

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
June 17, 2025
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: Carl Schwarz, Ron Bailey, Cheri Lewis, Kate Tabony, Jerry Rosenthal, Roger Birle, James Zehmer, Jenny Lauer

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

Pre-Meeting:

There was discussion surrounding the security of City Hall and making sure that the doors of City Hall lock and close.

Ms. Lewis asked Mr. Matthews if he has spoken with the residents on 7th Street. Staff and members of the BAR did go over what should be focused on with the project at 7th Street.

There was discussion surrounding the 218 West Market Street. Ms. Lewis will be recusing herself for the 218 West Market Street. Ms. Lewis was frustrated with the applicant not telling neighboring property owners about bringing the application to the BAR meeting.

Mr. Zehmer 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. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR #25-0083

120 West High Street, TMP 330184000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Christ Episcopal Church

Applicant: Devin Donnelly

Project: Partial demo, rear porch and storage area.

Motion to Approve Consent Agenda – Mr. Schwarz – Second by Mr. Bailey – Motion passes 8-0.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the demolition of the rear porch at the brick house formerly 103 West Jefferson 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 application as submitted, and the BAR recommends any salvageable elements be retained on-site, should a future recreation of the porch be considered, or be incorporated as a design elements in any new work at this location.

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR #25-0077

540 Park Street, TMP 520183000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Patrick & Jessica Fenn

Applicant: Douglas Croker

Project: Window replacements

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request for the replacement of existing windows using Lepage Millwork painted wood windows with insulated glass. (Where divided lights are simulated with applied muntin, there is an internal spacer, consistent with the design guidelines.)

Ms. Lewis – I did not see a reference about what is happening with that historic transom.

Mr. Werner – The transom is going to remain in place.

Ms. Lewis – It was not shown in the drawings. It was not mentioned texturally that I could find.

Mr. Werner – It is something from inside the house that would be interesting outside.

Ms. Lewis – Walking up Park Street today, I found several other examples, not all of it applied on the outside like that. There are other types of code dated windows that look a lot like that on more historic buildings.

Mr. Werner – Those are the 2 differences in the staff report. The recommended motion is as submitted. I would just ask that if there is a motion that you consider including these two.

Mr. Rosenthal – Was this the only issue that we had?

Douglas Croker, Applicant – We also made them all wood windows. We upgraded the window to all wood windows, so there was no clad window. I was happy to have my client agree to that.

The last time we talked about this thing that they hung the reference to the historic, it is hanging on old hinges. I thought that, in the last meeting, we were not going to put that. It is a hooked-up imitation. Is that important to do?

Mr. Zehmer – I don’t think we feel like that is historically accurate in that location. It might be from the house. It might be from a salvage yard. It is something applied to the exterior of the house. I don’t think it is in its original location.

Mr. Croker – We can certainly try. I would not want to put it up the way it is now.

Mr. Zehmer – I don't think we are requiring that to go back. Staff's suggestion is that they should put a partition or mullion in between 2 double-hung windows.

Mr. Croker – There will be 2 double-hung windows.

Mr. Werner – It can stay if they would like for it to stay. It is like shutters. They can remove it if they would like.

Mr. Zehmer – What is the intent of the applicant?

Mr. Croker – I was going to remove it and fix everything with real windows and fix the shutters that need it and not put that transom back. I am trying to fix the front porch. I am not going to make any changes to it. I am pleased that, from a client who was against doing anything, he has now agreed to do everything. I would ask that it be approved without that as a requirement. If he allows us to put it back, we will put it back.

Ms. Lewis – You are positive that it never fit the window?

Mr. Croker – Positive. It won't even sit flat. It is an old hardware. I don't think it would never fit because you have a mold down the center that will protrude.

Mr. Werner – I am confident that is not from that. It is not an exterior window. It was possibly a transom inside. It was not on there. It does not fit. It is not the right width. It is 2 regular hinges. I was not looking at it as an issue here. If it stayed, it stayed. If it left, it left.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – With the attic windows, are the existing windows casement windows because the proposed was replacement or casement up there?

Mr. Croker – They are casement windows.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – I want to thank you and the applicant for agreeing to do the double-hung windows.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed window replacements at 540 Park Street satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the clarification that [it is acceptable to] either remove or retain the [exterior] transom on the first floor window. The triple windows that are currently casements on the south elevation will remain casements. Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 8-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 24-0038

218 West Market Street, TMP 330276000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Cavalier Hospitality LLC

Applicant: Bob Pineo, Design Develop

Project: Construction of multi-story hotel

Ms. Lewis recused herself from the 218 West Market Street Certificate of Appropriateness Application.

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for a multi-story hotel: Six stories facing Old Preston Avenue; five stories facing West Market Street. (Maximum height allowed under DX zoning is 10 stories, 142-ft.)

Jeff Levien, Applicant – There are 2 things that we have done since the last hearing. Staff pointed out all the detail that we had to get into. We submitted a lot of detail that we could go through. We feel that we have given that. From an architectural design, we took the 3 to 5 things that stood out to address. We feel that we addressed them.

Next Slide

What we did was that we heard a lot of comments about more uniformity with the patterns. You were saying that it was not as symmetrical as you would like. We feel that we addressed that on both sides of the building. That was one thing on the upper portion.

Bob Pineo, Applicant –

Next Slide

This is related to Ms. Tabony's comment about column spacing, the ABC. We went through the floor plan and looked at all the cases where there was and created a more regular pattern of ABA to show that we have done that.

Mr. Levien –

Next Slide

Here we did a couple things. With that wall, it also bothered me. We were going to punt it a little bit. We heard everyone's concern. We added that planting bed in front. The plan is to make those seasonal and plant those. They are pieces that you buy. We are confident that you can install them. They are a great way to make that more available and shield that wall. We did not add the detail of the lighting that Ms. Tabony spoke of. We made a note of it that we are because we have some photometric issues we need to work on. We need to get the detail of where those will go. It is in our submission. We would expect that it would be approved. If you want us to come back and show the detail, we could. We were just at the point that I did not want to show you something fake and done on the fly. We do have to get to it. We added trees. Mr. Schwarz was strong in that comment about complying with tree and tree canopy.

Next Slide

This is a tight-in shot of that wall.

Mr. Pineo – We kept the front wall the way it was and planned and recessed the porch area. That porch area now responds well. The canopy is the same as it is. It used to stick out a little bit further than the canopy. They are basically in line.

Mr. Levien –

Next Slide

We took another look at this entrance. I still want this entrance to be what I am going to call the ‘cool, hip, find it’ entrance. I did want it shockingly ‘bells and whistles.’ It is primarily for guests. We feel strongly that anybody visiting that restaurant is going to come in off Market Street if they are specifically going there or they will be guests of the hotel or they will know to get there. Those are the only people that should be using that. We constantly went back to the preference of having the retail speak the strongest along that street. We did add a bump out to shield. We heard that comment about separating the driveway the more functional to the doorway.

Mr. Pineo –

Next Slides

As you remember that solid stair egress tower, that articulation was more blank. What we have done is incorporated more into that 3-dimensional 2-story brick façade. We bumped that out, made that stair open, added more light, and added another large window into that stairwell. The idea is to continue the focus on the retail feeling of the street. That base has been enlarged. It has been pulled out. There is more detail. The canopy is where it is. There is now a little bit of a recess. We separated it from the entrance to the garage portal. We have done other things like taking this idea of the planter. That is the back-of-house entrance to the garage. Incorporating some of those elements so that the building reads, it has the same elements on both sides. The focus for us was continuing to make the pedestrian experience, as far as retail and connectivity, our primary focus.

Mr. Levien – We did make it a little grander by adding that window. A big focus was to that back-of-the-house now with that landscaping and it does not become like this one little dark thing to walk by. We brought that column out. To separate those two, we toyed with it. We wanted to make it definitive enough but subtle enough. We were conscious awareness of sight lines. Whether we plant next to it, that is to be determined. We thought we captured some of the BAR’s concern about separating those 2 elements.

Cheval Oldaker, Landscape Architect –

Next Slides

We addressed Mr. Schwarz’s comments about the Market Street side where we brought in more trees. We meet our street requirements. Mr. Werner and I talked about the gingko on the Old Preston side where there is plenty of precedents on the Downtown Mall for gingko century. We feel that is the appropriate tree on that side as well. We were able to bring in more trees in the old Market Street side

Mr. Levien – We confirm that the trees will be using are compliant with the context.

Next Slide

We brought the materials the last time. We had a box of the actual material to feel. A lot of the stuff was further detailed. We did change the material on the screening on the roof because we knew that was important.

We are appreciative of everything we have received from the BAR. It took a lot of time. We are hoping for a positive vote and an approval tonight, so we can continue.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lauer – I had a question about the bed width for the trees on the streetscape. Do you know the bed width of the street tree on the Preston side?

Mr. Oldaker – I believe that is going to be about 5 to 7 feet. We are still in design development.

Mr. Levien – One thing that we went through the last time is we have utilities and stormwater in that sidewalk. We had to make it a little tight. We had to combine the green scape along with the sidewalk and respect the utilities underground.

Mr. Oldaker – We are not able to take the trees to the street side because of the stormwater systems and utilities. That is why we chose the ginkgo for that. It is probably closer to the building. They brought some more green. It creates a green wall. When you are looking on the Mall, this is like an alley style approach.

Mr. Zehmer – One of the comments that I sent to you was the location and material for the control joints. Did you show those somewhere? Could you describe those?

Mr. Pineo – On page 32 on the far right, that is the expansion joint.

Mr. Zehmer – I was looking more where are they are going to be on the façade of the building?

Mr. Pineo – If you look at all the elevations, they clearly show where. There is a vertical expansion joint at the windows.

Mr. Zehmer – You talked about the ginkgoes. Any concern that they are almost too close to the building? I understand that you have utility conflict. They mask the windows of the retail space that you are trying to provide there. It hides and screens it. I did not know if you had any concerns with that.

Mr. Oldaker – We are limited with what we can do in that space. We are trying to bring in trees in there.

Mr. Levien – My belief is that it might be two retailers, probably one retailer. With the right signage, it is not going to be this kind of row where there are 4 or 5 entrances. You must find them all. There is only one place. We will select an entrance. If we make that with the right signage, the trees will not have an effect. The retailers will have to adjust. It is also not something like a window shopping where it will have to pop, and someone needs to see something. We chose it because we like it. It is like that downtown feel. It is not like a part of Stonefield. I like that hidden feeling where you are finding something. With the pocket park, you are going to have a big pop there as well.

Mr. Zehmer – You have the minimum installed sizes as a 2-inch caliper. What is the typical height of a 2-inch caliper ginkgo?

Mr. Oldaker – It should be about 10 to 12 feet. They will be small to start out.

Ms. Tabony – Did the stucco joint on page 32 have a dimension? I did not see that.

Mr. Pineo – It is a stow detail. I can get you that. This is a manufacturer's detail. If I had to scale it, it looks like something between 5/8 or 3/4 of an inch. I don't think we have flexibility on that. I can get you that if you like.

Ms. Tabony – Can you remind us of the thickness of the stucco product?

Mr. Pineo – It is about an inch and an eighth. It is effectively a 3-coat masonry product. While it is a stow product, it is a wire lab scratch coat, brown coat. It is a real masonry stucco.

Ms. Tabony – The detail that I was looking at said it is the vertical joint detail. That detail would be the vertical and horizontal.

Mr. Pineo – It is a different detail. That detail there is specifically for the floor expansion. It allows for flexibility if the system changes. You don't need to have flashing.

Ms. Tabony – Do you have that shown in your application?

Mr. Pineo – I don't. I can get that for you.

Ms. Tabony – With the window detailing, I saw that you included that, but did not see any dimensions of the jam depth or sill depth. Is that something you have available?

Mr. Pineo – Let me see if I can get that from Mr. Kulkarni. We did bring the sample window profile.

Ms. Tabony – I remember the window profile. There was no brick. I think someone had a comment the last time about the depth of that window assembly relative to the outside of the brick just to understand the depth of that façade.

Mr. Birle – Page 29 shows the brick return at the openings. It is not the dimension but there is some relief there.

Mr. Schwarz – A more general question would be that with the windows that are in brick, are they going to be recessed into the brick so that we see something like the returns on here? Are they going to be more flush with the brick?

Mr. Birle – This suggests that there is a return. Is that the intent?

Mr. Pineo – Yes.

Ms. Tabony – It looks like the windows in the stucco are flush with the stucco. Is that correct?

Mr. Pineo – They are close. I believe that there is a recess that the windows are set back to a certain degree. These are not flamed windows. The capacity to set them back is there. To what degree? I will have to double-check.

Mr. Birle – The detail you provided does not show a stucco return at the opening.

Mr. Zehmer – On the center image for the sill, is it typical for that vertical face of that brick to tilt outward like that?

Nitin Kulkarni, Applicant – We have most of the drawings regarding the details. The windows are not flushed with the exterior. They are recessed in as you can see in this detail. They have these sections, which will imitate roll off bricks. Whenever there is a recess, there are corners available so that we can handle all those. It does not look like it is stuck on the sides of the windows. It looks real. These are thin windows. After nailing the pins onto the framing, there will be the stucco coming out around 2 inches. It will turn. They are not flush to the extreme. I

believe that there are details for the stucco. I don't know exactly if you have incorporated that. I also did share those details for the windows sill. If you don't have it, we can always share that.

Mr. Pineo – Is it what you gave us is in that packet?

Mr. Kulkarni – It should be in the packet. It is like this, except there are flashings coming out of the window bottom. That is part of the stucco system that they provide to treat the window returns on the side. On the left-hand side, you can see that sealant jam detail. Do you see at the bottom an end damp flashing, which comes out. There is a return after you put the frame in.

Mr. Birle – When I look at that detail, that is not a stucco return

Mr. Kulkarni – I was trying to show the bottom, the sill detail.

Mr. Birle – The sill projects a little bit. I don't think there is a problem with having a difference between openings in a masonry wall and openings in the stucco. That is not unusual

Mr. Pineo – Just looking at this section. If the framing is the same and the window is the same, you have the brick. Picture that detail with stucco. You are naturally going to get a return back.

Mr. Birle – It is not going to be like the detail that the stow section showed.

Mr. Pineo – If the framing and the window are the same, take away the brick and replace it with stucco. You would get a return on the jams and the head.

Mr. Birle – The framing is right behind the thin brick. What you are seeing there is just the blocking.

Mr. Pineo – You are seeing the wall framing, the sheathing, and all the subassemblies. Replace the brick with the stucco. Stucco is about the same if not even a little bit thicker than the brick. It would have that same return. Therefore, the window would recess.

Mr. Birle – You are not showing that anywhere.

Mr. Zehmer – Is there a difference between the previous slide where it has the flanged window versus the recessed window?

Mr. Birle – These slides are just to show the stow system.

Mr. Zehmer – I am talking about this.

Ms. Tabony – Where are these details shown?

Mr. Zehmer – It is like there is a double-step for the recessed window and a single step for this flange window.

Mr. Birle – You are showing both a flanged window that is flush with brick and you are showing a window that has a brick return, so that there is a recessed opening in the masonry. We want to make sure we know what is being suggested here. On 28, it is flush. On 29, there is a 1.5-inch reveal.

Ms. Tabony – I would also point out that if you go to the renderings, it looks like there are many more conditions in the renderings that are not shown in the details. I see flush brick condition. I see a deep return. I see

a stucco window. Some have the tilted sill detail. It would be helpful to have more clarity. I am sure that there are 3 window conditions that we should be seeing before.

Mr. Werner – I want to make sure what I am hearing. The return is a certain depth window that is punched. Windows are punched, and there is a certain depth to them. It is that. There are various places. It is various depths. It is being able to discern that, as shown, these are not flush as shown. As shown, we assume these are punched.

Ms. Tabony – That is correct. If you go to the Old Preston side, there is the very deep return there. If you look above the brick that looks to be a punched opening above the canopy, that looks like a different depth. I think there are some conditions that we are not seeing in detail.

Mr. Pineo – Do you feel comfortable with the idea that they are there. The idea of detailing this entire building with all these? There is one thing, I think the problem is that the level of specificity when we are getting a building that could fall apart at the detail level. We all get that. The idea is that there are different conditions. They are showing 3-dimensionally, they are showing design intent. With the Certificate of Appropriateness, is that an appropriate setting for the window? The idea now is how that gets done. That is a lot of work. From an architect's perspective, speaking as architect to architect, sometimes it takes time to fully flush out these details. You get better as you go, assuming that the hand who is doing it understands the requirement. It is embedded in the drawings. The intent is there. You are right. Some of the windows are flush. Some of the windows are recessed. The whole idea is that is the design intent. Resolution of those details is a lot. We could spend a lot of time and effort. It is coming. Is this the right time to get into those details? I am sure staff is saying, 'how am I going to review these?' We know that it is set back. We know that there are different window conditions. There needs to be an appropriate detail that is drawn, that is commiserate with the design intent. I always feel that, within time, these details will and should be resolved. At this point, design intent is true. How far do we go to try to resolve all these details? I would almost argue it is contrary to good building because you need the time. With good building design, you need time to flush these details out with the manufacturer. That is my advocacy. The design intent is there. We need time. The process needs time to evolve so that the details are done correctly.

Mr. Levien – Is the intent that they are going to be stacked that they are going to be different. Are they all one way and you just put 2 things on there by accident?

Mr. Pineo – No. The design intent is that masonry openings are different than masonry stucco openings.

Mr. Birle – That is all we are asking for right now. We are not asking you to detail the windows. You have shown 2 different conditions in brick, one that I would find objectionable. What you have said is that you are going to have returns at the masonry openings. You are going to make a distinction. That is as much as I would want out of this right now.

Mr. Levien – You must give them the definitiveness of what our intent is. If our intent is to have those in variation and we went for the final build and they were all the same, we would not be of that intent. I just want to make sure. You are right. We can go through every window and detail each different.

Mr. Pineo – In this iteration and the previous one, we have 30 slides of renderings up close. That is the design intent. That is a distinct difference between the upper floors.

Mr. Levien – I am trying to follow along. I did not know if it was like the 2 things there. You are saying that they are different.

Mr. Schwarz – The confusion might be that the details you gave us, you have the flange windows in there. It sounds like you did not intend to put that in there.

Mr. Pineo – The flange window would work.

Mr. Kulkarni – I have been informed by the contractor that we are closely working with that. He would like to use the flange windows. It will be a flat window. The amount of return shown in the windowsill detail for the break is not exactly what it should be. There will be a little less return. There will be some return. Once you put the flange on the framing, there will be some build up of the brick. We have moisture drainage system behind it. That is the extent of return we are going to get. We are not going to get a whole lot of return where the roll is shown completely coming out. There will be roll off, but it will not be as much as is shown in the detail.

Mr. Zehmer – Most of the renderings show a deep reveal. That is where we are struggling.

Mr. Kulkarni – The front ones are columns coming out. Are we talking about those? Are we talking about both?

Mr. Zehmer – It looks like there is one brick. For the windows where do have the deep return, it seems that there is a brick border around the window. Where I was reading the flange window might be the one that is over the Preston Street entrance where it seems more flush, perhaps where the workout room may be. There are some that looked like that on the first floor on the Preston Avenue side. They were more flush or flange windows. I was reading the others as more recessed. It might be beneficial to call it out. It could just simply be marking up. Windows #1 are flanged and windows #2 are recessed.

Mr. Pineo – If you see this rendering, do you see how the column lines are sticking out. There is a significant depth in that column. Even if you have a flange window, you could nail something to the side of it and create the flange. You are always going to have a big brick return. That is all the column lines on the main floor. That takes care of that entire lower floor. You are still on the Preston side. You are up on the second floor. It is the same condition. Those windows are recessed back. We might need a nailing flange or something like that to help secure the window. You are still going to be recessed back. The columns are going to be expressed. If you go to the third floor, it is still the same thing. Those windows are recessed. That is a masonry open with a punched opening that is recessed back significantly.

Mr. Schwarz – What about the windows above the garage door?

Mr. Pineo – I would say it is the same thing. We are returning. This is a question or task for Mr. Kulkarni to figure out.

Mr. Kulkarni – With those windows above the entry to the garage, those 2 columns are extending out just like the other columns. That creates a recessed opening there. That is why they are recessed. That is not a typical condition everywhere. That is just one exceptional condition where we have that effect. With the rest of those areas, we have vertical columns coming out. We have the windows, which are not really recessed. The thickness of the brick itself will be outside the frames. With the moisture drainage system, that inch and the brick thickness will be around 3 inches. It will be recessed by that much. Beyond that, we are not using the windows, which will be recessed inside. These will be the planned figures.

Mr. Schwarz – Did you provide the type of windows? I am seeing this and reading it as storefront.

Mr. Kulkarni – These are high-quality composite windows.

Mr. Werner – In the guidelines under New Construction, for doors and windows, traditionally designed openings generally are recessed on masonry buildings and have a raised surround on frame buildings. This tint here is masonry. Those buildings would be punched. Unless it is indicated, I am not concerned if this is 2 inches, 2.5 inches, or 3.5 inches. The intent is that they are either punched or flush. That is where I would like some clarification. If applying the guidelines, these should all be punched and have some level of recess. It sounds like there are some flush windows.

Ms. Tabony – Do the guidelines include that if any material needs to be punched?

Mr. Werner – If it is a masonry. If it was framed, the trim would project out around where the siding comes in. For a masonry building, yes, we would assume a punched opening.

Mr. Zehmer – I heard that Mr. Kulkarni say that they were not planning to use the roll lock detail with the sill.

Mr. Kulkarni – We will use the roll lock detail on the sill. That tin brick system comes with that roll out detail. It will not be as deep as it is shown.

Mr. Zehmer – That is part of our hangup. The rendering is showing one thing that you are saying is not the intent.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Deanna Gould – I am the executive director of Lighthouse located next to the 218 Hotel build. I understand the BAR makes decisions based on design, not safety or noise. By approving this design, you are approving a garage door placement, which is next door to Lighthouse's accessibility ramp for the Vinegar Hill Theater and our theater door entrance. I attended the November meeting when you determined a redesign of the 218 Hotel was necessary. On January 13th, I asked Mr. Levien for an update. He said it would take a few days to get back to me. He never did. On May 30th, Mike Stoneking, Lighthouse's architect advisor reached out to Bob Pineo asking about the proximity of the new build's garage door to our theater. Mr. Pineo needed to check on this. Mike did not hear back from him. On June 5th, I reached out to Mr. Levien and asked for a meeting the week of June 9th. I received a reply telling me that the meeting was premature. However, on June 13th, Mr. Levien suggested meeting tomorrow morning, the morning after asking you for approval. The garage door placement is not safe. Every day and throughout the day, our students, teachers, staff, and theater attendees exit our theater door and turn right to access The Mall. They will be forced to navigate cars entering and exiting the hotel. Our accessibility ramp is located beside our theater and next to the hotel's garage door. It is used by individuals in wheelchairs as well as attendees. The November hotel design showed a garage door located on Old Preston. Today's design shows another one located on a dangerous street curve where accidents happen. Currently, you are not allowed to exit left or right from The Artful Lodger parking lot on Market Street. My understanding is that there is a Charlottesville city planning and design goal to not allow large vehicular openings on primary streets. As this driveway descends into the garage, it will create a fall hazard along our wheelchair access path. Our theater is much more likely to suffer from the sounds as cars enter and exit given the garage door placement. This might make our theater inoperative, which would result in a major revenue loss. Vinegar Hill has been around since 1976. We recognize the importance to our community. We agreed to keep it going. We hold about 100 events annually. Last year, we gave \$47,000 back to our community.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Tabony – Where are the guidelines for pedestrian crossings? Is that in zoning? It is in zoning.

Mr. Schwarz – Unfortunately, this is a thing where we can push for. We can say whether a garage door is appropriate on a façade or not. As far as our guidelines are concerned, that is the most appropriate place for a garage. As far as being a good neighbor is concerned, I don't know. I think zoning is going to end up looking at whether that garage can be there or not. I am pretty sure that with zoning, it can. At that point, that is going to be considered a ground floor. I think they will have to get some exceptions. I don't know for sure on windows on that ground floor. They won't treat the main level as a ground floor by the time you get so far over there because the ground is sloped or drops off so much. I don't know how zoning is going to take this. With zoning, we are going to pretend that we are going to approve based on our guidelines. I have asked Mr. Werner if you must get an exception, even if it ends up being administratively approved. At least, somebody could tell us. I don't know if it must come back to us. At least, we are aware of what is going on. It sounds like you still need to go through the whole development process.

Mr. Levien – I dislike the characterization that Ms. Gould painted. I have been in communication for years with her and trying to be cooperative. Any conversation before going through this whole process is premature. You should know that, operationally, that garage door stays closed. It is all valet. It is not residential where people are coming in and out. Part of our conversation tomorrow is going to be about logistics, how we can work that out and how that might be a benefit to her operation in permitting additional parking. This characterization of we are just putting up a driveway and ignoring them is a mischaracterization. We have met with her on separate occasions. I took objection to that.

Mr. Zehmer – Mr. Schwarz's comments are well taken. It is a zoning question. From the BAR perspective, it is the exterior of the building. I agree that seems to be the best place for a garage entrance. I would certainly recommend painting a pedestrian crosswalk across that driveway and any other safety features could be implied there. The function of the building and where parking comes in is up to the designer.

Mr. Schwarz – I can respond to the garage door. It does seem like that is, as far as our guidelines are concerned, you put it in the lowest location, which I think is preferable. You have made some changes to the streetscape. They are small changes, but they do make a big difference. I appreciate that. With the last couple of meetings, I have picked on this. You have responded as well as you can. You push back where you have had to push back. In general, I am feeling more comfortable with this. If things end up changing, it will come back to us. If things don't work out in the site plan process or the development plan process, we will end up seeing it again. The renderings do show a lot of detail. I appreciate that detail. However, you figure out how to make it work with the thin brick, I realize that cornices may change profiles. You may have bell courses in different locations. If that same level of detail comes back or ends up in the final product, that is what I would like to see. Lighting is going to come back to us. I am ready to approve this tonight.

Mr. Werner – This is a prior elevation. I also wanted to offer a comment that might be helpful in your discussion. I alluded to this at the end of the last meeting. Gingkoes are no longer on the tree list as a recommended tree. They are not on the list as a prohibited tree. I understand the intent that we don't want invasives. There is some concern about monocultures. There are situations where ginkgo is the perfect tree. I would ask that if you are looking at that and thinking about that, a statement of that specifically would be helpful. When it goes to the site plan and suddenly it says that this isn't on the tree list, this is that. That is where I say that the BAR has purview to review the landscape design. This is the design intent. I just want to not lose that in the mix.

Mr. Kulkarni – I just got the confirmation that we can use the punched windows where the bricks are used to have them recessed. I wanted to let everybody know that.

Mr. Schwarz – If the city comes back and they can somehow move all their sewer lines out of the way and we can get some real trees, that would be fantastic. I don't think the applicant is going to be able to do that.

Mr. Zehmer – Can we require male gingkoes?

Mr. Birle – The applicant has done a good job of being responsive. There are small changes, but they have improved it. I am sorry that we got hung up on the returns of windows. It is an important point. These elevations did not start to feel great until we saw some of the recesses 2 times ago. There is a lot of detail here. The architectural details are not really showing the detail that I am seeing in the renderings. The renderings look very intentional. The way the windows are treated are a big part of that. I am on board with this if it can look like these renderings.

Ms. Tabony – What does that require? Detailed submission?

Mr. Birle – We cannot ask for this building to be detailed at this point. It is really a matter of intent that there is agreement that masonry openings will be punched. I would be of the opinion that stucco is a masonry product. I am Ok with that being a flatter abstracted surface, which the renderings kind of show, as long as the masonry openings have a deep recess.

Mr. Werner – We have characterized it on some entrance corridor stuff. At least, it has been characterized as reasonably consistent with the renderings, something that would direct me to refer to the renderings relative to that depth. I would be comfortable with that. If it is Ok to have those upper story windows flush, say so. If some level of recess is necessary, say so with some general guidance. I would at least hope they would not be proud. I hope these would not be projecting.

Mr. Zehmer – Looking at the renderings, most of the punched windows are where we have brick that is recessed. The exception potentially being the one right over the Preston Avenue entrance and some on the Market Street side to the left of the front door and maybe the ones that separate the lobby and small dining area. I think even those at the little dining area are recessed. It seems to me that the confusion is that the detail shows a flush brick or a flange with the brick. That does not seem like what they are showing in the rendering. Mostly the flush is more with the stucco. Is that what I am reading right? Is that what you all are reading?

Mr. Birle – When we zoom in on the renderings, there is a little bit of a return on the stucco as well.

Ms. Lauer – I am curious if the renderings are not the best vehicle for analyzing building details and if it would be helpful for the applicant to provide an elevation markup that indicates each window condition if there are 3 or 4 conditions. That does not mean they need to detail every condition, but just to indicate where those conditions occur and what the depth is of the return.

Mr. Zehmer – That is what I was alluding to when a mark of type 1, type 2, ABC.

Mr. Schwarz – What we have asked for in the past is that we have asked wall sections. We don't necessarily care about the guts of the wall section. It is more of just that outer profile of knowing what we are going to get. It has been a while since we have gotten one of those. We have had some big buildings in between. I don't know if that is something that they could just send to staff to confirm that this looks like what we were talking about.

Mr. Werner – I agree that this has always been the challenge of where we have a rendering, an elevation, and none of them align. We like stucco, which is a masonry material, and the windows should be punched. Is there agreement on that? My primary concern is the upper floor. I will express my opinion on this. I feel that the EIFS, stucco, and whatever the material is, and we have those flush windows on the upper floors, it has that generic hotel look. I am primarily concerned that upper floors where those windows are punched, you all can stipulate that it maybe be a full brick course or half brick course or a certain thickness, it does not matter to me. If they

come back and show those as flush, I am going to say that we need to talk to the BAR, unless you want to stipulate something differently.

Mr. Birle – I am fine with that. That is how they are showing it in the rendering.

Mr. Levien – We are not looking for any wiggle room. We have an intent of what we are doing in recess. The only thing we beat is whether that is 2 inches or 3 inches. If we meet that intent and they are all recessed and we have that series laid out, we can work through that. We are Ok with an approval of it looks like, but it does not have this flush or something. We are not trying to move off that. We need time to detail what each window condition is.

Ms. Tabony – I am not seeing the punched stucco detail anywhere. That is my concern. I agree with you that that should happen. That would make it a better building.

Mr. Pineo – We agree too. How about a 2-inch recess on the stucco?

Ms. Tabony – Can it match the brick? I don't know the dimension of the brick. I would love to see dimensioned, the brick detail depth. It would be great if it matched that. It looked like it was about right. I still don't know the dimensions.

Mr. Pineo – It is a simple thing here. We have 3 conditions. We have the stucco. Let's say that is 2 inches. The window plane is 2 inches set back from the face of the plane of the stucco. When it comes to windows that planer with the brick, we will do 3 inches or a full brick back. If you look at the Preston side, there is no flush. There are very few flush window details. There is a column line that sticks out. The window is recessed 1 or 2 feet back from that. It is only the window that is above the garage and potentially some of the windows on the upper floors. The way the articulation of the structure is, those windows by design are recessed back.

Ms. Tabony – There is a brick element that is more or less flush with the window.

Mr. Zehmer – There is a border that is along that vertical edge.

Ms. Tabony – It appears to be recessed.

Mr. Pineo – The design intent and what Mr. Kulkarni alluded to was if there was an idea of a flange window, we don't need to do that. The flange does not need a nailer. The brick plane goes back perpendicular to the front of the building. The frame sits right next to it. We would have to work on that. I almost question the idea that that is brick material anyway. Why not extend it? We were working on that when we used that ABA because the thickness was different. The design intent is drawn here. Let us work on it. We will meet the design intent. The windows are recessed in the stucco by 2 inches. They are recessed where they can. Where they are planar when you don't have an abutting column by the width of a brick, that would be the design intent. That happens a lot more at this elevation because we don't have a column line that engages in the façade. Those windows would be recessed. The design intent would be for a thickness of a brick.

Mr. Zehmer – What we are hoping to do is make this into a motion. If we can get there, that will be a good thing. On the stucco, I am hearing a 2-inch recess. On the planar windows, the depth of a brick (roughly 3 inches). The 3rd condition is where the window abuts into a large column line.

Mr. Werner – How we have treated this in the past is that I would ask in the motion that you are acknowledging that the punched opening and the intent is a full brick or approximately 2 inches at stucco openings. The applicant will provide a detail for the BAR record. You accept that detail into the record. You can say that this is

not what you heard. It allows an approval of this design so they can move forward. If this detail at the window becomes 2.25 or an inch and 5/8, we are not stuck. When that information is provided and we accept it for the BAR record, there is time for some discussion.

I had another suggestion on the motion. There will need to be something for that decorative gate on The Mall side. It is an interesting design element. I am not suggesting the BAR say that it must look like this. If the BAR feels like that is an interesting design, that is something the zoning would say that is a fence and you cannot have it. It would require some kind of exception.

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed hotel at 218 West Market 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 application as submitted with the following clarifications and conditions:

- **We support the landscape design showing Sentinel Ginkgo trees on Old Preston Avenue noting the conflict with sub-grade street utilities.**
- **[Prior to staff approving a building permit.] The applicant shall provide [for the BAR record] a diagram showing the locations of the typical details for windows matching the design intent. [Specifically, the intent being the depth of the brick and stucco returns as shown on the renderings]. It is the BAR’s understanding that the stucco return should be no less than 2”. The planar windows should have a depth of a typical brick, which our understanding is 3”. That the windows on the Old Preston [Avenue] façade at the street level shall fill the column bays. [Specifically, the full width of the masonry opening.]**
- **Exterior lighting will require BAR review and a CoA.**
- **The BAR expects the final result to have a similar level of brick detailing as is shown on the renderings.**

brooSecond by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 7-0.

Meeting was recessed for 5 minutes.

Ms. Lewis rejoined the meeting to do discuss the Pre-Application Conferences.

D. New Items

N/A

4. Pre-Application Conference

BAR #25-0081

555 17th Street NW, TMP #050059000

Rugby Road - University Cir - Venable ADC District

Owner: Pipson Properties LLC

Applicant: Wolf Ackerman Architects / Fred Wolf

Project: Rear Addition

- Staff passed out additional renderings for this project. Staff introduced the proposed project to the BAR for discussion, feedback, and suggestions.
- Staff also presented that this is an opportunity for members of the BAR to let the applicant know if something is not right.
- There will be no action taken for this pre-application conference.
- It is an older home and student rental.
- The property owner asked the architects to possibly add more units onto the property.
- There is going to be modest changes with the courtyard space.

- The proposal is for 2 single-family attached dwelling units to have a shared garage/
- The applicant is proposing moving the proposed house up to the property line on the north side against the parking and up to the alley within limits of the zoning.
- The property is zoned RX-5. Base ordinance allows 5 stories and 72 feet.
- The proposed project is 3 stories on top of a garage that is considered a basement according to the ordinance.
- The maximum height to the top of the parapet wall is 37.5 feet.
- The proposal for the pre-application meeting is a massing diagram with punched holes representing windows.
- The applicant would also like the BAR's input and feedback on a possible 4th story on top of the 3rd story that is proposed.
- The applicant is trying to be very respectful of the original house scale and being careful of the impact on neighboring buildings.
- The 4th story would be more bedrooms and units.
- The applicant does believe that they could fit 12 cars in the parking garage. The intent is attached family dwelling.
- Mr. Birle asked about the exterior materials for this project.
- The applicant is planning to use a vertical wood or synthetic material on the exterior.
- For an apartment building to be built on this location, the current existing structure would have to be demolished.
- The applicant is proposing trees in the courtyard of this proposed project.
- Ms. Tabony offered positive comments regarding this proposed project.
- Mr. Schwarz expressed concern about the lack of windows on the 3rd or 4th story on the proposed building.
- There was support from all the members of the BAR for this proposed project.
- Mr. Birle liked the simplicity of this proposed project.
- Ms. Lewis did go through the guidelines and whether the proposed project would follow the guidelines.
- Mr. Rosenthal did raise the question of screening of the HVAC units. The applicant does intend to follow the ordinance with screening the mechanical units.

5. Pre-Application Conference

BAR #25-0084

202, 204, and 208 7th Street SW

204 & 208 7th Street SW - Individually Protected Properties

Owners:

202: Monticello Media LLC

204: William Lynch & 204-7 LLC

208: Michael J. Christian

Applicant: Mitchell-Matthews Architects

Project: New multi-story, mixed-use building

- Staff introduced this proposed project of a new building behind protected properties.
- Staff has already received comments from a neighboring property owner in opposition to this proposed project.
- Each of these are individually protected properties. The parcel is essentially a mini district.
- The new proposed building would encroach onto the parcels that are protected.
- Both houses were built in the 1860s to 1880s period by James Hawkins, who lived on Ridge Street.
- Each of the houses were constructed by brick.
- This project is being evaluated because of the brick houses being individually protected properties.

- The applicant is intending to remove the 1970s shed that is currently there.
- The applicant is also intending to build behind the 2 individually protected properties.
- The 2 brick houses on the property are dilapidated and have not been occupied for close to 23 years.
- The applicant does intend to rehabilitate or renovate the 2 houses currently on the site.
- The properties are individually protected properties that will fall given the current conditions according to the applicant.
- The floor area of the 2 houses on the property is about 800 square feet.
- The 2 houses will be incorporated into the proposed building as a possible study or support space. The 2 houses will contribute to the new building.
- There are going to be issues with renovating and rehabilitating of the 2 houses.
- The proposed name of the project is going to be The Mark. Ms. Lewis recommended using the name of the builder of the houses as part of this project.
- Staff did provide insight from the design guidelines.
- Under the current zoning, the by right height is 5 stories or 72 feet maximum height with 7 stories allowed as a bonus.
- The city code says that the BAR can only reduce the height no more than 2 floors below what is allowed.
- Staff does not know how that will apply to the bonus floors. That has not yet been used.
- There is 25 feet in step-backs of the upper floors.
- There is going to be 2 floors of podium parking with 5 stories of residential and wood frame above the podium parking.
- The big question or concern with this proposed project is the pedestrian feel and experience.
- Mr. Schwarz is uncomfortable with how the proposed building will frame the 2 existing buildings.
- Mr. Schwarz would like to see the proposed new building feel more like in the background when compared to the existing 2 houses.
- The applicant did emphasize that the landscape plan has not yet been prepared. The applicant is going to be looking to add trees in the landscape plan.
- The applicant emphasized the importance of the zoning code and what the zoning calls for on this property.
- Mr. Birle brought up the context of the scale of the existing buildings compared to the new proposed building.
- Mr. Zehmer did speak to the possible removal of the 2 existing historic structures due to the structural issues.
- There was consensus among the BAR members about the massing and scale of the new building compared to the existing buildings.
- Ms. Lewis brought up possible functions for the 2 existing historic buildings as an entrance to the new larger building.
- The applicant did go over the comments, suggestions, and feedback from the members of the BAR regarding this proposed project.

6. Staff questions/discussion

517 Lexington

- Historic Conservation District property.
- Construct a secondary structure/garage facing Kelly Avenue (Not in the District)
- The old ordinance did allow secondary structures with review by staff and the BAR chair.
- With the new ordinance, secondary structures that were minor construction, there can be a minor review if there has been review by the BAR.
- From Kelly Avenue, you would see this garage.
- The plan is for a stucco finish.

- The staff plans to review and approve administratively.
- Mr. Schwarz asked if it could go on the Consent Agenda in case there is public comments. There was consensus on the BAR to have the project on the Consent Agenda.
- Mr. Bailey had concerns about the precedent of adding 517 Lexington to the Consent Agenda.
- This project is not yet at the process of applying for a building permit.
- There is no requirement for notices to be mailed out for projects that will go through an administrative review.

Windows – processes, examples
Sub-committee for bylaws review

E. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:43 PM.