

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
SEPTEMBER 16, 1997 - 5:00 PM
MICHIE ANNEX CONFERENCE ROOM

REVISED AGENDA

A. MINUTES

AUGUST 19, 1997

B. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS

1. BAR -97-09-21 110 Ten and 1/2 Street
West Main Street
Demolition
Wyn Owens, Applicant
2. BAR -97-09-22 118 West Main Street
Main Street Side Renovation
Oliver Kuttner, Applicant
3. BAR -97-09-23 304 East Jefferson Street
Enclosing Porch
Jim Boyd, Architect
4. BAR -97-07-17 301 East Main Street
Changing Colors
Giovanna Galfione, Architect

C. OTHER BUSINESS

West Main Street Guidelines

D. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

E. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

F. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
SEPTEMBER 16, 1997

Members Present

Kurt Wassenaar, Chairman
Todd Bullard, Vice chairman
Joan Fenton
Dawn Thompson
Jessie Hook
Linda Winner
Michael May

Staff Present

Satyendra Singh Huja
Marcia Joseph

Meeting convened 5:03 PM.

BAR 97-09-21 110 Ten and 1/2 Street - Demolition

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Mr. Wyn Owens, applicant spoke for the demolition request. He noted that his most immediate need was parking. He indicated that the house from an economic view point is more valuable as a place to keep cars. He said he would like to do something different 10-15 years down the road, but for the present he said he would like the current business to grow.

Mr. Owens said that he understands that the building has appeal, but stated that it is most valuable to him now as a parking lot.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if he had an estimate of how many spaces the area would provide.

Mr. Owens said that it could hold from 14-15 spaces.

Ms. Hook asked what kind of residential use he had been contemplating.

draft

Mr. Owens explained that he has been putting together a patchwork of properties from Wertland to Main Street.

Ms. Winner asked if he had acquired the properties yet.

Mr. Owens stated that as of yet he had not acquired the properties.

Mr. Wassener asked if there were comments from the public.

Madison Spencer stated that he didn't know if other people knew that Mr. Owens has been putting other residential areas together.

Mr. Owens stated that he had developed property across the street from this site as multi use.

Ms. Martha Gleason said that she felt the city should provide more parking in this area.

Mr. Gabe Silverman asked if it were possible to move the structure to city property. He asked if there was a way of relocating the building and making a donation to the end user. He said it would help the applicant and the city. He said it was possible if the building was basically structurally sound. He then asked if there was any vacant property near by.

Mr. Owens said that it was very congested in this area.

Mr. Silverman asked if the city had the possibility of moving the structure in mind.

Mr. Huja stated that in the past year the city helped to move a structure from near the Baptist Church. He said that he was not aware of any city lot near by.

Mr. Wassenaar then closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bullard said that what Gabe mentioned is a win-win solution. He said that it is a hard call because the building sits surrounded by commercial uses, but the building is structurally sound. He said that the area was devoid of a neighborhood context. He indicated that he could support the request, but didn't want to support the transformation into a parking lot.

Ms. Fenton said that there maybe an individual that could use the house. She agreed that the location was difficult, but said that she would like to explore ways that the building might be saved.

Ms. Thompson said that she understood the provocation for economics and said that moving the building was the best scenario.

Ms. Hook said that she was in favor of what had been said so far, but she questioned the density that may result in developing the area for commercial or residential.

draft

Ms. Winner said that she would prefer to hear any way to save the building. She said that the building may become an eyesore in the long run. She also stated that she understood the economic ramifications, and would like staff to explore the opportunities.

Mr. May said that if moving the building was not possible, then he would like to see plans for future development, if it is not a parking lot.

Mr. Wassenaar said that it was the first demolition request on Main Street and that it was difficult to call. He said that it was important to be thoughtful about how and why this is occurring. He said that the development in this area must be responsive to the B-5 zoning.

He said that in the past the board had looked at the use and should be consistent in approving items that offered a higher and better use. He said that he was not absolutely opposed to the demolition. He said that they should look at the demolition with some zoning related development consistent with the B-5 zoning.

Mr. Huja said that they can act on the issue or defer the item to look for alternatives.

Mr. Bullard explained that the owner could also put the site on the market, and if it doesn't sell within a year then it can be demolished.

Mr. Wassenaar asked Mr. Owens what he thought.

Mr. Owens said that he would look at the alternatives.

Mr. Wassenaar said that the best action would be to defer the item to give some time to receive additional information.

Discussion then followed concerning the time that the board must act on the item. It was determined that the BAR must hear the item again within the next 60 days.

Ms. Fenton moved to defer the item so that additional information could be gathered, and that the meeting should occur within 60 days of this meeting.

Mr. May seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

BAR 97-09-22 118 West Main Street

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

There was discussion on the prior approval to the side of the building.

draft

The architect, Julia Williams, presented the item to the BAR. She showed changes that had been made to the plan since it had been submitted. She said that the applicant had decided to forego the rail that had been proposed, and instead, carry the glass to the front plane of the building. They would also keep the soffit in place.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if they were hoping to achieve the same effect that had been constructed on the Eastern Standard building.

Ms. Williams said that her client had been worried about the BAR's reaction.

Mr. Bullard said that they would have to provide wheelchair access, and that they may have to modify the access from the sidewalk.

Mr. Wassenaar stated that they should look at the front and the side.

Ms. Fenton said that she thought the design was still evolving, and that Mr. Kuttner did not like to work with architects.

Mr. Wassenaar replied that the problem was that the BAR then became the architect for the applicants. He said that he did not have a problem with the direction this project was following. He said that depending upon the details proposed, that he had no problem supporting the project. However, he said that he wanted the building to come together as a whole.

Ms. Fenton said that the side of the building was different from the front.

Mr. Wassenaar asked about the frieze band around the front doors, the handicap access on the side, and the fact that there were three pieces of the facade that they were dealing with.

Ms. Williams said that the frieze would remain.

Mr. Wassenaar said that he would like to see conceptually what was happening with the entire building, and to see it organized as a master plan.

Ms. Williams asked if the black glass was historic.

Mr. Huja answered that it would be nice to keep the glass if they could.

Mr. Wassenaar said he did not have a problem if they decided to remove the black glass.

Ms. Williams asked about the historic quality of the black glass and asked if it was important.

Mr. Wassenaar answered that the black glass was part of 1930's architecture.

Mr. Huja requested that the BAR relate specific advice to the applicant.

draft

Mr. Bullard responded by saying that he was comfortable with the new direction being taken by the applicant, and that they should keep the pallet simple. He said he was comfortable with the black glass. He also said that the window store front was more desirable than the rail. He then said that they should stay away from the ceramic tile.

Ms. Fenton said that she would abstain from comment.

Ms. Thompson said that she had nothing to add.

Ms. Hook said that she would like to see the building treated as a unit.

Ms. Winner said that she would like to make sure that the applicant understands that the building should be treated as one unit.

Mr. May agreed that he would like to see an over all plan of the project.

Mr. Huja then reiterated by stating that the board would like to see a plan, that they had no objection to keeping or removing the black glass, and that there were a couple of ways to look at the whole building.

Mr. May stated that there should be no railing.

Ms. Galfione said that it was good to hear that the side street was as important as the mall side.

Ms. Winner said that ceramic tile should be discouraged, and that new material should not be added.

Ms. Williams said that they were attempting to match the black glass with something black and shiny. She asked if the BAR would require the building to be treated as a whole.

Mr. Wassenaar answered by stating that they could not deny the request in parts of the building.

Ms. Fenton asked if Ms. Williams was asking for comprehensive review.

Mr. Huja said that Mr. Wassenaar was correct, that we can suggest that the owner present the building as a whole, but could not require this to occur.

Ms. Williams asked if the board would say that it would not go forward unless it had all the information.

Mr. Huja answered that the board could only suggest.

The board suggested the following:

- 1) Continuing the black glass or brick to match the facade was acceptable.

draft

- 2) Discourage the use of ceramic tile.
- 3) The plan submitted illustrating the plate glass window facade was acceptable.
- 4) The rail proposed on the first submission was not acceptable.

BAR 97-09-23 304 East Jefferson Street

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Mr. Jim Boyd, architect, presented the item to the board. He said that they were not actually replacing the retaining wall, but they were building a new wall on the inside of the existing wall so that the Elm Tree would not be disturbed. He said that they were letting the wall come up underneath the porch. He said that the windows would be installed with a stock brick mold, not the same as the existing trim, but similar.

Mr. Boyd then presented a beige color for the siding and trim and green for the shutters. He said they would use a Cherry Avenue brick to match the existing building as close as possible.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if there were any gutters.

Mr. Boyd answered that there were not any.

Mr. Boyd then stated that the building was twin to its' next door neighbor, and that they had enclosed a porch a few years ago.

Mr. Wassenaar then asked if there was public comment.

Ms Galfione asked if they were going to face the building in brick, and wanted to see some more openings in the addition to more resemble the existing porch.

Ms. Gleason said that the Carter-Gilmer building had enclosed a porch and that it looked good. She said that she didn't like the two windows.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if the windows were wood double hung.

Mr. Boyd answered that the proposed windows would be similar to the existing windows.

Mr. Wassenaar then closed the meeting to public comment.

Mr. May said that he was glad that they were keeping the cornice and that he liked the idea of using wood trim. He then said he was bothered about the side and would like to see more windows or some other element.

draft

Ms. Winner said that she did not have a problem with the request.

Ms. Hook said that she thought it looked fine.

Ms. Thompson said that she agreed that it needed more windows to retain the feeling of a porch.

Ms. Fenton said that it was all right with her because the design fit the function.

Mr. Bullard said that he liked the open porch, but he understood the user of the building. He said that it was almost fundamentally impossible to keep the character of the open porch. He said he could not support the request, but if it was approved, he hoped that consideration would be given to allow the brick not to come all the way up to the porch, but to allow the area under the porch to remain open.

Mr. Boyd said that they would still have to put in railings even if they put the columns up.

Mr. Wassenaar said that if they left the fascia board on the bottom that there would remain a connection of the past use.

Mr. Bullard said that he felt it shouldn't be enclosed at all.

Mr. Wassenaar replied that he had allowed Carter-Gilmer to enclose a porch and that a lot of precedent had been set.

Mr. Boyd said that he would resubmit the final drawings for approval.

Mr. Wassenaar suggested that the review may be done administratively.

Ms. Fenton moved to approve the item with the following conditions:

- 1) Using #22 Colonial Red Orange old Virginia mould - Old Virginia Brick,**
- 2) Using Benjamin Moore paint -906 for the trim,**
- 3) Using Benjamin Moore paint - HC-134 for the shutters, and**
- 4) Using a flat black color for the metal railing.**

Mr. Wassenaar asked if there would be lighting.

Mr. Boyd said that they were not adding any lighting. He said that the railing would be flat black, subject to final approval.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

draft

The vote approved the item, with Mr. Bullard voting no.

Todd Bullard left at 6:05 PM.

BAR 97-07-17 Advanced Auto

Ms. Galfione presented the item and discussed that once the brick was exposed they discovered more of an indentation. She said that they had added vertical strength by adding pilasters, trygliphs and capitals on the pilasters. She said that the building would assume more of a classical face.

She said that the other major change proposed was the colors. She proposed changing the colors from the orange that had been approved to a gray green muted color. She said the stucco would be a light cream or sandstone color and the windows and awning would be dark green.

Ms. Galfione then said that the last change proposed was to place double hung windows on one side of the building. However, she said that both sides of the entrance would appear the same. She also wanted the option of using wood frame windows.

Another item proposed for change on the building was to design a frieze decoration suggesting figures on the relief that would all be in one color.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if they were amending the approved plan.

Mr. Huja answered that they were amending the colors, frieze and facade.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if there was public comment.

Ms. Gleason said that she liked the plan.

Mr. Wassenaar then closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Wassenaar said that he did not have a problem with the wood windows. He said that he could approve the metal door with paint color to match the windows.

Ms. Fenton said that she loved the colors and that it was a big improvement. She asked if the colors on the cookie building would change.

Ms. Galfione said that the cookie building and the glazing building would stay the orange color.

Ms. Fenton said that it was nicer for those businesses on the side to be different.

Ms. Thompson said that the plan was good.

draft

Ms. Hook said that she would like to see the details of the frieze.

Ms. Winner said that she thought the plan was good.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if there was any lighting proposed.

Ms. Galfione said that there was some for the side street above the soffit in the recessed entrance.

Mr. Wassenaar said that he would like to see the motion include administrative approval of the details, the color, the frieze and the operable windows.

Ms. Fenton moved to approve the amendment of the certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

- 1) **Using comparable colors as presented in memo presented to the BAR on 9/16/97.**
- 2) **using operable windows.**
- 3) **Using wood or metal windows.**
- 4) **Submission of details of frieze proposed.**

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Madison Spencer 107 Second Street SE

Mr. Spencer presented his request to the BAR. He said that he would like to put up a wooden fence, and replace it within 6 months.

Mr. Huja asked for the fence to be painted.

Mr. Spencer said that he had planned to paint the fence white or brick red.

Ms. Hook said that natural wood was less attractive for graffiti.

Mr. Huja said that black would be fine.

Ms. Fenton moved to grant a certificate of appropriateness for the fence with administrative approval of the following conditions;

- 1) **The wooden fence is to be painted red or black.**
- 2) **The 4' high wooden fence can be used for no longer than one year.**

draft

3) The wood fence is to be replaced by an iron fence approved by the BAR.

Ms. Thompson asked how tall the fence would be.

The answer was 4'.

Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.

The board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

West Main Street Design Guidelines - Discussion

Mr. Huja led the discussion by talking about the three categories for demolition proposed.

Mr. Wassenaar said that the guidelines should closely resemble the national standards.

Mr. Huja said that he was concerned about how the buildings were shown. He told the board that if they did not like the designations that had been given that it was important to change that now.

Mr. Wassenaar suggested a survey team set up to determine the buildings' status.

Mr., Huja suggested that the team meet before the next package went out to the board members.

It was decided that the BAR would meet at 2:00 PM on Tuesday October 7, 1997 to walk the corridor. Prior to the meeting they would receive information concerning the ordinance standards and the secretary of the interior standards.

Mr. Wassenaar requested that they defer approval of the minutes until the next meeting.

The BAR agreed to defer approval of the minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:53 PM.