

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
August 17, 2004**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Lynne Heetderks, Vice Chair  
Wade Tremblay  
Preston Coiner  
Joe Atkins  
Fred Wolf  
Cheri Lewis

**Also Present:**

Mary Joy Scala

Ms. Heetderks convened the meeting at 4:59 p.m.

**A. Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Lewis asked that Mr. Wolf be added as being present. Ms. Lewis also asked that the first paragraph on page 3 be amended to read: "She expressed satisfaction that the applicant and the City Staff would address the cemetery issue." Ms. Lewis stated she felt confident it would be dealt with now that it had been brought to light. Ms. Lewis also asked that the seventh paragraph on page 11 be amended to read: She stated she was not aware of any ethical constraints that would prohibit members of the BAR from contacting City Councilors on this appeal, and encouraged BAR members to do so. Ms. Heetderks asked that item F on page 4 be corrected to show the applicants' name as Struble.

Mr. Coiner moved they approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, which carried 5-0-1; Mr. Tremblay abstained since he had not been present for the July meeting.

**B. Matters from the public**

There were no matters from the public.

**C. Preliminary Discussion**

**108 West South Street  
Partial demolition-Replacement of existing windows**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant wants to replace three second-story windows on the South Street facade of the building as well as three windows on the west side with Rusco

ProWeld II vinyl replacement windows with grids between the glass. The applicant was concerned about the cost of wood windows if they were required by the Board.

Mr. James Marshall, owner of 108 West South Street, stated he had been before the Board previously; at that time approval was granted for this type of window on the west side of the building. The wood frames needed painting that could not be done without major expense due to an electrical wire at the front of the building.

Ms. Lewis wanted to know the current condition of the windows. Mr. Marshall stated the paint was peeling and the windows looked bad; the muntins were heart pine and in good shape.

Mr. Tremblay stated the Board preferred simulated divided light. Mr. Marshall felt that was too costly.

Mr. Atkins stated all window reviews had been consistent: The Board was open to simulated divided lights and open to vinyl clad and, in some cases, other than wood windows -- but only in rare circumstances. He was in favor of the more expensive wood or wood-clad with divided lights and perhaps allow matching vinyl windows on the west side.

Ms. Heetderks cited Rehabilitation Guideline for Windows, number 2: Replace windows only when they are missing or beyond repair. She stated these windows did not seem to be beyond repair, they were just inconvenient.

Mr. Wolf concurred that maintenance was not a convincing argument for replacement. He also felt that Mr. Atkins' proposal for treating the two sides differently would set a precedent. Mr. Atkins explained that the three west windows were not pure and character defining.

#### **D. Preliminary Discussion**

##### **1223 West Main Street, University Baptist Church Partial demolition/Replacement of existing windows**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. University Baptist Church is a Colonial Revival structure built 1928-1929. The applicant wants to replace 160 wood double hung windows with Rusco ProWeld vinyl clad aluminum insulated windows with grids. The double hung windows will be replaced with the same style; the 91-inch tall windows will be replaced with single hung windows.

Ms. Sandy Jones Garrison, Chair of Buildings and Grounds at University Baptist Church, stated the windows had last been maintained in 1989. The windows are in varying degrees of millwork rot. The muntins are rotting. All of the windows need to be reglazed. They did not want to jeopardize the historical look of the church. The windows are original; most of the ropes and pulleys are no longer functional. She introduced Ray Gaines to speak additionally on behalf of the Church.

Mr. Coiner noted for the record that he was a client of Mr. Gaines'. Mr. Coiner did not feel that would interfere.

Mr. Ray Gaines, of the Gaines Group and a member of University Baptist, stated they were considering a sash pack, which would replace the window sash. The windows are in the education wing, approximately 115 feet from Main Street. The proposed windows are the same as approved for the Downtown Recreation Center.

Ms. Heetderks thanked the applicants for the comprehensive packet including photographs showing the condition of the existing windows.

Mr. Atkins suggested they consider the aluminum panning which is made in brick mold shapes and which provides a shadow line and profile. He felt a vinyl window was not an option.

Ms. Lewis mentioned several guidelines: replace windows only when they are missing or beyond repair -- Ms. Lewis mentioned a recent discussion that if the owner was responsible for the windows being missing or beyond repair, that may not bode well in the owner's favor; reconstruction should only be based on physical evidence or old photographs; do not use inappropriate materials or finishes that radically change the sash, muntin configurations, or reflective quality or color of the glazing, the appearance of the frame; use true divided light to replace similar examples; do not use false muntins in the replacement.

Mr. Ed Smith, member of University Baptist, stated they were aware of the historical significance of the building and they try to keep it up-to-date. He stated there was a huge price difference, approximately \$41,000, between their choices and the simulated divided light.

Mr. Wolf, while respecting the cost difference, stated that the added costs would have added benefits.

Ms. Heetderks felt the general sense of the Board was that the existing windows be repaired. If they were beyond repair and evidence could be presented to that effect, then the Board would be far more likely to consider the muntins on the exterior with a spacer in between.

Dr. Tom Leland, Senior Minister at University Baptist hoped the decision the Board reached would be one the church could manage. Even doing something on the inside of the building would not help with the enormous upkeep of the outside that would continue to grow. He expressed a fear that a growing percentage of the budget going for maintenance of the outside buildings would not allow the church to do the things it was supposed to do.

## **E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 04-02-02**

**505 Ridge Street**

**Tax Map 29 Parcel 138**

**Material selection for rear addition & stair,**

**Jane Covington, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In March, the BAR had approved partial demolition of a rear structure and rehabilitation of the existing structure with the provision the applicant submitted

further information on materials and detailing. The applicant had submitted a drawing showing wood siding to match the existing siding. The rear back porch and stair would have painted wood railings and stiles. An amendment had been submitted by the applicant who was seeking state tax credits stating the state would prefer painted tongue and groove for the porch decking; the stair treads would remain painted lumber. Two flat fixed skylights were added to the rear addition roof; these were approved by the state. The window arrangement of the rear addition is slightly different. Staff recommends approval of those changes.

Ms. Covington was present but had nothing to add.

Mr. Coiner asked if the treads were true tread. Ms. Covington stated she had not made it that far and asked if the Board would prefer true tread. Mr. Coiner stated they would.

Mr. Tremblay stated they couldn't ask for an application that came any closer to meeting the guidelines.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner asked for clarification of the treads. Mr. Atkins accepted the friendly amendment that the motion include the verbal clarification that there would be one inch nominal tread depth, not a standard inch-and-a-half piece of treated lumber. Mr. Tremblay also accepted the clarification. Ms. Heetderks called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

## **F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 04-07-04**

**321 East Main Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 226**

**Resubmittal -- Partial demolition & changes to exterior elevation**

**SNL Financial, LC, Owner**

**Robert Nichols/Formwork Design, Architect**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Partial demolition of selected features had been approved at the July meeting. It had been suggested the applicant submit a new design based on the Board's recommendations. The Staff opinion is that the applicant has done an admirable job reducing the scale of the building and organizing the design of the openings on both facades. The new design on Fourth Street works well with the Mall side of the building.

Mr. Robert Nichols stated the large opening on Fourth Street had been omitted from the application to demolish and should be considered since the new curtain wall would be going on that side of the building. The motion that was approved at the last meeting was to retain the precasts up to the top of the columns and the frieze running across; it was awkward to integrate that with the additional window. They propose keeping everything to the top of the columns and then add a square surround. The owners were interested in having two entrances on the Mall level.

Ms. Lewis sought clarification that the circular window on the Fourth Street side would also need to be demolished. Mr. Nichols concurred.

Ms. Heetderks 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 stated she had been in the minority in voting against the elements, which were demolished. She felt none of the elements proposed for demolition were any more objectionable than the cornice and pediment, which were significant elements of the building. In view of the Board's vote at the last meeting, she would support these changes. Mr. Wolf concurred.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve the demolition as submitted, specifically the front architrave as well as the round window on the side of the building that Ms. Lewis referred to earlier and the large Fourth Street window. Ms. Lewis asked if it would also include removal of the existing storefront entrance doors. Mr. Tremblay concurred. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis asked if they should include the classical features on the west elevation windows. Mr. Tremblay concurred. Mr. Atkins accepted the addition. Ms. Heetderks called the question. The motion carried 5-1 with Ms. Heetderks voting against.

Mr. Nichols then explained what materials would be used in the proposal: precast concrete to match the existing ornamental trim; a painted coating for the metal components of the storefront. He also provided samples of materials and provided a color palette.

Ms. Heetderks called for questions.

Ms. Lewis sought clarification regarding the grid framing of the windows and the spans. Mr. Nichols explained it was aluminum; he provided a sample of the material. Ms. Lewis asked if a larger sample was available.

Mr. Nichols explained that the device supporting the canopy would not be a cable system but a rigid rod with discreet turnbuckles. He also stated the color palette had lightened.

Mr. Tremblay applauded the applicant for a very interesting and creative adaptation of a relatively contemporary building.

Mr. Atkins wondered if having the storefront panel go all the way to the ground would help tie together some of the disparate elements under the canopy.

Mr. Wolf felt the canopy pulled together and unified the elements.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve the application in terms of material texture, color, height and scale of the modifications and particularly the materials and choices being visually and architecturally compatible with the District and with what the Board considers to be the salient and important architectural features to remain from the original. Mr. Wolf asked if the applicant should bring back a larger sample of the finish on the storefront and the finish on the steel of the canopy. Mr. Atkins amended his motion to include the condition that the applicants bring back, at the next

opportunity, a larger sample of the aluminum storefront with the color chosen. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis thanked the applicant; there had been several iterations of the proposal and each one had gotten better. She thought the programming of the new building would be appealing and compatible with the District. Ms. Lewis also felt it met the Guidelines. Ms. Heetderks called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 04-08-01**

**410 East Water Street**

**Tax Map 28 Parcel 610A, 1K**

**Metal steps & railing,**

**Tim Michel/Charlottesville East, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The building is a contributing structure. The applicant proposes adding metal open grate steps, railing, and landing at the new opening of the courtyard approved in June. The railing will match the style of the existing vertical pickets and will be painted a dark reddish-brown.

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

Mr. Coiner felt the open tread seemed to convey the look of a fire escape rather than a permanent structure.

Mr. Atkins wondered if there was a way to convey an industrial status without using that stair.

Mr. Wolf felt the stair was too contemporary and did not seem appropriate for a main entrance.

Ms. Heetderks asked if the applicant were willing to make changes. Mr. Michel concurred.

Ms. Lewis cited the Guideline, which asked the Board to review the impact of the proposed change on other protected features of the property such as gardens, landscaping, fence and walls. Ms. Lewis felt the courtyard was special and defined the building.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to defer subject to the comments that had been made. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis wanted the stairway to be attractive and add to the courtyard. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting stood in recess, 6:24 p.m. - 6:42 p.m.

#### **H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 04-04-05**

**12 Elliewood Avenue**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 88**

**Extension of rear deck roof and south side rear deck  
Art Conroy, Applicant/Bruce Wardell, Architects**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant requests approval: to extend the roof on the south side of the rear deck to cover the existing uncovered deck area; to fill in a small area of the floor surface on the south side of the rear deck; and to reroof the entire roof area with metal painted dark green. The building official has said the applicant must use fire retardant lumber for construction near the property line. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Mark Humbertson, of Bruce Wardell Architects, stated the Structural Engineer had informed them that the existing roof supports are in unsafe condition and would need to be replaced at every ten feet by a 6x6 column. He presented drawings to the Board to depict that.

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

Ms. Lewis moved to approve this with the revisions brought to the Board meeting. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Humbertson asked for suggestions from the BAR about the alley between the properties. The alley, currently covered by gravel, was deteriorating asphalt and concrete. He stated the owner would like to cover that area in concrete pavers. The material is similar to that used by the City but would be 14 inch square pavers.

Ms. Scala stated she had not been comfortable approving it administratively since there was a lack of notice for the proposal. Ms. Scala thought part of the area in question was within the City right-of-way and stated it would need to conform to City standards.

The Board treated the matter as a preliminary hearing.

Mr. Tremblay stated he would support the addition since it would be a nice finishing connection.

Mr. Coiner also would support it but would be more enthusiastic if the pavers were smaller.

Mr. Wolf would support it but was concerned about the size of the pavers.

Mr. Atkins suggested care be taken so that it did not look like a driveway.

**I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 04-08-02**

**12 Elliewood**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 88**

**Addition of new roof sign**

**High Tech Signs, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant proposes a MDO roof sign. The plywood sign would have applied flat cut acrylic letters and would be externally illuminated. The top of the sign is cut out with rounded shaped flames. The sign area is approximately 10.5 square feet. Roof signs are permitted if they do not exceed the height of the roof they are on and structural supports must be enclosed and not visible. The sign is pedestrian in scale with appropriate colors. It will not obscure architectural details. Staff recommends approval subject to staff approval of lighting details and structural supports being enclosed.

The applicant, who did not identify himself, had nothing to add but sought suggestions from the Board about the color for the enclosure on the sides of the roof support.

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

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification as to the size and type of the enclosing material. The applicant explained that staff had recommended MDO.

Ms. Lewis asked if the background was white. The applicant concurred.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval of the sign as submitted with the MDO covers on the support elements and suggested white as the color that would blend most appropriately, and that the lighting, when selected, be approved by staff to be consistent with the lighting ordinance. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 04-08-03**

**20 Elliewood Avenue**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 96**

**Extension of existing patio at Buddhist Biker Bar & Grill**

**Loren Dangelo, Applicant/Anne Albright, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks approval to extend the brick patio using paver bricks laid on a sand base in a basket weave pattern to match the existing. The 6x6 framing would be pressure treated. Staff would prefer brick facing rather than wood and asked that a cushion area be provided around the existing tree.

Mr. Loren Dangelo provided pictures and pavers to demonstrate consistency with existing materials.

Ms. Heetderks called for questions and comments.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know how many more tables would be accommodated. Mr. Dangelo thought five more would be possible.

Ms. Lewis asked if the applicant would consider making the steps trimmed in brick. Mr. Dangelo stated he would if it were possible.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve with Staff recommendation to leave a cushion area around the tree and making the steps trimmed in brick rather than wood. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **K. Certificate of Appropriateness**

### **BAR 04-06-05**

**East Water Street and East Main Street**

**Tax Map 53 Parcel 160**

**Transit Center and Mall extension details**

**WRT, Architects**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant was seeking final approval of details for the Transit Center and Mall extension. Staff recommendations: if the roof material is clearly visible, metal would be appropriate; a traditional hand rail design would be more appropriate; the choice of trees at the edge of the amphitheater and grass plaza is important; the three types of lighting should meet the City's full cut off requirements; the intersection lighting design is extreme. Staff also suggested bringing down the height of the large retaining wall by building a lower brick wall next to it incorporating planters and seating.

Mr. Ignacio Bunster-Ossa, of WRT, gave a PowerPoint presentation about the site plan and landscape component. Mr. Antonio Fiol-Silva, also of WRT, gave a presentation about the building.

Ms. Heetderks called for questions or comments from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks asked if the Board wanted to consider the components separately. Mr. Coiner sought clarification of which components were to be considered. Mr. Atkins cited the June minutes which suggested more details on: bus canopies, the window, flooring and paving, lighting, plantings, roof material, and fenestration.

The Board began with consideration of site elements.

#### **Paving:**

A previous report on the condition of the paving suggested getting rid of the mortar system in favor of a bituminous bed with sand swept joints between the bricks. The applicant proposed a bituminous system.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve both Phase I and Phase II with regard to paving and other minor site walls including the Three Notch'd Road architectural granite central element. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

#### **Retaining Wall:**

Mr. Atkins queried the link between what is useful mechanical or storage space and the amphitheater wall as a retaining wall. The applicant made use of the site plan to answer Mr. Atkins' concern.

Ms. Heetderks stated the amphitheater would be coming before the Board in September.

Ms. Lewis stated there were concerns about the walkway to Belmont Bridge and the relationship of the amphitheater to the wall. She felt the Board was without sufficient information to make a decision about the wall.

Ms. Lewis reluctantly moved to defer the wall. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Bus Canopy:

Mr. Atkins moved to approve the bus canopies as submitted and further described. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The Railing:

Ms. Heetderks reiterated that Staff felt the railing was too modern. The applicant explained it was a thin, strong wire and the supports were flat plates to be open. The railing was meant to be thin given the massing of the wall. Mr. Atkins felt the unintended effect was that design was often used in highway overpass design.

Ms. Lewis stated her support for the railing.

Ms. Heetderks felt they could not give an approval or denial of the railing since the wall was being rethought which could change the railing.

Windows:

Mr. Atkins felt the previous questions and concerns had been met.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve all of the window and fenestration systems presented with administrative review of the final wood window and finish selection in keeping with the way it has been described to be in harmony with the Douglas fir. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried, 5-1, with Ms. Heetderks voting against.

Materials:

The applicant explained the roof drains were internal to the wall; the only things, which would be visible, were the beams and the lights.

Mr. Wolf queried the type of material, which would be atop the brick wall. The applicant stated it was copper coping.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval of the roofing material and color, the copper sheathing and the Douglas fir framing members, brick and mortar color, joint detail. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried, 5-1, with Ms. Lewis voting against. Ms. Lewis stated her opposition was as to the roof.

#### Plantings:

Ms. Heetderks stated there was some concern since the Board's landscape architect was not present.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve the planting plan as presented with, what appears to be the general consensus of the Board, follow up on the tree species via Ms. Scala and Mr. Knight. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### Lighting:

The lighting system had been chosen because it came in two versions; one did not have holes in the top, the other emitted five to ten percent of the light through the top by a series of holes. This would allow for up-lighting of the trees by some of the lights; lights that weren't adjacent to trees would not emit light from the top. This would help eliminate light pollution of the night sky.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the Pennsylvania Avenue series antique street lamps and the antique street lamps, model 57K, downtown fixtures for use on the side street and ask the applicant bring back the intersection taller lights for consideration. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

#### Benches, waste cans, newspaper box enclosures:

Ms. Lewis sought clarification if the material of the newspaper box enclosures was aluminum. The applicant stated it could be colored stainless steel.

Ms. Heetderks asked if those were only for the Mall or if they would also be used on the Water Street elevation. The applicant explained that a three-sided corral would be used for freestanding newspaper boxes; those which backed up against a wall would only have side elements. The applicant concurred that benches would be on the Water Street side.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the assorted Mall trinkets including furniture, box enclosures, and planters, provided that all metal surfaces are black. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **L. Discussion Item – BAR By-laws**

Mr. Tremblay moved to defer until the next meeting when the Chair was present. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

#### **M. Matters from the public**

There were no matters from the public.

#### **N. Other Business**

Ms. Lewis noted that the City Ordinance was being changed to eliminate the requirement that the BAR have one member constituted from the Planning Commission. Ms. Lewis had recommended the change, which was supported by the Director of Neighborhood Development Services and the Mayor.

Ms. Lewis also noted she had asked Staff about the brightness of the lights on Court Square.

Mr. Coiner asked if there had been any resolution about the one remaining utility pole at Court Square.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification regarding the term of the current Chair. Ms. Fenton had been elected to serve a one-year term as Chair in July 2003; Ms. Scala had discovered that elections were to be held in September. Ms. Fenton's term on the Board was to expire in December; she had volunteered to help groom the next Chair through the end of her term on the Board if necessary.

Ms. Lewis noted she had done the naturalist walk at Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue. The site was very challenging. Ms. Scala stated the PUD might not be done based on neighborhood complaints.

Mr. Tremblay moved to adjourn. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:12 p.m.