

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
May 18, 2004**

Present: Also Present:

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

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

A. Matters from the public

Mr. Bill Daggett, of Daggett & Grigg Architects, came before the Board about the Haney Building at 500 West Main Street. The project architect was proposing three changes: using modular brick rather than standard brick, using Anderson snap in windows with real muntins on the exterior, and duplicating the ABC building's combination of brick with a white band at the top of the building by using a lighter cream-colored banding on the Haney building. There was no push for a decision at the moment.

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

Mr. Atkins stated that simulated divided light had been permitted in the past. Mr. Tremblay felt the Anderson 400 Series qualified.

Mr. Atkins asked if standard versus modular brick had been discussed previously for this project. Ms. Scala stated they had recommended the use of standard size brick.

Ms. Fenton clarified that Mr. Daggett only needed a decision on the windows at this time.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve the Anderson 400 Series windows. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion with the friendly amendment of the verbal clarification that it is the simulated divided light with exterior and interior muntin bars that are permanently applied with a metal spacer between the two panes of glass. Mr. Tremblay accepted the amendment. Ms. Lewis asked if they were allowed to take formal action on this matter since it was not noticed on the agenda. Ms. Fenton thought they could since it was a modification to an application that had been before the Board. Ms. Lewis noted for the record that this was not on the agenda and was not a public hearing and had not been noticed for any neighboring properties if they had wanted to speak up about this. Ms. Fenton called for the vote. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay encouraged the applicant to come before the Board at its next meeting with a formal presentation. Ms. Fenton also asked that he return with a formal presentation.

B. Preliminary Discussion -- Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue site

William Atwood, Applicant

Mr. Atwood, architect for the project, stated he had met with Neighborhood Development Services staff and that three neighborhood meetings had been held. Mr. Atwood gave a presentation informing the Board that by right his client could get 68 units in four stories. During meetings with staff and the neighborhood, concerns had been expressed about affordability/neighborhood specific housing and housing. Mr. Atwood displayed aerial photos of the site and adjoining properties. The site has a large green belt in which the neighborhood is interested. Mr. Atwood then used a diagram to explain the four types of houses in the neighborhood and the design possibility for the site.

Ms. Swenson sought clarification as to the density available with the new diagram. Mr. Atwood did not think they would reach the by right density of 68, rather a possible maximum would be in the 50s.

Ms. Swenson thought the applicant should take advantage of the zoning allowed but also stated it was essential to keep the green space.

Ms. Swenson also commented that we all want to respect the architecture on Ridge Street but perhaps a different typology is needed. Attached row houses would be very appropriate given the context of single-family houses on a major entrance.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public.

Mr. Herb Ford, of Fifeville, spoke in opposition of the proposal. He was resentful of the high density in the neighborhood and was concerned that the green border would be going away.

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

Ms. Lewis applauded the applicant for working with the neighborhood groups and also commented on Herb Porter's comments on how the residences face, which is part of our purview.

Ms. Fenton felt that Cherry Avenue was more of a commercial street. Ms. Fenton agreed with Mr. Atkins that having a bigger presence on Ridge Street is different. She suggested that the applicant think of Cherry as a commercial street with retail on the ground floor and with residential above. She commented that the Cherry Avenue building should not be a wall, but it should rather be designed so neighbors can use it. (food, restaurant, shopping). She suggested the Terraces were a lively space. She encouraged that Ridge Street be sensitive to the surrounding area. Ms. Fenton also wanted to see the design within the context of the block and the blocks on either side. Ms. Fenton stated that construction needs to tie into the neighborhood. She also said

that the applicant should feel free to call her and meet with individual BAR members to discuss the project further.

Mr. Knight echoed the need for sensitivity to the Ridge Street massing and character.

He commented that what he saw on Cherry Avenue gave him a lot of pause. He showed concern that what was further down the road for Cherry was not good. The “pinwheel” gives him concern. He sees reason on the corner for three separate building types on street frontages but he was hesitant to proclaim a landmark on the corner. He stated that what is presently urban changes over time and that Cherry could eventually lose its importance as a major intersection.

Mr. Atkins suggested that applicant look at the guidelines for massing and spacing (up to 120% size of existing buildings), commenting that the applicant needed breaks in “bar” along Ridge Street. Mr. Atkins also asked where were the driveways to access parking?

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from April 20, 2004)

BAR 04-04-05

12 Elliewood Avenue

Tax Map 9 Parcel 88

Patio Renovations

Art Conroy, Applicant/Bruce Wardell, Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant has submitted a revised design proposal for the new dining terrace and pavilion. The proposal is for a pressure treated wood deck covered with asphalt shingled hipped roof design. Two-thirds of the deck is enclosed with fixed translucent panels. The panels may be lifted up in good weather. A sign permit has been submitted by High Tech Sign Company for two semi-circular signs of purple, red, white and orange -- approval of the size of the signs is required by the Zoning Administrator; the Board of Architectural Review is to approve the color and shape of the sign or the Board can allow for administrative approval.

Mr. Bruce Wardell brought drawings of the proposed rear stair exit off the deck. The deck has been redesigned to mimic the front porch. The columns are of the same proportion. The alley closing would be on the agenda of the next City Council meeting.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the public. Hearing none, she called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Coiner asked if there was an intention to stain the pressure treated wood. Mr. Wardell stated they probably would after letting it go one season; however, there would be an opaque stain on the railing.

Ms. Lewis sought clarification as to the material proposed for the columns. Mr. Wardell at first was unsure, but stated they would use wood if the Board so wanted although the fiber cast columns actually last better and have just as precise detailing. When pressed further by Ms. Lewis, he stated the columns would be permacast.

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

Mr. Atkins appreciated the applicant's willingness to meet with the Board again and for having addressed their concerns.

Mr. Knight appreciated the changes that had been made and felt the structure was as appropriate as it could be for the location.

Mr. Atkins felt that pulling back had made a huge difference. His only misgiving was the asphalt shingle roof.

Ms. Swenson appreciated the changes. However, she thought a metal roof might be nice.

Ms. Lewis, having supported the application previously, agreed the new proposal was much more handsome and much more improved.

Mr. Knight asked if the Board could encourage or require a different roof. Ms. Fenton felt they could ask the applicant to return with other materials. Mr. Tremblay stated he would have a hard time forcing the applicant to go to a metal roof when the house has a shingled roof.

Mr. Knight moved to approve the front structure as submitted with the exception of the shingle roof and the sign. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis did not feel she could support the motion since the guidelines don't allow them to require a different type of roofing structure in that the guidelines say, "The roof materials would be consistent with existing structures in the district"; in this district, asphalt shingles are the roof. Ms. Fenton called for the vote. The motion carried with only Ms. Lewis voting against.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the stairs as submitted, subject to City Council approving the closing of the alley. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-045-01

706 Lyons Court Lane

Tax Map 52 Parcel 77

Restore two-story porch

John A. and Jackie G. Binder, Applicants

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks to repair the existing two-story porch with some alterations. The metal roof of the main structure will be replaced with standing seam copper.

Mr. John Binder stated that in November 2000, the Board of Architectural Review had approved a renovation, an addition and some demolition on the structure. Originally the applicants had requested a one-story porch. However, the applicants had come to appreciate the style of the

existing porch, which was in need of repair. The applicants were seeking approval of rebuilding the existing porch with new brick piers at the base of the columns. The existing masonry porch would stay. The applicants also sought to remove the anodized aluminum storm windows, re-glaze the windows and put back in the white storm windows.

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

Mr. Knight wanted to know why the applicant was proposing brick. Mr. Binder stated it was being done because the house was brick.

Mr. Coiner asked if the brick columns would be painted. Mr. Binder concurred.

Ms. Swenson asked if the existing porch roof was to be demolished. Mr. Binder concurred.

Mr. Tremblay felt the application was consistent with what the Board looks for in a repair of this nature. He applauded the applicant for the material selection and his plans.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment of the condition that the brick column bases be painted. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Knight accepted the amendment. Mr. Knight expressed concern about the little hip on the roof as it extends beyond the end walls. Ms. Lewis sought clarification that the fascia board was being reduced and that the dentils would be rebuilt; Mr. Binder concurred. Mr. Atkins offered a friendly amendment that the pitch of the porch roof be shallower than the pitch of the main body of the house roof. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Knight accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-05-03

400 Ridge Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 153

Privacy fence in side yard

Mark S. Check, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant had received administrative approval to place a four-foot high, white painted picket fence along the Ridge Street and Dice Street property lines. A four-foot high white picket fence will replace the temporary boards blocking pedestrian access. The applicant now seeks permission to place a privacy fence along the south property line. The fence would be a six-foot high, unpainted treated wood where it was not visible from the street; where visible, it would be kept at four feet high and be painted white. Staff felt it was acceptable but transition details needed to be worked out.

Mr. Check presented the Board members with photographs of the transition zone. He stated that he would like the wood to season before painting it white.

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

Mr. Coiner agreed there was a need for the fence both for privacy and security.

Mr. Knight had concerns that the solid character of the portion of the fence visible from the street was not a form found anywhere else in the neighborhood, nor did it pick up on the detailing of the building or anything in that district. He also had concerns about the material. He recommended a survey of Ridge Street to see examples of appropriate fences.

Mr. Coiner moved to approve the application as submitted with the option that the owner might use wrought iron for the portion that faces Ridge Street. Mr. Tremblay seconded the Motion. Ms. Fenton informed the applicant he could come back before the Board if he wanted to add some greenery to hide the fences. Ms. Fenton called the vote. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-05-09

501 Park Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 12

Change handicapped ramp materials

Hospice of the Piedmont, Applicant/Bruce Wardell, Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The application seeks to change the materials but not the size, location, and configuration of the handicapped ramp to the Hospice house. The proposal is to change the materials from brick and concrete to a new, lighter, and more congruous painted wood railing, post, and ramp deck. The new rails and posts would be painted white. The ramp deck and step treads would be grey. The profile of the top rail pickets and posts would be similar to the existing house but would not match. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Kurt Keesecker stated that he and Bruce Wardell had thought that a portion of the new ramp be painted a dark green to match the house.

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

Mr. Knight moved to approve the change in materials as submitted with the note that the applicant has offered to change the color of the paints to the dark green to match the gable ends of the house. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-05-06

1018 West Main Street

Tax Map 10 Parcels 66 and 69

New UVa Hospital Core Lab Building

University of Virginia Foundation, Applicant
William B. Daggett, Architect

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Demolition requests from the applicant had been approved at the April meeting. The applicant intended to restore the Patton Mansion. This proposal is a new, two-story, 21,000 square foot brick and metal steel-framed building, which is where the UVa Hospital Core Laboratory will be relocated. This is Phase I of a two-phase project. Phase I includes demolition of the existing office building located south of the Patton Mansion; Phase II will include demolition of the Papa John's Pizza and the other eastern addition to the mansion and construction of a vest pocket park to create a wider setback on the south side of Main Street and to enhance the pedestrian connection between the University and downtown. A site plan is under review for administrative approval. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bill Daggett, of Daggett & Grigg Architects, stated that there had been some changes to the plans submitted after having a chance to gain access to the building. The rear addition is actually two additions, one built around the other. Mr. Daggett presented the Board with a materials board.

Ms. Swenson asked if they were trying to match the fascia detail. Mr. Daggett stated they were not; they were trying to pick up the fact that there was detail.

Mr. Knight sought clarification that they were not being asked to comment on the restoration of the Patton mansion but that it would be coming before the BAR. Mr. Daggett concurred.

Ms. Swenson clarified that they were only approving the terrace. Mr. Knight asked for additional information on the terrace. Mr. Daggett stated there was an existing brick terrace and the intent was to match or come very close to it. Mr. Daggett stated they were asking for a conceptual agreement to this idea without having all the details.

Ms. Fenton felt it was very sensitive to the neighborhood.

Ms. Lewis stated for the record that the University has been submitting these requests and applications voluntarily because they do not have to submit anything to the Board; Ms. Lewis felt the voluntary submissions were the result of the advent of the new University Architect who should be thanked for his gesture in beginning to cooperate with the City in developing along West Main and other areas and neighborhoods of the City that are going to be affected by the many plans that UVa has. She further stated it was a great gesture and completely voluntary and optional.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the proposed two-story, 21,000 square foot brick and metal building as presented, reserving approval of the pocket park and other site plan elements on the West Main Street side and reserving any approval of further improvements or renovations to the Patton mansion itself. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson asked if Ms. Lewis could include the new material that was presented; i.e., the keeping of the addition, which was not in the original application. Ms. Lewis said she would amend her motion to include that. Ms.

Fenton clarified that it was essentially accepting it as amended by the applicant. Ms. Fenton called the vote. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called for a brief recess. The Board of Architectural Review stood in recess at 7:02 p.m. and was reconvened at 7:09 p.m.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-05-06
235 West Main Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 155
Omni Hotel Dining Terrace
Paul H. Maher, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The application was for a new 1,000 square foot dining terrace consisting of two levels located between the Omni and the Downtown Mall. Access would be from an existing restaurant in the hotel. Use of this area for an outdoor eating terrace was suggested by WRT in their work for the City on the Downtown Mall improvements. Board of Architectural Review approval is subject to administrative site plan approval and City Council approval of the use of City-owned property. Staff recommends approval; more detail is needed on the proposed canopy.

The applicant's architect, Marthe Rowen with RBGC Architects, apologized for the sketchy nature of earlier submittal items. She stated there was an existing door that had been recently added to the Omni for the purpose of leading out to this future deck. The canopy, which is intended to be painted steel, is designed to be seen from the Mall.

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

Mr. Knight felt it was an elegant solution. However, he did have concerns about the concrete caps on the walls.

Mr. Coiner stated that turnbuckles were not a good idea with the steel cables. The applicant stated she would, at a later date, bring back the precise hardware, which would be used.

Ms. Lewis thought this was a great solution for the Omni and the Mall. She asked if the two risers could be sloped to allow for an entrance for the handicapped. The applicant stated she could do that.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve the application as submitted, acknowledging a preference for a brick cap as an option for the top of the wall and encouraging the Omni or owner and architect to consider an accessible route and requesting that the applicant come back with further detail on the stainless steel cable railing system and support for the canopy. Mr. Knight seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-05-07

Fifth Street Southeast and Water Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 72

Water Street Plaza

William Nitchman, Applicant/Formwork Design, Architect

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A preliminary review had been held in November 2003. The five-story building would have retail on the first floor on Water Street and an entrance to the garage and entrance to the Combos lobby on Fifth Street. The second floor is parking; the top three floors are residential. The building has been successfully designed to be compatible with the character of the architectural design control district. Staff would not recommend approval of a final design, which does not meet the current step back requirement. There is a proposed amendment to limit the step back before the Planning Commission. Any approval of the building design by the BAR would be subject to final site plan approval. Staff suggests additional details to be reviewed on the windows, balconies, awnings, colors, rooftop, screening of mechanical equipment and signage.

Robert Nichols was the architect representing 5th & Water.

Mr. William Nitchman explained to the Board the design booklet before them. Entrance to the parking deck is the furthest north part of the building on Fifth Street. Each of the residential condominiums has some outdoor balcony space. The Water Street elevation has two brick materials and stucco material at the penthouse level as well as a zinc siding component on the upper level. Anodized aluminum clad wood windows would be typical for the residential floors. The frames for the storefront will be suppressed into the brick.

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

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification as to the susceptibility to damage of the glass canopies over the retail shops. Mr. Nitchman felt it would not be much as they were three-eighths to one half inch thick tempered glass.

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

Mr. Knight sought clarification regarding the removal of the sunscreen from the fifth floor. Mr. Nitchman explained that the owner had wanted that removed.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification if the south elevation was louvered. The applicant stated it would be louvered.

Mr. Coiner asked if there were any examples of the proposed brick patterns in existence. Mr. Nitchman didn't know of any.

Ms. Swenson appreciated the proposed view of the property from the Avon Street Bridge. She suggested the applicant consider the appearance of the south facade as to whether it would look like the alley or part of the front.

Ms. Fenton suggested the applicant reconsider the placement of signage.

Mr. Atkins felt there was a level of detailing missing from the top floor.

Ms. Lewis stated that the guidelines require a complexity of form on commercial buildings; she felt this building could be more complex to reduce the visual impact of the building. Within the historic district, the windows of commercial buildings tend to be more vertical than horizontal; the proposed windows are the opposite. She further stated that synthetic materials are not encouraged in the Historic District under the guidelines.

Mr. Tremblay asked if the stucco was real or synthetic. Mr. Nitchman stated it was a synthetic product.

Mr. Knight moved to approve the general massing and materials as submitted with the understanding that the applicant will be bringing more detail on all facets of the building and will consider the suggestions made this evening; specifically in terms of the facing along the first and second stories of the Water Street facade, the penthouse on the Water Street facade, the verticality of the fenestration on the Fifth Street facade and wrapping the corner on the southeast corner. Ms. Lewis asked if he wanted to add the additional details that staff wanted brought back as well, including windows, balconies, awnings, colors, rooftop screening of the mechanical equipment and signage. Mr. Knight stated he did. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion failed with only Mr. Knight, Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Atkins voting in favor.

Ms. Lewis moved to defer this application for further consideration and reworking pursuant to the Board's comments this evening. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Knight and Mr. Atkins voting against.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were a motion to adjourn. Ms. Lewis asked that they consider the minutes from March.

J. Approval of Minutes March 16, 2004

Ms. Lewis felt it was important that the minutes reflect that Keith Woodard was told to hire an architect. Ms. Swenson remembered that Ms. Ewing suggested it was an incredibly complex and sensitive issue he was facing and that, in her estimation, he was going to require the services of an architect. Ms. Lewis stated that the further away the minutes are from the actual meeting, the harder it is to recall, that was why she wanted them approved this evening, but it could be deferred to the next meeting. In the absence of Ms. Ewing, Ms. Lewis suggested the phrase, "The Board of Architectural Review recommended the applicant hire a professional architect and noted that he was an architect but that he should actually engage an architect."

Mr. Knight moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay moved to adjourn. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion, which carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:38 p.m.