

BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
July 19, 2022 – 5:00 PM
Hybrid Meeting – City Space



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: Breck Gastinger, James Zehmer, Jody Lahendro, Cheri Lewis, Ron Bailey, Hunter Smith

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

Pre-Meeting:

Ms. Lewis staff about the details regarding the Downtown Mall possibly being added to the National Registry. Mr. Watkins provided details regarding the meeting that occurred on Monday.

Mr. Zehmer had questions regarding the Preston Place, Court Square, and 14th Street COA applications on the Consent Agenda. Members of the BAR discussed those items on the Consent Agenda. After discussion, the Court Square and 14th Street COA applications were kept on the Consent Agenda. The Preston Place COA will remain on the Consent Agenda. It could be pulled following Public Comments.

The BAR is going to be meeting at 4 PM at the Levy Building site to examine the building materials for the Courts Project for the regular August BAR meeting or a special BAR meeting on August 31st.

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 PM by the Chairman.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

The BAR received comment from Paul Wright in regards to the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 605 Preston Place. He'd like to see details on how deep the proposed balconies will be.

Beth Turner also spoke about 605 Preston Place. She asked the BAR to not allow the proposed changes to the building and to not allow more balconies. Balconies create noise and reduce privacy.

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 September 21, 2021

2. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-06-02
636 Park Street, TMP 520113000
North Downtown ADC District (contributing)
Owners and applicants: Jennifer and Blakely Greenhalgh
Project: Rooftop solar panels

3. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-06-03
500 Court Square, TMP 530096000
North Downtown ADC District (contributing)
Owner: Monticello Hotel Event & Receptions LLC; 500 Court Square LLC
Applicant: Caitlin Byrd Schafer, Henningsen Kestner Architects
Project: South addition--window replacements and fire escape alterations

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-07-02
123 Bollingwood Road, TMP 070022000
Individually Protected Property
Owner: Juliana and William Elias
Applicant: Gabrielle Sabri / Grounded LLC Project: Landscaping plan

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-07-04
207 14th Street, TMP 090070100 Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District
Owner: University Hotel Management, LLC
Applicant: Bill Chapman
Project: Exterior alterations

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-07-03
605 Preston Place
TMP 50111000 IPP and Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District
Owner: Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP
Applicant: Kevin Riddle, Mitchell Matthews Architects
Project: Modify windows in new apartment building (CoA approved October 2021)

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the Consent Agenda – Second by Mr. Lahendro – Motion passes 6-0.

C. Deferred Items

None

D. New Items

7. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-06-04
517 Rugby Road, TMP 050046000

Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District (contributing)

Owner: Alumni of Alpha Mu, Inc.

Applicant: Garrett Rouzer, Dalglish Gilpin Paxton Architects

Project: Porch repair and alterations and window sash replacements

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: c1910 District: Rugby Road - University Circle - Venable Neighborhood ADC District

Status: Contributing. (Also a contributing structure to the Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District, VLR 1983 and NRHP 1984.)

Constructed as a private residence, 2-1/2 story, Colonial Revival 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.

Request CoA to remove the non-historic decks flanking the front porch, re-construct the roof of the front porch, and replace all non-historic sash with Marvin sash replacement kits (new sash within frame inserts; existing wood frames and exterior trim to remain).

Porch alterations

- Retain and repair existing elements:
 - o Columns
 - o Architrave and frieze associated with porch roof
 - o Stairs and skirt board
- Remove:
 - o Non-historic flanking decks
 - o Asphalt shingles on porch roof
- Install new:
 - o Azek skirt boards and composite lattice panels on sides
 - o Painted wood railing
 - o Standing-seam metal roof

Windows

- Remove non-historic sash and replace with Marvin exterior clad/interior primed insulated window sash within frames inserts. Insulated glass, applied grilles with internal spacer bars.
- Existing entrance door, transom and sidelights and window at the east dormer to remain.

Discussion and Recommendations

Front porch: Staff suggests removal of the flanking decks and the rehabilitation of the existing porch are appropriate and recommend approval.

Windows: The applicant has provided documentation that, with the exception of the diamond-pattern windows in the east dormer, all of the sash are replacements (installed into the existing frames) sometime after 1987. In 2014, the BAR approved a remove the post-1987 replacement sash and install Marvin replacements with frame inserts. Staff recommends approval. (Note: The BAR has denied replacement sash inserts; however, the most recent request proposed removing original sash and installing new windows with frame inserts under-sized for the existing opening, requiring wide metal trim panels at the sides, heads and sills. For 517 Rugby Road, the original sash no longer exist and the replacement frames will fit relatively right to the existing frames.)

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the front porch repair, removal of non-historic porch wings, and window sash replacements 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.

Jody Lahendro seconds motion. Motion passes (5-0).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-06-05

159 Madison Lane, TMP 090145000

The Corner ADC District (contributing)

Owner: Montalto Corporation

Applicant: Jack Cann, Montalto Corporation

Project: Install brick infill panels (and other repairs to south porch)

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: 1928 District: The Corner ADC District Status: Contributing

Fraternity house designed by UVA architecture professor Stanislaw Makielski. Prominently situated at the north edge of the Madison Bowl, the five-bay, two-story brick house has a two-story Tuscan-columned portico at its center.

Request CoA to infill with brick the three, basement-level windows at the front of the porch.

Applicant also wishes to address additional maintenance issues, including:

- o Reset basket-weave brick paving on the portico floor and replace bricks where necessary

- o Repair east and west stairs portico stairs

- o Reconstruct deteriorated concrete stairs leading from kitchen to portico

Staff finds that these activities fall under “routine maintenance and repair” and intend to review these repairs administratively. The BAR can offer any suggestions or feedback on these proposed repairs.

Discussion and Recommendations

The applicant has asked to brick-in the three basement-level opening under the portico to address maintenance issues and prevent vandalism. The original windows no longer exist.

The three openings are headed with steel lintels, all significantly corroded. This corrosion has contributed to the buckling of the brick bulkhead wall beneath the portico.

The applicant has also shared that the three windows are also subject to vandalism from passersby. The windows are therefore currently covered up with insulation and metal screens.

In historic photographs, each window has two-lites separated by a mullion. Compared with the building’s other fenestration (lunettes, double-hung sash windows, compass-headed French doors) these basement windows appear utilitarian in nature.

There are nearby examples of the apparent or suggested filling-in of basement-level openings. For example, at 165 Rugby Road (a nearby fraternity house), the arched basement openings under the rear porch are filled-in and stucco clad.

Staff finds that filling in these utilitarian openings will not alter the building’s historic character and will contribute to its future maintenance. In addition to the necessary repairs to the masonry, the steel lites have deteriorated and must be replaced. Staff recommends the brick infill, recessed (1/2” to 1”) into the opening. Brick should be similar, but not matching, differentiating new from old. The other option would be infill with CMU, recessed (1/2” to 1”) into the opening, then parged and painted a neutral color.

The flat arches and the brick sills should be retained. The infill panels should be simple and unadorned. If brick, they should not be tuted into the existing, allowing restoration/recreation of the original, if later considered. The BAR should state the preferred solution, including any details related to material and color (brick, parging), masonry coursing, depth of panel recess, etc. Repairs to the existing brick should use matching or similar bricks, replicating the existing bond and coursing. The existing mortar should be evaluated and, if necessary, repairs made with mortar using an appropriate proportion of lime [vs Portland cement].

Motion – Ms. Lewis - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City’s ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed infill of three masonry openings and other repairs noted at 159 Madison Lane satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this district and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition that the coursing, brick color and mortar be matched as closely to the historic as possible, and that the brick infill be set back several inches from the plane of the porch floor. Mr. Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (5-0).

9. Sign Permit – BAR Consent for Design Approval

BAR 22-06-01

550 East Water Street Suite 101, TMP 530162302

Downtown ADC District (contributing)

Owner: Downtown Office, LLC

Applicant: Kyle Gumlock, Gropen, Inc.

Project: Install pole sign

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – 550 East Water Street is mixed-use building constructed in 2018.

Application

- Sign Permit Application for 550 East Water Street, Suite 101: 18” x 11-3/4” x 3/8" aluminum sign, painted with applied vinyl logo installed at a height of 4’-4” on a 3" x 3" painted metal post within a landscaped bed.

Pole signs are allowed in the Downtown ADC District only with BAR approval.

Discussion and Recommendations

Note for clarity: All sign permit applications are submitted to and reviewed by the Zoning Administrator. Applications for signs within design control districts (per Sec. 34-1025) are also reviewed by design review, on behalf of the BAR and applying the pertinent ADC District Guidelines. In addition to the Zoning review, Sec. 34-1041 requires BAR approval for pole signs within the Downtown ADC District. The Code indicates approved sign permits *take the form of a Certificate of Appropriateness*; however, with no separate BAR application for the design review component, staff does not refer to *approved sign permits* as *approved CoA*. For continuity, the proposed motion reflects this terminology; however, regardless of phrasing, the BAR’s action is equivalent to action on a CoA request.

There are very few pole signs within the Downtown ADC District and most, if not all, likely predate the required BAR review. Except for the clearly unique Lucky 7 sign, most are located within landscaped beds and where there is space between the building and the sidewalk. (Map and images below indicate existing pole signs—possibly not all--within the Downtown ADC District.)

Staff finds that the proposed pole sign is appropriate for the Downtown ADC District; however, this finding assumes a single pole sign for this building. Within the building are ten condominiums, each

with a separate Tax Map Parcel number and--either currently or potentially--separately owned. Staff is concerned that one pole sign here creates a precedent that might result in ten, separate pole signs in front of this building. Staff has requested a determination from the Zoning Administrator and will present that prior to the June 22 meeting. Should those broader questions related to the City's sign ordinance not be resolved—separate from the design review of this one sign--staff recommends this be deferred to the July 19, 2022 BAR meeting.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Cheri Lewis: Having considered the pertinent sections of the City Code and the ADC Design Guidelines for Signs and per City Code Sec. 34-1041, I move the BAR concur with staff on the administrative approval of the design review component of the sign permit application for a pole sign at 550 East Water Street with the following conditions:

- That the vertical post supporting the sign be set back equally with the first vertical post of the bike rack
- That the pole sign design match the wall sign in lettering and background color
- That this approval is explicitly for this one pole sign. Any future applications for pole signs for this building need to be submitted with a signage package for the entire parcel.

Ron Bailey seconds motion. Motion passes (5-0).

10. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-06-06

0 Preston Place (also 508 and 516 Preston Place),

TMP 050118001, 050118002

Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District

Owner: Steve & Sue Lewis

Applicant: Leigh Boyes

Project: New residence

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Year Built: Extant remnants of c1920-1937 parking garages

District: Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC

Status: non-contributing

These parcels historically contained a stone and frame garage complex. All the remains are low segments of the masonry walls stand along the western and northern property lines, which will be retained. The parcels are otherwise vacant and undeveloped.

This project is on two parcels: TMP 050118001 (now addressed 516 Preston Place) and TMP 050118002 (now addressed 508 Preston Place). Property owner will be combining these parcels; therefore, for consistency from the prelim discussion in February, staff refers to the project as 0 Preston Place, understanding that the CoA request applies to what are currently two separate parcels.

Application

- Submittal: Sage Designs drawings Lewis Residence, 0 Preston Place, dated May 30, 2022:

- o S1.0 – Site context photos

- o S1.1 – Preliminary landscape and site plan

- o S1.2 – Building perspectives and material swatches

- o A1.1 – First floor plan

- o A1.2 – Second floor plan

- o A2.2 – Elevations

- o A2.1 – Elevations

CoA request to construct a new single-family residence and attached garage on vacant parcels.

Note 1: The applicant is anticipating revisions to the landscaping plan (specifically, tree and plant selections) and modifications to the driveway (as necessary to comply with zoning requirements that driveway/parking area does not exceed 25% of the front yard.) For the BAR action, these components can be included (with conditions, if warranted) or separated (to be reviewed later as separated submittals).

Note 2: The consolidation of the two parcels has not been completed, which requires the resolution of utility easements and conformance with applicable zoning requirements. Staff does not anticipate this will result in significant changes to the current design, if any. In the event of changes, staff suggests these be reviewed with the BAR chair to determine if they warrant a resubmittal and formal review or they can simply be noted in the BAR record.

Materials

- Roof: factory-painted dark bronze standing-seam metal and dark
- Gutters: K-style or half-round, dark bronze.
- Cupola: painted composite siding with copper roof and weathervane
- Walls: field stone veneer and painted cement fiber board siding
- Porches: painted composite columns, composite sun-shade trellis, and bluestone pavers.
- Chimneys: field stone veneer
- Windows: factory-painted Pella or Jeldwen metal-clad wood windows with simulated divided lites or shadow bars
- Doors: factory-painted Pella or Jeldwen metal-clad wood doors with simulated divided lites or shadow bars
- Garage doors: Overhead Door “Courtyard Collection” insulated steel garage doors

Landscaping/Site Work

- pea gravel driveway and motor court
- bluestone paths and terraces
- new stone retaining walls to match existing
- picket fence along street

Discussion and Recommendations

The BAR had a preliminary discussion on this project at the February 2022 meeting. Video link below (discussion at 03:07:50) - <https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzeuyv3iclkx1a?b=tycoam74nerhajuktwgz>. During the prelim discussion, the BAR offered the following:

- Stone retaining walls along property line will be retained as is, with new wall added. BAR recommended new wall be differentiated from existing.
- Concerned about elaboration of garage and recommends street-facing door be removed.
- Requested diagrams/drawings showing proposed house in relation to neighboring buildings.
- Recommended perspective or 3D views of proposed house to express site context and parcel depth.
- Acknowledged the variety of architectural styles on Preston Place that proposed house fits.
- Concerned about use of different materials on façade, proposed altering roof lines between stone core and siding-clad wings.

From the ADC District design Guidelines – Introduction

Rugby Road - University Circle - Venable Neighborhood ADC District: This residential area north of the University of Virginia was carved out of two large farms to house the University’s growing number of students and faculty during the boom years between 1890 and 1930. The neighborhood contains a number of architecturally significant structures including apartment buildings, residential dwellings, and fraternity houses, as well as a school, a library, and two churches. Although a wide variety of architectural styles exist in this area, the Colonial Revival and Georgian Revival styles are most commonly represented.

Subarea C. Preston Place: A moderate scale single family residential neighborhood constructed in the 1920s and 1930s with the exception of Wyndhurst (605 Preston Place), built in 1857, which was the original farmhouse on the property; porches, brick, wood frame, variety of architectural styles, deep setbacks, wooded lots.

The BAR should consider the following 14 criteria for new construction from Chapter III of the ADC District Design Guidelines:

A. Building Types within the Historic Districts

(Staff used Subarea C to generate typical dimensions and building comparisons. See Appendix and attached for summary and images of existing structures in Subarea C.)

Staff Comment: The proposed house will be residential infill on a street of existing historic houses. With residential infill, the Design Guidelines express that the following criteria are the most important:

- Setback
- Spacing
- General massing
- Residential roof and porch forms

B. Setback: For residential infill, setbacks should be within 20% of the [neighborhood average].

Staff Comment: Existing front setbacks range between 20 ft to 80 feet. Average is 51 feet. Recommended range for new is 41 feet to 61 feet. Front setback of proposed house is approximately 45 feet.

C. Side Spacing: New residences should be spaced within 20% of the average spacing.

Staff Comment: Spacings between existing houses range between 22 feet to 62 feet. Average is 39 feet. Recommended range for new is 31 feet to 47 feet. Spacing between proposed house and 620 Preston Place is approximately 25 feet. Slightly less than the lowest recommended spacing; however, it is equal to or greater than the three lowest dimensions: 22-ft, 23-ft, 25-ft, 30-ft, 32-ft, 40-ft, 42-ft, 50-ft, 60-ft, and 62-ft.

D. Massing and Footprint: New infill residential should relate in footprint and massing to the majority of surrounding historic dwellings

(Footprint) Existing footprints range between 1,389 square feet to 5,218 square feet. Average is 2,234 sq ft. Footprint of proposed house is approximately 4,800 square feet and within the range of the subarea.

(Massing) The proposed house, viewed from the street, is wider than average and exceeds the maximum; however, its two-stories are the same as 10 of the 14 houses in the subarea, its large footprint visually reads as four individual structures (see the perspectives on sheet S1.2), and as summarized below, other elements such as materials, color, and landscaping will mitigate the massing.

E. Height and Width: Attempt to keep the height and width of new buildings within a maximum of 200 percent of the prevailing height and width in the sub-area.

Staff Comment:

- (Height) Existing heights range between 1-1/2 floors to 2 floors. (Floors = stories.) Average is just under 2 floors. Recommended maximum for new just under 4 floors. Height of the proposed house is 2 floors, well under the recommended maximum.

- (Width) Existing widths range between 34 feet to 106 feet. Average is 55 feet. Width of the proposed house is 156 feet, which exceeds the existing range; however, perception of this length will likely be broken down by a number of elements, allowing this house to relate other houses on Preston Place.
- The height of the house varies in an A-B-A-B pattern of one- and two-story sections.
- The variation of stone veneer and siding minimizes the visual predominance of a single material.
- The porches, the porte cochere, and frontward plantings will visually buffer the massing.
- Historically located at this site (early 20th century) was an approximately 216-ft long, masonry structure of individual garages. (The garages are not shown on the 1920 Sanborn Maps, but are visible in the 1937 aerial photos. They were razed between 2006 and 2009.)

F. Scale: Provide features on new construction that reinforce the scale and character of the surrounding area, whether human or monumental. Include elements such as storefronts, vertical and horizontal divisions, upper story windows, and decorative features.

Staff Comment: The proposed house has two stories and a familiar pattern of windows and doors, resulting in a scale similar to houses in the subarea.

G. Roof

Staff Comment: The hipped roof on the proposed house is similar to hipped roofs on several other Preston Place houses, including 620, 622 and 608 Preston Place. The factory-painted standing-seam metal is an appropriate material. (See the Appendix for roof types and materials within the subarea.) Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring half-round gutters and full-round downspouts.

H. Orientation

Staff Comment: The house is situated on an irregular parcel with frontage on the primary Preston Place loop and its connector east to Burnley Avenue. The proposed house is oriented towards Preston Place.

I. Windows and Doors

Staff Comment: The proposed house has windows and doors in a pattern and scale familiar to neighboring historic houses in the district. The aluminum-clad wood windows are an appropriate window type for new construction. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring internal spacer bars within insulated glass (doors and windows) with applied grills.

J. Porches

Staff Comment: Houses on Preston Place have a variety of porch styles, from single-bay covered entrances to full-length porches. The porch on the proposed house is consistent with the subarea.

K. Foundation and Cornice

Staff Comment: Some sections of the house and garage will have a stone-veneer base at the foundation. The house's deep eaves relate to several other deep-eaved houses on Preston Place, including 620 and 622 Preston Place.

M. Materials and Textures

Staff Comment: The proposed composite siding is an appropriate material. The guidelines recommend that stone is more commonly used for site walls than buildings, but do not prohibit its use. There are numerous examples of stone buildings in Charlottesville's historic districts. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring that exposed face of siding and trim be smooth; no faux graining.

N. Paint [Color palette]

Staff Comment: In addition to the fieldstone veneer, the exterior walls (siding, trim, columns) will be painted white, the shutters painted black or green. This palette is appropriate.

O. Details and Decoration

Staff Comment: The Design Guidelines suggest that building detail and ornamentation relate to the surrounding context. Staff finds the proposed style and details similar to those found in the subarea; however, the building reads as a contemporary structure. During the preliminary discussion, the BAR expressed concern that some elements—for ex., the garage cupola—are more elaborate than those found nearby. Staff agrees the proposed house has a greater degree of elaboration than its neighbors; however, the proposed design and materials are not incompatible with the subarea.

Regarding the site, staff is concerned that a substantial amount of the front yard is consumed by the driveway and parking area. Chapter II of the Design Guidelines (Site Design & Elements) recommend placing parking in the rear:

E. Walkways & Driveways: Place driveways through the front yard only when no rear access to parking is available.

Staff Comment: Staff recommends the BAR consider alternate driveway layouts that would minimize impact on the front yard.

The front elevation is essentially identical to the design reviewed for the February 15 preliminary discussion, except for modification of the first floor of the garage.

Motion – Mr. Bailey – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed single-family house and garage at 0 Preston Place 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 with the following conditions:

- **That the stone being repurposed for new walls be differentiated from the existing stone site retaining walls.**

Ms. Lewis seconds motion. Motion passes 4-1 (Lahendro opposed).

11. Recommendation to City Council – IPP Designation

BAR 22-07-01

415/415-B 10th Street NW, TMP 4046000

Owner/Applicant: Dairy Holdings, LLC

Former church, parish hall, and rectory for Trinity Episcopal Church

Request for designation as an *Individually Protected Property*

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Background

The church, parish hall, and rectory were originally constructed elsewhere and relocated to this site in-- or soon after--1939 by the congregation of Trinity Episcopal Church. The church, built in 1910 in Palmyra (Fluvanna County), was disassembled and moved to 10th Street in 1939. According to church history, either in 1939 or very soon after, the parish hall and rectory were either moved to 10th Street from other locations or constructed new; however, their origins and dates of construction are uncertain. (Between 1919 and 1939, Trinity was located at what is now a pocket park at intersection of West High Street and Preston Avenue. The acquisition of land for Lane High School and McIntire Road forced the congregation’s move to 10th Street, leaving behind a church and, possibly, a separate dwelling, which were razed. In 1974, the congregation moved from 10th Street to its present location at 1118 Preston Avenue.)

Request

The BAR is asked to make a recommendation to City Council on the owners request to designate as an Individually Protected Property (IPP) an approximately 0.19-acre parcel with three existing structures—referred to as church, parish hall, and rectory--at the NE corner of 10th Street, NW and Grady Avenue.

This request would amend City Code Section 34-273(b), designating the parcel an IPP, and City Code Section 34-1, adding to the parcel the overlay of a Minor Architectural Design Control District. Designation of an IPP follows the process for an amendment to the City's zoning ordinance and zoning map, including a public hearing and notification. In reviewing the requested designation, City Council shall consider the recommendations of the Planning Commission and the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) regarding criteria found in City Code Section 34-274.

Proposed revisions to Sec. 34-273. - Individually protected properties.

(b) Following is a list of landmarks, buildings and structures outside the city's major design control districts, which are deemed by city council to be of special historic, cultural, or architectural value (each, individually, a "Protected Property"). Each parcel containing a protected property is hereby designated a minor design control district.

Discussion

Based on the criteria found in Section 34-274 (analysis below), staff recommends the BAR recommend that City Council amend Code Sec. 34-274 to add this parcel to the list of IPPs and to amend the Zoning Map to designate this parcel as an IPP, with the church, parish hall, and rectory as contributing structures.

Note: An IPP is a local designation, therefore primary consideration should be given to its importance to this city and this community. While it is helpful to refer to the NRHP criteria, neither eligibility nor listing should be considered requirements for local recognition. In fact, the relevant City Code section states that IPP designation is not determined by NRHP listing, but a way to encourage nomination of historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places and the Virginia Landmarks Register.

Additionally, of the City's 76 IPPs:

- 32 are not listed on the NRHP
- 25 are individually listed on the NRHP
- 19 are contributing resources to a NRHP historic district (most, if not all, were IPPs before being included in a district)

Motion – Mr. Lahendro - Having reviewed the criteria for designation of Individually Protected Properties per City Code Section 34-274, I move the BAR recommend that City Council approve the request to designate 415/415-B 10th Street NW (Parcel 4-46) an Individually Protected Property.

Ms. Lewis seconds motion. Motion passes 5-0.

I. Other Business

12. Updates

Review of Courts Expansion

- Meeting August 16th at Levy Building for Pre-Meeting at 4:00 PM.

Zoning Rewrite

- Mr. Schwarz (former BAR Chair) has been appointed to Planning Commission.

Downtown Mall – update on VLR/NRHP nomination

13. Staff Questions

- Current positions on BAR – Licensed Architect and Historian.
- Possible Return to Normal Operations at City Hall.

J. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 PM.