

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
November 19,2002**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair
Lynne Heetderks, Vice-Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Allison Ewing
Cheri Lewis
Linda Winner
Also Present:
Ron Higgins, Planning Manager

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Ms. Fenton called for matters not on the agenda. She recognized Jim Tolbert. Mr. Tolbert stated that Ms. Tarpley Gillespie was no longer with the Planning Staff; she was now working for Albemarle County. He further stated that the office was searching for someone to fill that position. Ron Higgins would be working with the BAR until the position was filled. Ms. Fenton asked that Mr. Higgins send an E-mail to the Board members so they would have a way to contact him. Ms. Fenton also volunteered to sit in on interviews of the Planning Staff applicants.

Mr. Tolbert also stated he had sent a memo regarding the Second Street Mall crossing. The City is putting in a temporary fix. The third item Mr. Tolbert brought before the BAR was regarding the Transit Center. The City signed a contract with Wallace, Roberts & Todd. Mr. Tolbert stated he would be meeting with WR&T to get a detail schedule and to make sure the BAR is built in as early as possible.

Ms. Sue Weber, of 601 Locust Avenue, wanted to speak about the Zoning Ordinance Update. Under Historic Preservation, the document states that University Circle, Belmont and the Locust Avenue area would be considered in the future for a historic district. She expressed concern over changes in the B-1 district as well as the Mixed Use districts that are going up in the City. Mr. Tolbert explained that there had been no intent to change B-1, B-2 or B-3. Some changes that gone in accidentally are being culled out. He further explained that some properties on Locust had been included in the Downtown Extended Commercial/Residential Mixed Use District that should not have been; that will be corrected in the next iteration of the map.

B. Preliminary Conference -- Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Expansion Project

Antonio Fiol Silva and Ignacio Bunster-Ossa, representatives of Wallace, Roberts & Todd, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed plan for the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Expansion Project. Mr. Silva stated they wanted to get a reading of the BAR's concerns about the proposal.

Ms. Ewing expressed concern about the scale of the garage relative to the neighborhood. She wondered if there were a way to give it some type of kinship with what's around it. Mr. Silva stated there would be trees and other vegetation cover for the garage including a trellis-work or mesh that would have greenery on it.

Ms. Ewing stated that the handicap ramp in the courtyard takes up a large proportion of the space. She wondered if there were another way to treat it to use less space. Mr. Bunster-Ossa stated that due to the difference in grade between the street level and the entrance to the jail, they were caught with this proposal. He further stated the choice was between scissoring the ramp at the head of the courtyard or at the end. However, he stated they were trying to find a better way.

Mr. Coiner stated his concern that benches on the ramp would cause people to congregate there which could restrict people from using the ramp. He also asked that WR&T be sensitive to the neighbors concerns about the noise level of the HVAC system.

Ms. Winner thanked them for their presentation which had helped her see what the architects had needed to take into consideration. Her only concern was over the HVAC system.

Ms. Fenton commended the architects for their work. However, the garage was an issue that needs to be figured out. She suggested they research the approach to a garage being built at Colonial Williamsburg, which is being made to look like a collection of buildings representing a little English town. She also stated they should look at the garage at the Darden School.

Ms. Heetderks wondered if the portico on the front of the building was going to be replaced. She suggested they look at the old Elks Club. Mr. Silva explained they had looked at that portico as well as others. The architects felt that it was important to be sensitive to the materials, the spirit, the scale, and to the proportions of the building.

Ms. Lewis expressed appreciation for what was being proposed for pedestrian traffic. She expressed a desire to see elevations of the garage and the J&DR Court building expansion to see what the massing would look like.

Mr. Atkins commended the WR&T team for focusing on the landscape. He felt that the proposed ramp was unsatisfactory. He felt that it was too big for such a little court.

Mr. Tremblay left the meeting at 6:01 p.m.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 02-11-33
Tax Map 26-10
114 Lankford Avenue

Renovate Existing Building and Construct New

Apartment Building

Dale Ludwig, Applicant/Ron Keeney, Architect

Mr. Higgins explained the site plans which were on display. The property is R-3 zoned for apartments. The square footage of the property allows for up to eight units on site. The staff report prepared by Ms. Gillespie recommended approval of the design concept pending discussion on materials.

Mr. Keeney, of Keeney Company Architects, stated that the applicant accepts the fact that the existing house will remain. The applicant proposes to remove the partial second floor which the previous owner had partially built. Mr. Keeney stated the plan to replace all of the old siding with a vinyl siding of a newer grade and quality to help keep the structure water tight. He further stated that the proposal was to put a new asphalt shingle roof over the whole structure. The owner would prefer a very light, slightly off-white color for the siding. In order to take advantage of the financial investment in the property, the applicant wants to put a second building in behind the existing structure. The building for the seven one-bedroom units is intended to be turned sideways so the projection to the street is approximately the same width as the existing house. The proposed building would have vinyl siding with a matching roof to emulate the original building to keep a consistency.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the public.

A member of the public who failed to identify herself wondered what precautions could be made to protect the original logs since vinyl siding can sometimes trap moisture. Mr. Keeney stated that getting a water-tight roof on would help a lot. He further stated that replacing all the siding would prevent joints that would allow water damage. He continued that the biggest issue for Preserving the inside would be to get it heated and occupied.

Mr. Aaron Wunch, of Preservation Piedmont, sought clarification that the drawings showed two windows being cut into the back wall. Mr. Keeney stated that was correct. Mr. Keeney further stated his belief that there were two old openings in the back wall which were blocked when the partial second story was added. Mr. Wunch asked what made the architect think there had been openings in that wall. Mr. Keeney stated that demolition had not yet been done to see if the wall was framed.

Mr. Keeney further stated that, if there were an objection, the owner would be happy to leave that wall as is.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the Board members.

Ms. Heetderks expressed her belief that the BAR was loath to approve vinyl siding in any context in the historic district. She then asked why replacing a material with a like material was not being done administratively. Mr. Higgins explained that it was under BAR consideration due to the changes being made to the site and the building.

Ms. Winner asked if the architect had samples of the proposed materials. Mr. Keeney affirmed that he did have samples of the vinyl siding, the shingles, and the windows. He further stated that they proposed to use a similar vinyl window that matches the vinyl siding in appearance. The vinyl siding which was proposed was a four and-a-half or five inch horizontal siding with a Dutch lap which would create a shadow line.

Mr. Coiner stated his belief that the siding was aluminum, not vinyl. Mr. Keeney concurred and apologized for misspeaking. Mr. Coiner also stated that the vinyl sample provided was the one he would like least. Mr. Keeney stated that the applicant would be open to suggestions and choices from the Board.

Mr. Coiner asked if the board could take the proposal in separate parts rather than as a whole. Ms. Fenton sought approval from the Board members to do the building first.

Mr. Coiner asked if the intention were to remove the siding and the stucco. Mr. Keeney stated the position was definitely to remove the siding because they felt a watertight surface could not be achieved otherwise. The architect explained the condition of the stucco would require repairing or upgrading to a point above grade.

Ms. Fenton asked if there had been consideration to leaving the logs exposed once the siding was removed. Mr. Keeney explained that attempting to make an attractive interior of the logs brings up the issue of preservation from further decay or from abuse from an occupant. Mr. Coiner asked if Ms. Fenton's question was to the interior or exterior of the house. Ms. Fenton stated she was thinking to the exterior. Mr. Keeney explained that there was not enough of the original logs and wondered if the open weather would cause more damage to the logs.

Mr. Atkins asked if the windows on the new structure would be vinyl sliders. Mr. Keeney concurred.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public.

Mr. Aaron Wunch stated there was a 50 percent chance that the building was originally sheathed on the outside. He further stated that the new building was out scale with the protected house and neighboring buildings. The design increases the architectural density of the neighborhood and destroys an old farm road which predates Lankford Avenue and obliterates almost the entirety of the preexisting landscape by paving the side and rear yards for a drive and parking lot.

Ms. Gillian Galley, of the Albemarle Conservation Committee, spoke in opposition of the proposal. She concurred with Mr. Wench's statements.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the architect's statement about reconstructing the former roof line. Mr. Keeney stated they were building a new roof at the top of the first floor.

Ms. Ewing asked if they could deny the new building in its entirety. Mr. Higgins was not sure. Mr.

Atkins reiterated what had been stated by Ms. Galley: If the proposed change is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the property or district, the BAR had grounds to deny.

Ms. Ewing expressed her hope that the historical status of the house would prompt the owner and architect to look at this as a chance for restoration in a way that would give value. She felt that consideration should be given to the overhang, the porches, the scale of the openings and the materials. She stated a preference for hardy plank rather than vinyl siding.

Mr. Atkins stated his belief that a new roof would be more compatible if the gable ran the other way. He suggested that the architect consider hardy plank as a substitution for vinyl siding.

Ms. Winner stated her agreement with Mr. Atkins' statements.

Mr. Coiner also concurred with Ms. Winner and Mr. Atkins. He further stated that hardy plank should be a requirement, not a suggestion.

Mr. Keeney stated he would like to go back to the applicant with a list of suggestions and specific demands about the site so the applicant can move on.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to defer approval of the proposal and ask that the applicant and architect present it along the lines suggested. Mr. Atkins clarified his motion. He made a motion to defer with the suggestion that the roof replacing the damaged second story addition from the previous owner be turned 90 degrees so the gable end faces Lankford Avenue in the manner of the documented file photograph from when the BAR reviewed this before the second story addition; that in terms of the exterior materials, rather than vinyl siding, hardy plank be used to sheath the existing building; and, thirdly, that the addition of windows in the rear portion which would affect the existing log structure be prohibited unless two conditions are met -- one, there is evidence of a preexisting opening in that original log wall, or the material has deteriorated to the extent that there is not enough wall, original log structure, to be preserved and, in that case, the opening would be appropriate. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton asked if the applicant/architect had anything to add regarding the proposed building on the site. Mr. Keeney stated that they had tried to do the new one to match the old one.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the public. There being none, she called for questions from the BAR.

Mr. Coiner asked if the proposed location was the only location the building could go. Mr. Keeney stated the building had been designed from the inside out based on the absolute minimum size of the unit involved and would not fit across the back of the lot because of the 25 foot setback.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public.

Mr. Hal Sharp, a doctoral student in Architectural History at the University of Virginia, quoted Section 34-577 of the Charlottesville City Code which lists the review application criteria to be applied by the BAR.

Mr. Aaron Wunch added that there was a very old tree directly behind the historic house which would be obliterated by the parking lot.

Ms. Gillian Galley stated that although the area was zoned R-3, it was scheduled to be down zoned to R-1. She suggested that the apartment complex be downsized since it was too large to fit any other way on the property.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Atkins stated there were grounds to reject the proposal due to general grounds of incompatibility

with the historic structure and its landscape as well as the 20 percent rule of spacing between structures. He further stated that if the building were approved or deferred with conditions, he felt that issues to be addressed included complexity of form, a modest porch on the front would help the scale, windows and doors needed to be compatible with adjacent historic facades. He would suggest a vertically-oriented window rather than sliders. He wondered if downsizing could be suggested since this amount of units would not fit.

Mr. Coiner concurred with Mr. Atkins except in regard to the parking since the target group of occupants do not drive.

Ms. Lewis felt the new building did not meet the criteria of relating to surrounding historic dwellings.

Ms. Winner stated she did not want to deny the property owner the possibility of constructing something economically viable on his property. She felt he could come up with something.

Ms. Fenton stated she would like to deny this proposal and have the applicant come back with a different proposal that is smaller in size that faces the street, that doesn't impose itself on the existing building.

Ms. Ewing stated she would like to deny the proposal and see the architect come back with something more consistent.

Ms. Lewis stated that, in light of the fact they

deferred on the existing building, she would like to make a motion to defer on this building as well and allow the owner/applicant to come back and perhaps take into consideration on the new building some of the comments that have been made by the Board. Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

Mr. Atkins asked if she would accept a friendly amendment to encourage reducing the number of units to reduce the number of parking spaces, making the building smaller, the problems smaller and more of the site retained, or pursuing allowances in the zoning ordinance to allow fewer parking spaces for what is proposed so that more of the ground can be yard. Ms. Fenton asked that consideration be given the change in materials. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Heetderks left the meeting.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 02-11-34

Tax Map 10-78

900 West Main Street/Hampton Inn

Install Communications Equipment on Roof

Triton PCS, Applicant

Mr. Higgins gave the staff report. The new Communications Facility Ordinance requires that equipment not be visible. The applicant has come up with a disguise which is a brick mat chimney to match the brick detailing and brick type of the building. Staff recommends approval since it does what it is intended to do. Mr. Dale Cook, a planner representing Triton, also known as Suncom, provided the BAR with photographs of an installation that had been done at the Robert E. Lee building in Lexington. He stated the three chimneys on the roof would be offset from the parapet. The equipment would be shielded with a grey colored screening.

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

Ms. Fenton wanted to know why they wouldn't just use brick. Mr. Cook explained that the owner was concerned that due to the size, that brick would look like a large addition on the top of the building.

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

Mr. Coiner asked if these were usually approved administratively. Mr. Higgins stated this was an addition to the building so staff felt it should go before the BAR.

Ms. Winner made a motion to approve as presented. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 02-11-35
Tax Map 10-16
1309 West Main Street/Red Roof Inn
Install Communications Equipment on Roof
Omnipoint Communications, Applicant

Mr. Higgins gave the staff report. The applicant is trying to take the Red Roof Inn's elevator tower and extend it to stealth the equipment.

Mr. Nate Collins, representing Omnipoint communications, which is known as T Mobile, stated the company was hoping to extend service to the Charlottesville area. The applicant proposes to build a wall similar to an existing wall on the other side of the roof. They plan to match the existing wall in color and paint scheme.

Ms. Fenton called for questions.

Ms. Ewing sought clarification as to what was existing and what was proposed on the drawing. The applicant demonstrated the difference.

Ms. Fenton asked for an explanation of "screened wall." Mr. Collins explained it would be a fiberglass wall similar to that displayed by Triton.

Ms. Ewing asked if the antenna addition had to go at

that spot. Mr. Collins explained that there was an existing carrier at the side of the penthouse. He further explained that, by the new ordinance, they have to stealth their equipment. He stated the best way to stealth the equipment was to go on top of the penthouse, which also gives the applicant some additional height and fully enclose the antennas so they are not seen at all.

Mr. Coiner stated that the drawing was too technical for what the BAR needed to look at. He asked that the applicant eliminate all unnecessary technical information in any future proposal.

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

Ms. Ewing stated she would like to see it lowered and the antenna moved elsewhere on the roof. She felt it must be technologically possible to do. The applicant explained that the azimuth of the equipment required an optimum placement. Placement on the side of the penthouse would only shoot a signal into the wall. Placement elsewhere on the roof would require additional antenna placed in other sites.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to accept the proposal as presented with the condition that staff approve the final material. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Ewing stated it was too tall. The motion carried by a vote of four to one with Ms. Ewing voting against.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 02-11-36
Tax Map 53 Parcel 12
501 Park Street
Remodel for Hospice of the Piedmont
Hospice of the Piedmont, Applicant

Kurt Keescker, Architect

Mr. Higgins gave the staff report. There were some porch enclosures and additions added to the back of the building. The applicant was proposing to remove those and put new additions to the rear. Staff's only concern was to see the final materials.

Mr. Kurt Keescker, of Bruce Wardell Architects, stated that the applicant wanted to maintain the Victorian character of the home. Elements which needed to be introduced into the building and its design to meet the concerns of the applicant include: the demolition of an existing porch and an addition of a new patient room and a larger elevator; a series of sidewalks to the existing front porch and a new side porch on Hedge Street that would allow accessible entrance to both areas; a garden in front of the porch area facing Park Street for patients and their families. Mr. Keescker presented the Board with a rendering of proposed color schemes as well as a sample of fiber plank. Fiber plank would be a lower maintenance material.

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

Ms. Winner asked if the applicant had addressed the BAR concerns about the ramp on the front had been to put the ramp to Hedge Street. Mr. Don Pruitt, also of Bruce Wardell Architects, stated the ramp had been downsized and was partially imbedded in the earth and that they had tried to make it as least noticeable as possible.

Mr. Coiner asked if they had met with the North

Downtown Residents Association. Mr. Keescker stated they had not. He further stated they would like to understand where the BAR opinion rests and they would put together a project team that would go to the Residents Association that would be able to give complete answers. Mr. Keescker further stated they valued the opinion of the Residents Association.

Ms. Ewing asked if they were looking for comments or approval. Ms. Fenton informed her it was an application for approval.

Mr. Keescker stated they did not want to give the impression that they were going to ignore the comments from the neighborhood. He stated they would go to the neighborhood and present to them the idea which was being presented to the BAR. If the neighborhood had any large concerns, they would come back to the BAR to ask if those concerns could be incorporated.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the general public. She then called for comments from Board members.

Mr. Atkins expressed appreciation for them coming to do a preliminary conference.

Ms. Lewis made a motion to approve the proposal with the conditions noted in the staff recommendation, final approval on siding materials, window and door details, roof shingles for the addition, and detailed information for all new plantings. Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

Ms. Fenton asked that Ms. Lewis clarify her motion as to what was being approved rather than giving a blanket approval.

Ms. Lewis asked Ms. Fenton to help phrase the motion. Ms. Fenton stated approval as submitted with the understanding that all details that are not proposed, that were not spoken to at this meeting and were not discussed, would come back before the Board. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Fenton deferred approval of the minutes.

H. Other Business

Mr. Coiner stated that action had been deferred on the pipes for the Ice Rink. He did not want that deferral to mean if the Board did not act, the pipes would be automatically approved.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to deny the guard for the

downspouts on the Ice Rink that were presented, and deferred, at the October meeting since the applicant did not come back. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Ms. Fenton stated that if something was deferred, the decision had to be made at the next meeting. She asked that the agenda for the next meeting automatically say that these items were deferred so that if the applicant does not come back it is still on the agenda so that they would make sure to have a vote.

I. Adjournment

Mr. Coiner made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:30 p.m.