

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review

October 16, 2007

Minutes

Present: Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay Amy Gardner

Preston Coiner

Lynne Heetderks **Also Present:**

Brian Hogg Mary Joy Scala

Michael Osteen

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

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- September 18, 2007

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Reapplication)

BAR 07-10-07

301 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 198

Mooney West Main Street LLC

Demolition of building

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Reapplication)

BAR 07-10-08

315 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 197

Mooney West Main Street LLC

Demolition of building

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-05

526-528 North First Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 13

Joan Albiston/Jason and Lisa Colton

Upper rear terrace

Ms. Heetderks asked that items 1 and 3 be pulled from the Consent Agenda. Mr. Wolf stated the minutes would be dealt with at the end of the meeting while item 3 would be dealt with after the consent agenda.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval of the consent agenda. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B. 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Reapplication)

BAR 07-10-08

315 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 197

Mooney West Main Street LLC

Demolition of building

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. 315 West Main Street was built in approximately 1936 and is located in the Downtown ADC District. By a 7-2 vote, the BAR approved the demolition of 315 West Main Street at its November 15, 2005, meeting. The Certificate of Appropriateness will

expire November 15, 2007; a demolition building permit must be issued before the Certificate of Appropriateness expires. The demolition building permit cannot be issued while the tenant occupies the building. Staff had not recommended demolition until the applicant submitted a structural report supporting the proposed demolition.

Mr. Jim Mooney, one of the property owners, stated the structural survey spoke for itself.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the property had been in the possession of Mr. Mooney's family since it had been built. Mr. Mooney confirmed that it had.

Ms. Heetderks sought confirmation that no significant maintenance had been done on the property since 1963, as was stated in the previous minutes. Mr. Mooney stated that was not correct; there had been numerous roof repairs as well as repairs to the cracks in the walls.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner stated that when the application first came before the Board he had concerns about approving the demolition. However, after having inspected the structure himself, and based on the structural report, he felt the building was not worthy of restoration or renovation. He stated he would support the demolition at this time.

Mr. Tremblay stated the applicant had been working in good faith. He stated changing course at this time would be disingenuous with an applicant who had worked this hard.

Ms. Heetderks stated she had felt at that time -- and continued to feel -- the Board made a mistake in granting this demolition permit. She felt this was an issue of precedent. Based on the Staff report, Ms. Heetderks felt this proposal did not meet criteria of Section 34-284(b) (1) and (2) of the City Code. Nor did it meet the standards for considering demolition (a)(1), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), (b), (d), (e)(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6). Ms. Heetderks stated this was a case of demolition by neglect. She stated she would be willing to entertain the possibility of some sort of partial demolition.

Mr. Hogg felt there was no argument for demolition by neglect simply because the family had owned the building since it was constructed. The only argument for demolition by neglect would be based on what has happened since the district was created. He stated there were no new facts that would lead him to believe the past Board ruling should be overturned.

Ms. Heetderks stated no criteria had been provided in the previous motion and should be cited in any new motion.

Mr. Adams stated he would honor the decision of the previous Board.

Mr. Wolf agreed with Mr. Adams. However, he did respect Ms. Heetderks' request for considering how the motion was crafted.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to approve the request for demolition of 301 and 315 West Main Street finding that they satisfy the BAR's criteria for demolition. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks respectfully requested that the particular criteria be cited in the motion. Mr. Hogg stated it met criteria: 2, as it was not part of the National Register District; 3, there are no known associations; with respect to criteria 4, he disagreed with Staff's analysis and felt the building did not represent a particularly distinctive example of its type without any distinctive features that identify it; this was also true for criteria 5 to some degree; 6, he felt Staff's analysis did not reflect some of the later evidence as there had been substantial alterations to the rear and sides of the building; 7, there were a reasonable number of relatives to this building remaining so losing this building would not substantially diminish the character of the street; (c), as a condition report identifies deficiencies with the building; (d), the building would be difficult to relocate; (e)(3), as there was no special public purpose in retaining this building as it was not a distinguished structure and had no particular association; (5) was neither here nor there as the location of any old building was part of its meaning; (6) the configuration of the building detracts from the adjacent building to the west rather than enhancing it; and (7), the structural report. Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment as did Mr. Tremblay. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment that the motion state the Board was extending the demolition permit rather than granting demolition. Ms. Scala stated they could not extend it as it had already been extended once. Mr. Wolf and Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 6-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

C. Discussion and Recommendation

Bridge Design: Route 250 Bypass Interchange at McIntire Road

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. No action is requested at this time. A steering committee has been working on this since November, 2005. City Council has requested BAR review of the proposal. The steering committee endorsed two concepts, C1 and G1.

Ms. Angela Tucker, of NDS, and Owen Peary, the project manager, were present to discuss the matter.

Ms. Tucker stated a public hearing would be held November 1st from 4 to 7 p.m.

Mr. Peary gave a proposed timeline for the project to follow.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted additional information on the roundabout. Mr. Peary stated roundabouts were safer; the roundabout would be discussed in more detail at the public hearing.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know whether an open handrail would allow more noise than a masonry enclosure. Mr. Peary stated a noise analysis had been done based on a closed type parapet. He stated the noise level between C1 and G1 was affected by the dead stop at the bottom of the ramps on the G1 plan.

Mr. Wolf stated he did not see this bridge as a gateway; as it was configured, it was an extension of 250.

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for a cast in place bridge.

Mr. Hogg expressed a preference for a bridge that would be as light, transparent, and thin as an engineer could responsibly make it.

Mr. Osteen expressed a preference for not seeing a major highway.

Mr. Wolf asked the Board members their preference between the options. C1 was preferred.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-01

422 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 52

Marthe Rowen / Gabriel Silverman

Renovation of the A&N Store

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC district was built approximately in 1900. Staff believed it to have been a two story building. The applicant seeks approval to remove the aluminum storefront and supporting wall, the sign panel and the soffit. They also propose to unblock three of the Fifth Street windows. Refurbishment includes repainting the brick, patching some of the brickwork, repairing or covering with stucco the brick band above and behind the sign panel. New construction includes a dark green aluminum and glass storefront set on a glazed block wall, a standing seam metal canopy with painted steel frame rods and brackets, and dark green aluminum clad one over one wood windows. Staff recommends a cast stone cornice rather than foam; however, the applicant has indicated problems with structurally supporting that.

Ms. Marthe Rowen was present but had nothing to add to the Staff presentation.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted to know the reasoning behind the proposed yellow color. Ms. Rowen stated the owner preferred yellow or orange.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the cornice could be fabricated out of sheet metal and painted. Ms. Rowen stated she had not looked at that. She added her client respectfully requested that foam be used as they had used it on the Rapture building.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf stated they were dealing with a building that was not original and was different than the historic fabric behind it. He thought the proposal looked good. He did have some apprehension about the color of the glazed block. He expressed a preference for something more in keeping with the green and the copper.

Mr. Adams did not think the glazed block had a place there.

Mr. Hogg felt there was a lot going on and that the materials and color palette should be calmed down. Mr. Hogg felt the windows should meet the spring point of the arches.

Ms. Heetderks did like the glazed block; however, the color did need to change or be toned down.

Mr. Wolf felt the cornice should be painted white and matching the brick would be a suitable solution. He concurred with Mr. Hogg that the windows should meet the spring point of the arches.

Mr. Wolf made a motion supporting this with the exception of the color of the block, which would have to come back to staff, and a request for the coordination of that color with the upper sign panel and with the condition that the windows that are being reinstalled in the side wall of the building meet the spring point of the existing arches regardless of what has to be done on the interior. Ms. Heetderks asked if he would be willing to leave out the cornice and ask that it return if the applicant has a chance to explore some of the other options. Mr. Wolf added "with the cornice to be reconsidered and the color of the block to come back to the Board."

Mr. Wolf then restated his motion.

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 facade renovations/new windows satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the qualifications that the color of the glazed block will be returned to the Board for approval and that the final selection of the material and a profile

if that changes with the material, for the cornice would also come back to the Board, and with the requirement that any new windows inserted in the old masonry openings on the east facing wall of the building on Fifth Street would meet the spring point of the existing arch in the brick wall. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-2; Mr. Hogg and Mr. Adams voted against.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

433 North First Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 103

Malcolm and Ruth Bell

Rebuild front stairs

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a request to replace the existing wood stairs and horizontal board railings with wood stairs and railings of a different design. The stairs would be rot-resistant wood -- cedar, mahogany, or redwood -- with treads painted to match the existing porch floors and railings painted to match existing house trim. The proposed design does an adequate job of matching the existing pattern of the front porch.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner wanted to know how the lattice would be attached under the stairs. Mr. Bell stated the lattice would be nailed to a triangular panel made to fit the space under the steps. He added they had not resolved the question of how it would be attached to the stringers. Mr. Coiner suggested the lattice be attached to a cleat attached along the stringer.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD: None

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, moved to find that the proposed front stairs satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the reference to the cleated attachment of the lattice work suggested by Mr. Coiner. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-02

200 East Water Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 61

Wachovia Bank, Jim Goggins/ Charlottesville Parking Center Inc.(Water Street Garage)

Replace existing overhead door with smaller door and panels

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is located on the Fourth Street facade of the Water Street Parking Garage. The design would be similar to an existing design on the ACAC garage door on Monticello Avenue. Staff does not think this will adversely affect the historic district.

Mr. Jim Goggins stated the existing door was a grill that people climbed on, bending out the bars. The new design was perforated slats instead.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams sought clarification that the horizontal at the head of the door lined up with another horizontal. Mr. Goggins stated they did.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Tremblay stated this was a straightforward request.

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 garage door replacement satisfies the BAR's criteria and is 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 the question. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-03

540 Park Street

TM 52 P 183

Osteen Phillips Architects/Tobias Dengel

Rehabilitation of garden shed

Mr. Osteen recused himself from the matter as his office was involved in the project.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This project is located in the North Downtown ADC District. Both the house and garden shed are listed as contributing resources. Architectural and site changes were approved in December, 2005. The corrugated siding material would be replaced with new stucco, which is consistent with other structures on the property.

Mr. Matt McClellan, present on behalf of the applicant, stated his client had been making his best effort to bring the structure to a point where it can last for another hundred years.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if there was a walkway in front of the building connecting it to the street. Mr. McClellan stated there was not currently.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf liked what was proposed and he liked tying the mass of the building to the house. The changes were all within keeping of the original. He asked that the roof framing and the underside of the exposed portion of the roof be dealt with similarly to the existing.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code moved to find that the proposed garden shed rehabilitation satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with a friendly request that those considerations be given to the way existing framing is dealt with. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 6-0-1; Mr. Osteen recused himself from the matter.

Mr. Coiner asked that the meeting have a brief recess.

Mr. Wolf recessed the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:22 p.m.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-09

223 East Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 234

Alexander Nicholson, Inc. (Tony Witte) / Tony LaBua

Chap's Ice Cream storefront renovation

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Partial demolition of the siding and the parapet was granted in July. The applicant is seeking approval of a renovation which includes: removing the existing aluminum and glass storefront and replacing it with a new folding door system; adding three second story windows of anodized aluminum, the bottom sashes would be operable outward awning style; cover the existing brickwork with a three coat masonry stucco system in two colors; the cornice would be finish with stucco and flash with a metal cap; and add a box type canopy extending five feet from the building. The seasonal outside stand is not permitted. The proposed wall finish is appropriate. The proposed canopy is out of place. The colors are appropriate. A signage permit would be required.

Mr. Enoch Snyder, of Alexander Nicholson, Inc., was present with Tony LaBua to answer any questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner wanted to know what options had been considered for the canopy. Mr. Snyder stated there were four buildings on the Mall with canopies. Mr. Coiner expressed concern about the engineer's report that the wall would not support a box canopy. Mr. Snyder stated that had been addressed within the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern that the design was themed which was in violation of Guideline 7.

Mr. Wolf stated two of the four canopies were at theater, two more existed prior to the establishment of the Design Control District.

Mr. Hogg thought, setting aside the canopy, this was an appropriate design.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth in the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed storefront renovation satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following conditions: that the design of the awning considered independently and will come back to the BAR for further review but that all other components including doors, windows, finishes, colors, and placement of new windows as described in the application are approved. Ms. Heetderks asked if Mr. Wolf had meant to include the request that the

texture of the stucco be switched so that the heavier grit was on the wall and the lighter texture on the trim. Mr. Wolf accepted that as a friendly amendment. Mr. Tremblay seconded the amended motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Board members suggested the following changes to the canopy: that it be of a considerably shallower depth to the overall dimension, dealing with the top differently than the bottom, color being more consistent with the palette of the other pieces.

Mr. Coiner moved to defer action on the canopy. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-04

1600 Gordon Avenue

Tax Map 9 Parcel 14 and 16

Martha Jefferson House

Site plan amendment including revisions to entry circle; new shed

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The plan was approved in March of 2006. The amendment allows for a more formal entrance to the property.

Ms. Andi Gross, of Daggett and Grigg, stated red oaks would be in the tree wells.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams sought clarification of the parking. Ms. Gross stated it would be in an I pattern.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

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 Site Plan Amendment satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-10

513 Dice Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 63.1

New Infill Dwelling

Shackleford House LLC/Jane Covington, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is an Individually Protected Property. The applicant received a Special Use Permit to add an additional home. This is the final application for approval of the design of the dwelling and final site plan.

Mr. Steve Edwards was present on behalf of the applicant. He had nothing to add to Staff's presentation.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD: None

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg, recognizing how unhappy the applicant was with the Board's direction, felt the applicant had responded in a responsible fashion. He felt the blue shown in the renderings was not an appropriate exterior color and suggested white, yellow, or beige. He asked that something else be found. He expressed a preference for a one-story front porch.

Mr. Osteen thought the two-story porch dominated the deck on the existing house and also felt the one-story porch was appropriate.

Mr. Wolf stated he had not had a problem with the two-story porch, but could understand from an historic perspective the preference for a one-story porch on the front with a two-story porch on the back.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed Infill Dwelling and Site Design satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and the BAR approves the application as submitted with the exception of color which will come back to Staff for approval within the guidance range which has been given. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- September 18, 2007

Ms. Heetderks stated Item B should be Ms. Gardner rather than Ms. Heetderks.

Mr. Wolf moved approval of the September meeting minutes. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

L. Other Business

Proposed Martha Jefferson National Register Historic District -- Request for Comment

Mr. Wolf expressed support for the district and thought it was appropriate.

Ms. Scala stated the neighborhood had initiated the report.

Mr. Hogg moved that the Board endorse the nomination to the Department of Historic Resources. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if a memo had been sent to City Council about the Monticello Dairy. Ms. Scala stated it had not as they wanted to be able to make a recommendation regarding the National Register nomination for Fifeville. A consultant was revising that. After public reaction to that, it would be presented to Council on November 19th.

Mr. Hogg suggested there be a presentation at the next meeting about the Market Square competition.

M. Adjournment

Mr. Wolf moved to adjourn. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:29 p.m.