

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
December 19, 2006  
Minutes**

**Present: Not Present:**

Fred Wolf, Chair Amy Gardner  
Syd Knight, Vice Chair William Adams  
Wade Tremblay  
Preston Coiner

**Also Present**

Lynne Heetderks Mary Joy Scala  
Brian Hogg (arrived 5:06 p.m.)  
Michael Osteen

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. 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.)**

**Minutes -- August 17, 2006 -- Special Meeting**

**Minutes -- September 19, 2006**

**Minutes -- October 17, 2006**

**Minutes -- November 28, 2006**

Ms. Heetderks asked to pull the November minutes for discussion.

Mr. Tremblay moved to approve the Consent Agenda minus the November minutes. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-07-06**

**201 Avon Street**

**Tax Map 58 Parcel 1**

**New construction**

**Croxtan Collaborative Architects, PC, Applicant**

The applicant was not present at the time, therefore the Chair moved this item to later in the meeting.

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-11-02**

**200 Second Street NW**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 174**

**Rebuilding McGuffey Park**

**Kristen Suokko, Friends of McGuffey Park, Applicants**

**City of Charlottesville, Owner**

The applicant was not present at the time, therefore the Chair moved this item to later in the meeting.

**E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-12-02**

**Second Street NW**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 174.1**

**Green roof over garage at McGuffey Hill Condos**

**Ruth Stornetta, Applicant/ Richard Franzen, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The McGuffey Condos were built in the early 1980s and were added to the North Downtown ADC District in January, 2006. The applicants seek approval of a green roof over the existing McGuffey Condos community parking garage which is adjacent to McGuffey Park. The work is to be done parallel with the upcoming renovation of the park. The roof is visible from the park. The parapet wall on the west side will be removed to 1 foot; existing posts and cable on the east side will be removed. Omega fencing will be added on both those sides. The existing roofing will be removed and repaired. The stucco will be repaired. Vegetation of various species will be added to give a structured appearance to the green roof.

Staff finds the project complements the residential buildings on the site and also the new renovations at McGuffey Park. Staff recommends approval. (Mr. Hogg joined the meeting during the staff report.)

Ms. Ruth Stornetta, of 307 C Second Street NW, was present to answer any questions as she had nothing to add to the staff report.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the applicant had considered any other type of fencing and if so, why the Omega fencing was chosen. Ms. Stornetta stated they had wanted to choose a fencing that would give a physical barrier but not a visual barrier. Mr. Tremblay stated it was the same kind of fencing used at the Wertland Square project and it was designed to be climb-resistant and tough to vandalize.

Ms. Stornetta sought advice from the Board members as to whether the fence was high enough to keep people off the roof. The fence height is 3 feet, 6 inches.

Mr. Osteen wanted additional information on the vegetative mix. The applicant explained that the different depths were different costs; the deeper the dirt, the bigger the shrub. Ms. Stornetta stated they wanted to coordinate with the park. The variety of plants was intended to make it look more like a garden.

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

Mr. Coiner did not think the fence was compatible with the neighborhood. He thought it looked more cage-like than fence-like due to its many horizontal and vertical elements.

Mr. Knight shared some of the concerns about the fencing. It was a modern material which may not be appropriate in this setting and in this neighborhood. He expressed concern about the complexity of the planting and suggested the applicant simplify the planting. He was concerned about what the garden would look like over the years.

Mr. Osteen stated he was open to the idea of the fencing being coordinated between the two projects. However, he thought a galvanized fence might be a little less intrusive. He expressed concern about the plantings, especially the differing depths, and urged the applicant to simplify the planting.

Mr. Wolf also had concerns about the fence, in large part because there was something funny about placing a garden inside a protective cage and viewing it as a thing you don't touch or engage. He felt there were still details which needed to be talked through and walked through. He stated he would not feel comfortable approving the details the way they were.

Mr. Hogg stated a fully fenced garden had historic precedence in an urban context; a barrier between the park proper and the roof was not an inappropriate idea. He stated the variety of plants had some appeal and made it more interesting to look at.

Mr. Tremblay expressed support for the concept. He stated he looked forward to seeing some refinements.

In light of the need for additional detail, Mr. Wolf asked Ms. Scala if this could be seen as a preliminary discussion. Ms. Scala stated it could; the applicant had applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness Application and would need to change that or request deferral.

Mr. Knight suggested the applicant return with a set of drawings as that would be helpful. He also suggested that the applicant provide drawings or renderings that would show the this project in juxtaposition with the park project.

Mr. Wolf stated he would feel better about supporting the fence if it engaged the garage.

Mr. Richard Franzen asked if the Board members had a suggestion for a fence. Mr. Hogg stated some version of the proposed fence, but not the current proposal, that was contained within the notch rather than sitting in front of the wall would work. Mr. Wolf stated a fence that was designed as part of the garden rather than an element that was placed.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Site Design and Elements, moved to find that the concept of the proposed new green roof satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property/historic district, and that the BAR approves the application in concept with the stipulation that further details for the project return for approval including, but not limited to, the fence, the planting, the trays that the planting and the arrangement of those trays go in, and that the applicant show this in better context with the design of the park. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

## **F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-12-01**

**26 University Circle**

**Tax Map 6 Parcel 76**

**Add deck**

**James Moore, Owner and Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a one-story, brick veneer, two-family dwelling constructed in 1970. It is a noncontributing structure located in the Rugby Road/University Circle/Venable Neighborhood Architectural Design Control District. It is zoned R-1U. The

applicant seeks to add a new 10x13 foot deck on the north side of the house; a three foot wide extension of the deck will wrap the corner and connect the new deck to one of the two front doors. There are no doors on the rear of the house for entry. The proposal is for treated wood for the frame and lattice work. The deck is to be grey composite material. The railings will be grey painted wood with square pickets. The applicant proposes to replace the existing light grey asphalt shingle roof with a cranberry red shingle roof. Staff requested the applicant bring samples of the shingle color and grey composite decking material to the meeting. Issues are the location of the deck which has been moved back but is still located partially in front of the house. The treated unpainted wood for the framing and lattice screen is not usually preferred by the BAR. There is a lack of detail how the proposed railing would tie into the existing railing on the front stoop where the door is located. Staff opinion is the painted grey wood railing material and style is appropriate. The grey composite decking is probably appropriate given the recent age of the home. The proposed red shingle roof is appropriate. Based on the character of the houses in the neighborhood, Staff feels a covered porch would fit in better.

Mr. James Moore provided the Board with samples of the grey composite material and the type of shingles, but not in the cranberry color. He stated he was not interested in putting a porch on the front of the house; all he wanted was a deck.

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

Mr. Knight noted there were no steps from the deck to the ground and asked the applicant if he had considered steps. Mr. Moore stated he had not.

Mr. Wolf asked if the applicant had considered changing a window in the back of the house into a door to locate the deck differently. Mr. Moore stated there were only bedrooms and bathrooms on the back of the house.

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

Mr. Wolf stated that normally you would not expect or commonly see a deck on the front or side of a house. He was somewhat leery of having a deck there.

Mr. Knight stated he had the same hesitation about a deck on the side of the building. He stated he thought he could be more comfortable with a deck on the side of the building if there were not a direct connection at finished floor elevation wrapping around from the front porch. An entrance from within the building on the side to the deck would be more appropriate. Mr. Knight thought all of Staff's comments were appropriate and he would support them. He had no great concern about the roof.

Mr. Wolf expressed concern about alternate ways to work this without a floor plan of the building. He stated he shared Mr. Knight's concerns.

Mr. Hogg expressed concern that the deck would be visible down the driveway. He stated he could not approve a roof which was described as cranberry red without seeing a sample of the color.

Mr. Osteen stated he had similar concerns as those which had been expressed. He felt it was a prominent location. He stated there was a long viewshed into the side of this house. He stated he sought guidance in the Guidelines and they did not speak overwhelmingly on dealing with a noncontributing building. He stated the BAR was tasked with preventing any construction which would be architecturally incompatible with the character of the Design Control District; he stated this was incompatible with the adjacent properties.

Mr. Knight stated he was going to make separate motions on the deck and roof.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements in New Construction and Additions, moved to find that the proposed deck does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR denies the deck as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

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 roof replacement does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR does not approve the roof replacement as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf stated he would have felt comfortable allowing the applicant to bring back a sample and the Board to approve or deny it. Mr. Knight withdrew his motion; Mr. Coiner withdrew his second.

Ms. Heetderks moved they defer the issue of the roof replacement to give the applicant a chance to bring a color sample. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

### **C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 06-07-06**

**201 Avon Street**

**Tax Map 58 Parcel 1**

**New construction**

**Croxton Collaborative Architects, PC, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was deferred from the November meeting so the applicant could respond to comments discussed at the meeting. The preliminary site plan has been approved. City Council approved a Special Use Permit to allow increased density. Comments

from the November meeting included creating a more symmetrical relationship to Beck Cohen with the step backs, bringing the metal down, the metal on the top should be treated in a more consistent manner, extending the sidewalk around the whole block, reducing the whiteness of the stone to a cream uniform condition, providing future retail at street level, finding a way to diminish the presence of the prow behind Beck Cohen, the corner gave the appearance of a high rise apartment building, the design needs more respect for the neighborhood context, and the landscaping at the end of the Avon Street plaza needed work. The applicant supplied responses to the suggestions on the first page of the submittal. The perspective drawings and elevation drawings were revised. Staff feels the applicant has addressed all of the BAR's concerns. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Coiner asked the Chair that the meeting return to its usual format within the comments portion and possible allow the applicant a chance to address the comments once all Board members had finished.

Mr. Randy Croxton, of Croxton Collaborative Architects, felt all of the fundamental comments from the previous meeting had been addressed. He provided the Board with a more detailed rendering in larger scale. He stated there had been a discussion with the owners of Beck Cohen; a coordinated agreement about extending the sidewalk around the block had been reached. The two low portions are now centered around Beck Cohen. He stated there had been a conscious attempt to reduce the number of unique conditions and intersections and to simplify the vocabulary of the building.

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

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the Board had samples of the materials. Mr. Wolf stated they did not yet, but it would be fair to expect those to come to the Board.

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

Mr. Osteen felt the applicant had done a tremendous job of responding to the comments the Board made at the last meeting. He stated the overall mass was an issue for him but the step backs did a great job of attempting to mitigate it. Mr. Osteen felt the moves made to simplify the building had helped.

Mr. Coiner thanked the applicant for all the effort put in to addressing the concerns. He expressed concern about the sheer size for the neighborhood.

Mr. Tremblay stated the evolution of the building from its initial presentation had been very positive.

Mr. Knight stated he had two areas of concern. One of his concerns was the site elements in the street life, some of which had been addressed, but there was still a basic lack of street life that has not been addressed. He felt the building was in the neighborhood but not of the neighborhood because it did not participate in the life of the neighborhood. His second concern was the sheer mass. He stated he would have a hard time supporting the application.

Ms. Heetderks stated she was willing to have been convinced about the mass if it could be articulated in a way that did not overwhelm the Beck Cohen building. She thought the shoulders were an improvement, but she was not convinced. She was concerned about the lack of respect shown to the historic building on the site.

Mr. Knight felt the building was out of context with the neighborhood which was essentially two- and three-story buildings. He stated it would stand out -- and not in a beneficial way -- in the neighborhood. He expressed concern that it was going to block many of the more attractive views of downtown as you come across the Belmont Bridge.

Mr. Hogg stated he was relatively comfortable with the size of the building but was unhappy with the design as proposed. He felt the design was extremely busy. The rendering around Beck Cohen was not pleasing.

Mr. Wolf shared Mr. Hogg's concerns about the volume and the massing. He stated he was pleased with the adjustments that had been made. With some details that he thought could continue to be discussed, he was feeling fairly comfortable with the project. Mr. Wolf stated he did not care for the choice of color for the metal panels and the window frames. He would feel comfortable if there could be stipulations attached to approval.

Mr. Croxton stated, as regarded the street life, the use of the building had been changed in that there was now a boutique hotel accessible off South Street. Future accessibility was also being provided for a project in transition over time. He stated his firm was tied to a philosophy of sustainability and bringing higher density and higher utilization in the center of town. He stated they had implemented changes based on comments from previous meetings which resulted in a better design for the building. Mr. Croxton stated there were issues which had been raised at this meeting that they would be glad to continue as a stipulation on an approval. He stated this would be good for sustainability, open space, and reduced pollution.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification from Ms. Scala of the prevailing height and width of the surrounding subarea as considered under Guideline 3.7 of the Guidelines for New Construction. Ms. Scala stated it was hard to determine what the subarea is; it is either Water/South Street or the Downtown Mall. She stated a case could be made for either area. Prevailing height could be three to four stories.

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 building at 201 Avon Street 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 but requests the applicant come back with modifications specifically related to windows and lentil definitions as has been discussed this evening, alternative studies on the color for the metal panels, submission of actual proposed materials, revisiting the number of window types, the sky garden railings, a correct site and building plan that reflect the design as presented, one cornice on the front that was different from the other caps be looked at, and another pass be made at the entrance. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Osteen stated he did not feel bad about the overall bulk of the building. He thought the building had possibility. Mr. Osteen expressed his support of the concept. He also



stated the architect had done an excellent job of following through on concerns. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 4-3; Mr. Knight, Mr. Coiner, and Ms. Heetderks voted against.

Mr. Coiner asked if the Board could stand in recess. Mr. Wolf recessed the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:06 p.m.

#### **D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-11-02**

**200 Second Street NW**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 174**

**Rebuilding McGuffey Park**

**Kristen Suokko, Friends of McGuffey Park, Applicants**

**City of Charlottesville, Owner**

Mr. Wolf stated his office had a relationship with one of the people working on the project but he did not feel that would impact his ability to debate, discuss, or vote.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had first been before the Board a year ago. The park concept was approved with the understanding that details and materials would come back to the BAR for their approval prior to construction. The Certificate of Appropriateness was extended for one year administratively in October. The plan for the park is to implement it in phases as funding becomes available. The applicant is seeking approval of the site plan elevation drawings, furnishings, plants, and material palette. The plan includes preservation of an existing rock wall on Second Street. The Second Street entrance will be eliminated and the rock wall filled in. New entrances with stairs are proposed at the corner of Second and High and at the corner of Jefferson and Second. An entrance with handicapped access is proposed from Jefferson Street. The design is similar to the previously concept approval. The entrance designs have been approved. The BAR may wish to see the design of the donor panels and future signage.

Mr. Pete O'Shea, of Siteworks, stated there had been some adjustments to the plan since its submittal based on talks with Friends of McGuffey Park, the City, and the neighborhood, as well as in response to budget and costs. The donor panels are no longer part of the project due to costs. Donor recognition will be incorporated into the mosaic wall along High Street. A path was changed to preserve an existing cherry tree. Plantings were being adjusted to generate volunteer gardeners and to generate donated plants for the park. The lighting element will be chosen to match the Mall extension.

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

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the proposed fence. Mr. O'Shea stated the fencing was on the McGuffey Hill Condominiums property. There was a small stretch between the new retaining wall and corner where there is currently a wire mesh fence on pressure treated posts. A 36 inch retaining wall was on the northern down grade.

Ms. Edith Goode, of 305 B Second Street, sought clarification of a space designated ball court. Mr. O'Shea stated it was for basketball and that it could double as a stage area. She expressed concern about balls coming out of the park.

Mr. Knight wanted to know how the phasing would occur. Mr. O'Shea stated under the current plan, relative to the budget and current fundraising, it was not an issue. Mr. Knight expressed concern about phasing.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the toxicity of some of the berry-bearing bushes near the playground had been considered. Mr. O'Shea stated most of the hollies and other shrubs were on the perimeter, outside and down the slopes away from the play areas. He added they would continue to develop the plantings and would make sure they looked into that.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification that there was no funding for a donor wall. Mr. O'Shea explained that, within the priorities of the budget, there was not. Mr. Coiner expressed his belief that there was not a place for donor walls in public spaces.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know what existing plant materials were being removed. Mr. O'Shea stated a number of trees were evaluated by the City Arborist and a number of them along Second Street were evaluated as being in poor health and having structural problems. A maple, sweet gum, and hackberry were coming out.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification of the relationship between the park and the green roof. Mr. O'Shea explained the garden would be interactive over time with people helping to maintain the garden. He stated they wanted to know what was being done with the roof to be able to collaborate with them in terms of the arrangement of plants on the roof and in that area of the park.

Mr. Wolf called for comments.

Mr. Chris Gensic, Parks & Trail Planner, stated Parks staff was very happy with this proposal. He stated the design was great.

Mr. Wolf stated he could support the whole thing. It was done in a way that was sensitive to the area. He stated that it showed a lot of restraint in some ways.

Mr. Knight stated he was impressed with the design with one exception, the planting. He felt it was over designed in terms of planting; simplification from the beginning would make it easier to maintain and allow it to look better over time. He felt it was a gardenesque planting design.

Mr. Osteen thought the new design was much improved. He expressed concern about the juxtaposition of the existing wall and the new wall.

Mr. Wolf stated the junction between the new and old walls, some editing or consideration of the overall palette, and the fence and division between roof and park are the three primary issues that would probably be stipulations to be studied a little bit more.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Public Improvements, moved to find that the proposed site plan, elevations, furnishings, plants and materials satisfy the BAR's criteria with the exceptions mentioned by Mr. Wolf and are compatible with this property and historic district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the requests for further information on those issues come back before the Board at a subsequent date. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **B. Consent Agenda**

### **November minutes**

Ms. Heetderks asked to defer the minutes until the next meeting.

## **G. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

There were no matters from the public.

## **H. Other Business**

### **I. Adjournment to Holiday Dinner**

Mr. Wolf asked that they adjourn the other business to discuss at their dinner.

The meeting adjourned to another location for the holiday dinner at 7:50 p.m.