

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
April 18, 2023 – 5:00 PM
Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Space & virtual via Zoom)**



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

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

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

Pre-Meeting:

The Pre-Meeting was held in the small conference room behind the main conference room in City Space.

Staff notified the BAR that they could be meeting back in City Hall Chambers for the month of May. A decision will be made before the next meeting.

Mr. Birle had a question about the setback on the Downtown Mall. Staff went over the process of the SUP Recommendation. Staff did receive emails and comments in opposition of the project.

Staff did remind the BAR that the rezoning is coming along. The rezoning will most likely should be done by mid-summer according to staff. There was discussion by the BAR and staff regarding the rezoning effect on the guidelines. There was also discussion surrounding IPP and the Stadium Road appeal to City Council.

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Public Comments from the Public

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

1. Meeting Minutes – November 15, 2022; December 20, 2022; January 18, 2023, and February 23, 2023

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 23-04-03

800 East Market Street (Key Rec Center), Tax Parcel 530160000

Downtown ADC District

Owner/Applicant: City of Charlottesville Public Works

Project: Install metal gate at dumpster enclosure

3. SUP Recommendation

BAR 23-04-02

218 West Market Street, Tax Parcel 330276000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Market Street Promenade, LLC, Owner

Applicant: Heirloom Real Estate Holdings LLC,

Applicant Request: Modify height setback. (In lieu of 25-ft setback at 45-ft height: Old Preston Ave allow 5-ft setback at 45-ft height; W. Market St allow 10-ft setback at 45-ft height.)

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 23-03-02 (deferred from March 21, 2023)

506 Park Street, TMP 530123000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Presbyterian Church Ch'ville Trust

Applicant: Todd Shallenberger, Waterstreet Studio

Project: Landscaping: Memorial Garden and Tree Planting Plan

Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the Consent Agenda – Second by Mr. Zehmer – Motion passes 6-0.

C. Deferred Items

(See BAR 23-03092 on Consent Agenda)

D. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 23-04-01

810 West Main Street, TMP 300002000

West Main Street ADC District

Owner: Union Station Partners LLC

Applicant: Kurt Keesecker / brw architects

Project: Roof Canopy Addition

Jeff Werner, Staff Report –

Background Year Built: 1885 District: West Main Street ADC District Status: Contributing

810 West Main Street was built in 1885. The baggage room was doubled in size in 1905. The station was remodeled in 1913-1918. (historic survey attached). Significance: Three railways joined together to build this depot at the junction of their lines. The baggage rooms were remodeled in 1997 for the current Amtrak Station. The former Union Station was remodeled in 2000 for a restaurant.

CoA request for the construction of a new roof canopy at the front (north) elevation.

From the applicant's submittal:

Addition of permanent (not temporary) Roof Canopy over existing outdoor dining area.

E. Height & Width

- We believe the height and width of the addition are respectful of the Historic Structure by being lower than the original building.

F. Scale

- Similar to the existing building, the new addition incorporates some building characteristics, like vertical proportions and eave line, that help building scale relate to the human scale. The shape of the roof canopy is the primarily viewed as a single slope, used to direct water to the trackside façade.

G. Roof

- Roof Forms and Pitches / we've provided a single slope structure with approx. ¼" :12 slope to the trackside facade
- Roof Materials / we're suggesting a polycarbonate translucent panel system similar to system used at former Little Star restaurant on West Main
- Rooftop Screening / The roof form is perceived as a simple and flat shape. All lighting, fans, and space heaters will be suspected below the new roof canopy area. There will be no mechanical equipment on top of the new roof canopy.
- The new roof materials will be translucent polycarbonate system on the painted steel superstructure. We have included moment connections at the beams and columns to eliminate diagonal lateral bracing (which we believe would adversely affect the aesthetic of the new roof and diminish views from the dining area to the surrounding buildings and mountains.) diminish views from the dining area to the surrounding buildings and mountains.)

H. Orientation

- The new addition does not provide a new point of entry to the facility, so the Station entrance and primary façade are respected and maintained.

I. Windows & Doors

- Our design for addition does not include 'windows' or 'doors' but we've provided a new exit stair for the addition accomplishing the code requirements exit separation.
- The existing windows in the existing building will remain and will not be altered.

J. Porches

- Our design for addition does not include traditional 'porches'.

K. Street-Level Design

- Our work area is one level above street level, so views of the new roof canopy will be from below. We have arranged the new lights, fans, heaters to follow the regular structural pattern of the steel support to reduce visual clutter when viewed from below. Our new work does not affect the street level facade of the existing building.

L. Foundation & Cornice

- Our design for roof addition does not include foundation as we are building over the existing building. Our new cornice will not match the historic details, but instead will have a minimal roof system edge with translucent panels and framing system only.

M. Materials & Textures

- The New Roof Canopy addition will have two primary visible materials
- 1) Steel support structure, bronze color (painted - southern vine 2138-10)
- 2) Hercules System, translucent polycarbonate (UV protected).
- Some elements contained in the intervention area like the existing metal guard rail & relocated steel stairs will have the same finish as metal structure (painted - southern vine 2138-10).

N. Paint

- Steel structure will be bronze color (painted - southern vine 2138-10). Paint at the existing building (if any) will not be disturbed unless attachment of new materials require it. In these limited areas, any painted brick will be painting to match adjacent.

O. Details & Decorations

- The details and decorations for the new structure are minimized, with emphasis on the new steel structure providing the visual character. Moment connections will be welded and smoothed, with a paint finish (no visible bolts.)

1. Locates the addition above the existing (currently uncovered) roof dining area. We will not increase the footprint of the existing building.
2. Set the additional roof height/massing is below the cornice lines of the historic structure and minimizes visual impact with thin profile at edges and separation from parapet walls below by supporting new canopy on limited number of columns.
3. Does not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property
4. New work is differentiated from the old and the massing/size/scale is compatible with the adjacent historic building.
5. The new work/addition is not an exact copy of the original
6. We believe by location and massing the new addition will be complimentary to the overall building massing, our deference to the historic structure is demonstrated in the selection of color and limited (only essential) structural components.
7. Our material palette for the new building is limited and ‘simple’ providing a unified aesthetic for the addition. The exterior materials palette includes painted steel structure & white translucent polycarbonate roof panels.

Discussion and Recommendation

The structure currently contributes to the West Main Street district and has a long history of association with the railroads. The BAR should discuss how the façade changes relate to the original building. The structure has been modified over the years, adapting this former train station to a restaurant. While the proposed canopy is aesthetically consistent with the current expression of the building’s architecture, it is still an addition onto the historic façade. Staff supports the design and intent, but recommends the new canopy be constructed in a manner that separates it from the existing building. The north and south façade of canopy addition respects the setback line established by the historic building without competing with the general massing and height of the existing structure. The BAR should discuss the plan to adjust the location of the existing egress stair with repairs to the existing opening in the parapet and the proposed new opening. BAR should also discuss the how the canopy addition will adjoin to the existing structure.

No exterior lighting is indicated; however, the BAR may apply conditions to address future lighting, if planned.

Kurt Keesecker, Applicant – I am happy to present our design ideas for the addition for a roof canopy over an existing dining deck at the train station. This was an outdoor dining space that had been informally covered with a variety of either wood or tent-like structures haphazardly in the past. The building owner has decided to make that covering more permanent to essentially enliven and extend the season at that future restaurant use. It could aminate that urban space. Our response to that request is to do a couple of things. There were some limitations working with the existing building that we had to think about. We obviously wanted to follow the Guidelines and make the new roof canopy different from the historic architecture. We are using exposed steel that is painted and a polycarbonate panel system very similar to the one that is on Little Star on West Main. The material choices were related to simplicity and an expression of that in the industrial utilitarian setting. We decided to align the columns. The placement of the vertical columns is determined by a series of columns that are actually on the lower level that were added some time ago when the floor of this roof area was rebuilt and made more solid. We had asked if we could try to avoid x-bracing on this roof canopy structure. To do that, we needed to align our new columns with the columns that are down below so they will go into the foundation. We’re going to use monet frames or momet connections at the beams and columns

to make rigid connections. That holds well for the 3 column locations. I should note that our new columns go behind the existing parapet walls. There is no structural interruption there on the exterior of the façade. Our connection that staff had mentioned in the report to the existing building is a connection that allows us to get some stability to the roof structure. That connections need to occur where the framing for that mechanical area is located. The framing for the mechanical area is a new addition to the original cargo area. Our structure aligns with the framing. The parapet goes up from that to conceal the existing mechanical that is not part of our space. That mechanical area is existing. We have slightly sloped the canopy. It is higher on the parking lot side of the building. It looks slightly lower on the rear track (east-west track). We did suggest moving the stair for a couple of reasons. The existing stair location is technically too close to the other exit, backend of the building. They count as a second means of egress. To have a second means of egress, it is better to have that stair further away from the other door. There is a little wedge space between this building and an off-property CSX owned utilitarian building. We thought it would be a nice place to sneak that stair in. We can then open up the rear façade toward the tracks. The rear façade has a big fume hood existing piece of equipment that is there and some other mechanicals. I am not going to claim that façade is historic or beautiful. The existing stair location covers up the door and an archway. We think by moving the stair to this blank end of the building, it will be more suitable. It is hard to tell from our renderings. It might be hard to tell from our photos. This entire part of the building is painted existing brick. We think with the repair to the existing canopy, we can use some of the railing, moving the pieces. The coping piece and the railing that was original to the buildout, take from where we want the opening and bring it back and repaint to match. The only other thing that is notable is that we have our lights, some fans, and some heaters to extend the seasons into the shoulders under the canopy. What we're trying to do is not make that a cluttered mess of electrical conduit.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Birle – You're moving the existing stair. That's not the primary stair to get upstairs.

Mr. Keesecker – There is an interior stair that leads to dining space inside on the second level. It is the secondary exit.

Mr. Birle – Doesn't it need a landing?

Mr. Keesecker – It does have a landing at the top. At the bottom, it will connect to the sidewalk in the rear area. I think it is OK. We had planned on moving it. I think it conforms now. It is a little deceiving how tall it is. The parapet wall is taller.

Mr. Whitney – With the purlins that are going to have the conduit running through it, those are steel tubes.

Mr. Keesecker – I am thinking of using two angles that will be able to change. That's how we're going to be able to get this slope on the roof. We're building in a little bit of adjustment. They will slide up and down. That will let us make the holes where we want to make them. They're only there to support that polycarbonate panel that needs support about every 2 feet to 30/32 inches. They're not structurally significant. I think we can pull that off.

Mr. Gastinger – That's a translucent?

Mr. Keesecker – It is a translucent panel. It is exactly the same material as used on The Little Star building. It will let light in. It is not clear.

Mr. Gastinger – It is diffuse. Is it white?

Mr. Keesecker – It is white. It will hopefully have a little glow in the evenings when we turn the lights on. It is hoped that it will provide a little bit of shade just like the one on West Main in the summer months. That's been part of the problem.

Mr. Gastinger – I just wanted to clarify something about the slope to make sure I am reading the drawings correctly. It reads to me like the roof edge on the north façade as level and on the south façade as level. It is sloping evenly towards the tracks.

Mr. Keesecker – That's correct. It is at a very low slope. It is around a half inch per foot.

Mr. Gastinger – The only other question I had was about the lighting. This was a point of discussion with Little Star. Initially, they proposed some lighting that was LED and full color range. I wanted to understand a little more about the lighting intentions. I don't know if there is any lighting in terms of the kind of light. A white surface like this could turn into quite a feature.

Mr. Keesecker – We haven't specified the lights exactly. We know they are probably going to be linear. They will be LEDs. We are going to do full cutoffs that have all of the light go down. By glow, it's probably off the reflected light from the tables that are below. We're not going to shine light towards the roof canopy from underneath.

Mr. Whitney – Is there any opportunity to relocate some of the mechanical units that are on the north side adjacent to where you're moving the stair to?

Mr. Keesecker – All of those serve in the tenant space. It is now unoccupied. There is no fit out plans specifically for the future restaurant use depending how they need their service to be provided in the future. I think we would have to come back to the BAR for that. The sequence of events for the owner was to try to create an amenity space that would help attract attention to the restaurant space and have the restaurant go through a series of approvals as needed. There are some things that exist in front of this building (concealing fence around one of the doors) attached to this building. Once they decide what their final approval improvement plan is, I think they probably have to revisit it. We haven't gone that far yet because that is still unknown.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – It seems to fit perfectly with our guidelines. It looks like it will be a nice project.

Mr. Birle – This is a nice, quiet insertion here

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed patio canopy at 810 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other**

properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- **Lighting will be Full cut-off. Lamping will be dimmable, have a Color Temperature not exceeding 3000K, and Color Rendering Index not less than 80, preferably not less than 90.**
- Mr. Bailey with the second. Motion passes 6-0.

E. Other Business

6. Informal discussion

- There was discussion on turf grass on the front yard of a fraternity house on Rugby Avenue.
- Members of the BAR did not like the idea of turf grass on the front yard of the fraternity house on Rugby Avenue.

7. Staff questions/discussion

- DT Mall NRHP update – April 19 meeting – Meeting on the 19th was postponed to a later date. The first meetings of the Downtown Mall Committee have been held. The first two meeting have been about getting a historical background of the Mall
- Letter of support for CLG Grant requests: • *GPR Survey and Archeological Assessment of McKee Block*
- *In-Depth Analysis of Ceramic, Faunal, and Personal Item Artifacts Recovered at the Swan Tavern Archeological Site*

Staff provided an update regarding the excavation taking place at the Levy Building site.

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – I move that the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review allow the Chair to sign a letter of support for CLG grant requests for the GPR Survey and Archeological Assessment of McKee Block and an in-depth analysis of ceramic, faunal, and personal item artifacts recovered at the Swan Tavern Archeological Site. Second by Mr. Birle. Motion passes 7-0.

8. Informal discussions:

- BAR training
- Term expirations
- Board composition
- Minor reviews/approvals

There was a discussion regarding the zoning rewrite and the role of the Board of Architectural Review with the new zoning.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:13 PM.