

From: Scala, Mary Joy
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2014 10:10 AM
To: stephen lee (stephenleesrm@gmail.com)
Subject: BAR Action November 2014 - 12 Elliewood Avenue

December 4, 2014

Youn Soon Lee
12 Elliewood Avenue
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from August)

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 November 18, 2014. The following action was taken:

The BAR approved (7-1with DeLoach opposed) the painting of the exterior as submitted; with landscape plan to come back for administrative approval in the spring.

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 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
November 18, 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.

August 19, 2014 - 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.]

Application

The shrubs that were in front of the property in 2011 have since been removed; it is unknown when this landscaping was taken out. The applicant has also painted the building. The paint job looks professional and with landscaping could significantly enhance the visual experience of the passerby.

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





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 include:

N. PAINT

The appropriateness of a color depends on: the size and material of the painted area and the context of surrounding buildings,

1. The selection and use of colors for a new building should be coordinated and compatible with adjacent buildings, not intrusive.

2. In Charlottesville's historic districts, various traditional shades of brick red, white, yellow, tan, green, or gray are appropriate. For more information on colors traditionally used on historic structures and the placement of color on a building, see Chapter IV: Rehabilitation.

3. Do not paint unpainted masonry surfaces.

4. It is proper to paint individual details different colors.

5. More lively color schemes may be appropriate in certain sub-areas dependent on the context of the sub-areas and the design of the building.

Discussion and Recommendations

As the first picture indicates the building has already been painted. The paint job looks professional and is located in a part of the street that also has unique colors (in example Para Coffee), so it could fall under #5 in the Guidelines for New Construction and Additions. With the addition of a little landscaping the color would not seem so out of place and could significantly enhance the visual experience of the passerby. Colors can always be changed.

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 painting of the exterior 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...).