

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
November 15, 2005
Draft Minutes**

Present:

Joe Atkins, Chair

Fred Wolf, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay

Preston Coiner

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Syd Knight

Bill Lucy

Kate Swenson

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Atkins called for matters from the public; there were none.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-10-01

513 Dice Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 63.1

Exterior restoration of dwelling (Add three fixed skylights)

Jane Covington, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had been before the Board at the 18 October meeting. An application to restore the two-story dwelling had been approved. The applicant proposes exterior renovations in accordance with Secretary of Interior Standards. The applicant wishes to amend the approval to allow three fixed, flat, inoperable, low profile, not reflective, clear glass skylights in the roof on the rear elevation. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Covington was present to answer any questions, but had nothing to add to the Staff report.

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

Ms. Covington stated it was extremely important that she receive the historic renovation income tax credit. She asked the Board to move quickly on approving the Fifeville Neighborhood as a historic district.

Mr. Coiner expressed his support for the proposal.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed change satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and that BAR approves the application submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins asked if they could add language of general support and specific guidance continued through Mary Joy, Staff and the City. Mr. Tremblay accepted that as a friendly amendment as did Mr. Coiner. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

(Deferred from October 18, 2005)

BAR 05-10-06

116 Second Street, NE

Tax Map 33 Parcel 243

Replace Market Street door

VMDO Architects, PC, Applicants

Second & Market Development, Owner

Mr. Atkins, as part owner of VMDO Architects, recused himself from the matter.

Mr. Joe Celentano, of VMDO, apologized to the Board for not having been present for the October meeting. He stated having places that feel active and are part of the street life is

important. A good way to do that was to get that opening as transparent as possible. That area was the reception area as well as a presentation/gathering area. Mr. Celentano provided the Board with a 1919 postcard showing the original shape of the building.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public; there being none, he called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay sought an explanation for not retaining the five light transom. Mr. Celentano stated they wanted to get the opening as large as possible and as simple as possible in a way that is similar to the original building opening.

Ms. Heetderks asked if they could retain the transom and raise the canopy above it. Mr. Celentano stated the canopy is above the transom in the drawing provided to the Board.

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

Ms. Heetderks expressed a preference for the transom to be retained.

Mr. Tremblay stated his comfort with not retaining the transom.

Ms. Swenson was comfortable with removing the transom since the building had morphed so many times.

Mr. Wolf agreed that the entrance had been modified to such a degree that the existing parts were not part of the original structure. In general, he was in support of the proposal.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this District and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson asked what would happen to the existing doors when they were removed. The applicant was unsure but suggested a salvage yard. Mr. Coiner thought perhaps they be saved and stored somewhere in case someone wanted to go back to the existing facade. Mr. Wolf called the question; the motion carried.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

(Deferred from October 18, 2005)

BAR 05-10-05

315 and 313-317 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 198 and 197

Demolish two buildings

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Applicant

Mooney West Main Street, LLC, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the October meeting, the Board voted 8-0 to allow demolition of the corner building and then the applicant requested deferral of the demolition request for the building on the left. Since that meeting, the applicant has submitted a structural report. The building was built in 1938 with additions in 1947 and 1951. The structural report concludes that the building is in poor condition and its findings support the proposed demolition.

Mr. Russell Mooney was present. He stated his representative, Mr. Eddie Bane, was unable to attend; Mr. Bane had prepared the structural report.

Mr. Steve Barber, project engineer, stated many conditions with the potential to be unsafe had been noted. He stated it would cost more to rehabilitate the structure than it would to demolish.

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

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that the building had been in the same family since it was built. Mr. Mooney concurred. He explained the corner building had been rented out but the other building had not been rented for the last ten years.

Ms. Swenson wanted to know about the last major repair to the building. Mr. Mooney stated the last repair was in 1963 when it was changed from an automobile showroom to office space.

Ms. Swenson asked if the north addition could be separated from the building. Mr. Barber stated all or any part of the building could be demolished, but the unsafe conditions were throughout the entire building.

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

Ms. Heetderks was distressed about what appeared to be demolition by neglect. The property has been owned by the family since it was built and has been ignored in terms of maintenance. She felt this building was an infrequent example due to some of the detailing. She felt it had potential.

Mr. Tremblay stated that, as the building had evolved, its ability to earn or return had diminished or largely evaporated. He stated a lot of the uniqueness had disappeared. He expressed support for demolition.

Mr. Lucy had been surprised to find this was in the Downtown District. He had researched the property and had discovered it was in the district due to its location based on the zoning ordinance and not due to any characteristics of the structure.

Mr. Coiner stated he had been waiting several years for someone to come up with an adaptive reuse of the building. Prior to receiving the structural report, he had been prepared to deny demolition.

Ms. Heetderks stated the structural report was one of 14 criteria to be considered. She stated the report did not seem to say the building was beyond repair; it just said it could cost more to repair than to replace.

Mr. Wolf found the report compelling. He also stated he did not find the characteristics of the building to be particularly special.

Mr. Knight did not find the building to be a good enough of the architectural style.

Ms. Swenson, citing the adaptive reuse of the Belmont building, expressed concern about the proposed demolition.

Mr. Atkins felt the building had many negatives in the criteria for demolition.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, moved to deny the request for demolition at 313-317 West Main finding it does not satisfy the BAR's criteria -- she noted the demolition of 315 West Main had been approved at the October meeting -- this motion is made considering specifically that the building represents a unique example of the automotive culture of West Main and one of the few areas remaining from the Vinegar Hill Neighborhood. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion failed.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolitions about which they had spoken extensively, moved to approve the request for demolition of 315 West Main Street, earlier described as Tax Map 32 Parcel 197, finding that it does satisfy the BAR's criteria to allow demolition. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion carried, 7-2.

Mr. Lucy left the meeting at 6:15 p.m. to attend the CPC meeting.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-11-01

616 Park Street

Tax Map 52 Parcel 184

Replace kitchen addition in rear

Marla Ziegler, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. On 20 September approval had been given for demolition of the kitchen addition and any damaged portion of the historic structure. A tree had fallen on the structure. The proposed addition is respectful of the massing, scale, size and architectural features of the main house and other historic houses in the district. The materials, painted wood and standing seam metal, are the same as those used on the main house. The new windows and doors are simple in design and compatible with those on the main house. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Knight, having considered the Guidelines, moved to approve the kitchen addition and related site improvements as submitted and paint changes with the specific inclusion that any of the listed options that they see in the application are to be considered approved as well. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting stood in recess at 6:31 p.m.

Mr. Atkins reconvened the meeting at 6:43 p.m.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-11-02

200 Second Street NW

Tax Map 33 Parcel 174

Rebuilding McGuffey Park

Kristen Suokko, Friends of McGuffey Park, Applicants

City of Charlottesville, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. McGuffey Park and McGuffey School were not yet in the North Downtown District, but they were proposed to be added. There had been a large house on the park site; it was unknown when it had been demolished. The McGuffey School was built in 1915. The applicants seek approval of the current conceptual plan for McGuffey park. The plan includes preservation of the rock wall. The Second Street entrance is planned to be eliminated; new entrances are proposed at the corner of High Street and Second and also from Jefferson Street. The existing green roof covering parking for McGuffey Hill Condominiums will be maintained as a demonstration roof garden. The plan will be implemented in phases as funding becomes available.

Ms. Swenson stated she would abstain from voting as she was a founding member of Friends of McGuffey Park.

Mr. Coiner stated he was in that neighborhood and used that park. He stated he had attended several meetings and supported the concept. He felt comfortable that he could participate without prejudice. Mr. Atkins concurred.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about the legality of approving something over which they did not yet have jurisdiction. Mr. Coiner stated the applicant was asking for approval. Mr. Atkins suggested they move ahead as if it was a legitimate request and proposal.

Ms. Kristen Suokko and Ms. Elvira Hoskins were present on behalf of Friends of McGuffy Park. Ms. Suokko explained Friends had been formed in 2004 because the Park was not living up to its potential. Comments were being sought on the basic approach.

A representative of the applicants, who did not provide his name for the record, gave a presentation of the proposal.

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

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that the concept only was being discussed; materials and detailing would come back later. The applicants' representative concurred.

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

Mr. Knight stated he was impressed. Conceptually, the proposal was well done. He suggested the applicants consider maintenance as they design.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about the High Street entrance.

Mr. Atkins thought it was a fantastic design. He supported it wholeheartedly.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Public Improvements, moved to find the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and the historic district and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the understanding that materials and additional details will be returning. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Knight offered a friendly amendment that the motion be for approval of "the concept." Ms. Heetderks clarified the motion was for the proposed concept, not the proposed changes. Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment to reword the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Swenson having recused herself from the vote.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-11-03

325-327 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 195

Change to facade

Main Street Associates, LLC, Applicants

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The building was built in 1956. The applicant seeks approval to redesign the storefront by removing a window and two doors and replacing them with a symmetrical design consisting of a new center glass window and two new flanking doors. The new design will fit into the existing brick opening. The brick surface will be cleaned and painted a different color. The new window will be thermal paned set in a walnut frame. The proposed changes are compatible with the building.

A representative of the applicant, who failed to introduce himself, was present to answer questions.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public or Board.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the choice of the walnut color. The representative stated it was a dark color and not too orange.

Ms. Swenson, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks asked if Ms. Swenson meant to add that it was with the understanding that the color would be approved administratively. Ms. Swenson and Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-11-04

405 Ridge Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 133

New construction to replace cottage in rear

Jeff and Susan Lanterman, Applicants

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the 21 June meeting, the Board approved the applicants' request to demolish the structure at the rear yard. The applicants deferred their request to replace the second house until more detailed plans could be prepared. The application is to build a new accessory dwelling to replace the tenant house. The proposal shows a stucco material, but the applicants have decided to use all Hardiplank siding. The proposed Marvin windows are two

over two, painted wood with simulated divided light. Staff feels the proposed second house should be simple and subordinate to the main house. The site plan shows the proposal meets the minimum five foot setbacks. Still needed are: color samples, window sample or cut sheet, an accurate revised drawing. Staff suggests the Board make comments and request any missing information, and the applicant should request deferral until the information has been submitted. Ms. Scala noted some of the missing items were currently before the Board.

Mr. Jeff Lanternman stated they had learned that day that the proposed setback was nonconforming. He stated they would meet the conforming setback.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification that Ms. Scala was satisfied that the site plan before the Board qualified as a site plan. Ms. Scala stated it did not show a fence the Lanternmans had mentioned wanting, also the house would have to be changed to meet the setbacks; other than that, she concurred that it did qualify.

Mr. Atkins called for comments.

Mr. Coiner concurred with the staff assessment it should be a simpler structure.

Mr. Tremblay was comfortable with the proposal.

Mr. Knight felt it was a nice design. However he felt there was not much relation between the architecture of the main structure and the proposal.

Mr. Wolf and Ms. Heetderks expressed concern over the size of the proposed building.

Mr. Atkins expressed concern about how to frame the approach to the project. He wondered if a secondary structure on a prominent historic site would detract from the historic qualities of the main house. He felt the size and mass of the second structure was not compromising the main house. He suggested the roof line and porch be simplified.

Mr. Atkins, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed changes -- the overall scale, mass and concept design of the secondary house -- satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as such with the requirement that a completed site plan showing the final position of the house and all site improvements between the main house and the secondary house come back, also addressing the modest changes to simplify the design in that it would not detract from the main house. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Swenson left the meeting at 7:58 p.m. to attend the CPC meeting.

I. Election of BAR Officers for 2006

Mr. Coiner moved that Mr. Atkins serve as Chair, Mr. Wolf as Vice Chair and Ms. Scala as Secretary for a period until their seats were filled by Council. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion which passed. Ms. Scala stated new elections would be held after the two seats were filled.

J. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Heetderks asked that the third to bottom paragraph on page 8 be corrected to show that the Guidelines do allow for faux slate replacement as needed.

Mr. Coiner noted a member of the public's street address was shown as Pine Street and should have been Wine Street.

Ms. Gardner thought, that after the motion, they has asked that Comyn Hall come back before the Board with the detail of the two story glass front that was a connector of the hyphen.

Ms. Heetderks moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Matters from the public

There were no matters from the public.

L. Other Business

Mr. Atkins asked if anyone was interested in serving on a Conservation District Committee. Mr. Atkins volunteered to serve as did Ms. Gardner and Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Coiner asked that Ms. Scala ask the Paramount Theater to find out when the electrical transformers would be screened.

Mr. Knight wanted confirmation that the lights on the dining terrace of the Omni were the lights which had been approved.

M. Adjournment

Ms. Heetderks moved to adjourn. Mr. Knight seconded the motion which carried unanimously. The meeting stood adjourned at 8:19 p.m.