

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

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair
Lynne Heetderks, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Allison Ewing
Syd Knight
Cheri Lewis
Katie Swenson

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 4:54 p.m.
A. Matters from the public
Ms. Fenton called for matters not on the agenda. There were none.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 03-12-05
Downtown Mall
Vendor Cart
Henry's Restaurant, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The application was for a stainless steel vendor cart with a dark green umbrella. The sign is similar to the Sam's Hot Dog Stand sign. The stand meets the Guidelines. Staff recommends approval.

The applicant, Ms. Debbie Hackett, explained that the signs were magnetic and brought one for the Board to see.

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

Ms. Lewis made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 03-12-01
409 Ridge Street**

Tax Map 29 Parcel 135
New single-family residence

Jefferson Area Builders, Applicant, for Brad and Danielle Wilcox

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The site has been vacant since the house was destroyed in 1994. The application is for a new single-family residence. The houses in this part of Ridge Street are predominantly two-story brick with standing seam metal roofs; most have porches, double hung windows and detail work. The proposed two-story brick residence is very appropriate for the site. It will have a small porch, decorative sidelights and transom around the front door, operable shutters and a steep roof pitch. Hardiplank is appropriate for the rear addition. Staff recommends a standing seam metal roof although dimensional shingles are acceptable under the Guidelines. Staff recommends wood rather than aluminum trim around the cornice; wood rather than fiberglass columns; and windows with true divided lights. Because this is new construction, the proposed windows with grills on the exterior may be acceptable to the Board of Architectural Review.

Mr. Mike Sadler, president of Jefferson Area Builders, and Tom Crouthamel, the homeowner designer, were present to address any questions or concerns.

Mr. Sadler brought a sample of the simulated true divided light section of the window so the Board could see the construction and profiling. Also presented for consideration was an example of the aluminum cornice and samples of the dimensional singles.

Mr. Crouthamel stated the driveway for the property would come off an alley off of Fourth Street. He was unsure what would be required by the City to convert the alley to a driveway.

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

Mr. Knight sought clarification regarding the size of the porch. The applicant explained that the porch was based on the request of the homeowners.

Ms. Swenson asked if the neighboring houses had deeper porches. Mr. Brad Wilcox presented the Board with pictures of other houses on Ridge Street.

Mr. Atkins wanted to know how the cornice where it meets the corner was trimmed out. Mr. Sadler explained it would be cut and caulked at that seam.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification regarding the choice of fiberglass columns rather than wood. Mr. Sadler stated fiberglass would last longer than wood. He further stated that, architecturally, it looked just the same as a wood column.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public and then the Board of Architectural Review. Ms. Ewing stated it was clearly attempting to be faithful to the style. But she was concerned about the roof overhang and the width of the shutters. She felt a metal roof would improve the plan.

Ms. Heetderks echoed Ms. Ewing's concerns about the shutters citing a guideline which stated that shutters should be of a size that, if closed, would completely cover the window. She also stated a preference for a standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Atkins felt several things were a step down in quality and expectation. He expressed concern over the aluminum cornice, missing detail work in the drawing.

Mr. Knight stated he would prefer that a motion include further examination of some of the detailing.

Ms. Lewis wanted clarification as to the type of roof for the porch. The applicant stated it would be standing seam. Ms. Lewis noted that the applicant had two different types of roofs; one of which was desired by the Board.

Mr. Tremblay stated there was a huge difference in cost. He suggested that a middle ground would be a slate replica material since many of the homes on Ridge Street had slate.

Mr. Coiner stated the metal seemed to be the only real choice for the porch.

Mr. Atkins stated that because the applicant was looking for overall approval, he moved that they approve the basic design of the house -- brick, with punched windows, double hung, entry porch -- as presented with a follow up, basically deferring decision on some of the details as follows: many specific material references and detail designs to follow, particularly the material of the front stairs, proportions of the divided lights particularly on the side elevations that are typically vertical or squarish but not horizontal; that they encourage a combination of these quality improvements: to go to a stucco gable or a shiplap wood siding that gives a flat appearance that's painted; to consider replacing aluminum cornice with some telltale reveals at the corners, replacing that with a wood cornice painted; looking at a slate version of dimensional shingles; showing the wood railings missing on some of the drawings and their size and picket dimensions; also to look at half the window opening being the dimension of the shutter; and asking the applicant to consider increasing the size of the porch. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis stated a preference for a more generous porch. Ms. Swenson also expressed concern regarding the width of the front door and the sidelights. Ms. Fenton called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-12-04

500 West Main Street

Tax Map 29 parcel 10

New Construction -- The Haney Building

Daggett & Grigg, Architects for Roy C. Haney

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This corner building had been planned in 1989 but was not developed so the applicant had to return for site plan approval. The ordinance has changed since then. Mr. Haney had come before the Board for a preliminary review. The proposal is for a new

three-story mixed-use building made of brick and artificial stucco. The first floor would be business use; the second two floors would be apartments. Parking and landscaping are intact; parking needs to be restriped to fit the new ordinance. Proposed are vinyl clad wood windows with simulated divided lights, possibly Anderson windows with exterior grills. The storefront windows would be similar to those on the neighboring ABC store. The West Main Street facade shows black painted metal rails, dark blue canvas awnings. The rear facade features a prefinished standing seam metal roof, painted wood columns and stairs and vinyl railings. Staff feels the building is appropriate for the site; details in keeping with the guidelines include the general massing, use of brick, flat roof, the use of storefronts on the ground floor with smaller window openings above. The overall building and site design are very compatible with the West Main Street corridor, especially the building to the setback line and locating the parking in the rear. Based on the guidelines and contributing buildings in the area, staff recommends real stucco in place of the artificial. Staff also recommends painted wood or metal rather than vinyl porch railings, as well as windows with true divided lights. Because this is a new building, the proposed windows with grills on the exterior may be acceptable to the Board of Architectural Review. The use of prefinished metal roofing was not addressed in the guidelines and may be acceptable. Staff recommends the addition of a storefront entrance on the West Main Street elevation.

Mr. Richard Boyd, of Daggett & Grigg, was present as was Mr. Roy Haney. Mr. Boyd provided examples of the proposed brick, the metal roof, the mortar, and the stucco. He explained they would be changing to an aluminum window with a simulated divided light; he then presented the Board with a sample of the proposed frame color. He also provided the Board with a sample of the proposed awning.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know why there were no doors on the front of the building. Mr. Boyd explained they were trying to divorce themselves from the ABC Store and give the building a new address.

Mr. Knight expressed concern about what could be done with the 15-foot setback. Mr. Knight sought clarification from the Chair or staff if it was within the purview of the Board of Architectural Review to suggest a zoning change. Ms. Fenton stated it was. She added that it had been done before to recommend a zoning variance on a house. Mr. Knight asked if that was something the applicant would like to pursue. Mr. Haney concurred.

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

Ms. Giovanna Galfione stated the 15-foot setback was a recommendation from the group studying the West Main Street corridor to make it more pedestrian friendly.

Ms. Lewis recognized the entrance into the meeting of Mr. Jim Tolbert, Director of Neighborhood Development Services, and asked that he address the Board as to its authority to grant a variance. Mr. Tolbert stated that the Board did not have the authority to grant a zoning variance; it would have to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals. He further explained that the 15-

foot setback is new to the ordinance because of the work being done on the West Main design. The WRT design calls for the promenade between downtown and the University to be on the south side of the road. It is not physically possible to get a wider sidewalk on the north side. Ms. Lewis asked if there was a preference given to street access from West Main. Mr. Tolbert stated the intent was to create a pedestrian presence and a West Main presence so a West Main access would be important. Ms. Lewis noted for the record that a lot of the members of the Planning Commission as well as members of the Board of Architectural Review were unfamiliar with the new zoning ordinance and were trying to figure their way through some of the applications.

Mr. Tolbert stated that the vision was that the 15 feet would be a public space.

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

Mr. Coiner thought the applicant was missing an opportunity by not having doors on West Main Street.

Mr. Atkins appreciated the improvements from the last proposal. The building was much improved.

Ms. Heetderks had some detail concerns. She stated the Guidelines were explicit about using real materials including the use of stucco rather than Dryvit. She also felt the vinyl porch railings in the rear of the building were questionable given that there were metal ones in the front.

Mr. Tremblay expressed appreciation for the applicant coming back with a rethought design, which was more consistent with what had been asked of him.

Ms. Ewing also felt frontage opening onto West Main Street would be essential to attracting business.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the overall design as presented including the massing and general approach to the building in terms of windows with a particular focus on certain things the Board would like to see studied: First is the space between the building and the sidewalk in the 15 foot setback and the encouragement of the Board to look at entry doors with a terrace to basically cover Guideline 3-12 Number 4 -- "Include doors in all storefronts to reinforce street level vitality," "When designing new storefronts or elements conform to the configuration of materials of traditional storefronts"; That the applicant look at putting doors in there in conjunction with the terrace -- if there are not doors, then a different kind of strategy for that 15 feet would make sense; Reconsider the oversized brick; confirming that the applicant was using aluminum clad windows, not vinyl, with simulated divided lights with both sides and a fixed integrated spacer bar between; Looking at Guideline 3-14 Number 13, "That synthetic sidings, including vinyl and aluminum and synthetic stucco-like finishes are not historic cladding materials in the historic district and their use should be avoided"; Reconsider the vinyl railing which is not a material which has been typically accepted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Knight asked if there was concern about the commercial roof as opposed to the standing seam. Ms. Fenton asked that the applicant just reconsider the roof. Mr. Atkins asked if that were

a friendly amendment. He then spoke to the prior mention of the roofing material and the degree at which it was capped. Ms. Fenton called the motion, which carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-12-03

210 W. Water Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 80

Patio Enclosure -- La Cucina Restaurant

Giovanna Galfione, Architect for Frank Benincasa

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant proposes to cover and enclose the front patio. Staff recommends that the proposed design is a good solution to the practical issues confronting the space; it highlights and complements the second story of the original building. The new design draws from traditional elements and creates an attractive street wall that works well with both abutting buildings. The Guidelines do not support metal awnings; however, the BAR has generally used a broader interpretation of the Guidelines in the Water Street area. Staff recommends approval subject to approval of color choices and exterior lighting details.

Ms. Giovanna Galfione presented the Board with a rendering of the enclosure with the proposed colors as well as the color palette for the other elements of the new elevation.

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

Mr. Coiner sought clarification that the visible portions would be brick. Ms. Galfione concurred that the visible portions of the wall going west as well as the front.

Mr. Coiner sought additional information on the placement of signage. Ms. Galfione explained that the 2x2 sign would go in the center above the entry portal. She also stated the sign would be submitted when the design was ready. Ms. Galfione also stated the lighting would be submitted later.

Ms. Swenson asked if the structure would be built in such a way as to allow it to be built on top of. Ms. Galfione concurred, stating that was a requirement of the owner.

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

Ms. Ewing made a motion to approve as submitted with details of signage and lighting coming back. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Ms. Fenton called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton suggested the Board take a five-minute break whereupon the Board of Architectural Review stood in recess from 5:58 p.m. to 6:04 p.m. Ms. Ewing left the meeting during the break.

Ms. Fenton reconvened the meeting at 6:04 p.m.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-12-02

411-417 E. High Street

Tax Map 53 Parcels 27, 28, 32, & 33

J&DR Courthouse renovation/addition; new annex and parking garage

J&DR Court Committee, Applicant for City of Charlottesville and County of Albemarle

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Staff's opinion is that the overall plan provides for the continued use and preservation of three historic structures. No alterations are planned that would adversely affect the old jail or jailer's house. The engineer indicates they are aware of the difficulties associated with construction on the confined site and care will be taken not to disturb the foundations of the old structures. The facade of the old Elks Building will be encapsulated but the new design highlights a section of the former facade as part of the new lobby. The new facade is simple and well proportioned and respects the character of the historic district. The new annex and garage are three stories in height with lower level largely below grade. Details of the courtyard have not been provided. A detailed landscape plan will be included as part of the site plan approval. The Board of Architectural Review should discuss and approve materials and colors.

The architect presented a PowerPoint presentation for the benefit of the Board. He also provided samples of the colors for the back building.

Ms. Fenton called for questions.

Mr. Coiner asked for clarification about the handrail. The architect explained it was a wrought iron handrail of standard height.

Ms. Fenton called for comments.

Ms. Heetderks expressed appreciation for the way the architects have preserved the buildings. She expressed concern over the encapsulation of the old Elks Building: it seemed counter to the purpose of the historic district to take a historic facade and obliterate it with a faux historic facade rather than trying to find a creative way to adaptively reuse the existing facade; and that the Board tends to lose some control over the fate of these historic structures once they are encapsulated. The architect stated there was nothing left of the existing detail except the frames of the doors on the front and the fanlight on the first floor, which they wish to reposition on the upper level. He further stated there was an enormous investment being done in the building so it would be doubtful that it would be demolished.

Ms. Fenton stated that when the Board made its recommendation to Council, they recommend that a commitment be made to preserving what is left of the facade as part of the approval process.

Ms. Lewis stated a concern that this public building where families and children have their matters litigated would have had a more welcoming approach with front steps. She would like to

see further detail of the benches, landscaping, a place for people to pause and wait for their counsel and family.

Mr. Atkins felt the landscape architect was proposing a promising direction. He did, however, have four or five detail questions particularly with the parking structure. He would like more detail on the screening wall and the stone, the steel mesh, and the steel structure supporting the wood slats.

Ms. Swenson thought the lattice work, though extensive, looked very beautiful. She thought that knowing that those materials would fit into the budget was very important.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the application with regard to the Courthouse renovation and addition, the new annex building and the parking garage for the total design approach, including the partial encapsulation of the existing former Elks Club facade withholding approval of certain aspects of the parking garage component based on further detail presentation for material of the wood slats, the steel structure that supports it, the stone used and the steel mesh screening panels as part of the garage; also looking forward to the review of the site plan and the way that the front portion immediately in front of the portico may change including a more welcoming front with places to sit which could mean actual changes to the base where the columns are sitting. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Fenton called the question. The motion carried with a vote of 7-1; Ms. Heetderks was the sole vote against.

G. Preliminary Discussion

Charlottesville Hotel 200 E. Main Street

Ms. Scala did not prepare a staff report since this was a preliminary discussion. However, the Board members should have received a booklet detailing four different options.

Mr. Mark Hornberger, architect, was present as a representative for the client, Lee Danielson. Mr. Hornberger gave a 19-minute slide presentation on the proposed hotel of roughly 90 to 100 rooms.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Ms. Fenton revealed that she owned property on the block proposed for the hotel.

Ms. Fenton called for comments for the applicant.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about the demolition of the facade. Mr. Hornberger stated they had found that the historic resources of the building have been obliterated.

Mr. Knight felt, in regards to overall massing, that Options B and C were least preferable; he did not have an objection to A, and, in fact, found himself favoring A.

Mr. Coiner echoed Mr. Knight's comments and hoped that the inside was preserved. He also urged the architect to bring a 3-D model with him at the next presentation.

Mr. Tremblay favored Option D.

Ms. Heetderks also favored Option D.

Ms. Fenton liked Options A and D. She also stated the Board had no purview over the paintings.

Ms. Lewis thanked the applicant for coming before the Board regarding the massing. She favored Options B and D. She also supported demolition of the facade.

Mr. Atkins supported keeping the existing facade because of its elegance. He felt a hotel would be a significant addition to the Mall. He favored Options A and D.

Ms. Swenson expressed an interest in incorporating the existing facade in the design. She also wanted the presence of this building on the Mall. She felt Option A was a more dynamic building.

H. Approval of Minutes:

November 18, 2003

Ms. Fenton called for approval or revision of the minutes. Ms. Heetderks asked for an amendment to page 5, paragraph 2, the last sentence, so that it read: "She stated that past commercial interests that had used the building had largely maintained the integrity of the exterior of the structure with the exception of the porch." She also asked that the phrase "in the daytime" be struck from page 7, paragraph 3. Ms. Heetderks asked if the minutes should clarify that the meeting adjourned to a restaurant. Ms. Fenton concurred and added that no Board of Architectural Review business was discussed. Ms. Lewis asked that the section of page 12 regarding the Second Street elevations, she did not think she said, "give a clear of view to what is ahead," but clear view of the activity on the Mall; she also stated she was concerned that improvements along Second Street would impede drawing people up Second Street to the Mall.

Ms. Heetderks made a motion to approve as amended. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

I. Matters from the public

There were no matters from the public.

J. Other Business

Ms. Fenton stated that in April the Board would do its Preservation Awards.

There would be an appeal for the door on 909 West Main in January.

A work session with City Council and the Planning Commission would be held on January 29th from 5:00 to 7 p.m. William Frasier, the consultant chosen to update design guidelines and to do the entrance corridor guidelines, would be present.

Ms. Scala and Ms. Fenton asked that proposed changes to the design guidelines be E-mailed to Ms. Scala

Mr. Coiner made a motion that everyone have a happy holiday. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Scala stated that the January and February meetings would be held in the basement conference room.

K. Adjournment

Ms. Lewis made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:39 p.m.