

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
October 19, 2010
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Michael Osteen
William Adams
Preston Coiner

Not Present:

Rebecca Schoenthal
H. Fairfax Ayres
Brian Hogg
Eryn Brennan

Also Present:

Melissa Celi Thackston
Jessica Casey (Planning Intern)

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

1. Discussion

Jeff Dreyfus wanted to get some feedback on what he is proposing to do for Social Hall, 109 East Jefferson Street. He distributed handouts of his plans during the meeting. Had site plans, maps, and more history that they discovered about the property. He intends to make a formal submission soon and would like to get some feedback for what they are going to do and may contact members of the board over the next few days to go over his plans. Received approval in the last meeting to demolish the existing ranch house in the back, as well as the tree and the small white picket fence. Want to propose a single new structure in the back northwest corner of the property as a small pool house with an office. The new structure would be made of wood with a metal roof. They also plan to build a pool as well as constructing landscaping around that. Looked at moving parking to the northeast part of the property as advised in the last BAR meeting, but became more difficult and disruptive. Still feels that having the gravel court that they had previously proposed is the least disruptive and maintains the integrity of the building. Proposing to reuse the old opening on the existing structure and add a new door and new porch down to a play area on the side of the house. Proposing to put new windows on the building.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes – September 21, 2010

Mr. Coiner suggested deferring the minutes from September 2010 as they were not available until that evening. All were in favor (5-0).

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

D. Previously Considered Items

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 10-10-04
All Historic Districts
City of Charlottesville
Dark Sky Compliant Street Light**

Mr. Coiner recused himself.

Mrs. Thackston gave the staff report.

Members from Public Works, Lonnie Randall and Judy Mueller, were there.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf asked if they knew the temperature of the lamp that they would use.

Mr. Knight asked if they were using the existing footprint. Was wondering if they had done the photometric calculations to make sure that the forty foot spacing wasn't going to give them a bunch of hot spots.

Mr. Adams stated that 21 seems very bright for an application. Mr. Randall answered it was that for two reasons. Because they are putting 90 percent of their power straight down and limited out to the sides, and if they go dark sky compliant, they are going to end up like that. Said they can buy a 50 watt fixture instead of a 65 watt.

Mr. Knight asked what the material of the pole was. Answered the new poles would be the same as the existing poles in style and that the head and poles would be in aluminum

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams thinks that they are better than the old lights, but worries about hot spots right under the lights. It will create a contrast ratio of having very bright spots and darker areas and make it very difficult to see. He stated that there are places, such as parking lots and empty lots, which are not built up like the corner and will not have lights to fill in the space between the brighter areas. It is a concern. Mr. Randall answered that the concern that Mr. Adams has exists mostly with the old lights. While it isn't as bright as it is underneath them, the lights will produce more illumination that was there before.

Mr. Knight stated that there are several variables that you can play with for outdoor lighting. They include, pole spacing, the strength, the height, etc. Mr. Knight doesn't have a problem with the architectural character of the fixture and believes it is appropriate for historic districts and the City of Charlottesville. He is concerned that the city has yet to engineer a design to make the light levels even and properly calculated for the areas. Doesn't have a problem approving these, but would ask the city to do the research on the individual applications of this to make sure the lighting design is carefully considered.

Mr. Adams said that he would like to see photometric plans that would work through to help select the appropriate wattage. May be better to under light a lot of these public spaces than it is to over light them, especially in a historic district.

Mr. Wolf asked to consider moving down from 65 to a 45 wattage. Asked what would happen to the lighting when they would move down to 45 watts.

Mr. Adams stated as a guideline, when they did the lighting of the downtown mall, the brightest was 8 foot candles and the way it spaced out was very successful. Mr. Randall said that they are not dark sky compliant, so the option to change the diffusion was different.

Mr. Knight wanted to clarify a few comments made. No one should read into the record that the BAR is proposing to under light public areas, but are merely asking for appropriate levels of lighting for public areas, rather than over lighting.

Mr. Wolf said that he believes a respect for the historic context of the area as well as providing safety with the lighting can go hand in hand.

Mr. Wolf said the BAR believes that additional information, a site photometric plan, and looking into lower wattages would be helpful. In this case the applicant can either defer or the BAR can defer. With advice from the BAR, the applicant chose to defer their application. They will bring back another month with additional information including site photometric drawings and studies looking at different wattages.

Mr. Knight moved to accept the deferral.

Deferral approved (4-0-1) with Mr. Coiner recused.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 10-09-03

201 East Market Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 196

**Chris Gensic, Charlottesville Department of Parks and Rec., Applicant/ Krista Farrell, JMRL,
Owner**

Install artistic bike racks on concrete

Mrs. Thackston gave the staff report.

Chris Gensic, the applicant from Parks and Recreation, presented additional information on the Library's preference to where the bike racks would be placed.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight asked if it would be a problem to put all four bike racks together. Mr. Gensic said they may be a little tight if they were all used at one time. At this time, Mr. Gensic passed out drawings to illustrate what it would be like if two racks were in front of the building.

Mr. Knight stated that his understanding is that you need all four bike racks together to get the full effect.

Mr. Wolf asked what the spacing between each unit would be. The BAR had previously decided it would be three feet between each.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner met with the applicant last week and looked at the spacing. They were told that there is a problem that people are chaining their bikes to the railing. The handrail by the library is six feet, and can only allow two bikes on the location by the railing as to not interfere with the handrail at all.

Mr. Knight asked if they are wedded to the particular racks. Mr. Gensic stated that they are the fourth installation in a design series and two are already constructed.

Mr. Knight stated that separating the bike racks seems to be against the purpose and would take away from the overall effect. He stated that they are being constrained by the design of the rack, the site, and guidelines.

Mr. Wolf suggested placing the bike racks in a more logical placement. He suggested aligning them all together in one space away from the railing. He likes the aesthetics and playfulness of the design.

Mr. Osteen agreed that the bike racks should be all placed together as to only create one place to park bikes in that area. Suggests considering placing only three in one location so they would fit better.

Mr. Adams would be in support of putting three or four together in one spot.

Mr. Coiner suggested that one of the members of the BAR should meet with Mr. Gensic to help with the placement of the bike racks.

Mr. Osteen also suggested to even consider having the bike racks closer together to accommodate all of them.

Mr. Knight, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, and for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed bicycle racks located [by the book drop or at the bottom of the stairs] satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application on the provision that either three or four racks would be included in one group at one location (either by the book drop or by the pavement at the bottom of the stair) and strongly suggest the city take advantage of the offers made by the members on the board to help them.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion

The motion passed (5-0).

- 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-09-08
422 East Main Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 52
Marthe Rowen, Applicant/ Gabriel Silverman, Owner**

Remove existing storefront and sign panel at front and replace with a new facade, refurbish side facade, and construct new roof deck

Mrs. Thackston gave the staff report. New handouts were distributed.

Marthe Rowen discussed the changes that had been made to the plan from the last BAR meeting. She stated that the changes that were made were due to two sets of input. The first set of input was from the previous BAR meeting and the second set was from the potential tenant. The original design had been for two tenants, but the potential tenant would like to use the whole space. This would mean that they want everything on one level, matching the first floor, so the sill has been raised to match the first floor. Still have the entrance on grade on the side, but that is primarily to get up to the roof.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams asked what would drive having all of the material on the rooftop terrace. Ms. Rowen said that it was for aesthetics because the wall behind is very poorly made, so the landlord asked to cover the entire wall to provide the correct atmosphere for the event space.

The BAR asked clarifying questions to the detail of the design and articulation of the plans.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight stated that this is a tremendous improvement and is impressed with the results over the last few weeks. Was wondering why the entrance wasn't on the corner as opposed to the center. He stated that he is comfortable supporting the project.

Mr. Osteen likes the design for the building, as it is not a traditional structure. His one concern is the material on the roof along the existing building. Thinks to keep the building exposed is more valuable than adding the material in front of it. To create a clean simple line that doesn't completely cover the neighboring building. Ms. Rowan suggested that they could consider not having it go all the way up.

Members of the board discussed the possibility of lowering the panel on the wall to expose more of the neighboring building's wall.

Mr. Adams says that the wall is a lot of material and it would cause attention to itself. It is a great improvement over the last submission and he will support it. Stated that there are ways that the composition can be tightened up and he urges the applicant to explore that.

Mr. Wolf expressed that he will support the design. He would echo the one concern about the height of the panel against the party wall.

Mr. Osteen, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed façade renovations satisfy the BAR's criteria

and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the proposed building as submitted with the condition that the applicant considers the comments discussed in the meeting about lowering the west wall.

Mr. Knight seconded the motion

The motion was approved (5-0).

- 4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-07-06
219 14th Street NW
Tax Map 9 Parcel 66 and 69
Dinsmore LLC, Applicant and Owner
Dinsmore II Apartment Building: add a solar array on roof**

Mrs. Thackston gave the staff report.

Applicant, Paul Risber from Altenergy, described the application. He passed out a new packet with few more clarifications for the plan. The original proposal was to cover the entire roof, but then a week before they submitted decided that they could cover only half of it. It now appears that they can go back to the original proposal of having the entire roof covered. The applicant asked them to consider approving solar panels covering the entire structure.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams was asking for clarification about the track down the middle and if that was needed for access or if they could do one smooth surface. The applicant said that they do need access paths, and that if needed they can make those vertical and in tracks of three panels.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen expressed that he is in total support of this application. It is complicated with the endless possibilities for the arrangement of the panels. Believe that the visible area of the panels, the parking lot and train tracks, is not an area that should be concerned about.

Mr. Adams stated that he was attached to the view in the packet that was submitted with the amount of roof versus the amount of solar array, and would prefer it, but it does not stop him from being in full support for the addition of the solar panels.

Mr. Knight spoke about the possibility of placing a design with the array; however that goes away if you cover the whole roof.

Mr. Wolf sees the design as one flat simple piece. Having the full roof done is viable.

Mr. Osteen suggests moving the panels in so that there is more of a statement of roof.

Mr. Knight is a little hesitant to approve something with many possible variations, but would approve the overall concept and have a drawing come back for administrative review.

Mr. Coiner asked applicant to clarify how many square feet of panel there is in the design.

Mr. Adams stated that he would approve either scheme.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, for Site Design, and for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed photovoltaic roof panels satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the installation of photovoltaic panels on the roof with the consideration of the applicant to remove some panels from either end of the roof and submit the final layouts to the staff for administrative approval.

Mr. Conier seconded the motion.

The motion was approved (5-0).

E. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 10-10-01

225 East Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 233

Stacy Capital, LLC, Applicant and Owner

Replace current window with a full light window with a white aluminum frame

Ms. Casey gave the staff report.

The applicant, Mr. Varoliussen, presented his application. He stated that this issue came up because they are having a deteriorating wood frame on the window.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant had seen the staff recommendation before the meeting. Mr. Coiner tends to agree with the staff recommendation.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams stated that he does not have a problem with the single pane window and would not have a problem with going with what is being proposed.

Mr. Wolf stated that he is not sure that he would support this plan with the solution. There are other ways to address the maintenance and issues without changing the language and material of the window, which is consistent with the others of the building.

Mr. Osteen would like to see a new metal window that replicated the existing pattern.

Mr. Wolf stated that he would support Mr. Osteen's suggestion.

The BAR asked the applicant if he would be comfortable replacing the window in the same pattern that already existed. Applicant responded that he would have to ask the owner, because it will be more expensive.

Mr. Adams said that the pattern would start to look awkward if it were with an aluminum frame.

Mr. Wolf, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed façade renovations 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 with the following modification that the replacement window either exactly match the divisions of the existing window, or if they do not match, the applicant resubmit a drawing of the revised elevation for administrative review.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion.

Motion passed (4-1) with Mr. Adams opposed.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 10-10-02

408 N. First Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 97

Robert B. Anderson, Applicant/ Patricia Cochran, Owner

Repair damage from storm on pergola, 2nd floor porch, and roof above front porch. Replace solid panels on east end of pergola with wood screen, extend existing pergola, install pitched roof from below 2nd floor south elevation windows down to edge of the pergola structure, and replace fence.

Mrs. Thackston gave the staff report.

New handouts were distributed at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Anderson, the applicant, was present to answer questions and clarifications during the meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight asked applicant to clarify if there were any changes made between the original submission and the new handout distributed in the meeting.

Mr. Adams asked what would happen to the existing slate roof near First Street. The applicant stated that part would be covered over or the owner may store some of the slates. Would have liked to put slate on the sloped roof, but the slope is too shallow to accommodate slate.

Mr. Wolf asked what would happen to the tie rods that are attached to the screening of the upper deck.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen stated that the second level deck screen is an improvement and has no issues with that. He is concerned about bringing the pergola forward. Questioned what the programmatic necessity of the pergola is. Applicant answered that it is to give protection to walk towards the back.

Mr. Wolf suggested the option of moving the pergola one bay back.

Mr. Adams stated that he would prefer to have the pergola two bays back on the basis that it harms the property and compromises the original design of the house.

Mr. Wolf agrees that the original work looks fine and is willing to discuss the extension of moving the pergola up one bay, but two bays are getting too close to disrupting the front façade.

Mr. Knight does not think that bringing the pergola one bay forward would harm the building, but if it were to be brought two bays forward it would.

Mr. Adams stated that he cannot support the porch addition. He thinks it is fine if the applicant would like to repair the existing pergola, the back porch, and fence.

Mr. Osteen agrees that one bay is better than two bays; however not extending it any bays is preferable.

Mr. Wolf thinks that moving the roof into a flat lock helps to preserve more of the original slate roof and helps to minimize the impact of the piece.

Mr. Wolf, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, I move to find that the proposed new porch screen, pergola extension, turn roof, and new fence satisfy the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application on the condition that the new pergola only extend one bay to the west to include one arched opening, that the new metal roof be limited to a virtually flat lock metal roof so as to limit its impact on the existing slate roof of the main body of the house. Also consider the detail to the connection of the existing house. A new drawing depicting those two changes should be submitted to staff for administrative review.

Mr. Knight seconded the motion.

The motion was approved (4-1) with Mr. Adams opposed.

**7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-10-03
320 East Main Street**

**Tax Map 28 Parcel 43
David Ackerman, Applicant/ V.H. Marshall, Jr., Owner
Replace nine windows, add skylight to the roof, and remove and replace one existing HVAC
rooftop packaged unit**

Mr. Wolf recused himself, Mr. Knight directed the discussion.

Mrs. Thackston gave the staff report.

The applicant, David Ackerman, was present to answer questions and clarifications.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Osteen asked what the reason was for replacing the windows. The applicant answered that they are not in great shape, hard to operate, and single plate glass.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams asked if the owner has agreed to use this window when replacing future windows until consistency has been achieved. The applicant said that it will take some time until consistency has been achieved, but he can certainly suggest that.

Mr. Knight finds this plan very straightforward and that believes that Mr. Adams suggestion should be included in the motion that future window replacements should be consistent with those in the plan.

Mr. Osteen, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and for Site Design, I move to find that the proposal to replace 9 windows, add a skylight, and replace an HVAC unit satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district and that the BAR approves the application as modified this evening with the requirement that future window replacements be compatible with those at the time.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The motion was approved (4-0-1) with Mr. Wolf recused.

- 8. Preliminary Discussion
BAR 10-10-05
627 Park Street
Tax Map 52 Parcel 190
Mary and Dick Howard, Applicant/ A.E. Dick Howard, Owner
Kitchen Addition**

Mrs. Thackston gave the staff report.

Mary Howard, applicant and owner of 627 Park Street, gave her presentation of potential changes that would occur to her property during renovation. She would welcome the opinions from members of the BAR and a visit from any or all of them.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf suggested that looking at the guidelines would be helpful. The addition seems viable, but it depends on the detail of the construction and how it would fit within the existing structure.

Mr. Coiner suggested that once they retain an architect, get them to review the guidelines and meet with the City to determine the zoning and get those opinions in writing (because there is always room for interpretation). Also suggest that the applicant speak with the neighbors as well as the head of the neighborhood association.

Mr. Osteen encouraged the applicant to meet with an architect to start to work towards some solutions with what to do with the property.

Mr. Wolf stated that as a board it is hard to talk about hypotheticals. He suggested getting a preliminary review or engaging members of the board individually once the applicant has some plans for the property.

F. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes)

None

G. Other Business

None

H. Adjournment

9:50 PM