

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
April 16, 2013  
City Council Chambers-City Hall**

**Present:**

William Adams - Chairperson  
Melanie Miller - Vice-Chair  
Michael Osteen  
Brian Hogg  
Whit Graves  
Laura Knott  
Justin Sarafin

**Absent:**

Candace DeLoach  
Tim Mohr

**Also Present:**

Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner

- A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes) None**
- B. Consent Agenda** (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled minutes will be discussed at the end of the agenda, but pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning.)
- 1. Minutes- none available**
- C. Projects in Non-Compliance - No report**
- D. Previously Deferred Items - None**
- F. New Items**
- 1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
BAR 13-04-01  
9 Gildersleeve Wood  
Tax Map 11 Parcel 16  
Gail McIntosh, Applicant and Owner  
Deck with sheds addition

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

The applicant Gail McIntosh was present and gave an overview of the potential renovation plan and had samples to view.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Ms. Knott asked what elevation the shed would be from the street.

The applicant stated that you would not be able to see the shed from the street due to vegetation.

Mr. Adams asked where would the poplar bark be used and the applicant stated that it would be used on the bottom shingles.

Mr. Hogg feels that this is really neat material and he really wouldn't like to see the entire structure with it. He feels the size and proportion goes well with the house.

Mr. Sarafin feels that the material will go well with the house.

Mr. Adams feels that the addition meet the guidelines and he would be able to support the application.

Mr. Graves said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed deck with sheds addition project satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst Circle district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion.

**The BAR approved (6-0-1 with Osteen recused) the revised plan as submitted at the meeting, including the Poplar bark accents.**

**Osteen joined the meeting.**

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**  
BAR 13-04-02  
301 5<sup>th</sup> Street SW  
Tax Map 29 Parcel 104  
City of Charlottesville, Applicant/Michael McMahon, Owner  
Remove/replace wall and steps

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

Michael McMahon, the owner, was present and said he would be happy with whatever the BAR decides.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Ms. Knott clarified what the two options were in replacing the wall. She asked if the City of Charlottesville was proposing to replace the wall.

Ms. Scala was unsure, but wanted to know what the BAR would find appropriate..

Mr. Adams asked if the wall was completely in the City's right of way.

Ms. Scala stated that it may be; she thinks that it might be partially.

Mr. Hogg feels that the wall would be better than a planter. He would like the wall to look like the old one.

Mr. Osteen's preference would be for a stone wall.

Mr. Sarafin thinks that replacing the wall to match the adjacent wall isn't the right solution.

**The BAR had a preliminary discussion with the owner present. There was consensus to rebuild a wall across the front and turn the corner slightly onto Dice Street. The first choice is stone to match original, similar to the wall at 303 5<sup>th</sup> Street SW, or the second choice would be a contemporary expression of the old wall (warm-colored concrete with rounded top and same proportions, with stone piers at entrance). The BAR wants the City to have prepared construction drawings showing elevation and section. They have concerns how the footing will be placed under the sidewalk.**

**3. Preliminary Discussion**

BAR 13-04-03

203A 2<sup>nd</sup> Street NW

Tax Map 33 Parcel 174.2A

Anna Tatar, Applicant/ Steven, Maria, Anna & John Tatar, Owner

Replace windows

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

Anna Tatar, the applicant, was present and feels that vinyl windows would be better.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Graves asked the applicant if she had discussed with the HOA plans to replace the windows.

The applicant stated that she would have to go before them but they would support the BAR's decision.

Mr. Adams stated that vinyl windows are not usually accepted in an historic situation.

Mr. Hogg said that there is only 10 year expectancy for vinyl windows.

Mr. Osteen would like to have seen some consistency and for the applicant to have spoken with the HOA. It would be good to have a common window so that anyone needing to replace a window would know which to use.

Mr. Sarafin said a single fixed pane is fine.

Mr. Hogg made a motion to approve the window details administratively.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion.

**The BAR approved (7-0) replacement of two windows with either painted wood or aluminum clad wood, with a single fixed sash, with administrative approval of details.**

**4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 13-04-04

418 E Water Street #800

Tax Map 28 Parcel 601K

DeTuncq Builders, Applicant/Keith Skinner, Trustee, Owner

Remove existing window and install new door

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

Robert Kroner represented the applicant.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Questions from the board:

Mr. Hogg asked where the door would actually go.

The applicant stated that door would go near the center bay near the reception area.

Mr. Knott asked if the door would be ADA accessible.

The applicant stated that it was not intended for that; they already have an accessible entrance. He also stated that the brick will match what is currently there and the left hand frame would remain the same.

Mr. Osteen would like to see a scaled and accurate drawing.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know how they intend to deal with the arch.

The applicant stated that the arch would be taken out, and a new, wider arch put back in place.

Mr. Osteen said they may not need to expand the opening. Have they considered a frameless door?

Mr. Hogg said they need to provide to Mary Joy for circulation an elevation showing what masonry will be taken out, showing you are just dropping the sill within the width of the opening, and an elevation of the door showing what the door and transom will look like.

*Mr. Adams said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposal to replace a window with a new door and transom (within the bounds of the existing window opening) satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with the qualification that the door opening to be no wider than the existing window opening, with the existing jack arch to remain, and with details drawn to scale including the elevation of the door and the amount of brick to be removed to come back to staff for administrative approval.*

Ms. Miller seconded the motion.

**The BAR approved (7-0) the application with the door opening to be no wider than the existing window opening, with the existing jack arch to remain, and with details drawn to scale, including the elevation of the door and the amount of brick to be removed, to come back to staff for administrative approval.**

5. **Preliminary Discussion**

BAR 13-04-05

University Circle

Tax Map 6 Parcel 97.1

William F. Indoe and Forbes R. Reback, Co Trustees of

Crossfield Land Trust, Applicant/Owners

New 2-Story Brick Residence

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

The architect for the applicant, John Rhett, was present and he presented a list of items the applicant would like to see approved.

## **Comments from the public**

Karen Marsh, 1841 University Circle

Karen Dougald, 20 University Circle

Sylvia Sanides, 34 University Circle

Martin Kilian, 34 University Circle

Bruce Nelson, 36 University Circle

Geoff Leblond, 1836 University Circle.

This is a list of neighbors who have some zoning issues. They brought up the fact that there are two houses now with zoning violations and would like to know how this will be taken care of.

**The BAR had a preliminary discussion. They wanted to see more context, including how this property relates to the adjacent properties and the streetscape, the gracious front yards, the adjacent building footprints, the character of adjacent plantings, the driveway should relate to the neighborhood precedence. The garage needs to be reconsidered, perhaps set back or adjusted in relation to the chimney. The BAR wants to see a mortar sample. They asked the applicant to engage the neighbors to review the proposed design.**

**Hogg left the meeting.**

### **6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 13-04-06

621-627 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 165.1

Brooke Fedora, Applicant/Paul's Rental Properties, LLC, Owner

Horse & Hound Restaurant Patio Tent

Brooke Fedora the applicant was present. She handed out more pictures and added how important the tent is for her business revenue.

There were no questions from the public.

Ms. Miller asked the applicant if she had looked at other options to meet her needs.

The applicant stated that she hadn't and she doesn't have the money for other options.

Mr. Adams asked if the clear roof would stay.

The applicant said that it could stay but prefers an opaque roof in the summer to cut down on the heat.

## **Comments from the Public**

Peter Castiglione stated that the clear tent gives the space more depth and when the sun goes down in the evening it doesn't feel so closed in.

Ms. Knott understands how hot it may get under the clear tent.

Mr. Sarafin feels the building is non-contributing and the clear tent would add life to the corridor.

The applicant feels that the tent is not covering up anything. She feels the front of the building is plain and this would add something to it.

Mr. Osteen feels that having a tent all the way down Main Street would look awful. He feels that the tent hides what is on Main Street. He would like to see a much smaller tent and feel that there are other alternatives for this business and corridor.

Mr. Adams feels that this issue is problematic for a lot of different reasons. He feels there is a place for tents to happen. He is inclined to support.

Ms. Miller feels the problem is with the way the guidelines are written. She would like to challenge an architect to come up with some sort of structure.

Mr. Graves completely agree with Ms. Miller and Mr. Sarafin. He feels he could support the applicant.

*Ms. Knott said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending and Cafes, I move to find that the proposed outdoor tent satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.*

Mr. Sarafin seconded the motion.

**The BAR approved (4-2 with Miller and Osteen opposed) the tent as submitted with clear top.**

**7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 13-04-07

120 E Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 26

120 East Main Street, LLC etal, Owner/ Stu Rifkin, Applicant

Ten Restaurant café furniture

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

Stu Rifkin, the applicant, was present and stated that the material would be made from recycled milk jugs.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Adams asked if natural wood would be used and matches what is in the restaurant.

The applicant stated that it would be like the sample here on the podium.

Ms. Miller feels that the black would go with the restaurant's aesthetic.

Mr. Sarafin feels the wood tone is unconvincing.

Mr. Adams feels the black would look more elegant.

Ms. Knott feels that the black looks less fake.

Mr. Graves has no strong feeling one way or the other. He will support the application.

*Ms. Miller said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending, and Cafes, I move to find that the proposed (black) café furniture 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 as submitted.*

Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

**The BAR approved (6-0) the black café furniture as submitted.**

**8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 13-04-08

629-631-633 W Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcels 163 &164

Backwater, Inc., Owner/ Peter Castiglione, Applicant

Maya Restaurant Patio Tent

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

Peter Castiglione, the applicant, was present and he would love to have a permanent structure on his property, but cost will not allow it. He feels this is the closest he can get to that. He stated that the clear tent is really beautiful at night when it is lit up by the lights.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Sarafin feels that this applicant has some of the same issues as the previous applicant.

Ms. Knott likes the continuity of the plastic tent at both restaurants.

Mr. Osteen still will not support this application.

Mr. Adams would like to see some other types of structure used.

*Mr. Graves said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Tents, I move to find that the proposed outdoor tent satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with/is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves/denies the application as submitted.*

Ms. Knott seconded the motion.

**The BAR approved (4-2 with Miller and Osteen opposed) the tent as submitted with clear top.**

**G. Other Business**

**1. PLACE Task Force update – Tim Mohr No report**

**H. Adjournment 8:10 p.m.**