From: Scala, Mary Joy

Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 1:56 PM

To: 'Clark Gathright'

Subject: BAR Action 418 17th St NW November 18, 2014

November 20, 2014

Daggett & Grigg Architects 10th Street NE Suite 200 Charlottesville, VA 22902

RE: Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 13-10-01
418 17th Street NW
Tax Parcel 090008000
Beta Bridge LLC, Owner/ Daggett & Grigg Architects, Applicant
Pergola Design

Dear Applicant,

The above referenced project was discussed before a meeting of the City of Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR) on November 18, 2014. The following action was taken:

#### The BAR approved (6-0-2 with Mohr and DeLoach recusing) the consent agenda items as submitted.

In accordance with Charlottesville City Code 34-285(b), this decision may be appealed to the City Council in writing within ten working days of the date of the decision. Written appeals, including the grounds for an appeal, the procedure(s) or standard(s) alleged to have been violated or misapplied by the BAR, and/or any additional information, factors or opinions the applicant deems relevant to the application, should be directed to Paige Barfield, Clerk of the City Council, PO Box 911, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

This certificate of appropriateness shall expire in 18 months (May 18, 2016), unless within that time period you have either: been issued a building permit for construction of the improvements if one is required, or if no building permit is required, commenced the project. The expiration date may differ if the COA is associated with a valid site plan. You may request an extension of the certificate of appropriateness before this approval expires for one additional year for reasonable cause.

Upon completion of the project, please contact me for an inspection of the improvements included in this application. If you have any questions, please contact me at 434-970-3130 or <a href="mailto:scala@charlottesville.org">scala@charlottesville.org</a>.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Joy Scala, AICP
Preservation and Design Planner

Mary Joy Scala, AICP
Preservation and Design Planner
City of Charlottesville
Department of Neighborhood Development Services
City Hall – 610 East Market Street
P.O. Box 911
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Ph 434.970.3130 FAX 434.970.3359
scala@charlottesville.org

### CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT November 18, 2014



**Certificate of Appropriateness Application** 

BAR 13-10-01 418 17<sup>th</sup> Street NW Tax Parcel 090008000 Beta Bridge LLC, Owner/ Daggett & Grigg Architects, Applicant Pergola Design

#### **Background**

416-418 17<sup>th</sup> Street NW (1993) is a (3-story + basement level) non-contributing structure in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. 422 17<sup>th</sup> Street NW (Ca. 1925) is a 1.5 story contributing structure with an unusual, original two-story front portico.

October 15, 2013 - The BAR accepted (6-0) the applicant's request for deferral. The BAR wants the architect to address their concern that the proposed addition would loom over the contributing building in front. They also suggested contacting the neighbors, specifically the Martha Jefferson House, First Church of Christ, Westminster Presbyterian Church, and Delta Delta Delta Sorority.

<u>November 19, 2013</u> - The BAR approved (6-1 with Miller opposed) the scale and massing as submitted, with following details to come back to BAR: Detailing of roof forms and gable ends: and the entry sequence between the house and existing apartment building.

<u>February 18, 2014</u> – The BAR approved (8-1 with Miller against) as submitted the roof form and gable end; but not the requested change to vinyl windows (keep aluminum clad windows); and not vinyl railings; and they asked the applicant to continue to consider the entrance structure.

October 21, 2014 - A motion was made to deny the application, which was withdrawn before the vote. The BAR accepted (5-0-1) the applicant's request for deferral, with Keesecker abstaining because he was not on the BAR when the item was previously considered.

BAR suggestions included: A re-worked design should be in scale with the smaller residential building; painted wood or steel; or could avoid overhead structure entirely, instead using low brick piers or use plantings to mark the entrance.

#### **Application**

The applicant was asked to come back to the BAR with a revised design for the entrance structure (previously shown as a pergola). The proposed entry elements are two brick piers, approximately four to six feet tall, which provide a human-scale that relates to the boarding house, while the brick material relates to the apartment building.

The BAR previously approved an application for a (4-story + ground level) 11-unit addition to be located behind the two existing buildings on the site. There is a new entrance walkway located between the two existing buildings, which leads to the rear addition. The proposed entrance piers are located on this walkway.

The BAR also approved demolition of a side porch on the contributing structure (boarding house) to facilitate pedestrian traffic through the site into the new addition. The existing side door onto the porch will be converted into a window.

The new addition will be constructed using the same brick veneer, trim and fiberglass shingles used on the existing apartment building. The stucco on the addition's fourth floor will match the beige color of the existing building's stair corridor. Windows were approved as aluminum clad; railings are white metal.

Four Willow Oak trees are proposed along the City street frontage.

#### Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines

#### **Review Criteria Generally**

Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that,

In considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

- (1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and
- (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

#### Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:

- (1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;
- (2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;
- (3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;
- (4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;
- (5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;
- (6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;
- (8) Any applicable provisions of the City's Design Guidelines.

#### Pertinent Guidelines for New Construction and Additions

#### F. SCALE

1. Provide features on new construction that reinforce the scale and character of the surrounding area, whether human or monumental. Include elements such as storefronts, vertical and horizontal divisions, upper story windows, and decorative features.

#### P. ADDITIONS

Many of the smaller commercial and other business buildings may be enlarged as development pressure increases in downtown Charlottesville and along West Main Street. These existing structures may be increased in size by constructing new additions on the rear or side or in some cases by carefully adding on extra levels above the current roof. The design of new additions on all elevations that are prominently visible should follow the

guidelines for new construction as described earlier in this section. Several other considerations that are specific to new additions in the historic districts are listed below:

- 1. Function and Size
  - a. Attempt to accommodate needed functions within the existing structure without building an addition.
  - b. Limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building.
- 2. Location
  - a. Attempt to locate the addition on rear or side elevations that are not visible from the street.
  - b. If additional floors are constructed on top of a building, set the addition back from the main façade so that its visual impact is minimized.
  - c. If the addition is located on a primary elevation facing the street or if a rear addition faces a street, parking area, or an important pedestrian route, the façade of the addition should be treated under the new construction guidelines.
- 3. Design
  - a. New additions should not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.
  - b. The new work should be differentiated from the old and should be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- 4. Replication of Style
  - a. A new addition should not be an exact copy of the design of the existing historic building. The design of new additions can be compatible with and respectful of existing buildings without being a mimicry of their original design.
  - b. If the new addition appears to be part of the existing building, the integrity of the original historic design is compromised and the viewer is confused over what is historic and what is new.
- 5. Materials and Features
  - a. Use materials, windows, doors, architectural detailing, roofs, and colors that are compatible with historic buildings in the district.
- 6. Attachment to Existing Building
  - a. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to existing buildings should be done in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the buildings would be unimpaired.
  - b. The new design should not use the same wall plane, roof line, or cornice line of the existing structure.

#### **Discussion and Recommendations**

The proposed entrance piers are appropriate.

#### **Suggested Motion**

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed entrance piers satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

# RECEIVED

OCT 28 2014

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

# **TRANSMITTAL**

То:	Mary Joy Scala
Of:	City NDS
From:	Clark Gathright
Date:	October 28, 2014
Project:	Beta Apartments
CC:	

WE ARE SENDING YOU:		FOR Y	FOR YOUR:	
	Drawing		Approval	
	Specification		Use	
	Copy of Letter		Review and Comment	
	Change Order		As Requested	
	Shop Drawings		Refer to Enclosure	
	Other		Pricing	
	Attached			
	Under Separate Cover			
	Via:			

COPIES	DATE	NO.	DESCRIPTION	
10			BAR package with new entry pier details	

daggett + grigg architects



## **Description:**

The Beta Apartment project proposes to add a four-story, eleven-unit addition to the existing four-story apartment building and rooming house. The new addition will be located behind the existing buildings on the site. Parking, bike storage and utilities will be located on the ground level, with four-stories of apartments above.

The proposed addition will use the same brick veneer, deck rails, trim and shingles used on the existing apartment building. Stucco will be introduced at the fourth floor, and will match in color to the beige color used at the stair corridor of the existing building.