City of Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review April 17, 2012 Minutes

Present:

Not Present:

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

Mr. Knight convened the meeting at 5:30 pm

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Jim Tolbert, Director of NDS spoke about the approval process pertaining to 601 Park Street. Mr. Coiner noted that storm water from Park Street was being diverted across the City sidewalk onto this project.

Mr. Mohr arrived.

B. Consent Agenda

- 1. Minutes Consideration of March 20, 2012 minutes will be deferred until next month.
- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Conservation District)

BAR 12-04-01

510 Locust Avenue

Tax Map 54 Parcel 4.1

Fred Wolf, Applicant/ Locust Realty, LLC, Owner

New doorway and entrance canopy; new window

Mr. Hogg made a motion for the approval of the Consent Agenda with item 1 being deferred until next month.

Mr. Graves seconded the motion

Consent agenda approved (9-0).

C. **Projects in Non-Compliance No report.** Mr. Hogg and Mr. Osteen asked about the lack of a front porch at 516 Valley Road.

D. Previously Deferred Items

1. 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
Rear Addition (**Deferred from March 20, 2012**) and
Revisions to Loft Addition (**Approved February 21, 2012**)

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Greg Jackson, applicant and architect, was present

Questions from the public

• Martin Burke, owner of J F Bell Funeral home said he would like an explanation of the patio addition and if the patio will be enclosed.

The applicant stated that the patio will be open air with columns, but the intended use is not for a restaurant.

Questions from the Board

- The Board wanted a better explanation of where the porch columns will be.
- Mr. Osteen questioned whether there were any building code issues?
- Is there an issue with having flammable material 6 inches from an adjacent building?
- Was the curb cut on Commerce Street part of the site plan review?
- Was there ever consideration to repair rather than replace the windows?

The applicant stated that as far as he knows there are no issues with the proximity of the buildings and flammable material. He also stated that the windows were beyond repair and since most of them had been taken out anyway, so they felt removal and replacement would be the best option. The sidewalk intent is to keep it level with the street.

Comments from the public

Mr. Burke feels that there is not enough space between the buildings, and said that the loft extends out near the chapel.

Comments from the Board

The Board feels that there are some building code issues with the proximity of the buildings. They would like the drawings to show the windows. The porch has already been approved so that issue can't be discussed. They like the panels and the change of material. They would like to see the porch reconsidered due to neighbor's concerns.

Ms. Miller made a motion to deny window replacement, which died due to lack of a second.

Mr. Knight made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposed material change to the loft addition, and the window replacement 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: details for the installation of new windows shall be submitted for administrative approval.

Mr. Mohr seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (7-2 with Miller and Adams against)

Mr. Hogg made a motion, to defer for one month the application for a rear addition on Commerce Street to answer questions raised by the application.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion.

The motion was then withdrawn.

Mr. Knight made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the rear addition and courtyard on Commerce Street 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 condition that the following details come back to the BAR for approval: details of the site plan including sidewalk, street tree and planters; the detailing (section/elevations) of the window wall and balconies; and the pattern of the cement board on the side wall.

The BAR approved (8-1 with Adams against)

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from March 20, 2012)

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

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

The architect was present and brought in some samples of the concrete material from the handicap ramp. She also suggested saving the window. The applicant feels that putting glass in the door may be good for security reasons.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none

Questions from the Board

• Has back-painted glass been considered in the transom?

The applicant feels that back-painted glass would be fine.

Comments from the Board

Mr. Hogg expressed that what has been presented is what the BAR expected to see. He really likes what is being done. Option A would be fine, and he likes the fact that the windows will be saved for future use.

Mr. Hogg made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolition and Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposal to change a window to a door satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application to change a window into a door with the condition that transom glass back-painted gray be used. Options A and B are acceptable, but not C. A friendly suggestion was made to save/store the window.

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (9-0).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness (Deferred from March 20, 2012)

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

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

The applicant was present and stated that they are trying to improve the property for the owner.

Ouestions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Is the gate still mechanical?
- Wanted details of the project phasing.
- Appreciate the effort made on the project.
- Maybe look at making the gate flat on top.
- Is the pedestrian gate on Park Street similar?

The applicant stated that the gate will be manual. Making the gate curved was an attempt to mitigate the scale.

Mr. Hogg made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, New Construction, and Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application including demolition of the existing garage, with Option 2 new garage, but painted the same color as the house.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (9-0)

The BAR requested that the applicant consider using a flat top on the pedestrian gate on the side street, and also double check the garage door to make certain you can achieve the details as submitted. Also, look into eliminating the masonry column at the pedestrian gate.

DeLoach left the meeting.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness (Deferred from March 20, 2012)

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

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

The applicant wanted the BAR approval on the paint color.

Ms. Miller said any or the colors presented would be appropriate, but the lighter colors would be better.

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 paint color satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the paint color #8 "Gull".

Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0)

The applicant presented a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed appurtenance.

Questions or Comments from the Public

Mary Gilliam wanted the term appurtenance explained.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Will the roof top be vegetated?
- The BAR feels the architect has done a nice job in response to massing.
- The BAR feels that the design is appropriate.

Mr. Hogg made a motion: 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 appurtenance addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the appurtenance addition with the conditions that (1) the railing is extended the entire length of the west elevation, and (2) the oversized eaves are eliminated in favor of a simple and straight eave.

Mr. Graves seconded the motion

The BAR approved (8-0)

5. Certificate of Appropriateness (Details related to February 21, 2012 Approval)
BAR 12-01-04

1308 &1310 Wertland Street
Tax Map 10 Parcels 10 & 11
Dinsmore, LLC, Owner/ Daggett & Grigg, Applicant
New 4-story apartment building with 12 units and commercial space

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

The applicant, Clark Gathright, was present.

Questions or Comments from the public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- What is the texture of the stucco?
- The BAR feels this is an improvement and appreciates the development.

The applicant stated that the stucco will be a sand finish.

Mr. Osteen made a motion: Hhaving considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and 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 with the additional details as submitted.

The BAR approved (5-3 with Miller, Adams and Hogg against).

The following item was heard out of order:

E. New Items

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR-12-04-05
306 E Jefferson Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 208
Harrison Marshall, Applicant/VHM Corporation, Owner
Add new window

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Has the applicant considered adding glass to the existing door?
- The Board feels the changes are acceptable.

Mr. Hogg made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposal to add a new window 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 (8-0) the application as submitted.

Ms. Miller left the meeting.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness (Deferred from February 21, 2012)

BAR 12-02-04
601 Park Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 4
Guy Blundon, Applicant/Comyn Grounds, LLC, Owner
Revisions including retaining wall; new handicapped ramp

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant, Guy Blundon, stated that he only made changes that were approved by staff.

Questions or Comments from the Public

Neighbors and adjoining property owners still had some of the same previous concerns such as: the placement of the HVAC system, slope of the parking lot, configuration of the bio-filter, lack of vegetation screening, staining of the fences, warping of the wood screens, and the railings on the ramp.

The applicant stated that most of these issues have been changed and he is in the process of making more changes.

Questions or Comments from the Board

The Board feels that the changes made to the site plan were not approved and they would like to see the changes on paper to ensure the proper changes are being made. They feel the current site plan is different from what the BAR approved and would like to an explanation.

The applicant stated that he thought he would only need staff approval to change the site plan and not BAR approval. The applicant would also like to request a deferral.

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

Mr. Graves seconded the motion.

The BAR accepted (7-0) the applicant's request for deferral. All the changes discussed verbally need to be put on a drawing: a more appropriate handicapped ramp and railing; a lot more information on landscaping (evergreen screening of HVAC units; bio filter plantings; plants at retaining walls to hold slope and mitigate appearance); slope grades configuration at bio filter basin; how to deal with the light pole footings, bolts, etc. It was also suggested that you look into ways to reduce the size of the parking lot. Investigate if the City can correct the storm water coming from Park Street onto this property.

Continuation of E. New Items

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-04-02 500 Park Street Tax Map 53 Parcel 123 First Presbyterian Church of Charlottesville, Inc., Owner Site changes to memorial garden

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant was present and added that they are trying to make the garden more attractive and comfortable for member and their families.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Is there evidence that the oak tree is declining?
- Have you considered removing the oak tree now?
- Mr. Mohr suggested having a sprinkler system that is on a motion detector.
- Mr. Knight suggested finding a better way to address the issue other than five different plantings.

The applicant stated that an arborist has looked at the tree and recommended removal. He also said that they would like to enjoy the oak tree as long as they can.

Mr. Osteen made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposed landscaping and lighting changes to the meditation garden 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: dark sky compliant lighting. Also reconsider the species of the proposed tree – choose a hardwood species that grows well as an understory tree (Sugar Maple, White Oak or Red Oak).

Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (6-1 with Knight against).

The applicant asked Mr. Knight for some tree suggestions.

Mr. Knight stated that staying with some kind of oak would be better. Maybe October Glory or another hardwood.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-04-03 112 W Market Street Tax Map 33 Parcel 254 First Street Church project, LLC, Owner Laurel hedge

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant was present.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- How was the type of planting determined?
- Will the planting be protected on the seated wall?
- Feels that the idea is worth a try and it does meet guidelines.

The applicant stated that the planting was suggested by the landscaping company. They will be purchasing plants that are already 4 feet in height.

Mr. Hogg made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design & Elements, I move to find that the proposed wall, scrim, and hedge satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines 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 (7-0).

10. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 12-04-04
212 E Main Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 35
Mike Stoneking, Applicant/ Main Street Associates, LLC, Owner Façade changes

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant was present.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Color of the woodwork.
- The BAR is happy with what is being presented.

The applicant stated that the woodwork will be painted black.

Mr. Hogg made a motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed awning, signage, and painting of the facade 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 one exception - without the signs on the awning side flaps.

Mr. Mohr seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (7-0).

F. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mark Kavit spoke again about 601 Park Street and the notification process.

G. Other Business

ADC Guidelines: Recommend changes to City Council for Adoption

The BAR deferred action for one month to have more time to review.

The BAR supported Mr. Kavit's suggestion regarding posting a real estate-type notification sign to alert the public about applications.

Mr. Mohr suggested hiring a lighting consultant to assist the BAR about the recent codification of light issues (LED lighting for example). Staff should pass that suggestion on to Jim Tolbert.

H. Adjournment 10:25 p.m.