

From: Scala, Mary Joy
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 3:57 PM
To: stephen lee (stephenleesrm@gmail.com)
Subject: BAR Action - August 19, 2014 - 12 Elliewood Ave

August 21, 2014

Youn Soon Lee
12 Elliewood Avenue
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-08-01
12 Elliewood Avenue
Tax parcel 090088000
Youn Soon Lee, Owner /Stephen Lee, Applicant
New front patio and paint building

Dear Applicant,

The above referenced project was discussed before a meeting of the City of Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR) on August 19, 2014. The following action was taken:

A motion to approve the paint color as submitted failed 3-4.

The BAR accepted (7-0) applicant's deferral (for no longer than 3 months) to make a proposal for an entire color scheme, landscaping, and deck option.

[If the applicant chooses to go back to the way it was, then at the least the applicant must repaint the building white, and submit a landscape plan to replace the shrubbery that was removed.]

You may resubmit when you are ready. The next deadline is Tuesday August 26 for the September 16 BAR meeting.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 434-970-3130 or scala@charlottesville.org.

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
August 19, 2014**



Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-08-01
12 Elliewood Avenue
Tax parcel 090088000
Youn Soon Lee, Owner /Stephen Lee, Applicant
New front patio and paint building

Background

The Corner District was adopted November 17, 2003. 12 Elliewood is a contributing structure in The Corner ADC district.

January 20, 2004: Preliminary Discussion was held in which Art Conroy discussed adding an awning (tent), paving, extending the deck, wider stairs. The BAR said it sounded reasonable in concept but wanted more details of how it fits on the property and what it looks like. They asked for photos of the neighboring properties, materials, more detail in the drawings.

April 20, 2004: A motion to approve the patio renovations failed (2-6). A motion to defer was approved (6-2). The BAR recommended that they examine strategies to make the addition feel more like the intended outdoor eating space. Massing and scale should be compatible with the site and the district. The BAR listed a number of factors that make the proposal more an enclosed space than an outdoor veranda, and therefore inappropriate to the scale and character of the existing building and neighborhood.

May 18, 2004 – The BAR approved the front patio renovations except shingle roof and signage, and approved the covered rear fire stair.

June 15, 2004 – The BAR approved a dark green metal roof, and the elimination of the proposed front porch, necessitated by the actual front boundary location. The BAR also voted to allow fire rated wall changes on the south patio wall, if they do not deviate from the previous submittal.

June 21, 2004 - City Council approved closing part of the private alley that runs between 12 and 17 Elliewood. A plat to combine 12 and 17 Elliewood properties with the alley has been submitted for approval.

July 6, 2004 - Administrative approval was granted (with assistance from Joe Atkins) for the fire rated wall, to include 6 ceramic glass transoms and a large ceramic glass panel in the entry door.

August 5, 2004 – Administrative approval granted to change painted metal roof to copper. Staff also approved a small extension of the rear roof to the enclosed fire stair, and safety improvements to the rear porch railings.

August 17, 2004: The BAR unanimously approved the requested revisions, including extending the roof on the south side of the rear deck; filling in a small area of deck on the south side of rear deck; and re-roofing the entire rear roof with metal painted dark green. Also, the BAR noted they would support a future application to pave the alley with pavers.

May 17, 2005: The BAR approved (7-1) the application to enclose the rear deck as submitted, subject to the details (drawings and photographs) on the fire wall coming back to the BAR, and subject to staff approval of the window details. Regarding the window details, either a 1/1 double hung window or a casement window with one horizontal muntin bar would be acceptable, to look similar to the existing windows on the second floor rear elevation. Also, there should be consistent wood trim around all of the windows.

Application

The current owner recently removed the shrubs in front of the structure, in preparation to install a small patio.

The owner is requesting approval for the addition of a new flagstone front patio area. This patio addition will fill the seven (7) feet of depth between the building and the City sidewalk, and will be twenty-five feet long, the width of the porch. The white rail was removed from the front of the porch, but will be replaced.

Since the shrubs have been removed the applicant intends to flatten out the dirt area so it is level with the existing sidewalk. There will be three (3), 4 by 4 wood posts, located at the front of the flagstone area nearest to the sidewalk. These posts and the addition of enclosing chains will be used to create a partition between the dining area and the passers-by on the sidewalk. The applicant also wants to paint the building with a dark brown and white color scheme.

The photos below show (1) the current condition of the space, and (2) the landscaping that was previously in place in 2011:





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 Design Review Guidelines for Additions

J. PORCHES

Most of Charlottesville's historic houses have some type of porch. There is much variety in the size, location, and type of porches, and this variety relates to the different residential areas, strong consideration should be given to including a porch or similar form in the design of any new residence in these sub-areas.

Porches and other semi-public spaces are important in establishing layers or zones of intermediate spaces within the streetscape.

P. ADDITIONS

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.*

Pertinent Design Review Guidelines for Outdoor Cafes

All elements, including chains, bollards, tables, chairs, planters, and trash containers, should be the same color, materials, and design character. Black, being the dominant color of mall elements, or silvertone metal are preferred. The use of treated lumber or unfinished wood anywhere on the mall is not allowed.

1. *Fences, Chains, and Bollards*
 - a. *Should be wrought iron or black painted metal.*
 - b. *Should be kept well-maintained.*

- c. Chain-links shall be two inches in length or larger.*
 - d. Bollards shall be at least 3 inches in diameter.*
- 2. *Tables and Chairs*
 - a. Should be wrought iron, black painted or silvertone metal. Other materials or colors require BAR approval.*
 - b. Cloth tablecloths and removable seat cushions are permitted. Materials other than cloth, and color are subject to BAR approval.*
- 3. *Planters*
 - a. Should be compatible in terms of design, scale, and color with other elements of the café. The planter material shall be terra cotta or concrete. Other materials require BAR approval.*
- 4. *Umbrellas*
 - a. If used, may contain a maximum of one dark or neutral solid color that is compatible with the furniture.*
 - b. The size of the umbrella should be in scale with the table. Oversize umbrellas may be permitted, but all parts must be contained within the café space.*
 - c. No text is permitted on an outdoor café umbrella.*
- 5. *Trash Containers*
 - a. Black metal is preferred.*
 - b. Should be located within the café enclosure.*

Discussion and Recommendations

The addition of a flagstone porch seating area seems minimal; however, the leveling of the topography needs to be looked at in detail. Since the water previously drained there from the front of the building, the gradient of the new patio should slope slightly toward the existing sidewalk. The open area below the porch should be covered to avoid trash accumulating.

Specifics on the color and material of the café barrier need to be defined; something that matches the white ADA accessible railing on the side would seem appropriate. If the white railing goes back on the building, then perhaps a black chain with black painted posts would alternately be appropriate.

Visuals of a few different color schemes should be explored with photoshop or sketches, and a dark brown color chip submitted, so the BAR can make an informed decision.

Suggested Motions

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Additions and for Site Design , I move to find that the addition of the flagstone porch satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted (or with the following modifications...).