

MINUTES OF THE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
OCTOBER 23, 1990

Present

Lawrence Herbert, Chairman
Todd Bullard
Jean Hiatt
Kurt Wassenaar
Blake Caravati
Courtney Sargeant
Margaret Van Yahres

Absent

Staff Member Present

Fred Boger

Mr. Herbert, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

A MINUTES There were no minutes to consider at this meeting

B APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 86-6-265A

2038 India Road, Peyton House
The Meadows, Wm. Atwood, Applicant

Mr. Boger briefly reviewed with the Board the history of this project which originally involved the dismantling of the outbuildings. The materials from the three buildings were to be saved and protected from the weather. Mr. Boger also stated that prior to Mr. McNeil's death, he was talking about coming back to the Board to discuss the possibility of rebuilding only one of the three buildings.

Mr. Atwood, Architect, was present and informed the Board that Mr. McNeil's son, Dan, asked him to explore with the Board other options instead of rebuilding the three outbuildings. The reason for this discussion is that very little of the original materials are salvageable for use in reconstructing the buildings. There would be so much new material used in the buildings that the original fabric of the buildings would be lost. Mr. Atwood also stated that the buildings were not dismantled in the proper fashion and the materials were not kept separate for each building.

Mr. Atwood said that Dan McNeil would like the Board to consider other options to rebuilding the three structures. One option proposed is to take the funds required to rebuild the structures and apply them towards an internship for some type of historic preservation activity. Another would be to use the funds to help restore the main house.

Mr. Caravati asked what kind of monies are we talking about. Mr. Atwood responded around \$6,000.00 which was the amount bonded for reconstructing the buildings. Mr. Caravati said that is way too low.

Several Board members expressed their concern about why the owner waited so long to do anything with the buildings. The buildings should have been rebuilt much sooner.

Following further discussion, the Board made the following three points which are to be relayed to Mr. Dan O'Neil:

- a. The proposed internship is an interesting idea; however the maximum amount of \$6,000.00 would be insufficient to equal the cost of reconstructing the outbuildings.
- b. The idea of using the funds for the three outbuildings to restore the main house appeared unacceptable. The preservation of the main house was one of the original conditions which must be completed.
- c. A second opinion should be obtained from a preservation professional experienced in the restoration of log buildings on the condition of the materials saved when the buildings were dismantled. Can these materials now be used to rebuild the three structures, since they have not been adequately protected from the outside elements?

2. BAR 90-10-352

800 Delevan^E St. (801 Estes St.)
Demolition Request
Brasco Bay Corp, Applicant

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report and closed by stating that staff's recommendation is to deny the request and ask that the exterior be repainted according to City Code Section 31-141 "Maintenance and Repair Required".

Mr. Scott Peyton, Vice President, Brasco Bay Corporation, was present and made several opening comments. One was that he had not received in the mail a copy of the staff report and that he had come down to City Hall on Monday to get a copy of it. Another comment was that he takes exception with the statement that the owner had done little to protect the property and allowed it to decay - what the staff report calls "destruction by neglect".

Mr. Peyton said the building is appraised at \$2,500.00 and its current condition does not justify fixing up a building valued at \$2,500.00. The building was condemned on April 30, 1990, and he had three options: (i) restore it, (ii) secure it, and (iii) remove it. He and his father originally elected to demolish the building; however his application to demolish it was denied because the building was considered historic. In his May 16, 1990, letter Mr. Pace rescinded the demolition option, and as a result, the building was secured.

Mr. Peyton said after the building was secured, people have constantly broken into it and used it for illegal purposes. We have been inside and found all kinds of things from the remains of small fires to pornography materials. Chief Bowen has been to the location and he is concerned about the safety of

BAR Minutes (October 23, 1990) meeting
Page Three
November 14, 1990

the neighborhood with all this illegal activity taking place at the house. Mr. Peyton said the house has been in the family for a long time, and when his great aunt died in 1976, it was rented out.

Mr. Wassenaar asked what efforts "have you or your family made to preserve it, other than demolish it?" Mr. Peyton said "we would rent it to tenant tradesmen for minor repairs to it. The building has continued to deteriorate. We had Warren Martin of Martin/Horn, Inc. look at it and he indicated there is no way to justify restoring it."

Ms. Van Yahres said it is sad it has come to this state. Mr. Caravati asked when was the building vacated. Mr. Peyton responded in the past spring after receiving Mr. Tomlin's letter. Mr. Caravati further stated that he totally agreed with the staff comment that the current condition of this structure was the result of demolition by neglect.

Mr. Caravati asked what the plans for the property were. Mr. Peyton said there weren't any plans. Mr. Bullard asked why it couldn't be restored to a livable condition. Mr. Peyton said there was a lack of funds. Mr. Bullard questioned why the house has been allowed to fall into such disrepair during the 14 year period from 1976 to 1990 during which period rent was collected by the owner. Mr. Peyton said nothing has been done because of the expense. Mr. Bullard said "you have been collecting rent for 14 years and as a part of the rent your tenants agreed to repair and upgrade the house." Mr. Peyton said "basically our concern has been security in the house". My great aunt had full-time people with her. Mr. Bullard said, "What, you didn't make enough to restore the House?" Mrs. Hiatt asked how many people own the property. Mr. Peyton said the family and proceeded to name them. Mr. Peyton also said the family has no desire to sell the property.

Mr. Herbert asked Mr. Peyton if the family would consider selling part of the land with the house if someone was interested in restoring it.

Mr. Peyton said, "We" did look into moving the house to an alternate location within the site, but moving the house from its site proved to be infeasible due to the wires. etc. Also the building may not withstand the move?"

Mr. Herbert said the neighborhood is being improved and sees the neighborhood rebounding. This is a beautiful site with a neat, old house on it. A while back we had a City agency request the demolition of two old houses and we rejected it. A private individual bought the two old houses and restored them.

Mr. Wassenaar said he is sympathetic to the applicant's concerns regarding liability; however, when an applicant has allowed a property to deteriorate over a 14-year period until it becomes a liability, he finds it difficult to consider that as a factor with regards to this issue. He said we are losing too many historic properties. The owners of this property must see if there is some way to restore it. One possibility is to remove the later additions if it would lead to preserving the main house.

Minutes BAR (October 23, 1990) Meeting
Page Four
November 14, 1990

Mr. Herbert asked if the owners had explored with other developers the possibility of developing the entire site and incorporating this house into the plans. Mr. Peyton said there are limits as to what a person can financially do.

Mr. Caravati said he agreed with the staff report. He said he owned historic properties and made efforts to maintain them. Brasco Bay has apparently not done this. There are many alternatives out there. Also, there are insurance policies available to cover the liability question. He said he's been in a similar position.

Mrs. Hiatt said she would like to see the building preserved.

Following the discussion, Ms. Courtney Sargeant moved to deny the request to demolish the building at 800 Delevan Street (801 Estes Street) for the following reasons:

1. The Rose Cottage/Peyton House is a unique building and is an important part of the City's historical and architectural heritage.
2. This building is an interesting vernacular combination of the Greek Period and Italianate styles
3. The building is the only large house remaining in Charlottesville with an Italianate bracketed parapet cornice concealing a shed roof.
4. The building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places
5. An effort should be made to locate someone who would be interested in buying the building and restoring it.

The Board also requested that the owners of the property explore various alternatives to restore the building and grounds. The Board would be willing to discuss these alternatives with the owners at a later date. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bullard and was unanimously passed by all members present.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

The Board postponed discussion on the proposed zoning amendments until October 30, 1990.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.