

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
20 June, 2006
Minutes**

Present: Also Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Mary Joy Scala
Syd Knight, Vice Chair (arrived 5:39 p.m.)
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Amy Gardner
Lynne Heetderks
Kate Swenson (arrived 5:20 p.m.)
Bill Lucy
William Adams

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:01 p.m. He stated item D had been removed from the agenda.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

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. May 16, 2006 Minutes

2. May 23 Work Session Notes

3. 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 (details)**

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 06-06-01
1831 University Circle
Tax Map 6 Parcel 68**

Martha D. Ballenger, Applicant/Allan & Dahven Doctor, Owners
Replace the cedar shake shingled roof with 30-year architectural shingles

Mr. Wolf stated the two Certificate of Appropriateness Applications were both material modifications that had come back to the Board. Ms. Scala stated she had talked to an owner adjacent to the Monsoon Restaurant who expressed concern as she shares the alleyway and pulls into her parking space. The adjacent owner stated the addition and deck would make it harder to pull into the parking spaces. Ms. Scala stated she had spoken with the architect who was amenable to pulling the last support back three feet to make it easier for the adjacent owner and the Monsoon Restaurant to get into their parking spaces.

Mr. Coiner requested they pull the minutes for additions and corrections. Mr. Wolf stated they would deal with those at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Coiner moved they approve items 2, 3, and 4 as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-06-01
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. Application was made at the April 18th meeting for a four-part design. At that time, the applicant requested a preliminary review instead of final; the Board accepted that. In the April meeting approval was granted for demolition of the one-story building. Site plan review for the project is ongoing. The applicant has created a design that is compatible with the Guidelines and with the other buildings in the historic district. The smaller scale and traditional architecture is pleasing in contrast to the contemporary Water Street buildings. The applicant made design and material connections to historic buildings. The applicant is seeking approval of massing and materials; staff recommends approval.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, presented the Board with a handout of information on the project. From the first meeting with the Board, the applicant has changed the plan for South Street to no garage doors and no cars to lawns. He gave a brief presentation of the new plan which included a green building.

Ms. Swenson arrived during the presentation at 5:20 p.m.

Mr. Mark Hedges, the project architect, continued the presentation with details on the materials being considered. Materials included: an Indiana cut limestone for the first two stories; stucco; composite metal panels; smooth Hardiplank siding; Marvin windows; and storefront-type windows on the tower.

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

Ms. Swenson wanted to know if the roof surfaces were being used in any way. The applicant stated a green roof could be used on the front step back.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know the connection between the buildings. The applicant stated it was a connection that may not happen but they were including it in the drawings. He further explained there would be some connection to allow for emergency egress.

Mr. Coiner then asked if the project was at maximum height. When told the project was, he then asked where the mechanical would go. The applicant stated it would go in the penthouse.

Mr. Knight arrived at 5:39 p.m.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification of how much "green" there was to the green building. The applicant stated there would be a sod roof on the green building.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know when the applicant anticipated site plan approval. The applicant stated 45 to 60 days.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. Tim Michelle was present in support of the proposal. He did express concern about what was happening in the City with regard to density and height. He appreciated that the applicant was responding to both Water Street and South Street. He thought this would be an interesting project that would be a model of what was trying to be done in the City.

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

Mr. Wolf stated the development the project had gone through and the modifications that had been made as well as the changes in massing and the respect of the structure as reflected in the sensitivity to the context of both the existing building and the surrounding buildings was great. Mr. Wolf also stated this was a significant project which would have a big impact on the City. He stated it was moving at a pace that was sensitive to input and collaboration. Mr. Wolf stated the materials, in general, were acceptable.

Mr. Coiner thanked the designer for the time he had given the Board.

Mr. Adams stated the project had made tremendous strides and had gotten a lot better but he did have some concerns about the architectural quality of the tower piece. Mr. Adams expressed serious reservations about the massing of the piece on South Street. He felt it was too big and the articulation of it was too monumental.

Mr. Tremblay stated he was comfortable with seeing this project move forward.

Mr. Lucy recommended that the BAR approve the massing of the project and the materials as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 7-1-1; Mr. Adams voted against and Mr. Knight abstained since he had not been present for the entire matter.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-06-02

1401 Gordon Avenue

Tax Map 5 Parcel 83

Brad and Laurie Booker, Applicant

Construct four bedroom detached unit to rear of existing structure

This item had been removed from the agenda prior to the start of the meeting.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-03-04

410 East High Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 39

County of Albemarle, Owner(Ron Lilley)/DJG, Inc., Architects

Albemarle County Courthouse sally port

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The addition of a sally port was approved in March subject to additional details -- construction details of the patio, lighting beneath the sally port, and the results of the archaeological study to determine its appropriateness -- coming back to the Board. The plan had been revised to slightly enlarge the sally port area and push it back three feet from High Street. Additional demolitions include part of the chiller pit wall and one doorway at the end of the breezeway which will be replaced. The applicant plans 32 watt fluorescent lighting under the brick patio and in the tunnel. Staff feels the revisions and details are appropriate. The archaeological map, which was based on an 1886 map, indicates that no buildings were located in the proposed sally port area. Staff finds that the proposed sally port satisfies the Guidelines and is in keeping with the Board's previous action.

Mr. Coiner asked if any archaeological work had been done in the area under discussion. Ms. Scala stated it had not. Mr. Coiner thought that was what the Board had asked be done. Ms. Heetderks stated that she thought the Board had asked for an archaeological survey to be done in that spot.

Mr. Wolf recognized the applicant.

Mr. Ron Lilley, of the Albemarle County General Services Office, was present with Donald Booth of DJG Architects. Changes had been made to create a tunnel and alternate entry into the building from the sally port based on concerns from the Commonwealth's Attorney Office whose offices line the breezeway. Mr. Lilley stated that anything of archaeological value which was

unearthed would be given to the historical society. He stated the area had been dug in the past when putting lines from the chiller pit to the building and when putting in gas lines.

Mr. Michael Stumbaugh, Senior Project Manager for the County, was also present. He explained the initial reason for originally coming forward.

Mr. Coiner stated he did not want to see a front end loader in there, digging up the area and taking the dirt to a fill site. He stated the County had a responsibility to put in writing what they plan to do.

Mr. Adams asked if they would agree to have an archaeologist monitor the excavation and catalog material as it was removed. Mr. Lilley was not sure he was authorized to agree to that. He stated they typically have project inspectors on jobs.

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

Mr. Knight asked if there was an elevation drawing of the rear wall of the sally port. Mr. Booth stated there was not one in the packet. He stated it was identical to every wall inside the sally port.

Mr. Knight wanted to know why fluorescent lighting was chosen. Mr. Booth stated the lighting would only be switched on as needed. It would offer energy efficiency. Mr. Knight sought clarification that the fixtures would be shielded from the street but the light, when on, would be visible. Mr. Booth confirmed that.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the lights would only be on during daylight hours. Mr. Booth clarified the lighting would be on during Court hours.

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

Ms. Heetderks stated she shared with Mr. Coiner, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Knight the concerns about the lack of archaeological study on the specific site. She felt this was the most significant site in downtown Charlottesville. She stated conducting test trenches or having an archaeological oversight of some sort was not asking too much. Mr. Coiner stated, should approval be granted, it should be conditional upon that.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that approval would be conditioned upon receiving an archaeological report of the actual site that provided acceptable information.

Mr. Tremblay clarified that it be an agreement to archaeological oversight of the actual excavation.

Mr. Knight stated they had requested a specific archaeological investigation on this specific site. He expressed his disappointment that it had not happened. In order to move the project along, he would be amenable to requiring an on site person. He also expressed concern about the detailing

around the opening of the doorway into the tunnel. He stated there was a consistency in the existing breezeway and the main opening into the sally port that he would like to see extended back to that opening. He stated he was troubled by the fluorescent lighting; he expressed a preference for incandescent lighting with recessed fixtures.

Mr. Wolf expressed his support for Mr. Knight's comments. He also stated that would be a good motion.

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 partial demolitions and new sally port 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 following modifications and conditions: one, that the brick opening around the entrance to the tunnel be finished in a manner consistent with the rest of the project; that the light sources be recessed, incandescent fixtures; and, three, that there be a trained archaeologist on site during excavation for the project to review anything that got dug up. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Adams offered a friendly amendment that anything discovered be documented and preserved. Ms. Heetderks clarified that it be donated to the local historical society. Mr. Knight and Mr. Coiner accepted the friendly amendments. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-07

700 East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

**Van Yahres Associates, Landscape Architects/City of Charlottesville, Owner
Pavilion – main pedestrian entrance**

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

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had been before the Board at the May meeting at which time the applicants' deferral request was accepted. The Board had requested additional information. Staff feels there are a lot of physical and programmatic constraints in the area. Staff felt this proposal was a good solution given all the constraints to the property.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, stated his understanding that their charge was not to finish the Mall but to create a handicap entrance. He stated the current proposal had taken suggestions from both previous schemes.

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

Mr. Wolf stated a preference for the simplicity of the proposed handrails.

Mr. Coiner expressed his pleasure with the proposed bench.

Ms. Swenson expressed a preference for only one handrail.

Ms. Gardner stated she agreed with Ms. Swenson from a design standpoint, but recognized the handrail configuration was a way for the City to protect itself.

Mr. Tremblay moved adoption of the ramp plans, undulating wall, bench, radius modifications as seen on the current plan, as meeting the Guidelines and as an acceptable solution to the issues the Board was trying to resolve. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8-0-1; Mr. Knight abstained from voting.

B. Consent Agenda

1. May 16, 2006 Minutes

Mr. Coiner asked that page 5 show that the applicant, not Mr. Wolf, responded to his question. Mr. Coiner also asked that page 11 show that he and Mr. Wolf met with the operator of the Pavilion. Mr. Coiner asked that "it was Mr. Wolf and Mr. Atkins who met with Mr. Watts" be changed to "it was Mr. Wolf and Mr. Atkins who were to meet with Mr. Watts."

Mr. Coiner moved acceptance of the minutes. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8-0-1; Ms. Heetderks abstained from voting.

G. Other Business

Mr. Lucy sought clarification of the status of the three buildings on Wertland after the City Council meeting. Mr. Wolf stated Wertland had been referred back to the Board under a new application to move the structures.

Mr. Knight stated Mr. Wolf had done an excellent job on the two presentations he made before Council; Ms. Gardner had also made an excellent presentation on the Melting Pot appeal.

Mr. Wolf noted the Board would be losing Ms. Swenson. Mr. Wolf stated the Board appreciated everything that Ms. Swenson had done.

Mr. Coiner stated he had had a chance meeting with Aubrey Watts who had indicated the Amphitheater improvements were close to starting.

Ms. Scala stated the members' packets included a proposed map of the division into subareas of the new Rugby Road ADC District. A map would be required in the Guidelines.

Ms. Scala stated when the Transit Center was approved it had been meant to have a clear glass wall on one end. As the Transit Center was being built, it was decided it needed thermal glass rather than the single panel glass which had been approved. The design could not support itself with the change in glass. Two options had been provided to Staff. Mr. Coiner stated he would be comfortable with Ms. Scala approving the change with input from Mr. Wolf and Mr. Adams.

Mr. Knight stated at least two Councilors had mentioned at the meeting that the Board should be allowed to consider what would follow in place of a building demolition. He felt this should be discussed at the joint Work Session.

Mr. Coiner asked if the owners of 1401 Gordon Avenue were in violation for having cut down trees. Ms. Scala explained that Ms. Kelley has stated in the past she was not sure how much authority the Board had over landscaping. Ms. Scala stated she would usually bring to the Board anything involving a major tree but not shrubbery. Ms. Scala also stated she did not know what the property had looked like prior to the clearing.

H. Adjournment

Mr. Tremblay moved to adjourn. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:36 p.m.