

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review

April 17, 2007

Minutes

Present: Also Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Eryn Brennan

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay

Preston Coiner

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Brian Hogg (Arrived 5:39 p.m.)

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 from the public not on the agenda. There were none.

B. Consent Agenda

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

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. Brennan gave the staff report. The Smith-Reaves house is an individually protected property located in the Fifeville neighborhood. On 20 March, 2007, BAR approved the application for renovation of the historic building and construction of a new addition on the condition the applicant returned to the Board with details of the ramp bridge; details of the guardrail; details of the screen for the new addition; details of a typical window head and sill for the new addition; detail of a typical eave for the new addition; a more specific site plan including plantings, drainage, and pavement material, and a shingle sample for the historic house. The applicant is requesting final approval of the construction and material details as well as the site plan. Detailed drawings had been provided as requested. Staff recommends that the proposed final details pertaining to the site design, construction, and material meet the Guidelines. The applicant had also submitted a sidewalk waiver. Staff asks that the Board make a recommendation on the issue so Mr. Tolbert can make a final decision.

Mr. Wolf recognized the applicant.

Mr. John Quale was present on behalf of Mr. Mark Watson. He provided the Board with an additional drawing.

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

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the frame supporting the screen would be steel. Mr. Quale stated it would be steel or aluminum; if steel, it would have to be painted and, if aluminum, it would not be.

Mr. Knight sought clarification behind the request for a sidewalk waiver. Mr. Quale stated there would be no front yard at all if the sidewalk was there.

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

Mr. Knight appreciated the itemization of the responses made by the applicant. While reluctant to allow someone to not install a sidewalk, he saw the logic behind not putting one in; he would support a waiver. Mr. Knight noted a lot of thought had been dedicated to the site plan and drainage. He suggested that the planting choices come back to staff for review. He supported the changes made and stated he continued to support the project.

Mr. Wolf stated he also supported the sidewalk waiver. He expressed a preference for a more traditional sill on the original structure as opposed to a picture frame molding wrapping the windows.

Mr. Adams stated there were a few technical issues to resolve with the window and siding detail.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed rehabilitation and addition satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the stipulation that planting be submitted for staff approval and with the further recommendation from the Board that the sidewalk waiver be approved by City Staff. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner stated that since the applicant indicated he may solicit a business with which Mr. Coiner was involved for either the purchase or donation of material, Mr. Coiner would abstain from the vote. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Coiner abstained.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-04-01

1824 University Circle

Tax Map 6 Parcel 97

Tree removal

University of Virginia Hillel

Ms. Brennan gave the staff report. This is in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The applicant is seeking approval to remove a large Siberian Elm from the right rear corner of the building for safety reasons. Due to the substantial size of the tree, the visual impact of its removal will be noticeable from the street but will not be a detriment to the historic character of the neighborhood. If removal is approved, replacement species and location should be discussed.

The applicant had nothing further to add.

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

Mr. Knight stated he had called the arborist to talk about his findings.

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

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed tree removal 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. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Knight offered a friendly amendment that replacement species and location be submitted for staff approval. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Osteen accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-04-07

401 East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 59

New wood soffit and sign

East Mall LLC, Owner/Formwork Design LLC, Applicant

Ms. Brennan gave the staff report. This building is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. The applicant is seeking approval to remove the existing Vavino awnings, suspend a new horizontal wood soffit below the existing wall and in front of the existing storefront glazing, and install a new sign on the soffit. The proposed sign has painted metal letters and a cutout design of a wine bottle that is indirectly illuminated with a concealed LED lamp. Staff finds the sign meets the Guidelines and suggests the BAR view a sample of the wood for appropriateness.

Mr. Robert Nichols, of Formwork Design, stated the wood choice was ipay, a naturally resistant wood.

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

Mr. Osteen sought clarification of the two typefaces. Mr. Nichols stated there was only one typeface, but of two different heights.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if there was going to be a tagline on the sign or just the name of the restaurant. Mr. Nichols confirmed there would be a tagline: Italian Wine and Panini Bar.

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

Mr. Wolf stated he like the proposal; however, he was concerned with the projection of the sign out past the face of the building. Mr. Nichols stated their desire was to have the sign inboard. He further stated they would try to do that.

Mr. Adams expressed a desire for the sign to be inboard.

Mr. Hogg joined the meeting.

Ms. Gardner thought the signage was nicely restrained. However she thought the tagline should be left off.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Signs, moved to find that the proposed wood soffit and sign satisfy

the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Adams offered a friendly amendment that the sign be treated in a manner consistent with the front elevation. Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Tremblay seconded the amended motion. Mr. Wolf amended his motion to include the recommendation that the tagline be omitted from the signage and the signage be simplified to include only the business name. Mr. Tremblay accepted the amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion passed, 8-0-1; Mr. Hogg abstained from voting.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-04-03

7 Gildersleeve Wood

Tax Map 11 Parcel 17.1

Construct addition

Mary and Scott Prior

Mr. Osteen stated he was going to recuse himself from this matter.

Ms. Brennan gave the staff report. This property is a contributing structure in the Oakhurst-Gildersleeve ADC District. This is a colonial revival-style brick building constructed circa 1955. The applicant seeks approval of a proposed 16x16 foot two-story addition with adjoining mudroom to the back of the house. The Board may treat the application as a preliminary discussion or approve the application in concept and let Staff approve the final drawings.

The applicant was not present. Mr. Osteen stated the applicant was planning to use Pella pro-line, aluminum clad windows.

Mr. Wolf suggested deferring this to later in the meeting to allow the applicant to be present as the BAR meeting was ahead of schedule.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-04-02

130 Madison Lane

Tax Map 9 Parcel 138

Demolish rear shed, reconstruct patio area, and enlarge two window openings on rear facade

Gregg Donovan, Applicant/W.V. Daniel, Owner

Ms. Brennan gave the staff report. This is in the Corner ADC District. The circa 1912 property is a contributing Georgian-Revival fraternity house. The exterior has remained unaltered with the exception of the modern iron railings on the roof. This is one of the earliest fraternity houses constructed in Charlottesville. The applicant seeks to remove the existing storage shed behind the main structure and remove the eight-foot wood fence along the south patio in order to build a brick wall with painted wood fencing infill between brick piers. The applicant also proposes to construct a nine-foot wall along the east end of the property. The applicant seeks to replace two windows on the southeast facade with two French doors that match the existing French doors on the south facade. The existing shed does not contribute to the historic integrity of the main structure. The proposed site design alterations and demolition of the existing shed comply with ADC Guidelines. Alteration of the original six-over-six window is not recommended; the need for ease of access does not outweigh compromising the pristine historic architectural integrity of the building.

Mr. Wolf recognized the applicant.

Mr. Gregg Donovan gave a presentation of the property and proposal. The shed had been done by one of the fraternity members who had been in the Architectural School. Mr. Donovan stated the owners wished to reclaim and rectify issues that had arisen as a result of interior renovations made in 1984.

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

Mr. Hogg, noting the variety of paving materials, wanted to know if any thought had been given to creating a more uniform palette. Mr. Donovan stated they had looked at using stone in other areas and it had been found to be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification behind the proposed nine-foot brick wall. Mr. Donovan stated that was a typographical error. The existing green wood fencing was 8'2"; the replacement would be the same height. Mr. Coiner wanted to know why that height was chosen. Mr. Donovan stated it was to maintain the existing and as a barrier to define and demarcate the yard from an adjoining house's parking lot.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if any landscaping was being considered for the area. Mr. Donovan stated there was not beyond the two large bushes at the entrance to the side patio.

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

Mr. Adams stated the proposal was really complex with really funky existing conditions. He thought it needed to be a stronger project and simplified.

Mr. Hogg agreed there was way too much going on in a small space. If less was going on, it could be more harmonious with the building. He stated he did not mind replacing the windows.

Mr. Knight agreed the wall sections and materials needed to be reduced. He did not have a problem with converting the windows to doors. While he understood the reasons for the wall on the east side, he thought the wall should be brick veneer on both sides.

Mr. Wolf also expressed concern about the raw concrete. He appreciated Staff's comments about the doors; however, he had no problems with replacing the windows. Mr. Wolf agreed simplifying materials would be nice.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about the tree and suggested pulling up some of the existing brick rather than bringing more bluestone up to it.

Mr. Knight stated it was not a specimen tree. He suggested it may be worth doing away with the tree and coming back with an alternative. Mr. Donovan stated the tree was not in the best of shape. He stated removing the tree would provide a nice, clean solution to the side yard.

Mr. Wolf stated his sense of the Board's preferences were a simplification down to one decking material.

Mr. Coiner felt deferral, whether by the Board or the applicant, was the best answer to the matter as the proposal could not be redesigned during the meeting.

Mr. Donovan stated he might as well defer.

Ms. Heetderks moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-04-03

7 Gildersleeve Wood

Tax Map 11 Parcel 17.1

Construct addition

Mary and Scott Prior

Mr. Osteen restated he was going to recuse himself from this matter.

Mr. Wolf stated the staff report had been previously given and asked if the applicant had anything to add.

Ms. Mary Prior provided the Board with a sample of the roof shingle which was proposed to match the existing roof. She stated the Pella windows which were proposed had a simulated divided light. She provided the Board with a drawing of the project.

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

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the short section of the existing porch would be left. Ms. Prior stated it would.

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

Mr. Hogg stated the little porch roof left over the left-hand staircase seemed a little odd.

Mr. Knight stated it was very straight forward.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed rehabilitation and addition satisfy 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 with final drawings to be approved by Staff. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8-0-1; Mr. Osteen abstained from voting. The applicant sought clarification of what needed to be provided to Staff. Mr. Tremblay sought consensus from the Board if the CAD drawing submitted was sufficient; finding that it was, Mr. Tremblay amended his motion to remove the final approval by Staff. Mr. Knight seconded the amended motion. The motion passed 8-0-1; Mr. Osteen abstained.

H. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 07-04-05

413 and 425 7th Street NE

Tax Map 53 Parcels 122 and 122.1

Create new parking lot entrance and reconstruct parking lot

Alan and Susan Norfleet, Applicant

Mr. Adams recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Brennan gave the staff report. These properties are contributing structures in the North Downtown ADC District; 413 is a 1923 Colonial Revival style brick structure while 425 is a circa 1905 brick vernacular building. The new access would require the existing parking lot to be lowered and would require the removal of two trees and the possible construction of retaining walls. The applicant is considering removing two large trees near the foundation of 425 to be replaced by smaller sized street trees. The applicant is considering converting the original garage adjacent to 425 to a studio office; the original garage appears to be constructed during the same period as the house. Staff feels the impact of the tree removals on the historic character of the

property and surrounding neighborhood and suggestions of replacement trees should be discussed.

Mr. Alan Norfleet had nothing to add to the staff report. He stated they were seeking a general feel for the project. Current access to the property was through a parking lot off an alleyway off Maple Street. He stated they needed to lease three parking spots on a month-to-month basis to ensure access to the property. The existing parking would need to be lowered approximately 3'5".

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if any consideration had been given to how the end of the garage would be done. Mr. Norfleet stated they had looked at having a carriage door on one end.

Mr. Knight thought that, in concept, access off 7th Street was doable. He hoped the applicant would explore legal easement options before proceeding with access from 7th Street. Mr. Knight expressed a desire for a greater level of scrutiny to the entire site including how would the property be separated from the current access and how the sidewalks are going to work. Mr. Knight suggested the applicant seek an arborist's recommendation on the tree removals.

Mr. Coiner stated he was generally supportive of what the applicants sought to do. However, he was concerned about the tree on Maple Street that was so close to the house. Mr. Coiner asked that property line issues be cleared up before the access be approved.

Mr. Tremblay complimented the applicant for the idea of doing historic renovation on the two houses. He hoped the site plan would be consistent with the Guidelines.

Mr. Wolf supported the idea and echoed Mr. Knight's comments about seeking an arborist's recommendation.

Mr. Osteen thought this proposal could be advantageous.

I. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Wolf called for matters from the public. There were none.

J. Other Business -- Comments requested for National Register nomination reports:

Fifeville-Castle Hill National Register Historic District

Fry's Spring Service Station

Mr. Wolf stated the Board members should have received information in their packets about the Fifeville-Castle Hill survey. He stated they should look at the material and prepare comments for Staff.

Ms. Brennan stated a public meeting would be held to discuss Fifeville on 26 April at 6:30 p.m. and comments would be appreciated prior to that.

Mr. Coiner thanked Mr. Wolf for his work in getting the brick face on the stage.

K. Adjournment

Mr. Knight moved to adjourn. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:25 p.m.