

Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
August 14, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, Chair; Tim Mohr, Vice-Chair; Stephen Balut, Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger, Emma Earnst

BAR Members Absent: Whit Graves, Justin Sarafin, Corey Clayborne

Staff Present: Scala, Mess, McCray, and Saunders

Call to Order: Chair – Melanie Miller calls meeting to order at 5:30

5:30 A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

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. Minutes            July 18, 2017            Regular Meeting

Motion: Schwarz moved to approve the July 18, 2017 minutes. Balut seconded. Approved (4-0-2, with Mohr and Earnst abstained).

C. New Items

2. Special Use Permit (SUP) Recommendation  
BAR 17-08-09  
201 West Water Street  
Tax Parcel 280012000  
Black Bear Properties, LLC, Owner/Clark Gathright, Applicant  
SUP Recommendation

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Jim Griggs: What you have here is a small parcel and the proposal is to put a garage on ground and seven apartments. Our appurtenance is very small because of the way the zoning is written. I am sure there is going to be concern about parking. We would love to have a storefront, but these apartments will need to have a parking spot for their selling point. We will screen the ground floor so that it does not look like a garage.

Questions by the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions by the Board:

Mohr: the transformer can't go underground?

Griggs: I don't think so, but it'll fit in a

Schwarz: On two of your facades it includes false windows

Griggs: just on the mall side

Mohr: have you looked at stacking at all?

Griggs: no

Miller: have you looked at putting it underground

Griggs: yes but it is not possible unless it is automated

Miller: why are the windows on the mall side fake

Griggs: we wanted to break up the wall, but are not permitted to not have any openings. But I am not attached to it; we could use brick patterns to break up the façade.

Gastinger: has the city taken issue with the parking entry

Griggs: not yet

Mohr: could you get away with a single wide entrance?

Griggs: the rules state it needs to be a 20' wide entrance.

Balut: are we considering the balconies protruding over property line? And we are just concerned with the design not the legality right?

Schwarz: I think you can only invade so much of the sidewalk.

#### Comments from the Public:

Malcolm Bell: Have you considered that this is along the bus route, and the bus goes by every 15 minutes and is frequently blocked by trucks.

Griggs: We had not considered this, but I don't think it will be a problem.

#### Comments from the Board:

Mohr: I have a problem with the parking situation. Forcing parking on the corner doesn't make sense. This is I think, what we are looking for in buildings in terms of scale. There is a big building across the street that needs balancing out. I really am just conflicted about the parking hugging this corner. It could be like the court square building where the street tracks along the base of the building

Schwarz: I am curious how the price of one of these compares to the terraces, which don't have parking. I assume you could just buy spaces in the market street parking garage.

Mohr: this is a very active corner, and I think this will be a nice building but the parking just pains me.

Gastinger: I think we are asked to consider the public good that comes from the increased height and I don't think, with parking on the ground floor, that public is benefitting from it

Miller: I am fine with the increased density but I agree. The only thing that is similar is far away though

Mohr: I do think massing wise this will have some sort of saw tooth, and it would be a different issue if it were on the mall. There are still low buildings on the corner with mono loco.

Schwarz: a trade off with a small building on a small corner is not having a commercial base. I agree that we are approving more height with anything on the ground, but the planning commission will have to figure out what conditions to put on it. One I would put onto the SUP is that the materials look to be high quality, and I would want to see that followed through

Mohr: I am wondering about the stackers. If you have a seven car stacker, that could work. I know the adjoining property is talking about that

Griggs: The condition will probably be the same if we don't get the added height. We'll need the same number of parking spots regardless. It would be wonderful to have something there but

Balut: How would you articulate the benefit to the public?

Griggs: You have more tax revenue; it's not so much a design argument, but the revenue that will come from this. The taller it is the more desirable it is. It's an economic benefit without an impact on services.

Miller: I think the applicant has a good point, when you're asking for SUP it gives the board an opportunity to comment on these things that they wouldn't get to weigh in on if it were a by-right building. Another negative is that it has to have a blank wall regardless, and you could say that the mall side is more important. Our guidelines do say that the massing of infill should be similar to the historic buildings in the area. Not the new buildings. [Miller read massing guidelines] While I support the density, I don't know that it is worth a Special Use Permit.

Gastinger: I agree. I think the city could benefit from a tall building. But I do think there are risks in having more drivers here.

Balut: I agree with what has been said, my concern is still the parking. With the large projects around this site, I think that the mass of this could fit within the scale of that. So I am not concerned with that added height. I also think that that proportions and design of the building are well executed, and the massing I could get on board with. But our guidelines clearly state that engaging with the public life on the street level is desirable. It really offers nothing to the public. You are asking for two extra floors and maybe there is a benefit to the public that could be explored for that. It would be great if we could see something offered.

Schwarz: I agree with Stephen. I like the height; it is already surrounded by large buildings. There are blank facades downtown that no one notices anymore. I would think a solution would be to say that we don't approve the garage and you can negotiate your public benefit argument with council.

Mohr: The second floor is an apartment right?

Griggs: Well it has to be mixed use, so part of the floor will be office space, accessible by a fire escape.

Schwarz: if we put conditions on this, I would say high quality materials need to be part of this. And if the garage survives the process, the garage doors should be better looking and less utilitarian. Also NDS needs to make sure all the zoning requirements are met, we can't control that.

Mohr: I think the only other thing is wrapping that base around. I don't have a problem with the blind wall, that is pretty common in an urban setting and eventually something will be backed up to that too. I would like a more creative way to deal with parking. The scale of this building is appropriate and I'd rather see this than anything we are seeing on west main.

Balut: One thought from experience, have you looked into exterior sprinkler systems for the windows? That's something to consider if you put windows on the back side. I actually don't mind the sparseness of the windows as shown.

Miller: I do agree that it is a nice building and a lot better than what we have been seeing on West Main.

Motion: Mohr moved to find that the proposed special use permit to allow increased density (from 43 units per acre to 101 units per acre) and additional building height (from 70 feet to 94.17 feet), for the redevelopment of 201 West Water Street into a mixed use development will not have an adverse impact on the Downtown ADC District, and the BAR recommends approval of the Special Use Permit, subject to the usual BAR review, and subject to the rooftop appurtenance and balconies meeting current regulations with the following modifications. Schwarz seconded. The motion passed (5-1, with Miller opposed)

- The BAR would like the base details to wrap around the building
- The implication of the high quality of materials
- The BAR would like the applicant to investigate the idea of real windows on the north face
- The BAR does not approve the concept of a full level garage
- The BAR would like to see at least the leading corner of the first floor as a functional commercial space
- Also, the BAR has a concern for public safety with cars backing out into a public street

### 3. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-08-03

430 North 1st Street

Tax Parcel 330088100

David and Nancy Hughes, Owner/ Outlaw Design Company, Applicant

Street Additions

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Ruth Outlaw: Just to clarify, the shed is going to be constructed behind the existing block wall, not replacing it, and is below the driveway level. It is flush with one course of block. And we understand the concern about the front. It is currently unoccupiable, formal rather than functional. Nancy is a Landscape Architect, and they are excited to live downtown. But the bridge is isolating the house from the street when they'd really like an outdoor room and is able to engage with the street. This way the house can make a gesture to engage with the street. We want to retain the bridge concept but make it more functional. We also want to propose landscape that will work with this.

### Questions from the Public:

Malcolm Bell: (433 N 1<sup>st</sup> Street): I have lived across the street since 1977. We know the contribution that Robert and Vickery made to this street. Bob Vickery was a key figure responsible for preservation of this street. We know that they are concerned about the house; his idea was to create a bilaterally symmetrical structure with the moat and bridge. He has trees flanking the bridge. There is an entrance from the parking space. The moat and bridge are central pieces of the design. The house also won an award from AIA. It is

one he designed for himself and the board should consider carefully what is being proposed to the front of the house. I hope that the owners move into the house as well.

Mark Kavit: David Garth was looking at this project and was going to comment on it. I am concerned with the use of PVC which is not allowed in the guidelines. I am also concerned with the cement mix that is used. I have seen several

Question from the Board:

Schwarz: I understand where the neighbors are coming from, but since the building was built in 1994 so do Scala: in N. downtown we don't distinguish between contributing and non-contributing. I don't think there's a black and white answer.

Schwarz: Can you clarify the PVC?

Outlaw: we want to replace the shutters with something that is zero maintenance but looks exactly like them. They aren't on a hinge, there on a track. PVC may not be the right word, they're a composite material.

Mohr: There are no cables on these canopies, what is the reason for introducing these cables?

Outlaw: There actually are cables, they are very thin. And they weren't in the original design. That front canopy was supposed to be cantilevered and during construction he tried to give it support in almost an invisible way. But they were somewhat clumsy, so if we could give them more character that could tie into the details on the addition. Also the owners intend to live in the house; it is just occupied by tenants while we are making plans for renovation. Also MR. Vickery was my boss right out of Architecture school

Balut: The perspective drawing looks shorter, are there changes to the sidewalk?

Outlaw: No the sidewalk is the same as the existing, it's just the perspective. It would meet the sidewalk in the same way, but hopefully flush with the driveway.

Miller: what are you proposing to do with the pipe railing?

Outlaw: It is the city's property, as is the retaining wall. I would like them to be different, but that is up to the city.

Mohr: What is the drop off there?

Outlaw: About four and a half feet. The high point is on the south side

Mohr: How wide is the parking bay?

Outlaw: about 12 feet wide, with landscape stairs on the other side that we plan to rebuild.

Mohr: what is the parking on the street?

Outlaw: it is permit, each owner gets 4 passes

Miller: You are talking about bridging the gap with the bridge and the parking, but you also extend the edge of the bridge to the left so that it is inclusive of the whole width of the shutter.

Outlaw: That is correct.

Comments from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: the bridge makes me nervous because the house is a very pure form from the street. Having said that, it does seem like you could not park a car there and use that area as a more integrated space with the house. Taking the bridge out is a real compromise to the building I think. I am not sure that the cables make sense. The rest of the changes seem nice.

Miller: The bridge is the most character defining feature, so I would not want to alter that.

Mohr: a planter boxes wouldn't hurt my feelings

Miller: the house already has two outdoor rooms, though not on the street

Gastinger: This house was part of my course work which I was in School with Mr. Vickery. I think there are ways that the front can be asymmetrical. The drop off and threshold is important. Moving the railing to the left would get rid of the alignment of the house, so I would advise against that. In playing with the way the planning bed is organized, you can give that sense of threshold while giving more space. I am excited to see what the next iteration of this design would be.

Schwarz: I think if this were new construction I would encourage what you are doing. Because this was built in the 90's, and is not historic, then I think it is appropriate.

Balut: I feel the same way. I love this house, and the formality of the bridge. There is something lost for sure. But what you are proposing is beautiful and effective. It is not what I prefer but I think that it is acceptable with the design guidelines. I agree with my colleges about the bridge. I also prefer the cantilever be reinforced in a more stealthy and hidden way. I don't like that the rails go right to the shutter doors, in a way that is tight and awkward. I wonder about widening the bridge on the left as well as the right. Miller read Sarafin's comments on the house.

Miller: if the bridge in line with the cantilever and the door?

Gastinger: Yes, and through the house

Mohr: The purity of the cube goes away

Schwarz: What if the addition was down one or two steps?

Mohr: That would help quite a bit. It all blends together right now.

Gastinger: I think that space could be quite small and intimate, I wouldn't want it to get too big and cluttered

Mohr: You could just make a cube at the end of the bridge for a small occupiable space

Earnst: when Mr. Vickery built the house, he intended to preserve the slope in front, and so having some way to recall that idea is important still. The extended piece is one way of doing that. I think activating the street is important, but this is an infill house and it is supposed to be different.

Miller: Is there more feedback that you all want?

Outlaw: We want to make sure that we are on the right track with the projections on the driveway side of the house. We wanted the storage space of the shed, and aren't sure how much we can affect the volumes and planes of the original design. If we screen them (the trash cans) we would echo the stutters.

Miller: what you're proposing seems appropriate

Mohr: I am not as concerned with this. It is nice looking. My only issue was with the purity of the front façade. Anything back there won't compromise the character of the house.

Outlaw: So in general you think there is some flexibility with the design of the bridge, but we need to keep the strong axial component and the idea of threshold.

Hughs: We bought the house last year and were taken by what everyone said, and how difference the house is from everything else here. We are trying to bring things that are already here and replicate them. But what I found most interesting today is how much we heard about Mr. Vickery. It is very neat to hear that and it makes the house more special.

Miller: they also used to open it up for house tours.

Motion: Since this is a preliminary discussion there is no suggested motion.

The large part of the discussion was centered around the front entrance bridge and the symmetry of the house. The members present felt this is the most character defining feature of the structure, and were hesitant to see it changed. It was suggested if the applicants wanted a front occupiable space that they sink it down or make it symmetrical. Another suggestion was to make the cantilevered canopy reinforcements less noticeable keeping with the original designs intention. The BAR thought the side and back additions were appropriate according to the guidelines.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 17-08-11  
158 Madison Lane  
Tax Parcel 090129000  
Alpha Chi Omega NHC, Owner/ Kevin Blair, Applicant  
Replace Roof Railing

Reid Saunders present the staff report.

Kevin Blair: I brought samples of the composite railing. This is a composite material with a mineral composite substrate layer and a vinyl material on top. I believe the railing was put up in the 80s when the porch was built up.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: do the occupants go up on the roof?

Blair: they are not supposed to

Schwarz: was there consideration of the original chip and dale railing?

Blair: I have not seen this

Schwarz: is it possible to replicate that?

Blair: I have seen this kind of railing, but this kind of wood working would not hold up.

Miller: Does it come in a matte finish?

Blair: I do not think so.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: I know it is composite but it has a vinyl finish. It does not have sharp edges like woodwork. But it is on the second story so it matters less. These composite fences do come in a chip and dale style.

Miller: It matters less to me on the second story since you don't touch it. But the guidelines do say don't replace wood with vinyl, some composites are okay if they are painted.

Schwarz: I think one concern is that it is a flimsier material. Vinyl railings always seem to be broken.

Mohr: You can always spot a vinyl fence. They have this wet look to them and they're so much flimsier. It is so shiny but it'll be on the roof

Balut: I am less concerned because it's on the roof. I would prefer to adhere to the guidelines. I just think it's unfortunate that it's not compliant or preserving the historic integrity of the house.

Blair: the chip and dale railing is significantly more expensive

Miller: We are open to something that is not wood, but we may not be there yet on this particular product.

Motion: The applicant moved for a deferral.

Schwartz moved that the BAR accepts the applicant's request for deferral. Bault seconded. The motion passed (6-0).

The BAR suggested that the applicant look into a composite chippendale railing, as the guidelines do not permit using vinyl to replace a wooden railing.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-08-09

510 17th Street NW

Tax Parcel 050064000

Zeta Beta House Corp of Gamma Phi Beta Sorority Inc., Owner/ Garrett Rouzer, Applicant

East Elevation Addition and replacement of window sashes

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Rouzer: I have hard copies to respond to the concerns in the staff report. For clarification, all existing sashes would be replaced with the Marvin sashes. I do not have a survey done for that.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Gasitnger: Is the intention for the new siding to match the existing all around the building?

Rouzer: yes

Schwarz: is there anything to let us know where old ends and new begins, if trim and everything else is contiguous?

Rouzer: no, the intent is the original structure faces 17<sup>th</sup> street

Balut: to clarify what Carl is getting at are these two guidelines. Is there a reason you chose to make this addition not discernable and carrying the cornice line?

Rouzer: We were just adding to those additions and tying together with the house

Mary Joy: The elevation he just gave us is different from the original submission.

#### Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

#### Comments from the Board:

Mohr: It is tricky because it sits on the footprint of another addition. It is a fraught condition with the guidelines.

Schwarz: this is where guidelines and what is rational or aesthetically best don't match.

Miller: I also think it's a little weird to have what looks like the front of a building in the back.

Gastinger: I agree. You've done so well with continuing the details that the original structure is lost. I think there are simple things that can be done to differentiate the two.

Rouzer: The residents typically enter through the back, and there are far fewer details here than in the front of the house, which has bays and fluted columns. Be we also didn't want it to feel like you entering through the kitchen door.

Gastinger: It is off center, and there are other things you're doing that make sense. Just being able to discern the old and the new is important.

Mohr: Why is the porch so long? I am wondering if it makes sense for that porch to wrap around. You're already extending the addition up.

Rouzer: It was a way to provide symmetry to the back of the house.

Balut: It does look like the front of the house, but it is more casual. So I think that the details are appropriate. The only caveat is distinguishing it from the original structure. Which could be a number of solutions

Schwarz: If you even just changed the siding a little that could be enough of a difference.

Mohr: the façade just seems so big to me, so I wonder is wrapping around the porch would help at all.

Miller: Regardless we need more details on the dimensions and cut sheets on the windows. I am going to read the guidelines on windows just to reiterate that we do not like wholesale replacement of windows. We definitely need more details on the condition of the windows.

Rouzer: can you consider the windows separately.

Schwarz: will you continue the Philadelphia gutters on the addition? It would be good to know what that will look like. It looks like the windows you have are two over one, what is on the addition? Are the Marvin windows aluminum clad? Or just wood?

Rouzer: they are aluminum clad, and we were going to replace windows with like windows.

Schwarz: I think that makes sense.

Miller: I feel like we are supportive in concept but the details just aren't fleshed out in a way we would require from other applicants.

Balut: if you are changing the design logic with trim and siding, then the gutter appearing will make sense.

Schwarz: the images you provided are great but it would be great to have hard line elevation drawings.

Rouzer: So you need an elevation, light fixture cut sheet, cornice and gutter details?

Motion: The applicant moved for a deferral.

Schwartz moved that the BAR accepts the applicant's request for deferral. Mohr seconded. The motion passed (6-0).

The BAR requires additional information and suggested the applicant looks at cornice details, the gutters, dimensioned elevations for all three sides, window surveys, submit a cut sheet for the light fixture, and differentiate between the original structure and the new addition.

## 6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-08-12  
605 Preston Place and 506-512 Preston Place  
Tax Parcel 050111000 and 050116A00-050116E00  
Preston Place Neighborhood Investments PC, LP, and Preston Place Properties, LLC, Owner/Julie  
Dixon, Applicant  
Move building and demolition of wall

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Applicant: our property is adjacent to the receiving cite. I want to give some context to this neighborhood effort. In the 80s we tried to incentivize the surrounding fraternity houses to preserve their buildings. We worked with the university and Houja to create this historic district and designate houses around here. All of the properties surrounding the garage structure have changed their covenants to keep development low, so even though the parcels are zoned R-3, which does not reflect what can be built. The developers planning to build townhouses on the garage property finally sold their properties and we bought them with intent to consolidate them from 7 parcels to 3. The most prominent lot will go to this farm house. The house has been empty for ten years and is really in disrepair. As it sits, there is no justification to reconstruct that house. It has been a long battle, and has come up with a solution for this structure and the neighborhood. This structure will be reborn as the jewel of this small neighborhood.

#### Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

#### Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: is there a plan for how to move it, the street is obviously very narrow.

Dixon: the current conception of the move, which the details will have to be worked out over time. I have been involved with moving structures in my career, which I think has to do with corner bracing in houses like this. With this structure we can reset it at the same height and with the same orientation, which is really beneficial. Mr. Bavier has met with a contractor, Old House Movers, and there is one large tree that will need to be removed, and power lines will have to be moved underground.

Gastinger: Could you comment on conversation with the DHR on keeping listed status?

Dixon: It is not listed independently, only as part of the district. We have been talking with Mark Wagner from DHR in order to maintain status.

Gastinger: are you aware of the connection with 611

Dixon: no I am not

Scala: 611 was built prior to this structure, as the servants quarters

Miller: why not keep the additions?

Dixon: The additions cannot be moved structurally. But we want to use as many materials from the old additions from the additions.

Balut: did you consider reconstructing them

Dixon: yes but

Schwarz: Was there a reason you chose to make additions to the west side when the additions were originally on the east side

Dixon: house flow

#### Comments from the Public

Murdoch Matheson: I am the neighbor to the receiving site. I have been along for the ride of the hostage situation with the treat of the townhouses. I think the garages were torn down for public safety and not in prep for the building. We think that this is absolutely the right thing for the neighborhood. It is in sadly dialect shape and cannot be worth anything in its current location. I have a privacy fence because of this lot that the townhouses were going to come on to, and I would be willing to take that down

Paul Wright: That house will come by my house right next to the ash tree that will have to come down. It has had branches come down, and it's just a matter of time for when that tree would have to come down anyway. It would be very sad to let this house become a boarding house again. I think putting this into a new,

prominent site, is the only good solution. The burying of the power lines would be an enormous boom for the trees on the street.

Christine Colley: The walk to the additions to the back of that house is just a few feet from the property line. 611 is quite a bit older, we found that out when we restored it. It would have been a farm house until Wyndhurst was built. There is not an integral relationship between those two buildings. We will be most impacted by the move. We will not miss the Ashe tree, it seems to have problems with ashes and so the chances of this tree are not good. We are enthusiastic proponents of this project.

Gregg Kendrick: We have been in our home for 21 years. We are in full support as are our neighbors. The manor house where it is, I would call it the invisible house. You walk right by it, it is uninteresting and unattractive. It would be great to see the front of the house.

#### Comments from the Board:

Miller: I got to go inside the house last year and it is fantastic. I thought this idea was crazy originally. It wouldn't make sense to put the money into rehabilitating it

Gastinger: Thank you for your decades of persistence to this project and neighborhood. I don't debate the necessity for the restoration of the house or the creation of single family lots. Something is lost with the movement of this structure. The position of the house and its relationship to the topography, the house behind it, and non-relationship to the street tells a story. There are other benefits to moving, but I want to name that as a loss. The relationship to 611, I am not sure if I know of other relationships between the farm house and servants quarters still existing in the city. Some of our Criteria are about the public necessity and impact on surrounding properties. The relationship to 611 is still up for question.

Schwarz: I agree with Breck, this is not the only house with a funny relationship to the street. You find these all over town and they do tell a story about how the city developed. When you move it, it no longer makes sense; you don't think it's the oldest house. I am concerned about the street, but you all seem supportive so that is not much of an argument. I am concerned with the loss of history.

Mohr: I agree that you're going to lose the sense of place, but I think it regains a sense of place in the new location. In the olden days you would have approached it from the front. Losing the relationship with 611 is a shame. But you can't move 611 with it, so there needs to be a marker to explain it. It is a cool old house, and I think it gets a breath of life in a new location. I agree with the loss of history, but I think there is a net gain in the move.

Miller read Sarafin's comments on the application.

Balut: I want to thank you all for your efforts on this project. Breck brought up some great points about the location of the house on a hill and its non-relationship to the road. But as soon as you realize that, you realize it's such a shame that these apartments were built in front of it. The original context of this house has already been lost. It has not been maintained, and giving it new life by moving it, I think is worth the loss since the site has already been compromised. I am very encouraged by what you want to do in moving. And I like the additions that you have on it, and I really like that you intend to restore it to a single family dwelling. As much as I like the old additions, and think they're valuable, the new additions make sense on this other lot. I am in support of everything you're proposing

Earnst: Hearing the care and backing from the neighborhood helps ease my mind a little bit. The orientation of the building not changing is a benefit, but not it faces the street. That is significant. I see it as you are demolishing everything past the original farmhouse. With that though process, the east addition are important. I think it is important to save those, or reconstruction with care. Adding an education element is also extremely important.

Schwarz: I am not set on the idea that this house could not be used on site. There is a sizable lot to the side. My understanding is that it has been vacant because the previous owners wouldn't sell it. I think we are losing quite a lot by moving it. I think it could be tweaked a little bit where it is and be a perfectly good house in a beautiful neighborhood. I also don't like the implication that this lot is then being primed for higher density development.

Applicant: I just restored another house in the neighborhood. And I don't know that you guys are supposed to consider the economic argument, but I don't know that this house could break even on this site.

Gastinger: I think that is a very powerful argument, that moving it makes it economically feasible.

Miller: It looks like we have mixed opinions on it but are mostly in favor, I think one thing would be the additions on the east. They can't be moved but they could be reconstructed if people are concerned.

Mohr: Given that the new additions are going off the rear, my bigger concern are the east additions and why they can't be rebuilt, especially the bowed one that is really cool.

Richard Spurzem: The additions certainly can't make it down the street. So they would have to be reconstructed. But the additions are not very well done.

Mohr: It is one of those things that shows how the house evolved even if it is funky. We went through this with a house on West Main. I get why they can't be moved with the house.

Balut: It is a tough call. It is a subjective decision and I could go either way. It all has to do with the intent of the restoration and the research done. I can get on board with a period of significance and that can be part of the educational component.

Gastinger: I thought Emma's description of going back to a period of significance is compelling, and I think that stripping it down to the original structure is even more strange than moving it. I also thought that a historic marker would be necessary.

Schwarz: I like the idea of adding onto the east side instead of altering the unaltered west side.

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions and Moving, I move to find that the proposed (1) moving of 605 Preston Avenue house, porch and chimneys, and the east side additions to 506-512 Preston Place, and (2) demolition of the rear additions of the house satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mohr seconded. The motion passed (4-2, with Gastinger and Schwarz opposed).

Miller: The demolition of the stone wall is necessary for the creation of single family lots?

Dixon: The portion of the wall that remains has retaining function. And the lot readjustment wraps that corner. Since the application was made, the engineers marked more of the wall for demolition than was needed, so we'll actually be keeping more than we thought.

Miller: is the thing driving the changes in lot shapes the setback requirements?

Dixon: yes, we worked with the city on those. The front yard setback is 50 feet, which is the average for the road

Miller: I feel like the city is making the wall demolition necessary because of the wacky setbacks.

Miller read Sarafin's comments on the stone wall

Gastinger: Do we have any more information on the garage structure and if it is contributing to the neighborhood?

Scala: When the survey was done, the garages were considered contributing, but they were torn down before the demolition would have required BAR approval. I don't know that it contributing, they are a reminder of the garages that were there. But I am not sure that it is necessary to keep the whole thing. And the part they want to demolish really looks odd.

Schwarz: I remember the garages, and I would have been okay with demolishing those, for this intent.

Balut: I am in favor of removing the wall. The fact that there will still be some of the wall there is enough to tell the story. It is kind of a letdown that this beautiful wall was part of a garage, anyways.

Mohr: Why should this house have to play by the rules and be pushed all the way back into the wall? I feel like the setbacks would not have to be so far back. I think this is a special condition, that the house is being moved.

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions and Moving, I move to find that the proposed demolition of part of the stone wall at 500-512 Preston Place satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mohr seconded. The motion passed (6-0).

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 17-08-13  
506-512 Preston Place  
Tax Parcel 050116A00-050116E00  
Preston Place Properties, LLC, Owner/Julie Dixon, Applicant

## Renovation of building

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Dixon: Considering the last decision, my question would be if any additions on the west side and rear side of the building would be appropriate

### 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:

Gastinger: in concept I am supportive of any additions that meet our guidelines and that the original structure is still legible.

Mohr: I agree. And I could see the kitchen on the east side

Miller: Do we feel like we have enough information?

Schwarz: It doesn't look like there is differentiating between old and new

Miller: I think there is universal support for what you are proposing

Motion: The applicant moved for a deferral.

Schwartz moved that the BAR accepts the applicant's request for deferral. Balut seconded. The motion passed (6-0).

The renovation of the structure was not discussed because the east additions are now moving with the house instead of being demolished, as originally proposed. This changes the overall design, so this application will come back for BAR approval. The BAR requested larger, scaled drawings of all elevations.

## 9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-07-01

425 2nd Street NE

Tax Parcel 330085000

James E. and Lynn K. Garnett, Owner/ James E. Garnett, Applicant

Construct new front wall, front walk, and install gates

Camie Mess present the staff report.

Jim Garnett: We are basically now replacing what was there. It was buckled by the maple that had to be taken down. We would like to do that in a manner that respects the period of the

### Questions from the Public

Mark Kavitt: Will the steps have sandstone on them?

Garnett: no, it will be brick

Kavitt: what about the gates?

Garnett: the gate is gone.

### Questions from the Board:

Balut: when did the dark trim color take place?

Garnett: a couple years ago, it was a sandstone color

Gastinger: are you planning on coming back later for the replacement of the maple?

Garnett: we are thinking about another maple, but we have to deal with the stump

Mohr: can you just let us know when you get the brick and we can come by and see how it looks.

Schwarz: do you want the brick or would you prefer the sandstone?

Garnett: I am fine either way

Schwarz: is the root ball the reason you're putting the maple on the other side of the yard.

#### Comments from the Public

Kavit: I hope everyone got my email that I sent on Sunday. The sign for the item was not posted. That block is very unique.

#### Comments from the Board:

Mohr: looking at old picture I wonder how high the wall was

Gastinger: thank you Mr. Garnett for meeting with me, and thinking about our concerns with the original proposal. And I appreciate the commitment to restoring the best porch in Charlottesville. I think the revised planing plan respects that. I would just say that the piers being replaces would have caps similar in kind

Garnett: The top on the old pillar was concrete; I think stone caps would look a lot better.

Gastinger: Yeah, and these guys might have better suggestions. But I think replacing it as close in kind is most advisable.

Garnett: We could do brick caps and piers. The low wall will be rebuild, but the corner piers are crumbling. I don't know about replacing the concrete.

Gastinger: To note alternatives to the hedge and paper bark maple, a chalk maple would also work. I think it would be better proportionally to have a large tree on the other side for registration of the curve of the porch. Not on the corner.

Garnett: There is not much room for another root ball but we can figure it out. So would you be inclined to put a tree on the east corner? We were proposing the paper bark maple

Gastinger: that is where I am suggesting a larger tree there and not one in the corner. I think the uphill location is better for the composition of the house.

Schwarz: I am happy to get any tree there, especially if it gets big. My one concern is that there is now a hole in the tree canopy. But I won't push that because I just want to put a shade tree in.

Motion: Gastinger moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the revised proposal changes (found in an e-mail to Camie Mess, dated August 14th, around 1pm) to the front wall, front walk, and landscape satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted pending a resubmittal and approval of the revised landscape plan, and seeing the brick on site. Earnst seconded. The motion passed (6-0).

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 17-08-05  
419 East Main Street  
Tax Parcel 530062000  
Holly Ridge, LLC, Owner/ Clifford H. Fox, Applicant  
Window Replacement

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

#### 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:

Schwarz: Why can't the applicant retie the balances?

Scala: I don, think the windows are that old.

Schwarz: were the windows installed in the 70s? or just the balances?

Miller: They don't look like they are from the 70s.

Mohr: The replacements look a little heavy; the sample window picture shows the muntins look really fat. These could be from the 60s or 70s

Earnst: We still need a better understanding of what's going on.

Schwarz: I think we should defer it and ask some questions. How old it the window? How is it broken?

Mohr: Can we see the inside? My guess is that they're replacement windows, these look light. Older windows have wider sashes.

Gastinger: One question is about the muntins.

Mohr: yeah the muntins are really fat.

Schwarz: if the windows were from the 70's I would say just replace them.

Motion: Schwartz moved that the BAR defer the application. Mohr seconded. The motion passed (6-0). The applicant will be required to come to next month's BAR with the requested information.

The BAR requested more information:

1. How old are the windows?
2. What exactly is broken?
3. Comparing muntin dimensions between the old windows and the proposed replacements.

D. Other Business

10. PLACE report

Mohr: I wasn't there. But we do have a meeting on building heights on Thursday.

E. Adjournment 10:15

Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
August 15, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, Chair; Tim Mohr, Vice-Chair; Emma Earnst, Stephen Balut, Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger, Corey Clayborne

BAR Members Absent: Justin Sarafin, Whit Graves

Staff Present: Scala, Mess, Saunders, and McCray

Call to Order: Chair – Melanie Miller calls meeting to order at 5:30

5:30 A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

B. New Items

1. Rapid Flashing Beacons

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Paul Oberdorfer from Public Works: I wanted to be thorough in this because it does have a dramatic impact. I got feedback from business owners near here. There is also the cost concern and these beacons do provide a large margin of safety. We are always looking for the best way to protect the public and in being sensitive to the historic district we plan to buy powder coated black poles that have mounting brackets and the signs are a matte finish on the back so they are non-reflective. Outside of that I wanted to give you are reason for steering away from the in ground. It is not just for cost but to increase the safety for the pedestrians.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Miller: What was the cost of the Timmons Group Study?

Oberdorfer: The purchase order was cut for about \$5,000.

Miller: What time of day do most pedestrian accidents occur? Do we have any data on the in Charlottesville or nationally?

Oberdorfer: The city traffic engineer is not here this evening, but I can get that information for you. Typically, it would have to do with weather conditions or poor visibility.

Miller: Were any other options considered besides what we have now or rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RFB)?

Oberdorfer: Yes, right now the two options are your typical crosswalk or the RFB. We do not want to go backwards in terms of providing a safety feature, the in ground lights have shown to be not as effective, and we want to give the public what would be the most cutting edge technology as far as safety is concerned.

Schwarz: What do you mean by not as effective?

Oberdorfer: The studies included in the report show a slight margin of increase when you go from the in ground to the RFB, in terms of the probability of someone being in the crosswalk.

Schwarz: I didn't catch that, I saw a statement that said during bright lights they are a little less effective.

Mohr: It is the reverse the in ground are a little more effective in the dark. Which seems like the time when it is more dangerous.

Gastinger: There are a couple pictures that range from something simple with two signs to a totem pole of things, what are we to expect at the intersections you have identified?

Oberdorfer: It would be the W11-2 the pedestrian crossing, the symbol of the person with the arrow, and the beacon in between the two.

Gastinger: So it isn't like the picture on the right that has a solar panel on the top.

Oberdorfer: No, these are hard wired.

Mohr: So it is about ten feet tall?

Oberdorfer: Roughly yes.

Miller: Looking in the safety benefit section, can you direct me to where it says one is slightly better than the other?

Oberdorfer: I believe it is the intensity of the strobe and the fact that it, we call it wiggle-waggle between the two, instead of being constant in the pavement. I would have to look up where I saw that. I don't know how receptive NDS would be to doing a study; I would have to contact the traffic engineer. The two locations on Market Street have been there quite a while.

Mohr: Did Bike/Ped or Amanda Poncy have anything to say about these?

Oberdorfer: She didn't have anything to say, but was supportive of these. We don't prefer the in ground lights, from the point of safety and maintenance. Quite frankly the lights were out more than they were on.

#### Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

#### Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: I think it would important for us to have a better understanding of the safety concerns. Are the in ground less safe because they are out most of the time or are they actually less effective?

Oberdorfer: It is my understanding they didn't work frequently, but also the visibility is better because of your cone of vision. Also, the visibility of the in ground lights are much worse depending on the weather.

Mohr: One design question I have is about the amount of signage found on the pole.

Oberdorfer: Can I be frank, we should have all that signage regardless of if it is in ground or above.

Schwarz: There are no signs near Market Street crossing

Oberdorfer: Correct, they are still non-compliant. If there was an incident there, it is a clear liability.

Miller: What about testing a wireless solar option?

Oberdorfer: We could certainly look into it. Something to consider is each one of those pucks has a battery so every time one is out, the seal on the puck needs to be broken.

Miller: I think they are guaranteed for 5 years and they can last anywhere from 7-10.

Oberdorfer: That is according to the vendor, which is not always right.

Gastinger: Getting one of these is going to significantly detract from pedestrian experience. Not to mention the character of the views of the historic park, library, and corner of the VMDO, where the pedestrian crossing signs are already really visible. I don't mind the beacon as much, especially if there is already a pole there, but when it gets a whole thing like this that's much more shocking.

Oberdorfer: These are supposed to be intrusive. We are required by law to address these out of compliance signs.

Gastinger: It just looks like it is designed for a much more car centric place like Florida.

Earnst: In the report it talks about these beacons being on wide roads with higher speeds, how did they end up here?

Oberdorfer: It has to do with the pedestrian count being so high

Mohr: The worst crosswalk is across McIntire and that is where this would make sense because you have car doing 40 or 45MPH down the hill. It seems like there is a scale of regard that could be used when looking at crosswalks in a historic district.

Oberdorfer: When we have a crosswalk we are obligated to sign it, which follows the manual of uniform traffic control devices, it is predicated on federal guidelines.

Schwarz: Just to be clear the city government has some leverage in manipulating those correct?

Oberdorfer: That is outside of my realm of experience, you would have to ask the city attorney.

Gastinger: Are there other alternatives in establishing a pedestrian district? Where you receive warning that you are about to enter into a place that has high pedestrian activity.

Oberdorfer: I can't speak to that, I am sorry.

Schwarz: Has PLACE been involved in this discussion at all?

Mohr: No. The one at the library from an empirical standpoint seems to be very effective. That intersection also has some lights on it, which allows people to see you.

Oberdorfer: I would have to agree with you. When you redesign an intersection you often times add more light so visibility is easier.

Schwarz: I feel like we should have a work session with PLACE, the BAR, Public Works, and traffic engineering on this. Cluttering the sidewalk with more signage is not helping pedestrians, removing the beacons does not help either. I feel like there needs to be more research, and if there is any flexibility. We seem to be filling our city up with highway sized signage that were developed by traffic engineers who favor highway architecture and more suburban type cities, and Charlottesville is not that. It seems as a city we need to figure out a better method of improving our safety.

Mohr: I understand this on a faster road, but not where there is a tradition of pedestrian and cars working together and also visibility. Visibility is the big one I think.

Miller: I think a work session would be more productive because everyone is coming to the table with ideas and are willing to brainstorm.

Oberdorfer: I would like to do this now, so we do not have to do this again when we get down to Water Street. Maybe we could also just talk about lighting in general.

Miller: So we would suggest you request a deferral.

Motion: The applicant requested a deferral.

Schwarz moved that the BAR accept the applicant's request for deferral. Gastinger seconded. The motion passed (7-0).

They felt the street was too small for such a large installation and the BAR requested a work session with the BAR, PLACE, the City traffic engineer, and Public Works to discuss other options.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 17-08-04  
525 Valley Road  
Tax Parcel 110043000  
John Butler, Owner/Applicant  
Minor Exterior Renovations

Camie Mess present the staff report.

Questions by the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions by the Board:

Schwarz: If he were to come back later with exterior storm windows, would that be administrative or is that just allowed in general.

Mary Joy: That is administrative.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: I agree with staff completely, it was a through and thoughtful application and I also commend him on taking good care of a nice house in a historic district., and I think all the changes he is submitting are all completely appropriate

Mohr: The fan pattern seems a little over the top for a simple house, I am not sure if anyone else agrees with me on that.

Gastinger: I am okay with is, especially in a vehicular setting.

Motion: Gastinger moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements and City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed minor exterior renovations satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Balut seconded. The motion passes (7-0).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-08-10

406 Altamont Street

Tax Parcel 330150000

Robert Troxell, Owner/Applicant

Tree Removal

Camie Mess present the staff report.

Applicant: It is a very constricted space, that it taken up mostly by the maple's roots system. My best thought is to plant some more volunteer dogwoods

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Schwarz: Could a maple seedling potentially go back in there?

Gastinger: Sure. It is a challenging space. We did talk about the option of planting a larger species that was a smaller specimen that would have to be located a small distance from where the current tree is located.

Comments from the Public:

Miller: Last night we received a comment from Mark Kavit, 405 Altamont Street, in support of the application.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: A baby sized large tree.

Gastinger: We can't require a replacement tree. But that street would benefit from another large shade tree. But the application is just for the removal of a tree

Motion: Gastinger moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed tree removal satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the recommendation that a small size of a large species shade tree replace the current tree being taken down. Clayborne seconded. The motion passes (7-0).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-12-03

1600 Grady Avenue

Tax Parcel 050110000

Neighborhood Investments-PC, LP, Owner/ Henningsen Kestner Architects, Inc., applicant

Landscape Plan

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

John James: Removing the trees around the perimeter of the building has to do with the trenches we have to build in order to waterproof the foundation of the building. OSHA standards say that the trenches have to be 8 feet wide.

Miller: They were waterproofing this property in 2012.

Richard Spersum: These are the OSHA requirements for the trenching. A lot of the drainage work from before was to do work on the front porches

James: The issues with the poplars is they were heavily top pruned and are now in decline. They have lost their presence on the street and there is no real canopy, and one is too close to the building so it will have to come down anyways. I had recommended replacing the magnolias we are taking out with gingkoes which are a heartier tree.

#### Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

#### Questions from the Board

Gastinger: What is the story with the magnolias on site? They seem like they're a particular design intention.

James: I think there was at one time. I asked the arborist, and he said they are nowhere near as old as the building. The ones on Grady do add something distinct to the design and those we are not planning on moving.

Miller: When we reviewed this multiple other times someone brought a postcard of this property and there were medium sized deciduous trees in front of them.

Schwarz: It wasn't that long ago there was a full canopy over the street. The gingkoes you are planting are the spreading version, not the sentry version, correct?

James: Yes.

Gastinger: Is there a plan of the proposed location for where the trees will go?

James showed the planting plan to the BAR: we are planting tree for tree except for the two tulip poplars

Gastinger: All the street magnolias are staying?

James: Correct.

Miller: Can you show us where the magnolias are coming out of the courtyard?

James: Yes, there are two, they are right in front of the stairs.

Miller: Have you considered anything larger than serviceberries?

James: No, anything larger would overwhelm the space, also we were looking for something that would add a bit of light.

Schwarz: What was the reason for replacing the ramp?

James: We are trying to get some light into the basement units.

Balut: Why use five gingkoes?

James: The gingkoes are tough street trees that will grow in tight spaces. Also, they are not particular to soil composition. There are faster growing trees that I could recommend, but they would get too big too fast for this space.

Gastinger: If one of the specimen trees, like the beech or pecan were closer to the trenching, would there have been an alternative

James: I do not know the answer to that.

#### Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

#### Comments from the Board:

Mohr: I think this is a great building and the courtyard will be much nicer than what was there previous. I buy the argument that it should not have any large trees in it since it is north facing. I like the gingkoes; I think they are very nice trees

Gastinger: As the landscape architect on the board, I will speak on many things. I like the interior courtyard, I don't have any issues with that at all. It seems appropriate to the style of the building. I went over the tree removing request (prior to knowing about the additional magnolias); I don't have an issue with the removal

of any of the trees on the original request. The west part of Preston Place on the corner seems to be struggling anyways. I do have an issue with the large magnolias. They seem to be a part of a larger intentional design, so if they need to be removed maybe they should be replaced with something like a sweet bay magnolia. I don't think a green wall around the building would be good so I agree with the gingkoes. There are also these much taller trees (green ash) that if put in with the magnolias would provide dappled shade for those porches on the south façade. I think something besides the gingkoes should be considered when looking at the replanting of those areas. I guess where I am headed is, I still have questions about the magnolias and the overall street planting on the exterior.

Schwarz: I think it makes sense to replace the magnolias with single species. In the front, I would be more inclined to regain the tree canopy that existed years ago, maybe a larger shade tree to match the ash, the pecan, or something that would spread over Grady in the future.

Miller: We see gingkoes all over Charlottesville, but we are losing a lot of tree canopy at once, so there might be some merit in a larger shade tree that can come up and over the building at some point.

Spersum: What is your suggestion to replace the Ash?

Gastinger: It is a fairly narrow space, so a larger tree that eventually grows above those magnolias that would benefit both the street and the building.

Schwarz: You could use elms like in front of the courthouse.

James: The ash isn't a good idea; it is hard to pick a tree that would work well.

Schwarz: What about a tulip poplar, to replace the missing two.

James: They are great but the sap heavily making them a very messy tree.

Mohr: With the landscape LED lighting, are they on controls so that you can dim them? LEDs are so squirrely in terms of their output.

Clayborne: Will the courtyard require irrigation of some sort?

James: We will use what is already there.

Miller: It looks like we are okay with the interior courtyard, with the suggestion of LED dimmers, and then there is support for removing the bulk of the trees, but a question about trees that weren't originally included in the packet (the two magnolias and the green ash).

James: I like the suggestion of sweet bay magnolias to replace the magnolias, but I am unsure about the ash.

Gastinger: I think we need to wait and see a revised landscape plan.

Balut: Clearing things up, your position is the two magnolias need to be removed because they will be severely compromised.

James: Each one is probably within eight feet of the wall, so even if you up in a four foot trench, there would be too much root damage.

Gastinger: I think there is support for the removal and the interior courtyard, I would just like to see a revised planting plan with what they are planning on replacing those with, and it would make sense to have it be considered as opposed to designed in this session.

Schwarz: When are you expecting to do this excavation work?

Richard: The building was emptied already and we would like to do the waterproofing within the next month.

Motion: Gastinger moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed landscape, lighting plan, and tree demolition plan 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 with the stipulation that the applicant return to the BAR with an updated planting plan for the plantings in the three yards, that shows at least a one-to-one replacement for the removed trees. Balut seconded. The motion passes (7-0).

### C. New Construction

#### 5. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-08-02

Belmont Bridge

Public Right of Way, Tax Map 53 and 58

City of Charlottesville, Owner/Applicant

## Belmont Bridge Design

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Sal Musarra with Kimley Horn & Associates presented the Belmont Bridge presentation. (1:28:00)

### Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

### Question from the Board:

Schwarz: Are you intending to design the color pavement areas or is that left to future development?

Applicant: Yes, the plaza areas will be part of the bridge project.

Schwarz: Your renderings are very fluid, but will we end up seeing something more segmental?

Applicant: The truth is it is more segmental than it looks, because of the structure, but I think we will make it look more fluid.

Schwarz: So there will be joints, but it will be somewhat curvilinear. When will you know if you need the railroad fence?

Janette: The conversation is still open, we will build the supports for it, and they are willing to have a conversation, but we won't get a response until they have plans in hand.

Schwarz: How wide is the sidewalk and planting area?

Applicant: We have a minimum 6 ft. planting area, with a 10 foot sidewalk and 10 foot bike lane. The effort will be that when there is fluff in the width it will go into the planting area so that 6 feet should grow since we moved the planted median.

Schwarz: Depends on where you are on the bridge. If you're on a bike will you be able to hop up on the sidewalk or is that blocked?

Applicant: We have a travel lane and then a small median, protecting the bike lane. There is a curb between the bike lane and the pedestrian lane. It is a cycle track layout until you get to the intersection.

Schwarz: The powder coating (on the railings) how is that maintained?

Applicant: The stainless steel will do better with rail and the guard itself needs stableness. So the headwear surfaces will be powder coating. The maintenance is good for 30 years plus.

Schwarz: How you spoken to RNC events about the plaza. Security seems difficult.

Applicant: It is an operations issue. There will be people circulating around. The last conversation was how to look at security and events based on the design, but it has more advantages than otherwise

Mohr: The light fixtures and benches are placeholders right now, correct? What is driving those?

Applicant: We were going to use city standards except the light fixtures that will match West Main Street fixtures, recommended by staff. But we can certainly go in another direction.

Mohr: The benches are a hot point for us, considering the downtown Halprin benches

Applicant: Do we want this corridor to feel different than the rest of the City of Charlottesville?

Clayborne: Is there a bus stop close by?

Applicant: Just the transit station.

Mohr: Do we have a definitive elevation section for the pedestrian pass through?

Applicant: We have priced a product, and it will be a pre-fabricated arch system, which will structurally work. It is smaller than what is under the pavilion right now. But lighting and the wall surface is key on that. It is the minimal height you need to get people through it safely. We can get you more detail that reflects the scale better.

Miller: Do you have to have the high street lights across the bridge or can this be accomplished at a lower level?

Applicant: The lights do have to be tall because we have to meet a highway lighting standard so the taller they are the further apart they need to be. Going lower you have to put more out there

Miller: You have to meet highway standards on a 30 mile/hour road?

Applicant: Yes, and this is the minimum lighting that we are proposing.

Gastinger: Where is it located and how is it interacting with the trees?

Applicant: It has to be out of the travel lane, so, on the sidewalk.

Miller: Is the city okay with the stamped paving?

Janette: We explored other options on Hillsdale and we do have a stained stamped concrete, so yes.

Balut: You mention the green wall and the panel system, have you located them or are they just in concept?

Applicant: It is envisioned to be most of the surface cladding throughout the area except planter walls and if we dedicate areas for public art.

Gastinger: Is that just on the south approach, or is that also on the northern exposed walls?

Applicant: The east and west exposed surfaces will be consistent with the vertical cladding, but not on the north and south abutments. However, we did have a rendering showing a green wall on that south facing abutment on the north side of Water Street.

Balut: So that is a possibility? I thought the renderings were not showing green wall in the circulation north of Water Street.

Applicant: That is part of the concept.

Balut: If you can add intrigue to the armature supporting it than that is good. To what extent are you concerned about loitering? Since intrigue and benches are missing from the rendering

Applicant: We are conscience of that, but the more active and well lit it is the more those detrimental things won't be around. Public art may also be a way to occupy that place.

Gastinger: Why do both stairs go down to the street in the same direction, it seems redundant and people going west don't have a good option.

Applicant: We don't have a reason for that, but it is a good option.

Miller: Is there a better way to plant this concrete wall more?

Applicant: Yes, that is the intent.

Gastinger: Their planting plan shows a lot more trees than the elevations show.

Janette: Do you as a board have a thought on where to move forward with this? Do you think we are moving in the right direction?

Applicant: Particularly with the approach to paving...

Miller: We will cover that in the comments.

#### Comments from the Public:

No questions from the public.

#### Comments from the Board:

Miller: I think overall the requirements you were given and your mission forced you toward replacing the bridge with one that looks a lot like what's there. Anything you can do to make it look less like a highway is good and any fixtures you can use that are more creative would be better. I don't think the city has a true standard.

Mohr: It will relate more to the furniture downtown than elsewhere. I do like the lighting and the railing that makes it seem less hot. Anything to enliven these kinds of spaces (underpasses) and getting convincing ideas on how that will be okay, it feels like something on FDR drive, that might change as it gets used more.

Schwarz: I do have a big concern; the plaza you created is a lot of space that I don't think has a use. It gets rid of a lot of green space and adding concrete that leans over Water Street that is already tight. It is going to mess up pavilion event and the circulation looks fine as is. The rendering looks cool but it looks like a lot extra unnecessary design, and I'm worried about what it will do to Water Street

Miller: In the conceptual plan, you can see the diagonal parking, and it has a toothed edge and on the other side it had a straight diagonal. I think it is nice to have as little paving as possible.

Schwarz: One thing you are going to get from the bike/ped committee is don't use a squiggly bike rack, always an inverted U. If you have someone that is good with colors than I would say don't shy away from bright colors with the pavement. The tunnel solution as you have it, is a very boxy stair. If you want people to go down and use that tunnel and not j walk, it has to be a more cohesive design. All these right angles, going back and forth, people are just going to j walk. If you don't leave the crossing up, people are still going to cross it since the alternative is inconvenient

Miller: Is it possible to wait on closing the street until there is more development?

Janette: Another reason we are closing that off is for better pedestrian access for Levy and 9<sup>th</sup> Street, improving both pedestrian flow and then flow of the signal, right now those are both inefficient.

Gastinger: I am going to disagree with Carl, I think the curve that connects the pedestrian way with the bridge is a significant design element. I would not want to see that minimized. I think the character under the bridge is going to feel like under a bridge. I don't think there are enough trees in the entry and some more diversity in the plant pallet. The plants in general seem good, except maybe the sycamore. I am a little worried about the soil volumes you have, I am worried that the design would begin to chip away at those volumes. I am worried about the green screen on the west and southern facing walls. I see them as really challenging, hot, and exposed location that won't get attention and maintenance. Finding ways to make the grove of trees in the plaza is a much better way to bring shade than on the wall itself. I do like the wall patterns. The color concrete, I feel like it could feel dated quickly. There may be other ways to treat the concrete and give it texture. That may be more paving than necessary. I agree with the comments on furniture. The curve that sweeps into the bridge, I think the continuity of line will be the most attractive feature of the bridge. Ironing out the kinks of that line is best and making it as graceful as possible.

Miller: It would be great to have a rendering of the CSX fencing with the pavilion beyond.

Gastinger: I commend you on the design of that and the way you have integrated it. Depending on what you do with the concrete you could get more graceful line on the curve of the walkway.

Mohr: Introducing bright color elements under the bridge will give it life that you won't get out of the green wall. I agree with Breck that those stairs sweeping up and the ramp access is nice. I think it is a key design element. The freehand plan of that pattern in the concrete looks promising.

Schwarz: The swooping stairs come with a long extension, is that necessary in the design. There is a part that is hanging over Water Street that is gratuitous, that is the part I don't like.

Applicant: There is a structural reason it looks that way, but would tighten up the footprint.

Gastinger: What is important to me is the gracefulness of the curve.

Balut: Overall, I really would have hoped for a more articulated understanding of the overall design. The decisions for certain details are understood. I feel like the benches and lighting are lost opportunities that could have been included in the overall design opportunity. The curve creates an elegant effect and I am thankful for that. The CSX fence offers a way to articulate that and make it feel like more than just an overpass. The rail, benches, lighting, and trash cans, could have come together and provided a design theory that can evolve and grow as the space grows. There is intrigue to the angle of the rail, but I hope that there will be a more unified general approach to all the design elements at the end of the design. The benching was integral to the Highline in New York where they followed one design philosophy. The more green space and trees, the better. There is the question of water, but the more trees and green space are active and less concrete effects, especially under the bridge where it needs to be softened, maybe a zero-scape planter or public art would help this. Then perhaps varying the pallet under that. Maybe something softer and warmer like wood or stone. I think you are making a good effort to do that, and I like the pre-cast angle panels and green you are proposing. Just be mindful that green ends up being brown a lot of the time. I caution you about being funky, because it is hard to do well. Which you have been advised with moving away from color or patterned concrete. Maybe go with more muted colors. Then perhaps there is one lot that the parking can serve a dual purpose, and be more functional when it's not used as parking. You might lose a space or two but you could place a seat walls or an amphitheater around that parking that shows you intend it to be used as something else when it is not used as parking.

Clayborne: I would encourage you to integrate more of the senses. You use a lot of concrete surfaces but maybe think about how to integrate touch and sound. Integrate more than once sense. Maybe use gravel that you can hear when you walk, or a water feature.

Gastinger: I would like to encourage the underpass; I think it'll benefit the city long term.

Schwarz: I still think the circulation needs to be much more fluid.

Balut: I would probably j walk, before I used that because I don't like those kinds of spaces and they are hard to do well. The walkways should be more cohesive. Be generous with the volume, and make it a nice approach. You'll also have to count on there being graffiti there all the time.

Mohr: That underpass won't have validity until there is activity.

Motion: Since this is a preliminary discussion there is no suggested motion. Some comments are:

- The combination of landscaping, engineering, and planning is going in the right direction, but there needs to be more cohesion and an overall design philosophy. The seat walls, rails and lighting seem too disparate. CSX screen needs to be integrated more.
- The furniture color must be black like the Mall street furniture. Furniture could be more creative design, but must fit more into the design and character of the Downtown ADC.
- Reduce the amount of concrete with more stone, wood, green space, planters, or possibly different materials such as gravel. Green screens may not survive the hot and exposed locations.
- Fix the “kinks” in the most attractive feature – the continuity of line, gracefulness of curve that connects the pedestrian way into the bridge.
- Pavement colors could look dated quickly. Consider more muted colors or textured variations.
- Look further into a dual purpose for the parking area.
- Integrate more of the senses (touch, sound, sight, etc.) Introduce bright colors under bridge.
- Supportive on the tunnel underpass, but wished the circulation was more fluid in the design; streamline approach to it.
- Keep pedestrian crosswalk for now until future development changes current pedestrian patterns.
- Complete discussion at :  
[http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

6. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 17-08-01

230 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280001000

Taliaferro Junction LLC, Owner/ Fred Wolf, Applicant

Ice Park Arena Redevelopment

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Fred Wolf: We brought additional materials to illustrate the massing in context and sections through the gallery and courtyard. For those we have both a straight on, a very technical line drawing, and a perspectival section. We also have shading studies at the end of the packet. It is a really unique site that slopes almost 18 feet diagonally and 7 feet between Water Street and the mall through what we are calling the gallery. Those spaces will be ADA accessible and the gallery space is key to this design. Halprin talked a lot about connections in his writings. It also gives us the opportunity to take 218 East Main Street, and use that as its current retail purpose, and then add some new program along that edge. There will also be a courtyard space that will be connected to the front of the buildings and the terraces. The front door has moved to the mall and at the bottom of the gallery. We will have additional secondary egresses at the top of the gallery and at 473, at the top. There is an auditorium piece there. The idea behind the massing centers around making an internal transparent lobby space that is open. There will be retail and café and maybe a bar. That piece is rendered abstractly in these drawings, and we would like that to be transparent. The primary thing we are doing is start low and step up to an intermediate height at the corner of water, and step up to full height at the theater. There we will have the garage and service entrance. The potential development next door will have a similar height. We like the stepping scheme because it helps us to be sensitive to the street and gives us a lot of terrace spaces. The very top is actually the mechanical appurtenance. The roof below that is almost exactly the height of water house. Before we go further with the design we want to see if we have general support for the massing strategy.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Mohr: This first floor lobby for the auditorium is how tall?

Wolf: 11 feet. At that level you come in at the top of the auditorium space. We will have co-working space at that level which will comingle with lobby functions. All of those things are about animating that level. Floor to floor we have 13 feet. And this level fluctuates between 15 and 13 feet

Gastinger: Could you talk a little bit more about the acute angles and how you are going to approach those as far as materials

Wolf: That is something we are working on with the façade. It is a big building, and we are trying hard to control the mass so that it doesn't feel big. We are sensitive to the façade and what materials can quickly turn. The skin is going to be a lot about performance and aesthetics. We don't want it to look monolithic. It is hard to just look at the massing diagrams. We want to articulate it and make it interesting without looking like a lot of different volumes

Clayborne: Are you building right to the street on Water Street or are you all looking to help with street improvements on that street?

Wolf: Zoning codes say we have to build right up to the property line. That being said we have odd geometries on the site and I think that we might try to development some zones where we can bring the glass down but not right to the walking surface so that there are more shadows and places for plantings. I see the potential to develop something on that edge. Where we really want to make an impact is looking at the space between us and the Omni and how that will work. We have looked at what is proposed for it right now, I think there is an opportunity here; it could be an interesting place with a stronger connection between the mall and the West Main Streetscape. It will also be a great place to memorialize the story of Vinegar Hill. I see that plus the gallery space as a place for public gestures. I see that as a great moment where the site can improve the connectivity and experience of the mall.

Mohr: Is this open during the day, the gallery and garage door location?

Wolf: Yes, that is happening directly behind the Carytown Tobacco Building.

Balut: Why did you open up the alley, you had it covered before.

Wolf: It was about letting those two pieces stand as the bookends to that gallery space. I think it does help lighten it up. We had explored light wells. This is the piece that is most fluid right now. Realistically, we are showing it thirty feet off the property line, but we could get closer and still have window openings. So we have wiggle room. It is intentionally remaining secondary to the big spiral. Pushing that back was more respectful to the Carytown building.

#### Comments from the Public:

No questions from the public.

#### Comments from the Board:

Mohr: The general massing makes a lot of sense to me. I like the idea of the courtyard. The gallery is hard to discern how that final space is going to feel. I wonder how well you can sense it from Water Street; I like the idea of it being open or with a glass ceiling. The light seems like the most critical gesture in relation to the courtyard. The stepping makes sense. I would go for the higher ceiling height on the southwest elevation  
Schwarz: That elevation is extremely important as the gateway to the mall. I am concerned that the co-working space will end up being a big wall of office space. I have been waiting for someone to put an arcade in Charlottesville; it reminds me of something you would find in Europe. I like the idea that it is kind of hidden from one side; it has a lot of promise.

Wolf: We are here to make sure that we understand the general massing of the site, and how it is responding to the height of structures around it.

Mohr: I think being able to see that gallery from both sides is really critical. I think it works really well, and it'll be a key part of this.

Wolf: One of the things we like is that you can see right through the building, not just in from all sides, this will be really important. The building is kind of levitating. And if it's active you can see all these different landscapes of uses. When we moved the lobby we moved the double height space

Balut: I like the massing and I think it is sensitive and interesting to the scale of the places around it. I really like the terraces and courtyard. I agree with Tim that you opened up the gallery more, and appreciate the entrance from water. I think the more open that is the more inviting and public it will be. If the intent is to be open to the public, then being open to the sky will help that. I think it makes sense and having fun with ideas.

Mohr: Should it be celebrated on Water Street more because it is unusual?

Balut: I think shifting that line over with the building set back would help the public as well. The massing looks great from the bird's eye view. But it does look intimidating from the ground. It is so big that I think it

can stand to be more than one volume. I know it is just massing, but I would like to emphasize that fact that those are long facades.

Wolf: The steps in the massing might provide opportunities to break the skin and break it up into more bite sized pieces.

Schwarz: Did you ever investigate pushing the height towards the southwest, where the Waterhouse parking lot is. That would then celebrate the point of the massing

Wolf: That is the other scheme, stepping up the hill to a point. It put the height at the highest point and then it felt very tall, and made a tower at that point. Among the team there is still favor for that strategy but we landed here to make a more medium sized building.

Gastinger: I like the horizontality of the building. I am excited for the development and think the stepping works well. The points of level four and five don't have a strong relationship to the facades below them. The garage feels odd the way it steps forward. It takes a notch out of the façade. It is prominent which is disappointing. A couple other comments, the roofs seem to be spaces you want occupiable. Make sure to be generous with volumes for plantings. It can't be overstated how important this gallery is going to be for the city. I have seen smaller versions of these. It needs to be designed well, and be generous with the public space. It should feel more like the street than a lobby. It could easily become a sea of handrails. I have also see alleys that have retail use that bring life to it. Maybe that commercial space has an architectural home. It seems more like an add-on element here.

Wolf: One idea is that it might be populated with versions of Marco and Lucas and maybe you have plug and play small retail to activate that space. Right now the ramp in there is a placeholder. It has to be accessible. The direction to us is to create a building where people overlap and cross paths and have informal interaction. Letting public circulation push through the building is part of that.

Gastinger: One of the differences between being on the street and in a building is the levelness of the ground. Not everything has to be flat or it will look like an atrium.

Miller: It would be interesting if the back of Carytown read as part of that building with the garage doors. Overall, I think the massing is perfectly appropriate.

Earnst: We have a lot of trouble separating material from massing, but the stepping is in good hands. You should continue to refine the gallery and the southwest corner, because those are the most important elements from our perspective.

Motion: Since this is a preliminary discussion there is no suggested motion. Some comments are:

- The idea of the arcade/gallery is the key part of this whole design concept; the BAR wants this to be welcoming to all pedestrians, not just the building users. Open it up more to the sky; celebrate it more on Water Street.
- Go for higher in lobby area – it looks squished
- The massing is sensitive to the proportion of the mall, Water Street, and the walkway into the mall
- The garage feels a little out of place with how it sticks out from the façade, look at different options
- Make sure to take into account soil volumes that will be needed on the terraces if they are going to green occupiable spaces. Also, keep the heights in mind when you are designing those spaces.
- Keep in mind how the building's façade is going to be articulated when designing this massive structure (i.e. breaking up the façade)
- The BAR is very supportive of the massing submitted at the meeting, and they are grateful the applicant is looking at building it by-right
- Complete discussion at :

[http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://charlottesville.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

D. Adjournment 9:45