

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review

November 20, 2007

Minutes

Present: Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay Brian Hogg

Preston Coiner William Adams

Amy Gardner (arrived at 5:35)

Lynne Heetderks **Also Present:**

Michael Osteen Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:02 p.m. He stated Item G had been deferred at the request of the applicant.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- October 16, 2007

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-11-03

407 East High Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 31

Virginia A&E, PLLC, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner

Add a handicap-accessible ramp to the front door

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-10-09

223 East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 46

Enoch Snyder, Applicant/Tony LaBua, Owner

Add new canopy (Chaps)

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-11-05

205 14th Street

Tax Map 9 Parcel 72

Daggett and Grigg Architects, Applicant/Jim Stoltz, Owner

Elevator addition

At the request of Ms. Heetderks, the minutes were pulled from the Consent Agenda. At the recommendation of Ms. Scala, Item 2 would be held for discussion after Item C of the agenda. Mr. Wolf noted the only items remaining on the Consent Agenda were items 3 and 4.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-11-07

400 East Jefferson

Tax Map 53 Parcel 46

Candace DeLoach

Renovation

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In March and April of 2003, the applicant had received approval for renovations. Some of those have been done, but most have not. The applicant had a new list of proposed renovations. The notable feature of this 1920s building is the mansard roof, one of few remaining examples in the City. The four proposals which were of concern to staff were: a request to create a living space on the third floor as it requires changes to the roof of the

building; replacing the Philadelphia gutters with half round metal gutters; a request to add a third floor porch; change the rear dormer to a door. Staff found the other requests to be reasonable.

Ms. Candace DeLoach was present with Leslie McDonald who is helping on the project. Ms. DeLoach stated there were two things missing from the list provided by Ms. Scala: adding patina to the brick, and putting a railing around the perimeter of the metal roof.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf: Would the roof pitch be maintained. Ms. DeLoach stated it would.

What was the purpose of the railing at the juncture between the two roofs? The applicant stated it was purely decorative.

Ms. Heetderks: Was the earlier request to paint the brick denied? Ms. DeLoach stated it had been.

Mr. Tremblay: What did the applicant mean by "patina"? Ms. DeLoach explained it would be a whitewash to make the brick look older.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks had the same concern as the first time the application had been before the Board. She was concerned the building was being turned into something it wasn't.

Mr. Osteen agreed with Ms. Heetderks. This building out to exemplify what the BAR was trying to accomplish in regards to historic preservation and conservation. He stated the decorative railing was out of character.

Mr. Wolf thought the Philadelphia gutters were an important part of the architecture. Painting the brick would not be appropriate.

Ms. Heetderks moved approval of the elements of this proposal that were approved previously. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Ms. Scala broke down the list of items to reflect that: items 1, 2, 4, 8, 13, and 18 were new requests; item 3 was a maintenance issue which staff had given approval to start on; items 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 were previously approved; item 9 was previously rejected because it was too ornate; item 12 had been previously approved for the East Jefferson side but not the Fourth Street side. Mr. Osteen expressed concern about the proposed metal work in items 16 and 17. Mr. Wolf suggested if anyone had issues with previously approved items on the list, those items should be removed. Ms. Heetderks amended her motion to read that they approve all of the proposed changes that were previously approved with the exceptions of the gas lantern and the decorative arch bracket. Mr. Coiner seconded the amended motion. Mr. Wolf called

the question. The motion passed, 5-0-1; Ms. Gardner did not vote as she had arrived during discussion of the motion.

Item 1:

Mr. Wolf moved to approve the application to install a new hand crimped metal roof over raised insulated roof panel, not to exceed 2x6 dimension plus roof sheathing with the fascia and trim details to match those as submitted with the deeper panel in this package and that the proposed new metal roof will match the color of the slate mansard roof. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Item 2:

Mr. Wolf moved to approve the replacement of the existing integral Philadelphia enclosed gutters with new metal gutters to be painted white to match the wood trim and the repair of the rotted wood eave boards and soffit boards. Mr. Tremblay offered a friendly amendment that if the applicant chose to use copper, it would not be objectionable. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment that it be half round. Mr. Wolf clarified that it be six inch half round metal gutter to be painted white with the friendly amendment to consider copper if suitable. Mr. Coiner seconded the amended motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

Item 4:

With no drawing or pictures provided on this item, Ms. Heetderks asked for additional information on this item. Mr. Osteen wanted to see a working plan to have it on the opposite side and stay away from either street facade.

Mr. Wolf suggested the profile not exceed three inches, and was a direct linear form that had a flat panel as opposed to a radius glass top and was located on the east facing (driveway side) portion of the new roof and be brought to Ms. Scala for administrative approval. Mr. Tremblay suggested Mr. Wolf make that a motion. Mr. Wolf so moved. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Item 8:

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for putting a handrail on the second story porch would help to make it safer and give a more viable form of egress.

Mr. Osteen expressed a preference for a roof over the second story porch rather than a handrail.

Ms. Heetderks expressed a preference for a railing rather than the proposed columns and roof.

Ms. Heetderks moved to deny the addition of the third floor porch including the second floor columns and the third floor railing based on the Guideline recommending against

radically changing entrance and porches important to defining a building's character. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-1; Ms. Gardner voted against.

Item 12:

Mr. Tremblay moved that they approve the addition of panel type wood shutters with operable hardware on the upper front and all Fourth Street side windows, but not on the dormers or doors. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

Item 13:

Ms. Heetderks moved to deny the request to turn the rear dormer into a door based on the Guideline recommending against changing the size or shape of an existing dormer, but to allow a window in that dormer. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Item 16:

Ms. Heetderks felt this was a little fussier than the building could take. She had no problem with the concept but wanted it simplified.

Mr. Osteen concurred with Ms. Heetderks.

Mr. Tremblay moved that they approve the suspended gas lantern from decorative brackets as illustrated in both the sketch and pictures to create an arch above the shared driveway between the two buildings. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner stated he had voted against this previously and would vote against it this time because he thought it was too big and he had a concern about the height. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion did not pass, 3-3; Ms. Heetderks, Mr. Coiner, and Mr. Osteen voted against.

Item 17:

Ms. Gardner moved that they approve the applicant's submittal for the proposed signage brackets for 400 East Jefferson Street. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 4-2; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Osteen voted against.

Removal of existing canopies over the doors on Fourth Street:

Mr. Tremblay moved to approve the applicant's request to remove the existing 1960s canopies over both doors and to replace them with traditional canvas awnings to be administratively approved consistent with the samples that the applicant brought this evening. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner asked the applicant to please not put a name on the awning until she makes sure it is correct. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Heetderks moved to deny the railing on the roof and to deny the painting of the unpainted brick. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Consent Agenda

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-11-03

407 East High Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 31

Virginia A&E, PLLC, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner

Add a handicap-accessible ramp to the front door

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant's original proposal had two ramps. The current submittal does not include the side ramp as originally proposed.

Mr. David Giles, architect with Virginia A&E, was present to answer questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen: Did the applicant consider putting the ramp behind a low wall? Mr. Giles stated it had not been considered but was possible.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen thought the brick sidewalk would be a good idea. He also recommended a low brick wall to be parallel and level with the water table course to allow the ramp to be hidden.

Mr. Wolf liked the inclusion of the wall to match the water table and the change to the brick paving pattern and suggested the handrail come back for administrative approval.

Mr. Wolf made a motion that the Board approve the application for the new handicap-accessible walk as an addition to the Preston Morris building for ADA modifications with the conditions that the front cheek wall or that all cheek walls associated with the ramp be held to the height of the water table, done out of brick with a walking surface also out of brick in a herringbone pattern and that the handrail associated with the ramp be brought back to Staff for administrative approval with the intention that the handrail be rendered as visually transparent as possible eliminating the guardrail pickets, if, in fact, that's

possible. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-11-02

315 East High Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 67

Virginia A&E, PLLC, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner

Add a handicap-accessible ramp to the front door

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant had submitted a new proposal with several options. Staff preferred the U-shaped configuration on the west side of the building.

Mr. Giles expressed a preference for option 5. They would match the rail on the existing courthouse.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf moved that the Board approve the design with option 5 with the condition that the top of the cheek wall is flat and aligned with the water table of the building and that the walkway of the ramp is done in brick with a herringbone pattern to match the previously approved ramp. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Giles sought clarification of the approval of brick in a herringbone pattern as this location had flagstone. Mr. Wolf stated the ramp walking surface should match the landing of the courthouse as opposed to the brick which was just approved.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-11-01

210 Second Street NE

Tax Map 33 Parcel 199

City of Charlottesville, Applicant

Skatestoppers at Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had been scheduled for review in September. The applicant seeks approval for skatestoppers currently installed on the marble wall on the site of the Historical Society. The applicant has submitted other design options. The current skatestoppers are a simple L-shaped metal form with no elaborate detailing. Staff asked the Board to discuss the procedure for future applications as skateboarding was a continuing problem in the historic district. Staff recommended approval of the current application with the design that is being used. Staff suggests the Board give Staff administrative approval for the current design model for future applications. The damage to walls and structures caused by the installation of skatestoppers is less than the damage caused by allowing the skateboarders to continue to use them as obstacles.

Mr. Lance Stewart, of Public Works, apologized for not observing the process in the first place.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf: Is there a standard way of fastening the skatestoppers? Mr. Stewart stated there was a design on the screw that was resistant to removal.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner stated they were in a position with no choice but to approve. He supported Staff dealing with them in the future but he did not want this to be the only option considered.

Ms. Heetderks expressed a preference for the current skatestopper to be changed out for something a little more unobtrusive as she feared whatever was used would become the precedent for future applicants.

Mr. Wolf suggested these be approved as not conforming to the Guidelines but accepted so as not to set a precedent.

Ms. Heetderks stated the Board was not happy with them and felt pushed into a corner and this was not to be taken as precedent for future applicants.

Mr. Osteen, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the current skatestoppers satisfy the BAR's criteria and would be compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves this application with the concept that if additional skateboard stoppers are bought in the future, the Board would consider trading out other more appropriate ones. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-07-08

1018-1022 West Main Street

TM 10 P 66, 69

University of Virginia Foundation

Renovation of exterior Patton Mansion with addition of pocket garden

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had been before the Board in July but the applicant requested deferral as the proposal wasn't quite worked out. The application is to renovate the exterior and add a pocket garden which would be brought up to West Main Street level with a brick veneer retaining wall and metal guard rail painted Rookwood Shutter Green on two sides of the retaining wall.

Ms. Chris Cho, of Coyne Evans Architects, gave a brief presentation of the proposal.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner: Are there any plans to screen the emergency generator? Ms. Cho stated a garden would go there.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf stated the whole presentation was thorough and carefully thought out.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design and for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed exterior renovations and pocket park for the Patton Mansion satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the ATM installation at the window to be administratively approved once the final details were worked out. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-11-06

1106-1112 West Main Street

Tax Map 10 Parcel 64

Atwood Architects/John Bartelt

Demolition of Sycamore House (Studio Art Building)

Deferred prior to the meeting.

H. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 07-11-08

509 Second Street NE

Tax Map 33 Parcel 18

Allison Ewing, Applicant/Mark and Barbara Fried

New Construction

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks a preliminary discussion for a proposed single family dwelling with internal accessory apartment. Accessory apartments are permitted if the owner resides in the property. This is to be built on a vacant lot. Existing stone walls and terraces have been incorporated into the design. The combination of nearly blank stone wall and three garage doors at street level cause the house to appear unfriendly to its neighbors. The smaller windows on the north front are compatible with the district architecture. The larger expanses of glass on the south front terrace level and above the center entry and the mostly solid ground floor are unlike anything in the district or on the street.

Mr. Coiner disclosed that he lives on this street, approximately a block from this location. He felt he could participate in a preliminary discussion unless others felt he should not.

Ms. Allison Ewing, of Hays+Ewing Design Studio, gave a brief presentation to the Board including elevations and site photos. The side walls are obscured on one side by landscaping and the apartments on the other side. Sustainable design practices were being incorporated into the building.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Gail Foster, of 504 Second Street NE, wanted to know the dimensions of the stone wall. The applicant stated it was 24x9.

Ms. Pam Friedman, of Second Street NE, wanted to know what would happen to the evergreens on the north side of the building. The applicant stated they would do their best to preserve existing trees.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner: How many terraces are on the lot? Ms. Ewing stated there were four.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Irene Dorrier, of 506 Second Street NE, read a letter on behalf of residents of 502 Second Street NE in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Frederick Schneider, of 506 Second Street NE, a preservation architect, spoke in opposition of the proposal. He cited Section 34-284(b): "In considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds: (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application." The proposal was not compatible with the district. The proposal was missing a strong landscape expression which was present in other homes of the neighborhood. The massing seemed more in line with Midtown Manhattan than North Downtown Charlottesville.

Mr. Ron Bailey, of 517 Second Street, stated he was in favor of modern architecture; however, the garage was the most offensive part of this design.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen thought there were many nice things about the project. This was a unique site. A house as large as this is problematic in this neighborhood. He was interested in where this was going with the three garages. He expressed concerned the space in front of the garage may become parking as well. If the intent was to save the existing trees, then steps need to be taken from the very beginning of the process.

Ms. Gardner agreed with many of Mr. Osteen's comments. The lack of front porch or any way to interact with the neighborhood was unfortunate and not at all compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Wolf expressed concern about the severity of the front, the width and scale of the building. He stated it had more of a feeling of institutional rather than residential.

Ms. Heetderks stated she was not a proponent of modern architecture, but was willing to consider it in the design control district as long as it is in context. The design seemed to be hostile to the street and very inward focusing. She expressed a desire to see some green space in the front of the property as well as some relief on the huge expanse of wall. The general size of the building seemed to be a problem.

Mr. Tremblay had no comment.

Mr. Coiner had nothing to add.

Ms. Ewing stated they planned to meet with the neighborhood.

I. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were none.

J. Other Business

There was no other business.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- October 16, 2007

Ms. Heetderks asked that the phrase "since 1963 as was stated in the previous minutes" be added to the second paragraph in Questions from the Board on page 2.

Mr. Coiner moved approval of the minutes with the correction as noted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 5-0-1; Ms. Gardner abstained from voting as she had not been present for that meeting.

K. Adjournment

Ms. Heetderks moved to adjourn. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:50 p.m.