

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
17 October, 2006
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Amy Gardner (arrives 5:53 p.m.)
Lynne Heetderks
Brian Hogg
Bill Lucy
William Adams

Also Present:

Erin ?

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

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.)

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-03
600 Block of Main Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 60
Satyendra Huja
"Sister Cities" Sculpture

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 (plaza and wall section details)

Mr. Knight asked that both items be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-03
600 Block of Main Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 60
Satyendra Huja
"Sister Cities" Sculpture

At the September meeting Board members had requested that the applicant return with a site plan. The BAR also suggested the sculpture have no base, a concealed base, or a low base set one to two feet above grade. A majority of Board members preferred the west side of City Hall over the east side. The applicant is seeking approval of the base design and specific location in front of City Hall. The applicant has proposed three different concepts. Staff prefers scheme A-1 which shows the sculpture sitting on a raised concrete platform in front of the far west wall of City Hall. Scheme A-2 shows the sculpture in the same location but on a concrete slab which is flush with the sidewalk. Scheme B places the sculpture immediately to the left of the Main Street entrance with a circular base made of material similar in color to the sculpture. A small tree will be removed to accommodate scheme A-1. The low base in A-1 seems most appropriate as it provides a visual transition between the ground and sculpture.

Mr. Satyendra Huja stated they would be happy with either location.

Mr. Knight asked if there was a representation of the plaque. Mr. Huja stated it would just be a bronze plaque.

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

Mr. Coiner expressed his disagreement with Staff that the sculpture was not subject to BAR approval. He asked that any action they took would be only on the site itself.

Mr. Huja stated he had been told it was not under BAR purview.

Mr. Knight expressed a preference for scheme A-2 and stated the Board did have purview over the sculpture but had no qualms with the sculpture itself.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements, moved to find that the two proposed pieces of sculpture location A-2 on a flush concrete base satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2. 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 (plaza and wall section details)

This is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. This matter had been before the BAR on 18 April 2006 at which time the Board allowed demolition of the one-story building identified at the meeting as 218 West Water Street. On 20 June 2006, the Board approved the massing and materials of the new construction. On 15 August 2006, the Board accepted the applicant's request to defer. The applicant is requesting final approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Waterhouse project. A new two-story addition on the east end of the townhouses will obscure the elevator and stairs from South Street. Staff recommends approval as submitted but feels the final color choices should come back for BAR approval.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, stated the organic fence had been lowered by one-third.

Mr. Hogg stated this submission addressed the questions he had about the relationship between the windows and the exterior walls. He stated he was content with what he was seeing. He encouraged the applicant to revisit the decision about the charcoal coloring of the large areas as it seemed to be too great a contrast on the model.

Mr. Knight stated he had a problem reconciling the forms, the materials, and the colors for the courtyard with the facade. He encouraged the applicant to knit things together a little better. He stated he did have a problem with the South Street side since there was an established streetscape of small yards with fences, flowers, and hedges. Mr. Knight further stated this did not seem to meet the Guidelines for context either in terms of form or materials. He also did not feel it complemented the flip side of this building.

Mr. Adams expressed difficulty with the classical tower. He felt it was problematic. He thought it needed more work and could not support it at this time.

Mr. Wolf thought the building had made tremendous strides due to the listening and efforts on the part of the applicant. He stated the project seemed to build quite a bit of square footage in a way that is sensitive to South Street and sensitive to the streetscape of Water Street. He expressed a desire to see an elevation of the wall facing the exposed wall of the elevator and the stair when it comes above the organic wire fence.

Mr. Lucy, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Waterhouse Project satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application, specifically the outdoor plaza, the townhouse, yard areas, and section details, as submitted and final exterior color choices should come back to the BAR for approval. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Knight offered a friendly amendment that the motion include a redesign of the townhouse front

yard areas on the South Street side because they were incompatible with the architecture and the existing streetscape and, therefore, the Guidelines. Mr. Lucy and Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment. Ms. Heetderks stated they needed to see the east elevation of the courtyards from the exterior. Mr. Lucy and Mr. Tremblay accepted that as a friendly amendment. Mr. Adams stated he would like to see a reworking of the classical tower elevations; he doubted there would be any support for that. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote by acclamation. The motion passed, 7-1; Mr. Adams voted against.

Ms. Gardner joined the meeting at 5:53 p.m.

C. Proposed Individually Protected Property

BAR 06-10-03

700 Lyons Avenue

Tax Map 52 Parcel 26

Pat and Leo Napoleon, Applicant

The property was constructed in 1937. The Zoning Ordinance provides that City Council may, by ordinance, designate individual buildings, structures, or landmarks as Individually Protected Properties. Staff recommends approval of 700 Lyons Avenue as an individually designated historic property.

The applicants were present and had nothing to add. They thanked the Board for looking at this.

Mr. Coiner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including Criteria for Additions to or Deletions from Districts or Protected Property List, moved that the BAR recommend that City Council should designate 700 Lyons Avenue as an Individually Protected Historic Property. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-10-04

223-A Fourth Street SW

Tax Map 29 Parcel 42

Mark Watson, Applicant/ FNRI, LLC, owner

Rehabilitation and Addition

This one and-a-half story house is an example of local vernacular architecture possible constructed by a freed slave circa 1860. This property was before the Board on 19 April 2005 at which time an application for demolition was denied. The applicant appealed to City Council on 16 May 2005, but Stu Armstrong from Piedmont Housing Alliance pulled the item from the agenda and no action was taken at that time. The applicant is seeking a preliminary discussion regarding the renovation of the existing structure and the construction of an accessory unit.

Mr. John Pauley, an Assistant Professor in the School of Architecture, stated they were working with Piedmont Housing Alliance on this project. This is a collaborative project with graduate and undergraduate students. This is a classic example of a slave cabin. There was a team which was carefully documenting everything they found.

Mr. Tremblay applauded Mr. Pauley and his class on the effort they were making.

Mr. Coiner expressed his belief that the house could be rehabilitated and made into a reasonable dwelling.

Mr. Adams stated restoration could be a wonderful undertaking.

Mr. Hogg stated he would be inclined to leave the door where it was rather than switch it. He stated he did not have a strong objection to the footprint or the massing of either addition. He was concerned that the roof line for the one-story addition had an exuberant quality which may emphasize its presence at the expense of the historic building.

Mr. Knight asked for careful consideration of site and context.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-10-01

100 & 102 Oakhurst Circle

Tax Map 11 Parcels 1 and 2

Neal Deputy, Applicant

Demolition of Garage and

New Construction (preliminary discussion) and

Recommendation regarding special use permit

The property at 100 Oakhurst Circle is circa 1925 and the property at 102 Oakhurst Circle is circa 1931. They are zoned R-3 with a density of 21 dwelling units per acre by right and 87 by Special Use Permit. The applicant seeks approval to demolish the 1920s outbuilding behind 102 Oakhurst Circle. The applicant will be requesting a Special Use Permit for increased density in a 15 foot setback.

The applicant had nothing to add but would be available to answer questions.

Mr. Tom Petrow, owner of an adjacent property on Jefferson Park Avenue, stated he owned one of the few remaining single-family homes remaining on the block. He expressed concern about height and setback. He also expressed concern about the pedestrian traffic in the area.

Mr. Wolf asked that they address each segment individually.

Mr. Hogg stated that since the building had no significance and did not contribute to the character of the district, its removal would not diminish the reasons that led to the designation of the district.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed demolition of the outbuilding located behind 102 Oakhurst Circle satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay offered a point of clarification that the applicant was proposing one- and two-bedroom units.

Mr. Wolf thought parking would be one of the bigger issues.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if they needed to make a formal statement supporting the SUP.

Mr. Adams stated he could not support a reduction in the set back.

Mr. Wolf stated the Board would offer its support of an increased density of some level on this piece of property to allow consideration of a future project to be built on this site, and furthermore would allow consideration of some reduction of the front yard setback as described in the Zoning Ordinance subject to all of the Guidelines and review based on the Design control district in which it sits. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 8-1; Mr. Adams voted against.

Mr. Wolf called for comments on the new construction. He stated some comments had already been given.

Mr. Hogg stated they needed to see the full context of the new building. He expressed concern that the building breaches the imaginary plane of the facades of adjacent buildings.

Introduction of Project

BAR 06-10-05

109 East Jefferson Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 194

Bethany Puopolo, Applicant/Janice Aron, Owner

Partial demolition and new construction

This property is located in the North Downtown ADC District and is an example of late Georgian architecture. It was constructed in 1814. The applicant is seeking preliminary comments regarding the demolition of the mid-20th Century addition and subsequent construction of a new addition. The applicant intends to return the building to its original use as a single-family structure.

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the applicant was only seeking to remove the addition in its entirety. Ms. Puopolo confirmed this. She stated no new holes would be punched; some which had been closed would be reopened.

Mr. Knight stated he was happy to see someone wanting to turn the building back into a house.

Mr. Hogg stated he was fine with the demolition. He did express concern about the height of the proposed design. He felt the porch should be subordinate to the house.

Mr. Wolf called for a recess at 7:19 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

H. 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 (revisions to rear deck)

This property is in the Downtown ADC District in the Market Street subarea. On 18 April 2006, the Board voted to approve the demolition of the one-story addition, a rear second-story window on Monsoon Restaurant and the fire escape. The Board also voted to approve the design concept for the new construction. It was requested the applicant should bring back for approval the materials, details and colors. On 20 June 2006, the Board voted to approve the details as submitted with administrative approval for signage. The applicant seeks to expand the scope of the approved design to include a new third-floor rear deck with railings to be constructed over the previously approved second floor rear deck. The new deck will extend just beyond the roof peak of the existing brick building on Second Street NW. The ground floor rear parking patio is proposed to be enclosed with a six foot high fence and paved with brick to form an outdoor seating area. The proposed additions meet the Zoning and Guidelines for massing and height. Staff suggested to the applicant that the height of the third floor deck railing should not exceed the height of the roof of the existing building and new construction.

Mr. Gate Pratt, with Limehouse Architects, explained a roof was needed to provide a protected walkway to the apartments on the second floor. He thought the visual impact would be negligible.

Mr. Knight stated he found it to be a relatively awkward looking structure. However, he did not think he could find anything in the Guidelines that it directly violates.

Ms. Gardner agreed with Mr. Knight that it seemed awkward and a little forced. She thought the use of Jeffersonian elements on the handrails didn't seem to match. She expressed a preference for the railing to be lower and for the design of the handrail to be simplified.

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 new third floor rear deck and ground floor patio enclosure modified with the railing detail as discussed 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. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-10-02

420 Park Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 120

Edward H. Bain, Jr., Applicant

Tree removal

This property is located in the North Downtown ADC District. The applicant seeks to remove a large white ash tree from the south side of the building for safety reasons. A justification from a consulting arborist was submitted. This is a significant tree and Staff was uncomfortable approving removal administratively. A replacement species and location should be discussed if removal is approved.

Mr. Ed Bain stated this was not something he did lightly. He wanted to replace it with a Yellowwood tree, and behind that, a Black Gum tree.

Mr. Knight wanted to know any additional information on what was wrong with the tree. Mr. Bain did not.

Mr. Knight stated it was a magnificent tree and he appreciated the work done with it over the years. He stated he would need to see more specificity on what was wrong with the tree. He encouraged Mr. Bain to get a second opinion.

Mr. Wolf agreed with Mr. Knight and especially that a more detailed report was required to validate the decision to remove a very large tree.

Mr. Bain expressed concern since an eight foot section had fallen three weeks prior. He stated he was not willing to take the risk that someone would be injured by falling branches; if the Board was, that was fine.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed tree removal satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion failed, 1-8; Mr. Tremblay voted in favor.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to defer to give the applicant the opportunity to get a second opinion. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 8-1; Mr. Tremblay voted against.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-05

1115 Wertland Street

Tax Map 4 Parcel 305; Tax Map 4 Parcel 312

Mitchell/Matthews Architects, Applicant/Wade Tremblay, LLC, Owner

New construction

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the matter.

This is in the Wertland Street ADC District. The BAR approved demolition of 1115 and 1115 1/2 Wertland Street on 16 May 2006. Demolition of 1107 Wertland Street on 18 July 2006. A preliminary discussion was held on 19 September 2006. The applicant is requesting approval of a four-story with basement multi-family building with 32 apartment units. The basement level contains parking. There will be adjustments to the surface parking and landscaping. The materials are brick or cultured stone foundation, fiber cement siding, vinyl clad wood windows with vinyl window casing and asphalt roof shingles. The property is zoned Residential University Medium Density. The maximum height permitted is 50 feet. Some changes have been made but it is not clear that the main concern of bringing down the mass has been addressed. The pergolas have been removed. The applicant submitted a perspective section of the floor heights and a view from Wertland. The windows on the end bays have been redesigned. The Board needs to see all four elevations. The applicant should be mindful of the appearance of the rear elevation from Page Street. The site design needs attention including retaining wall material height.

Mr. John Matthews, of Mitchell Matthews Architects, stated they had taken into consideration the previous meeting and they had tried to address all concerns. He stated the pergola was still there.

Mr. Knight stated he had not been present for the last meeting. He had been concerned about the relationship of this building with Page Street. Most of his fears had been allayed by the photograph provided by the applicant. He stated he could support the project.

Mr. Hogg expressed his appreciation for the applicant's response to the concerns he had raised.

Mr. Wolf stated he shared the concerns about the bays, but he did not think it rose to the level to hold up the project.

Mr. Wolf moved to approve as submitted with the conditions that the color choices in terms of the siding and the trim and the windows would come back for Staff approval and with the recommendation for a dark color and a near monochromatic palette for the overall building and a strong request that the bays be revisited and that preference be given perspective renderings and a preference for a stone bay with the use of one of two base materials and one of two window styles. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Other Business

Mr. Lucy stated there still wasn't language for a conservation ordinance. He also stated the Fifeville historic survey had been moving forward.

Mr. Lucy made a motion that the language for a conservation district be completed in conjunction with the completion of the Fifeville survey so they are both available at the same time. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

Mr. Knight moved to adjourn. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:00 p.m.