

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
February 18,2003**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Lynne Heetderks, Vice Chair  
Wade Tremblay  
Preston Coiner  
Allison Ewing  
Cheri Lewis  
Also Present:  
Mary Joy Scala

Ms. Heetderks convened the meeting at 4:56 p.m.

**A. Matters from the public**

Ms. Heetderks called for matters from the public not on the agenda. There being none, she closed that portion of the meeting.

**B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 03-01-02  
530 Ridge Street  
Tax Map 29 Parcel 268  
Erect Privacy Fence around Front Yard  
Kenneth Horst, Applicant**

(Deferred from January 21)

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Action was deferred at the January 21, 2003 meeting so the applicant could pursue other options. The original proposal was for a six foot privacy fence across the front and partly on the north side yard. The applicant met with Mr. Knight to discuss landscaping and fencing options. The applicant proposes to allow the privet hedge to grow across the front yard and erect a four foot high privacy fence of treated lumber painted white between the front yard of this property and the adjoining property to the north on Ridge Street. This proposal is in compliance with the design guidelines. Nearby properties on Ridge Street have low decorative brick walls, low concrete walls, or hedges; no high fences are in the vicinity. Staff finds that a fence of untreated lumber would look inappropriate in this location.

Mr. Knight noted his agreement with the applicant that the privacy fence is necessary along the north property line. Staff recommends approval with the existing hedge along Ridge Street and a four-foot high wood fence painted white along the north property line. Staff agrees that the

height of the fence may be increased to six feet from the porch setback to the rear of the property; the fence board should be even on top and supports should be on the inside. Ms. Horst sought clarification about what staff proposed for the Elliot side of the property. There had been a partial privet hedge originally on that side as well as a five board fence. Ms. Scala stated that

Mr. Knight had not mentioned that. Ms. Scala felt that a four foot high fence would be appropriate on that side of the property.

Ms. Heetderks presumed that Mr. Knight had meant that the privet would take the place of the proposed fence in all places except along the side property boundary.

Mr. Tremblay expressed approval for allowing the privet to regrow.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to accept the proposal with the caveat that the applicant be allowed to erect a wooden fence painted just as described on the north side, on the Elliot side, to the corner of the house as shown on the plan. Ms. Lewis and Mr. Coiner sought clarification as to which corner was described. Mr. Tremblay explained that he meant the front corner of the house where the original plan shows it stopping.

Ms. Lewis asked if the Ridge Street side was included.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Ewing made a Friendly amendment that, should the applicant choose to install a fence along Elliot Avenue, that it be in conjunction with privet hedge or comparable landscaping. Mr. Tremblay accepted the amendment.

The motion carried unanimously.

### **C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 03-02-05**  
**1223 West Main Street**  
**Tax Map 10 Parcel 20**

Install Playground Equipment

University Baptist Church, Applicant

Ms. Heetderks called for the Certificate of Appropriateness Application. The applicant was not present, so Ms. Heetderks deferred the item until such time as the applicant arrived.

### **D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 02-11-33**

**114 Lankford Avenue  
Tax Map 26 Parcel 10  
Resubmittal of Denied Plan to Renovate Existing**

Building and Construct New Apartment Building

Dale Ludwig, Applicant/Ron Keeney, Architect

Denied on January 21 -- Resubmitted

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In June, 2002, the existing building had been deemed unsafe to the point of being a public nuisance and had been ordered taken down and removed. In August, 2002, the Board of Architectural Review reviewed a request to demolish; action was deferred.

Upon consideration in September, 2002, the demolition was denied. In November, the applicant sought permission to renovate the structure and build a new, seven-unit apartment building on the site; recommendations were given by the Board of Architectural Review for both plans. In December the applicant requested deferral to complete suggested revisions. The January request was denied due to the non-appearance of the applicant. The plan before the Board shows a new arrangement which also has fewer parking spaces. All windows are vertical; not sliders. No windows have been placed in the rear wall of the existing building. The siding will be hardy plank. The new building still imposes on the existing building but the design is improved. Since January 21st, the Property Maintenance Code official has expressed concern that the existing building remains a nuisance and would like the issue resolved as soon as possible. Staff recommends approval of the new plan subject to details about shingles, paint trim, colors, and so forth.

Mr. Keeney asked the Board members to keep in mind that this was not a historic neighborhood or street.

The proposal was before the Board because of the logs buried somewhere within the building. By pulling the new building up against the existing building, the old wall containing some of the original logs would not have windows punched into it. The new plan also drops the height of the new building by six and-a-half to seven feet.

Ms. Heetderks called for questions from the public.

Mr. Ben Ford, of Preservation Piedmont, stated his disagreement that the neighborhood is not historic. Since the property dates back to the mid-19th century, there is a strong likelihood of an archeological site on the property. He asked that the Board consider that new construction would adversely impact the archeological resources there.

Ms. Heetderks called for questions from the Board.

Ms. Lewis asked how the architect determined where the existing logs were. Mr. Keeney explained that the walls had a thickness of 15 to 20 inches. He further explained that they did

remove some of the finish materials so the logs could be seen. He stated that, in deference to the Board, nothing further had been done to determine the exact location of the logs.

Mr. Tremblay asked for a description of what would be done with the historic structure. Mr. Keeney stated that they proposed to patch the holes in the wall. Mr. Tremblay asked if the historic elements would be visible. Mr. Keeney stated they would not since that could allow destructive actions upon the logs. Mr. Tremblay asked if the new structure would abut the original structure yet remain entirely independent of the existing house. Mr. Keeney concurred and explained that it would have to be flashed against the existing building to keep water from getting between them.

Ms. Ewing asked if additional footings would have to be added to the existing wall where the new building would abut, which would disturb the soil upon which the log cabin is sitting. Mr. Keeney explained that something would have to go into the ground if he were to build the new structure.

Ms. Ewing asked if there were any mechanism within which the Board could ensure that if there were any archeological findings, they be preserved. Mr. Tremblay felt that would be opening a Pandora's box.

Mr. Ford had a follow up question about guarantees for the structural integrity of the existing structure while construction is going on. He wondered if it would be in everyone's best interest to recommend having bracing there even though a wall was not going to be removed.

Mr. Aaron Wunch, of Preservation Piedmont, asked if there would be anything in place other than flashing to help prevent rot at the juncture of the old and new buildings. Mr. Keeney explained that they were replacing the exterior siding and the roof shingles allows them to flash between the two structures and get a tight seal.

Ms. Heetderks called for comments from the public.

Mr. Wunch stated that for individually designated historic properties the Board of Architectural Review's jurisdiction is not just over a particular element, it is over the whole building. He commended their concern for the logs, but the whole building is within the scope of their responsibility. The Board of Architectural Review had suggested that the original roof line be restored; the current proposal alters the original roof line by four feet.

Ms. Heetderks called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Ewing expressed concern that the addition would compromise the existing structure.

Mr. Tremblay stated that the applicant had significantly adjusted the original plan and done what the Board of Architectural Review had asked him to do -- preserve the structure as it now exists.

Mr. Tremblay felt that the applicant had done all that was asked of him and that the Board of Architectural ought to approve the plan.

Ms. Ewing made a motion to approve with the request that the architect/owner solicit engineering services to examine the foundation condition of the existing building with the new adjoining property at the north side of the existing structure. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Mr. Tremblay made a friendly amendment that it would be subject to staff's recommendation that they ultimately approve shingle color and trim colors.

Ms. Heetderks made a friendly amendment requesting that the applicant consider taking the time to do some archeological exploration in the course of the excavation and if anything is found, to turn it over to the Historical Society. Ms. Ewing and Ms. Lewis accepted the friendly amendments. Ms. Lewis stated her opinion that the architect had done a good job consolidating the existing structure with making the property economically viable for the owner. She also expressed her appreciation for what Mr. Keeney had done to harmonize this property with surrounding properties. She further stated that she wished the applicant had done a little exploration about the property.

Ms. Heetderks called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tolbert informed the Board that the representatives for agenda item G were still in Philadelphia so the item would be postponed to a later date.

## **E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

### **BAR 03-02-03**

#### **Fifth and Water Streets**

#### **Tax Map 28 Parcel 51**

Renovation of Grand Piano and Furniture Building to Office/Retail

Space Fifth and Water Streets, LLC, Applicants

Stoneking/Von Storch, Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This section of the Grand Piano and Furniture Store was constructed in 1976. The applicant is seeking Board of Architectural Review approval for exterior renovations. The existing walls are concrete masonry units that are scored to resemble brick, and painted white. On Water Street, new windows are being created on the first and second floors. No entrances are proposed on the Water Street elevation. Window frames will be black aluminum. The walls are being repainted a deep yellow, ochre color. The lower windows have translucent plastic awning treatments. On the Fifth Street side, existing downspouts divide the elevation into five bays. The Water Street color and window treatment wrap around to the first bay. The other bays have newly created store fronts and windows and a separate color scheme. Tinted glass samples were available for review. Staff has a slight reservation about using tinted glass, color A, for the large expanses of glass storefronts and other windows rather than a clear glass. Staff recommends that the Board of Architectural Review discuss the use of tinted glass for color A; staff recommends approval subject to administrative approval of the signage and the final materials/color choice for the awnings.

Ms. Heetderks called for comments from the applicants.

They had no comments but would answer questions.

Ms. Heetderks called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification for the use of solid pane windows on the Fifth Street side as opposed to divided windows as on Water Street. The applicant explained it was a matter of interest. Ms. Ewing sought clarification for the variance of the bays on the Fifth Street side. The applicant explained that the sidewalk slopes but the interior floor level is flat.

Ms. Heetderks called for comments from the public; there being none, she called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Ewing stated she liked the direction of the design but felt it would be improved by a regular structural fenestration bay and by the use of a continuous canopy.

Mr. Coiner stated he would like to see the windows on the west side match the windows on the east.

Ms. Heetderks had concerns with the tinted glass.

Ms. Lewis agreed with the concerns over the use of tinted glass. The applicant asked if the concerns were because it presented a black, opaque, non-engaging exterior condition. Ms. Lewis stated it was not historical.

Ms. Ewing asked why the applicant wanted tinted glass. He stated they felt it was handsome. An unidentified co-applicant stated that the two principle elevations face east and south, opening the building up gives the users have the benefit of exposure but at the same time, they are trying to handle the sun to some degree. The selected tint is a solar tint which is the first tint off of clear.

Ms. Heetderks asked if there were an example in the historic district which used tinted glass. The applicant stated that the hospital used green tinted glass.

Ms. Lewis stated she liked the color on the Fifth Street side.

Ms. Heetderks asked about the signage on the front of the building. The applicant explained they were not asking for a review of the signage at this time.

Ms. Ewing made a motion to approve as submitted with the exception of changing the east face glass portion to a consistent bay width, with, however, deferring approval for glass and awnings and revision to the west face window sizes to match the east face window size. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks called for discussion on the motion. Mr. Tremblay stated he had no problem with the motion except he had a problem with redesigning what had been brought before the Board. He further stated that altering the bays would have significant impact on how the interior space is used. Mr. Coiner agreed with Mr. Tremblay and stated he was not

comfortable with changing the bays. Ms. Lewis stated she had a problem with the awnings and suggested reserving approval on that. Ms. Lewis made a friendly amendment that the applicants return with glass material awning detail and any signage at a later date. Ms. Ewing accepted the amendment.

Ms. Ewing clarified that if the applicants changed the third bay to be larger, it would pick up a rhythm.

Ms. Ewing asked the applicants if the window size could be done. The applicant explained that would not be structurally possible; glass was not made that big. Ms. Ewing changed her motion to remove that section. Ms. Lewis accepted the change. Mr. Coiner sought clarification that the motion was to accept the proposal as it is with the exception of the tinted glass, the awnings and the signage.

Ms. Ewing stated it also included the one window on the one side. Mr. Tremblay asked if the motion was as they saw the design with those exceptions.

Ms. Heetderks concurred. Ms. Lewis stated this was an exciting plan. Mr. Coiner stated that he remembered the building as it previously was and the window would make it look more like it used to. Ms. Heetderks called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

## **F. Preliminary Discussion**

### **423-425 First Street N**

### **Tax Map 33 Parcel 104**

### **Discussion of Exterior Renovations and Additions**

### **Wade Apartments, Applicant**

Dalgliesh, Eichman, Gilpin & Paxton, Architects

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the matter. He hoped to answer any questions; however, the matter was not up for voting.

Ms. Scala stated she did not have a staff report. Ed Eichman was in attendance to present some ideas for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Eichman sought the Board of Architectural Review's input relative to the initial proposal for the buildings on First Street. Mr. Eichman provided the Board members with a booklet describing the buildings. He stated that 423 did not make a significant architectural contribution to the neighborhood. The building was constructed in the early 1970s as an apartment house. The most significant part of the proposal is an addition of a two-story porch with a brick base that extends in front of all of the existing windows on the front of the building. This would provide some outdoor functional space for the front apartments. Some of the details indicate modifications to entrance door and window openings. French doors are proposed as well as triple sash windows.

Ms. Ewing stated the proposal was a big improvement. She expressed a preference for a true divided light and for a wood railing.

Mr. Coiner asked for the reason behind choosing metal railings to go with the wood columns. Mr. Eichman explained it was partly a maintenance issue. However, he felt a metal railing was a more delicate element.

Mr. Eichman also stated that due to new Code regulations, a wood railing would have to be very massive to meet the guard rail height of three and-a-half feet with a four inch space between pickets. He further stated that wrought iron was a traditional porch/stair/exterior stair element.

Ms. Lewis concurred with Mr. Coiner about the railing. She expressed her amazement at the proposed change to the building which she felt was beautiful.

Ms. Heetderks stated it was great. She did have some concern about the simulated divided lights.

Mr. Eichman gave a history of 425 First Street. It was built around 1900 as a two family dwelling. This building has most of its architectural features in tact, only minor changes were proposed. The proposal would remove a brick railing to replicate the original post bases which had supported the porch. He stated a wooden railing would be appropriate for this particular turn of the century vintage building. More landscaping would be done in the front as well as changing the color palette.

Ms. Heetderks asked if Mr. Eichman had tried to find any photographs of the building predating the condition of the front porch. Mr. Eichman stated he had not yet, but that would be part of the process they would go through to try to authentically replicate what was there.

Ms. Ewing stated she preferred the wood railing.

Mr. Eichman stated that would probably be the most appropriate.

Mr. Coiner asked if they had spoken with anyone in the neighborhood. Mr. Eichman stated they had not yet. He stated that the plans had not gone any further than what he had shared with the Board. He was seeking the Board's initial thoughts about the proposal. He appreciated the opportunity.

Ms. Heetderks stated that everyone seemed enthusiastic about it.

Ms. Heetderks recalled agenda item C.

### **C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 03-02-05  
1223 West Main Street  
Tax Map 10 Parcel 20**



**Install Playground Equipment  
University Baptist Church, Applicant**

Ms. Lewis made a motion to approve the proposal.

Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

**H. Discussion**

**350 Park Street, Levy Building  
Tax Map 53 Parcel 109  
Temporary Sally Port and HC Ramp for County  
Sheriff's Use  
City of Charlottesville, Applicant**

Ms. Scala stated that the tenants of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court must move to this building while the new building was being worked on. The Court Clerk's office, the judges and the County sheriff would be moved to this building. The ADA access is for the Court Clerk's office. One of the existing windows will have to be removed in the new section to turn it into a door. They would like to make that handicapped ramp permanent. The City has leased the building for three years and the improvements will be up for two and-a-half to three years.

Mr. Tremblay left the meeting at 6:53 p.m. at which time a quorum was no longer present, hence no question could be decided (Robert's Rules of Order, Article XI, Miscellaneous, 64, Quorum. Discussion may continue in the absence of a quorum until some one raises the point while no one is speaking.)

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that no action was required of the Board and that it had been already approved administratively. Ms. Scala explained that Mr. Tolbert thought it did not need approval since it is a temporary measure, but he wanted the Board to see it.

Ms. Scala stated that railings need to be placed on both the proposed temporary ramp and the existing ramp. A suggestion had been made to put black vinyl on the chain link fence to improve its appearance.

Ms. Heetderks asked for issues that anyone may have.

Ms. Lewis expressed concern that the mesh would be ugly on Court Square. Ms. Heetderks asked if the BAR should ask that they come back with a material sample.

Ms. Ewing expressed concern over approving something which was designated "temporary" and what assurances there were that it would not become permanent.

Ms. Heetderks asked if this were a bigger issue than the Board wanted to deal with at the time, in particular since there was no longer a quorum. Upon recognition of a lack of quorum at 6:55

p.m., no question could be decided. Ms. Heetderks continued to allow discussion of agenda items off the formal record until 7:03 p.m.