

**City of Charlottesville**  
**Board of Architectural Review**

**June 19, 2007**

**Minutes**

**Present: Also Present:**

Fred Wolf, Chair Mary Joy Scala

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Preston Coiner

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Brian Hogg

William Adams

**Not Present:**

Wade Tremblay

Michael Osteen

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**

**1. May 15, 2007, Minutes**

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 06-04-09

218 West Water Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 84

Demolition reapplication from 03/31/2006 original application

William Atwood, Applicant/Oliver Kuttner, Owner

### **3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 06-05-04

1115 and 1115 1/2 Wertland Street

Tax Map 4 Parcel 305

John Matthews, Applicant/Wade Tremblay, Owner

Demolition of buildings on site

Mr. Wolf called the consent agenda.

**Mr. Knight moved the consent agenda. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion passed; Ms. Heetderks abstained from voting on item 1 of the agenda.**

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

**BAR 06-10-05**

**109 East Jefferson Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 194**

**Demolition and new construction**

**Bethany Puopolo, Architect/Janice Aron, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property is in the North Downtown ADC District and was last before the Board on January 16, 2007. The applicant seeks approval for an alternate design for the west side addition. The brick and mortar will match the existing house. The applicant also submitted details which had been requested previously for a wood version of the addition. The existing stone wall along Second Street, which is structurally unsound and failing structurally, is proposed to be taken down and reconstructed at the same height as the rear wall. The proposed alternate brick addition and the guest house are compatible with the character of the building and district.

Ms. Bethany Puopolo was present to answer questions.

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

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the brown gravel. Ms. Puopolo directed the question to the landscape architect, Mr. Charles Stick. He stated the gravel would be rolled into an asphalt base.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the proposed wall would start at the property line or at the sound portion of the wall. Mr. Stick stated he thought they had to go back to the property line to unify the character of the wall along the street.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if there absolutely had to be a 3 foot high railing on top of the rock wall. Mr. Stick explained the applicants had asked for it from a security and safety standpoint.

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

Mr. Adams suggested the applicant consider historical brick as it might be closer in texture.

Mr. Hogg preferred the brick alternative as it seemed simpler and more straightforward. He suggested the fence be moved behind a hedge.

Mr. Knight thought it was a very well crafted design. However, he did not see a legitimate reason for the fence in the front yard. Mr. Knight did not like the height of the sliding gate extending above the height of the wall.

Mr. Coiner stated he was not in favor of the railing on Jefferson Street. He also thought the applicant should rethink having the urns on the posts of the gate or how to attach them.

Mr. Wolf asked if the applicant would care to address the concerns which had been mentioned.

Mr. Stick stated he was concerned that reducing the height of the gate would make it appear to be an unattractive sliver within the opening when it was closed. He also stated it would be closed more often than open.

Mr. Wolf expressed concern about the proportions of the gate if it were reduced in height. He expressed a preference for the brick addition. He suggested moving the fence back along on Second Street and planting in front of it.

Mr. Adams wanted to see more detail on the masonry.

Mr. Knight appreciated the argument for the gate and stated he would accept it since it would be counterweighted and would be in the closed position most of the time. He did not think hedges should be relied upon to hide things. Mr. Knight stated he was troubled by the message that was being sent and the precedent that was being set.

**Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, moved to find that the proposed demolition and**

**reconstruction of the stone wall along Second 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. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and Site Design, moved to find that the proposed site design Alternate Brick Addition and New Guest House, as submitted, satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the provision that the fence currently shown above the to be renovated stone wall on Second Street be offset from the stone wall to allow for the planting of a hedge to match the existing hedges on East Jefferson to conceal the fence and that the BAR be allowed to participate in the review of the mock up of the masonry construction when that is performed to help evaluate in terms of brick pointing and joint pattern and brick selection. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

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

**BAR 07-06-03**

**1704 and 1704 1/2 Gordon Avenue**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 2**

**Lane Bonner, Applicant**

#### **Demolition of buildings on site**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. These are contributing structures in the Rugby Road/University Circle/Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish both buildings. Their removal may not be noticed and may not affect the character of the district but will affect it by the design of the structure that will replace it. The structures were designated as contributing based on their age. They meet the criteria of demolition.

The applicant was present but had nothing to add.

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

Mr. Hogg stated the buildings were tired and had not been made of great materials to begin with.

Ms. Heetderks stated she found the buildings charming but she was not sure that was not enough to justify saving them.

**Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed demolitions satisfy the**

**BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

#### **E. Preliminary Discussion**

**BAR 07-06-02223 East Main Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 234**

**Replace doors and windows, new canopy, remove siding, new facade roof system**

**Alexander Nicholson, Inc., Applicant/Anthony LaBua, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District on the Downtown Mall. The applicant is seeking preliminary comments on a proposal to: replace the existing ground level doors and windows with a folding door system, which would be considered a partial demolition; add a canopy; remove the siding to expose the brick; add three new windows to the second floor, which would also be a partial demolition; and a new metal roof system to the top of the facade. Bringing the tables or counters out on the Mall has a specific Zoning Regulation which the applicant would need to have addressed. Removal of the existing siding shingles and storefront is appropriate. Replacing the existing ground level doors and windows with a folding door system is appropriate. If new window openings are allowed, the three punched openings should be aligned with the storefront openings below. The mansard-type roof parapet would be unusual.

Mr. Anthony LaBua, the owner, and Mr. Tony Whitty, of Alexander Nicholson, were present. Mr. LaBua asked that the center window on the upper floor be allowed to open all the way. Mr. Whitty stated the windows would be more like clerestory lighting as there was no full second floor.

Mr. Hogg did not like the idea of upper story windows. He believed canopies are not an appropriate way of identifying a retail activity as canopies have particular architectural functions they are associated with. He suggested if the applicant was peeling off everything that was put on in the '70s, they should also take off the roof as well since that would allow a decent sized window in the upper story that had a nice proportion. Mr. Hogg suggested painting the sign on the brick.

Mr. Adams wondered if the ground floor openings were actually taller than the applicant thought. Mr. LaBua wanted to know if they were allowed to remove the T-111 and look at what was under it. Mr. Coiner suggested a simple application be made to Ms. Scala who would be allowed to approve it administratively. Mr. Wolf thought it would be all right to do an exploratory probe of some small sections.

Mr. Knight stated it would be helpful to have a little more contextual information when the applicant returns with a site design. He suggested they not use EIFS as an alternative.

## **F. Preliminary Discussion**

**BAR 07-06-01**

**Corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue**

**Tax Map 29 Parcels 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 157**

**New Construction**

**Train & Partners Architects, Applicant/Southern Development Group, Owner**

This item has been deferred until further notice.

## **G. Discussion**

**513 Dice Street**

**Tax Map 29 Parcel 63.1**

**Infill development**

**Shackleford House LLC/Jane Covington, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant had received a Special Use Permit for infill development from City Council on June 4<sup>th</sup>. The applicant must obtain preliminary and final site plan approval prior to building the second residence as well as subdivision approval of the second lot and BAR approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction including the site design. The item is set for discussion of the site design to determine if the Board still prefers that the second dwelling be constructed in the rear of the property or if the applicant's choice to build closer to Dice Street would be acceptable.

Mr. Steve Edwards was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Wolf called for comments.

Mr. Hogg stated this house was an anomaly and the solution which the Board had come up with was the better solution. With further understanding of the neighborhood, Mr. Hogg continued to support the solution arrived at previously as it places the new structure back and away from the house allowing its unusual orientation to be discernible.

Mr. Adams agreed with that. He stated the earlier plan had a smaller footprint.

Mr. Knight stated he had been leaning toward bringing the house to the street for the sake of the neighborhood but became convinced by the arguments to set it back. He stated that when the applicant brought back the final site design, it needed much more detail flushed out.

Ms. Jane Covington wanted the Board to explain the significance of the 513 Dice Street as she had spoken with the Department of Historic Resources which had stated the individual property was not significant. Mr. Wolf stated the house predated the Fifeville neighborhood. Ms. Covington stated it did not. She stated this was a vernacular structure and was never meant to be a monument.

Mr. Hogg stated there was no historic argument to support the proposed design.

Mr. Wolf stated it did not matter how many stories the building had as long as it was deferential to the existing structure.

Mr. Hogg expressed a preference for the ridge of the new building to be below the existing structure.

Mr. Adams stated the existing house is a strong presence and needs to be recognized.

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

Mr. Wolf called for matters from the public not on the agenda. There were no matters from the public.

## **I. Other Business**

Mr. Wolf called for other business.

Mr. Coiner suggested that Mr. Wolf or Ms. Scala communicate with the Chief of Police that as the area is patrolled, they enforce the skateboarding law as the skateboarders were raising havoc on the marble steps and wall caps. Mr. Wolf felt it was worth a simple letter that the BAR was concerned that the architecture not be modified to protect itself from the buildings and site elements being used as a playground or for purposes for which it was not intended. Mr. Coiner stated he was not anti-skateboard as he had been doing the same thing 40 or so years ago.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if the Melting Pot final appeal had been set with City Council. Mr. Wolf thought it was set for July 16<sup>th</sup>.

## **J. Adjournment**

Mr. Hogg moved to adjourn. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:21 p.m.