

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
January 18, 2005**

Minutes

Present:

Joe Atkins, Chair

Fred Wolf, Vice Chair

Preston Coiner

Kate Swenson

Lynne Heetderks

Syd Knight

Amy Gardner

Bill Lucy

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Atkins convened the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

A. Approval of Minutes -- December 21, 2004

Ms. Heetderks asked that the second occurrence of the word "based" in the third paragraph on page 5 be stricken. She also asked that item I on page 7 be clarified as to being two separate work sessions.

Mr. Atkins asked that Item H on page 6 be clarified to show that the signs on the Paramount construction fence were not meeting zoning regulations. Mr. Atkins also stated the unidentified person on page 7 in item F was Bill Lenart. He also asked that the fourth paragraph of page 7 be corrected from "accepted" to "excepted."

Mr. Knight moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried, 7-0-1; Ms. Gardner abstained.

B. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

C. 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/Dalgliesh, Eichman, Gilpin & Paxton, PC, Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Ms. Scala was not sure the applicant was present or would be able to attend. Ms. Scala presented the Board with color drawings. The Board had approved colors in November. The applicant's new choice differs from what had been approved. Staff interprets the paint guidelines as liberally as possible since paint is temporal. However, staff has received comments from the neighbors suggesting a more neutral color scheme. Staff suggests the applicant reconsider the original color scheme which was more neutral.

Mr. Atkins opened the matter to public discussion.

Mr. Bob Vickery, of North First Street, although he was theoretically unsure the Board of Architectural Review should be reviewing what colors people paint their houses, he stated the neighborhood did not like the pink color which was wanted by the applicant.

Mr. Malcolm Bell, of 433 North First Street, spoke in opposition of the proposal. The building was important and the owners should be commended for the extensive work already done; however, the new colors were assertive in an inappropriate way. He urged the Board to recommend the original color.

With no one else from the public wishing to speak, Mr. Atkins closed that portion of the hearing and opened the floor to comments from the Board members.

Mr. Coiner reminded the Chair that the Board had been encouraging applicants to use strong colors which accent the details on the building. Mr. Coiner felt the dark purple trim was an historic color. He stated color was subjective.

Ms. Heetderks cited the rehabilitation guidelines which state "choose colors that blend with and complement the overall color scheme on the street; do not use bright and obtrusive colors." Ms. Heetderks considered the proposed color to be bright and obtrusive considering what was going on with the rest of the street. She stated she would not support the modified paint colors and urged the applicant to go back to what had been originally approved.

Ms. Swenson felt the proposed colors matched the buildings on either side too closely. She wished the applicant were present to explain the reasons for the proposal.

Mr. Knight did not like getting the Board involved in choosing paint colors; however, the Board was governed by the Guidelines. He felt the colors did not blend with other colors on the street.

Mr. Lucy asked if there would be any harm in deferring to February, giving the applicant a chance to speak. Mr. Atkins and Mr. Coiner concurred with Mr. Lucy.

Mr. Atkins, while respecting the comments of Ms. Heetderks, did not feel the colors were inappropriately bright or obtrusive. However, based on neighborhood comments, Mr. Atkins felt the applicant should discuss the colors with the neighbors.

Ms. Heetderks moved to defer to give the applicant the opportunity to discuss with the neighbors his choice of paint colors and to be present, if possible, at the next meeting so they could take up

the issue again, and bring samples. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-07-04 (Resubmitted)

321 East Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 226

Partial demolition/Changes to exterior elevations

SNL Financial, LC, Owner/Robert Nichols/Formwork Design, Architect

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Certain demolitions had been approved in July. In December, a sample of the aluminum had been provided. When the cornice was removed, it was discovered the facing brick did not continue under the cornice. The proposal is to cover the exposed concrete masonry units and the unmatched brick with a band of thin brick to match the rest of the building. The Main Street canopy has been deleted. The new storefront for the Fourth Street side has been deleted; the canopy over the Fourth Street door is shorter. Staff felt details were needed on the Fourth Street canopy, that the applicant reconsider deleting the previously approved new storefront as the Guidelines state office buildings should provide windows or other visual interest at street level; otherwise, staff recommends approval of the changes.

Mr. Robert Nichols, of Formwork Design, presented the Board with a sample of the proposed thin brick. Elimination of the Main Street canopy had been an economic decision since the owner decided to lease the ground floor to two separate tenants. The deletion of windows on Fourth Street was due to the placement of a fire stair within the building.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public. There being none, he called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification of the dimension of the thin brick and the method of attachment. Mr. Nichols explained there was both a mechanical and an adhesive connection.

Mr. Knight sought clarification if there would be any benefit in retaining the mezzanine on the Fourth Street side now and removing it later. Mr. Nichols felt it would be next to impossible to coordinate with the design and the goal to get daylight.

Mr. Wolf felt the changes had a cumulative effect and would ensure that Fourth Street would be a lifeless place.

Ms. Swenson thought the loss of the canopies was a detriment to the building.

Mr. Knight agreed with Ms. Swenson as did Ms. Gardner.

Ms. Swenson sought clarification that the approval granted on August 17th included the canopies and the whole ensemble. Board members confirmed Ms. Swenson's belief.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve the application as presented: specifically referencing the brick banding and the materials presented at the meeting -- the spandrel glass as a substitute for what was originally proposed and approved, also presented at the meeting; the elimination of the canopy along Main Street on the Mall; but to not include in the approval the proposal to infill the opening as presented with brick and that some redesign of the stretch of Fourth Street is required in order to provide an acceptable level of visual interest along the street. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks expressed support for the motion even though she would like to see the canopy over the front entrance remain. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-12-03 (Resubmitted)

100 West Main Street/107 First Street South

Tax Map 28 Parcel 19

Bridge details, lighting and signage

Lexie Boris, The Terraces, Applicant and Ludwig Kuttner, K Holdings LLC, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The plan had been approved at the December meeting with certain details to come back. Lighting has been added and the canopy is squared off at the corner, as was suggested by the Board. Copper downspouts were relocated in the new plan to connect with existing drainage pipes under the pavement. Staff was unsure if the lighting met the Ordinance for full cut off shielded lighting. Staff recommends approval of the bridge design and building details; the downspouts and drainage will require Engineering approval.

Mr. Wolf recused himself since his firm had worked on this at one point in time. Mr. Coiner suggested he take part in the discussion as long as it was no concern of the applicant. Mr. Peter Nichols stated there was no concern on the applicant's part.

Mr. Nichols explained the differences in submittals to the Board. The bridge would be cast in place. Mr. Nichols stated most of the lighting was meant to be concealed. A large steel column had been discovered in the front of the store; therefore the entry was shifted to the center line of the facade. The window system has less mullions and larger sheets of glass.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and then the Board. With no questions for the applicant, Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Ms. Swenson thought the new window treatment was an improvement on the old scheme and seemed more simple and elegant.

Mr. Knight had been concerned about how the bridge would meet the ground; he felt the new proposal was done as gracefully as could be done.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve as presented specifically noting a number of changes from the submission in their packets, those being: the centering of the main entrance to accommodate a found steel column; the change in the division of the mahogany windows, being simplified with greater expanses of glass; no recessed entry along the First Street side, but the inclusion of a canopy there; and refined details on the stair which are appropriate and acceptable; that the

lighting is also acceptable with the follow up that the applicant should return with Ms. Scala to pursue the cut off and any problems associated with the uplights; that the new ramp at the entrance vestibule is also appropriate and a nice addition. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion which carried, 7-0-1, with Mr. Wolf abstaining from the vote.

F. Proposed Individually Protected Property
1010 Preston Avenue (Rock House)
Tax Map 4 Parcel 41
Place on Individually Protected Properties List
Legal Aid Justice Center, Owner/ Alex Gulotta, Executive Director

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking the Individual Historic Designation so they may preserve the house which is next to their main office building. They believe designation would improve their chance for receiving grants and private donations in support of their efforts. City Council was seeking a recommendation from the Board and from the Planning Commission. Criteria was listed in the members' packets; based on those criteria, staff recommends forwarding the proposal to the Planning Commission and City Council with a recommendation to designate the Rock House property as an Individually Designated Property.

Mr. Alex Gulotta, Esquire, thanked the Board for their support and assistance. There are no plans for substantial changes to the house.

Mr. Atkins called for questions and comments from the public. There were none. Mr. Atkins then called for questions and comments from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks was thrilled that they were stepping forward to individually designate the property. She would wholeheartedly recommend the addition of this property to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Ms. Swenson felt the documentation was great and was incredibly valuable to the community to individually designate the property.

Ms. Heetderks moved they recommend to the Planning Commission and to City Council the adoption of this property at 1010 Preston Avenue as an individually designated property. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins, citing the criteria in the written staff report, stated it was the opinion of the Board through support of this document that all eight criteria are met. Ms. Heetderks accepted Mr. Atkins' friendly amendment as did Mr. Coiner. 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
Amphitheater (Design Details)
FTL /Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Staff recommended the Board make a decision on the Winter Creeper alternative. The BAR should indicate if there are any remaining concerns or details the Board needs to take up on the Amphitheater plan. Staff recommends approval of the submittal as requested.

Mr. Bill Lenart, of FTL Design Engineering, stated they were seeking approval of: paving at the stage, substitute plantings, the railing submittal, fixed columns at the perimeter of the Amphitheater, the seat wall detail, tie down detail and the regrading at the north and south of the site. The applicant had three models to display to the Board. The paving would be a circular element using the same materials, textures and finishes as the primary seating area. There were five alternates for the planting substitutions. FTL had been unable to get samples of the brick for the seat wall; FTL would use whatever the City was able to acquire since the City had not yet found a vendor for the samples.

Mr. Atkins thanked the applicant for providing the models. He then called for questions and comments from the public. There being none, he called for questions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Atkins called for a brief recess whereupon the Board stood in recess at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Atkins reconvened the meeting at 7:16 p.m.

Mr. Knight was happy to see the changes that had been made. He expressed concern about the year-round suitability of the Winter Creeper.

Ms. Swenson thought there were a number of great things happening especially with the removal of the retaining walls.

Mr. Wolf moved that they approve as submitted with the exception of the preference of Liriope or the Ajuga; and the brick return on the wall at the cast in place stairs. Mr. Knight clarified that the Winter Creeper would be appropriate in the bounded planter and could remain there. Mr. Wolf accepted that as a friendly amendment. Mr. Knight seconded the amended motion. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Discussion: Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Ms. Scala had no additional information to provide beyond what had been submitted to the members in their packets.

Mr. Atkins suggested they focus on any suggestions or critical comments to be passed along.

Mr. Lucy queried the process of appeal by an aggrieved person.

Mr. Atkins cited a memo from Deputy City Attorney Lisa Kelley giving three options: reject the proposal and leave the term undefined; to accept the definition as written; or propose an

expanded definition based on Manassas or Alexandria. However, Mr. Atkins stated they did not need to make a recommendation at this time.

Ms. Heetderks felt it was a good idea to list property names with the Individual Designated Properties.

Ms. Swenson supported the recommendation of having a landscape architect on the Board and suggested that person be a permanent member.

Ms. Swenson left the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Mr. Atkins suggested they propose either a licensed professional contractor or a Planning Commissioner based on the availability of a Planning Commissioner to serve.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification of the recommendations proposed. Ms. Scala stated they were: leave the definition of "aggrieved person" alone or pursue one of the two options cited; individually protected properties should include the name of the property but keep the list alphabetical by street name; keep landscape architect rather than either/or with a licensed contractor; keep the Planning Commission member on the BAR or a licensed professional contractor.

I. Proposed Design Guidelines - broad concerns and how to best approach the work session

Mr. Coiner suggested it be shorter and simpler with better graphics. He also felt there was no need to show district maps.

J. Other Business

There was no other business.

K. Adjournment

Ms. Heetderks moved to adjourn. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:07 p.m.