

City of Charlottesville

Board of Architectural Review

Basement Conference Room -- City Hall

February 20, 2007

Minutes

Present: Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Amy Gardner

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay **Also Present:**

Preston Coiner Mary Joy Scala

Lynne Heetderks

Brian Hogg

Michael Osteen

William Adams

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Wolf called for matters 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. Pulled minutes will be discussed at the end of the agenda, but pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning.)

1. Minutes -- 16 January 2007

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

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from January 16, 2007)

BAR 07-01-01

222 South Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 95

Landscape changes and handicap ramp

Michael Stoneking, Applicant /EAM Commercial Investments, LLC, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In January the Board asked the applicant to make some modifications. The Board had unanimously disagreed with enclosing the front porch. There had also been concerns about the proposed paint colors and Zen garden in the front yard. The Board had suggested the applicant meet with the neighbors. The applicant has made some modifications. The design is in response to an existing drainage problem and the need to provide handicapped access. More detail on the proposed landscaping is needed. Freestanding signs such as those found on Park Street would be appropriate in this location but are not permitted in the Downtown ADC District. The proposed monument sign is not addressed within Zoning. Color chips are needed. The chimneys should not be painted.

Mr. Michael Stoneking reiterated the water problem in the front yard caused by the grade sloping from the street towards the building. Framing is being replaced due to the years of rot brought on by the water problem. He stated that was half the reason to raise the floor of the porch eight inches. He explained they only wanted to extend the existing handicap ramp by five feet. He stated they had met with three of the neighbors. Mr. Stoneking stated there had been unanimous consent of the color scheme, garden idea, and raising the porch. He stated the landscaping plan had been recently completed and would be submitted later.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

One of the neighbors, who did not identify herself for the record, confirmed they had met with the applicant and had agreed with the proposal.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the applicant had any samples. Mr. Stoneking stated he did have color samples but the paint chips did not look right in the lighting of the conference room. He submitted the paint chips to the Board. He asked the Board to allow him to meet with Ms. Scala and to have administrative approval of the colors.

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

Mr. Wolf stated raising the porch this nominal amount does not detract from the quality of the porch. He thought it did a good job of preserving it and accommodating the need.

Mr. Osteen stated he was comfortable with the bulk of the scheme; however the painting concerned him. He wanted to see the porch painted different from the body of the house so that it popped a little bit.

Mr. Wolf felt Mr. Osteen's point about the porch was good and Ms. Scala's point about not painting the chimneys was also good.

Mr. Hogg stated he was not convinced bluestone was the right material for the porch surface.

Mr. Knight stated this was well executed. He stated he was still bothered about extending the handicap ramp. He was also concerned about all of the walls that cut up the space and take it out of character with the surrounding yards. He recommended getting rid of some of the extraneous walls. Mr. Knight wanted to see a completely different sign design.

Ms. Heetderks felt raising the porch would set a precedent. She was not convinced there could not be some other solution. She thought it was in violation of the spirit of Guidelines for Rehabilitation 4.6(1) -- The original details and shape of porches should be retained including the outline, roof height and roof pitch -- and (11) -- Provide needed barrier-free access in ways that least alter features of the building.

Mr. Adams felt it would be a stronger project if it was simpler. He stated he had no problem with altering the porch by six inches.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Site Design and Elements, moved to find that the proposed project details satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application specifically the request to raise the elevation of the front porch, to continue the handicap ramp from the side to the front entrance of the building, the color palette on the building as discussed, the front walkway and the general concept of the front yard design, but specifically not the monument sign, and make the strong recommendation that the cheek walls lining the steps and the ramp be either revised or eliminated as possible. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Board members clarified that the discussion regarding color had been for a simpler palette and that Ms. Scala would work with the applicant. Mr. Adams strongly encouraged a more formal pattern plan for the bluestone walks instead of a random pattern. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 7-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

D. Recommendations for Special Use Permit (deferred from January 16, 2007)

SUP 07-01-01

513 Dice Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 63.1

Infill development

Shackleford House LLC/Jane Covington, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the January meeting the Board had stated they would support dividing the parcel into two lots but asked for more detail. The property is individually designated. If the Special Use Permit is granted, the applicant will return to the BAR for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant has submitted more detail for two concepts. Unless a waiver is granted a city sidewalk will be required. Parking is provided on street in the neighborhood. The existing parking is nonconforming.

Mr. Steve Edwards, of Care Concepts, was present on behalf of the applicant. He had nothing to add but would answer any questions.

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

Mr. Knight wanted to know which concept the applicant preferred. Mr. Edwards stated they were leaning toward concept 1, option A and concept 2, option B. He stated concept 2, option B because it pulls parking away from the street and creates more landscaping while minimizing the additional house.

Mr. Hogg, stating it was a mistake to regulate an individually designated property as if it were in a historic district, expressed a preference for option A because it minimizes the amount of parking on site.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know how parking would be accommodated. Mr. Edwards stated it was all on street. He further stated they were trying to minimize the existing parking.

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

Mr. Wolf stated the concept 2 studies were more deferential and did a better job of framing the original structure.

Mr. Knight stated he supported the notion of infill on this location. He stated he could support the concept 2 location as long as parking was removed from the lots. He strongly recommended a sidewalk be part of the package as part of being a good neighbor.

Mr. Coiner expressed a preference for 2A. He asked if they could recommend a sidewalk.

Mr. Tremblay stated his support for concept 2, option A.

Mr. Wolf suggested the parking be done in a way more consistent with single family residences and more like a driveway.

Mr. Knight stated he had a preference for no parking on the site. If parking was to be on site, then it should be limited to a single driveway.

Mr. Knight moved that they recommend to the Planning Commission and Council that they support the Special Use Permit for infill development for this property as presented

upon concept 2, option B with the recommendation that the parking be modified to reflect the spirit of the discussion this evening including narrowing the throat of the driveway, potentially reducing the amount of pavement and incorporating the parking court concept that was discussed and with the strong recommendation that a sidewalk be provided along the entire frontage of Dice Street. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Final details)

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

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In December the Board voted to approve the application with a request that further information on the following issues come back: simplify the plantings; use simple details to turn the corner where the old stone wall meets the new wall; and design the boundary with the proposed green roof. The perimeter walk has been curved and allows a more gradual handicapped entry ramp. Sculpture panels on the west side have been eliminated. Additional details have been submitted about the entry gate, hand rails and guard rails, picnic tables and benches. Landscaping has been simplified. The new stone wall will end before it meets the existing wall. The design of the boundary with McGuffey Park Condominium green roof has been postponed. Staff recommends approval of design details. Any future signage would be approved by the Board unless delegated to Staff.

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter as his firm is doing a project separately with the applicant.

Ms. Jordan Phemister, of Siteworks, brought some minor adjustments to the plan to the attention of the Board.

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

Mr. Adams sought clarification behind the location of the gate at the northeast corner. Ms. Phemister stated concerns had been expressed by parents within Friends of McGuffey Park about the closeness of the play area and the stairs that could be a potential hazard.

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

Mr. Knight stated that, in general, he was still very impressed. However, he was moderately concerned about the planting mixes. He urged the applicant to continue to simplify.

Mr. Osteen, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Public Improvement, moved to find that the design details and revisions satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and the historic district, and that the BAR approves the details and revisions as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment to address the changes made which were not depicted on the submittal. Mr. Osteen clarified that those included: the relocation of the gate and the widening of the entry path. Mr. Coiner seconded the amendment. Mr. Knight called the question. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Final details)

BAR 06-07-06

201 Avon Street

Tax Map 58 Parcel 1

New construction -- Final details

Croxtan Collaborative Architects, PC, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board in December when there was a 4-3 vote approved the application but the applicant was requested to return with certain modifications. The applicant has addressed all of those comments.

Mr. Coiner suggested the Board follow its rules of procedure during the comments portion.

The applicant gave a presentation with additional drawings of perspective and detail drawings. The cornice now matches the other side. There were now only three different window types. Lintels and sills were uniform throughout the building. The brick would be tan rather than the reddish-brown. He provided a sample of the window glass.

Mr. Wolf called for questions.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the glass was set forward. The applicant stated it was set back.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant had considered using a local molded brick. The applicant had not, but would be more than happy to.

Mr. Wolf called for comments.

Mr. Tremblay stated he was impressed with the thoroughness of the responses to the issues that had come up with each phase of this.

Mr. Osteen stated he liked the wall panel color. He suggested simplifying the heads and sills of the windows.

Mr. Hogg felt the brick needed to be revisited. He suggested the applicant consider one with a lot more red in it.

Mr. Wolf stated the simplicity at the entry reads nicely for the structure. He reiterated his colleagues concerns about the brick.

Mr. Adams stated he was still opposed to the massing of the building. He thought more could be done to simplify the building.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about the tinted glass which appeared to be quite dark.

Mr. Adams expressed concern the glass may be in conflict with the guidelines.

Mr. Coiner asked if they could reserve judgment on the glass and brick.

Mr. Knight wanted to know if there was any other details the Board wanted to see again other than the glass and brick. He stated drawings of the window sills and lintels would be helpful. He stated they had not seen any detail or cut sheet on exterior lighting. Mr. Hogg wanted to see detail of the aluminum.

Additional information required from the Board was: a typical wall section through brick, through a panel, through a curtain wall ideally including heads and sills of openings; exterior accents; lighting as it is connected to the building; a section through the pergola; plant materials; the brick and the glass to be evaluated under better conditions.

Mr. Wolf asked if the Board could approve the application as submitted with the exception of the list above which would give the applicant an endorsed concept upon which they could move forward. With verbal consent, Mr. Wolf made that a motion. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-02-01

200 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcels 31 and 32

Partial demolitions to existing structures and construction of The Landmark Hotel

Hotel Charlottesville, LLC, Applicant/HROK, LLC, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This plan was approved by the BAR in February, 2004. A site plan was made and never received approval. A one year extension was granted and the applicant applied for a demolition permit which was not issued. The property was sold. The new owner applied for a demolition permit for the interior. Oliver Kuttner had submitted preliminary sketches for a new building in November. The property was sold back to the original applicant, Lee Danielson. Mr. Danielson resubmitted the 2004 plan. The applicant seeks permission to demolish the vacant former bank building with additions, except not the black granite facade and to demolish 108 Second Street SW which is the building behind it. The applicant was also seeking permission to construct a nine-story full service hotel. Since the 2004 submittal and approval, the new ADC district design guidelines had been adopted but are not substantive changes that would affect this building. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Coiner wanted to correct the address; the demolition was for Second Street SE.

Mr. Mark Hornberger, the project architect, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the project. He also had available a color palette.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the oil paintings were still in the lobby. Mr. Hornberger did not know. He stated the previous plan had been to preserve them or make them available for one of the City buildings. Mr. Coiner wanted to know if that was still the applicant's intention if they were still there. Mr. Hornberger stated it was.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant was going to revisit the stepping arrangement on Second Street. Mr. Hornberger stated the City had retained a consultant to prepare a design for Second Street. He expressed a hope to coordinate with them as they went forward.

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

Mr. Tremblay stated he had supported the proposal in 2004 and would support it again.

Mr. Coiner stated he felt the same way. He stated there had been some concern about the outdoor cafe and whether approval of the concept of the building meant they were approving the cafe.

Mr. Knight stated he had been an enthusiastic supporter last time and still was. He expressed appreciation for the way the applicant was incorporating the preservable portion of the old bank. He expressed concern about the public sidewalk along Water Street which became part of the auto entrance of the proposed hotel. He stated he would like to see a stronger expression of the public sidewalk across the front of that space.

Mr. Adams stated this was a very strong application and would support it. He suggested the applicant look at the steps on Second Street again.

Mr. Osteen thought it was a very nice proposal. He suggested the applicant reconsider placement of the emergency egress from the front entrance to the service entrance.

Mr. Wolf stated he was happy to see this proposal and would be happy to endorse it.

Mr. Knight, 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 200 East Main Street with the exception of the front of the black granite facade and the front eight feet down Second Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and the historic district, and that the BAR approves the application for demolition as submitted with the additional request that if the oil paintings are still intact that they be preserved or made available to the City. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner stated a fear he held in common with Ms. Heetderks was that demolition approval would be given and demolition would be begun and construction would not start for several years and with the history of this project it was even more of a concern; he asked that they not knock anything down until they were ready to build something. 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 New Construction, moved to find that the proposed new Landmark Hotel satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the general massing and architectural design as submitted with the condition that the applicant come back to the Board with further detailing and materials when he is ready. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 07-02-02

Wayfinding and Signage Program

City Wide Signage for Charlottesville

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. NDS interns had prepared and presented a PowerPoint presentation in August 2005 as a preliminary plan for Wayfinding Signage. The design consultant Hillier and Associates have been contracted to refine the signage designs. A steering committee had been formed to work with the consultant. The committee had been shown three design concepts; the concept they favored was further refined and brought back to them.

Mr. Jim Tolbert stated the concept had been included in the member packets. Mr. Tolbert stated they wanted to catch people as they were coming into Charlottesville and direct them to Downtown as well as other destinations in the city.

Mr. John Bosio, of Hillier Architecture, gave a presentation. He stated they had expanded upon what the interns had worked up and would be utilizing the regional branding and color.

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

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the typeset was appropriate for the welcome sign. Mr. Bosio stated the font was Rawlinson which was FHWA approved. Mr. Bosio stated it was important to build the brand equity the Visitors Bureau was trying to accomplish.

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

Mr. Hogg appreciated the idea of decorating the back of the signs but expressed concern about having a 3-D design as it seemed to invite vandalism.

Mr. Osteen felt the word Virginia should be removed from the welcome sign. He also thought the typeface for the welcome sign was wrong.

Mr. Adams asked if the branding logo could be removed as it was hard to read.

Mr. Knight asked that the consultant look at removing that brand from as many of the signs as possible. He felt that the red entrance signs on the parking garage were the same shade as the Do Not Enter sign and was counterintuitive.

Mr. Wolf agreed with his colleagues that what had been done was really good.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess at 8:24 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

I. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 07-02-04

214 West Water Street (at La Cucina)

Tax Map 28 Parcel 80.1

New Construction: The Village at Waterhouse

Atwood Architects, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant requests a preliminary discussion for an addition to the existing La Cucina building. The proposal would abut the Waterhouse project to the east. This is in the Downtown Corridor.

Mr. Mark Kestner, of Atwood Architects, gave a brief presentation.

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

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if there was anything left of the first floor of the original building. Mr. Kestner stated there was.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the applicant had considered peeling off the front. He stated the drawing was not working; he did not like the asymmetrical extension across the front of the one-story extension. Mr. Hogg suggested going back to the base building and doing something distinctive on top.

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for building something simple and understated on the two story base. He stated it would seem cleaner than having a stepped series of glass boxes.

Mr. Adams felt the documentation was thin which made it hard for him to look at it as it seemed there had not been a lot of thought put into it.

Mr. Hogg stated the applicant needed to step back and think about the larger context in which this project is occurring.

Mr. Wolf confirmed there would not be consensus among the Board for increasing the surface at the street and further obscuring a structure which they may wish had not been obscured in the first place. He reiterated it would be far more favorable to concentrate on additions on top of the yellow structure, especially an addition that was deferential in some way.

Mr. Tremblay wondered if removing the existing brick and having some other structure constructed in front of the historical building would be more respectful.

J. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 07-02-03

1003 West Main Street (Studio House)

Tax Map 10 Parcel 51

Atwood Architects, Applicant

New construction at Under the Roof

Mr. Hogg stated he would recuse himself from this item and the one to follow.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking a preliminary discussion and comments on a proposed four-story addition to the Under the Roof building. This is in the West Main North Corridor Mixed Use District which allows two to four stories.

Mr. Mark Kestner, of Atwood Architects, gave a brief presentation. The Under the Roof building is not historic, but there is a desire to keep the iconic notion that started here. He stated they had been discussing with staff ways to move toward low-impact measures on this building. Mr.

Kestner stated they wanted to do as much green architecture as they could. He stated they also wanted to see if they could increase the footprint of the building.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the original building was there and would be totally encapsulated. Mr. Kestner agreed.

Mr. Wolf felt there was a kind of simplicity to the project. He stated it was kind of over simplified in terms of fenestration and surface and articulation.

Mr. Osteen stated he would not support anything with non-compliant parking.

Mr. Wolf stated the density was lower on that side of West Main in deference to the residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification from Ms. Scala that the building should be a contributing structure. Ms. Scala stated it was typical of the forms along West Main Street and should have been contributing. However, when the district was adopted, someone removed that building from the contributing structures list.

Mr. Knight clarified the Board's stance: a willingness to consider gaining increased density by coming forward to the street dependent upon the design; whatever happens needs to be a more productive use of the space; a willingness to entertain coming to the sidewalk with all four stories. However, more specificity and more detail were needed as well as a case being made for whatever would be designed there. Ms. Heetderks expressed a desire to see a more traditionalism in some form.

K. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-11-02

1108 West Main Street (The Sycamore House)

Tax Map 10 Parcels 64 and 65

William Atwood, Applicant /John Bartelt, Owner

New Construction at Sycamore House

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant was seeking preliminary discussion and comments on a proposed seven story addition to the Sycamore House. A Special Use Permit would be required for the proposed height. The West Main South Corridor allows two to five stories by right and up to seven stories with Special Use Permit.

Mr. Kestner stated they fully intended to keep the existing historic structure and build around it. He stated they would like to create a corner at that intersection.

Mr. Adams wanted to know how this met the Guidelines. Mr. Kestner stated the intention was to build a glass box around the original building and let the existing building protrude from the glass box. He further stated the intent to take the module from the existing building and play off of it.

Mr. Wolf stated the area he had difficulty with would be the angle and its relationship to the street. He also expressed concern about the curtain wall and glazing. He felt it would be better if it was more straight forward.

L. Preliminary Discussion

301 West Main Street

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Board had denied a request for new construction because it did not meet guidelines. The applicant is requesting preliminary comments and guidance on a proposed rezoning to Downtown Corridor on this site which is currently zoned West Main North. The property behind it is zoned Downtown Corridor. The applicant proposes a nine story mixed use building with a two to three-story street wall. No drawings have been submitted.

Mr. Bob Englander gave a brief presentation. He asked if there was an appetite among the Board to change the zoning to Downtown Corridor. Mr. Wolf explained the Board could recommend the change but could not make the change.

Mr. Knight stated that in principle he could. He stated he was concerned that corner had been under-zoned. He stated the site needed a significant structure. However, everything would come down to details and what was proposed.

Mr. Tremblay concurred with his colleague.

Mr. Osteen stated this would be an excellent opportunity for a building of significant height.

Ms. Heetderks reminded the applicant the biggest things to remember were: to read the Guidelines and to have his architect read them, think about them, and address them in the presentation; consider the quality of the materials; consider the context.

Mr. Hogg stated a building on such a prominent location needs to be very well designed in and of itself.

Mr. Wolf stated that this needed to be designed as much from the perspective of the street as an urban design exercise for what is right for the street and that corner.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the applicant would be using the same architect as before. Mr. Englander stated his architect was Will Scribner who has drawn eight buildings for him since 1995.

Mr. Coiner stated there were some on the Board who would argue about the "insignificance" of the one story building west of this proposed site. Mr. Englander agreed it was not an insignificant building, but its size was insignificant.

M. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent agenda

Minutes

Ms. Heetderks asked that the second paragraph from the bottom of page 3 read, "did not address the issue of roof color, but she felt the principle guiding paint color applied."

Ms. Heetderks asked that the bottom sentence of page 12 be amended to reflect that she was as concerned about impacting the neighborhood as the existing house.

Mr. Knight clarified that the applicant's representative on page 4, item E, was Bill Atwood.

Ms. Heetderks moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

N. Other Business

Mr. Coiner stated a list had been compiled about the Pavilion and a meeting was held with City Staff in May. They had been told some of the items would be addressed at the end of the season (October). The new season was getting ready to start and the items had still not been addressed. Mr. Coiner asked if the Board members wanted to drop the issue or make contact with Staff again to ask if they planned to do what they had promised. Mr. Wolf felt it was worth the effort to address again. Mr. Knight thought it might be worth an official letter from the Board.

O. Adjournment

Mr. Coiner moved they adjourn. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:12 p.m.