

BAR ACTIONS

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
August 16, 2016 - 5:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers - City Hall



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). After presentations by staff and the applicant, members of the public will be allowed two opportunities to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. The Chair will first ask for questions from the public, then from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to ask questions, and up to three minutes to comment. Comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

Members Present: Miller, Chair; Mohr, Vice-Chair; Sarafin, Knott, Balut, Schwarz, Keesecker, Graves (arrived late). Members absent: Earnst.

Staff present: Scala and McCray

PLEASE NOTE THE TIMES GIVEN ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE INTENDED TO BE A GUIDE. THE ACTUAL MEETING MAY BE LONGER OR SHORTER.

5:30 A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

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** July 19, 2016 Regular Meeting
July 18, 2016 Worksession

Sarafin moved and Schwarz seconded approval of both sets of minutes. Approved 7-0.

C. Previously Considered Items

5:40 2. 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
Removal and Replacement of Side Porch, Streetscape and Yard Renovations

Sarafin moved and Mohr seconded a motion to approve the demolition of the side porch. The BAR requests that the applicant photograph and draw the porch before demolition, which documentation is to reside with Preservation Piedmont. Approved 7-0.

Schwarz moved and Knott seconded a motion to approve in concept, the massing and scale of the proposed new addition, and landscaping and site changes, as submitted, with further details to come back to the BAR. Approved 7-0 The BAR further clarified that their approval was not a COA.

D. New Items

Graves joined the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

6:00 3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-08-02
450 Rugby Road

Tax Parcel 090004000
Westminster Presbyterian Church, Owner/ Sanford Wilcox, Church Administrator,
Applicant
Addition of Solar Panels

Keesecker moved and Balut seconded a motion to approve the solar panels as submitted. Approved 8-0.

- 6:20 4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)**
BAR 16-08-03
801 Rugby Road
Tax Parcel 050015100
Diane Jacques, Owner/Applicant
New Fence along Rugby Road and Fendall Avenue

Graves moved and Balut seconded a motion to approve the proposed fence as submitted [given the Guidelines and the fact that the historic district is not an ADC district]. Approved 6-2 with Miller and Knott opposed.

- 6:40 5. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Historic Conservation District)**
BAR 16-08-04
510 Locust Avenue
Tax Parcel 540004100
Greg Horridge, Locust Realty LLC, Owner/Frederick Wolf, Architect, Applicant
Second Story Addition, New Front Door, and New Concrete Wall at Driveway

Keesecker moved and Balut seconded a motion to approve the proposed addition as submitted. Approved 6-2 with Miller and Knott opposed.

- 7:00 6. **Preliminary Discussion**
BAR 16-08-01
118 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 280016001-280016009
M&O Corporation, Owner/Jim Boyd, Grimm and Parker, Applicant
Proposed Rooftop Additions

No motion made. The BAR made suggestions and asked the architect to bring back a final design. Some comments were: Show more context, including precise perspectives where viewable, massing model; needs more human scale, intrigue, could be jewel-like and fun; not so utilitarian; use stepped parapet wall as a cue, or step away from it.

E. New Construction

- 7:20 7. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Preliminary Discussion)**
BAR 16-08-05
NW Corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Avenue (William Taylor Plaza)
Tax Parcel 290147000, 290146000, 290145000
Cherry Ave Investments LLC, Owner/ Management Services Corp., Applicant
New Construction of Residential Building

No motion made. The BAR made comments:

Miller: Overall, this site is way more important than the hotel site, in terms of its relationship to the historic district, and I think taking cues from Ridge Street are important. The overall massing and setback is still too much for the site and the historic district. The historic district has a feeling of verticality and space between the existing structures and your plan attempts this to an extent, but this feeling should be increased. Also, the feeling of a front door needs to be incorporated into the plan. In addition to the verticality look at larger bay windows and the idea of a front yard. The stair areas need to be lighter and more transparent, although that could just be your rendering. Also, I am not sure how this works into the scheme; there are a lot of hipped roofs, and that might help bring down the massing on some of the edge

pieces. I think it is a nice thing to have all of the units (except for 2) to be accessible, but is that making this more difficult to deal with because of the connectivity?

Schwarz: I agree with a lot of the thing that Melanie [Miller] said. Some smaller things, I am wondering where you have the two outer buildings that have the gables, but don't step back from the gables, if a small stepback (even 4-8 inches) would create a break in the façade and help articulate it a bit more. I wouldn't have window boxes, because you can't make people plant flowers, and you have no idea of knowing what is going to be there. The columns on the porches, an entire stucco language makes it feel commercial and takes away from the residential feel. If you have more wood trim, creates a change in material, which would help create a residential sense in the structure. The parapet idea on the north edge has me a little bit worried that is not a place you want to bring the wall up any higher than it already is, so I would reconsider how you handle that flat roof and the mechanical equipment. I think you tried with the two and a half story thing to work, but I think you could go a bit further.

Keesecker: I think it is the appurtenance like details that make Ridge Street district interesting. I think it is that mixture of details found on the historic homes that makes it visually appealing. I don't know how you do that in a larger footprint, without making it seem like a false front fake façade, but that is the key. I remember from the PUD that there were some outdoor areas dedicated to gathering, and I think all of those [outdoor] spaces that can be occupied will also aid in blending into the neighborhood. The façade that faces onto the courtyard, in context with the hotel should also be revisited. I think mixing up the rhythm of the facades would help tremendously, making it less symmetrical.

Balut: I am going to start from a general design standpoint which I am confused about, it seems like it is between this new modern building and old late 19th century homes. I am having a hard time understanding the aesthetic identity of the building, I feel like it is in this in between place, and because of this it is not resolving a number of issues. Specifically, you are saying it is breaking down into volumes, but I feel like it is going to read as one volume, from the front and the back. I think varying the rooflines could help a lot with that. Currently, the spacing between the masses is not enough that it breaks the buildings apart. I think focusing on the little details and on symmetry versus asymmetry is minor, because the overall structures are lacking a cohesive identity and massing concept, if you could articulate what you trying to accomplish with the massing of the building that could inform a lot of these details. The human scale seems to be taking place on the interior of the building, but it might be nice to have something on the exterior that speaks to this scale.

Sarafin: To put a few specifics to what you are talking about, I remained unconvinced that the gable is the roof form of choice here. I am having a hard time moving beyond this roofline.

Mohr: One thing I think would help is to have a longer rendering of the street, so you could see the overall sense of the street. What if conversely you take that center section, pull those two things apart and make it more like a courtyard entry? The amount of wall to window ratio on the older houses is much less glass with simpler punctures, the scale of the openings feels almost 3/4 scale even though it is taller because they have a greater wall to window ratio. Maybe taking a totally different approach with the center building would help break up the massing a little bit. The only other thing is on the courtyard elevation, get rid of that opposing gable and extend the roof the whole way through.

Knott: I am not hearing enough of how your design was influenced by the precedence of the physical characteristics of the district. I made a list of things that I saw on Ridge Street a consistently large set back, a layering of spaces from public to private, variety of roof lines, windows centered in different parts of the building, bay windows, porches, defined entrance with a clearly prominent front door, etc. What I am seeing here is a lack of concept. Another point, in the PUD drawing, it really reads as individual townhouses and it is more of a residential cluster of buildings, and I think this design lacks that residential feeling. Also, in terms of the setback it seems simple to achieve a graceful setback by setting the northern most building back by about 8-10 feet, that way it doesn't create such a hard edge, and then the third volume could setback 5 feet. That way there is a more acceptable setback that allows for more layering of

spaces with the streetscape. The last point I wanted to make is the stairs in between each section remind me of the stairs you would see on the back of the buildings on Ridge Street and it doesn't seem appropriate on the street front. I would prefer a treatment like the center opening where the main entrance is rather than seeing those stairs there because it reminds me of a back door.

F. Other Business

7:40 8. PLACE Report: Blue Ribbon Commission talking about development pressures and gentrification; 3D modeling is pressing forward; Form-based Code discussion.

9. Guidelines review: BAR will first tackle Historic Conservation District Guidelines, then ADC Guidelines. Mary Joy will send out a Word doc with Guidelines so each member can work individually on revisions, then have a collective discussion.

Mary Joy asked about a possible bench with plaque to honor Sage Smith, to be located at the bus stop near Amtrak where she was last seen. The BAR prefers a traditional design of black metal; they said to check with Rhodeside and Harwell for guidance, the Chair wants PLACE to be tasked with a style guide.

Mary Joy will meet with Mohr and Knott to look at Mall lighting near Freedom of Expression Wall on Thursday August 18 at 10:00 a.m.

Mary Joy said to save the dates for:

- Tuesday August 30- Work Session starting at 5:30 p.m. in NDS Conference Room for 501 W Main Street new hotel project;**
- Thursday Sept 1 at 5:30 p.m. in City Space to hear Historic Resource Committee's proposal for naming the west end of the mall as Vinegar Hill Park; also**
- Sunday October 16-Monday October 17 for the Preservation Virginia statewide annual conference to be held in Charlottesville.**

7:50 G. Adjournment 9:30 p.m.