

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
January 19, 2010
Minutes

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Brian Hogg (arrived at 5:11 p.m.)
William Adams (arrived at 5:32 p.m.)
Michael Osteen
Eryn Brennan
Rebecca Schoenthal
H. Fairfax Ayres (arrived at 5:14 p.m.)

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

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

Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

Mr. Wolf announced that the item for 1314 Rugby Road had been withdrawn from the agenda.

Consent Agenda

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

Projects in Non-compliance

108 2nd Street SW

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant, Oliver Kuttner, said he was concerned with trespassing in this alleyway behind his building. He also had a tenant who needed ramp access. Mr. Kuttner installed a fence with two gates and a ramp in the alley. He had previously come to the Board for approval of a gate; support was expressed for a gate but not as a faux facade. Staff feels a gated barrier is appropriate in this location.

The proposed materials are appropriate. Since this was submitted, Staff received a letter of objection from the abutting owner, Chuck Lewis.

Mr. Hogg joined the meeting at 5:11 p.m.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if there was any indication that the copper backing for the access ramp was still coming or if the applicant had given her any reason why it was left off. Ms. Scala had not been given a reason and she had not pursued it.

Mr. Ayres joined the meeting at 5:14 p.m.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated he had issues with the fence as it is installed. The varied heights of the different components and the structure holding it up serve to draw undue attention to this feature.

Mr. Wolf stated his general reaction was that the ornate level of the gate seemed to be excessive given the utility of the space and what it was trying to do. He thought that this discussion had been before the Board before and it was made clear that additional work needed to be done and brought back to them made him inclined not to support this. He stated it was hard to imagine the applicant could claim ignorance of the Guidelines in this case and generally. From a precedence standpoint he was not happy about supporting something simply because it was done to expedite some other schedule.

Mr. Knight agreed with Mr. Wolf. He stated he could not support this.

Ms. Brennan also could not support this.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, moved to find that the proposed alleyway gates do not satisfy the BAR's criteria or Guidelines and are not compatible with this property or other properties in this district, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Scala informed the Board that the City Attorney was preparing to take 503 West Main and 219-221 West Main to court for the civil penalties. 219 West Main would come before the Board in February. 12th Street Taphouse had partially repainted the sign.

1704 Gordon Avenue

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The last major approval on this was in April, 2009. The applicant is requesting approval of a change in the manufacture and type of brick veneer for the foundation. The proposed brick is Lawrenceville Monticello and Atlantic blend. The applicant states the proposed brick and accent brick is very similar in color and texture to the approved brick. Staff finds the proposed brick and mortar colors appropriate.

Mr. Adams joined the meeting at 5:32 p.m.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, explained the supplier had problems with delivery in the time scale so they wanted to switch manufacturers.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight asked for a comparison display of the approved and proposed brick. The applicant complied.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen expressed concern in general. He was not convinced this job needed a new material.

Mr. Knight stated he shared Mr. Osteen's concerns over the presentation. However, he was inclined to be open to the possibility.

Ms. Schoenthal stated this was not a faux material and she was inclined to support it.

Mr. Adams expressed concern about the details and how it would turn corners.

Ms. Brennan stated that in this particular instance she supported the use of the material but she could respect her colleagues' desire to have more information.

Ms. Brennan, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed new thin brick does satisfy 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. Ms. Schoenthal seconded the motion. Mr. Knight offered a friendly amendment that this approval is conditioned as a technical solution to conditions found in the field and does not necessarily constitute the establishment of precedent for the use of this material and that future applications for use of this material will be considered as they come before the Board. Ms. Brennan and Ms. Schoenthal accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Osteen thought this product would have to be considered after site conditions, but he would not vote for it at this time based on what he had seen. The motion passed, 4-3; Mr. Osteen, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Hogg voted against.

207 14th Street

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This Special Use Permit was before the Board so they could make a recommendation to City Council. The property is a non-contributing structure in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. It was formerly used for 21 residential units. Exterior changes to the building are planned and will come back to the BAR for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness after the SUP is approved. A third floor and roof area with meeting space and two penthouses and roof terrace will be added. There will be valet parking drop off and a small parking area on 15th Street; the existing parking on 14th Street will be replaced with landscaping. The main impact of the hotel will probably be increased vehicular traffic. Staff feels the proposed addition and site work will be an improvement, especially adding landscaping on 14th Street and directing traffic to 15th Street.

Mr. Whit Graves, who was present on behalf of University, LLC, stated the design was in the preliminary stages. He 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 sought clarification of the pedestrian path. Mr. Graves stated there would be a walkway through the front garden area.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought the hotel use was fine for this area. He expressed concern about the preliminary drawings. He thought it was admirable they would remove the parking on 14th Street; however, it seemed like 15th Street still had a lot of hard surface. He thought the extra story was a reasonable thing to propose.

Ms. Brennan supported the additional floor. She commended the reuse of the existing structure.

Mr. Knight reiterated Mr. Hogg's point about the amount of green versus paved material on the 15th Street side. He asked the applicant to make sure the public realm was continuous across the face of the property.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about the loop a car goes on to park in the garage. He suggested there be a dedicated plan for getting people to the garage first. He agreed with Mr. Knight about the public realm.

Ms. Schoenthal stated there was a certain charm in the existing building. She supported the Special Use Permit.

Mr. Wolf expressed his support as well.

Mr. Wolf moved to find that the proposed Special Use Permit to allow a hotel at 207 14th Street NW in an existing building will not have any adverse impact on the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Oliver Kuttner, the applicant for 108 2nd Street SW, arrived during the question phase of this item and apologized to the Board for his late arrival from Lynchburg. He stated he would do whatever the Board wanted.

Preliminary Discussion 1512 East Market Street PUD

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking feedback on a potential planned unit development, Timberlake Place, which would impact the Timberlake Branham property, an Individually Protected Property. The applicant plans to rezone a two acre parcel behind the Timberlake Branham house from R-1S to PUD to create senior-friendly or accessible units for low to moderate income. Additional units would

be mixed generational work force housing. The protected house would be rehabilitated into two market rate apartments. The existing Mary Williams Senior Center would be converted to four accessible apartments. Three additional buildings and associated parking lots are proposed for the rest of the parcel. One of the parking lots is on the protected property. The applicant is seeking guidance on proffers they should offer City Council to help mitigate the impact of their proposal. They are proffering design review on the entire project and a conservation easement to protect the wooded area from future development.

Mr. Chris Murray, with the Jefferson Area Board for Aging, stated they were looking for an intergenerational community and a mixed income community that includes work force housing. He stated they were committed to working with the neighborhood to come up with a project that meets everyone's goals. He stated they would proffer BAR review for the entire project. They would be applying for tax credits for the proposal.

Mr. Charles Henderson, of the Gaines Group, explained the phasing of the project.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Schoenthal wanted to know if the properties could be combined. Ms. Scala explained that in the Ridge and Cherry site, with a PUD over the entire property, the historic district remained where it was designated. The PUD would be a new underlying zoning.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Victoria Dunham, president of the Neighborhood Association, stated the association did not want this kind of density in the neighborhood at all so to accept this they had to lay down some mitigation factors. She stated this could be great for affordable housing. They wanted to be sure the new construction did come under BAR review.

Mr. Pete Sim, of 1600 East Market, stated this proposal seemed a little different and seemed workable. He thought this was the best thing that could happen to the property if what the developer had in mind could happen and the proffers came through to protect what the neighborhood thought they could protect.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to see more information. He thought the site plan was a missed opportunity. He wondered if there was a way to coordinate the design for the three new units with the design of the existing structure.

Mr. Hogg thought this was a really thoughtful proposal in terms of how to put buildings in the backyard of this house.

Mr. Wolf thought there were ways in the modulation of the buildings to recede the buildings.

Mr. Adams thought it would be nice to screen the cars a little bit.

Mr. Wolf moved to recommend that this application for a PUD on tax map 56 parcel 40.4, 1512 East Market Street, be approved with the provision that the applicant's proffers for BAR review of the property adjacent to the Individually Protected Property and new construction be subject to BAR review, that the wooded area immediately to the south and east of the property is subject to a conservation easement or some other legally binding requirement that protects and preserves that portion of the landscape. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

Other Business

2010 ADC Design Guideline Review Process

Ms. Scala explained this was the year that the five year update needed to be done on the Guidelines. She suggested the Board members review half of the Guidelines for discussion before the February meeting and the second half for the March meeting. A subcommittee will be appointed in April to review them.

Mr. Hogg moved to nominate Mr. Wolf as Chair. Ms. Brennan seconded the nomination. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Wolf abstained from voting.

Ms. Brennan nominated Mr. Knight for Vice-Chair. Mr. Wolf seconded the nomination. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Mr. Knight abstained from voting.

Mr. Hogg moved to adjourn. Mr. Wolf declared the meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.