

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
July 15 , 1997 - 5:00 PM
MICHIE ANNEX CONFERENCE ROOM

AGENDA

A. MINUTES

May 20, 1997
June 17, 1997

B. DISCUSSION OF WEST MAIN STREET GUIDELINES

C. PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE

Jefferson National Bank
Demolition
Commercial Infill
Architect, William Adams

D. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS

- | | | |
|----|---------------|---|
| 1. | BAR -97-07-16 | 616 Park Street
Residential Infill
Carrie and Kevin Burke, Architects |
| 2. | BAR -97-06-15 | 411 East Main Street
Window Replacement
Joe Geick, Applicant |
| 3. | BAR-97-06-14 | 333 West Main Street
Deck Addition
Jim Gilbert, Applicant |
| 4. | BAR-97-07-17 | 301 East Main Street
Facade Construction
Giovanna Galfione, Architect |
| 5. | BAR-97-07-18 | 216 West Water Street
Covering and Screening Containers
Oliver Kuttner, Applicant |

OTHER BUSINESS

D. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

E. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

F. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
JULY 15, 1997

Members Present

Todd Bullard, Vice Chairman
Jesse Hook
Dawn Thompson
Blake Caravati
Michael May
Linda Winner

Staff Present

Satyendra Singh Huja
Marcia Joseph

5:00 PM Meeting convened.

Todd Bullard explained the process to the members of the public. The approval of the minutes was deferred to the end of the meeting. The discussion of the West Main Street Guidelines was deferred to an undetermined date.

Jefferson National Bank Preliminary Conference

Marcia Joseph presented the staff recommendations.

Mr. Huja reiterated that the major topics concerning the project are:

The proposed demolition
How much of the original fabric still remains
The nature of the proposed building
The economic viability of downtown

Kenton McCarthy represented the application. He stated that the bank had been working with Train and Spencer, the architects since 1993. He gave a brief history of the buildings that the bank had considered constructing over the past 28 years. He stated that he did not know exactly what the space needs for the bank were, but wanted to know what their options were. He said that currently, the buildings were not contributing to the economic fabric of the downtown.

Kirk Train, architect for the project, stated that the bank has been working with them on expanding its operations. He stated that the zoning ordinance requires ground level retail use, and that the bank required 45,000 square feet for its operation, and that they were looking at the entire block for their uses.

He said that the structural engineer that they hired indicated in an initial report that the existing buildings would not meet the modern office load capacity requirements. He said that there was not a clear span between the buildings, that the facades are separating from the wall, because of the normal shrink swell cycle, not because of neglect. He said that the basements have water running through them. He said that the buildings have remained stable and are in the same shape as they were in 1969 because the bank had been maintaining them.

Mr. Train said that they were examining the options based on the building and for the best interest of their client. The existing building configuration was unusable by the client. He said that the retention of the outside wall of the building doubles the price of the skin of the building. He stated that he expected this to be a Preliminary Conference and that many of the final reports on the building are still forthcoming.

He went on to explain that 31% of the Main Street wall is historic or old fabric, and 100% of 3rd Street remains as historic. He said the Market Street side has 3 story and 2 story buildings. The problem he expressed with over building would be that the footings would have to be underpinned and that the footing would be quite expensive.

He stated that along Main Street, 3 parts of what had been 5 bays had been removed. He said that the existing buildings are not capable of supporting what they propose. He said that the old buildings were not landmarks.

He said that currently, the ground floor is the only floor in use.

He said that the building he was proposing created a facade that did not currently exist. By using the bay rhythm, fenestration, and an evolving facade he said that he would be creating a mercantile rhythm. The building would be 4 stories with the 3 lower stories relating to the existing mall heights and the 4th floor designed to resemble an attic.

He said he would look at the verticality of the bays and that he welcomed anyone's comments. He said that he would propose that the building fill the existing envelope and then turn the corner. He said that the Market Street side would face a park wall.

Tom Keogh then presented models of development on the site that had been approved in the past.

Mr. Train said that he offered the opportunity for people to walk through the buildings.

Mr. Bullard asked if they would submit for a certificate of appropriateness in August, what would happen if the merger of the banks did not occur.

Mr. McCarthy said that he assumed that the merger would take place. He said that it was the best use for down town and Jefferson National Bank. He said that they know that they do not need the space now, but would like to create retail for revenue and create office space to be used in the future.

Mr. Bullard then asked if they would come back before the BAR.

Mr. McCarthy's answer was yes.

Mr. Bullard then opened the meeting to public comment.

Al Tabackman stated that he was concerned if the building was torn down and not replaced. He said the owners of the property should bond for the improvements.

Mr. Huja stated that staff had added that to its set of recommendations.

Gabe Silverman said that the bank had not improved its relationship with downtown and the rest of the community. He said that the building proposed did not have a human scale. He asked how much of the area would be used for residential. He said the mammoth continuous facade was not better than what was there, and that it did not have vitality. He then asked who was speaking for Jefferson National Bank.

Mr. McCarthy said that he spoke for the bank. He then explained that the bank bought the property in 1969 for expansion, they used the old Miller and Rhodes in the late 70's instead. He said that in the late 80's there were real estate problems making it too expensive. In the early 90's they began again and built an operations center in 5th Street.

Mr. Silverman asked how long they had been working on this scheme.

Mr. Train answered that it had been one month. He also stated that he could not put apartments in a contiguous space.

Mr. Silverman asked if it would make sense to find out what Wachovia would do.

Mr. McCarthy said that he was trying to find out what the options may be for Wachovia.

Mr. Silverman stated that he wanted to know who to deal with and was concerned about how to determine what the best solution for the downtown is for the next 20 years.

Mr. McCarthy said the building would not be built for just one user. He said that he wants to build for the future and the size of the building would be used if they needed space in the future.

Mr. Train said that the building would be over built and the bank would fill out into the space in time.

Mr. Silverman said that the plan for the downtown must be comprehensive.

Mr. Bullard stated that he thought things were in flux because of the proposed bank merger.

Baughn Roemer, president of the downtown neighborhood association said that he would like more light shed on the uses proposed. He said that he valued the right of JNB to use the property. However, he said that he thought that this was not an ordinary request, and that he hoped it would get the respect it deserves. He said he would like the City to guarantee that a comprehensive review of the block would be made. He said that he would welcome comments from Mr. Huja concerning the potential development and said that he would like to see residential space included.

Mr. Bullard asked Mr. McCarthy how he felt about the residential uses and whether he thought it was a compatible use.

Mr. McCarthy discussed that the 3rd and the 4th floor would be the connecting floors to the bank.

Mr. Train said that residential over office is expensive and that they had not discussed this land use.

Terry Shotwell, business and downtown land owner, asked if JNB doesn't have and intended use then why couldn't they sell the buildings individually, and allow the individual owners to redo the buildings.

Mr. Bullard said that he understood that the owner did not want to sell the property.

Brent Nelson said that he agreed that the back portions of the building did not add to the area and were not meant to be viewed. He said he had no problem with taking down the back, but he thought the front should be left. He further stated that all the reasons that were given for demolition apply to most buildings on the downtown mall. He said that just because a building was not a landmark was not a reason to tear it down.

Dick Howard said that he thought the design for the back of the building was fine. He said he was more concerned with the mall side. He said that he had genuine concerns that JNB would leave altogether. He said it is too easy to look at old buildings and say that it is easier to tear it down. He said that if you put the design submitted in a suburban office park it would work, but he said that he did not think that it was appropriate to the feel of the downtown mall. He said that he hoped the BAR would ask for a creative adaptive use of the existing facades.

Kevin Lynch spoke to the demolition concept without knowing the fate of the property. He said that most small builders must jump through hoops just to get a building painted. He voiced concern that the process could be circumvented by a large company. He said that not using the upper floors was a waste of the building's use. He said he would like to see more residential units downtown and said he wanted to see something more attractive.

Bob Hodus said that he has a close association with JNB and knows the buildings. He said that he agreed with the suggestions by staff and JNB and thinks staff and JNB are being prudent. He

said that maintaining the current state is romantic but there is an economic risk to the owners of the property.

Giovanna Cox stated that she has witnessed all kinds of development that have occurred without tearing down a building, but occurs by using an existing building. She said that we should make an effort to keep the historic structures, even if the only factor that makes it special is age. She said that age is important. She said that we should see what the building looks like underneath. She said it could be a bigger investment for the developer, but there could be another solution.

Mr. Bullard then asked for additional comment, there being none he closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Caravati asked if there were two certificates that would be granted.

Mr. Huja said that they did not require action now, but would need two separate actions for the demolition and the building.

Ms. Winner asked if they should just listen and ask questions or take action.

Mr. Bullard answered that the applicant was looking to see if the BAR would consider demolition and the construction.

Mr. Train said that he considered the meeting a preliminary conference and that they hoped to receive comments to incorporate, explain or rebut. He said that he only expected comments.

Mr. Bullard said that they could proceed in a couple of ways, that they could leave with just the community comments and reconvene later, or they could go around the table to receive the BAR comments.

Mr. Bullard then addressed the issue of demolition and said that it should never be taken lightly. He said that the BAR was charged with protecting architectural treasures. He stated that demolition was permanent and brutal. He said that none of the buildings are outstanding but they are all contributing buildings. He said that many of the original facades have been lost or compromised, and a small percentage of the original integrity of the design remains. He said that he would not want to use false facades of the old store fronts, and that we must adapt or wither and die.

He then continued to state that the social and economic terms must also be considered. He said he expected to see the existing buildings if replaced, be replaced by a vibrant commercial entity. He said that he would like the bank to stay. He said he was in favor of replacement, but that the replacement must be contingent on the replacement structure proposed.

Mr. Bullard indicated that he felt the existing building should be documented with measured drawings and descriptive text. He said that the proposed structure should respond to the design

guidelines and comments from he BAR. He reiterated his recommendation to consider residential use in the proposed structure.

Dawn Thompson asked if the parking area would be open to the public.

Mr. Train said that they had not discussed designation of the users for the parking.

Ms. Thompson said that she agreed with the concerns expressed by the public. She said that it was a serious thing to demolish a building and that she would like to see the facade retained. She also said that she would like to see residential uses in the building.

Mr. Caravati said that he was more focused on the facade presented and that he had problems with the design presented. He said that he would like to visit the site and see for himself.

Mr. Train said that the structural engineer's report had been rewritten.

Mr. Caravati said that he was bothered by the lack of vertical definition and the separations between the bays was too thin. He also stated that the site plan should be part of the approval of the building.

Mr. Train then presented a site plan illustrating the proposed building and parking area.

Mr. Caravati then said he was concerned about the cornice treatment.

Mr. Train stated that they had not completed the design on the cornice.

Mr. Caravati asked if the windows would be operable.

Mr. Train said that it had not been addressed at this time.

Mr. Caravati said that he would like to see some residential use allotted for in the building. He said that each demolition should be considered separately. He stated that he wasn't sure bonding was a good idea, but said that he would like to see if there was some other way to ensure that something would be built if the buildings were demolished. He said that staff should come up with a way to do this.

Michael May stated that he could not support demolition because of the location of the buildings and the fact that it would destroy the integrity of the district. He stated that he would like to see residential uses within the building also.

He said that the parking lot on the Market Street side gave them more of an option to build a building over the parking area. He said it would give the area a more urban look.

Mr. May continued to state that there are problems with arcades, and that they tend to provide shelter for people off hours. He also said that there was a lack of detail and that the lintels and sills tended to blend into the facade. He said that they would read as just brick.

He said that he was concerned about the restoration of the home building. He felt that the designers should duplicate the cornice.

Mr. Train stated that they are showing the cornice as it is on the building but they had received no commitment from the bank to restore the home building.

Mr. May said that he hoped the bank would consider restoring the landmark.

Mr. Bullard commented on the arcade, he stated that he did like the arcade and said that it lends interest to the mall. He said that the projections could respond to the canopies on the mall.

Mr. May said that he was concerned about the voids and the fact that the arcade was recessed and different from the rest of the mall.

Ms. Winner said that this was a classic values dilemma she said that she was not convinced that there was a clear bad or good. She stated it was a viewing the viability of the downtown vs the historic district. She said she could support demolition if renovation is too costly, the buildings are no longer viable, overbuilding is not possible, the existing buildings were poor quality initially, and much of the history had already been compromised.

She said that she would like to see the cost figures. She also stated that she would like to see residential uses accommodated in the proposed building.

Jesse Hook said that she tended to go along with the comments that had been stated. She said that she wanted to see a plan that she can accept before she could approve demolition. She said that the arcade looked good but it would be conducive to problems already on the mall. She said that there was no egress for any shops and that all the goods must be trundled down the mall to be placed in the stores and that it would tend to attract small businesses instead of the larger ones.

Mr. Bullard then summarized the sense of the comments by stating that the board needed to have more information. He requested the applicant to look at a couple of options and one was to look at providing some residential use and determine if there was an effective way to use the existing buildings.

Mr. Caravati asked if there was anything behind the facade at Catos.

Mr. Train said that the western windows were destroyed and they have not uncovered part of it but the masonry had been removed and replaced by lighter construction on the bottom.

The discussion concerning the Jefferson National Bank came to a close.

The meeting was suspended for ten minutes and reconvened at 7 P.M.

BAR 97-07-16 616 Park Street - Residential Infill

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Carrie Burke, the applicant, represented the project. She stated that the building was sited to allow for preservation of the character of the site. She stated that the house was set back quite far from the street. She stated that she felt the building was exemplary of its time. She said that she was not comfortable with building a miniature Victorian building, but was creating a simpler vocabulary.

She said that the environmental concerns were critical. That daylighting and generation of the building from the inside out were essential for utilizing the economy of the building envelope. She elaborated that the roof line was important the solar aspect. She also pointed to the similarly sloped roofs in the general vicinity.

She also stated that they would provide screening from Park Street by adding Mahonia and Nandina. She said that the Magnolia that would be removed would be replaced with deciduous trees.

Mr. Bullard then asked for public comment.

Marla Ziegler, a neighbor, stated that she felt it was a solution to a problem. She said the building restores the appearance and does much for the concept of historic preservation. She said that she supported the concept for the house.

Ashlin Smith said that she was delighted with the planning process and the project. She said it was the right way to use the property. She said that she liked the form, fenestration, and the roof line. She said that she was not bothered by the loss of the Magnolias.

Dick Howard said that he supports the building and the siting.

Theo Van Groll said that he supported the request also.

Mr. Bullard then closed the meeting to public comment and asked the BAR for their comments. He then stated that he echoed the comments from the public. He said that the siting sets the house back from the street and the house can therefore hold its own. He said that the BAR should avoid meddling with the design.

Ms. Hook asked where the driveway was located.

Ms. Burke answered that the curb cut will be shared by the two houses.

Ms. Winner said that she thought the design was meant to be.

Ms. Thompson said that she thought the house should be approved.

Mr. Caravati asked if the neighbor, Stan Tatum, was concerned about anything.

Ms. Burke said that he was concerned about water runoff and screening. She stated that they would be installing French drain pits and work with water retention planting under the drip line, and would be screening with a fence.

Mr. Caravati asked if the stucco would be natural stucco.

Ms. Burke answered that the marbesil they planned to use was from Italy and had marble dust in it, and was stone like in color. She agreed that it would not be painted.

Mr. May said that he agreed that the presentation was beautiful. He said that he liked the house, but he had a problem with the horizontal window to the right of the door.

Ms. Burke replied that most outbuildings had a purposeful use and that the windows in them would vary.

Ms. Winner stated that in vernacular architecture everything has a purpose.

Mr. May stated that he liked the spacing of the windows.

Mr. Huja reminded the applicant that they would need a specific drainage plan prior to approval of the building permit, and that screening and fencing between this property and the Tatums was an important facet of the design.

Mr. Bullard moved to approve the item as presented with the following conditions:

- 1) Subcommittee approval of the colors proposed,**
- 2) Subcommittee approval of the fence.**

The motion was seconded by Mr. May.

The BAR voted unanimously in support of Mr. Bullard's motion.

BAR 97-06-15 411 East Main Street - Window Replacement

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Mr. Bullard asked if there was anyone present to represent the project.

There was no one present, and it was determined that the board would hear the item.

Mr. Caravati asked if the Certificate of Occupancy could be revoked.

Mr. Bullard moved to deny the request to place grids in the existing windows.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

The board voted unanimously to deny the request.

They also allowed the applicant to replace the original windows in their original locations, or new windows made to exact replication of the original windows should be installed in the original locations. The board also asked staff to investigate the possibility of revoking the certificate of occupancy if the windows are not restored to their original condition within ninety days.

BAR 97-06-14 333 West Main Street - Deck Addition

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Mike Stoneking represented the item. He said the lighting proposed was proposed to avoid harsh light.

Ms. Winner asked if handicap accessibility was an issue.

Mr. Stoneking said that there was handicap accessible outdoor seating in the rear of the building.

Mr. Caravati asked if plantings could be placed in the rear of the building.

Mr. Stoneking stated that planting could occur in the lower portion but not in the upper portion.

Mr. Caravati asked about the mural.

Mr. Stoneking said that he would like to make the mural an issue at another time. He said that the pressure treated lumber would be painted to match the trim and anything under the structure would be painted a charcoal color.

Mr. Bullard asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Mr. Caravati said he was concerned that the Wisteria would not be green all year long and that a wood tressis is not a sufficient material.

Mr. Stoneking said that he would speak with Gregg Bleam.

DRAFT

Mr. Bullard moved to approve the item with the following conditions:

- 1) **Excluding the mural, and**
- 2) **Administrative approval of the plant materials proposed.**

The motion was seconded by Ms. Winner and approved unanimously by the board.

BAR 97-07-17 301 East Main Street - Facade Construction

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Ms. Galfione represented the application. She stated that the roof proposed would overhang 1 foot. She said that the color proposed would complete around the corner. She said that they were hoping to remedy a drainage problem with the roof. She stated that they needed another entrance along 3rd Street.

She said that the entrance on 3rd Street was a handicap accessible entrance. She also stated that the windows would all be repaired and painted.

Ms. Galfione continued to explain that the 3 bays would establish what the building looked like before the 1950's renovation, when it was W.T. Grants. She said they planned to use dryvit on the face. The awning proposed she said, would be glass and painted metal.

She addressed the concept of the color proposed and explained that the fabric awnings on the mall are all different and said that she didn't think that the color proposed would be an issue. She said that the other option was to paint the areas a dark gray or black.

She said that the individual establishment signs would be placed underneath the awnings.

Mr. Caravati asked if the windows in the front were painted aluminum.

Ms. Galfione said that it was baked enamel, and the white color would relate to existing white trim on the mall.

Mr. Huja asked what material the door was made from.

Ms. Galfione answered that it would be made from wood.

Mr. Caravati asked if the awning frame was painted.

Ms. Galfione said that the frame would be painted blue.

Mr. Caravati asked if the soapstone base was there now.

DRAFT

Ms. Galfione said that it was not existing and that the door sill would also be made of soapstone.

Mr. May asked if the cornice would be the same color as the facade.

Ms Galfione answered that it would be the same color and the same material.

Mr. Huja asked if the Advance sign was new letters.

Ms. Galfione said that the letters were new and would be placed on the frieze.

Ms. Thompson asked if the board had given up and accepted dryvit as a material for use on the Mall.

Mr. Bullard asked if there were comments from the public. There were none.

The meeting was closed to the public.

There was discussion concerning the color blue proposed.

Mr. Bullard said that he would be comfortable with a dark blue, and asked if this could be approved administratively.

Mr. Caravati said that he would like to see a subcommittee formed to approve the color.

Mr. Bullard said that he was comfortable with allowing administrative approval.

Ms. Thompson said that they could refer to the color approved as navy blue.

Ms. Winner said that she would like to see the color administratively approved.

Mr. Bullard then stated that there were two issues not reviewed by the BAR, the roof height should be a separate matter, and the building code would call for tempered laminated glass for use as an awning.

Ms. Galfione stated that the glass would be sloped.

Mr. Caravati moved to approve the item with the following conditions:

- 1) **The roof on 3rd Street must measure 10 feet from the sidewalk, and**
- 2) **Natural stucco must be used, excluding the cornice treatment.**

Mr. Bullard seconded the motion and asked the applicant how she felt about using stucco.

DRAFT

Ms. Galfione said that she did not object to the use, but felt that it had not been budgeted for.

Mr. Caravati stated that the cornice did not have to be natural stucco, but that it could be wood or dryvit. He said that he was concerned with the appearance of dryvit closer to eye level.

Ms. Galfione stated that she felt she was not representing the applicant well in defending the use of dryvit.

The board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

BAR 97-07-18 Covering and Screening Containers

Ms. Joseph discussed the memo presented to the BAR.

Mr. Huja explained that the containers had been in the parking lot for years. He said that he approved it administratively as screening, and felt that it was better to screen them than to just leave them. He said that at first the top of the structure was to be covered in sod, but after talking to Mr. Bullard, it was decided that sod would be a maintenance problem.

Mr. Kuttner, the applicant, said that it looked like an easy solution to a difficult problem. He said that he was trying to salvage the building. He stated that he did want the area to look nice.

Mr. Caravati asked if he proposed using a flat roof.

Mr. Kuttner said that he would like to build a concrete deck on the top of the structure. He said that he wanted to keep the height of the structure down, and that he would use the same material for the roof as he would use for the sides.

Mr. Bullard asked if there was public comment.

Ms. Galfione asked if Mr. Kuttner had spoken with a professional.

Mr. Kuttner said that he did not care to use a professional.

Mr. Bullard then closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bullard then stated that he had discussions with Mr. Kuttner and residents of South Street, Martha Gleason and Brent Nelson. He said that the best way to resolve the issue is for a committee of BAR members to meet on the site and look at the conditions first hand. He felt that they could determine a way to ameliorate the situation and find an amicable solution.

Mr. Kuttner stated that he would like to see at least three BAR members and he would like all the owners on the street to be invited to participate.

DRAFT

Mr. Caravati moved to form a subcommittee to meet with the applicant and the neighbors on the site to work out some solution to ameliorate the activity that has taken place on the site.

The BAR determined that the committee should consist of:
Blake Caravati, Linda Winner and Todd Bullard.

Ms. Winner asked why it was a BAR issue.

Mr. Huja explained that it was not a building visible from the public right-of-way and the issue had come before the Planning Commission and that the Planning Commission suggested that it come before the BAR for review.

Ms. Hook seconded Mr. Caravati's motion.

Mr. Bullard then stated that he was concerned about the BAR being dragged into a design charette. He said that he agreed that a professional should be involved. He felt that the meeting should be a session used to mitigate the situation and get the real concerns of the neighbors.

Mr. Caravati agreed that the committee should not design but offer design solutions.

The board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Mr. Caravati moved to approve the Minutes of June 17, 1997.

Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.

Mr. Bullard, Ms. Winner, Ms. Hook and Mr. May abstained and the motion passed.

The committee to work with Mr. Kuttner agreed to meet on site the following Tuesday at 4 P.M.

The meeting adjourned at 9 P.M.