

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
December 19, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, chair; Tim Mohr, co-chair; Justin Sarafin; Stephan Balut; Carl Schwarz; Whit Graves (late); Corey Clayborne (late)

BAR Members Absent: Emma Earnst and Breck Gastinger

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala and Camie Mess

Call to Order: Chair – Melanie Miller calls meeting to order at 5:35

5:30 A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)
No matters from the public were discussed.

No matters from the public, not on the agenda.

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 November 21, 2017 Regular Meeting
 September 26, 2017 Work Session
 October 31, 2017 Work Session

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
 BAR 17-12-02
 421 West Main Street
 Tax Parcel 320178000
 Quirk Charlottesville, LLC Owner/Jennifer D. Mullen, Esq., Applicant
 Re-approval of Demolition of Atlantic Futon

Motion: Schwarz moved to approve all the consent agenda items, with his modifications to the November 21st minutes (fixed prior to the meeting by Camie Mess) which include the November 21, 2017 regular meeting minutes, and the September 26, 2017 and October 31, 2017 work session minutes, and the Certificate of Appropriateness Application for 421 West Main Street, the re-approval of demolition of Atlantic Futon. Balut seconded. Approved (5-0).

C. Deferred Items

Corey Clayborne joined the meeting.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
 BAR 17-02-02
 118 East Main Street
 Tax Parcel 280025000

West Cote Properties, Owner/Jeff Bushman, Applicant
Storefront Renovation

Camie Mess presented the staff report.

The applicant spoke and handed out a new packet of drawings, including scaled elevations, renderings, and specifics about the perforated metal patterns. He explained some of the design difficulties and how they arrived at the current storefront design.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Miller: The perforation does not go into the store correct?

Applicant: Yes, because of the ceiling height there is duct work behind it.

Schwarz: To be clear, you changed the stainless steel to aluminum.

Applicant: Yes, they are almost identical in appearance. Also, the tile has changed from steel panels to porcelain from the previous informal application that was submitted.

Miller: I am assuming that will be dark grout.

Applicant: Yes.

Schwarz: There is a little decorative crown mold on the adjacent store front, how do you intend to terminate that?

Applicant: We are carefully slicing that crown mold off, there is a little return on it now, so we are going to cut it and fill it, so it just looks like a little cut extrusion. Also, looking at older drawing, we have gotten rid of the intercom box.

Balut: What is the dimension of the perforated screen?

Applicant: Three quarters of an inch diameter (3/4") on the front and back.

Mohr: What is that little projection there [gestures to packet]?

Applicant: That is just the model.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: Nice, elegant, simple. It makes a lot of sense to me, and I think the perforations will look good.

Balut: I agree.

Miller: Definitely an upgrade from what is there.

Mohr: I think the porcelain is an upgrade and will have a better feel with the masonry of the building.

Motion: Balut moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the proposed new storefront design 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 application as submitted. Sarafin seconded. Approved (6-0).

D. New Items

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)
BAR 17-12-01
714 Locust Avenue
Tax Parcel 510069000
Rashad Dacus, Owner/James Robertson, Applicant
Additional front porch and landscaping

Camie Mess presented the staff report.

[This item was moved to the end of the agenda to wait for the applicant, who never arrived. The BAR was required to take action at this meeting since it is located in a historic conservation district.]

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

No question from the board.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Sarafin: See my arguments for the last item; I have the same exact sentiment.

Mohr: This one is even more problematic, because for this one the character is completely driven by that steep gable.

Balut: I definitely don't feel the same way, as the last one. Clearly, the gable creates a monumental proportion and entryway, and it is the only major identifying feature of the house.

Mohr: It is the most interesting feature of the house.

Balut: I think it would be a shame to lose that.

Mohr: They could perhaps put a little flat roof canopy that perhaps would be okay, but anything that competes with that gable or closes up the dove coat ventilation, doesn't cut it. They might be able to get away with a flat canopy, that wouldn't disturb the integrity of that gable.

Miller: What do you think about the one foot high garden wall, and changing the actual porch itself?

to brick and bluestone? Is that acceptable? It looks like concrete now.

Schwarz: There is nothing in our guidelines that would preclude that.

Mohr: I think you should be able to read the brick going the entire way down. So the stoop needs to come in at least 8 or 12 inches, so as not to interrupt the vertical language of that gable.

Balut: I agree.

Miller: What about the one foot high wall with the bluestone cap?

Clayborne: I do not have an issue with that.

Mohr: Why is the wall so short?

Miller: I think it is short because there is a window there. The shrubs have already been taken out.

Mohr: You had a comment about the mission style arts and crafts door correct?

Miller: Correct, even with the light fixtures. It is not a critical thing, but it doesn't seem to match the style of the house.

Schwarz: Some of the problems I am having understanding is with the abbreviated drawings. Did they say if they are replacing the door trim? I would say this is in a historic conservation district, so

that is minor. I agree with revising the door or light fixtures, but I don't think we can enforce that, only make a recommendation.

Sarafin: I agree we should make a recommendation though.

Miller: It sounds like we have decided that the stoop itself can be rebuilt, but it needs to come in a minimum of 8 inches, the low wall with a bluestone cap is appropriate, and a friendly request to consider the style of the house when selecting the front door and the porch lights.

Balut: Tim [Mohr] would you like to make a recommendation of how they can achieve the cover they are going for?

Mohr: I suggest they do some kind of a flat roof canopy, which relates to the detail of the center section, but not a porch.

Miller: Okay do we have a motion?

Motion: Mohr moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed front porch roof addition does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District, because the porch roof addition covers the primary front gable which is a character defining feature of the house and that the BAR denies the porch roof addition as submitted.

Also, Mohr moved to find that the material changes to the stoop, stairs, and proposed garden wall satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District and that the BAR approves that part of the application with these modifications:

- The materials for the stoop, stairs, and garden wall meet the BAR's Guidelines
- The stoop must be held back a minimum of 8 inches on both sides from the existing brick central bay
- The proposed porch roof is denied, but the applicant may submit an alternate design to the BAR for a smaller canopy (with a submission to come back to the BAR to review)
- The BAR suggests the applicant retain the existing trim and door, and look into light fixtures that are in keeping with the current style.

Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-12-05
300 East Main Street
Tax Parcel 280040000
East Main Investments, LLC, Owner/James Barton, Applicant
Rear Façade Renovation

Camie Mess presented the staff report.

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Mohr: Have you all considered any planters or anything that grows? It is facing south and you have a lot of glass.

Applicant: I have not. The area outside appears larger than what we have access to because the drive-thru is coming back.

Miller: So is that overhead door still operable?

Applicant: Yes, I am hoping to keep it operable for moving things in and out. So it could be used as a loading dock, such that the rail could be convertible.

Schwarz: So you are keeping it as a useable loading dock.

Applicant: Yes, that is the hope. Also, because of how the loading dock is it also creates a patio type area on a nice day.

Miller: That would be especially nice with movable planters that would create a nice space.

Balut: What is the intent with the parking?

Miller: So in this picture where that curve is, that is where the property goes back to them?

Applicant: Yes, we are hoping to get a few spaces. Although, my preference would be for that area to be used more as a patio space, I think that would be better than having a single parking space.

Balut: What is the purpose of the white washing?

Applicant: I just thought it would make the building look better.

Clayborne: Is that a stairwell on the left?

Applicant: Yes, that goes into a fire escape stairwell.

Clayborne: Was there any thought into introducing glazing to that entrance?

Applicant: I have not planned on it.

Clayborne: Even if you are not changing it at all, it might be nice to add a glazing so it better fits in with your storefront façade. Right now it looks very industrial. Just something to consider, it would help it blend better with your storefront design.

Schwarz: Is that asphalt still required?

Applicant: I do not know what authority I have over that space.

Schwarz: Are there usually cars parked there as well?

Applicant: Yes, since the drive thru is not functioning, that is where all of the contractors park right now.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Miller: Just for clarification, due to staff's recommendations and budgetary concerns you are not going to whitewash the brick correct?

Applicant: Correct.

Schwarz: If you could find some way to develop the outside of this to be a little more friendly, get some greenery in there. I thought you were going to get rid of the loading zone and put a tree there, but I guess that is not going to happen. Personally, I don't know how historic this building is, but if you wanted to eventually come back with a little more radical transformation to it, I don't think that would be out of line. I think what you proposed is fine and meets our guidelines.

Balut: I agree it is an improvement to what is there. I think anything you can do to soften the hard scape would be great.

Mohr: Anything that would help bring the entrance to the street, a planter, walkway, different paving patterns and if you could get a tree or two in there that would definitely help soften the building and bring the scale of that down without having to paint it, but I understand the desire to make a base out of it, it helps the scale of it.

Miller: Having a planting there would also help differentiate the building from its neighbors.

Mohr: If you can get a planter in front of that wall where that emergency door is, as well as one in front of the wall with the sign. It just seems like you could do some things there to make it feel more like a courtyard to draw people in.

Applicant: Do you have any inclination as to what might be under the asphalt? Would it be possible to permeate that?

Mohr: Without doing borings, I don't know.

Applicant: I was thinking one of those concrete grids where there is grass growing in there, but you can drive on it.

Balut: There is permeable asphalts as well, so there are other options.

Mohr: I don't see anything technically challenging with this, and the light colored storefront makes sense because it comes forward. To my mind the only issues are if you find a way to deal with the parking issues, and how to deal with that area. That would have to come back before us, and we certainly encourage you to do something nicer than what is there.

Motion: Schwarz moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed new storefront design 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 application with the modification that the brick not be white washed. Clayborne seconded. Approved (6-0).

6. ~~Certificate of Appropriateness Application~~
~~BAR 17-12-04~~
~~1001 West Main Street~~
~~Tax Parcel 100050000~~
~~Ian Kelly, Owner/Tom Bartell, Applicant~~
~~New Outdoor Deck~~

Graves joined the meeting.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-12-03
122 Maywood Lane
Tax Parcel 110060000
Neighborhood Properties, LLC, Owner/Henningsen Kestner Architects, Inc., Applicant
Additions and Renovations

Camie Mess presented the staff report.

The applicant spoke about the renovations. He specified they were planning on using cellular PVC as opposed to wood aluminum clad windows. He also said that they had already taken off the asbestos siding from the cottage.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

No questions from the board.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Mohr: generally I don't have a problem with the proposal, other than that front stoop and the little hood, which seems to be a real part of the character of the house.

Schwarz: Is there anything that needs to be done to differentiate the addition? Or once it is built, will it be different enough.

Mohr: It isn't stridently modern, but it is clearly an addition.

Applicant: We don't want to have any siding on the addition; we wanted it to look more like an enclosed porch.

Schwarz: The changes you are making are how a house would naturally evolve.

Balut: I agree with Tim's comment that it is unfortunate to lose one of the key identifying features of the house. What you have proposed with it extruding out, is perfectly within our regulations. Is the size of that pediment larger than what currently exists?

Applicant: It is not significantly larger.

Balut: I think with that addition and the larger addition on the side, I think it looks like how a house would evolve in Virginia. It is called telescoping, when you put that side piece on, and it is very common. The fact that you proposed something that is trimmed that out and you proposed something that is more like a porch extension addition. From a massing standpoint I think it fits the guidelines. I could go either way on the front; I think it is similar enough that it is keeping with the original design intent of the house. Just to conclude, I think the other additions and modifications are fine as well.

Mohr: I think it makes more sense to take that existing hood and extend it. The scale of it seems right for the building, and the one you are proposing looks a little bit too fancy, for lack of a better word. If you extend it to 3 or 3 ½ feet out then you get the coverage while you are under the door.

Balut: I agree, I think that is a better solution.

Applicant: I think the problem with extending it, is that is raised so we can have the right entablature and such on top of the columns. I do not think you can extend that.

Mohr: You wouldn't include the columns. You could just have it cantilevered. It would be little tricky, but it is possible. My concern is that little hood seems like a character defining feature of the house.

Sarafin: The hood with the dormers makes the composition of the house. I would be inclined to not alter the entrance; I think everything else is entirely appropriate.

Mohr: That would be my first choice.

Clayborne: I could go either way. I do like the scale of the original hood, I like that better than what I see here.

Graves: Where do we stand on the window conversation?

Miller: That is a great point, if we look at the guidelines, it would say no, but we are currently working on updating them.

Mohr: We are talking about a composite material correct? They can be painted and are not flimsy like a vinyl window. I am not adverse to it.

Miller: Are the muntins a similar size?

Applicant: Whatever you all decide, we can do that.

Graves: I don't think our guidelines support it, but I think it is comparable to aluminum clad windows and it might even be a superior material over time. Plus, it is paintable and we could specify a simulated divided light.

Mohr: These actually look more like a wood window than aluminum clad and they will take paint.

Schwarz: I wanted to clarify that it is only the windows marked for demolition that you would change out correct? Also, you offered to bring in a sample correct.

Applicant: Yes.

Graves: I am supportive of the windows and the porch either way.

Schwarz: I can support the porch and what is proposed. It is how a house would evolve over time and it also makes it a little dressier.

Sarafin: I would argue that the porch with the slight cantilevered overhang as it exists is a character defining feature of this style colonial style house that I would argue ought to be retained. It is such a character defining feature of this style and time period of house and I would hate to lose it.

Applicant: In that case would you suggest having wrought iron railing projecting out?

Mohr: Yes, that way you still have the entablature, and the greater detail of the addition and it helps distinguish the two.

Miller: I see agreement from everyone. I like the original and it seems like you would be able to extend it, but if someone strongly agreed with the new porch, it is not something that makes or breaks it for me. Overall, I think the demolitions are appropriate.

Mohr: I think the hood has a lot to do with the character of the building.

Clayborne: I am not going to dig my heels on that one, like I said I could go either way.

Sarafin: It looks entirely appropriate to me.

Schwarz: I am curious on what you are planning for the overhang of this door.

Applicant: The existing overhang is low, and the approach to the door is straight ahead, so the brackets are not a problem with the current configuration. With the proposed configuration, we want to raise the structure to have the same eave line as the rest of the house.

Schwarz: So you are going to bring a downspout down but the front of the steps?

Applicant: Correct.

Schwarz: What is your reasoning for replacing all of the windows?

Applicant: The windows are in pretty bad condition.

Schwarz: Is the muntin pattern going to change?

Applicant: No.

Schwarz: I feel this one is losing any character it had, but then again it is an outbuilding.

Mohr: Are the windows rearranged because you have changed the inside configuration?

Applicant: Yes.

Schwarz: Can you see this from the street?

Applicant: No.

Sarafin: Is there a driveway that continues along the right, down to two more houses?

Applicant: No, it continues along the house, but goes to the back of the property.

Sarafin: So I think the motion stands as it is, adding in the cottage.

Mohr: I think that should be up to them, if you want to extend it for functionality reasons,

Motion: Sarafin moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and for New Construction, I move to find that the proposed partial demolitions, new additions and rehabilitations to the house and cottage satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst Circle- Gildersleeve Wood ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with either retention of the original, slightly cantilevered entrance hood [on the main house] or to extend the cantilevered hood for functional purposes. Also, a window sample will come back to the BAR to be reviewed. Balut seconded. Approved (7-0).

E. Other Business

8. PLACE report

Mohr recapped what PLACE has been doing, even though he was not in attendance at their last meeting.

- They mostly followed up on their mixed use workshop (what constitutes mixed use, what is its role in zoning, whether we need to think how it is addressed, specific percentages that the zoning code calls out for commercial versus residential, etc.)
- PLACE wants to come out with a more definitive statement of what mixed use actually is, because it is clearly something that is at odds with form based code
- Mohr will e-mail the link about this discussion

- More discussion about the 3D model and how that can be integrated into other things that the City is doing

9. Discussion: Zoning text amendment for Downtown Corridor setbacks

- Discussion and review of the street wall suggestions document that Carl Schwarz sent around to the BAR. In the Downtown Corridor (DN) district, requirements for street wall height and number of interior stories should be more flexible, due to pervasive site constraints downtown, and the fact that almost all the DN district is also in an ADC district subject to BAR review.

10. Recognition:

The BAR would like to recognize Whit Graves and the time he has put into serving on this review board. The BAR would also like to thank Mary Joy Scala for the past fourteen years.

F. Adjournment Graves made the motion to adjourn at 7:15pm