

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

Minutes

Present:

Joe Atkins, Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Amy Gardner
Lynne Heetderks
Syd Knight
Bill Lucy
Kate Swenson

Absent:

Fred Wolf, Vice Chair

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Atkins convened the meeting at 4:59 p.m.

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

Ms. Sue Keyser, of 1 Gildersleeve Wood, stated she and her husband would like to make some small changes to the entryway of their home. They wanted an entryway more compatible with the Dutch Colonial design of their home. Ms. Keyser presented the Board with pictures of the current entryway and explained they were seeking feedback from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if the house was in its original condition. Ms. Keyser confirmed that it was.

Mr. Atkins expressed concern about the use of metal for the overhang since the house had a shingle roof.

Mr. Knight expressed a desire to see supporting research.

Ms. Scala informed the Chair she had not added a preliminary discussion about Mono Loco to the agenda and asked if the architect could come forward at that time. Mr. Atkins concurred. The architect's representative, Cecelia Hernandez, stated Mono Loco has an outdoor courtyard which is poorly graded. The architect was proposing an extended courtyard area which regrades around the restaurant with paving on a sand and gravel bed. The wall and iron gates on the Water Street facade would be kept; however new plantings were proposed.

Mr. Knight suggested they rethink the proposed plantings.

Mr. Jim Tolbert, Director, Neighborhood Development Services, asked that the Board appoint one of its members to a committee which was being formed to examine issues regarding the Downtown Mall and other downtown development issues.

Mr. Tolbert also asked the Board to have a special meeting in the following week to deal with amphitheater issues.

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 (return to mauve palette)

Edward L. Eichman/Dalgliesh, Eichman, Gilpin and Paxton, PC, Architect

Mr. Tremblay stated he would abstain from the discussion and the vote on this matter as he was involved with the project.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant had decided to go back to the mauve color palette. The neighbors prefer a warm earth tone color grouping which had been approved in November. Examples were present for the Board. Staff feels this is an appropriate scheme. Since color is temporal and very subjective, staff is inclined to interpret the guidelines as liberally as possible to allow the owner's color preferences to prevail. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Ed Eichman stated the colors were intended to complement and emphasize the architectural and ornamental details on the building.

Mr. Atkins felt the colors were neither bright nor obtrusive but were in character with the style of architecture.

Ms. Heetderks found the colors to be bright and obtrusive.

Mr. Knight moved they approve the amended color palette as submitted on the grounds that it does meet the guidelines. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6-1-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against and Mr. Tremblay abstained.

Discussion

Designation of 215 Avon Street (Brown Milling Company building; recently Beck-Cohen building) as an Individually Protected Property

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The City has contracted with an architectural historian consultant to survey the remaining portions of the Charlottesville/Albemarle County National Register District. This parcel is in the National Estate Register but is not in the local historic district. Based on the criteria in the prepared staff report, Staff recommends the BAR forward the proposal to the Planning Commission and City Council with a recommendation to designate the former Brown Milling Company property at 215 Avon Street as an individually designated historic property.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the owners were making the request. Ms. Scala stated they were not; the City is proposing to fill in all the blanks of historic properties and this was the first to come before the Board.

Mr. Guy Cohen, of Wilco Properties, stated they had only been notified of this meeting on 10 March; the agenda and staff report had only been received this day March 15, 2005. He asked if the matter could be deferred to the April meeting so they could have ample time to review the matter.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to defer. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins felt the property met the criteria and stated the staff report had been well prepared. The motion carried unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 05-03-01
211 East High Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 75
Demolish 1970s rear addition and add new addition
Bob Anderson, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The house is a five-bay Federal house supposedly from 1850. Members' packets included a listing of pertinent guidelines. The 1970s addition, while attractive, is not significant to the architecture or history of the building. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the 1970s addition. The massing and the scale of the new proposed addition are compatible with the existing historic structure. The new roof would be standing seam metal which is appropriate for the location. The proposed fenestration mimics that of the 1970s addition. Vinyl clad wood casement windows are proposed; if approved, staff would recommend the vinyl be off-white to match the trim on the main structure.

Mr. Coiner stated he would see this building from his front door on a daily basis; however, he felt he could be objective and would like to join in the discussion and the vote. Mr. Atkins encouraged Mr. Coiner to participate as they were all neighbors in some degree or another.

Mr. Lucy stated he would abstain from participation in this matter due to multiple associations with the property and its owners.

Mr. Bob Anderson, architect for the project, stated that, after speaking with Ms. Scala, he would prefer to do double hung windows on the first floor.

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

Mr. Coiner felt it had been a good idea to use the smooth stucco.

Mr. Tremblay moved to approve this subject to staff approval of the SDL windows consistent with those they have approved in the past, or true divided light. Mr. Atkins offered a friendly amendment that the trim around the windows on the upper level is to be painted wood and that

they were looking at only the standing seam metal on the addition. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. The motion carried, 7-0-1; Mr. Lucy abstained from the vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-03-02

507 Ridge Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 141

Paint Stucco

David Galgano, Applicant and Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant wants to paint the stucco which has never been painted before. There are patches that do not match the original stucco. The applicant provided a sample of the putty color which had been chosen. The chosen color is in keeping with the original appearance of the stucco, but may be somewhat darker. Staff recommends approval.

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

Mr. Atkins moved to approve the painting of the unpainted stucco as it does meet their guidelines. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-03-03

East side of Fifth Street, Southwest

Tax Map 29 Parcel 11

Paint mural on retaining wall

Alia Anderson, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a concrete block wall beside The Station restaurant on Fifth Street. It ranges from 3.5 to 8 feet tall and is 110 feet long. This is a community project. The wall may be in the City right of way. It is being surveyed; if it is in the right of way, City Council approval would be required. It is an ideal location for a colorful mosaic mural. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of "mosaic" since the application mentioned tile, glass and mortar as well as a section which would be painted on.

Mr. Coiner expressed a desire to abstain from voting on the matter since he did not want to send a message of not supporting public art, but he did not support approving something when he would not know what it was going to look like. Ms. Heetderks felt that was not a reason to abstain as much as a reason to vote against the project.

Ms. Swenson felt part of the beauty of the mosaic would be in the process, not just the final outcome. She felt it was appropriate for them to support that kind of process.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern that tile set in concrete would be more permanent than paint.

Mr. Atkins suggested they approve the concept, the approach, and request submission of the intent of the mural.

Mr. Knight was not comfortable approving a pig in a poke, but there is nothing in the guidelines about public art thereby he was inclined to approve it sight unseen.

Mr. Coiner suggested they ask for materials.

Mr. Tremblay stated his support for Mr. Atkins' suggestion of approval of the concept. Mr. Coiner stated he could support that as well.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the concept and approach to a mosaic mural designed on the spot for this wall on Fifth Street, but that they would like to see the range of color, material range used, and design intent in order to feel more comfortable with knowing what the final product would be like. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6-2; Mr. Knight and Ms. Gardner voted against.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 04-06-05 (Amendment)
East Water Street and East Main Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 150
Transit Center design changes
WRT & ftl/Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. She stated a letter had been received explaining why a cedar sunscreen could no longer be used; the architects wanted to use painted aluminum. The copper standing seam roof on the Water Street bus canopy had been changed to a membrane roof like the one approved for the main structure. The laminated wood columns and beams, which had been approved as Douglas Fir, were now shown as Southern Pine. The change in board was due, in part, to the desire to build a green building. The applicant would get credit for LEED points if there is a source for the wood within 500 miles. They seek to replace the cedar slats with aluminum to be painted a dark color so they would not contrast with the low-e glass. The applicant felt the cedar slats would be a long-term maintenance nightmare for the City.

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

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern that the great things about the building, the materials, were dwindling away one by one leaving something which was not at all what was approved of to begin with. She was not happy with the idea of replacing the wood with aluminum.

Mr. Atkins concurred; he could not support the change to aluminum. He stated there had been a park-like quality to the originally approved plan which was changed to a more industrial quality with the substitution of aluminum.

Ms. Scala stated the applicant could substitute Southern Pine for the cedar if the aluminum was not approved.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of LEED ratings.

Ms. Swenson stated the building had not originally been presented for LEED certification. She explained it was a program of the US Green Building Council that certifies buildings which are built in a sustainable fashion. Ms. Swenson stated that should have been made known in the initial application. While she supported LEED certification, she did not feel the applicant had done a good job of proving that to be one of their goals.

Mr. Knight concurred that the LEED certification may be a red herring. He felt more information was necessary on all points of the application. Mr. Knight also wanted to see samples of the proposed materials. He felt the original proposal had been a small, well-crafted, well-detailed gem using very nice materials. Without clear justification of how these changes would impact everything else, he could not approve them.

With the lack of that information, Mr. Atkins wanted to say no to the substitutions of aluminum for wood; he felt it raised serious questions about the color of glass; he rejected the discovered change to the rubber roof from the copper; he stated "grant some leniency and evaluate the switch to Southern Pine with stain." Mr. Atkins then stated "so moved." Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. Mr. Lucy wondered if they should wait until an applicant could provide additional details. Mr. Knight stated he had been leaning towards deferral and asking for more information. Ms. Swenson felt comfortable supporting the motion; she did not feel she needed more information about the change from copper to membrane. Mr. Knight asked if Mr. Atkins could restate the motion. Mr. Atkins stated the motion was: to deny the substitution of the Lebanese cedar sunscreen with aluminum; to deny the substitution of membrane roofing for the copper on the bus canopy; and to essentially defer the decision on the proposed change to Southern yellow pine for the main structural wood members pending review of a sample that should show the kind of cut, size, and finish; also including raising a concern to review the glazing proposed as it is the Board's understanding that it was without color clear glass with a low-e finish. Mr. Atkins further stated the motion was a challenge to the applicant to either find in the minutes or defend this color in the glass based on previous discussions. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion carried, 6-2; Mr. Knight and Mr. Lucy voted against.

Preliminary Discussion

601 Park Street (formerly Comyn Hall)

Proposal to demolish 1970s addition, replace with enlarged addition; renovate original building

John Matthews, Mitchell/Matthews Architects, Applicant

Ms. Scala stated there would be no staff report since this was a preliminary discussion; however, members did have a copy of the survey as well as materials from the applicant.

Mr. Atkins stated the presentation was very complete and well put together. He referenced Standard One: Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, and mass and placement of the

proposed change are compatible with the site and property. He thought the enlargement of a property to be four times its size was an aggressive strategy but was not inappropriate. He recommended increasing the "hyphen" between the original house and the new building and lowering its mass. He encouraged the applicant to look at a landscaped space between the two buildings.

Mr. Atkins left the meeting at 6:44 p.m. Ms. Heetderks assumed chairmanship of the meeting.

Mr. John Matthews stated they also had an issue with the hyphen. He stated they had tried to maintain the massing. Mr. Matthews stated all parking was obscured. He stated they had used the existing common hall as a model and had replicated some of the major elements in the massing of the facade of the new building. He stated they had incorporated a number of the suggestions of the neighbors.

Ms. Swenson encouraged the applicant to look at the suggestions made by Mr. Atkins.

Mr. Matthews stated the neighbors had suggested demolishing a part of the existing building which was approximately 20 years younger than the original structure.

Ms. Heetderks felt the building was of local significance to the history of Charlottesville and, as such, it was unlikely the Board would approve a request for demolition. Mr. Coiner asked the applicant to be very specific when applying for a demolition permit as part of the formal application.

Mr. Knight felt the curving walkway, the stone walls, and little arbor structure shift the emphasis of the site to the hyphen and the new structure rather than deferring to Comyn Hall. He felt less was more in site design.

Discussion

2005 Preservation Awards

Ms. Scala asked that the members consider for awards those buildings which were already constructed. She asked that nominations be sent to her within the next two weeks so voting could be done at the April meeting.

Other Business

Ms. Heetderks suggested they set a time for a meeting to be held the following week. The members suggested 5:30 p.m. on March 22nd .

Ms. Heetderks asked if there were a mission statement for the Board; she asked that it be incorporated into the orientation/refresher course work session.

Mr. Knight expressed interest in serving on the committee suggested by Mr. Tolbert. Ms. Swenson nominated Mr. Knight to the position. The members concurred.

**Approval of Minutes:
January 18, 2005 and February 15, 2005**

Ms. Heetderks asked for a clarification of the fourth paragraph on page 9 of the February minutes to state that Ms. Heetderks stated the job of the Board was to protect the historic resources and not to accommodate the convenience of the applicant.

Ms. Gardner made a motion to approve the February minutes as amended. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion which passed, 6-0-1; Mr. Knight abstained due to his absence from the February meeting.

Mr. Knight moved they approve the January minutes as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6-0-1; Mr. Tremblay abstained due to his absence from the January meeting.

Adjournment

Mr. Knight moved to adjourn. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned.