

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
December 15, 2015

Location: City Council Chambers, Charlottesville City Hall, 2nd Floor

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller, Vice-Chair Tim Mohr, Justin Sarafin, Candace DeLoach, Carl Schwarz, Kurt Keesecker, Whit Graves, Laura Knott (arrived late).

Members Absent: Emma Earnst.

Staff: Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner, Camie Mess, Preservation Assistant, and Carolyn McCray, Clerk.

Call to Order: the meeting was called to order by Chair Melanie Miller at 5:34 p.m.

A. Preservation Awards 2015

Awards were presented to Eugenia Bibb for documentation of historic resources; to Nancy Kraus (Preston Avenue, LLC) for rehabilitation of 1218 (formerly 1709) Preston Avenue; and to James Sacco (Wacco Property Investments, LLC) , George Stish with CMS Builds, and Little Rhino Studio for rehabilitation of 102 East Main Street.

B. Matters from the Public – None.

C. Consent Agenda

1. **Minutes**

October 20, 2015 - Necessary correction
November 17, 2015

Mr. Schwarz motion to approve the minutes seconded by Mr. Graves with the necessary corrections proposed by Mr. Keesecker, motion passes 6-0-1. Ms. DeLoach abstained.

2. Special Use Permit Recommendation (Removed from the Consent Agenda)
206 W Market Street – Private Club

When the BAR recently considered an addition to this building, the applicant had not yet made application for the special use permit. Because the BAR already approved a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed design changes necessitated by the private club, the BAR has, therefore, determined that the additions are appropriate in the North Downtown ADC district. It follows that the BAR should recommend that the proposed use would not cause adverse impacts to the historic district.

Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the special use permit to allow a private club will not have an adverse impact on the North Downtown Architectural Design Control (ADC) District, and the BAR recommends approval of the Special Use Permit, but the BAR is not making any determination as to the impact of the use, seconded by Mr. Mohr, motion passes 7-0.

-Ms. Knott arrived-

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-12-03
416 West Main Street Unit B
Tax Parcel 290012000
Charles Roumeliotes, Applicant/ Allan H. Cadgene, Owner
Façade renovations

In staff opinion, the proposed changes are appropriate.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Mr. Mohr moved to find that the proposed facade changes satisfy the BAR's criteria, and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modifications: change the operable glass to the transom, keep the existing muntin development that's at the corner - extend that across the façade, and submit the sconces for administrative approval, to be mounted at the same height as those at Albemarle Baking Company, seconded by Mr. Sarafin, motion passes 8-0.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-12-01
213 7th Street N.E
Tax Parcel 530101000
Townsquare Associates, LLC, Owner/Allan H. Cadgene, Applicant
Removal of tree and planting new tree

In staff opinion, it is unfortunate to lose a large tree in this block. However, the site does not have room to accommodate another tree.

The applicant was not represented.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, Ms. Knott moved to find that the BAR does not approve the proposed tree removal as submitted, seconded by Mr. Schwarz, motion passes 8-0.

Friendly suggestions are to plant street trees in front of Shenanigans or Three-Penny Grill; put a wheel stop at the back of the parking space next to the tree to prevent cars from backing into it; and remove the ivy.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 15-12-04
1600 Grady Avenue
Tax Parcel 034091000
Preston Court Limited Partnership, Applicant/Lynn-Hall Ward, Owner
Removal of magnolia tree (west side of building), and an ash tree (south side).

Staff noted that the property owner is unwilling to have a grading/drainage plan prepared. Even if the BAR was willing to approve removal of the two trees, the R-3 zoning requires certain plans to be approved before tree removal and grading may occur.

Staff suggests that the BAR vote either yes or no on the two trees, and allow the application to move to the next step in the process. If yes, then staff will inform the Neighborhood Planner that the applicant may apply for a site plan amendment. If no, the applicant can appeal to City Council.

The applicant was represented by Barbara Lucas, the property manager.

Ms. Knott spoke to the applicant about coming before the board five times and the board has asked her three times to present a grading or a landscape plan.

Ms. Lucas said the trees are healthy and they have no interest nor do they have a requirement to produce a plan.

Ms. Miller said the BAR has been sympathetic to her cause but the thing we must have is a replacement plan. She said she is not supportive of removing these two trees.

Ms. Knott commented that she will not support this application because no plans have been provided.

Mr. Schwartz said he wanted to see a replacement tree somewhere on the site.

Mr. Sarafin requested treatment for the trees there now. He said this is one of Charlottesville's prize buildings.

Mr. Mohr said there doesn't seem to be a clear plan for going forward.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design, Ms. Knott moved to find that the proposed removal of two trees (Ash and Magnolia) does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted, seconded by Ms. Deloach, motion passes 8-0.

6. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 15-12-02

120 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 280026000

Kelly Tripp, Applicant/ William L Achenbach, Owner

Façade changes

In staff opinion, the proposed façade changes are appropriate. The BAR should confirm that the glass will be clear. Staff would recommend using an exterior varnish over the stain to maintain the appearance.

The plan proposes a four-panel folding door system that folds inward. The double entrance doors will look very similar to the folding doors, and will swing out. Each door/panel has six divided lights made of engineered lumber core with black aluminum cladding.

Above the doors are three fixed transoms with no muntins. The transom over the entrance doors is recessed to allow space for a hanging light on the exterior. The entrance doors and the transoms are framed with horizontal oak siding stained dark brown. Between the doors and transoms is a painted horizontal steel channel. One new sconce light is proposed to the left of the entrance doors.

After discussion with the board, the applicant requested a deferral.

Mr. Graves moved to accept the applicant's request for a deferral, seconded by Mr. Keesecker, motion passes 8-0.

BAR suggestions were to divorce the geometry of the base section from the upper section with the transom area having a bolder horizontality that reinforces the cornice and the break. Submit specification for varnish; explore extending steel channel across Ten.

E. Deferred Items

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred from October)

BAR 15-10-04

200 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 280010000

William S Banowsky, Jr, Owner/Violet Crown Cinema Charlottesville, LLC, Applicant
Change to approve new materials

The applicant has returned as requested with additional information regarding proposed design changes at the new Violet Crown Cinema theater.

Staff Report

1. The lighter paint color is appropriate. Staff is unsure how the texture could be made to look smoother like the original ceramic panels; perhaps a semi-gloss sheen would do that.
2. The marquee scale issue has been addressed with the added trim.
3. The applicant's argument that the building code requires darkly tinted glass is incorrect because this addition is considered a rehabilitation rather than new construction, according to the Building Code Official, so is not subject to the 2009 Energy Code. Staff has provided the architect with specific examples of clear glass products that may be appropriate. The applicant should replace the tinted glass with clear glass per the ADC District Design Guidelines.
4. The applicant said the transom issue can be corrected with fourteen week lead time. Staff advised the applicant to order the new transom. The applicant has been notified that the zoning violation must be corrected sixty days following BAR approval.
5. The applicant is not required to repaint the existing painted brick wall.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Ms. Miller moved to find that the following proposed design changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the following changes as submitted:

- the additional trim on the Marquee to address the scale issues,
- the additional 4 movie posters to the left of the entrance door and the moved mechanical equipment box,
- the transom on the east side of the building to match door height transom on the front.

In addition, Ms. Miller moved to find that the following proposed design changes do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with this property and other properties in

the Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR denies the following changes so that the original approved design must be built:

- the change to clear glass tinting must be clear glass with a VLT in the upper 60's or above, and a specification is needed;
- defer the change to the Hardie panels to be determined after samples are submitted and reviewed,

seconded by Mr. Schwartz, motion passes 8-0.

8. **Certificate of Appropriateness (Deferred from November)**

BAR 15-11-04

225 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 33023300

Jim Cheng, Owner/Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects, Applicant

Demolish rear section and parapet, new addition and window openings, other renovations

Mr. Keesecker recused himself.

Staff noted that the BAR should be clear about:

- Whether the brick will be left unpainted, as this would affect the parapet removal decision;
- Whether the middle section of parapet may be removed;
- That the existing front cornice may be replaced.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, Ms. Miller moved to find that the proposed demolition of the rear addition, the front storefront and cornice, the middle section of parapet and window openings satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Graves, motion passes 7-0-1.with Keesecker recused.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and for Rehabilitation, Mr. Graves moved to find that the proposed new rear addition, and changes to the existing building satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following details to come back to the BAR (circulated by email) : final brick samples, final window and door elevation details, final canopy details, seconded Mr. Mohr, Motion passes 7-0-1.with Keesecker recused.

Five Minute Break at 9:09

Reconvene at 9:18

F. **New Construction**

9. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 15-08-04

NW Corner of Ridge and Cherry

Tax Parcel 290145000-147000, 290149000-151000, 290157000

Cherry Avenue Investments LLC, Owner and Applicant

Proposal for a new Marriot Hotel on Cherry and Ridge (final details)

Staff has requested from the applicants a list of changes since the last meeting.

The two signs on Cherry Avenue appear to meet the maximum 100 square foot aggregate area, with no signage proposed on Ridge.

The applicant met with Ms. Knott since the November meeting, so the BAR should hear her comments on the site and landscaping updates.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction, Ms. Miller moved to find that the proposed details satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the proposed new building and site design details as submitted with the following modifications:

- eliminate the sidewalk colored pavers and floating seat wall from the plaza;
- change redbuds on plaza back to red maples;
- raise the canopy on the plaza side, and continue to refine, submitting any changes via email;
- institute lighting controls;
- replace upright shrubs on retaining walls with leafing or draping ones; and
- replace the Japanese Beauty Berry with the American Beauty Berry.

seconded by Mr. Schwartz, motion passes 8-0.

10. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from October)**

BAR 15-09-05
425,501,503 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 320175000, 320176000, 320177000
William H. Atwood, Applicant/The Sutton Group, Owner
Massing and elevations approval for a new mixed use development

The applicant is requesting massing approval. Staff noted that the BAR should decide if the massing is appropriate, so that the applicant can proceed in the design of other elements.

The BAR should focus on how the new construction interacts with the surrounding buildings as well as the streetscape and pedestrian experience of both West Main Street and Commerce Street.

Question from the Public

Brad Worrell 213 Sixth Street, said in the last design there was the parking entrance and two additional store fronts, the upper one to the west it appears to be a commercial entrance, the middle one was much less clear from the design so he is asking for clarification of what the anticipated functionality is on Commerce Street.

Mr. Atwood said in all of his designs he has been very consistent with the elevation on Commerce Street and he said that has not changed. We are very consistent and we are committed to no substantial changes at all.

Schaffer Sommers said he represents the owner of 208 Sixth Street, he said he is curious about the level 1 of the proposal of main street level which is the floor level that is being annotated as a parking plaza at the main street level. He said that is the floor level that is being annotated as being the most in proximity to the historic structures.

Comments from the Public

Schafer Sommers- He said he appreciates the efforts to take down height and reduce the mass of the building, he wanted to acknowledge that personally. His comments are directed specifically to the issue of the drive down on West Main which he doesn't think is appropriate to the type of streetscape that we want here in Charlottesville. He said the property doesn't have the width to do both of these things and it's so reasonable both aesthetically as well as reflecting on how we use the site and how active it's becoming and how the bicycles and other uses of the public realm of West Main will suffer having this type of more urban way of entering a basement. It seems more appropriate for something in Washington D.C.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, Mr. Graves moved to find that the proposed new mixed-use complex satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the massing only, as submitted, seconded by Ms. Knott, motion passes 6-2, (Ms. Miller and Mr. Keesecker opposed)

G. **Other Business**

Mr. Mohr talked about the lighting study.

Ms. Miller attended PLACE in Mohr's place. They discussed crosswalks, private street ordinances, sidewalk priorities- how they are chosen, site plan reviews outside of BAR areas- could they be more robust, form based codes may be applicable outside of ADC districts, and architectural review- should urban design chapter becomes its own chapter.

H. Adjournment 11:40 p.m.