

City of Charlottesville

Board of Architectural Review

August 21, 2007

Minutes

Present: Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Amy Gardner

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay

Preston Coiner **Also Present:**

Lynne Heetderks Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director NDS

Brian Hogg Mary Joy Scala

Michael Osteen

William Adams

The Chair not yet being present, Mr. Knight, the Vice Chair, convened the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Knight called for matters from the public not on the agenda.

Mr. Peter Kleeman, of 407 Hedge Street, stated he had attended the Route 250 Bypass Interchange at McIntire Road Steering Committee Meeting where he learned the construction and bridge details would be coming before the Board of Architectural Review. At the meeting it was pointed out that there will be less pedestrian access. Mr. Kleeman expressed his hope that the Board's deliberations would consider the pedestrian and bike access.

Mr. Wolf arrived during this discussion.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes July 17, 2007

Mr. Adams asked that this matter be held to the end of the meeting.

Ms. Scala recognized the presence of Mr. Rich Harris of the City Attorney's Office; he was assuming the position previously held by Ms. Lisa Kelley.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR-07-08-10

Downtown Area

City of Charlottesville

Downtown Wayfinding Signage

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In 2006, the City had hired a graphic design consultant, Hillier & Associates to refine signage designs. Preliminary comments on the signage plan were made in February. Staff recommends the use of brick rather than stone for the base of the main gateway sign. There is a need to direct visitors to side street businesses.

Mr. Tolbert stated the Steering Committee did decide to pull consideration of the main gateway sign and work on it further. Mr. Tolbert stated they did want to get the bid package out.

Mr. John Bosio provided the Board with illustrations of the changes made based on Board comments from February. The vehicular signage is single faced; pedestrian signage is double sided.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought clarification that only the vehicular and pedestrian signs were being considered and not the gateway signage. Mr. Tolbert confirmed that.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner stated his agreement with Ms. Scala that the stone was not appropriate for the gateway sign. He stated he would support a native rock such as fieldstone which is a typical construction material in this area. He stated that as a driver, he looked more for instructions rather than something which would introduce him to the area. Mr. Coiner saw no purpose for anything in the gateway sign other than a base and the word "Charlottesville." He stated the graphic made him think of the Verizon logo. Mr. Bosio stated there would be directional signage.

Mr. Adams expressed a preference for a brick base for the gateway sign.

Mr. Knight, in reference to the gateway sign, stated he had an aversion to do something with such a radical shift from the rest of the package.

Mr. Hogg expressed a preference for Mall Gateway package two as package one seemed too aggressive.

Mr. Knight stated everything seemed well thought out. He requested the red garage signage be changed.

Mr. Coiner stated he was distressed by seeing "Virginia" abbreviated. He also suggested City Hall be left off the signage and be replaced by the Discovery Museum.

Mr. Adams felt the aluminum paint provided too much of a contrast.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Signs, moved to find that the proposed Wayfinding Signage designs, specifically the vehicular and pedestrian designs but excluding the gateway and Mall entrance signs, satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as modified. Mr. Hogg offered a friendly amendment to recognize Mr. Knight's garage entrance comment and Mr. Coiner's concern about the way the text is expressed. Mr. Knight accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Hogg seconded the amended motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-03

516 Valley Road

Tax Map 11, Parcel 76

Matthew Frey

Add roof over front door and extension of the eaves over the side door and entrance to the basement apartment

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant appeared before the Board in July under Items from the Public seeking permission to get administrative approval for work already in progress. The Board wanted the applicant to return for formal review. The applicant proposes to wrap the pressure treated wood with pine which will be painted. The applicant proposes a composite material for the handrails on the porch. The proposal meets the Guidelines. It is unfortunate the front door surround has been lost; a simple front porch is a better option than leaving the front facade bare.

Mr. Matt Frey stated he was not doing the composite material but would go with a standard wood.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of whether a porch or deck handrail was proposed. Mr. Frey stated it would be a porch handrail.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf felt there was a slight difference in the elevation drawings.

Mr. Hogg noted that the door surround had been considered a very fine feature of the house. He stated the Board should consider whether they would have allowed the surround to be removed. Mr. Frey stated the project started due to rot and termites in the surround. Mr. Hogg wondered if the Board would have approved removal given the condition but asked that it be replaced in kind.

Mr. Wolf agreed the surround was a significant feature but was one which was out of place with the rest of the house.

Mr. Knight stated the Board wanted to make sure what went up was worthy of the house and holds together as a finely crafted piece of work.

Mr. Osteen stated the surround was the nicest thing about the house. He thought there should be a higher level of design.

Mr. Wolf stated if they accepted the removal of the surround, they should ask for some modifications to the new existing front entry piece.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about how the wrapped pressure treated wood would look.

Mr. Frey stated he would like to have the matter deferred. He also asked for the possibility to speak with some of the Board members outside the meeting for some guidance.

Mr. Knight moved that they accept the applicant's request for a deferral. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-04

510 Valley Road

Tax Map, 11 Parcel 78

Andrew Jenkins, Applicant

Alan Jenkins, Owner

Install a privacy fence, shed, and greenhouse

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant requests approval to construct a six foot tall privacy fence in the front yard. The fence will be flush with the building wall and run down the sides of the property to the rear property line. The fence will be double sided to hide the fencing structure. Fence material and paint color have not been specified; the applicant plans to stain the fence. The applicant also seeks approval to construct a greenhouse and shed; the buildings appear to be prefabricated aluminated and the shed would have vinyl siding. The prefabricated nature of the greenhouse and shed will allow them to be removed in the future if necessary. If the fence is approved, neither structure would be seen. Staff suggests painting the fence.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the fence would be wood. Mr. Jenkins stated it would be.

Mr. Knight wanted to know what color the fence would be stained. Mr. Jenkins stated it would look like the provided picture.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if there were any other stained fences on the street. Mr. Jenkins stated there were no painted or stained fences on the street.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the applicant would consider setting the fence back approximately six inches. Mr. Jenkins stated he would.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight suggested setting the fence back rather than having it flush with the building. He stated the style of the fence was not appropriate for the house or neighborhood and suggested adding caps and getting rid of the staggered effect. He also suggested painting the fence to match the trim on the house.

Mr. Wolf agreed the fence should be capped. However, if the fence was painted a dark color that might hide the staggered effect.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed fence, greenhouse, and shed 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 following conditions: that the fence be moved back two feet -- or approximately -- from the front of the house and that the fence be painted a neutral color to blend with the surrounding landscape and leaving the issue of a cap up to the applicants, and that the color be submitted for approval to staff. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that the distance be a minimum of one foot. Mr. Knight accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Osteen seconded the amended motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-09

617 Park Street

Tax Map 52 Parcel 186

Ron and Shannon Wilcox, Applicant

Install garden shed

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicants request to construct a ten foot by ten foot garden shed in the backyard. The frame structure would be clad in cedar siding painted an off white with bright white trim to match the house. The location and scale is acceptable to the Guidelines.

Mr. Wilcox provided the Board with pictures of the proposed shed and a 1920 map of Park Street showing a shed with the house.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought confirmation that the shed would be functional and not just ornamental. Mr. Wilcox confirmed it was functional.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight stated he was reluctant to approve this. He stated a shed would be appropriate there, just not this shed as it is a catalogue item that is not designed in composition or in coordination with the house. He stated it seemed to be placed on the site rather than tied in to the site.

Mr. Hogg did not find a building of this size and design could diminish the character of the house or street.

Mr. Adams agreed with Mr. Hogg.

Ms. Heetderks found it to be in the nature of a garden folly.

Mr. Wolf echoed the comments of Mr. Adams and Mr. Hogg.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed garden shed 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. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 7-1; Mr. Knight voted against.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-05

400 Altamont Circle

TM 33 P 129

James Wall

Add picket and privacy fences and privacy screens

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant proposes building a four foot high wooden picket fence which will be painted to match the trim of the existing house. The top line of the fence will have a scallop pattern between the posts. Two matching gates are proposed. The applicant proposes a privacy fence along the north property line beginning with a four foot height and ending with an eight foot height. It will be painted dark green and the current privacy fence will be removed by the neighbor. The applicant also seeks to build two privacy screens for the second story breezeway connecting the main house and the two-story guest house/garage. The redwood lattice screens would be eight feet tall and painted to match the trim on the house. The privacy screens would replace the existing guardrails. Staff felt the fence and privacy fence meet the Guidelines for fences. The slope of the yard would minimize the impact of the fence. The privacy screens are not specifically addressed in the Guidelines. Staff feels that due to their height they will appear to be more like a wall and change the massing of the house. Staff suggests either lowering the height of the privacy screen or having a differently shaped porthole.

Ms. Wall was present on behalf of her husband. Mr. Wall was also represented by Ian Mossman. Mr. Mossman stated the privacy screens would be below most of the adjacent windows. He felt it was in scale with the house.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if there was a detail or drawing of the proposed privacy fence. Mr. Mossman stated his assumption that the privacy fence would match the picket fence in details.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf stated he felt comfortable with the fence design. He expressed concern about the quality of the privacy screen.

Mr. Knight stated the square lattice and the handrail detail was excellent and perhaps the height could be adjusted. He had concerns with the fence design and its compatibility with the house. Mr. Knight felt the scallop fence style may be inappropriate with the house.

Mr. Osteen agreed the scallop pattern was too busy.

Mr. Hogg suggested a change in paint color might help preserve the visual separation of the house and garage. He stated he was not troubled by the height.

Ms. Wall asked for deferral.

Ms. Heetderks moved to accept the applicant's deferral. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess. The meeting stood at recess at 7:13 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:19 p.m.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-06

526 North First Street

Tax Map 13 Parcel 33

Joan Albiston, Applicant/Jason and Lisa Colton, Owner

Replacement of outdoor, rear stairs

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to add a six feet by nine feet landing and stairs from the main floor of the house to the rear yard. The owner removed a

noncontributing wood deck in July; Staff informed the owner that approval was required for future changes. The pressure treated lumber will be used; it will be painted to match the trim of the house. Some of the risers will have stair lights. Staff recommends approval of the proposed landing and stairs.

Ms. Joan Albiston was present to answer any questions. She also apologized for doing the demolition. She stated it was a misunderstanding and was not intentional at all.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the Board needed to approve a partial demolition before considering the application. Ms. Scala stated they could.

Mr. Coiner moved they approve the demolition of the prior deck and stairs. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

CONTINUED QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if consideration had been given to using anything other than pressure treated lumber. The applicant stated there had been, but cost had limited the consideration. She also stated the stair treads would not be painted due to safety reasons.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD: None.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, moved to find that the proposed landing and stairs 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. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-01

159 Madison Lane

Tax Map 9 Parcel 145

Montalto Corp.

Add rooftop railing

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting to add a rooftop railing around the perimeter of the portion of the roof that is flat as a way of promoting safety. The proposed railing has Chinese Chippendale balustrades and match the original 1928 pattern of a second-story porch railing. Staff feels the railing does not meet the Guidelines.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if Staff had an image of the railing at 130 Madison Lane. Ms. Scala did not.

Ms. Heetderks moved to defer this application until next month to give the applicant a chance to come and discuss the choices. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-02

1901 East Market Street

TM 55A P 149

Jon Fink

Demolition of historic shed

Mr. Wolf stated he would recuse himself from this matter. Mr. Coiner stated he also needed to recuse himself due to a possible perceived conflict of interest.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is an Individually Protected Property which is on the National Virginia Register. The shed was built prior to September, 1902. In 1994, the Board approved an addition to the back of the shed. The applicant seeks approval to demolish the pre-1902 shed. The main argument in favor of demolition is that the shed has been altered over the years. Any replacement structure must meet the front yard setback. The owner of the neighboring property says the shed straddles the side property line. A letter had been received from Preservation Piedmont opposing the demolition.

Mr. Jon Fink stated all historic materials would be reused. He stated that, due to vandalism on the property, he wished to demolish that structure and build a carriage house.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification of the setback requirements. Ms. Scala thought if the applicant kept the shed, they could add to it and the setback would not apply.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if alternatives had been considered. Mr. Fink stated they had.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Beverly Catlin, of 202 Riverside Avenue, stated she was also speaking on behalf of the co-owner of the property, Dimitra Costan. They asked that the request be denied. Ms. Catlin read a statement in opposition of the demolition. She asked that those who were present in support of saving the shed stand. Mr. Knight noted for the record that seven members of the public rose in response to Ms. Catlin's request.

Mr. Fran Lawrence, Esquire, was present on behalf of Ms. Catlin, Ms. Costan, and Ms. Catlin's sister who was also his wife. He spoke in opposition of the demolition of this small, but important structure in the Woolen Mills.

Ms. Victoria Dunham, Co-President of the Woolen Mills Neighborhood Association, requested the Board table this matter as the association had not had a chance to meet with Mr. Fink regarding his plans for this key historic corner.

Mr. Bill Emory, of 1604 East Market, read from the Guidelines to speak in opposition to the demolition.

Mr. Fink stated if he thought or felt in his heart that this had unbelievable historic significance, he would have never brought this application forward.

Ms. Laura Covert, of 1809 East Market Street and Co-President of the Woolen Mills Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition of the proposal. She stated historical resources were a finite resource.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks stated she was uncomfortable considering this matter without the City Attorney present if there was any legal dispute about the ownership of the property. She was in favor of tabling this application until that issue was resolved satisfactorily.

Mr. Adams expressed his agreement with Ms. Heetderks.

Mr. Hogg stated he was inclined to share Ms. Heetderks' concern. He also felt there had not been a strong case for demolition.

Mr. Osteen stated the outbuildings were incredibly important. He felt they should remain.

Mr. Tremblay also felt the outbuildings were significant.

Mr. Knight stated he had not seen a compelling argument for demolition.

Mr. Fink requested deferral and stated he would like to meet with Board members and Staff for suggestions.

Ms. Heetderks moved to accept the applicant's deferral. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called the question. The motion passed 6-0-2; Mr. Wolf and Mr. Coiner had recused themselves from the matter.

K. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-07

104 Oakhurst Circle

Tax Map 11 Parcel 3

Neal Deputy, Applicant/ Tenth and Main LLC, Owner

Demolition of garage

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish the 1920s outbuilding behind 104 Oakhurst Circle. Based on an analysis of the demolition criteria within the Guidelines, Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Neal Deputy stated the proposal was a modest one. He stated he had spoken with the Oakhurst/Gildersleeve historic neighborhood in July and they had posed no objection.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated there were clearly condition issues with this building. He did not believe removal of this structure would detract from the overall character of the District.

Mr. Wolf asked if that was a motion to approve the demolition of the structure. Mr. Hogg stated it was. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

L. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-08

235 West Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 155L

Nathan Holland, Verizon Wireless, Applicant/ Omni Charlottesville Virginia Corp, Owner

Add antenna to rooftop of Omni Hotel

This matter was deferred at the request of the applicant.

M. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-11

213 Second Street SW

Tax Map 28 Parcel 76

JD Associates, Applicant/ Two Chefs LLC, Owner

Replacement Roof at Bang restaurant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The new standing seam metal roof will use prefinished metal. Even though this is a metal roof replacing a metal roof, it is coming before the Board because of concerns about it being a prefinished roof.

The applicant stated the owner was asking to keep everything the same; the ridge line would be identical.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf asked if there was a preference for color. The applicant stated they were not sure what to use. Mr. Hogg asked that they not use green. Mr. Wolf suggested charcoal grey. Mr. Adams thought black would work well with the brick.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed roof replacement satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and others in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the one provision that the color of the roof replacement be the Englert Charcoal Grey has shown on the standard colors and coatings chart that is submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes July 17, 2007

Mr. Adams asked that part D, the replacement of three exterior windows at 212 East Main Street reflect "Mr. Adams suggested that they get the applicant to redo the storefront, but if that was not the case then just reset the windows" instead of "Mr. Adams stated they could not get the applicant to redo the storefront and suggested the windows be reset."

Noting that his firm was involved with that application, Mr. Wolf recused himself from voting on the correction.

Mr. Coiner moved approval of the minutes with the corrections stated. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-0-3; Mr. Wolf, Mr. Tremblay, and Mr. Knight abstained from voting.

N. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

O. Other Business

The Board adjourned from City Council chambers to the NDS conference room at 8:28 p.m. to discuss other business.

Upon reconvening in the NDS Conference Room, the Board discussed having a future work session to address the possibility of expanding design review in the City.

P. Adjournment

The Board adjourned at 9:11 p.m.