

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
June 15, 1999**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Joan Fenton, Chair  
Jessie Hook  
Linda Winner  
Kenneth Schwartz  
Dawn Thompson

**Also Present:**

Tarpley Vest

At 5:10 Ms. Fenton convened the meeting.

Grover Smiley, building code official, told the group that a fire truck had to drive down the mall last Friday. He said that it took 10 minutes to get the truck on the Mall and the firelanes were blocked. He said that there is more and more activity on the Mall everyday. He indicated that there are no markings for the firelanes and there is no real way for people to see the lanes. He stated that he proposes using plastic disks about the size of a quarter. He indicated that the disk will be inserted into the mortar joint. He indicated that the disks would be placed about every 5 or 6 feet and about every 25 feet at intersections. He indicated that he has issued summons to court for blocking the firelane and the defendants have argued that they couldn't see where the fire lane was located.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board is concerned with the fire lanes and with the encroachment. She asked Mr. Smiley if the size of the firelane is adequate with all the people that are down on the Mall.

Mr. Smiley answered yes. He indicated that people have time to move out of the way of the truck but that the real problem is when cafes encroach into the firelane.

Ms. Fenton asked how they came up with the concept for the markers.

Mr. Smiley answered that he and the city engineer, David Vanaman came up with the idea.

Ms. Hook asked how hard it would be to remove the markers.

Mr. Smiley answered that they will become a part of the grouting. He indicated that he will get a sample and let the board look at the design and color. He indicated that he wants to know if the board is interested in this solution.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he has a question about the 5 to 6 foot spacing. He indicated that he encourages using as few as possible.

Mr. Smiley indicated that some of the turns and tighter places will require more markings. He indicated that they need to maintain an 18-foot wide clear area.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they are comfortable dealing with this administratively or if this will need to come back to the board next month.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application with Joan Fenton and Tarpley Vest looking at the sample when it is available. Mr. Schwartz suggested that a positive press story could be done on this issue. He indicated that the story is that there is a public safety concern and it is important that the message get out to the public.

Mr. Smiley indicated that they will need to do a lot of educating on the issue.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.  
The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton explained the procedure for the meeting, indicating that there is a time for questions and comments from the board and from the public.

#### 113 W Market Street

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Hook moved to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

#### 323 E Main Street

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the color of the grill.

Andreas Gaynor, applicant, indicated that it would be silver and would meet fire code. He indicated that the grill is in line with the upper windows. He indicated that the hood system is completely recessed inside the building.

Ms. Thompson asked if there was a way to install the system under the window instead of above it.

Mr. Gaynor indicated that the window is above their workspace and there is a counter at the window.

Ms. Thompson asked if the window is sealed.

Mr. Gaynor indicated that the window is sealed and that you will see through the glass.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the board reviewed revisions to this building when SNL first bought the building. He indicated that the revisions included new windows carefully cut to bring the wall alive. He indicated that he is concerned that the wall will start to get a lot of pockmarks. He

indicated that centering it on the wall makes sense. He indicated that in isolation this is reasonable but that he is concerned that there be no more additional openings.

Ms. Winner asked why there would be others.

Mr. Gaynor indicated that he is the last tenant in the building and it is a small space. He indicated that his equipment is small and is comparable to what is used in homes.

Ms. Hook asked about the dimensions of the vent.

Mr. Gaynor said that it is 2ft by 2ft.

Ms. Winner moved to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Fenton seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

#### Vending Cart on Downtown Mall: Lester Washington

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Hook asked what the hours of operation would be.

Mr. Washington indicated that he would primarily use the cart on weekends.

Ms. Schwartz moved to approve the cart as submitted.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

#### 410 4<sup>th</sup> Street NE

Staff presented the report.

Robert Gray, applicant, indicated that they are asking to keep the white lights to retain the single scheme that reinforces the detailing on the building. He indicated that the white lights blend in with the white trim and with the brick.

Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Gray if he realized that the white had not been approved.

Mr. Gray indicated that two years had passed between the approval and the arrival of the lights. He indicated that the white lights are an error but that he believes that they are in the best interests of the building.

Ms. Hook indicated that the white lights might be in the best interest of that particular building but that they may be inconsistent with the entire street.

Ms. Winner asked if the black color was administratively approved.

Ms. Vest answered yes.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he has received a lot of comment on this project and he is trying to figure it out. He indicated that there is the issue of the consistency of the lights. He indicated that in the context of the historic square they stand out and become very aggressive. He indicated that the explanation makes sense for this particular building on its own terms. He indicated that people

are responding to the windows and part of that response may be that the detailing language of the windows and other white elements is incompatible. He indicated that the design is successful in breaking down the mass of the building. He indicated that the windows are a more modern expression. He indicated that compromise is a healthy thing but that he would prefer to see all the lights painted black. He indicated that all black lights would go a long way towards calming things.

Ms. Fenton indicated that most of the comments she has received on this building have related to the lost parking lot. She indicated that the white does draw attention to the windows.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agrees with Ms. Hook's point that, in isolation, there is a logic to what they are trying to do. He indicated that, as a precedent, it is really discomfoting. He indicated that he understands what the architects were trying to do.

Ms. Hook indicated that the original design called for black.

Mr. Schwartz asked how many lights are on the building.

Mr. Gray indicated that there are 6 mounted lights and 4 or 5 recessed lights.

Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Gray what he thinks about the black fixtures. He asked if making them all black would be more consistent.

Mr. Gray indicated that he feels that this is a modern building doing its best to be a good neighbor. He indicated that the building is successful from the inside out. He indicated that he knows that if he paints the lights they will peel and he has a problem with that. He indicated that he is sorry that they made the mistake but that they have the problem of maintenance to face. He indicated that it is a matter of taste and that he happens to be a modernist and likes the freshness and newness of the white.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the white draws us to the white windows but that there is a sense of black because the windows are darkened.

Ms. Hook indicated that she is concerned with the effect of the white lights on the entire area.

Ms. Hook moved to follow staff's recommendation and require that the lampposts be painted black and to permit the wall mounted lights to remain white.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he thinks that this is a healthy compromise. He indicated that he thinks that it is more than an issue of taste. He indicated that it is not just an arbitrary subjective decision but is most appropriate to the district. He indicated that he has been watching the momentum in the Court Square area. He indicated that it has a lot to do with what the community is envisioning for this important historic center.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.  
The motion was unanimously approved.

1314 Rugby Road

Staff presented the report.

Belinda Reeder, architect, indicated that when the house was built there was a different porch on the right side and a two story porch on the left side where the 1980's addition is currently located. She indicated that last year she came before the board with an addition that was intended to complete the formal symmetry of the house and with a plan to improve the proportions of 1980's addition by changing the roof pitch. She indicated that the new owners want to save the porch and build another addition onto the back of the house. She indicated that the kitchen was added in the 1980's and includes an indoor pool. She indicated that the pool was built out off center of the bay of the addition. She indicated that they are proposing removing the indoor pool and are proposing a new rear addition with a courtyard terrace off the main floor. She indicated that underneath the terrace there will be habitable space. She stated that the new plan creates a formal symmetry in the back of the house and an opportunity to enter the house from the gardens.

Ms. Reeder pointed out the side elevation and indicated that it will barely be visible from the street. She indicated that the landscaped island blocks the view from the road.

Ms. Fenton asked if the change of window above the terrace was newly proposed.

Ms. Reeder indicated that they are introducing new windows and creating a French balcony.

Ms. Fenton asked about the materials to be used.

Ms. Reeder indicated that the house doesn't have a base and that they are proposing scored stucco continued around the front of the building to articulate the base. She indicated that the bottom of the Palladian window is the baseline.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he thinks the project is great and it is lovely to see this kind of care going into an historic property. He indicated that he understands the point about the stucco but that he could easily make an argument that the existing brick would work more successfully, specifically in terms of the guidelines that recommends that the new be distinguished from the old.

Ms. Reeder indicated that they gave the stucco issue a lot of thought and discussed whether or not they should leave it as is. She indicated that they wanted each façade to read as a separate plane.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he understands but that he does not agree. He indicated that he does not think that this is the right strategy. He indicated that this type of application is found on large post-modern houses. He indicated that he lives in the neighborhood and he looks at the house every day. He indicated that part of the charm from the front of the house is the fact that the brick comes all the way down.

Ms. Reeder indicated that she did not see the design as post-modern. She indicated that she did a restoration at Montpelier in which they restored stucco as a traditional material. She indicated that she would be happy even if the base is not stuccoed, but that she does not see it as post modern. She indicated that this type of stucco application was something that was done in the region during the period of the building and that they would plaster the stucco in a traditional way.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she had not thought about what Mr. Schwartz had said, but that the board's purpose is to preserve buildings. She indicated that she is more comfortable with his suggestion if the objective is to preserve the building.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he thinks that the scheme is fantastic as it combines a restoration with a beautiful design of a new addition. He indicated that they have achieved the best of both worlds. He indicated that he genuinely has concerns about the stucco. He indicated that he is not an expert in Virginia vernacular architecture but that his sense is that it is more common to see brick going all the way down. He indicated that he strongly prefers maintaining the existing integrity of the block.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she agrees with Mr. Schwartz but that she does not feel qualified to make this motion.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it sounds like the applicants are not set one way or the other.

Ms. Reeder indicated that the goal is to restore the house. She indicated that the part that isn't changing will be restored.

Mr. Schwartz moved to enthusiastically approve the application with the condition that no stucco be added to the front block of the house and with commendation to the architect and owner.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.  
The motion was unanimously approved.

#### 800 Block West Main Street: Wild Wing Café

Staff presented the report.

Joe Phillips, architect, indicated that he had received the request for further information. He indicated that the primary issue is the view from West Main Street. He indicated that they are designing for a new restaurant and that the exterior restoration is a separate project. He indicated that code requires additional egress from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. He indicated that the roof will be an outdoor dining area. He indicated that they presented a preliminary proposal some time ago. He indicated that the response from the board was not to replicate the existing façade. He indicated that the comment from the board was to look for a different palet of materials so that the new work will be clearly differentiated from the old. He indicated that the major visual element is the awning that will project out over the outdoor seating area. He showed the group the railing detail. He indicated that it is an adaptation of the original steel frame with industrial. He indicated that the gable fabric awning would be the principle visual element from the street.

Ms. Fenton asked about the screen fence.  
Mr. Phillips indicated that it is a vertical wood screen fence.

Eldon Wood indicated that there are photos of the old train station showing extensive 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor passageways connecting with W. Main Street. He indicated that it is unclear whether there has been any attempt made to pick up some of that concept.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he is responding to the brick coursing patterns on the original building and he is not responding to past interventions.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Phillips what the plans are for signage.  
Mr. Phillips indicated that they had not looked at signage yet.

The owner of Wild Wing Café indicated that they plan to hang signage inside of the mainframe window. He indicated that they do not want to disrupt the beauty of the building.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he has comments on two issues. First, he indicated that he is having trouble understanding the variety of elements that come together three dimensionally. He indicated that he is trying to understand the volumetrics. He indicated that there is a lot going on. He indicated that part of it relates to the practical need for egress but he does not have a feel for what the proposal does three dimensionally. He indicated that he is an architect and he wonders if the other board members are struggling with this. Second, he indicated that he wonders how to handle the outdoor dining on the roof. He stated that the proposal is a canopy structure that covers the entire wing. He indicated that the logic they have used is understandable but that he is somewhat uncomfortable with the overall mass. He indicated that part of what he is concerned with is the canopy. He indicated that he thinks it is legitimate to have a debate about whether it might be better to somehow treat that element not as something that is directly a part of that lower dome, but as something that is in some ways independent or maybe doesn't go the full length of the roof. He indicated that the logic is understandable and that the canopy provides shade and shelter but he is somewhat uncomfortable with the mass of the element.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he hopes to come away from this meeting with a clear understanding of where they need to go from here. He indicated that he needs some clear direction of what sort of action would be appropriate. He indicated that if they have to rethink or redesign that is understandable but that they are dealing with pressing time issues. He stated that he wants feedback that will allow them to take some definite steps.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that this is the first time that he has seen the plans that correspond to the elevation. He indicated that Mr. Phillips question is reasonable. He indicated that he is concerned that there is too much activity that could take away from integrity of the historic structure. He indicated that his personal guidance is that he would love to see some way to deal with these various elements that produces less activity. He indicated that if he is reading it correctly there seems to be a lot going on. He indicated that he questions whether that stair should be external.

Mr. Phillips indicated that they want to be able to get a double use out of the outside stair. He indicated that they don't see the stair as a primary way of delivering service from the kitchen to the upstairs, but they don't want to eliminate the option.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the goal is to build the new in a unique way that respects the old and that building an exposed stair may be much more preferable.

A representative of Wild Wing Café indicated that they need to know what to do next so that they can proceed. He indicated that they need to know specifically what to do next. He indicated that he

understands the issue of the stair, but he is confused about exactly what they need to do in order to get approval.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the board does not design the project.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he understands where to go from here, based on the board's feedback. He indicated that he will look at reducing the variety of materials and at simplifying the language.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it would be nice to have a clear direction to guarantee approval of something that the board has not seen. He indicated that the board does not design the projects, but they provide feedback and direction. He indicated that he is very enthusiastic about the idea of putting a restaurant in this space. He indicated that it is a terrific idea. He indicated that he is excited by the ideas that were presented for developing the railing. He indicated that this idea is to take something that is there now and is not great and turn it into something that is inventive. He indicated that he is very excited about this detail because it takes an element that is there and creates a new expression. He indicated that his question about the canopy is not to say yes or no to the idea of the canopy but to raise the question about the mass of the canopy.

The wild wing café owner asked what should be done instead.

Mr. Schwartz suggested that the canopy may not have to go over the entire building.

Mr. Phillips indicated that the canopy would likely be a darker blue gray.

Ms. Fenton indicated that a higher canopy that comes down gradually might keep the canopy from looking like one huge massive piece. She indicated that there are some beautiful canopies and some that are OK looking. She indicated that they will want it to look as appealing as possible to people driving by.

Mr. Phillips indicated that Mr. Schwartz' point is essential that they can come and ask for direction but that they are designing the project. He indicated that he thinks he understands the nature of your suggestion. He indicated that it is an open structure but that it is a major visual element. He indicated that he hears that a canopy is a good idea and outdoor dining is a good idea but that the design of the canopy should be thought through again.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he understands the strongest concern here is the number of materials. He indicated that they can simplify the materials. He indicated that he does not hear any objection as to how they addressed the overall location and massing of the volumes.

Mr. Schwartz asked what is behind the screen wall.

Mr. Phillips indicated that there will be a walk in cooler attached to the kitchen.

Mr. Schwartz asked how big the gap is between the cooler and the wall.

Mr. Phillips answered that he did not know exactly.



Mr. Schwartz indicated that he has a concern that if they come up with a heavy detailing system it might be preferable to have some detailing on that wall on a side that is relating to a prominent part of the site. He indicated that it might be better if there were some way to treat that.

Ms. Fenton asked the owners what their timeframe is for getting started.

The owner replied that they need the numbers to put the plans out to bid July 15. He indicated that they will receive the building September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they were hoping to get approval today and deferral will set them back a month. She indicated that the unresolved issues are the stairs, the use of materials and the canopy. They indicated that part of the issue is that they were not able to see all the views ahead of the meeting.

The owner asked Mr. Schwartz how he felt about the rear egress.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he does not feel strongly about the exposed stair. He indicated that if you look at the multitude of expressions and volumes you may see that it may be less complex if exposed.

The owner indicated that the stairway will cover and protect the food.

Ms. Winner indicated that from the lay perspective she is struck by the multitude of different materials. She indicated that it looks really busy from the front façade and from East Main Street.

Ms. Hook indicated that she agrees with the other comments. She indicated that it is a cosmetic issue and some painting and landscaping could tie the elements together and make a more cohesive look. She indicated that she does not think that the canopy should be cropped up.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she is confused by the drawings. She indicated that the canopy looks like it is dwarfing the existing building.

Ms. Winner indicated that she likes the fact that it's open. She indicated that they will be able to see through the space to the trees behind. She indicated that there must be a way to soften it.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the sketch does not render the materials.

Ms. Winner indicated that looking through from the top it would look less massive.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if this is a design they are willing to approve and if they are willing to have an interim meeting.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he is comfortable soliciting individual comments from board members and responding for the next regular meeting.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that several meetings ago a presentation was made for a Mosque on 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The applicants heard the comments of the board and came back the following month with a

proposal that responded to the board's comments and concerns. He indicated that they are very supportive of giving the applicant a chance to interpret their comments in any way that they can.

Mr. Phillips indicated that the hardest comment to respond to is that the addition dwarfs the existing building.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she would like to amend that comment. She indicated that she is in agreement with Mr. Schwartz on this issue. She asked what the height from the roof to the canopy will be.

Mr. Phillips answered that it would be about 9 feet above the floor line. He indicated that it is somewhat reduced on the perspective sketch.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the issue for her it is not the length of the canopy but the way that the way the canopy relates to the adjacent roofline.

Mr. Phillips indicated that the shed roof sounds problematic to some people.

Ms. Fenton indicated that board members are more than willing to look at drawings during the interim before the next meeting and provide feedback.

The owner indicated that they received a letter with a list of what is required. He indicated that they made sure to have all the required items.

Mr. Schwartz asked Ms. Vest the history of the application.

Ms. Vest indicated that the architect submitted drawings to her on the day of the deadline. She indicated that this was the first that she had seen of the application. She stated that she called the architect, Mike Osteen, and informed him of the checklist and faxed him the checklist. She indicated that she informed him that additional materials would be requested and gave him the option of submitting for a preliminary review. She indicated that, because of the time sensitivity of the project, the applicants chose to proceed with the applicant and submit additional materials at the meeting. She indicated that the staff report also reflects the request for additional information. She indicated that she got similar feedback from board members when they received their packets.

Ms. Fenton asked why the applicants were unaware of the checklist until the day of the deadline.

Ms. Vest indicated that she was unaware that the application was going to be submitted until the deadline day. She indicated that as soon as she received the materials she called the applicant.

Ms. Hook indicated that it seems that they are basically in favor of this, but that they do have a number of concerns.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the information that he received in the packet was incomplete. He indicated that the additional materials presented at the meeting have helped but that they have not fully addressed the issues which are giving him anxiety. He indicated that it is not their responsibility to manage private citizens timelines. He indicated that he is perfectly happy to meet with the applicants and help.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Phillips what the timeframe will be to come up with additional drawings. She asked if they would like to request an interim meeting to review the project.

Mr. Schwartz moved to defer the application with the following basis for the deferral:

1. Concern about the massing of the proposal and its relationship to the existing historic structure. Concern for the massing specifically refers to the concern that there may be too many elements in the expression;
2. Lack of sufficient information received in the application.

The owner indicated that they want to be able to make sure that next time the application contains all the necessary information.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he understands the concern and that they need to move on this project. He indicated that the most expedient approach will be to consult with board members and to meet formally in a month. He indicated that he wants to make sure that they have everything necessary for the next meeting.

Ms. Thompson seconded Mr. Schwartz motion.  
The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she will be glad to meet with the architects and provide feedback. She indicated that several of the architects on the board are not present but that they may wish to consult with them as well.

#### Administrative Review Procedures

Ms. Vest presented the memo.

She indicated that the fence at the Higher Grounds Café was approved administratively. She indicated that staff acknowledges that this was a mistake and that the fence should have come before the board.

Ms. Thompson indicated that cafes are only to receive administrative approval if they conform to the guidelines.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it was an error and we must make sure that this doesn't happen again.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he appreciates the way that Ms. Fenton handled this issue. He indicated that he thinks the Higher Grounds café is very attractive.

#### Downtown Recreation Center: East Market Street

Andy Thomas, architect, indicated that this is a preliminary proposal. He indicated that they want to get early feedback on the project. He indicated that the preliminary assessment of the slate roof shows that it can be retained. He stated that they will replace the existing windows. He pointed out the drawing of a new entrance on the south side of the building. He indicated that the idea is to have public restrooms accessible from the amphitheater. He showed an example of the proposed new windows and stated that the color of the windows is to be decided. He indicated that the

existing windows are steel sash windows and they are proposing aluminum-clad windows with as thin a mullion profile as possible. He indicated that they used a very similar window on the synagogue. He indicated that they are open to talking about the color. He indicated that they will match the existing mullion pattern and that the new window is energy efficient.

Mr. Thomas stated that there will be two new outside mechanical units. He indicated that they will be screened with a metal screen painted a dark color to match the windows. He indicated that the south entrance will lead to bathrooms to serve the amphitheater. He indicated that there is a grade change with a sloped walk. He indicated that they feel it is an appropriately sized entrance into the side of the building. He indicated that the entrance will be a glazed opening into the existing masonry wall. He indicated that it will be a double door with sidelights and transom. He indicated that this entrance will be the accessible entrance to the bottom floor.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the windows on the temple are exactly like the proposed windows. Bruce Wardell, architect, indicated that because it is a city project they will be required to get three bids from three manufacturers but that windows like the ones on the temple are only produced by one manufacturer.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that if the BAR feels strongly about the windows they need to say so. He indicated that steel is prohibitively expensive and it wouldn't make sense. He indicated that it is important to use a window that is sympathetic with the historic building.

Ms. Winner asked if the front canopy would be replaced as part of the project. Mr. Wardell stated that the front canopy is not included in the project.

Ms. Fenton asked if brick would be a better choice for the structure over the AC unit. She indicated that Old Ivy Commons has an attractive dumpster enclosure made of brick and lattice.

Mr. Wardell indicated that brick would be less expensive.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that replacing the canopy with a new canopy would be great. He indicated that the guidelines discuss distinguishing the new from the old with some sensitivity to the old. He indicated that this is an inventive but appropriately scaled element.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the basic strategy of the steel element is great. He asked if the entrance would contain both steps and a ramp.

Mr. Thomas answered yes.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he does not agree with the brick mechanical enclosure. He indicated that there is a nicely developed detailing language and the metal enclosure relates to that. He indicated that it is important that the slate roof is retained. He indicated that it is so important for the city to set a precedent on this issue.

Mr. Wardell indicated that expectations at this point are that the roof will remain slate. He indicated that the funding for the project is still up in the air.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there is a vast amount of community support for the project.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the board could collaborate on a memo expressing the enthusiastic support for the project, the importance of the windows and the importance of the slate roof.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the memo could also mention the canvas canopy on the front of the building.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it might help to ask about the canopy.

Mr. Wardell indicated that the steps are required to be covered by code. He indicated that once the project is completed the building will look great and the existing awning will be out of character.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they might want to ask the Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Property Owners to express their support for the project. She indicated that she is highly in favor of the bathrooms.

#### Other Business

Mr. Schwartz announced that there will be a forum on the court complex on June 22 at 7:00 P.M. He indicated that it would be good to have board members present at the meeting.

Ms. Fenton indicated that Brent Nelson and Maurice Cox have discussed how the board can have more input on design issues in the city. She indicated that she will ask Mr. Nelson to address this at the next meeting.

At 7:30 Ms. Winner moved to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Fenton seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
June 2, 1999**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Joan Fenton, Chair  
Joe Celentano  
Dawn Thompson  
Jessie Hook  
Linda Winner

**Also Present:**

Tarpley Vest  
Clyde Gouldman

815 W Main Street

Staff presented the report.

Jeff Daniels indicated they have decided to replace the door on West Main Street with a new door. He indicated that they cannot keep the same door, but that they will replace it with a standard six panel solid door. He indicated that the door would not open and would not have door knobs.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the door should have knobs because it may look odd without them.

Mr. Daniel indicated that it may take 6 months for the wood deck to weather. He showed pictures of similar painted structures and indicated that it could be painted out to duplicate those.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the new drawings show that the door on the porch has changed. She asked if the door would have 6 window pains or 4.

Mr. Daniel answered that the porch door will have 4 window pains, as shown on the first drawing.

Mr. Daniel indicated that a tin roof is cost prohibitive and that he found 8 examples of shingle roofs in the area.

Ms. Thompson asked about the existing roof material on the porch.

Mr. Daniel indicated that it is a shingle type roof and that it is very unattractive. He indicated that what he is proposing would make a nice addition.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he prefers the painted version of the porch. He indicated that a metal roof is more appropriate. He indicated that he would prefer a metal prefabricated roof with fasteners.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she agrees that a metal prefabricated roof would be a better choice. She indicated that she put this type of roof on a shed at her house and it blended in well with the tin roof on the house. She indicated that this type of roof can be purchased at Lowes and it is affordable.

Ms. Winner asked if there is anything in the guidelines that addresses this issue.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the issue here is that the roof should look commercial instead of residential. She indicated that a shingle roof is incongruous with this type of building. She indicated that the metal makes more sense as an addition that is set off as commercial space.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the prefabricated metal roof is laid on the roof and attached with fasteners.

Mr. Daniel indicated that it may be possible to get that roof.

Mr. Celentano recommended getting the roof in a galvanized finish.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she has had this type of roof on her house for about 5 or 10 years and it looks good. She suggested that the board approve that application as submitted with a strong recommendation that the applicant use a prefabricated metal roof.

Mr. Celentano asked about painting the deck.

Mr. Daniel indicated that he needs to stay within a budget but that they have considered painting the porch.

Ms. Winner moved to approve the application as submitted with the strong recommendation that the applicant consider the recommended metal roof and with the recommendation that the porch be painted.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Daniel asked if he would need to follow up with the board on the new door.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they were comfortable having staff review the door.

All board members present agreed to have staff review the new door.

#### 800 Block West Main Street: Union Station

Staff presented the report.

Doug Gilpin thanked everyone for attending the interim meeting. He indicated that two years ago they selected the Slateline shingle for the baggage building and they felt it was the best substitute for slate. He indicated that the developer, Gabe Silverman, wants to rehabilitate and protect the building. He indicated that they looked at the costs of other roof types. He indicated that the GAF Slateline roof costs \$8,000, a new copper roof costs \$23,000, and a new slate roof will cost \$33,000. He indicated that he would like a shingle and not a metal roof on this structure.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that there were several issues raised at the last meeting including: the possibility of using the revolving loan, the issue of extreme financial hardship, and the big picture development plans for the site.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she spoke to the mayor and several city councilors about possible funding partnerships for the roof. She indicated that council is comfortable with the GAF roof and is not interested in providing funding for the slate.

Mr. Silverman indicated that he has owned the building for over 2 years. He indicated that he is in the process of renovating the second building. He indicated that he has spent about 1 million dollars in cash and he has not received any return on that investment. He indicated that he has to stop the bleeding first so that the building can be rented and can become economically viable. He indicated that they received an Istea grant for the property but that the money is for infrastructure, such as electrical and drainage improvements. He indicated that it is an economic decision for him. He indicated that he can't spend the money on the slate at this time. He indicated that over time he would like to put a slate roof back on the building. He indicated that the roof can't be patched effectively. He indicated that the water that is coming in is doing damage and he would like to stop that and make the building weather tight so that the building can be occupied.

Ms. Thompson asked if any of the slate is viable.

Mr. Silverman indicated that the slate can't be turned over. He indicated that slate patches would not match.

Mr. Celentano asked if the \$33K estimate is for a completely new slate roof.

Mr. Silverman answered yes.

Ms. Winner asked if the shingle is the same as the shingle on the baggage building.

The answer was yes.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the minutes from the meeting when the asphalt was approved for the baggage building stipulate that approving the roof should not set a precedent for the main building.

Ms. Winner indicated that the issue is not just the precedent, but that the two roofs are compatible.

Mr. Silverman indicated that his only other option at this point is to patch the slate.

Ms. Vest asked if patching the slate would protect the building from water damage.

Mr. Silverman answered no.

Ms. Fenton indicated that if the board denies asphalt Mr. Silverman will likely patch the slate. She stated that this would be maintenance and would not require BAR approval.

Ms. Thompson asked if the roof is leaking because of missing slate.

Mr. Gilpin answered yes. He showed her the photographs and pointed out the holes on the roof.

Mr. Celentano asked if they have explored synthetic slates.



Ms. Winner indicated that an alternate shingle was used on 1<sup>st</sup> Street and Hedge Street. She indicated that the shingle had a dimensional quality to it.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that there have been some problems with some of the faux slate shingles. He indicated that Superslate went out of business because of colorfast problems.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Gouldman about the interpretation of the design guidelines as they relate to the issue of economic hardship.

Mr. Gouldman indicated that the guidelines include a list of acceptable materials and asphalt is on that list.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the current board has not insisted on slate, but that slate has been required in the past.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the decisions have depended on the existing roof. She indicated that they have also considered the visual prominence of the roof.

Mr. Gouldman indicated that the board still has the authority to deny shingle if they can make a case that the absence of slate is not in harmony with the surrounding area and is inconsistent with other architectural features.

Mr. Gouldman indicated that he reads the economic hardship sentence in the guidelines to deal with a situation in a historic district in which an owner cannot afford to pay to the roof. He indicated that it should be used in very limited circumstances. He said that if it is read in the broader sense he does not think that this provision was designed to fit this situation and he does not think it is applicable. He indicated that the board has the authority to say no to asphalt on an individual basis, but they will need to make a case for the slate.

Mr. Celentano indicated that they have been faced with the roof issue a number of times and have been asked to consider the overall historic quality of the district. He indicated that sloped roofs are a part of the quality of the district. He said that roof material is always difficult and the board hasn't felt like they have had the authority to require slate, based on the design guidelines. He said that, in terms of the aesthetic character, this building is very visible. He indicated that, although it will be in a private use, the building presents itself as a public building. He indicated that the adjacent building should never have had the brown shingle on it. He indicated that it isn't as important that this roof match what is already there. He indicated that the guidelines are not clear as to how to look at the roof.

Mr. Gouldman indicated that hard criteria in terms of choosing between slate and asphalt is just not there. He indicated that we are always trying to make this process less subjective, but this is a subjective process.

Ms. Winner indicated that everyone, including the owner, would like to have a slate roof on this building. She indicated that the question is, can the board require slate?

Mr. Gouldman indicated that the board can require slate roofs, but they will have to make a case for slate.

Ms. Thompson indicated that if they were dealing solely with the question of aesthetics it would be simpler. She indicated that they are dealing with the historic aspect, as well as prominence and precedent.

Ms. Winner indicated that they need to make the decision based on what is written.

Ms. Hook indicated that when the building is viewed from a distance she does not know how many people will pick up the asphalt with the substantial number of other improvements that are planned.

Mr. Silverman indicated that Phase II will be three stories and will partially block the roof.

Ms. Hook indicated that this makes her question the aesthetic value of the roof.

Ms. Fenton indicated that in reality they are faced with an asphalt roof or a patched slate roof or an appeal to council. She indicated that she was not there when the baggage building roof was approved. She indicated that if this building gets a different roof there will be three roofs with conflicting material.

Mr. Celentano said that the guidelines do not require replacing slate with slate. He indicated that they say not to replace standing seam metal with asphalt. He indicated that this is a new type of roof that would dramatically alter the building. He stated that the guidelines allow for substitute material.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they will need to discuss the guidelines in a worksession.

Mr. Celentano asked Mr. Gilpin if this is the best slate-looking shingle available.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that this shingle is the closest they have found that is colorfast, has longevity, and is within the price range.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the GAF Slateline shingle to match the existing baggage building. Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion passed with Mr. Celentano, Ms. Fenton, Ms. Hook and Ms. Winner voting in favor and with Ms. Thompson voting against.

At 5 P.M., Ms. Fenton adjourned the meeting.