

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
February 16, 1999**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton: Chair
James Oschrin
Kenneth Schwartz
Dawn Thompson
Jessie Hook
Joseph Celentano
W.G. Clark

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

At 5:00 P.M. Ms. Fenton convened the meeting. Ms. Fenton explained the meeting format and procedures. She asked the applicants to keep the presentations brief.

Sal's Restaurant Cafe

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board only approves the look of the furniture and not the size or location of the café.

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if there were comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

Mr. Celentano moved to approved the application as submitted.

Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Downtown Inn Café

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they had comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the application as submitted.

Vending Cart: Hernando Cason

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the cart would be on the trailer or off of the trailer.

Mr. Cason stated the cart would be on the trailer.

Ms. Hook asked if the extension would be jutting out from the trailer.
Mr. Cason answered yes.
Ms. Hook stated that this would be a hazard.

Ms. Fenton asked if there was any way to remove the cart from the trailer hitch.
Mr. Cason answered no.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions or comments from the board.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he cannot see placing a trailer on the Mall.
Mr. Cason indicated that this would just be for Friday's After Five.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she has difficulty with the idea of a trailer located on the street. She indicated that she would recommend that the applicant choose a cart that can be wheeled out onto the Mall.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that there is no way he is willing to approve this cart unless modifications can be made to the cart. He indicated that he cannot see having trailer frames on the Mall.

Mr. Cason indicated that he would not bring the trailer onto the Mall.
Ms. Vest indicated that the BAR approval applies to any location in the Historic Districts.

Mr. Clark indicated that the trailer is out of the question, if not for aesthetic reasons than for safety reasons. He indicated that this cart should not be on the Mall. He indicated that he does not want to preclude the applicant from being able to vend Downtown.

Ms. Fenton indicated that every cart that has been approved has been wheeled off of the trailer.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that staff probably assumed that this cart was coming off of the trailer. He indicated that if the cart is attached to a trailer then he has trouble with it. He indicated that if there is a model that can be separated from the trailer, that would be a better solution.

Mr. Cason asked if he should have just a cart without a trailer.
Mr. Schwartz answered yes.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her sense is that this is a used cart that the applicant is considering buying. She stated that there are carts available that do come off of the trailer.

Ms. Hook indicated that the board could defer the application until the applicant has had the opportunity to come back with a new cart.

Mr. Clark moved to deny the application as submitted.
Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton indicated that this cart was not approved because of the trailer. She indicated that a similar cart without the trailer should not be a problem. She indicated that if an umbrella is used, it should be a dark color.

206 East Jefferson Street: New Asphalt Shingle Roof

Staff presented the report.

Susan Payne, applicant, indicated that the building is located between the Historical Society and the Catholic Church. She indicated that the roof is hard to see from the street. She stated that they bought the building in 1984 and that the roof has not been replaced or fixed. She indicated that the rear portion of the roof is in disrepair. She indicated that this is a good opportunity to improve the entire roof.

Mr. Clark asked Ms. Payne if she had talked with the building department about using shingles on such a low-pitched roof.

Ms. Payne indicated that she has spoken with several roofing companies including Martin and Lynch. She indicated that there are essentially two options: metal and asphalt shingles. She indicated that the front porch will remain metal.

Mr. Clark indicated that usually under a certain pitch roof it is considered unwise to use shingles. He indicated that metal is a better material for low hipped roofs for shedding water.

Ms. Payne indicated that the roofing company did not point out this issue. She indicated that the pitch is similar to that of the Catholic Church.

Mr. Clark indicated that the building code may specify the material for this pitch.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the back portion of the building has a steeper roof pitch than the front portion. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Clark's concerns.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he shares these concerns. He indicated that 3:12 is usually the minimum pitch for shingle roofs.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is pleased to hear that the front porch will have a metal roof. He indicated that the area of the roof that is in trouble is the back portion. He indicated that the front portion does not have to be replaced right now.

Ms. Payne indicated that the front portion is at least in need of being refinished and repainted.

Mr. Oschrin asked if it is more economical to replace the roof with asphalt shingles.

Ms. Payne answered that she is looking at the project from the standpoint of longevity. She indicated that they bought the building with the existing roof and that there was no leakage and no damage.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that a properly cared for metal roof can last an awfully long time.

Mr. Thompson asked Ms. Payne why they are replacing the metal with asphalt shingles.

Ms. Payne indicated that it is a long-term investment. She indicated that they are looking at the future life of the building. She indicated that there are places on the metal roof that need to be repaired or replaced now. She indicated that there are cost factors involved.

Ms. Thompson asked if she has looked into the option of recoating and repainting the existing metal roof.

Mr. Oschrin moved to accept the proposal.
Mr. Fenton asked for a second. There was no second.

Mr. Schwartz offered the following motion:

With an understanding of the economics, I move to approve the asphalt for the back portion of the property and to hold off approval of the front portion of the property until there is an opportunity to discover if standing seam metal is necessary for the slope of the roof. The reason for this decision is that the back portion is not visible and if possible, repainting the existing metal roof on the front portion of the building would retain the existing integrity of the building from the street.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

Mr. Fenton indicated that the board is not trying to penalize the applicant. She stated that she concurs that tin would be the better roof.

Mr. Clark indicated that when the applicants apply for a building permit, the permit may be denied.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the board's responsibility is to determine if it passes muster from an aesthetic standpoint.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board could include a recommendation to reconsider a metal roof and to have somebody objective who does stand to have an economic gain assess the material.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that they should leave that as a suggestion.

Mr. Fenton indicated that repairing the existing roof may cost less and provide the applicant with a better roof.

Ms. Payne indicated that she is present to see what is in their parameters.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board could recommend metal but still permit the asphalt.

Mr. Clark indicated that it is the position of the board to protect the city from egregious design mistakes. He indicated that he would vote to approve the asphalt shingles but that he was not willing to make a motion for approval.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

Ms. Vest asked if this motion was to approve either shingle.

Mr. Schwartz asked Ms. Payne which shingle she preferred. Ms. Payne indicated that she preferred the darker shingle. (GAF Slateline Shingle in Granite Gray).

The motion was passed with Mr. Celentano, Mr. Clark, Ms. Fenton, Ms. Hook, Mr. Oschrin, and Mr. Schwartz voting in favor and with Ms. Thompson abstaining.

300 Preston Avenue: Parking Attendant's Booth

Staff presented the report.

Robin Lee, applicant, introduced himself. He indicated that one of his jobs is managing several parking lots around town. He indicated that he was asked by the landowner to build a screen for the dumpster and to build an attendant's booth. He indicated that the goal is to keep the booth under a tree and as invisible as possible. He indicated that because the dumpster is there, it makes sense to build a fence around it.

Mr. Celentano asked if the dumpster screen was required.

Ms. Vest indicated that the dumpster is pre-existing and has been there for many years.

Ms. Fenton asked why they wanted to have the booth and the parking attendant.

Mr. Lee indicated that it is a management issue for the property.

Ms. Hook indicated that you have to really be looking to see the dumpster in this location.

Mr. Clark indicated that this dumpster has managed to be there for years without him ever noticing it. He indicated that he does not think that this building is very distinguished in design and that he does not think that it will grace Preston Avenue. He indicated that he thinks that more design time can be spent on this building.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he agrees with Mr. Clark. He indicated that screening can sometimes make a problem worse. He indicated that specifically he would suggest that the screen and the attendant's booth be designed to relate to each other structurally.

Mr. Lee indicated that the reason that the booth has been designed at this scale is to not harm the tree. He indicated that there is very little space to work with and there is a pole at the site. He indicated that they are working around what is there.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the Design Guidelines reference to sheds are in reference to sheds on residential properties and do not apply to this site. He indicated that this is a design problem that needs a different design approach.

Ms. Hook asked about wiring on the site.

Mr. Lee indicated that the wiring would be underground.

Ms. Hook indicated that this is a positive aspect of the project.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he has no problem with the location or the basic strategy. He indicated that the problem is that this site is very prominent and probably should be designed. He indicated that this is an important enough location that it deserves a design solution. He indicated that what they have right now is not far off, but it requires further attention and refinements in the design and in the detailing.

Mr. Lee indicated that he does not follow what sort of attention the board is referring to.

Mr. Clark indicated that greater attention should be paid to the detail and accuracy of the drawings. He indicated that the drawing shows the roof edge of one side of the building as twice as thick as the other side. He indicated that there needs to be greater care in the detailing and that both the drawings and the design need a little refinement.

Mr. Lee indicated that a young student produced the drawings and that he thinks they are adequate for this project.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she would like to see more architectural detail. She indicated that the basic orientation seems fine.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the dumpster is used for the bank's garbage.
Mr. Lee indicated that the dumpster serves the whole building.

Mr. Oschrin asked if there is a parking lot attendant on the property now.
Mr. Lee indicated that there is not an attendant now, but that there will be one.
Mr. Oschrin asked what the attendant will do.
Mr. Lee indicated that the attendant will monitor who parks in the lot.
Mr. Oschrin indicated that he does not understand the evolution of the need for this shed.
Mr. Lee indicated that the landlords have had problems with people parking in the lot who shouldn't and that they have made the decision that they want to have the lot managed.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he does not like the shed so close to the road and that he would like to see the shed located within the parking lot area. He indicated that the location of the shed so close to the road is not appropriate.

Mr. Lee indicated that the location was chosen to hide the booth from site and to allow the attendant to see and monitor the entire lot.

A member of the public indicated that he is a student of landscape architecture and that when you construct under a tree the tree will eventually die.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the point is well taken. He indicated that the tree is temporary but the building is not.

Mr. Clark indicated that this is a modest building. He indicated that he sympathizes with the builder. Mr. Clark moved to deny the building in the hopes that something will be resubmitted with more design work.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board doesn't object to the booth in and of itself. She indicated that the objection is to the shed at this very prominent location. She indicated that more design refinement and refinements in the drawings are necessary.

The motion was unanimously approved.

620 Park Street: National Register Nomination

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they agreed to move this item up on the agenda because it would probably be a shorter item. All present agreed.

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that this is the first such package he has received and that it is well put together. He indicated that he visited the house and that he understands the logic of including the property on the national and state registers.

Mr. Clark indicated that he thinks that the board is in enthusiastic support.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the property is lovely and she appreciates all the work that has gone into it.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he appreciates the work that has gone into the nomination packet. He indicated that it looks like a strong case for designation.

Mr. Schwartz moved for the BAR's unanimous support of the designation.
All present voted in support of Mr. Schwartz' motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

418 East Jefferson Street: Building Addition

Greg Brazinsky, applicant, displayed a model of the site and context. He indicated that he is back before the board after making several modifications to the project. He indicated that he would be happy to move forward with the proposed 1 story addition above the infill building and a 1 1/2 story addition on the McQue building. He indicated that he initially came before the board with a gable design. He indicated that he has been working with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and that he has tried to take into account the comments that he has received from the BAR. He indicated that he has tried to setback the new addition and to use lighter materials so that the addition does not have the weighty look of masonry.

He indicated that he is trying to combine into a single roofline while treating each façade as a separate façade. He indicate that he is proposing to put the door back in and to open the space up enough.

Mr. Oschrin asked what eifs is.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that it is a drivit material.

Mr. Clark asked what the eifs will cover.

Mr. Brazinsky answered that it will cover the soffits on the overhang and the recessed element on the façade.

Mr. Celentano asked about the materials and paint.

Mr. Brazinsky pointed out where the paint is to be applied and where the red brick will be used. He indicated that the goal is to break up the existing brick.

Mr. Clark indicated that he is very pleased with the direction of the project. He indicated that the design is stronger and better all the way around than what was first submitted. He indicated that he had a comment about all the use of all the white stuff. He indicated that using white always works as a strategy. For example, the University hospital did not recede or go away. He indicated that sometimes glass and dark mullions conspire with glass. He indicated that the design is exciting but that if it were his design he would look at the color again. He indicated that he would not vote against it based on the color.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that there were several reasons for the color choice. He indicated that there was no way to bring the masonry there and he did not want the building to rise so tall. He indicated that he chose the horizontal banding for the same reason. He indicated that he was working within the dictates of the setback.

Mr. Clark indicated that it would be interesting to look at tonal studies of the façade.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that he would be glad to bring that back to the board. He indicated that he is still working out the final details with VDHR. He indicated that the white windows were decided by VDHR. He indicated that one reason for the white windows is that white wood windows are currently on the building.

Ms. Fenton indicated that colors can be easily changed after the fact.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that color is an issue in the final product.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he reviews the project with enthusiasm. He indicated that the applicant has found a good balance between trying to accomplish certain purposes in the program while respecting the existing street context. He indicated that the drawings include a good view of what it will look like from Court Square. He indicated that something new had been introduced which is clearly setback and is subordinated from the street. He indicated that he had one question for the applicant. He indicated that the solid elements seem a little chunky on the model and they seem more subtle in the plans.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that the model is conceptual. He indicated that there are 6 to 8 inches of projection.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it is not a major issue. He indicated that it does not seem quite as active in the plans. He indicated that the only new introduction on the street is the canopy marking the building. He indicated that this simple strategy is good.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that the canopy is a steel framed grid and it is only a marquee to mark the entrance. He indicated that cables from above will suspend it. He indicated that the goal is to keep the canopy as light as possible.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he supports the idea of introducing a delicate canopy along the street.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he would like to see a more detailed drawing of what the canopy looks like.

Mr. Clark amended his motion for approval of the application with the additional submittal of a detailed drawing of the canopy, when developed.

Ms. Fenton seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board agreed to a second meeting for minor changes to applications that are already in progress. She indicated that Oliver Kuttner has requested an interim meeting for the remainder of the Woolworth's building.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he sees two wrinkles in this issue. First, he indicated that he did not have the impression that the meeting is for anyone with a new issue or an issue that is time sensitive. He indicated that he sees the logic in trying to accommodate the public. He indicated that a new building at the Woolworth's site is an issue for the full board. He indicated that he does not think that we should encourage this and he is not supporting it. He indicated that most people felt willing to give their time in special circumstances. He indicated that this application is a different beast. Second, he indicated that he is uncomfortable establishing a quorum without an architect present.

Mr. Clark indicated that he has qualms about establishing a precedent of two meetings a month. He indicated that this idea could quickly go overboard. He indicated that he proposes that the board be left with the power to vote on the second meeting at the regular meeting.

Ms. Fenton asked what should be done with major projects that are in the construction process and need minor approvals.

Mr. Clark indicated that this should not happen. He indicated that people who are in the building business are scheduled by deadlines. He indicated that if the project is well run that should not happen.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is unavailable on Thursday, March 4.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she completely agrees with the concerns. She indicated that auxiliary meetings are intended primarily to replace subcommittees. She indicated that Thursday evenings are a very problematic time for her.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board should come up with a definition of what they are willing review at an interim meeting. She suggested that it be 1) minor details 2) A change in a detail that was previously approved 3) a revision of something that has been denied.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the meeting should be agreed upon at the regular public meeting.

Mr. Clark indicated that he hopes that the interim meeting is something that happens only once a year.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the number one complaint for applicants is the timeframe of meetings and having to wait for approvals.

Mr. Clark indicated that the board is often under pressure from unprepared applicants and they are forced into approving applications under pressure.

Other Business

Ms. Thompson indicated that in the past the Board of Architectural Review has participated in Historic Preservation Week. She indicated that this is a perfect opportunity to build up the image of the board and the work that we do. She indicated that in the past they have given a certificate of commendation to property owners who are worthy of commendation. She indicated that it is a good idea to start thinking about this now. She indicated that a property named The Farm on Jefferson Street could be recognized. She indicated that when she first joined the board, they were trying on an almost monthly basis to get the owner to repair the property. She indicated that two architects bought the property and did a very commendable restoration of the property. She indicated that this might be a nice opportunity to show the community what historic preservation is all about. She indicated that she would like the board to think about the property. She indicated that it seems like a worthy candidate.

The other members present agreed to consider the awards and this property at the next meeting.

Ms. Vest distributed a letter with the board members from residents of the Park Street neighborhood regarding the Burke residence at 614 Park Street. (Please see attached letter.)

A board member asked how long the copper would remain the existing bright color. Mr. Clark answered that it may last a couple of months, depending on the weather.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that currently the site is a construction site and the new copper is very bright. He indicated that when the site is complete and the new copper fades it will be a beautiful soft brown color. He indicated that when the plantings go in and the leaves come back on the trees the copper will prove to be a smart decision.

Ms. Thompson asked if the same procedures for public notification were followed for this property. Ms. Vest indicated that the same procedures were followed and that adjacent property owners are notified only in the case of a demolition.

Ms. Hook indicated that when the initial project was presented it was presented as infill of a small carriage house. She indicated that the house is not a carriage house. Ms. Hook indicated that the BAR agenda could be published once a month as the City Council agenda is published.

Minutes: January 19, 1999

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the text should read: "the scale of the model is 1 inch = 20 feet", not 1 to 20.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the minutes with the correction.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Clark moved to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.