

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
April 18, 2006  
Minutes**

**Present: Not Present:**

Fred Wolf, Chair William Adams

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay **Also Present:**

Preston Coiner Mary Joy Scala

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Kate Swenson

Bill Lucy

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

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

Mr. Wolf called for matters from the public. There were none.

**B. Preliminary Discussion**

**310 West Main Street**

**Tax Map 32 Parcel 197, 198, 199**

**The Rebkee Co., Owner/Carter & Burgess, Applicant**

**CVS Mixed-Use Project**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition of 301 and 315 West Main Street were given at the end of last year. The property is located in the Downtown ADC District. The applicant seeks a preliminary discussion of a proposed three-story mixed use building at the corner of Ridge Street/McIntire Road and West Main Street. The main structure will include retail on the first floor and two stories of residential units above. The residences will be accessed through a one-story lobby area on the west side of the building with elevators and stair. Vehicles access the rear parking area and drive through window from Ridge Street/McIntire Road or Fourth Street entrances and exit only via Fourth Street. There are two levels of parking; one is located under the building. The loading and trash area are on the retail level; they may need to be screened from view on West Main Street. The structure is pulled to the property line by means of a one-story arcade with turrets above, a three-story corner tower, and several projecting three-story porches. Proposed materials for the first floor have not yet been provided. The signage shown probably is accepted according to the Ordinance. Staff feels this is a very important corner in Downtown Charlottesville. The site plan and building design

should be addressed by the Board. The site deserves a significant building including the corner tower element; this may be an appropriate location for a tower. Traditional Charlottesville material, such as a brick building with a standing seam metal roof, would be appropriate in this location. If the applicant prefers a traditional design, then the architectural details should relate to Charlottesville architecture.

Mr. John Mack, of Carter & Burgess Architects, gave a presentation to the Board. He stated they want to echo the local architecture. The two residential floors would have 12 units each in a mixture of one bedroom, studio, and two bedroom layouts. The majority of the building would be masonry or brick. A water table would be introduced in terms of precast or limestone materials. The roof would be asphalt shingles with the feature tower having a standing seam metal roof. He stated this was still a work in progress and nothing was yet finalized.

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

Mr. Knight sought clarification of how pedestrians would access the building from the parking area. Mr. Mack used a diagram to demonstrate.

Ms. Swenson wanted to know if there was a residential access on McIntire. Mr. Mack stated there was not; the only entrance at this time is on Main Street.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what determined the footprint of the site. Mr. Mack stated the building footprint was the footprint of the arcade. He further stated the interior box was representative of a prototypical CVS but the exterior footprint would relate to the street and its relationship to the property line.

Ms. Gardner asked if the applicant had found any uses of arcades or colonnades other than the University. Mr. Mack stated they had not; the intention was to capture the feeling of the University.

Ms. Swenson asked if the windows of the elevator tower would be transparent and what would be seen if they were. Mr. Mack stated the windows would be transparent with some spandrel glass at the floor. The elevators would be glass enclosed. Vertical transportation would be seen with an open stairwell.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification of what generated the 20 foot first floor height. Mr. Mack stated the height was driven by the potential commercial user, CVS.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know the range of numbers of residents. Mr. Mack could not speak to that at this time.

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

Mr. Knight agreed that this was an important site and that it was an anchor to the West Main Corridor. He thought the mixed use development was good and that some of the elements, such as the arcade, could be good, too. However, in terms of the building, he saw the CVS Corporate

standard model number 2 wrapped in a ersatz Jeffersonian architecture on two sides. He did not think either of those succeed. The corporate box did not respond to the needs of the site in terms of scale, mass, response to the configuration of the site or the topography of the site. He stated the site plan had a long way to go before it could be considered worked out. The wrapper on the south and east sides of the building was not appropriate to the setting. He suggested the applicant look at the West Main Street Corridor and Downtown and give the Board an idea of where all the architectural details were coming from. Mr. Knight did not see any direct relation to any contextual examples reflected in the building. Mr. Knight stated the facades were over designed. He stated he did not see this meeting the Guidelines. Mr. Knight thought the building needed to be fundamentally rethought.

Mr. Coiner and had nothing to add other than a suggestion to scrutinize the Guidelines very carefully.

Mr. Tremblay stated he had nothing creative to offer.

Ms. Heetderks stated she recognized a lot of Charlottesville architecture in the design -- the opera house, the Courthouse, the Pavilions and the Lawn. She stated the problem was those are monuments of local civic architecture and this was a drugstore. She expressed concern that the building trivialized 300 West Main and the Lewis & Clark monument.

Mr. Wolf appreciated that the applicant talked about the CVS being the secondary component, but it did not read that way. He felt they should consider the building from an urban design analysis and then figure out how the store would fit into it as if the building had existed prior to the store. This is a critical footprint on the topography of Downtown, and it was important this building was looked at from that standpoint.

Ms. Gardner stated she would ditto everything said by Mr. Knight and Mr. Wolf. She further stated it seemed they were designing for their tenant which was fine in other areas of the City but not in this location.

Mr. Lucy felt the 175 foot length with only one access would be a problem for pedestrians. He stated the arcade and classical features seemed out of place and over done.

Ms. Swenson stated the transparency of the elevator and stairwell with 50 foot columns in front of the stairwell was not appropriate. The underground parking was a brilliant move. This project seemed like a big box, but perhaps a whole new version of the big box could be developed here that would have a pedestrian friendly engagement with entrances and windows.

Ms. Swenson suggested they consider if there was any way to have a mix of smaller retail as well as the CVS. Mr. Mack stated they did not have the ability to look at multiple tenants in this footprint.

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

**BAR 06-04-01**

## **101-105-107-111 East Main Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 244, 248, 249, 250, 251**

**Keith O. Woodard, Owner/A2RC1 Architects, PC, Applicant**

### **Selective demolition of buildings on site**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Members' packets contained the City Council resolution from September 18, 2000. At that time Council denied demolition of the four structures except for certain parts. That permit expired. In May, 2002, the BAR considered partial demolitions of the four buildings and approved partial demolitions identical to City Council's resolution. The applicant is seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of 107 East Main, the building with a concrete front, and selective demolition of 101, 105 and 111 East Main Street. The selective demolition will include the stabilization and preservation of existing facades on Main and First Streets except replacement of the existing storefronts with a respectful interpretation and replacement of interior structural framings to meet current standards. Ms. Scala reminded the Board they must not consider the proposed use of the properties but must only consider the criteria standards and Guidelines pertaining to demolition. In addition to the submission booklet from the applicant, members had received a packet from Preservation Piedmont which included excerpts from previous City-prepared reports. Justifications for decisions must be noted so they do not adversely set precedents for future demolition requests, especially on the Mall. Previously City Council did not approve demolition of 101, nor the three-story part of 105, nor the facade of 111. Staff recommends that if particular portions of the exterior should be preserved, the Board must consider if portions of the interior must also be preserved in order to make that happen. Staff recommends, at a minimum, the facades of 101, 105, and 111 must be preserved and restored. The storefront of 101 should be preserved and restored.

Ms. Heetderks asked, since this application was independent and discrete from the application for new construction which would possibly be considered after this and since the Board was not to consider what was to be built on the site should demolition be granted, that the drawings should be removed while the demolition request was considered. Mr. Wolf agreed.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification as to whether this was a preliminary request as was stated on the sign on the building, or an application. Ms. Scala stated it was a real application for demolition. She also stated everyone was correctly notified by letter.

Mr. Greg Brezinski, of A2RC1 Architects, was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated they were seeking partial demolition of interior structural framing, roof framing, and the north walls facing the alley of buildings 101, 105, 107, and 111 East Main Street. Mr. Brezinski gave a brief presentation which included: the historical overview of the property; its existing condition -- the buildings are stable but no longer meet floor loading requirements, snow loading requirements, seismic requirements; a response to the standards; how to stabilize the building during the demolition process; and a brief summary likening the building to the history of the Downtown

Mall. Mr. Ilios LaGazaros, a Structural Engineer with McPherson Design Group, helped with the presentation.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Mr. Brian Broadus, stating his understanding that masonry would remain but essentially everything else was being removed, asked if there had been a more specific demolition specification proffered to the Board and whether there had been an inventory of the condition of those elements. He also asked what was going to be done to the exterior of the facade in order to make the temporary connection to the exterior steel framework and how would that intervention be repaired later. Mr. LaGazaros stated there was no exterior steel work anticipated in the project; the steel would be removed once the facade had been properly connected. Through bolts would be used to hold the temporary steel beam in place. Mr. LaGazaros did not think the through bolts would damage the facade.

Ms. Swenson wanted to know what doors or other pieces would be removed. Mr. Brezinski knew of one pair of doors which would be removed. Some period trim remains, but it has been predominantly replaced.

Ms. Heetderks asked if anything had changed in the condition of the buildings since the BAR denied demolition in March of 2000, August of 2000, City Council substantially in September of 2000, and the BAR again in May of 2002. Mr. Brezinski answered in the negative and stated the buildings have had a new roof put on. He stated the only difference is the Building Codes requiring seismic requirements.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. Aaron Wunsch, of 338 Monticello Road, and Vice President of Preservation Piedmont, read a prepared statement in opposition of the proposal. He stated this was not preservation.

Ms. Gina Haney, of 807 Elliott Avenue, and a member of Preservation Piedmont, spoke in opposition of the proposal. She expressed concern about the effects of selective demolition on Main Street.

Mr. Maurice Cox, citizen of Charlottesville and former City Council member and mayor, stated he had been on Council when both previous applications came before the Board of Architectural Review and subsequently to Council. He thanked the Board for going over this again. Nothing has fundamentally changed since Council came to a compromise that tried to preserve the historic character of this block while allowing for its adaptive reuse. He is excited there is a development possibility on this site. He expressed confidence that the developer team could adaptively reuse as well as add to the site. He hoped the Board would respect the work which had been done before by the BAR and Council. Mr. Lucy asked Mr. Cox what the compromise had been. Mr. Cox stated his best recollection was that 101 be kept intact; 107, having been defaced, offered an opportunity to insert an appropriately scaled entrance into a new building that may be developed in the interior of the block; 111 was also deemed probably the most

valuable of the exterior facades and the compromise was that an effort to preserve that as a facade could be done.

Mr. Brian Broadus spoke in opposition of the proposal. Charlottesville is no longer full of 19th century facades.

Mr. Don Spark, a local architect specializing in historic preservation, stated the argument about economic interest falls short. He did not see a gain by building these buildings out and building up over the top of the facade.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner noted that even though Council had reached a compromise, the BAR is not allowed to compromise.

Ms. Heetderks did not see any change since the last time this had been before the Board. She saw no justification for the demolition of 101, 105, or 111. She stated she was interested in the arguments about the integrity of 101 after the first 20 to 40 feet. She did not feel strongly about 107. She did not see how this Board could be consistent and make any decision that was any different from the one made three times on these structures. She argued they should consider each address individually.

Ms. Swenson did not want her comments to be interpreted that she would not like to see these buildings preserved and restored. She was troubled by the tenor that nothing has changed. She did not think they should relish empty, boarded up buildings. She hoped that the buildings would be reinhabited.

Mr. Lucy asked if there had been any discussions by the Board about preserving facades and the situations in which that might be an appropriate action. Ms. Heetderks, asking if he meant the shell of the building and not just the front facade, stated everything the Board does is de facto facadism since they had no control over what happens in the interior of any of these buildings. Mr. Lucy stated that if they thought about what was valued by the public about these structures, he would be surprised if it was the interiors or the rears; he further stated it was apparent it would be the facades and the First Street side. Mr. Lucy felt discussion of the plan could be considered along with preservation and demolition should be discussed in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Wolf stated the more that you disintegrate the representative buildings, the more you deteriorate the fabric that creates the background for the special and monumental. The importance of the building to the scale and character of that street, along with the comments made by the past mayor, made him more empathetic to the notion that what had gone before in the decisions that have been made seem like an appropriate starting point.

Mr. Knight stated he shared some of the frustration with the requirement to not look ahead. He felt that in order to have a meaningful discussion, they needed to be able to look ahead. Mr. Knight thanked Mr. Brezinski for the even-handedness and fairness of his analysis and structural analysis. He appreciated the objectivity. He stated he was leaning toward following the precedent

that was established by the compromise and denying demolition on 101, 105; he was open to discussion on the other buildings.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to deny the application for demolition of 101 and 105 East Main Street based on City Code Section 34-284 (b)(1) and (2), the pertinent standards for considering demolitions including (a)(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (b), (e)(2), (e)(3), (e)(4), (e)(5), and (e)(6). Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Tremblay expressed concern that they were hamstringing the process and that it would not proceed. Ms. Swenson wondered if they could separate out 101. Ms. Heetderks did not see the merits of that since this was, functionally, a duplex. Mr. Wolf stated that, as the two-story portion of 105 was previously approved for demolition by City Council and ratified by the Board, it would be a fair statement to go back to that point. Mr. Coiner clarified the Board had denied that before Council approved it. Ms. Heetderks stated she was not willing to amend her motion on that point. Mr. Knight stated he could see the merits for removal of the two-story portion. Mr. Lucy stated he wanted to approach this in a way that would get the best result for the city. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion failed, 2-6; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner voted in favor.

Mr. Lucy moved that they permit the demolition of 107 East Main. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson stated this was consistent with the former findings of the BAR and City Council. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the demolition of the rear two-story addition to 105 East Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria, but that 101 in its entirety and the three-story front portion of 105 do not meet the criteria for demolition and that the Board approve only the demolition of the rear two-story addition to 105 East Main Street. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner did not think it was an addition and asked that they call it the rear portion. He stated he would vote against it because he did not think there was any difference in 101 and 105 other than the height. Ms. Heetderks echoed Mr. Coiner's point. Mr. Knight and Mr. Lucy accepted the change from "addition" to "rear portion." The motion passed, 5-3; Mr. Coiner, Ms. Heetderks, and Mr. Tremblay voted against.

Mr. Wolf stated that left 111. Mr. Lucy moved to retain the facade and to permit the demolition of the remainder. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks sought clarification of how many feet in terms of depth were meant in facade. Mr. Lucy stated he meant the wall, but if more was necessary to maintain structural integrity. Mr. Brezinski stated 3 to 4 feet was necessary in order to provide enough stability for the supports on either end. Ms. Swenson sought clarification of the depth of the three-story portion of 105; Mr. Brezinski stated that was roughly 40 feet. Ms. Swenson suggested the intention of the motion was to save the facade. Ms. Heetderks wondered if the same thing might be accomplished by -- instead of allowing the demolition of original historic fabric which sets unfortunate precedent -- simply allowing the demolition of the rear wall with the assumption that if something is built, the Board won't know what happens to the interior of that building and that this would not be an endorsement of facadism on the part of this Board. Ms. Swenson suggested the applicant assure the Board, pending this resolution, there would be no demolition until he gets the building permit. Ms. Heetderks was not sure that was

legal but wanted to hear what Lisa Kelley would say about that. Mr. Coiner stated that had come up in the past and was not a condition they could impose on the builder. Ms. Swenson felt they should express that there was a balance between preserving 101 and 105 and the street front of 111, but recognizing that in the best interest of some unknown future plan there is a balance there that would serve the best interest of the City in this instance. She further stated that the Board could later say there has to be a 40 foot setback. Ms. Heetderks stated that would be too late as the demolition would have already been granted for all those 40 feet. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 6-2; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner voted against.

Mr. Coiner stated the applicant has really proven themselves with the thoroughness of their application and their promises for the future. Mr. Coiner stated they had basically upheld a decision that was made four years ago.

Mr. Wolf called a brief recess at 7:32 p.m. He reconvened the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

#### **D. Preliminary Discussion**

##### **101-105-107-111 East Main Street**

##### **Tax Map 33 Parcel 244, 248, 249, 250, 251**

##### **Keith O. Woodard, Owner/A2RC1 Architects, PC, Applicant**

##### **New construction -- Market, 1st and Main**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A preliminary discussion had been held on this at the March meeting. At that time the Board had liked the way the design was developing but urged restraint and sympathy with other buildings on the Mall and a smaller scale on Market Street. Staff felt more information was needed on the elevation to determine if setbacks are being met on Market Street. The larger building should be articulated in a way that respects the historic buildings in the Downtown ADC District, especially the buildings that it rises above. In the latest sketches, the historic buildings have been altered to the point that they are not recognizable. The Market Street tower and the Main Street entrance are important features the BAR should address.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification that the project could not be built as designed because of the denial of the demolition of 101. Mr. Wolf confirmed that. However, he thought there could be some beneficial conversation about the quality of the elevations, the quality of some of the massing, the types of things the building appears to try to do.

Mr. Michael Bore, of Humphries & Partners, made a presentation to the Board. The retail character of the first level on the Main Street side would be retained. The First Street height would be used as a guideline to create a base for the building. He stated there were not many buildings of this size in Charlottesville upon which they could draw. He stated that, as Thomas Jefferson had drawn upon resources from other countries, they too had taken forms and elements from other architects who were brilliant at the execution of more traditional architecture.



Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Mr. Aaron Wunsch, of Preservation Piedmont, noting that 111 is shown as a building without arches, asked if the facade was to be preserved or not. That was an error on the general drawing. Mr. Wunsch then asked the Board, and particularly Ms. Swenson, why these buildings could not be reused while keeping them substantially intact; he suggested it was not structural integrity nor the configuration of the internal space. Ms. Swenson stated she had not meant to suggest that these buildings deserved to be torn down, but rather to suggest that empty buildings not changing was not the primary element to be celebrated. Ms. Swenson stated her voting on the record stands and she stands by it with many of her colleagues.

A member of the public, who did not clearly announce his name for the record, sought clarification of the relevance of Jefferson in considering the context of downtown Charlottesville when he had specifically moved his University away from the urban area. He stated the use of "Jefferson" seemed to be a lame bit of fluff typical in architectural presentations. Mr. Bore stated he had hesitated to invoke the name. He further stated the name was used because he took from other resources instead of just looking to Charlottesville which had been a comment made about the last presentation.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification if the tower on the Market Street facade was a decorative element or functional. Mr. Bore stated it had been envisioned as a flag pole or some other decorative element.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. John Stohlman, of North First Street, commended the developer on the design of a mixed use development. However, he stated the proposal clearly violates the BAR Guidelines on additions. The building seemed like it would be totally out of character. He stated the BAR should be stewards of the historic buildings.

Mr. Maurice Cox stated he felt a certain amount of responsibility to the Board and the developer because he had advocated to see higher density mixed use residential development downtown. He felt this was a healthy, positive trend. He appreciated the attention the Board was giving the matter since these were very important buildings.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Lucy felt the footprint issue was crucial.

Ms. Swenson stated the Guideline they most needed to consider was the appropriateness of the scale and massing of the new building within the historic district. She stated both Zoning Codes and BAR Guidelines needed to be considered and this proposal appeared to exceed the Guidelines.

Mr. Knight stated the building was still essentially a big rectangle. The mass is unprecedented. Mr. Knight stated the detailing, materials and forms were continuing to improve, but he still suggested simplification.

Mr. Wolf thanked Mr. Cox for his observations. Mr. Wolf applauded the architect for the level of study and consideration in terms of the elevation. However, he expressed concern about First and Market Streets which seemed to have a grander scale than the Mall.

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

**BAR 06-04-09**

**216 Water Street**

**Tax Map 28 Parcel 84**

**Oliver Kuttner, Owner/William Atwood, Applicant**

### **Demolition of one-story building**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property is contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. The garage addition was constructed in 1974. Staff had gone through all the criteria, standards and guidelines and recommend approval of the demolition as proposed.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public and then the Board. There being no questions, he called for comments from the public and the Board.

Mr. Coiner noted for the public that this had been discussed on at least two other occasions.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed demolition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Ms. Heetderks was not present when the vote was taken.

## **F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Changed to Preliminary Discussion at the applicant's request)**

**BAR 06-04-03**

**218 West Water Street**

**Tax Map 28 Parcel 84**

**Oliver Kuttner, Owner/Atwood Architects, Inc., Applicant**

## **New mixed use building**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Preliminary discussions had been held in December and February. The current design had been seen at the March meeting; the applicant was to call the members for comments. There are several buildings in the scheme with a landscaped plaza between the South Street and the Water Street buildings. Staff feels more detail is needed as well as additional drawings. Staff suggests this be treated as a preliminary and ask the applicant to defer.

Mr. William Atwood asked that they stay at the preliminary discussion stage. He stated he had spoken with all but three of the Board members on a one-on-one basis in an attempt to get suggestions on the proposal. They had met with the South Street neighbors and the Lewis & Clark neighbors. Discussions had led to a design with a townhouse look. They had decided that three was a more appropriate number of stories for the street front. The base of the building was redesigned. There would be no more garage doors.

Mr. Wolf called for questions and comments from the public.

Ms. Stacy Meckland expressed concern about the potential demolition.

Mr. Wolf called for questions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know the dimensions of the plaza. The applicant stated it was about 30 feet but they wanted to make it wider.

Mr. Knight thought treating Water Street and South Street differently was a bold stroke. He suggested the applicant not forget about the east and west ends as the plaza was developed. Regarding the Water Street part of the development, he stated variety was not to be avoided, but it was also not something which could be forced. He stated the vertical pieces worked well.

Ms. Heetderks echoed Mr. Knight's comments.

Mr. Wolf stated he liked the scale and consistency of the fabric at the South Street end. The centerpiece seemed to demand too much attention. He appreciated the concessions the applicant was making in terms of height and scale.

Mr. Wolf asked if the applicant had met with both the South Street neighbors and the Lewis & Clark neighbors at the same time. Mr. Atwood stated they had not but that was the next step.

Ms. Gardner felt the project was moving in a good direction. She appreciated the flexibility and willingness to explore with the neighbors.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess at 9:07 p.m. He reconvened the meeting at 9:26 p.m. Ms. Heetderks did not return to the meeting.

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

**BAR 06-03-03**

**225/227 Fourteenth Street NW**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 63, 64, 66**

**New construction - 225/227 Fourteenth Street Apartments**

**Sadler Court Apartments, LLC, Owner/DBF Associates, Architects**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A preliminary discussion had been held in March. The BAR had many concerns at that meeting, including materials, especially vinyl siding, shutters; the building, parking, and site layout; window type; retaining wall material; mass of building; relationship to surrounding neighborhood; and that it was lacking a cohesive package on site. The applicant has revised the proposed materials and has re-submitted the building elevations with the materials sheet. The site plan has not changed with the exception of the retaining wall being changed to brick faced concrete. Staff commends the applicant for altering the materials. The windows, shingles, some cementitious siding and trim and entrance door treatments with transom and copper roof are significant improvements. The building massing and general site layout are still at issue. A mitigating factor may be that the applicant had already made major design decisions at the point in time when the ADC District was adopted by Council.

Mr. George McCallum, Esquire, and Mr. Rick Funk were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. McCallum stated his belief that they had met every condition in the preliminary site plan except for the Certificate of Appropriateness and the final review of the civil engineering items by the City engineering department.

Mr. Funk, Vice President of DBF Associates, Architects, gave an architectural presentation to the Board. He stated that they had a multi-lot design. In comparison to Wertland Square, the footprint of this building is a little shallower in terms of overall length. In an attempt to meet the Guidelines, a portion of the parking footprint is located beneath the building. Parking is screened by masonry walls.

Mr. Wolf called for questions or comments from the public. There being none, he called for questions or comments from the Board.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if they had examined cars entering the parking area off Sadler Street and not off Fourteenth Street. Mr. Funk stated they had but could not due to the difference in elevations.

Ms. Gardner expressed disappointment that something as important as a building of this size and this close to the University seems to be something that has been designed for other areas and is now being sort of plopped down and slightly modified for this owner, for this site. She further stated it may be within the letter of the law, but she did not think it was within the spirit of how the Board would like to see buildings designed.

Mr. Knight stated the owner's willingness to reconsider use of materials was very helpful. He further stated that, in terms of massing and site design, the Guidelines have an overarching respect for the integrity of the neighborhood; he felt this design violated the rhythm of the street. He thought the site design on this was so minimal as to be almost non-existent. He also felt the internal pedestrian corridor needed to be addressed. Mr. Knight stated for him to support this, it was going to have to undergo some revision in terms of mass and site design and relationships to the streets, especially to Fourteenth Street.

Mr. Wolf stated his feeling that the addition of this section of the city or this district was a response or an intent to ensure that the sort of structures and the opportunities to build here that happen, going forward, take advantage of a kind of localized, specific context. His biggest concern was with parking.

Ms. Swenson felt the design principles violated the front facade. Ms. Swenson wondered if it would be possible to see all design sketches of a project to see what process the designer had gone through before settling on a final design submittal.

Mr. Tremblay felt it was unlikely that someone driving past the property was going to focus on the parking entrance. He felt there would be more focus on the landscaped corner of the property and the signage. He commended the applicant for the adjustments in materials. Mr. Tremblay reiterated that the applicant was well along in this process and, in fact, thought they were far enough advanced to have this approved before it became a historic district.

Ms. Gardner wondered if the applicant could rework the parking underneath so that the opening changed.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed new building and site design do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with other properties in this district and that the BAR denies the application as submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Knight stated he understood the concerns and pressures but the Board's charge was not to consider those, but to consider the long-term implications of this development over the coming years and how it fits with the rest of the city. Mr. Lucy didn't think the other issues had been clarified very well. Mr. Wolf stated he, as well as other Board members, would make every effort to work with the applicant in meeting to talk about the alternatives and try and give positive feedback to expedite this proposal. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-2; Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Lucy voted against.

## **H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-04-07**

**524 East Main Street**

**500 Block East Main Street Mall**

## **City of Charlottesville, Owner/Virginia Discovery Museum, Applicant**

### **Carousel and fence**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to locate an antique carousel in the 500 block of East Main Street. The carousel is not motorized. The applicant is arranging to have a security camera installed to prevent vandalism. The proposed powder coated finished black metal fence with light blue trim is 42 inches tall with a scalloped top. It is proposed to be placed in the grove of trees opposite the Discovery Museum. This had been previously approved with a 6 foot high fence; that approval has expired. The proposal is generally compatible with the historic district. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Peppy Linden, Executive Director of the Virginia Discovery Museum, was present with Mr. Michael Osteen of Osteen Phillips Architects. She stated they thought this was unique and historic and would be a wonderful gift to the community. This is the last known kiddie carousel in the country of this type.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification behind changing the design of the fence. Ms. Linden stated the previous fence was going to be rented and needed to be a hard protective fence; now that the Museum owns it, they thought they would have a more architecturally interesting fence compatible with the carousel.

Ms. Swenson, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Public Improvement, moved to find that the proposed carousel and fence 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. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-04-04**

**112 Fifth Street SE**

**Tax Map 53 Parcel 72**

**Water Street, LLC, Owner/Formwork Design and Holiday Signs, Applicants**

### **Comprehensive signage plan for the Holsinger Building**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The first tenant, The Melting Pot, is ready to occupy the building and they proposed a sign application; Ms. Scala went to the owner and suggested he apply for a comprehensive sign plan. The proposal is for three wall signs on Water Street -- one for each retail tenant -- and one wall sign on Fifth Street, three projecting signs on Water Street and two projecting signs on Fifth Street. The wall signs will be reverse channel metal letters back lit by LED fixture. The projecting signs are half inch aluminum plate construction with vinyl letters

and will not be lit. Staff recommends approval of the proposed comprehensive signage plan. The Melting Pot projecting sign should be changed to conform to the design proposed by the owner for the other projecting signs. The Melting Pot wall sign is appropriate but without the logo. Each tenant wall sign should not exceed 25 square feet.

Mr. Bill Nitchmann, the owner of the building, expressed concern about removing the logo from the sign for The Melting Pot as its sign was copyrighted and required by the franchisor of all franchisees. Ms. Scala stated wall signs could not have logos. A logo sign could be placed in the window of the establishment. Mr. Allen Twedt, of Holiday Signs, stated most smaller shops would not have federally registered trademarks. He stated there were very strict guidelines that apply to federally registered trademarks. Mr. Wolf asked why they could not have a sign affixed to a window. Mr. Twedt stated they would prefer to have a lit sign on the wall. Ms. Gardner felt the tenant could discuss it with their franchisor. She felt image logos should not be on the Downtown Mall with its historical significance. Mr. Coiner stated he had been in some McDonalds which were not allowed to use the Golden Arches on their signage but had used them on their doors. Mr. Twedt stated there was a lot of precedence that protects trademark and copyright images. Mr. Knight felt that was something that needed to be taken up with the City Attorney. Mr. Twedt wanted to know the most expeditious thing that could be done until all signage was approved. Ms. Scala stated they could put a vinyl sign in the window.

Mr. Wolf moved that they approve the comprehensive signage plan as submitted, and if the applicant wishes to come back to make revisions, they can revisit that with the Board; and he moved that they approve the text of The Melting Pot, without the logo, to be affixed and back lit on the building with the provision that the text in a revised layout once the symbol of the pot itself is removed is brought back to staff for administrative approval. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-04-06**

**810B West Main Street**

**Tax Map 31 Parcel 184**

**Norfolk Southern Corp, Owner/ALLTEL Communications, Applicant**

### **Install Generator**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval for installation of an emergency generator with diesel fuel tank next to their radio tower and within an existing chain link fence that marks the leased area. The generator is 98 inches tall and sits on a 4x8 foot concrete pad. Brown slats are proposed to be added to part of the existing chain link fence as a screening measure. This area is generally unkempt and is visible from West Main Street. Preferred screening would consist of evergreen shrubs or trees. The Board may want to require a larger portion of the fence be screened. Staff had no other suggestions.

Mr. Larry Dickens, of Alltel, stated the generator was in the back corner of the compound, far from the street.

Mr. Wolf called for questions and comments.

Mr. Tremblay asked if it had a test cycle once a week. Mr. Dickens stated it did.

Mr. Coiner asked when the test cycle ran. Ms. Scala stated she had asked for it to be set during a weekday and not at night or on weekends.

Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant would be willing to put slats in the entire fence. Mr. Dickens said if that was what they wanted; however, the generator was hidden in the back corner by other buildings.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed new generator and fence slats satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with the other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **K. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-02-02**

**204 Ridge Street**

**Tax Map 28 Parcel 143**

**Karina Goldstein, Applicant**

### **Exterior renovations -- revised front deck; enclose rear addition**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This application had been seen previously on February 21<sup>st</sup>. The applicant had talked of removing part of the front walkway and redoing it with wood railings. On this plan they want to completely remove the connection from the building to the City sidewalk. The applicant also seeks to fill in the first floor porch which is on the back. The rear addition is post-1923. The appearance of the building is not adversely affected by filling it in.

Ms. Karina Goldstein apologized to the Board for a discrepancy in the drawing submitted with the application. In Option B, the steps would go straight to the ground without going to a landing.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification as to whether the door was swinging or sliding. Ms. Goldstein stated it was a swinging door.

Mr. Coiner asked if there was a plan to fence the property. Ms. Goldstein did not know of any.



Mr. Knight asked if the applicant had a preference between the two options for the stairs. Ms. Goldstein expressed a preference for Option B.

Mr. Coiner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed front porch entrance configuration described as Option B and the proposed enclosure of the lower part of the rear addition 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 understanding that the door to be installed under the rear porch will be as shown at this meeting. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Knight asked if they could add a stipulation "Option B as modified by the applicant in her description." Mr. Coiner accepted the amendment as did Mr. Tremblay. Mr. Coiner suggested the applicant rethink having glass in the door because of security. Ms. Goldstein said she would take it into consideration. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

## **L. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-04-08**

**202 Second Street NW**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 175**

**Lu Mei Chang, Owner/Limehouse Architects, Applicant**

### **Exterior addition and renovations and demolition of one-story addition**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant proposes to demolish a one-story frame addition and a frame fire escape built in 1990. An existing rear second floor window at 113 West Main is proposed to be changed to a door. In Phase I the existing two-story outbuilding will remain and will be renovated. A new two-story frame porch will be added to the front of the brick building and a new two-story frame and stucco mixed use addition will be attached to the south side of the two-story brick building. A two-story frame porch will be added to the rear of the brick structure; the porch will extend in an L shape to create an entrance stairs and to connect 113 West Market with the new addition. The entry will be separated from the sidewalk with new metal gates. In Phase II, the two-story brick building will be expanded to the street, making it more like the new two-story addition next door and replacing the two-story front porch which was Phase I. Staff has no problem recommending demolition of the '86 addition, the '90 fire escape; however, there should be a justification shown to enlarge the window in Monsoon into a doorway. This area is zoned Mixed Use Downtown Commercial. The general concept is sound; however, the transition area of the entry stairs between the restaurant and the proposed mixed use addition does not match the rest of the architecture of the mixed use addition. Tall metal gates are not appropriate. Ms. Scala suggested the Board treat this as a preliminary and get the applicant to defer.

Mr. Gate Pratt, of Limehouse Architects, explained he was using a two phase approach due to the owner's budget. The gate was at the request of the owner because she has been having some problems with security and vandalism.

Mr. Coiner asked if the deck and stairs would be treated lumber. Mr. Pratt stated the deck would be treated; however, since the stairs would be protected, they could be more of a finished material.

Ms. Swenson stated she was having trouble understanding the connector. She did think converting the window to a door would be appropriate.

Ms. Swenson sought clarification if this was being treated as a Certificate of Appropriateness Application or a Preliminary Discussion. Mr. Wolf thought they could do an approval in concept with material palette and color selection and details to come back to the Board; however, they would accept the two phase approach and the general scale, proportions, openings, and the modification to the one window at Monsoon.

Mr. Wolf moved that they approve the demolition of the one-story structure as submitted as well as the demolition of the second floor window on the existing Monsoon Restaurant and the existing fire escape as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf moved that they approve in concept the design as demonstrated by the proportions, the scale, the openings, the roof lines, and the way that it makes its connection to the existing structure with the understanding that the applicant will bring back to the Board specific information about finish materials, albeit stucco or siding, color, roofing materials, and specifically details as they pertain to any metalwork or porch railings. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

## **M. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-09-03**

**540 Park Street**

**Tax Map 52 Parcel 183**

**Dengel residence -- fence details**

**Tobias and Lynn Dengel, Applicants**

Mr. Knight recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The materials and design are very appropriate. The height of the proposed fence exceeds the Guidelines recommended height of 6 feet all along the rear and in places on the sides. The BAR may approve the fencing if they find the overall design modulated

heights make it compatible with the property design and other properties in the district. The south wall height varies from 6 feet to 7'6". The rear varies from 7 feet to 7'6". The north varies from 6 feet to 8 feet.

Mr. Syd Knight stated the height was the real issue. They did not have accurate topographic information previously but do now. The reason the 6 foot height was exceeded was driven by the rear fence which is most necessary for screening. They felt a level top was preferable to staying at 6 feet and zigzagging everywhere.

Mr. Wolf called for questions and comments.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know why the lattice work would not carry around on the east side. Mr. Knight explained that was the side which was right up against the neighbor's house. The owners have said if it is the BAR's wish, it will be fine with them.

Ms. Swenson, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation New Construction Additions, moved to find that the proposed fence details 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 an understanding that the designated east fence could either be as designated or as designed within the BAR. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0-1; Mr. Knight had recused himself from the matter.

## **N. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

### **BAR 06-04-02**

#### **10 University Circle**

#### **Tax Map 5 Parcel 44**

#### **Wade's Apartments, LLC, Owner/ALLTEL Communications, Applicant**

#### **Installation of 3 antennas on rooftop**

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks approval to install three false roof vents for the purpose of housing telecommunication antennas on the rear and side faces of the existing roof. The false roof vents are proposed to be black pipe, 18 inches in diameter extending 6 and-a-half feet high above the roof in each location. The coax cable is proposed to run along the exterior building face and will be painted to match the building exterior brick. Staff feels the vents will appear large and incongruous. This project was previously reviewed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources who rejected the idea of enclosing the antennae in false chimneys.

Mr. Pete Caramanis, Esquire, was present on behalf of Alltel.

Mr. Wolf called for questions.

Mr. Wolf asked if the top of the pipe appeared higher than the ridge of the roof. Mr. Caramanis stated it did if you were at that height looking straight across the roof, but it should not be visible from ground level at the front.

Mr. Knight asked if there was any play in the height. Mr. Caramanis stated there may be.

Mr. Wolf stated that, in an aspect of respecting one of the great old structures, it would be nice not to have something that would be accessory mechanical equipment projecting higher than the ridge of the roof.

Ms. Swenson, recognizing that this project has been approved by the Department of Historic Resources of the Commonwealth of Virginia and having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed antenna in false roof vents satisfies 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. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0-1; Mr. Tremblay abstained from voting.

## **O. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-03-01**

**211 East High Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 75**

**Change from stucco to Hardiplank siding on new addition**

**Bob Anderson, Applicant**

Mr. Lucy recused himself from this matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was approved 1March 16, 2005. The applicant is requesting approval to change the siding on the new two-story addition from smooth stucco to Hardiplank. Staff recommends the applicant try to use smooth finish Hardiplank rather than wood grained.

The applicant had nothing to add. He thanked staff and the Board for being willing to put this on the agenda. He stated they had located a smooth finished Hardiplank with a bead on the bottom and was consistent with some of the material on the rear of the building.

Mr. Wolf called for questions and comments.

Mr. Coiner suggested the applicant make Mr. Buck aware that the Board has purview of things that are visible all the way round, not just from High Street.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval for the substitution of materials. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf stated that with the substitution there was the detail of the corner; he hoped there would be corner board and not just Hardiplank turning the corner in a mitered fashion. Mr. Tremblay accepted that as a friendly amendment as did Ms. Swenson. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 6-0-1; Mr. Lucy recused himself from the matter.

Mr. Lucy brought to the Board's attention the fact that there were six nine-story buildings working their way through the development process. As zoning permits hundreds of buildings of this height, he suggested they reevaluate that and revisit what the zoning should be. He stated he would urge the Planning Commission to do that.

Mr. Wolf stated it had been suggested that there may be some use in having a study of the urban infrastructure and what a build out would look like.

Ms. Swenson suggested communicating to the larger community that by right development and maximum build out development in this historic district was not simply filling every inch of the set back line. She did not think that had been communicated in any way.

Mr. Coiner asked for an explanation behind the Planning Commission allowing the change in penthouse to add another 16 feet on top of a building. Mr. Lucy stated it was cut to the same height as the mechanical equipment.

## **P. Adjournment**

The meeting stood adjourned at 11:57 p.m.