

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
October 21, 2008
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Amy Gardner
Brian Hogg
Michael Osteen
James Wall
Eryn Brennan
Rebecca Schoenthal (joins meeting at 8:22 p.m.)

Not Present:

William Adams

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes – February 27, 2008 (work session)

Ms. Brennan asked that "cemeteries" be changed to "history" in the description of Scott French.

Mr. Knight moved the consent agenda. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-10-06

200 E. Main Street

TM 28 P 32

Minor Family Hotels, Applicant

Demolition of black granite facade

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Demolition of this building, except for the black granite facade, was first approved January, 2004, and reapproved February, 2007, at which time approval was also allowed for removal of the marble centerpiece over the door. The applicant is concerned about what will happen when the existing floor is removed as that is holding it all together. Staff's original opinion was that the main portion of the 1966 bank building was

structurally sound and architecturally worthy of preservation; currently staff feels if the foundation is structurally unsound, the demolition may be approved. A report was received from Moeller & Associates which stated the walls as standing are unsafe.

Mr. Cliff Harrison was present on behalf of the applicant and had nothing to add but would answer questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen wanted additional information about the building diaphragm. Mr. Harrison stated the roof diaphragm had been removed. However, there is also a floor diaphragm which became structurally unstable and would not support the live load classified for the use.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that the design had not changed. It had not.

Mr. Hogg sought clarification that the intent was to disassemble the facade, store the stones, and reassemble it at some point in the future. Mr. Harrison explained it was an option to prevent impeding the progress of construction. Mr. Knight stated his understanding had been that it would be taken down but not necessarily stored and reassembled. Mr. Harrison apologized and clarified that he was unsure whether they could remove the granite and maintain its integrity for storage and reassembly.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight stated the Board needed to look at this as if the facade may not be restored as it is or they would have to make that a condition of approval. He was in favor of granting the request and offering the applicants the flexibility they were looking for. He hoped they would be able to keep the facade.

Ms. Brennan was not in favor of granting the application. She thought the facade had a great historical value.

Mr. Hogg disagreed about the importance of the facade. He stated they were holding onto a shred of the building and wanted to know when holding onto that had any meaning. He suggested the building had been totally denatured at this point.

Mr. Wolf thought that from a stylistic standpoint and a character standpoint this was unique on the Mall. He recognized that this was a small fraction of what originally stood there. He expressed a desire to see the facade saved as is.

Mr. Osteen was inclined to see it preserved as is.

Ms. Gardner thought a number of Design Guidelines for Demolition were not met. She also thought this would set a precedent for future applicants. She expressed a preference for the facade to be kept.

Mr. Hogg thought the incremental approach made the conversation difficult.

Mr. Wolf noted the application was based on safety issues and not aesthetics. He suggested the Board require a provision that the facade be restored precisely as is.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth in the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed request to demolish the remaining black granite facade would satisfy the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following provisions: that should there be any demolition required due to structural or safety reasons involved with construction that those portions of the facade or the facade in its entirety must be replaced with details and materials and constructions and proportions to match precisely the existing facade and that all attempts possible shall be taken to try to maintain the current facade and avoid demolition and limit demolition to the greatest extent possible. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-1; Ms. Brennan voted against.

- D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Replacement brick stair design deferred from September 16, 2008)
BAR 08-09-07
Walker Street at Altamont Street
TM 33
City of Charlottesville, Owner/Lauren Hildebrand, Dir. Of Utilities, Applicant
Replacement brick stairs design

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The designer had been asked to make every effort to keep the same rise to run ratio of the previous stairs. The main issue is what the bricks look like on the riser.

Mr. Dan Norman explained the vertical risers will have a similar brick but without the bullnose, standing vertically with no cut.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the proposed design met Code. Ms. Scala stated she had spoken with Tom Elliot, the building official, who had said it was fine.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what the edge restraint would be. Mr. Norman stated it had not yet been selected.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the railing was ADA compliant. Mr. Norman did not know.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner thought the design was too heavy for the surrounding area which was minimalistic.

Mr. Knight agreed with his colleague and thought it could be simplified.

Mr. Hogg also agreed. He thought a simple, square profile stair with no nosing would solve the problem; he suggested the cheek walls be concrete. Mr. Wolf asked if that was a motion; Mr. Hogg stated it was. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 07-12-03
Charlottesville Downtown pedestrian Mall
MMM Design group, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner
Vehicular crossings design, fire lane, drinking fountains, brick and granite colors

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. MMM was last before the Board in August at which time approval was granted for: 4X12 bricks for the Mall with 4X8 bricks in the crosswalk; mortar set, reconstructed runnels and soldier courses on either side; the light fixtures; granite inserts; newspaper boxes; and lighting levels. The applicant was to bring back to the Board: color samples of the brick and granite, which was seen by the Board on the Mall earlier in the day; tree preservation plan; the light poles -- the applicant had decided to use the existing light poles; and additional design work for the vehicular crossings -- a submittal had been provided. Two new drinking faucets were proposed. The designer had eliminated the interbanding and quatrefoil design.

Mr. Chris McKnight, of MMM, provided material samples. He stated he was present to answer questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Liza Sherman wanted to know if anything was being ripped up or if brick was going to be painted over. Mr. Wolf explained it was part of the entire Mall renovation and would be new brick, new granite, and would not be placed over existing. Ms. Sherman wanted to know when the renovation would take place. Mr. Wolf stated it would be January. Ms. Sherman wanted to know the reasoning behind the renovation as the Mall looked great; she wondered if it was a good use of tax dollars. Mr. McKnight explained there was failure of the mortar joints around the bricks and poor bedding underneath which had deteriorated to a point that brick was loosening.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight thought clarification of what elements were remaining and which were removed; the granite cruciform in the center of the crosswalk was gone as was the granite banding within the crosswalk. Mr. Knight then wanted to know why the granite was gone. Mr. McKnight explained it was an attempt to delineate the current work from the Halperin design.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated he was fine with the proposal as submitted although he preferred the alternate fountain.

Mr. Knight agreed with Mr. Hogg about the fountain as the proposed fountain was at odds with the rest of the furniture on the Mall. He stated he was troubled by the detailing on the Mall crossing. He understood the reasoning behind making it different from the Halperin design; however, he thought it was a clumsy design for carrying out that intention. Mr. Knight thought the granite banding needed a more convincing level of detailing to the whole piece.

Mr. Wolf agreed it didn't go far enough in distinguishing itself as different from the original design. He thought the crossing seemed to be the primary concern while the Mall seemed to be secondary. He thought this was a big move to change the Mall in this way.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about the lack of tactile warning strips at the runnels due to their use by blind pedestrians.

Mr. Hogg thought the material samples were appropriate as were the fire lane identification. The water fountain alternate was sympathetic to the Mall's design. He suggested deferring the crossing design while approving the other items.

Ms. Gardner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements, moved to find that the proposed changes in items B, fire lane delineations, c, drinking fountains with the Halsey Taylor model 3420, brick color as submitted and granite samples as submitted 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. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf wondered if they should make note they were deferring on item A. Ms. Gardner amended her motion to include that they find the design intention of item A, vehicular crossing to be compatible, but at this time are not satisfied with the level of design or detail as submitted and request that that come back to the Board for review. Mr. Hogg accepted the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-09-05
625 Park Street
TM 52 P 189
Ovation Builders LLC, Applicant/Shaffrey, Owner
Add rear addition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was heard at the September meeting, at which the applicant requested deferral. This is a 1902 building. The proposed changes were revised to include: remove certain non-original construction, including an octagonal room and porch from the rear of the house; add a one-story addition to the rear of the house. The applicant no longer requests to add on to the front porch; this proposal had been rejected by the Board at the September meeting. The Board had had no problem with the demolition proposed at the September meeting. The addition does not impact the original house.

The applicant, who did not identify herself for the record provided sketches for the Board's perusal.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if there were any drawings showing the existing pitch on the northside porch. The applicant confirmed which drawing did that.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight expressed his appreciation for everything the applicant had done to be open and willing to work with the Board and the Guidelines. He wondered if any of the architects on the Board were concerned with the pitch on the northside porch.

Mr. Wolf stated he did have some concern about the intersection of the existing roof and the new roof over the bay, but he did not know how significant that would be. He appreciated the continuity in the detail in the new proposal.

Ms. Gardner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and Demolition, moved to find that the proposed demolition of the existing rear addition and the new rear addition 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. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-1; Mr. Hogg voted against.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-10-04
105 Ridge Street
TM 29 P 20
Music Resource Center, Applicant
Remove grass and add river stones; add guitar sculpture

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant proposes to remove grass from the Ridge Street front yard and replace it with brown river stones for ease of maintenance. The applicant also proposes to add a five-foot soapstone electric guitar sculpture on a three foot tall 2x2 foot pedestal of brick that matches the brick of the church building. Placement of artwork in this location with a brick base is appropriate. The eight foot height would be the height of the peak of the existing brick sign. Staff does not recommend replacing the grass with river rock gravel. River rock in place of grass is incompatible with the local historic landscape patterns in the area. A more urban design with a brick or concrete surface and tree walls may be an alternative.

Ms. Sibley Johns, the Executive Director of the Music Resource Center, stated they were open to suggestion from the Board in terms of the yard.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the applicant was leaning toward one of the proposed designs more than the other. Ms. Johns stated the design would be determined more by the piece of soapstone.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if the existing sign would still be used. Ms. Johns explained a larger sign would fill the space to bring attention to what they were doing.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight noted Ms. Scala's comment that there were other acceptable alternatives to the grass was a good one. He thought the sculpture and pedestal were fine although he did want to know more about the pedestal.

Mr. Wolf also supported the sculpture. He concurred with Mr. Knight about the grass and felt a more detailed landscape plan involving some alternative such as paving or hardscape would be reasonable. Mr. Wolf stated that would be his motion. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-10-01
316 E. Main Street
TM 28 P 42
Tim Goering, Applicant/ 316-318 East Main St Investment LLC, Owner
Exterior storefront improvements

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This project was approved in 2007. The applicant is requesting storefront modifications to the Water Street and Main Street elevations. A set of double doors are proposed to be enlarged, eliminating side lights and reducing the size of the transom; the aluminum storefront material will be replaced with wood clad frames. One of the two previously approved light fixtures is being replaced with a horizontal fluorescent fixture located above both doors and has a dull, galvanized finish. A new sign saying Urban Outfitters will be painted on the window in a dark grey color. The existing canopy on the Main Street side will remain. The existing projecting sign will be reused with new laser cut letters to form a new sign. Revisions are in keeping with previous approvals and the spirit of the building. Staff would reconsider the entry lights; the fluorescent light fixture must be fully shielded. The canopy and signage on Main Street are acceptable. The signage requires separate permits. The previously approved canopy louvers are no longer needed.

Mr. Tim Goering stated the louvers would need to be kept in place as previously approved. Incandescent lights would be installed on the Main Street side.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg sought clarification that the three openings would no longer match. Mr. Goering stated the center bay would be framed with wood as would the new storefront for Urban Outfitters while the accessible entrance on the left side would remain as is.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought the proposed changes were appropriate. He liked the way the new pieces were being layered onto the old.

Mr. Wolf liked the idea of the lighting but thought it seemed counter to the coffering. He stated he would support the application as submitted with the exception of asking that the one lighting detail at the front on the Mall side be reconsidered.

Ms. Brennan also liked the changes. However, she was concerned about the wood material.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about the 4x8 framing on the door as it looked chunky.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Rehabilitation satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the one provision that the walnut framed, glass on the fixed window on the Water Street entrance be revised and submitted to Staff for administrative approval, that that stop be reduced in scale to a degree that is appropriate with the proportion of that opening. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess at 7:56 p.m. He reconvened the meeting at 8:21 p.m.

Ms. Schoenthal joined the meeting.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-10-05
1003 West Main Street
TM 10 P 51
William Atwood, Applicant/Studio House LLC, Owner
New construction

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

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board in April for a preliminary discussion. Zoning was changed in May to allow for additional height by Special Use Permit; the Board recommended a Special Use Permit for this property in July with the condition the building not encroach into the public right of way on the facade facing West Main Street. The proposal is for a six story with roof appurtenance mixed use building with three levels of underground parking and a rainwater harvesting system on the roof. Proposed building materials are precast concrete and metal. Vegetation includes two Freeman maple street trees, Japanese maple trees on the roof terrace level, and Japanese holly hedges and cross vines on the balconies. Most of the concerns expressed during the April preliminary hearing have been resolved.

Mr. William Atwood was present with Ashley Cooper and Mark Kestner. The representatives gave a brief PowerPoint presentation.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the applicant was pursuing LEED certification. Mr. Atwood stated they were not.

Mr. Wolf sought confirmation that the rendering correctly showed the degree to which the water towers would not be seen. Mr. Atwood confirmed that they would not be visible from the sidewalk.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Schoenthal thought the project had come a long way and looked good.

Mr. Knight thought the changes had been very worthwhile. He expressed his appreciation for the applicant making those changes.

Ms. Brennan agreed with her colleague.

Mr. Osteen was happy with the project and was interested in seeing it going forward. He did express concern about the garage entry. He felt it needed to respond to the elevation since it was the largest opening on the building.

Mr. Wolf agreed with Mr. Osteen. He felt there was room for the aesthetics of the water collection system to be more in line with the building. Mr. Wolf expressed concern about the public storefront being seven feet. He was not sure that was substantial enough as the rest of the building was quite striking.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed new building satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following provision: that the entrance to the garage be studied and revised to better align with the bay structure above it and with the friendly recommendation that the height of the storefront datum be reconsidered to both look at surrounding examples on the same block and to look at whether or not it should be slightly taller. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-0-2; Ms. Gardner and Mr. Hogg recused themselves from the matter.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-10-03

1824 University Circle

TM 6 P 97

Bruce Wardell, Applicant/Hillel Jewish Center at the University of Virginia, Owner
New construction and landscaping

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant proposes the renovation of an addition to the existing Hillel Jewish Center. Materials include stucco to match the existing house, wood fascia and gutter to match the existing house, and aluminum clad wood windows. The proposed hip roof eave will align with the height of the existing eave and will match the slope, overhang, and material of the main house. Street trees and a new seat wall are proposed along

part of University Circle. Also proposed are two biofilter gardens and three terraces. A 16 space parking area is proposed. A letter was received from neighboring property owners expressing concern about how the property was viewed from their property.

Mr. Bruce Wardell stated the design approach sought to pick up a little more accurately on the historic precedent of the existing building. The parking would be organized to the east side of the building and would be screened from the street by a seat wall with some landscaping.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Margie Burris, present on behalf of the owners of 38 University Circle, sought clarification that there would be no more than 16 spaces. This was confirmed. She also wanted to know the height of the highest point of any of the construction. Mr. Wardell stated the highest point of the new construction would be lower than the peak of the existing roof.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if all of the mechanical units would be housed in the carrel between the roofs. Mr. Wardell confirmed they would be.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Karen Dougald stated the design was greatly improved; however, the neighbors still had some concerns. The entryway was very austere and cold. The rear balcony was close to the properties behind this one and could be a noise distraction to the adjacent neighbors. She expressed appreciation for Mr. Wardell listening to their concerns.

Ms. Sally Nelson, of 36 University Circle, expressed concern about the impact of the back of the building, especially the balcony, on the rear neighbors.

Ms. Margie Burris expressed concern about the screening of the rear of the new addition. She asked that more mature greenery be used.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight, in follow up to concerns expressed by the public, wanted to know the rationale behind the second store balcony and if it was an indispensable element of the design. Mr. Wardell stated it was an element similar to an existing portion of the west side of the building. He also explained that upper room would be used for Friday evening services and the balcony was not intended to be an intensely used space.

Mr. Hogg thought it represented a significant and positive evolution of the original design. He thought the canopies should go away. Mr. Hogg thought the seat wall would be an attractive nuisance. His biggest concern was the large window on the north side of the new building.

Mr. Osteen had thought the front facade needed to be back a little bit more but worried about how that would affect the rear neighbors. He stated he found the applicant's rationale for the balcony to be compelling.

Mr. Knight thought this was one of the most thorough and visually descriptive applications they had seen. He thought this was a fairly sensitive addition to a significant structure. Mr. Knight was happy to see the biofilters incorporated into the design but thought the front biofilter could use a design change.

Mr. Wolf thought the project had made great strides. He was concerned about the large bay window, the lobby, and the chapel space and the scale relative to the house and to other residential structures. He thought the size of the balcony should be diminished.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed New Building Addition and Site Design satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves the application in concept for its site plan, massing, use of materials, and general design distribution, with the specific provision that the following would come back in an additional supplemental application which would involve the entry and the east elevation in terms of fenestration, revisions to the large curtain wall or bay window system at the lobby and the chapel, a study or revisions to the projection and canopy or not of the hyphen, and consideration of the neighborhood concerns in terms of the back balcony and site screening along the rear property line. Mr. Hogg suggested a study of the setback of the canopy and the facade on both the north and south side elevations of the hyphen. Mr. Hogg suggested something be done about the seat wall. Mr. Wolf accepted the amendment of the hyphen setback and amended the motion to include the phrase "with the provision that the seat wall be removed from the site plan." Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-10-02
112 W. Market Street
TM 33 P 254
Dave Ackerman/Wolf Ackerman, Applicant/First Street Church Project LLC, Owner
Exterior changes and landscaping

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This project had been before the Board in 2007. The applicant is requesting approval of revisions to the site and landscape design as well as exterior details. A steel picket gate is proposed for the alley on the west elevation. A new glass canopy, supported with a single pole, is proposed for the new entry at the northwest corner as well as a new 15-pane entry door with transom. Staff feels all changes are reasonable. All exterior lighting fixtures must meet dark sky requirements.

Mr. Dave Ackerman explained the exterior changes had been brought about by interior changes as well as the simplification of systems.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought clarification of the grade difference between the ramp and pad. The applicant stated it was about 12 inches. Mr. Knight then wanted to know if the entire length of retaining wall was required. The applicant explained the wall would also have light fixtures along the edge.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan appreciated the changes and thought the new proposal was more cohesive.

Mr. Hogg thought this was less of an intervention on the building and was appropriate.

Mr. Knight thought the applicant had gracefully handled one of the toughest design challenges an architect or landscape architect could get.

Mr. Hogg having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Site Design, moved to find that the proposed exterior building changes and site landscape plan satisfy 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. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter.

K. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

L. Other Business

-- Training Session October 28

Ms. Scala stated the training session would be in the second floor conference room at 5 p.m.

-- Recommendation of Oakhurst/Gildersleeve

Ms. Scala stated this was currently an ADC district that would become a National Register and State Register District. This was being done at the request of the Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Hogg moved to recommend listing on the Virginia Landmark Register and National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

With no other business, Mr. Wolf called the meeting adjourned at 10:23 p.m.