the color/black. We have a miniscule chip that is quite dark. It is really nice in the shade. There is a lot of light bouncing around there. In many circumstances, it reveals the contrast that we're looking for with respect to the backing material, which is a very light aluminum. The color for that material is a dark bronze. It has a little bit of metallic flake. It give a little depth and helps it tolerate pollen without it looking lessened. We also have brick and mortars samples for you tonight. The three of them together do a good job. The dark color, light bronze to our eye are well tuned with the little bit of warmth we're looking to come through a neutral pallet. In terms of material, Mr. Gastinger had made some comments the first time we showed these projecting components of this and how that was going to be handled down close to grade in terms of encroaching into the right of way, accidents, or vandalism. His comments really helped us get more complexity and layering to the system; above nine feet, we don't have any of these projections. When these projections do occur up higher, they correlate with topographic information. As we get up in the Blue Ridge, they adjust accordingly. When we're towards the bottom/the lower nine feet, the panel corresponds with the tidewater conditions. We have no 3 dimensional characteristics. We have more of a graphic indication of low, non-varying topography. That is the circular penetrations. At the lower levels, we need to be aware of durability. At those elevations, we will have a material that is twice as thick as this. It will look as you see here. It will be able to register that depth in the penetrations. We will probably elect for a little more thickness as we get higher. With the panels that are going up there, each panel is about 3 feet square. It would be out of reach and have to tolerate the occasional falling branch. It wouldn't be subject to vandalism or accidents. The views here let you see with a little more clarity what specifically would be happening with these panels in ways our previous illustrations were mostly full view. It reduced detail down to a level that was very hard to register.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Lahendro – You mentioned before the meeting that there was some of these examples that you didn't like and you wanted to make sure they weren't going to be in the final design. Can you clarify that for the record?

Mr. Nichols – What is happening is that there are overlaying conditions. In some cases, they behave like this. When we have a topographic change we want to make, we are adjusting the angle of this flap but to reveal more of the backing material. We are shortening the length. We have collisions like this where the circle cutouts are intersected. We're going to build into our algorithm, depending on the length of the wing, we will have a modified number of columns of circles here.

Mr. Strange – Is that the maximum angle?

Mr. Nichols – What is modeled digitally gets up to about 60 degrees. This is just hitting 45 degrees. It is definitely a goal to not let them be confused for 90. We want them to be directional.

Mr. Zehmer – The first 9 feet off the ground, everything will be flat/flush?

Mr. Nichols – Yes. That comes across in the illustrations. There are two kinds of penetrations that are being indicated there. There is the circle. That indicates a certain kind of low type of topography. There's another shape that is denser. That is an indication of population.

Mr. Timmerman – What does a dense square look like?

Mr. Nichols – You can see that there is a difference in the grid. It is a racetrack shape. They maintain the same height as the circles. They get a little narrower this way, which allows for the greater density.

Mr. Lahendro – Is there going to be a sign that explains to people what this is?

Mr. Nichols – We have been thinking about that. One of the goals with the design of something that is decorative, their success comes when they don't quickly become mute. There is some complexity and ambiguity that you get more familiar with over time. Why leave something unaddressed when it is there? There are probably 3 phrases that could mention this. We have a few panels where there is no penetration. The various rules that determine where we have penetrations is left in a few flat panels. I would like to have a bit of information and a little description that doesn't reveal itself as a historic plaque, just a little explainer.

Mr. Lahendro – I am not suggesting that you have to. I was curious.

Mr. Nichols – Any appreciation of it or dislike of it isn't dependent on the genesis of it. We live in a culture where common language for decorative schemes has been going on for a long time. It would be nice to have some history or cultural resonance there. I would like to give a minimum amount of description.

Mr. Edwards – I agree that interpretation is incredibly important in this space. Can you contextualize what this means especially because you have projections here that some people might consider dangerous/look dangerous? Have you done any studies on how they will effect birds?

Mr. Nichols – I have not.

Mr. Edwards – What does maintenance look like? Will you have to paint this?

Mr. Nichols – The finish on this will go on in the same technique/same method as any coating on a storefront or commercial glazing system.

Mr. Gastinger – Can you describe the weathering that you would expect on the back bronze material? Is there a gap?

Mr. Nichols – There will be a gap. The gap introduces another shadow where it starts to break things up. We do want some air movement back there. When I originally thought about this, we were calling it bronze. We liked the idea of having real materials back there. To maintain the contrast we want, we can't go with an architectural bronze back there. We're using this aluminum, which is pretty stable. It looks metallic because you have seen the metallic nature of it. It should be quite stable.

Mr. Bailey – The topographic intentions will only be really noticeable if you're looking at it from the east?

Mr. Nichols – I wouldn't put it that way. It will reveal itself. It is definitely a different experience coming from the west. If you're coming from the west, it won't expose itself anymore as you approach it.

Mr. Timmerman – I have a question about the materiality. Do you think there is going to be enough of a contrast? Looking at those renderings, the bronze portion looks to glimmer. There is almost a sheen to the renderings. That illustrates a nice contrast between the two colors. If you think there is enough contrast in those colors, maybe the story is how the sun hits that piece in your hand.

Mr. Nichols – I do think there is enough contrast. This product is about as light as you can get within this range. The orographic elevation shows a bright color. There are two criteria that helped us get comfortable. The first is that we spent some time with it. The second is that I am fine with some subtlety. That is subjective: both with the repetition of penetrations of the dots. With the length of the pathway, it has that "Great Wall of China" effect. The width is nothing substantial. Those two conditions favor whatever pairing there. It is a concern that has led us to abandon some other choices and get to this one.

Mr. Strange – When I first saw this project, I thought you were actually leaving a glass façade behind it. It actually became a screen for the elevator. It is pretty far along in the process to make a decision like this. I can imagine that at night with the elevator shaft behind it, it would be quite spectacular. My concern is that it is never going to look as bright as it does in the renderings. It is going to have shadows. That's my biggest skepticism. As far as interpretation, I don't mind that we have to figure it out for ourselves. There are a lot of things about The Mall we don't know about but can still enjoy about it.

Mr. Gastinger – I had a question about the mortar. Are you intending to have it raked back? Or would it come up to the face?

Mr. Nichols – It would be up to the face.

The second time we were here, we had some changes in the orientation of the brick. We're not showing it now. Given the limited size of our panels, we decided to let everything rise. There's no change in the materials.

Mr. Timmerman – What is the size of the brick?

Mr. Nichols – It is a modular brick.

Mr. Gastinger – You have the actual brick color. The renderings show some variation in the brick color.

Mr. Nichols – There is not an intended range. There's a little bit of texture.

Mr. Werner – I just wanted to offer something to bring to the discussion. I view as a sculptural element to be used as a part of the façade. Our guidelines don't give us a lot to work with in that regard. To work through some of the pertinent review, material, color, and scale; is it compatible with the Mall? Does this fit? Our guidelines introduce the idea of flexibility of new design. We want new and creative designs. We're not disturbing a historic structure. This isn't removing an element. We're trying to restore or rehabilitate. This is new and viewing it as such. The guidelines, for street level design, provide visual interest to the passing pedestrians. The brick, glazing, and typical pieces that we can look at are easy enough. I want to make sure we're using our guidelines and not getting into liking/disliking a sculpture. The other thought that I wanted to offer was that somebody who evaluates a sculpture has a title. I noticed that there was some discussion around the glass. I have included in the staff report of the discussion a

couple of years ago and the flexibility with the VLT. I wanted to balance this with the Design Guidelines. Those are some of the pieces that might be helpful.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – It has been interesting looking at the sample panel as we have been talking. The way this metal is deployed will be really dynamic in reflection of a wide range of colors in seeing greens, blues, and purples. It is not even outside yet. In actuality, you might think of it as dark/black. It's going to be quite vibrant in the way that it reflects the landscape.

Mr. Zehmer – Maybe we should consider it a curtain wall and not a sculpture. It is very sculptural. We have discussed whether some inscription. I like Mr. Strange's assessment of let it be what it is. People can self-interpret. If you want to have some kind of plaque, tuck it in the recess of the entryway so it has to be discovered. I am curious if there is a way to pinpoint/highlight where you're standing. It looks pretty neat. For me, it looks like a lightning strike, which is exciting. This is a façade that had a unique/modern adaptation to it a long time ago. That's in the spirit of this façade.

Mr. Timmerman – I agree with Mr. Gastinger in that the materiality is going to work very nicely. It is hard to see in the dark space. This mockup is a little misleading. The two materials are off from what they're going to be. I like the idea of subtly. It is such a neat idea. I want to make sure that there isn't an underwhelming effect with that subtly. You strike the right balance between less contrast but something that is imaginative and really strikes peoples' imagination as they walk by. Looking at the bronze at certain points where the light reflects really does that. It sounds like you looked at glass samples. There is this glass that has the foil back. I don't know if you would be interested in exploring a little more depth in the back. Not actually seeing the materials together, I am curious as to how the outside shell interacts with the back. Right now, it looks like a flat connection. I get what you're saying about separating those two. It would create a shadow line and it creates a totally different effect. I am excited about it as another innovation for The Mall. This kind of variation is wonderful.

Mr. Strange – It is interesting to go from this placelessness of the future to something that is so much about the place.

Mr. Lahendro – I will speak in support of it. I applaud the architect and the applicant for sticking with it and doing something interesting and persevering against a bit of our pushback in wanting to get more information and not taking the easy way out. I am in support of it.

Ms. Lewis – This is compatible with the guidelines and certainly meets the guidelines that I am looking at that govern new construction on the Downtown Mall. I do find that the rhythm and patterns of the exterior and solids to voids is found elsewhere on the Mall. The materials certainly meet the guidelines. They are noble. They are not discouraged by our guidelines. There is a verticality to both of the facades, South Street and The Mall. That is also called out in our guidelines. It is a façade and it is beautiful. It is a piece of art. It will be a wonderment. The 'space rocket' elevator was imagined in the 70s looking to the future. This looks to a past, a road from Richmond through the Blue Ridge Mountains. That is a past road. It will be beautiful to look at and walk around.

Mr. Gastinger – I have been in support of the project. It has been an elegant way of dealing with this challenge of giving this new façade. I really do appreciate that vertical composition on both streets. It is going to be a good contribution.

Motion – Mr. Lahendro – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed façade alterations on the Downtown Mall and Water Street elevations at 310 East Main Street satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application [as submitted], provided that the applicant adhere to the qualifications he made about the samples brought to the meeting and the types of patterns that will not be incorporated into the final design.

Mr. Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 10-11-04

123 Bollingwood Road, TMP 070022000

Individually Protected Property

Owner: Juliana and William Elias

Applicant: Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects

Project: Modifications to the west elevation

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1884 District: IPP

Disney-Keith House, a vernacular farmhouse. Between 1923 and the mid-20th century, Arthur Keith’s wife, Ellie Wood Keith, operated a riding academy here.* A barn, outbuildings, and stables immediately west of the house are no longer standing, but can be seen on the c1965 Sanborn Maps and 1966 aerial photo--see the Appendix. The existing garage south of the house was constructed in 1988.

Application

Request CoA to modify the west elevation of the rear addition: New sliding door and exterior stoop at the door. (The landscape plan, including other work on the property, is aspirational and included in the submittal for context only.) Note: In November 2021, the BAR reviewed a conceptual sketch of the proposed changes.

Discussion and Recommendations

Modifications to the west elevation: The existing door and window to the left (in the photos and elevations) are not in the historic photos and were added after/during construction of the small addition to the SW corner of the main house. (See the comparison photos in the Appendix.)

The City’s landmark survey suggests the rear wing was added to the original, 1884 house, with that work completed in two stages, likely prior to 1923. Staff believes the rear addition (excluding the addition at the SW corner) likely dates to between 1894 and prior to 1907.

Staff suggests the alterations to the elevation should be allowed, within the framework of the design guidelines, and supports this request conceptually. With that, staff suggests BAR discuss whether or not the proposed sliding doors are appropriate, within the framework of the design guidelines.

The applicant’s submittal makes clear the design intent for the proposed changes: To connect the interior and exterior with better views and accessibility to the entertainment terrace. The design is intended to emphasize a distinction between the older building fabric and the modern renovation, not to pretend that this work was part of the historic fabric.

* Typically, house additions are associated with growing households. The census data does not tell us when this house was expanded, but it does show how many people were living here. It is speculation only, but the census suggests the addition likely dates to between 1894 and 1907, when Lambert Disney and his family occupied the house.

- o 1884: Frederick Wm. Disney constructs 123 Bollingwood.
- o 1890 Census: Records are not available.
- o 1894: Property given to Lambert Disney.
- o 1900 Census: Lambert Disney and his nine children. (Disney's wife died in 1895.)
- o 1907: Property sold to Stella Carver
- o 1908: Property sold to Frank Thornton.
- o 1910 Census: Thornton, his wife, and four daughters.
- o 1919: Property sold to Henry Corbet.
- o 1920 Census: Corbet, his wife, and two children.
- o 1923: Property sold to Albert Bolling, then to Arthur Keith.
- o 1930 Census: Keith, his wife, two children, and two servants.
- o 1940 Census: Keith, his wife, and three children.

Jeff Dreyfus, Applicant – We were before the BAR in November with a concept sketch of this same small project. The response was favorable. Based on that, we have gone ahead and detailed the design to give you more nuance to what we're talking about and to ideally receive approval for this component of a larger plan that our clients have for the property. What you see here is a more recent new landscape plan for the property. The landscape architect will probably be before you next month with a version of this plan. We included it here so you can understand that the future context ideally of the sliding glass door we're talking about here. Relative to the project itself, you can see that Bollingwood Road is on the right. To the left is another parcel. Beyond that is Alderman Road. The sliding door is on the southwest/west elevation/southwest corner of the building. It is not seen from any public roads. It does currently open on to a bricked terrace. The future terrace will likely be bluestone. We're not asking for any approvals. We would certainly entertain any commentary that you all have about this landscape concept plan. I am not prepared to talk about it. The idea here is that there will be a small plunge pool and a large entertaining area outside of this part of the house. You can see that this wing of the house is the kitchen and the family dining area.

Next Slide

This is the elevation that we're talking about. It is interesting to see the evolution of the house, the telescoping additions here on the south end of the house. In the top left, you can even see a lean-to addition to the original farmhouse. The original farmhouse will be more exposed than some of the earlier photos. Outlined here in red is the location of the sliding door. On the right, we're really talking about taking over those two windows and the door and maintaining the existing head height, 6 foot, 8 inches on the interior of the building as is that current door. On the right of the window, that small enclosure is the electric meter. We are going to need relocate that as part of this project. That has not been figured out yet. That will need to be moved.

Next Slide

These are some of the older photos of the house. The top right is the image that we're talking about. On the original farmhouse, the lean-to is not yet in place in that photograph. Some of the first telescoping addition going out to the right is consumed by the lean-to that is added later. We have a series of not-original structures.

Next Slide

Here are the elevations: existing and proposed. With the proposed sliding glass door, we are working to minimize the amount of structure on the element. The idea here is to be distinctly different than the historic fabric of the house. In some of our earlier studies, we were looking at enlarging some of the openings on the original farmhouse on the left where the main living room is. The BAR was very opposed to modifying that façade. Our approach on this (the newer portions of the building) is to take a distinctly different approach and not pretend to be historic in any way, mimicking history, or trying to make it fit in. We're going to distinctly modern with a three panels, sliding glass door. The two panels on the left will stack with the panel on the right. You can see the alignments that we're going after with the left edge of the new unit aligning with the left unit of the window above it, similar to the one unit currently in its place, as well as the window on the right. Head height will mimic the existing door.

Next Slide

The house is currently grey, white, black shutters. The intent here is a metal surround that frames the opening, framed by a powder coated black seal surround. The sliding door system itself will likely be white. Black was a little ominous. It didn't look quite right. We like the way white does relate (colorwise) to other elements of the existing house. The third element in the composition is the stoop, which will be bluestone to match the bluestone terrace that we're showing here. The stoop stretches the width of the three panels. Compositionally, that's the most settling and gratifying. The step down to the terrace is at the two doors for a little bit asymmetry. It is still a little bit more modern than if the step were to go the full width of the stoop because only those two panels on the left are operable.

Next Slide

This is the head-on elevation. We will be repairing any and all of the siding to match the existing siding. The intervention will require underpinning some footings in the basement. When we come back, we expect that it will look simply like a surgical cut all the way around. The siding will be repaired.

Next Slide

This is a section through the sliding glass door with elements called out. We also include here a plan on the far right. You can see exactly how the interior lays out. This will actually straddle the kitchen and the family dining room.

Next Slide

We did include some of the precedent images that we showed the BAR in November. The idea in all of these is that this is a very modern intervention in a historic structure, not trying to pretend to be anything other than that.

Ms. Lewis – On the elevation concept where you show what this three panel window will look like, I can't figure out whether it is recessed or whether it is proud. If you at it on the left hand side, it definitely looks not recessed. On the right hand side, it looks like it is proud.

Mr. Dreyfus – The shadows are probably confusing. The reason the sliding door unit itself is just proud of the existing wall is structural. We are going to need to pour a new foundation and footing underneath there. We have studied the existing basement foundation. To put it in plane with the existing wall would

potentially compromise the foundation. In this instance, the window is just proud of the plane of the existing wall. Beyond that, the metal surround is 8 inches proud of the wall. The window unit is about 4/4.5 inches deep. The metal surround is another 3.5/4 inches proud of the wall.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Timmerman – I have a question about the screening systems. Is that going to be integrated?

Mr. Dreyfus – There is a screen system that is integral to the frame. It disappears when it is not in use. It actually folds into the frame when the doors are closed. When the doors are open, you can pull the screen out of the frame. It actually attaches to the operable window edge. It is a German system and beautifully engineered.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – How old are the windows that we're demolishing in order to accomplish this?

Mr. Dreyfus – I am not sure any of us are clear when these additions came. I know that staff did some research. I don't know that any of us were able to discern when these additions came.

Mr. Werner – From the census data, there was a house built. Mr. Disney built the house.

Ms. Lewis – The staff report says that you believe the rear addition, excluding the addition to the southwest corner likely dates between 1894 and prior to 1907.

Mr. Werner – Yes. That is from the aerial photos. Nothing is clear.

Mr. Watkins – This is the one historic photo that we have. I imagine that it was taken in the 70s. It shows the elevation in question. It is possible that these two windows on the first level are the two windows in question. A door has been inserted since then. These might be different. It is hard to tell. There has been this lean-to addition that consumed this space.

Mr. Dreyfus – The one on the second story has been moved. It has a larger number of divided lights.

Mr. Watkins – There have definitely been several different changes of just the apertures on this elevation.

Jeff Elias, Owner – There are some original windows on the main portion under the single pane. The windows that we're talking about are double pane windows. They're different in the photo.

Mr. Timmerman – When they moved window A, they also moved window B.

Mr. Dreyfus – The lower window is still even closer to that line #4. Both of those windows to the left of the yellow line are further right than that earlier photograph.

Mr. Gastinger – I felt comfortable that these windows would be removed. It did not seem to be that they were either, definitively original nor really critical to the buildings overall design or detailing. They are not visible from the street. I am in support of this project. I feel that it is an elegant solution that distinguishes the contemporary addition to the historic fabric.

Mr. Timmerman – I agree. I am in support of it. It is an elegant solution in the way that it clearly contrasts with this historic fabric. There are some nice moves to relate to it. It improves the composition of that elevation. It will be a nice addition for that house. It will provide light for the owners.

Mr. Bailey – I also think it is an elegant solution. I am a little amused by the addition of the extra shutter on the story above it.

Mr. Gastinger – Mr. Dreyfus asked us if there was any guidance on the landscape plan since they will be presenting it shortly. Personally, I find it in keeping of the many ways that this landscape has been manipulated over the years. I don't find anything particularly objectionable or out of line with our guidelines.

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City's ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed alterations at 123 Bollingwood Road satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this IPP and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Mr. Lahendro seconds motion. Motion passes (8-0).

D. Other Business

Staff Questions/Discussion

- There was a previous project that members of the BAR had been receiving emails about. Staff went over the purview of the BAR. The BAR does not have purview over zoning. The members of the BAR do not need to respond to the applicant.

E. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:01 PM.