

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
August 17, 1999

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton
Brent Nelson
Jessie Hook
Joe Celentano
W.G. Clark
Kenneth Schwartz

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest
Jim Tolbert

At 5:05 Ms. Fenton convened the meeting. She explained the procedure for the meeting. She explained that there would be periods of questions and comments from both the public and the board members. She welcomed Jim Tolbert, the Director of Neighborhood Planning and Development Services.

Mr. Nelson asked if there would be a time for items not formally on the agenda. He indicated that he thinks that there should be a time for the public to bring forward any concerns that they have.

Ms. Fenton asked the other board members if they would like to have such a time. All the members present agreed.

Ms. Gleason asked if there was a possibility of putting the BAR applications up on a wall. She indicated that she can't find anything out about the applications without interrupting the planners.

Mr. Nelson indicated that this idea was generated by the Neighborhood Protection Task Force and that it could apply not only to BAR but also to site plans and anything else under development review.

Ms. Hook asked if these items could be put on a city webpage. Mr. Clark indicated that the agenda should be published in the newspaper.

Ms. Fenton asked about the feasibility of notifying the adjacent property owners and posting notices in the neighborhoods.

Ms. Vest indicated that it would take some extra staff time but that it is feasible.

Mr. Tolbert indicated that they are currently looking at the way that the whole building flows and that there may be an opportunity to incorporate some of the ideas about displaying the applications.

Mr. Nelson asked if these issues would be included in the minutes.
Ms. Vest answered yes.

Approval of the Minutes: July 20, 1999.

Mr. Nelson submitted the following written corrections to the July 20, 1999 minutes:
Page 3 Paragraph 6: She indicated that adding another element to the fabric would be a distraction.
Page 4 Paragraph 2: Preston ~~Coyner~~ Coiner suggested that...
Page 8 Paragraph 7: ...it would be a good time to question what required a building permit.
Page 9 Paragraph 2: He indicated that the other issue that he wants to find out about ~~it~~ is what happened to the request...

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the minutes.
Ms. Hook seconded Mr. Celentano's motion.
The motion was approved with Mr. Schwartz and Ms. Fenton abstaining and with Mr. Clark, Ms. Hook, Mr. Celentano, and Mr. Nelson voting in favor.

1003 West Main Street

Staff presented the report.

Hardy Johnson, architect, presented the drawings. He indicated that the building is a warehouse space for a furniture store. He indicated that they extended the steel canopy over the existing door. He pointed out the dumpster enclosure on the drawing. He indicated that they would use white stucco and concrete on the building and black steel on the loading dock.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the addition seems appropriate to the building.
Mr. Celentano moved to approve the application.
Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

201 W. Main Street

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Celentano asked if they were going to paint the building to match the trim.
Tim Slagle, applicant, indicated that they would paint the fence hunter green to match the trim.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the application as submitted.
Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the enclosure would set a nice precedent for the Downtown Mall.

500 Park Street

Staff presented the report.

Terry Forbes, applicant, indicated that there is a desire among the church to place the garden at the corner of Park and Maple. He indicated that there is a retaining wall and an existing large maple. He introduced Scott Price of Snow's Nursery. He indicated that Mr. Price selected the plants and laid out the design.

Mr. Price indicated that they were maintaining existing materials and they were removing a small section of existing walkway. He indicated that they are using concrete unit pavers. He indicated that there are several mature boxwood on the site and they are adding more boxwood to create a sense of enclosure. He indicated that the maximum size of the boxwood will be 3 1/2 to 4 feet high.

Ms. Hook asked if there would be markers.

Mr. Forbes indicated that there would not be markers but that they plan to take the ashes and distribute them. He indicated that there would be teak benches.

Mr. Celentano asked how tall the Otto Laurels will be.

Mr. Price indicated that they will be 3 1/2 to 4 feet maximum size. He indicated that from the sidewalk they will not effect the view.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the church committee had received any input from the neighborhood on the proposal.

Mr. Forbes indicated that two couples from the neighborhood were involved and they were very much in favor of the project.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any plans for lighting the area.

Mr. Price indicated that they did not have any plans for lighting. He indicated that the existing post lamp will effect the canopy of the trees.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the proposal looks great. He indicated that the church has a history of quality construction.

Mr. Nelson moved to approve the proposal as submitted.

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

617 Park Street

Staff presented the report

Mr. Koch, architect, indicated that the existing flagstone porch will be enclosed to make a family room.

Mr. Nelson asked what the material of the vertical siding is.

Mr. Koch indicated that it is to be vertical groove siding to be consistent with the existing two-story porch. He indicated that they chose the Hardiplank siding to be consistent with the original siding on the building, which is beneath the existing cedar shingles.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she did not see the jut out on the drawing.

Mr. Koch pointed on the jut out on the drawing.

Mr. Nelson asked if the space was for a fireplace without a chimney.
The answer was yes.

Mr. Nelson asked if the front piece facing Park Street would be vertical siding.
Mr. Koch answered yes. He indicated that it will be mostly impossible to see from Park Street.

Mr. Nelson asked if all of it was within the setbacks.
Mr. Koch answered yes.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it will be hard to see from the street. He indicated that the notion that the owners might recover the original siding helps him to understand the materials. He indicated that, as a design suggestion it might be simpler to use horizontal siding. He also indicated that there might be a scenario where the upper terrace is built up two more feet.

Mr. Celentano indicated that if there is a possibility of uncovering the old siding, vertical siding has a way of siding pieces that have been added. He indicated that the entire piece has been added

Mr. Celentano asked if the horizontal was the same as the house and if the vertical was to be painted white. The answer was yes.

Ms. Vest asked if there was a resolution on the mullions.
Mr. Koch indicated that they would use simulated divided lights that would be attached permanently to the glass.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the guidelines require true divided lights.
Ms. Vest indicated that the guidelines recommend true divided lights and recommend against fake clip in mullions. She indicated that these sound like something between true divided lights and snap in mullions.

Mr. Koch indicated that these mullions can allow them to maintain as narrow a profile as the original windows on the house.

Ms. Hook asked if the whole window would be replaced if one individual pane was broken.
The answer was yes.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the application as submitted.
Mr. Clark seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

Liquid Vending Cart

Staff presented the report.

Greer Runyon of Liquid indicated that she strayed from the guidelines in an effort to keep with the idea of a fruit smoothie. She indicated that they chose cool and refreshing colors.

Mr. Clark asked if the cart is a manufactured cart.

Ms. Runyon indicated that the cart is very well made and that it was the original Higher Grounds cart that has been refaced.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it comes down to an issue of color.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the guidelines stipulate that any use of natural wood is highly discouraged. He indicated that he has a hard time with the issue of the royal blue and the lime and with the natural wood. He indicated that the cart is very handsome in terms of the actual construction but that he cannot support the application because of the color and the guidelines.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is concerned about the colors, too. He indicated that when you start to imagine the possibilities he is concerned. He indicated that he recently spent a week on the Jersey shore and that there are a variety of elements there. He indicated that the restraint that Brent has described and is found in the guidelines may be better on the Downtown Mall. He indicated that it is a chaotic situation on the Mall and he is trying to visualize the cart with everything else that is down there.

Mr. Clark indicated that he totally supports the cart. He indicated that the mission of the board is to protect the fabric of the city. He indicated that now that Pantops is lost to development he cannot worry about the colors of a cart.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he is worried about issues on the Mall that are outside of the board purview. He indicated that he is more worried about the quantity and location of vending. He indicated that there is a lot of activity. He indicated that he has concerns that are similar to Mr. Schwartz's but that he does not have a problem with the particular cart.

Mr. Runyon indicated that the reason why she was comfortable with this cart although the colors do not apply with the guidelines is that the cart is really well built. She indicated that the cart is going to be used elsewhere if it is not used on the Downtown Mall but that she thinks that the cart fits in perfectly with the atmosphere on the Downtown Mall.

Ms. Fenton indicated that, in terms of the colors, she is concerned with the other things that will follow. She indicated that she would rather see a black cart. She indicated that she does not generally believe that the board should arbitrate color, but that in this case, she is concerned about what other carts will come after this one.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the cart as submitted.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion failed with Mr. Clark, Mr. Celentano, and Ms. Hook voting in favor and with Mr. Nelson, Mr. Schwartz and Ms. Fenton voting against.

Ms. Runyon indicated that she spent a lot of money on the colored laminant and the wood and she does not want to paint it black.

540 Park Street

Staff presented the report.

Stan Tatum, applicant, indicated that the house was originally clapboard and now it is stucco. He indicated that they have to move the fig tree in the backyard. He indicated that they are proposing an new potting shed to be about 1 1/2 or 2 stories with board and batten siding and a corrugated fiberglass roof. He indicated that they chose a red color to match the color of the main house. He indicated that the grey trim colors show up in the main house and in the cottage.

Mr. Nelson asked about the doors.

Mr. Tatum pointed out the doors on the drawing and indicated that they may want to use the same trim.

Mr. Clark asked if they had considered using French doors.

Mr. Tatum answered no because they would be using the inside for storage.

Mr. Clark asked if security was a concern.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the shed is far enough into the yard that security should not be a concern.

Mr. Celentano asked about the materials and colors of the main house and the garage.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the siding on the main house was originally clapboard and it has now been stuccoed. He indicated that the garage is all corrugated metal. He indicated that the sides are gray.

Marla Ziegler asked what direction the shed will face.

Mr. Tatum indicated that it is turned slightly and faces towards Ms. Ziegler's yard.

Martha Gleason asked if there is a reason that the doors are facing out rather than facing in.

Mr. Tatum indicated that they want to place the shed so that it will not be as visible from Park Street.

Ms. Ziegler indicated that the shed is tall and the second story would be visible from Park Street.

Mr. Tatum indicated that there are trees and there will be a new fence.

Ms. Ziegler indicated that the two-story height would make the shed very visible. She asked why they don't use the garage for yard equipment.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the garage is full. He indicated that the potting shed is to be a part of the garden and that it is more convenient.

Ms. Ziegler asked about the proposed fence.

Mr. Tatum showed the fence on the drawing. He indicated that there would be a gate for access into the back yard.

Ms. Ziegler asked how tall the fence is going to be.

Mr. Tatum indicated that it would be a 4 by 8 lattice with a height of about 5 feet.

Mr. Schwartz asked what the overall height of the potting shed would be.
Mr. Taut indicated that it will be about 20 feet tall.

Mr. Burke indicated that, given the height of the structure and what is visible, a fiberglass roof doesn't seem like a historic treatment. He indicated that he questions if that is a historic material. He indicated that he questions if the entry to the tool shed could be moved to the south.

Mr. Tatum indicated that they could accommodate some adjustments in the orientation.

Ms. Ziegler indicated that as a neighbor she is concerned about the view from her yard.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the applicant may be able to reorient to address the neighbors concerns.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the issue of the view affects both sides of the property line.

Ms. Ziegler indicated that she has an objection to the shed being 2 stories.

Mr. Tatum showed the proposed addition to the cottage on the drawings. He indicated that the cottage was built 8 years ago. He indicated that they are proposing to make a connection between the existing house and the new addition. He indicated that they use the cottage as a rental property and they would like to have additional space in the cottage. He indicated that the materials are to include coarse textured stucco at the base with board and batten finish above. He indicated that he thinks that they would match the stucco and the other colors would blend back.

Mr. Burke indicated that the cottage that exists is a simple design and he wonders about the addition of the board and batten. He indicated that the addition is highly differentiated. He asked if the link is to be enclosed.

Mr. Tatum indicated that they may close the link at some point and that they would come back to board at the time.

Ms. Ziegler asked if there is no closed space between the addition and the cottage now.
Mr. Tatum answered yes that it is an open porch.

Ms. Ziegler asked if the entire cottage would have only one set of tenants.
Mr. Tatum indicated that it would be one household and that they have had many requests from prospective tenants for 2 distinct bedrooms.

Mr. Nelson asked if the connection will act as a second breezeway.
Mr. Tatum indicated that, initially, it will. He indicated that they would have to come back before the board after they have figured out how to close that space.

Mr. Nelson asked if there is any board and batten on the existing structure.
Mr. Tatum answered no.

Mr. Celentano asked about the roof material on the addition.
Mr. Tatum indicated that it will match the shingles on the cottage.

Mr. Burke indicated that a temporary fence was installed behind the cottage during construction of his house. He asked if this fence would be replaced and the new fence would be continued behind the cottage.

Mr. Tatum indicated that he honestly wants to look at that in terms of additional panels. He indicated that the back of the structure is pretty exposed.

Ms. Fenton asked Ms. Vest what the purview of the BAR is in terms of the driveway.
Ms. Vest stated that the BAR reviews what is visible from a public right of way. She indicated that the Burke's driveway is not a public right of way, but that anything visible from Farish or Park is in the BAR's purview.

Mr. Nelson asked about the colors of the house.
Mr. Tatum indicated that the colors would be the same as the existing cottage.

Mr. Burke asked what the front door of the cottage would be.
Mr. Tatum indicated that the cottage would have the same front door.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he had a question that is not in the BAR's purview. He asked if any of this lies within the setbacks.

Mr. Tatum indicated that it does not lie within setbacks. He indicated that when they subdivided the parcel they were aware that they might want to build this addition.

Mr. Burke indicated that the roof material of the playhouse does not seem appropriate, given the height and proximity to the historic house. He indicated that he questions the intervention of the board and batten material on the addition to the cottage.

Ms. Ziegler indicated that she is opposed to the extra level of the two-story potting shed.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the purpose is to create a place space for his grandchild.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it makes sense to separate out the two structures for comments. He indicated that he would comment on the addition first. He indicated that the prospect of building a by right addition onto a small structure is attractive and should be supported. He indicated that his concern is about the issue of the stucco and the board and batten. He indicated that he would be more sympathetic if it did not make that change at the floor level. He indicated that it seems like if you look at the main elevation from Farrish you see another roof. He indicated that he is getting nervous about the complexity of the addition. He indicated that it is a by right addition but that the issue is the specific design expression. He indicated that it is a good proposal that could be better.

Mr. Clark indicated that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz. He indicated that he is perplexed about the connection not being addressed. He indicated that the connection is very important to the entire

piece and it makes him a little antsy about the intention. He indicated that he would rather see what that piece will be. He indicated that developing that piece may help the overall design.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that overall the issues that he is uncomfortable with are the break in the wall and the change in the materials.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with Mr. Clark's comments.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board can defer the issue and ask the applicant to take in mind the comments and concerns of board members and neighbors.

Mr. Schwartz moved to defer the application with the request that the stated points be taken into consideration. He indicated that the points for consideration were:

The suggestion that the scheme could improve with a simplification of materials and roof forms, especially on the West Elevation.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that, regarding the potting shed he is enthusiastic. He indicated that it looks like a beautiful structure in the garden and it makes perfect sense. He indicated that he does not think that the board can say that the structure cannot be 2 stories. He indicated that on the issue of height he wonders if the potting level could be kept to the minimum acceptable height. He indicated that the slope of the roof is steep. He asked if that is related to the house.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the house has some very steep roof pitches. He indicated that this pitch is about 12:10.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he wonders whether it is possible to mitigate the height as much as possible by working with the floor height and the roof pitch.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the roof height may be able to come down.

Mr. Clark indicated that they could probably lose a foot without a problem whatsoever.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the 2nd story is for smaller people and so the roof height may be able to be lower. Mr. Celentano indicated that the existing roof pitch helps to reinforce the fact that it is a tall structure in the back yard.

Mr. Clark asked what advantage there is to rotating the shed. He indicated that it seems Mr. Tatum is not pleasing his neighbor. He indicated that it is not any of his business, but that it may be possible to mitigate the neighbor's view.

Mr. Tatum indicated that it may be possible to rotate the shed without much difficulty.

Mr. Nelson indicated that, given the prominence of the roof, the roof material is of concern. He indicated that it is compatible with the garage but the garage is non-original. He indicated that, because of the prominence and visibility of the roof, they have to be careful.

Mr. Celentano indicated that in his experience with the corrugated material, the issue is the scale of the corrugations. Mr. Celentano indicated that he is concerned that it can be a little chunky. He indicated that corrugated metal is an appropriate material for the roof.

Mr. Clark indicated that he hopes for an agreement to study lowering the height and the angle position and considering the material. He indicated that it may make more sense to defer the application than to make a motion with changes.

Mr. Tatum asked Mr. Clark if he was referring to the material of the door.
Mr. Clark answered yes.

Mr. Clark moved to defer the application to consider the above stated issues.
Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her sense is that the board supports both projects and the details need to be worked out.

705 Park Street

Staff presented the memo.

Mr. Nelson moved to endorse the induction of 705 Park Street onto the State and National Registers.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwartz commented that the nomination report was very good.

Mr. Nelson's motion was unanimously approved.

Other Business

Ms. Fenton asked the board members present if they could attend a worksession on September 14 at 6:00. All members present agreed on the date and time of the meeting. She indicated that one issue to be discussed at the worksession is administrative approvals. She indicated that she has suggested that somebody on the board be involved in administrative approvals and if there is a question, the approval can be brought before the entire board.

Ms. Vest indicated that another issue to discuss at the meeting are the Design Guidelines for roof materials.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would also like to discuss the issue of what the board can do to influence the quality of design proposals that are brought before them. He indicated that he would like to explore ways to better communicate to the general public the projects that are successful.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that another issue is the need for a comprehensive study of the Downtown Mall. He indicated that in looking at the issues around the Downtown Mall it seems there is an opportunity to bring the community into the process. He indicated that many aspects are being looked at simultaneously including the court system study, a study of downtown parking, and the brick resurfacing. He indicated that it makes sense to somehow bring these processes together and make suggestions comprehensively.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she is willing to write a letter to City Council and Planning Commission encouraging a master plan. She indicated that she would fax the letter to Mr. Schwartz and Ms. Vest. She indicated that the board can discuss the letter at the worksession.

Mr. Tolbert indicated that he and Aubrey Watts have discussed looking at the whole area comprehensively including urban design and economic issues as well as vending carts and Mall resurfacing.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the original Court Study committee has been expanded and that he has been invited to sit on that committee.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she is on the committee that is looking at the Court Square streetscape improvements. She indicated that a firm has been chosen to conduct the improvements.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would like to see it written in the code that adjacent property owners be notified of BAR applications.

Carrie Burke indicated that she is a resident of the North Downtown Residents Association and that they would be very supportive of this idea.

Mr. Schwartz moved to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

At 7:00 P.M. the meeting was adjourned.