

Agenda

City of Charlottesville

Board of Architectural Review

Regular Meeting *Rescheduled from 2/19/2025

*February 26, 2025 5:30 p.m.

Hybrid Meeting (In-person in Council Chambers and virtual via Zoom)



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review. Staff will introduce each item, followed by the applicant's presentation, which should not exceed ten minutes. The Chair will then ask for questions from the public, followed by questions from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. For each application, members of the public are each allowed three minutes to ask questions and three minutes to offer comments. Speakers shall identify themselves and provide their address. Comments should be limited to the BAR's purview; that is, regarding only the exterior aspects of a project. Following the BAR's discussion and prior to taking action, the applicant will have up to three minutes to respond.

Noted times are approximate only.

5:00 Pre-Meeting Discussion

5:30 Regular Meeting

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda [or on the Consent Agenda]

B. Consent Agenda

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

1. Meeting minutes December 17, 2024 & January 22, 2025 [Attached in draft form.]
2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR # HST25-0059
218 West Water Street, TMP 2800084000
Downtown ADC District
Owner: The Residences at 218, LLC
Applicant: Chris Henningsen
Project: rooftop decks, stairs and guardrails
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR # HST25-0058
610 Lyons Court, TMP 520078000
North Downtown ADC District
Owner/Applicant: Wyck Knox
Project: construction of pavilion in rear yard

C. Deferred Items

N/A

D. New Items

- (5:40) 4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR # HST24-0047
1000 Wertland Street, TMP 100038000
(1010 Wertland St; 129 10th St NW; Portion of 1105 W. Main St.)
West Main Street ADC District
Owner: UVA Foundation
Applicant: Elizabeth Chapman; Grimm + Parker Architects
Project: Multi-story residential building
- (6:20) 5. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR # HST25-0060
200 West Main Street; TMP 280010000
Downtown ADC District
Owner: Violet Crown Cinema Charlottesville LLC
Applicant: Jeff Levien / Heirloom Development (contract purchaser)
Project: Demolition of contributing structure (front façade non-contributing)

E. Other Business

- (7:00) 6. **Preliminary Discussion**
No formal action will be taken.
BAR #24-0051
300 Ridge Street, Tax Parcel 280151000
Ridge Street ADC District
Owner: Donald J. & Brenda C. Toney, Trustees
Applicant: Carla Shifflett & Greg Jackson, TOPIA design
Project: Addition
- (7:20) 7. **Preliminary Discussion**
No formal action will be taken.
BAR # HST24-0038
218 West Market Street, Tax Parcel
Downtown ADC District
Owner: Cavalier Hospitality, LLC
Applicants: Robert Pineo/Design Develop, LLC
Project: multi-story hotel

- (7:40) 8. **Staff Questions**

F. Adjourn (8:00)

BAR MINUTES – DRAFT
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

Regular Meeting

December 17, 2024 – 5:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Council Chambers & virtual via Zoom)



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review. Staff will introduce each item, followed by the applicant's presentation, which should not exceed ten minutes. The Chair will then ask for questions from the public, followed by questions from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. For each application, members of the public are each allowed three minutes to ask questions and three minutes to offer comments. Speakers shall identify themselves and provide their address. Comments should be limited to the BAR's purview; that is, regarding only the exterior aspects of a project. Following the BAR's discussion and prior to taking action, the applicant will have up to three minutes to respond.

Members Present: Ron Bailey, Carl Schwarz, Roger Birle, Jerry Rosenthal, Breck Gastinger, James Zehmer, Cheri Lewis, David Timmerman

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Kate Richardson, Jeff Werner, Remy Trail

Pre-Meeting:

There was discussion surrounding on 200 West Main Street. Staff asked whether the BAR wants shade on the Downtown Mall. Mr. Birle stated that he is not Ok with the proposed height. Mr. Schwarz did say that there are other tall buildings on the Downtown Mall, mostly on the north side of the Downtown Mall. Those buildings have a much smaller footprint. No application for demolition has been submitted for 200 West Main Street. There was discussion surrounding a pre-application meeting and pre-application conference.

Staff did present proposed building shadow heights scenarios to the BAR. There was discussion surrounding the 4 different scenarios presented by staff.

There were no issues with the 128 Madison Avenue.

The BAR discussed the project for 1609 Gordon Avenue.

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

No Public Comments

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

1. Meeting Minutes – November 19, 2024

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR #24-12-02

128 Madison Lane, TMP 090139000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Omicron Chapter House Society

Applicant: Greg Koehler

Project: Paved terrace at front yard.

Motion to Approve Consent Agenda – Mr. Gastinger – Second by Ms. Lewis – Motion to Approve Consent Agenda passes 8-0.

C. Deferred Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 24-10-02

1609 Gordon Avenue, TMP 050063100

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

Owner: Brice Craig / 1609 Gordon Avenue, LLC

Applicant: Kevin Schafer, Design Develop

Project: Three-story apartment building

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for construction of a three-story apartment building with internal parking. Specifically note items 7, 8, and 9 summarized on sheet 14 of the submittal. *See a side-by-side comparisons in the attached. (* Items 1 through 6 were modifications shown in the October submittal.)

7. New entry element and doorway into a common lobby space.

8. Stairway and balconies facing Gordon Ave less visible.

9. Rooftop screening of mechanical units.

Mr. Zehmer – I have Design Develop doing some design work for me. I am going to abstain from this.

David Timmerman, Vice-Chair, took over running the meeting during this CoA application.

Kevin Schafer, Applicant – I am the Charlottesville Studio Director for Design Develop here in Charlottesville.

Next Slide

The substantial changes that have been made since we last saw this project in October are twofold. The entryway that we are referencing is now street facing on Gordon Avenue. It is a full glass door with a covered area. We are emphasizing the entryway by pulling forward the glazing bay that is above it by about a foot to emphasize that main entryway, which is covered by about a 4-foot overhang. In addition, we have recessed the balconies. These balconies were sticking proud of the front façade and the front elevation. They have now been recessed behind that façade to deemphasize that sort of circulation route while still maintaining a very strong, decisive void to make these 2 building forms very legible in their nature.

Next Slide

You can see this deemphasis of the balconies. Instead of having the landing, the stairs come out of the building. They are now entirely recessed behind the front façade of the building. We have the 4-foot overhang that extends from that walkway over to the main entrance. We have reconfigured the first floor so that the main entrance now opens into a common space lobby. Previously, that was a 2-bedroom unit. We have since broken it up in that first floor and done units on the right side and common space to the left. It will open into a common space lobby, a mailroom, and behind there is bike storage. As you work your way back towards the garage, this is several layers deep into that building all in an effort to deemphasize the circulation path in that main open area and provide that front entry element. The other zoning comment that staff mentioned was the new screening that is required on the roof to hide the rooftop units.

Next Slide

We went back and we listened to the previous February hearing and October hearing. We tried to ‘tease’ out what was successful about the project in the eyes of the board members. One of the things that was said repeatedly was the contextual appropriateness in nature. I like this slide because it shows the roof forms that are very much in keeping with the adjacent residential scaled buildings and the broken-down nature. If we could anticipate the discussion points that might happen, it is the continued move of the breaking down the intentional and explicit into the 2 forms and turning the roof gable. As we come back, with that alley, we get a 3rd gable form as we go down. It is a recognizable form for the neighborhood/for this district. It is a to-scale when you start to look at the widths on the street and the overall massing. It felt important to reduce the visual mass of this building. As we are one of the early ones in with the new zoning to make a concerted effort to break down the building façade and the building mass. In doing this, we took this strong approach with the void.

Next Slide

In elevation, it starts to read as these 2 different buildings in the rotated gable as it comes around with the brick background building. This slide also helps emphasize the front main entryway, the canopy that can provide some signage opportunities for our main entrance and for building identification. It is a recognizable building form. It is a recognizable material palette as well.

Next Slide

This is another example of how the 2 distinct building forms help reduce the overall visual mass and the visual scale. That is what we heard from initial preliminary hearing. The success lies with the contextual approach.

Next Slide

The second part is, not only just a recognizable mass, a recognizable scale and form, but a material palette that is very recognizable. If you draw a 4- or 5-block radius around our site, stucco or EIFS is a very common building material. It is not just any stucco. It is a light-colored cream or white stucco. You couple that with a red brick. That is a pretty traditional color palette with a cream stucco. It becomes very contextual, recognizable, and familiar from a material palette and a building form perspective.

Next Slide

There was discussion and debate amongst the board members at the October hearing regarding EIFS and the appropriateness of EIFS. Building technology changes. I don’t know if this is ‘a hill that I want to die on.’ What EIFS has changed over the past 15 years is very favorable from an architect’s perspective. We get 2 inches of rigid insulation outside of our structure. The thermal bridging that is happening through studs is no longer a concern. Building code and energy code is starting to push

towards continuous insulation on the outside of our building. The second thing we like about it is that improvements in the finish coat and how the finish coat is applied is that it is finished the same way as a stucco. It comes down what is the backer behind it. We can now do fine finishes that are very similar appearance to stucco. We can control the joints, which is something that we have talked a lot about. We can control the joints and have less joints than would be typically required particularly if we were using a panelized system, The third thing that we like about it is that improvements in our WRBs (water resistant barriers) have dimpled drainage mats. We have fluid applied water barriers. We double up our water barriers here. The idea of EIFS trapping in moisture and rotting is not a concern as much anymore in these mechanically fastened high quality systems.

Next Slide

Previously, a board member had used the word ‘cheap.’ If we were going for the cheapest building material, it would be a 4-by-8 sheet of panel. From a cost-per-square-foot perspective, it does not get any cheaper than a 4-by-8 material. There are challenges that we have seen and talked about in terms of the panelized system. There are more joints. The joints are harder to control where they land. The flashing on them is questionable. It starts to muddy the waters of the party a little when we start to consider that as a system. We did not like going to that as a system despite that being perhaps the most cost-effective method.

Next Slide

We think about contextual in an ADC district perspective and what is adjacent. We also think from a Charlottesville City perspective and what is familiar and recognizable from a multi-family perspective in this area. Two of these examples, not only use a stucco, but they use a very deep recess into a circulation area. That hallway is glass behind it. If that hallway was not glass and it was a railing or a balcony, would we think that project is any less successful? I don’t think it would. What is successful about the project is the legibility of the forms and how it breaks down on the street. I often reference South Range Apartments. A similar approach is an open circulation and an open staircase that helps break down a building form in such a way that it feels appropriate from a pedestrian perspective. On South Range on JPA, it allows it to bend the corner around Emmet Street in a successful way. These are projects that are recognizable in their materiality but also employing similar approaches to breaking down the mass and addressing the street in successful ways.

Next Slide

We have a spec on our rooftop screening; architectural louvers are the name brand we are specifying with 4-inch-deep vertical blades (black) to match our adjacent trim colors. In the location shown in red, we have the luxury of having these gable roof forms that help us terminate these screening elements nicely. It is a smart use of a screening system to hide our condenser farm on the roof.

Next Slide

We had some additional housekeeping items on our specifications. Working with Deb Brown at Cheney to specify a brick that seemed appropriate and felt appropriate on the street. It is not too red or too brown. It is the Buckingham Tutor brick. I have brick and grout samples available here if anybody would like to look at those. We also have the pack clad standing seam metal roof in matte black. We have those samples available as well. Ultimately, we went back and listened. We tried to ‘tease’ out the specifics that were ringing true in terms of a success and how we could emphasize those and ensure that the board’s comments were heard and addressed, and the positives were able to remain.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Timmerman – Do you have samples of the stucco that you plan to use?

Mr. Schafer – I don't have a physical sample. It is a fine finish. It is a mechanically fastened EIFS system in a fine finish that is field painted.

Mr. Timmerman – Sometimes those have different finish names. Sometimes they call them limestone. Is it a specific manufacturer that you are using?

Mr. Schafer – We do have a specific one.

Ms. Lewis – With the detail on the new front door entrance, I did not see any detail on it.

Mr. Schafer – It would be part of the Pela series. Imperia does not make a door that is in that size. It is the upgraded. It is an aluminum clad wood glass door with side lights on either side of it.

Ms. Lewis – You said that there will be mailboxes and bike parking.

Mr. Schafer – Bike parking would be towards the rear at the parking garage. The front entrance is a common lobby space that can serve as a gathering space for residents.

Mr. Birle – I have a question about the entry sequence. If you go into the recess to the right of the front door, does that lead you to the stairs?

Mr. Schafer – You do not have to go through the front door. That would also be the common space and the mailroom.

Mr. Timmerman – With the windows, are they clad? What is their exterior material?

Mr. Schafer – The Imperia is a fiberglass product. It is the same product that was used at Virginia Avenue. It has a profile that is like a storefront.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – There are definitely some improvements. I realize that the door is superfluous. What you have done to the front entry has helped a little bit. Pulling back the stair balconies and pushing out that big window has helped. One of my main concerns from this project was that it is austere. It seems like it is lacking residential details. I need to keep reminding myself that it is not that big. It is 3 stories. It is little house sized pieces. We have seen this 3 times. I am hesitant. I don't think that is going to hold me back from voting to approve it. The vine species that you have chosen is something that sticks. I would be worried about getting near the stucco. It seems like a solution to trying to prevent headlights from shining through those garage windows. It would be better if there was something more permanent like a louver system. I don't know if that is something that I could vote

approval on this, and you work with staff to come up with something. You are going for contemporary design. Shutters are not contemporary. That is my primary concern. This has progressed and it has gotten better. I can finally vote for approval on it.

Mr. Birle – You have made some good improvements. I have 2 comments. If you are trying to emphasize the front door and get people to use it, why not have the stair from the exterior sidewalk go to the front door? I questioned the fine texture of the stucco. If you closely looked at stucco in the neighborhood, you would find that it is pretty textured. That might play into that stark feeling that Mr. Schwarz is talking about. If this is fine, it is going to feel very stark. The massing is really good. The massing works in this neighborhood. We have said that in previous meetings. I can vote for this with that stipulation of the stucco finish.

Ms. Lewis – Why put the door where the window was? Why not put it where the stairs and the entry to the parking are?

Mr. Schafer – We felt that it is important enough to break down the building form in such a finite and decisive way. You have a building here that is a gable. You take that building form, you rotate it, and there is a void in between. When we start to put the glass in between it, it becomes a singular mass. We looked at it. We tried to address the concerns and comments we had previously heard. When we considered the context and the initial comments that we had heard, it was important enough to hang on to it in terms of that void, that shadow line, and that distinct breakdown in the building forms. I have 2 responses. The configuration of the entry sequence is to get an ADA ramp onto the site. That is what aligns the stairs and the location that they do need all that square footage to get up in terms of an ADA ramp. The location of the front door is tied together with the overhang. With the finish, that is a great point. Some tactility would be appreciated here. Maybe we go look at adjacent textures and try to match it. We used a sand pebble finish before. I was upset at the time that I did not get the fine that I wanted. It does have a certain tactility to it that we could explore. The louver system is a great suggestion. We have tried to find the vine species that worked. We are on our third vine species. We are still not hitting it. Let's go to louver system or some more permanent way of screening those headlamps. That is what it is.

Why not shift the door over? It is important to have those 2 buildings.

Ms. Lewis – Is the building overhanging the top 2 stories four feet? You have an additional opening over the door. How much protection from the weather would I have if it was raining?

Mr. Schafer – That trimline that is in that wrap is the difference between the proposed brick and the proposed EIFS. That sticks out 4 feet from that door.

Ms. Lewis – You have a slightly covered part over the door.

Mr. Schafer – That canopy extends over the door.

Mr. Timmerman – I tend to agree with your argument on EIFS stucco. It is advantageous over some of the other examples that you showed. While it is minimal, minimal can be good. The massing works with the neighborhood. You have broken down the scale to match some of the other residential houses on the street. I appreciate that. With stucco, the next question is what the finish is. There is a wide spectrum. I would love to see a sample. There are better quality ones and lesser quality ones. The lesser quality ones have more of a plastic look to them. It would be interesting play with the

contextual nature of this scheme and try to find something that ties in if you do a closer dive. Look at if there is a pattern of stucco textures. Try to find something that more matches the traditional materiality. That can be a nice material, something that has less of a plasticized look or shiny look and something that has more of a richer finish. I know they are out there. There are different levels that I have looked at. I would encourage the deeper investigation on that and understand what those differences are. I like the entry sequence of the upper image. It is a cleaner circulation pattern. It is less ambiguous. It helps support the building rather than detract from it. I agree with Mr. Schwarz about the louvers. It depends on the screens that you use. Whether it is stucco or brick, you don't want a vine attaching to that material. I like the idea of a landscape growing up a building. I understand Mr. Schwarz's opinion. It makes sense, especially when you think of it at night and the lights are coming on in the cars. You don't want to see that. Blinding that from view and putting a blind into the parking garage, you don't see that it is a parking garage. I support the project.

Mr. Gastinger – My comments are similar to the last meeting. I appreciate and support the massing of the project. That is a deft way of approaching the site. I still have concerns about the EIFS. I don't find the way that it is being deployed here compatible with the neighborhood. The other examples of light-colored stucco in the neighborhood are fundamentally different. There are smaller planes. There is more architectural articulation. The combination of the lightness of the stucco or EIFS and the way it is elevated in the building and the flatness of the surfaces. It does feel like a lot of those large student housing projects that are in other parts of the city but not in this neighborhood. I retain those concerns.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed apartment building at 1609 Gordon Avenue satisfies the BAR's criteria 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 with these conditions:

- All exterior lighting and fixed lighting within the garage that produces light visible outside (that is, excluding vehicle headlights), will have lamping that is dimmable, have a Color Temperature [CCT] not exceeding 3,000K, and have a Color Rendering Index [CRI] not less than 80, preferably not less than 90.
- The EIFS material will be a drainable, exterior wall covering consisting of sheathing, air and moisture barrier, insulation board, reinforcing fabric, base coat, finish coat, adhesive and mechanical fasteners as applicable, and where installed in areas adjacent to pedestrian traffic or prone to damage [for ex, at the balconies and stairwells] it will be reinforced or a Class PM system and/or a high-impact resistant system.
- Any ground-level mechanical equipment and/or utility boxes will be appropriately screened.
- Meters and panel boxes for utilities, communications, and cable connections will be located preferably within the garage; if not, then in non-prominent locations on the side elevations only and appropriately screened.
- Applied grilles are allowed on insulated glass windows, provided they have internal space bars.
- A louvered solution be provided for the garage screening in lieu of climbing plants.
- And with the recommendation that further investigation into EIFS materiality be explored, with the applicant providing staff with an option to be reviewed and once accepted, be approved, and entered into the BAR record.

Second by Mr. Timmerman. Motion passes 6-1 (Mr. Gastinger) with 1 abstention (Mr. Zehmer).

Discussion following second of Motion.

Ms. Lewis – I agreed with Mr. Timmerman that I would like to see a sample more about the EIFS. I don't want to delay approving. I wonder for staff what we can do to bring that back. We are looking at doing a conditional CoA for another project. Do we want staff to review that? The material is the material to the building.

Mr. Werner – It is not changing from EIFS. The way that we treated things like that is for Mr. Schafer to bring something back for the record. You all accept for the record a, b, or c. With that selection, that is what goes into the archive. It is not changing the material. It is not changing the joint lines. You are looking at the texture of the coating. I don't have a problem with that.

D. New Items

NA

E. Other Business

4. Pre-Application Conference

No formal action will be taken.

BAR # 24-12-01

606 Lyons Court; TMP 520063000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner/Applicant: Christine P. Martin, Trustee

Project: Alterations to house and site

- Staff did introduce the proposed project to the BAR.
- Applicant seeks to have a bracketed roof.
- The changes being proposed in this project are not meant to be extravagant.
- The plan is to remove the asphalt on the driveway and replace with a permeable material.
- Staff had concern about the changes to the front door.
- Mr. Schwarz did ask about replacing the windows on the house. The applicant is intending to replace the windows of the house.
- The applicant is intending to keep the storm door and all the trim around the door.
- The members of the BAR did provide feedback and suggestions on how this project and house could be improved going forward.
- There was discussion between the BAR and the applicant on improvements that could be made to the proposed project.
- Ms. Lewis did have some concerns about removing the pediment and the pilasters on the front of the house.
- Ms. Lewis also emphasized the importance of the history of the house and the neighborhood.
- Mr. Zehmer, Ms. Lewis, and Mr. Timmerman would like to see the front door preserved.
- The applicant will need to go back and speak with her architect about the design, the front door, and the pediment.
- There was a straw poll on the pediment (5 to 3 for removal of the pediment).

- There was confusion between the applicant and the staff regarding whether this being a CoA application and a pre-application conference. The applicant had originally applied for a CoA in October.
- There was some miscommunication between staff and the applicant regarding this project.
- The applicant did express frustration with the process and with staff. The applicant was under the impression that she could get an approval of CoA at this meeting.

5. Pre-Application Conference

No formal action will be taken.

745 Park Street, Tax Parcel 520051100

North Downtown ADC District

Owners/Applicants: Karen Vadja and Kevin Riddle

Project: Addition to existing dwelling

- The applicant is looking at this as an addition.
- The applicant is wanting to remove the top half of the house and replace with a full story.
- The applicant is looking to add a porch and replace the gabled roof with a new story.
- It is going to be clad in a metal siding. There is going to be a new porch with a cover over the porch.
- This project is an independent project and the priority for the applicants going forward.
- Members of the BAR asked questions and provided feedback/criticism regarding the new project.
- Ms. Lewis did go over the guidelines on additions and expressed support for the proposed addition to the current house.
- Mr. Schwarz also did go over the guidelines on porches and expressed support for this project.
- Members of the BAR did provide suggestions and feedback for the applicant on how to improve the project.
- Mr. Gastinger recommended that the ends of the joist on the stair be covered and that the white under the black is striking.
- There was broad support for this proposed project.

The meeting was recessed for 5 minutes.

6. Pre-Application Conference – (Continuation of May 2024 discussion.)

No formal action will be taken.

1000 Wertland Street, TMP 100038000

(1010 Wertland St; 129 10th St NW; Portion of 1105 W. Main St.)

West Main Street ADC District

Owner: UVA Foundation

Applicant: Elizabeth Chapman; Grimm + Parker Architects

Project: Multi-story residential building

- The applicant is on time for getting LI HTC by March 20, 2025, and will need to get site plan approval prior to that date.
- The applicant is proposing a 6-story building on the site.
- Most of the site is used for surface parking.

- The new zoning CX-8 and the applicant is planning for it to be all affordable housing. The applicant is planning on building up to 6 stories.
- There are some significant grade changes with this site.
- There will be a parking garage going under the building.
- The applicant did show the elevations along Wertland Street and 10th Street. The applicant also presented the changes that have been made to the project since May.
- The applicant is sticking with wood construction because that is the only way to get the tax credits.
- There are going to be 2 main entrances into the apartment building so that staff can have interactions with the tenants.
- The applicant has developed a landscape plan for this proposed project.
- There has been discussion about possibly undergrounding the utilities for this project.
- The surrounding neighborhood associations are lobbying for a small market on the ground floor.
- All the units in the proposed project will be affordable units.
- The applicant is proposing to put solar panels on the roof of the proposed building.
- Members of the BAR provided suggestions and feedback on what the applicant can do to make the project better.
- Mr. Zehmer wants to see the other 2 sides of the building and how it interacts with the surrounding residential neighborhood.
- Members of the BAR did provide suggestions and feedback on how to improve the project going forward.
- Mr. Schwarz did go over the different items and exceptions with the zoning code. The applicant is aware of the exceptions being made to the zoning code for this project.
- Mr. Schwarz did go over all the items and documents that are required for a formal CoA application.

7. Pre-Application Conference – (Continuation of November discussion.)

No formal action will be taken.

200 West Main Street; TMP 280010000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Violet Crown Cinema Charlottesville LLC

Applicant: Jeff Levien / Heirloom Development (contract purchaser)

Project: Multi-story residential

- The applicant presented what has changed from the previous iteration of the proposed project.
- The applicant is not close to a CoA application. It is going to be at least a year before the project becomes more detailed.
- The Violet Crown Theater owner approached the applicant about developing this site.
- Office of Economic Development said that millions of dollars will come in as a result of this project.
- The goal of the project is to be a net positive. All considerations of the BAR will be taken seriously.
- The applicant did present shadow studies of The Mall on the 4 days of the season change- Winter Solstice, Spring Equinox, Summer Solstice, and Fall Equinox-to show the tree shadows.
- Applicant stated that the proposed massing is providing sunlight for the trees to thrive. Some of the trees are going to be removed.

- Mr. Zehmer would like to see more views of the building from the street level on the Downtown Mall.
- Mr. Zehmer did emphasize the importance of the pedestrian experience and human experience on the Downtown Mall.
- Mr. Gastinger did emphasize the impact of this building will be beyond the site and adjacent areas.
- Members of the BAR did provide suggestions and feedback with what the applicant can do to improve the proposed building.
- Members of the BAR are wanting to see the pedestrian experience from the Downtown Mall.
- Members of the BAR would like for the applicant to show what the pedestrian experience is like on the Downtown Mall.
- Mr. Timmerman expressed concern about the parking for this project.

8. Staff Questions/Discussion

- Update on Council's review of café design guidelines.

F. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 PM.

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

Regular Meeting

January 22, 2025 – 5:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Council Chambers & virtual via Zoom)



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review. Staff will introduce each item, followed by the applicant's presentation, which should not exceed ten minutes. The Chair will then ask for questions from the public, followed by questions from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. For each application, members of the public are each allowed three minutes to ask questions and three minutes to offer comments. Speakers shall identify themselves and provide their address. Comments should be limited to the BAR's purview; that is, regarding only the exterior aspects of a project. Following the BAR's discussion and prior to taking action, the applicant will have up to three minutes to respond.

Members Present: Cheri Lewis, Roger Birle, Carl Schwarz, Jerry Rosenthal, Kate Tabony, Ron Bailey, David Timmerman

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Kate Richardson, Jeff Werner, Kyle Ervin

Pre-Meeting:

There was discussion around the Consent Agenda. Mr. Schwarz asked if there would be a landscape plan for The Doyle. Staff reminded the BAR that there are 2 options with CoA applications. If the BAR makes the motion for a deferral, the applicant has a month. If the application asks for a deferral, it is up to the applicant when the application comes back to the BAR. Mr. Rosenthal asked how many projects are presented via an architect and property owners. Staff response was that it varies. Most applicants do have an architect.

Ms. Lewis had a question about the location of rear door for 606 Lyons Court. There was a discussion surrounding the CoA application.

Ms. Lewis asked why the Grit Coffee was not on the Consent Agenda. Staff went over why the Grit Coffee CoA application was not a part of the Consent Agenda.

The Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:34 PM.

G. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

No Public Comments

H. 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.)

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR #25-01-01

606 Lyons Court; TMP 520063000
North Downtown ADC District
Owner/Applicant: Christine P. Martin, Trustee
Project: Alterations to house and site

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 25-01-05
614 Park Street, Tax Parcel 520184100
North Downtown ADC District
Owners/Applicants: Carrie & Kevin Burke
Project: Site alterations and courtyard parking

11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 25-01-07
499 West Main Street, Tax Parcel 320177000
West Main ADC District
Owner: Blue Suede Charlottesville, LLC
Applicant: Ryan Roman
Project: Rooftop addition

12. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 25-01-08
500 Park Street, TMP 530123000
North Downtown ADC District
Owner: First Presbyterian Church of Charlottesville, Inc
Applicant: Richard Lutz
Project: Playground fence

13. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 25-01-09
321 East Main St, TMP 330226000
Downtown ADC District
Owner: 321-323 East Main Street, LLC
Applicant: Jazmine Mays / Thalhimer
Project: Install door at side entrance (4th Street, NE)

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

I. Deferred Items

NA

J. New Items

14. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR #25-01-02
144 Chancellor Street, Tax Parcel 090109000
The Corner ADC District
Owner: Delta Zeta National Housing Corp.

Applicant: Kevin Blair
Project: Demolition of contributing structure

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA to demolish the existing, approx. 20-ft x 56-ft, single-story, wood-framed structure.

Ms. Lewis – Do you think this is an instance of demolition by neglect? Has there been any work done since the 2010 engineering study that we got a copy of that was presented to this board in 2013?

Mr. Werner – Structurally, I cannot answer that. The building is maintained as good as you would expect. The roof and gutters are functioning. It is in rough shape. My understanding is that as it is currently, it does not serve the use of the owner. With what is proposed, I did not get into that. As it is now, it does not serve their use. Repairing it would not make that any more usable.

Kevin Blair, Applicant – Since the 1979 purchase of the entire property, including the former adjacent hotel and our main sorority house by Delta Zeta National Housing Corporation, this building has never really served any specific purpose other than occasional storage and a light source for our rear parking lot. There is a tendency by the interpretation of some that the building makes an aesthetic contribution to the area's collective architecture. However, we believe this should not be the sole consideration in determining its continued existence. The building does have some architectural characteristics, which are common for a structure of its age and time (circa 1905). Due to the following, its accessibility, location, amid large housing buildings, limited square footage, rudimentary earthen basement, and antiquated systems, it no longer serves the needs of our sorority, the surrounding student housing population, or University neighborhood community. At no fault of its own, it has unfortunately become an abandoned residential structure isolated within a commercial and university developed district. The previously projected cost estimate in 2013 to bring the building systems into compliance with current technology, efficiency, and structural soundness was estimated at \$625,000, which would be considerably more factoring in today's costs. These costs far exceed our value of the building in its current form and functionality. As noted in the present and former structural reports and applications, the building has been deemed unsafe and is currently uninhabitable. We no longer have an intended use for the structure and are respectfully asking for your understanding and consideration to allow its safe demolition and removal.

Nothing to our knowledge, except for a roof, has been done. An asphalt shingle roof has been put on the building.

Ms. Lewis – You have reviewed the Martin Quarles report from 2010. It looks like the same conditions are there now. There is no doubt that there is degradation. Are you trying to demolish this by neglect? That report is 15 years old. If you are telling me that you have done no work on that bowing brick foundation wall and done nothing in this earthen foundation and other structural issues that you are citing, that works against your application for demolition. You cannot just let a building fall. We have a duty, especially with a historic building, to maintain things. You are saying that the roof is the only thing you have done in 15 years.

Mr. Blair – Our use of the structure would not warrant the cost and expense of those repairs to the building. It was part of the property when we originally bought it. It was never of any use to us.

Ms. Lewis – You said that the \$625,000 amount was from 2013, the last time you were here. Who came up with that cost?

Mr. Blair – It was Dalglish Gilpin Architects.

Ms. Lewis – I thought that report had an amount between \$275,000 and \$325,000.

Mr. Blair – It was a cumulative cost for all the systems to be upgraded in the building. It pretty much needs to be taken back to the studs.

Ms. Lewis – The structural rehab part is more than \$350,000.

Robert Krumpen, Applicant – The 2010 structural inspection report was done by Dunbar Engineering. The BAR documentation was excellent. That allowed me to go through our files. I was able to pull up the 2010 photographs and compare them with the 2024 photographs. One of the things that I was able to determine was that front stoop has dropped about an inch in that 15-year timeframe. That reinforces our previous concerns in the 2010 report and the 2024 report. That unreinforced masonry wall is bowing out. We also think it is shifting. It is also reiterating the southeast masonry pier. In the 2010 report, it has a tight gap between the seam and the infill. That was probably done later. The 2024 report shows a half-inch gap. We believe that the western masonry wall is failing and is in bad shape. We think the building is, as the result of the lateral pushing, sinking and shifting slightly to the east. There is some movement happening unassociated with the building in that 14-15-year timeframe. It was interesting for us to do a comparison and contrast. These are 2 data points for us to do a comparison.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Birle – Everything above the foundation is sill plate. What is the condition of that?

Mr. Krumpen – For the wood-frame part of the structure, there are some localized damage, dry rot. There are some areas, especially at the connections with the masonry piers, that are damaged. A fair amount of the floor system looks to be in pretty good shape. The sill plates are damaged in localized areas. It did appear that there probably is some localized damage to the wood structure. The major structural implication is the foundation.

Mr. Birle – The sill plate is typical of a turn of the century house.

Mr. Timmerman – When you were looking at this, were there any alternate solutions that you began to think about as far as how to alleviate the structural situation with the foundation?

Mr. Krumpen – The biggest challenge is that the wall has failed to an extent that I cannot reinforce it. To do a competent repair, you must dig out that wall and install a more modern foundation in it like a concrete retaining wall to make it stable. It is the front, west wall. That is where the stoop sat. That part is the most damaged. The northern part of the structure looks better. There are some shifts on that. It looks like the southern part is experiencing the most movement and has the most issues associated with it. It is the southwestern wall. With the pier, that is the southeastern side. Those 2 are showing the most degradation.

Ms. Tabony – When was the roof replaced?

Mr. Blair – I believe that it was 12 or 13 years ago.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Timmerman read Mr. Zehmer's comments into the record – I visited this site with Me. Werner, Ms. Richardson, Mr. Timmerman, and Ms. Tabony. The owner's rep showed us around the building including the crawl basement space. I agree that there are areas of structural concern. However, this property is not beyond repair. The recommendation in the structural engineer's report to rebuild the brick foundation wall is a good recommendation. However, it is not the only solution. If cost is a concern, some 2-by pressured treated lumber could be used to construct bracing to stabilize this wall and prevent further movement. The sentiment that the CMU infill needs to be connected to the sill plate is incorrect. The brick piers are holding up the building. The CMU infill is just that. It is infill. Although our purview is typically limited to the exterior of the building, I think that when a CoA for demolition is submitted, the owner has invited the BAR into the building. It is worth noting that the interiors still retain much of their original finishes, including doors, fireplace mantle, window trim, plaster, and wood floors, this helps argue for preservation of the building. The original wood siding is still extent underneath the medal siding. I would not be able to support of the CoA. The applicant is pursuing demolition by neglect. We cannot support or reward this approach to the maintenance of the contributing buildings in a historic district.

Ms. Lewis – Mr. Blair notes that he wants us to focus on other factors, recognizing that it is an older building. He would like for us to look at factors, such as the accessibility of the building, its location. It is currently amid many larger housing buildings on Chancellor. He is also probably referring to across the tracks and nearby, the limited square footage of the building, the earthen basement, antiquated systems, the fact that it no longer serves the needs of the owner (been the owner since 1979). He cites that it is basically an abandoned residential structure in a commercial university, a district that has become developed around it. He cites the cost. I don't see that in 2013 or this year where we have had a contractor put numbers on that. These are guesses. They are guesses by qualified engineers. We did not get any numbers this time. The ones cited by the architect firm the last time would be that plus inflation with 12 to 15 years. Cost is not one of the factors that we consider. For the applicant and public information, we are beholden to look at the guidelines for demolition. They are cited in Chapter 34. I am citing to the old code because we don't have references. The new code has not been codified. It is section f.2.5.2.7.1b. Factor we are supposed to consider are the historic architectural cultural significance of the structure or property including without limitation, the age or structure of the property, whether it has been designated nationally or statewide. This building is a contributing structure in The Rugby Road University Corner Historic District. It is noted on the National Register listing. The third factor is the extent the building or structure is associated with a historic person, architect, master craftsman, and historic event. We don't know of any. Whether the building or structure or any of the features represents an infrequent or first or last remaining example within the city of a particular architectural style or feature. Staff notes that the building is an unusual building type. We probably don't have any other 1-story school buildings. They are existent wood school buildings that are existent at all in the city. It might be the last remaining example of that type of building. The 5th factor is whether the building or structures of such older distinctive design texture or material that it could not be reproduced or could only be reproduced with great difficulty.

Nobody think this building could be reproduced because of the antiquated features of it. You could reproduce it with new materials. It might look a little alike. The degree to which distinguishing characteristics, qualities, features, or materials remain. It has been noted that many of them do remain because, so little has been done by these owners who have owned it for 45 years. It is like it was when they bought it. We consider whether and to what extent contributing the structure is linked historically or aesthetically to other buildings and structures within the district or is one of a group of properties. It has been noted by staff that this is linked with the history of the university. This area being a residential district and a residential place for staff and other people that were associated with the university and might have schooled their children. The overall condition and structural integrity of the building as indicated by studies prepared by an engineer, whether the applicant proposes means, methods, or plans for moving, removing, or demolishing the property that preserves portions, features or materials that are significant to the property's historic, architectural, or cultural value. What the applicant has proposed is to raze it and maintaining none of those elements and any other applicable provisions of our design guidelines. We are bound by that. Many of those might be subjective. Many of them are easy to answer. Those are how we consider this question. I wish that this sorority would use this building, come back to us with a partial demolition, and use some of the space in the remaining parcel. There is a little bit of space in the back to add onto this building and add new life and certainly bring it a new purpose for the sorority. I cannot approve a whole demolition. I am concerned that this owner has owned this building since 1979 and not have done anything in 45 years to a building that is quite unique in the city.

Mr. Werner – The design guidelines for demolitions refer to the old code section, which has been superseded by the new code. In the staff report, the criteria are there for reviewing decisions related to demolitions from the current ordinance. Under that are the guidelines from the ADC District Design Guidelines. That is where the reference is to the old code. I have included both in there. Both are similar. There is no code conflict.

Mr. Timmerman – It is important to draw distinction between the idea of an individual's purpose for a building or just a more generic purpose for a building and what our intentions are here. I hope that helps clarify.

I would like to augment a certain perspective. I will start with reading the introduction to the ADC District Design Guidelines. In the introduction, it broadly states that historic buildings are irreplaceable community assets. Once they are gone, they are gone forever. With each successive demolition or removal, the integrity of a historic district is further eroded. Therefore, the demolition or removing any contributing building in a historic district should be considered carefully. That is significant in this case. When I arrived on the site, I appreciated the time you spent with us and walking us through. I appreciate the structural report. I appreciate what you said earlier and your presentation. All of it was respectful. It makes a lot of sense. When I arrived on the site, I noticed was the building itself and the structural issues. I noticed how well intact it was. Even with the siding that is on it, you can almost feel the history of it in the form of the building. You could imagine it the way it used to be. I looked up and down the street. It is on a street that has a consistent fabric. It has not been interrupted unlike many of the areas surrounding the university. That was significant to me; not only the building being within reach but also the continuity of the street. When you walk down the street, it is a great experience. You are not walking on a street like Wertland where it is marked by developments that are out of scale and out of range of the historic district that it embodies. An important thing to consider here is its location within the greater context of the street. That is an important thing to consider. It is an important asset in our community. These are the kinds of things that we are all impassioned to try to protect or to uphold. Everyone on the BAR has that mission

whether they agree with this situation or not. I agree with Mr. Zehmer's recommendations regarding the structural. While there is a serious structural issue, I wonder if there isn't a more creative approach. When I was in the crawl space, it was clear that front retaining wall is failing because it is a brick wall. It is retaining soils that had been left exposed. Something has changed. As you mentioned, there has been a significant tilting of it in the last 10 years. Are there other ways of dealing with this kind of situation? Is there a solution for infilling part of the crawl space to encase that foundation? Is there a way to encase that wall so that you relieve yourself of the expense of jacking the building up and putting in a new wall? Given that the building is intact and given that the structure is not beyond repair, I suspect there are ways of dealing with it. I would not be willing to approve the demolition. It is an important part of the fabric of the community around the University.

Mr. Schwarz – I agree with what my colleagues are saying. I feel for you guys. Unfortunately, you need to go through the process. It sounds like we are going to deny this. Out duty on this board is to not let you demolish it. Unfortunately, you are right. You are right it probably has served its use in the neighborhood. You can take it to Council and appeal. If they deny it, you can put it on the market for a year. If nobody buys it, you tear it down. Ideally what would happen is that some student group or someone sees it as a community space, sees the value in it as a historic school building, that would be the dream. We can hope that happens. We need to allow that process to take place. Fortunately, with our updated zoning code, there is no minimum lot size. You can sever your lot and sell this portion. You probably should have gone through that process in 2013. You need to go through the process of seeing if somebody can buy it and somebody else can take care of it.

Mr. Birle – The fact that this is a contributing structure according to the VDHR (Virginia Department of Historic Resources). What we are hearing from people who have seen it, from the report, and everything from the sill plate up is in decent shape. The bar for demolition would have to be much higher than that. We need to protect buildings like this.

Mr. Werner – I have talked a lot with Mr. Blair. I was very candid with him that the BAR's responsibility is the historic resource. There is a process of appeal. It must occur within 10 business days of your action. That would be February 5th. The practice has been that an appeal is presented in writing. It is not a hold to come and have a discussion later. The appellant must make the case of the grounds for the appeal and including anything where the BAR might have misapplied the standards. There is a \$100 fee for an appeal to a BAR decision. It is part of the process. Too often in the appeals, it has been viewed as a rebuke of the BAR. The BAR is doing its job. The process allows Council to review it. In the ordinance, Council may consider any additional information, factors, or opinions that they deem relevant to the application. Whereas you are constrained by the guidelines and the criteria of the new ordinance, Council can consider other things. That is what the process was designed for. They are the elected officials. I want to be clear that it is going to Council. The applicant has an opportunity to make their case. There is an opportunity for a valid statement.

Mr. Timmerman – It shows that we feel strongly about the significance of the building. We are not trying to be on a soap box. Maybe counter to what Mr. Schwarz is saying is that there is an option. I don't know how feasible it is. My hope is that the sorority find a purpose. You said that there is no purpose for it. Often with buildings, spaces, structures, it is not so much to have the purpose. It is finding the purpose. There might be an opportunity.

Mr. Werner – We have referred a couple of times to a contributing structure. You have purview over locally designated historic districts and locally designated properties. Per our code, anything that is considered a contributing structure, you have purview over the demolition review. In the review

criteria for demolitions, we refer to contributing structure into the state and national register districts- the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. This school is a contributing structure to that National Register District. That is not what causes you to have the purview over the demolition. It is part of the consideration. It is state and national significance.

Motion to Deny – Mr. Timmerman – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed demolition of 144 Chancellor Street does not satisfy the BAR’s criteria and its guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC District for the following reasons:

- **The cultural significance of the historic building and the street on which it is located.**
- **Its relatively extant condition.**
- **It is an extant example of this vernacular period.**

The BAR denies the application as submitted. Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 6-0 with one Abstention (Mr. Bailey).

15. Certificate of Appropriate Application

BAR #25-01-03

745 Park Street, Tax Parcel 520051100

North Downtown ADC District

Owners/Applicants: Karen Vadja and Kevin Riddle

Project: Addition to existing dwelling

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for addition and alterations:

- Remove gable and build 1-story addition
- Remove existing concrete stoop
- Add porch with covered roof
- Paint brick at lower level

Ms. Tabony – Are we trying to decide if it is an addition or new construction?

Mr. Werner – I will go back to Tim Mohr, who was on the BAR for a long time. He often said that before we even discuss a project, the BAR should decide what the preservation approach is. What is the objective of the project? This will come up when we talk about 300 Ridge Street. As we look at this site and this request, what is it around that we want to take into consideration in evaluating this? If you look at it as an addition, according to the guidelines, it says to respect the existing structure. Don’t overwhelm it. Be subordinate to it. Something like this is a little tricky. With new construction, the primary goal is design compatibility with the surrounding district. Viewing it in that context makes this simpler. I know that Mr. Zehmer had some different thoughts on that. Trying to make this an addition onto that single story brick structure that they had been allowed to raze, that complicates things unnecessarily.

Kevin Riddle, Applicant – My wife and I are looking to make changes to our house. As far as we are concerned, we don’t mind how the Board decides to interpret this, whether it is an addition or a new structure. It is depending partly on the existing structure. That structure was approved for demolition unanimously several years ago, in large part, because we realized that its history is not remarkable. It has been a solid little house. There are hundreds of others like it around town. It is not distinctive. There is no special history attached to it. We don’t see an issue with adding to the top of it and

somehow overwhelming the house as it currently exists. You saw this last month. Since then, the changes that we have made are virtually no changes. The documents explain it well.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Rosenthal – I gather that you are not changing the footprint. You are going to change the square footage by going to 2 stories.

Mr. Riddle – The half-story will become a full story.

Mr. Timmerman – How would you argue that you responded to the comments from the last time? What changes have you made?

Mr. Riddle – I believe that Mr. Gastinger had mentioned stub joists that are supporting a long step on the front. He noticed that they seemed prominent with just a clear finish on them or something that matches the wood siding that we are proposing on part of the lower story. I did send an updated package. With those joists, we are proposing that they would be painted out a dark blue-grey color like the rim joist behind it. It is still a similar construction. They just aren't as prominent. I don't recall that there were any other critiques of significance.

Mr. Rosenthal – Why did you decide not to do the demolition?

Mr. Riddle – It was a change in direction. We did have a new house design. It looked like it would be daunting to go through with the full demolition and a rebuild.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Birle – I want to commend you for keeping the house from a sustainability standpoint, which is in the Comprehensive Plan. It is also a contributing structure. I am glad that it is remaining. I don't think it overpowers it. Because of the color it is a quiet solution.

Mr. Bailey – The design fits well. It keeps the street contemporary. It is one of the more interesting streets in our town because of the various architectural styles. This will add to it very nicely.

Mr. Schwarz – It is a small structure. As a contemporary addition to Park Street, with the dark metal on the roof and the fact that it is a small structure, it is not going to stick out. It is going to recede pretty well. That gave you some leeway to do some less traditional moves. I am ready to approve it.

Ms. Lewis – I was supportive of it the last time and I still am supportive of it. There are other contemporary homes in North Downtown. We will have an application later from another one on Park Street. It is sustainable to retain that first floor and affordable for the owners and project architect. I welcome it to the neighborhood. I commend the owners and the architects for not engaging in false historicism or classicism and adding elements that would mimic other buildings along Park Street. I

fully support this. For comment purposes, I regard it as new construction. I don't think there are many elements you are retaining except for the exterior wall. You are changing some apertures. You are retaining a foundation and building up on it. I really do not see it as an addition.

Mr. Timmerman – Mr. Gastinger, last time, mentioned the starkness and color. I would agree with him. It calls attention to itself. It is a little not in keeping with the rest of the surroundings. It is not a matter of style. A contemporary building can work on Park Street. I would like to encourage some more relationship and dialogue with the surroundings there. I find it to be a little bit of a one-off. It sounds like I am in the minority. I did not speak up last time. That is where a lot of the fun and the play can happen with contemporary architecture. There are layers and levels to that, how much it can absorb what is surrounding it.

Mr. Riddle – Some of it depends on someone's proclivities like on Farish Street. I like that variation. Our neighbors to the south put a pretty striking color on that 1880s house. I know that not everyone likes it. I think it is great. In that spirit, the contrast here looks fine. I hear what you are saying.

Ms. Tabony – I support the modern insertion into the Park Street landscape. I think it is great. The elevations look a little cartoonish. With the adjacency of the black to white, I wonder if the detail of the existing brick to the new metal siding, I don't know how far you have developed that. There is something nice about this simplicity. It is a fine line right now. Is there going to be more flashing? Is that line going to be expanded to be a thicker datum than what is shown in your images right now? I like the blue. The blue is great on your steel and the front porch. I am wondering if you could bring a little bit more of that playfulness into the fence. The fence is unresolved for me now. The south façade feels very stark. I know that you are seeing that south façade coming up Park Street. That is the main view. Maybe there is a landscaping element that you could bring to that to soften that black over white box.

Mr. Riddle – That could be a challenge with the driveway right next to it.

Motion to Approve – Mr. Birle – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the addition at 745 Park Street 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 request with the condition that the owner document the existing house and conditions for city staff prior to construction. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 7-0.

16. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 25-01-04

116 West Jefferson Street, Tax Parcel 330183000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: West Jefferson Properties, LLC

Applicant: Kristin Cory/Joshua Batman

Project: Rear porch exit stairs

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for approval of modified trim and railing details at rear porches due to alterations necessary to accommodate code-required egress stairs.

Ms. Lewis – When was the hyphen between the 2 buildings added? That seems to be one of the factors that is driving the confusion on the back.

Mr. Werner – It is not historic. My guess is that it happened when they built the addition or after. It is not pre-1980.

Ms. Lewis – I don't remember them being connected.

Mr. Werner – As long as I have looked at this, it has been there.

Mr. Bailey – As I recall, the idea was that they were going to remove the hyphen at one point when they were going to reinstall or recreate the front porch. That has changed.

Mr. Werner – There are many pieces and parts to this. I did not go back and reconstruct it. I looked at whatever was the last thing that we looked at. It included the hyphen being there and the deck out over the top of it.

Ms. Lewis – Is this the same owner that we dealt with on the previous application with the porch? It is.

Joshua Batman, Applicant – The building official and structural engineer do not think that we can adequately attach the posts and tie them down. Maybe there is a way we could do some steel that goes down to the floor if you want to keep the brick. We are open to that.

Next Slide

There is this landing that must be there. What I did was add posts in there to help ground this thing and take it from this structure that is tall and up in the air there. The lattice that we have proposed here would not be a typical lattice. It would be an inch and a quarter by an inch and a quarter fur painted with a larger aperture in it. Underneath there is a little residential unit. That little porch underneath would be a little patio for that unit. We want it to be nice down there. This really helps anchor that. It helps take away from a stair there. We like the railing going across the top. It is an ode to the old porch. The roof structure is beautiful. I want to keep that roof structure that is historic. That part is historic. We have lighting proposed in there. All the trim would be white. Along the rims of the porch, we have 1-by-4 and 1-by-12. That would all be painted composite boards there. It looks good. That is up to you to decide.

Next Slide

It almost looks like teak decking. They had already purchased this railing, which is a typical fur rail. That is what we are proposing to use. Up top, we would like to put these little brass half-moon post lights and some step lighting that you see there. Up on that top deck, we would like to use these little lit deck caps to go around that top little roof deck area.

We will have to submit a full landscape plan. That is why we hadn't addressed the screening on the HVAC on the other side. We are working with engineering to figure out exactly how the entries tie into the sidewalk. The 6-by-6s are from the structural engineer. She would maybe give us a letter or something that said we could use the posts. Down below, it would be very difficult. Up top, it would not be as difficult. We have retained all the existing posts. That might be an option to put those existing posts along that top porch structure. It is a typical column detail with bed molding and a plant at the top or little capital piece at the top. We did have to shift it a bit from the original porch rack to allow the code required 36 inches on the stairs. There is 1.5 inches offset from that original porch rack

there. You can see the rest of the details on this. We intend on putting some Arbor Vitae in between where the posts go around the base.

Next Slide

With this option, we looked at putting some painted white shakes underneath that stair landing down to the original porch elevation on the first floor. The lattice does work pretty well. The other one is less remarkable.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Birle – Did the applicant ever get a demolition certificate?

Mr. Werner – Some of that is on me. We were talking about one thing. The answer is ‘no.’ That miscommunication is on me and not on the applicant. They were following what the building code official was requiring of them.

Ms. Lewis – I don’t think that you should ‘fall on that sword.’ This is an owner that came before us. We had a significant discussion about altering this building. There were 2 meetings about the front porch and about this particular purpose. I find it hard to believe that they thought that they needed permission to put a front porch on but not to take a back porch off, almost 3 stories worth of structure. Somebody might say it is somewhat historic if it is original to the building. I have a hard time with this demolition. I don’t believe that it is staff’s fault at all. This is a historic building. It is in an ADC District. The applicant had come before us before. They were obviously aware of the constraints of this being in a historic district and what they needed to do to alter this building.

Mr. Batman – We finally had gotten the building permit. They had already taken the rails and decking off. The posts were still there. We did think that the exit stair had been approved when we finally obtained the building permit. All the conversation was before the building permit was obtained. That is when Chuck Miller had asked Mr. Werner. I understand your concerns. It is not all on Mr. Werner. This was a confusing project because it went on so long. There were so many different iterations. The building permit took 9 months. I came in after they hadn’t been able to get the building permit for about 6 months. We finally obtained the building permit. When we got the building permit, we thought that everybody was happy. That is why Chuck released it. He thought that we were there. We obviously were not there. We have all the original posts. That is the only part that was truly original. We have those.

Mr. Timmerman – They are in pretty good shape.

Mr. Batman – They are in pretty good shape.

Mr. Timmerman – Has the structural engineer ever assessed them to see if you could reuse them anywhere?

Mr. Batman – The part that would be difficult to use them on is the landing. That is where it would be very hard to use them. I think we could use them on the top portion. That is just roof load. Because it is now R-1, boarding house is where it falls under the code. The structural engineer is having to

design the deck and the stairs and everything to 100 pounds per square foot. That is when she went to the 6-by-6s. We have all the posts. I think that we could use them up on the top portion. I am sure that she would sign a letter that would say that these are structurally capable to carry that roof, which is what we need.

Mr. Birle – Aesthetically, the landing is going to hit the post right at the belly of the curve there. Personally, I think that ‘ship has sailed.’ To use the turn posts at the top is going to look fake at this point. It is a shame. When I look at this 1980s photograph, it was a handsome back porch. It was all original based on what I am seeing. What you have done is about as good as you are going to do.

Mr. Werner – With the 1980s photos, the assumption was that it was original. What was there when they came in and started, a lot of it was replaced.

Mr. Batman – The deck framing was pressure treated. It wasn’t original. That part was not original.

Mr. Timmerman – I had a question about your section on sheet 7, the bottom part. I am trying to figure out where the bottom beams cut through.

Mr. Batman – It starts with the detail on the top of this column and up to the port track.

Mr. Timmerman – With the little curve you made that into the fascia board?

Mr. Batman – That is for head height. It is to get down in this basement. Even to do something here, I think that I will still have to pull this stair out from the building and demolish the concrete there. There are a couple concrete stairs there. It was to get head high. That line needs to stay there where the original porch was. It looks strange if you do anything else. I can just get to the head height there and not have to demolish the entire patio that already has drainage. I would rather not have to demolish that.

Ms. Tabony – With the 3 options in the materials, are you asking our opinion about that?

Mr. Batman – It could be. That was based on the owner. The owner was worried there might be too much lattice. It might feel like a bird cage inside. He wants it to be nice under there. I want to do an inch and a quarter by an inch and a quarter with 3.5-inch hole there. It is not this slapped together lattice like you put under a porch. It feels nicer and it is a nicer to be behind and in front of. If you have an opinion, I would love to hear them or get suggestions.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Bailey – I agree that the post ‘ship has sailed.’ Trying to put them on top would look fake at this point. Aesthetically, it would be a mélange mismatch that simply would not work. If you are going to be an honest modern addition, you may as well go that way as opposed to try fake recovery at this point.

Mr. Timmerman – My biggest issue right now is that it feels like it is too much. I want to see simplicity. Part of the issue for me is that you have 2 squares, the rectangle, this thing with a bite out

of it, and another. I just want to see some simplicity even if you were to take that out and make this an opening. This bothers me. There is too much happening.

Ms. Tabony – I agree. There are too many parts and pieces from the last time we saw this. I agree that the ‘ship has sailed.’ The original porch is gone. What is still there is the beautiful roof and the cornice. If there is a way we can, let’s just make this a modern box. It is a modern thing. The detailing now is trying to recall a historical period. It does not seem honest to me. Let’s depart from that. My suggestion would be to depart from that and do something more contemporary and acknowledge that this is a new thing.

Mr. Werner – Is this necessary? Before, it looked like they were jamming that rail in there. Is that deck even necessary given these changes? It resolves some of that head height issue. I am speaking from my construction experiences. This is one of those details. This might be something that we must look at a couple of times. That is why I think if you are letting this be a stair and we acknowledge up here that you are retaining that railing. Do we even need the illusion of a deck or a horizontal member there?

Mr. Birle – If you are going to have a deck there, why wouldn’t the column in the middle section come all the way down to it? It would be the same height as the original column. I agree with Ms. Tabony. The more contemporary this is handled, the better in a lot of ways. The more I look at this, it is that middle column being as squat as it is, that throws that off.

Mr. Timmerman read the following comments from Mr. Zehmer – The biggest issue is that they have torn down what may have been an original porch fabric. Based on the historic photos, the railings were recently removed. The picket originals had balusters. I am not sure that the turn columns had been replaced. There is a distinct bulb shape on the columns that appears in earlier photos. If they have not yet disposed of them, they should reinstall the turn columns. These are character defining features of this back porch. If these do not work for the new structure, that is not our problem. The structural engineer should figure out a solution to preserve the columns and achieve their egress stair goals. I agree that the required railing at the landing hit the turned column at mid-height. It would be an awkward juxtaposition. However, they could install another simple post and board with a historic column to achieve this structurally. Alternatively, a new code compliant egress stair could have been considered on the side of the building. The BAR would have had to approve this. It may not have been egregious as running a useful 2-story porch. The columns cannot be reinstalled. We should ask that they be put into storage on site, attic, or basement or even strapped to the underside of the lower porch. This will give future owners the opportunity to restore them if the building returns to a private residence one day.

Mr. Schwarz – I was ready to approve this tonight. It sounds like we are not going to. I would be willing to make that motion if there is enough agreement. If this porch was finished tomorrow, when could you get your CO? Are you waiting for this?

Mr. Batman – It is not on the path right now. If I need to come back, I am fine with that. I recognize that there is some angst over this.

Mr. Schwarz – I think you said during your presentation to us you wanted to keep that lowest deck line. Is that something that you looked at and it looked awful to you?

Mr. Batman – Without some horizontal there, they start to feel like long legs going up. That is why I kept the horizontal. I hear you on the squatness of that column at the landing. We could just not put a base there. We could come down and put the base back where the original porch was. That might help that.

Mr. Schwarz – You are just wrapping the wood that you have already constructed at this point. The column could appear to come all the way down.

Mr. Batman – It could. We could do anything here that you want us to do. I tried it out. They look long going up to that landing. It is tall. It needs something. When I put these other columns to help ground that landing there, because it has that one column, she originally had a column coming down to a big 2-by-12 beam where the horizontal is. Originally, there was a post coming down here to support this landing to a beam here. The other column was here. This feels awkward without something under it. That is where I came up with this rhythm to help ground it. I just carried it around. I am happy to do another iteration on this. I would have taken some of the comments and come up with something.

Ms. Lewis – What is in the hyphen? Is that a passageway? Is it livable space? What, functionally, is going on in there?

Mr. Batman – It is a back-of-house space. It acts as a connector. There is a unit on the ground floor of that rear. This is a required ADA unit here. There is a unit above. The way you are accessing this unit above is through a door right here. You can also get back to where the lounge is.

Ms. Lewis – It is a passageway.

Mr. Batman – It has a laundry room and storage, which you need in a property like this. That is what it is functioning as right now.

Ms. Lewis – Along with what Ms. Tabney and Mr. Birle said, I would like to see the back contemporary maybe enclosed in glass. That is why I asked whether that could be opened up or how enclosed. The sad part is that you would lose that back porch. With the structure next to it, you would maybe get a view across the street of McGuffey. This would become an addition instead of this confusing series of porches. You still have the problem of the stairs come down. All of the framework could be simplified. Whether it is interior space or exterior, there is a lot happening. Functionally, we know those stairs must get down. We have headspace requirements. You have that hyphen sitting there, which you need to work around.

Mr. Schwarz – I said this the last time. This is not an uncommon thing to have a stair to a porch. It happens a lot. My memory of them is that they are not complicated. Maybe they are and we don't notice. I feel that once it is complete and painted, there are going to be a lot of 'sins' on this that we are not going to see anymore. We are not going to notice that the columns are 'out of whack' by 2 inches. As much as that frustrates me architecturally, I don't think anybody is going to see that. What you did to the 1980s building to make it look so historicist, it is well done. I hear you about doing a contemporary something there. At the same time, you have worked so hard. The applicants worked so hard to make this very traditional. I don't know if that would feel even more out of place.

Mr. Batman – The applicant does want to do the front porch. He is working on getting funding to do that. He wants to do that. He wants to keep more of that historic feel versus making this a modern

statement. I like Mr. Birle's comment on that squat column. I think that is right. I think that I can simplify this. Once it is white and we put some arbor vitae in front of it, we are going to submit a landscaping plan for this area once I figure out with engineering what they are going to allow me to do. With walks coming and meeting at the street, one of the things that we would like to do is to potentially put a little rod iron fence there. We have had trouble with homeless people coming in and invading the house. We want to make sure it does not feel too open to the street. By the time you put the landscaping down there and it is white, I love the corners work up at the top. It is gorgeous. It is a beautiful Philadelphia gutter. The columns are decent. They are not that striking. The cornice work is beautiful.

Mr. Timmerman – It sounds like you have engaged in a lot of the comments that we made. It sounds like you are on the right path where you can make revisions that you are going to feel good with and we will hopefully feel good with next time. I don't think I would necessarily approve it this round. It sounds like you are willing to come back and make revisions. It would be the best for the project.

Mr. Batman – I agree. I am happy to have your comments. I appreciate them. It is a tough design problem. I am grateful for the input. Next time, I will do more. I will get the landscape architect involved. That is going to help a lot. Once you landscape the bottom of this and you paint it white, if we were to take it modern, we could maybe make it work. With everything else in the house, he wants it to feel like a historic boutique house. You have these nice, beautiful luxury rooms. That is the feel he wants. I have a lot of lighting on there. At night, it is going to look pretty with the deck lighting and the small accent lighting. The part that I have the most problems with is that lattice. What do we do between the columns? It needs something. I don't know when they put this in, but it was not historic. It was essentially security grading.

Mr. Timmerman – I don't think we suggested any one material but to take home the more general concepts of geometry and purpose. What is the intent? He should not feel tied to historic norms or a portion of the historic norms. Revising the design to meet its new needs, even if it is a contemporary solution, but to clean up the geometry that is a little chaotic.

Mr. Batman – I am happy to get you some more options. We want to do more options. I will probably be coming back to you anyways. I know that I am going to come back for the landscaping. I need to figure out with the engineering how they are going to allow me to get to the sidewalk.

Mr. Timmerman – Thank you for willingness to work with us.

Mr. Schwarz – You have mentioned on the drawings that you are removing the brick piers. Are we good with that? Does the applicant need to keep the brick pier? Can we let it go? I am Ok with it going away.

Mr. Birle – On one elevation, you do show a parged concrete base for that. You are going to have to do something. You cannot bring the wood down to grade.

Mr. Batman – This is existing concrete. This would be the intervention here on the corner. The brick columns come down. It makes a corner here. They put a concrete well to create that little porch down there. It is a tiny retaining wall this tall.

Mr. Birle – With the side elevation that we are seeing when we see the partial south elevation, we are seeing that in front of the brick pier. I am Ok with not having a brick pier.

Mr. Schwarz – I am going to bring up something that has been, for previous BARs, a point of contention. You appear to have that historic, weird, curved curbing on the edge of your sidewalk. We probably want to see what you intend to do with how you are going to cut through that or if you are going to cut through it.

Mr. Batman – That is where I still need to get with engineering and see what leeway I am going to get. Right now, the intent was to put a sidewalk at this entrance back here straight to the street and take a path that goes right up to this current sidewalk coming in. I need to get with engineering. I want to do a full landscape plan to bring to you. I am going to see how far I can get. I want to do enough that you all feel happy with this so I can build it. It might take a while with engineering and planning. They want to come back and do a minor site plan/minor development plan on this. We are not taking anything out. We came into this, and it had been partially done. We thought that we were good. We have halted on this part before we do anything to those concrete pieces that come up at the entrance.

Mr. Schwarz – The reason I noticed that is because you have this little pyramid at the edge of the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Batman – That is where this path comes out.

Mr. Bailey – If you are going to be doing landscape, I noticed that staff has put in a possible amendment to an approval.

Mr. Batman – We are going to put the front porch on. We must do landscaping around it. There is going to need to be a whole landscaping plan. The owner likes his properties to look nice. The landscaping is what is going to help blend this in and take away from it being right there.

Mr. Rosenthal – How many units are there in this complex?

Mr. Batman – It is going to be a boutique hotel. There are 12 rooms. Some of them are longer stay suites

Mr. Batman – asks for a deferral on his CoA Application – Ms. Lewis moves to accept applicant deferral – Mr. Schwarz with the Second – Motion passes 7-0.

17. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 25-01-06

201 West Water Street, Tax Parcel 280012000

Downtown ADC District

Owner/Applicant: Dan FitzHenry

Project: Signs for Grit Coffee

Mr. Schwarz recused himself from this CoA application discussion due to a conflict in interest. Mr. Schwarz is still contracted to work for the architect, who is doing another project for Grit Coffee.

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for installation of new signage:

- Sign A: Two applied window signs. Vinyl decals on interior of storefront glass. (Per sign regs, Div. 4.11.9.I.)

- Sign B: One canopy sign suspended below front canopy. (Per sign regs, Div. 4.11.9.E.)
- Sign C: One wall sign. Vinyl letters applied to painted masonry exterior wall. (Per sign regs, Div. 4.11.9.H.)
- Sign D: One projecting sign installed perpendicular to exterior wall. (Per sign regs, Div. 4.11.9.G.)

Dan Fitzhenry, Applicant – We are very excited to occupy this beautiful space on Water Street. We are moving from around the corner where our current space is. If you have been to any of our shops, we pride ourselves on our design and our look and feel. We have a mid-century modern aesthetic to our branding. What we are going for here is that there are many points of visibility to this building because of the unique way it is shaped. We are not trying to be visibly cluttered. We are trying to give some access points to let people know that we are occupying this space, whether they are coming either way on Water Street or either way on Second Street. I agree with staff about the canopy sign. Unfortunately, we would place it right behind the Downtown Mall sign that is already standing there at the corner.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Bailey – Did you say that you agree with staff about the canopy sign?

Mr. Fitzhenry – Yes.

Ms. Lewis – There might be some of us who support this.

Mr. Fitzhenry – We would love that visibility coming up Water Street before you crest that hill where you would be able to see the 2 window signs. We would love the package as submitted to be approved.

Mr. Werner – The point I am making in the staff report is that signage is a contentious issue on The Mall at some places for some businesses. I want to encourage you that, in saying ‘yes,’ then expressing it. I am not trying to overdo it. There are unique circumstances here and express those so I don’t have to be constantly getting asked why people cannot have 5 signs.

Mr. Rosenthal – Will we be setting some precedent by allowing the 5 signs?

Mr. Werner – It is difficult to say because of where window signs have now become. We have turned the page. We are not sure how things are going to play out. The correct answer would be that you look at everything individually. If this was on The Mall and between 2 other buildings, 30-foot storefront, and somebody wanted 5 signs, that would be a different set of circumstances. You could defend yourselves.

Ms. Lewis – To support it, you are at an intersection. The other complicating factor is that Water Street comes to a crest at Second Street. You are below it even when you are down at Waterhouse and at The Terraces. It is a little blind in some ways until you get to the top. You must figure out what pedestrians are going across. Who wants to go down The Mall crossing? I always find it a challenging intersection. I use that crossing a lot. All of them are warranted. If the window signs were not

permitted, you could hang a mobile sign there and do the same thing. All of them address different ways that one would approach this business. I thought that the canopy sign was a good idea. If I was walking or driving up Water Street, I am not sure you would not see the recessed wall sign. All of them serve different purposes. Whoever designed your package was thinking about that. Our ordinance should consider how much street frontage you have. If you think about the width and the depth of that parcel, it is worth 2 or 3 storefronts on the Downtown Mall. It is quite large. You have the problem with the recessed entrance. I would be in favor of all 5 signs for those reasons.

Mr. Rosenthal – Are you planning on having seating outside underneath that canopy?

Mr. Fitzhenry – If we do, it would be limited along the left side.

Mr. Timmerman – What are you going to put under the canopy?

Mr. Fitzhenry – We are going to keep 3 of the parking spots.

Ms. Tabony – What is the height of the underside of the canopy?

Mr. Fitzhenry – I believe it is 12 feet.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Timmerman – I would like to add, in relation to the idea of precedent, I almost consider this a 4-sign proposal. The 2 glass signs are like a column. I would look at it as a 4-sign proposal. You are looking at a building with not 2 faces but 4 faces. You have this unique situation. It is in keeping with the guidelines. It is a great proposal.

Motion to Approve – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed signage at 201 West Water Street satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the request as submitted. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 6-0.

K. Other Business

18. Pre-Application Conference

No formal action will be taken.

200 West Main Street; TMP 280010000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Violet Crown Cinema Charlottesville LLC

Applicant: Jeff Levien / Heirloom Development (contract purchaser)

Project: Multi-story residential

- Third time in front of the BAR for a preliminary discussion continuing from the discussions in November and December.

- According to staff, there must be a demolition CoA before the CoA for the construction of the new building.
- The applicant is intending to submit a demolition CoA application for the February BAR Regular Meeting.
- The applicant made a presentation intending to address the concerns and comments raised by members of the BAR at the previous meetings.
- Ms. Tabney asked if the Tree Commission had reviewed the shadow studies. The Tree Commission does not have an official capacity.
- The applicant did admit that there is still a lot of work to do with this project with design and aesthetics.
- The applicant needs to be able to demolish a building and needs to know an envelope of a building.
- There has not been much change with the massing. There has been a lower step-back with the 3rd story.
- The applicant made a presentation with the proposed massing of the building. The applicant provided the proposed step-backs, the massing, and the proposed elevation compared to the other buildings on the Downtown Mall.
- Included in the presentation were the different and multiple pedestrian views.
- The applicant presented a shadow impact study and sun hours on the Spring Equinox, Summer Solstice, Fall Equinox, and Winter Solstice.
- Mr. Rosenthal had some concerns about the process and the granting of a CoA for the demolition of the building on the site.
- Mr. Rosenthal's concern was the possibility of the lot sitting empty and vacant following the demolition of the building.
- Mr. Bailey asked how many residential units would be included in this building. The applicant said that it would be about 200 residential units.
- Mr. Timmerman did express more support for the shadow studies versus the solar studies. Mr. Timmerman found the shadow studies more compelling.
- Mr. Schwarz did say that he is not concerned about the right-of-way. The step-back helps to break down the scale of the building to the pedestrian walking by.
- Staff encouraged the BAR to express support for a specific height and step-backs.
- Mr. Rosenthal asked the question about the timeline for this project. The applicant answered that it was going to take close to 18 months before breaking ground and 4 to 5 years for project completion.
- Ms. Tabony asked if another 25-foot step-back was possible. The applicant said that what the zoning allows and what the economics allow.
- Mr. Schwarz compared the proposed building to the Dewberry Building.
- Mr. Schwarz said that he felt that the Dewberry Building did not loom as much over the Downtown Mall as this proposed building because of the setbacks of the Dewberry Building.
- Mr. Schwarz did state that height is most appropriate on this end of the Downtown Mall.
- Each member of the BAR provided suggestions and feedback for the applicant to improve the project.
- Ms. Lewis had serious concerns with the height of the proposed building. Ms. Lewis said that it is very difficult to imagine this building with the proposed height.

The BAR switched to the 300 Ridge Street Pre-Application Conference.

After completion of the 300 Ridge Street Pre-Application Conference, the BAR returned to the discussion on 200 West Main Street.

- Zoning does not review projects until a building permit application has been submitted.
- Even though Mr. Zehmer was not at the meeting, Mr. Timmerman read the comments from Mr. Zehmer into the record.

19. Pre-Application Conference

No formal action will be taken.

No formal action will be taken.

300 Ridge Street, Tax Parcel 280151000

Ridge Street ADC District

Owner: Donald J. & Brenda C. Toney, Trustees

Applicant: Greg Jackson, TOPIA design

Project: Addition

- The project is currently conceptual.
- The plan is for an addition on the backside/downhill side of the house.
- The applicant asked members of the BAR for feedback and input to make this project happen.
- Mr. Birle asked the applicant about the materiality of the project. Mr. Jackson is considering using cement panels.
- Members of the BAR provided suggestions, feedback, and criticism that could be done to make the project better.
- The applicant does need about 1000 square feet for the business.
- Ms. Tabony stated that the entry into this building was going to be important for this building.
- Ms. Lewis was positive about there being commercial activity in this building.

20. Staff Questions/Discussion

- Vacant seat for Landscape Architect
- Review 2025 meeting calendar (see below)
- CLG Annual Report – BAR training requirements
- Schedule work session re: process and procedures

L. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 PM.