

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
March 20, 2012
Minutes**

Present:

Syd Knight, Chair
Preston Coiner
Candace DeLoach
Melanie Miller
William Adams, Vice-Chair
Brian Hogg
Michael Osteen
Whit Graves
Tim Mohr

Not Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Knight convened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. He also wanted to inform the Board and members of the public of the absence of Mary Joy Scala and that he would be presenting the staff reports and Mary Joy's intern Kelly Clifton would be taking notes on Mary Joy's behalf.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were none

B. Consent Agenda

1. **Minutes – February 21, 2012 Consent agenda approved (8-0-1 with Hogg abstaining).**

Mr. Coiner recommended approval of the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Miller seconded the motion.

C. Projects in Non-Compliance No report.

D. Previously Deferred Items

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from August 2011)**
BAR 10-07-07
5 Gildersleeve Wood
Tax Map 11 Parcel 18
A.Bahlmann Abbot, Applicant/ Deren Bader & Paul Lyons, Owners
New studio/office in rear yard

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant gave an overview of the changes that have occurred since first presented to the Board. The applicant shows exactly where the studio would be located on the property and the plantings that would be added to the lot. The applicant noted that materials proposed on the project are compatible with the existing house and garage.

Questions or Comments from the public

Mr. Scott Pryor, an adjacent property owner, spoke in support of the project. He believed that the project would be of high quality, and enhance the property value of the existing house and of the entire neighborhood.

Question or Comments from the Board

- The updated design is substantially smaller and addresses previous concerns the Board expressed.
- Is there a walkway or stairs from the main house to the studio?
- How will the standing seam metal roof be treated?
- The Board feels this design is appropriate

The applicant's intention is to treat the roof with the same copper colored aluminum that is used on the house, without the use of heavy ridge caps, and it will be crimped in the field. The landscape designer suggested a stone dust path with a simple footprint connecting to the studio.

Mr. Hogg said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, and for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed new studio/office in the rear yard 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.

Ms. Miller seconded the motion.

The BAR approved as submitted (9-0).

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from February 2012)**
BAR 12-01-03
1250 Wertland Street
Tax Map 10 Parcel 25
Wertland, LLC, Owner/ Daggett & Grigg, Applicant
New 4-story boarding house

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant described the open stairs and open back of the project. They also liked the asymmetrical elevation. The applicant tried to incorporate a lot of parking into the design.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Is the entry to the street is open in the rear?
- Is the decision to not address the courtyard because of financing?
- Are 3000 lumen lights allowed under the dark sky ordinance?
- Is there a reason there could not be an opening on the side of the stairwell to reduce the expanse of wall?
- The flat panel fiber glass door seemed odd.

The applicant has put a front door on the building and eliminated two parking places. The stair has to be a breezeway and not enclosed because it is a four-story building. The applicant says the owner will address the courtyard in the future. The applicant prefers the asymmetrical elevation especially with the front door. An

opening could not be placed in less than three feet. There is an option for shielding and the light fixtures will definitely meet the dark sky ordinance.

Mr. Mohr said, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the additional details 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. He suggested a more appropriate choice of light fixture.

Mr. Graves seconded the motion.

The BAR approved the application as submitted, but with a more appropriate choice of light fixtures (8-1 with Hogg opposed).

E. New Items

- 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 12-03-05
505 W Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcel 174
Greg Jackson, Applicant/Main Street West, LLC, Owner
Addition

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant adjusted the submittal, replacing the metal clad with wood. Also, added a 5/8 inch divider with 1/2 inch glazing.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- You have already removed all the old windows?
- Is this intended as a front entrance or an entrance for a separate tenant?
- All the doors are narrow style storefront?
- What is the green space?
- Who owns the woven board fence?
- What is the deck roof material?
- Why the choice of the fiber cement board?
- Mr. Hogg feels that this is a discouraging project. This owner is doing renovations as he sees fit with no regards to the City. The windows have already been removed. The face of the brick is gone due to sandblasting in large areas of the facades. The entire façade of the eastern building was rebuilt when a crack developed. Although there is a lot to like about this proposal the Board is uncomfortable with approving the application.
- The Board feels that dealing with a project a small piece at a time is difficult to fully see how the project will look in the end. It would be more comprehensive if seeing the whole thing altogether. Earlier meetings showed no indication that more was happening.
- Grass pavers are inappropriate if someone is going to be parking there on a daily basis. The material does not suggest parking.

- The street is becoming more significant with the Jefferson School project. Although there are some interesting elements to the plans, there is no indication of how well these plans will be executed.
- Why did the applicant not run all the way to the street line?
- How many of the windows have been thrown away and how many remain?
- Why were the windows removed?
- The Board requested that NDS staff investigate the violations that occurred when the original windows were removed.

The applicant has already removed the old windows without the Board's approval. The owner wants to leave the entrance flexible at this time depending on what the tenant will need. They are swing doors. The applicant indicates that the green space is just a basic sketch at this time. Simple pavers against the building and along the side as a walk that can be used for parking are currently intended. The applicant thinks the funeral home owns the woven board fence. Roof deck material is not detailed, but will probably consist of rubber membrane with floating wood deck. The fiber material board seemed clean and wasn't attempting to recreate the brick. The applicant wanted to use the space next to the street line for parking. Eight windows were original: two on the east and six on the west. Two on the east have been saved while the rest have been discarded. The applicant states the windows had been in disrepair for so long.

The applicant requested a deferral from the Board on both the removal of the windows and the addition.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to accept the applicant request for both deferrals.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion.

Accepted (9-0) the applicant's request for deferral.

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
 BAR 12-03-03
 222 E Main Street
 Tax Map 28 Parcel 37
 Michael R Williams, Applicant/ Williams Pentagram Corp, Owner
 Replace 5 second-story windows

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.
 The applicant was present and did not add to the report.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Would the glass be clear and can the old glass be used
- Much easier to recreate detail with newer windows; being on the second floor it would be pretty hard to tell these aren't original
- Why the choice of mahogany for the sills

The applicant stated that the company suggested insulated windows for energy reasons and the trim will be retained as is.

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 replacement of five windows and sills 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. Osteen seconded the motion.

The BAR approved as submitted (9-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-03-06

632 W Main Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 1

Pastor Hodari Hamilton, Applicant/ First Baptist Church, Owner

Change window to door for emergency exit

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant, Pastor Hodari Hamilton was presented. The ramp would not come from the sidewalk but from the side of the building to allow for a lower slope. The majority of the door would be covered and not damage the exterior.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Will the door fit just by lowering the sill or will the actual opening have to be made wider?
- Will the head be moved?
- The other window is into an office?
- Will the door look like the existing door or the existing windows?
- The ramp is a concern because of the current rise of the stairs.
- The Board felt that the applicant needed the help of an architect to design the door and the ramp and gave some guidelines of things that the BAR needed to see. The BAR suggested the applicant defer.

The applicant stated the opening would only have to be made deeper so the door could fit. The head does not have to be moved. The other doors would not accommodate a door either because of the slope, location in the building, or being blocked by a heating unit. The slope from the other windows would be so steep and create other problems.

The applicant requested a deferral from the Board.

Mr. Knight made a motion to accept the applicant request for a deferral.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion

Accepted (9-0) the applicant's request for deferral.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-03-02

29 University Circle
Tax Map 6 Parcel 79
Achsah Carrier, Applicant and Owner
Driveway extension

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant was present.

Questions or Comments from the Public

Don Doogle, living at 20 University Circle, spoke on behalf of the applicant. They felt that the applicant needed more parking in her home because the excess number of cars impacted parking and driving on the entire street.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Does the shorter extension run right up to the retaining wall?
- Any concern about disrupting the tree and its roots?
- Feel cars physically would not fit on the right side
- Can put back what was there in the 1920s instead of paving over what is there? Maybe using a gravel material?
- Grass can look nice, but parked cars would damage the grass
- Concern over establishing a precedent of parking cars in front of homes

The applicant says the retaining wall will not have to be reworked. The shorter driveway would only run to the retaining wall. The tree is probably alright because the roots run farther back. The applicant plans on repairing the existing driveway to limit disintegration.

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 extension of the primary driveway satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application for extension of the longer driveway but denied extension of the shorter driveway.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion

The BAR approved (9-0) the extension of the longer driveway, but denied extension of the shorter driveway.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-03-01
230 W Main Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 1
Mark Brown, Applicant/Main Street Arena LLC, Owner
Add PV solar panels on south roof

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant was present and gave an overview of the importance of the time frame of approval of the application.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Will the mechanical units be hidden?
- Does something have to happen with the snow guards that already exist on the roof?
- Not something normally that the BAR would approve in this district but feel an exception can be made.
- What is the pay back for solar panels?
- Will raw aluminum be on the copper roof?
- This is a novel thing in a historic district
- Wouldn't approve the panels if they were facing the toward the Mall

The applicant stated that the mechanical units will be hidden. Snow will melt off the solar panels before it melts off the roof.

Mr. Knight said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Sustainability and Rehabilitation, 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 application as submitted.

Mr. Graves seconded the motion.

The BAR Approved as submitted (9-0).

- 8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 12-03-04
705 Park Street
Tax Map 52 Parcel 58
Waterstreet Studio, Applicant/ Greyson & Ariana Williams, Owner
Demolish and replace garage and rear porch; master landscape plan

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant was present and gave an overview of the proposed application.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Work at the back of the house seems appropriate while the garage's siting is a problem.
- Arrival court at the front of the house has nothing to do with the house.
- Highly institutional quality to the landscape proposed.
- Sun porch addition is not the strongest part of the house. The proportions don't have to do with the house.
- Unprecedented amount of security for this house. It shouldn't be presented in the design.
- Feels the garage door is really not appropriate for this house.
- Why is there extra height on the garage
- The scale of the fence is not appropriate
- There are a lot of elements tied to this house relating to the garage
- Is the existing garage an original
- Are there examples from other Charlottesville historic districts offering precedents for garage

- Garage should not be mated to the house architecturally

The applicant stated the garage was built in the 1920s and not built at the same time as the house. The applicant wants to make the landscape a continuous plant bed in front of the house. The applicant plans to keep as much as the existing planting as possible. The extra height on the garage is to align with the house.

The applicant requested a deferral from the Board

Mr. Coiner made a motion to accept the applicants request for a deferral

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion

Accepted the applicant's request for deferral (9-0)

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-03-07

600 Preston Place

Tax Map 5 Parcel 109

Will Teass, AIA, Applicant/ Xi Chapter of Theta Chi Alumni Corp, Owner

Revisions to approved design

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant was present and gave an overview of the updates on the application. The applicant withdraws the underground storage and keeps the porous pavement. The porch no longer has casement windows and wants to use double hung windows.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Why the additional patio entrance. Will that increase the party crowd?
- What is the rationale for the casement and split face wall?
- What is the enlarged trash enclosure made of?
- The windows in the sun porch were better before due to the large slender proportions. The proportions should be preserved in the double hung window.
- Feel the changes are appropriate but not comfortable with the windows or the split face block. Open to a combination of planting for screening. The BAR feels some of the application can be supported.

The applicant would still control the security by a single point of access. The applicant indicates that both decisions for the casement windows and split face wall are both cost measures. The applicant has changed the configuration of the trash enclosure, not the material.

Mr. Hogg said, 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 revisions 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 modifications....

Mr. Graves seconded the motion.

The BAR partially approved (7-2 with Miller and DeLoach opposed) the application as follows:

1. Reconfigured HC route;
 3. Trash enclosure screen enlarged to accommodate mechanical units.
 5. Add second pedestrian entrance to patio.
 6. Remove masonry retaining wall/handrail from patio where not required by Code.
 7. The existing concrete porch slab will be removed and replaced.
 8. Substitute Pella Proline for Marvin aluminum clad windows with SDL's. Replacement and new French doors will be painted wood with true divided lights.
 9. Substitute HardieTrim for Miratec.
- The following item was withdrawn: 4. Underground storm water storage/asphalt is substituted for use of porous pavers.

The following items were denied: 2. Brick veneer parking screen walls changed to split face CMU at both locations Grady and at Preston Place. Also, denied was the revision to change the casement windows on the second floor sleeping porch to double-hung windows.

10. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 12-03-09
600 Rugby Road
Tax Map 5 Parcel 126
Richard Jones, Applicant/ 600 Rugby Road Housing Corp, Owner
Replacement of 27 windows

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant was present with nothing to add to the report.

Question or Comments from the Public

There were none

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Would like to know why the windows need to be replaced
- What other work will be done to the property in the future
- Feels replacing the windows are very appropriate
- What do the three window options look like
- Is there a cost estimate to restore the windows
- The house is a mess
- We will not approve the vinyl option due to the design guidelines

The applicant stated that when the property was acquired it was in really bad shape and felt replacing the windows first would be a good place to start. More renovations are planned in the future.

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 window replacement 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 provided the following replacement window is used: the Jeld-Wen aluminum-clad sash kits in white.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion

The BAR approved (8-1) the Jeld-Wen aluminum-clad sash kits in white.

- 11. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 12-03-08
218 W Water Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 84
William Atwood, Applicant/Waterhouse LLC, William Atwood, Owner
Addition of roof top appurtenance

Mr. Knight presented the staff report.

The applicant was present. The applicant noted the plan matched the details of the existing. The darker color building helped the appearance.

Questions or Comments from the Public

Bill Warchdain, from Lewis and Clark Building, felt that the 3 separate pieces on the appurtenance were very odd.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Perimeter wall defines a larger area and the intent of limiting the rooftop appurtenance to limit the perception that it's a whole other floor.
- Just extruding the façade up but having 2/3rd of it fake is going to be silly looking.
- The Board feels that the windows and glass walls are inappropriate and would like to see more detail on the total design. The Board feels that could only approve the removal of the stucco
- Is the northeast corner open to the light?
- 40 feet of high glass wall does not make sense
- The drawings are inadequate, need to take more time to show the plans better

The applicant requested a deferral from the Board

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 elevation changes does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with this property and other properties in this district.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion

The BAR accepted (9-0) applicant's request to defer decisions regarding the rooftop appurtenance and the paint color for the previously-painted brick; but approved removal of the stucco.

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

G. Other Business

The Board wanted to suggest that the Martha Jefferson neighborhood pursue making that area a design control district. The Board received a report that there were concerns voiced by board members of the Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Association about designation after such a short amount of time. Mr. Knight wants to still make the recommendation and write the letter to approach the neighborhood association. Fifeville and Fry's Spring are possibilities for future design control districts.

H. Adjournment 9:30 p.m.

