

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
June 21, 2016

Location: City Council Chambers-City Hall

Members Present: Chair-Melanie Miller, Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Carl Schwarz, Kurt Keesecker, Whit Graves, Emma Earnst, Stephen Balut, Justin Sarafin

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala, Camie Mess, Siobhan Perks, Preservation Intern, Carolyn McCray, Clerk

Absent: Laura Knott

Call to Order: Chair – Melanie Miller calls meeting to order at 5:30

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

Mr. Mark Kavit: said that it is always best if neighbors communicate, especially when it is about a change to a property. It should be mandatory for developers to inform and meet with neighbors about for a property. Recently, Kavit's wife noticed new stakes along their property line. They knew the house next door sold a few months earlier. She spoke to one of the tenants renting the house, who told her the owners were planning to build a fence. Later that day, Kavit spoke to the daughter of the owner. Moments later her mother walked up to the house and they were able to speak. She discussed and showed him the fence plans. Mr. Kavit noted his concerns and would consult with an attorney to protect his property. His concern is how this fence will affect his property rights. He believes the BAR would not approve of this fence because it is not traditional and it could set a bad precedent. He feels that with some modification this fence could work in the downtown location. He would like to see this matter come before the BAR. He hereby appeals the administrative approval made about the fence to be built by his neighbor behind his property at 402 Altamont Street. Kavit condends that he should have been made aware about the fence, and that this issue could have potentially been worked out earlier.

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 applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. Minutes May 17, 2016

Motion by Mr. Schwarz to accept the consent agenda; seconded by Mr. Keesecker.
Motion passes 6-0-1 (Mr. Sarafin recused).

C. Previously Considered Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-03-04
36 University Circle
Tax Parcel 060092000
Margaret Nelsons Spethmann, G.P.A., Owner/Russell Skinner, Applicant
Front Dormer Redesign

The BAR should decide if the new dormer design is appropriate. It is a good plan to keep the existing windows, and to remove the aluminum siding.

Mr. Keesecker said he could not remember the plan, but he assumes the alignment from the center line of the windows in the new dormer (being off center of the triple windows down below the chimney) is a result of what is going on in the plan.

Mr. Skinner said the chimneys are not really symmetrical; it would not work to try and align the windows with the chimneys. He aligned the center of the windows with the mullion with the two outside windows below trying to make some sort of order.

Ms. Miller said the change with the windows is great news and the same with the siding. The dormer is a more complicated issue; she did not like the dormers to begin with but they were approved.

Mr. Sarafin said the BAR did not approve the dormers; they were put off so that a new design could come back.

Mr. Schwarz said he would be more comfortable if the dormers were two sheds. This would give more depth to the center portion and would not stylistically change the house.

Mr. Mohr agrees that the windows are more proportionally appropriate to the house.

Ms. Knott said that any type of dormer on this façade would be taking the focus away from the porch and would be incompatible with the historic character of the building and hence, the character of the district. Guideline C.10 recommends avoiding "cutting new openings."

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Graves** moved to find that the revised dormers and plan to remove aluminum siding satisfy the BAR's criteria and are 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 with the following modifications:

- Keep existing windows, but with new storms
- Patching/repairing of the existing shingles after removing the aluminum siding
- Move to a two dormer option as shown on the drawings submitted to the BAR at the meeting.

Seconded by **Mr. Balut**, motion passes 8-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-03-03
513 14th Street NW
Tax Parcel 050087000
Lane Bonner, Owner/Wassenaar & Winkler Architects, Gregory Winkler,
Applicant
Two Story/Attic Additions – Details

The proposed addition is larger than the original building, but it is well-located to minimize its visual impact. The addition's roof line has been changed per BAR suggestion, which was to raise the connecting eave and reduce the overhang depth, and to lower the connector roof so it is lower than the existing roof ridge. Removal of the rear porch would not diminish the character of the historic structure.

The applicant has also included a window cut sheet and landscape plan.

In staff opinion, larger trees should be added back to help replace those removed. The BAR should decide if the roof changes are appropriate, given Council's determination.

Mr. Wassenaar said he appreciates the BAR's consideration and thank you for seeing him again.

Mr. Schwarz said the BAR should decide if the roof changes are appropriate, given Council's determination.

Ms. Scala said Council's decision cannot be reversed; the BAR should review the design as it has come back. Council did not agree that the massing was too large.

Mr. Mohr asked for a picture of the house to see whether the chosen brick color matches the existing house – it is hard to tell from the drawing.

Kurt Wassenaar said he followed the National Park Service Guidelines in terms of color shift as well as handling of the joint – the final will be a negative joint, which is the typical way it is handled - when we get a shadow line at the edge and the brick color shifts which is consistent with the National Park Service Guidelines from restoring restoration.

Ms. Miller asked about the handicap ramp, both in general and about its location because that is what is requiring the removal of many of the biggest trees on the property.

Mr. Wassenaar said there is about a 4 foot grade shift from the alley to the front of the house which had to be accommodated for in order to meet ADA compliance.

Ms. Miller asked if there is another place the ramp could be located.

Mr. Wassenaar said that unfortunately there is no better place; the clearance is only on one side. All sides were looked at and 3 or 4 ideas were made for the handicap ramp, but this one seemed the least offensive.

Ms. Miller asked if there are any other options other than a ramp, maybe a lift.

Mr. Wassenaar said that he and the client prefer not to put in an electric ramp because they can be a maintenance nightmare.

Mr. Mohr said we did mention the height, color rendering, and the later addition to the building. There is a color shift which is hard to tell on the drawings.

Ms. Knott said the site plan is incompatible with this district because it entails the removal of several large trees, one of the character-defining features of the district. As described in the National Register nomination associated with the ADC district, "the District's visual appeal is further enhanced by its large, well-planted yards; its streets lined with towering deciduous trees."

The planting plan is not compatible with this district because its proposed plant materials are inappropriate for the site in scale and species. She would like to see this plan return after an actual landscape architect has worked on it.

Mr. Wassenaar said he would be happy to present some samples to Mary Joy.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, **Mr. Mohr** moved to find that the proposed addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines 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 with the following modifications:

- A sample of the brick as proposed
- Alternate ramp plans or see the project go to a walkway with a lift – the objective being to keep as many of the existing trees as possible
- A finished landscape plan with larger trees and more planting options that mimic what is already going on in the district

Seconded by **Mr. Balut**, 7-1 (**Mr. Sarafin** opposed).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 15-11-04
225 East Main Street
Tax Parcel 330233000
Jim Cheng, Owner/Bruce Wardell, BRW Architects, Applicant
Exterior Alterations

June 2016 - The proposed changes are appropriate.

Some things to discuss:

- A glass sample and specifications are needed to make sure it is clear
- The BAR should confirm that the proposed waterproofing is appropriate
- The BAR should approve the final window and door elevation details
- The final canopy details

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Sarafin** moved to find that the proposed new 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 as submitted, noting that the canopy should be 4 feet so that the leader of the Gingko tree at 5 feet will not have to be cut. Seconded by **Mr. Balut**, motion passes 7-0-1 (**Mr. Keesecker** recused).

The BAR also confirmed that the windows will have SDL's with spacer bars, and the brick will not be sealed.

D. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-06-02
518 17th Street NW
Tax Parcel 050066000
Charlottesville VA House Corp (Alpha Phi), Owner/George Stone, Applicant
Fence Replacement

Feral Joskafee said the current fence is old, broken, and not salvageable.

In staff's opinion, the new fence, which uses a simplified design of similar materials and height to the old fence, is an aesthetic and practical improvement that fits within the ADC Guidelines for this area.

Mr. Kavit asked what type of metal the fence is made of.
The applicant said it looks like aluminum.

Mr. Kavit asked if she knows where the fence will be coming from.
The applicant said the supplier is called Aluminum Fence Supply.

Mr. Kavit asked if is it appropriate to use a modern day aluminum type fence in this location. He believes a cast iron fence would be more appropriate. This fence looks like something you could pick up at Lowes; he feels as if something of structure would be more appropriate.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, **Mr. Graves** moved to find that the proposed fence 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.

Prior to installation, the BAR would like to see samples of the new aluminum fence; the BAR would also be open to looking at any alternative fences that could be better. The BAR approves the removal of the existing fence. Seconded by **Mr. Sarafin**, motion passes 8-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-06-05
150 Chancellor Street
Tax Parcel 090109000
Delta Zeta National Housing Corp., Owner/John J. Grottschall for Zeta Corp., Applicant Tressie Daniels,
Front Yard Landscaping
Discussion and Recommendations

This is a small, triangular planting area located behind a stone wall. It is not clear which shrubs will be removed, so that should be clarified. The proposed plantings seem appropriate, but the BAR may wish to discuss.

Ms. Tressie Daniels said to come and see the windows - they look awesome and you cannot tell from the outside that they are different; the back where we did the

air conditioning is very neat and clean. She is happy with the results and hopes the BAR will be as well when they see it.

Ms. Daniels said as far as the landscaping goes, she is very flexible with whatever the BAR decides. The bushes that are going inside of the stone wall that borders the sidewalk are to help erosion – the stone wall is getting down to the foundation from the backside where you can see from the yard. The new would be very beneficial to help with the erosion of the structure. Ms. Daniels does not want anything to happen to that stone wall.

Regarding the bushes in the front, two boxwoods would be replaced with what is already existing in that area. They are lined with spiraea neon flash to replace the boxwoods that have had one too many beer cans thrown at them.

Ms. Knott said the planting plan seems appropriate for the site, although she would like to see a broader bed of pachysandra to balance the hostas behind it. She would also like to see the proposed planting bed edging meet the sidewalk at a 90-degree angle, instead of an acute angle, which is easier to maintain and doesn't leave a woeful little bare corner.

Board members commented that it seems appropriate.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, **Mr. Keesecker** moved to find the proposed landscaping changes 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 as submitted. Seconded by **Mr. Balut**, motion passes 8-0.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-06-01
111 West High Street
Tax Parcel 330111000
Marianne & Gerry Starsia, Owner/Applicant
Exterior Renovations - Tree Removals, Window/Door Exchange, and Porch Renovations

This is a 1908-12 beautiful home. It was the home of an architect firm, was subdivided and chopped up, and at some point, a window was taken out to put in a single door which feels like an entrance to a small apartment. The applicant would like to take out the single door and have it replaced with a window. In the yard, one of the trees was struck by lightning, and two others are diseased. Van Yahres suggests two tulip poplars, to restore the brick work and trim, and to put everything back as it was. Two smaller French trees. This house has three porches..

Mr. Kavit said the NDRA always likes it when a home goes back to residential, so welcome to the neighborhood. He asked if the front that is facing High Street will stay as is. He said with the Black Walnut tree you might want to replace and he questioned if the barlett pear would be appropriate for downtown and the dogwood would not grow in such a way that to block the sidewalk and we do have a problem with dogwoods blocking the sidewalk.

Mr. Starsia said yes.

Mr. Sarafin toured the house and looked at all of the particulars and the application represents all of that and it is generally appropriate.

Ms. Miller said she agrees, she was able to visit the house and from her perspective we are lucky that they have taken this on and are spending the money to turn what was commercial back into single family.

Ms. Knott said it seems like a compatible solution.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, and for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Sarafin** moved to find that the proposed exterior changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Seconded by **Mr. Schwarz**, motion passes 8-0.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-06-03
1397 West Main Street (Boylan Heights)
Tax Parcel 100004000
West Main Street LLC, Owner/Dan Zimmerman, Alloy Architecture,
Applicant
Addition of Second Story Deck

Dan Zimmerman said he is not painting the brick building and has color sample and the finish materials to do that with. We are looking to do, as far as the texture of the material, the fine texture and the gray flannel color. The actual deck is going to be metal decking with a concrete pour on top with wood decking on top of that. The first floor will be protected from the weather. The arbor is not intended to be covered and not covered at a later date so we can run ceiling fans up there.

The project was originally started in 2008 with a different architect who we approached, and were able to get the drawings, although they were not up to date. The drawings need to be clarified as to existing and proposed elevations. The drawings do not reflect what the building currently looks like.

In addition to the new Boylan Heights deck, the drawings appear to show a plan to enclose the north stair, and to add a second lower window at the adjoining restaurant.

Mr. Sarafin asked if there was any thought given to incorporating the two sidewalk-level decks into the overall design since it is the same tenant. He can understand if it is refused, but at the same time it would seem relatively straight forward to redo the decks below to be the same. That would really unify that corner. It seems to him that with a few more details and steps, both the street space and the façade of this building could be fully face-lifted.

Mr. Balut said he thinks it could be much stronger if the rear decks were integrated.

Mr. Mohr asked how far past the windows the frame goes relative to the outside windows on the right hand side.

Mr. Zimmerman said it follows the footprint of the existing deck, just to the right side of those windows.

Ms. Miller said it definitely goes pass the window.

Mr. Zimmerman said yes.

Mr. Mohr asked where the property line comes this way. Make it stronger on the other side.

Mr. Zimmerman said on the 14th street side.

In staff opinion, because this addition is so prominent, the drawings should be prepared with greater thoughtfulness and detail.

- The new entrance to the deck should probably be located in the third or fifth entrance bay.
- There should be a plan addressing how the deck could be covered in the future. A metal pergola that does not provide protection from weather may not be a permanent condition.
- Are the new railings to be solid black metal with no openings?
- Where will the lights be relocated?
- Will the currently mis-matched first floor decks be integrated into the design of the new work above?

In staff opinion, this very visible corner deserves careful attention. The exposed aggregate banding could be improved with painted stucco perhaps, but painting the brick would not be an improvement. The ADC Guidelines explicitly state “Do not paint unpainted masonry surfaces,” (Chapter 3 N.3) so painting the existing brick veneer grey is not compliant with these guidelines. This application should be treated as a preliminary discussion, with the applicant’s permission.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, and for Rehabilitation, Mr. **Schwarz** movde to find that the proposed exterior changes satisfy the BAR’s criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties West Main on the Corner, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following modifications:

Administratively, the BAR would like to see:

- Lighting plan
- Lower decks to be rebuilt to have the same material/quality as the upper deck
- Edges of the second story balcony to be reworked where they meet the brick
- New concept figured out for the Christian’s sign

Seconded by **Mr. Balut** (approved administratively), motion passes 8-0.

9. Preliminary Discussion
BAR 16-06-04
1211 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 100059000
1817 House LLC, Owner/Ryan Hubbard, Applicant
Porch Demolition, Porch Expansion, and Streetscape

Ryan Hubbard is the Manager of the Dinsmore House Inn Bed and Breakfast, which is in its 13th year and has housed more than 26,000 guests since they opened in 2003.

This is a Preliminary Discussion to receive some feedback from the BAR. The applicant proposes improvements to the landscape and the streetscape. We propose demolishing a failing two-story side porch that is not original to the building, and replacement of the porch to provide café space, handicap access, a service kitchen and improved guest suites.

In general, the inn is a perfect use for this property and location. The side porch has been in a deteriorated condition for many years.

These building are very inflexible, they are not good buildings.

The BAR did not want to see the existing porch removed; they suggested considering ways to accommodate the business plan at the rear, or to find a creative way to push out the porch to gain additional space, but still distinguish new work from old. They did not think the octagonal porch was compatible with a federal style building.

Mr. Schwarz asked if the entrance and side porch were added before or after 1913.

Mr. Hubbard said it was 1917.

Mr. Mohr asked how to address the language; there is nothing that says you cannot design a federal style building today. If you are going to build it new and demolish the old one, what does the new one do to tell you that it is not from 1917.

Mr. Sarafin said it is hard to distinguish if the proposal is to demolish the 1917 porch and then replace it with something that looks almost the same - the Secretary of Interior standards shy away from that kind of a treatment so an addition to a historic building would need to be differentiated more.

Mr. Mohr said it might the details of the federal columns and the entablatures to handle the glazing systems; something has to make it clear that it is not the old structure at least that is the way it is interpreted these days.

Mr. Schwarz said definitely that is a major issue, but he is stuck that it is 100 yrs. old. Although it is not original to the building, it has historical significance and demolishing it would be problematic. He said there is something contributing about the green space around it, pushing it out an extra bay would lose the green space in the Marriott. This could be troubling in terms of what it would do to the rest of West Main Street.

There is a line of trees along the long elevation that faces the Marriott, they are pretty crammed in there but if you extend the building another bay out another 5 feet.

Mr. Mohr said it looks like about 2 ½ feet and how much wider is the new then the old one.

Mr. Hubbard said about 5 feet and there is a hedge there before you get to the trees and the beds at the Marriott, there are actually two sets of hedges so if you

were looking at it from that angle you would actually see about this width of hedge there right beside the porch and then you get to the Marriott's landscaping and another hedge.

Mr. Keesecker suggested that Mr. Hubbard present some design ideas and try to show the distinguishment of the old from the new with the details along the change in the roof. That would be helpful.

Mr. Balut asked how everyone feels about the octagonal porch. The older building has additions of another time and place that we now appreciate. The octagonal porch doesn't blend with this kind of design.

Mr. Mohr said the only reason is because the octagonal porch is from an era, it is a little iffy. It is a weird censorship thing.

Mr. Sarafin said it is not the original building era and it is not the colonial revival era and you build something on there now and it's of now. If the desire is to maintain a historic appearance to the property then he would argue that a design element is not an appropriate mix for what is there.

Mr. Balut spoke to Mr. Hubbard saying he hopes this helps him get to a point where he can understand why the BAR does not think the octagonal porch is an appropriate addition. It may need to be restored somehow, or maybe there is some historical evidence that there were some designs that had been done and lost that could now be redone or re-configured. If none of that evidence exists, the best would be to go with a more contemporary design that does not try to be of a different era.

Mr. Sarafin and Mr. Balut said to stick with local and regional types, especially for this building. This was built by Jefferson builders, and you would want to stay in a Virginia vocabulary.

E. Other Business

10. **PLACE Report** - Tim Mohr said the 3-D software discussion (UVA is using City Engine); desire to get it up and running in the SIA area. There is a green initiative, City Green, to integrate all levels of green infrastructure.

Continued Discussion by the BAR

Mr. Keesecker said there are areas of town where zoning conflicts with use patterns. He suggested a work session to make a list of top ten areas where massing conflicts with what is there currently, to prepare for future code audit work. (14th Street, Booker Street and Starr Hill examples were mentioned).

Ms. Scala said William Taylor Plaza Phase 2 is ready to move forward and they have requested a work session. The BAR was in agreement with that plan to schedule a work session for preliminary discussion, provided the BAR can receive documents a week ahead and the applicants should come prepared to the meeting.

Mr. Balut asked about the BAR's purview to specify maintenance techniques on a historic building or offer advice on building code issues.

Ms. Miller asked if 400 West High Street and 120 West High Street could now be considered applications in non-compliance.

Mr. Mohr asked about the Violet Crown glass and the Landmark Hotel.

Mr. Mohr asked Mark Kavit what he wanted to say about cast iron.

Mr. Schwarz said the Starr Hill residents he talked with do not want an ADC or a Conservation District designation. Keesecker said Woolen Mills neighborhood does want a Conservation District.

Ms. Miller referenced a letter from Genevieve Keller regarding the Halprin designed chairs on the Mall, and suggested that the BAR reply back as a body to endorse those views.

Other topics were the poor condition of the Second Street crossing, and Mr. Mohr noted an article about Cincinnati.

F. Adjournment 9:30 p.m.