

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
January 20, 2004
Basement Conference Room -- City Hall**

Minutes

Present: Also Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair Mary Joy Scala
Lynne Heetderks, Vice Chair
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Allison Ewing
Syd Knight
Cheri Lewis
Katie Swenson

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

A. Matters from the public

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

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application -- follow-up details

**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. This Certificate of Appropriateness Application had been presented and approved in December with the request that certain details come back to the Board. The shingles are now GAS-slate lined. The standing seam metal porch roof is pre-painted steel. The windows are double hung, aluminum clad wood with simulated true divided lights; the grills are applied inside and outside with a spacer bar between. Fiber cement siding is on the rear addition. The front porch structure will be block and brick with a mahogany deck; the steps will be pressure treated carriages with mahogany treads and risers. The proportions of the divided light windows on the sides at the foundation level cannot be altered. The owner does not want a larger window in the window well. The gables will be synthetic stucco or an equivalent. The aluminum cornice would be replaced with wood of similar size. The porch has been increased to a five-foot depth rather than four. The entry door sidelights and transom have been increased to

14 inches. The applicant accepted all of the Board's suggestions except for the gabled siding and the proportion of the side windows. Enough changes have been made such that staff recommends the application has proposed.

The applicant had nothing to add to the presentation.

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

Mr. Knight sought clarification as to the use of synthetic stucco. The applicant stated he had learned that real stucco could be used instead.

Mr. Atkins expressed appreciation for the applicant's willingness to work with the improvements suggested by the Board.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve as submitted. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Mr. Knight stated his discomfort with approving "as submitted" unless it was amended to stipulate the use of genuine stucco on the gables or shiplap siding. Ms. Fenton concurred with that. Ms. Lewis preferred not to withdraw her motion. The motion carried with Ms. Fenton, Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Knight voting against.

Ms. Fenton asked if it would be possible to have a second motion allowing the applicant to have the option to use genuine stucco.

Ms. Heetderks made a motion to give the applicant the option of using true stucco rather than synthetic stucco. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-01-03

500 East Market Street Parking Garage

Tax Map 53 Parcel 91-L

Rebuild and reconfigure brick planters

City of Charlottesville, Owner

Scott Hendrix, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The proposal was to rebuild and reconfigure two planters on Fifth Street between Market Street and the Mall because they have incurred structural failure and are in need of reconstruction. They will be rebuilt with lower walls to provide better visibility for retail locations behind them. The new masonry and railings will match the existing. There was no replanting plan available at the time; staff could approve that administratively if the Board of Architectural Review so wanted.

Mr. Scott Hendrix stated the reconfiguration and reconstruction would be in the same existing motif. The aesthetic would not be changed. The walls would be reconfigured to lower the height and to become ADA compliant.

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

Mr. Coiner asked if consideration had been given to using the old brick. Mr. Hendrix stated they had, but a lot of it was damaged.

Mr. Atkins stated he would like to see the railing changed, as it was so heavy-handed. Mr. Hendrix stated the center railing shown on the prospective sketch would be deleted.

Ms. Fenton asked if any thought had been given to the plantings. Mr. Hendrix stated he had not nor was he the right person to do that. The City Horticulturist was working on a plan.

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

Mr. Knight made a motion to approve as submitted with the stipulation that the planting plan be submitted to staff for administrative approval. Mr. Atkins stated he would second it as long as it would be recognized that the cap course on the tops of the walls, which was not noted, but is an integral part of the success of this application. Mr. Knight concurred and further modified the motion to stipulate, as the applicant stated, that the center railing is no longer part of the application. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-01-01

1110 Wertland Street

Tax Map 10 Parcel 32

Exterior Alterations

Richard and Robert Tremblay, Owners

Gercke Brothers, Inc., Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property is a contributing structure in the Wertland Street Historic District. The rear porch is not on the 1920 Sanbourne maps. The storeroom, which forms part of the enclosure on the porch, was built in the 1970s. Under the new zoning ordinance, the Board of Architectural Review will now review all exterior changes, not just those visible from the street. The applicant proposes to enclose the remaining open area under the rear basement-level porch to provide a bedroom; the adjacent storeroom would be converted to a full bathroom. The porch posts will remain visible and the siding will match that used to enclose the storeroom. The existing metal roof with Philadelphia gutters will be repaired and retained. Two new windows, similar to those in the basement level of the building, will be placed in the rear wall of the bedroom. The existing storeroom window will be replaced with a similar window, the same size as the existing. The windows are Certain Teed vinyl insulated, trimmed with flat stock. All windows in the building have been replaced by this type of vinyl window already. Staff recommends approval because the proposed porch enclosure meets standards and criteria set forth in the ordinance and guidelines and it is compatible with the character of the property and district.

The applicant had nothing to add to the presentation.

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

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve as submitted. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Scala stated that the applicant for item E on the agenda could not be present until 5:30 so that item was bypassed until such time as the applicant could be present.

F. Preliminary Discussion 12 and 17 Elliewood Avenue

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A proposal had gone before the Planning Commission to close part of the alley between and behind these two parcels. Mr. Conroy had not owned both parcels at that time, but had acquired them since that meeting. Both parcels had become part of the Corner Historic District. He was seeking ideas from the Board of Architectural Review about his plans for the properties.

Mr. Conroy stated he wanted to paint the buildings and put up temporary awnings that would go up and down depending on the weather. The buildings would be a restaurant. He was also planning to extend the decks halfway out to the alley. Ms. Scala clarified that the awning would be a canopy-type so it would be more like an outdoor room. Mr. Conroy presented the Board with drawings of his plans.

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

Ms. Fenton expressed concern that the drawings made the awning look like a tent. She stated the Board had never had a problem with extending decks as long as the materials were appropriate with what was already there; however, a tent had never been approved for a long-term basis.

Mr. Conroy explained that the awning was not meant as a tent. The awning was meant to serve public safety issues for insurance purposes. Public safety was also the consideration behind changes to the alleyway.

Mr. Knight stated he would like to see more detail in the drawings.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the applicant present the full proposal at one time rather than piecemeal. She also suggested that he consult with Ms. Scala as to what the Board would need in his presentation. She suggested that he provide photographs of the neighboring buildings to see it in perspective.

Mr. Conroy asked if it would be possible for someone to tell him why it was called the Floyd or Flynn House and why the two properties were considered to be contributing. Ms. Fenton stated that information would have to come from Ms. Scala. Ms. Scala stated she would try to find the information from him.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-01-02

200 East Main Street and 108 Second Street Southeast

Tax Map 28 Parcel 31 and 32

Partial demolitions to existing structures and construction of boutique hotel

Braham II LLC., Owner

Hornberger & Worstell, Inc., Applicant

Ms. Fenton stated they would start with the request for demolition, and then afterwards discuss the proposed construction.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. 200 East Main Street contains the former bank and an addition to that bank at the back. 108 Second Street Southeast is the current location of the Visitor Center. A preliminary discussion had been held December 16th. Massing options were discussed. The Board was divided between options A and D. A brought the building closer to the Mall; D pushed it away. Some board members had hoped the interior murals would be saved; the interior is not within the Board's purview. Subsequent drawings received from the applicant focused on option D. The applicant is seeking approval to demolish the vacant former bank building and abutting office buildings; and, secondly, to construct a nine-story hotel with approximately 100 rooms and restaurant and bar.

Regarding demolition, pertinent standards had been addressed in the written staff report presented to the Board. Design guidelines had also been presented to the Board in writing.

Staff recommends that, if the Board of Architectural Review intends to approve demolition on the site, it should be done concurrently with an approval for new construction. Since the Board may not be permitted legally to require that demolition occur only if the new building is approved, staff recommends deferral since staff feels they should be taken up at the same time. Staff feels that the main portion of the 1966 bank building is structurally sound and is architecturally worthy of preservation. It appears the proposed new restaurant construction could incorporate the existing bank building into its design. Neither the addition nor the one-story office building on the back property appear to be architecturally or historically significant and could be demolished.

Mr. Mark Hornberger and Mr. Rob Wilson were present as representatives of Braham. Mr. Hornberger stated that the existing old bank building was a series of four elements: a 12x53 foot facade facing the mall which was a black granite redo of the previous facade; a room, redone in about 1966, with murals attached to the wall -- the intention was to preserve and reinstall the murals once the new room was built. The proposal was to save and reuse the front 12 feet and rebuild the room, structurally cantilevering it off to allow for the new tower of the proposed hotel. The other two pieces were later additions in the same beige brick and undistinguished fenestration; those would need to be demolished completely to make way for the hotel building.

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

Mr. Knight stated he saw nothing in the guidelines that would argue in favor of denying the permit for demolition. He sought clarification of the statement that both properties "contain contributing buildings in the Charlottesville and Albemarle County Courthouse National Register and Virginia Landmark Register's Historic District" in light of the guideline, which is based on whether the property has been, designated a national historic landmark listed on the National Register or listed with Virginia Landmark's Register. Ms. Scala stated that when the Downtown District was adopted, there was no distinguishing between contributing and non-contributing; everything was considered contributing. Mr. Knight asked if there was nothing contributing beyond the first 12 feet of the building; Ms. Scala stated that was her conclusion.

Mr. Knight made a motion to approve the application for demolition of 108 Second Street Southeast. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Knight made a motion to approve the demolition of the rear portion of 200 East Main Street with the stipulation that the black granite facade in the front 12 feet of the building and the full width of 53 feet be preserved. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis asked if he would accept a friendly amendment for the motion to pertain to the whole building. Mr. Knight and Mr. Atkins accepted the amendment, keeping the stipulation regarding the facade. Ms. Lewis commented that all of the Board would like to see the murals preserved and displayed. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called for the design of the new structure.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Staff has reviewed and made recommendations on the information submitted to date; more information is required to make a final recommendation on the project. Based on the size of the project, decisions should be made incrementally. No site plan has been reviewed. The proposed building will be nine stories, or 101 feet. The penthouse is not counted in the height measurement but it should not cover more than 25 percent of the roof area; the proposal exceeds that limit. Standards for review in construction alterations had been provided in the members' packets. Guidelines for new construction had also been provided to the members. Since this has been submitted as a Certificate of Appropriateness Application, action must be taken. Staff recommends that, due to the amount of new information provided, either the applicant request deferral or denial of the application, which would cause the applicant to resubmit an application. Major concerns remaining include: meeting the height and setback requirements of the zoning district, massing issues, window design, the canopy design, the relationship of the building to Second Street, incorporation of the existing bank building, and presentation of materials and colors. The signage will come back to the Board of Architectural Review.

Mr. Hornberger and Mr. Wilson presented a PowerPoint Presentation to the Board.

Ms. Swenson entered the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Upon conclusion of the PowerPoint Presentation, Ms. Fenton called for a brief recess whereupon the meeting stood in recess at 6:24 p.m.

Ms. Fenton reconvened the meeting at 6:31 p.m.

Mr. Coiner asked if they could discuss the demolition once again. Ms. Fenton concurred. Mr. Coiner stated that the removal of the medallion had not been part of the presentation. Mr. Coiner asked for a friendly amendment that the applicant be allowed to remove the medallion. Mr. Atkins concurred with Mr. Coiner regarding the removal of the stone backing where there used to be an eagle and currently displayed the logo of the last occupant of the building. Mr. Knight accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Atkins, having seconded the original motion, also accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously with Ms. Swenson abstaining.

Ms. Fenton called for questions and comments from the public and the board regarding the new structure.

Mr. Knight wanted to know why massing D had been chosen rather than A. Mr. Hornberger explained that A had internal layout problems.

Mr. Hornberger stated they were willing to defer a final decision from the Board of Architectural Review until the next meeting. Ms. Fenton explained that if the applicant deferred, the Board had until two meetings to make a decision; if the applicant did not defer, the Board must decide at the next meeting. Mr. Hornberger explained that a decision at the next meeting would allow them to start working on the project by the end of the summer since the demolition work, foundation work and slab work should be done before the winter season. The Board felt that would be reasonable.

Ms. Fenton asked if the applicant was deferring. Mr. Hornberger concurred.

Mr. Atkins stated that the structure needed to respond to the Mall in the way the old Monticello Hotel and Wachovia Building had. He felt the addition of the suite layer was appropriate. He also felt the north and south sides needed to be different; the applicant could stay with the basic massing but do an additional treatment similar to the extra bay. He felt that the stripped layer at the top would have to be a cornice.

Ms. Heetderks felt the treatment for the top of the building from the first submittal was more graceful than the current submittal; the three brick "fingers" enhance the verticality of the building.

Mr. Coiner suggested the applicant reconsider the cover over the restaurant door.

Mr. Knight concurred with the comments of Mr. Atkins.

Ms. Ewing also liked the design; however, she felt it would be necessary to see the materials noted on the drawings before she could support the application.

Ms. Swenson expressed concern about the renderings of the windows on the Second Street side of the building.

Ms. Lewis felt that if the main entrance of the hotel was Water Street, the canopy did not provide enough grandeur.

Ms. Fenton disclosed her ownership of a lot on Water Street, a piece of property on the Mall and a store on the Mall, none of which were adjacent to the property under discussion. Ms. Fenton asked that signage be brought in with the design work. She also suggested the applicant consider how to block noise from the Mall as well as noise from the hotel onto the Mall.

G. BAR Discussion

Changes to Guidelines (preparation for January 29 Meeting)

Ms. Scala stated that Bill Frasier would be meeting with the Board on January 29th. She asked for comments from the Board of Architectural Review so she could compile them for Mr. Frasier in order to facilitate the discussion with him. Comments were to be given to Ms. Scala by January 26th.

H. BAR Discussion

2004 Preservation Awards

Ms. Heetderks asked if a list of recent preservation sites could be given to the Board. Ms. Scala concurred.

Mr. Atkins suggested consideration be given to the carriage house associated with First Presbyterian Church. He also suggested the roof of the church on the corner of First and Market (First Christian) for having done such a good job on the slate.

Ms. Lewis asked if there could be an additional category recognizing an individual's efforts. She then suggested Lloyd and Ashlyn Smith for consideration. She also asked if there could be a category for park or environmental preservation.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the nominations be held at the February meeting. Ms. Heetderks suggested a deadline be set for submission of nominations prior to the February meeting so the members could visit the sites if necessary. Mr. Knight suggested that the nominations be limited to within the City. Ms. Fenton suggested that all nominations be E-mailed by February 10th.

I. Approval of Minutes: December 16, 2003

Ms. Fenton mentioned a statement at the end of the first paragraph on page 6 which stated that Mr. Atkins asked if that was a friendly amendment and no mention was given as to the status of his question. Ms. Fenton stated it was very ambiguous, and she was willing to leave it as stated, but she could not remember where the Board had ended up with regards to the issue.

Ms. Lewis mentioned the first line of page 5 which stated zoning variance rather than zoning ordinance. Ms. Lewis also asked that the statement which read, "figure their way through some of the applications" be changed to say, "were trying to interpret the ordinance as the applications came before them."

Mr. Knight made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

J. Matters from the public

There were no matters.

K. Other Business

Mr. Coiner offered a special thank you to Ms. Scala for all her work on the hotel application.

Ms. Fenton asked if the Board would have preferred to have her cut short the applicant's presentation on item E. The Board felt it had been a major project with many components and needed the extra time to give it justice.

L. Adjournment

Ms. Ewing moved to adjourn. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:26 p.m.