

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
July 21, 2009
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Amy Gardner
Brian Hogg (arrived at 5:35)
Michael Osteen
James Wall
Eryn Brennan (arrived at 7:08)
Rebecca Schoenthal (arrived at 5:10; left at 8:52)

Not Present:

William Adams

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:07 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. John Bright, of 109 Altamont Circle and owner of 107 Altamont Circle, explained to the Board that the shingles on 107 were deteriorating. He wanted to replace them with a system made by Cedar Valley. He provided the Board with a sample of the material.

Mr. Wolf noting it was the exact same material with the same exposure going back stated he could see this almost as maintenance. He stated he would be willing to allow Staff to approve this administratively.

B. Consent Agenda

1. **Minutes -- January 20, 2009**
2. **Special Use Permit Recommendation -- 101 and 103 S. 1st Street (Dance hall in the space formerly occupied by Gravity Lounge)**
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-01-05
104 Elliott Avenue (formerly described as Cherry Avenue, Ridge Street, and Elliott Avenue)
Tax Map 29 Parcel 265
Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner
New single family ecoMOD house -- revised plan**

Mr. Wolf noted item 1 was not available and was not on the agenda.

Mr. Osteen asked that item 3 be pulled for discussion.

Mr. Osteen moved approval of the remaining item on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Ms. Schoenthal joined the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Ms. Scala gave a staff report on item 3. The design of the house was approved April 9. Due to the excavation of large chunks of concrete and other fill in the location where the house was previously planned to be built and approved by the BAR, the applicant is requesting an amended Certificate of Appropriateness for a new location and orientation of the dwelling with a smaller parking area.

Mr. John Quale, of the University of Virginia, explained that after 25 feet of excavation there was still fill. They propose moving the house to the other side of the property which puts it closer to the existing house which they had been trying to avoid.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that the issue was being driven by soil bearing. Mr. Quale confirmed that.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Eugene Williams, of 620 Ridge Street, first expressed concern that there was no longer a black [sic] member on the Board. He then stated the general public should be able to see some rendering of the matter. He stated he did not understand what was proposed. Mr. Williams also expressed concern about the City's landscaping. He thought all of the neighborhoods should be treated equally.

Mr. Wolf stated Mr. Quale could show Mr. Williams some images of what was being proposed. Mr. Wolf stated his agreement with Mr. Williams on points one and three. Mr. Osteen noted there would be an opening on the Board soon and encouraged Mr. Williams to encourage an applicant.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen stated he was sympathetic to the issues that were being addressed. He appreciated the idea that the existing sidewalk and existing curb cut would be used. He expressed concern that the parking was allocated to an area that would cause cars to back over the sidewalk. He wanted to know if the building could go five feet back towards the set back and get a five foot planting strip out front. Mr. Quale explained there was a sunshade projection that comes off the back of the building and

that could not go over the setback. Mr. Wolf suggested the driveway be smaller to allow for Mr. Osteen's suggested planting strip.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Alison Singer, of 142 Bollingwood Road, stated she had been working with the landscape design for this project and stated that the idea of pushing anything that was an architectural screen past the setback in any direction was impossible due to City Codes.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf fully supported moving the house and was sympathetic to the project, its constraints, and all the work that had gone into it. He also sympathized with the concerns being raised about making some type of gesture that helped deal with this project from the perspective of the pedestrian, the street, and the neighborhood. He suggested finding some way to work in a small strip or zone that helps to modify and deal with the edge. Mr. Wolf would support the relocation of the house and everything else with the possible exception of asking if there was some alternative that could come back in terms of that buffer at the drive to address the concerns about how the sidewalk and driveway interact with one another.

Mr. Osteen thought that sounded like a motion. Mr. Wolf stated he would be happy to call it a motion.

Mr. Osteen did not think the Board could solve it. He stated there were a lot of issues involved and the applicant needed to weigh all those concerns.

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 single family dwelling satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition that the applicant submits to Staff for administrative approval an alternative layout for the parking graveled driveway that accommodates some type of buffer between the gravel drive and the sidewalk. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Hogg joined the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

**C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-04-06
218 W. Water Street**

**Tax Map 28 Parcel 84
Waterhouse, LLC, Owner
New construction -- revisions to Water Street parking garage facade**

Ms. Gardner recused herself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the June meeting a redesign of this project was approved with the condition that the first two stories of the north facing facade on Water Street be studied and resubmitted with an eye towards balancing the need for vehicular access with the public nature of the facade, use of the storefront, and how the facade responds to the street and the pedestrian, and particularly how the second floor fenestration works with the first floor openings to the garage. This application includes a proposal to replace the glass windows in the parking garage area with metal ventilation grates which are set back from the face of the wall and have a two inch depth to help block light from the garage. Also submitted were details on the proposed lighting which include recessed wall luminaires, and pole mounted down lights to be located on the South Street side of the building. If the BAR chooses to approve the plan, approval should be conditioned on having any final details come back to Staff or the BAR for approval, specifically for signage. HVAC units will all be interior. If the building design should change, for example, due to a building code issue, then the redesign would have to come back to the Board for approval.

Mr. Bill Atwood stated they had re-detailed this window, particularly creating a sill with the structure coming down. He stated they also lifted this fenestration up, creating a mezzanine effect.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Brent Nelson, of 707 Northwood Avenue, stated they would welcome proper site lighting. He stated there was not enough information provided to know that the lighting met standards. He wanted to know if the City did not require a full cut off requirement for site lighting that meets or exceeds 3,000 lumens. He wanted to know if the City did not require a photometric plan that shows the lighting values across the full width of the site. He wanted to know if the City did not hold the lighting value to a certain number, probably a half a footcandle, at the right of way line. Mr. Wolf believed that the answer was yes; however, that was a site plan as opposed to a BAR issue.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall wanted to know if the garage still functioned as before since the opening on South Street had been moved. Mr. Atwood stated they had redesigned and submitted the site plan to the City so that the entry was -- per all the discussion -- off center; the

entire parking area was redesigned to meet that need. He also noted the lumens and all requirements had been submitted to the City as part of the site plan.

Ms. Schoenthal wanted to know the color of the metal grate. Mr. Atwood stated it would be gun metal gray just like all other metal on the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight thought that changing the second floor to a grate rather than the glazed openings made sense and was a likely improvement over what they had seen. However, he did not think it addressed the street life issue. He was not sure this was an appropriate response to what was emerging as a more and more pedestrian area of the city.

Mr. Wolf stated one of the challenges was 50 percent of the new tower at ground level was dedicated to garage entry on the primary facade. He thought the Board had been looking for some sort of balance that there would be some way to deal with the second story to animate the facade. He thought it was unfortunate that the new piece added so little to what existed.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about the grate blocking light.

Mr. Wall appreciated the changes. He thought the applicant had made the South Street side and the Water Street side more closely resemble each other.

Mr. Osteen, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including ADC Design District Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed Waterhouse project revisions satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and the BAR approves the application as submitted with the concept that it will still come back for final approval of signage and any visible HVAC equipment on the property. Ms. Schoenthal seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-1-1; Mr. Knight voted against while Ms. Gardner had recused herself from the matter.

- D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-06-01
16 & 16 1/2 Elliewood Avenue
Tax Map 9 Parcel 97
Andy McClure, Applicant/Geary Albright, Owner
Biltmore Grill -- add decks, replace fence, site changes**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the June meeting, the Board asked for a more formal site plan and more detailed architectural information on the proposed fence,

deck, railing, and bar. The BAR said the applicant should rethink the decking of the garden space and suggest alternatives. The new proposal is for stained cedar board fencing which will be four feet high along Elliewood, while it will step up to five feet in height on the north side. The new bar will be 10 feet by 15 feet by 3 1/2 feet. The face of the bar will be wood. The roof over the bar will be constructed of open wood framing with a galvanized corrugated roof. The applicant still proposes a gravel surface seating area with benches rather than tables. There is no longer a fence proposed between the seating area from the landscaped slope. Staff found the proposed bar addition, surrounding deck, coordinated fence and railings, and existing graveled area were well designed and appropriately located, but recommended against the graveled patio space in the existing landscaping bed. The existing contrast of planted areas to brick should be maintained in front of the restaurant; tables could be added to the existing brick patio.

The applicant's representative, who did not identify himself for the record, stated he had discovered during the site plan amendment that there was a sanitary sewer easement going through the property which means the City is not allowing a wood deck around the bar.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know what would be done where the existing brick wall stops along the sidewalk. The applicant stated there was an existing concrete wall that would be left as it was.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the applicant and the City had discussed removable deck pallets to allow access to the easement. The applicant stated it had been brought up but the City had only granted that in the past was if it was for handicapped access.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the rotation of the bar was driven by the easement. The applicant stated it was.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight thought the difference between the last submission and this one was remarkable. He thought the materials and design were compatible with the site and the Guidelines. He stated he would support approving this plan.

Mr. Hogg disagreed with putting seating in the front area. He expressed concern about how dense the enclosure was. He stated that the diagonal turn of the bar was a nice inflection that related to the street.

Mr. Osteen thought it was an opportunity to look for another kind of space. He thought the landscaping strip could be more interesting and could engage the fence.

Mr. Wolf stated he was taken aback by the skew of the bar. He applauded all the design changes and the increased level of specificity. He expressed concern about the little strip in front of the original restaurant. He stated he could support all of the other changes, including skewing the bar, if the piece in front of the bar could remain more landscaped.

Ms. Schoenthal concurred with Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and New Construction, moved to find that the proposed changes 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 including the potential alternative of eliminating the deck and skewing the orientation of the bar with the provision that the section of landscape immediately in front of the original restaurant at 16 Elliewood have mulch rather than gravel and be maintained as a planted garden as opposed to a porous sitting area, and that the fence enclosure for the new crushed stone area at 16 1/2 be studied and resubmitted to just increase visibility between the patrons and the sidewalk, and that those two items can be approved administratively by Staff. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0-1; Ms. Gardner did not vote.

**E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-07-01
412 E. Jefferson Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 44
Phillip St. Ours, Applicant/Doug Hudson, Owner
Window replacement**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a two-story contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC district; historically known as the Norris-McCue building, it was constructed in the second quarter of the 19th century. The applicant requests approval to replace all the windows with new custom sash replacements. The applicant has presented options to replace the double hung six-over-nine sash wood windows and one two-over-two window with either true divided lights or simulated divided lights. The Colby & Colby true divided light sash replacement has single clear

glass with wood interior and exterior. The simulated divided light sash replacement option has double pane glass with exterior simulated divided lights with a shadow bar. True divided lights will provide the most accurate look and historic feel of Court Square. The Board should decide if it is appropriate to replace the windows at all and, if it is, is it appropriate to do the simulated divided lights.

Mr. Phillip St. Ours provided the Board with additional drawings of the two proposed options.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the Colby & Colby was an insulated glass panel or a true single pane. Mr. St. Ours did not know and wanted to know which the Board would prefer. Mr. Wolf stated it should be closer to the original would be better.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall thought, due to the location of the building, it was vital that the windows remain as close to the original as possible.

Ms. Schoenthal wondered if they had enough information to proceed. Mr. Wolf stated he would want to see very specifically what was going back in.

Mr. Hogg expressed concern about the impact this would have on the other house which retained its historic windows. He stated they needed to be faithful to this house and also minimize the perceived difference between this house and the adjacent houses.

Mr. Wolf queried the Board as to whether there was general support for replacement if the window was constructed in such a way that it matched or almost matched the original window. There was general support among the Board. Mr. Wolf stated they would need more information to approve the actual replacement. Mr. Wolf stated the Board would want it to be a true divided light with special attention paid to the precise dimensions of the sash, meeting bar, and the muntin bar as well as the profile of the muntin bar.

Mr. St. Ours requested a deferral.

Mr. Knight moved to accept the applicant's request. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6-0-1; Ms. Gardner did not vote.

**F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-07-03
605 E. Main Street and 606 E. Market Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 80
Timothy J. Breitenbach, Facilities Management, Applicant/City of
Charlottesville, Owner
Window replacements**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The City Hall and police building were designed by Stainback and Scribner in about 1967 and are contributing structures in the Downtown ADC district. The City of Charlottesville is seeking to replace all 87 windows; 77 are the same size while the other ten are smaller. The smaller windows face Market Street. Eight windows facing the Mall have bronze colored frames while the others have clear aluminum frames. The proposed glass will be clear, not tinted. The proposal is to install fixed undivided units rather than attempting to simulate the muntin that divides the operable from inoperable portions of the existing units. The reasons for installing inoperable units are energy efficiency and cost. The proposed finish for all the replacement windows will be black or dark bronze. On the more visible facades the window openings are multi-story elongations; each opening has one or two windows with slate panels in between. The window openings near the main entrance to City Hall have a masonry lattice in front. The slate panels and masonry lattice will not be disturbed. On the less visible facades, the window openings are the same size as the individual windows. Replacement of any windows in an ADC District requires BAR approval. The masonry openings, slate panels and masonry lattice will not be disturbed, which is important. The use of clear glass and a uniform frame color are good decisions. The replacement of operable units with inoperable units is a discussion point mainly in terms of the BAR because of the difference in appearance.

Mr. Tim Breitenbach read a prepared statement to the Board. The windows were the original single-glazed windows and were not airtight. In order to achieve the greatest offsets of the energy loss, the City proposed installation of a single fixed-window unit in each opening. Mr. Breitenbach provided the Board with a sample of a dark bronze finish which was available. He expressed a preference for this over the black especially since the bronze was closest to the original intent of the designers.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the three horizontal windows were part of the replacement program. Mr. Breitenbach stated they were not as they had recently been replaced.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the Board had any purview over the idea of operability. Mr. Wolf thought that was a separate issue; he thought they did have purview over the aesthetics.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg found it surprising, given the City's commitment to sustainability and environmental quality, that they would eliminate the operable windows in City Hall. He noted one of the fundamental tenets of LEED designing was access to fresh air. However, he did think this proposal was an aesthetic improvement to the exterior of the building because the existing windows were a very clumsy forced design.

Mr. Osteen agreed with Mr. Hogg. He also noted a LEED tenet of the individual control over their own space. He also expressed concern that the Board had sent away an individual property owner to get more details while they didn't have any more information from this applicant. Mr. Wolf noted the proposed alternative in this case was better than the existing, while in the other case the Board was saying what was originally there was more important. Mr. Osteen felt the City should be held to as high a standard as an individual property owner.

Mr. Wolf echoed the comments about reducing operability. However, he thought the Board's ability to regulate or mandate whether windows operate was different than their ability to make an aesthetic judgment based on the Guidelines and existing conditions of the building. He expressed a preference for the clear anodized aluminum.

Mr. Knight agreed with what his colleagues had said about operability. He suggested a motion state this was being approved on the narrow grounds of aesthetics and that they wholly support operable windows and they urge the City to reconsider that.

Mr. Wolf stated he would make a motion to support this with the caveat that they do not endorse the decision to limit the windows to small fixed units with no opportunity for operability.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed windows 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 following modification: that the window finish for all exposed units would be a clear anodized aluminum and that the dark bronze finish be limited to those units which are concealed by the masonry lattice inserts in the facades and with the caveat that the Board, while approving this on an aesthetic basis within the Guidelines is opposed to the notion that operable units would be replaced with fixed units, and supports the objectives of LEED design and sustainable design practices that would suggest that maintaining operable units would be preferable. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Osteen stated he would vote against this based on the operability issue. Mr. Breitenbach sought clarification that the eight bronze colored windows in the front were to be converted based on this motion. Mr. Hogg and Ms. Schoenthal stated they were to stay bronzed. Mr. Wolf sought clarification that it wasn't just the ones behind the lattice screens. Mr. Hogg stated the windows should be replaced in kind. Mr. Wolf called a vote by voice acclamation. The motion passed 6-1; Mr. Osteen voted against.

Ms. Brennan joined the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

**G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-07-02
500 Park Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 131.1
Michael Cantoni, Applicant/Rev. Gavin Meek, Owner
Bench (Eagle Scout project)**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is on the property of First Presbyterian Church with a carriage house adjoining. Both are contributing structures in the North Downtown ADC district. The church, designed by Stainbeck and Scribner, dates to 1955. Three significant 19th century structures were demolished to make way for the church; the carriage house is a surviving outbuilding from that time period. The applicant proposes to design and construct a wood bench adjacent to the carriage house for an Eagle Scout project. Two proposed sites are an open lawn to the south of the carriage house or closer to Park Street in some trees. The proposed material is treated wood, either painted or stained. A simple bench normally would not require BAR approval; however, the pergola will increase the mass of the bench so that it will seem more like a permanent structure. Ms. Scala thought it would be good for an Eagle Scout to go through the process.

Michael Cantoni stated the proposed location for the bench was along a paved walkway between the carriage house and the parking facility because the alternate location had been disapproved by the church. He provided the Board with drawings of the bench, which was not necessarily the final work, based on budget and supply needs.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know about the roof and lattice which made it seem like more of an enclosure. The applicant stated the solid roof was intended to keep rain off since the area is open.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the wood would be painted. Mr. Cantoni stated he would prefer staining it due to the maintenance issues of painting.

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the lattice was going to be premade. The applicant stated it was.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall thought it was a worthwhile project but he questioned the finish and giving it such a rustic feeling in that setting. He expressed a preference for something painted.

Ms. Brennan cited the Guidelines: the design and location of any new site feature should relate to the existing character of the property. She expressed concern about the finish and about the asphalt shingles. She stated her primary concern was if it was compatible with the carriage house as well as material selection.

Mr. Hogg felt the dominant feature on the site was the church. He thought the proposed style related nicely to the church. He expressed a preference for an opaque stain or even a one which was lightly colored. He thought it might not need to be as enclosed as was proposed with the lattice. He stated it would be hard to make premade lattice look nice in the context of everything else that was being done. He suggested if the budget was a concern, then removing the lattice could ease that burden.

Mr. Osteen thought it was a beautiful design which aspired to good craftsmanship and more noble materials.

Mr. Knight expressed concern about the applicant being able to make pressure treated lumber perform the way he wanted it to. He wanted to know what timeframe the applicant had. The applicant stated he had to have it finished by his 18th birthday in February but wanted to have it done in the early fall.

Ms. Brennan expressed a preference for it being painted white.

Mr. Wolf thought the applicant had done a nice job in terms of the presentation. He agreed with his colleagues about the challenges of using store bought lattice and thought it would be a simple way to simplify the project if costs needed to be cut. He thought this would be a more sympathetic piece in the landscape if it were painted. Mr. Wolf thought the applicant may need to use a couple different species of wood to accomplish certain things. He saw this as a garden element which was an impermanent structure. He suggested that the final solution of what was being built would be brought back to Staff for administrative approval if it differed from these drawings. He stated he would support this with the caveat that it be painted to match the trim of the church or stained with an opaque finish.

Ms. Schoenthal, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed bench satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the contingency that the finish becomes white or light paint. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess at 7:31 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

**H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-04-11
135 Madison Lane
Tax Map 9 Parcel 148
Daggett + Griggs Architects, Applicants/Virginia Delta Upsilon Alumni
Association, Owner
New Construction**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property is located in The Corner ADC district. There is an existing noncontributing structure on the property that does not require approval for demolition. Comments were made on the preliminary design for this structure in April; many of those revisions have been made.

Mr. Jim Griggs stated the Board had made some good comments at the preliminary meeting and they had studied it and worked on it. He stated they were working on an agreement with the neighbor to take care of an easement issue. If that could not be done, the project would have to be redesigned two feet smaller.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted to know how the balcony was being held up. Mr. Griggs stated it would be cantilevered.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought it did represent a significant improvement over what they had seen in April. He stated he would have no problem with a two foot reduction if needed.

Mr. Osteen thought their previous comments were responded to well. He expressed concern about the bike rack floating in the grass; he suggested a pad or a mulch bed.

Ms. Gardner thought it was a handsome project and a great presentation. She thanked the applicant for his thoroughness.

Mr. Wolf echoed his colleagues' comments. He stated he would not need to see it come back if it was reduced by a foot on either side and nothing else was changed; he thought it could be administratively approved.

Ms. Brennan agreed.

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 Virginia Delta Upsilon fraternity house new construction satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and others in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Hogg wanted to know if Mr. Wolf wanted to include that Mary Joy could approve it administratively if the footprint needed to change by two feet. Mr. Wolf amended his motion to read "approves the application as submitted and furthermore would allow Staff administrative approval for a building footprint that was reduced two feet in width to accommodate a potential conflict with a sewer easement." Mr. Hogg accepted the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

- I. **Preliminary Discussion**
BAR 09-07-06
219 14th Street NW
Tax Map 9 Parcel 66
Daggett + Griggs Architects, Applicant
New construction

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Currently there is a noncontributing structure on this property which may be removed without approval for demolition. The property is zoned University High Density. The applicant wants a preliminary discussion for new construction of a contemporary four story apartment building with elements of sustainable design and a drive under basement parking deck accessed from 15th Street only. The building's east and west elevations will front on both 14th Street NW and 15th Street NW. There will be 21 four-bedroom units and 37 parking spaces. Materials include stucco, painted fiber cement siding, wood molded brick base and concrete base. The roof is proposed to be asphalt shingles.

Mr. Jim Griggs stated he was not sure they were ready to be before the Board but wanted to get the concept before the Board as soon as possible.

Mr. Wall liked the way it was sited. However, he felt the larger building seemed like a barracks. He wanted to see more interest in that building.

Mr. Hogg thought that, in terms of the size and the massing, this was a good start. He thought the way the 14th Street side addressed the older houses to the south was a very respectful way of putting a new building on the street. He agreed the larger building could be more interesting. He thought the 15th Street side could have a more dignified entrance.

Mr. Osteen thought the building was handsome. He liked the idea that the 14th Street piece got smaller and related to adjacent buildings better.

Ms. Brennan thought the facade on 15th Street could be articulated in such a way to create solids and voids to be a little more dynamic.

Ms. Schoenthal thought the 14th Street piece was a breath of fresh air. She thought the roof form on the larger building didn't seem to be a good fit with the size of the building.

Mr. Wolf liked the footprint and the arrangement of the pieces. He thought there might be a way to make a more honorific or monumental entrance piece on the 15th Street side.

J. Preliminary Discussion
BAR 09-01-02
Corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue (William Taylor Plaza)
Tax Map 29 Parcels 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 157
Train & Partners Architects, Applicant/Cherry Avenue Investment, LLC,
Owner
New Construction -- revised plan

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board in January for a preliminary discussion. Because this project will require rezoning, the developer will be making voluntary proffers to City Council that would mitigate any impacts of the development; the BAR's preliminary discussion is important in assisting in that process and influencing a successful outcome. The project proposes a new curb cut on Ridge Street and one on Cherry Avenue. The fire department may have an issue with the proposed narrow lanes.

Mr. Kirk Train stated the project had been significantly retooled since the first preliminary discussion.

Mr. Hogg appreciated the changes on Ridge Street. However, he was concerned about the top of the office buildings and the south facing window walls.

Mr. Osteen thought it had gotten too literal on Ridge Street.

Mr. Knight thought there was a disconnect between the site vocabulary and the architecture. He thought the plaza at the corner was much improved and did a better job of creating the juncture between the two different pieces. He expressed concern about the rigid site geometry.

Ms. Brennan thought the building ended abruptly on the Cherry Avenue side.

Ms. Schoenthal left the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Mr. Wolf thought there had been a lot of improvements in terms of site accessibility and the massing. He shared some of his colleagues concerns about the abruptness of the two pieces coming together.

Ms. Scala reminded the Board they were reviewing this because it was such a big project and they needed to provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Knight stated he was wary of a formal recommendation.

Mr. Hogg suggested they instead provide a sense of the Board that the massing and uses which are shown on the plans they have reviewed appear to be consistent with their expectations for development in this district.

Mr. Wolf requested that Staff summarize the Board's discussion which was generally positive and in support of the project's direction for development in this district, it's general massing, and the approach that it's taking including the improvements that have been made and be conveyed to the Planning Staff who is directing the site plan and rezoning or zoning variance application.

K. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

L. Other Business

1. As built issues

Ms. Scala explained this included projects undertaken without BAR approval and projects built differently than approved. She stated it was important to process violations that occur so citizens may rely on the BAR process and that applicants are treated equally. She wanted to develop a process which could be applied consistently to discover these discrepancies and to decide which ones are significant enough to warrant correction, and to decide which should be processed as violations.

Mr. Hogg thought the two were different. He suggested if work was done without a permit, they get brought into the process and it get reviewed as if the work hadn't happened. Noncompliance should give the applicant two choices: correct the work so it is in compliance with what was approved, or they come back and ask for remedial approval.

Mr. Osteen thought it should be on the formal agenda, especially early in the agenda.

2. Schedule Work Session -- BAR's role in contributing to a long-range vision for Charlottesville

Ms. Scala explained this was to step back and look at the cumulative impacts of the Board's decisions and undertake a project to address a larger view of the City than it normally does. She further explained this was inspired by a summit of architects and could be a response to the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the city in 2011.

M. Adjournment

Mr. Hogg moved to adjourn. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:21 p.m.