

City of Charlottesville

Board of Architectural Review

March 20, 2007

City Council Chambers

Minutes

Present: Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Michael Osteen

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay **Also Present:**

Preston Coiner Mary Joy Scala

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Brian Hogg

William Adams

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Wolf called for matters not on the agenda.

Mr. Robert Nichols, of Formwork Design, stated he was working on some exterior design work for 401 East Main Street (Vavino). He made a brief presentation to the Board. Mr. Tremblay stated the proposal looked fine. Mr. Wolf thought the concept looked great, but details would need to be fleshed out.

There were no additional 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. Pulled minutes will be discussed at the end of the agenda, but pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning.)

1. Minutes -- February 20, 2007

Mr. Coiner wanted clarification from Mr. Hogg that he stated that which had been attributed to him on page 4, line 2. Mr. Hogg asked that the minutes be pulled.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-10-04

223 4th Street SW

Tax Map 29 Parcel 42

Mark Watson, Applicant/FNRI, LLC, Owner

Rehabilitation and Addition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Smith Reeves house is dated 1866 to 1870 and is an individually listed structure in the Fifeville area. A preliminary discussion had been held at the October, 2006 meeting. The applicant requests approval to renovate the existing 1852 square foot structure (Unit 1) and the construction of a new 384 square foot external accessory unit (Unit 2) which will be rented. The applicant proposes to raise the level of the existing house and repour its foundations. A front porch, similar to one in the 1920s, will be added as will a new rear addition. The existing rear 1970s addition will be removed. Asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof. Pella aluminum clad wood double hung windows are proposed as replacements for all but the oldest remaining window which will be preserved and restored. Unit 2 materials will include Hardiplank, Galvaloom, and storefront windows. The Guidelines do encourage sustainable design. Great care should be taken to protect the existing building as it is rehabilitated. Replacement of the windows is appropriate given their condition and the fact they are not original.

Mr. John Pauli, Assistant Professor at the School of Architecture of UVa, was present on behalf of the applicant, Mr. Mark Watson of Piedmont Housing Alliance. Changes had been made since the project had been before the Board in October. The structural insulated panels originally proposed for the roof would not be used; foam insulation would be used to maximize the existing insulation. The chimney would have to be taken down temporarily to allow the building to be lifted.

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

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification of the percentage of the original structure which would remain when the project was complete. Mr. Pauli stated he could not give an exact estimate in terms of massing, but certainly as much of the framing as possible would be maintained. He stated flooring material would be taken out and then reused. Mr. Pauli stated the original plaster would be maintained as much as possible.

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

Mr. Hogg expressed his appreciation for how responsive the applicant had been to the Board's comments given during preliminary discussions. He did not see much not to like about this project as it seemed like a very nice way to address this house and build an addition on the property.

Mr. Adams stated it had helped the applicant to keep the new masses tiny and in sympathy and scale with the original building. He expressed concern about tying the new pieces to the existing piece, and pulling some alignments from the old building to the new. He stated there were detail concerns which were not addressed in the drawings. Mr. Adams was also concerned about the foundation system.

Mr. Wolf stated his support for the project. However, he did want to see the roof of the small piece attached to the original in the same plane or at least in the same pitch. He also felt a more explicit site plan with more information should come back for further approval.

Mr. Knight thought there were a few things that still needed to be considered including maintenance, the drainage issue, and the paver system.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Additions, and Rehabilitation, moved to find that they find that the proposed rehabilitation and additions satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and the BAR approves the application with the following requirements to come back to the BAR which would include: details that describe the construction and materials of the ramp/bridge, the guardrail on that, and the screen/canopy piece that attaches to the accessory unit, a detail that shows a typical head and sill of a new window, a detail that shows a typical eave detail on the new construction, and a more specific and detailed site plan that illustrates plantings, walkways, drainage, and stormwater, in addition to any paving materials. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from November 28, 2006)

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. This is a 1925 Colonial Revival Foursquare house and is a contributing structure in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The applicants requested deferral at the November meeting. The applicants request approval to add an independent three-story addition containing a four-bedroom unit to the rear of the existing house. Two alternative versions are proposed. The intention is to match the materials of the existing house. The addition has been designed in an effort to be compatible with the main structure and incorporates all the suggestions from the BAR.

Ms. Laurie Booker provided the Board with a brick sample, a window sample, and the gate design.

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

Mr. Knight asked for details of the trash enclosure. Mr. Booker stated it would be a simple screen made of five-quarter board painted to match the trim.

Mr. Knight sought clarification for which version the applicants sought approval. Mr. Booker explained he was seeking the Board's suggestion.

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

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for scheme A1-7. He stated there had been a lot of simplification of the elevation which made the addition stand on its own from the original structure. He felt comfortable supporting this.

Mr. Hogg agreed with Mr. Wolf.

Ms. Gardner stated the applicants should be proud of their work.

Mr. Knight felt the project had come a remarkable way, but it could be tweaked a little bit. He thought the sidewalk should go out to the street. Mr. Knight felt the applicant should reduce the foundation plantings. He also suggested they consider planting some trees.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design and New Construction, moved to find that the proposed addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application, Plan A1, as submitted with the sidewalk that has been mentioned connecting it to 14th Street as well as the landscape modifications plan to be submitted for Staff approval. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Rezoning Recommendation (Withdrawn)

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-03-01 (SUP 07-01-01)

112 W. Market Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 254

Wolf-Ackerman, Applicant/Shady Acres, Inc., Owner

Window Replacement

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter as his firm was handling the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This application is for First Christian Church and attached annex. The annex is dated post-1920. This is a contributing property located in the Downtown ADC District. This had been before the Board in January at which time recommendations were made for a Special Use Permit for renovations for a day shelter. The applicant seeks approval for complete sash replacement for all window openings in the annex building. All existing woodwork, trim, and moldings would be kept in place, repaired, and repainted. The proposed replacement window is a Colby & Colby wood window with insulated glass and simulated divided lights. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. John Ottinger, of Wolf-Ackerman Design, provided the Board with a paint chip sample as well as a sample of the Colby & Colby Heritage window series.

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

Mr. Adams asked if the rotted sills would be replaced. Mr. Ottinger stated they would.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the windows were spring balanced. Mr. Ottinger affirmed they were.

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

Ms. Heetderks stated it looked good.

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 replacement sash windows and painting of trim as proposed satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted including the applicant's ability to replace rotted and deteriorated sills and other portions as necessary. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called a voice vote. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Wolf had recused himself from the matter.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-03-01

1010 Preston Avenue

Tax Map 4 Parcel 41

Legal Aid Justice Center, Applicant

Construct a new retaining wall and bus stop bench

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Rock House was designated an Individually Protected Property in March, 2005, at the property owner's request. It was rehabilitated for use as offices. The applicant is requesting to construct a new stone retaining wall with a bench at the existing City bus stop. An existing concrete block retaining wall and steel bench will be removed. The intent is to match the stone of the house and existing stone wall as closely as possible. The drawing provided to the Board members erroneously includes a shelter roof which is not proposed. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Martha Grohan explained that the applicant did not want to do the roof which had been shown by the original architect. She asked for the Board's suggestions on whether to use cedar decking or recycled material for the bench.

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

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the height of the wing walls was the same. Ms. Grohan stated they were.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know how the bench was supported. Ms. Grohan stated it was angle iron built into the stone retaining wall.

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

Mr. Knight appreciated the public spiritedness of the applicant. He felt this was a good and civic thing to do. He expressed his support for the proposal.

Mr. Wolf stated the scheme without the canopy was significantly improved. He would support it 100 percent.

Mr. Adams expressed a preference for wood over recycled materials. Mr. Wolf concurred. Mr. Knight agreed and stated it did not need to be cedar as long as it was real wood.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, moved to find that the proposed retaining wall and bench satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-04

100 West Jefferson Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 180

Christ Episcopal Church, Applicant

Replace front porch decking and handrails (as built)

Mr. Wolf stated this matter was deferred.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-02-04

214 West Water Street (at La Cucina)

Tax Map 28 Parcel 80.1

Encapsulation of existing structure (and preliminary discussion of new construction)

Atwood Architects, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. A preliminary discussion had been held at the February meeting. The applicant seeks approval of the encapsulation of the existing structure. The front patio enclosure of 2003 would remain intact. The current design proposal would be constructed above this earlier addition as well as the existing building. The proposed construction would completely encapsulate the original 1920s building. The applicant also seeks preliminary discussion of the design proposal to construct a three-story addition on top of the existing one-story porch enclosure. Staff recommends incorporating the historic building into the new design so it is visible and engages with the new construction. If the historic building is entirely encapsulated in such a way that renders it invisible, then the Board should consider the application as a request for demolition. This building is one of several auto-related buildings in that area.

Mr. Mark Kestner, of Atwood Architects, stated they really sought an acceptable set of conditions for encapsulation and a conditional approval of that. He stated they never intended to tear down the existing building as they thought it worth saving. He explained they wanted to supplement the retail space available on the ground level.

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

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification behind the reasons the applicant had for encapsulating the building as a method of preservation. Mr. Kestner stated the building was a sound structural shell and was worth preservation.

Ms. Heetderks asked if there were any plans for any of the original details of the building to be visible. Mr. Kestner stated the intention was to have the existing facade visible from the lobby of the retail and the sidewalk.

Ms. Heetderks asked if the applicant had considered applying for a demolition permit. Mr. Kestner stated they had not.

Mr. Hogg asked the applicant to address the three demolition Guidelines which would apply for this building: the degree to which significant features remain on the building; the degree to which the building is linked historically or aesthetically to the surrounding buildings; the condition of the building is documented as being deteriorated. Mr. Kestner stated the important details of the building were the brickwork and the openings of the fenestration. He reiterated the intention of whatever was added on to be transparent enough to see what is there. Mr. Hogg stated the applicant had not given any reasons for demolition and that encapsulation, while not a physical demolition, was effectively removing the building from the streetscape.

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

Ms. Heetderks stated the point for declaring historic districts was to preserve historical structures for the benefit of the public. She stated privatizing the historic facade of this building was taking it away from the public which was essentially a demolition. She took issue with the argument that since there was a poor addition on the front they should give up on the structure and obliterate the rest of it. Ms. Heetderks could not support demolition of the structure by encapsulating it.

Mr. Hogg stated he could not see an appropriate argument for enclosing the facade. He further stated encapsulating would stop the facade from being an exterior wall which is regulated and it turns into an interior wall that is no longer regulated.

Mr. Wolf expressed his agreement of the comments about privatizing this and removing it from the street. He stated he would have a hard time supporting this.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed encapsulation does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR denies the application for encapsulation as submitted. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion passed, 7-1; Mr. Tremblay voted against.

Mr. Wolf called for other comments and feedback.

Mr. Hogg stated his understanding that the Board did not want to repeat the mistake made by allowing the addition in 2003. Mr. Hogg stated they were not being capricious and arbitrary in reviewing this project.

Mr. Adams stated the proposal did not elicit support from him.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-03-02

316-318 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 42

Rehabilitation and conversion to mixed-use

Mike Stoneking, Applicant/Octagon Partners, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This request was for rehabilitation and conversion to Mixed Use of the former Hardware Store building on the Downtown Mall. Originally called the Walker Building, it was built in 1909. This is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. Relatively minor changes are proposed to the exterior. The major proposed change is removing part of the front display window to create a new recessed entry. All proposed exterior changes are related to providing fire egress and handicap access to meet the building code for the new use. All historic signs that are painted on the building will be kept; two newer signs will be repainted and reused for the new tenants. On the Water Street elevation, the existing steel overhead door to the loading dock will be removed and replaced with new aluminum storefront. The applicant proposes to retain the former wood loading door located in the center of the facade but wants to replace the wood panels with glass to allow light to the interior. Staff finds the building is remarkably intact. The changes are sensitively designed. If the existing wood loading doors in the center of the Water Street facade are original, staff recommends they be preserved without replacing the panels with glass; an alternate solution may be to install some kind of glass panel or window on the exterior of the door and the wood doors could be opened to admit daylight.

Mr. Mike Stoneking, architect for Octagon Partners, gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Coiner suggested they deal with proposed changes to the Mall side and then the Water Street side.

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

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant had looked at historic photographs of the building. Mr. Stoneking stated they had searched but had found interior pictures and pictures of the exterior of a prior building which had burned down.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know why the lighting was being moved. Mr. Stoneking explained the client did not like it.

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

Mr. Coiner thanked the applicant for being so respectful to the existing building.

Mr. Adams stated he was glad for the respectful attitude to one of the finest mercantile buildings downtown which deserved a high grade of treatment. However, he felt the applicant was not being respectful enough on the Mall side. He felt the proposed new lighting did not work with the existing entry.

Mr. Wolf stated his first option would be that the storefront not be modified at all.

Mr. Hogg stated he did not find this hard to approve.

Mr. Adams, noting that this was one of the finest examples around and they aren't making any new ones like this, did not see the proposal as a small intervention.

Mr. Knight stated he was swayed by Mr. Adams' comments. He wondered if there was an alternative for the vestibule.

Ms. Heetderks stated she was swayed by Mr. Adams' comments because this storefront is so essential to the defining character of this building. She found it hard to say that one of the more interesting, defining architectural features of this building could be compromised to accomplish something that could be accomplished without destroying the historic fabric. Ms. Heetderks cited the Guidelines: "New additions, exterior alterations related to new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property." She also cited "Retain all elements, materials, and features that are original to the building and repair if necessary."

Mr. Tremblay moved to find that the proposed application to alter the eastern display window as has been described and as submitted is consistent with the Guidelines and is appropriate for this location. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks asked if this motion was meant for the flagpoles and other things or only for the storefront. Mr. Wolf thought what they were approving ought to pertain to the entirety of the changes proposed on the front, Mall-side elevation and should recognize exceptions to that. Ms. Gardner offered a friendly amendment expressing preference for a single stem light fixture. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Coiner accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion passed, 4-3; Ms. Heetderks, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Knight voted against.

Mr. Wolf, turning the discussion to the Water Street side of the building, called for questions from the public and the Board.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the loading dock doors were original. Mr. Stoneking stated they appeared to be original. He further stated he preferred Ms. Scala's suggestion.

Mr. Knight sought clarification of how much masonry would be removed from the west door. Mr. Stoneking stated approximately two feet. Mr. Knight asked if that was necessary for ADA compliance. Mr. Stoneking explained it was not only the door but also the approach area.

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

Mr. Adams stated this was one of the nicer elevations on Water Street. He thought it deserved to be honored. He could not support the glass panels in the wood door.

Mr. Knight could not support replacing the panels of the wood door with glass either. He would like an alternative found to preclude demolition of any of the existing masonry.

Mr. Wolf stated altering the masonry was very serious to him.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the Board was leaning toward deferral since they had asked the applicant to explore alternatives to the handicap access.

Mr. Stoneking requested a deferral on the Water Street portion of the project.

Mr. Coiner moved they accept the request for deferral. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-03-04

University Circle and University Way

Tax Map 5 and 6

Add bollards and street trees in the public right-of-way

University Circle Neighborhood Association and City of Charlottesville

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This application is proposed on City street rights-of-way in Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The applicant is requesting approval to add 81 new bollards in specific locations along University Circle between Rugby Road and University Way and on the west side of University Way to protect the grass strips and granite curbs from parking cars. All but seven of the bollards would be 6x6 inch pressure treated wood similar to those in front of 4, 10, and 14 University Circle. Seven bollards made of concrete-filled four inch diameter steel pipes and painted black or Charleston green would be used on University Way opposite where larger trucks have been backing over the curb. Eleven new street trees are proposed on University Circle and University Way. This application is in memory of the Copper Beech tree cut down from the Watson Manor property; the Neighborhood Association is using the money awarded from that to fund this proposal. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Dan Friedman, of 1835 University Circle, stated the funds had just come from the Foundation which owns Watson Manor as well as contributions from homeowners and property owners on University Circle.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the trash company had been consulted to see if they would have enough space with the bollards in place. Mr. Friedman stated they had not, but they had allowed 25 feet for the vehicle to maneuver. Mr. Coiner suggested that if it were approved, they get make sure it will be adequate before going forward.

Mr. Knight sought clarification behind the mix of trees chosen. Mr. Friedman stated they were selected at the advice of Tim Hughes who felt there should be a mix of trees because of disease. He further stated the lindens had been chosen because the street had been known as Linden Way and the red oaks had been chosen to replace red oaks which had been lost.

Mr. Tremblay noted he owned two properties in the area. He shared Mr. Coiner's concern about the truck access.

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

Mr. Knight understood the reasoning of the City Arborist and thought a mix was fine. However, he had reservations about the little leaf linden and the hawthorn.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, moved to find that the proposed bollards and street trees 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 substitution of two other trees for the proposed hawthorns. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment that they use square steel posts rather than round and that no installation of the square steel posts be done until there is a conversation with Waste Management. Mr. Knight and Ms. Heetderks accepted the amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Consent Agenda -- Minutes -- February 20, 2007

Mr. Wolf called for corrections to the minutes.

Mr. Hogg stated he had not said it was a mistake to regulate individually designated properties; the proper context was it was a mistake to regulate an individually designated property as if it were in a historic district and that it should be looked at on its own and not in the context of the neighborhood.

Mr. Wolf asked that page 5 note he had recused himself from the McGuffey Park matter because his firm was doing a separate project for one of the people who was presenting.

Mr. Wolf asked that Jordan Fenester be corrected to Jordan Phemister.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval of the minutes. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Ms. Gardner had abstained from voting as she had not attended the February meeting.

L. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Wolf called for matters not on the agenda. There were none.

M. Other Business

Mr. Coiner stated that one of the outdoor cafes had umbrellas in place that were in violation of the cafe rules. He requested that Ms. Scala talk with them about it. Ms. Scala stated the Zoning Administrator had been informed of it already but she would follow up on it.

Mr. Wolf stated he had talked with Mr. Tolbert who has been having ongoing communication addressing the outstanding issues and incomplete items on the Pavilion project.

N. Adjournment

Mr. Wolf asked if there was a motion to adjourn. Mr. Coiner so moved. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:15 p.m.