

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
October 1, 2002**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton
Joe Atkins
Linda Winner
Cherri Lewis
Syd Knight
Allison Ewing
Wade Tremblay
Lynne Heetderks
Preston Coiner

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

On October 1 at 12 Noon, the BAR conducted a Special meeting with representatives of the University of Virginia to discuss temporary modular classrooms within the West Main Street ADC District.

At 12 Noon, Ms. Fenton Convened the meeting. There was a brief discussion of the Three Party Agreement between the City, County and University and an explanation that University properties located within "Area B" are to undergo voluntary development review with the City.

Mr. Jay Levine of the University Medical Center explained the plans to install modular classrooms behind 1222 West Main Street. He also mentioned the University's long range plans to demolish the Max/Trax building.

Ms. Ewing asking if the trailers may end up being there for longer than 5 years. Mr. Levine explained that the trailers are not the highest and best use of the property over the long term.

Mr. Coiner asked if the University had discussed the plans with the adjoining owners. Mr. Levine explained that he had spoken with a representative of the Blake Center but not with Hal Brownfield, owner of the parking lot.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her reaction is that the trailers would not be approved if they came before the board for approval. She said that she's interested in everything that can be done to shield them visually.

Ms. Ewing suggested evergreen plantings and also suggested planting trees in the parking lot.

Mr. Levine said he would look into putting trees in the parking lot.

Ms. Ewing shared with the group that the Sunday New York Times had done an interesting story on prefabricated houses. She indicated that some prefabricated houses are more attractive and might also be a nicer place for students. She also suggested that the Architecture School may be able to do a design exercise on way to develop an interesting façade.

A general discussion about landscaping and screening followed, with the board encouraging landscaping.

Mr. Levine asked the Board if they had any comments about the demolition of the Max Trax building.

Ms. Fenton indicated that a quality wood construction fence should be used and consideration should be made to develop a quality pedestrian passage during construction.

The discussion was closed.

Ms. Fenton indicated that Gabe Silverman was present to discuss his project at 909 West Main Street. Mr. Silverman explained that he had deferred the application from the last meeting by accident and asked if the board would discuss it then. The board agreed to discuss the application.

Ms. Heetderks pointed out that the building originally had no front porch and asking Mr. Silverman if he had considered removing the porch and returning the building to the original.

Mr. Silverman responded no, explaining that the porch accommodated the deck for the 2nd floor apartment.

Ms. Heetderks commented that there is little relationship in the design between the upper and lower stories. She said that the building is one of few pre civil war buildings left standing in the district and it should be preserved.

Mr. Atkins expressed support for the expanded steps but not for the new openings.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the applicant explore the use of small white window panes in the openings.

Ms. Ewing commented that the viability of the ground level of the building is in question, acknowledging that adaptive reuse is a reasonable expectation.

Mr. Heetderks stated that the purpose of the BAR is to protect historic resources, not to protect private investments.

Ms. Lewis explained that in the proposed zoning for West Main, residential would not be permitted on the first floor.

Ms. Heetderks suggested that the building be preserved and rented in a manner similar to "Social Hall" on East Jefferson Street.

Mr. Silvermen responded that that would not work at this location, but it may work in another 5 years or so.

Ms. Fenton mentioned that in Williamsburg there is retail within old houses and that the shops often have bay windows with small panes.

Mr. Silvermen said he would investigate that possibility.

Ms. Ewing commented that heavy masonry on the upper floor looks unsupported and it looks as though the upper window is not picking up the load of the masonry. To her, the scale of the opening does not look supported visually.

Ms. Heetderks commented that it is sad that a façade that has not changed in 100 years will now be changed.

Mr. Atkins commented that the steps do not detract from the site and are a nice bridge between the building and street. As far as the windows, he expressed that the modern bronze material is a part of the problem. He suggested exploring French doors or sidelights.

Ms. Ewing suggested building the storefront out to the front of the building to protect the historic wall.

At 1: 00 PM Ms. Fenton adjourned the meeting.

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
October 15, 2002**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)
Lynne Heetderks (Co-Chair)
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Linda Winner
Syd Knight

Also Present:

Tarpley Gillespie

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

A. Matters from the public

Ms. Fenton called for matters not on the formal agenda.

Mr. Curt Keith Ecker, of Bruce Wardell Architects, along with Don Pruett and Bruce Wardell, presented for comments the renovation of 501 Park Street. The site was Rosewood Manor and is to become a hospice house for eight patients for Hospice of the Piedmont. Most of the renovation work centers on the back quadrant corner facing Hedge Street. They wish to remove a porch to provide a new side entrance and patient room. They are seeking feedback to be able present a formal proposal for the November meeting.

Mr. Don Pruett explained they had found an opportunity to develop a better staircase that would facilitate all the floors necessary. He asked if they would be able to remove the savannah porch to begin to engage the new elements. He presented the BAR with photographs and site plans.

Ms. Fenton called on the Board for comments and suggestions.

Ms. Fenton asked the age of the porch. Mr. Pruett explained that they had only found drawings dating to 1983 which showed porch expansion. He stated there was very little information on the history of the porch.

Mr. Coiner asked if they had spoken to the North Downtown Neighborhood Residents' Association. Mr. Pruett said they had not. The project had only just begun and they were trying to come up with something to present to the Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification that all four options were wood. Mr. Pruett concurred.

Mr. Knight asked if ramp access was necessary for all entrances or if access could be on one side only. Mr. Pruett explained that 75 percent of the Hospice clients would be non-ambulatory and they would like everyone to come in the front door for a welcoming presence. Mr. Knight expressed concern over how ramping would impact the front of the site.

Mr. Atkins stated the basic strategy seems reasonable and fine. He would prefer a simpler design.

There being no further items from the public, Ms. Fenton closed that portion of the meeting.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 02-10-31

Tax Map 33 Parcel 196

201 East Market Street/Jefferson Madison Library

New walkway from Third Street

Train and Partners, Architect

Bill Lyons, Applicant

Ms. Gillespie gave the staff report. In April of 2002, the library had been before the BAR seeking feedback about a walkway. The Board was generally supportive of the idea. The application is for a new path from Third Street to the front entrance. Staff looked at the proposal against the design guidelines. All proposed ground cover is the same as the existing ground cover. The proposal meets all guidelines so staff recommends approval. A representative of Train and Partners explained that the pathway may be altered in the field to allow for the root system of the two existing trees.

Ms. Fenton called for questions and comments.

Mr. Atkins asked how drastically would the slope adjacent to the main steps change. The representative explained that there was a level change that would be changed slightly so that people would step up.

Mr. Tremblay asked how big the step up was. He was told it was a foot.

Ms. Winner sought clarification on the timeframe for the project. The applicant explained that, thanks to the Friends of the Library, funding was already available. He thought that the project could proceed in a month after approval.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion for adoption as presented. Ms. Winner seconded the motion which carried six to one with Mr. Knight against.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 02-10-32
Tax Map 28 Parcel 1
230 West Main Street/Charlottesville Ice Park
Replace column base and install new downspouts
DTMP, LLC, Applicant

Ms. Fenton stated that at the Request of Mr. Coiner, the column and downspouts would be considered separately for the purpose of motions.

Ms. Gillespie gave the staff report. The Ice Park was constructed in 1997 with BAR approval. Since construction, there has been a problem with vandalism of various elements. The applicant is requesting to replace the existing wood column bases at the front of the Ice Park with brick. The brick is to match the existing brick. The applicant would also like to install U-shaped steel guards to protect the downspouts. The guards can be painted to match the downspouts. Staff looked at the changes against the design guidelines. The materials selected are compatible with neighboring buildings. Staff finds the proposed column bases are an appropriate solution. Staff recommends approval.

Tim Slagle stated the Ice Park had opened in 1996. Downspouts have been replaced numerous times. He stated they were trying to look at solutions to limit the amount of vandalism.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the public or the Board.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification of the second page of drawings for the piers. Mr. Slagle explained what was depicted. The brick would be up to the height of the existing wood column.

Ms. Fenton called for comments. There being none, she closed that portion of the meeting.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the brick pier replacement for the deteriorated and vandalized wood piers. Mr. Knight seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called for questions regarding the proposed downspouts.

Mr. Coiner recognized the need to do something, but thought something better could be done. Mr. Slagle stated he was open to suggestions. The proposed solution would work for all of the downspouts since they are not all the same angle.

Mr. Coiner stated he would support a steel pipe, or a thicker copper pipe, from the gutter to the brick. He further suggested using a cast iron rectangle or square up to the water table.

Mr. Knight sought clarification as to whether this was only for the Mall-side gutters. The applicant explained it was only for the Mall side and not at the front entrance.

Ms. Fenton called for comments.

Mr. Atkins wondered why the cast iron was not being extended.

Mr. Tremblay concurred; he felt this solution was not as aesthetic as cast iron.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to defer the application, and suggested looking at cast iron downspout boots that could follow the contour of the brick face and go up to the desired height in a much more agreeable manner than what was presented and if presented to staff, and it seems in their opinion to meet the intent of the motion, that it could be administratively approved; staff could ask them to come back. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Fenton sought clarification that if it could not follow the contour, it would come back to the BAR.

Mr. Atkins concurred. Mr. Coiner expressed concern about the proposal not coming back before the Board. Ms. Gillespie expressed discomfort with the BAR approving something that had not been applied for. Ms. Fenton suggested the Board just defer. Mr. Atkins retracted his motion with the agreement of Mr. Tremblay.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to defer the application based on the reasons suggested in his last motion.

Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Fenton wanted to clarify in the motion that they were suggesting that the applicant look at cast iron and other alternatives as well. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 01-9-25

Second Street SE and Water Street: New Charlottesville Contemporary Arts Building Tax Map 28 Parcel 28

Amend BAR Approval:

Change opening on Second Street and change

siding from Zinc/Titanium to terne-coated

stainless steel

Bushman Dreyfuss, Architects

Charlottesville Contemporary Arts, applicant

Ms. Gillespie gave the staff report. The approval granted by the BAR in December, 2001, was for a building that was going to be clad with a Zinc metal. Since that time they had problems with pricing and obtaining the material and were requesting a change in material to a terne-coated stainless steel that would look almost identical to the approved material. The applicant

was also seeking a minor change in the fenestration openings along the Second Street elevation. Staff looked at the changes against the design guidelines. While the building does not meet the materials/texture guidelines, the building was approved as an appropriate new, modern statement in the downtown area. Staff feels the proposed changes would not significantly alter the spirit of what was approved. There is an example of the material at the Law school at the University of Virginia.

Jeff Bushman distributed photographs of the roof material in place at the University. He explained the Zinc came from Canada and was hard to get. The terne-coated stainless steel is a better material which will last longer and not rust. He also showed the Board two samples of the proposed material: new and artificially weathered.

Ms. Fenton called for questions.

Ms. Fenton asked about the vandalism possibilities of the material. Mr. Bushman explained that most of the material would be out of reach.

Ms. Fenton called on the applicant to discuss the proposed window changes.

Mr. Bushman explained there were two theaters in the building. The stage door area for one of the theaters was far too large. Decreasing the width of the corner stair by three feet resulted in a necessity to readjust the elevation and bring the openings into harmony.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the public and the Board. There being none, she called for comments.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification for the change on the other windows. The applicant explained that some windows were brought into alignment with the same pattern and division of the rest of the windows. Mr. Coiner also expressed his frustration with being presented with one set of plans and the architect having a newer, different set with him.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the change from the Zinc/Titanium metal to the terne-coated stainless and accept the minor changes in the building's elevation. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of six for, one against. Ms. Heetderks gave the dissenting vote.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 02-8-29

Tax Map 31-169

909 West Main Street

Elevation changes and porch reconstruction

Gabe Silverman, Applicant

Ms. Fenton explained they would look at the application in two parts.

Ms. Gillespie gave the staff report. It is one of the few remaining residential structures of the William Jeffrey era. The applicant is trying to convert the lower level to retail space, the upper level would remain as an apartment. When the applicant came before the Board in September, concerns expressed included that this building was one of the few pre-Civil War buildings remaining in the district, there was little relationship between the upper and lower stories in the proposed design. It was suggested the applicant explore windows with divided lights and running the store front out to the edge of the porch, leaving the existing brick wall intact. The applicant modified the proposal in response to those suggestions. The application for the front steps has not changed. The proposal for the two storefront openings was modified. Staff looked at the new proposal against the design guidelines. The applicant had revised the proposal to address the BAR concerns and comments. Staff recommends approval.

The applicant stated he had explored putting another facade in front of the steps and had explored multiple designs of openings. He also explained that the windows on the second story do not match up so there was no way to line it up from the bottom.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the public or the Board.

Mr. Knight asked if the railing would be extended when the portecochere was extended. Mr. Silverman explained he was only extending the beam and moving the columns out. Mr. Knight also sought clarification that there would be two separate retail spaces. The applicant concurred.

Mr. Atkins asked if there were anything preventing the addition of another column between the existing end of the porch and the extended column. The applicant thought he might be able to put one at the handicapped ramp.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public and the Board.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern over punching additional openings in the historic facade. She also stated that, while she applauded the attempt to adaptively reuse the building, she was concerned that they were trying so hard to accommodate the applicant that they would be squeezing a round peg into a square hole.

Mr. Coiner echoed Ms. Heetderks comments. He did not feel he could support the windows and doors.

Mr. Atkins agreed with Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner. However, he felt the remedies from last time in making the openings more compatible justified approval.

Mr. Tremblay applauded the reuse of a historic and significant house.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the change to the steps in having them go the entire length of the porch. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms.

Fenton sought clarification as to whether the pillars were included in the motion. Mr. Atkins added to his motion a request to study adding a column at the corner of the ramp and flight of

steps that goes up to shorten the span to be more in keeping with traditional wood-framed porch construction. Mr. Tremblay accepted the clarified motion. The motion carried unanimously after clarification that the motion was approved as presented with a recommendation that the applicant explore adding an additional column.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to accept the new door openings as shown in the plan submitted. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of four to three with Mr. Coiner, Mr. Knight and Ms. Heetderks voting against.

Ms. Fenton recalled Mr. Bushman to discuss signage for the Charlottesville Contemporary Arts Building. Ms. Fenton also noted for the record that she owns the driveway adjacent to the CCA Building, but did not feel there was any conflict since she can do nothing with the driveway.

Mr. Bushman stated he had been notified by Live Arts about getting started on the marquee for the CCA. Live Arts would prefer if the signage incorporated some type of LED display rather than a more typical marquee similar to the Paramount. His options were a more standard style marquee, contacting an artist to make the marquee an art project, or a combination of high-tech, low-tech.

Ms. Fenton stated the marquee could not be backlit.

Ms. Gillespie clarified that it could not be internally lit.

Mr. Coiner asked which side of the building it would be on. The applicant stated it would be on the Water Street side.

Mr. Coiner felt that a 21st century building should have a 21st century marquee.

Mr. Knight asked if the LED would be a scrolling message board. Mr. Bushman stated it would probably be a constant display changed as needed for shows.

Ms. Fenton stated that she would not approve a commercially made sign. An appealing, artist-made sign she could override the lit sign consideration.

Mr. Knight sought clarification from Ms. Gillespie as to whether the sign ordinance said anything about animation, i.e. traveling lights. Ms. Gillespie did not think so. The owner's representative stated that the owner would like to explore the possibility of some kind of LED sign if the BAR were open to the idea.

Mr. Coiner asked that consideration be given to the property across the street.

Ms. Fenton suggested the applicant come before the Board with options.

F. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Fenton called for approval of the August 20, 2002 minutes. Ms. Heetderks wanted to correct the spelling of Cheri Lewis' name. Ms. Winner made a motion to accept the minutes as corrected. Mr. Knight seconded the motion which carried with Mr.

Atkins and Ms. Heetderks abstaining.

Ms. Fenton called for approval of the September 10, 2002 minutes. Ms. Gillespie noted that Alexandria Sorrels should be Alexandria Searls. Ms. Fenton expressed concern that the minutes were not as detailed as they had been in the past, that the minutes had subsections A, B, C with a jump to G with no mention of what happened to D, E, and F.

Ms. Heetderks made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion which carried with Ms. Fenton and Ms. Winner abstaining.

G. Other Business

Ms. Fenton called for other business.

Mr. Blake Hart, representing Art in Place, stated there were two projects that needed BAR approval.

Ms. Fenton asked if these would be temporary structures. Mr. Hart concurred. The art would go up in October and would be taken down in September. One of the pieces of art would go on the parking garage where the United Way sign goes. It would be a life-size lit box sculpture. The sculpture will have a photocell to turn on the light, it will not be lit constantly nor will it blink on and off. The second piece is an approximately ten feet tall, unlit sculpture which will be placed next to the armory.

Mr. Coiner asked what the dancer sculpture was made of. Mr. Hart stated neon, fiberglass, and steel.

Mr. Knight asked if a base were going to be made for the second sculpture. Mr. Hart concurred that a concrete base would be made.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification regarding the placement of the second sculpture. Mr. Hart explained the placement in conjunction with the Avon Street Bridge. Placement would be close to Rockwell Park.

Ms. Fenton called for other questions.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification that the guidelines did not help and that it was totally subjective.

Ms. Fenton stated there was an issue of lights on the Mall. She further stated art had been discussed previously with the fountain at the Station Restaurant and with other temporary placements. She wanted the Board to look at the pieces separately.

Mr. Coiner stated he could not support the sculpture on the Mall. Ms. Fenton agreed with that statement.

Mr. Knight found the pieces to be positive due to their accessibility. However, he expressed concern with the lighting issue. Ms. Fenton agreed that allowing the sculpture would set a precedent by which the Mall could be lit. She stated she was willing to do a lit Lewis and Clark down the entire Mall. Ms. Fenton clarified that her statement was a joke of doing the whole Lewis and Clark trail in lit figures down the Mall.

Mr. Atkins felt the lit sculpture was not appropriate for the Mall in that being a lit piece it takes on at night an extravagance and a level of visibility that starts to overtake a number of the pleasant aspects of the Mall.

Mr. Hart sought clarification that the Board would not approve the lit sculpture on anything within the BAR's jurisdiction. Ms. Fenton stated that was her feeling. Mr. Atkins stated he would be open to considering it in a different location.

Mr. Hart stated other possible locations which had been considered were the Market Street Garage and the top of West Main Street Station. Mr. Hart asked if those were worth considering. Ms. Fenton asked if that were the train station or the restaurant. Mr. Hart clarified that he meant the Station Restaurant on West Main Street.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the sculpture proposed for temporary installation behind the Armory adjacent to the amphitheater. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner sought clarification of "temporary." Mr. Atkins and Ms. Fenton stated as described as being just under one year. Mr. Coiner sought additional clarification as to what happened if the City decided to buy the sculpture. Ms. Fenton stated they would have to come back to the Board. Ms. Fenton then asked if all were in favor of that; all were.

Mr. Atkins asked if Art in Place were willing to consider other places for the lit sculpture. Ms. Fenton asked for a motion to deny it at the location presented. Ms. Fenton informed Mr. Hart that if he wanted it placed somewhere not in the BAR purview, he would not have to come back. She further informed him if he wanted to place it at Station Restaurant, he would have to come back.

Mr. Knight made a motion to deny the request to place the lit sculpture on the parking garage as applied for. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Gillespie introduced Page Weiss and John Zehmer from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Ms. Weiss spoke about the Certified Local Government Program, of which she is the state manager. The program is a partnership between local governments that have good preservation practices in place, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and the National Parks Service. Virginia has 25 Certified Local Governments. The Certified Local Government Program is designed to create a community of active localities as related to preservation. Ms. Weiss volunteered to be a point of contact should the Board run up against something they have not

dealt with before. She also spoke about dedicated grant funding. The funding needed to be matched, but part of the match could be staff work or in-kind contribution. Grant applications would be coming out in November. Ms. Fenton asked what could be applied for. Ms. Weiss stated anything that would enhance the local preservation program. The VDHR have funded training opportunities, surveys, updates of design guidelines, archeological studies, African-American historic context. Mr. Coiner asked if they would fund bricks and mortar. Ms. Weiss stated there were two issues with bricks and mortar projects: visibility for the program and a tight time line because of the federal fiscal year does not always allow for closing a project on time.

Ms. Fenton stated she had been attending the Sorenson Institute and in a discussion about "What is a Meeting," the determination had been that if someone sent an E-mail to all members of the Board and they could do a reply to all, that was a meeting.

Ms. Fenton wanted to have a meeting/work session about entrance corridors. Ms. Fenton further stated she was bothered that it was all decided administratively unless there was a problem. Ms. Fenton wanted a discussion about what should be a problem that should come to the Board. Ms. Gillespie stated that the zoning ordinance was advancing through the Planning Commission which hoped to get it to Council by December; she felt the BAR should have their discussion in time to approach Council before they adopt the ordinance.

Mr. Coiner asked if they could also discuss some procedures for Council to follow when hearing an appeal. Ms. Fenton thought that would be great.

Ms. Fenton suggested they meet at 5 p.m. on 29 October 2002.

Ms. Fenton called for the meeting to go off the record at 6:39:14 p.m. She put the meeting back on the record at 6:40:33 p.m. She stated she wanted to put pressure on the planning department to get the packets to the Board in a timely manner. She felt the Board members should get the packet within seven days of the scheduled meeting.

Ms. Fenton stated that she would like to have a motion that is reported back to the staff about the Board that if they do not get their packets within seven days of the meetings, that the chair, at their discretion, can postpone the meeting. Clarification was sought that Ms. Fenton meant "at least" seven days before the meeting. Ms. Fenton concurred. Mr. Atkins asked if the 21 day limit placed too big a burden on the applicants. Ms. Gillespie stated that the greater distance from the meeting has created problems when the design is still evolving. Ms. Gillespie also stated there was an internal issue of staff coordination getting the packet through the system. Ms. Fenton stated she had no problem with getting an updated packet on Thursday or Friday before the meeting.

Mr. Knight expressed approval of the consideration that it would be at the Chair's discretion and not automatic. Ms. Gillespie sought clarification that there was a motion that needed to be seconded. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Ms. Winner asked if there were some ordinance which set the day of the meeting so that the BAR could not change it. Ms. Fenton stated that it was more that there had to be public notice of the meeting.

Mr. Atkins expressed appreciation for the spirit of being as cooperative as possible, and he stated he would go along with the motion as long as meetings weren't being cancelled all the time.

Ms. Fenton tended to doubt it would happen. She further stated that should it happen once, it will never happen again. Ms. Fenton called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Coiner asked if there had been any word from the owner of the log house. Ms. Gillespie stated she had not heard from him but that several people had approached him with an interest in buying the house. She stated her assessment that he seemed to be receptive in having someone take it off his hands.

Mr. Knight wanted to know the outcome of the Ruby Tuesday appeal. Ms. Fenton stated it was denied.

Ms. Heetderks left the meeting at 6:47 p.m.

Ms. Fenton asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Knight made the motion to adjourn.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 6:49 p.m.