

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Notes from September 2, 2003 BAR Special Meeting

Present: Lynne Heetderks, Joan Fenton, Wade Tremblay, Syd Knight.

Preston Coiner and Joe Atkins came earlier and left, thinking that the meeting would be canceled due to the weather.

Also present: Ashley Cooper, Staff Intern.

The meeting convened at approximately 5:15 p.m. at the Corner.

Since there was a decent sized group present, they decided to go ahead and do the walk. It was thought that others that are still interested could arrange another meeting time go individually.

The following conclusions resulted from the group's discussion:

1) Board of Architectural Review members would like to see more research and historical photography on the Corner Outlet building. They are not convinced that the current structure is historic internally or externally. Ashley Cooper will start by looking through the Corner book and the Holsinger Collection to see what she can find.

2) More research should also be done on The Biltmore Restaurant buildings. The Board of Architectural Review felt that this property has a 'hodge-podge' of buildings and additions. Those present are not sure that this structure should be considered contributing so they would like to know more about the main building and its later additions.

3) Even though the Bank of America building is a more recent structure, the Board of Architectural Review would like to explore the possibility of deeming this structure contributing to the Corner District. The reasons being it is approaching the 50-year mark, but more importantly it is an example of Jeffersonian Revival architecture that is quite unique and the quality of construction is remarkable due to its time period of construction.

4) Lynn Heetderks would like us to find out more information about the old school house that is located on Chancellor Street.

5) Board of Architectural members are curious about the process on designating individual structures. Does this have to be owner initiated? Must the owner be in favor of designation? The Board of Architectural Review has concerns about fraternities located to the west of Rugby Road. They feel that these structures are every bit as historically significant as fraternity houses within the proposed district boundaries. Can these be included in the Corner District or would they have to be individually designated?

The meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
September 16, 2003**

Minutes

Present: Also Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair
Mary Joy Scala
Lynne Heetderks, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Syd Knight
Cheri Lewis

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

A. Matters from the public

Ms. Fenton called for matters not on the agenda. There were none.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

(Deferred from August 19, 2003)

BAR 03-08-05

308 East Market Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 223

Addition of third story and terrace

Charlie Kabbash, Applicant/Formwork Design (Cecilia Hernandez), Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant had requested deferral from the August meeting. Concerns had been expressed about the lack of setback and the blank appearance of the east bay of the building. The new plan is true stucco. The terrace wall is set back four feet from the existing brick wall. Windows are recessed an additional eight feet. A new window has been added to the east bay so it is no longer a blank wall. The terrace would have three French doors; they are true divided lights. Staff recommends approval of the addition which meets the standards and criteria set forth in Section 34-577 and which is compatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the property and district.

Mr. Robert Nichols, representing the applicant Charlie Kabbash stated the changes were made to help marry the new addition with the existing building.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted additional information regarding the stairs. Mr. Nichols stated there was a stair going from a previously approved and built deck. The guardrail and handrail would be solid construction and would take off from the railing at the front. Ms. Fenton sought clarification that this was not yet the final drawing nor were the stairs part of the application. Mr. Nichols concurred.

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the windows would be recessed eight inches rather than eight feet. Mr. Nichols concurred.

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

Ms. Lewis stated this proposal was a huge improvement.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the third floor addition as submitted excluding approval of the side stairway, encouraging the applicant to come back with materials and more specific plans on that at a later date. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

(Applicant has requested deferral)

BAR 03-02-04

420 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 51

Renovation of Grand Piano and Furniture Building

Revision to Fifth Street Entrance

East Mall LLC, Applicant/JD Architectural Studio, Ltd., Architects

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-09-02

506 East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 65.2

Install new glass door with transom and sidelight

Ciao Bella LLC, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The building was built in 1986. Ciao Bella, a beauty salon plans to install a new glass door, transom and sidelight with bronze trim to match the existing openings. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Ms. Fenton called for the applicant to speak. The applicant had nothing to add.

Ms. Fenton called for questions.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the proposed door was replacing an existing door or if it were coming out to the edge of the Mall. The applicant stated it would be recessed.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public and Board. There were none.

Mr. Coiner moved for approval as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-09-01

230 West Main Street (Water Street side)

Tax Map 28 Parcel 1

Art in Place sculpture "Blessed Rain"

Charlottesville Ice Park

Bruce Williamson, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is one of the areas selected by the City for public sculpture; it should be in place for 11 months. The sculpture is 42 inches tall and would be placed in an existing planter. Staff recommends that the landscaping plan for the planter be approved administratively; staff recommends approval of the sculpture as submitted.

Mr. Williamson had nothing to add to the staff presentation.

Ms. Fenton called for questions and comments.

Mr. Coiner asked if the typical Art in Place sign would be next to the sculpture. Mr. Williamson was not positive. Mr. Coiner stated his observation that oftentimes the sign detracts from a small piece; he encouraged a smaller sign.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-09-03

611 Park Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 1

Replace slate roof with copper

James E. Treakle, Jr., Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property is in the North Downtown Historic District. The property is an 1874 vernacular Victorian house. The applicant is seeking to replace a slate roof with a standing seam copper roof. Part of the roof, which is visible from Wine Street, is copper. The proposal meets criteria 1 and 4; it may not meet criteria 3, the Secretary of Interior standards. Staff recommends that the roof be replaced with slate if possible; if the applicant can provide financial justification as noted in the Guidelines, the Board of Architectural Review may approve the request.

Ms. Fenton recognized the applicant. Mr. "Bud" Treakle stated the house was a stacked two on two with a central hallway with later additions. Several porches had existing copper roofs. Slate repairs have been made since 1978. There is difficulty in getting slate that matches in color, appearance, and the durability of that which was installed in the 1870s. A copper roof could be done for about one-third the cost of trying to match and replace the existing slate.

Ms. Fenton called for questions of the applicant.

Mr. Coiner asked about the possibility of using manmade slate. Mr. Treakle expressed concerns about moisture problems experienced by people who had used that material.

Ms. Heetderks asked about the condition of the slate. Mr. Treakle stated it was extremely brittle and pieces would break when removed; approximately two-thirds of the slate would be lost as it was removed.

Mr. Tremblay stated from his own experience that the cost of replacing slate was prohibitive. He suggested a CertainTeed product, the Grand Manor Shingle, as one of the better slate replicas for a steeped pitch roof.

Ms. Lewis read from the Guidelines: "Before replacing slate with new slate or a substitute material, ensure that the slate is deteriorating and not the roof flashing. Buckingham slate used on many local structures should last approximately 175 years or longer and repairs may be possible instead of wholesale replacement. Rusted fasteners may cause slates to slip and leaks to develop. Rehang slate with new fasteners. Pennsylvania slate lasts approximately 75 years before it begins to delaminate. At that time, it will need to be replaced. Since slate is so expensive and when replacing an entire roof in cases of extreme financial hardship consider using materials such as artificial slate or possibly standing seam metal or appropriately textured asphalt shingles."

Ms. Fenton called for comments.

Mr. Tremblay stated he had been permitted to substitute Grand Manor Shingle for the slate without needing to demonstrate a financial hardship beyond the obvious difference in price.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about a wholesale change in the appearance of a roofline. She stated she might be more persuaded to approve a slate substitute than a standing seam metal.

Ms. Fenton stated that in the past the Board of Architectural Review had allowed for administrative approval of any slate or copper roof.

Mr. Atkins stated the guidelines conflict when there is more than one. A copper roof is an appropriate roofing material for this house in this district. He also felt there had been a compelling argument of why the strategies of replacing nailing and flashing only may not be effective due to the brittle nature of the older slate. He felt the copper roof would be an appropriate and acceptable substitution in this case.

Ms. Lewis stated it would be easier for her to approve if copper could have been a material used originally. Mr. Coiner stated a standing seam metal could have been used when the house was constructed.

Ms. Lewis moved for approval of the roof as submitted in copper. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Fenton asked that Ms. Lewis state why it is being accepted. Ms. Lewis stated it met the guidelines. Mr. Atkins made a friendly amendment that the balance of the guidelines come into play, the appropriateness of the copper material for its own sake and the composition of all the materials on the house including existing copper roofing makes this a compatible choice. Ms. Heetderks also stated that the roof was not the single distinguishing characteristic for the structure. Ms. Lewis and Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-09-04

112 West Main Street (and Water Street side)

Tax Map 28 Parcel 23

Install eight burgees (pennants)

York Place

Hightech Signs (Ben Foster), Applicant

Ms. Scala stated she had combined applications G and H.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-09-05

112 West Main Street (and Water Street side)

Tax Map 28 Parcel 23

Install four projecting signs and planters

York Place

Hightech Signs (Ben Foster), Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report on items G and H. Item H is for two projecting signs on the Mall side of York Place; the signs on Water Street will be wall signs flanking the door. The applicant proposes eight two-color burgees, which are triangular shaped flags or pennants; four on the Downtown Mall side, four on the Water Street side of York Place. The burgees are 3x5 feet and mounted on black fiberglass poles. The colors are to be chosen by the City; the Zoning Administrator suggested color changes depending on the season. The existing awnings on the Downtown Mall side, as well as the green flags above the cornice, are to be removed. The proposed projecting signs are positioned lower than the normally requisite ten feet height; therefore, the applicant proposes to install a planter under each sign to direct pedestrians around the sign. Each projecting sign will display the names of five business located in York Place. Each of the aluminum nameplates will be a different color with white lettering. The shop sign over the door will replace two smaller signs. This is the first proposal for a Comprehensive Signage Plan under the new ordinance, which normally provides for administrative approval of a Comprehensive Signage Plan. Staff is seeking discussion about what the Board of Architectural

Review would like to see in the future. For a multiple tenant building, the Comprehensive Signage Plan is a good solution for the need for flexible signage. Flags used as signs are becoming more common on the Downtown Mall. Staff would prefer the signs to be wall mounted. The Guidelines talk about primary colors being objectionable. Staff prefers gray as it complements the gray painted building. Staff recommends the Board of Architectural Review provide guidance on the Comprehensive Signage Plan. Staff could work with the applicant to finalize color choices. The signs had been placed earlier in the day.

Ms. Fenton recognized the applicant. Mr. Foster apologized that the signs had been placed; he had been under the impression the proposal had been approved. Signs not at eye level are not seen by pedestrians. The idea was for bright, cheerful colors, which were not obnoxious.

Ms. Fenton called for questions.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification of the material of the burgees. Mr. Foster stated they were nylon.

Ms. Fenton called for comments.

Mr. Coiner felt the colors were shocking. He also expressed concern about the use of planters, which may add to the congestion of the area.

Ms. Fenton stated she had never seen protruding signs on a building in any historic district anywhere. She further stated she saw it as inappropriate. She saw it as being loud and noisy with too much color. She stated if they allowed it to happen, this would be presented with other buildings in other places. She felt it was an obstacle. She felt it was a precedent they did not want to start.

Ms. Lewis concurred with Ms. Fenton's comments about the height; however, there are protruding signs that are higher up. Ms. Fenton clarified that she meant protruding signs at the proposed height.

Mr. Atkins felt the Guidelines were helpful in this case: the ten-foot rule, wall-mounted signs, a three-color maximum.

Mr. Knight felt the banners didn't cause a problem under the Guidelines. He felt the protruding signs did cause a problem. He thought they were a violation of the ADA. He was leery of the use of planters, as they become seats and trash containers.

Ms. Lewis stated she supported the burgees but nothing else in the proposal.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the eight pennants as submitted -- materials and everything -- and decline approval of the planters and projecting signs as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks sought clarification as to whether the motion included the wall signs on the Water Street side and the "Shops" sign. Ms. Lewis stated it did not; she further stated the motion included rescinding the A-frame sign board. Mr. Tremblay suggested not rescinding the A-frame until some other sign is approved. Ms. Lewis withdrew that portion of the motion. Ms.

Heetderks again asked if the motion included the "Shops" sign. Ms. Lewis amended her motion to include the new "Shops" script sign. Mr. Knight stated he could not second the friendly amendment. Mr. Tremblay stated he would second the motion as amended. The Board was unsure that could be done. Ms. Fenton stated they had a motion to accept the banners and could vote on that. Mr. Coiner and Ms. Lewis both stated it was difficult to deal with a proposal upon which the applicant had already acted without approval. Ms. Lewis withdrew her motion.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification as to the colors of the burgees. The applicant stated the colors were blue and red, which had been chosen by the City. Ms. Scala stated her understanding that the City was working with the applicant on using seasonal colors.

Mr. Atkins moved to deny the request for approval as submitted on the following grounds: Item 3 -- the effect on the proposed change of the historic district neighborhood, in particular the relationship of the signage to the building they found inappropriate based on Guidelines number 2, talking about how high it should be away from the sidewalk; number 3, that it suggests a wall mounted sign per each street frontage -- which this would qualify, but it suggests wall mounted sign; number 9, that the colors are specified at three maximum, although more could be considered; number 11, suggesting flat wall mounted directory sign. He continued that looking at the burgees as an acceptable part of the total design package, they would want to consider their color in concert with the rest. He finished off by relating it also to the staff report along some of those same items. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called for a five-minute recess, whereupon the Board stood in recess, 6:04 p.m. - 6:09 p.m.

Ms. Fenton reconvened the meeting, noting that Mr. Coiner had not yet returned. She then called for the next item on the agenda.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-09-06
409 East High Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 33
Demolish four structures

Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Project

Linda Peacock for J&DR Committee, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Four structures were proposed for demolition: a one-story brick addition next to the old Jailer's House, a one-story frame addition added to that which was built in 1969, a one-story brick structure located behind the court building, and the two-story parking garage/storage building behind the jail building which is attached to the jail wall enclosing the jail.

Mr. Coiner rejoined the meeting, 6:11 p.m.

Ms. Scala continued the staff report. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the jail wall that is tied to the garage following demolition of the garage. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the four structures as requested; the demolition of the garage and the reconstruction of the old jail wall should be accomplished as carefully as possible to avoid unnecessary damage to the existing jail wall.

The applicant had nothing to add to the staff presentation.

Ms. Fenton called for questions and comments.

Mr. Coiner stated he was prepared to support the demolition of all four as one motion. He wanted the condition of the rebuilding of the jail wall to be to the Secretary of the Interior standards. Ms. Fenton felt the reconstruction should be a separate motion. Mr. Coiner stated his comments would be a motion. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Coiner then moved that, on the reconstruction of the jailhouse wall, the work be done to the Secretary of Interior standards as far as materials and quality of work. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

J. The Corner District -- Contributing/Non-contributing Buildings Discussion

Ms. Scala stated there were three buildings in question as to being contributing or non-contributing: the Biltmore Grill, the Corner Outlet Store, and the Bank of America.

Staff had sought additional information from Ann Albright, owner of the Biltmore Grill. It was a 1947 house built of cinder block. A description of its uses over the years had been provided. Staff recommended it remain a contributing structure.

Staff had received a picture of the Corner Outlet Store prior to it being painted. The facade was essentially the same. Under the idea that the building was basically intact, staff recommended it remain as a contributing structure.

The Bank of America had been listed as non-contributing. Ms. Scala deferred to Ms. Lewis to comment on the structure. Ms. Lewis felt the building was contributing. Even though it had been built in 1959, it was designed by Floyd Johnson who had been a restorative architect at Monticello. She mentioned comments from other Board of Architectural Review members who had been on the walking tour and who had stated the building materials were remarkable for construction at that time.

Ms. Lewis made a motion that all of the properties be included as contributing structures in the new district. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Scala stated the advertisement for the matter was handled incorrectly so the Planning Commission would have to hold another Public Hearing in mid-October and would go before City Council at their first November meeting.

Mr. Knight wanted to know what would happen with the three fraternity houses on the west side of Rugby Road since they split the seam between The Corner District and the Rugby District. Ms. Scala stated it had been thought best to add them later; however, they could only be added if they were on private property rather than University property.

Ms. Fenton stated the Board of Architectural Review needed someone else to be on the Steering Committee selection. Mr. Knight stated he could do it.

K. Approval of Minutes:

August 19, 2003

Mr. Coiner moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Knight and Mr. Atkins abstaining.

August 26, 2003

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion, which carried with Ms. Heetderks, Mr. Atkins and Mr. Tremblay abstaining.

September 2, 2003

Mr. Atkins (?) moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion, which carried with Ms. Lewis and Mr. Coiner abstaining.

L. Matters from the public

Ms. Fenton did not call this item.

M. Other Business

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about an E-mail regarding the J&DR Court, which stated there were only a couple of concerns. Mr. Coiner thought there had been more concerns than the architect mentioned.

Ms. Heetderks felt the court facade needed to come before the Board as a partial demolition before any new construction was considered.

Mr. Coiner asked if anything had been heard about downspouts for the Ice Park. Ms. Scala said the latest plan, which had not yet been submitted, was to build brick pilasters.

Mr. Coiner asked if the downspouts had been approved for the Fifth Street side of the Grand Furniture building. Ms. Scala stated downspouts had been shown but they were altered since the approval.

Mr. Coiner asked if anyone had heard anything about Ms. Swenson. He was informed that she had delivered a baby girl named Bliss.

Mr. Coiner informed the Board that he had heard from someone about Linda Winner that she was doing so-so but was resting at the beach.

N. Adjournment

Mr. Coiner moved for adjournment. Ms. Fenton did not accept that motion, requesting instead a motion, which would state where they would adjourn to have dinner. Mr. Tremblay suggested the site to be named later and seconded the existing motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the Board stood adjourned at 6:37 p.m. with those who could do so to readjourn for dinner.