

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
April 20, 2004**

Minutes

Present: Also Present:

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

Prior to Ms. Fenton convening the meeting, Ms. Scala explained that the first hour would be videotaped and that the second and subsequent hours would be audio taped. Ms. Fenton then convened the meeting.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

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

Ms. Fenton then informed the Board that the regular minutes taker was not present due to the death of his mother; a sympathy card was being passed among the members to sign. She then reiterated that the meeting was being videotaped.

Ms. Fenton stated that four members of the Board had attended the Steering Committee meeting regarding the transit center and amphitheater.

Ms. Fenton informed the members that the Preliminary Discussion of Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue had been deferred to a later meeting.

The Preservation Awards were scheduled to be presented before City Council on May 3rd; Ms. Fenton would be out of town. Ms. Lewis volunteered to present the awards.

Ms. Fenton announced this was her last term on the Board and that a new chair would need to be chosen at the September elections.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

BAR 04-04-01

416-418 West Main Street

TM 29 P 12

Exterior Renovations to Main Street Market

Main Street Associates, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. An application to remodel the existing storefront was reviewed in December 2000. The ground floor design was approved at that time. In August 2001, revised storefronts were approved. In September 2002, the Board of Architectural Review approved an enclosed stair on the northeast corner as well as a series of new storefronts and the rear garage. The rear garage is the subject of the application. The proposal is for a new two-story addition housing and storage/office area as well as access to the roof. The applicant will seek approval of the lighting at a later date. Landscaping and the restriping of the parking lot are being handled administratively. The proposal is generally compatible to the complex and with the District. At issue is the scale of the window in the stair tower; the applicant is reconsidering the window design. Signage may be considered administratively.

Mr. Tremblay moved for approval as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson offered a friendly amendment of "approved as drawn and/or with a smaller window." The friendly amendment was accepted. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton informed the applicant there was a new Comprehensive Sign Ordinance which would give him more leeway.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-04-02

201 East Main Street

TM 33 P 240.1

Zocalo Patio planters, tables and chairs

Stoa Design/ Zocalo Restaurant, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Staff has recently approved awnings administratively and the Zoning Administrator has approved the sign administratively. The proposal is for patio furniture and new planters. The tables and chairs will be silver powder coated steel; the planters, of pressure treated wood planting boxes painted black, will enclose the patio area. The smaller planters will have concrete bases. The planters will be connected by cables. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about the size of the cables. The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, explained that three cables would be used; this would also provide the look of a barrier.

Mr. Knight had concerns about the unpainted cedar proposed for the planters. The applicant stated it was meant to tie in to the interior of the restaurant. Ms. Heetderks asked if the applicant would consider a clear coat for the cedar; he stated he would prefer that rather than painting the cedar black.

Ms. Swenson expressed concern over the cables since they look taut enough to climb on but low enough to climb over.

Ms. Fenton concurred with Ms. Swenson about the safety issue of the cables.

Ms. Lewis lauded the applicant for the information submitted, including plant samples.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve as submitted provided that the wood slats are treated to match the interior -- the backside of the bar -- and that approval of the horizontal cables be achieved at staff level. [Ms. Swenson] seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins entered the meeting. The motion carried, 7-0-1, with Mr. Atkins abstaining.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

BAR 04-04-04

619 East High Street

TM 53 P 112

Replace windows

Munro Russell & Sandy McElroy, Applicants

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Peyton Apartments building was constructed in 1938 and incorporates part of an older Baptist church that was begun in 1901 and later burned. The applicant proposes to replace the existing wood windows with Windsor Legend Series solid vinyl windows because the old windows are in poor repair and are not energy efficient. The Board of Architectural Review has approved a wide variety of windows based on the significance of the building and the appearance of the windows relating to the structure and the context of the historic district. The proposed windows are of good quality, but given the prominent location of the building and its historical significance and the character of the Court Square area staff recommends replacement with wood windows.

Ms. Fenton suggested moving on with the agenda, as the applicant was not present.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

BAR 04-04-05

12 Elliewood Avenue

TM 9 P 88

Patio renovations

Art Conroy, Applicant/ Bruce Wardell, Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A preliminary discussion had been held in January. At that time the Board of Architectural Review requested more detailed drawings, a sense of context, relation to the street and suggested a good arborist as well as requesting more details, photos of existing neighboring buildings and materials used. The applicant had requested closing part of the private alley between 12 and 17 Elliewood, which he also owns; the City Attorney sent a letter stating the applicant may proceed with plans to build in the alley. The applicant proposes building a dining terrace with trellis roof between the existing front porch and the sidewalk. The roof will be sheathed with translucent roofing. The walls of the enclosure are painted 6x6 wood posts with translucent wall panels between them. Some panels are fixed; others are hinged to lift up in good weather. This is a large addition that will conceal the front porch from the street; the pergola draws on the three bay design of the porch. Staff feels there should be discussion of the height and design of the privacy fence proposed for the south property line.

Mr. Bruce Wardell stated the concept had been to pick up on the idea of a trellis or dining veranda to bring some life back to the street. He further stated that subsequent to the submittal, the alley issue had been resolved; therefore, an exit stair needed to come off the back terrace. Under new code, the second story would need a fire escape, which would go on the side of the house to be as inconspicuous as possible.

Ms. Fenton called for questions of the applicant from the public.

Ms. Ruth Stornetta, of 19 Elliewood, wanted to know the height, materials and location of the proposed privacy fence. Mr. Wardell explained that there would be a lattice and three feet behind that would be the translucent material; then on the side towards Martha's has a framework that comes up to a bar top height for a backing of the existing vegetation on Martha's site. Ms. Stornetta then asked if there were plans to integrate 12 Elliewood with 17 Elliewood. Mr. Wardell said there had been some discussions about whether there might be some outdoor dining on 17, but they had been told to drop that plan.

Mr. Gary Albright, manager of six of the buildings on Elliewood, sought clarification that this would be a fully enclosed outdoor room. Mr. Wardell stated it would not be heated. Mr. Albright then expressed concern that it has a big visual impact that would change the footprint of the building. Mr. Wardell explained that the new ordinance encouraged new building on this street to come up to the edge of the property.

Ms. Fenton then called for questions from Board members.

Ms. Lewis asked if the street closing had been approved. Ms. Scala stated the City Attorney had said they were able to get building permits; she said she hoped it would go back to Council to be firmly resolved, but she felt the City interests had been met.

Ms. Lewis asked if any of the plans require construction in the alley. Ms. Scala stated the fire escape would. Mr. Wardell stated that currently they did not because the alley issue needed to be resolved first. Ms. Lewis stated that alley closings needed to be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council; this alleyway closing had not yet been approved.

Ms. Lewis then asked what portions of the existing structure would be affected by the proposal. Mr. Wardell explained the new trellis comes in underneath the cornice of the front porch. Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the proposed structure could be removed and the house would appear as it always had been; Mr. Wardell concurred. Mr. Coiner asked if it were attached to the porch. Mr. Wardell stated it was.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public.

Ms. Stornetta stated that, even though she did have some concerns, she felt this was a very appropriate addition and it would fit in well with the street. She just wanted to be sure there would not be a stockade fence.

Mr. Albright expressed his hope that it would have been a bricked in patio. He stated there was no other enclosed eating areas in the neighborhood.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Atkins stated his agreement with Mr. Albright. He felt the language of porch and garden architecture seemed to be well employed, and given the charge of creating an eating space to be used nine or ten months out of the year, a remarkably good job had been done of mitigating the effects of making a large, almost indoor space. He did cite the guidelines, which state, "the new work shall be compatible with massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment." He further stated the scale of the footprint, as a terrace was not troubling; it became troubling when considered as a veranda when it was wider than the house. He stated he would lean toward a deferral to reexamine ways of making the space more of an outdoor space.

Mr. Coiner stated his agreement with Mr. Atkins. He felt it was a dramatic change.

Mr. Tremblay expressed concern about the zoning change. He was struck by the fact that the proposed addition could be removed at some future point and the house would still be there as it always was.

Ms. Fenton was concerned whether this was defined as an outdoor garden space or as an addition to the building.

Ms. Swenson expressed concerns about the area between the sidewalk and the lattice space. Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve as submitted recognizing the many concerns that had been expressed but feeling that it responded to what the zoning is suggesting. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion failed 2-6.

Mr. Atkins moved to defer recommending that the applicant examine strategies to make the addition actually feel more like it is intended as an outdoor eating space and that, as he described previously, a number of factors contribute to it feeling much more like an enclosed room. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks asked if Mr. Atkins wanted to cite the particular guideline. He stated it was in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, number 9, the second part; it was repeated verbatim in the Guideline under new construction, additions, part C, Design: "Any new work... should be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment." Mr. Atkins stated more specifically the attributes of that small house and its porch and the neighboring properties with largely outdoor terraces suggested to him an outdoor dining terrace; he asked for a subtle shift and perhaps less use during the year. Ms. Fenton asked if Mr. Coiner approved the reference; he did. The motion carried, 6-2.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION (15 MINUTES) EAST END OF THE MALL: Transit Center and Amphitheater

Ms. Fenton reiterated that four members had been at an earlier meeting for a presentation by WRT. A more complete formal presentation would be at a separate meeting in May. She stated they were looking for any problems there may be with the proposal. This would not be a complete presentation. (END OF VIDEOTAPED PORTION OF MEETING)

(AUDIOCASSETTE BEGINS)

Ms. Scala gave a report. The architects talked about creating a line between the front of City Hall and the train station. The transit station has become an oversized pavilion; it goes from brick piers to heavy timber framing. There would be a brick wall in the back for the timbers to rest on. Materials would be textural brick, soapstone, brass and wood screens. There would be a series of screening layers on the glass curtain wall of the building. There would be a coffee shop and a visitor's center. The amphitheater would consist of a structural arch. The stage and the tent proposed to be over it would all go away; the only thing remaining would be the arch and the concrete stage area. They are trying to create a zone to blend the activities of the transit center into the amphitheater.

A representative of WRT gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the Board members.

Mr. Tremblay was curious about access to Avon Street and Lexis-Nexus.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about losing the sidewalk from Ninth Street to the Mall. He was also concerned about the wood in the Transit Center.

Mr. Knight was impressed with both projects but there was a lot to work out on both projects. His concerns regarded things not yet seen on both projects. He wanted to know more about: the outdoor spaces for the Transit Center; the dining area; the steps and the plaza coming down towards the railroad station; what happens at the Merrill Lynch building; crossing the street; design of the bus shelters along Water Street; the retaining wall parallel with Water Street. Regarding the amphitheater, he felt the architects had a tall order trying to retain the public space. Circulation through the site was of concern; people would look for the shortest path between points. He wanted to know how it would function as a public space on a daily basis when it was not an event space. He felt it needed to be an attractive urban park even when not in use. He wanted to see more about the materials in the ground plane. He felt access and loading were critical features.

Ms. Heetderks echoed Mr. Knight's concerns about the off-season appearance. She was unsure about the arch and about materials. She stated she was happy the size had been diminished; it was more respectful of the train station across the street. She echoed Mr. Coiner's concerns about the use of wood. She stated she would be more supportive of copper.

Ms. Fenton wanted to know if the cover for the amphitheater was graffiti proof. She felt that, as a public space, it must feel comfortable to the public and that there must be enough room around it; perhaps 100 seats should be removed.

Ms. Lewis was supportive of both projects. Regarding the amphitheater, she liked the arch and felt it would be significant to look at even off-season. She was disappointed to be losing the grassy amphitheater, which draws the outdoors into the middle of the City. Regarding the transit center, she agreed with Ms. Heetderks about the reduced size. However, she was concerned about how the variety of materials would be brought together.

Mr. Atkins was pleased to see the retractable tent. He suggested that two of the three tiers be landscape with the third tier being grass. He felt the arch was a cheeky St. Louis/Jefferson reference. The transit center depends on some of the landscape associated with the amphitheater.

Ms. Swenson was concerned about the change in grade between the Mall and the uppermost seating.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

BAR 04-04-03

1018 West Main Street

TM 10 P 66 & 69

Demolish two additions to Patton Mansion

William B. Daggett, Jr./Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Patton house was built in 1907; the pavilion to the east is dated approximately 1940; the rear addition is 1970; the Papa John's building is dated 1960. The applicant describes the side and rear addition as two demolition requests; staff represents the side as two additions since it was built in two phases. The proposal is to demolish the two side additions and the rear addition in order to make room to build a new building behind the Patton Mansion to house the core laboratory facilities for UVa Hospital. The new addition will come before the Board of Architectural Review for approval in May. The UVa Foundation intends to restore the exterior of the original mansion in the future. The rear facade will be restored in conjunction with the construction of the new rear addition. The side facade will be restored when the side additions are removed. Demolition guidelines were in the members' packets. Staff recommends approval of the request for demolition of the three additions.

Mr. Bill Daggett stated he had been working with the University for a month and-a-half on the project. He was seeking to demolish the secondary structures attached to the original Jefferson Revival mansion. The additions were made for commercial purposes over time. The east addition encroaches on the zone between the curb and building front.

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

Mr. Atkins moved to approve the application for demolition of the two phases shown, which the staff description constitutes as three additions, in that none of those additions qualify according to the standards and guidelines for demolition as stated in the staff report. [Mr. Tremblay] seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. David Neuman, University Architect, then explained some of the plans for the Patton Mansion.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

BAR 04-04-07

101 East Jefferson Street

TM 33 P 190

Add fence

First United Methodist Church

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A preliminary discussion had been held as part of the February meeting. Board members supported grating as a first choice; if the applicant decided on a fence, the Board of Architectural Review requested to see the design. The proposal is to install a five-foot high by 84-foot long wrought iron fence parallel to the east property line to protect the public from the large eight-foot deep window well. The fence will be painted black with one six-foot wide beam. The fence will be placed as close to the window well as possible. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Jack Adams was present as a representative of the church but had nothing to add to the staff report.

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

Mr. Coiner informed the Chair that he had an association with the church and would be excusing himself from the vote.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve as presented. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried, 7-0-1 with Mr. Coiner abstaining.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION (recalled)

Ms. Fenton recalled 619 East High Street. The applicant still was not present.

Ms. Lewis moved to reject the application as submitted. Ms. Heetderks asked Ms. Lewis if she wanted to cite the applicable guidelines for design rehabilitation. Ms. Lewis concurred and stated that there was no factual finding that the windows were beyond repair. [Note: Audiotape was not clear enough to denote who seconded the motion.] The motion passed 6-2.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue site

The applicant requested deferral.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 16, 2004

Minutes were deferred to the May meeting.

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no matters from the public.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion of the bylaws was deferred.

ADJOURNMENT

[Ms. Swenson] moved to adjourn. [Mr. Atkins] seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the Board of Architectural Review stood adjourned.