

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
February 19, 2008
Basement Conference Room -- City Hall**

Minutes

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Amy Gardner
Brian Hogg
William Adams (joins meeting at 5:47 p.m.)
Michael Osteen
James Wall
Eryn Brennan

Not Present:

Syd Knight, Vice-Chair

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

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. There were none.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- January 15, 2007

Mr. Hogg moved to accept the consent agenda. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion passed, 4-0-2; Mr. Wolf and Mr. Osteen abstained from voting as they had not been present for the January meeting.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-02-01

200 E. Main Street

TM 28 Parcels 31 & 32

Hotel Charlottesville, LLC

Landmark Hotel - details

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval of the details and materials for the Landmark Hotel. The applicant had provided construction drawings including a plan of the roof terrace and section drawings of the walls, windows, and parapet. Details of the Main

Street and Water Street canopies had been provided. Any improvements shown in the Second Street Southeast right-of-way are subject to City approval.

The applicant gave a brief presentation of the proposed materials: Old Virginia Brick in Colonial Red; anodized aluminum windows; and anodized aluminum for the canopies.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know how the edge detail of the laminated glass canopies would be handled. The applicant stated it would have an aluminum frame on the edge.

Ms. Gardner sought clarification of the Second Street elevation floor-level detail. The applicant explained it was a curtain wall detail.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if there would be lighting for the top story and if it would meet the dark sky ordinance. The applicant stated there would be lighting. Ms. Scala clarified that the lighting was inside and therefore not regulated by the dark sky ordinance.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know what had changed from the previous approval. The applicant stated that in the interest of time, there would not be any design change other than the canopy.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought the submittal was consistent with the previous submittal. He thought it was nice to see the details develop. Mr. Hogg thought the canopies were one of the very nice parts of the project and asked the applicant to be careful if they were redesigned.

Mr. Osteen stated he liked the building just as he had a year ago. He expressed concern about changing the designer. Mr. Osteen felt the project was being rushed. He appreciated the cast stone as he had felt the brick was problematic.

Ms. Gardner agreed with Mr. Hogg that the canopy for the Water Street entrance was very elegant. She reiterated that the tent at the front of the building would be periodic and stated it needed to be down more than it was up. With all of the other careful detailing and planning of the building she wanted more detail of the frame structure.

Mr. Wolf felt specific details may need to come back. He stated he was leaning towards supporting the project in general with minor conditions.

Ms. Brennan agreed with Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Osteen noted that the staff report included an incorrect address and that it should be 108 Second Street Southeast.

Ms. Scala stated the applicant was looking to get a building permit. Mr. Hogg stated the details needed would not have a meaningful effect on the large scope of the project and would be so late in the process that he would be happy to have the project start.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the details and materials for the proposed new Landmark Hotel 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 request that the applicants return with additional information about the structure and the appearance of the tent on the terrace at the north end of the project and further details about the brick and stone cladding on the west wall of the old building and the canopies if they change. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-02-04

700 Main Street

City of Charlottesville

New Entrance Sign at Charlottesville Pavilion

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant requests to add a monument sign to the main entrance to the Pavilion. The proposed materials are aluminum wrapped in patina copper, Buckingham slate, and aluminum anchoring T plate assembly. No exterior lighting is shown. A 32 inch LCD screen is proposed for advertising purposes. Staff thinks the sign identifying the Pavilion on a permanent basis is appropriate. Monument signs are not permitted in the Downtown ADC District; however, in the case of the Pavilion there is no building on which to place a sign and since it is on City property an exception to the ban may be made. Staff recommends the height be limited to six feet. The sign ordinance does not provide for LCD screens.

Mr. Kirby Hutto, General Manager of the Pavilion, stated the LCD screen would have a static image of upcoming events during times there was not a Pavilion event. During events, the screen would display video clips recognizing sponsors of the event.

Mr. Adams joined the meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner wanted to know the reason for the materials chosen. Mr. Hutto stated they wanted to match the Transit Center.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if alternate placement had been considered for the signage, especially the Transit Center. Mr. Hutto stated the Transit Center was not part of the Pavilion's lease premises.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know how close the sign would be to the bench. The applicant stated that would be determined by the utilities. The goal was to have it just a few feet behind the bench due to the slope of the ground.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner stated she could not support the LCD screen since neither the ordinance nor the guidelines support it. She felt it would be setting a bad precedent if it were approved. Ms. Gardner thought the sign could be simplified

Mr. Wall stated he had no problem with the sign but could not support the LCD screen.

Mr. Osteen stated he was willing to consider the LCD since the City was considering informational kiosks with LCD screens on the Mall. He said the sign looks like a sign for the Transit Center.

Mr. Hogg stated they had to take the sign on its own merits. He understood Ms. Gardner's point about being mindful of precedent. Mr. Hogg stated he would have the sign dynamic all the time.

Ms. Brennan felt there should be some policy to follow. She did not like the proposed location. Ms. Brennan was unsure about using an LCD screen. She reiterated the City should come up with some type of policy before the Board considered this.

Mr. Wolf agreed this was a slippery slope for the Board. He felt the LCD should be static with the possible exception of being backlit. He expressed a preference for the sign to have a slightly more subordinate location by being moved closer to the path.

Mr. Adams wished it had been considered at the same time as the bench and entrance as it might have been integrated more easily in the composition. He also had problems with the LCD.

Ms. Gardner stated the Board would have no control over what would be on the screen.

Mr. Hogg stated they should ask the applicant to consider deferring the matter while they consider comments about design and location of the sign. He added the Board could defer the matter but the applicant would have to present at the March meeting.

The applicant suggested having a removable panel which would cover the LCD screen except when the Pavilion was in use.

Mr. Wolf thought the removable panel was a viable option.

Ms. Brennan stated she would be open to a panel. She thought a more specific site design would be helpful.

Mr. Hogg moved to defer the application. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-02-02

501 Water Street

TM 53 P 27

Holiday Signs/Water Street LLC

Melting Pot, awning revision

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-02-08

501 Water Street

TM 53 P 27

Holiday Signs/Water Street LLC

Melting Pot, changes to comprehensive signage

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A comprehensive signage plan was submitted and approved in April, 2006, for the new construction. The Melting Pot got a sign permit for a wall sign in accordance with the comprehensive signage plan. Without approval the Melting Pot put up four awnings which had signage associated with them. The Board denied the awnings; the decision was appealed to City Council which upheld the BAR's decision. The applicant seeks to replace the awnings with ones of black cloth with signage limited to the front vertical flap only. The comprehensive signage plan allows each tenant one wall sign plus one projecting sign; the corner property occupied by the Melting Pot was allowed one wall sign and two projecting signs. Staff believes the original comprehensive signage plan as recommended by the architect is still appropriate. Staff feels that solid cloth awnings are appropriate in lieu of metal canopies and that either a projecting sign, which is preferred, or signage on a canopy should be permitted in addition to a wall sign but not both. The applicant asks that the comprehensive signage plan be changed to allow two projecting signs in addition to the wall sign and one additional wall sign. The proposed projecting signs conform with the original approved comprehensive signage plan. Staff finds that the original comprehensive signage plan is still appropriate. In total, the applicant is asking for two wall signs, two projecting signs, and four awnings in addition to the window signs.

Mr. Allen Twedt, of Holiday Signs, was present to answer questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know where the signage would be placed. Mr. Twedt demonstrated on a diagram the proposed placement.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf stated it seemed like a lot of marketing for one particular tenant. He did like the simple black awning.

Ms. Gardner thought it was a restrained modern design which was being cluttered with the awnings. She thought an awning over the entrance made sense. Ms. Gardner could not support amending the comprehensive sign package.

Mr. Twedt asked if they could do the black awnings with no copy, get the projecting signs and the single face cast aluminum plaque. He stated he would like to have the Melting Pot on the entrance awning.

Mr. Wolf thought having the signage on the entrance awning was better than having an additional placard or wall sign. He thought a simple black awning fit into the language of the building. He stated he could support something that had a small bit of text on the awning over entry and allowed the other awnings to be all black with no text and have the two wall signs that project perpendicular to the building. Mr. Wolf noted this would set the tone for the other tenants of the building.

Ms. Brennan stated she would not support the additional wall sign.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Signs and Canopies or Awnings, moved to find that, (a), the replacement of the awning fabric with fabric to match the color with no text on any of the surfaces is appropriate and that the inclusion or addition of two projecting signs in the color of the silver aluminum with black copy are also approved and 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 described; it does not allow for the addition of any additional signage on the awnings or any additional wall signs in addition to the existing one. Ms. Gardner offered a friendly amendment that the two projecting signs are not additional, they are allowed under the comprehensive signage package. Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment and clarified that this corner-occupying tenant was allowed three signs. Mr. Adams offered a friendly amendment that the location of the signs was to be approved by staff. Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-2; Ms. Gardner and Mr. Hogg voted against.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-02-03

410 East High Street

TM 53 P 39

County of Albemarle

Remove two Locust trees and replace with one Southern Red Oak

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. These trees are located to the rear of the Albemarle County Courthouse at Court Square. The two locust trees are dying, if not dead. Mr. Knight had suggested the Southern Red Oak be placed closer to the corner so it could shade both sidewalks.

Mr. Michael Fraden stated they would be willing to locate the tree closer; however, he was concerned about getting it too close to the retaining wall.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

There were no questions from the board.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen thought it was appropriate. He appreciated Mr. Knight's comment about shading the sidewalks but he thought it should be balanced with the applicant's concerns.

Mr. Osteen, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Removal of two locust trees and the replacement with one Southern Red Oak tree 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 final location to be approved by Staff. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-02-06

801 East High Street

TM 53 P 194

Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects/Core Knowledge Foundation

Add two porches to front facade and canopy to rear facade

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This Individually Protected Property is near the North Downtown ADC District. The applicant seeks to add two porches to the front facade on existing masonry landings as well as a canopy to the rear facade. The two porches are Victorian in style. There will be hand railings along both sets of existing porch stairs. The porch on the gable facade will have a flat seam copper roof; the recessed porch will have a standing seam metal roof. The rear canopy will provide coverage to a basement door and window. Paint and material samples were provided. Staff feels the new porch should not be an exact replica of the original; however, the new porch should maintain the scale and form of the original.

Mr. Bruce Wardell stated a retaining wall which was not original to the structure limited the width of the porch.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted to know why the porch did not more closely mimic the original. Mr. Wardell stated it was due to the issue of were they copying or making some distinction. Mr. Hogg felt it should have been recreated rather than being replaced with a simpler Victorian style porch. Ms. Brennan agreed.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall thought this was a wonderful change but agreed that the balusters needed to be replicated as closely as possible to the original.

Mr. Hogg stated it was a lovely project and thanked the applicant. He thought the canopy at the back was fine. He thought there should be some revisions to the smaller of the two new porches.

Mr. Wolf concurred.

Mr. Adams thought the porch needed to be the full length.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Addition of two porches to the front facade and addition of a canopy to the rear facade satisfy 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 with the condition that the design of the smaller front porch be modified to more closely replicate the detail shown in the historic photographs. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 08-02-05

1824 University Circle

Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects/Hillel Jewish Center

Renovation and addition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The application included context photos and drawings of the proposed addition. Any proposed renovations to the exterior were not described. Site plan review has not been initiated.

Mr. Bruce Wardell stated there had been meetings with the neighborhood. He gave a brief presentation of the proposal and the reasons behind it.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall wanted to know the neighborhood's reaction to the presentation. Mr. Wardell stated there had been a vigorous but good discussion with the neighborhood.

Mr. Adams wanted to know what materials were proposed. Mr. Wardell stated stucco, steel, and glass.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Karen Dougal, president of the University Circle Association, stated they had been pleased at receiving the invitation to see the plans. She stated the neighborhood was upset with the design which they felt was much too harsh. The neighborhood would like to see something which would blend with the neighborhood. A second concern of the neighborhood was parking. They were also concerned with the number of cars coming into the Circle especially with the Watson Manor development.

Mr. Bruce Nelson, of 36 University Circle, expressed concern that this proposal would be amazingly dissimilar with the buildings in this historic district.

Ms. Sally Nelson read a prepared statement in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Andrew Carter, of 17 University Circle, was struck by the awkwardness of the design of the sanctuary.

Ms. Karen Dougal read an E-mail of opposition to the proposal into the record on behalf of Joan Frye.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg did not have any reservations with regards to enlarging the footprint of the building but did have issue with what was being put forward. He thought it was too far forward and subordinated the historic building to the new addition. Mr. Hogg thought the scale was too large. The color palette was a serious mistake. The design was too busy and would benefit from simplification. Mr. Hogg also felt there was too much parking proposed.

Mr. Wolf agreed with the comments regarding scale and parking in relationship to the house.

Ms. Brennan thought it needed to be subordinate to the historic structure. She did not like the pergola.

Mr. Adams agreed with the comments which had been made.

Mr. Osteen thought it essential that an entire site study be done. He thought the property would be better off with as little parking as allowed.

J. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 08-02-07

1003 West Main Street

TM 10 P 51

William Atwood

New Construction, Sycamore 10.5

Mr. Hogg and Ms. Gardner recused themselves from the discussion.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting preliminary discussion on a proposed six story plus roof appurtenance mixed use building with underground parking and a rainwater harvesting system on the roof.

Mr. William Atwood, with Ms. Ashley Cooper and Mr. Mark Kestner, gave a brief presentation and described the need for rainwater retention before it reached street level. Ms. Cooper stated a site plan had been submitted and was under review.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if there was another way to achieve water retention without projecting into the right of way. The applicant stated it was their choice to capture the water before it hit the street.

Mr. Osteen found the three different forms problematic. He thought the proposal still had a long way to go. Mr. Osteen expressed appreciation for the concern about water retention.

Ms. Brennan expressed concern about a 16 foot tower coming off a 16 foot appurtenance. She felt this would be visually obtrusive.

Mr. Wall applauded the effort to collect water but expressed concern about the method.

Mr. Wolf noted the two points made most consistently: the building and the water collection system.

K. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

L. Other Business

· **Fifeville National Register District Nomination** – request for BAR comments

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Since Charlottesville is a certified local government, any nominations for the National Register get sent to the review board for comments. The nomination will be going to the state review board in March. The neighborhood was opposed to the nomination; City Council held public meetings to try to resolve the neighborhood's concerns. Some objections to the nomination included homeowners who thought their house belonged in a different district, the history portion of the report does not accurately reflect the history of the neighborhood. Fourteen of the survey properties had been demolished.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if anyone had come out in support of the nomination. Ms. Scala stated there were some people who wanted it so they could get tax credits.

Mr. Hogg stated there was a huge discrepancy between the description section of the nomination report and the description of the buildings within the district. He stated the boundaries were arbitrary. Mr. Hogg stated there was a terrific history told of the neighborhood. He stated this listing did not do preservation any favors.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if there was anything else that could be done to stop or slow down the demolitions. Ms. Scala stated they could individually designate the properties against the owners' wishes.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if there was any reason not to move the nomination forward. Mr. Hogg stated there was not. Ms. Brennan stated she was hesitant to support the nomination given the amount of opposition towards it, but would support it.

Mr. Wolf moved to recommend the Fifeville Castle Hill Historic District nomination for National Register nomination. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

M. Adjournment

Mr. Wolf moved to adjourn. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:25 p.m.