

Minutes
Board of Architectural Review Board
July 16, 2013
City Council Chambers

Members Present

Mr. William Adams - Chairperson
Mr. Justin Sarafin
Ms. Candace DeLoach
Mr. Brian Hogg
Ms. Laura Knott
Mr. Tim Mohr
Mr. Michael Osteen

Staff Present

Ms. Mary Joy Scala

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda-There were 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** June 18, 2013

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 13-07-06
111 Altamont Circle
Tax Map 33 Parcel 120
Toby Heytens and Sarah Sawtelle
Replace garage roof

Mr. Sarafin made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Knott seconded the motion.

Consent agenda approved (6-0)

C. Projects in Non-Compliance – No Report

D. Previously Deferred Items

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 13-05-01
1619 University Avenue
Tax Map 9 Parcel 102
Stephen Hruska, Applicant/ Sovran Bank, Owner
Site demolition and ADA Renovation to front sidewalk area

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

The applicant's architect, Mark Van Sickle, was present to answer any questions that the Board may have.

There were no questions from the public.

Questions from the Board

Mr. Adams had concerns about the hand rail design and the applicant stated that the rail will be standard and the walls will have a consistent elevation.

Mr. Adams asked about the three small masonry piers and the applicant stated that a stone cap was added where the grade drops off.

Ms. Knott asked what the purpose of the new design was and the applicant stated that the new design is in response to the previous meeting.

There were no comments from the public.

Comments from the Board

The Board feels this design is better than the original and it makes things go away visually.

Mr. Osteen feels that the project needs a lot more work. He was not present for the first submission.

Mr. Mohr said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and for Rehabilitations, I move to find that the proposal for site demolition and ADA renovations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with conditions that the handrail design will match existing; eliminate two stairs in the center front; carry the bluestone cap detail across so it breaks the upper level from lower level; carry City sidewalk brick color to wall; clean up geometry east side so there is a memory of an arc. Resubmit digitally to staff to be circulated to BAR for approval; *include two photoshop versions of brick color [dark City sidewalk brick and red brick to match existing] so final decision can be made.*

Ms. Knott seconded the motion

Approved (4-2 with Adams and Osteen opposed)

Brian Hogg arrived at the meeting.

E. New Items

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 13-07-01
41 University Circle
Tax Map 6 Parcel 86
Karen Dougald, Applicant/ Sally Nelson, etal, Owner
Replace triple sash window with door and transom

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

The applicant was present and stated that they are only trying to make the house less drafty and safe.

There were no questions from the public.

Questions from the Board

Will it be a single door used to fill the opening?

The applicant stated that it would but could not find a perfect match.

There were no comments from the public.

Comments from the Board

The Board feels that no one will ever see the door so it will not affect their decision. They also feel it meets the guidelines and they will support the project.

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 window replacement with a door and transom satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

Ms. Knott seconded the motion.

Approved (6-1 with Osteen opposed) as submitted.

- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
 BAR 13-07-02
 1817 University Circle
 Tax Map 5 Parcel 38.1
 John Butler Tytus, IV, Trustee, Owner and Applicant
 Detached carport

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

The applicant was present and didn’t contribute anything more to the report.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

There were no questions from the Board.

Comments from the Board

The Board feels that this is within guidelines. They feel it has minimal presence on the street. Painting it a darker color would be better so that it can fade away, or maybe a neutral color such as tan.

Mr. Adams said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, I move to find that the proposal for a shed satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road/University Circle/Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with condition that shed must be painted either a dark or neutral color.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion.

Approved (7-0)

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 13-07-03

144 Chancellor Street

Tax Map 9 Parcel 109

Delta Zeta National Housing Corporation, Owner/ Eric Amtmann, AIA, Applicant

Demolish building

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

The applicant was present and gave a brief overview of what it would cost to move the building and the cost to demolish it.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Questions from the Board

Mr. Hogg asked when was the last time the building was occupied, and the applicant stated that the building has been empty for 10 years.

Mr. Osteen asked if the applicant has acquired any historic photographs in his research and the applicant stated no.

Comments from the Board

Mr. Hogg noted the current owners have owned the building since 1979, and they have allowed it to sit unoccupied for ten years. From a historical standpoint, the late 19th – early 20th century is particularly meaningful for this part of Charlottesville. The development of Chancellor Street with boarding houses and this school created a very interesting interaction between the University and the Charlottesville community. This building of that time period is significant. Even though its form is relatively diminutive, the form – gables roofs and complex massing - is compatible with the streetscape of larger buildings. Mr. Hogg said that the fact that the owner was able to use the property for 24 years, then allowed it to sit vacant for ten, intentional or not is an essay in demolition by neglect. He thinks that the applicant has not met the criteria in the guidelines, and that the building merits preservation even in its current condition.

Mr. Mohr agreed with his comments regarding the long term ownership. The foundation has been failing for a while, and could be addressed. It is a specious argument that the building is now ready to be torn down. The BAR is not to take into consideration the financial implications, but only the building's historic value in a historic district.

Mr. Osteen said he would like to have seen historic photos, and would have a hard time supporting a demolition without a full understanding of what it used to be.

The applicant noted that #7 in the review criteria calls for consideration of a “professional economic and structural feasibility study.”

Mr. Adams said that from the 2010 structural report it looks like water has been running through for a great period of time, which indicates a demolition by neglect situation.

Mr. Sarafin noted that extensive work was done around 1979, according to a site plan from that time. He agreed that the length of ownership and the delayed maintenance – termite damage for example, is absolutely part of a normal maintenance schedule for a building – were problematic. As for the architectural value of this type of vernacular school building, which are lost all the time, all over the state, in terms of the context of early 20th century Charlottesville – it is very important. He would not support the demolition.

Mr. Hogg 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 demolition of 144 Chancellor Street does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC district, and that the BAR denies the demolition as submitted.

Mr. Sarafin seconded the motion.

Denied (7-0).

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 13-07-04
835 W Main Street
Tax Map 31 Parcel 183
Fluvanna Holdings, LLC, Owner/ Ryan Bourke, Applicant
Temporary trailer for The Plaza leasing office

Ms. Scala provided the staff report.

The applicant was present and added that they are proposing a modular office with a ramp.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Questions from the Board

Ms. Knott asked how would pedestrians cross the street to get to the rental office? The applicant stated that they would have to cross at the (Hampton Inn) hotel crossing.

Ms. Deloach asked if the applicant looked at any other spaces and the applicant stated that the owner wanted something closer to the site.

Comments from the Board

The Board feels there is a lot of signage on the trailer. They agreed to the total signage aggregate area permitted per parcel, which is 75 square feet maximum in the West Main Street ADC district, to be approved by staff.

Mr. Osteen said, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, I move to find that the proposal for a temporary trailer 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, with signs to be approved by staff (maximum 75 sq. ft. as allowed by ordinance.)

Mr. Hogg seconded the motion.

Approved (7-0) as submitted.

F. Other Business

1. PLACE Task Force update – Tim Mohr

PLACE is preparing annual reports. PLACE members should be invited to BAR work session to discuss West Main Street.

2. Work Session on Thursday, July 25, 5:30-7:30 p.m.,

Small Conference Room, City Space

BAR requested a separate work session with City Attorney, since the agenda is too full with other topics.

The BAR asked to get legal interpretation of question – should BAR be considering economic implications of a demolition?

3. Former Bethel Baptist church on Commerce Street – Remove some vinyl to see what stucco condition is like underneath. Fasteners from vinyl siding could damage stucco. Stucco may need to be repaired or replaced. If water gets behind it, stucco could come loose from lath. Use historic photos to assist in restoration. A great, idiosyncratic building; presence on the street. The BAR encourages the project.

G. Adjournment 7:50 p.m.