

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
February 16, 2010
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Brian Hogg
William Adams
Michael Osteen
Eryn Brennan

Not Present:

Rebecca Schoenthal
H. Fairfax Ayres

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:18 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

Minutes – June 16, 2009

Mr. Wolf stated the minutes had not been distributed so there were no items for the consent agenda.

C. Projects in Non-Compliance (status report)

Ms. Scala had nothing to add to the projects in non-compliance.

D. Previously Considered Items

- 1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (SUP Discussed at December meeting)
BAR 10-02-02
632 Preston Place
Tax Map 5 Parcel 124
Joan R. Berndt LLC
Parking and landscape modifications for boarding house**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. On February 1, City Council approved the Special Use Permit with conditions clarifying how many parking spots should be required on the site. The determination was for four tenant vehicles on site and one additional temporary spot would be allowed for a visitor. The applicant submitted an amended site plan showing four tenant spaces and one temporary visitor space. Some paving will be removed from in front of the house and also on the south property line. They added a bicycle rack to the rear yard as recommended by the Board. The Board should consider if the proposed parking configuration and landscaping meets the intent of its previous recommendations.

Ms. Cheri Lewis was present on behalf of the applicant. She reminded the Board of the December meeting when they had found there were no adverse affects on the Historic District. Ms. Lewis stated the applicants were active preservationists. She reminded the Board this property had been vacant for the last three years. The plan which would be shown to the Board includes City Council's approval for four parking spaces plus a visitor's space as well as an attractive thematic plan for revised front yard that meets the Board's requirement to present a typical residential front yard look commensurate with the other properties in the neighborhood. She stated the plan met the specific design guidelines in that all large trees on the property and current plantings are maintained, all plantings are compatible with what is currently found in the neighborhood, and all of the plantings are indigenous to this area, and the parking is screened through the use of various plantings.

Mr. David Kariel stated they would be putting in Skip Laurel and Red Holly. They were considering Inkberry or Nandina for the front yard because of their shallow root systems.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Dick Crozier, of 624 Preston Place, asked that the applicant consider replacing the Flotinia which had died.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if there was edging between the beds and the gravel. Mr. Kariel stated probably not; there was, currently, a brick edging at the front which would remain.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the applicant had scrutinized the property in relation to Section 34-972, a relatively new section which require no parking in the front yard. Mr. Kariel stated he was not familiar with that section. Mr. Kariel explained there was no physical way to put four parking spaces on the side yard.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen stated the big issue for him was trying to reduce the impact of the gravel surface of this property and in this neighborhood. His perspective was that 55 percent of the front yard was currently paved and Code now required less than 25 percent to be paved. He suggested the paving in the front yard could be reduced by half.

Mr. Wolf expressed his support for Mr. Osteen's comments. He felt this proposal didn't hit the spirit of the Board's previous comments. He suggested all of the parking be limited to the left side of the walk and adjacent to the drive; this would create more of a traditional yard that could be seen as a layer in the entry sequence.

Mr. Hogg thought the huge turnaround area created additional parking spaces and was excessive.

Mr. Knight agreed with the comments that had been made about the amount of parking and the amount of pavement. He saw room for improvement in the establishment of some sort of form to the landscape other than the parking.

Ms. Lewis asked for a deferral. She also asked if the applicants could solicit comments from Board members on renderings. Mr. Wolf stated all members were open to informal feedback to help expedite the process.

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

- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Discussed at December meeting)
BAR 09-12-06
219 W. Main Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 272
Kathy Galvin, Galvin Architects
Joe H. Gieck, Trust, Owner
Reconstruct storefront**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Carter Bennett building, better known as the Victory Shoe Store, was built in 1921. The demolished storefront of black glass with curved clear glass showcase windows dated to 1947. At the December meeting, the after the fact application to remove the storefront was denied. The Board also accepted the applicant's request for deferral of an application to reconstruct the storefront, telling the applicant the storefront should either be

replaced as it was or, if the applicant wanted to do something different, he should do more research on the 1921 appearance. The applicant has conducted additional research on the 1921 storefront design and has produced accurate, carefully dimensioned drawings. The proposal shows painted wood bulkhead and trim with quarter-inch tempered glass. One difference between the proposal and the 1921 storefront design is the depth of the doorway location. The proposal shows a 5 foot depth; the 1921 version was 7 feet, 7 inches deep while the demolished version was 13 feet, 4 1/2 inches. The building official determined the proposed entrance meets handicapped accessibility requirements.

Ms. Kathy Galvin provided the Board with pictures.

Ms. Ashley Cooper, of Cooper Planning, apologized to the Board members and City Staff and to the public. She stated this was an unfortunate situation and their approach was to take this from where things stood to how they could moved forward as productively as possible. Ms. Cooper gave a history of the storefront.

Ms. Galvin stated they looked not only at the historic character of the 1920s, they looked at the context within which this facade resides. She provided the Board with material samples for the proposed storefront.

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 beautifully documented proposal. He stated the architect had overlooked the fact that the storefront that was removed was only a fragment of the 1940s storefront; the whole storefront was all black glass. He expressed his belief that it had been a metal storefront -- a steel storefront with some kind of bronze cladding on the base and on the framing. He thought a wood storefront would look too heavy.

Ms. Brennan agreed it was a great presentation. She expressed concern about the black and white awning.

Mr. Wolf thought the work done and the level of thought and research put into it spoke volumes of the care that was being taken and would be taken in a restoration

and reconstruction. He stated he had originally been inclined to say the only solution was to put it back the way it was; however, he thought the proposal was an historic response and accurate as a restoration.

Ms. Brennan inquired about the status of the pending court case, and thanked the representatives for starting their presentation with an apology.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed new storefront design satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves this application with the request that the applicant diligently pursue efforts to narrow the corner components and revisit the consideration of the striped awning to see whether a strip would be okay if it weren't such high contrast, and to align the panes in the transom with the framing elements of the storefront itself. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-1; Mr. Adams voted against.

E. New Items

- 1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-02-03
113 West Main Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 259
Charley Lewis, Charles Hendricks, West Mall LLC, and The Gaines Group PLC
Install windows in rear of building, remove garage door and install storefront doors**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is the back of 113 West Main Street, which is currently partially occupied by Blue Whale Books. The rear facade is partially obscured by the newly renovated Day Shelter. The applicant wants to put retail on the first floor with residential above. Exterior changes would include removing the existing garage door on the north side and replacing it with bronze aluminum storefront doors with a transom. The applicant wants to unblock a window above the storefront and add a new Marvin bronze aluminum clad one-over-one double hung window. The applicant wants to remove the plywood from three window openings on the same side of the building on the second floor and add the same type of double hung windows. The applicant also wants to remove plywood from three window openings on the second floor of the west side which faces Second Street; an awning-type window will be added to the two existing square openings and a double hung window will be added in the third, larger opening. The applicant

would also like to repaint the brick facade since the existing paint is wearing away; no color had yet been selected.

The applicant provided the Board with a sample of the Marvin double hung window.

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. Knight thought it seemed appropriate and seemed to meet the Guidelines.

Mr. Wolf saw no reason not to support this application. He thought the side of the building that had previously been painted could be painted again. He thought the side that had not been painted should not be painted. He thought the color selection could be worked out with Ms. Scala.

Ms. Brennan also supported the application.

Mr. Hogg suggested the applicant consider a color closer to the brick.

Mr. Osteen suggested the parking be eliminated in favor of plantings.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed request to add a storefront and windows satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the requirement that the paint color be submitted to Staff for review and approval. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 10-02-01

1204 West Main Street

Tax Map 10 Parcel 60

UVA Foundation

Construction of Children's Clinical Building and Outpatient Surgery Center

Mr. Hogg recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A clinical building and parking garage for this site was approved November 28, 2006. Zoning requires a street wall of 40 feet, minimum, to a maximum of 60 feet; after that street wall, there is a step back of ten feet. The current plan does not meet the street wall requirement. The set back on West Main Street is a minimum of 15 feet with a 20 foot maximum. This property is set back a little further than 20 feet.

Mr. Tim Rose, CEO of the University of Virginia Foundation, reminded the Board of the 2006 approval of a three-phase project. He stated two phases were now complete. He introduced Kevin Fox of Facilities Planning and Capital Development for the Health System.

Mr. Fox stated there had not been a specific detailed program for the building in 2006. The program has been set. The building will house the consolidated pediatric outpatient facilities. The pediatric facilities were at North Ridge, part of the West Complex, the Primary Care Center, and at Kluge. The upper part of the building will consolidate those facilities to deliver world class care in a modern environment. The basement and the first floor above grade will house the relocated and expanded outpatient surgery center.

Mr. Roger Soto, design architect with Odell Associates, was present with Michael Verguson, landscape designer, and Bill Talley, also a designer with Odell. The architects gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Osteen stated he had envisioned it as being something that would have nodes of activity and different character. He stated they had been looking for density and thought that three story buildings along there. He appreciated the diagram relating the building to others; he thought this building was more in keeping with the buildings across the street. Mr. Osteen stated he was comfortable with the height.

Mr. Wolf thought the street section was a compelling argument for the height. He thought the applicant was bringing forth architecture that was responding in its language to a complex that exists within the University medical realm that is not part of the Design Control District and is a very different character and scale from West Main; having those two things meet was a tricky thing. Mr. Wolf thought there was a nice relationship between the two stories, the glass cube above it, and the cornice level.

Mr. Knight found very few areas that he would suggest need attention. He thought it was wonderfully inventive and well worked out. He did think the street wall needed additional work. He thought the ground floor was the weakest part.

Mr. Adams wanted to know the plans for the terrace. Mr. Soto stated there was a terrace plan to develop an area of landscaping. Mr. Bergeson stated there would be planters along the outer edge and a thin soil planter back against the building.

Mr. Adams stated the glass being at six feet had a sneeze guard or quarantine quality.

Ms. Brennan agreed the massing and scale had been broken down very well. She expressed concern about the number of materials being used and wondered if there was some editing that could be done or restraint that could be used so the building responded more to the context in which it sits. She wondered if the building was too transparent. Ms. Brennan did not have a problem with the 32 foot height on West Main Street. She thought this met the Guidelines in terms of scale and compatibility with surrounding context. She did not like the white metal paneling.

Mr. Wolf thought the challenge was in the balance of the number of materials and simplification; he thought this challenge had been met. He expressed concern about the perception coming down West Main. He thought the upper portion would be prominent and deserved as much attention.

Mr. Osteen did not think the double row of trees was necessary or appropriate at this block. He expressed concern about the bollards in the elliptical drive being flush. He suggested the applicant consider a subtle evening lighting plan.

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-02-04
165 Madison Lane
Tax Map 9 Parcel 146
MW Cox Properties LLC
Replace windows with vinyl windows**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property in The Corner ADC District was constructed in 1920. The applicant is seeking permission to replace the existing wood double hung two-over-two windows with Pella white solid vinyl double hung two-over-two windows. The applicant would like to replace all windows eventually, one apartment at a time beginning with apartment A in the front. Eight windows are on order. In this location the BAR previously approved the use of wood windows at

135 Madison Lane, at 180 Rugby Road, and 128 Madison Lane. Ms. Scala thought this location deserved something better than vinyl windows.

Mr. Wayne Branch was present on behalf of the applicant. He had nothing to add to the staff report.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the windows were all the same size on the first floor. They were. Mr. Osteen stated he was sympathetic to the applicant and would like to work with the applicant to make the building as right as they possibly could.

Ms. Brennan appreciated the applicant coming forward. However, the Board had denied vinyl several times in the past. She cited the Guidelines which stated the condition of the windows needed to be determined before the Board could address their replacement. She felt there was not enough information yet on the condition of the existing windows in order to determine whether they warrant replacement. She stated she would be more sympathetic to vinyl windows that were not on the main street facade.

Mr. Wolf suggested the applicant use six of the windows on the back of the building and donate the other two to Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Hogg expressed concern about the bright white of the windows in context of the dark building.

Mr. Hogg stated that when they look at window replacement, the Board evaluates the effect of the change on the character of the building and the adjacent properties as well as the effect on the historic fabric; in this case, because the south facade faces a narrow alley that is very close to an adjacent building and has a very limited visibility from the public way, the change in material and some detail doesn't have a negative effect on the character of this particular building or the character of the streetscape, so that in this one location on this particular building this replacement, which is somewhat of an anomaly for the Board, would be acceptable. Mr. Wolf wanted to know if that was a motion. Mr. Hogg stated it could be considered a motion. He also added that he would like the window replacement to be as closely coordinated with repainting the building as possible. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Ms. Brennan asked if they could specify south facade,

back. Mr. Hogg accepted that as a friendly amendment and added that they had counted five windows for replacement. Mr. Wolf noted this would be going from apartment to apartment. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf told the applicant that, in a perfect world, future windows would be wood with a putty profile and an appropriate divider bar that was the right dimension relative to the original windows. However, he added that the Board has allowed aluminum clad replacements. Ms. Brennan noted the condition of the window could allow for repair rather than replacement.

Mr. Wolf expressed his appreciation for the owner bringing this forward and trying to abide by the Guidelines.

F. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

G. Other Business

1. Request for Comments on the Daughters of Zion Cemetery National Register Nomination Report

Ms. Scala asked if the Board could recommend that this be listed as a National Register property.

Mr. Hogg so moved. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Call for BAR comments on ADC Guidelines, Chapters 1-3

Ms. Scala reminded the members their comments were due.

H. Adjournment

Mr. Hogg moved to adjourn. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.