

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
September 20, 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: Cheri Lewis, James Zehmer, Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger, Ron Bailey, Tyler Whitney, David Timmerman

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Jeff Werner, Remy Trail

Pre-Meeting:

There was discussion with the 0 Third Street Northeast preliminary discussion.

There was discussion around receiving materials, messages, and comments before the start of BAR meetings.

Staff went over the items on the agenda. The discussion was over the 1301 Wertland project and the need for a formal Certificate of Appropriateness Application. The applicant for 0 Third Street Northeast is looking to possibly get the project onto the October BAR meeting agenda. There was discussion regarding public comments during preliminary discussions.

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Public Comments

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

1. Meeting Minutes – November 16, 2021

Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the Consent Agenda (Second by Ms. Lewis) – Motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

NA

D. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-09-01

608 Preston Avenue, TMP 320014000

Individually protected Property

Owner: King Lumber Partners, LLC

Applicant: Bradley Kipp/Random Row Brewery

Project: Random Row Brewery – enclosed patio area

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Year Built: Site first developed in 1909 District: Individually Protected Property

Status: Contributing

608 Preston Avenue is a former industrial site developed by the King Lumber Company, a major lumber processing and distributing center. At one time, it was Charlottesville’s largest employer. King Lumber Company went out of business during the Great Depression, but the property continued to be used and developed in the intervening decades. The property was used for storage and later, as a Napa Auto Parts location. The site contains numerous buildings that relate to its industrial use. Its primary building is a three-story brick warehouse facing Preston Avenue. This stepped gable-fronted building was constructed in 1909. A one-story metal-clad annex is situated immediately west of the historic brick warehouse building. This annex was constructed sometime between 1957 and 1966 and was originally connected to the adjacent warehouse. In 2016, parts of this annex were demolished to create a new pedestrian gallery between the historic warehouse and the annex, transforming the annex into a freestanding building.

CoA request for the construction of a metal canopy at the front (northeast) elevation of annex building. Canopy will be supported by 6 steel I-beams that match I-beams at present front entrance as well as those supporting smaller canopy at building rear. Canopy will be clad in metal tuff-rib panel.

Discussion and Recommendation

This building is a contributing element to the King Lumber Company IPP at 608 Preston Avenue. This IPP encompasses the subject building, the 1909 brick warehouse immediately east, and two one-story industrial buildings at the rear. The subject building (Random Row Brewery) is not the site’s primary historic structure and has already experienced substantial alterations from its original appearance.

Aerial photographs reveal that the structure was built sometime between 1957 and 1966 (see Appendix for photos). The structure was originally a one-story addition to the brick King Lumber Company warehouse. However, in 2016, the site was substantially reconfigured. The annex was partially demolished to create a new pedestrian gallery separating it from the historic warehouse. As a result, the annex became a freestanding building. The annex was also entirely reclad in galvanized metal and its apertures were reconfigured to create larger windows.

Staff finds the use of industrial materials, like I-beams, consistent with the site’s industrial history and the subject building’s contemporary appearance. Because the building is not the IPP’s primary historic structure and because it has already experienced such dramatic alterations, staff finds that the proposed project will contribute positively to the building’s continued use.

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 patio canopy at 608 Preston Avenue satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other Individually Protected Properties, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition the colors will match the information provided by the applicant [1], the gutters and downspouts will be black, and staff will review the building permit drawings for consistency with this CoA [2]. Mr. Bailey, second. Motion passes 6-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-09-02
113 West Main Street, TMP 330259000
Downtown ADC District
Owner: West Mall, LLC
Applicant: Ben Wilkes/United Way
Project: Mural

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background

Year Built: 1913 District: Downtown ADC District Status: Contributing
111-115 West Main Street is a three-story brick commercial building in downtown Charlottesville. The building has two, two-bay commercial units and is crowned with a projecting cornice at the parapet. Built in 1913, the building originally housed a bakery and a silent movie theater. A theater continued to operate in the western half of the building until 1966; the east half was long home to the *Men and Boys' Shop*.

Paint a mural on the building's rear (side oriented towards Market Street). Mural would wrap building corner and would consist of:

- Large rectangular-framed mural on north elevation
- Discrete painted butterflies on west elevation

Discussion

The north elevation's brick cladding is already painted. The proposed mural does not obscure or interfere with architectural element--staff finds this portion of the mural appropriate.

The proposed butterflies on the west elevation would be applied on masonry that is currently unpainted. The Design Guidelines do not recommend painting unpainted masonry, so the BAR should discuss if this mural section is appropriate. Staff notes the butterflies are limited in size and number and the west wall is not a primary elevation. (In fact, for several decades it appears this was an interior wall.) The proposed butterflies complement, even complete the mural, and will likely invite people to view the entire mural. If there are concerns, the BAR might reduce the size and/or number of butterflies and establish precise locations; however, staff encourages the BAR to allow them, in some form.

Motion – Mr. Bailey - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and Public Design and Improvements, I move to find that the proposed mural at 113 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted; however, omitting the QR code and pie chart [at the lower section of the mural]. Mr. Zehmer, second. Motion passes 6-0.

Discussion following the second of the above motion.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-09-03
1301 Wertland Street, TMP 040303000
Wertland Street ADC District
Owner: Roger and Jean Davis, Trustees
Applicant: Kevin Schafer/Design Develop
Project: New apartment building/existing Wertebaker House c1830

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background

Year Built: [Likely] 1842. (Some believe c1815 or c1830, but that cannot be confirmed.) *District:* Wertland Street ADC District *Status:* Contributing

1301 Wertland Street--the *Wertenbaker House*--is a two-story, three-bay, brick house with a rear ell. (Wm. Wertenbaker was UVa's second librarian, serving from 1826 until 1880, he died in 1882.) Built in the Greek Revival style, it owes much of its appearance to renovations later in the century, when a Victorian porch was added. (In 1842, Wertenbaker acquired 27-acres from James Dinsmore's estate. He immediately sold all but 6 ¾-acres, on which the house was built. By 1886, the parcel was 1.4-acres. By the 1980s, it had been reduced to 0.4-acres. See map in Appendix.)

Proposed construction of apartment building, including parking, landscaping and site improvements, adjacent to c. 1830 Wertenbaker House.

Discussion

This application follows two preliminary discussions: February 15, 2022 and March 15, 2022. (See Appendix for links to prior submittals and meeting videos.) With the two prior discussions, staff requested the project be submitted as a formal CoA request. (Public notice is not required for prelim discussions; however, the concern is that continued informal discussions [on a large-scale project like this] without notice might exclude input from neighboring property owners and others. With that, this review will be a continuation of the prior discussions, so the BAR will not take action to approve or deny the CoA; however, because it is now a formal application, the BAR must take action to defer the matter to a later meeting.

In this discussion the BAR may express an opinion about the project as presented. (For example, the BAR may take a non-binding vote to express support, opposition, or even questions and concerns regarding the project's likelihood for an approved CoA. These will not represent approval or even endorsement of the CoA, but will represent the BAR's opinion on the project, relative to preparing the project for final submittal. While such votes carry no legal bearing and are not binding, BAR members are expected to express their opinions—both individually and collectively--in good faith as a project advances towards an approved CoA.)

This is an iterative process and these discussions should be thorough and productive. The goal is to establish what is necessary for a final submittal that provides the information necessary for the BAR to evaluate the project and to then approve or deny the requested CoA.

In response to any questions from the applicant and/or for any recommendations to the applicant, the BAR should rely on the germane sections of the ADC District Design Guidelines and related review criteria. While elements of other chapters may be relevant, staff recommends that the BAR refer to the criteria in Chapter II--*Site Design and Elements*, Chapter III--*New Construction and Additions*, and Chapter VI – *Public Design and Improvements*.

Staff recommends that the BAR refer to the criteria in Chapter II--*Site Design and Elements* and Chapter III--*New Construction and Additions*. Of assistance are the following criteria from Chapter III:

- A. Residential Infill
- B. Setback
- C. Spacing
- D. Massing & Footprint
- E. Height & Width
- F. Scale

- G. Roof
- H. Orientation
- I. Windows & Doors
- J. Porches
- K. Foundation & Cornice
- L. Materials & Textures
- M. Paint [Color palette]
- N. Details & Decoration

To assist with discussion. Materials and elements to be specified.

- Roof
- Gutters
- Downspouts
- Exterior walls
- Trim
- Doors & windows
- Lighting
- Railings
- Balcony details
- Plantings
- Patios & walks
- Public spaces
- Screening (HVAC, utilities)

The BAR must also evaluate the impact of new construction on the historic house and site.

- Relative to the site, the Design Guidelines incorporate by reference the *Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation*, which recommend that *archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.* For some projects, that BAR has recommended an archeological investigation of the site. Given the significance of this site and its association connection to two prominent individuals associated with the University (Wertenbaker and Dinsmore), staff recommends a Phase I archeological survey be conducted prior to any site disturbance, with the results submitted for the BAR record.

- Relative to the historic house, the design guidelines for Additions provide a useful framework. Additionally, a former BAR member suggested that for this project—and for others with similar circumstances--the BAR establish a design ethic regarding the house and site. To identify the characteristics, elements, and design/preservation principles unique to this property, and use them for guidance when evaluating the new design.

Spatial Elements

Note: The following approximations are for nearby structures only, not a broad analysis of the entire district, which range widely.

- Setbacks: *Within 20 percent of the setbacks of a majority of the neighborhood dwellings.*
 - o Average front setback for *nearby structures* is approximately 33 feet, ranging between 0 and 95 feet.
 - The proposed building setback is **approximately 15 feet.**

Spacing: *Within 20 percent of the average spacing between houses on the block.*

- o Average side spacing for *nearby structures* is approximately 31 feet, ranging between 5 and 93 feet. The proposed building spacing is **approximately 27 feet from 1215 Wertland Street and 10 feet from the existing house.**

Massing and Footprint: *Relate to the majority of the surrounding historic dwellings.* o Average footprint for *nearby structures* is approximately 4,000 square feet, ranging from 1,500 square feet to 14,000 square feet. The proposed building footprint will be **approximately 5,600 square feet**.

Height and Width: *Keep the height and width within a maximum of 200 percent of the prevailing height and width.* **Height.** The prevailing height nearby structures is three stories, ranging from two to five stories. The recommended max height of the new building would be six stories. The proposed building will be **just under five stories**.

Width. The average building width nearby structures is approximately 45 feet, ranging between approximately 30 feet and 72 feet. The proposed building will be **approximately 40 feet wide**.

Applicant requests a deferral to a future BAR meeting – Motion to Accept Deferral – Ms. Lewis – Second by Mr. Gastinger.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

Preliminary Discussion (no action to be taken)

BAR 22-09-04

0 3rd Street NE, TMP 330020001

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Scott Loughery

Applicant: Candace Smith, Architect

Project: New residence on vacant lot

- Staff made a brief presentation on the characteristics of 0 3rd Street Northeast. The GIS Analyst has not assigned an address for this location.
- The applicant presented the project proposal for this location at 0 3rd Street Northeast. The applicant went over the elevations and concept design for this project.
- There are some grades associated with this location
- The applicant did present a comparison of the square footage of the proposed house and the square footage of the neighboring properties.
- Members of the Board provided questions for the applicant to answer regarding the proposed house and project.
- There was a discussion between members of the Board and the applicant regarding the proposed project presented by the applicant.
- The Chair did open with the Public Comments to members of the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

- The Chair opened up the comments from the Board.
- Mr. Zehmer's comments echoed what members of the public stated in the Comments from the Public.
- Ms. Lewis provided the story of a similar proposed project on another street in the North Downtown. Ms. Lewis had concerns about the two garages on two different streets. It is not in character with North Downtown.
- Mr. Gastinger agreed with the comments made by Ms. Lewis regarding this project.
- Mr. Bailey brought up the story of the garages being built on 2nd Street Northeast. Mr. Bailey brought up his experiences of living in the North Downtown.
- Mr. Timmerman brought up the positives of no garages in the North Downtown neighborhood. There are similar characteristics in the Fry Springs neighborhood.
- Mr. Schwarz did bring up the difficulty of this site.
- The applicant did respond to the comments made by the Board and the Public.

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

E. Other Business

6. Preliminary Discussion

Discussion: No action to be taken.

Modifications to approved façade.

BAR 20-11-03 (December 2021- approved CoA)

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

West Main ADC District

Owner: Heirloom West Main Street Second Phase LLC

Applicant: Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects

Project: Construction of a mixed-use building

- Applicant notified the Board that the price of brick had risen such that the project was not economically possible.
- There have been some significant changes in the materials and the materials on the façade on West Main Street.
- There is going to be no changes in the massing. The verticality is going to be staying the same.
- The applicant stated the change in the materials was to focus on the use of stucco/EIFS.
- The entrances are going to change by no more than six inches.
- Mr. Timmerman questioned where the applicant is going to need control joints using stucco and EIFS. The applicant did note that this was a concerns of theirs and they hope to have it addressed in the formal COA request and application.
- Ms. Lewis asked about why the entire building wasn't being done in stucco. The applicant noted that the change from stucco to EIFS is not going to be discernable from the street.
- There was more questions and answers from members of the BAR with the applicant about the changes that the applicant is going to be making to the project.
- Mr. Zehmer did support the colors with the hyphens.
- The Board did provide comments on the changes that the applicant is proposing. Both Mr. Schwarz and Ms. Lewis did ask if it was possible to have some brick.
- There was some disappointment from members of the BAR with the change from brick to stucco.

7. Staff questions/discussion

Church Solar Panels

32 University Circle – 1940s Metal Windows

F. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:07 PM.