

**MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Work Session Meeting  
November 7, 2016 – Noon  
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room - City Hall**

**BAR members present:** Melanie Miller, Chair; Tim Mohr, Vice-Chair; Carl Schwarz, Laura Knott, Justin Sarafin

**BAR members absent:** Kurt Keesecker, Steve Balut, Emma Earnst, Whit Graves

**Staff present:** Mary Joy Scala

1. Call to order at noon by Tim Mohr, who acted as Chair in Melanie Miller’s absence, who arrived late.

**2. Preliminary Discussion**

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 applicant was represented by:

Steven Von Storch, Architect; and Trey Steigman, Applicant

Mr Von Storch: We were asked to work on the base. There are two stucco choices: white or brown coat with dark window sash.

Mr Mohr: My gut reaction is that the lighter color is more successful – the upper banding and punching read more clearly. Suggest a steel wire structure instead of a pergola.

Look at keeping the stone base level.

Mr Schwarz: Not sure about a consistently low base.

Mr Sarafin: I agree the much lighter color reads better. It has a “Voyseyesque” feel.

There was consensus among the BAR members that everyone prefers a shade of white.

Ms Knott: The south corner is getting better, but it’s not there yet. The window will show above the hotel as a landmark, but it has flat-looking stucco. Perhaps extend the trellis structure across the end?

Mr Mohr: Is the south end occupiable space? A doorway may change how you perceive the building.

Ms Knott: The gable boards (vents) look awkward.

There was discussion about whether an extended pergola would have a purpose.

Mr Sarafin: If there is not programming back there, there is no reason for it.

There was discussion about dark gray porches and roof.

Ms Miller: Asked if the porches are concrete.

Mr Von Storch: Not sure yet- a deck is lighter.

Ms Miller: Asked what the connectors would be made from.

Mr Von Storch: They are all carpentry. They need to look at railing systems.

Ms Miller: The lighter, more transparent it could be, would make it go away.

Mr mohr: Take it up a notch in articulating. Maybe a screen effect on the hyphen – like a screen wall- seems like the back of a beach house. Make it more unified like a screen. The design is on the right track, but we need to see something.

Mr Schwarz: Suggested a different way to detail the pergolas.

Mr Steigman asked if the BAR could make a decision regarding the bus pull-off on Ridge Street. The BAR had indicated earlier that the project design would be better without the bus pull-off.

Mr Schwarz moved to direct Charlottesville transit to remove the bus pull-off from the plan. Mr Mohr seconded the motion. The motion was approved (5-0).

1:15 p.m. Adjournment

Board of Architectural Review  
Minutes  
November 15, 2016

Location: City Council Chambers-City Hall

Members Present: Chair-Melanie Miller, Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Carl Schwarz, Laura Knott, Stephen Balut, Justin Sarafin, and Emma Earnst.

Members Absent: Whit Graves, Corey Clayborne

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala; Preservation & Design Planner, Carolyn McCray, Clerk

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda – None.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes

October 18, 2016 Regular Meeting

October 10, 2016 Work Session (West Main Streetscape Plan)

August 30, 2016 Work Session (Hotel at 503, 501, 425 W Main St)

**Mr. Schwarz** moved to approve all three sets of minutes, as amended with his comments and Ms. Knott's comments. **Mr. Sarafin** seconded. Motion passed (7-0).

C. Previously Considered Items

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-03-03

513 14<sup>th</sup> Street NW

Tax Parcel 050087000

Lane Bonner, Owner/Wassenaar & Winkler Architects,

Gregory Winkler, Applicant

Two Story/Attic Additions – Final Details – Landscape Plan and Railings

**Mary Joy Scala** presented the staff report. She said the applicant is seeking approval of two remaining conditions that staff was unable to resolve with the BAR.

Staff recommends that the applicant figure out a way to add a second street tree.

The applicant, **Greg Winkler**, represented the property owner.

**Questions from the Public:** None

**Questions from the BAR:**

**Mr. Balut** said if the gasoline is running up the north side of the property then how are these trees that you are proposing going to be okay because they look like they are in 5 or 10 feet of the existing gas line.

**Mr. Winkler** said yes that is an existing gasoline that is already there, but as far as the evergreen, the LPDA noted that that was a small to medium shrub and felt that there was enough room for that Nelly Stephen's Holly.

**Ms. Knott** said that is not a small to medium shrub that is a large shrub small tree.

**Ms. Miller** said the drawing is not to scale, so is this key supposed to indicate something about the size.

Mr. Winkler said he believes the planting legend just represents symbols and that the planting plan is to scale.

**Ms. Miller** said the tulip poplar is the biggest thing maybe 40 feet wide. The sweeping magnolia looks a bit smaller and that would be probably 12-20 feet tall and wide and the same for the arborvitae and she felt an estimate of 10 to 15 feet high and 4 feet wide so it looks a lot bigger than what; the river birch 40-50 feet high.

**Ms. Knott** said description on the plant legend is not schedule is a single leader of a river birch so we can comment on that later.

**Comments from the Public:** None

**Comments from the BAR:**

**Ms. Knott** said this is a great improvement from what we seen before with exception of the missing street trees. She would prefer the water lines be moved over than we would have a nice space for another tree. She would like to see if a River Birch is in the place shown then it needs to be a multi trunk tree for really a shade tree.

**Mr. Winkler** the south side of this property and where the new walk is has been fairly damp and the intent was to remove a lot of that vegetation and creating a little spring down to where this River Birch is proposed.

**Ms. Knott** asked a question about the planting beds right behind the River Birch that has one shrub in it and rest of it is just empty.

**Mr. Winkler** said it could appropriate for either the St John's Wort or the Monkey Grass.

**Ms. Miller** spoke on the railing that should either be painted crossing green or black or just have more simplified railing.

**Ms. Knott** asked if the railing on the back existing or on the addition.

**Mr. Winkler** said those two railings are new; the rear half of the house is new.

**Mr. Schwarz** said if all of the trim is white so the railing can be white.

**Mr. Balut** said he can go both ways and get the second street tree.

**Mr. Mohr** said either is fine with him.

**Ms. Ernest** is in general agreement.

**Mr. Sarafin** said he doesn't have strong feelings with the railing color but he does with the second street tree.

**Motion:** Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions and for Site Design, **Mr. Balut** moved to find that the proposed landscape plan and railings satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines 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 with the following modification : that a second street tree is added to the front of the property, with the stipulation

that the street tree be an appropriate shade tree for the street. **Ms. Knott** seconded. The motion passed (7-0).

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-10-04  
401 Altamont Circle  
Tax Parcel 330111000  
Marianne and Gerry Starsia, Owner/Applicant  
Landscape Plan

**Mary Joy Scala** presented the staff report.

Staff recommends that all four canopy trees that were removed should have appropriate replacement trees shown on the plan; perhaps some street trees along High Street.

The applicant, **Gerry Starsia**, and landscape architect, **Ann Pray**, were present.

**Questions from the Public:** None

**Questions from the BAR:**

**Ms. Miller** asked about the cobble border and curb. Is that proposed where the half round curb is now on the High Street side or is it around the edge or just in the driveway?

**Ms Pray** said just in the driveway to re-define the edge. It is going to be a very new line for people to get used to, where the property line actually is located. They are proposing that it is going to be a flush on grade, they will use a larger size jumbo cobble to establish the edge co-planer with the paving that would be the parking area, and then the wrapping on the house side would be cobble curb that would be a 3 inch threshold, and the curb on high street needs to be re-built and a cobble curb as well.

**Mr. Mohr** asked if they planned to put a shade tree between the two. He said it makes sense to put more trees there.

**Ms Pray** said this is to help create some screening. When they are in the back pocket area they would like to have a little more screening and when coming down the stairs they do not want to be looking at the office building on the other side. She said planting a shade tree would start to take up too much space because the spot is already narrow for parking. An evergreen and its narrow nature would, in her opinion better fit their purpose.

**Mr. Mohr** said he didn't feel that the canopy would get up and out of the way if you put a shade tree for example.

**Ms Pray** said obviously if we were to get something much larger that really grew up that would open up the view on the neighbor's side with a larger tree you would lose that the screening opportunity with a tree with such a high canopy. They ended up keeping the initial screening idea.

**Mr. Mohr** said when you have expanded to where your property line is, the plan is going to feel quite a bit different.

**Comments from the Public:** None

**Comments from the BAR:**

**Ms. Knott** said it is a nice plan, and wondered if they had considered putting a shade tree on the corner on Altamont and High St. She thinks it might be a nice place for one, especially for summer southwest shade. I would certainly balance out the Nyssa and even give room to pull the Crape Myrtle apart a little bit. Maybe have 4 instead of 6. She can support having the privet for the primary reason that this is going to be a residence so more than likely to be maintained correctly rather than other commercial properties. She wants to be sure they are starting to look at having the same guidelines for fences, walls and hedges. Right now the ADC guidelines do not specify hedges as the same as fences and walls, but the BAR feels they serve the same purpose. She said some other cities do consider hedges the same and have the same height requirements and she would hope that it's maintained at a height that does not exceed at what is allowed on the street there for a fence or a wall.

**Ms. Knott** reiterated the fact that she would like to see a shade tree at the corner, otherwise, she does not know if there is some fine tuning needed before we can approve it.

**Mr. Mohr** said there should be a substantial shade tree at that corner and they are creating enough space for two trees at that corner. He said you can decrease the number of crepe myrtles as well and line them with blind panels on the house. He said with adjustment noted he probably can approve it.

**Mr. Sarafin** is full support.

**Mr. Schwarz** said he fully agrees and would like to have something emailed to them.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, **Mr. Schwarz** moved to find that the proposed landscape plan satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following modifications: that we'd like to see a street tree placed on the SW corner of the site, a reconsideration of the crape myrtle, and a provision that the privet hedge be maintained below 4 feet. **Mr. Balut** seconded. The motion passed (6-1 with Miller opposed).

The BAR wants to see a final copy of the plan emailed to the BAR. The BAR generally agreed with the applicant's understanding that he would do a second Nyssa tree, and fewer crape myrtles that are aligned with the blind panels of the house, rather than the windows.

#### **4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-05-05

630 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520115000

Park Lane Properties, LLC, Owner/Fred Wolf Ackerman Design, Fred Wolf, Applicant  
Amendment to prior BAR approval

**Mary Joy Scala** presented the staff report.

[This item and the next item were considered together.]

#### **D. New Items**

#### **5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-11-02

630 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520115000

Park Lane Properties, LLC, Owner/Paul Josey, Applicant

## Landscape Plan

**Mary Joy Scala** presented the staff report.

The applicants were represented by **Fred Wolf**, architect, **Paul Josey** and **Mary Wolf**, landscape architects.

**Questions from the Public:** None

**Questions from the BAR:**

**Mr. Mohr** asked about the glass, before it appeared to go past the height of the original building -is it driven by an internal geometry?

**Mr. Wolf** said we have made the glass go all the way up and removed that spandrel panel and we have not corrected it.

**Mr. Schwarz** said it looks like they are adding one new shade tree on the north, is the tree in the center a River Birch?

**Mr. Josey** said they are two new shade trees on the north and we are replacing three shade trees that are growing on top of or right next to the existing wall. A White Ash is growing right on top of the wall and the two new ones are either an American Elm or a Scarlet Oak.

**Mr. Mohr** asked if that was a snout in the kitchen area. Are the windows operable?

**Mr. Wolf** said the windows in the projecting bay on that side are not, and therefore, the windows behind the lattice are – we are using a tall thin cottage style, where the low piece moves and a square sash and the rest of it is tall, thin, and fixed because the projecting bays make for a deep and slightly raised shelf right at the sink.

**Mr. Balut** said the wood slats in the rendering looks like they are horizontal and are spaced far apart, and that there are stripes behind the way it is drawn. What is going on with that?

**Mr. Wolf** says it is literally a 2x6 with 1 ½” of space, then the flat fins make the sides and those have an 5 ½ inch gap to get increase in visibility.

**Comments from the Public:** None

**Comments from the BAR:**

**Mr. Sarafin** likes the revised design and thinks it works well

**Mr. Mohr** likes the dark paint.

**Ms. Miller** said the building and the landscape plan look good. She asked if the crush stone path is necessary.

**Mr. Josey** said it framed the lawn nicely

**Ms. Knott** said the landscape plan is high quality.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and for Site Design and Elements, **Mr. Schwarz** 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 both applications as submitted. **Mr. Mohr** seconded. The motion passed (7-0).

## 6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 16-11-03

1001 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 100050000

Mark Green, E-Corp, Owner/Kevin Schaefer, Design Develop, Applicant  
Exterior Changes

**Mary Joy Scala** presented the staff report.

**Kevin Schaefer** represented the applicant.

**Questions from the Public:** None

**Questions from the BAR:** None

**Comments from the Public:** None

**Comments from the BAR:**

**Mr. Sarafin** –doesn't mind the center exaggerating the entrance at the center of the building, but he does wonder about the wood product on the left side of the building. He believes the staff recommendation was a good one, and agrees that the look can be achieved with paint or even a flat hardie panel would work better than the faux wood product on this concrete block building.

**Ms. Miller** said it does a good job of identifying the section that is Pizza Hut but it does significantly alter the form of the building visually, which she thinks is problematic. She said this was a great presentation and this is toned down which she appreciates, but she doesn't think that would be appropriate here.

**Mr. Mohr** said would like Ms. Miller to clarify if she means just the wood, or the wood and the color.

**Ms. Miller** said just having an applied surface and the product itself. The color could be painted on, to have the identity the applicant is looking for but still keep the building the same. The garage door opening is great and keeping them the same, changing the opening in the back, seems like no problem, and painting it a different color seems fine.

**Mr. Mohr** said he is in agreement with the faux finish and would rather see an honest material, whether it's a hardie board or metal panels. He said the center section is fine. The white box is going to change color as well once you get tenants there, so he doesn't think there is a need for the building to be uniformly colored all the way cross. He said to revisit the material choice; and that they would want to see a section of the code and detail of the lighting on the letters to assure we all on the same page. The window package and the garage doors are terrific. He thinks it would be nice to see some ideas about site development. There needs to be more of a relationship with the street and some street trees.

**Mr. Balut** said he agrees with Tim and he really likes the operable garage door for sure. They are maintaining the massing and the parapet height, and the general massing and overall appreciation for the original structure is solid. It would be good to add some outdoor areas, liveliness to the street that could really help a lot, and contribute to the overall benefit and positive impact on West Main Street. He likes the entrance tile.

**Mr. Knott** agrees with Melanie. She has a real fondness for the original concept that was presented with this entire building being one character. The way it was originally done speaks to the mid-century transportation era function of West Main Street and the way it was; and she appreciates that they are keeping the garage doors. She feels strongly that the addition of the



parapet at the entrance is not appropriate for the building and its character which is mid-century modern slick. She does not think the addition is appropriate. She wonders if there might be a way to use signage to accomplish the kind of identity they are looking for. She would not like to see a different paint color, but that is a less important point. She said Pizza Hut is such a well-known brand, that the students already know and therefore, it is going to be busy and profitable.

**Mr. Schwarz** he agrees with Ms. Knott that the building it has lost its original feel to it. He said it feels like a strip mall.

**Ms. Knott** said it is a faux 19th century commercial streetscape sort of feature to have a faux parapet like that to always use to make the building look bigger than is and it seems unnecessary.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, **Mr. Sarafin** moved to find that the proposed exterior renovations satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modifications: 1. That the identity wood material not be used and the exterior surface be parged and painted; 2 With details to come back for the canopies, the light cove, the return on parapet on both sides, and with the hope that the applicant would consider additional site plan work. The details may be approved administratively – submit to staff for circulation by email to the BAR. **Mr. Mohr** seconded. The motion passed (5-2 with Ms. Miller and Ms. Knott opposed).

## **E. New Construction**

### **7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-01-04

512-514, 600 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 290007000, 290006000, and 290008000

Heirloom West Main Development LLC, Owner/Heirloom West Main Development LLC,

Applicant Jeff Dreyfus, Ann Pray

New Construction – Final Details

**Mary Joy Scala** presented the staff report.

The applicant was represented by **Jeff Dreyfus**, architect, and **Ann Pray**, landscape architect.

**Questions from the Public:** None

**Questions from the BAR:**

**Mr. Balut** asked about the ivy being that close to the brick wall.

**Ms. Knott** asked if they had considered not relying on planting beds so much and using some kind of system to plant the trees in covered tree pits, a bit like the proposal for Main Street so there is a connected system underground, creating more walking space. It seems like it is such a small space that it seems a little cramped and busy.

**The applicant did not request a motion – discussion only.**

- In general the BAR liked the direction of the courtyard with lots of greenery rather than a purely utilitarian use.
- The green walls are fine but they want assurance that it won't damage the historic structures.

- The zelcova tree could be replaced with something better such as a nice size street tree in that same spot or vicinity.
- Reconsider planters by front door – existing benches do a better job activating the street.
- They really like the idea of dining above the Blue Moon.

#### **8. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-11-01

401 Cherry Avenue

Tax Parcel 290150000

KHM Hotels, DJ Meagher, Owner/Purcell Construction, Andrew Purcell, Applicant

Proposed changes to materials for retaining wall

**Mary Joy Scala** presented the staff report.

**Mr Purcell**, the contractor, represented the applicant.

**Questions from the Public:** None

**Jeff Boushell** represented the retaining wall product that was originally specified. Our wall block can go as high as tall as it needs to be designed. The reason for the 4 piece system is because it was an old country look and it is in an historic area of Charlottesville as well as the height of the wall or the slope of the wall is not that big of a deal when it comes to designing the wall. It would have to be a re-design to adjust for the product they are proposing. It is not comparing apples to apples or apples to oranges

**Questions from the BAR:**

**Mr. Sarafin** asked what is driving the desire to go to the other product?

**Mr. Purcell** said their retaining wall contractor.

**Mr. Mohr** said when talking about a difference in its angle, what are we talking about.

**Mr. Boushell** said 4 degrees to 6 degrees.

**Mr. Purcell** said 50% of 6 degrees

**Ms. Knott** said the amount of space at the top of the wall, if they use the other product would be wider than what they approved. So really there is no difference. She said it won't be any narrower than what we approved to use the original material.

**Mr. Schwarz** said he is confused about the block the BAR approved versus the block they are asking the BAR to approve. The Chick-fil-a looks much like what they approved and the sides the applicant gave them in each photograph does not look the same. The proposed material on the cut sheet looks much cheaper and there is no variation in the sizes. He wants to know what it is that that the applicant is asking the BAR to approve. He said they have squares and rectangles whereas the Chick-fil-a picture, which is supposed to be what they want shows 10 big pieces. He wants to make sure that that is what you want.

**Mr. Purcell** said the sub-contractor told him they were the same system.

**Comments from the Public:** None

**Comments from the BAR:**

**Mr. Mohr** said they are not even remotely the same.

**Mr. Balut** said there is definitely a huge difference between these two wall systems. Undeniably, this is a more desirable wall system, he is agreeing with Carl.

**Mr. Sarafin** said it is really misleading.

**Mr. Mohr** said one looks like a tootsie roll and it doesn't have any outside pattern.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and for Site Design, **Mr. Schwarz** moved to find that the only change that satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is generally compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, is the change from stucco to siding, and that the BAR approves only that change. The BAR does not approve the site wall change, the change from brick to stucco, the removal of the awnings, or the stamped concrete in lieu of pavers. **Mr. Sarafin** seconded. The motion passed (6-1 with **Ms. Miller** opposed).

**F. Other Business**

**9. PLACE Report**

Mr. Mohr reported that Tony Edwards, NDS Manager, has presented the Lighting Study. PLACE wants to tag it back to the latest Illuminating Engineering Society recommendations.

The Belmont bridge is about to launch. PLACE was involved in vetting design firm candidates, and the City Manager made the final choice.

**G. Adjournment 9:05 p.m.**