

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
August 15, 2006
Minutes**

Present: Also Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Mary Joy Scala
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Amy Gardner
Lynne Heetderks
Brian Hogg
Bill Lucy
William Adams

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Wolf called for matters from the public not on the agenda. 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. June 20, 2006 Minutes
2. July 18, 2006 Minutes
3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-07-07
1602 Gordon Avenue
Tax Map 9 Parcel 13
Montessori School of Charlottesville
Build flower beds, a three foot picket fence from steps to sidewalk, and a mulch mound.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-01
38 University Circle

Tax Map 6 Parcel 91
ACE Contracting Inc., Applicant/ Chris & Priscilla Searcy, Owners
New walkway with new steps, and a new retaining wall

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-07
409 Altamont Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 136
Jason Johnson and Nataly Gattegno
Renovations to rear facade

Mr. Wolf called the Consent Agenda. Ms. Heetderks asked that the June minutes be pulled for review.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval of the Consent Agenda minus the June 20th minutes. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from July 18 -- Applicant has requested continuing deferral to September BAR meeting)

BAR 06-07-04
524 East Main Street
500 Block East Main Street Mall
City of Charlottesville, Owner/Virginia Discovery Museum, Applicant
Carousel sign

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from July 18)

BAR 06-07-03
206 Fifth Street NE
Tax Map 53 Parcel 93
Dalglish, Gilpin & Paxton, PC, Applicant/Alwood Partnership, LLC, Owner
Replacement of rear windows

Mr. Wolf stated this had been removed from the agenda.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from July 18)

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

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. On July 18th the Board accepted the applicant's request to defer the request for a carport. Concerns were voiced about the location of the carport in relation to other structures on the property. Concern was also raised about the concrete on the ground plane. Two members of the BAR met with the applicant on site on July 27th to review the topography. The proposed shed is appropriate in material, scale and design. The location has been determined by an existing guest house and large tree in the side yard. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Ms. Lisa Cohen, of Hayward Boyd Architects, was present on behalf of the owner of the property. She had photographs of the site to show existing vegetation which would hide their proposed location carport as well as a photograph depicting oak and hemlock trees which would be destroyed if the carport was turned 90 degrees as previously suggested by the Board. The grade is substantial enough that turning the carport would require additional railings, foundations, and a more solid structure than was proposed. She stated they had attempted to match up the columns on the house with the columns for the carport.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know what type of roof would be used. Ms. Cohen stated it would be standing seam copper.

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

Mr. Coiner stated he had met with the designer and Mr. Wolf and he was convinced the proposed location was the only place the structure could go. His previous concerns had been resolved by seeing the site. He stated he would support the application as proposed.

Mr. Wolf stated that in looking at the site, he did not see how this proposal would have a detrimental effect.

Mr. Adams stated he had visited the site on a different day and felt the proposed placement was not correct.

Mr. Knight stated he, too, had visited the site. He felt there was a better way to site the carport. He further stated there was the option of not building the carport if it was intrusive. He stated his belief that it was intrusive since it competed with the original building.

Mr. Hogg stated he shared the concerns about siting the carport. He stated it was substantially larger than it needed to be.

Mr. Tremblay expressed support for the proposal as designed.

Mr. Wolf stated that it would be better pushed back to the plane of the house.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find the proposed carport satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves this application as submitted. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called for a voice vote by acclamation. The motion failed, 3-6; Mr. Tremblay, Mr. Lucy and Mr. Coiner voted for.

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 carport does not satisfy the BAR's criteria, specifically Section P2.8 on Garages, Sheds and Other Structures, numbers 5, 7, and 8, and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that they therefore deny the application as submitted. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Knight encouraged the applicant to look at this again; he did not see that the current proposal met the Guidelines. Mr. Coiner stated they had made measurements and a 90 degree turn may not be the answer. The motion passed, 6-3; Mr. Tremblay, Mr. Lucy and Mr. Coiner voted against.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-04-03

218 West Water Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 84

Waterhouse, LLC, Owner/Atwood Architects, Inc., Applicant

New mixed use building -- Elevation details

Ms. Gardner recused herself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The last action on this was taken June 20th at which time the Board approved the massing and materials of the new construction. There are now four, rather than three, townhouses facing South Street. The massing and height of the townhouses has been reduced. A landscaped private plaza is located between South Street and Water Street buildings. The pedestrian bridge of a previous submittal has been eliminated. There is a location provided for a sculpture. Details on the plaza area design and building colors will be provided at a later date.

The applicant, who failed to identify himself for the record, stated the adjustments had been reviewed with the neighborhood and discussed in a positive sense. The changes which were made reflect specific requests from the Board. He stated they did have preliminary site plan approval.

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

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if the South Street structure had a factory finish metal roof. The applicant stated it was.

Mr. Knight sought confirmation that real stucco would be used rather than synthetic. The applicant affirmed it was real.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. Brent Nelson, owner of 214 South Street, expressed appreciation for the changes which had occurred in the building. He was concerned about the South Street elevation. He stated it was a shame that there was not more variation going from section to section. He noted for the record that he would like to see this proposal carried on across the length of the existing parking lot going eastward onto the parcel that was not under control at the moment.

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

Mr. Wolf applauded the changes which had been made. However, he did have some concerns about the stucco detailing of those elements which would usually be different.

Mr. Knight stated his belief that all the changes that had been made are positive. He did ask the applicant come back with details on the entire site.

Mr. Adams expressed a desire to see the details for the other buildings as well. He thought the South Street elevation was too big.

The applicant requested the matter be deferred.

Mr. Coiner moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion passed 8-0-1; Ms. Gardener abstained from voting.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-01-01

1618, 1620, 1622 JPA & 103 Valley Road

Tax Map 11 Parcel 7

**Wade Apartments, LLC, Applicant/ Mitchell/Matthews, Architects and Urban Planners
Jefferson Commons -- modification to JPA retaining wall, elimination of rear retaining
wall at back patio**

This was heard in conjunction with:

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-08

1618, 1620, 1622 JPA & 103 Valley Road

Tax Map 11 Parcel 7

**Wade Apartments, LLC, Applicant/ Mitchell/Matthews, Architects and Urban Planners
Jefferson Commons -- reduction of Squirrel's Nest parking from 4 spaces to 2**

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the discussion and voting on both items.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Last February the Board approved a new building. At that time the plan was to preserve the large deodar cedars and Norway spruces except for two. The applicant came back at the July meeting and the Board approved the removal of all the street front deodar cedars and spruces and a rear oak tree on the property line along with assorted smaller trees with the suggestion of moving landscaping forward in the rear and informally grouping yellow woods in the front. The applicant also broached the subject of revisions to the retaining wall at that meeting but was asked to bring that back to another meeting. The applicant seeks to modify the retaining wall adjacent to the JPA frontage and eliminate the rear retaining wall at the back patio area. Having received permission to remove certain trees, the applicant no longer finds it necessary to preserve grades to reduce land disturbance to existing trees; therefore he is making it a much more gentle grade. Two new red oak trees, several dogwoods, serviceberry and a holly are proposed. Staff feels the previous patio design was more interesting architecturally, but with adequate screening, the proposed plan meets the Guidelines. The front landscape design has interest and should provide adequate screening once established. The Squirrel's Nest could only be used for storage unless the applicant got a Special Use Permit. The proposed parking reduction has been done at other apartment complexes. The intent is to reduce parking there only if the SUP for increased density is approved by City Council; if it is not approved, the parking configuration would remain as is currently shown. Since the current configuration is nonconforming, any reduction could be seen as an improvement.

Mr. Hawker Dawes, of Mitchell/Matthews, was present on behalf of the applicant to answer any questions the Board may have. He stated the desire for reduction or elimination of the retaining walls was because they weren't constrained by preservation of root zones and trees. This allowed for an easier slope of grades.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Mr. Michael Osteen, of 9 Gildersleeve Wood, asked if lowering the grade in the front would cause more of the facade to be seen. Mr. Dawes stated they would not.

Ms. Sally McCallum, of 2 Gildersleeve Wood, sought clarification of the location of retaining walls. Mr. Dawes stated there would be no retaining walls in the rear of the property at all.

Ms. Sally Brown, of 110 Shamrock Road, stated Mr. Tremblay had always been held in high regard by the Neighborhood Association. She wondered if Mr. Tremblay had considered scaling the size of the project down so that some of the trees could be saved.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board regarding the retaining wall.

Mr. Knight wanted to know the material of the retaining wall along the western edge of the parking area. Mr. Dawes stated it was poured in place concrete with a brick veneer treatment on the street-facing side.

Mr. Coiner stated several people had received an E-mail addressing the fact that there would be more noise heard in the neighborhood with the elimination of the wall and wanted to know if the

applicant saw that as valid. Mr. Dawes stated that a wall that was at seat height would be screening noise from the patio areas.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. Michael Osteen, of 9 Gildersleeve Wood, stated the Board had been very responsive to the process. However, he felt a two-foot retaining wall was better than nothing for buffering the property which was surrounded by single-family homes. He felt the project did not meet Entrance Corridor Guidelines.

Ms. Diane Williams, of 108-A Oakhurst Circle, spoke in opposition of the proposal expressing concern about the noise. She did not believe the proposed screening was adequate.

Ms. Jane Foster, of Gildersleeve Wood, spoke in opposition of the proposal expressing concern about the traffic and noise.

Mr. Dawes stated the hardscape patio enclosed by a masonry wall could amplify the noise more than a softscape.

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

Ms. Scala clarified that the property was now in the Oakhurst/Gildersleeve ADC which overruled the Entrance Corridor designation. She also stated that multi-family development was allowed by right so the Board could not really discuss the noise.

Mr. Knight agreed the parking was awkward and intrusive, but felt it was helpful to have less. He suggested the applicant rethink the choice of plants. He wanted to see something more substantial especially since the air handlers needed screening.

Mr. Hogg stated Mr. Knight's comments were constructive.

Mr. Adams stated his belief that there was more opportunity for screening with a retaining wall which would also show deference to the neighbors.

Ms. Gardner expressed agreement with Mr. Adams. She stated the retaining wall would be better in keeping with the character of the project. She wished the stone wall could remain.

Mr. Wolf stated he agreed with Mr. Knight regarding the parking spaces. He stated he regretted the loss of the wall, but the proposal met the Guidelines.

Ms. Gardner stated that City Code stated "if the proposal was incompatible with the historic, cultural, or architectural character of the district in which the property is located," and given that, as Mr. Osteen had said, there were a number of existing low stone walls, the Board could argue that a retaining wall at the rear of the property contributes to the historic district or the character and the removal of it is incompatible. Mr. Wolf agreed that if it had already been built, they could consider it a removal; however, it had not been built.

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 -- specifically the area in front of the building and along the front edge of the parking area -- satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application of the revision to the proposed retaining wall along the parking area and the removal of the retaining walls along the walkways as submitted. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. There being no discussion, Mr. Wolf called for a vote by acclamation. The motion passed, 8-0-1; Mr. Tremblay abstained from voting.

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 in the rear of the building does not satisfy the BAR's criteria -- specifically section 2, page 2.9, item H, referring to screening of utilities and other site appurtenances -- is not compatible with other properties in this district, and that the BAR deny the request to revise the retaining walls in the rear of the building. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf stated he was going to support the motion simply because he did not feel the current screening adequately screens the mechanical equipment. Mr. Wolf called for a vote by acclamation. The motion passed, 8-0-1; Mr. Tremblay abstained from voting.

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 regarding the parking area off of Valley Road in front of the Squirrel's Nest satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application subject to the approval of the Special Use Permit by City Council. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. There being no discussion, Mr. Wolf called for a vote by acclamation. The motion passed, 8-0-1; Mr. Tremblay abstained from voting.

Mr. Coiner requested a dinner recess. Mr. Wolf recessed the meeting at 7:24 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-02

512 West Main Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 7

Blue Moon Diner LLC, Applicant/Janice Perkins Family Trust, Owner

Facade renovation

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Blue Moon Diner was built after 1949. The Diner first covered four bays of the house behind it which was built in 1884. It was extended to cover five bays in the early 60s. It is a contributing structure in the West Main District. The applicant wants to replace the existing door which is in the east bay of the building. The opening would stay as is. Around the corner they want to replace an existing window. The applicant wants to add a roof structure since the roof is used as a deck. None of the proposed changes would create openings in the brick larger than those existing. For the most part, the proposed changes are attractive and

compatible to the existing building. The new double door should not increase the size of the existing opening. The new roof structure should be designed to conceal as little of the older building as possible. The treated wood supports for the roof deck should be painted wood or metal. The proposed roof columns fail to align with the bays of the brick building. Staff has requested additional information including a photo of the window and door proposed for replacement.

Mr. Ted Nelson, of Design Build Office, and Mr. Mark Hahn, one of owners of the restaurant were present.

Mr. Nelson thanked the Board for listening to them. Mr. Nelson gave a brief presentation to the Board. Signage proposals had been submitted.

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

Mr. Adams wanted to know what the underside of the roof would be. Mr. Nelson stated it would be painted beadboard.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of what would replace the existing window on the east side. Mr. Nelson stated it was to be a wood window matching the size and divisions of light.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the door was to swing in or out. Mr. Nelson stated it needed to swing out for egress but they hoped to have door that would swing in or out.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. Price Hall, one of the owners of The Blue Moon Diner, stated one of the reasons they hoped to move the main entrance was so the public would be entering through the nonsmoking area rather than the smoking area.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks stated she was skeptical of the roof above the roof system. She stated if there were water problems on the roof, the roof should be fixed. She expressed concern about how it would look from beneath.

Mr. Coiner agreed with Ms. Heetderks.

Mr. Hogg felt that placing a porch roof on top of the existing roof completely changes the nature of the structure and the character of the street. He stated he also had a problem with reducing the window.

Mr. Adams applauded the applicants for their enthusiasm. However, the roof portion should be considered more carefully.

Mr. Wolf stated the applicants had done a good job. However, he had a hard time with the roof and agreed with Ms. Heetderks.

Mr. Knight concurred with his colleagues that the roof was a lot of structure and a lot of questions for a limited amount of utility. He thought this could be a great project. He stated the applicant had presented a couple of options for signage; he suggested they choose one to present to the Board. Mr. Knight expressed concern about the way the bench met the stairs.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed renovations 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 condition that the elevated roof not be built and that all windows on the front facade be the same size with the small window being made into a larger window. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Knight offered a friendly amendment asking that the sign come back to the Board. Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf asked if they could give Ms. Scala some latitude in revealing how the bench would look in conjunction with the window or if it would have to return to the Board. Mr. Hogg stated making storefronts more opaque was a mistake on a commercial street. He further stated if the solution delegated to Ms. Scala was leave the counter and leave the window, he could live with that as an answer. Ms. Heetderks stated that had been what she was thinking when she made her motion. Mr. Wolf stated he did not see this as storefront windows. Ms. Heetderks asked to insert paragraph 4.4, Windows, number 10, of the Standards for the Review of Construction for Rehabilitation -- avoid changing the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows by cutting new openings, blocking in windows, or installing replacement sashes that do not fit the window openings -- in her motion. Mr. Coiner stated if they were going to have Ms. Scala review the counter, she should also look into the bench Mr. Knight had mentioned because it looks like an accident waiting to happen. Mr. Knight withdrew his friendly amendment about signage. Mr. Wolf called the vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-06-02

1401 Gordon Avenue

Tax Map 5 Parcel 83

Brad Booker and Laurie Veliky, Applicants

Construct 4 bedroom detached unit to rear of existing structure

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The existing house is a 1925 Colonial Revival four squared house. It is a contributing structure in the Rugby Road District. There is a side porch on the Fourteenth Street side. The proposed rear addition will encapsulate the north side of the house and will have its main entrance on Fourteenth Street. A new driveway will access two new parking spaces. The intention is to match the building materials of the existing house: brick will match existing, the roof will be standing seam metal painted to match existing, porch roof will be painted metal to match roof, painted wood trim, painted wood porch columns, painted wood door with side lights, and the windows will be clad wood double hung with wood trim and simulated

divided lights permanently affixed outside and inside with spacer bars. The addition has been designed to be compatible with the main structure and the surrounding buildings. The proposed addition lacks a foundation which would make the building taller but would allow windows to align horizontally. The proposed driveway would look more residential if it was ten to 12 feet at the sidewalk and allowed to widen at the back.

The applicants were present to answer questions. Mr. Booker stated there was no foundation in an attempt to keep the roof lines as matching as possible. He stated this was their sixth attempt to meet design and building criteria and felt they were out of options.

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

Mr. John Yiannias, of 1409 Gordon Avenue, stated he was in favor of the proposed height.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay stated this was what they asked for when they created both a University High Density District and then put an historic overlay on it and said come back with ways to incorporate additions with the historic residences.

Mr. Adams wanted to know why the proposal was for an addition and not a separate building. Mr. Booker stated the buildings would need to be separated by eight feet which would affect the setbacks.

Mr. Knight felt the proposal was stuck and was neither fish nor fowl; it's neither addition nor separate building. He stated if it was an addition, it needed to be more respectful of the original building. Mr. Knight did not think this met the Guidelines and would have a hard time supporting it.

Mr. Coiner expressed agreement with Mr. Knight.

Mr. Hogg stated he was not bothered by the windows not lining up. He thought the building was too tall.

Ms. Gardner felt the materials needed to be different. The current proposal makes the addition seem like a growth on the original structure.

Mr. Hogg expressed a preference for a rectangular, rather than an L-shaped, building stating it would make the roof simpler.

Mr. Booker stated they would like a deferral at this time.

Mr. Knight moved to accept the applicants' request for deferral. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-04

633 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 16

Upstream & Associates, LLC

Replace doors and windows on front facade, new door and window openings on side/courtyard facade, and a new stucco addition with metal roof at rear facade.

Mr. Wolf stated he would recuse himself from this matter. Mr. Knight, as Vice Chair, took over the meeting.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a 1918 commercial building. It is a contributing structure in the West Main ADC district. The application seeks to replace the existing door and four windows in the first floor south front facade with four new painted wood double hung windows and a new door and transom. The location of one window and the door will be reversed by enlarging the window opening and filling in the doorway under the new window. The applicant also seeks to repair the existing arched windows and replace the existing door on the side courtyard facade with a new door and transom in the existing opening. The applicant seeks to create six new window openings with new painted wood double hung windows on the same courtyard facade wall. A new door opening for a new door transom would be created under the patio roof. The applicant seeks to remove the existing chimney and patch the stucco to match the adjacent wall surface. The applicant also seeks to add a new rear addition with stucco walls to match existing with a galvanized metal roof and two new painted wood doors with transoms. The new addition would replace the existing back porch. Staff feels the changes to the facade would not adversely affect the character of the building. A site plan amendment will be required for the building. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Dave Ackerman, of Wolf Ackerman Design, was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated this was an attempt to clean up the facade and get a little more light into the first and second floor from the east side and to renovate and repair the back porch area. He stated the three center windows on the first floor were aluminum storefront windows; he did not think they were original. Facing the building, the entry is currently on the left-hand side; they propose to move it to the right-hand side.

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

Mr. Adams wanted to know if there were any old photos of the building showing its original state. Mr. Ackerman did not have any.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification of the purpose behind removing the chimney. Mr. Ackerman stated it was the result of having secondary access -- primarily for service to the patio.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification if the punching of holes in the wall and the demolition of the chimney rose to the level of a partial demolition. Ms. Scala confirmed it could be considered a partial demolition.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the proposed removal of the door to be replaced by a window could also be achieved by putting in a glass door since it was evident that there were originally two doors on the front of the building. Mr. Coiner stated he would have no problem with knocking out the existing window to replace it with a door but he did not think the Guidelines would allow for a door to be replaced by a window.

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

Ms. Heetderks stated she did not like taking the chimney down. She thought it added a lot of character to the facade. She stated she also did not like punching doors and windows in existing historic fabric; the Guidelines are explicit about that. She felt they were bound to use the criteria for partial demolition.

Mr. Hogg stated he had no problem with the windows. He stated it was an undeveloped facade which may have some historic fabric associated with it, but he did not think it was especially meaningful. He thought it was a perfectly fine proposal. He stated two doors would be great.

Mr. Knight felt this did not rise to the level of a partial demolition considering the facade was ostensibly the remnant of an interior wall.

Ms. Scala stated she could find no additional information on this building which could be offered for consideration if this were considered as a partial demolition.

Mr. Coiner stated he would not support replacing the existing door with a window. Mr. Ackerman stated he could rationalize two working doors on that facade.

Mr. Tremblay moved that they approve the partial demolition to the east wall of the building and existing chimney to allow for window and door installation. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called the question. The motion passed, 7-1-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against and Mr. Wolf abstained from voting.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes -- specifically the insertion of windows and a door on the east facade as well as the window replacements and door replacements on the south side -- are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with paint colors and signage to be approved by Staff. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called the question. The motion passed, 7-1-1; Mr. Hogg voted against and Mr. Wolf abstained from voting.

Mr. Wolf resumed Chairmanship of the meeting.

B. Consent Agenda

1. June 20, 2006 Minutes

Ms. Heetderks asked that item E on page 4 be changed to reflect that she had requested an archaeological survey rather than an archaeological dig.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval as amended. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

L. Other Business

Mr. Lucy stated there should be a follow up on the status of the computer model that has been in preparation at the University of Virginia.

Mr. Coiner asked that if they were not going to act on the carousel sign that they move to allow the Museum to keep a temporary sign up until the matter could be heard. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

M. Adjournment

Mr. Tremblay moved for adjournment. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
17 August, 2006
Special Meeting
Draft Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay

Preston Coiner

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Brian Hogg

Bill Lucy

William Adams

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. 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

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The attached annex is post-1920. This is a contributing property. They are relocating the church and would like a preliminary discussion to address: demolition of the annex; removal of the stained glass windows; adding handicapped access; and building in front of the annex in a way which would encapsulate that building.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, stated there had been interest in purchasing the building but the purchasers backed out. According to the realtor it was because of inquiries made as to what changes could be made. This was an effort to find out what could be done to the building to make it more saleable.

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

Mr. Lucy wanted to know if any potential purchaser had wanted all or part of the stained glass windows removed. The applicant stated it had not gotten that specific.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know whether the windows were installed when the church was built or over time. The applicant did not know.

Mr. Coiner suggested the applicant get a copy of the Guidelines dealing with historic properties. He stated he could not support removal of the stained glass windows.

Mr. Knight stated there were six guidelines for demolition. He suggested the applicants read them.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the applicants had looked into whether the annex could support building on top of it. The applicants had not.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if there had been any proposal for a new use for the church. The applicant stated the main interest had been non-profit groups and one party was interested in converting to a restaurant.

Mr. Wolf explained one of the issues is the scar that would be revealed to the sanctuary by removing the annex. Churches, libraries, city halls, things like that typically stand out as special structures within a city. He stated he would not support removing the stained glass windows. He could see building in front of or on top of the annex. Mr. Wolf stated he could see selectively renovating the annex, but he could not see removing the annex totally.

Mr. Knight stated that, when considering partial or total demolition, they could not consider what might replace the existing building. He stated the Board's predilection was to encourage adaptive reuse wherever possible.

Ms. Heetderks stated the annex was not an attractive addition and the church was far superior architecturally and historically.

C. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-07-06

201 Avon Street

Tax Map 58 Parcel 1

Croxton Collaborative Architects, PC, Applicant

New construction

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property was added to the Downtown ADC District in January. The property contains a noncontributing structure, the Lethal Wrecker building. The adjacent building, the Beck Cohen building, formerly the Brown Millen company, is a contributing structure but is not part of the project. The property will need a Special Use Permit to increase density. They are allowed nine stories by right. The applicant intends to make application to close traffic to South Street and Sixth Street. The plan includes a health spa on the

first floor with residential units above. They propose green screen to screen their building from the Beck Cohen building. Proposed materials are recycled brick, high performance glass, and architectural metal panel. Street level activity is a concern on all sides of the building. Items to address may be the relationship of the design of this building to other historic buildings in the Downtown District, the lack of setbacks on South and Sixth, the visual interest of street level design, the specific impact on the Beck Cohen building, and the success of the site design including pedestrian connections to Belmont Bridge and Avon Street, and the green design elements.

Mr. Randy Croxton, of Croxton Collaborative Architects, stated this was an interesting project because it bridges between two very important and diverse districts. He stated they were striving for a platinum LEED rating; no residential building in America has achieved that rating. The sky gardens serve as an integral part of that rating and also serve to break down the mass of the building. The building would be 75 percent residential.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Ms. Caroline Fetera, manager of Avon Court, sought clarification of what road would be closed. Mr. Croxton stated the closing would be by joint agreement. Sixth Street would become a private street and access but would not be torn up or disrupted.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Adams wanted to know why there was not more retail around the ground level. Mr. Croxton stated they felt placing retail use at the more remote location would be extremely difficult.

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

Mr. Adams felt the street level was bleak and dead in a neighborhood where retail is finding its way into every nook and cranny. He felt there was more that could be done. He stated it felt more like a superblock. Mr. Adams felt a different colored brick would reduce the visual mass.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to see an attempt made to give more space to the Beck Cohen building.

Mr. Knight expressed concern about context in that he did not think much effort was being given to the old mill. He expressed a preference for uses which would encourage pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Tremblay stated he was generally supportive of the size and mass in this location.

Mr. Wolf agreed this was an opportunity for a building such as this. He expressed a preference for a darker brick.

Ms. Gardner felt it needed more animation on the street and needed to be friendlier and with more usability. She liked the use of the sky gardens.

Mr. Lucy thought the LEED platinum rating was a good thing to do. He agreed darker brick would help. He disagreed with the comments about retail; he felt the applicant was on a good track with the commercial use plan.

Mr. Hogg agreed they should not dictate the commercial use. He stated the building was not deferential to the Beck Cohen building and was going to over power it.

D. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-08-05

BRW Architects, Applicant/ Holy Comforter Catholic Church, Owner Renovation and two-floor addition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a 1925 building and is a contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC District and is located in a National Register District. The existing western addition was built in 1981. The intent is to replace this 1981 addition. The conceptual design is for a three-story addition with basement. The 1981 addition would be demolished and the west wall of the original church would be encapsulated by the new addition. The front of the new addition will line up with the existing sanctuary facade and will extend to the rear property line. The Board may want to address: the impact of the new addition on the church; the relationship of the design of the building to the church and to other historic buildings in the district; general massing and roof form; arrangement of openings and visual interests of the street level design.

Mr. Bruce Wardell provided the Board with an updated packet. He stated the church had conducted a feasibility study in 1990 that indicated their parish needs. On a suburban site, ten to 12,000 square feet of additional space would be built; in this case, just under 7,000 square feet were being proposed. Mr. Wardell stated the basement was already existing. The new addition would stay below the pediment of the original building.

Mr. Wolf called for discussion.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern that the proposed addition did not reference the original structure at all other than through the use of stucco.

Mr. Knight stated he saw reference in the four columns on the addition and the proportion between the columns and the height. It was helpful to see this level of thought go into the plan.

Mr. Hogg felt brick was important as this was a red brick neighborhood. He expressed concern that the side facade was very long and would be visible for a long time.

E. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-08-06

West Main between the Blake Center and Northern Exposure Tax Map 10 Parcel 60, 61, 81.1, 82

**University of Virginia Foundation
New building and parking garage**

Mr. Hogg recused himself from the discussion.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property is in the West Main Street ADC District and currently consists of surface parking lots. This is the West Main South Mixed Use Corridor and allows two- to five-stories and up to seven-stories by Special Use Permit. The applicant will be applying for a Special Use Permit. There are step back requirements; a 32 degree angle must be drawn and then the building step backs. University of Virginia Foundation is submitting for preliminary review the West Main Street Clinical Building Project which includes office and commercial space, a parking garage and a future pedestrian bridge across the railroad tracks. The clinical building is six-stories with an additional mechanical penthouse. The clinical building materials are primarily brick and off-white metal panels. Garage materials are primarily precast concrete with brick piers. Discussion should be held on whether the scale of the building and parking structure are appropriate on this site; if so, is the large building massed and articulated in a way that respects and relates to the historic buildings in the West Main Street ADC District. Other issues: whether the design draws upon forms and details of Charlottesville architecture, West Main Street architecture in particular; whether the three floors of glass are in keeping with West Main Street architecture; whether the first floor store fronts are articulated to read as retail spaces; whether any attempt has been made to reduce the scale of the parking structure; and the appropriateness of the building materials.

Mr. Fred Missel, Director of Design and Development of the UVA Foundation, was present with Tim Rose, CEO of the Foundation, Todd Marshall, Project Manager, Andrew Green and Luis Carranza, architects, and Mark Atwood, Odell, and Scott Matthews, of Mitchell Matthews Associates. Mr. Missel wanted the Board to understand how this project fits into the University Master Plan. The University will be constructing a state of the art cancer center located in the existing location of the West Parking Garage which will be demolished. This new garage will provide parking for that project as well as future projects.

Mr. Scott Matthews gave a brief presentation of the proposal.

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

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the Foundation owned the Blake Center and 1222 JPA. Mr. Missel affirmed the Foundation owned the Blake building; however 1222 JPA is owned by the University.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if the facade could be seen from Wertland. Mr. Matthews thought it could.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know which surrounding buildings were contributing structures. Ms. Scala stated Sycamore House and Kane Furniture were.

Mr. Adams thought the parking garage was part of the creeping gigantism which was disturbing. He wanted to see a better design for it. He had issues with the architectural piece along West Main. He thought it could be made better with more brick and punched openings on the lower level and curtain wall as the building steps up.

Mr. Knight stated he was not comfortable with the West Main design of the clinical building. He felt the parking garage did not relate well to West Main Street.

Ms. Gardner thought the facade was impressive; however, she had a problem with the corner element and circular roof line.

F. Other Business

Mr. Wolf stated Ms. Scala had passed out an update on Mr. Lucy's questions from the meeting on 15 August. Ms. Scala stated the man generating the computer model was waiting until September. Mr. Lucy did not think it would be ready in September. He had been told that it has been operable for quite some months. Ms. Scala's understanding was there was a written contract in place and the City would pursue legal action after September.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know who the owner/client was on the Croxton Collaborative Architects project. Ms. Scala stated it was not on the application.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know which BAR members were serving on the Demolition Committee and which were on the Development Group. Mr. Knight was serving on the Demolition Committee. Mr. Wolf was serving on Development.

G. Adjournment

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