

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
December 20, 2005  
Draft Minutes**

**Present:**

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

**Not Present:**

Kate Swenson

**Also Present:**

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Atkins convened the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

There were no matters from the public.

**B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-12-02**

**301 East Market Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 215**

**Reconstruct entrance stairs**

**Georges & Company, Inc., Applicant**

**Peoples Mortgage Co., Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

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

Mr. Wolf felt the detail should be the same on either side of the stair as a way to terminate the new retaining wall.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines, 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 with the inclusion of the cheek wall detail. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### **C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-12-04**

**203 Ridge Street**

**Tax Map 29 Parcel 22**

**Replace fire station's steel windows and concrete coping**

**James R. Boyd, AIA, Applicant**

**City of Charlottesville, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property is a contributing structure in the Ridge Street ADC. It was designed by Milton Grigg and built in 1959. The applicant seeks approval to: replace the existing steel windows with similar looking units but will meet the egress requirements; replace the existing concrete coping with either a square edged coping or metal coping. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Jim Boyd, of Heyward Boyd Architects, stated the manufacturer of the existing windows was no longer in business.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know what type of metal would be used for the coping. Mr. Boyd stated they had not addressed that in the application.

Mr. Atkins called for comments.

Mr. Knight stated the windows seemed to be consistent with the style of the building; the function was an improvement. He expressed a preference for the square precast concrete coping.

Mr. Wolf agreed with Mr. Knight's coping preference.

Mr. Knight, 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 the district, and that the BAR approve the application for the windows as submitted and approve the application for the coping on the building with the stipulation that the square precast concrete be used. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Tremblay expressed concern about a more expensive solution that was difficult to distinguish; he felt that was an odd way to approach it. Mr. Knight stated the building was architecturally significant; he saw the most consistency in using the precast coping. Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for the precast concrete but did not know if he would make it mandatory. The motion carried, 6-2; Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Wolf voted against.

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

**BAR 05-12-03**

**103 Elliewood Avenue**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 100**

**Replace door and glazing; Add new awning, lighting & signage**

**Kevin Hall, Applicant/ Amorgos, LLC, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing structure built approximately 1925. The applicant seeks approval to: replace an existing door with a wood door with glass lights; replace the existing recessed glazing with wood storefront glazing; install a new solid color opaque cloth awning with signing as illustrated in the members' packets -- the Zoning Ordinance requires that signage only go on the front flap, but this awning does not have a flap; install new surface lighting -- either incandescent or fluorescent -- under the awning to light the entrance; paint new wall sign graphic on the recessed wall; repair the existing recessed floor with a new concrete floor. The proposed changes are generally compatible with the building and the historic district. Staff should review the lighting fixtures to ensure they meet the shielding requirement. Signage must receive a separate sign permit.

Mr. Andy Thomas, was present to represent the architect. He stated this was a renovation for a cyber cafe. The intention was to allow more light and visibility. The awning would be anywhere from a bright yellow to a maple with blue lettering.

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

Mr. Wolf stated that, with the exception of seeing samples or that the colors come back for administrative approval, the application was compelling and could be an improvement.

Mr. Wolf, 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 the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the understanding that materials and colors will come back for administrative approval. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Tremblay

suggested they specifically offer a recommendation regarding lettering on the awning. Mr. Wolf amended his motion to include that the Board feels that the lettering as depicted in the perspective drawing submitted on the canopy is acceptable and supports its use provided that the size of the text does not exceed the bottom one foot of the awning dimension. Mr. Knight, as seconder, accepted the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

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

**BAR 05-12-01**

**Downtown Mall -- 200 block West Main Street**

**Newsstand Kiosk**

**Stephen Russell, Applicant**

**City of Charlottesville, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The kiosk would be in the trees in front of the Regal Theater. The stand is about ten feet long, three feet wide at the narrow end and six feet wide at the wide end. The roof measures 15 feet, seven feet and ten feet respectively. The roof height is nine feet, five inches from the ground. City Council approved the location in the grove of trees in front of Regal Theater last May. The newsstand will hold newspapers and magazines on the two long sides and it will hold local weeklies on the wide end. The narrow end contains a clerk access door and window for transactions and a side window. The materials consist of painted MDO side wall panels, painted steel tube columns, painted steel tube beams, a painted steel chassis, painted steel arched trusses, and a painted curved metal roof; a metal paperboy weathervane is on top of the roof. The newsstand sits on an axle and hidden wheels at each end. When the stand is closed, trifold security doors will fold down on each side to cover the magazines. The proposed newsstand is generally compatible with the historic district; staff will need to see color chips before recommending the proposed colors; all signage must receive a separate permit.

Mr. Stephen Russell and Mr. Mike Stoneking were present. A drawing was presented to the Board to show what the newsstand would look like when closed. The applicant expressed concern about the steel doors providing a surface for graffiti and stated a possible deterrent would be having it display newspapers and historic headlines.

Mr. Atkins called for questions.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know how the newsstand was secured to the Mall. The applicant stated it would be by its weight.

Mr. Atkins called for comments.

Mr. Knight liked what the design had become since the last time it had been before the Board.

Mr. Atkins liked the suggestion of graffiti-proof windows and screens.

Mr. Knight expressed a desire for colors to return for administrative approval.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements, moved to find that the proposed design satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with the Mall and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the stipulation that colors come back for administrative approval, signage be approved through the City, that the screen, once it was finally resolved, come back before the Board. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Atkins informed the applicant that if the colors of the graphics on the screen were subdued, it could be a smart way of handling a difficult situation. Mr. Tremblay liked the idea of front page headlines. Generally, the members could support that idea. Ms. Heetderks suggested they use headlines from the Daily Progress.

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

**BAR 05-06-01**

**601 Park Street**

**Tax Map 53 Parcel 4**

**Comyn Hall -- Lighting Details and Window Changes**

**Frank Stoner, Stonehaus Inc, Applicant**

**JABA, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The application had been basically approved at the October meeting. The applicant had provided two lighting plans; the second, showing the maintained lumens, was more accurate. The applicant had also provided a change in the window design for the facade of the new addition. Ms. Scala stated there was an error in the drawing; it showed the windows as four over one when they should be six over one as previously approved. The applicant seeks to change the appearance of the facade windows in the new addition. Staff recommends approval. An adjacent owner, Mr. Heilbronner, had wanted clarification whether the railings around the new building would be wooden or black wrought iron; Mr. Heilbronner expressed a preference for the painted wood railings.

The applicant gave presentations on the lighting and the windows. They would like to modify the lower windows on the Park Street side. The applicant wanted to use larger glass area; this would be more appropriate from the neighborhood and would allow more light into the unit.

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

Ms. Heetderks asked that the applicant address the question of the railing. The applicant stated they were planning a galvanized metal railing.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification whether the pitched roof of the hyphen was metal or asphalt shingles. The applicant stated it would be metal.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, moved to find that the lighting plan, Hyphen window details and revised windows on the new addition facade satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves those parts of the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay moved that they approve the galvanized railings as described by the architect. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried, 7-1; Ms. Gardner voted against.

## **G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

### **BAR 04-06-05**

#### **East Water Street and East Main Street**

#### **Tax Map 53 Parcel 160**

#### **Transit Center and Amphitheater (Revised Belmont Bridge Ramp)**

#### **WRT, Architects (Hank Bishop)**

#### **City of Charlottesville, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval of the following design changes: the previously approved handicapped accessible ramp is being replaced with a long, curving ramp that will not be handicapped accessible. The proposal also shows a handicapped access ramp from the rear of the Amphitheater into the seating area. The Water Street retaining wall has been raised to 17.5 feet at the highest point. The wall material has changed from modular concrete units to Redi-Rock to coordinate with the Pavilion retaining walls. The railings and pole lighting will also coordinate with what has been used in the Pavilion and on the Mall extension. The landscape plan will be revised once the handicapped access ramp is approved. Staff saw no problems with any of the changes.

Mr. Hank Bishop asked that the Redi-Rock wall be raised an additional 1.6 feet above the proposal so it would meet the top of the brick Mechanical Room wall.

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

Mr. Knight felt the request to raise the Redi-Rock wall along Water Street made sense.

Mr. Wolf expressed regret over all the time that was spent by everyone involved on planning the wall; however, he did support raising it so the rails could meet.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, moved to find that the revised Belmont Bridge ramp, Water Street Wall, and the revised landscape plan all 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. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner stated Mr. Bishop had made a revision after the proposal was submitted and asked that that be clarified. Mr. Wolf amended his motion to include that the Board accept the applicant's revision made at the meeting to increase the height of the Water Street wall at the west end where it intersects with the brick veneer of the Transit Center so that the two will align and the handrail is contiguous. Mr. Knight accepted the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

## **H. Preliminary Discussion**

### **Waterhouse mixed use project -- 218 West Water Street**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The site is located between Water Street and South Street. The proposal includes demolition of a portion of the building on Water Street. The applicant had submitted information and drawings. Ms. Scala suggested they discuss: whether the demolition of the building was appropriate; setbacks; massing; scale; and street level design.

Mr. Bill Atwood, project designer, felt they had met the Zoning. He stated he was not only the architect, but he also had the building under contract. The building is of 1940s vintage; the extension dates from 1974. Mr. Atwood made use of a diagram to explain his proposal to the Board.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the applicant wanted feedback on the proposal to demolish the service bay. Mr. Atwood concurred, stating that the building did not have a lot of structural qualities.

Mr. Tremblay stated he would have no problem with demolishing the service structure.

Mr. Wolf stated the back elevation looked good. He sought clarification as to the number of entrances. Mr. Atwood stated there would be two entrances. The principal entrance was on Water Street; the back entrance was more of a pedestrian kind of opening.

Ms. Gardner got a sense of walking down a side street in New York where you had densely packed and then a wide, mammoth opening. She stated she was uncomfortable with such a plan in a city like Charlottesville.

Mr. Atkins stated the density seemed at odds with the parking lots on both sides of the building.

Mr. Lucy felt demolishing the one-story wing was fine. He felt the three segment concept was good.

Ms. Gardner concurred on the demolition.

Mr. Wolf found the demolition acceptable. While he liked the scale of the back of the building, he did not think the front was as successful.

Ms. Heetderks liked the rear of the building. She found the cantilevered sail portion to be intimidating and off putting as a pedestrian; she did not find its form or materials to be in keeping with the area. Ms. Heetderks did not have a problem with the demolition of the one-story.

Mr. Tremblay was intrigued by the conceptual stage.

Mr. Coiner stated he would support the demolition of the garage section. He reminded the applicant that either 3-D renderings or a model are necessary for a project of this size.

Mr. Knight concurred with the other members about the possible demolition. He wanted to see the Water Street and South Street masses developed and articulated a little more, especially at street level. He felt the sail was not a contextual piece.

Mr. Atkins concurred with Mr. Coiner that a physical model would be helpful. The size and massing seemed appropriate.

## **I. Request for BAR support for National/State Register nomination**

### **C.B. Holt Rock House, 1010 Preston Avenue**

Ms. Scala stated a motion was necessary for the Rock house. She stated a letter would be needed stating they recommended.

Ms. Heetderks made a motion enthusiastically supporting National/State Register nomination for the Rock House and commending the organization, Legal Aid Justice Center, for the conscientious way in which they were restoring this building. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **J. Matters from the public**

There were no matters from the public.

## **K. Other Business**

Mr. Lucy wanted to know if the design guidelines provided the appropriate tools needed to review the sizeable area of new structures or if it provided tools to encourage preservation of some of those structures.



## **L. Adjournment to Annual Holiday Party**

Mr. Wolf moved to adjourn. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion carried unanimously, whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:52 p.m.