

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
September 20, 2011
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Preston Coiner
Candace DeLoach
Brian Hogg
William Adams

Not Present:

H. Fairfax Ayres
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Michael Osteen
Melanie Miller

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Announcements:

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

1. Discussion

John Conover-104 W High Street said he did not receive proper notice so he requested that the proposed generator project at 235 W Main Street be deferred to a future date. Regarding a sidewalk project at 100 W High Street, he wants any changes to the sidewalk in front of his property to be reviewed. He said the sidewalk from 1st to 2nd Streets should be unified.

B. Consent Agenda

- 1. Minutes – August 16, 2011**
- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 11-09-10
408 E Market Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 54AA
408 E Market St Condo Owners Assoc, Owner/Real Property Inc, Applicant
Replace copper roof cap with painted metal
- 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 11-09-01
819 W Main Street
Tax Map 31 Parcel 184B
Virginia PCS Alliance, LC, Applicant/ Citico Realty Co (Southern RR Co), Owner
Add antennas and equipment

Mr. Hogg made a motion to approve the consent agenda with one correction to the minutes.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (5-0) the consent agenda with one correction to the minutes.

C. Projects in Non-Compliance –No status to report this month.

D. Previously Deferred Items

4. 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 presented the staff report.

The applicant, Chris Gensic was present and added that they are working with the ADA advisor for the City of Charlottesville to see if a handrail is needed.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- **Safety is most important**
- **The sidewalk could be finessed to where a handrail would not be necessary.**

Mr. Wolf said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements and Public Improvements, I move to find that the proposal for a concrete sidewalk and landscaping satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application of the new sidewalk as submitted. If a handrail is necessary, then that design must come back to the BAR for review; it could be approved administratively with circulation to BAR members.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (5-0).

5. ~~Certificate of Appropriateness Application~~ (Discussion only)

BAR 11-05-02

9th Street NE and SE

Tax Map 53

City of Charlottesville, Applicant

Belmont Bridge Replacement Design

Questions or Comments from the public

Greg Jackson, 631 Blenheim Avenue, is glad that the application is only being presented for discussion only. He feels that a lot of issues are inadequately addressed, and a lot of other issues should be looked at.

Brian Wimer, feels that the process is not matching up to expectations.

Galen Staengl, 129 Goodman Street, feels that the design is not really functional for a bridge. He feels they need to go back to the drawing board.

Jordan Phemister, 716 Monticello Avenue, feels that a step back needs to be taken and the design looked at again.

The BAR had a discussion about the sketch-up drawings. They asked again to see better documentation (plans, sections and elevations), including how the bridge connects to roadways at either end, and a design that is more responsive to public comments.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 11-07-07

235 W Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 155L

Omni Charlottesville Virginia Corp, Owner/ Cellco Partnership, Applicant

New generator on Old Preston

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

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR accepted (5-0) the applicant's request for deferral due to improper notice.

E. New Items

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 11-09-03

315 E High Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 67

City of Charlottesville, Applicant and Owner

Charlottesville Circuit Court fence, landscaping, and security camera/light pole

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant was present and added that the fence is needed due to high profile cases in the future.

Questions or Comments from the public

Dr. Bunny Sheppard, 412 3rd Street NE, stated that she is for this and the applicant has promised to keep the neighborhood looking residential.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- How tall would the fence be?
- The fence should be located near the curb where it is level.
- The fence would be far off the street, so not very visible.

The applicant stated that the fence would be 4.5ft and the space is tight but feels it can be fixed.

Mr. Hogg said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed fence and streetlight 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 following conditions, the use of a 4-5 ft. height Omega fence with the condition that it is located closer to the curb.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (5-0)

- 8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 11-09-02
100 W. High Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 189
City of Charlottesville, Applicant/ James and Susan Neale, Owner
New handicapped ramp/City sidewalk/walkway and porch step

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant and owner were present; the owner stated that the walkway leading up to the house is concrete, and not attractive.

Questions or comments from the public

There were none

Questions or comments from the Board

- **Wall should be installed on both sides of the walkway.**
- **Does the property line go right through the pillar?**
- **Feels engineering has done a great job coming up with a solution.**
- **Feels the pillar should be kept and not have any curb on the opposite side of the sidewalk.**
- **Sidewalk should be sloped so no guardrail is necessary.**
- **Making the walkway brick would be fine.**

Mr. Hogg said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed project satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modification; the ramp/sidewalk, new walkway and porch step in concept, but the construction details must come back to the BAR for final approval. A brick walkway to the house would be permitted; design the new retaining wall with a curved edge and retain the four existing concrete posts; cement samples to match; new concrete retaining wall and sidewalk to match adjacent concrete; the street side lawn must be re-graded to avoid a new curb on the street side of the ramp.

Ms. DeLoach seconded the motion

The BAR approved (5-0)

- 9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)**
BAR 11-09-04
854 Locust Avenue
Tax Map 51 Parcel 092
Turner & Christine Lisle, Owner

Demolish/renovate three accessory structures

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none

Questions or comments from the Board

- **The Board felt this was within the guidelines.**

Mr. Wolf said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and Demolitions in Conservation Districts, I move to find that the proposed demolitions and restorations 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. Hogg seconded the motion

The BAR approved (5-0) the application to demolish parts of three accessory structures as submitted.

- 10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 11-09-06
513 West Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcel 172
Gabriel Silverman, Applicant/ Main Street West, LLC, Owner
Extend balcony; revise door design

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

The architect, Greg Jackson, represented the applicant.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- **Why extend the balcony?**
- **Will the doors on the other end change?**
- **Keep the porch a feature back behind the plane of the garage. It is not appropriate on that side.**
- **Fine with the garage- like doors.**
- **Balcony is not okay.**

The applicant added that the balcony would overlook the area and the doors on the building would change.

Mr. Adams said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed renovations and addition 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 revised door design but denied the revised balcony.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion

The BAR approved (4-0-1 with Wolf recused)

- 11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 11-09-05
505 West Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcel 174
Schaeffer Somers, Applicant/ Main Street West, LLC, Owner
Renovate existing building

Mr. Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant was present and added that they are looking for a contemporary look to stand out from the street.

Questions or comments from the public

There were none.

Questions or comments from the Board

- Color of projecting window?
- Will the paint be taken off the façade?
- The changes are not appropriate with the guidelines.
- Change is too dramatic.
- The new look is a bad look.
- Will the height stay the same?
- Do away with the corner to square it off?

Mr. Hogg made a motion for a deferral

Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

The BAR deferred (4-0-1 with Wolf recused) the application to renovate the existing building. Because the BAR deferred, they are required to take action at the November 18 meeting.

- 12. Certificate of Appropriateness**
BAR 11-09-09
616 Park Street
Tax Map 52 Parcel184
Irene & Elliott Jennings, Owner
Enclose existing porch; perimeter fence

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

The architect, Carrie Burke, was present.

Questions or comments from the public

There were none

Questions or comments from the Board

- Feels that everything looks fine.

Mr. Coiner 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 porch enclosure and perimeter fencing satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property, and other properties in the historic district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion

The BAR approved the application to enclose the existing porch, and the perimeter fencing as submitted.

- 13. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 11-07-06
207 14th Street NW
Tax Map 9, Parcels 70.1, 70.21
University Ltd, LLC, Owner/ Whit Graves, Applicant
Convert existing apartment building to Alcove 14th St Hotel

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

The architect, Bob Anderson, was present.

Questions or comments from the public

There were none

Questions or comments from the Board

- Trellis enclosure need to be discussed.
- What are the changes in material?
- Circulation on the south side of the building?
- How would the south side look at night?
- Need additional window frame details.

Mr. Hogg said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed addition and 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 in concept, with the following conditions:

1. Treatment of the east and west ends of the building be reconsidered to simplify the materials;
2. Trellis design be revisited to reduce its size and presence on the south elevation;
3. Additional information including wall sections, window details, information about canopies on the west end of building and their design and attachment to the building, and sun shades be submitted for review and approval by the board.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (4-0-1 with Wolf recused)

- 14. Special Use Permit Recommendation and Preliminary Discussion**
BAR 11-09-08
600 Preston Place
Tax Map 5 Parcel 109
Will Teass, AIA, Applicant/ Xi Chapter of Theta Chi Alumni Corp, Owner
Enlarge fraternity with three-level addition for five additional bedrooms

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

Questions or comments from the public

There were none

Questions or comments from the Board

- What trees will be removed?
- Size of windows being used for the bathroom?
- Is the roof synthetic slate?
- East addition will be a sleeping porch?
- 15 block panels and the elevation shows windows

The applicant stated that three small pear trees would be removed and two sycamores that are adjacent would also be removed. Posts and panels would be used in the sleeping porch. HVAC system would be added to the second floor and mechanical space used.

Mr. Wolf said, I move to recommend that the proposed Special Use Permit will not have an adverse effect on the ADC district and the BAR recommended that City Council approve the Special Use Permit to allow an increase in number of bedrooms for 600 Preston Place.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion

The BAR recommended (4-0-1 with DeLoach recused)

- 15. Certificate of Appropriateness Application and Rezoning Recommendation**
BAR 11-09-07
612-632-702 Ridge Street
Tax Map 25, Parcels 262, 64, 65
Burnet Commons Development, LLC, Applicant/ Maurice Cox, Rosa Lee &
Otis Lee Jr and Red & Rosa, LLC, Owners
Remove portion of properties from ADC District and create walkway connector

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

Maurice Cox, applicant was present and added Burnet Commons would not be seen from Ridge Street.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none

Questions or comments from the Board

- Has tree survey been done?
- What are the building heights and masses?
- 2 story building would fit in the slope.
- Landscape the buffer.

Mr. Wolf said, I move to recommend that the proposed rezoning to remove the ADC designation from the rear portions of 612, 632 and 702 Ridge Street, but not including the walkway strip from Ridge Street to the new cul-de-sac, should be approved.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion

The BAR recommended (5-0) that the proposed rezoning to remove the ADC designation from the rear portions of 612, 632, and 702 Ridge Street, but not including the walkway strip from Ridge Street to the new cul-de-sac, should be approved by City Council.

Mr. Wolf said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the concept of the walkway connection satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the walkway connection in concept only, with the following details to be returned to the BAR for further approval: design of the walls showing relationship to other walls nearby, detailed site/landscaping design, and brick sample.

The BAR approved (5-0) the concept of a walkway connection, with details related to paving, planting, landscape, retaining walls and any impact on that property or the adjacent property with respect to the driveway and paving shall come back to the BAR for further approval, and the area being presented as part of the walkway connection shall remain in the ADC district.

- 16. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (emergency request)**
 BAR 11-09-11
 908 Cottage Lane
 Tax Map 2 Parcel 55
 Dale L & Chris A Ludwig
 Replace slate roof

Ms. Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant, Whit Graves, and the owner, Dale Ludwig, were present and stated that the roof was damaged by the storm.

Questions or comments from the public

There were none

Questions or comments from the Board

- Synthetic slate is more appropriate.
- Did the storm blow the ridges off?
- Roof is a defining feature.
- Metal is not appropriate for the house.

The owner stated that metal is cheaper and can’t afford what the BAR is suggesting.

Mr. Wolf said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed roof replacement does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion

The BAR denied (5-0) the application for a standing seam metal roof because the property is designated as an Individually Protected Property and the scalloped slate roof is highly visible and a character-defining feature of the property. (Some suggested researching a synthetic slate option).

F. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes) -None

G. Other Business -None

H. Adjournment 11:10 pm