

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**

**JANUARY 21, 1997**

**3:00 P.M.**

**MICHIE ANNEX CONFERENCE ROOM**

**AGENDA**

**A. MINUTES**

December 17, 1996

**B. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS**

1. BAR 97-01-01 300 East High Street  
New Construction, Office Building  
Shank & Gray Architects, Applicant
2. BAR -97-01-02 109-11 Water Street  
New Construction/Demolition  
SLDC Architects, Applicant
3. BAR 97-01-03 Burger King  
Appeal Administrative Approval  
New Construction/Entrance Corridor  
Keith Wright, Applicant
4. BAR 96-11-536 Union Station  
Roofing and Lighting  
Doug Gilpin, Applicant

**C. OTHER BUSINESS**

Training opportunities  
January 6, 1997 Memo to City Council from S.S. Huja

**D. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

**E. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Enterprise Building

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

JANUARY 21, 1997

Members Present

Kurt Wassenaar  
Dawn Thompson  
Eldon Wood  
Pryor Hale  
Gregg Bleam  
Blake Caravati  
Todd Bullard

Members Absent

Martha deJarnett  
Diana Betts

Staff Present

Satyendra Singh Huja  
Marcia Joseph

Meeting began 3:05 P.M.

**BAR 97-01-01 300 East High Street**

Staff presented the report to the BAR.

Mr. Huja stated that the applicant had responded to comments made by a committee that Council had created to review the building concept for this site. For example the concept the committee reviewed had been proposed in phases, with a portion of the site vacant. The applicant responded to the committee's request to use the entire site and not separate it into phases.

Mr. Gray presented the proposed building and site to the BAR. He indicated that the building was banded vertically and horizontally, to create a scale harmonious to its surroundings. He referenced the model to state that even though he would like to see balconies on the east and west side of the building as it faced High Street the owner, builder and tenant did not want to construct them. He stated that he felt that the building although contemporary, fit within the context of the site. He also stated that he didn't feel that the minutes were crucial in context and the windows available with individual lights would not be cost effective or energy efficient.

Eldon Wood then questioned what happened to the roof at the balcony.

Mr. Gray stated that the dark brick banding continued around.

Mr. Caravati questioned why the brick changed color.

Mr. Gray stated that the change in color helped to break down the scale, and it would enhance the shadow line under the cornice.

Mr. Caravati questioned the color of the window trim and the placement of the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Gray indicated that the well on the roof would be 7' deep. He said that as they progress through the design that they would bring additional information concerning the mechanical equipment. He said that the equipment may be placed in the garage area, or in the alley adjacent to the synagogue.

Kurt Wassenaar questioned if they were proposing clear glass.

Mr. Gray said that the glass would be clear.

Mr. Caravati asked what material was proposed for the foundation.

Mr. Gray answered that it would be cast stone, the same as the banding proposed.

Kurt Wassenaar asked if there would be mullions in the front entrance.

Mr. Gray stated that it would be sheer glass, like the Crestar Bank building.

Kurt Wassenaar questioned what material and color the drain leaders would be and where they would be located.

Mr. Gray said that they hadn't worked out that detail as yet.

Kurt Wassenaar then asked if the entrance to the garage could be made smaller.

Mr. Gray stated that the opening could be reduced, but wasn't sure how much, because there would be trash removal in the area and large trucks would be using this entrance.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if the windows were operable.

Mr. Gray stated that they were not.

Mr. Caravati questioned why the handicap ramp was on the western entrance.

Mr. Gray stated that until they knew who the tenants were they would not know how the ramp would be placed.

Mr. Caravati asked what roofing material would be used.

Mr. Gray stated that gray standing seam metal roof was proposed.

Mr. Wood asked how this compared to Queen Charlotte.

Mr. Gray stated that Queen Charlotte was painted and that the color has faded in the sunlight.

Mr. Wood questioned if the roof was performed.

Mr. Gray said that the roof may have to be custom made.

Mr. Wood said that he hoped that this would not use a stock soffit.

Mr. Gray said that they would not use a stock soffit because it would waste too much material.

Mr. Bullard questioned the use of the balconies.

Mr. Gray said that the builder said they might leak, the owners and tenants want more available interior space.

Gregg Bleam asked if the plantings proposed could be explained.

Mr. Gray said that the majority of the plantings were street trees and shade trees and he didn't know what was going on at the ground level.

Mr. Bleam asked if they were going to save the two big locusts on 4th Street.

Mr. Gray stated that they were constructing curb to curb and that they wouldn't be able to save much. But they intended to replace anything removed with compatible trees.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Gleason said that she did not like the change in brick color.

Mr. Gilpin stated that he felt the building was too monumental in scale and that it needed more whimsy or finesse.

Mr. Wassenaar then closed the public discussion.

Ms. Hale stated that this may be the last big building in the downtown area and that the board should be happy with it. She indicated that she was concerned with the visibility of the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Huja stated that there was an issue of the mechanical equipment and the visibility from Queen Charlotte.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that he didn't think that it would be seen by any place other than Monticello Hotel.

Ms. Hale stated that she felt the tree canopy was a crucial part of High Street.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that the shift in color of brick should be significant.

Mr. Huja said he shared the concern that the color shift be significant.

Mr. Gray said that they will field test the colors.

Mr. Wassenaar said that almost all the elements on the building were successful, but felt that maybe too much was going on. He felt the building might be simplified.

Mr. Wood asked what the band of material between the 1st and 2nd windows was.

Mr. Gray stated that it was a soldier course of brick.

Ms. Hale asked why the smaller windows were on the north elevation.

Mr. Gray stated that the building code specified only ten percent of the wall could be windows and that the arithmetic and the interior arrangement dictated the size and spacing of the windows.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that a modern building on the site was good but perhaps they could limit their pallet of materials.

Mr. Gray stated that the materials proposed were simple.

Mr. Huja stated that he felt the building was an excellent design.

Mr. Blean stated that the massing proposed ran contrary to the buildings surrounding it, and that the building was more horizontal than vertical.

Mr. Gray stated that they broke up the wall to prevent the image of one solid wall running the expanse of any side of the building.

Mr. Bullard stated that he thought the architects had done a good job in breaking down the scale and it looked very Wrightian or Usonian.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if they should be worried about the Ginkos.

Mr. Blean said no. He then discussed the difficulty in replacing the White Oak. He suggested a smaller size and different species, possibly Red Oak. He also said that the Linden may attract and be eaten by Japanese Beetle, and may provide more shade than they want. He also felt that the edges of the garden court areas needed harder more urban edges. He felt that evergreen hedges may be more effective than the Butterfly Bush. He asked what the proposed ground cover was. He stated that it was not clear what was happening in the High Street planting area.

Mr. Wassenaar asked when they thought construction may begin.

Mr. Gray answered that it would begin in May.

Mr. Wassenaar then called for a motion.

Mr. Wood proposed the motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

The equipment must not be visible from any public right-of-way.

- 1) Advise the staff of the methods of concealing the mechanical equipment.
- 2) Provide brick sample panels.
- 3) Provide roof details including drain leaders.
- 4) Provide details of mullions.
- 5) Provide more detail on the size and quality of the landscaping.
- 6) Provide a detail of the roof including the whole eave assembly.
- 7) Provide information concerning lighting.
- 8) Modify the size of the opening on the west elevation allowing it to still function properly.
- 9) Simplify the building design, e.g. windows, soldier course.

Motion seconded by Mr. Caravati.

Motion approved unanimously.

#### **BAR 97-01-02 109-11 Water Street**

Staff presented the report to the BAR.

Mr. Huja stated that it was a shame to see the garbage stored in bags on the curb in the morning.

Chuck Lewis stated that he did not have access to the alley, or they would use that.

Jerry Dixon stated that all the residential units had trash compactors.

Mr. Huja asked if interior space could be used to house the garbage and suggested that they explore the entrance to the residential area.

Mr. Dixon stated that the area would have to be secured.

Mr. Huja stated that he felt that this was a successful infill.

Mr. Dixon stated that the windows had divided lights and the building was fairly modern. He stated that they were using brick to break the scale of the building down.

Mr. Bullard asked if they were using wood on the balcony.

Mr. Dixon answered that they were using a Brazilian wood that did not rot or check.

Mr. Wassenaar asked where the electrical underground box was located.

Mr. Dixon indicated that the box must be available for Virginia Power.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if it was stainless steel.

Mr. Dixon said it was and that it would be visible.

Mr. Huja asked if they had talked to the owner of the alley.

Mr. Lewis stated that he had and using the alley was not an option.

Mr. Dixon stated that the gas meters will be visible and that screening them too much would create a problem.

Mr. Huja asked if the meters could be placed in the ground.

The group responded that the meters could not be in the ground, because of environmental reasons - snow.

Mr. Caravati asked if the neighbor agreed to allow access of the alley, and stated that he felt that the impact on the alley owner would be minimum.

Mr. Dixon said that a lot of utilities were located in the alley.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that it may be premature to come up with solutions.

Mr. Bleam stated that they might try some other paving material instead of using plants.

Mr. Dixon stated that he wanted to see a little bit of living things around the street.

Mr. Huja agreed that it was nice to have some green.

Ms. Hale stated that they could do something else as long as it was green.

- Mr. Bleam stated that they might use 2' or 2 1/2" caliper to specify the tree size.
- Mr. Wassenaar asked if there would be ceiling lights.
- Mr. Dixon stated that the lights would be recessed in the ceiling. There would be three lights under the trees to cast shadows on the building.
- Ms. Hale asked what the thoughts were on the color proposed.
- Mr. Dixon stated that he was breaking up the size with different colors. He said they wanted to use a deep urban brick color.
- Mr. Wood asked where the light brick color would be used.
- Mr. Dixon answered that it would be used in the soldier courses and in the rusticated area.
- Mr. Wassenaar stated that the railing looked very thin.
- Mr. Dixon said that it was thin, 1/2", that the wood was dense and that they will keep the vertical elements as thin as possible.
- Mr. Huja stated that the balconies may be unusable because they had no privacy, and he asked how they worked.
- Mr. Dixon stated that they have had complaints because some balconies had too much privacy.
- Mr. Caravati asked about the cornice detail.
- Mr. Dixon stated that the downspouts would be inside the building.
- Mr. Wassenaar asked if there would be lighting on the balcony.
- Mr. Dixon stated that there would be, and they will show it and that it will be directed down.
- Mr. Wood asked what the concrete siding was.
- Mr. Dixon said that it was called Hearty Plank. He said that it was a beveled siding with wood grain.
- Mr. Wassenaar called for a motion.
- Mr. Caravati moved for approval with the following conditions:
- 1) Provide brick panels for review.



- 2) Provide lighting details.
- 3) Provide a section showing the gas meters.
- 4) Explore other methods of handling the garbage collection and location of electric box.
- 5) Provide alternatives to the Mondo Grass.
- 6) Provide samples of roofing and other materials.

Mr. Bullard seconded.

Motion was unanimously approved.

### **BAR 97-01-03 Burger King**

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Keith Wright presented his case. He stated that the standing seam metal roof was acceptable. He said that he had a problem using red brick, he wanted to use a lighter color brick. He explained the light and bright program, the improved the soffit light and exterior treatment that caused sales to increase by 10-12%. He said he understood that the roof sign had to go, but the red band around the roof was a trade mark. He said that he felt that the red band was necessary for identification and for curb appeal.

Mr. Bullard asked if they wanted the red brick changed to a lighter brick.

Mr. Wright said they did want lighter brick in conjunction with the lighting.

Mr. Bullard asked where this was located on Fifth Street.

Mr. Huja stated that it was near the Pet Discounters. He stated that he had no objection to the project, and reminded everyone that the three issues were the roof material, the color of the brick and the illuminated red roof band.

Mr. Wassenaar asked which color brick was desired.

Mr. Wright stated that he wanted the lighter color because of increased sales.

Mr. Bullard asked if he was absolutely certain that the color of the brick is what increased sales.

Mr. Wright said that it was the over all package and that he couldn't say it was just the brick.

Mr. Wright stated that they did not have a captive audience, and that he would be at a competitive disadvantage in this area.

4:25 Dawn Thompson entered.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that there are some very light bricks in the red range.

Mr. Wright stated that he would like to use gray brick to be similar with the development around him.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that he could be supportive of brick in a very light color still in the red spectrum.

Mr. Wright stated that he is open to suggestions.

Mr. Huja said that the catalog shows two shades of brick and the staff chose the red.

Mr. Wright said that he prefers a lighter color gray or beige.

Mr. Bullard said that he agrees with the lighter red brick color.

Mr. Wright said that he wanted to belong to the development around him.

Mr. Wood stated that he is cognizant of the problem. He asked where the trade was coming from.

Mr. Wright said that 40-50% would be coming from I-64, the rest within a 2 to 5 mile radius. He said that he feels that he needs some sort of immediate identification. He feels that he needs the red stripe on the top of the building.

Mr. Wassenaar reviews the process stating that the BAR can say yes or no that they can work with the applicant to get them through the process. But it is up to the applicant to propose alternatives.

Mr. Wright states that he wants the identifiable red band that it is necessary for identification, and that the building is not as obtrusive as his competitors

Mr. Huja questioned the red illuminated roof band.

Mr. Wright stated that if the band is not lit then it is useless.

Mr. Wood suggested lights placed on the roof to wash the roof and the red band.

Ms. Hale said that she did not want it to look like a neon strip.

Mr. Bullard said that the whole question is difficult, it is a commercial strip and we could be making a silks purse out of a sows ear. He further stated that the idea in a commercial area is to attract customers and sometimes it is gaudy.

Mr. Caravati stated that he would like to see the kind of development that is happening on Pantops.

Ms. Thompson asked if the applicant had access to pictures on how this had been done in other areas.

Mr. Wright stated that they had not been successful at their location on the corner.

Mr. Bullard stated that he did not think that the red band on the corner would have made the sales jump.

Mr. Huja said that the intent was not to make the building invisible.

Mr. Wright said that he did not want to be at a competitive disadvantage. If everyone else had to build that way it would be all right.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that everyone building in this area would have to abide by the BAR standards.

Mr. Bullard stated that he was struggling whether it is productive to turn this area into an austere beautiful assemblage of buildings or accept it as a commercial strip.

Mr. Wassenaar said that the entrance to the city should be thoughtful. He said that he was concerned about the intent of the overlay district.

Mr. Huja stated that the county has done well on 250E.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that he supports staff and that this project can be done successfully without illumination.

Mr. Wood asked about the signs.

Mr. Huja stated that the signs should be ground and 6' in height.

Mr. Wassenaar questioned Mr. Caravati and Mr. Bleam. They both stated that they supported staff recommendations. Stating that they were not requesting another Toys R Us building.

Ms. Hale stated that she had a concern with the internally illuminated band.

Ms. Thompson said that she was in agreement.

Mr. Wassenaar said that it was the sense of the board to affirm what the staff has said, and that one or more members of the BAR would be happy to sit down with the applicant to work things out.

Mr. Bullard asked if the building were flood lit if staff felt that was better.

Mr. Huja answered no, it would not be better.

Mr. Wright stated that they would look at the possibility of mounting some sort of light to shine up at the base of the red band.

Mr. Huja reminded them to not pick pink brick.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that they did not want to delay the process and that they would work with the applicant administratively.

Mr. Huja reminded the applicant that he must submit a color scheme.

Mr. Wassenaar moved to affirm the amended staff recommendation.

Mr. Wright summed up the BAR's decision to:

- 1) Agree to the red band as long as it is not illuminated.
- 2) Use a light brick in a red hue.
- 3) Use bronze standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Caravati seconded the motion.

Unanimously approved.

Mr. Beasley protested that the Chairman had never opened the discussion to the public.

Mr. Caravati moved to open the discussion to the public.

Mr. Beasley then stated that he had nothing to say.

Mr. Caravati then withdrew his motion.

### **UNION STATION RENOVATION OF BAGGAGE BUILDING - BAR 96-11-536**

Staff introduced Mr. Doug Gilpin and explained that he would be presenting various components of the project for the BAR to discuss.

Mr. Gilpin informed the BAR that the project was currently under review by VDOT, and that the Virginia Department of Historic Resources had approved all historic aspects of the building including the reconstruction of the roof. He then proceeded to address the lighting proposed. The fixtures proposed are the same fixtures that are used on the bridge. He made reference to the manufacturers (Sternberg Vintage Lighting, Old Town A8405 R/508 fixture corner bracket 6990 Pole Augusta 12' 4200-FP) cut sheets he had included in his partial submission. He indicated that the location of the fixtures would be available for review at the next BAR meeting.

Mr. Huja asked if the lighting would be shielded.

Mr. Gilpin answered that the lighting would be shielded.

Ms. Hale asked if the colors chosen for the poles would be rust.

Mr. Gilpin answered that the colors would not be rust but would match the colors of the city fixtures, a fiberglass structure done in slate.

Mr. Wood questioned whether Richmond had any problem with using asphalt shingles.

Mr. Gilpin answered that Richmond had approved the asphalt shingles.

Mr. Bullard indicated that he had concern with a statement in Mr. Gilpin's letter of December 17, 1996 that stated that he (Mr. Gilpin) was concerned about the power of the BAR.

Ms. Thompson stated that the request for an estimate on the roofing cost had simply been a request for information.

There was some discussion about a premature review, because this also lies in the West Main Street District.

Mr. Huja stated that this structure was designated as a district when it was reviewed by the BAR.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that the BAR has taken a lot of heat on why this project has been allowed to go on without a Master Plan for the entire site and all the buildings.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that the developers intent is to stabilize and maintain the main building.

Mr. Wood asked if all the funds had been allocated.

Mr. Huja stated that they had.

Ms. Hale said that she has had calls on this and that she was told it was inappropriate to develop in this manner.

Mr. Bullard stated that the request for the cost of slate for the roof was because the roof at this location is highly visible. When this was requested at the prior meeting he thought that Mr. Gilpin was in agreement.

Ms. Thompson stated that they just wanted to know the costs and that she was astonished by the sentence in the letter.

Mr. Caravati said he also took the letter personally.

Ms. Hale leaves 5:05 pm

Mr. Gilpin then discussed the paint colors. He proposed a color for the brick that he feels matches the existing brick - Glidden 71-68. For the woodwork trim he proposed a white color Glidden 70-09. The stones over the windows would remain their natural color. For the roof, Mr. Gilpin stated that he wasn't sure if the existing material was Buckingham slate, it is currently covered by a coating of asphalt. His proposal was to use GAF Slateline asphalt shingles in a color and texture that looks the same as that on the building now. He also stated that the main building roof would need repair.

Mr. Gilpin proposed using a pressed brick that matches the 1805 wing, it is a smooth brick. He also proposed a fine textured glass block on the south elevation to allow day light and enhance security. The question raised on the mortar color will be addressed in the future.

Mr. Gilpin then presented the signs proposed on the site.

Mr. Huja reminded him that a 6 square foot directional sign was exempt.

Mr. Gilpin then proceeded to review the signs proposed and their locations. The signs will be red white and blue.

Mr. Huja informed him that the entire sign package would have to be submitted for review.

Mr. Gilpin stated that he would put a sign package together once the engineer had completed the site plan drawings.

Mr. Huja left 5:15 p.m.

Mr. Caravati asked if the whole site would be addressed.

Mr. Gilpin said that the plan will show the parking area. He stated that the money from Amtrak and ISTEPA will be used as the plan shows the construction phases.

Mr. Bullard then questioned if they included plans for the main building in the site plan.

Mr. Gilpin said that they have been given the go ahead to identify any repairs that should be made. The maintenance will include weather proofing, cleaning the exterior, repair the windows, doors and the roof. He said that he didn't think that the repairs required BAR approval.

Mr. Wood stated that in maintaining the main building it would look occupied and not boarded up.

Mr. Caravati reiterated the issues listing lights, color, the brick and the roof as issues. He then moved to:

Approve the

- 1) Lights as presented and
- 2) The brick, mortar and paint color with administrative approval.

Mr. Bullard seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously with Mr. Wassenaar abstaining.

Mr. Bullard stated that if the roof had to be asphalt then the one that was chosen was acceptable. He said that the main building still concerned him. He said that it is a significant property on Main Street and is highly visible. He said that he was struggling with the issue because it is a lot of money, and he is sensitive to the BAR wielding power. He felt that from an aesthetic standpoint slate is the best material.

Mr. Caravati said that he agreed with Mr. Bullard and felt that he may abstain because of the unknown nature of the whole project.

Mr. Blean stated that he would like to see slate, but he knows it is costly.

Mr. Wood said that one redeeming factor is that the asphalt shingles were approved by the Department of Historic Resources. He then questioned whether the Federal authorities had approved the roof material.

Mr. Gilpin stated that the Federal authorities had not approved the roof as yet.

Mr. Wood stated that this would not be precedent setting for the rest of the project.

Mr. Wassenaar said that he supported the use of asphalt but he recognized a higher set of issues including the fact that the project was proceeding in fragments. He felt that the material should be reexamined when the entire project came in, and that it is a good intervention for the little building. This could be language in the motion that states that the roofing be looked at again. He then called for a motion.

Mr. Caravati questioned if Mr. Wassenaar would vote.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that he would not vote.

Mr. Bullard asked if they assumed the main building would be renovated, what material would be deemed appropriate.

Mr. Gilpin said that when they do the repairs they plan to repair with Buckingham Slate. He said that this will stand out, but the repair is not in a really visible spot. The extent of repair depends on the life of the roof.

Mr. Bullard then questioned what is appropriate or proper for that building if restored to some productive use.

Mr. Gilpin stated that he thought that slate would be appropriate.

Mr. Bullard then presented a motion:

The asphalt shingle as presented is acceptable temporarily until the main building is substantially renovated, (*or roof replacement is proposed.*) at which time it will be reevaluated.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Caravati.

The vote was unanimous to approve the motion with Mr. Wassenaar abstaining.

Mr. Wood then moved to place in the record that in the review of the Burger King there was no public inquiry when opened to the public at Mr. Beasley's reminder that the meeting had been closed prior to public inquiry. Mr. Beasley refused to comment once the meeting had been reopened.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Thompson. It was approved unanimously with Mr. Caravati abstaining.

Mr. Wassenaar then reminded the BAR members that the lighting appeal for the Ice Rink was before the Council that evening and encouraged them to attend if possible.

Adjourn 5:45p.m.