

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
Wednesday February 22, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller; Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Carl Schwarz, Corey Clayborne; Justin Sarafin; Whit Graves; Emma Earnst;

Members Absent: Stephen Balut and Breck Gastinger (made written comments which are included in the minutes)

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala (arrived late), Preservation & Design Planner, and Reid Saunders, Preservation Intern, 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

No comments made

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes

December 20, 2016 Regular Meeting

January 17, 2017 Regular Meeting

Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved to approve the December 20, 2017 and January 17, 2017 regular meeting minutes. Mr. Sarafin seconded, and the minutes passed 6-0-1 with Ms. Earnst abstaining because she was not present at the January meeting.

C. New Items

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 17-02-05

501 17th St. NW

Tax Parcel 050062000

1701 Gordon Avenue, LLC, owner/ Roof Top Services, applicant

Replace slate roof with new synthetic slate

Reid Saunders presented the staff report.

John Epperly, the applicant, spoke:

- 1) He would like to keep the lower roof with asphalt shingles and replace the upper roof with synthetic slate
- 2) Color is midnight gray and size is a standard 12 inch

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Mr. Clayborne: this is a replace in kind, with the slate replaced with synthetic slate, instead of the asphalt with asphalt.

Mr. Mohr: Are you replacing the gutters?

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Ms. Miller: She read in the guidelines that synthetic slate is allowed. It should match the original materials and it should go back to 10 inch, the pre-made capping would be appropriate, and if we are making the modification to go from real slate to synthetic, a fair compromise is not to use asphalt on the lower roof; either do metal or more synthetic slate, but metal would be more historically appropriate. Other companies have brought in this Eco-slate that looks like asphalt shingles.

Mr. Mohr: We would request that he administratively come up with 10 inch slate.

Mr. Sarafin: We suggest administrative approval because it really can vary in quality. The two roofs should be treated similarly, and not asphalt.

Mr. Graves: He has been to this house in the photo, and it looks very successful. He is comfortable with the 10 inch and the 12 inch product because he has seen it installed and knows what it is going to look like. He agrees the shingles can be replaced with metal or synthetic slate, either will be fine.

Ms. Miller: Could you check with another manufacturer to see if they have the 10 inch shingle.

Mr. Sarafin: Use the 10 inch and then provide more details on the hips and the ridges with administrative approval.

Breck Gastinger (from written comments): He agrees with the staff recommendation of allowing synthetic slate on both upper and lower roof surfaces.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the proposed roof replacement 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 with the following modifications: to see [administrative approval of] hip detail and investigation of 10 inch shingle, and approval of the synthetic slate on upper and lower roofs in the Buckingham slate grey color. Mr. Sarafin seconded and the motion passed (7-0).

D. Previously Considered Items

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-12-01

310 4th Street NE

Tax Parcel 330205L00

Court Square LLC, owner/ Richard Shank, Shank & Gray Architects, applicant

Exterior Modifications

Reid Saunders presented the staff report.

Robert Gray, Architects, spoke: he would like to see this as a successfully knitted, crafted, addition to the building.

Questions from the Public:
No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:
Mr. Mohr: What is the width of the fin wall?

Comments from the Public:
No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:
Breck Gastinger (from written comments): I'm not excited about the way that the brick end walls are expressed at the corner, revealing their thin-ness. It seems to make the brick feel quite different from solid and substantial mass of the building. I agree that adding porches seems a normal and desirable addition.

Mr. Mohr: said it doesn't have enough "umph" to it. It needs to be thicker.

Mr. Schwarz: it is coming down on top of site walls, correct? What happens to the structural side, if the site walls are 12 inches how they would look next to each other? He is concerned how that ramp is going to look when you put one of the walls in that location.

Mr. Schwarz: would like to see the conditions created at the ramp, would like to see the whole building and how it is going to work out, as our usual procedure we didn't see it in your submittal.

Motion: Mr. Mohr moved to find that the proposed exterior balconies and lighting satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District with the following modifications: to see the fin walls thickened to a module at or above 18 inches at the base, and a submission at a later date of the final design for the ramp area, and any other changes that you think merit discussion may be emailed to BAR through Mary Joy. Mr. Schwarz seconded and the motion passed (7-0).

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 16-03-02
800 East Market Street
Tax Parcel 530160000
City of Charlottesville, Owner/Facilities Dev./Public Works Dept., Applicant
Landscape Plan

Reid Saunders presented the staff report.

Bill Mechnick: (LPDA), said the ADA access in front of the Key Rec Center needs to be replaced, including the front steps and the ADA ramp to meet ADA code. They are putting in new planters and planting and replacing some sidewalk against the parking lot. They are using the standard city mix.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

No comments made.

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Breck Gastinger (from written comments): I agree that finding ways to add street trees to this block of Market Street would be desirable, but I appreciate the very narrow space between street and building facade.

Re: the planting plan: have we received reasoning as to why the changes were made? The previous submittal included several nice selections that fit in well with Design guidelines B3, plants indigenous to the area. I am disheartened to see that they have been removed in lieu of selections more standard to the trade.

In particular, losing Pennsylvania sedge and maidenhair fern in lieu of liriopis is a big disappointment. I do appreciate the fringe tree addition. The hosta, astilbe, and leucothoe additions are disappointing. Why variegated boxwood? The new plan is a little jumbled whereas the previous plan was a little more simple and straightforward. This building forms an important gateway to the downtown district from the east and seems could set a better precedent for East Market Street. I would like to have had the benefit to hear more about 1) why the selections were changed, and 2) how these selections fit the recommended guidelines. I'm sorry that I haven't had the benefit of the presentation from the designers. I would like to speak with you further about the guidelines for landscape so that I can properly divide any personal preferences from the jurisdiction of our review

Mr. Mechnick: the changes were made due to review by the City Maintenance staff, specifically Mr. Mann. He will have to go back and confirm. He is representing the project manager. He said the plans were reviewed by City Parks and Rec staff and Maintenance staff between finalizing the plans. This was the recommendation of that review. Looking towards the entry on your left is just wide enough to get an understory tree. We could push those closer to the sidewalk but we are going to have conflict with the tree zone and the sidewalk and have to do a root barrier, so we tried to pick some trees that are going to be attractive and contribute to the front entry, but we are not able to put a big street tree in there. He said you could plant other different species of trees in that planting bed but this evaluation has come from the City Maintenance and their review.

Motion: Ms. Miller moved to find that the proposed planting plan changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, with the following modifications: we return to the original plant palette [from March 2016] and add a street tree from the City's list, to be circulated for administrative approval, and that the BAR approves the application otherwise as submitted. Mr. Schwarz seconded. Motion passed (7-0)

E. New Items

5. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 17-02-01

100 West Jefferson Street

Tax Parcel 330180000
Christ Episcopal Church, owner/ Christie Walker, Preschool Director, applicant
Proposed Fence

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Christie Walker: the applicant spoke: She is the Director of Christ Church Pre-School and they want to create an outdoor classroom behind the MacGruder House. In order to make it safe for the children we need a fence there to match with the existing fence that is already in place in the rear> We would also like to hear any additional recommendations you may have.

Questions from the Public:
No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:
No comments made.

Comments from the Public:
No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:
Mr. Mohr: asked if the proposed fence is wood.

Mr. Sarafin said the height is 3 feet.

Ms. Miller: said a white picket fence, or an iron fence, located right behind the bushes would be appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Sarafin moved to find that the proposed new fence 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 option to use wood picket painted white or a dark color, or iron, or black aluminum, with the height of 3 feet. Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passed (7-0)

6. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 17-02-03
801 Park Street
Tax Parcel 470020000
Dan Krasnegor and Kristin Jensen, owner/ Michael Savage, applicant
Exterior Renovation and Proposed Small Addition

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Michael Savage, the applicant spoke.

Questions from the Public:
No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:
Mr. Sarafin: you mentioned that you found actual historical photos that give precedent for any of the details, so we are not adding fictitious elements, but you have it there.

Mr. Schwarz: for the addition you are doing, you are getting tax credits. He said our guidelines say to differentiate from old and new. Are you making the porch addition that different because you want it that different, or are you just following the guidelines?

Mr. Sarafin: that was advice from DHR.

Mr. Mohr did DHR say anything about the sky light in the center of the bay window?

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Mr. Gasinger (from written comments): It does not appear that there are particular aspects of landscape as part of the submittal, but I do appreciate the careful and detailed approach to the historic property. The specificity of the drawings are particularly helpful and the approach and resolution seem appropriate. It is good to see the care taken with some of the original details. I support the recommendation.

Disclosure: I worked with Michael Savage and STOA on an addition project on my own residence that was completed last year.

Mr. Clayborne: the standing seam metal on the roof is factory painted.

Mr. Savage: it is not clear what the lower roof is but it is obvious that it was not slate. They will be open to it being a painted metal roof, which will probably have to be hand painted.

Ms. Miller: said they will approve either one.

Mr. Clayborne: with the slate roof is there a thought to use a copper flashing?

Mr. Savage: said he thought it would have to be copper flashing but DHR would say the copper flashing is the best

Ms. Miller: said it looks like a great project and it always make our job easier if DHR is involved. She appreciates you not proposing a plastic roof and going through all the trouble to trying to figure out what the original details were.

Mr. Sarafin: really nice drawings and we really appreciate the approach to the house, and with tax credits and DHR's involvement it adds an extra layer in how confident we are with the project.

Motion: Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the proposed house renovation and new addition 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. Mr. Sarafin seconded. Motion passed (7-0).

7. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 17-02-02

118 East Main Street

Tax Parcel 280025000

West Cole Properties, owner/ Jeff Bushman, applicant

Replace Windows (2nd and 3rd Stories) and Storefront Renovation

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Jeff Bushman, the applicant spoke, requesting a low E glass that was not quite 70% VLT. on the back windows, which have a southern exposure. The visible light transition factor on the front is in accordance with those 70% guidelines. We are asking to keep the 366 glass on the back, and he showed samples. Color of the window sash is a dark gray.

The abutting owner only said not to paint the two facades the same color yellow, so ours is a little whiter than it is now.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

No question made.

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Mr. Gasinger (from written comments): I have no objections to the window replacement/insertions and support the recommended approval. Without the benefit of hearing the design presentation, I prefer storefront concept A. This concept seems to give the shared stairway door a certain amount of autonomy while not treating it as an almost fully independent element (such as in B). I think B could lead to a more cluttered and confusing street facade where the door appears to belong to neither 118 or 114.

Motion: Mr. Graves moved to find that the proposed new windows and rear window openings satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with a friendly amendment that, due to the secondary location on the rear 2nd and 3rd floors, an exception for a VLT of 65 is approved on the rear windows. Mr. Mohr seconded. Motion passed 6-1 with Ms. Miller opposed.

The BAR offered comments on the storefront concepts. They liked downplaying the third door; liked the dark metal façade better than Corten; and liked creating an alcove.

- F. Other Business
- 8. PLACE Report- No Report because Mr. Mohr missed the meeting. He noted there was discussion regarding the possibility of creating a position of Chief Architect for the City.
- G. Adjournment: Moved by Mr. Schwarz, seconded by Mr. Mohr to adjourn at 7:10 p.m.