

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

Present: Not Present:

Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Fred Wolf, Chair
Wade Tremblay

Also Present:

Amy Gardner
Mary Joy Scala
Lynne Heetderks
Bill Lucy
William Adams
Bryan Hogg

Mr. Knight convened the meeting at 5:02 p.m. Mr. Knight introduced Brian Hogg, the new member of the Board. Ms. Scala introduced two interns from Bulgaria who were helping in the City and the County.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Knight called for matters from the public not on the agenda.

Mr. Theo Diamond, of Design Build Office, stated he was working on Blue Moon Diner. Some of the preliminary designs were completed and he anticipated the project being on the next BAR docket as a Certificate of Appropriateness Application. He was asking the Board to check for any glaring omissions or errors.

Mr. Knight asked if Mr. Diamond had a copy of the Design Guidelines. Mr. Diamond stated he did not. Mr. Knight recommended he get a copy.

Ms. Heetderks stated there was a guideline which explicitly stated do not punch additional holes in historic facades. She stated this included making doors out of windows. She stated she was also concerned about how the roof would attach to the historic structure.

Ms. Heetderks encouraged Mr. Diamond to bring information about the building which they planned to tie into.

Mr. Coiner stated there were Guidelines for lighting and there seemed to be a lot of lighting in the proposal.

Ms. Gardner suggested he look into the signage.

Mr. Knight asked that measured drawings, elevations, plans, sections, samples of materials, specificity about materials, colors and lighting, and any additional information to help explain the proposal be presented when it comes before the Board at the next meeting.

There were no additional matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

1. June 20, 2006 Minutes

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-07-01
1709 University Avenue
Tax Map 9 Parcel 143
James M. Wilson, Applicant
Landscaping Upgrades

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-07-05
1107 1/2 Wertland Street
Tax Map 4 Parcel 312
John Matthews, Applicant/Wade Apartments, LLC, Owner
Demolition of building on site

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-05-04
521 North First Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 2
Mary Buford Hitz, Owner/James R. Boyd, Applicant and Architect
Construct new accessory structure

Mr. Knight asked if the minutes were under consideration. Ms. Scala stated they would be considered at the next meeting.

Mr. Knight asked if the Board wanted any of these items removed from the Consent Agenda for separate discussion.

Mr. Coiner stated his understanding that an E-mail had been received regarding BAR 06-05-04. Ms. Scala read the E-mail she had received from Genevieve Keller at 4:53 p.m. Ms. Keller had expressed concern about the proposed alteration of the spatial organization of the landscape. Mr. Coiner asked that they discuss this matter separately from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Coiner moved for approval of items 2 and 3. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called for a voice vote by acclamation. The motion carried; Mr. Tremblay abstained from voting on item 3 given his involvement with that item and Mr. Hogg recused himself from voting as well.

Consent Agenda Separate Discussion re: BAR 06-05-04

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing structure located in the North Downtown ADC District. The application is to add a carport. The carport roof will be the same as the main house. It will be constructed of painted wood; the columns may be a painted spun-polyester material. The asphalt driveway may be extended slightly to provide a turnaround. The intent is to obscure the carport as much as possible with landscaping. The proposed shed is appropriate in material, scale and design. The location has been determined by an existing guest house and a large tree in the side yard. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Knight recognized the applicant.

Ms. Lisa Cohen spoke on behalf of the applicant. She stated there was no other way to locate the carport.

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

Mr. Adams wanted to know why it could not go parallel to the guest house. Ms. Cohen stated there was a sloped drop off.

Mr. Knight called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner stated the guest house was an original structure to the house. He thought having a carport in front of it was not very sympathetic.

Mr. Knight asked if the carport could change locations with the proposed turnaround. Mr. Boyd stated there had been a different location considered; however, it was not in compliance with a City ordinance.

Mr. Adams stated his belief that the carport should be behind the plane of the front of the building.

Ms. Heetderks stated that it may be difficult to move this further back on the property but the house deserved it. She expressed a desire to see an option that would show the structure further back.

Mr. Knight stated he shared the concern about placement.

Mr. Boyd asked to defer the application.

Mr. Coiner moved that they accept the applicant's request for deferral. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Preliminary Discussion (Applicant requested deferral to August)

BAR 06-07-06
201 Avon Street
Tax Map 58 Parcel 1
Croxtan Collaborative Architects, PC, Applicant
New construction

D. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-04-05
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. The Board had approved Certificate of Appropriateness Applications for two buildings on this site. A Preliminary Discussion had been held in April on a proposal for a three-story mixed-use building. The applicant is now proposing a two-story commercial building. The rear parking area is accessed through a one-story lobby area on the west side of the building. Vehicles may enter the rear parking and drive through window from Ridge Street/McIntyre Road or Fourth Street; exit is only onto Fourth Street. None of the windows are functional. The Guidelines recommend against false windows. The applicant has designed a more subdued building but it does not respond to previous concerns. The site deserves a significant building. The lighting, signage and colors also need discussion.

Mr. John Mack, of Carter & Burgess Architects, was present.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern that the proposal did not meet Zoning setbacks and might not be able to be considered due to that. Mr. Mack stated they were trying to meet setback requirements with this proposal.

Mr. Mack stated the windows on the second floor were meant to provide architectural fenestration for the building and would be frosted glass.

Mr. Knight called for questions or comments from the public. There were none. He then called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Adams wanted to know why the housing had been removed from the top of the building. Mr. Mack explained the massing was too large for the corner and the client did not want to take the project that far.

Mr. Knight sought information about the proposed materials. Mr. Mack stated they would be using a combination brick/precast material, a cast stone for the base, and the first floor would have clear glass windows.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know how if the new proposed design had any connection to Charlottesville architecture. Mr. Mack stated it had a closer reference to the surrounding area of West Main Street.

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

Mr. Lucy stated there did seem to be more work to be done as there was a question regarding the fit between Zoning and the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Tremblay expressed support for the wider sidewalk area on the side of the building.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about the dead windows. She stated they were a violation of the Guidelines. She also expressed concern about the generic quality of the structure.

Mr. Adams thought the previous submittal had more potential than the current proposal. He liked the idea of having residential above the commercial. He did not like the mezzanine design. Mr. Adams stated he would have a hard time supporting this proposal.

Mr. Hogg expressed concern about the stair vestibule projecting out of the main facade. He felt this was an anomaly along Main Street. Mr. Hogg suggested the applicant again look at the relationship between the first and second floor.

Mr. Knight stated the proposal had changed significantly. However, not all of the Board's concerns were addressed in the ways suggested. He felt the building was not pedestrian friendly.

E. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-07-02

112 West Market Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 254

Jeff Marshall, David Legault, Lane Bonner, Applicant

Partial Demolition of Annex

Mr. Knight stated this had been withdrawn by the applicant.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-07-04

524 East Main Street

500 Block East Main Street Mall

City of Charlottesville, Owner/Virginia Discovery Museum, Applicant
Carousel sign

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In April the Board had approved the location of an antique carousel and fence on the Downtown Mall. The applicant seeks approval to locate a sign on the carousel fence. The proposed sign is three feet by two feet. This is before the Board because Staff disagreed with the applicant regarding the size of the sign. Staff feels the sign is out of scale and detracts from the carousel. Staff recommends a sign no larger than two square feet.

Ms. Peppy Linden, Executive Director of the Virginia Discovery Museum, stated the sign was developed to complement the historic and unique kiddie carousel.

Mr. Knight called for questions and comments from the public. There were none. Mr. Knight called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Coiner stated the mock-up sign had more colors than were allowed by the Guidelines. He agreed that the sign was too large. Mr. Coiner felt that rather than naming donors and supporters, the sign should tell the age and significance of the carousel. He also felt the sign blocked the view of the carousel for children.

Ms. Gardner felt the sign competed with the carousel. She also felt the fonts and colors made the sign garish.

Mr. Knight concurred with his colleagues. He suggested the donors' names be placed on the back of the sign.

Ms. Heetderks expressed agreement with Mr. Coiner's idea of the sign telling about the carousel.

Ms. Linden asked to defer the proposal.

Mr. Tremblay moved to accept the request to defer. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment that the applicant be allowed to keep the mock-up sign in place at least until the August meeting. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Adams accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Knight called for a voice vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-07-03

206 Fifth Street NE

Tax Map 53 Parcel 93

Dalgliesh, Gilpin & Paxton, PC, Applicant/Alwood Partnership, LLC, Owner

Window and awning replacement, repainting, and plant thinning

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a 1903 structure. The windows were replaced in 1946; the front door was replaced in 1992. The applicant seeks approval to replace five second-story windows on the west facade with double hung all wood sash replacement kits with simulated

divided lights, muntins permanently affixed inside and out with spacer bars. The applicant would like the option to replace all the rear windows under the two-story porch with light patterns to match. The applicant also proposes to replace the existing awnings with dark green canvas awnings and repaint the building the same color; trim the wisteria and pear trees. The applicant would like the option of either repairing the stucco or painting the brick under the missing stucco. The Guidelines do not qualify when original windows are significant enough to retain; they allow replacement of original windows that are beyond repair. The rear windows are more attractive than the front windows. Staff feels the proposed replacement windows are appropriate on the front west elevation. Staff recommends the awning replacement. If the stucco is going to remain, then either repairing it or painting the exposed brick should be acceptable solutions; however, the exposed red brick, cracked stucco and wisteria look appealing.

Mr. Eric Atman was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated they concur with the staff recommendations. He presented a sample of a sash kit for the Board's consideration.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the deteriorating stucco was causing internal water leaks. Mr. Atman stated it was not.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about the Board's consistency regarding window replacement. She reminded the Board they had requested photographic evidence of the deterioration of existing windows. She wondered if the windows were beyond repair.

Mr. Coiner stated the windows seemed irreparable. He expressed his support of approving a replacement.

Mr. Tremblay complimented the applicant for the continued maintenance of the historic structure.

Mr. Tremblay moved that they approve the replacement of the five second-story windows on the west side, noting their condition and believing it to be in compliance with the Guidelines for replacement. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called for a voice vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Coiner moved to defer the rear windows until the August meeting with the condition that the applicant bring photographic evidence that the windows are beyond repair. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Coiner felt the applicant did not need the Board's approval on anything else as it was all maintenance. Mr. Knight agreed the Board did not need to act on the maintenance issues.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**1618, 1620, 1622 JPA and 103 Valley Road
Tax Map 11 Parcel 7
Wade Apartments, LLC, Applicant/ Mitchell/Matthews, Architects and Urban Planners
Revised Landscape Plan**

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction had been approved on 18 January 2006. The applicant seeks to revise the landscape plan based on the arborist's recommendations that the large cedars and spruce will not survive construction. Two approaches are offered: implementation of an alternate landscaping plan; or proceed with the previously approved plan, replacing dying trees as they are impacted. The alternate plan proposes replacing the cedars and spruces with two European beech trees flanking the entrance and seven American Yellowwood on either side. Removal of the evergreens will have a significant visual impact if removed all at once. Staff commends the applicant for working with abutting property owners to preserve large off site oak trees as much as possible.

Mr. Hawker Dawes, of Mitchell/Matthews, was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated their preference was to remove the trees that were at risk of damage and risk to the public and to come in with new plantings.

With no members of the public remaining at the meeting, Mr. Knight called for questions from the Board.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if any existing trees would remain. Mr. Dawes explained that none of the front trees would remain, but other trees on the site would.

Mr. Knight called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Knight suggested pulling the oak into an area where it would not be competing with an established canopy. He noted there was a Norway Maple in a similar situation on the eastern edge. He suggested they go with a different species than the Norway Maple.

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 revised landscape plan which stipulates the removal of the deodar cedar and the spruces as well as the oak from the adjoining property and the assorted smaller trees satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the suggestion that the Red Oak be moved forward, the Norway Maple be moved forward and changed to a different species and that an arrangement of the Yellowwoods proposed for the front of the building be grouped more informally. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-1; Mr. Tremblay had recused himself from the matter.

Mr. Dawes stated that the original site plan had shown a small screen wall running behind the building and around the perimeter of the rear patio. He stated they had selected to remove that and grade back without a retaining wall. He stated they had reduced the retaining wall in the

front as well. Ms. Scala noted there were air conditioning units in the back that were intended to be screened by the walls.

Mr. Coiner asked if the Board could act on this at this time. Mr. Knight suggested they require that this come back before the Board as a revision to be heard with documentation and proper notice.

I. Other Business

Mr. Knight asked Mr. Coiner and Mr. Lucy if they had anything to share about the joint meeting of the Board with the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Lucy felt there should be some follow up as the end of the meeting was ambiguous.

Mr. Knight stated the Mayor wanted to create a committee composed of himself, Ms. Kendra Hamilton, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Knight to discuss what the Board should be able to review in cases of partial demolition.

Mr. Coiner stated his understanding was that the Board would be meeting with City Council to discuss the overturning of a decision made by the Board as well as other BAR issues. He felt it had not been a forum to talk about some of the concerns the Board had.

Mr. Coiner asked that the professional designers on the Board take a look at the newsstand to determine if future applications like it should have a skirt at the bottom.

Mr. Lucy stated the Board had asked for models of various sorts for various situations and the City has contracted for computer models from the School of Architecture. The original due date had been approximately one and a half years ago. He felt they should ask for that. Mr. Knight asked if the Board should go on record and ask the City to expedite the process.

J. Adjournment

Mr. Knight asked if there was a motion to adjourn. Mr. Tremblay so moved. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:54 p.m.