

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
March 21, 2023 – 5:00 PM
Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Space & virtual via Zoom)**



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

Members Present: Tyler Whitney, James Zehmer, Carl Schwarz, Kevin Badke, Roger Birle, Breck Gastinger, David Timmerman, Ron Bailey

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Mollie Murphy, Remy Trail, Jeff Werner

Pre-Meeting:

316 First Street North application was removed from the agenda. Kevin Badke was welcomed to his first BAR meeting.

There was discussion regarding the proposed Hotel on West Main Street.

Staff went over those items on the Consent Agenda and Regular Agenda. Members of the BAR asked questions of staff regarding the meeting tonight. Most of the pre-meeting discussion was centered on Madison Lane. Members of the Board had concerns regarding the condition of the roof and replacing the roof.

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

The Chair welcomed Kevin Badke to the BAR.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Public Comments

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

1. Meeting Minutes – May 17, 2022
2. Review of action notes for July 19, 2022; August 16, 2022; September 20, 2022; October 18, 2022; November 15, 2022; December 20, 2022
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR-23-03-01

204 Hartman's Mill Road, TMP 260038000
Individually Protected Property
Owner: Jocelyn Johnson and William Hunt
Applicant: Bridget Ridenour / Alloy Workshop
Project: Addition and exterior alterations

Motion to Approve Consent Agenda – Mr. Bailey – Second by Mr. Zehmer – Motion passes 6-0 with 2 abstentions.

C. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 23-03-02
506 Park Street, TMP 530123000
North Downtown ADC District
Owner: Presbyterian Church Ch'ville Trust
Applicant: Todd Shallenberger, Waterstreet Studio
Project: Landscaping

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Background

Year Built: 1954 (Fellowship Hall 8th Street constructed in 1986) District: North Downtown ADC
District Status: Contributing

CoA request for alterations to memorial garden.

[Edited from applicant's narrative.] Renovation of the memorial garden to provide a more sacrosanct space for events and ceremonies. Bluestone walk will lead from Maple Street and align with existing walk and gathering terrace. (Small entry way at the chapel will be repaved with bluestone.) The paving replicates the cruciform of the granite cross, expressing the cross-axial arrangement with bluestone pavers. The connecting transitions that close the circle will be colored concrete with saw-cut joints in a radial pattern. A low brick wall and piers will match the existing brick wall and mark the southern edge, between the garden and Maple Street. The plantings are structured with 4' tall boxwood hedge forming the space--allowing for privacy and transparency without making opaque green walls. Eight dogwood trees mark each threshold of the axis; four sweetbay magnolias distinguish the two sides. Deciduous shrubs of dwarf fothergilla, winterberry hollies and summersweet contrast with the evergreen hedge. Small 'little missy' boxwoods define the circle and reinforce the bluestone axis. Plantings of perennials, groundcovers, ferns, grasses, and bulbs are intended to provide a predominant white flowering garden with different forms, textures, and four-season interest.

Discussion

Staff finds the proposed landscaping plan is consistent with the design guidelines and recommends approval; however, the BAR should discuss the recent removal of two large trees and resolve with the owner/applicant what is planned for the site's tree coverage. Note: During discussion in 2020 and 2021 regarding proposed alterations, the BAR expressed specific concerns regarding the tree coverage—see links below. (Refer to images in the Appendix.) In front of the chapel and south of the sanctuary, a large tree near Maple Street was recently removed and a 28" tree near the sanctuary (noted on the July 2020 submittal) has also been removed. Neither reviewed by the BAR.

Additionally (see maps in the Appendix), on this lot prior to construction of the church was a 19th century, two-story brick house. Of historic note, General Philip Sheridan established his headquarters in this house during the Union Army's brief occupation of Charlottesville, from March 3 to March 5 or 6, 1865. Sheridan's cavalry camped further north along Park Street. The arguably more infamous

General George Custer established his headquarters at *The Farm* (1202 East Jefferson Street). No evidence suggests the memorial garden area is archeologically significant; however, the applicant should be mindful of the site's history and encouraged to treat appropriately any evidence revealed during excavations.

Todd Shallenberger, Applicant – I wasn't part of the decision to remove the nine trees in the last 3 years. I understand that the city arborist did conclude that those trees were in decline and towards the end of their life. I did speak with David Forney (Pastor of the Church). They do plan on planting upwards of 19 new trees in the coming years. Those 10 trees are proposed for the Memorial. We are making a renovation to an existing memorial garden. We're changing the pavement and the planting. We're helping define the space better using boxwoods that are about 4 feet high as a framework and border to help define the space we use for ceremonies and events. It is basically a small gathering space. We're trying to make all of the planting relate to the Church and be a white flowering garden. We're proposing dogwood trees because the sepals of the dogwood are in the form of a cruciform. The pavement that we're adding is bluestone and concrete. We want to emulate an existing cross that will be preserved in the center of the garden. We plan to use deciduous shrubs to help play off the boxwood hedges. We have 4 magnolia trees that are going to be in the corners of the garden. Originally, we wanted something taller but there is an existing overhead line that parallels Maple Street. We're trying to keep the trees in scale to Maple Street and keep them more gardenlike. In the future, that doesn't prevent a larger tree along Park Street to help define the street in a more urban way.

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. Timmerman recused himself from this application due to wife working at Waterstreet Studio and the firm is working on the Church.

Mr. Gastinger – I don't have any comment or critique of the garden as designed. It is a beautiful addition to that landscape and fully within our guidelines and all of the direction that our guidelines give, especially related to use of native plants and pedestrian scale. It will be a beautiful addition. The reason why this is not on the Consent Agenda is to take a moment to note that the significant loss of canopy trees on this property has made an impact on this district. Whether it can happen within the bounds of this project, there is a real need for considering canopy trees of scale to give back to the city. I am happy to hear that there might be a coordinated plan. That is even better than one offs here or there. I would invite First Presbyterian to let us know how that unfolds. It is something that we should be involved in and help facilitate. I don't think it will be arduous. It can be easy. It is important to know while this project is up.

Mr. Schwarz – I was a little confused. I saw staff's marks where the trees have come down. I was shown something on streetview where they have taken trees down further north on the site. Did the city approve that?

Mr. Werner – There are two trees that I saw. There is the large tree along Maple. Facing Park Street from the chapel/fellowship hall, there was a 24 inch tree in the prior reviews that was supposed to stay. There is something new there. It hadn't been reviewed by you. I remember how much concern and questions there were back in 2020 about tree coverage.

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Gastinger was pointing out a tree that is just north of their entrance drive on Park Street. I think that we do need to see a plan, not just invite them to bring it in. We need to see replacements. For the trees that have come down, we definitely need to see replacements. We should be seeing a plan of what they are going to put back. If there is some discussion about not having trees under the power lines, that is fine. It is a very big property. They can pull some large shade trees further away from the power lines if they had to.

Mr. Werner – One of the questions: What if any are required relative to the site plan? With that in mind, it sounds like a deferral is in order with some clear direction of what it is that you all would like to see. You can express in the deferral where you stand with the Memorial Garden not as an approval. The COA applies to the property/parcel. We're talking about this whole parcel. There are trees that are going to be planted. You would like to see them. Request that drawing as part of this request and bundle it together. You have the right to defer something on your own at its first discussion in front of the BAR.

Mr. Schwarz – Are they planting this spring?

Mr. Shallenberger – I am not sure. I do know that the Church is committed to being good partners of North Downtown and providing trees along Park Street. That is an important entrance corridor. What is interesting with the First Presbyterian setback off the street is that it does lend itself to a strategy where you can have sizeable trees adjacent to the street. Not all business owners along Park Street where some of the buildings, houses are close to the street allow that to happen. On this site and given the fact that some sizeable trees have already been lost, it would be nice to think holistically about that edge.

Mr. Schwarz – The language is not one of mistrust but more of procedure. We are covering our bases. We should see these.

Mr. Gastinger – You mentioned a specific number of trees. Do you know if there is a plan already in the works?

Mr. Shallenberger – It is in the plan for the works.

Mr. Birle – Did the BAR approve the removal of those trees in the first place?

Mr. Werner – Not the 24 inch deciduous on the prior review. If a tree is dangerous, we do allow its removal. The 24 inch tree was removed. Something was planted in its place. I don't know what it was. I can't address the north side. As far as additional trees or planned trees, you can request a plan. That is reasonable. I know that there are some tree cover requirements for properties.

Mr. Gastinger – Given the recent loss of really significant trees and a plan is in the works, it would be both expedient for the congregation and from our point of view better to consider the site plan as a whole and see if the applicant would be willing to ask for a deferral so that they can come back with a tree planting diagram of how the congregation is planning on moving forward in that regard.

Mr. Shallenberger – The Church wants to start building this in the summer and have planting for the garden in the fall.

Mr. Schwarz – We are either going to defer it and you have to come back next month or you can ask for a deferral and you come back when you're ready.

Mr. Bailey – I am curious if we can do this motion with the following conditions. We can approve the Memorial Garden subject to a planting plan being presented and approved by the Board. Is that a possibility?

Mr. Gastinger – From what I can tell, that is not a condition we would be able to make. Sometimes we ask for things to be filed for record and that can happen. It is not subject to an additional approval from us.

Mr. Werner – It sounds like you want to see a plan that indicates what has been planted new, how it might differ from the prior review, and what the plans are for appropriately sized trees elsewhere on the property so that we have some record of that. That is a relatively simple request.

Mr. Gastinger – It would be nice if that plan could include the trees that have been removed in the last year.

Mr. Werner – I will follow up on anything that is necessary. It is a relative formality with the site plan. That is reasonable. You (BAR) get to defer regardless. The applicant certainly come back next month with this. Given the calendar that they talked about, it fits within their calendar. You haven't indicated in any way the BAR is opposed to the memorial garden. It is about trying to document, know what trees have changed, and what trees are proposed. Are there any recommendations? Is there anything you would prefer to see at this site?

Mr. Gastinger – The comment has been made about canopy trees of scale. The trees that are included in the memorial garden are perfectly suited for that use. They are smaller statured and not contribute to the character of the district in the way that those large canopy trees have in the past.

Mr. Shallenberger – asked for a deferral – Mr. Schwarz moves to accept deferral – The BAR would like to see tree plan for the site. That includes trees that have been removed and those trees that you are proposing to put back in their place with a preference for canopy trees – Second by Mr. Bailey – Motion passes 7-0 with one abstention. (Mr. Timmerman)

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 23-03-04

130 Madison Lane, TMP 090138000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: St Elmo Club of UVA INC

Applicant: Kevin Schafer

Project: Rehabilitation

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background

Year Built: ca. 1912 *District:* The Corner ADC District *Status:* Contributing

St. Elmo Hall, constructed for the Delta Phi fraternity, is a Georgian Revival, brick fraternity house with four Doric columns supporting a flat portico roof. Except for the railings on the portico roof and

main roof, the exterior remains generally unaltered since construction. The National Register nomination for Rugby Road-University Corner Historic District (104-0133) identifies this as one of UVa's earliest fraternity houses.

Request CoA to install faux slate, reconstruct the roof railing, and renovate to the rear/side patio.

Roof:

- Replace deteriorating slate shingles with synthetic slate.
- Remove 1980's metal railing along top of roof; reconstruct wood railing to match original.
- Repair "crow's nest" roof, remove vents no longer in use.
- Replace copper flashing.

Patio:

- Remove existing trex decking.
- Reinforce deck framing.
- Weatherproof basement ceiling to prevent further water infiltration.
- Install trex decking above new waterproofing and sleeper system.

Discussion and Recommendations

Regarding the patio work and roof railing.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Regarding the slate roof.

In 2008, sections of slate roofing were replaced with faux-slate. There is no BAR record of a review; however, in the BAR archive is a roof plan (dated February 2008, see the Appendix) indicating planned replacement of *cracked, broken, and missing slate shingles*. It's possible the roof work was approved as part of the broader submittal, but not noted in the staff report, which was focused on the new work at the patio.

The BAR has approved replacing slate with faux-slate; however, staff suggests discussing whether replacement of all the slate is warranted. Buckingham slate, when properly maintained, can last 150 years or more. [Note: The longevity of Buckingham slate was cited in the BAR's recent denial of a request to remove portions of the slate roof at FUMC, constructed in 1923.] Typically, the nails holding the shingles fail long before the slate requires replacement. In fact, it is likely the shingle replacement in 2008 was necessary more due to activity on the roof than to the age and weathering. Additionally: (Images below from the applicant's submittal. **See Appendix - 3/15/2023 e-mail re: roof questions.**)

- 1) The existing slate has mitered hips. Applicant is proposing a hip cap. The BAR should determine if that detail should be retained or allow cap. (Staff recommends a cap is preferable, relative to mitigating leaks.)
- 2) The existing slate include *splits* worked in between whole shingles. Staff believes the roof dates to the 1916 construction; however, because there is no apparent decorative pattern, might this suggest the *original* slate was salvaged material, not new?

Kevin Schafer, Applicant –

Next Slide

The primary goals of the proposal in front of you this evening is to address some deferred maintenance items to ensure water tightness, longevity of the structure, and to restore the historic railing or recreate the historic railing at the crow's nest at the top of the structure. This slide identifies the areas of the proposed work and the DE terminology of the crow's nest for this presentation.

Next Slide

The membrane on the crow's nest is beyond its lifespan and in need of replacement. Though this isn't visible from the public right of way, this does give us the opportunity to take advantage of restoring

this historic railing. The original railing on the crow's nest, at some point, has been removed and replaced with a welded metal railing. It is not historic or appropriate. Because we understand the importance of replicating a historic element not through conjecture, I want to talk about our process recreating the historic railing.

Next Slide

The existing building was scanned with a 3D point cloud scanner inside and outside for an accurate understanding of the existing conditions and a digital record of the structure. We next modeled the historic structure off the point cloud to ensure confidence in our digital replication of this existing structure. With this 3D model created digitally, we were able to align our model and some found historic imagery at the same angle and perspective.

Next Slide

These historic photos are high quality scans of the original negatives that were found in UVA's Holsinger Collection. They were taken in March, 1919 and sometime in 1924. From this photo and model alignment, we are able to produce an accurate replication of the original railing, again confident in our analysis on proportion, sizing of the railing members, and specific motifs found on this original architectural element.

Next Slide

It is important to note that this area is not an occupiable space. This railing is not required to meet building code standards for the guardrail. It is lower than what the guardrail requirements would be for today. Because this is an unoccupiable space, this is simply an architectural element. We have no concerns about meeting the building code requirements.

Next Slide

The restoration or replication that we're proposing will be done using a quoia wood, which is a pine species from The Netherlands. It has undergone a modification process that turns the pine into an exceptional stable wood. This product has been used at UVA in restorations of railings on The Lawn. It was recommended to us for this application, which will be exposed on the crow's nest of the roof. We will be specifying stainless steel screws for fasteners. We aim to ensure high quality painting on a routine maintenance schedule. The goal here is to ensure a high quality railing restoration or replication that will look good for the foreseeable future.

Next Slide

Regarding the slate roof and understanding that this might be the subject of the most scrutiny, I do want to convey to the Board that St. Elmo's Hall has carefully and deliberately considered the state of the roof before making this request. After extensive review and consultation with roof subcontractors, architects, historians, the owner feel replacing with a synthetic slate is the best path forward to ensure the longevity of this structure. The slate, as noted by staff, is in poor condition. It has been subject to wear and tear over the past 115 years that has been more intense than what a normal slate roof would undergo. As mentioned in the staff report, there are irregularities in the tiles. There are odd tiles shapes. There is random placement of tiles, perhaps lending to staff's theory that this could potentially be a salvaged roof upon original installation.

Next Slide

In an effort to better understand the existing conditions and study the roof more carefully, we did do the aerial drone footage to try and get some detailed shots and evaluate each façade carefully. These images show broken and cracked slate tiles that are prominent on all sides of the roof.

Next Slide

Particularly concerning from my perspective is the patchwork the project has already undergone. This large portion on the western façade is out of synthetic slate. These are around the troubled areas where the slate has undergone more wear and tear, as students have traversed to the crow's nest over the years. That's why you are seeing the synthetic slate replacement in this location done in 2008.

Next Slide

What we see on all sides is some form of patching, particularly around the typical troubled areas you might find on the roof valleys, cricked chimneys, and around the dormers have all been patched in some way. There isn't a single façade/side of the roof that hasn't had some sort of patching issue with it.

Next Slide

It has been noted in several areas of the ceiling in the upper floor have had to be re-plastered and repainted as water infiltration has occurred over the years. The current St. Elmo President noted moisture continues to appear through the paint in some areas. There is very limited attic access in this third floor. Finding specific leak locations is particularly challenging. The fear from the St. Elmo organization is that the continued deterioration of the roof will lead to rot within the structural elements. A roof replacement will become much more invasive and extensive.

Next Slide

It is important to note that in order to restore the slate and ensure the water tightness on the roof, we did attempt to source Buckingham slate. Buckingham slate is currently not available for roof tiles. The current deposit is "better suited for the production of flagstone, decorative stone, and hardscape products." That presents another logistical challenge in sourcing Buckingham slate at this time.

Next Slide

We know that there are challenges with this synthetic slate, mainly around the trimmed details staff has identified. Because of the hollowed core of synthetic slate, a minor hipped corner becomes very challenging if not impossible. The existing house does have that minor hipped corner. It has also been identified as an area of concern. It has also been identified by city staff as an area to potentially be rectified for leaks in the future. We are suggesting that hipped ridge tile as staff mentioned. We are open to the Board for guidance on the preferred hipped detail. With the synthetic slate, there are two options: the hipped ridge tile or we can have exposed metal flashing. We are proposing all copper flashing, particularly around the crow's nest. There is some exposed copper there. It could be a design solution to have an exposed copper hipped ridge on all four sides.

Next Slide

We are aware that the Board reviews each application individually. A solution that has precedent on adjacent structures in this Madison Lane ADC District is the implementation of this high quality synthetic slate, including at 123 Chancellor Street and 167 Chancellor Street. When you consider the application individually, the poor condition of the existing slate, the recent water infiltration, and the previously performed patchwork with synthetic slate, all of this makes this individual application more logical and appropriate from my perspective.

Next Slide

At the rear deck, these images show our selective demolition we did at the rear deck. The sleepers have rotted here. The rigid insulation has compressed and the drainage plain is full of debris. We intend to restore the deck and ensure water tightness there. It should be noted that the deck is above a 1984 sub-

grade expansion of the basement and is not part of the original 1916 structure. The deck boards were replaced in 2008.

Next Slide

The final portion of the project is an outdoor kitchen, which is located on the western portion of the exterior patio. The outdoor kitchen is screened by existing dense mature shrubs. It will sit within the existing, non-historic steel railing that bounds the exterior patio. The outdoor kitchen is held off of the historic structure by an amount that allows for debris removal but also allows for safe demolition in case the kitchen is no longer desired in the future.

Next Slide

The goals of this renovation are to promote the replication of this lost architectural element. We think it would be much more in keeping with the historic structure and to address these deferred maintenance items in an effort to preserve and protect this historic structure for the next 100 years. We believe all of the areas of the scope in this proposal are within the ADC Guidelines. We hope that you will take note of the care that our client has gone to faithfully and accurately restore the original railing in a high quality manner. Please note that the client did seriously debate the necessity for the requestment for the slate replacement.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – I want to recognize that this is my fraternity. I was a former member of the board of directors. I am no longer a member of the board of directors. I will not benefit financially in any way from this project. I do not feel that I need to recuse myself from voting or discussion.

Mr. Whitney – The application is to maintain the existing synthetic slate that has been applied rather than replaced?

Mr. Schafer – This will be a holistic replacement and reflashing. There is still reflashing that needs to be done around those existing dormers directly above the portico. The idea is to replace with the cohesive materials so it looks all uniform.

Mr. Whitney – What is the expected lifespan on synthetic slate and tile?

Mr. Schafer – I know they have 20 year warranties.

Mr. Birle – I have a question about gutters and downspouts. Are you replacing those?

Mr. Schafer – The original copper gutters and downspouts are to remain. There is one gutter that has been damaged on the rear exterior patio. It is not in the public right of way view. It is more of a maintenance item than anything else.

Mr. Timmerman – Can you review the options that you have for the eaves?

Mr. Schafer – There are two hipped details that are available in synthetic slate. The first is a hipped cap tile, which is whatever angle you need it to be for the hip that covers that joint of the tiles as they come together. Because of the hollowed core of the synthetic slate tile, you can't cut that edge and

form a minor. It effects the structural stability. That's why we have to look to these alternatives. The other would be an exposed metal flashing cap that goes down that ridge. It would have 'a return' that the tiles would abut into.

Mr. Gastinger – A picture on page 11 that shows an example of a hipped detail doesn't sound like either of those. On page 11, it looks like two tiles that have been 'glued' at the corner rather than a single tile.

Mr. Schafer – I think we have that. I believe we are showing the hipped tile. It is a single tile that has been bent. That layer laps up.

Mr. Zehmer – Is that still sealant?

Mr. Schafer – It is a single piece of synthetic materials.

Mr. Bailey – You're replacing the membrane on the flat portion of the crow's nest?

Mr. Schafer – That is correct and the rigid insulation that provides the pitch for that. We're actually increasing the pitch slightly. The ridge wouldn't be visible from the street. The rigid insulation has been compressed over the years.

Mr. Timmerman – Have you had any discussion about replacing the railing on the porch?

Mr. Schafer – That one wasn't originally there. That was added some time in the 80s.

Mr. Zehmer – I know that it was after 2002. I feel like it was somewhere around 2008. That was the fraternity's 100th anniversary. There was a lot of work done right before that.

It looks like there are two options for the ridge. There is a hipped ridge tile one piece and hipped ridge two piece.

Mr. Gastinger – Do you know which one is your preference?

Mr. Schafer – The original intention was certainly for the one piece, for the water tightness of that detail. We are open to the Board's preference on this. We would prefer the most water tight, appropriate option, which I believe is the one piece.

Mr. Birle – That would definitely be preferable.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – If any slate roof does need to be replaced, this one meets the requirements. It already has synthetic slate up there. It is in our guidelines. In the past, I was bothered when you gave us this for a previous project. The hipped seemed prominent. I am less concerned now. I am happy to approve the whole thing.

Mr. Timmerman – I commend you on the nice replacement of the railing and going the extra mile, doing the research, and doing the facsimile that replaces what was there. It is definitely a huge leap above what is there now. It would be nice to take the front one off above the porch if there has to be railing up there for whatever reason. It would be nice to see the two matching. I understand that it might not be in the scope. Although I don't like synthetic slate, it makes sense in this particular case given the leave times and the need to prioritize protecting the structure of the old house.

Mr. Zehmer – With the sentiment to replace the portico railing with one that matches the crow's nest, we would be in jeopardy of false historicism there. I wouldn't necessarily recommend that. Beyond that I fully support the application.

Mr. Whitney – There is a difference in that functioning as a guardrail.

Mr. Zehmer – There are a couple sections of railing between the front dormer windows that were part of a BAR approval. Somebody on the BAR recommended that we paint those black so they would disappear against the slate. I thought that was a good suggestion. I don't know if painting the portico railing black would make it disappear or if it would mar the appearance of the front of the building.

Mr. Timmerman – That is a good point. It is worth thinking about. What kind of railing would you put up there to replace what is there? It is not a replica of something historic. Is there something better you can replace it with? It might contrast with the overall style. It is not supposed to be like the original house. It still serves the purpose. It seems like it is pretty necessary.

Mr. Gastinger – In addition to the commendation Mr. Timmerman gave about the research that went into this, I want to specifically call out and applaud Design Develop for this application of technology using drone modeling, photo matching as part of that research. It makes for some interesting discoveries and development of new techniques that can help a number of projects in the future.

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City's ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed patio renovations and railing reconstruction at 130 Madison Lane satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this district and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Second by Mr. Schwarz. Motion passes 8-0.

D. Other Business

6. Preliminary Discussion

843 West Main Street, TMP 310175000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Kim Tran Dabney

Applicant: Mitchell-Matthews Architects & Planners

Project: Proposed Hotel

- Staff introduced this preliminary discussion for 843 West Main Street to the Board. Kevin Riddle with Mitchell-Matthews Architects is at the meeting to make a presentation on this preliminary potential project and answer questions from members of the BAR.
- Since this is a preliminary discussion, there will be no action taken during this meeting.
- The applicant made an informative presentation regarding what the applicant/owner of this property is wishing to do on this site.
- The proposed hotel will have around 100 rooms with a parking garage under the building.

- This project is going to be a by right project depending on the zoning rewrite for this area.
- There is going to be future imagery with the façade of the building facing the Westhaven neighborhood.
- The height of the roof is expected to be 68 feet tall.
- The entry drive for the hotel will possibly be a paved entry into the hotel.
- The restaurant is going to be on the ground floor with a large window on the ground floor facing West Main Street.
- The four stories above the ground floor restaurant will be the guest rooms for the hotel.
- At the top level, there is going to be an outdoor space, roof lounge that will overlook West Main Street.
- A courtyard will be open on the east elevation.
- There were no comments or questions from the public.
- Members of the BAR provided suggestions for feedback for improvement and questions for this project on West Main Street.
- Most of the feedback from the members of the BAR was mostly positive for this project.

7. Misc. Discussion

Staff questions/discussion

- DT Mall Fountains Discussion – Café Space Railings around fountains on the Downtown Mall.
The consensus from the BAR was that temporary grates be used instead of railings.
- DT Mall NRHP update

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 PM.