

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
October 18, 2016

Location: City Council Chambers-City Hall

Members Present: Chair-Melanie Miller, Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Carl Schwarz, Corey Clayborne, Laura Knott, Emma Earnst, Whit Graves, Stephen Balut

Absent: Justin Sarafin

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala

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

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 September 20, 2016 Regular Meeting
August 30, 2016 Work Session (503, 501, 425 W Main St)

Ms. Knott pulled the work session minutes for corrections.

Mr. Schwarz moved approval of the regular meeting minutes, Mr. Balut seconded. Motion passes, 7-0-1 with Mr. Clayborne abstained because he did not attend that meeting.

C. Previously Considered Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-07-04
1509 University Avenue
Tax Parcel 090078100
Amorgos LLC, Owner/William Adams, Train Architects, Applicant
Façade Renovation

According to the applicant the proposed façade renovations involve opening the current masonry façade to include: an oversized 3'x 10' door with glass transom above and glass sidelight to the left, painted folding aluminum wall, painted wood planks beneath the folding wall and in between the door and folding wall, and painted steel beam above the masonry opening. The existing masonry facade around this opening will be repaired and painted. Above the opening will be a signage area and new lighting for the signage.

Two paint colors are proposed: Urbane Bronze for the wood and aluminum; and --- for the brick and steel beam. The parapet height is to remain the same height as currently, as approved in July. The 10' door opening height is lower than the previously approved 13'-8" opening height.

The area below and to the left of the folding wall is now proposed to be wood; it was previously approved as brick. The BAR has already approved several details of this proposal in July (Drawing dated 7/19/2016 attached)—including the general configuration, the 13'-8" opening height, the painting of the brick, and maintaining the height of the parapet.

Guidelines for renovations and additions suggest that while wood siding, masonry, and stucco are most appropriate for historic districts, metal storefronts in clear or bronze are also appropriate. The folding painted aluminum wall does resemble a traditional storefront that is largely glass, and the Guidelines contemplate that it may be appropriate to create a more contemporary façade design when undertaking a renovation project.

Clear glass (with a VLT of at least 70, and low reflectance) must be specified.

Mr. Graves moved approval with the following modifications: 1) Clear glass with VLT of minimum 70; and 2) The awning must come back to the BAR for approval (to be circulated by email). Ms. Earnst seconded. Motion passes 8-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-06-04
1211 West Main Street (Dinsmore House Inn)
Tax Parcel 100059000
1817 House LLC, Owner/Ryan Hubbard, Applicant

At the September 20th meeting, the motion passed to approve the application with the following items to come back: the awning on front to extend to the edges of the recess; reconsider the panel on the front; a resolution for the ramp and required railing; look at both the materials and size of the awning along the back (complete with a section drawing), a painted balcony on the original building on the back (instead of stained or natural), the return of the hedge in front of the addition behind the wrought iron fence; the material of the dormer window in rear; the consideration of zinc element to read as a fin wall on the West Main Street elevation, and a site visit to see the brick.

Staff has requested from the applicant a list of all approved material, colors, and specifications (storefront windows, fire-rated windows, clear glass, railings, brick, zinc).

The proposed materials of the rooftop structure should be clarified.

The dormer material should be noted. The material for the dormer window will be a composite vinyl exterior with the wood interior to match the design of the windows in the original main Dinsmore house building.

The paint color for the rear porch will be matched the existing which is shown.

The hedge return needs to be shown.

The hedge has been returned between the wrought iron fence and the café.

Mr. Hubbard confirms the brick color will wear overtime just as wood would.

Mr. Balut moved approval of the final details of two-story addition, landscape and site changes as submitted with the following modification:

Ms. Knott said on the concept plan #16 looks like a hedge but is not in any of the other illustrations.

Mr. Hubbard said #16 is referencing the wrought iron fence and there is not going to be another hedge.

Ms. Knott said someone would look in through the fence into the planter that is inside the patio.

Mr. Hubbard said yes, and that the line of trees are going to extend along the entire east side of the property.

Ms. Knott said it is confusing because the illustrative drawing does not show the trees or the hedge. She said it just looks like pavement.

Mr. Hubbard said they have not changed the landscape plan since the last time they brought it to the BAR. The hedge along the front where it says H that is the one we returned.

Ms. Miller said vinyl clad windows are not recommended in our guidelines and the wood that is shown on the front (on page 6) is the same as in the elevations.

Mr. Hubbard said Mr. Mohr had asked to see a version with that reflecting as a fin which is what they are showing but the actual submittal is to keep that as the zinc finish that goes across, but it had been requested that they show it with a different material, so they are showing that wood. Their submittal is to maintain the weathered zinc to continue the materiality of the fin across, but the BAR asked in two different meetings to see it as something different.

Mr Schwarz said that the applicant could get better documentation from the brick supplier that what they have out there would work, and how it would weather.

Balut moved approval of the final details of two-story addition, landscape and site changes as submitted with the following modification:
Brick (either a treatment or new proposed brick for the façade) be submitted administratively for BAR review, and if required, an on-site sample will be installed or provided for BAR review. Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passes 8-0.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-09-04
409 Altamont Street
Tax Parcel 330136000
James and Lauren Record, Owner/Formwork Design LLC, Applicant

South Elevation and Landscape Plan

In September the BAR approved the rear demolition, and approved with conditions the new addition, landscaping and site changes. As requested, the applicant is returning with a reconsidered south elevation, landscaping details, and site plan details.

In addition, the applicant is now requesting additional demolition of a rear chimney, and to add a new window opening on the rear elevation. (Copies of the September submittal are attached for comparison, including site plan, south elevation, and photos of existing conditions that show the rear chimney and rear elevation.)

Kathy ___ 407 Altamont Street, her question is regarding the planting along the property lines, which ones are staying and which ones going away. How is the fence supposed to work with the existing group of houses. She did not speak into the microphone.

Applicant – we figure we will talk to the neighbors on both sides and whether they want to keep their existing fences and have us build our fence line in the inside of the property or whether they would be interesting in working together and have us build the fence on the property line. And said her preference would be to remove the existing fence and hedge and rebuilt a nice new fence and paint it on both side. She said she will talk with the neighbors.

Mr. Mohr moved to approve the new addition, removal of the rear chimney, new window, revised elevation on new addition, landscaping and site changes as submitted; the applicant should talk to neighbors about (landscaping) specifics; with metal clad windows and clear glass. Mr. Balut seconded. The motion passes 7-1 with Ms. Miller opposed.

D. New Items

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-10-01
19 Elliewood Avenue
Tax Parcel 090090000
Geary Albright, Owner/Brandon Wooten, Applicant
Front deck replacement/backyard deck addition

The applicant is requesting to replace the existing front (south end) entry deck with a new structure, decking, and railings, and to add a new deck to the back yard. The new decks will be pressure treated pine boards stained with Cabot solid stain, Ochre color with wire mesh infill panels.

Elliewood Avenue at The Corner is characterized by outdoor dining and a pedestrian scale. The proposal to replace the front entry deck maintains the same size and shape as the old deck—the only change is the darker stain (which was previously approved at the north end deck) and the wire mesh infill panels on the railing. Painted wood is preferred over stained treated lumber in a historic district; however, the restaurants across Elliewood received approval for stained treated wood railings. The proposed deck

addition in the back yard is lower in elevation and will not affect the view of the building from Elliewood Avenue.

Ms. Miller said put in some bushes because the yard is so ugly.

Mr Schwarz said if there are design changes due to the building permit process, please submit construction drawings to us. The applicant agreed.

Mr. Graves moved to approve the application with the following suggestion: use hogwire rails all around. Mr. Schwarz seconded. The motion passes 8-0.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-10-02
214 West Water Street
Tax Parcel 280080100
Klingel Enterprises II, LLC, Owner/Klingel Enterprises II, LLC, Applicant
Storefront Renovation

The applicant wishes to remove an existing folding aluminum door storefront and replace it with a stationary storefront with operable door in the left side. The existing double doors on the right side will remain. The black aluminum color will match existing.

The proposed changes are appropriate. The new glass should match existing in the double doors.

Mr. Mohr would like to see other churches do some of the same, he said it has great promise.

A great addition to Charlottesville

Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the application per the handout drawing received at the meeting. Ms. Knott seconded. The motion passes 8-0.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-10-03
101 East Jefferson Street
Tax Parcel 330190000
First United Methodist Church, Owner/William L. Owens, AIA, Applicant
Steeple Lighting

The applicant proposes to add lighting to the exterior of the steeple, on each of the two levels with balustrades, and the cross at the top of the spire. A continuous linear LED tape will be mounted on each base, and directed to wash the vertical architectural features, softly illuminate the cornices, and backlight the balustrades. The two faces of the cross will be illuminated. The entire lighting system is adjustable, on dimmer and timer controls.

The church would like to have the lighting installed while the scaffolding is in place to repair and repaint the steeple built in 1924.

The lighting guidelines support the consideration of lighting key landmarks and facades. In staff opinion, the proposal meets the guidelines and has been carefully designed.

Mr Schwarz encouraged the applicant to strongly consider setting a timer for complete darkness during the middle of the night.

Ms. Knott moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Mohr seconded. The motion passes 8-0.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-10-04
401 Altamont Circle
Tax Parcel 330111000
Marianne and Gerry Stasis, Owner/Applicant
Demolish Porch or restore balcony

As renovation of the building continues, the applicant is requesting to either (A) restore back the porch that faces West High Street to a balcony, so that the house's main entrance is clearly on Altamont Circle; or (B) demolish the porch.

(A) If the porch is restored to a balcony to resemble its pre-1956 appearance, the plan is to remove the stairs and wing walls on both sides, and infill with masonry and porch material to match the original. At the sidewalk level the brick landing would be removed, and the concrete curb would be extended to match the existing. The existing door to the porch would be replaced with a triple-hung window in the existing masonry opening.

(B) If the porch is demolished, the house would resemble its appearance on the 1920 Sanborn map, which showed a projecting brick bay but no balcony or porch on that side.
Build a planer for it to go under the house.
The applicant also may wish to remove a walnut tree on the east side of the house.

The balcony structure was added sometime between 1910 when the house was built, and 1956, when the stairs were added. Although the curved stairs are now 60 years old, there is merit in removing them and restoring the porch to a balcony to resemble its pre-1956 appearance with a triple-hung window. It would not be appropriate to demolish the balcony structure entirely because it contributes to the character of the house.

Mr. Schwarz moved to approve Option A to restore the porch to a balcony, as submitted, with the provision that Preservation Piedmont can come to document the stairs, and the BAR approves the removal of the walnut tree. Mr. Balut seconded. Motion passes 7-1 with Ms. Miller opposed.

9. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-10-05
206 West Market Street
Tax Parcel 330111000
Biarritz, LLC, Owner/David Ackerman, Applicant

Proposed Solar Panel Addition

This application proposes the addition of photovoltaic panels to three locations: the top of the roof trellis; on the south (rear) wall of the new addition; and on the unoccupied roof of the original building, hidden behind the building parapet. The panels on the rear wall would be mounted on brackets so they resemble awnings.

In addition, the applicant requests a change to the wall material on the addition. The proposed modification would eliminate stucco on the east, south, and west sides of the addition below the roof deck level. Instead, those surfaces would be painted concrete masonry units to match the stucco color. The reason for the requested modification is that those surfaces are only visible from the alley/parking area to the south (rear) of the building, or from within the very narrow alleyways on the east and west sides, which will be gated.

Staff attached small copies of the drawings and photos approved in November 2015 (pre-roof collapse) and the March 2016 amendments.

Guidelines related to photovoltaic panels are those for roofs and for utility equipment. Because the panels will not be visible from the street they are not in conflict with the character of the building or site.

The proposed modification to allow painted CMU in place of stucco on the lower walls of the addition is also appropriate.

Mr. Balut moved to approve the application for solar panels and to eliminate stucco on part of the addition as submitted. Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passes 8-0.

E. New Construction

10. Certificate of Appropriateness
BAR 16-08-05
NW Corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Ave (William Taylor Plaza Phase 2)
Tax Parcel 290147000, 290146000, 290145000
Cherry Ave Investments LLC, Owner/ Management Services Corp.,
Applicant
New Construction of Residential Building

The current owner is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for Phase Two of a new mixed-use Planned Unit Development on the corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue. The proposed project will be built on a total of 2.9 acres.

The applicant is currently requesting approval of the "massing, scale and elevations." The submittal includes a plan of the parking garage layout; a roof plan; elevation drawings showing building height; and larger scale elevation drawings with general materials called out.

They are requesting an interim approval of the massing, scale and elevations. It is important to note that such an approval is not a COA. The BAR should determine whether the overall massing design (setbacks,

stepbacks, spacing, etc.), scale of the building (in relation to the neighboring buildings and the site), and the general design of the elevations are compatible with the character and scale of the historic district, and whether they are consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff has requested perspectives to assist the BAR in understanding the current proposal. If the BAR is satisfied with this iteration, the BAR may approve the massing, scale and general elevations only, in order to allow the applicant to proceed with confidence to the final submittal. A future submittal for approval of the COA must include pertinent items from the new construction checklist below :

1. Massing drawings
2. Dimensioned elevation drawings, color perspectives in context, site/landscape plan, wall sections and other details
3. Materials and colors (materials samples) for:
Walls, roof, foundation, cornice, trim, windows (70 VLT specifications for clear glass), appurtenances, doors, garage doors, storefronts, railings, decking
4. Site/landscape design:
Site walls and fences (height, material), paving materials, species of trees and additional plantings, patio furniture including umbrellas, tents
5. Lighting: site and building (fixture cut sheets, mounting height, dark sky, color of light)
6. Signage: Locations and general sizes for building name (1) and retail spaces (2 each)
7. Mechanical units: rooftop and ground locations; screening; transformer locations; restaurant vents
8. Canopies, awnings, pergolas

Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the massing and scale only in order to allow the applicant to proceed with confidence to another submittal. This is not a COA. Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passes 5-3 with Mr. Balut, Ms. Miller and Ms. Earnst opposed.

F. Other Business

11. PLACE Report – Mr. Mohr reported they did not have a PLACE meeting.

Several of us attended a Form Based Code seminar.

A member of the public, John Erdwurm made additional comments about the William Taylor Plaza Phase 2 development.

G. Adjournment 9:07 p.m.