

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
May 16, 2006
Minutes**

Present: Absent:

Fred Wolf, Chair Lynne Heetderks

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay **Also Present:**

Preston Coiner Mary Joy Scala

Amy Gardner

Kate Swenson

Bill Lucy

William Adams

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:06 p.m. He stated that 521 North First Street, which had been publicly noticed but not listed on the agenda, had been withdrawn.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

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

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. If pulled, minutes will be discussed at the end of the agenda, but applications will be discussed at the beginning.)

1. February 21, 2006, Minutes

2. March 21, 2006, Minutes

3. April 18, 2006, Minutes

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-05-05

411 Second Street NE

Tax Map 33 Parcel 90

Preston A. and Julie M. Coiner, Owners and Applicants

New wooden pergola in rear yard

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-02-02

402 Dice Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 124.1
Exterior renovations -- new shed
Molly McCoy/Applicant

Mr. Wolf stated the minutes would be pulled and addressed at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Wolf explained the Consent Agenda was a way to expedite certain projects which seem to meet all the Guidelines and do not present any issue to any Board member or to Staff in reviewing the application as a way to expedite the project and to reduce the necessity for the applicant and Staff to make a description to help the Board move along as the number of projects increases and the number of designated historic districts/design control districts increase.

Mr. Coiner stated he would abstain from Item 4.

Mr. Tremblay moved adoption of the Consent Agenda. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried; Mr. Coiner stated he would vote "aye" for Item 5 but was abstaining from voting on Item 4.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-05-01

136 Chancellor Street

Tax Map 9 Parcel 107

Beta Alpha House Corp. of Kappa Delta Sorority, Susan Dallas, Applicant

Replace windows

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This Victorian house, built in 1900, is located in The Corner ADC District. The house was extensively remodeled in 1978. The applicant seeks approval to replace all the windows with double hung aluminum-clad wood windows with various light patterns to match the existing. The windows that include dividers will have permanently affixed exterior and interior muntins with spacer bars. The exterior wood trim will be wrapped in aluminum with a white finish to match the siding. The Guidelines do not qualify when original windows are significant enough to retain; they do allow replacement of original windows that are beyond repair. Given the alterations that have been made to the house over the years, Staff opinion is that the proposed replacement windows are appropriate and will add attractiveness to the property. The Board should address the proposal to wrap the wood window trim with aluminum.

Ms. Susan Dallas provided the Board with a sample of the proposed window. She stated that some of the windows were not original; many had already been replaced. The old windows are significantly deteriorated. She stated she had been told by an architect and her contractor that it was best to replace them.

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

Mr. Adams asked if there were any photographs or views of the house before it was remodeled in 1978. Ms. Dallas stated she did not have any.

Mr. Adams and Mr. Wolf sought clarification as to whether the casing was being replaced. Ms. Dallas stated they would use the existing casing.

Ms. Swenson, stating that since it seemed like a sash replacement, asked if it was necessary to wrap the existing wood trim or if the window sash could just be replaced leaving the wood trim as is. Ms. Dallas stated it had been recommended by the contractor that the existing trim be wrapped.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification that the existing windows would be replaced in kind. Ms. Dallas stated she was open to recommendations to do otherwise. Mr. Coiner suggested some of the one-over-one windows be replaced with two-over-two windows.

Mr. Coiner stated the window with the 20 divided lights did not look appropriate to the house. Mr. Adams stated it was probably not a projecting bay originally. He recommended the applicant find a view of the house before it was remodeled and try to get as close to that.

Mr. Adams stated he did not like the sash replacement as it changed the proportion of the window. He wanted clarification as to whether this would be sash replacement or if the old windows were going to be pulled completely including casement. Ms. Dallas stated it was her understanding that it was sash replacement.

Ms. Swenson wanted to know if the two existing nine-over-nine windows could be kept since they were at street level. Ms. Dallas stated those windows were not original and were in fair condition.

Mr. Wolf called for comments.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern that the applicant seemed to be unsure as to whether it was window replacement or sash replacement. Mr. Knight stated he would like something a little more definitive. The applicant provided the Board with a copy of the brochure. Mr. Adams stated it did look like a sash replacement.

Ms. Swenson stated she was in favor of the replacement sash. She was against wrapping the existing wood trim in aluminum. She recommended finding some old photos so the proposal would not just replicate what was currently there but would either move back to what had been or go forward instead.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification from Ms. Swenson as to whether she preferred sash replacement only or the sash package that was proposed. Ms. Swenson stated she preferred sash replacement.

Mr. Wolf stating his agreement with Ms. Swenson, stated the window arrangement had been arrived at in an ad hoc manner over time and trying to replicate that did not make sense. He

stated two-over-two windows seemed like the kind of window that would be found at the time of the house. He did not want the wood trim to be wrapped in aluminum.

Mr. Tremblay stated he had experience with wrapping frames with aluminum. He stated it was a mixed blessing as they tended to leak and you would not see what was going on underneath. From that standpoint, he felt not wrapping the window areas was best.

Mr. Adams felt the applicant had an opportunity to do it better.

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 replacement window sash package satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the window sash package as submitted; he further moved that, having considered the standards, they find that the proposed wrapping of the window trim with aluminum does not meet the City Design Guidelines and be denied, and further would propose that the applicant consider revising the light treatments on the replacements to bring the replacements closer in line with the original light pattern which was found on the building. Mr. Coiner clarified that was two-over-two. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-05-02

107 First Street #405 (The Terraces -- Chloe retail on Water Street)

Tax Map 28 Parcel 19

K Holdings/Jonathan McVity, Applicant

Install new energy conserving awning

Mr. Wolf stated he would recuse himself from this matter as his firm was handling the design work. Mr. Knight, as Vice Chair, took control of the meeting.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Terraces is a mixed use building built in 2000 located in the Downtown ADC District. The application is to install a new tube steel canopy with solar panel over the storefront window. The canopy will be supported with welded steel angles bolted to the brick building with a steel plate. The energy will be stored and reused for nighttime sidewalk lighting. The lighting design is not included in the application but is intended to be a small four watt LED bulb with a reflector to divert the lighting downward. There will not be any fixture or light source projecting down from the underside of the overhang. This meets the Guidelines and will be a creative addition to The Terraces building. Lighting should be reviewed by staff to ensure it will be as described. Staff recommends against lighting that shines upward to illuminate the canopy itself.

Mr. Knight recognized the applicant.

Mr. Jonathan McVity stated there would be six bulbs to illumine the sidewalk.

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

Ms. Gardner wanted to know why the canopy was only being proposed for one tenant. Mr. McVity stated it was just starting to meet the needs of one tenant.

Mr. Adams wanted to know what material would be under the solar panels since they did not run the whole length of the canopy. Mr. McVity explained it was a perforated metal.

Mr. Coiner asked if the metal was stainless or something that did not require painting. The applicant stated it would have a finish much like the frame of the storefront.

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

Ms. Swenson stated her hope that this awning would be a prototype for others so it could be used around town as often as possible.

Ms. Gardner stated it seemed odd to be putting only one canopy on the building. Mr. McVity reiterated this was a solution for one tenant only at this time to solve a problem with heat gain from incandescent lighting.

Mr. Knight stated his agreement with Ms. Gardner. He stated that adding an exterior element to solve an interior problem seemed a little tortured. He stated he was uncomfortable with the logic behind the matter; however, he did feel the awning and the application were well done.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed canopy satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with lighting to be reviewed by Staff to ensure it will be as described. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called the question. The motion passed, 5-2-1; Mr. Knight and Ms. Gardner voted against and Mr. Wolf did not vote, having recused himself from the matter. With the matter concluded, Mr. Wolf rejoined the meeting and resumed chairmanship.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-05-03

31 University Circle

Tax Map 6 Parcel 80

James & Lee Breeden, Owner/Charles Dickey, Applicant

New circular driveway, entry porch (demolish existing), storage shed, add windows to side and rear porches

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property is located in the Rugby Road/University Circle/Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The Georgian Revival/eclectic house was built in 1928. The applicant is requesting: a) to create a new paved circular driveway by adding a second

curb cut -- a sample of the color of the pavers was provided by the applicant just prior to the meeting; b) to add a new entry porch and to demolish the existing front porch -- the new porch will be constructed of painted wood trim, copper flashing and gutters, rubber membrane roofing, and brick pavers; c) to add operable screen windows to the west screened porch -- the proposal is for Pella aluminum clad windows with painted wood trim and copper flashing; d) to add a small outdoor storage shed under part of the existing rear porch -- it will be constructed of painted fiber cement board with painted wood trim; and e) to add a new sunroom on the rear elevation -- it will be constructed by removing the existing lattice and steps and infilling the porch space with fiber cement siding and operable double hung Pella aluminum clad windows with copper flashing. Items C, D, and E meet the Guidelines. Item A originally appeared to be in conflict with the Zoning requirement; however, a revised site plan had been submitted earlier in the day. Item B should be discussed by the BAR. At issue is whether the existing porch with curved roof is significant enough to warrant repair rather than replacement with a new design. If demolition of the existing porch is allowed, the new design is compatible with the property and the district.

Mr. Wolf recognized the applicant.

Mr. Charles Dickey was also present to answer any questions from the Board. He stated there had been discussion about replacing the existing porch with another of the same design. The owners knew Murray Howard, architect of The Lawn; his opinion was that the porch was not a jewel of an architectural element and was a little under scaled for the front elevation of the house.

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

Ms. Swenson asked if the footprint of the porch would be changed. Mr. Dickey stated it was being enlarged by two feet on either side.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the existing porch is the original porch. Mr. Dickey confirmed that it was.

Mr. Knight wanted to know why pavers were chosen for the driveway rather than brick. Mr. Dickey stated the owners like pavers because they are from Charleston and it reminds them of Charleston.

Ms. Swenson asked if the existing columns would be reused in the new porch. Mr. Dickey stated they would not.

Ms. Swenson sought clarification of the reason for the demolition. Mr. Dickey stated it was due to disrepair. Ms. Swenson asked if there was supportive evidence of the disrepair. Mr. Dickey stated it was based on the word of the contractor.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know what was wrong with the porch. Mr. Dickey stated it was falling apart and that repairs made over the years had not been made in the best possible way. Mr. Dickey stated the porch was rotting from the inside out.

Mr. Wolf expressed concern about the lack of supporting evidence of the state of disrepair of the porch. He was concerned about the precedent this would set.

Ms. Swenson felt it was odd to be considering a proposal in conjunction with a demolition.

Mr. Tremblay stated the porch was a distinctive element of the house.

Mr. Adams stated the porch was idiosyncratic and may not have had the best of proportions when built but introducing the new porch was like unraveling a sweater. The window above the porch would have too much space below it. The new porch would cover up the brick work over the existing entry.

Ms. Gardner felt they did not have enough information to approve demolition of the porch.

Mr. Tremblay clarified that if they deferred the demolition request, the applicant must return the following month; however if the applicant sought deferral, the matter could return whenever the applicant was prepared.

Mr. Coiner suggested to the Chair that the five parts of the application be considered separately. Mr. Wolf felt that was reasonable.

Mr. Wolf asked if there was additional discussion on item A, the driveway.

Mr. Knight stated his finding that the proposed material, the concrete pavers, did not meet the Guidelines. He suggested if the applicant wanted cobbles, they use cobbles. Mr. Knight suggested the applicant pursue a different configuration between the new pavement and the existing pavement.

Ms. Swenson stated she could approve the individual pavers set in sand.

Mr. Knight stated his objection was that the Guidelines discourage those. He stated he objected to them on appearance sake. Mr. Dickey stated he had been in favor of brick and would relay Mr. Knight's comments to the applicants.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed new driveway satisfies the BAR's criteria with the stipulation that a material other than concrete pavers be used, that the junction of the new driveway and the existing driveway and the existing sidewalk and curb cuts be reexamined and that those matters come back to Staff for review and with the further suggestion that the applicant pursue relief from the 25 percent of the front yard Zoning requirement. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that, while pursuing relief to that 25 percent regulation, the drive does not exceed 12 feet in width. Mr. Knight and Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Adams suggested no asphalt. Mr. Dickey stated that was fine. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 7-1; Mr. Coiner voted against.

Mr. Wolf called for discussion of, or a motion on, item B. Mr. Tremblay moved to defer consideration of this aspect of the application. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for item C. 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 enclosed screen porch satisfies the BAR criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the porch as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called items D and E. Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, New Construction, Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application for a small outdoor storage shed as described and the addition of a new sunroom on the rear elevation. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner stated that in the past when painted fiber cement board was approved, the Board had requested that smooth rather than the grained type be used. Mr. Tremblay stated he would amend his motion to specify smooth. The seconder accepted the amendment. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Dickey asked, in the event the owners did not want to pursue the porch issue at the June meeting, what should be done. Ms. Scala stated he could tell her he wanted to withdraw that portion of the application. Ms. Scala asked the Board if they would accept that the applicant wanted to withdraw the porch. The Board members stated they would accept that.

Mr. Wolf stated that portion of the application was deferred by the applicant.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-05-04

1115 and 1115 1/2 Wertland Street

Tax Map 4 Parcel 309; Tax Map 4 Parcel 308

Wade Tremblay, Owner/John Matthews, Applicant

Demolition of buildings on site

Mr. Tremblay stated he would not be participating in the discussion, nor would he vote.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The properties are in the Wertland Street ADC District. The properties are located behind large houses that front close to Wertland Street. Both buildings were built around 1950; most of the houses on that street date from 1870 to 1920. The applicant seeks approval to demolish both buildings and has responded to the demolition criteria in his submittal. No structural report was submitted. Staff supports demolition of these buildings.

Mr. John Matthews had nothing to add to the Staff report but was present to answer any questions.

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

Mr. Wolf asked if a structural report had been prepared. Mr. Matthews stated one had not since they were not asking for demolition based on their condition.

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

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed demolitions satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the demolition application as submitted. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Tremblay did not vote, having recused himself from the matter.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-07

700 East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Van Yahres Assoc., Landscape Architects/City of Charlottesville, Owner

Pavilion – main pedestrian entrance

Mr. Knight recused himself from the matter as his firm is involved in the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This matter had last been before the Board in February at which time the Board had approved the concept of a main pedestrian and handicapped entrance to the Pavilion. The applicant was asked to return with more details including resolution of the floating steps, bench dividers to discourage skateboarders and trying to use the new entrance to reconcile the shift in axis from the Mall to the Pavilion. In March, Staff met with the applicant, the Pavilion operator, and the landscape architect to resolve these issues. Three revised schemes were presented; two of the schemes were most likely to satisfy the BAR's desire to reconcile the forms of the Mall and Pavilion. The applicant is requesting approval of the revised design which features the ramp with one straight side that aligns with the Mall and a curved side that points towards the Transit Center. The steps are in a more protected location. The bench is a simple stone block set at an angle located partially in the grass. This solution creates a formal ending to the Mall and a very desirable direct entrance from the Mall to the Pavilion. It also gives handicapped persons a clear plan of access. Staff believes the revised plan has been greatly simplified and achieves the intended purpose. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Jeff Wilbur, of Van Yahres Associates, was present to answer any questions.

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

Ms. Gardner sought clarification behind the jog in the wall. Mr. Wilbur stated it happened out of cost considerations.

Ms. Swenson stated the whole project had been difficult and she wished they could see a model or a more three-dimensional view.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know how the decision was made for the location of the stone bench. Mr. Wilbur stated the angle was taken off the Transit Center.

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

Ms. Swenson reiterated the need for a model to be sure this proposal would help the entry. She expressed concern that she was losing track of the design of the Pavilion. Ms. Swenson stated she did not have enough information to fully understand the proposal.

Mr. Wilbur asked what would be needed. Ms. Swenson suggested a full set of sections or a perspective or details. Ms. Swenson also wanted to be sure that a section of the plan rendered in green was not part of the application because it was completely unacceptable and she did not want any indication that they were approving it as is.

Mr. Wolf stated he was uncomfortable with the change and seeing where the radius come together.

Ms. Swenson stated she did not see this as an elegant resolution of the end of the Mall.

Mr. Wolf stated that, from the standpoint of details and better representation, sections through the lawn and ramp and through the undulating wall would be helpful. He also stated there was enough issue with whether the bench was enough to end the Mall. He stated this would benefit from having additional information come back to the Board.

Mr. Adams agreed with Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Lucy stated he was unclear about the nature of the resolution that was being sought. He also stated the power of the Mall was in the trees and there were no trees in this. He stated little features were not going to make a big statement.

Ms. Swenson stated this design was not satisfying an appropriate resolution of the juncture.

Mr. Wolf stated this piece should be held to the same standards to which they tried to hold the Pavilion.

Mr. Wilbur sought clarification that it would be better for them to seek deferral and then asked for guidance on what would help to come back before the Board. Board members suggested: details, sections of the terracing and land forms, sections of the seat wall, materials of the seat wall.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that the applicant was asking to defer the matter. Mr. Wilbur stated he was.

Mr. Coiner moved to accept the Applicant's request for deferral. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried 7-0-1; Mr. Knight did not vote, having recused himself from the matter.

H. Other Business

Mr. Coiner stated that he and Chairman Wolf had met with the operator of the Pavilion, Jim Tolbert, Ms. Scala, and Aubrey Watts to review some of the deficiencies in the Mall and Pavilion.

Ms. Swenson expressed concern about what was their responsibility as a Board and what was within their purview if they were reviewing projects that either got overturned without just cause or they reviewed projects that were built incorrectly and it did not matter.

The Board discussed the recent decision by City Council overturning the Board regarding BAR 06-03-03.

Consent Agenda -- Minutes

Mr. Wolf called for discussion of the minutes.

February -- Mr. Coiner asked that the first paragraph of page 16 reflect it was Mr. Wolf and Mr. Atkins who were to meet with Mr. Watts rather than Mr. Wolf and Mr. Knight. Ms. Scala asked that the name of Jerry Shan be changed to Jerry Shea on page 13.

April -- Ms. Gardner asked that Item F on page 11 be changed to Preliminary Discussion not Certificate of Appropriateness Application. Mr. Coiner noted that the second paragraph in that item incorrectly identified Mr. Atwood as Mr. Kuttner. Mr. Coiner also asked that Mr. Bill Mitchell be changed to Mr. Bill Nitchum in the second paragraph of page 15. Mr. Knight noted from page 4 that Mr. Fred Brezinski should be Mr. Greg Brezinski. Ms. Scala stated Ms. Heetderks had asked that the word "to" in the second sentence of the fourth paragraph of page 3 be changed to "of."

Mr. Coiner moved that the minutes of February 21st, March 21st and April 18th be approved as corrected. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson stated she would be voting only on the April minutes as she had not been present for the February and March meetings. The motion passed.

Other Business -- *continued*

Mr. Coiner stated he would like to serve on the Wayfinding Steering Committee.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification on what other appeals were pending before City Council. Mr. Wolf stated one was for the Melting Pot sign; Ms. Scala stated that would be on the 6 June Council meeting. Mr. Wolf stated the other was BAR 06-04-01.

Mr. Wolf stated that Ms. Swenson would be moving; as she will no longer be in a Design Control District, she has tendered her resignation from the Board.

I. Adjournment

Mr. Tremblay moved to adjourn. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:34 p.m.