

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
January 18, 2011
Minutes**

Present:

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

Not Present:

Brian Hogg
Eryn Brennan
H. Fairfax Ayres

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

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

Announcements:

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

1. Discussion

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes – December 21, 2010

Mr. Coiner moved the consent agenda.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion.

Consent Agenda approved (4-0-2 with Adams and Knight abstaining because they were not at the meeting)

Approved with Mr. Adams and Mr. Knight abstaining from voting, they were not at the meeting.

C. Projects in Non-Compliance

No report, working on projects for next month's meeting.

D. Previously considered items

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 10-04-03

1901 East Market Street

Tax Map 55A Parcel 149

David L. Puckett/FPW, Applicant/Jon Fink, Owner

Move historic shed, new garage/connector and decks

Ms. Scala gave the staff report.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the flood plain had changed.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the applicant wanted to add anything to what was in the report.

The applicant, David Puckett, handed out a new plan and stated that he had made the changes that the BAR recommended and the picture should reflect this.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public. There weren't any.

Mr. Knight asked what material would be used for the retaining wall.

Applicant responded with parged CMU material which is a better solution and more calm.

Mr. Coiner asked would the roof be traditional or pre-painted.

The applicant responded by saying that copper would be the first choice, hand crimped.

Mr. Coiner also wanted to know about the shape of the gutters.

The applicant stated copper half rounds.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if Hardie plank will be used as siding.

The applicant responded with yes.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know would he use the smooth side, as opposed to wood-grain.

The applicant responded with yes.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know why the stairs are so prominent from the rest of the structure. Mr. Osteen also wanted to know about hedge material.

The applicant responded by saying they are looking at hedge material, its not finalized yet and its less aggressive.

Ms. DeLoach wanted to know if the existing rail is metal.

The applicant responded with yes.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the garage would come in contact with the house.

The applicant responded by saying 2ft separates the house from the garage.

Mr. Wolf was concerned about the over hang of the garage.

The applicant responded by saying that he would hold back 18 inches.

Mr. Osteen was concerned about set back issues at the face of the garage.

Mr. Adams wanted to confirm whether the applicant had met with the neighbors in the community about the design.

The applicant stated that they did with the old design but not on the new design.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know about the minimal set backs.

Ms. Scala stated that Riverside is considered the front, and the set back is 25ft, or, if the setback is more or less than 25 ft on 40% of other lots within 500 ft, then an average is used.

Mr. Wolf asked were there any more questions or comments from the Board.

There were no more questions or comments.

Mr. Wolf asked for comments from the public.

Ms. Dimitri Costan, 202 Riverside Ave, opposes the addition. She feels that it takes away the integrity of the neighborhood.

Mr. Fink plans to not to start building until the property line is determined.

Mr. Wolf asked for anymore comments from the public; there were no more comments.

Mr. Coiner feels the garage would not impact the historic property. He wanted to know about the stairs.

Mr. Wolf suggested maybe putting it in a different spot.

Mr. Wolf is very sympathetic to the neighbors of the community. He has no issues with the garage. He feels that applicant has made the changes and done what was asked of them. His preference would be to have wood rails.

Mr. Adams wanted to know the reason for the garage ceiling being 11 ft - 5 in.

Mr. Fink stated it would be easier to move storage in and out.

Mr. Osteen feels that the plan has been done nicely.

Mr. Fink stated that there is another house right next door that has a garage and also a new house with a new garage.

Ms. DeLoach feels that this decking is out of scale for this neighborhood and should be scaled down a little.

Mr. Knight appreciates all the work. He feels it is a tremendous improvement. He wants a better understanding of the placement and the mass of the roof.

Mr. Wolf said we work hard to be sure an addition does not overshadow or project in front of a primary structure. He feels like the front of the building faces East Market but we are looking at a side of the original building. He also made known that there is potentially a split decision and tie would not pass. He also wanted to make known that the addition on the current additions are allowed. He feels some changes are practical and viable.

Mr. Wolf said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and Site Design, I move to find that the proposed addition satisfies the BAR criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district and that the BAR approves the application with the following conditions:

- 1. The roof ridge of the garage to be minimized, with the goal of 20 feet or less, maintaining the 12/12 pitch.**
- 2. The stair from the deck at the rear to be contained within the body of the deck structure or framing.**
- 3. The material used for the deck and guardrail to be painted wood not composite.**

4. The retaining at the Southwest corner of new garage to be expanded to extend the walkway to the driveway.
5. Roof of garage to be standing seam metal either copper or terne, hand crimped and painted on site with no ridge vent.
6. Details relating to the guardrail design and open uncovered wood terrace to be submitted to staff for administrative review.
7. Plant materials to be submitted to staff for administrative review.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved the plan (4-2 with Adams and Osteen opposed).

E. New Items

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 11-01-02
610 East Main Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 160
Chris Gensic, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner
New sidewalk at Transit Station

Ms. Scala gave the report.

Chris Gensic from Facilities Management represented the City.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner asked if the grade had been checked with the adjacent building

The applicant responded by saying someone from facility had checked the slope at Merrill Lynch and the slope would work.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the same material used by the City would be used for the rest of the project.

The applicant responded that facility just inherited the green space.

Ms. Scala stated that the landscape was approved.

The applicant stated that the landscape that was approved was grass.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Coiner pointed out that he has observed people cutting through further to the south.

Mr. Knight felt the same as Mr. Coiner. He also added that a walkway is needed and a lot more questions needed to be answered. Such as; location, steps and landscape being altered.

The applicant felt that some options needed to be played with.

Mr. Knight felt that the solution would be easy with more thought.

Mr. Wolf suggested more intentional options such as an extension coming off a sidewalk spur at Merrill Lynch to meet a stair landing or making a wider arc instead of bifurcating the site into upper and lower grass areas.

Mr. Coiner feels the applicant should come back with a plan.

Mr. Adams wanted to know how much of a design the project would receive.

The applicant felt that they should not go overboard with a design. He also feels they need more time to think it through.

Mr. Wolf does not support the current proposal strongly with what he is hearing. Mr. Wolf suggests the applicant defer and come back with a plan.

The applicant felt the same way.

Mr. Coiner stated that a similar condition exists at the end of the mall.

Mr. Coiner moved to accept the applicant request for a deferral, which passed unanimously (6-0). They want the applicant to come back with a more thought-out plan.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 11-01-01

610 Lyons Court

Tax Map 52 Parcel 78

Wyck Knox, Applicant and Owner

Replacement of Rear Additions

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

The applicant Mr. Knox was present at the meeting and added to the report. Mr. Knox explained how he wanted to preserve the memory of the wall and foundation. He also added that he wanted to replace the porch that use to fill in the columns. He noted that he would be using material that has a 20 year "no rot guarantee". He also gave a little history of prior renovation done in the early 19th and 20th century.

QUESTION FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. DeLoach would like to know if closed fixed shutters could be used instead of panels.

The applicant feels shutters would make it look too busy.

Ms. DeLoach feels that it is already busy with so many panels and windows.

The applicant stated that the 1st floor will stay the same.

Ms. DeLoach wanted to know was the 1st floor originally opened.

Applicant stated that they will keep what was there. He stated that there are no closets, and they will be putting it back to the way it was found. Applicant also stated that the molding will be extremely close to original.

Ms. DeLoach wanted to know if the applicant considered mirrored windows.

The applicant feels that mirrored windows are not appropriate.

Mr. Wolf suggested a solid double hung window with solid panes.

Mr. Adams suggested different ways to do the porch fill. He does not want to defer away from the original features of the house. The older broad husky moldings are different from the early 20th century finery.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if he is talking about the lightness and transparency of the infill that goes solid now.

Mr. Adams felt it starts to look fussy but the original design has a strong broad quality.

Mr. Wolf regrets the windows cannot be more dominant. He would still support it.

Mr. Osteen agrees and respects the applicant choices. Mr. Osteen feels that the plans and pictures look quite nice. Mr. Osteen feels the applicant is adding a lot of better composition.

Mr. Wolf suggested making certain transoms solid. He clarified the type of windows.

Mr. Wolf 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 replacement of the Rear Additions and porch satisfy the BAR criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the note the windows will be painted wood, by Jeld-Wen simulated divided light.

Mr. Knight seconded.

The BAR approved the motion (6-0).

- 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
Bar 11-01-03
116 W Jefferson Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 183
Blake DeMaso, Applicant/Blue Ridge Outdoors Properties, LLC, Owner
Fencing Under Porch and Breezeway**

Ms. Scala gave the report.

Questions from the public

There were no questions

Questions from the board

Mr. Wolf wanted to know the design, whether it would be square on top.

Mr. Knight wanted to know the location of the fence in relation to the brick columns.

The applicant stated that the fence would be steel, painted black, built on site, 1” square and the fence would be located inside the brick columns.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know the purpose of the fence, is the applicant trying to keep unwanted people out.

The applicant stated they and the funeral home are having problems.

Comments from the public

There were no comments

Comments from the board

Mr. Coiner is pleased that the applicant is going to steel. The fence should go between the columns, not behind them. He also touched on the gate being key locked with egress requirements. A panic bar may be needed to satisfy code.

Mr. Wolf agreed it should be anchored into the brick and pushed back near the rear of the columns. He stated he is comfortable with the F-100 design with square top, and that the top or bottom rail should be held off the end of the pickets. Any modifications can be dealt with through staff approval.

Mr. Knight said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposal as modified verbally by the applicant to have a steel fence welded on site satisfies the BAR criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district and that the BAR approves the application as modified.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (6-0) the motion.

- 4. Individually Protected Property Recommendation
233 4th Street NW
Tax Map 32 Parcel 89
City of Charlottesville, Owner
Jefferson School**

Ms. Scala gave the report.

Mr. Wolf feels that the school has played an important part in the history of the city. He feels it is pretty incredible.

Mr. Coiner has no problem supporting it.

Mr. Adams said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Criteria for Additions to and Deletions from the Individually Protected Property List, I move that the BAR

recommend that City Council should designate the Jefferson School building and property as an Individually Protected Property.

The BAR approved the motion unanimously (6-0).

- 5. Discussion
600 Block of Downtown Mall
Tax Map 53 Parcel 160
Ed Smith, Designer/ City of Charlottesville, Owner
Sister Cities Clock Details**

Ms. Scala gave the report. Ed Smith, the designer, was present.

Questions from the public

There were no questions.

Questions from the Board

There were no questions.

Comments from the public

There were no comments

Comments from the Board

Mr. Wolf prefers monochromatic seals to color seals, which could look like decals. He likes the idea of marking the months on the meridian line. Where the meridian line starts and stops is important. The idea of lighting is nice. He likes that the shape of the clock is defined by the solstice sun angles.

Mr. Knight wanted to know about the size and placement of the Sister City seals.

Mr. Smith said the south side of the clock, where they would go, is only one foot wide.

Mr. Adams likes the bronze idea.

Mr. Osteen said it is a great project. Check with the Sister Cities to see if they have a monochrome version of the seals.

Mr. Knight said the concept is wonderful, but there are a lot of details to be resolved. He prefers a rough (not polished) finish on the granite.

Mr. Osteen suggested a polished circle clock face.

Mr. Knight said the lighting would take some thought.

Mr. Adams would not light it at all. He suggested a more subtle line across the mall.

Mr. Osteen agreed the line has to stop somehow, not just run into the liriopie.

Mr. Wolf said the line should dissipate somehow but it's an important part of the idea. How dominant it needs to be versus the vertical element is a fair consideration.

Mr. Knight suggested a darker granite strip.

The BAR made preliminary comments, and asked the designer to return to the BAR for final approval. They did not think that external lighting was practical to accomplish; they preferred a matte finish on the granite; they wanted to see the meridian line made more subtle, possibly of brick; they wanted months as well as the solstices and equinoxes marked on the meridian line; they preferred bronze detailing to aluminum; they preferred monochromatic sister city seals.

F. Matters from the public not on the agenda -None

G. Other Business -None

H. Adjournment

7:27 p.m.