

**Board of Architectural Review
January 15, 2008**

Minutes

Present:

Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Amy Gardner (arrived 5:40 p.m.)
Brian Hogg
William Adams
James Wall
Eryn Brennan

Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Michael Osteen

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Knight, in the absence of Mr. Wolf, convened the meeting at 5:01 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Knight called for matters from the public not on the agenda. There were no matters from the public.

Mr. Knight welcomed the two new members to the Board, James Wall and Eryn Brennan.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- December 18, 2007

Mr. Hogg moved to approve. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called a voice vote. The motion passed, 5-0-3; Mr. Wall and Ms. Brennan abstained from voting as they had not been on the Board in December.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 08-01-01
1600 Gordon Avenue
Tax Map 9 Parcel 14 and 16
Martha Jefferson House, Owner
Remove ash tree**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Martha Jefferson House is a contributing structure in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The Board had approved an addition for 12 independent living units in March, 2006. In October, 2007, the Board approved an application to reconfigure the entry circle, add a pergola, and remove some plantings from the courtyard. The applicant seeks to amend the October site plan. The applicant requests to remove a large 33 inch ash tree in the courtyard garden and replace it with a two inch caliper Acer Campestre, which is a Field Maple. The tree is in good health according to the City arborist but will become hazardous due to planned excavations. If the Board decides the tree should be removed, Staff recommends it be replaced with a similar large shade tree rather than a small bushy maple as is proposed.

Mr. Tom Bernier, President and CEO of Martha Jefferson House, stated the ash tree had been challenged by the addition of an apartment in the 1970s which had cut out part of the root system of the tree. The tree has also been affected by the City gas line going through the root system. They did not prefer to remove a tree of that size but did not think it would survive. One of two Sugar Maples which had been donated to Martha Jefferson House would be placed in that position while the other would be placed in the northeast end of the courtyard.

Mr. Knight stated his firm had worked with Martha Jefferson House briefly on this project approximately a year and-a-half ago. As his firm currently had no interest in the project, he saw no reason to recuse himself from consideration of this application.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know the nature of the work being done that would affect the tree. Mr. Bernier asked that the project's engineer answer. Mr. Clark Gathright, of Daggett & Grigg Architects, explained that in trying to maintain the ADA slopes and working with the existing topography, there were some minor variations in the site plan that warranted cutting lower than what was originally intended; this would affect the roots.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams stated it was a shame to see the tree go. However, he could see the construction endangering the tree. He had no objections.

Mr. Hogg stated it was not a street tree so the effect of the removal on the character of the neighborhood would be negligible.

Ms. Brennan agreed.

Mr. Knight stated he had always admired and appreciated the work done by Martha Jefferson House in taking care of their grounds. He stated this was unfortunate and he hated to see that tree

go. He appreciated the switch to two sugar maples. He reluctantly agreed with the rest of the Board that this should be approved.

Mr. Adams, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed Tree Removal and Replacement 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. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Knight suggested a friendly amendment that the Board specify or acknowledge the substitution of two sugar maples for the hedge maple that was in the original application. Mr. Adams and Mr. Hogg accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Knight called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 07-11-08

509 Second Street NE

Tax Map 33 Parcel 18.1

Allison Ewing, Applicant/Mark and Barbara Fried, Owners

New Construction

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is the second preliminary discussion for this property. This is a revised design for a single family dwelling with internal accessory apartment. This is to be constructed on a vacant lot. Existing stone walls and terraces have been incorporated into the design. There have been significant changes since the last meeting: the garage has been moved to the north side of the dwelling; a front porch is shown on the main level with stone and wood stairs leading up. Front gardens are now proposed on Second Street enclosed with new stone garden walls and a corten steel garden wall along the driveway. Proposed materials are stone walls, Galvalume or Kynar coated metal roof with Kynar coated metal fascia, painted fiber cement panel walls, and louvers and trellises of wood, likely Ipe wood, with painted metal or wood supporting structure. A vegetated green roof would be on the south side and solar panels and thermal tubes on the north roof. The design has some good points including preserving the existing stone walls and the concept of a central path through the site.

Ms. Allison Ewing, of Hays+Ewing Design Studio, gave a brief presentation to the Board. She stated they wanted the house to be carbon neutral and off the grid.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Gayle Foster, of 504 Second Street NE, wanted to know how tall the private wing would be if it had changed from the last presentation. Ms. Ewing stated the highest point of the roof was 35 feet. Ms. Foster also wanted to know the material of the louvres. Ms. Ewing stated they would be wood louvres with some steel structure.

Mr. Ronald Bailey, of 517 Second Street, wanted to know what would happen to the existing pine trees. Ms. Ewing stated they were at an age where they were starting to decline. They were not a native species and would shade the solar panels so she would like to remove them. They

would be replaced with mature trees. Mr. Bailey wondered if mature trees would also shade the solar panels. Ms. Ewing stated the replacement trees would be in a different location on site.

Ms. Gardner joined the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Ms. Irene Dorrier, of 506 Second Street, stated she was under the impression the stone wall beside the driveway was not on this property. Ms. Ewing stated it was on the property.

Ms. Janet Cutler, of 514 North First Street, stated the rock wall was part of her garage which was on her property. Ms. Ewing stated that it appeared from their survey that a portion of Ms. Cutler's garage was on her property. She expressed her intent to talk with Ms. Cutler about that to see what could be done.

Ms. Helena Devereux, of 532 North First Street, wanted to know how much green space there would be between the front facade and the sidewalk. Ms. Ewing stated there was a 17 foot setback so it would be between 17 and 20 feet.

Mr. Frederick Schneider, of 506 Second Street NE, stated Ms. Ewing and her team had taken significant revisions to the design and held a meeting with neighbors in an effort to facilitate conversation. He wanted to know if there would be an opportunity for the neighbors to see the drawings and give comment back to the Board. Mr. Knight stated this meeting was one opportunity to do that. He stated there would also be opportunity at the meeting for the Certificate of Appropriateness Application; Mr. Knight hoped there would be other opportunities outside the hearing. Ms. Ewing stated she would be happy to meet with the neighborhood again.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the retaining wall was right on the property line. Ms. Ewing stated they would be.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know what the solar tubes would look like. Ms. Ewing stated they were long glass tubes that would be put in a line at a 45 degree angle.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg appreciated the changes that had been made and thought they were a significant improvement. He stated it was hard to read the elevations with all of the trees included; he asked for clean architectural elevations of all four sides when the plan came back. He asked that a larger site section be provided as well. Mr. Hogg wanted to see wall sections to show how the windows would relate to the wall. He thought the south wing was coming together but the north side still seemed to be a mess. He expressed concern about the number of window types in that section of the building. He also expressed concern about the staggering of the pitch of the roof with the setback and the clerestory. He felt there was a busyness that was at odds with the contemporary design. He wanted to know more about how the solar collectors would look.

Mr. Adams agreed clarity would help. He stated it was a very horizontal project and some of the proportions of the openings were at odds with the neighborhood. Mr. Adams stated the house seemed like a California house that was not based on any kind of regional typology. He felt sustainability was laudable but wondered if there was a formal agenda for a carbon neutral house.

Mr. Hogg wondered if there was a way to build a carbon neutral, LEED certified house in a historic neighborhood without the house being so conspicuous in achieving its goals.

Ms. Gardner appreciated the applicant's response to the street elevation and the efforts on massing which had been a concern at the last meeting. She stated the elevations seemed to be plan driven and out of context with the neighborhood.

Ms. Brennan expressed concern about the possible demolition of the wall as it was historic and added greatly to the patina of history the site exudes.

Mr. Wall appreciated the tremendous changes put into place between this and the previous design. He agreed the presentation was difficult to read. The house did not seem to settle in the neighborhood.

Mr. Knight agreed with his colleagues' comments. He thought improvement could be made in: windows; fenestration; massing; and roof lines. He stated more specificity was needed for the formal application. He wanted to see a site survey. Mr. Knight expressed concern about the parking turned at 90 degrees as it seemed like a gash in the hill. He felt the corten steel wall was one material too many.

Mr. Knight reiterated some of the Board's concerns: the presentation graphics should be more clear and specific in the plan and in sections and elevations; the nature of the walls in the site plan, especially the north retaining wall; materials on the site plan; further refinement of window treatments and facades including wall elevations.

Mr. Adams thought there was a lot about the neighborhood structurally and proportionately that could inform the applicant's design.

E. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 08-01-03

600 East Water Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 162.1

Daggett & Grigg, Architects, Applicant/Sansovich Development, LLC, Owner

New Construction

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing structure in the Downtown ADC District. The former C&O Depot was built in 1905 and refurbished in 1991 for offices. The area of new construction is an existing parking lot on the west side of the building. The proposal includes parking on a basement level, three residential units and offices on the first floor, and offices on the second floor, and residences with exterior balconies on the third through ninth floors.

Proposed materials are yellow brick, precast concrete, bronze or white clad wood windows, bronze or aluminum storefront, and canvas awnings. A metal picket fence at the rear of the property along the railroad is proposed for removal and partial reuse. Massing is generally appropriate but scale drawings are required to see if the proposal meets current zoning requirements. Yellow brick is not found in the downtown area.

Mr. James Grigg, of Daggett & Grigg Architects, did not think there was a problem with the density. He also stated they were not married to the idea of yellow brick.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg sought clarification of the door openings as the retail plan seemed to show recessed entrances while the elevation seemed to show doors. Mr. Grigg stated he preferred recessed entrances but the owner preferred storefront doorways so he had shown both.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams thought the massing was okay. He stated yellow brick would not be his choice. Mr. Adams thought it was a good start.

Mr. Hogg agreed with Mr. Adams about the massing. He thought the proposal was a nice response to the site. Mr. Hogg thought the base needed more articulation. He expressed concern about the use of multiple window types. He thought less of the balconies should be seen from the east and west. He suggested decorating the spandrels in the tower. He suggested a tan brick with tan windows. Mr. Hogg thought the railroad side should be simplified.

Ms. Gardner thought the massing was nice. She thought this was an interesting project. She did not like the buff brick.

Ms. Brennan agreed it was a nice start. However, she expressed concern about the long pedestrian wall.

Mr. Wall thought there were some interesting components in the building but thought it looked like two buildings. He felt like it was a conventional solution for an unconventional site.

Mr. Knight echoed the comments about the tower portion. He felt it could be very well done and meet the guidelines and a welcome addition to Downtown. He did not think the railroad side should be simplified as it would be seen from Belmont Bridge. He expressed concern about the two story portion. He agreed with Ms. Brennan about the street facade.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if any consideration had been given to sustainability. Mr. Grigg stated they were intending to do a green roof on the two story piece.

Mr. Knight thought the roofscape was going to be very important.

F. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

G. Other Business

Mr. Knight called for discussion of the UVa Parking Garage. Mr. Hogg recused himself from the discussion as he was affiliated with one of the parties involved. Ms. Scala had sent an E-mail to the Board members about the project because the brick veneer could not be completed due to the presence of utility poles which needed to be moved. Ms. Scala thought it would be possible to hold a bond to ensure completion but wanted to make sure the Board had no concerns about the garage being opened while it was still incomplete. Mr. Knight thought it was to everyone's advantage to finish the project; he saw no reason to not grant this. Mr. Knight wanted to know if Ms. Scala needed a formal motion on the matter. Ms. Scala stated she could handle it administratively.

Ms. Gardner expressed concern about what she thought was to have been a temporary tent in front of Mono Loco as it appeared to still be up two years later. Ms. Scala stated she would look into the matter.

Ms. Scala stated she would like to set up the annual training session which could be part of a work session.

Ms. Scala stated City Council had asked the Board to move forward with designating more Individually Protected Properties. City Council had suggested considering 75 year old properties as well as 100 year old properties along with newer properties if they were very significant.

City Council was proposing to appoint the final member of the Board of Architectural Review on January 22, 2008.

H. Adjournment

Mr. Knight stated he would entertain a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hogg so moved. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Knight called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:14 p.m.