

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
November 16, 2004**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair
Lynne Heetderks, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Fred Wolf
Syd Knight
William Lucy

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 4:58 p.m. She welcomed the new representative from the Planning Commission, Mr. William Lucy.

B. Matters from the public

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

A. Approval of minutes

October 5, 2004 (special meeting)

Ms. Fenton called for any changes or corrections to the minutes.

Ms. Heetderks asked that the minutes include who cast the dissenting votes; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Knight had cast the two dissenting votes

Mr. Tremblay stated he had been present for the special meeting.

Ms. Fenton asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Knight so moved. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion, which carried.

October 19, 2004

Ms. Fenton called for any changes or corrections to the 19 October minutes. There were none.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were a motion to approve. Mr. Coiner so moved. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion, which carried with Mr. Wolf, Mr. Knight and Mr. Atkins abstaining.

C. Preliminary discussion

Demolition of 17 Elliewood Avenue

In the absence of the applicant, the Board continued with the agenda.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

(Deferred from 10-19-04)

BAR 04-10-02

106 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 22

Replace C'ville storefront

Gate Pratt, Limehouse Architects, LC, Applicant, and Rob Jiranek and Bill Chapman, Owners

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Board of Architectural Review had deferred approval with a recommendation for resubmittal addressing the Downtown Corridor zoning requirement that all entrances be protected from the weather. The existing storefront is being replaced with a new, clear anodized aluminum and glass storefront. A 12-inch masonry base has been added. The existing sign will be moved slightly to accommodate the canopy. The sign will be backlit with white neon. The existing stone pavers in the recessed doorway will be removed.

Mr. Gate Pratt, of Limehouse Architects, presented the Board with color studies and more detail on the awning. He was proposing a two-color treatment of the trim details to pick up on the colors inside the C'ville office. The canopy would be a canvas awning projecting four feet out from the building to shelter the doorway.

Ms. Fenton noted for the record that she owned property on that block; she did not think there was a conflict of interest.

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

Mr. Tremblay stated the applicant had responded to the Board's earlier questions, comments and suggestions in a very straightforward manner.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion that they approve the submittal. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks asked if Mr. Tremblay wanted to clarify which color scheme was being approved; Mr. Tremblay stated he was comfortable with either color scheme and would leave it to the applicant. Mr. Pratt stated they would probably use the blue and yellow scheme. Mr. Tremblay stated he would include the blue and yellow color scheme in his motion. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-11-01 (Amending BAR 03-05-03)

425 North First Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 104

Change exterior paint colors

Edward L. Eichman, Dalglish, Eichman, Gilpin & Paxton, PC

Ms. Fenton felt they could proceed on this matter without the applicant. Ms. Fenton asked if there were any concerns among the Board. Mr. Tremblay stated he would not vote on the matter.

Mr. Knight moved that they approve the change to the paint scheme as submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins offered a friendly amendment that there be an administrative review of the actual paint to make sure it matches the renderings. Mr. Knight and Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried, 7-0-1; Mr. Tremblay abstained.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-05-05

1018 West Main Street

Tax Map 10 Parcel 66 and 69

New UVA Hospital Core Lab Building

University of VA Foundation, Applicant

William B. Daggett, Architect

Amend choice of exterior siding

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A demolition request had been approved in April; in May, the Board approved construction of a two-story, 21,000 square foot brick/metal building. The applicant is requesting to use an exterior metal siding alternate; a sample had been provided. The originally proposed material was terne metal that would have weathered to a light grey. The proposed material is a prefinished metal panel that is a dark charcoal color. The applicant also requests elimination of the existing West Main Street entrance to the parking lot.

Mr. William Daggett, of Daggett & Grigg Architects, stated concern had been expressed about the originally proposed material. The University Architect, David Neuman, suggested the proposed panel, which is being used in a number of buildings at UVA. The proposed material produces the slate-roof compatibility look that was originally envisioned. Mr. Daggett informed the Board that the job superintendent misread a number; the building is one and-a-half foot higher than was anticipated. This additional height impacts the relationship of the building to the adjacent SunTrust Bank. The architects propose to close an existing curb cut and drive on West Main to orient parking parallel to the new building. SunTrust will need a walk-up ATM.

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

Mr. Knight felt making the driveway go away was a wonderful thing. He felt it would be nice if the area gained by closing the driveway could be used for pedestrian space.

Mr. Knight moved that they approve the change in the metal siding; that they approve the change in the conceptual site plan, requesting the applicant consider comments of the Board in further development of the site plan; and that they recognize the 18-inch discrepancy in the floor elevation of the building. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Knight clarified that the intent of the motion was to approve the ATM in the location, but not the design. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-06-05 (Resubmitted)

East Water Street and East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Transit Center and Amphitheater (Water Street retaining wall)

WRT, Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks final approval of the Water Street retaining wall and the reconfigured pedestrian connection from Belmont Bridge to the Amphitheater. In September, the Board approved the form and shape of the Water Street wall, not to exceed 17 feet in height with materials to be resubmitted to the Board.

Mr. Hank Bishop, of Wallace, Roberts & Todd, gave a presentation of the revised submittal.

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

Mr. Atkins was pleased to see steps to the Bridge. He had been concerned about what was the best resolution of the ramp.

Mr. Knight agreed with the form of the ramps and the steps. He felt the submittal was a big improvement over what had been before the Board previously. He was in favor of the steps and ramp. He expressed concern about the keystone material and the stacking block; however, the proposal was the best of the stacking block options. Mr. Knight could not rectify this material with the Guidelines for use in this District. He was worried about the precedent that would be set.

Mr. Bishop stated when the project had been put out to bid, an alternate cast in place concrete wall had been designed. However, the bid came in \$50,000 higher.

Ms. Heetderks concurred with Mr. Knight about the material and the precedent it set. It was an inappropriate infill for the historic district.

Mr. Knight clarified that his objection was because the Guidelines call for materials that are consistent with those used in historic districts. This material has not been used in historic districts. He was concerned about the longevity of the material.

Mr. Knight moved that the Board approve the configuration of the ramp and stair access from the Transit Center up to the Ninth Street Bridge as presented and the railings that are integral to that. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins asked for verbal clarifications that the bottom of wall elevation was incorrect -- it was an eight foot high wall, not a 13 or 14 foot wall; and that there is an intent to rework the sidewalk at the top of the bridge, acknowledging that those were part of the presentation. Mr. Atkins and Mr. Tremblay accepted the clarification. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Knight moved that the Board approve the configuration and height of the Water Street wall; and that they approve the railings on top, but that they deny use of the keystone block wall system. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion and asked that Mr. Knight reference the Guidelines Section 2 Site Elements, Section Z 4 -- Chain link fencing, split rail fences and concrete block walls, in general, should not be used. Mr. Knight thanked Ms. Heetderks and accepted the clarification. Mr. Coiner did not consider this to be a concrete block wall as the Guidelines are written, as it is possible the Guidelines were written before this product was available. Mr. Tremblay stated he would vote against the motion because he believed the wall was close enough to one, which has been already approved in the district. Ms. Fenton called the question. The motion failed, 3-5; Ms. Fenton, Ms. Heetderks, and Mr. Knight voted for.

Mr. Tremblay stated he would like to amend Mr. Knight's motion to allow the material as submitted. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-3; Ms. Fenton, Ms. Heetderks, and Mr. Knight voted against.

The Board recessed at 6:20 p.m. and reconvened at 6:28 p.m. in the NDS Conference Room.

K. Discussion: Court Square Banners

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Two of the previously approved signs would go up at the intersection of Park and High and on the other side of Jackson Park to identify the area.

Ms. Heetderks expressed a preference for choice A rather than B.

Mr. Coiner expressed a preference for the portico but without the City logo.

Mr. Coiner moved that they select the historic Court Square Banner, numbered B, without the City logo in a color identical or similar to that shown. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (Mr. Lucy was no longer present.)

J. Discussion: Oakhurst Circle Historic District sub-committee

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The University Architect wrote a letter stating the University had not been properly notified and that the boundaries of the district were arbitrarily drawn. The Planning Commission approved the Historic District, 4-3. Mr. Tolbert wanted to meet with the neighborhood before it came before City Council.

Mr. Atkins moved that they recommend to the Planning Commission and City Council their approval of the Oakhurst and Gildersleeve Historic and Design Control District according to the boundaries submitted by the DHR report. Mr. Knight seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Atkins moved that the recommendation be as follows: That, as previously mentioned, the boundary line of the proposed Oakhurst-Gildersleeve Neighborhood District remain intact according to the boundary submitted in the DHR report; that a new boundary line be explored, most likely to include Valley Road and Maywood Lane, as a separate conservation district distinct from the local historic district; that the creation of this type of conservation district should be explored not only in the Oakhurst area but throughout the City with the thought that the trigger for when the BAR reviews proposed projects in conservation districts would be less stringent than in a local historic district: (1) Only demolitions equal to 25% or more of the floor area and (2) Only new construction equal to 25% or more of floor area; and the Board of Architectural Review would present this concept at another time to Council in anticipation of future districts, but also to look at existing districts. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

I. BAR Elections

Mr. Tremblay moved that they elect Mr. Atkins as Chair and Ms. Heetderks as Vice Chair. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks, for personal reasons, did not feel she could be as accessible as the Chair ought to be. Mr. Tremblay, based on Ms. Heetderks' comments, amended his motion to elect Mr. Wolf as Vice Chair. Mr. Knight seconded the amended motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Coiner moved to elect staff as secretary. Mr. Knight seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

H. BAR Bylaws Amendments

Mr. Wolf moved that they approve the Bylaws amendments. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

L. Matters from the public

There were no matters from the public.

M. Other Business

Mr. Coiner stated Art in Place sculptures had been approved for Belmont Bridge in 2002. In 2003, a sculpture had been placed without seeking approval. Another had been placed this year, also without approval. Mr. Coiner spoke with Ms. Elizabeth Breeden who informed him City Council had approved the sites. Mr. Coiner asked that they be made to go through the approval process.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification of the status of shielding the brightness of the Court Square lighting fixtures. Ms. Scala thought the bulbs on the Court Square side had been reduced. Engineering had been told of the number of complaints about the lighting.

Ms. Fenton suggested they discuss temporary art or signage on construction fences at the next meeting

N. Adjournment

Mr. Knight moved to adjourn. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:25 p.m.