

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
May 15, 2012
Minutes**

Present:

Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Preston Coiner
Candace DeLoach
Melanie Miller
William Adams, Vice-Chair
Brian Hogg (arrived late)
Whit Graves
Tim Mohr (arrived late)

Not Present:

Michael Osteen

Mr. Knight convened the meeting at 5:30 pm

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mark Kavit - 400 Altamont Street - feels that people would rather pay fines than abide by the City of Charlottesville codes.

B. Consent Agenda

**1. Minutes - April 17, 2012
Changes to April 17, 2012 minutes on page 2: Michael Osteen questioned whether there were building code issues.**

Mr. Coiner made a motion for approval of the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Miller seconded the motion.

Consent Agenda approved (6-0).

Hogg arrived.

C. Projects in Non-Compliance No report.

Mr. Mohr arrived.

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 (**Approved with conditions April 17, 2012**)

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Greg Jackson, applicant was present.

Questions from the public

- Leona Ayres-202 Commerce St-concerned with the noise the increase traffic will have on the neighborhood.

The applicant stated traffic noise will not really be on the side her property is on.

Questions from the Board

- What is the use of the courtyard and why is it paved and not landscaped?
- A little more detail on the fence?
- What kind of planter will be used?
- Who approved the awning?
- What type of trees will be planted?

The applicant stated that they felt a simple landscape would be more appropriate. The fence will be standard aluminum and they will leave the decision of the planters up to the tenants. Mary Joy approved the awning administratively and the trees will be London Plane.

Comments from the public

There were none.

Comments from the Board

The Board feels that the application meets the guidelines.

Mr. Knight 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 changes 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 with the stipulation that the applicant provide additional details for the proposed courtyard fence and planters for staff approval.

Mr. Graves seconded the motion.

BAR approved (8-0) the motion.

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness (Deferred from April 17, 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 Keith Woodard was present.

Questions from the Board

- Was the fence initially approved that was installed?

Ms. Scala stated that the only fence that was approved was on the west side.

Questions from the Public

Jackie Lichtman, 336 Parkway, wanted to know if any consideration has been given to changing the slope or making the handicap ramp better to view, and stronger. She also wanted to know the long term plan for lighting the parking lot.

Mark Kavit, 400 Altamont Street, asked the applicant how many parking spaces were initially told to the neighborhood association, did he seek any guidance on the wood fence, will the rental sign be removed, what will be the long term signage plan and who will maintain the site?

Bud Treakle, 611 Park Street, how deep is the wall below grade, what are the sizes of the pipes?

Manuel Lerdaun, 329 Parkway, questioned will the runoff and slippage be addressed?

The applicant stated that the slope and handicap ramp will be changed once approved. The applicant will do whatever the BAR decides with the lighting and will commit to the same light Hospice has. The applicant stated that there was no guidance sought on the fence, 18 parking spaces was told to the neighborhood association, the rental sign will be removed, planting on the bank and yes they plan to maintain the property.

Comments from the public

Collette Hall, 101 Robertson Lane, feels the applicant has totally ignored the City of Charlottesville code and the BAR.

Mark Kavit, 400 Altamont St, feels that the parking lot is most of the developers' problems.

John Cruickshank, 324 Parkway, feels that the parking lot does not look very presentable.

Comments from the Board

The Board feels that there have not been any major changes done. They also feel that there is a complicated history and complicated approval with this application. The BAR feels that the applicant does not meet what they approved. The BAR would like the applicant to go back to the drawing board.

The applicant asked the BAR for a deferral.

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

Mr. Mohr seconded the motion.

The BAR accepted (8-0) the applicant's request for deferral.

The BAR would like to see:

- 1. Return to the original (slope and elevation) retaining wall design already approved by the BAR with a strong suggestion to reduce the size of the parking lot;**
- 2. The handicapped ramp designed to be consistent with details of the property (materials, details, finishes);**
- 3. Lighting plan;**

4. Screening specified between the parking lot and Parkway;
5. Plant material (around retaining wall and north and west sides and around the bio retention basin) needs to be specified and designed;
6. Appropriate screening of mechanical units on Parkway (one long fence and bushes);
7. Signage resolution as discussed at meeting.

E. New Items

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness**
BAR 12-05-05
409 Altamont Circle
Tax Map 33 Parcel 115
Jane Fisher, Applicant/Owner
Add door to garage, restoration

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Jane Fisher, applicant, was present.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Are the details of the roof different?

The applicant stated that the details of the roof are the same.

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 changes 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 for the proposed demolition of the side of the garage to install two new French doors, and the roof replacement as submitted, with the stipulation that the new standing seam roof details match the standing seam roof on the house (no hip caps; and the seam height not to exceed the height in the area.)

Mr. Graves seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0) the motion.

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness**
BAR 12-05-04
509 W Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcel 174
Waterstreet Studio, Applicant/ Mainstreet West, LLC, Owner
Courtyard Improvements, Renovations

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

- What are the color schemes of the buildings?
- Where will the mechanical equipment be located?
- What is the lighting plan?
- Feels that the material being used is very nice with a really great detailed design.

The applicant stated that they are willing to bring those details back to the BAR

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 changes 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 for the courtyard paving and plantings. The BAR would like to see details when available regarding the trash and mechanical locations and lighting plans

Mr. Mohr seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0) the motion.

5. **Certificate of Appropriateness**
BAR 12-05-02
616 Park Street
Tax Map 52 Parcel 184
Parabola Architecture, Applicant/Irene and Elliot Jennings, Owner
Porch Rebuild, New Windows

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

- Feel that the improvements are historically accurate.
- Adding windows will not distract from the character of the house.

The applicant stated that she is just trying to get the porch to a point where it can be enjoyable again.

Mr. Hogg 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 changes 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, with the request for architectural drawings to be submitted for circulation/review by the BAR.

Mr. Mohr seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (8-0) the motion.

Mr. Hogg left the meeting.

- 6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 12-05-06
513 Rugby Road
Tax Map 5 Parcel 53
Jeff Riley, Applicant/ West Ranger Castle Dango, LLC, Owner
Railing Replacements

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The applicant Jeff Riley was present and brought in a sample of the railing.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- **Would a wood railing be possible?**
- **Could you allow a Chinese railing design?**
- **Do the columns have steel support?**
- **Feel there is a better solution and it does not meet the guidelines.**

The applicant stated that wood railings have been used in the past and they have failed.

The applicant requested a deferral.

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

Ms. Miller seconded the motion.

The BAR accepted (7-0) the applicant's request for deferral. The BAR requested that an architect design something more aesthetically appropriate and structurally integral to the column (not a metal band, but something similar to the original design that would also meet the code.)

- 7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (removed from agenda)**
BAR 12-05-07
406 W Main Street
Tax Map 29 Parcel 14

Jim Rounsevell, Architect, Applicant/Peter B Mac Gregor, Trustee #1, Owner
Enclose pergola; change two windows to doorways

Mr. Graves recused himself.

- 8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 12-05-01
301/315 W Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcels 197 and 198
Robert Mooney, Applicant/Mooney West Main, LLC, Owner
Demolition of existing buildings

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

The property owner was present.

Questions or Comments from the Public

There were none.

Questions or Comments from the Board

- Has any other project come forth or conditions improved?

The applicant stated that the buildings have not improved.

Mr. Coiner said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including ADC District Design Guidelines for Demolition, I move to find that the proposed demolitions of 301 and 315 West Main Street 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 demolitions as submitted.

Mr. Mohr seconded the motion.

The BAR approved (4-2-1) the motion, with Miller and DeLoach opposed and Graves recused.

- 9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 12-05-03
315 W Main Street
Tax Map 32 Parcels 197 and 198
Clark Gathright, Applicant/VIM, Inc., Owner
New 7-story hotel

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

- Will there be access from the street to the opening of the courtyard?
- Enlarged plan that show the area?
- No drawings of surrounding included in the packet?
- Feel that the scale should be rethought.
- More window details and articulation of facades?
- Not a lot of thought given to the site plan.

The applicant requested a deferral.

The BAR accepted (6-0-1 with Graves recused) the applicant's request for deferral. The BAR requested further details on: the materials, wall sections, windows details, cornices, articulation of façades, lighting (cut sheets and photometrics), paving materials. Look at the plans along West Main Street. Do not necessarily propose white windows; part of the building may want to be monochromatic.

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

G. Other Business

1. ADC Guidelines: Recommend changes to City Council for Adoption

The BAR approved (7-0) the guidelines as presented.

2. Nominations for BAR Preservation Awards

The BAR was asked to submit the ballots.

H. Adjournment at 9:15