

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**

Regular Meeting

February 21, 2024 – 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 and in person at City Space. 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: Ron Bailey, Carl Schwarz, Cheri Lewis, Tyler Whitney, Roger Birle, James Zehmer, David Timmerman

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Jeff Werner

Pre-Meeting:

Staff introduced the Court Square doors CoA application. Ms. Lewis thought that the doors on the left might have been there since 1990s. The application was what could possibly replace the doors. Mr. Zehmer brought up an implied mold holding that he thought was inappropriate. Staff did go over the staff recommendation for the application. It can be clarified in the motion.

Staff next went over the preliminary discussion on Gordon Avenue. The Gordon Avenue project is going to be the first case with the new zoning. Mr. Schwarz did bring up that the applicant will need to meet the streetscape standards.

Staff did go over the 747 Park Street preliminary discussion that was removed from the agenda. There was an invitation for members of the BAR to visit the site in March.

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 PM by Mr. Zehmer.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

No Comments from the Public

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

1. Meeting Minutes – December 19, 2023, and January 17, 2024

Motion by Ms. Lewis to approve the Consent Agenda – Mr Bailey with the Second – Motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

No Items

D. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 24-02-01

222-224 Court Square, TMP 530099000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: H. McCray and M. Johnson

Applicant: Dan Bracy / Two Street Studio

Project: Entry doors

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA to remove two wood entry doors and install appropriate replacements.

Dan Bracy, Applicant – This is my office space.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

No Questions from the Board

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – We do prefer you remove that applied molding that is on the surface of the door itself. The integral molding to the style is fine. Otherwise, it looks good.

Mr. Bracy – These are going to be custom built. If you have a profile that you think is appropriate to the era in building, we would be happy to replicate it.

Mr. Zehmer – The rail style with the molding integral to the rail style to hole the panel is appropriate. The applied molding is not appropriate.

Mr. Werner – Whatever you shape as a motion, having dealt with doors in the past, whatever the door is sized for, that it is centered on a lock rail and centered on the style so that everything is centered appropriately.

Mr. Schwarz – What do you mean? Vertically? It is going to have to be within ADA range.

Mr. Werner – What will happen is for it to be centered on the lock rail. It doesn't end up with a doorknob over here. If it is going to have to be custom, the rail and styles can be sized and dimensioned so that the lock set would be centered in there.

Mr. Timmerman – Do you know why the doors are different heights?

Mr. Bracy – My understanding is that the doors themselves are different designs because the current landlord replaced them 20 years ago with doors she had in a barn. That is why the 2 doors are different.

Mr. Werner – The steps going up to each door used to be wood. What had been there may have also been a function of having doors of these size. That stoop was made to fit a door that someone found in a salvage yard. That is the most likely answer. The stoops themselves are different that what was there and that dictated the door height.

Mr. Schwarz – The 2 doors are different because it is 2 different buildings.

Mr. Birle – I am glad that you specified unlacquered brass. You share a square leaf hinge. I would say that should be a must that is not a round leaf on the hinges.

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 proposed entrance alterations [state options approved] at 222-224 Court Square satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the ADC District, and that the BAR approves the request with the following conditions.**

- **The applied panel molding shown in the shop drawings is removed.**
- **The lock set is centered on the lock rail and lock style such that it also conforms with the ADA code.**
- **The hinges are true square butt hinges.**

Second by Mr. Birle. Motion passes 7-0.

E. Other Business

3. Preliminary Discussion

1609 Gordon Avenue, TMP 050063100

Rugby Road - University Cir - Venable ADC District [non-contributing]

Owner: Brice Craig / 1609 Gordon Avenue, LLC

Applicant: Kevin Schafer, Design Develop

Project: Apartment building

- Staff introduced the proposed project to the BAR. New construction on the site does require a CoA. Since the current building is non-contributing, it can be demolished without a CoA from the BAR.
- Mandatory review for any projects with a price greater than \$350,000 in front of the full BAR.
- This is going to be the first project that the BAR will be reviewing under the newly adopted zoning ordinance. The new zoning for this site is RX-5.
- The applicant presented their proposed project for this site. The current building is student housing.
- The applicant did show the surrounding context that does have multiple churches, houses, and fraternity and sorority houses.
- The applicant stated several times of being aware of the ADC Design Guidelines and that the plan is to follow the ADC Guidelines.
- Members of the BAR provided feedback and suggestions to improve the proposed project.

- Both Mr. Timmerman and Mr. Birle provided positive comments regarding the proposed massing.
- Members of the BAR also asked the applicant questions about the proposed project.
- Mr. Schwarz did have some concerns about the proposed materials for the project. He proposed EIFS instead of using fiber panels.
- Most of the feedback and suggestions from the BAR were mostly positive for the proposed project.
- Ms. Lewis did thank the applicant for reading, reviewing, and following the guidelines in the proposed project.
- Staff did bring up the space that is left for trees with the new zoning ordinance when it comes to new and proposed projects.

4. Preliminary Discussion

0 Park Street/745 Park Street

New Construction

Applicant: Kevin Riddle

- This preliminary discussion replaced the preliminary discussion on the agenda that was for 747 Park Street.
- Staff did over the ADC Guidelines for new construction in the North Downtown Historic District.
- The applicant did present the proposed project that will be behind the existing house on 745 Park Street.
- There is a large walnut tree between the existing house and the proposed house. The house is not going to be visible, except for the winter months. The house would be partially visible during the winter months.
- The members of the BAR did provide suggestions, feedback, and questions for the applicant.
- Mr. Birle did ask about vehicular access to the proposed house. There is nothing proposed now for vehicular access to the proposed house.
- The applicant did ask what need to be brought back for a formal submission. Lighting was the big concern for the members of the BAR.
- The members of the BAR did provide very positive comments, suggestions, and support for the proposed house.
- Ms. Lewis did ask about whether there will be views from the proposed house.

The meeting was recessed for 5 minutes to reorganize the room to discuss the BAR Guidelines.

5. Staff Questions/Discussion

- BAR Awards 2023
- Design Guidelines
 - The first set of ADC Guidelines are Rugby University Circle Venable ADC District.
 - Mr. Whitney presented on the current condition of the Design Guidelines for this district.
 - There is a proposed name change to the name of the elementary school in the neighborhood. Staff said that Council could make a name change to the name of the neighborhood.

- There is no mention of the school, and it is a very prominent building within the historic district.
 - There was a discussion among the members of the BAR and staff regarding the guidelines for the Rugby University Circle Venable ADC District.
 - Mr. Whitney did have some suggestions for possible additions and subtractions to the list of contributing structures and non-contributing structures within the district.
 - Mr. Zehmer did bring up adding structures to contributing structures with the new zoning ordinance.
 - Members of the BAR looked at individual houses within the district to possibly be added as contributing structures.
 - There are not many over head powerlines and that has allowed a lot of trees in this district.
 - According to staff, the historic districts have been created in a couple of different ways.
 - The city is way behind in updating some of the district surveys. They were done 30 to 40 years ago.
 - There was discussion around the different neighborhoods within the city and the definition of ‘character defining features’ within the different neighborhoods and districts.
 - There is going to be some conflict between the Design Guidelines and the new zoning ordinance.
 - There was discussion regarding the border of The Corner, West Main, and Rugby University Circle Venable Districts. The borders of these districts are going to be adjusted.
 - Mr. Zehmer asked whether any updates to the districts approved by the BAR will need to go to City Council.
 - Staff believes that it would be best to ‘tidy’ up Chapter 1 of the Guidelines.
 - The goal, by the end of the summer, is to have a draft of Chapter 1 of the Guidelines. The second part is to look for conflicts between the Guidelines and the new zoning ordinance.
- Reminder: Vacant seat – Review changes to code and membership

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.