

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
February 15, 2000

Minutes

Present:

Jane Fenton (Chair)

Ken Schwartz

Joe Celentano

Jesse Hook

Tarpley Vest

At 5:10, Ms. Fenton convened the discussion. She indicated that only four members were present and they did not have a quorum. She suggested that they go ahead and discuss the applications so that the

votes would move more quickly after 6:30, when Dawn Thompson would arrive. She suggested that they defer discussion of the VNB door, Monsoon Cafe and Thomas Belt's vending cart until after 6:30.

All present agreed with Ms. Fenton's suggestions.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone present had any comments or changes to make to the minutes. There were no comments or changes.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the issues that would be discussed at the beginning of the meeting would include Northern Exposure, the Hot Dog Stand and the Water Street Garage addition.

Northern Exposure

Staff presented the report.

Bob Witesnar, applicant, indicated that they wanted to be sure to add windows that can be opened to get the same feeling of open air eating. He indicated that he proposed Marvin standard wood windows, but that he would like approval for both the wood windows and for a fiberglass window that would look the same as the wood. He indicated that the fiberglass window

would allow him to eliminate the fixed glass used at the top. He indicated that the appearance of the windows would be essentially the same. Mr. Witesnar showed the group catalogue information on the fiberglass windows. He indicated that he would like approval to use either window.

Mr. Celentano asked if the windows have fixed upper windows with no sliders. The answer was yes.

Ms. Fenton asked if they had looked at the windows on Escafe.

Mr. Witesnar answered yes but that it turned out to be too difficult for them because of the space and the alley on the side of the building.

Mr. Schwartz asked Ms. Vest what the guidelines say about the windows.

Ms. Vest indicated that the guidelines recommend wood windows with true divided lights.

Mr. Celentano asked Mr. Witesnar if casement type windows would stick out into the driveway.

Mr. Witesnar answered yes and that they would be hit by the cars.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the synthetic windows are not consistent with the guidelines and are not as good a product. He indicated that the advantage of using the synthetic is maintenance. He indicated that the board should stick with the Design Guidelines whenever possible.

Mr. Witesnar asked the board to vote on both windows.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the board do a motion on the wood windows and a separate motion on the other windows.

Mr. Witesnar said that he would like to have the option to use fiberglass.

At this point, Ms. Fenton closed the discussion on Northern Exposure.

Hot Dog Stand at Exxon in Entrance Corridor

Ms. Vest indicated that the Entrance Corridor section of the Zoning Ordinance requires that applications be reviewed under the same criteria and design

guidelines as in the Historic Sections. She indicated that staff was uncomfortable approving the vending structure. It was therefore being brought before the board for evaluation. She presented board members with a color photograph for their review.

Mr. Habibullah Rasool, applicant, stated that the building material would be the same as that of the building, and that the signs could be redesigned if necessary. He also indicated that he would be building this structure from scratch and that its hours of operation would be from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Ms. Fenton then called for comments from the general public. There were none, so this portion was closed and opened to comments from board members.

Zoning requirements were questioned and the proposed structure was not found to be in violation of the setback. Discussion followed regarding compatibility of the structure with existing property.

Mr. Schwartz commented that although the structure might be compatible with the building, it might not be appropriate within the larger context, which

includes office buildings and hotels. He stated that he was not comfortable with approval of this type of mobile commercial structure in such a prominent area.

Ms. Hook expressed concern regarding the amount of pedestrian traffic the hot dog stand would generate.

She stated that it would likely generate a lot of crossing of 29, which would be very difficult to control, and that it would be dangerous.

Mr. Celentano concurred, stating that he shared Mr. Schwartz's concern about the precedent approval of such a structure would set. Mr. Schwartz added that in unregulated areas of the country, such structures tend to propagate.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the City would not want to see this type of structure in the entrance corridors. Discussion followed between applicant and board regarding more substantial building materials and perhaps utilizing an architect to design an appropriate structure and working with Ms. Vest to come up with a proposal that could be a positive contribution to the City.

Ms. Fenton stated that the "food-in-gas-station" concept is really an extension of the gas station, not a separate entity.

Mr. Schwartz gave examples of appropriate gas station/convenience layouts in Charlottesville.

The applicant withdrew his request for approval.

Addition to Water Street Parking Garage

Ms. Vest summarized the issues and concerns raised at the last meeting. She stated that although it was positively reviewed, there was disagreement over the tower design. There was also a request to restudy the west facade, materials and general design of connection piece. The applicant was asked to provide a model, which he has now provided. She indicated that staff supports this and feels it is an appropriate design.

Mr. Celentano summarized the first presentation at the previous BAR meeting, stating that most of the comments from the last meeting focused on the elevation of a portion of the structure, and the treatment of the 2nd Street piece. He then indicated

that they have come to a new way of looking at the design, which entails extending the language of the existing building into the addition, and making the transition in the geometry at the corner where vehicular entrance into the lower parking level will be. He stated that this allows the Tower to stand as more of an object in that space. He indicated that although the tower is square inside, the masonry enclosure around it is circular, and the roof will be circular as well, and made of copper. He added that materials used in the existing garage will be carried over in the new addition. He drew the Board's attention to the security fence design in the model, which incorporates the design previously discussed, and added that the existing steel members will continue all the way around the back as well.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the board.

She then asked if the entrance is by the Tower.

Mr. Celentano replied that it was.

Ms. Fenton inquired if vehicles might be held up on the railroad tracks if traffic backs up as people turn into this entrance.

Mr. Celentano indicated the entrance is at the

bottom, so there wouldn't be a larger number of cars in that area than there are now. The rest of the levels are accessed from the main ramp inside the garage.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there is access to the existing entrance from the parking spaces at the left of the new entrance.

Mr. Celentano indicated there was no access.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the City had considered putting isolated ground level retail space in a spot he indicated on the model.

Mr. Celentano stated it hasn't come up, as the City considers the parking spaces to be the major issue.

Mr. Schwartz asked if this current design could be adapted to a commercial space.

Mr. Celentano indicated that it could.

Ms. Fenton asked if the City is interested in putting public restrooms in this area.

Mr. Celentano stated that they were not.

Mr. Schwartz commented that once this site becomes a

mixed-use commercial/retail/residential development,
that little pocket of retail use could be very
important to the life of the street.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the notch between the old and
new facility was necessary from a functional
standpoint.

Mr. Celentano stated that there are two transformers
on the ground level in that area.

Ms. Fenton asked for comments from the general
public. There being none, Ms. Fenton asked for
comments from the board.

Ms. Schwartz indicated his approval of the project.

Ms. Fenton stated her approval of changes made in the
2nd Street treatment.

Ms. Fenton called for a break at 5:50 p.m.

Ms. Fenton indicated they now had a quorum with the
arrival of Dawn Johnson.

Virginia National Bank: New Rear Door

Ms. Fenton indicated the door had been approved two years ago with Ms. Fenton as the applicant. Since the door was never installed, the new applicant is applying for the exact same door. She indicated she would abstain from voting on this, but suggested that a motion be made, if there were no objections.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously, with Ms. Fenton abstaining.

Temporary Canopy over Hamilton's Cafe

Ms. Fenton asked that Ms. Vest make the presentation.

Ms. Vest indicated that the applicant is requesting approval for a canopy on the cafe space immediately adjacent to the building, approximately four tables in length. She stated that they want it for graduation weekend reservations. She indicated that Heidi, the Zoning Administrator, had addressed the board previously regarding vendor use of canopies on the Mall, which had not been approved by the BAR.

The board instructed Heidi to start enforcing that such requests be approved by the BAR beginning 2000. Also, in conjunction, the City is conducting the corridor study of the Downtown Mall, as a master plan for the Downtown Mall. Recommendations will be forthcoming from that study regarding canopies, vendors, cafes, etc. Staff is awaiting these comments before implementing major changes relative to the Mall.

Ms. Vest stated that several reasons were given in support the applicant's request: The canopy is an attractive white wedding-type canopy; it only covers a small area; and it will only be in use for three days. Because it is for a special event, Ms. Vest stated that staff supports the request but has nevertheless put it before the board.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions from the board.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the approval was for this event only, as a more comprehensive study is in the works.

Ms. Vest stated it is for three specific days in May, the 19th through the 21st, 2000.

Ms. Fenton stated that any motion entertained should

be very specific, i.e. that it is for a special event.

Ms. Hook asked how long the canopy can remain up.

Ms. Vest indicated that for an event of this type, a canopy has to come down the same day, but one was up for over a week for First Night. It was suggested that a caveat be added to the approval stating when the canopy must be taken down.

Ms. Fenton asked for a motion.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion for approval of a white canopy for a three-day period as indicated in the application, with the understanding that it will be removed the day after the final day, which would be May 22, 2000.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

New Awning: Monsoon Cafe

Ms. Vest stated that the BAR gave prior approval for changes to Monsoon Cafe building including a side entrance. She indicated that the applicant is requesting to make the front entrance inaccessible

and to use an awning over the side entrance to indicate it is the main entrance. She expressed concern about the compatibility of the current awning to this building in an historic district, based on the color, material and actual design of it. She pointed out that the signage is legal under the sign ordinance, although it is not part of the present decision. She provided the BAR with canopy color and material samples.

Ms. Fenton asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. David Gorly, with Rusco Home Service and the maker of the awning, stated he was there to speak for the applicant. Mr. Gorly indicated the applicant is trying to emulate the canopy on the front of the Downtown Rec Center with similar fabrics and colors.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were questions for the applicant. There being none, Ms. Fenton asked for comments from the general public. There were none.

Ms. Fenton then asked for comments from the board.

Ms. Fenton inquired about the choice of color.

Mr. Gorly indicated the owner liked the Downtown Rec awning, and felt a bright color would coincide with

the Monsoon Cafe interior.

Ms. Hook stated the tri-color in the canopy gave her concern.

Mr. Gorly stated that the one at the Rec Center is just two colors.

Ms. Johnson asked if the guidelines for canopies and awnings on the Mall extend beyond the Mall.

Ms. Fenton replied that Monsoon was part of their purview.

Ms. Fenton stated that the board has never approved multi-colored awnings.

Ms. Hook replied that there were several blue and white striped canopies that the board approved in the past.

Mr. Gorly gave examples of other businesses downtown that have striped awnings.

Mr. Schwartz asked about an opening in the awning.

Mr. Gorly stated that the design is intended to cover the doorway, but not block the window.

Mr. Celentano indicated that even though it's rather

unusual with the pink and yellow striping, he likes the continuance of the color scheme from within the cafe to the awning.

Ms. Hook stated she would prefer non-pastel colors.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the two issues are design of the awning and color. She asked if there were any problems with the physical design.

Mr. Schwartz asked about a line at the bottom of the awning.

Mr. Gorly indicated that it is the lacing around the edge of the fabric.

Mr. Schwartz stated his approval of the awning, but added that he would prefer the color scheme be of a quieter nature, given the building itself is rather neutral, and that the brighter color scheme be kept inside the cafe.

Mr. Gorly indicated that the applicant would like a gradation of color, not necessarily utilizing pastels.

Ms. Hook asked about the color of the building trim.

Mr. Gorly replied that it is pastel blue and the

building is an off-white color.

Ms. Fenton requested that the canopy colors be more in keeping with the neighborhood, and suggested attention could be drawn to the canopy by contrasting lettering to the canopy color.

Ms. Hook made a motion to approve the design as presented.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it is not appropriate for the board to actually select colors for the awning.

Ms. Fenton suggested the applicant submit color samples for board approval.

Mr. Schwartz suggested the owner come back to staff with a proposal about the color scheme in conjunction with the existing building colors.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to deny the color request as presented.

Ms. Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to delegate the authority for approval of color to staff plus the Chair of the BAR, with the understanding that it's the Board's opinion that a single material color with another color for lettering is the best approach.

Ms. Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Enclose outdoor Seating -
Northern Exposure Restaurant

Ms. Fenton summarized the applicant's request for wood-framed windows and an option to use fiberglass windows.

The applicant indicated that there wouldn't be any difference in the look between a fiberglass window and a wood window, but will add to long-term quality in terms of wear. He stated he is asking for approval of a change to fiberglass in order to save money.

Mr. Schwartz stated his approval for wood windows.

Ms. Johnson asked if wood windows are in keeping with the guidelines.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion for approval of the wood windows as proposed.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion was carried unanimously. There was no motion made concerning the fiberglass.

Addition to Water Street Parking Garage

Ms. Fenton indicated the model presented brought a favorable response from the board. There were no requests for changes or for anything to be done differently.

Mr. Schwartz inquired about the number of extra spaces that are being sold to the City of Charlottesville.

The applicant responded 270.

Ms. Hook made a motion to accept the proposal as presented with all of the improvements.

Ms. Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Hook asked if parking areas would be designated for large, small and SUV vehicles.

It was indicated that there will probably be some.

Mr. Schwartz wanted added to the record his wishes to commend the architect and the client for responding to comments from last month's BAR discussion. He considered the final design to be a carefully considered response to issues and concerns that were raised.

Wertland Street - 1205

Ms. Fenton invited Ms. Vest to make the presentation. Ms. Vest stated that there was a communication mix-up related to the deadline. It was agreed to hear Mr. Trembley's request to replace the slate roof at 1205. The issue of slate versus asphalt shingles had been discussed previously, and the board recommended changes to the design guidelines. In order to use these changes, they have to be adopted by City Council and this has not been completed. Staff is asking that the BAR use their usual design guidelines, but there is room to look at each roof on a case-by-case basis. She stated that Mr. Trembley has a new asphalt shingle, which he feels is a better shingle. She then added that the front porch is tin and he would like to use copper instead, which would

change the look a bit, but that she did not see a design issue here.

Mr. Trembley commented that the cost of a slate roof is very expensive and the material will take 5-6 months to obtain. He further added that he wishes to retain the character of the 1205 house and a slate look is important to that. There is another material called "Grand Manor" made by Certainty that is the heaviest shingle product available and looks very much like slate. He stated that he should be able to replicate the look of slate with this product in a timely fashion. A sample board was provided.

Mr. Trembley gave a presentation on the various types of slate and indicated that he will select the shingle that most closely resembles Buckingham Slate.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions or comments.

Mr. Celentano asked if the roof had ridge flashing in copper originally.

Mr. Trembley replied that it is a metal now that has deteriorated, but not copper.

Mr. Celentano asked if it is possible to use ridge flashing in asphalt shingles.

Mr. Trembley replied that they are going to replicate the ridge flashing in a metal material to retain the detail. He added that built-in Philadelphia guttering will not be replaced; copper gutters would be hung off the house.

Ms. Fenton commented that the previous guidelines stated that either slate or asphalt could be used.

Ms. Vest said that the material must be appropriately textured and that staff feels that this material would be appropriate based on these guidelines.

Mr. Celentano stated he would like to see real slate used in the roofing areas, but the proposed ridge flashing treatment would be acceptable.

Mr. Celentano made a motion that they approve the proposed roofing in a color to match the existing slate and with attention to detail of the existing roof.

Mr. Schwartz supported the reconstruction of the existing ridge flashing in metal.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with Ms. Johnson abstaining.

Mr. Celentano asked if it was necessary for the applicant to return for approval in replacing metal roofs with metal roofs.

Ms. Vest responded that by law, if you go from tin to copper, board approval is required.

Mr. Schwartz stated that there are various types of painted, standing c-metal roofs.

Mr. Trembley commented on the various types of metal roofs available.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion for approval of the copper as proposed in the shallow sloped elements of the 1025 Wertland Application.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the minutes needed to be approved and asked if anyone had changes or amendments.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the minutes.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion was approved, with Ms. Johnson abstaining since she wasn't in attendance at the last meeting.

Vending Cart on Downtown Mall

Ms. Vest stated that the circled pink cart is acceptable to the applicant, but he prefers a dark forest green color. She stated that the sign boards can be replaced with whatever the board deems appropriate within the guidelines. She presented an example of a fiberglass board with a metal frame to the board.

Ms. Fenton stressed that the City is reviewing the issue of carts and BAR approval does not guarantee that a permit will be issued again next year. She suggested the board put a note to this effect in their acceptance letters.

Mr. Celentano questioned if this cart was to be used to sell tacos.

Ms. Vest stated that tacos are not being sold, perhaps funnel cakes or something else.

Ms. Johnson asked about the color of the canopy.

Ms. Vest stated the applicant suggested dark forest green.

Mr. Schwartz expressed concern over approving the application without being sure about the color.

Mr. Schwartz moved to deny the application due to incomplete information.

Ms. Johnson seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwartz stated that an actual sample of the dark green color would provide necessary information for the board to make a decision.

Ms. Vest inquired if the applicant is going in the right direction in terms of design and the choice of a dark green canvas canopy.

Ms. Johnson indicated she would like to see a sample of the material.

Mr. Schwartz suggested an actual photograph instead of something downloaded off the Web.

Mr. Schwartz stated the motion for denial is due to insufficient information, and the board would request at the time of resubmission that the applicant provide a photograph of an example of this product, as well as a sample of the proposed color of the canopy.

The motion for denial was carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton asked if there was any other business.

Ms. Johnson commented that she abstained from voting

on the roofing presentation because of the applicant's claim that the slate was unavailable. She is concerned that the slate roofs are going to disappear in the area. She indicated that she is uncomfortable hearing from commercial developers about the difference in cost between a real slate roof and a substitute facsimile, and that it would be a different issue if it were a request from a homeowner.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he shares her concern and feels the guidelines are flawed as they exist now.

He stated that an initiation is in place to change this and he is hopeful that the City Council will back the board on this.

A discussion followed in which it was generally agreed that the current wording of the guidelines contributed to this issue, and that the new guidelines would prevent such problems from arising.

Mr. Celentano made a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned.