

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
October 21, 2014  
City Council Chambers-City Hall**

**Members Present:**

Melanie Miller - Chairperson  
Kurt Keesecker  
Carl Schwarz  
Justin Sarafin  
Laura Knott  
Whit Graves  
Brian Hogg

**Members Absent:**

Candace DeLoach  
Tim Mohr- Vice Chair

**Staff Present:**

Mary Joy Scala

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Melanie Miller as she welcomed Mr. Keesecker to the meeting as the newly appointed Planning Commission representative.

A. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes August 19, 2014 and September 16, 2014

Motioned by **Mr. Schwarz** to approve the Consent Agenda with two sets of minutes, necessary corrections to the September minutes, seconded by **Ms. Knott** motion passes. Mr. Keesecker abstaining because he was not on the BAR for those meetings. Motion passes 5-0-1.

B. Deferred or Previously Considered Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 13-10-01  
418 17th Street NW  
Tax Parcel 090008000  
Beta Bridge LLC, Owner/ Daggett & Grigg Architects, Applicant  
Pergola Design

The applicant was asked to come back to the BAR with a revised design for the entrance structure (previously shown as a pergola). The proposed design is tube steel with stucco exterior to match the stucco trim color on the existing building and the new addition (dark beige), and brick base to match existing brick. The shape mimics the existing apartment building's arched stairwell entry. The entrance structure aligns with the front wall of the existing apartment building.

The BAR previously approved an application for a (4-story + ground level) 11-unit addition to be located behind the two existing buildings on the site. There is a new entrance walkway located between the two existing buildings, which lead to the rear addition. The proposed entrance structure is located above this walkway.

The BAR also approved demolition of a side porch on the contributing structure (boarding house) to facilitate pedestrian traffic through the site into the new addition. The existing side door onto the porch will be converted into a window.

The new addition will be constructed using the same brick veneer, trim and fiberglass shingles used on the existing apartment building. The stucco on the addition's fourth floor will match the beige color of the existing building's stair corridor. Windows were approved as aluminum clad; railings are white metal.

Four Willow Oak trees are proposed along the City street frontage.

Mr. Schwarz asked if it is steel with a stucco exterior coating.

Ms. Knott said the intentions were to have a pedestrian entry in scale with the historic building on the site. She suggested he create a portal, this is not what we were looking for, and it should reference the historic house, not the new building.

Mr. Sarafin stated we were hoping it would relate to the rooming house in the foreground and the scale seems pretty large.

Ms. Knott said to take the arch off and the flat-line looks better to the trim of the house. She requested he look at the photo that shows the house.

Mr. Schwarz agrees but understands that it wouldn't be any more successful than if it related to the apartment building. He said he could support it.

Mr. Graves said its better relating to the apartment building. He also would support it.

Ms. Miller said she cannot support it.

Mr. Schwarz suggested to get rid of the arch.

A motion was made to deny the application, which was withdrawn before the vote. **Ms. Knott** motioned to accept the applicant's deferral, seconded by **Ms. Miller.**

The BAR accepted (5-0-1) the applicant's request for deferral, with Keesecker abstaining because he was not on the BAR when the item was previously considered. BAR suggestions included: A re-worked design should be in scale with the smaller residential building; painted wood or steel; or could avoid overhead structure entirely, instead using low brick piers or use plantings to mark the entrance.

C. New Items

**Brian Hogg entered the meeting.**

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-10-08

315 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 320198000

The Inn at Vinegar Hill, LLC, Owner/ Expedite the Diehl, Applicant

Mariott Residence Inn signage (Comprehensive signage plan)

Mr. Trent Law, the applicant is requesting approval of signage. The BAR approves signage in an ADC district when a building is new construction. It was originally anticipated that the amount of signage being requested would require a comprehensive signage plan. However, the proposed signage appears to be permitted under current zoning regulations for the Downtown ADC District without requiring waivers that could be approved with a Comprehensive Signage Plan.

The proposal is to have two identical box canopy signs, each 10.83 square feet, located at each of the entrances, on West Main Street, and at the porte-cochere in the rear parking lot. The signs would have push-through, back-lit graphics similar to the Jefferson School signage that reads, "Residence Inn Marriott."

Without a Comprehensive Signage Plan, permitted signage in the Downtown ADC District is fairly restrictive.

Mr. Keesecker questioned the elevation on West Main. The applicant said the notations indicated lintel widths, and were from an earlier drawing.

Mr. Hogg points to a directional sign being in the middle of the side walk, is it blocking the sidewalk on 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The applicant said he was certain that was an error.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, **Mr. Sarafin** move to find that the proposed signage for the proposed hotel satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district except the two directional signs (in order to not require a permit) shall have opaque backgrounds so that only the text "Entrance" is illuminated at night, seconded by **Mr. Graves** the BAR approves the application as submitted, motion passes 7-0.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-10-09  
511 West Main Street  
Tax Parcel 320174000  
Benjamin Clore, Owner/Benjamin Clore, Applicant  
Paint Sign over Unpainted Masonry

The applicant is requesting approval to paint a nine foot by two foot vertical wall sign on the unpainted brick. The building was previously painted a solid cream color when it was C&R Auto; the paint was sandblasted off in 2011 when it was rehabilitated for restaurant use. Remnants of a blue C&R Auto sign above the doors still remain.

Painting on unpainted masonry is generally not permitted, but a mitigating factor is that this building was painted at one time, and then the paint was removed.

A painted sign is attractive, and there is clearly historic precedent on this building. The only downside to approving a painted sign in this instance would be that painted signs are more difficult to remove than signs that are attached to the building. If this restaurant leaves, then the options would be either to paint over the painted sign, or to physically somehow remove the sign, without further damaging the brick.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Graves** moved to find that the proposed sign painted on brick, with preference for the solid black sign with white letters, subject to the final placement of the sign to be submitted to staff for approval, satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, Seconded by **Mr. Schwarz** the BAR approves the application as submitted, and going back to Ms. Scala for review, motion passes 7-0.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-10-05  
532 1st Street N  
Tax Parcel 330011000  
Helena Devereux, Owner/ Helena Devereux, Applicant  
Exterior Changes: replace gutter

The applicant proposes to remove the Philadelphia gutter on the porch roof only and to replace it with a ½ round gutter. The BAR must determine if the Philadelphia gutter contributes to the style and character of the building. The BAR has permitted similar replacements in North Downtown.

Ms. Miller said she finds taking out the gutters are appropriate.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolition and Rehabilitation, **Mr. Hogg** move to find that the proposal to remove the Philadelphia gutter from the porch roof only satisfies the BAR's criteria and

is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC district, seconded by **Mr. Sarafin**, the BAR approves the application 7-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-10-02

425/421 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 320177000/320178000

The Sutton Group and Andie Levine, Owner/ Bill Atwood/Southern Cities Studio, Applicant

Demolition of 425 and 421 West Main Street

The applicant is requesting demolition of the former Mel's Barber Shop at the rear of 425 West Main Street and the Atlantic Futon building at the rear of 421 West Main Street.

The applicant has recently had two preliminary discussions for new construction on these properties, and has received approval of massing only for the proposed new buildings.

Both of these building were built after 1920 and were constructed out of concrete blocks. They are not recognized as historic buildings on either the Virginia or National Register of Historic Places, nor are their designs unique. They do not encompass unique construction practices, materials, or have any defining architectural features. Relocation of these building given their age and lack of architectural significance is not practical.

These buildings do not contribute greatly to the West Main Street ADC district. Their only historic significance is in their age and location. They indicate a type and scale of activity that was found on Commerce Street in the 1920's. The brick buildings that were destroyed on West Main Street in the early 1980's were more significant.

Bill Atwood said the Barber shop will be put back in the new scheme and the Atlantic Futon will be put back in the new scheme as well.

Mr. Hogg said it seems to meet the criteria that Ms. Scala outlined.

Mr. Keesecker – asked when could the demolition occur as it relates to the broader certificate of appropriateness for the new project before them.

Ms. Scala said as soon as you approve it and they get a building permit for demolition. She said they don't have to wait for any additional approval to demolish the building. She said on the other side of it, if it is approved, there is the 18 month time limit for the certificate of appropriateness and then the demolition permit is good for another six months. If they get a site plan approved, then the period of validity for any certificate of appropriateness runs with the site plan.

Ms. Knott made a request that they add to the terms of the approval, document in plan and photograph the inside and outside for the public record.

Mr. Atwood said they will do that.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, **Mr. Graves** move to find that the demolition of structures at the rear of 421 and 425 West Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with these properties and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, provided the building will be documented, photographed and foot print drawings made before demolition, seconded **Mr. Schwarz**, motion passes 7-0.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-10-01

501 Park Street

Tax Parcel 530012000

Hospice of the Piedmont, Owner/ Jackie Gamache, Applicant

Installation of hardscape and fountain (Hospice House Memorial Garden)

It is the applicant's desire to create a memorial garden as an inviting place to experience serenity, reflection, tranquility, peace, and healing. This is already an existing pedestrian path, including an oval walkway that was approved by the BAR in May of 2003.

This proposal is essentially a second phase to the original project that replaces the grass within the oval with memorial bricks and pavers. In the center of the oval there will be a modest, low profile water fountain. The front yard is the only available outdoor space for leisure where families of patients, volunteers, and staff would be able to venture outdoors to rejuvenate. Additional flowers, wooden benches, and landscaping would be included to create a comforting space to enjoy while visiting loved ones.

The development of this grassy patch with the addition of a center fountain and multiple plantings will improve the overall aesthetic quality of the site and neighborhood. The proposed design fits neatly within the existing oval sidewalk to create an inviting new outdoor room. There are a few considerations:

The choice of gravel or rocks as a groundcover in the landscaped areas should be discussed. While being easy to maintain, another material such as mulch or woodchips might be a better fit and allow the new landscape to blend into the old.

Mr. Keesecker asked what is the width of the planting bed in the garden.

Ms. Knott would like to see some to-scale drawings of this plan and a lower fountain, because when looking at the view of the house, it is really a spectacular view across the lawn and she thinks putting a multi-tiered fountain would detract from the historic house view. The drawing does not have the same proportions as the site plan. She asked how

the fountain would be installed and what kind of pavers is being used. She also recommended exploring the different paving patterns to fit the oval shape. Regarding the mulch, she said the shredded hardwood mulch is always best and is much easier to maintain than gravel. She wanted to know what kind of edging was going to be used between the planting bed and the pavers.

Mr. Hogg offers some assurance to Hospice that we are trying to move this forward.

The scaling, massing, and profile of the fountain need to be given careful consideration with regards to the overall site.

An unfortunate reality downtown is that benches are frequently used in off-hours by other persons. Perhaps a different design should be considered that discourages sleeping, or motion sensor lighting may be a deterrent.

Ms. Miller said you can ask for a deferral and re-submit when you are ready. Maybe you might want to talk with the people at First Presbyterian Church down the street who also put in a seating area.

Mr. Keesecker worked on this project in 2000, and a lot of the ideas are still reflected in what you are trying to achieve with this. One thought he offered was on occupying the lawn with bricks and plants is one approach and the other approach is to let the lawn stay as grass, and build the planting on the outside of the walk so it is an empty space in the middle instead of a place way people go will make the space bigger but imagine that the planting would not be on the inside of the walkway but on the outside and the benches would be along the walkway. He said it would be broadening the prospective view toward the front porch and be less constrictive occupying the middle.

Motioned by **Mr. Hogg** and seconded by **Mr. Graves**, the BAR accepted (7-0) the applicant's request for deferral. BAR suggestions included: Scaled drawing; radiating design so pavers fit oval; shredded hardwood mulch; specify kind of edging between pavers and planting bed (how would the planting bed edge be stabilized?); two-tier fountain would be lower but still provide sound; consider leaving the oval unoccupied, pushing the planting to the exterior of the oval walkway

#### 8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-10-06

134 10th Street NW

Tax Parcel 310156000

CCBW, LLC, Owner/ Mike Stoneking, Applicant

Exterior Changes: modify existing door and window openings; paint exterior

The applicant is requesting to make changes to the north side of the building, which part was built between 1946-1952. From east to west on the façade:

1. Repair sliding service door; reglaze; paint wood "Lemon Shine."
2. Replace plywood in adjacent opening with "rusted finish" steel panels.

3. Replace plywood in large window opening with “ruled finish” steel panels.
4. Remove some masonry to re-establish some of the original window opening around existing door. Infill with steel sash fixed window and steel framed glass door.
5. Add a second sliding door in “rust finish” steel panels.
6. Repaint wall near Tenth Street “Tucson Teal.” Paint the remaining CMU wall “Misted Green.”

The part of the addition to be painted “Tucson Teal” was previously painted dark red.

Staff has identified two issues:

- Should the former window openings be restored as metal windows rather than steel panels?
- Are the proposed paint colors appropriate?

The applicant said a replacement window is \$17,000 which is a little out of reach. The steel windows have been covered with a diamond mesh.

Mr. Hogg has issues with painting the unpainted concrete block. He said the ruled steel is a mannered artificial choice. The building is a high styled industrial, well-kept building and he said keeping the rustic mesh is not doing service to the individually protective property and thinks the color palette doesn't have anything to do with this property and has no reference to the context of the project.

Mr. Keesecker asked if it is safe to assume the different color paints designate different uses, such as yellow for the service door. He said the other idea about colors, the people next door, tried to add a little bit of light and bright colors.

Ms. Knott has no problem with the bright colors it is appropriate with people working and living there. She said she could support this.

Mr. Schwarz said it is great to see this restored and it seems what the applicant has proposed matches with what the tenant does that is there and he supports this.

Ms. Knott said she had no problem with the bright colors but thought to leave the two together and have some unpainted material with an application of bright openings or doors and she would be able to support this.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and for Site Design, **Mr. Keesecker** moved to find that the proposal satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this individually protected property, seconded by **Mr. Sarafin** the BAR approved (5-2 with Mr. Hogg and Ms. Miller opposed) the application with the change that the metal panels would be re-visited, not to be rust finish, and to be approved administratively.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 14-10-07



425 2nd Street NE  
Tax Parcel 330085000  
James E. and Lynn K. Garnett, Owner/ James E. Garnett, Applicant  
Exterior Changes: gutters, fencing, exterior paint, porch screening, and  
new garage doors

The applicant proposes to renovate the exterior of the house and garage.

1. Replace garage gutters, the "K" style gutters were removed due to damage and replace with ½ round metal gutters and 4" round downspouts painted black.
2. Add a picket fence enclosure around the exterior hvac compressor units. This fence would match the existing painted wood picket fence that encloses the patio between the main house and the garage.
3. Paint the exterior: main trim (Rolling Hills), front door and porch floor (Ebony King), and porch ceiling (Texas Sage).
4. Screen in back porch; replicating the rear porch renovated by their next door neighbors, Pat and Kay Humes.
5. Add new garage doors; replace the garage overhead doors with "swing out" doors. This design would create four wooden frame and panel doors with a small window at the top. The doors would swing out and "bifold" so as not to encroach beyond the garage apron.

The changes proposed in this application are in accordance with the guidelines.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Schwarz** move find that the proposed refurbishment including steel panel infill panels, new sliding door, new prefinished steel window/door system, and new paint colors satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this Individually Protected Property, seconded by **Ms. Knott**, the BAR approves the application, motion passes 7-0.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 14-10-03  
113 West Market Street  
Tax Parcel 330175000  
Lu Mei Chang, Owner/ Scott Gordon, Applicant  
Transformation of Porch Roof to Roof Deck

The applicant would like to transform the existing porch roof into a roof deck for dining purposes. The scope of work includes a new railing, wood decking (which would not be visible from the street), and lastly transform the existing window into a doorway.

The proposed rail is 1-1/2" tube steel frame with pickets @ 4" o.c. painted black. The posts are 9-1/2" square wood painted gray to match porch trim, with metal trim cap. Solid wood panels, painted gray, are proposed to infill between the posts.

The roof will be a new membrane with 5/4 board wood deck. The new door materials are not specified, but the lite pattern, dimensions and profiles are intended to match adjacent windows.

Making use of a historic building is generally desirable, and the applicant has been a successful restaurant owner in this location for years. The drawings are clear and thorough. However, the proposal presents some concerns. The BAR should take into careful consideration how drastically the change from a window to door and introducing roof dining will impact the façade of the building.

The building directly next to this has an identical façade and any change, especially one of these magnitudes, will alter that likeness. The designer has tried to minimize the impact of the new door, which, if permitted, should match the materials of the adjacent windows. However, adding a solid rail will change the massing of the façade. If permitted, the rail on the roof porch should be wood pickets to mimic the rail found at ground level. Building code may require the rail to be guardrail height, 42".

Another consideration is whether the additional seating for the restaurant is a necessity. The addition of a roof porch would be maximizing the use of the site.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Hogg** moved to find that the proposed roof deck **does not satisfy** the BAR's criteria **is not** compatible with this property and other properties in this district, Seconded by **Mr. Sarafin** the BAR **denied** the application as submitted, motion passes 7-0.

### **BAR elections for 2015 Chair and Vice-Chair**

The BAR re-elected unanimously Melanie Miller as Chairperson and Tim Mohr as Vice Chairperson, motion passes 7-0.

Adjournment - Mr. Hogg motioned to Adjourn at 8:00 pm