

## Lasley, Timothy G

---

**From:** Lasley, Timothy G  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 19, 2018 10:02 AM  
**To:** Hendrix, Scott  
**Cc:** Werner, Jeffrey B; Mess, Camie  
**Subject:** BAR Actions - July 17, 2018 - 315 East High Street

July 19, 2018

### Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-06-02  
315 East High Street  
Tax Parcel 330067000  
City of Charlottesville, Owner/ Scott Hendrix, Applicant  
Amendments to COA

Dear Applicant,

The above referenced project was discussed before a meeting of the City of Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR) on May 15, 2018. The following action was taken:

Motion: Schwarz moved having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements and Canopies, I move to find that the proposed Amendments to the COA, approved on June 20, 2017, satisfy 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 application as submitted with the following stipulations:

- Submit a less transparent gate to staff to be circulated to the BAR for approval.
- Align the screen wall with the center line between the two existing windows.
- The recommendation of planting a tree at the corner from the Charlottesville master tree list.
- The new window will match existing in-kind.

Sarafin seconded. Approved (7-0).

This certificate of appropriateness shall expire in 18 months (January 17, 2020), 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. You may request an extension of the certificate of appropriateness before this approval expires for one additional year for reasonable cause.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 434-970-3130 or [wernerjb@charlottesville.org](mailto:wernerjb@charlottesville.org).

Sincerely yours,  
Jeff Werner

--

**Tim Lasley**

Intern | Historic Preservation and Design Planning  
City of Charlottesville | Neighborhood Development Services  
University of Virginia | Class of 2020  
School of Architecture

Phone: (434)970-3185

Email: [lasleyt@charlottesville.org](mailto:lasleyt@charlottesville.org)

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
STAFF REPORT  
July 17, 2018**



**Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 17-06-02  
315 East High Street  
Tax Parcel 330067000  
City of Charlottesville, Owner/ Scott Hendrix, Applicant  
Amendments to COA

---

**Background**

Designed by Johnson, Craven & Gibson, and built in 1962, the Charlottesville Court House is a contributing building in the North Downtown ADC District. It is built in the Jeffersonian Revival style. The entrance to the building is through a tall arcade, which recalls the Ranges at UVa. The arches are further enriched by the use of stone key stones and impost blocks. The low, horizontal composition is capped by a cupola similar, yet less heavy, to the one found on the County Court House. (Historic survey attached)

April 19, 2005 - The BAR deferred application for a landscape plan due to absence of applicant and BAR member concerns.

May 17, 2005 - The BAR approved 9-0 a landscape plan for the City Circuit Courthouse.

November 20, 2007 - The BAR approved (6-0) a “U-shaped” handicapped ramp on the west side of the front with conditions that the handrail is to match the existing rail; the top of the cheek wall is flat and aligned with the water table; and the surface shall be flagstone to match the existing portico landing surface.

September 20, 2011 - The BAR approved (5-0) the use of a 4-5 ft. height Omega fence in the rear parking lot, with the condition that it is located closer to the curb.

June 20, 2017 - Sarafin moved: 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 new addition satisfies the BAR’s criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the recommendation that blank windows be incorporated to help turn the corner of the building. Mohr seconded. Motion approved (6-0).



## **Application**

FPW Architects submittal dated May 23, 2018: site plan and detail amendments (4 pages).

Request to amend the COA approved on June 20, 2017.

- Additional brick bay added to wall at mechanical area.
- Revised gate at mechanical area. (Gate to match existing metal rail at east, lower floor entrance; to be painted black.)
- Metal canopy added over rear entrance. (Per architect's email of June 12, 2018: *The canopy...over the Judge's entrance... to be constructed of steel and to be very simple so as not to draw a great deal of attention. The exposed metal will be painted black to coordinate with the handrails and other exposed steel items on the existing building.*)

## **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;*
- (7) When reviewing any proposed sign as part of an application under consideration, the standards set forth within Article IX, sections 34-1020 et seq shall be applied; and*
- (8) Any applicable provisions of the City's Design Guidelines.*

### **Pertinent Guidelines for Site Design and Elements**

#### **C. WALLS AND FENCES**

*There is a great variety of fences and low retaining walls in Charlottesville's historic districts, particularly the historically residential areas. While most rear yards and many side yards have some combination of fencing and landscaped screening, the use of such features in front yards varies. Materials may relate to materials used on the structures on the site and may include brick, stone, wrought iron, wood pickets, or concrete.*

- 1) Maintain existing materials such as stone walls, hedges, wooden picket fences, and wrought-iron fences.*
- 2) When a portion of a fence needs replacing, salvage original parts for a prominent location.*
- 3) Match old fencing in material, height, and detail.*
- 4) If it is not possible to match old fencing, use a simplified design of similar materials and height.*
- 5) For new fences, use materials that relate to materials in the neighborhood.*

- 6) *Take design cues from nearby historic fences and walls.*
- 7) *Chain-link fencing, split rail fences, and vinyl plastic fences should not be used.*
- 8) *Traditional concrete block walls may be appropriate.*
- 9) *Modular block wall systems or modular concrete block retaining walls are strongly discouraged but may be appropriate in areas not visible from the public right-of-way.*
- 10) *If street-front fences or walls are necessary or desirable, they should not exceed four (4) feet in height from the sidewalk or public right-of-way and should use traditional materials and design.*
- 11) *Residential privacy fences may be appropriate in side or rear yards where not visible from the primary street.*
- 12) *Fences should not exceed six (6) feet in height in the side and rear yards.*
- 13) *Fence structures should face the inside of the fenced property.*
- 14) *Relate commercial privacy fences to the materials of the building. If the commercial property adjoins a residential neighborhood, use a brick or painted wood fence or heavily planted screen as a buffer.*
- 15) *Avoid the installation of new fences or walls if possible in areas where there are no fences or walls and yards are open.*
- 16) *Retaining walls should respect the scale, materials and context of the site and adjacent properties.*
- 17) *Respect the existing conditions of the majority of the lots on the street in planning new construction or a rehabilitation of an existing site.*

#### H. UTILITIES & OTHER SITE APPURTENANCES

*Site appurtenances, such as overhead utilities, fuel tanks, utility poles and meters, antennae, exterior mechanical units, and trash containers, are a necessary part of contemporary life. However, their placement may detract from the character of the site and building.*

- 1) *Plan the location of overhead wires, utility poles and meters, electrical panels, antennae, trash containers, and exterior mechanical units where they are least likely to detract from the character of the site.*
- 2) *Screen utilities and other site elements with fences, walls, or plantings.*
- 3) *Encourage the installation of utility services underground.*
- 4) *Antennae and communication dishes should be placed in inconspicuous rooftop locations, not in a front yard.*
- 5) *Screen all rooftop mechanical equipment with a wall of material harmonious with the building or structure.*

#### **Pertinent Guidelines for Awnings, Marquees, and Canopies**

##### C. AWNINGS, MARQUEES, & CANOPIES

*Awnings can contribute to the overall image of the Downtown, The Corner, and West Main Street by providing visual continuity for an entire block, helping to highlight specific buildings, and covering any unattractively remodeled transom areas above storefronts. They also protect pedestrians from the weather, shield window displays from sunlight, and conserve energy. Marquees are usually associated with theaters and contain areas for changing information. Canopies are more permanent structures.*

- 1) *Types*
  - a) *Fixed, sloped fabric awnings are the traditional awning type and are appropriate for most historic buildings, both residential and commercial.*
  - b) *Boxed or curved fabric awnings; a more current design treatment, may be used on a non-historic or new commercial building.*
  - c) *Marquees and canopies fabricated from rigid materials are appropriate on some commercial buildings, however, they must fit the storefront design and not obscure important elements such as transoms or decorative glass.*
  - d) *Historic marquees and canopies should be retained and maintained on historic building facades.*
  - e) *Backlit awnings or canopies used as illuminated signs are inappropriate.*
- 2) *Placement*

- a) *Place awnings carefully within the storefront, porch, door, or window openings so they do not obscure elements of damage materials.*
  - b) *Choose designs that do not interfere with existing signs or distinctive architectural features of the building, or with street trees or other elements along the street.*
  - c) *Choose an awning shape that fits the opening in which it is installed.*
  - d) *Make sure the bottom of the awning valance is at least 7 feet high, or consistent with the current building code.*
- 3) *Color and Materials*
- a) *Coordinate colors with the overall building color scheme. Solid colors, wide stripes, and narrow stripes may be appropriate, but not overly bright or complex pattern.*
  - b) *Aluminum, vinyl plastic, or overly ornate fabric awnings are generally inappropriate for any buildings within the historic districts.*
  - c) *Contemporary marquees or canopies may be constructed of combinations of metal, wood, and glass; some types of plastic may be appropriate.*

### **Discussion and recommendation**

Request for amendments to COA

- Additional bay added onto mechanical area
- Change in metal gate
- Metal canopy added over rear entrance

Staff finds the requested amendments to the COA appropriate.

### **Suggested Motion**

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements and Canopies I move to find that the proposed Amendments to the COA approved on June 20, 2017 satisfy 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 application as submitted.

22 May 2018

Mr. Jeff Werner  
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

RECEIVED  
MAY 23 2018  
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

RE: Certificate of Appropriateness Follow Up  
BAR 17-06-02  
315 East High Street  
Tax Parcel 330067000  
Addition to Charlottesville Circuit Court

Dear Mr. Werner

Thank you for meeting with me last week to discuss the above project. As I mentioned, when we received our COA we agreed to let the Board know if anything changed relative to our initial presentation.

We were able to incorporate all the Board's recommendations. The sole modification that has occurred during the design process concerns the equipment enclosure at the back of the building. This enclosure was needed after it was determined that no location on the existing building could provide the structural support for the new chillers. Accordingly we developed an equipment enclosure in a matching brick that screened the equipment and that complimented the existing building.

This enclosure is shown in the "before" renderings included in this packet.

As the design evolved, the size of the chillers increased to meet the anticipated cooling load for a new court room in addition to the rest of the building. This increase in chiller size has necessitated a larger enclosure. In appearance the new enclosure is much the same as the "before" configuration; only a bit larger.

The new enclosure is shown in the “after” renderings included in this packet.

We are asking that this enlarged enclosure be considered on the Consent Agenda at the Board’s upcoming meeting.

If you have any questions or required additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

**FPW Architects, PC**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "David L. Puckett".

David L. Puckett, President

C: file 1701

E: renderings of “before” and “after” configurations





Exterior Rendering - Before

May 23, 2018





Exterior Rendering - After

May 23, 2018





Exterior Rendering - Before

May 23, 2018





Exterior Rendering - After

May 23, 2018

