

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
May 16, 2023 – 5:00 PM
Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Space & virtual via Zoom)**



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, Breck Gastinger, Carl Schwarz, Roger Birle, Tyler Whitney, David Timmerman, Ron Bailey
Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Jeff Werner, Remy Trail
Pre-Meeting:

There was discussion regarding the ghost Coca-Cola sign on the Downtown Mall. Mr. Gastinger mentioned that he counted the relics of several old signs on the building. There was much discussion regarding the sign.

The BAR discussed the probable overturn of the BAR denial of 104 Stadium Road by City Council. There was also discussion regarding the 2005 JPA referral back to the ERB.

The final point of discussion regarding the items on the agenda and consent agenda.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:32 PM.

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 – March 21, 2023
2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR # 23-05-03
485 14th Street NW, TMP 090034000
Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC District
Owner: Hoo House, LLC
Applicant: Greg Winkler, Kurt Wassenaar
Project: Rear addition

Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the Consent Agenda with a small edit to the Minutes by Mr. Zehmer Second by Mr. Bailey – Motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

No Items

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR # 23-05-01

180 Rugby Road, TMP 090152000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Wooglin Company

Applicant: Ian Brown / UVREF

Project: Landscaping

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request for landscaping project, which includes area of artificial turf at front yard. The staff report can be found in the Staff Report in the Agenda Packet.

Ian Brown, Applicant – The dimensions for this are 36 by 36 by 48. The intent was to take some of that extra space on the sides of the walkway, so it didn't become a mud pit with people cutting across it.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Whitney – Can you describe the artificial turf product? What is the substrate?

Mr. Brown – It is not artificial turf in the way that you think of artificial turf of an athletic field. It is more of a synthetic turf. The height is 1.25 inches. The underlayment for that is quartz pellets. It is a very fine quartz pellet or a very dense sand depending on how you look at it.

Mr. Whitney – Those little pellets are loose. They could come up. It would need maintenance.

Mr. Brown – There would be sweeping maintenance.

Garrett Smith, Applicant – I have this turf around a swimming pool on my property. It's not the sort of artificial turf that you see on a sports field where you have chopped up rubber. They can fly up. It is completely covered by the synthetic material. It also permits drainage. There would be a system beneath it. I think it is primarily sand. That's what we would ask the contractor to install. It is also comfortable under your foot. It is not very hard.

Mr. Gastinger – Do you have a detail or a cross installation? How deep is going to be excavated to create this sub-drainage?

Mr. Smith – My understanding is typically about eight inches. There would be a gravel layer below with piping to carry water away sand above that and fabric above the artificial grass.

Mr. Timmerman – Why are you choosing this over a more durable material like adding brick on either side of the walkway or a stone paving?

Mr. Smith – This is more appealing for the students. It is attractive. It originally was a grass yard. These two halves of the yard are very small. Right now, it is just hard packed clay, packed dirt. Mr. Bailey might have seen a similar material. The idea is to make it comfortable for students to feel like a yard rather than a parking lot or a playground with a hard surface. This does last long. It probably has a 5/7/8-year life before it gets flattened out. You can rake it up and rather easily clean it up with a hose because water flows under it.

Mr. Gastinger – I see on the drawings some landscape lighting/pathway lighting. Is that also part of the project?

Mr. Brown – That’s correct. It is to the left side of the house by those landscaping steps.

Mr. Gastinger – What kind of lighting is the path?

Mr. Brown – It was in the specs by staff as to what those needed to be. We have not selected a specific product. There’s still plenty of room within those guidelines. I think there’s some confusion on the bollards. They will not have lights on them.

Mr. Smith – The goal of that landscape lighting is to illuminate the stairs and make it safe. It would be downward facing. It would not project upward. That’s certainly the goal.

Mr. Zehmer – With the hedges that run along Rugby Road, are those holly? Do you know what kind of hedges those are?

Mr. Smith – It is a form of holly. Those will remain.

Mr. Zehmer – I was curious if you all considered, instead of these large brick piers, just infilling with more holly hedges to fill the gap between the end of the existing hedge and the entrance sidewalk.

Mr. Brown – Our original intent for the piers was to add a gate. That’s not happening, at least, currently. That was a plan, but no longer is. We have had some crime incidents on the front porch of the house. We want to restrict access to the house. We would like to leave that option open for later whereas infilling with holly doesn’t achieve that purpose.

Mr. Zehmer – Where I am going with this is potentially infilling some of it with holly and you can then get a smaller pier. Three square feet seems very large in proportion to this property.

Mr. Smith – We can accept a smaller pier. That’s not an issue. Eighteen inches would be fine.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – We haven’t approved artificial turf frequently if ever. There is understandably some caution to considering it, making sure that if we do so, it would be specific to this project. Given that it is a new material, I would really want to see a sample of it. I would also want to understand how it is

constructed. I think you could understand that one of our concerns is that it is appropriately installed for a long, durable installation. It is not going to end up failing and detracting from the neighborhood and the house.

Mr. Birle – Given that this is a significant house, the front piers are important to this and more so than just the size. I would want to put a qualifier that we would want to see a drawing of what this looks like. It is really character defining. Those piers are going to make a statement.

Mr. Gastinger – The detail that is incorporated into the pier, the proportion, the way that the cap integrates is important. It would be important to see how it integrates with the whole.

Mr. Zehmer – It would be good to see a drawing. In terms of site design and elements under plantings, “selects mulching and edging materials carefully and do not use plastic edging, lava crushed rock, unnaturally colored mulch, or other historically unsuitable materials.” That would lead me towards the ‘no’ side of the synthetic grass. I might be convinced that it is not a planting. I am just going off what we have in our guidelines.

Mr. Bailey – What is the name of the product?

Mr. Smith – I selected the product because we already have it in a location. There is a historic home in the county that is a wedding venue. That’s where I initially saw it. When you’re on it, it is artificial from a distance. It has a nice appealing look. The artificial strands of grass are not all the same color. There is some gold and green in there to mix it up and make it appear natural.

Mr. Schwarz – You have seen it at a wedding venue. Was there another spot that you have seen it?

Mr. Smith – My house next to a swimming pool. We’re having a similar problem with hard packed Virginia clay, chlorine splashing all over it, killing everything. Here, it is college students’ feet.

Mr. Schwarz – I am a little worried. With some of the pictures of the existing conditions, there isn’t even a weed in there. It is completely packed down. I know this thing has an eight-year warranty on it. I think you said it is good for five to seven years. My concern is that once we let someone put something down, we hope it ages in a nice way. We don’t have a whole lot of enforcement to say that AstroTurf has just been flattened and it is ruined and that you guys will need to replace it. I am a little worried about that. It is a very small yard. I think it would be more appropriate if you just used pavers. You can clean it. If a college student throws up on it, it’s not going to be there forever. I was one of the people who said that I would entertain this. This looks like a condition that needs something that is durable.

Mr. Whitney – In regard to the artificial turf, I understand where you’re coming from. It feels nicer and would be more comfortable to stand on for people that are in the yard. There are going to be people standing in the yard. That’s why we can’t have grass growing there. I think that it would look better than having the dirt that is there now. With the hedge in the front, it is well hidden from view. I would be in support of letting the artificial turf be part of the project. There are different degrees of the product that I am more used to in an athletic field. I have seen that it is supposed to last for a long time. Those rubber pellets do come up. It doesn’t last as long as people have asked for. You say that it is not the one with the pellets that would come up to the top is appropriate for this application. The loose pellets would not be as appropriate.

Mr. Smith – I understand the issue of concern that it might wear out. The reason we’re spending all this money is to make a place look better. When it wears out, if we’re not satisfied with it, it will be replaced

with pavers. If it is great, we will replace it with the best material eight years down the road. This is not going to last forever. We know that. We intend to maintain the property. I understand your concern.

Mr. Schwarz – This house seems to be well maintained. There is precedent in the area that, unfortunately, has me worried. It seems that a lot of houses get fixed up and quickly run down and not fixed up.

Mr. Timmerman – My issue with it is the prime location and the fact that you're dealing with an impressive house. In your case, it sounds appropriate to have the turf around your swimming pool. You can do a service to the building if you design the piers appropriately. The same issue applies to the landscape. I feel that it is a missed opportunity in a way to put the artificial turf down. The fact is that it is a small yard, and you're not dealing with a lot of square footage. The cost of the artificial turf versus the cost of a nice paver is probably on par. I agree with Mr. Schwarz. There is the endurance of a paver no matter what happens to it. You don't have to worry about the turf fading. A good paving plane is always going to look good. It is going to enhance that no matter what happens. It is always going to be substantial when you walk down a city alley. There is an endurance to it. It boils down to location and priorities of the kind of building that you're dealing with.

Mr. Smith – My thought was that it is a yard. It is not a parking lot, basketball playing area. We didn't want rock, cement, pavers. If that is your decision, we understand. I felt that the grass would be more like what was originally there but what will no longer survive under today's traffic conditions.

Mr. Timmerman – That makes sense. I am thinking of that paved front yard as a yard, as a beautiful thing, not a parking lot. I am coming at it from a perspective of you putting in oversized planters, you can really soften the edges. You can make it a beautiful space.

Mr. Zehmer – The applicant has a good point. This is a substantial house by an important architect. The architect designed it intending for there to be a grass lawn in the front. The historic photos in the survey report have a log fence surrounding it. You can see a lot more. The hedges would help mask the artificial turf, especially if you were able to close the gap and possibly infilling the hedge of the holly. With a brick paved surface there, it is already a lot of brick. I am leaning towards a 'yes' for the Astroturf. I would rather have this come back to us with a drawing in detail of the piers.

Mr. Gastinger – I agree that there is more information that is necessary. I tend to agree with Mr. Whitney and Mr. Zehmer. I think that the things going for it in this application is that it is very small and that it is screened. It would also probably perform better for the kind of infiltration, not creating another additional drainage problems that could come with too much paved surface. There might be some zoning issues with having the entire front yard paved. I don't know if that is allowable. It is not my realm. If we're going to approve a product like this, we would need to see a sample of it. I think that's fair. We need to see a manufacturer's recommended installation. I think we need to understand, not just from you, but from any subsequent applicants that it is a material that is not thrown down and is installed with the care that is necessary to make it perform. I agree that those brick piers are very important. They're going to be difficult to design appropriately. They need some thought about them to see how they relate to the house. We don't want to them to feel necessarily that they were from the original. They should be complimentary. There is some guidance in our guidelines about how that gate or pier might be designed.

I wonder if we could give them guidance about the grass. Does anybody feel that either the grass or the piers are not acceptable in any case in this condition?

Mr. Schwarz – I need the materials that Mr. Gastinger mentioned. Some photographs of this same product installed. Samples would be really nice.

Mr. Brown – If I wanted to submit a physical sample of the material, could I bring that to staff?

Mr. Werner – That’s fine. In the discussion last month, the turf wasn’t the prominent feature. Is there any thought to incorporating steppingstones or something such that it is not the predominant feature?

Mr. Gastinger – That would complicate the installation and performance

Mr. Timmerman – I am against the turf. I am in the minority.

Mr. Werner – It would be helpful if you’re against the turf. You can certainly defer it. They can also defer it. If the turf appears unacceptable, it would be good to express that tonight. It would be fair to let them know tonight.

Mr. Birle – I can ‘live’ with the turf. For the many arguments that Mr. Gastinger made about this application, I think it could work. I’m not against having piers here. They’re an important design element. They could have a larger base. There are many things that you can do without copying the detailing of the house. That could be a positive.

Mr. Bailey – I am assuming you’re going to withdraw the COA this evening. If you’re going to bring back stuff, I would also like to see the lighting product you would use.

Mr. Gastinger – It would be a sample of the grass, installation detail, the lighting spec sheet, and the measured elevation of the proposed piers.

Motion by Mr. Schwarz to accept applicant’s request for a deferral. Second by Mr. Zehmer. Motion passed, 7-0. BAR requested applicant submit sample of the turf grass and information regarding its installation and maintenance, spec sheets for the pathway lighting, and measured drawings for the proposed brick piers, with a recommendation that the widths not exceed 18” and that, as important design elements on the site, the piers complement, but not mimic, the architecture of the house.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 23-05-02

410 2nd Street NE, TMP 330078000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Sherry Kraft

Applicant: Annie Mathot

Project: Rear alterations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for construction of rear addition expansion by increasing the footprint and increasing the height of the addition to two stories. A roof top deck will be constructed, accessed from a new gable in the existing roof. The roof deck will have a pergola structure that is partially covered with a roof and enclosed with retractable screened panels. The staff report can be found in the Staff Report in the Agenda Packet.

Annie Mathot, Applicant – The existing house, as staff mentioned, was built around 1896. It is a Queen Anne style, two-story frame house. There is a one-story addition on the back, which you can see here in this existing south elevation. That was also constructed by 1902. It shows up on the Sanborn Maps. The proposal is to expand the footprint of the house on the rear; essentially filling in as far as we can go as, far as the setback lines allow us to go, but staying stepped back a little bit from the existing side elevation.

Essentially, that one-story addition would be increased to a two-story mass. We would then build out that footprint. There is a site plan that shows that footprint expansion coming almost to the south elevation of the existing house. The rooftop would be flat with a new dormer coming off the existing roof that was set underneath the existing roofline. It would essentially have a flat roof on it and be clad in a metal that would blend in with the existing roof. On that roof deck, the center section would be screened with retractable screens. One piece would have pergola over it. The other third would essentially have no pergola or screening. That would just be an open rooftop deck. That is the side facing parking lot on the south side. That side is a little bit more visible. None of this is very visible from the street. We included some rear elevations so that it would be clear what we are proposing. We've turned off the landscaping and the fence. In terms of materials, we're proposing a brick veneer on the foundation and cladding the frame walls with a composite siding. We have requested a smooth clabbered, painted. We can vary the exposure on that from the existing or we can change the profile up to a Dutch Lap if we want to differentiate it a little bit more. There is a little box bay on the side on there too. That also has a standing seam metal roof. The idea is that is pre-finished mechanically seamed metal that would be appropriate historically but not the same as the existing pre-finished half-round aluminum gutters with round downspouts. We did ask for a little bit of flexibility on some of the materials for the windows: aluminum-clad or fiberglass as long as they are simulated divided light. They're two-over-two double hung. The reason we ask that, in terms of lead times and cost, we would like to give them a little bit of flexibility if we can approve both. With the rooftop deck, the trim would also be composite and painted with a smooth finish. We are towards the end of schematics. We haven't yet launched into construction documents. We have asked for painted or stained to give them a little bit of flexibility as we make all these fine decisions going forward, the wood guardrail with wire mesh panels. We looked at a cable railing. There were some safety concerns with small children.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – What is the existing siding?

Ms. Mathot – The existing siding is wood painted

Mr. Schwarz – There would be a difference in the material. You have one existing window on the lower-level north side. Is that going to exist? Is the addition being completely removed? Is that wall segment going to stay?

Ms. Mathot – The idea is that the additions stay, and we build on top of it. Structurally, we have not gotten into the details of how that will work. We really must investigate the foundation and the load bearing capacity of that whole thing. It was built by 1902. I have not crawled under that part. There is only a cellar under a small portion of the house. From a zoning standpoint, that addition, if we want to call it that, violates the current setbacks by a bit. If we build up, we can stay in that footprint. The idea is that stays as much as possible, and we build up. The idea was that we could keep that window. It is a nice, good, wood window. Otherwise, we could reuse it.

Mr. Schwarz – I am curious if the siding is going to stay on that little wall segment.

Ms. Mathot – The idea was that the wall siding would stay on that portion. We have that horizontal band across there where the current roof cornice/eave is. That could stay. We're replacing a window with a pair

of doors. We're adding another window. There's a window there but it is offset a bit. We're moving that window. That was the idea. That stays and reads as that was there and then we build on top of it.

Mr. Schwarz – I am trying to understand the rationale behind the shutters. You're keeping the shutters in the existing window. It looks like most of the new windows don't have them. You did put them on the south side. They show up differently on your hardline elevations. Are they going to match the existing?

Ms. Mathot – The idea was that they would be flat panels as opposed to the louvered shutters that we have now. I think that you might be right, that on the model, we probably took one of those shutters and copied it over there, which would not be perfectly accurate. They would be flat panels.

Mr. Timmerman – Is that rear volume part of the original building? Or was added later?

Ms. Mathot – As far as we know, it shows up on the Sanborn Maps by 1902, which is the first Sanborn that the original house footprint shows up. It could have been a couple of years later or it could have originally been part of the structure. We're not certain. The siding matches exactly. I think the windows are the same. As far as I can tell, it is the same year. It has been heavily remodeled on the interior. They have opened the ceiling in there. It is difficult to tell on the inside.

Mr. Timmerman – Do you think it is feasible that you will be able to keep some of it?

Ms. Mathot – That's the hope. One of our next steps is to get a structural engineer on board and work out all the details of that.

Mr. Timmerman – From the renderings, it looks like the intent is to paint the new siding the same color as the rest of the house?

Ms. Mathot – We haven't yet settled on a color. Part of the scope would be to paint the whole house. It's getting to the point where it needs it. That would be the goal; to paint it all. I think that would look better to paint it the same color. If we need to differentiate it, we could probably do that.

Mr. Whitney – Could you clarify the new dormer that you're popping through the existing roof? The side walls are flat with standing seam metal. It is a membrane roof on top.

Ms. Mathot – It will either be membrane or metal. I think it would be pretty much flat. These are schematic. We can get a headroom of about 6.5/7 feet up in there and come out of that attic space with a pair of double doors to get as much light as possible in that attic. It's a nice volume up there. That would be a bonus room space and connect out to that roof deck. With the flat roof, we thought that tied in better. We looked at all sorts of gabled roofs and hip roofs. It got really crowded and large. That's why we stepped it back to the flat. We will need to work on the details of what exactly that is. The idea is that it blends in with the roof material, so it doesn't look like a big dormer back there.

Mr. Birle – You had mentioned some flexibility with windows. I didn't quite understand. You mentioned both fiberglass and aluminum clad. Is that the flexibility that you're talking about?

Ms. Matbot – That's correct; just to give them a little flexibility on material and manufacturer.

Mr. Werner – Those are fine per the guidelines. If it simulated divided light, there is the requirement of that internal spacer bar.

Mr. Gastinger – Could say a little more about the wire mesh on the roof terrace? You also mentioned painting or staining the pergola structures. What is the aesthetic intention back there?

Ms. Madbot – With the metal mesh, the image that came up from the client was that ‘modern farmhouse’ aesthetic where you have the panels in between. They wanted something a little more open than vertical pickets. We looked at a cable railing. Because there are young children, they didn’t feel comfortable having the horizontal. This was a way. We haven’t picked an exact mesh yet. I don’t want to bring to mind a hog panel, when that’s not really what we’re going for. It would be more refined than that; wood top rail and bottom rail and metal mesh in between to allow some visibility through there since they’re looking down.

Mr. Gastinger – With the pergola and columns?

Ms. Madbot – We have looked at both painting and staining. In our rendering, we painted them a gray color to go one shade darker than the siding. We’re still working on paint colors and things like that. I think that staining might be less maintenance than painting. Aesthetically, we haven’t quite pinned that down yet. I am not sure if it is okay to ask for permission either way or if you have a preference one way.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – One of the concerns about this project is how tall that rear structure gets. From my point of view, it is fine. I don’t it is going to detract from the neighborhood or the house. If it is done in a clean, contemporary way that distinguishes it, that is a good thing. Personally, a darker or gray tone, not white, will probably be less visible and mitigate some of the concerns about the overall height of that rear addition. I feel that the addition is generally within our guidelines. I don’t have major concerns about it.

Mr. Werner – With the colors, typically if we have our guidelines for a certain period of house, a certain palate is appropriate. When people say that they are painting their house from light gray to beach brown, that is fine. A color may be preferred. You are certainly welcome to do that.

Mr. Schwarz – I am fully in support. I agree with Mr. Gastinger about the colors. You’re doing some nice, subtle things to differentiate old and new. I don’t think you need to do anything special with the exposure on the siding. It is already going to be smooth as the existing wood. The way you’re treating the windows and shutters is subtle. It all works well.

I don’t think we talked about lighting

Ms. Madbot – We didn’t talk about lighting. When the previous agenda item came up, I realized we haven’t talked about lighting. We’re wrapping up schematics here. If there are things like landscaping items and lighting need to come back later, the goal today is to make sure that we’re on the right path that we can move forward. We can come back with lighting. We would have some lighting around the back where those doors are. We will need to work out those details.

Mr. Werner – That’s fine. I tend to differentiate between if it is a commercial project. Lighting and all of that is a big deal. We know our standards. We will have to talk later about how 3000 should be 2700. For residential, I have struggled with this.

Mr. Schwarz – My concern is that you're surrounded by parking lot. It doesn't really matter but there is a neighbor to the north. Having something big and bright in that pergola shining down on everybody, that would be problematic.

Ms. Madbot – That is a good point. I was thinking about the lighting down at the lower level there. You make an excellent point about the pergola lighting. We will take that into consideration because it is up very high.

Mr. Werner – I don't think we have ever approved the fixture. It has primarily been a question about lamping. It is relatively simple to resolve. We had it at some of the fraternity houses when they had those spotlights up high. We don't approve mailboxes or the letters on a column.

Mr. Schwarz – We have looked at light fixtures on houses. We just need avoid something that is big and bright that shines onto the neighboring property from the third floor

Mr. Bailey – Would you be willing to let that be an administrative decision?

Mr. Schwarz – Yes.

Mr. Werner – When a residential project comes in, unless there's really a lot of lights, I tend not to be too worried about it.

Ms. Madbot – This is an interesting, unique situation where you're up above the neighbor's yard. That's a good point that we will take into consideration in the design of that.

Mr. Bailey – The design is elegant and should be approved.

Mr. Birle – I can support this as well, especially considering it is not on the street side. As far as lighting, it might be something as simple as overhead lighting that it might be two sconces next to the door. It is a small enough space.

Mr. Zehmer – On the south elevation, with the second-floor windows that are over your square bay bump-out, those are new?

Ms. Madbot – That's right.

Mr. Zehmer – Those have shutters, and all the rest of new windows don't have shutters. Is there a reason why those do have shutters?

Ms. Madbot – The homeowner really wanted shutters. We said that we would ask. She said that if it didn't work out, that's why we differentiated them to be a flat panel.

Mr. Birle – Have we approved fiberglass windows?

Mr. Werner – Yes. It is final. We stay away from it. It is vinyl that we don't allow.

Mr. Whitney – It is a nice project, and I would be in favor of it.

Mr. Timmerman – Somebody mentioned how you distinguish it from the old and making sure there is a clear language of it being a new addition is important. It doesn't blend into the old. It's going to be a nice addition for them.

Motion – Mr. Bailey - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed rear alterations at 410 2nd Street NE satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions: with a condition that new exterior lighting be reviewed and approved by staff. [Specifically, confirm the lamping will be dimmable, have a Color Temperature (CCT) not exceeding 3,000K, and a Color Rendering Index (CRI) not exceeding 80, preferably not exceeding 90.] Second by Mr. Schwarz. Motion passes 7-0.

Meeting was recessed for five minutes.

E. Other Business

5. Preliminary Discussion

704 Park Street, TMP 520061000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Lauren Kenney

Applicant: Leigh Boyes

Project: Replace windows, paint brick

- Staff introduced the proposed project to the BAR and a brief summary of the project.
- The homeowner is trying to get away from the 80s look of the house.
- There was a talk of converting the window on the porch into a French door.
- The applicant went about presenting what they have envisioned for the house.
- Members of the BAR provided questions and feedback for the applicant.
- Mr. Birle suggested any paint that is put on the brick would be an improvement over the current condition of the brick.
- There was discussion amongst the members of the BAR and staff on what could be done to improve the proposed project.
- Members of the BAR did offer support for reconstructing/redoing the whole house. There were some questions as to why the building is contributing.
- The applicant did express a desire to use double hung windows as part of this project. The homeowner is also contemplating putting a fence around the house (not a part of the project).

6. Preliminary Discussion

DT Mall

- Coca-Cola sign
- Historic building recognition
 - Michael Caplin was introduced by staff to introduce the proposed project of the Coca-Cola sign on the Downtown Mall on 2nd Street Southeast.
 - Mr. Caplin introduced the idea of adding historic markers within the historic buildings of the Downtown Mall.
 - The idea is for visitors of the Downtown Mall use their phones/technology to read about the history and backstory of the specific buildings on the Downtown Mall.

- Members of the BAR provided questions and feedback for Mr. Caplin on what he could do for improvements for this idea/project.
- Staff did provide the backstory and history of 20 buildings on the Downtown Mall that could be created.
- Another part of this presentation was the rehabilitation of the Coca-Cola sign on Second Street Southeast just off the Downtown Mall.
- There was no legal action/motion taken by the BAR at this meeting with the presentation of the Coca-Cola sign or the addition of markers to historic buildings.
- It was determined that the Coca-Cola image on Second Street Southeast was determined to be a mural.
- Michael Fitts provided public comment in opposition to paint being applied to the Coca-Cola brick wall.

7. Staff questions/discussion

- DT Mall NRHP update
Community Meeting next week. Application going to Richmond for state review.
- Zoning rewrite questions
Role of BAR in design review coming out with the zoning rewrite.
There was a discussion regarding the differences between the zoning and the BAR Guidelines.
- Levy Building Update
Staff provided an update on the excavation work being done at the Levy Building site and the Swan Tavern. This is going to be the new County and City Courts Complex.

The next BAR meeting is Wednesday, June 21, 2023.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 PM.