

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

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
William Adams
Preston Coiner
H. Fairfax Ayres
Brian Hogg
Eryn Brennan
Candace Deloach

Not Present:

Michael Osteen

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala
Jessica Casey (Planning Intern)

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Announcements:

Mr. Wolf welcomed Candace Deloach as the newest member on the BAR.

He noted that Item number 2 is moved to the slot after Item number 4 to give the applicant a chance to show up.

The applicant for Item number 9, 108 Oakhurst Circle, has requested a deferral.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

1. Discussion

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes – September 21, 2010; October, 2010

Mr. Coiner provided some revisions to the minutes. Revisions were located on pg. 2 of the September Minutes and on pg. 3 of the October Minutes.

Mr. Coiner moved the consent agenda as noted.

Mr. Wolf seconded the motion.

Approved with one correction to each set: September (5-0-1) and October (4-0-2). Deloach abstained from the vote; Hogg abstained from voting on October minutes.

C. Projects in Non-Compliance

Ms. Brennan arrived.

Mr. Adams arrived.

Ms. Scala distributed a sheet earlier in the meeting. She was asked to report on 219 West Main Street, the demolition of victory shoes storefront. The City filed for damages on that illegal demolition on October 26. They are awaiting the response, which should occur the next week.

There is also a stop work order for the two windows at the BB&T Bank on Jefferson and 4th Street. The City has asked them to submit an application for the December 2010 BAR meeting.

Mary Joy voiced if anyone has any other violations or anything to add, to email her and let her know.

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.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant has submitted the photometric drawings that were requested in the October meeting.

Lonnie Randall from Public Works represented the City.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg asked if there had been any discussion that the luminaries do not have any glass in them. He said that they look like street lights, however there is no glass.

The applicant responded saying that any glass will diffuse light and cut down on dark sky standards. There are no 100% dark sky compliant lights with glass. They are trying to meet City code that requires a dark sky standard.

Mr. Knight asked for clarifications on what the plans show on the sidewalk. The applicant responded saying that the image was showing depth to give different perspective.

Mr. Wolf asked what the light color was in terms of temperature. The applicant replied that it was a high Kelvin, about 5500.

Mr. Adams asked to clarify the spacing of the poles. The applicant replied that they would be 40 feet center to center.

Mr. Wolf asked if the light candles would be different than with 20-foot spacing between the poles. The applicant responded saying no, because the way that the light is designed, more light is shining out than directly below.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight expressed his thanks to the City for coming back with the plans and work done and thank you for considering the 65 watt fixture. He expressed that he thinks the fixture fits the guidelines, and that previously the light levels had concerned most, but now with the revised light levels, he can support the application.

Mr. Hogg expressed that he thinks the fixture may look a little odd because it presents to look traditional, but has no glass in the fixture which shines down from above. He felt that from an aesthetic standpoint, this would diminish the characteristics of the historical district. He thinks that if there were a way to get glass in the fixture, it would satisfy most of his concerns.

Ms. Brennan thanked the applicant for all of the work that was prepared for the meeting and stated that she agrees with Hogg in his comments.

Mr. Wolf asked what percent would be lost from putting up glass on the fixture. The applicant answered that 10% would be lost, making it 90% dark sky compliant rather than 100%. Mr. Wolf stated that he would support it if they added glass to the fixture. The applicant replied that it was not a problem in getting the lenses if that was what the City desires.

Mr. Adams stated that he agrees with what they were saying.

Mr. Knight stated that the discussion has changed his mind, and he agrees that glass should be added to the fixtures.

Mr. Wolf suggested trying a motion with the condition of including a glass enclosure.

Ms. Brennan asked if there was a possibility that if they installed glass in this particular fixture that it wouldn't meet certain code requirements and that they would have to choose a different fixture. The applicant replied saying that they will lose some light, only the 10%. The 10% is not going to be that noticeable.

Mr. Wolf stated that sacrificing the 10% loss of light for the glass is a compromise for the sake of the Historic District is necessary.

Mr. Adams asked if the applicant would be using every other existing pole on the bridge and then there would be something done with the unused poles. The applicant replied yes. Mr. Adams then asked about the other areas of town. He was wondering if they would use a food candle study in determining the spacing because it would be beneficial to have an even distribution and amount of light all the way down the street. The applicant expressed that they hope to have an even distribution of light.

Mr. Wolf said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for public improvements, I move to find that the proposed street light design using the 65 watt (LED) lamp satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approved the application with the following provision that the fixture includes a glass lens to enclose the lamp on the fixture.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (7-0-1) with Coiner recused, the proposed street light design using 65 w LED lamps with the provision that the fixture includes a glass lens to enclose the lamp on the fixture.

Mr. Wolf said that earlier in the at the beginning of the meeting he suggested that they move Item number 2 to after Item number 4 on the Agenda. However, he noticed that the applicant is present, so they should move to Item number 2 to continue in order on the agenda.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Follow-up)

BAR 10-09-02

180 Rugby Road

Tax Map 9 Parcel 152

John Rhett/ RA Architects, LLC, Applicant/Wooglin Co.,Garrett Smith, Tim Akens, Owner

Add 3 dormers, rebuild terrace, and relocate landscaping

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

The applicant, John Rhett was present.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight asked if the description to add 3 dormers, rebuild terrace, and redo landscaping from the last application had been approved. Mary Joy answered yes, that they approved an application to edit the landscaping, redo the terrace, and rebuild the front porch as it had been. She said this request was to follow up on that original application.

Mr. Coiner asked if the skylights were hinged. The applicant responded that yes, they were hinged in the bedrooms, but not in the bathrooms.

Mr. Hogg asked how the applicant decided on the angle for the new roof. The applicant responded that it is the minimum slope to achieve the headroom without adding a dormer. The slope of the roof is for headroom in order to get access to a second egress stair.

Mr. Wolf asked if the material of the roof would be slate. The applicant replied, yes, it would be. Mr. Wolf then asked if the skylights sat on a curb. The applicant replied saying yes, it is a minimal 2.5 or 3 inch curb. And then there would be another two inches for the window.

Mr. Adams asked if the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) approved the proposed scheme. The applicant replied saying yes, they did.

Mr. Hogg added that he saw they now have possession of the house. So they are eager to get going.

Mr. Adams asked how much of the slate is going to be new. The applicant responded saying that they are going to reuse as much of the old slate as possible and limit the new slate to the Madison side, the East elevation, where it would be least visible.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated that he preferred the first solution. He stated that the existing slope of the T matches that of the main roof, so when they change it would be a bit bulkier. But as this is the back of the building, he doesn't think that the change will have any serious effect on the character of the building.

Mr. Wolf stated that he agrees with Mr. Hogg and that the plan is already approved by DHR, making him feel the changes are fine. He feels all changes satisfy and met the guidelines.

Mr. Knight said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed cornice returns and rear roof alterations with three skylights 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.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0) the steeper rear roof, three skylights, and redesigned cornice returns as submitted.

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application
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. New handouts were distributed by the applicant at the meeting.

The applicant Cynthia Deupree and the owner Deren Bader were present.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg asked Mary Joy if the roof was asphalt and if the BAR had approved to change the roof. There was a discussion concerning the change in the material of the roof. It was later determined the asphalt shingle roof had been changed to standing seam metal without BAR approval.

Mr. Hogg asked what the footprint of the main house was. The applicant answered saying approximately 25 feet deep and 30 feet wide.

Mr. Adams asked if there was any landscaping proposed. The applicant replied not at this time.

Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant could answer the questions about the materials that Mary Joy had asked. The applicant stated that the windows are Pella with an exterior muntin. She stated it was the same series that were previously approved in '08, which are wood on the inside and aluminum clad on the outside. The applicant stated that the columns will be a synthetic material that looks like wood when painted with a paintbrush. The applicant had been looking at Turncraft, a fiberglass material.

Mr. Wolf asked the applicant if she had an elevation of the building from the high, uphill side of the addition. The applicant stated that from the ground to the eve, was about 6-7 feet from the top of the retaining wall (which is 2.5 feet from the floor level).

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

The applicant and architect, Cynthia Deupree, stated that the plan she distributed with the existing footprint of the current house is a little small. The addition is close to, but not as large as the house footprint.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thanked the applicant and owner for thinking about the last comments and stated that the plan shows a lot of improvement. He went on to say that it looks like the proposed structure is the same size as the existing house on the footprint and he is concerned that it is too large in relation to the existing house. He is also puzzled how the roof has changed in material.

Ms. Brennan wanted to thank the applicant as well. She stated that it is important to see an existing conditions plan and then a proposed plan to understand the impact the new construction will be making.

Mr. Adams stated that in the site plan, a lot could be done to deal with the issues. Some examples are burying the building in vegetation, etc. The concern about the view from the East is very valid. He thinks the applicant could look at the landscape around it and manipulate it to help the project a lot.

Mr. Knight expressed that there seems to be a track record of what was approved and what was actually done and that they do not always match (for example, the roof). As previously stated, it is not that the roof is inappropriate, but that it was not presented at the BAR. He also expressed that the site is surprising because there is no site plan. He wants to make sure that what they are approving is what will be built. Mr. Knight thinks that the building is headed in the right direction.

Mr. Wolf stated that there is a positive movement in the development of the design of the building and agrees with Mr. Hogg and Mr. Knight that the roof form and proportion of the building is important. He said that he is concerned about the scale and shape of the roof. He also expressed concern about what is going to happen to the site in terms of landscaping, connections, and paths. He stated that he assumed there would be no support for the project as it stands or with any conditions, so told the applicant that they could either defer or they could ask the BAR to review and vote on the plans.

The owner, Deren Bader, came up to speak. She said that once they received the standing seam metal bids, they went ahead and redid the roof to the house, just to match the garage. The original roofs of the porches were metal, not asphalt. In terms of site clearing, they have had extensive issues with the basement, and the pile of dirt has come from the basement. The owner stated that she appreciated the board's comments and thinks that it would be best to continue to work on the project a little more.

The applicant requested to defer the application.

Mr. Coiner moved to approve the applicant's deferral.

Ms. Brennan seconded the deferral motion.

The BAR accepted applicant's request for deferral (8-0). The BAR asked the applicant to continue to reduce the scale in relation to the main house, make the shape of the roof more sympathetic, and provide a site plan showing proposed improvements.

- 4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-09-04
109 East Jefferson Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 194
Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Arch, PLC, Applicant/ Janice Cook Aron, Owner
Site improvements, Demolition of west addition, west elevation renovation,
construction of new pool pavilion, new stairs to north porch**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. New handouts were passed out at the meeting.

The applicant Jeff Dreyfus and Pete O'Shea (Site Works Landscape Studio) were present at the meeting and added to the report. Mr. Dreyfus explained the packed that was distributed and displayed large boards that he brought in. He also spoke about the history of the east elevation. Mr. O'Shea spoke extensively about the site plan and landscaping. He stated that they looked at different elements including circulation. He also discussed different materials that would be used throughout the property, including having a concrete terrace by the pool. He also acknowledged that they will have to come in to get the final site plan approved.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight asked what the height of the security fence in the back was. The applicant answered that the fence will rise four feet from where it starts. Mr. Knight also asked if the new stone wall would be replicated. The applicant answered that the existing wall is not in good shape, so they will create a stone veneer atop a stone wall. Use a stone that is the same type of stone, to blend it into the wall. The wall will be new, but the details are not yet determined.

Ms. Brennan asked if shutters are being proposed for the west elevation along the basement windows. The applicant stated that basement shutters are only proposed on the east elevation.

Mr. Wolf asked about the other openings on the West elevation. He asked if the applicant had said that they were later openings. The applicant discussed the findings on the openings from previously additions, and uncertainties that still exist about the origin of certain openings.

Mr. Hogg asked about the handrails by the columns on the rear elevation. Mr. Dreyfus said the wood version was the most accurate, and they would come back with details.

Mr. Adams asked if the planting beds either side of the gate will be raised beds. The applicant said they will be low, at ground level.

Mr. Ayres asked if the gate will be an electronic swinging gate with a keypad. He also asked about the front gate. The applicant said the gates will swing inward. The front gate will be operated by a remote control.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ayres said he appreciates what the applicant did with the courtyard design and the landscaping.

Mr. Wolf stated that he thinks a lot of things are consistent with everything that they have previously approved. He feels that he can generally support the application. He is comfortable with the changes on the west elevation and the site conditions, especially mitigating the appearance of the fence. He said keeping the top of the hedge even will help. He said that landscaping details need to come back.

Mr. Hogg stated that he agrees with Mr. Wolf, and is certain the applicant will be able to finesse the handrails. He asked the applicant that if they start to see evidence of old openings while during the demolition, to let the BAR know, and to do what they can to keep the openings.

Mr. Wolf added that the basement level is distinct enough to not give the basement windows the same articulation as the windows on the other floors, except on the east side.

Mr. Knight said details need to be worked out, but the project is headed in the right direction. The way the driveway is handled on the sidewalk area is as graceful as can be done. The trees to be removed are not specimens, and they are adding new canopy trees.

Mr. Wolf stated that just to be clear they are approving the revised drawings in terms of the modifications to the house. They are approving the site concept with details to come back. They are not listing the details to come back, but are approving a general concept with details to come back, including fencing, gates, walls, that is, a detailed site plan.

Mr. Coiner stated that since there is a fair amount of excavation on the property. It would be good if the applicant could keep an eye on archaeological items they may dig up. If they do dig up something, please do not haul it away and bury it somewhere else. The applicant stated that the contractor has been spoken with and told to hand over anything they may find.

Mr. Wolf said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations and Demolitions, I move to find that the proposed site improvements, demolition of west addition, west elevation renovation, construction of new pool pavilion, and new stairs to north porch, satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the one condition that the site plan is approved in concept with details for a full site plan and construction details to come back to the BAR for further review.

Ms. Brennan seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0) the revised drawings presented at the meeting for site improvements, demolition of west addition, west elevation renovation, construction of new pool pavilion, and new stairs to rear porch, with one condition that the site plan is approved in concept only, with details to come back to the BAR for future approval.

E. New Items

Mr. Wolf made one more announcement that the last item on the agenda, 108 Oakhurst Circle, would not be reviewed tonight. The applicant has requested deferral.

**5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-11-01
204-206 East Market Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 238
Schaffer Somers, Applicant/ Gabe Silverman, Owner
Addition of a shed dormer and roof terrace**

Ms. Casey gave the staff report.

The applicant, Schaffer Somers, was present. He explained what was displayed on the new sheet that was brought to the BAR meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf asked what the material of the roof is. The applicant answered that it is a white membrane roof.

Mr. Ayers asked where all of the existing equipment on top of the roof would go. The applicant responded saying that the HVAC's would be replaced on the sides of the roof, outside the solid guardrails.

Mr. Wolf asked what the windows would be. The applicant answered that they are looking at commercial storefronts.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ayers commented that the addition looks like it would be completely invisible from the street.

Mr. Hogg stated that he thought the application was a very clever idea.

Mr. Wolf stated that he would support the application as submitted.

Mr. Hogg said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed addition of a shed dormer and roof terrace satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Mr. Ayres seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0) the revised plan for a shed dormer and roof terrace as submitted at the meeting.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 10-11-02
511 North First Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 1
Mark Marshall
Plant two Japanese maple trees to replace two oak trees removed last summer**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

Mary Joy noted that there were several comments from the public when the previous trees were removed from the property. Photos of stumps were submitted from a citizen. There was also an email from residents about the signage on the lot.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Ayres asked why the previous trees were taken down.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight stated that he felt the staff was right and there needs to be a large shade tree, possibly off of the City's provided list. He stated that they could either defer or deny the application, so that the applicant could come back another month.

Mr. Wolf stated that another option would be to approve replacing the torn down trees with the conditions that a larger shade tree would be put in their place.

Mr. Hogg wanted to emphasize that they should communicate that the mass of the torn down trees should be replaced, not just the number.

Mr. Wolf made a motion to deny the application.

Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

The BAR denied (8-0) the request to replace two Oak trees removed without approval with two Japanese Maples. The BAR wants the applicant to return to the BAR with a site plan with a creative solution; not a one-for-one replacement; including large trees to serve as shade trees on the street.

Also, a suggestion was made to have smaller and fewer parking signs at the entrance.

**7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-11-03**

**801 West Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcel 144.2
Verizon Wireless c/o Stephen Walker, Applicant/ Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., Owner
Add five new antennas to an existing cell phone tower**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

The applicant's representative, Maynard Sipe from LeClair Ryan, noted that, due to a merger between Verizon and Alltel, they no longer need to accomplish the full array at 140 feet. Instead, they can add four antennas to an existing array.

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. Knight said it is what it is.

Mr. Ayres said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed new antennas satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Mr. Wolf seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0) the application adding four new antennas at 185 feet, and adding cross bracing between 125-131 feet levels as submitted.

**8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 10-11-04
123 Bollingwood Road
Tax Map 7 Parcel 22
Jeff Dreyfus, Bushman Dreyfus Architects PLC, Applicant/ Emily and Jeff Elias, Owner
Modifications to west elevation: replace single window with triple window; replace single window with pair of French doors; add wood pergola/sunscreen**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

The applicant, Jeff Dreyfus, further explained the project.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf asked if the French doors will be wider than the current window opening. The applicant said that is correct.

Mr. Wolf asked what was the thinking behind the steel brackets and rods. The applicant said it was clearly an addition.

Mr. Wolf asked why the triple window was proposed to be 1/1 rather than 2/2. The applicant said all the first floor windows are 1/1.

Mr. Ayres asked if the shrubbery will disappear, and if the owners are contemplating a patio. The applicant said they are discussing it. He said the greatest priority is getting more light into the living room.

Mr. Knight asked if they had considered a freestanding pergola.

Ms. DeLoach asked if they had considered another set of French doors rather than the triple window.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg said he had no real issue with introducing a door, but he preferred a single leaf door so that they could avoid widening the opening, which was in his mind a mistake. He said this elevation couldn't be cleaner or simpler – four windows under a gable – a farmhouse. Nothing in the guidelines would suggest that a horizontal enlargement of a window would be appropriate. While the pergola is clever, it is not appropriate to attach it. Options would be something freestanding, or perhaps a wind-up awning.

Mr. Ayres agreed, and wants to see a landscape plan.

Ms. Brennan agreed.

Mr. Coiner had nothing to add.

Mr. Wolf said that keep the current window opening with a single leaf door makes sense. He said in general, the simplicity of the current elevation makes sense. There is something funny about a tie rod attached to this house. He can see changing a window to a door, or both windows to doors, and can see a trellis. He suggested a deferral might be in order.

The Applicant requested a deferral.

Mr. Knight made a motion to accept the applicant's deferral.

The BAR accepted the applicant's deferral (8-0) and made suggestions to keep the simplicity of the façade, to use a single leaf door rather than French doors, to use traditional supports for the trellis, and to reconsider widening the single window.

Mr. Coiner added that this property was previously listed as Bollingwood Avenue, not Bollingwood Road, which may have caused confusion.

- 9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL
BAR 10-11-05
108 Oakhurst Circle
Tax Map 11 Parcel 6
Peyton and Bobbie Williams, Owner
Replace Windows**

The Chair said that this item was deferred at the applicant's request prior to the meeting.

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

Jeff Dreyfus noted that new member DeLoach's name was not yet added to the BAR's website.

- G. Other Business**

Suggestions were made to staff to write a letter to area roofers reminding them that BAR approval is needed prior to replacing a roof; and to ask applicants for digital drawings so that they could be displayed onscreen for the public's benefit during meetings.

- H. Adjournment**

7:35 PM