

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
February 15, 2005**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Joe Atkins, Chair  
Fred Wolf, Vice Chair  
Wade Tremblay  
Preston Coiner  
Amy Gardner  
Lynne Heetderks  
Bill Lucy

**Also Present:**

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Atkins convened the meeting at 5:00 p.m. He recognized the students from Ken Schwartz' Professional Practice class.

A. Matters from the Public

There were no matters from the public.

**B. 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 and Paxton, PC, Architects**

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from this discussion and vote.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant had come before the Board in January seeking approval of new paint colors. Since the meeting, the applicant has met with the neighbors who prefer the warm earth tone color grouping that was first painted on the upper left side of the building after the Board of Architectural Review approval in November. Some color adjustment will be made to darken the lightest and darkest colors.

Mr. Edward Eichman, representing Wade Apartments, gave a brief presentation to the Board explaining the color palettes before the Board.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification as to which of three options the applicant was considering. Mr. Eichman explained they were leaning more toward the original scheme with some adjustments.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Coiner applauded the applicants for all the effort placed in the submittal.

Mr. Atkins moved they give the latitude requested and have staff review to make sure it is within the range suggested. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks asked they reference the Guideline for Rehabilitation: choose colors that blend with and complement the overall color schemes on the street; do not use bright or obtrusive colors. Mr. Atkins accepted the friendly amendment and added that the plan did meet the guideline stating: Deep rich colors, such as greens, rusts, reds, browns are appropriate for late Victorian houses. Mr. Coiner accepted the amendments. The motion carried, 8-0-1; Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the vote.

### **C. 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. The matter had been before the Board in January at which time most elements had been approved with a redesign of the Fourth Street side to be returned to the Board of Architectural Review for approval. The proposed design for Fourth Street was informally endorsed at the January 26th work session. The proposal visually connects the two existing doorways. The new Fourth Street canopy will be a simple slab shape cantilevered over the sidewalk, projecting about 48 inches; the edge will be finished with aluminum to match the other new aluminum on the project. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public; there being none, he called for questions from the Board. With no questions, he called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Wolf thought reworking of the elevation and the canopy in relationship to the curtain wall makes a lot of sense and looks good.

Mr. Wolf moved to approve as submitted. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### **D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 04-05-06 (Resubmitted)**

**235 West Main Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 155**

**Omni Hotel Dining Terrace**

**Paul H. Maher, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had been approved in May, 2004, with the option of using brick instead of a concrete cap on the walls, encouraged consideration of providing an accessible route to the lower terrace, and requested that the applicant return to the BAR with more detail on the stainless steel railing system and canopy support. The terrace will now be one level with access from the restaurant in the hotel through existing double doors. A clear polycarbonate canopy is proposed to protect the hotel bellboys and make the entry more visible. The terrace would be post and beam construction with a brick veneer. All steel elements will be painted dark charcoal gray. The Board of Architectural Review approval of this plan is still subject to administrative site plan approval which is currently underway. Staff recommends approval of the revised plan with the materials and colors of tables chairs and umbrellas to be approved at a later date by staff.

Ms. Marty Rowan was present on behalf of the applicant. She had a sample of the polycarbonate for the Board as well as a sample of the color of the charcoal grey for the painted steel.

Mr. Atkins called for questions of the applicant from the public and the Board.

Mr. Coiner queried the availability of brick to match The Mall. Ms. Rowan stated they were proposing to use a standard brick in the herringbone pattern. She further stated her understanding that the precise brick was no longer available.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Coiner suggested the applicant verbally amend the application concerning the brick, that the pattern was to match, not the brick. Ms. Rowan stated that the brick pattern was to match the herringbone pattern of The Mall.

Mr. Wolf moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Heetderks suggested a friendly amendment that the motion include that material and color of tables, chairs, and umbrellas will be approved by staff. Mr. Atkins offered a friendly amendment that a brick sample be provided for staff to review. Mr. Wolf accepted the amendments. Mr. Tremblay seconded the amended motion. Mr. Coiner clarified that it was approval now with her verbal change. The motion carried unanimously.

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

**BAR 05-02-01**

**405 Ridge Street**

**Tax Map 29 Parcel 133**

**Exterior Renovations**

**Jeffrey and Susan Lanterman, Applicants**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is an 1891 house which recently changed hands for the first time since 1966. Originally weather boarded, the house is now covered with white asbestos shingles. The roof was standing seam metal but now is shingles; the tower roof is wooden shingles. The applicant proposes to change the doors and windows in the first floor of the rear ell and proposes to add windows to the third floor of the front tower. All other windows in the house

are being repaired but not altered or replaced. Renovations are proposed for three doors and six windows. The house was brought to the attention of NDS by a neighbor noting activity on the outside. Staff checked the building permit which indicated interior work only. Staff issued a stop work order on the exterior work so staff could go over the Historic District requirements and Guidelines. The applicant is rehabilitating a wonderful resource that was in bad condition. Guidelines recommend against changing the size of or creating new openings. There was no evidence of windows in the third floor of the tower structure.

Mr. Jeffrey Lanterman explained he had not known of the existence of the BAR so the changes were not being made in defiance but rather in ignorance.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Atkins stated that staff and one Board member had suggested taking the approval of each replacement or new opening individually.

Mr. Lucy stated he would like the windows in the tower as the building had always looked odd without windows. Mr. Tremblay concurred as the room would not be useful without the windows. Mr. Coiner felt that would be in direct defiance of the Guidelines.

Mr. Atkins expressed concern about the way the arch met the cornice of window 6. He sought clarification if the width of that window matched the window below. The applicant explained its width exceeded the lower window by three inches on each side.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Tremblay had visited the house and seen the restoration thus far. He felt it was remarkable that all the windows were being restored and that only five or six were beyond repair.

Ms. Heetderks expressed her dislike of situations where someone begins working on a historic property without knowing they should come before the Board. She stated the difficulty was in evaluating a proposal as if none of it had been done already. Ms. Heetderks cited Design Guideline for Windows, number 5, "Do not change the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows by cutting new openings, blocking in windows, or installing replacement sashes that do not fit the window openings. She stated the door guidelines were dealt more with whether entrances are important in defining a building's overall historic character. She thought most of the door changes in the rear of the building were not particularly defining of historic character of the structure. Ms. Heetderks felt the tower was the defining characteristic of the structure. She had a problem with punching holes in it when no holes previously existed. She stated she could support the door changes, but had significant reservations about windows 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. Lucy felt there should have been windows in the tower.

Mr. Wolf felt the mass of the tower could support windows that would allow functional rehabilitation and use.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about the comments of Mr. Lucy and Mr. Wolf since the Board was not in the business of redesigning historic buildings as the architect should have built them.

Mr. Coiner stated he could not support windows 4, 5, and 6 as they did not meet the Guideline requirements.

Mr. Tremblay, noting his more flexible interpretation of the Guidelines, stated he would favor the tower windows.

Mr. Atkins stated he did not see any reference to the blank third story as a distinguishing or defining characteristic. He stated there had been and should be an allowance for modifications. He expressed his agreement with Mr. Lucy, Mr. Tremblay, and Mr. Wolf that the act of putting a window in that tower does not negatively alter the defining characteristics of the building.

Mr. Lanternman stated he would sacrifice windows 4 and 5 to address Mr. Wolf's concern about the massing of the tower.

Mr. Wolf stated he would be in favor of the application if windows 4 and 5 were taken off the table.

Mr. Tremblay moved they accept the applicant's proposal for doors 1 through 3. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks suggested referencing the Design Guidelines -- Entrances, porches and doors: Do not remove or radically change entrances and porches important in defining the building's overall historic character -- since these were not defining to the building. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay moved acceptance of the applicant's proposal for windows 1 through 3 as he felt this was consistent with their guidelines in terms of replacing windows that are too far deteriorated to be restored. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks expressed concern that the Guidelines were explicit about not installing a replacement sash that does not fit the window opening. Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about window 1 as it was extremely visible and was in violation of the Guideline. Ms. Gardner agreed with Ms. Heetderks. Ms. Gardner did not like the transom over window 1. Mr. Wolf expressed his discomfort with the use of a casement window as it would not be of the period since all of the other windows were double hung.

Mr. Tremblay amended his motion to just include windows 2 and 3. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay felt window 1, while visible from Ridge Street, was not a defining aspect of the house. Ms. Gardner could not accept the transom.

Mr. Tremblay moved they accept window 1 as presented by the owners. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. The motion failed, 2-5; Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Lucy voted for the motion.

Mr. Tremblay offered an alternative motion that would allow replacement, in the same revised opening, of a casement-style window but without the transom. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks cited Design Guidelines for Windows number 1: Retain original windows if possible. Mr. Coiner was troubled about the addition of another vertical since a casement, in essence, was two windows. The motion carried, 5-2; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner voted against.

Mr. Atkins asked if they should consider windows 4 and 5 to have been withdrawn and only consider window 6. Ms. Gardner felt she could consider window 6 and cited Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation number 9: New additions for exterior alterations. No work shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historical integrity of a property. Ms. Gardner felt, if the Lanternmans decided to forgo windows 4 and 5, she could be comfortable with window 6. Ms. Heetderks pointed out the sentence before the one cited by Ms. Gardner: New additions, exterior alterations related to new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the site.

Ms. Gardner explained she was thinking historic materials was the quality of the windows and the quality of the doors and not something that had now been covered with asbestos siding. Mr. Tremblay stated he would second that if it were a motion. Mr. Atkins clarified that if windows 4 and 5 were eliminated, then window 6 would be agreeable.

Ms. Gardner proposed that, if the applicant was going to forgo windows 4 and 5, they accept window 6 with Secretary of Interior Standards number 9, Exterior Alterations compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historical integrity of a property in its environment. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that the dimensions and the profile, to the degree that it is possible, matches as closely the profiles of the other windows, particularly those on the front of the house. The motion carried, 5-2; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner voted against. Mr. Coiner asked that Mr. Atkins remind the applicant he could appeal the decision about window 1 to City Council.

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

**BAR 05-02-02**

**402 Dice Street**

**Tax Map 29 Parcel 124.1**

**Exterior renovations**

**Molly McCoy/Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is an individually protected property. The house was built in 1857; the kitchen wing may be older than the main house. The proposed changes are to the kitchen wing. The applicant recently purchased the house and wants to complete rehabilitations begun at the insistence of Preservation Piedmont. The applicant is requesting door and window changes to the rear concrete block addition behind the kitchen wing as well as the brick kitchen wing. The applicant wants to replace an existing double window with single one-over-one wood window, thereby reducing that opening size. On the west side of the block addition, an existing door opening is proposed to be replaced with a one-over-one window, filling in the bottom

opening. The applicant wants to add stucco finish over the concrete block addition. For the kitchen wing, the applicant is requesting to replace an existing door opening with a one-over-one window, filling in the bottom opening and create a door opening on the same side of the kitchen wing. The applicant is rehabilitating a wonderful resource that was in bad condition. The Guidelines generally recommend against changing the size or location of openings. The kitchen wing is significant because of its age.

Ms. Molly McCoy stated the flow of the kitchen was very awkward at present with the current placement of doors. For the south elevation she was proposing one window centered under the peak rather than the two existing windows.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public.

Ms. Melanie Jackman, of 404 Dice Street, felt the house had a lot of potential. She expressed concern that nothing had been said about the front porch. Ms. Heetderks explained the porch was not part of the current application.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know the vintage of the block addition. Ms. Scala stated it was later than 1920.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and the Board.

Ms. Heetderks had concerns about punching holes in the existing historic fabric; she had particular concerns in doing it in brick because it is impossible to replace.

Mr. Tremblay suggested they consider the changes to the concrete block building separately from the changes to the kitchen wing. He felt the block portion had little historic significance and the window changes were acceptable as was the stucco for the exterior. He stated he would make that in the form of a motion. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for keeping the same light pattern with true divided light windows. Mr. Tremblay accepted, as a friendly amendment, to have true divided light wood windows consistent with the two-over-two consistent with the balance of the house so that they are consistent. Mr. Atkins, as seconder, also accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Coiner sought clarification that the color of the stucco would come back to staff. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Atkins accepted that as a friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to allow the applicant's window replacement as described consistent with true divided light two-over-two on the east elevation. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks stated there was no historic fabric being destroyed on the east elevation. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that care is taken to match the existing brick mold profiles on the existing house. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Atkins accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Regarding the west elevation, Mr. Atkins felt the proposed openings did not detract from the overall defining characteristic.

Mr. Tremblay could agree with Mr. Atkins. He wondered if the applicant had considered using skylights to get more light into the kitchen. Ms. Heetderks stated she would be more likely to support a skylight on that portion of the roof than punching holes in the existing brick.

Ms. Heetderks stated this was a pre-Civil War era house; Charlottesville did not have a lot of those left.

Mr. Tremblay suggested deferring the kitchen portion to allow the applicant to look into skylights.

Ms. Heetderks moved that they deny the application for the new door placements and the blocking in of the existing door and window replacement on the western elevation of the brick kitchen addition to 402 Dice Street based on the Guideline for Windows: Do not change the number, location, size or glazing patterns of windows by cutting new openings, blocking in windows or installing a replacement sash that does not fit the window opening; and Do not remove or radically change parts of importance in deciding a building's overall historic character -- or adding a new entrance to a primary elevation. She also cited the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitations Number 9: New additions, exterior alterations and related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins felt moving the door four feet was not a radical change. The motion failed 3-4; Ms. Heetderks, Mr. Coiner and Ms. Gardner voted for.

Mr. Coiner asked that if there was a motion to allow these, he would request that the brick infill be addressed to have that brick which was removed for the door be used as the infill under the window.

Mr. Wolf wondered if moving the door to a central position to allow more light would not require an additional window.

Mr. Wolf stated he would support allowing two openings in that side specifically because you cannot see it from the street. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf so moved. Ms. Heetderks stated their job was to protect historic resources not to accommodate the convenience of the applicant. The motion carried, 4-3; Ms. Heetderks, Ms. Gardner and Mr. Coiner voted against.

### **G. Discussion -- Mall Extension Lighting**

Ms. Scala reminded the Board they had wanted the Mall lighting extended to the Amphitheater. Ms. Scala showed the Board examples of the proposed lighting.

### **H. Discussion -- Court Square signage**



A signage plan had been approved in May, 2003. An approved storyboard sign had been erected next to the Courthouse. Two monument signs would be erected; one at Park Street and one at the opposite corner. The Board of Architectural Review had requested that the logo be changed, but that request had not been communicated to the designer.

#### **I. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

There were no matters from the public.

#### **J. Other Business**

Mr. Coiner asked if they could schedule a work session with the tax assessor. Ms. Heetderks asked if they have a work session as orientation for new members and a refresher course for returning members.

#### **K. Adjournment**

Mr. Tremblay moved to adjourn. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:27 p.m.