

**City of Charlottesville**

**Board of Architectural Review**

**September 18, 2007**

**Minutes**

**Present: Not Present:**

Fred Wolf, Chair William Adams

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay **Also Present:**

Preston Coiner Mary Joy Scala

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Brian Hogg

Michael Osteen

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:02 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. Minutes -- August 21, 2007**

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**201 Second Street NE**

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**201 East Market Street**

Mr. Knight moved acceptance of the consent agenda. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called for a voice vote. The motion passed; Mr. Coiner stated his opposition to the second

item while favoring items one and three and Ms. Gardner abstained from item one as she had not been present in August.

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

**BAR 07-08-05**

**400 Altamont Circle**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 129**

**James Wall**

#### **Add picket and privacy fences and privacy screens**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had been heard at the August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting but the applicant had requested deferral to change some details of the submittal. Some of the fencing previously requested had been removed from the application. The application still includes a privacy fence ranging from four feet to eight feet along the north property line. The fence will be made of pressure treated pine stained dark green and will have vertical and horizontal lattice in the top portion. With the changes that were made, Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Wall stated he had been happy to make the changes.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD: None

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated he thought the original application was appropriate.

Mr. Tremblay noted the applicant had responded to the discussion points from the previous meeting.

**Mr. Tremblay, 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 privacy fence, privacy screens, and gate 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. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.**

### **D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from 21 August)**

**BAR 07-08-01**

**159 Madison Lane**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 145**

**Montalto Corp.**

**Add rooftop railing**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The application had been deferred from the August meeting since the applicant had not been present. The applicant is requesting approval to add a rooftop railing around the perimeter of the portion of the roof which is flat to promote safety. The house was designed around 1927 by Stanislaw Makielski. The original plan had Chinese Chippendale balustrades on a second story porch; those have been altered over the years. The proposed railing is supposed to match that original design. However, the applicant has not indicated any plans to restore the second story porch railing to match the proposed rooftop railing. The railing would be a combination of wood and steel painted white or Charleston green. Staff feels the proposal does not meet the Guidelines requirements because it would add a new element to the roof that would be clearly visible from all elevations of the building. Makielski had no intention of putting a railing on the rooftop. Since safety, not design, should be the motivating factor, perhaps a railing that is less visually obtrusive, such as black or white wrought iron rail, would be acceptable.

Mr. Benjamin Worthen, president of Montalto Corporation, was present with the architect, Ted Jones. This is part of a project that was designed and ordered by the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia five years ago. Mr. Worthen explained that residents of the fraternity were determined to gain access to the roof to sunbathe and this was meant to keep the residents safe. Mr. Worthen stated three of the fraternity or sorority houses on Madison Lane have porches or some structure on the roof which exactly replicates the design on the second floor.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if 36 inches would be sufficient or should it be 42 inches to meet Code. Mr. Ted Jones stated this was not considered to be an accessible roof and as such the height was meant to also be an aesthetic response.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that the applicant would eventually replace the railing which currently does not match the original. Mr. Jones stated that was the intent of the fraternity.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Tremblay noted there was no objection to a rail; the only issue was what kind of rail. He had no objection to the Chippendale as it was consistent with elements of design that were actually built on the house and with elements that show up in the original drawings.

Mr. Knight stated his agreement with Mr. Tremblay.

Mr. Hogg expressed concern about the three-quarter view of the house when the railing is installed. He was afraid it would look a little cartoonish. He added that accepting that accessing the roof was a behavior which could not be controlled, this design was the better of the two.

Mr. Wolf echoed the sentiments of Mr. Tremblay, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Hogg in finding the guardrail to be handsome in its relationship to the original house. He agreed the railing should match the other woodwork.

Mr. Hogg noted that old photos showed no brick pier and suggested the applicant use a paneled wood post on the corner rather than brick.

**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 rooftop railing as submitted 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. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner wanted to know what paint color was being suggested. Mr. Tremblay stated the white as submitted. Mr. Coiner stated there was an option between white and green. Mr. Tremblay specified white. Mr. Knight seconded the amended motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.**

#### **E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 07-09-04**

**235 West Main Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 155L**

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

#### **Add stealth antenna to rooftop of Omni Hotel**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant requests approval to add rooftop antenna to the Omni which would be screened through the use of a faux-brick styrofoam wall. The faux wall will be 19 feet by 18.5 feet by 9.7 feet with an outer surface designed to mimic the existing brick veneer of the hotel. The applicant was asked to explore other options such as real bricks, stucco or metal; however, the styrofoam is preferred by the applicant due to its ease in transmitting radio frequencies. A similarly constructed installation on the Hampton Inn on West Main Street was approved by the BAR in 2002. The faux brick wall has been matched to the existing brick color as closely as possible and is not visible from the Mall. It can be removed in the future.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if staff had verified that the Board actually approved styrofoam brick. Ms. Scala stated it was styrofoam. Mr. Knight stated his recollection was the other application had been presented as a faux brick. He did not remember the word "styrofoam" being used.

Mr. Wolf recognized the applicant.

Mr. Maynard Sipe, Esquire, of LeclairRyan, was present on behalf of the applicant Verizon as was Mr. Nathan Holland, of Wireless Resources, Incorporated. Mr. Sipe thanked staff for their work on the project. He stated the use was one which was allowed by right. He stated the proposed enclosure would not exceed ten feet over the parapet of what was on the penthouse. Mr. Sipe added this was a structurally sound material made of extruded styrofoam and could resist winds of over 200 miles per hour.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if this would be considered a rooftop appurtenance as they have a limit of 16 feet above the building height. Ms. Scala explained Staff had not looked into that as the building was not to the maximum height.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know the sizes of the panels. Mr. Sipe stated the panels are custom manufactured for this installation. Mr. Wolf also wanted to know what kind of cap the structure would have. Mr. Sipe stated it would be made of the same material.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg did not think this made any difference to anything. He stated it had no affect on the character of the building. Mr. Hogg stated it would be hard to discern the material of this addition from the distance from which it would be visible. This addition could not detract in any meaningful way from the character of the historic district.

Mr. Wolf agreed with his colleague as it regarded this building. He added it was important to note that it was this particular building and this application that were being endorsed and not necessarily this product.

Ms. Scala stated the application had been unclear whether the cap would have the brick pattern or a metal cap; she felt the Board should address that.

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for the cap to be dealt with in the same way the building wall is. Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if Mr. Wolf would have a problem with the cap being made of a metal replica. Mr. Wolf would not.

Mr. Osteen did not feel the Mall would be compromised.

Mr. Knight expounded upon the statements of Mr. Hogg and Mr. Wolf in noting that this was not to be considered a precedent for other applications and general uses in the Downtown District or any historic district. He thought it was fine in this case because of the circumstances but did not want the Board to have another applicant come back citing this application.

Ms. Heetderks citing Guidelines 2.9(5) stated that this particular building under these specific circumstances met the Guidelines but that Guideline may not be met with a different structure.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about the appearance of the mortar joints in the sample as they appeared to be more pronounced than in the real building. He asked that they be toned down and approved administratively.

**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 antenna with faux wall screening 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 with the requirement that the cap be amended as discussed and that the backing which simulates mortar be of a more muted color as discussed. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf sought clarification that Mr. Osteen also meant for the dimensions of the joints to be brought to Staff. Mr. Osteen agreed the color and joints could be verified to match the building. Mr. Knight accepted that as a friendly amendment. Mr. Tremblay also accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.**

#### **F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 07-09-06**

**200 2nd Street NE**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 190**

**City of Charlottesville, Applicant**

**Skatestoppers at Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society**

Ms. Scala stated the applicant was not present and asked that the matter be skipped over to allow the applicant to appear.

#### **G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 07-09-01**

**112 West Market Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 254**

**Wolf Ackerman Design, Applicant / Shady Acres, Owner (First Street Church)**

**Infill of six masonry window openings with brick; expand two window openings for new egress doors at fire escape; new entry door at annex basement; add two slate/steel canopies**

Mr. Wolf recused himself from this item and the next as his firm was involved in the project. Mr. Knight assumed chairmanship of the meeting.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is proposing several changes to the annex to First Christian Church. This was previously before the Board in March when window sash replacements were approved. Prior to that, recommendations were made regarding a Special Use Permit for renovation for a day shelter. The applicant proposes adding a new slate and steel canopy over the existing pair of entrance doors on the first floor north side of the annex, replace an existing window with a new pair of painted wood doors on the ground level on the north side, a slate and steel canopy is proposed for the ground floor entrance, replace an existing window with a new door at the fire escape on the second and third floors, and to remove six windows on the south side and fill the openings with concrete masonry units and recessed brick to create a new fire stair inside the building. Precedent exists for changing windows to door with the same masonry opening and steel canopies. If the applicant can provide satisfactory reasons for those changes for which precedent does not exist, staff can recommend approval.

Mr. Dave Ackerman explained the proposals were in order to get egress requirements to work within the building.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if there was any reason the windows could not remain and just be made blind windows. Mr. Ackerman stated that could be done to the small windows; however, it would be harder to do with the larger windows due to rooms in conjunction with the placement of the proposed stairway.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if the windows could be returned to windows at a future time. Mr. Ackerman stated they could.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the applicant had considered using two supports rather than three for the canopies. Mr. Ackerman agreed that might make it easier to deal with the detailing around the top of the door.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg appreciated the guidelines advocated retaining the sashes. He stated the patterns of the windows would be consistent with the Guidelines. Mr. Hogg stated changing windows into doors

for fire egress seemed perfectly sensible. He thought the slate would look more threatening than welcoming and suggested glass as an option. Mr. Ackerman stated he was amenable to changing the canopy material to glass.

Mr. Knight stated there seemed to be a general consensus that the handling of the conversion of the windows and doors had been done very sensitively leaving the legibility of the original building intact.

**Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes: add a new canopy over the existing pair of entrance doors, replace an existing window with a new pair of painted wood doors, add a new canopy over the proposed new pair of doors, replace an existing window with a new wood door on the second floor, replace an existing with a new wood door on the third floor, and remove six windows and fill the openings, 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 with the following understanding: that the roof material of the canopies will be revised, that one of the center supports for the canopy above the existing door will be eliminated, that the new pair of doors is subject to approval of some revisions to the landscape in front of the annex building, and that the details of the canopy will return to the Board for review as they develop. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the applicant would have to come back with the brick to be used for filling the windows. Ms. Scala suggested they say it would closely match the existing brick. Mr. Hogg and Mr. Tremblay accepted that suggestion. Mr. Knight called the voice vote. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Wolf abstained from voting as he had recused himself from the matter.**

## **H. Preliminary Discussion**

**112 West Market Street**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 254**

**Wolf Ackerman Design, Applicant / Shady Acres, Owner (First Street Church)**

### **Renovations to site stairs and ramps; tree removal; new terrace, courtyard, plantings**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking a preliminary discussion of the landscape plan for the north front yards of the church and annex buildings. Proposed for removal are: a large maple tree, a large dogwood, and another large ornamental in front of the annex, some rhododendrons in front of the church, some dogwoods, a crepe myrtle and other plantings in the church side yard. The entrance to the existing pair of doors will be filled in so the walkway is level. Existing stairs from the City sidewalk to this entrance would be removed. New terraces would be added in front of the church and annex on two levels. A new walkway to the annex with new stairs from the City sidewalk is proposed. A new pedestrian entrance wall is indicated on the northwest corner of the site. Proposed landscaping is not specified but includes flowering



trees, flowering shade trees, low trimmed hedge, planting bed with ground cover perennials and low shrubs. This is a good opportunity to redesign this location into an urban open space.

Mr. Gregg Bleam, landscape architect with Wolf Ackerman, provided diagrams depicting which trees would be removed.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg expressed concern about the severe appearance of black slate on the retaining wall. He stated he had a problem with taking the stairs off the center of the church.

Ms. Gardner sought additional information about the material of the terrace. Mr. Bleam stated the terrace in front of the sanctuary would be concrete; stone would lead to the upper level offices.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know why the terrace entrance to the side door would be three feet higher than the existing walk. Mr. Bleam stated they were trying to make the wheelchair access work.

Mr. Coiner asked the architect use his influence with the owner of the building to remove the vines that are growing on the east facade because they are getting into the stained glass window area.

Mr. Osteen commended the architects and landscape architect for the drawings. He stated they should be putting as many street trees along there as possible.

Ms. Heetderks asked that the front stair remain centered on the church.

Mr. Knight expressed concern about moving the stairs and about the dark slate wall. He agreed with Mr. Osteen that it would be preferable to get some street trees. Mr. Knight stated it was a very small site and anything they could do to simplify the design would be helpful.

Mr. Knight returned the meeting to Mr. Wolf's chairmanship.

## **F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 07-09-06**

**200 2nd Street NE**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 190**

**City of Charlottesville, Applicant**

**Skatestoppers at Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society**

Ms. Scala stated the applicant still was not present.

Mr. Wolf stated that as this was a retroactive approval, the applicant should be present.

**Mr. Coiner moved to defer the application. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.**

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

There were no matters from the public.

#### **J. Other Business**

Ms. Heetderks encouraged the Board to move forward with getting the Monticello Dairy and the Coca-Cola Building designated, and exploring whether they could designate part of the tax parcel for the Monticello Dairy building instead of the whole property. Ms. Scala stated she had been asked to prepare a memo for City Council for their meeting on October 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Osteen sought clarification of the status of the Compton house which had been mentioned in a City Council meeting. Ms. Scala stated it was built in 1914 and the last time properties were individually designated had been in the early 1990s and at that time they had only designated properties which were at least 100 years old. She stated the Compton house has been surveyed.

#### **K. Adjournment**

Mr. Knight moved they adjourn. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 6:45 p.m.