

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
July 20, 2010
Minutes**

Present:

Syd Knight, Vice Chair
H. Fairfax Ayres
William Adams
Michael Osteen
Preston Coiner
Eryn Brennan

Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Rebecca Schoenthal
Brian Hogg

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala
Laura Purvis (Intern)

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public not on the agenda.

B. Consent Agenda

1. **Minutes** – June 15, 2010
2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 10-07-01
150 Chancellor Street
Tax Map 9 Parcel 109
GTF Homes, LLC, Applicant/ Delta Zeta National Housing Corp, Owner
Re-roof house and replace shingles on dormer sides with hardiplank siding
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 10-07-02
205D 2nd Street NW
Tax Map 33 Parcel 174 Lot 2G
John Rhett, Applicant/ Claude Ripley, Owner
Install three custom wood windows in unit 205D
4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 10-07-09
207D 2nd Street NW
Tax Map 33 Parcel 174 Lot 2K
John Trimmer, Applicant & Owner
Install new bedroom windows in unit 207D

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 PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Coiner noted that for the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 150 Chancellor Street the use of non-grained hardiplank should be specified.

Mr. Coiner moved the consent agenda as noted. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0.

C. Projects in Non-Compliance (no status report this month)

D. Previously Considered Items

**1. Recommendation (Previously Considered June 2010)
Establishment of Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Historic Conservation District
Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Association, Applicant**

Mr. Knight recused himself from the discussion as a resident of the proposed district and named Ms. Brennan to serve as chair for this agenda item.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the June 2010 meeting the applicant requested a deferral to clarify both the boundaries and the character defining features of the district. The BAR requested that the differences in review process between the Entrance Corridor Review Board and the Board of Architectural Review. Ms. Scala noted that a subcommittee consisting of neighborhood members, one BAR member, and staff met to discuss the concerns raised in the June meeting. Ms. Scala summarized committee recommendations for the appropriate treatment of the buildings in the proposed district, particularly noting the neighborhood's desire to protect Maplewood Cemetery. Staff recommended that the proposal be approved, using the boundaries of the National Register historic district as a guide and including the Rucker Wing of Martha Jefferson Hospital. Staff support of the inclusion of the Rucker Wing was a change from earlier recommendations.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen asked why the boundaries were preferred to the exclusion of some properties in the 'donut' hole.

Ms. Scala responded that the proposed Conservation District boundaries conform to those used for the Martha Jefferson National Register Historic District. This will be the first Conservation District in the City of Charlottesville and, as such, will be a trial to follow the practical application of the new district type. Residents of the neighborhood outside the current boundaries may propose to be added to the district at a later date when the processes for Conservation Districts are established. However, Ms. Scala noted that the BAR could recommend to City Council that the donut hole be included.

Mr. Coiner added that there needed to be time to deal with the zoning issues if the donut hole was included.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Lydia Brandt, 5715 Ivy Road in the county, stated her support of the Conservation District. Ms. Brandt was the author of the Martha Jefferson Historic District National Register Nomination. Ms. Brandt described the reason for the jagged board of the National Register District. Working closely with DHR to identify appropriate boundaries, the land divisions that took place during the 1950s resulted in a cluster of houses that do not conform to the period of significance for the district and were excluded from the nomination. She did not support including the donut hole because of the historical background and architectural character of those buildings, which are not compatible with earlier historic buildings.

Martha Rowen, 717 Locust Avenue, noted that she was one of the subcommittee members that identified character defining features of the neighborhood. Ms. Rowen was concerned about the distinction about the architectural character of the houses in the donut hole and those within the National Register District boundaries. She also noted the desire to avoid introducing pseudo-traditional architecture into the area.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner stated that the neighborhood should be applauded for being willing to take on this Conservation District designation and noted his support.

Ms. Brennan echoed Mr. Coiner's support and noted her appreciation of staff and all the efforts that have gone into the Conservation District designation. Ms. Brennan asked if the eight identified character defining features would become part of the guidelines and if additions or revisions could be made.

Ms. Scala explained that these are sub-guidelines and that they are there to assist with the implementation of the district. She noted that additional character defining features could be added informally and that the processes were still being established.

Mr. Osteen noted that he was comfortable with the application.

Mr. Osteen, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, moved to recommend that City Council should designate the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District;

With the boundary as proposed, which is the same as the National Register district boundary; and

With contributing structures as proposed in the National Register nomination report; and

With design review on the three Entrance Corridor parcels 53-198; 54-8; and 54-9, which have contributing structures, and on the three Entrance Corridor parcels 53-234; 54-7; 54-17, which have non-contributing structures, to be accomplished by the BAR using Historic Conservation District guidelines; and

The BAR defines the architectural character-defining features of the proposed Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District as follows...

- 1. Encourage one-story front porches**
- 2. Encourage rear garages**
- 3. The levels of a building's stories should be consistent with those on surrounding structures with respect to the natural grade.**
- 4. Do not exclude well-designed, new contemporary architecture.**
- 5. Encourage standing seam metal roofs.**
- 6. Maintain and encourage tree canopy.**

7. **Concur especially with the following guidelines: maintain neighborhood massing and form; encourage the use of sustainable materials; and limit the height of fences in front yards.**
8. **Regarding the future development of the hospital properties, the neighborhood's focus has been: not to tear down the old houses; to encourage low density residential development north of Taylor Walk (with the suggestion that Taylor Street be reinstated); and to expect the High Street area to develop as a sensitively designed, high-quality, mixed use development.**
9. **Encourage good stewardship of Maplewood Cemetery.**

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

Ms. Scala noted a request that item 6 be moved to near the end of the meeting.

Mr. Knight returned as chair and requested that those present to represent the COA application for 401 4th Street let the board know when the member arrives.

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Preliminary Discussion June 2010)
BAR 10-06-02
218 West Water Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 84
Atwood Architects, Applicant/ Waterhouse LLC, Owner
New Construction, Waterhouse**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval of massing and materials. Ms. Scala noted some of the background of the project and the various versions that have been presented to or approved by the BAR. Staff requested a model from Mr. Atwood for presentation at the meeting. Staff recommends approval on the condition that details come back to the board for final approval.

Mr. Atwood, Applicant, stated that there was unanimous approval from the neighbors. In an effort to respect the Green Building, the new structure is designed with scoring and patterning details reminiscent of the historic structure. Mr. Atwood stated his efforts to create a more horizontal unified building and respond to comments made during the previous month's (June) preliminary discussion. Precast concrete is proposed on bottom floor. The third and fourth floors will be treated with stucco and the top floors will be more transparent glass construction. Mr. Atwood noted that residents of the Lewis and Clark building were more satisfied with the design. He noted that this Certificate of Appropriateness application was requesting massing and materials approval.

The board looked at the model.

Mr. Osteen noted that the façade has a significant break, but did not see it in the model.

Mr. Atwood noted that the drawings were accurate.

Ms. Brennan asked if the lower floors would be constructed of concrete block.

Mr. Atwood noted that the material would be cast concrete.

Mr. Knight thanked Mr. Atwood for the model and noted that it helped in understanding the project. Mr. Knight invited the public to come view the model.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner asked if the glass would be shaded or tinted.

Mr. Atwood noted that it was clear glass.

Ms. Brennan asked if he was asking for color approval as related to materials.

Mr. Atwood noted that it was only materials and massing, not color.

Ms. Brennan noted that there was no materials schedule and questioned about the specifics of the materials.

Mr. Atwood noted that the stucco will match the Green Building.

Mr. Adams wanted to know what type of metal would be used.

Mr. Atwood noted painted metal was proposed. The building would be predominately stucco.

Mr. Knight asked if the first two floors are retail and garage. He also inquired about the arrangement of entrances.

Mr. Atwood indicated that the proposed design adjustments were from the third floor up and the lower floors largely remained the same as an application previously approved.

Mr. Knight questioned if there was a ramp or sidewalk shown.

Mr. Atwood noted that the section was a landscape strip.

Mr. Adams asked if trees were planned for the Water Street streetscape.

Mr. Atwood stated that there was little room for trees, and that landscaping had not been extensively studied. He was willing consider adding street trees.

Ms. Scala noted that setback guidelines were made to permit more room for pedestrians and that street trees or a plaza could be added.

Ms. Brennan asked if there were plans to manage light within the parking deck, especially car headlights.

Mr. Atwood discussed the use of glass in the parking deck and that lighting fixtures could be shielded to not impact neighbors. Windows will be located on the façade facing the Lewis and Clark building. Mr. Atwood noted that discussion was ongoing about creating an open or closed garage and noted his preference for an enclosed garage.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams noted that he did not support the earlier project, and did not support this proposal, especially considering the proposed Water Street massing. He noted that the South Street façade does respond more

effectively to the scale of the residences along that street. He noted that the garage entry on Water Street may be better as a store front. Mr. Adams indicated that the articulation of the building was confusing and was unsure if imitation of the Green Building was the best design solution.

Mr. Osteen noted that he supported Mr. Adams comments, but that this proposal was much improved over previous versions of this building. He questioned if there could be a better interplay between the various depths and indicated that the uniform breakdown of vertical elements was dull. However, he acknowledged Mr. Atwood's requirements to respond to the needs of his clients. Mr. Osteen echoed earlier comments that the parking lot façade was problematic. He noted his support of the general massing of the project, but also acknowledged that many small details needed further work. He indicated that approving only pieces of a project was difficult.

Ms. Brennan appreciated that Mr. Atwood took previous comments and incorporated them into the design, especially the deference to the historic structure. She requested dimensions of the Water Street facade. E

Mr. Atwood noted that each portion of the façade along Water Street was 75 feet.

Ms. Brennan felt that more definition and articulation would improve the appearance of the façade.

Mr. Atwood noted that he did not know how to change the street wall.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if there was no entrance along South Street.

Mr. Atwood noted that the garage entrance has been located there for some time.

Mr. Coiner asked the chair if some massing and materials could be approved given comments.

Mr. Knight requested clarification on the approval request and noted his agreement with the concerns expressed by the board.

Mr. Atwood explained that the approval request was for massing and general materials only.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know Mr. Atwood wanted only general massing, not articulation which she felt needed much more refinement. She also noted concern about the lack of entrances on South Street.

Mr. Ayers indicated that the qualifications proposed for approval might not be useful for the applicant.

Mr. Atwood requested that the board still craft a motion with the qualifications necessary for approval.

Ms. Brennan, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, moved to find that the general massing, notwithstanding the articulation of all the façades of the building as shown here tonight, and the general material palette, not as presented in the drawings shown here tonight, of the proposed building satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the massing and materials in concept as submitted and that details be submitted to the BAR for final approval. Mr. Ayres seconded the motion.

Mr. Ayers seconded the motion.

Ms. Brennan amended the motion to include particular details: articulate fenestration, façade articulation, exact color and material palette.

Mr. Adams noted great concern over the design of the Water Street side and felt that it did not respond to the building's context.

Qualify the motion to reflect that the water street façade is of particular concern to the board.

The board discussed qualifying the motion to note particular concern on the Water Street façade.

Ms. Brennan and Mr. Ayres confirmed their support of the motion including more details and concerns about the Water Street façade.

The motion passed (5-1) with Adams opposed.

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from September 2009)
BAR 09-09-01
410 Altamont Circle
Tax Map 33 Parcel 124
John M Anderson Construction Co, Applicant/ Charles Johnston, Owner
One story addition with basement**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The BAR previously approved this project, but the design had to be changed to accommodate a sewer line. The proposed addition now accommodates the easement. Ms. Scala noted that the addition will now be flush with the front of the house. The materials are largely unchanged; however, the cable railing has been removed from the proposal. She emphasized that no ridge vent should be used.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen asked for more specifics on the material used for the hyphen.

Mr. John Anderson, applicant, stated that the connector will be sided with fir shiplap as previously proposed.

Mr. Knight requested more information about making the addition flush with the front of the house.

Mr. Anderson explained that the combination of the sewer line easement and wheelchair accommodations had brought about the change in design. Moving the addition façade forward a foot allowed for wheelchair access throughout the entire addition. Mr. Anderson referenced engineer's drawings for the sewer line change.

Mr. Knight asked if the line was eight inches.

Mr. Anderson confirmed that was the size of the line.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan noted guidelines state that additions should not be even with the front of the original structure. However, she felt that this proposal was an extenuating circumstance and that the hyphen mitigates the effects of the flush facade.

Mr. Adams echoed Ms. Brennan's comments.

Mr. Osteen noted his support of the proposal.

Mr. Knight agreed with other members of the board. However, He noted that, if the sewer is six inches closer than currently thought, he would not support moving the addition any farther forward.

Mr. Osteen, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including ADC District Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions moved that the proposed addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the proposal as submitted. Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

Mr. Coiner underlined that the metal roof could not have a ridge vent.

The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

E. New Items

**4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-07-10
220 East Main Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 36
Pam Marraccini, Applicant
Exterior Paint Color**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The building dates from the 1860s. The applicant proposes to paint the tan portions of the storefront blue, including stucco and wood first floor cornice. Ms. Scala showed the board proposed Benjamin Moore paint chip.

Ms. Pam Marraccini, the applicant, noted that she chose the color to match the branding of the store. However, she also brought other gold tones as an alternative to blue if the board does not approve of the blue.

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 PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner asked to see the other color choices. He did not feel that the blue color was appropriate.

Ms. Brennan did not like the idea of using a branding color for the exterior of a downtown mall building. She asked to see other colors as well.

Mr. Adams seconded the comments.

Ms. Marraccini showed the board a range of gold colors and indicated her preference for “monarch gold.”

Ms. Brennan questioned if approval of the gold color could be done administratively.

Mr. Coiner thought the board should give guidance to the range of the color, but not the exact color.

Ms. Brennan, having considered City Code and City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the use of a muted earth toned gold color chosen by the applicant and to be approved by administratively by staff satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the color as described. Mr. Coiner seconded. The motion was unanimously approved (6-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 10-07-05

125 Chancellor Street

Tax Map 9 Parcel 137

Alpha Tau Omega Holding Corporation, Applicant & Owner

Installation of new pre-painted standing seam metal roof panels and new Philadelphia gutter system.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Ms. Scala noted that she had requested details for gutters and the color of the roof metal roof replacement; however she had not yet received more details. She requested that no roof vent be used for the metal roof. Because of lack of details, Ms. Scala did not feel comfortable recommending the project at that time.

Mr. Donnie Kidd, applicant, noted that the proposed repairs to roof were to preserve as many of the existing historic features as possible. He acknowledged that no ridge vents would be used. Mr. Kidd noted the preference to use a slightly darker roof color (dark charcoal or dark bronze) than currently exists but was willing to use slate grey to match current color if preferred by the BAR. The proposed gutters are half round with a rubber membrane.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight asked the applicant if there were drawn details of the gutters or if there were paint chips of the proposed roof colors.

Mr. Kidd brought photos of a similar system of gutters installed on a home along Jefferson Park Avenue. He also presented paint chips and photographs.

Mr. Coiner asked about the size of the pans for the new roof.

Mr. Kidd responded that 21 inch pans, close to the current size, would be used.

Mr. Adams asked if copper had been considered.

Mr. Kidd noted that copper was considered. However, copper was costly and the material was not currently on the house.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen described concerns over the use of crimped metal gutters. The appearance of the rubber also seemed problematic.

Mr. Kidd noted that a darker roof color could help hide the rubber.

Mr. Adams noted that the copper suggestion was considered because copper gutters are soldered and may be more durable.

Mr. Osteen felt uncomfortable approving the application without more details.

Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant had considered conventional gutters.

Mr. Kidd understood that Philadelphia gutters would be more appropriate.

Ms. Brennan was unsure if the gutters could just be repaired.

Mr. Kidd thought that the gutters were functional and not too deteriorated.

Mr. Osteen appreciated that the applicant is trying to work with the historic gutters.

Mr. Knight cautioned the board to not make any blanket statements about the replacement of the gutters, but agreed that it was not a defining feature of the building. He indicated that the applicant may consider requesting a deferral.

Mr. Coiner indicated copper could be used for the gutters.

Mr. Kidd would be happy to go with a copper gutter.

Ms. Brennan asked if the applicant had a preference of the roof color.

Mr. Ayres noted that a dark color might not be best.

Mr. Kidd stated that the dark color choice was an effort to match existing roofs in the area.

Mr. Ayres, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the installation of a new pre-finished metal roof in a dark color of the applicant's choosing (the BAR encourages dark bronze) 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 stipulation that half-round gutters be approved administratively,

encouraging copper half round gutters. The board also stipulates that no ridge vent be used. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

[Item 6 moved to later timeslot in the meeting]

**7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-07-06
222 South Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 95
Michael Stoneking, Applicant/ Blue Moon Fund, Owner
New solar panel array in rear yard**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. In August 2009, the last application for the Blue Moon property came before the BAR. The BAR approved a rear terrace and garden. The applicant is proposing to install a photovoltaic solar panel array in the rear yard. Staff noted that the location of the array near the railroad may be appropriate. Ms. Scala requested that the board consider the size and location of the project, including the screening on the panels.

Mr. Greg Smith, Executive Assistant for Blue Moon, represented the applicant. He described the dimensions of the array. The proposed structure was 7 feet on the lower edge and 17 feet on the upper edge in order to maximize the sunlight. He noted that the building was recently certified LEED gold and the solar array was in keeping with their environmental efforts. The solar panel array is an opportunity to reduce the building's energy consumption by 25% and provides shade for parked cars.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams asked if the power generated by the array was reduced if the structure was tilted down further.

Mr. Paul Rossberg, representing the solar panel company, noted that changing the tilt would not greatly affect the panels' energy output. Reducing tilt would make the structure deeper and the structure larger and more expensive. The actual dimensions of the array would be closer to 6 feet and 12 feet to create angle.

Mr. Adams noted that a maple tree just to the west on the adjacent property might shade the array.

Mr. Smith requested that the tree be examined by professionals and the arborist indicated that only two limbs needed to be removed.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Brent Nelson, 214 W South Street, noted that the solar panel array would be visible from the Ridge Street Bridge. The array will impact the view of neighbors into the rear yard. Mr. Nelson emphasized that the proposal was out of scale, and that he was very strongly against the proposal. The very utilitarian appearance of the array needs to be mitigated. He indicated that placing the panels on the roof would be appropriate. He also supported constructing a carport with solar panels on the roof. He cautioned the BAR against setting a precedent for freestanding solar panels. He requested that the BAR encouraged applicants to work with the neighborhood, and was outraged that the applicants did not involve the applicant.

Mary Gilliam 218 W South Street, echoed Mr. Nelsons comments that the proposed structure was too tall, freestanding, and industrial. She encouraged the BAR to request mitigation of the appearance of the solar panel array and establish clear guidelines to outline the appropriate placement of solar panels within ADC districts.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ayres asked if the applicant had considered placing the panels on the roof.

Mr. Smith noted that a small system could be put on the roof.

Mr. Coiner was overwhelmed by the size of the proposed project. He noted that the guidelines committee was discussing the problem of installing solar panels on historic buildings. He agreed that a freestanding building with panels on the roof, as Mr. Nelson suggested, may be an option. He stated that he did not feel comfortable supporting this proposal.

Ms. Brennan agreed that the guidelines were a problem. She believed that it was appropriate to treat this application as a structure, and requested that the applicant work with neighbors. The proposal was too large for the site and location. She noted that a building for the rear of the site had been approved previously.

Mr. Knight inquired if the size of the array driven by the energy needs or shade for the parking area.

Mr. Smith explained that the cantilever was the most elegant design.

Mr. Knight asked if it was necessary from a functional standpoint to have a single unit.

Mr. Rossberg noted that the array could be broken into several structures and that the only requirement was that total combined square footage of the panels be maintained to achieve the 25% energy savings.

Mr. Osteen stated that the proposal was conceptually well done, and he initially supported the application. However, he felt working with the neighbors was crucial, and would like to consider an application that had a certain amount of consensus. He did not feel it was appropriate to support the application as it was presented.

Mr. Smith requested some parameters to guide revisions.

Mr. Osteen felt the only structural limitation was when the solar array became inefficient.

Mr. Adams noted that 17feet was very tall. He has seen examples with a much lower profile.

Mr. Knight stated that the issue was scale, and that he would generally support the location of the project. He indicated to the applicant that a deferral may be appropriate.

Ms. Brennan advocated for creating a solution so that solar panels that were compatible with the historic district.

Mr. Smith requested a deferral.

Mr. Coiner move to accept the applicants deferral

Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved (6-0).

8. Preliminary Discussion BAR 10-07-07

**5 Gildersleeve Wood
Tax Map 11 Parcel 18
Cynthia Deupree, Applicant/ Deren Bader and Paul Lyons, Owners
New studio and office in rear yard**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The BAR previously approved the demolition of a shed. The applicant now proposes to build a new studio/office and has brought the project in for a preliminary discussion. Ms. Scala noted that the property is zoned R1U, the most restrictive zoning in the city. The building can not be a dwelling and must be subordinate in scale to the original structure. She requested that the BAR determine the height of the proposed studio and make sure that it is not taller than the existing building. Also, the outbuildings may not take up more than 30% of the yard.

Cynthia Deupree introduced herself to the BAR.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight asked to verify the zoning requirements. Ms. Deupree noted that the building was well within the set back. Mr. Knight then asked if the 30% rule included terracing.

Ms. Scala indicated that most likely terracing would be included in that figure. However, the zoning administrator would be the appropriate person to answer that question.

Ms. Brennan asked the applicant about the view of the proposed building from the street.

Ms. Deupree noted that the roof would be just barely visible.

Mr. Adams asked about the proximity of homes on adjoining lots.

Ms. Deupree described the neighboring properties and indicated that the original homes are often close the property lines.

Mr. Osteen described the small lots in the neighborhood.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen indicated that this proposal appears to be beyond what is permitted by zoning. He noted that the mass and detailing were extremely problematic and that the original structure consists of simple squares. The longest dimension of the proposed building is 55 feet, while the longest dimension of the original house is 38 feet. The applicant appears to be creating a use that is inappropriate for the zoning.

Ms. Brennan echoed some of Mr. Osteen's comments. She appreciated that the building was not very visible from the street. However, the building is not consistent with the scale of the property. She requested that the applicant take some design cues from the structure.

Mr. Ayres agreed with Mr. Osteen and Ms. Brennan.

Mr. Knight said that the location works for a reasonably sized structure. The problem was scale. The architectural relationship with the main house is problematic since outbuildings should be differential to the main structure. Mr. Knight summarized that the board's general consensus was that the proposal is not going to be supported if it remained in the form presented.

Mr. Osteen suggested that the applicant reference existing hipped roof forms and begin redesigning.

6. Council-Requested Review
BAR 10-07-04
401 4th Street NW
Tax Map 32 Parcel 26 Lots 15A and 15B
**BRW Architects for Virginia Supportive Housing, Applicant/
Virginia Supportive Housing, Owner**
New Construction for The Crossings at 4th and Preston.
Sixty single occupancy efficiency units.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. She indicated that the BAR should review the general design. She noted that there were two colors of brick proposed and 31 parking spaces using permeable pavers. The applicant proposes using chain link fencing, which is generally discouraged. Ms. Scala described the context of the property as it comes to a point on Preston Avenue, a connector between downtown and the University of Virginia, with ADC districts in close proximity. She asked the BAR to consider the context of the project in relation to historic industrial buildings. Staff prefers that a shade tree be planted near the Preston Avenue sidewalk and that lighting be fully shielded.

Bruce Wardell, applicant and principle of BRW Architects, addressed the choice of brick color and other materials. The building will be surrounded by a mixture of materials and colors. The red brick would be used as a base, and the lighter brick would refer to other materials in the area. He noted that he would be willing to change to red brick on the Preston Avenue facade. The fencing in the design is a programmatic requirement. The fence would hopefully have a green screen to make it more pleasing, and the chain link was proposed along the rear of the property as a cost choice. Mr. Wardell presented material samples to the board and noted that the planters were intended to be brick.

Mr. Osteen asked about the process of submitting a recommendation to City Council and Ms. Scala summarized that the BAR needed to provide comments to guide Council.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Knight noted that comments and questions from the board would be combined to facilitate discussion of the project.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Brennan stated that the fence makes the property seem fortified and uninviting. She cited examples along Friendship Court. She preferred a fence with plantings if it is required.

Mr. Coiner agreed with staff that the yellow brick color was inappropriate for Charlottesville.

Mr. Adams echoed Ms. Brennan's opinion that the fence is unappealing, and that a security fence sends the wrong message. He felt the massing was appropriate, but indicated that the building should blend more rather than stand out. He asked about the possibility of relocating overhead utilities.

Mr. Wardell stated that locating utilities underground along 4th street had been mentioned, but was unaware if the City had made a commitment.

The board discussed including street trees along 4th Street if the utilities could be relocated. Mr. Adams suggested planting trees with a relationship to the geometry of the building.

Mr. Osteen agreed with staff that the point near Preston Avenue would be an appropriate place for a shade tree.

Mr. Wardell asked the board if the fence should go all the way to the point as proposed or if it would be more suitable to move it closer to the building. He indicated that moving the fence could create a more pedestrian friendly plaza area.

Mr. Adams appreciated the suggestion, and felt that the best option would be a low fence.

Ms. Brennan suggested that yellow brick might be appropriate as an accent, but not for large masses of the building facade. She indicated that the building might appear less monumental if more transparent areas were added.

Mr. Coiner asked the applicant if the mechanical units on the roof would be visible from Beck's Hill and High Street. Mr. Wardell noted that they had not looked specifically from that elevation and would consider the view from that area.

Mr. Knight suggested that the simplicity of the building be reflected in the plantings. The proposed design would be very high maintenance and Mr. Knight voiced concerns about the gardens receiving the amount of attention necessary. He referenced other planting in the area, specifically one maintained by the City in the cut under the rail road tracks. He also emphasized that all efforts should be made to reduce the fortified look of the building.

Mr. Wardell indicated that he would change the color of the brick to those more commonly used in Charlottesville.

Mr. Knight also suggested including fewer planters to make a more public transition.

Mr. Wardell listed in summary the board's comments:

- 1) Revise the fence design and configuration to respond to civic nature
- 2) Change the brick color
- 3) Calm the plantings and site plan
- 4) No chain link on the rear, something else
- 5) Shade tree at presto nave end
- 6) change in the brick and fence may make more transparent, concerned with decorating the volumes.

Mr. Osteen liked the solid and void composition as presented to the board.

Mr. Coiner requested that the applicant use something other than chain link fencing.

Mr. Wardell suggested using one kind of fence around the building.

Ms. Brennan asked if the building included a double soldier course. Mr. Wardell described the soldier course for the building. Ms. Brennan appreciated the detail.

Mr. Wardell wanted to avoid adding more windows and suggested including brick detailing where a window might have otherwise existed.

Mr. Adams inquired if the windows were operable

Mr. Wardell indicated that each room had one operable and one inoperable window.

Mr. Adams suggested using the same fence all the way around using brick piers or a seat height brick wall with 4ft fence.

Mr. Knight, having considered the design and appearance of the proposed SRO facility in the context of its location on Preston Avenue and near the historic areas of Downtown and West Main Street, the BAR recommended to generally endorse the scale, materials, massing and general design of the project, and the BAR recommends that the applicant or City Council:

- 1. Revise the fence design and configuration to create a more civic space on Preston Avenue. If the fence cannot be reduced in height, then suggestions are to move the fence back to the plaza; to use brick piers with “green” fence between; or use a 2 foot high brick seat wall with 4 foot fence on top; or make the fence more transparent on top.**
- 2. Replace the yellow brick with red brick. (But keep the molded type brick).**
- 3. Calm the plantings and site plan (with fewer plants and species, and larger trees) to allow easier maintenance and to be in keeping with the simplicity of landscape design along Preston Avenue. Open up and simplify the transition area from public sidewalk to building at the front entrance on 4th Street.**
- 4. Do not use a chain link fence in the rear – keep the same fence as in the front.**
- 5. Add a large shade tree at the point on the Preston Avenue to shade the sidewalk and plaza area.**
- 6. Larger street trees should be used on 4th Street in concert with the rhythm of the building. (It is recommended that the overhead utility lines along 4th Street are relocated underground to allow the larger trees.)**

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

Mr. Adams added relocation of overhead utilities on 4th street.

Mr. Wardell asked if the utilities would be a civic or private issue. Mr. Adams noted that he felt it was a civic issue.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

- 11. Preliminary Discussion
BAR 10-07-08
600 Preston Place
Tax Map 5 Parcel 109
Mackenzie Woolner, Applicant/ Christopher Winter, Owner
Extend deck and remove tree**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. She noted that the existing deck was treated lumber and that a similar application had been denied two years ago because the applicant at that time was not present.

Mackenzie Woolner, applicant, stated that the privet hedge cannot be extended, but there could be two separate hedges. Mr. Woolner also apologized for the previous application and stated that he was not living in the house when that application was made.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Osteen asked if there was an approved site plan on file for the property.

Ms. Scala did not know, but suggested that it may be so old that it was no longer in the file.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Brennan did not believe she could support the application because of the size of the deck with the addition.

Mr. Woolner described the extension, and explained that it would be completely contained behind the hedge.

Ms. Brennan requested that the applicant replace the lattice.

Mr. Osteen visited the site and was compelled that there were three new trees planted. He noted that the hedge on a public sidewalk remains a maintenance issue. He suggested planting a hedge and adjusting the deck design to accommodate the existing hemlock tree.

Mr. Knight echoed Mr. Osteen's comment to work around the hemlock tree. He also generally asked if the board felt comfortable extending a non-conforming deck.

Mr. Woolner explained that grass will not grow in the area and it is an unused, unattractive part of the yard.

Mr. Coiner cautioned Mr. Woolner to not assume that the property line was on the edge of the sidewalk.

Ms. Brennan asked that another skirting material be used other than lattice and inquired about the finish of the current deck. Mr. Woolner indicated that it was stained brown.

Mr. Knight indicated that he supported something that improves the site, but did not want to establish a lax precedent. He summarize the board's comments as 1) requesting that improvements be made to the existing structure, specifically the lattice. 2) extend the hedge and insure that it is maintained (especially that it is trimmed) 3) generally supportive of deck extension and two tree removal, provided that screening is consistent with the replacement, and that the skirting is not lattice.

F. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

G. Other Business

There was no other business.

H. Adjournment

Ms. Brennan moved to adjourn. Mr. Ayres seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:07 p.m.