

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
August 16, 2022 – 5:00 PM (4:00 PM at the Levy Building)
Hybrid Meeting – City Space and Levy Building**



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

Members Present: James Zehmer, Jody Lahendro, Breck Gastinger, Cheri Lewis, David Timmerman (4:00 PM Levy Building), Ron Bailey (City Space)

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

Pre-Meeting:

The applicants Walter Harris (Albemarle County Project Manager), Steve White, and Eric Amtmann (Frentress Architects) presented the different brick colors and mortar to members of the BAR at the Levy Building. The applicants presented three different brick and mortar colors to compare with the current bricks on the Levy Building.

There was a discussion regarding the open spots on the BAR. There is a need for an architect, historian, and a representative from the Planning Commission. There is an active recruiting for these open positions on the BAR.

Item 6 on the Agenda has been removed. It will be approved administratively by staff.

There was discussion regarding the other items on the Agenda in front of the BAR tonight.

A separate COA is going to be submitted for the color palate for the new courthouse building. The COA on the meeting agenda is going to be for the design of the new courthouse. There will be a special BAR meeting on August 31, 2022 to discuss the color palates of the bricks.

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Public 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 October 19, 2021

Ms. Lewis moved to approve Consent Agenda – Mr. Zehmer second the motion – Motion passes 6-0.

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 21-07-05

350 Park Street, TMP 530109000 and 530108000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: City of Charlottesville and County of Albemarle

Applicant: Eric Amtmann, DGP Architects [on behalf of Albemarle County]

Project: New courthouse building (at Levy Building)

Note: *Courts expansion: If necessary, discuss possible Special Meeting Aug 31?*

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background 350 Park Street Year Built: Levy Building 1852, Annex c1980 District: North Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing 0 Park Street Year Built: N/A, parking lot District: North Downtown ADC District Status: N/A

The Levy Building is Greek Revival, constructed with brick laid in American bond with Flemish bond variant. Three stories, hipped roof, three-bay front, heavy entablature supported by monumental stuccoed pilasters on brick pedestals, crossette architraves, and brick water table.

CoA request for construction of an addition to the Levy Building and new construction related to the expansion of the City-County Courts Complex.

Discussion

Since October 2020, the BAR has had three formal discussions regarding this project—not including the December 2020 approval of the selective demolition. Recently, four members of the BAR met separately with the design team to review modifications and discuss what information the BAR needs to consider taking a formal action on the requested CoA. Following those discussions, the design team revised the submittal documents and, on August 16 prior to the formal BAR meeting, will have at the project site material and color samples for the BAR to review.

In these discussions, the BAR has referred to the criteria in the ADC District Design Guidelines, particularly Chapter III. *New Construction and Additions* and Chapter VI. *Public Buildings and Structures*.

From Chapter III. *New Construction and Additions*

- Setback, including landscaping and site improvements
- Spacing
- Massing and Footprint
- Height and Width
- Scale
- Roof
- Orientation
- Windows and Doors
- Street-Level Design
- Foundation and Cornice
- Materials and Textures
- Paint [Color palette]
- Details and Decoration, including lighting and signage

From Chapter VI. *Public Buildings and Structures*, in

- Public buildings should follow design guidelines for new construction.
- New structures, including bridges, should reflect contemporary design principles.

Additionally, the BAR has applied the provisions of Sec. 34-282.d (below) as a checklist for the information necessary to evaluate this request. Except for a 3-D model (per item 5), which the BAR did not request, the information submitted has been thorough, comprehensive, and responsive to the BAR's requests and comments.

Sec. 34-282.d

- 1) Detailed and clear descriptions of any proposed changes in the exterior features of the subject property, including but not limited to the following: the general design, arrangement, texture, materials, plantings and colors to be used, the type of windows, exterior doors, lights, landscaping, parking, signs, and other exterior fixtures and appurtenances. The relationship of the proposed change to surrounding properties will also be shown.
- 2) Photographs of the subject property and photographs of the buildings on contiguous properties.
- 3) Samples to show the nature, texture and color of materials proposed.
- 4) The history of an existing building or structure, if requested by the BAR or staff.
- 5) For new construction and projects proposing expansion of the footprint of an existing building: a three-dimensional model (in physical or digital form) depicting the site, and all buildings and structures to be located thereon, as it will appear upon completion of the work that is the subject of the application.

Motion – Mr. Bailey – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Public Design and Improvements, I move to find that the proposed courts expansion project at the Levy Building satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, including the proposed brick size and coursing, with the condition that a further CoA be submitted in which the BAR considers the building's material palette, including the colors of the brick and trim, before the project moves forward.

Ms. Lewis seconds motion. Motion passes (6-0).

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-08-01
 Downtown Mall
 Downtown ADC District
 Owner: City of Charlottesville
 Applicant: Riaan Anthony, Parks and Recreation
 Project: Install grates at three mall fountains

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background The Downtown Pedestrian Mall was designed by Lawrence Halprin Associates from 1973-76. The first five blocks of East Main Street were pedestrianized in 1976. In 1980 the mall was extended by two blocks on West Main Street. The west end (at the Omni) was completed in 1985. The east end completed in 2006 with construction of the Transit Center, Freedom of Expression wall, and the Amphitheater.

Request CoA for the installation of metal grates, painted black, t the three (3) small fountain on the Downtown Mall: • between 2nd Street West and 1st Street, • between 2nd Street East and 3rd Street

East, • between 4th Street East and 5th Street East. Installation of the grates is in response to concerns regarding pedestrian safety on the Downtown Mall and potential liability relative to provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The grates (painted black) will be installed flush with the brick pavers, set on metal brackets anchored to the fountain's granite blocks and are intended to be permanent. The grating is constructed of 1" x 3/16" slats, spaced 1/2" apart on perpendicular metal rods. (Note: At this time, no related or similar alterations have been proposed for the fountain at Central Place.)

Recommendations and Discussion

The BAR has reviewed multiple projects with components related to ADA accessibility--primarily, if not entirely, related to accessible ramps and entrances associated with buildings. Typically, if not in all cases, the options reflect alterations commonly accepted as standard. Addressing pedestrian safety on the Mall presents a challenge and the BAR is asked to strike a balance between respecting the Halprin design and necessary adaptation. Installing grates is not the only viable solution; however, the City has determined the fountain pools must be covered and the grates provide a reasonable and, more importantly, expedient solution. Unless a viable, available alternative is proposed, staff recommends the BAR approve the grates, but with two conditions: • The grates be fabricated such that installation does not require boring anchors into the existing stone. For ex, the grates would be supported by a metal flange at the perimeter (see below). • The grates are deemed temporary for a period of one (1) year [following installation], with the understanding that pedestrian safety at all of the Mall's fountains will be evaluated during the City's planned stakeholder discussions and any proposed changes will be presented to the BAR.

With that in mind, staff has reviewed the relevant guidelines in Chapter VI of the ADC District Design Guidelines and provides the following comments for the BAR to discuss and consider:

From B. Plazas, Parks & Open Spaces

1. Maintain existing spaces and important site features for continued public use consistent with the original design intent.

Staff comment: With the goal of maintaining continued public use consistent with the original design intent, staff suggests the BAR consider the following:

- the original fountains will be retained,
- the reversibility of the proposed grates
- the absence of a reasonable, equally effective alternative.

2. Maintain significant elements in a historic landscape: grave markers, structures, landforms, landscaping, circulation patterns, boundaries, and site walls.

Staff comment: The physical elements of Halprin's design are generally intact; where original material has been replaced, the new largely reflects the original design, though not always replicating it. Arguably, the most evident and debated change has been the altered circulation patterns due to the outdoor cafés and dining spaces; however, these did not result in permanent, physical changes. If installed without boring into the stone blocks, the metal grates will not permanently alter the fountains. (If bored anchors are necessary, the BAR should discuss how these can be minimized and, if later removed, how the holes will be repaired.)

From the Charlottesville Downtown Mall PIF, prepared by Robinson & Associates, Inc.

April 2022:

Certain character-defining elements of the original design (planters, bollards, fountains, willow oak bosques) remain, while others (streetlights, metal and wood chairs) have been altered or changed out but retain some of the character of the original, LHA-designed features. The permanent location of the

chairs, bolted into place, contrasts with the ability to move the LHA benches short distances in order to create spontaneous gathering spaces. The spatial organization that the LHA design devised to influence movement along the Mall also remains, although the current use of public space for private dining areas hinders its original effect and adds to the sense of clutter on the Mall. The dining areas and the permanent locations of the chairs also detract from the Mall's intended function as a public gathering space for purposes other than private dining. It should be noted that both these alterations to the original design intent are reversible. The Downtown Mall continues, however, to fulfill much of its original purpose in its original location – offering an attractive public space to bring residents and visitors to the downtown area, providing housing for twenty-four hour use, and spurring the local economy. Integrity of location, design, setting, feeling, and association therefore remain moderate to strong.

3. Design new spaces to reinforce streetscape and pedestrian goals for the district. These areas offer the opportunity to provide visual focal points and public gathering spaces for the districts.

Staff comment: The changes are not associated with a new streetscape or pedestrian space.

4. New landscaping should be historically and regionally appropriate, indigenous when possible, and scaled for the proposed location and intended use.

Staff comment: No new landscaping is proposed.

5. Exterior furniture and site accessories should be compatible with the overall character of the park or open space.

Staff comment: BAR should discuss if the proposed metal grates are compatible/incompatible with the overall character of the Downtown Mall

6. Repairs and maintenance work should match original materials and design, and should be accomplished in a historically appropriate manner.

Staff comment: The original materials, physical design and function will not be altered; however, the perception and experience of the fountains will differ from the intent of the Halprin design.

7. Avoid demolishing historic buildings to create open spaces and parks.

Staff comment: Not applicable. The existing fountains will remain in place.

J. Public Art, Statues, & Fountains

1. Maintain existing features related to public art, statues and fountains.

Staff comment: The existing fountains will remain in place.

2. Public art is preferred that offers a place-making role in celebrating and communicating the history and culture of the districts.

Staff comment: The mall should be accessible to everyone.

Motion – Ms. Lewis - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Public Design and Improvements, I move to find that the proposed fountain grates do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with the Downtown Mall and the Downtown ADC district, and that for the following reasons the BAR denies the application as submitted:

• The application violates the following guideline from Chapter IV of the ADC District Design Guidelines:

B. Plazas, Parks & Open Spaces

1. Maintain existing spaces and important site features for continued use consistent with the original design intent.

• That the proposed design is inconsistent with the original Halprin design intent for the fountains because the grates obscure the sight and sound of the basin, and that the grates could cause additional water splashing that has not been considered.

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

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-08-02
800 East Market Street, TMP 530160000
Downtown ADC District (contributing property)
Owner: City of Charlottesville
Applicant: Scott Hendrix, Facilities Development Division
Project: Roof replacement, Key Recreation Center

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background Year Built: 1937 District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing

Serving as the National Guard Armory between 1937 and the 1970s, this brick, art deco building replaced the original armory (located at the current Police Station). When the armory relocated to its present site on Avon Street Extended, the structure was converted to a City recreation center and, following his death in 2004, named to honor Herman Key, Jr., a local athlete and prominent advocate for disabled athletes.

Request for CoA to repair/replace roof, including the slate roof and the membrane roofs behind the parapet walls. Any necessary trim repairs will match existing. (See images in Appendix.) Note: While this is being reviewed as a CoA request, Facilities Development has stated this is intended as a preliminary discussion and they seek from the BAR recommendations, suggestions, and any questions related to the options available. With that, staff anticipates the matter will be deferred following the discussion.

Recommendations and Discussion

The consultant working with Facilities Development believes the slate is likely Buckingham slate. It appears to be non-fading and matches other Central Virginia slate in texture, color and strength. If the existing slate is not re-used here, the consultant recommended the City retain what is salvageable for use elsewhere. Assuming most of the shingles are original, they have been in place for 85 years. Slate roofs can last 75 to 200 years. Buckingham slate, on average, can last 150 years. For comparison: o Asphalt, three-tabbed shingles are typically a 20- to 30-year product, at best. o Faux slate is advertised as a 100-year product, but this is a relatively new material, with warranties generally of 50 years. o Painted metal roofing can last 40 to 70 years, with that possibly being extended, depending on thickness, quality of the installation, and proper maintenance. o Copper roofing can last for over a century, with that extended much longer, depending on thickness, quality of the installation, and proper maintenance.

Whether the slate is repaired or replaced, the roof pitch and configuration will be unchanged. (There are no features such as dormers, skylights, etc. No new elements are proposed.) Options available include: • Reuse salvageable slate, using slate or faux slate to complete the roof. • Install new slate shingles. • Install faux slate shingles. • Install standing-seam metal roof. (Presumably painted.) • Install three-tabbed asphalt shingles.

The design guidelines support reuse of the existing and the installation of either new slate or faux slate. The use of standing-seam metal would alter the building's appearances and is not recommended. The use of asphalt shingles would arguably maintain the appearance of shingles and, being a 30-year material, represent the least-permanent option (thus reversible); however, while not specifically discouraged by the guidelines, it is certainly not a preferred option.

No action was taken.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-08-03

210 West Market Street, TMP 330271000

Downtown ADC District (contributing property)

Owner: McSwain Properties LLC

Applicant: Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects/ Heirloom Development, LLC

Project: Building demolition

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background

Year Built: c1935 as service station, renovated c1965 District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing (Note: By code, all structures in the Downtown ADC are designated as contributing, regardless of year built or historic significance.) Cinder block with white metal veneer panels and blue accent band (panels removed after 1980). Single story, flat roof, three bays; original service bays in west section likely closed. Fixed glass storefront; entrance in east bay. Staff research indicates the west wing (parallel to Market Street) was constructed c1935 as a four bay, single story, cinder block service station, possibly with applied exterior tiles [per the c1960s Sanborn Maps]. As early as 1886 and until the early 1930s, there was one and then three small, single-story, framed dwellings. The 1936 City Directory lists at the site a service station owned by Thomas Miller. By the 1951 it is Sam's Gulf Service Station. The 1937 aerial photo appears to show the service station, but the image is poor. It is clearly visible in the 1957 photo. The angled, east wing is not shown in the c1960s Sanborn Maps, but visible in the 1967 photo, suggesting when it was constructed. By the 1970s, if not prior, the structure was occupied by Brown's Lock and Safe. (See images and maps in Appendix.)

Request for the demolition of existing commercial building.

From applicant's submittal: 210 West Market Street presents an opportunity for the City to further its stated goals for the Downtown Mixed-Use Corridor of increased commerce and additional housing in the entertainment and employment center of our town. Looking at the current and future expansion of Charlottesville, the BAR must identify opportunities for accommodating growth in ways that are sensitive to our historic urban fabric by protecting important structures in our cultural and urban development while recognizing that some old buildings must be allowed to be taken down to make way for the future. With that in mind, the BAR approved demolition of the neighboring structure at 218 West Market Street in 2019. Approval to demolish 210 West Market Street would be consistent with the BAR's previous action, serving the long-term greater good to the City by making way for increased density on the site, rather than maintaining the existing structure with its suburban model of parking between the street and the building

Discussion and Recommendations

Per a review of the standards for considering demolitions (Code Sec. 34-278) and the Review Criteria for Demolition in the Design Guidelines (see below), staff concurs with the applicant's comments, generally, and finds no compelling argument to deny the requested demolition. Should the BAR approve the request, staff suggests the following conditions of approval: • Staff approval of the demolition permit [when that application is submitted] is contingent upon: 1. Applicant providing for the BAR record documentation of the existing building. [In addition to the photos provided, documentation will include dimensioned floor plans and elevations. Similar to documentation provided for 1532 Virginia Ave, January 2019.] 2. An approved building permit for construction of the new building. Or, in lieu of item 2: o BAR approval of proposed site treatment following demolition and prior to site redevelopment. Unless other criteria of the ADC District Design Guidelines prevail, BAR will apply Chapter 2. Site Design. Staff also suggests the BAR consider as either a condition or a recommendation that the redevelopment of the site incorporate stone elements that reflect the stone foundation wall at the south elevation. See staff comments below under Sec. 34-278(d).

Motion – Ms. Lewis - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed demolition of 210 West Market Street satisfies the BAR’s criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Staff approval of the demolition permit [when that application is submitted] is contingent upon:

- **Applicant providing for the BAR record documentation of the existing building. In addition to the photos provided, documentation will include dimensioned floor plans and elevations.**
- **An approved building permit for construction of the new building.**

Mr. Lahendro seconds the motion. Motion passed (6-0).

E. Other Business

6. Preliminary Discussion

921 Rugby Road, TMP 020072000

Rugby Road HC District

Owner: Grave and John Coleman

Applicant: Keith Scott, Rosey Architects

Project: Shed demo, landscape alterations

- Staff presented the project to the members of the BAR. The property does lie within a Conservation District.
- Staff can review projects administratively through permission from the BAR.
- There was discussion on whether there were any guidelines within the Conservation Guidelines that staff would have to get permission from the BAR.
- Members of the BAR expressed support for the proposed project.
- Ms. Lewis did bring up the upcoming changes that are going to be made through the zoning ordinance rewrite and future density.

The Following items were removed from the Agenda.

7. Staff questions/discussion

612 Locust Avenue, TMP 510039000

Martha Jefferson HC District

Project: Shed/garage demo

311 East Market Street.

Downtown ADC District

Project: Foundation vents

F. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 PM