

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
September 15, 2009  
Minutes**

**Present:**

Fred Wolf, Chair  
Syd Knight, Vice Chair  
Brian Hogg (arrives 5:07)  
William Adams  
Michael Osteen  
Eryn Brennan

**Not Present:**

Amy Gardner  
James Wall  
Rebecca Schoenthal

**Also Present:**

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:06 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. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 09-09-05  
222 South Street  
Tax Map 28 Parcel 95  
Mike Stoneking, Applicant/ Blue Moon Fund, owner  
Sculpture/fountain in front yard

Mr. Wolf noted item 1 had been removed from the agenda.

**Mr. Osteen moved approval of the consent agenda. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).**

Mr. Hogg joined the meeting.

**C. As Built Discussion**

**BAR 06-04-08  
202 2nd Street NW  
Tax Map 33 Parcel 175  
Limehouse Architects, Applicant/Lu Mei Chang, Owner  
Exterior addition and renovations**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This item had been pulled from the August consent agenda for discussion; however, the applicant had requested a deferral until the September meeting. The windows in the addition were approved as wood casement windows with exterior applied muntins. However, double hung windows with muntin bars between the planes of glass were installed. The applicant provided three options, all of which meet the Guidelines. Staff then found there were other, more significant, details that had been built incorrectly. The ground floor opening for the brick storefront was not constructed as wide as depicted in the approved elevation, nor is it centered.

Mr. Gate Pratt was present with Elaine Butcher. Mr. Pratt explained to the Board the situation had been brought about because of contractor troubles. The original contractor did not faithfully perform his duties and left the building halfway constructed. A second contractor was hired to finish the building and correct problems created by the first contractor with what remained of the budget.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if signage and awnings would be installed. Mr. Pratt stated they would at some point.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what had happened to the recessed stacked bond brick skirt below the storefront. Mr. Pratt did not know.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg felt the Board should ask themselves if they would have approved this facade if it had been presented as a proposal rather than something which had been executed. He stated he would not have because the proportions and the relationship of the elements on the facade are such that it does not have any resemblance to the buildings surrounding it. Mr. Hogg stated he felt sorry for the owners who were mistreated and not properly represented in the construction process. He also stated the facade could not have gone up in one day and it should not have gotten this far with this many mistakes. Mr. Hogg did not think the existing condition was appropriate.

Mr. Wolf stated he was sympathetic to the owner. He thought the contractor had made an absolute mess of something that should have been very simple. He stated the sum of the parts created something which did not live up to the idiosyncratic curiosities of

historic buildings. Mr. Wolf expressed concern about the precedent of allowing something like this retroactively because it was too late or because of financial concerns when the Board spent time reviewing and approving it in a certain way.

Mr. Knight stated the precedent issue alone was enough to require the Board to deny the application. He expressed sympathy for the owners also. However, he felt the City should not shoulder the burden of accepting something that was built wrongly by somebody else. He stated it just looked like a mistake, not an idiosyncrasy. He concurred with Mr. Hogg, noting that this proposal would not have been approved originally.

Mr. Osteen concurred with his colleagues. He wondered if the applicant should defer.

Mr. Hogg stated the applicant should revisit the relationship between the first and second floor openings in the brick facade.

Mr. Pratt wanted to know what other items the Board wanted worked on.

Mr. Wolf thought the alignment on the left edge with the window and the storefront was very, very significant.

Mr. Hogg thought the applicant should come back with an accurately measured elevation of the existing condition and showing how large the proposed signs are and where the proposed awnings would go.

Mr. Pratt thought the next best step would be to come back before the Board in a month. Mr. Pratt requested a deferral.

**Mr. Knight moved to accept the request for deferral. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 09-09-01**

**410 Altamont Circle**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 124**

**John Anderson Construction, Applicant/Charles E. Johnston, owner**

**Add one-story addition with basement**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property is a contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC district and is a Colonial Revival style brick building constructed around 1915. The applicant seeks approval for a one-story addition with basement. The

applicant provided three options for materials; the owner prefers option 1. The roof would be prepainted metal in a gray color. All options propose Marvin wood double hung windows to match the existing in style and color and painted wood railings on the handicap ramp. The applicant would like to receive the Board's comments and take those suggestions to the owner before coming back with a final plan.

Mr. John Anderson had nothing to add to the staff report.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant planned to bury the stair window that sits up a little high. Mr. Anderson explained that was stained glass and he would like to leave it exposed.

Mr. Adams sought clarification that the trees on the side would remain in place. Mr. Anderson explained the trees closest to the house would have to go; however, the trees in the planting bed around the fence would stay.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for option 1. He wanted to see drawings with additional information the Board could fall back on with respect to dimensions and getting the soldier course represented correctly. He stated in terms of massing, window placement, and the materials in general, he could support and approve it.

Mr. Adams thought the mass and scale of the addition was all right but there was a wealth of things to address in terms of the details and how it was developed.

Mr. Knight agreed generally with option A, but could support option B. He stated he would have difficulty with the embossed concrete. He thought the slant of the ramp would look awkward. He stated he could support this with the additional detail that had been requested.

Mr. Osteen also wanted additional information. He expressed concern about the roof.

Mr. Adams suggested a hedge screen bury the ramp.

Mr. Anderson stated that Zoning had asked that he hear from the Board of Architectural Review regarding the setback. Mr. Wolf thought keeping it rectilinear was better.

Mr. Wolf stated the Board would encourage the applicant to handle the ramp differently. He also stated they would need a roof plan and a building section showing the addition relative to the original house. He also asked for a wall section.

Mr. Anderson asked for a deferral.

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

- E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
**BAR 09-09-02**  
**University Ave. & 14th Street NW**  
**Tax Map 9 Parcel 160**  
**Phi Eta Sigma Honor Society, Applicant/Buckingham Branch Railroad,**  
**Owner**  
**Construct a brick wall with stained-glass mosaic windows**

Staff withdrew this item from the agenda at the request of the property owner.

- F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
**BAR 09-07-06**  
**219 14th Street NW**  
**Tax Map 9 Parcel 66**  
**Dinsmore LLC, Applicant**  
**New construction-Multi-family apartments**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a non-contributing structure which would be removed. The applicant proposes a new contemporary four-story apartment building with elements of sustainable design for the site. The building, which fronts on both 14th and 15th Streets is separated into two parts with a connecting bridge. Proposed materials for the facade include painted scored stucco in three colors and painted fiber cement siding and trim. Metal clad wood windows in prefinished colors are proposed. The site plan as submitted is not detailed enough to approve.

Mr. Ben Thompson was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated the building had undergone several design modifications with regard to the site plan and elevations. Planters had been introduced to the east and west sides of the building to provide a more urban feel. The stair tower had been brought to 14th Street.

## QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

## QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know how high the stucco planter was on the east elevation at the pedestrian level. Mr. Thompson stated it varied, but at its highest point, it was about five feet.

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated he had been generally supportive of this project when it was first before the Board and he remained generally supportive of it. He appreciated that the revisions addressed some of the concerns he had expressed earlier. He thought the massing and scale were appropriate. Mr. Hogg suggested the 14th Street planter be brought down one course of rustication. He expressed concern that the entrance to the building was not substantial enough to relate to the size.

Mr. Osteen expressed a preference for the more monolithic rear facade. He appreciated the idea of the entrance coming forward on the front, but he liked the previous arrangement of the three masses and lamented losing that. He thought too much had been crammed into the plan.

Ms. Brennan expressed concern about parking right on the street front. She suggested stepping down the planter, get more plantings, and eliminate the parking altogether. She expressed a preference for the previous color scheme. She stated she liked the variation in planes which kept it visually interesting while breaking the mass. She expressed support for the scale, overall mass, and articulation of the elevations.

Mr. Knight agreed with most of the comments that had been made by his colleagues. He expressed concern about the site. He agreed the planter should be lowered and the two parking spaces on 15th Street should be removed. He stated the 15th Street entrance looked applied onto the facade and he thought more attention there would be helpful.

Mr. Adams thought the large monoslope roof kicked up the mass on the north elevation. He thought it added a lot of looming quality to the building. He thought there were a lot of architecturally clean, lined up things going on as well as a nice break up of the masses. Mr. Adams thought it was going in the right direction.

Mr. Wolf stated he supported a lot of things his colleagues had been said. He stated he was in favor of the fourth color the applicant had gotten rid of. He thought the site plan and the issues raised by the Board would have to come back. He thought the project needed some minor tweaking but he was still in support of its general massing, character, and disposition.

Mr. Wolf sought the opinion of his colleagues as to whether partial qualified approval would be appropriate as opposed to deferral. Mr. Hogg thought that would be fine. Ms. Brennan suggested it come back with landscaping, color scheme, and entrance facades on both 14th and 15th. Mr. Hogg asked for consideration of the roof on the larger section of the building to address the concerns of Mr. Adams and Mr. Wolf; Mr. Wolf thought this should be studied. Mr. Osteen asked that consideration be given about the parking spaces on 15th Street.

**Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Site Design, moved to find that the proposed new building satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modifications and requests for additional information and design work: that a site plan detailing the landscape and paving materials be submitted; that the relationship of the entrance pavilion and the residential building be restudied to preserve a setback between the two; that the planter at the northeast corner of the site be lowered to better relate to the topography; that on 15th Street the southern two parking spaces be restudied and the configuration of the parking at the east end of the south side of the building be revisited; that the entrance to the 15th Street building be restudied to make it more substantial in keeping with the mass of the building; that the paint scheme revert back to the earlier ideas of four colors; that consideration be given to modifying the north edge of the roof on the 15th Street building to try to mitigate the bulk of the structure -- but that is more of a study than a required revision to the design. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

**G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 09-09-03  
521, 523, 529 Ridge Street and 529 Cherry Ave  
Tax Map 29 Parcels 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 157  
Southern Development, Applicant/ Cherry Avenue Investments, LLC  
New construction-Mixed-use**

Mr. Adams recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board on 21 July for a preliminary discussion. On 9 September, the Planning Commission met and recommended approval of the Planned Unit Development with proffers. The current owner seeks approval for construction of a mixed use development. The existing lots which front on Ridge Street are part of the Ridge Street ADC district. This plan was submitted as part of the PUD approval and does not have the same detailed information the BAR would normally receive; therefore, the BAR may approve the plan in concept but should require that detailed drawings including final architectural design, materials, and site design shall be submitted for final COA.

Mr. Kirk Train, of Train and Partners Architects, was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Train stated they had worked on a number of parts of the project based on further design development and further comments that were received from the BAR and Planning Commission. He provided the members with photos and then gave a brief presentation of the photos.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that this was not another preliminary discussion. Ms. Scala stated it was submitted as a final. Mr. Wolf did not think a Certificate of Appropriateness could be granted prior to the rezoning. Ms. Scala thought this should perhaps be another preliminary discussion. Ms. Brennan agreed they could provide comments to the applicant but could not approve or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness at this time.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen stated he liked the project and liked the first big office mass; however, he expressed concern about the corner where the uppermost level breaks down to allow the turn.

Mr. Wolf thought the changes in the massing on Cherry as well as the way the applicant handled the way it turned the corner and how the two pieces relate to one another at the corner, were really successful. He found the graphics and the scale and the way the applicant addressed the more conventional housing forms on Ridge and allowed those to morph and start to bring the language through that could help turn the corner and participate with the pieces on Cherry was really successful. He stated he was in very

strong support of the project. He did think there was more information to come back. He thought the addition of the median, from the standpoint of grounding that intersection and giving a counter piece to the existing median on the other side, was a strong move.

Mr. Hogg stated he was much less troubled by the Cherry Avenue building than were Mr. Osteen and Mr. Wolf. He expressed concern that the chimneys looked too small.

Mr. Knight thought this was a great project. He stated he could support the overall massing and layout of the project as being in conformance with the Guidelines. He asked that the applicant look at the corner piece.

Ms. Brennan found the roof to be problematic. She thought it competed too much with the Ridge Street properties.

Mr. Train requested deferral.

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

Mr. Wolf called for a brief break, whereupon the meeting stood recessed at 7:32 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

**H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 09-09-04  
1106-1112 West Main Street  
Tax Map 10 Parcel 64  
Atwood Architects, Applicant/ John Bartelt, owner  
Demolition**

Mr. Hogg recused himself from this matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Sycamore House is a contributing property in the West Main Street ADC District. The two-story brick building was built in either 1935 or 1947. The applicant is seeking permission to demolish Sycamore House. The preliminary plans did not propose demolition, but encapsulated the building so not much would be left. The building does not have any significant architectural features but is in good shape. There are few historic buildings left along West Main Street.

Mr. Mark Kestner, of Atwood Architects, stated there were difficult design and economic challenges. Since the last discussion in 2007, a number of variables regarding the project have changed including a significant zoning change which allows more height and density. Mr. Kestner stated his firm had asked Mr. Don Swofford to help in the analysis of the existing Sycamore House building.

Mr. Swofford gave a history of the house and told of its development potential. He stated the building lost all of its historic character in its renovation of 1982. He stated encapsulating the building was not feasible.

#### 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:

Ms. Brennan appreciated the very long analysis and stated it showed the applicant had put a lot of consideration into this. She noted hearing Mr. Atwood refer to this as a great iconic building of Charlottesville. She stated the Board could not consider the economic feasibility. She also thought that was not a relevant argument for demolition. She stated the burden was not on the building to fit into a design scheme, but rather the design scheme to fit into a historic building. She cited the criterion of whether it served a public purpose to demolish the building; she did not think this did. While the building was not nationally historic, it was historic on a local level. She thought it had a long social history. The importance of this building was not tied to its architectural detailing or style, but rather the social and cultural history it contributed to the West Main Street landscape. She stated she could not support this proposal.

Mr. Knight thought demolition requests were the hardest things that come before the Board. He thought there was a great deal of sentimentality surrounding this building. He agreed with much of what Ms. Brennan said, but leaned toward approval of the request.

Mr. Wolf thought there was argument in the Guidelines to support demolition of this piece. He expressed concern about maintaining this building as a placeholder. He noted the structural report did not suggest demo, but this was an unremarkable building.

Mr. Osteen agreed with most of what had been said. He thought the encapsulation idea was horrible. He stated there was not enough to try to save.

Mr. Adams stated the building's character had eroded. He thought demolition may be appropriate in this case.

Ms. Brennan noted for the record that this building shouldn't be punished for the loss of the streetscape that happened prior. She also stated it shouldn't be a hold out, but she thought industrial structures like this building were an opportunity to build on top of, around, and with.

**Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, moved to approve the request for demolition of 1106-1112 West Main Street, finding that it does satisfy the BAR's criteria for demolition. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion passed, 4-1-1; Ms. Brennan voted against and Mr. Hogg recused himself from the matter.**

**I. Preliminary Discussion  
BAR 09-09-06  
600 East Water Street  
Tax Map 53 Parcel 162.1  
Water Tower LLC, Applicant  
New construction-Mixed use condominiums**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is proposing new construction of a five-story mixed use condominium building. The proposed building contains 18 parking spaces on the basement level, and an additional two surface parking spaces at the east end of the site. The first floor will be commercial retail, floors two through five are residential with several of the fourth floor residences being two-story townhouse units with large rooftop terraces at the fifth floor level. Proposed materials are orange colored standard sized brick on the four-story mass fronting on Water Street and standard sized red brick are proposed for the five story mass located along the railroad side of the building. The garage entrance has been better located at the end of the building. The proposed doors and windows would enliven the streetscape.

Ms. Emily Novey, of Daggett & Grigg Architects, stated some changes had been submitted: The stair was moved based on potential buyers' interest. The pilaster had been added to help the reinforce the warehouse look. Ms. Novey asked the Board to comment on the metal cornice or canopy at the fourth floor.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Hogg thought the elevation presented at the meeting was a significant step backwards. He stated the changes made in this revision did nothing to enhance the design of the building or its relationship to the street. He stated the first submission was nicely defined. He stated the balconies were humungous and the cornice was not substantial enough to terminate the facade. The penthouse lost a lot of its lightness and interest. He thought moving the stair up the hill was a nice idea. He thought the balconies on the narrow end were out of proportion to the building. Mr. Hogg thought the combination of the color and texture of the brick did not belong.

Mr. Adams liked this version better; it had a cleanness to it and a strength that didn't rely on a lot of applied stuff. He thought this proposal worked better on the streetscape. He thought the first submittal was the direction the applicant should have pursued. Mr. Adams expressed concern about the orange brick.

Mr. Wolf stated he was not as concerned about the brick color and liked the contrast. He also expressed a preference for the earlier submittal. He thought the application of the cornice was odd.

Mr. Hogg thought the facade was not tall enough to have as many window types as are shown in the revised facade.

Mr. Knight liked the fact that the submittal paid homage to the Norcross building and the King Warehouse. He thought the pedestrian experience would be much improved. He thought the rustication seemed a little too decorative.

Ms. Brennan agreed with the comments that had been made about the elevation shown in the original submission. She suggested more attention be paid to the east elevation. She suggested the mass be broken up more in any way possible.

Mr. Hogg suggested the applicant consider a canopy which appeared to be suspended rather than something which was cantilevered.

Mr. Wolf stated he would recuse himself from items J and K.

**J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 09-04-09  
100, 102, 104 Oakhurst Circle & 1616 JPA  
Wolf Ackerman Design, Applicant/Tenth & Main LLC, Owner  
New construction**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. These are final details for this project. New construction and rehabilitation were approved at the May meeting with the stipulation that certain pieces of the project would come back for BAR approval.

Mr. Dave Ackerman provided the Board with some supplemental materials as well as samples.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the wooden slats projected beyond the wall behind. Mr. Ackerman stated they did not. He also stated all the exterior porch pieces were steel in their structural members.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams thought the reworking of the front entry and the elevator were very successful. He expressed a preference for operable windows.

Mr. Hogg did not see the relationship between the two parts as troubling. He did not find the height to be overpowering in relation to the house.

Mr. Knight thought the project was in keeping with a neighboring house.

Ms. Brennan thought the elevator shaft was a great solution.

Mr. Osteen thought a lot of positive changes had been made. He appreciated the screening of the garage lights.

**Mr. Osteen, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the ADC District Design Guidelines for New Construction and Site Design, moved to find that the proposed redesigns and photometrics for the new apartment construction 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. The motion passed, 5-0-1; Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter.**

**K. 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  
Amendment to approved design**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board in April, at which time the project for an apartment building was approved as submitted. The applicant proposes to change the layout of the apartments from eight two-story, four-bedroom units to two two-story and six one-story to create space for two balconies that overlook the church parking lot. This would change the circulation patterns within the building thereby changing door and window placements.

Mr. Kurt Wassenaar stated it was with great reluctance that this came back to the Board. The Gordon Avenue facade was not touched. The owner asked that there not be any bedrooms immediately adjacent to public walkways or common spaces for noise and security reasons.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were no questions from the public.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the applicant had gone forward with seeking approvals from the church. Mr. Wassenaar stated they were working with Sandy Wilcox from the church and the modifications had been approved by the church.

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the 17th Street facade was the most visible change due to the roof drain. Mr. Wassenaar confirmed that.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Osteen thought the 17th Street change was appropriate. He expressed concern about how the balconies would impact the church.

Mr. Hogg expressed concern about the impact of the balconies on the daycare center also.

Mr. Knight stated they should consider whether the changes met the Guidelines and whether the application would have met the Guidelines if it had been originally presented this way. He could not find anything in the Guidelines to prevent him from approving this given these changes.

**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 new building details 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. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion passed, 3-2-1; Mr. Adams and Mr. Hogg voted against while Mr. Wolf had recused himself from the matter.**

**L. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

There were no matters from the public.

**M. Other Business**

Mr. Wolf reminded the Board of their upcoming work session.

**N. Adjournment**

Mr. Wolf noted the only item still on the agenda was adjournment. **Mr. Hogg so moved. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 9:41 p.m.**