

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
August 18, 2009
Minutes

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Brian Hogg
William Adams
Michael Osteen
James Wall
Eryn Brennan (left the meeting at 7:04 p.m.)
Rebecca Schoenthal

Not Present:

Amy Gardner

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- January 20, 2009
2. As-built Discussion
202 2nd Street NW
(Windows in addition to Monsoon Restaurant)
3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-08-04
1901 E. Market Street
Tax Map 55A Parcel 149
Albiston Associates, Applicant/Jon & Robyn Fink, owner
Rehabilitation

Mr. Wolf stated the minutes were not available and would not be part of the consent agenda. He also noted for the record that he had in the past worked with the applicant for item 3, but had no conflict of interest and could render any decision fairly.

Mr. Hogg asked that item 2 be pulled from the consent agenda.

Mr. Knight moved to approve what remained of the consent agenda. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Scala explained the applicant wanted to defer item 2 until the September meeting.

Mr. Hogg moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Mr. Wall seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-08-01
5th Street SE
Side Street to Pedestrian Mall
MMM Design Group, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, owner
Replace sidewalk and utility improvements**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The City proposes to upgrade 5th Street SE between the old A&N store and Water Street by replacing the concrete sidewalks with brick and making utility and lighting improvements. The designer proposes to install three streetlights at the intersection of Water Street; this proposal is consistent with what has been done at the intersection of 3rd and Market.

Mr. Chris McKnight, of MMM Design Group, was present but had nothing to add.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant had done photometrics. Mr. McKnight confirmed they had.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight thought this was very much in keeping with the Guidelines and in keeping with the work which had been done on the Mall and on the side streets. He stated he could support this as submitted.

Mr. Osteen stated he did not like the result but he understood the logic to get there. He had no compelling reason to do something different.

Mr. Hogg thought there had been some thought that new parts of the Mall were distinguished by a different light fixture while the original part of the Mall had its particular light fixture.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements, moved to find that the proposed changes 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. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion passed, 7-1; Mr. Adams voted against.

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-08-03
301 5th Street SW
Tax Map 29 Parcel 104
Michael McMahon, Applicant
Rehabilitation**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. 301 5th Street SW was built before 1876 and is an Individually Protected Property. A one-story frame rear wing was added in 1907; a second-story was added to that before 1920. The rear wing was replaced with a one-story cinder block wing. The applicant proposes to rehabilitate the front porch by replacing or repairing deteriorated elements; rebuild the chimneys above the roof line; replace the roof; repair the rear brick wall; and regrade the yards and redesign site walls. The applicant is seeking approval to change the metal railing to new wood columns and railing. He also wants to replace the front door with a one light glass panel door and install recessed lighting in the ceiling. The applicant wants to restore two sidelights which were infilled. The applicant wants to replace both chimneys above the roof line, making them the same height; the historic survey confirms both originally may have been built to the same height. He proposes replacing the roof with standing seam tin painted silver as it is now. A planting bed, level with the sidewalk, is proposed to go between the City sidewalk and a proposed new stone wall with natural stone veneer to be 4 feet tall. The applicant's plans to rehabilitate the house are good except for a few concerns. The Board should comment on the new porch design and proposed recessed porch lighting; Staff thinks there may be a better alternative. A 4 foot wall would block the lower portion of the house from view.

Mr. Michael McMahon had nothing to add to Staff's presentation.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that this was about maintenance and stability issues. Mr. McMahon confirmed that it was for now. He stated he did not want to do design changes at this time other than to the front porch.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the applicant would reuse the current chimney bricks. Mr. McMahon stated he would save them; however, for structural reasons, new bricks would be used for the chimneys. He stated there were other brick repairs throughout the structure and the old bricks would be used for that.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wished the porch plan would have come before the Board before completion. He thought the rest of the work on the house seemed fine.

Mr. Knight agreed that what had been proposed for the house was appropriate. He found the work being done on the site to be less thought through. He expressed concern about moving the wall back three or four feet from the street.

Mr. Wolf thought that the porch addition had been done quite well. He thought the other issues the applicant was attending to were being addressed in an appropriate manner with the Guidelines. He agreed with Mr. Knight about the wall.

Mr. Wall thought what was done with the porch was fine. He thought the other things suggested for the house seemed sound, but the wall needed a lot of thought. He felt the moat was an integral feature. He suggested the applicant work to find a solution that preserved the moat.

Mr. Wolf, 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 changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following conditions: that the detail and resolution for the site retaining wall at the sidewalk as well as the restoration of the wall at the areaway and the detail for the new front door all be brought back to the BAR for approval and that the other

work included in the proposal is approved as submitted. Ms. Schoenthal seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-08-08
503 West Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcel 175
Bud Treakle, Applicant/The Sutton Group, LLC, owner
Partial demolition**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Paxton Place, built in 1824, is a contributing Federal-style structure in the Downtown ADC district. The applicant is seeking after-the-fact approval for a partial demolition of two original brick chimneys and the connecting brick curtain wall that were located on the west side of the building. Staff found no valid reason to remove the character defining elements of the building without approval. Staff recommends denial of the request and recommends that the applicant should submit to the Board details of how the demolished portion will be rebuilt. This was a significant part of this building.

Mr. Bud Treakle, manager of the LLC which owns the structure, provided the Board a study which had been prepared by Dunbar Milby. He stated they had been confronted with an emergency and in retrospect he realized there were procedures that should have been followed.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know how long the building had been owned by the Sutton Group. Mr. Treakle stated it had been bought in 2000 or 2001.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Aaron Weunsch, of 338 Monticello Road, stated this was one of a handful of Federal-style row houses left in the city and, until recently, one of the better preserved.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought this was not an appropriate change. These chimneys and chimney wall were character defining features of the building.

Ms. Brennan appreciated Mr. Treakle's concerns about safety; however, she suspected there was an awareness that the building was in an historic district. She stated she could not support this application.

Mr. Knight stated nothing in the Guidelines and nothing that the Board says or does is in any way contraindicating or discouraging maintenance even in the case of an emergency. However, he thought this went well beyond maintenance.

Mr. Wolf thought that ten years of ownership gave ample opportunity to understand a maintenance problem of the chimneys so it could be addressed in a way that was not as extreme. He stated he would not have supported this if it had been a proposal which had not been undertaken. He thought any motion should require it to be reconstructed to match the original character and using bricks that can be salvaged from whatever demolition occurred and then, if that is not possible, bricks that match as closely as possible.

Mr. Osteen thought the structural engineer's report showed there was still a substantial problem due to moldy brick, moisture damage, and masonry deterioration. He thought additional work should be done to repair the wall below roof level; this would be a convenient time to rebuild the chimneys.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the partial demolition does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted; the applicant must submit an application to the BAR to rebuild the demolished portion of the chimneys and the brick skirt wall that demonstrate both the material as well as the size, shape, and proportion of the chimneys which should attempt to match, as closely as possible, the existing that was removed. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-08-05
420 Park Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 120
Edward Bain, Jr., Applicant
Replace window sashes**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The McCue Martin house, located in the North Downtown ADC District, was constructed in Colonial Victorian Revival style in around 1901-1902. The applicant requests permission to replace all 31 window sashes, mainly

for energy efficiency. The window frames will remain and will not be covered. Proposed replacement sashes are the Andersen 400 Series, Fibrex material with Terratone finish to be painted brown to match the existing frames. All windows will be one over one. However, two existing windows that appear to be original with two over two will remain two over two. The BAR previously approved the use of Fibrex material at 534 Park Street.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if the existing two over two windows were an anomaly or if the one over one windows had also originally been two over two. Ms. Scala did not know.

Mr. Edward Bain, Jr., explained the two over two windows were on an addition. He stated the windows had been one over one since he began occupying it in 1970.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if a bronze spacer could be used rather than a silver one. The window manufacturer stated he could only get silver.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know the condition of the windows. Mr. Bain stated there were only two windows with any damage.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf thought this was a challenging application. He thought the starting point would be the Guidelines.

Ms. Brennan expressed concern that the windows may be original and that there was not a lot of deterioration or damage to them to warrant full replacement.

Mr. Wall also expressed concern about replacement since they looked to be in wonderful shape.

Mr. Hogg was not sure that the change in this case would be perceptible.

Mr. Wolf thought the dark color would mitigate loss of detail or any additional detail that might show up with the addition of the frame.

Ms. Brennan stated she was leaning against supporting this because she was concerned about voting for a full replacement of all original windows when their deteriorated condition does not seem to warrant replacement.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed window sash replacements satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, in particular in relation to the discussion about the particular circumstances of this window and the configuration and details of the existing window and the proposed window, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Knight wanted to know if Mr. Hogg wanted to include anything in the motion about suggestions about the screen channel or the color of the spacer bar. Mr. Hogg amended his motion to include that they would ask the applicant to investigate, but not make the approval contingent upon, the removal of the screen track and the use of a dark spacer rather than the bright aluminum spacer. Mr. Knight accepted the amendment. The motion passed, 5-3; Ms. Schoenthal, Ms. Brennan, and Mr. Wall voted against.

**G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-08-02
222 South Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 95
Mike Stoneking, Applicant/Blue Moon Fund, owner
Terrace addition and garden**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Burgess Brooks house was built in 1844. The current proposal is to create a basement level terrace to serve an existing conference room which is currently below grade in the rear of the building. Board-formed concrete walls will retain the existing grade around the terrace. Behind the terrace will be a demonstration garden and bioretention zone. The proposed rear changes extend the contemporary site design that was begun in the front yard. The neighbor to the south expressed concerns regarding drainage and the proposed Hollywood driveway.

Ms. Brennan left the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

Mr. Wolf noted for the record that his wife works for the landscape architecture firm which was presenting on this. He did not feel this would be a conflict.

Mr. Mike Stoneking stated they were eliminating the two track driveway. He added Timmons Group had been retained to do the site plan.

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. Hogg thought this was a substantial reduction in the effect on the character of the back of the property. He thought it was a perfectly handsome proposal.

Mr. Osteen thought it was a great design.

Mr. Wolf, 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 rear entrance and landscaping 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. Mr. Wall seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 09-08-06

119 5th Street SE

Tax Map 28 Parcel 51B

Stephen van Storch, Applicant

Replace glass windows

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is the former Grand Piano and Furniture store, constructed in 1976, with major renovations in 2003. The applicant proposes to install two retracting aluminum and glass garage doors on the interior of two existing windows that face East Water Street. The applicant proposes to remove glass panes from the existing windows leaving the black window frames intact.

Mr. Stephen van Storch was present on behalf of the restaurant owner. He reminded the Board the original building had been a completely windowless cinder block box.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if there was a functional overhead door that could break into the segments. Mr. van Storch stated they had tried to find one.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf thought this was a reasonable proposal. He liked the differentiation of material. He thought anything gained by opening this was a positive result in adding to street life.

Ms. Schoenthal agreed with Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Wall liked the idea. However, he did not like the fact that the garage door did not line up with what was there.

Mr. Osteen thought this was acceptable.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed window modifications 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. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Hogg stated he would not support this because it had gone from a solid wall to a huge void. The motion passed, 5-2; Mr. Hogg and Mr. Wall voted against.

**I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-08-07
608 Ridge Street
Tax Map 29 Parcel 264
City of Charlottesville, owner
Rehabilitation**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The bungalow-style house on this property was built about 1922. This project involves architectural and engineering students of the University of Virginia actively involved in the design and process of rehabilitating an historic building with elements of sustainable design. The proposal is to remove the exterior stucco and exterior sheathing back to the studs, remove the wood windows and doors and replace them, remove the existing standing seam metal roof and replace it, remove one of the two existing chimneys. The replacement windows are Pella aluminum clad wood with an historic muntin. The applicant proposes removing the

brick infill on the front porch as well as the existing porch flooring and the tongue and groove beadboard ceiling. They want to replace the roof shingle awning on the south side with a tin material to match the roof. Staff feels the proposal has some positive points; however, the project is overly aggressive as it is removing and replacing rather than repairing all the exterior historic fabric.

Mr. John Quale provided the Board with additional images of the stucco as well as additional documentation. He also provided the Board with paint samples. He clarified that they would not replace the beadboard unless they absolutely needed to.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated the documentation given out by the applicant seemed to suggest that the stucco repair was driven by the window work, but the entire south elevation was marked for removal. He wanted to know why the applicant wouldn't just replace the sashes. Mr. Quale stated there was water damage to the frame of many of the windows.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know if people from the preservation program were working with the applicant. Mr. Quale stated they had a graduate student in Architectural History and some faculty helping as well.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what the applicant would do if clapboard siding was found under the stucco. Mr. Quale stated they would probably want to replace it with clapboard.

Mr. Hogg felt it would help the conversation if the applicant did a few more probes of the structure from the outside.

Mr. Hogg thought the idea of doing a historic house as a model for green and sustainable technology was great. However, his concern was that, other than the interior finishes, nothing historic was left on this house.

Mr. Wolf thought the hope would be to strike a balance between demonstration of sustainable and smart building techniques and restoration and some level of preservation.

Mr. Hogg wondered if there wasn't too much being done with the house in terms of the aspirations.

Ms. Schoenthal did not find compelling evidence for an intervention of this scope at this time. She thought more investigation was needed.

Mr. Hogg stated he had rarely seen a situation that required 100 percent frame replacement of a house.

Mr. Quale stated he had expected to come before the Board for a Preliminary Discussion instead of a Certificate of Appropriateness. He requested a deferral.

Mr. Knight moved they accept the applicant's request for deferral. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

K. Other Business

1. Request for Comments on McGuffey School National Register Nomination Report (Individual Listing)

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The McGuffey School is currently in the National Register district downtown. A person who works at McGuffey voluntarily wrote the nomination to have this designated individually because he thought it was a significant building. An individual listing would indicate the building has a greater significance than just being a contributing building in a district.

Mr. Wolf thought this was a significant structure and an important piece of the Downtown fabric. He stated he would wholeheartedly support the application.

Mr. Hogg moved to enthusiastically endorse the nomination of the McGuffey School. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

L. Adjournment

Mr. Hogg moved to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously without a second whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:05 p.m.