

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
December 16, 2008
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Amy Gardner (arrived at 5:24 p.m.)
Brian Hogg
William Adams (arrived at 5:09 p.m.)
James Wall
Eryn Brennan
Rebecca Schoenthal

Not Present:

Michael Osteen

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Peter Silverman asked for administrative approval to add 24 feet of trellis exactly the same as was there using the same materials and colors. Mr. Knight stated that it was up to Staff to decide whether something could be approved administratively. Mr. Wolf thought it was something that could be on the consent agenda.

B. Consent Agenda

BAR 08-12-03
Certificate of Appropriateness Application
Tax Map 53 Parcel 64 & Tax Map 53 Parcel 64.A
Masonic Corporation of Charlottesville
423 and 425 East Main Street
Replace window with entrance door

Mr. Hogg moved acceptance of the consent agenda. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-12-01
436 N. First Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 102
Marcella Morgan Day, Applicant/L. Newby Day, Owner
Handicapped ramp

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is repairing an existing 1970s wood deck and requests approval to add a handicap ramp from the city sidewalk on First Street to that deck. The ramp railing will match the painted wood railing on the front porch. Pressure treated wood would be used. The handicap ramp as proposed is a good solution. A gate at the city sidewalk is proposed to match the existing handcrafted gate at the front steps.

Mr. Adams arrived at 5:09 p.m.

Mr. Michael Millen was present to answer any questions the Board had.

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

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the entire existing deck was being replaced. Mr. Millen confirmed it was and was almost complete. Currently there are ten large concrete steps from the street to the property and another four steps to get to the house and the owner has mobility issues.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought the existing gate had a stately quality. He thought having a simpler gate at the house would be a more appropriate solution.

Mr. Wolf thought the design would work. He liked that it was not trying to make something of the front that it shouldn't be.

Mr. Knight, 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 handicap ramp satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the stipulation that the design of the gated entrance at the ramp be altered to reflect the design of the existing gate. Ms. Schoenthal seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-11-05

University Avenue and 14th Street NW

TM 9 P 160

Phi Eta Sigma Honor Society, Applicant/Buckingham Branch RR, Owner

Paint mural on RR abutment wall

Withdrawn by applicant.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-10-03

1824 University Circle

Tax Map 6 Parcel 97

Bruce Wardell, Applicant/Hillel Jewish Center at the University of Virginia, Owner

New construction details

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board at its November meeting. There were three remaining concerns -- the different language of the stair window entrance bay, to bring the language of the existing structure into the front without mimicking it with more wall space, and articulation of the current wall on the hyphen to be neither frameless nor straight storefront. The applicant submitted a revised design and an alternate north elevation.

Mr. Bruce Wardell, architect for the project, stated he had tried to keep this as focussed onto the specific issues raised at the last meeting as possible. His client preferred the alternate elevation.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Karen Dougald, of 20 University Circle, wanted to know if the entry door on the east elevation had muntins since the bird's eye view did not show muntins. Mr. Wolf suggested those were tracing lines which had carried through rather than muntins.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg sought clarification on the relationship between the east and west windows on the new facade. Mr. Wardell stated the owner had asked him if it would make more sense to center the window; he would be happy to center the windows if the Board thought that was a more appropriate relationship.

Ms. Gardner joined the meeting at 5:24 p.m.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Karen Dougald thanked Mr. Wardell and the Board for the sensitivity they have given to this project. She agreed the alternate northern facade was better.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg appreciated how hard the architect and his client had worked to respond to comments as the project has moved forward. The entrance was nicely done. Mr. Hogg also felt the alternate elevation was better.

Mr. Wolf expresses his wholehearted support. He thought the alternate elevation was preferable. He also agreed with the suggestion of centering the windows. Mr. Wolf thought he would support it as presented.

Mr. Adams thought that the calmness of the design made it a stronger project.

Ms. Schoenthal preferred the alternate elevation. She also appreciated the deferential quality of the addition to the historic building.

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 revisions satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and others in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition that the elevation on sheet 2 labeled Alternate North Elevation is the approved elevation and that the window configurations on the new addition on the east and west side flanking the central bay either be paired or centered over its corresponding lower opening. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-12-02

5 Gildersleeve Wood

Tax Map 11 Parcel 18

Cynthia Dupree, Associate AIA, Applicant/Deren Bader & Paul Lyons, Owners

Demolish shed; garage renovations; changes to porches

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property contains three contributing buildings and is located in the Oakhurst Circle/Gildersleeve Wood Neighborhood Architectural Design Control District. The Colonial Revival style house was built around 1921 along with a one-story hip roof shed which was originally a one car garage. The application has three parts. First, it seeks changes to the existing porches by removing the flat roof and installing a slightly sloped and hipped copper roof. The applicant wants to add pavers to the steps on the rear sun porch as well as installing cedar siding which will be painted. The applicant also wants to extend and replace the existing metal roof with a standing seam copper roof. The applicant proposes adding a new concrete stoop and needs to make an existing window smaller, replacing it with an awning type window. There are two metal columns in the garage which may have been from a porte cochere; the applicant wants to put one on the back stoop. Second, the applicant wants to make changes to the two car garage including replacing the asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam copper roof and installing new electric overhead cedar garage doors which will be stained mahogany. Third, the applicant proposes demolishing the shed. Regarding the porches, the materials and colors proposed are compatible. The Guidelines suggest maintaining the original roof pitch and height; however the existing porch roof does not channel rainwater runoff adequately which has caused deterioration on the main part of the house. Regarding the two car garage, the materials and colors are compatible. Regarding

demolition of the shed, the building is not in good shape structurally nor is it architecturally significant, but it could be improved and turned into a viable use and a reminder of the history of the house.

Ms. Cynthia Dupree, architect of the project, was present to answer questions.

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

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the proposed paint colors were just for the wooden elements and not the stucco. Ms. Dupree confirmed that the paint, while a close match to the stucco, was only for the wood elements.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know the reason for having the steps off the side porch going on two sides of the stoop rather than just along the side of the house. Ms. Dupree stated they were trying to avoid placing steps over the sewer line.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner thought it was a thoughtful submittal. She had no problems with any portion of it, including demolition of the shed.

Ms. Brennan agreed since it seemed like these were improvements and maintenance to a valuable contributing historic structure.

Mr. Wolf thought the level of care in drawing the details of the renovation bore out that it would be thoughtfully done.

Mr. Hogg expressed concern about the mahogany finish for the garage doors and wondered if a painted finish wouldn't be more appropriate and in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Wolf sought the opinion of the owner. She stated the wood seemed more beautiful. Mr. Hogg was concerned the changes to the garage made it a more significant structure than the historic house.

Mr. Knight thought the house was very eclectic. He was concerned about the attention that would now be drawn to the garage.

Mr. Wall thought the project was thoughtfully done.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed complete demolition of the shed does satisfy the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and others in the

district, and that the BAR approves the demolition as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed changes to the porches, the sunroom, and the two car garage do satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves this application as submitted. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-2; Mr. Knight and Mr. Hogg voted against.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-12-04

1501-1505 University Avenue

Tax Map 09 Parcel 78

Ryan Rooney, Applicant/Terry Vassalos, Owner

Replace upper windows with openings; reconstruct facade

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The storefront property is a noncontributing structure in The Corner ADC District. The building was erected in the mid 1930s with a second story added in the '60s and the storefront rebuilt in 1978. The 1978 renovations were to repair fire damage. The property had a demolition in 1954. According to the applicant the original building was demolished in 1954 and a one-story building was completed in 1955 with the second-story possibly following the 1978 fire. The applicant proposes removing the second floor windows while retaining the openings and third opening would be added and wood doors would be added to all three openings upstairs. A proposed balcony would be 12 feet from grade. In general the rehabilitation improves a storefront in need of attention. The simple brick design with wood doors is appropriate and functional. The Board may wish to treat this application as a preliminary discussion. Ms. Scala did not think the application could be approved at this time since the balcony encroached into the City right of way; City Manager or City Council approval is required. Regarding materials, the proposed synthetic material is inappropriate for The Corner district.

Ms. Cheri Lewis, Esquire, was present on behalf of the applicant. The property has been vacant for two years and was in an extremely deteriorated condition. She stated they believe the glass and wood folding accordion doors meet Guideline 3(H)4. Also met would be 3(J)3, 4, and 5. Ms. Lewis stated the street level design met 3(J)1 and 3(F)1. The applicant seeks approval to install a cornice on the building on a currently unadorned roof to reinforce the character of the surrounding historic area and making the building more monumental and less utilitarian. An alternative drawing had been submitted without the decorative details.

Mr. Jon Sands, of Studio D Associates, provided the Board with product books and a sample chart.

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

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg sought the reasoning for having a balcony. Ms. Lewis stated the presence of humans on a balcony would give interest to passersby. Mr. Hogg also wanted to know how she would assess the relationship between this balcony and the historic building to the right. Ms. Lewis stated the balcony would not protrude in front of the historic district. She stated it would not be more prominent than the adjoining historic building.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if there was any more idea about signage. Mr. Sands stated there were several ideas including hanging a sign from the balcony or a wall mounted sign at the brick piers on the left and right of the nanowall system, or a wall sign above the nanowall system.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf complimented the applicant for being an advocate for the project.

Ms. Brennan agreed. She thought it was a lovely, elegant, contemporary facade which met the Guidelines. However, she expressed concern about the cornice, brackets, and arches over the windows as they did not meet the Guidelines. Ms. Brennan thought the balcony could be a vibrant addition to the facade.

Mr. Hogg concurred with Ms. Brennan. He thought the alternate facade was more appropriate. He did not think the balcony would have an affect on the perception of the streetscape.

Mr. Adams expressed support of the alternate facade. He suggested adding some structural interest to the balcony.

Mr. Wolf thought the presentation was compelling. He thought the structure between the door and the transom was significant and felt the proposal had too much stacked in the area.

Mr. Knight agreed with his colleagues that the simplified version was better. He wanted details of the balcony and its railing to come back for review.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth in the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed storefront renovations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition that the approved elevation is the alternate that was included in the packet supplied by Ms. Lewis and labeled 1505 University Ave. Elevation, and with the condition that details as they relate to the guardrail and the edge profile, essentially a detail that covers the balcony construction, come back to City staff for administrative approval, that signage will be addressed separately and will come back to the BAR for approval, and that if any of the doors and windows are painted as opposed to the approved stain color, that those

will also come back for administrative approval, and, finally, with the condition that the balcony projection into the right of way and any other projections that might pertain to the doorways meet the City Zoning Ordinance and the City Building Code. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Schoenthal left the meeting, 6:46 p.m.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-05-03

1704 Gordon Avenue and 419 17th Street NW

Tax Map 9 Parcel 2

Development Management Too, LLC, Applicant/ Wassenaar Design Group, Architects
New construction

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter as his firm had previously worked on this project.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board in May when a recommendation was made on the Special Use Permit. Concerns at that time dealt with excess parking, the gaping entrance to the garage, random window openings, oversized dormers, and the building not being square to the seat. The project is a three level multifamily structure containing eight two-story units with lower level parking for 25 vehicles, 16 of which are required by Zoning. Vehicle access to the parking is from Gordon Avenue. The buildings are corrected with a bridge on the first floor. All existing trees are set for removal except for a 12 inch oak. The plan proposes seven willow oak along the rear property, six ginkgo, one Lacebark elm on Gordon, three Lacebark elm and two golden rain trees on Seventeenth Street. Additional shrubs and perennials and biofilter plantings surround the buildings. Proposed materials are brick veneer, general shale, hardy fiber cement siding finished khaki brown, Eagle windows and doors, steel doors to be painted, Timberline fiberglass asphalt shingles in charcoal, and MiraTEC composite trim. Changes since the preliminary review include: replacing the garden plaza on Seventeenth Street with a landscaped yard; reorganizing the window locations so the first and second floors are aligned where possible; a reduction in garage window openings; a new landscape plan; and revised railing and column designs. The amount of parking has not been reduced. The garage entrance remains the same size. The dormers remain the same size; however, the architect noted the eave size was the concern and it has been changed on the dormers.

Mr. Kurt Wassenaar explained that his client and the neighborhood had expressed concern about students parking in the area and had requested the project have as much parking as they possibly could. He stated the neighboring churches wanted the applicant to have as much screening as possible.

Mr. David Anhold, of Anhold Associates, explained the landscape plan was meant to respect the neighborhood elements while meeting Code requirements. The landscape plan was a very traditional Virginia palette while having plants that would be interesting throughout the year.

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

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought the justification behind the removal of the existing trees. Mr. Anhold stated the existing trees were fencerow trees that had come up over time from seeds and birds. Other trees are in areas where sidewalks are slated.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams had reservations about the large opening into the parking area on Gordon Avenue especially about how it would comply with the Guidelines and how it would fit into the streetscape. He thought it was extremely problematic. He expressed concern about the distance between the handicap parking and the handicap units. Mr. Adams stated he had trouble supporting this project as it did not meet the Guidelines for this particular neighborhood and this location.

Mr. Hogg thought fundamental questions about size and scale with this project had not been addressed. The size, scale, and articulation of this building doesn't establish a relationship to its context. Setting aside style and details, the fundamental organization of the building is such that it isn't harmonious. The proportions of the facade are inverted making the second floor substantially larger visually.

Ms. Brennan cited the Guidelines to note that setbacks, spacing, and general massing of the new dwelling are the most important criteria that should relate to the historic existing structures.

Ms. Gardner agreed with her colleagues. The structure is so large it takes on an institutional quality. The design is not contributing in a way that is helpful to the neighborhood.

Mr. Wall also agreed with his colleagues about the gaping hole, the scale, and the institutional character of the building. It did not relate to its neighbors. Mr. Wall appreciated the changes, but they seemed minimal.

Mr. Knight sympathized with the issues the applicant had to deal with but could not take issue with the comments of his colleagues. He noted that certain site level requirements were taking the project further from the norm of the neighborhood.

Mr. Wassenaar requested deferral.

Mr. Hogg moved to accept the applicant's request. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0-1; Mr. Wolf had recused himself from the matter.

I. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

J. Other Business

Election of BAR Chair and Vice Chair for 2009

Mr. Hogg moved to nominate Mr. Wolf as Chair. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Ms. Gardner moved to nominate Mr. Knight to continue as Vice Chair. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf and Mr. Knight accepted the nominations. The motions carried unanimously.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know when the Board would discuss ADC Guidelines for vending structures and outdoor cafes. Ms. Scala stated it would be done in January. Ms. Gardner wanted to know if there was any consideration from the City to the fact that cafe owners were being asked to reopen with all new furniture and yet we had been in a recession for a year. Ms. Scala stated that most do conform.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if there was any way to have applications submitted digitally so they could be accessed by the public online. Ms. Scala stated the ordinance may need to be changed to get applicants to submit digitally. Mr. Hogg suggested having a day to display all applications at the same time.

K. Adjourn to holiday dinner at C&O Restaurant

Mr. Wolf moved to adjourn. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.