

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

**December 18, 2007**

**Minutes**

**Present: Also Present:**

Fred Wolf, Chair Mary Joy Scala

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay

Preston Coiner

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Brian Hogg

Michael Osteen (arrives 5:57 p.m.)

William Adams

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:06 p.m. Mr. Wolf thanked Mr. Tolbert with NDS for providing the Board with a binder which included updated Guidelines as well as additional pieces of information. Mr. Wolf also noted this meeting would be the last meeting for Ms. Heetderks, Mr. Coiner, and Mr. Tremblay, all of whom had served two terms.

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

There were no matters from the public.

**B. Consent Agenda**

**1. Minutes -- November 20, 2007**

Ms. Heetderks asked that the minutes be pulled.

**C. Preliminary Discussion**

**Renovation of the Downtown Mall**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The City has contracted with MMM Design Group to oversee the work.

Mr. Joe Schinstock, project manager from MMM Design Group, gave a PowerPoint presentation.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Rebecca Quin, of 104 Fourth Street, wanted to know how under drainage would be handled since there was a concrete slab. Mr. Schinstock stated weep holes would be provided through the existing slab. He stated there might also be a groundwater recharge through french drains.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if there were other color options for the brick paver. Mr. Schinstock stated there were.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know how emergency vehicles would impact the paver system. Mr. Schinstock stated the proposed products were capable of withstanding the light vehicle loads typical of mall maintenance activity but could not take the loads of heavy traffic or sustained loads; a heavy duty concrete paver would be required there.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what system would be used for tree wells. Mr. Schinstock suggested permeable pavers.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the designer had looked into a 4x12 paver as well as the 4x8. Mr. Schinstock explained the existing 12" paver was a custom shape and was not sure it was readily available.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if 12" pavers could be made. Mr. Schinstock stated they could. Mr. Knight explained that pavers larger than eight inches were not rated for heavy traffic.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight stated this was an important space since it was the heart and soul of Charlottesville and not the place to skimp or cut corners. He stated they needed to be as faithful as possible to the original design. Mr. Knight stated there were brick pavers that were rated for heavy traffic loads; he asked that be looked into and that concrete pavers not be considered.

Mr. Wolf echoed Mr. Knight's comments.

Mr. Adams stated the proportion of the pavers was important.

Mr. Wolf noted the crossings were going to be a critical part of the design.

Mr. Wolf restated the previously expressed preference that the brick match the original brick.

Mr. Osteen joined the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

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

**221 East Main Street**

**Giuseppe Finazzo, Applicant**

#### **Replace aluminum door and windows with mahogany**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property possibly has a 19th century core but the facade was completely renovated in 1985. Replacing the existing aluminum storefront with a mahogany and glass folding door system is appropriate and will be an attractive addition to the Mall.

Mr. Giuseppe Finazzo was present but had nothing to add to the Staff presentation.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant had considered placing a transom above the door. Mr. Finazzo explained there was metal above the door. He stated they would look into seeing if the metal could be removed.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Adams, while noting the drawing was not to proportion, thought there should be a glass transom over the entrance doors as it would not only look nicer but would also help in lighting the restaurant.

Mr. Wolf stated he could support the proposal but did want to see a scale drawing.

Mr. Coiner sought confirmation that the Chairman thought the Board could support the concept but could not take any action without a detail drawing. Mr. Wolf stated he would be comfortable allowing a hard line drawing coming back to Staff for approval as long as there was no major change between it and the submitted drawing.

**Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Partial Demolition and Storefront Renovation satisfies in principle the BAR's criteria and is, in principle,**

**compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the concept of the application with the stipulation that the applicant submit a measured drawing with sufficient detail for Staff to review and approve with the additional suggestion that that drawing include a transom above the existing door. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment that if Staff was not comfortable with the approval, the submittal would have to return to the Board. Mr. Knight accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion passed, 8-1; Mr. Hogg voted against.**

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

**112 West Market Street**

**Wolf-Ackerman Architects, Applicant**

### **Landscape and Exterior Change Details**

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter and turned control of the meeting to the Vice Chair.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting final approval of site and landscape designs. Conditions for approval from the September meeting have been met. Rooftop A/C units will be centered on the roof and are not screened but the parapet wall will keep them from being visible from the street. Solar panels on the roof will be visible.

The applicant provided supplemental documents to the Board.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Knight sought explanation behind the plans for the rain garden. The applicant stated only one bay was needed but two more were added to create a rhythm pattern.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about the Virginia Creeper proposed for the landscape.

Mr. Hogg thought the applicant had responded very nicely to the previous comments.

Mr. Knight expressed his appreciation for how willing the applicant had been to work with the Board.

**Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Site Design, moved to find that the proposed**

**Exterior Building Changes and Landscape Plan satisfies 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. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called a voice vote. The motion passed, 8-0-1; Mr. Wolf abstained from voting.**

Mr. Wolf resumed chairmanship of the meeting.

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

### **Seven 1/2 Street and West Main Street**

#### **Verizon Wireless**

##### **Adding additional equipment**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking to add 12 white antennas to the existing cell support tower. The applicant also seeks to install a new fenced in radio equipment shelter at the base of the tower. The proposal will not add height to the tower but will increase the footprint of the installation. Staff recommends the BAR condition approval on additional vegetative screening.

Mr. Maynard Sipe, Esquire, of LeClairRyan, was present with Mr. Nathan Holland of Wireless Resources, Inc. on behalf of the applicant. The additional antenna does not have a material impact on West Main Street beyond what already existed. He stated they were amenable to Staff's condition of landscaped screening within the area available to them. Mr. Holland clarified that the proposal was only to fence around the proposed shelter, not the entire area.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Knight wanted to know how often the generator ran. Mr. Holland stated it would test once a month for 15 minutes and then would run whenever power went out.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Knight stated it was always tough to review things like this that were outside the Board's normal purview. He saw no reason to object to this plan.

**Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed New Antenna, Equipment Shelter, and Generator satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the condition of adding evergreen screening on three sides of the perimeter of the new chain**

**link fencing with that screening plan to be submitted for Staff approval. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called for a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.**

## **G. Preliminary Discussion**

### **New apartment building, conversion of existing buildings and realignment of JPA**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was previously before the Board in October of 2006. The Board is to make a recommendation regarding a Special Use Permit. The applicant proposes converting two existing buildings on Oakhurst Circle to bed and breakfasts and erect a new 36-unit apartment building as well as realign JPA at Emmett Street to make it more pedestrian friendly. The bed and breakfast is allowed by right.

Mr. Neal Deputy gave a brief PowerPoint presentation.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

None.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Hogg wanted to know how the entrance to the existing buildings would be ADA compatible. Mr. Deputy stated the plan was to make the ground floor of 100 Oakhurst Circle accessible by rebuilding the walks.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know how many existing trees would be lost. Mr. Deputy stated they would only lose two significant trees.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if mechanical equipment would be on the roofs. Mr. Deputy confirmed there would be.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if the applicant favored flat roofs. Mr. Deputy stated he did and explained the money saved in using a flat roof rather than a hip roof could be used for stonework at the street level.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if the mechanical equipment would be visible from Oakhurst. Mr. Deputy stated it would be screened with a four foot parapet.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

Mr. Tom Petro, owner of 1616 Jefferson Park Avenue, stated he had met with the applicant about the project. He did have concerns about the project considering a large project on the other side of his property was still ongoing. He also expressed concern about pedestrian traffic.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Hogg stated he was curious about the retaining wall. He liked the massing of the three pavilions. The thing he found significantly problematic for the proposal was the stair towers and balconies. He felt the stair towers and balconies did not work together.

Ms. Heetderks also liked the elegance of the three pavilions. She thought the towers looked like guard towers. She expressed a preference for a hip roof.

Mr. Adams thought the massing was problematic next to 102.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about what was on the flat roofs. He stated all of the contributing structures in Oakhurst were stucco. He expressed concern about the setback. He felt the third building should be different or diminished in some way.

Mr. Knight agreed with much of what had been said. He did not object to the density on site, per se, as long as it could be gracefully accommodated. He wanted to know more about the use of the space between the buildings. He stated the trees individually may not be specimen trees, but the trees as a grove were more important to the site.

Mr. Wolf supported the comments of his colleagues.

Ms. Scala stated she needed a motion from the Board about the Special Use Permit.

Mr. Wolf did not see the front yard setback as a challenge for the property.

Mr. Adams stated this was a test of the increased density on the site; he did not think this passed the test.

Mr. Knight stated he felt about this the way he had felt in October, 2006. In concept the increased density and reduced setback made sense. He did not have a great deal of concern as long as this particular design can be sensibly carried out while responding to the concerns. Mr. Knight saw no reason to change the motion that was made in 2006.

**Mr. Wolf moved that the Board support their previous motion. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Knight offered a friendly amendment that the applicant take under advisement the comments made. Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion passed, 7-1-1; Mr. Adams voted against and Ms. Gardner abstained from voting.**

## **H. Preliminary Discussion**

**608 Preston Avenue**

**Andy McGinty, Applicant**

**Brick Warehouse and Metal Annex Rehabilitation**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The King Lumber Building is an individually protected property. The original openings will be restored on the north, south, and west sides. The annex will receive a new corrugated metal covering and storefront glazing system. Part of the annex roof and siding will be removed to expose the roof structure and create an open gallery walkway to the rear parking area. Staff feels the proposal is excellent and recommended. Staff's only concern is that the retaining wall seems overly tall.

The applicant's representative, who did not identify himself for the record, stated he would be happy to answer questions. He stated there had been some changes to the plan since its submittal. He gave a brief presentation.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the entire building was painted brick. The applicant confirmed it was.

Mr. Hogg expressed a preference for multi-pane windows. He stated there was nothing articulating the facade and stated something was needed to break it down. Mr. Knight suggested painted signs. Mr. Hogg agreed.

Ms. Heetderks suggested the building remain painted its current color.

Mr. Knight thanked the applicant for his efforts to reduce the impact of the wall and asked that they continue to reduce the impact.

Mr. Hogg and Mr. Knight suggested the front be simplified.

Mr. Wolf supported Mr. Hogg's feelings about the scale of the window openings; a multi-paned window made sense.

Mr. Knight suggested the grasses be removed from the landscaping.

#### **I. Other Business**

There was no other business.

#### **B. Consent Agenda**

##### **1. Minutes -- November 20, 2007**



Ms. Heetderks asked that the last paragraph of page 10 be changed to reflect that she was not a proponent of modern architecture but she was willing to consider it in the design control districts so long as it was in context with neighboring properties.

**Mr. Wolf moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0-3; Mr. Adams, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Hogg abstained as they had not been present for the November meeting.**

Mr. Coiner, recognizing this was his last meeting, stated he had enjoyed the opportunity to serve with his fellow BAR members. He stated it had been a really rewarding experience. He stated he had learned a lot from the professionals. He thanked the City Councilors who had appointed him eight years ago.

Mr. Wolf stated the job done by Mr. Coiner, Ms. Heetderks, and Mr. Tremblay had been phenomenal. He expressed the Board's hope that they could do as good of a job and serve as well.

### **Adjournment**

**Mr. Wolf moved to adjourn. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:25 p.m.**