

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
November 16, 1999**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton
Jessie Hook
Joe Celentano
W.G. Clark
Brent Nelson
Linda Winner

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

At 5:05 Ms. Fenton explained that a quorum had not yet formed and that the board could not take action.

Ms. Fenton asked the members present to look over the proposed changes to the bylaws. She indicated that 10 minutes seemed excessive for public comment.

Mr. Nelson stated that council allows 3 minutes for public comment and that is sometimes not long enough. He said that 5 minutes may be a good time period for BAR meetings.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they could always give 3 minutes and vote to extend the time.

At this time Mr. Celentano arrived and a quorum formed.

Matters from the Public

Kevin Burke of 614 Park Street stated that he had spoken with Tarpley Vest about the cottage addition on Farish Street. He indicated that the roof framing is under construction and it appears that what has been built to date is based on the 1st scheme that was not approved by the BAR. He stated that he wanted to call this issue to the board's attention and make them aware of what is happening.

Ms. Vest indicated that she and Ms. Misslebeck had visited the site and that the roof framing appears to be based on the first set of drawings, which were not approved. She indicated that the work on the project has been stopped. She indicated that the applicant would be coming to the board at the end of the meeting to explain the situation and ask the board to approve what is there.

Vending Cart on the Mall: Hernando Cason

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton asked if the cart will be removed from the hitch.

Mr. Cason answered yes.

Mr. Nelson asked if, when removed from the wheels, the cart would sit directly on the Mall.

Mr. Cason answered yes.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

300 East Main Street: ATM

Staff presented the report.

Marvine Harris, applicant, showed the group an example of the same ATM unit.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the ATM on the elevation drawing is different than the ATM in the photo.

Mr. Harris indicated that the difference is the metal surround. He indicated that they are proposing a unit that is the same as the unit that is there now. He stated that the proposed unit is to be right hand justified, which means that there will be a metal envelope holder on the right hand side of the surround. He stated that the ATM on the front of the building is center justified, which means that there is no envelope holder in the surround and the surround is smaller.

Mr. Clark indicated that the pictures show examples with less metal on them.

Mr. Harris indicated that he agrees that there is a lot of metal on the right justified model just to accommodate envelopes.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any other options.

Mr. Harris answered yes. He indicated that they could install the ATM without the right justified spot for the envelopes but that there would be no place to store extra envelopes.

Mr. Celentano asked if the awning is a part of the application.

Mr. Harris answered yes. He indicated that they are flexible about the look of the awning.

Mr. Nelson asked why the side envelope storage is necessary when that was not included on the front ATM.

Mr. Harris indicated that the front ATM was designed specifically for the existing space.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the cut sheet shows an envelope storage incorporated into the main ATM unit. She indicated that it appears that it would be possible without the metal piece on the side.

Mr. Harris indicated that the central envelope storage only holds about 20 envelopes, but that it would be possible.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the center justified ATM system with a gray awning matching the awning over the existing entrance.

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

303 East Jefferson Street: Replace roof on First Virginia Bank

Staff presented the report.

Merrick Murray, applicant, indicated that the roof has not held up and they did have some internal water damage. She indicated that the cedar shake shingles are splitting and may well have caused the leak. She indicated that she received a bid for Burks Best synthetic cedar shake that came in at \$12,000 more than the asphalt. .

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board is not so much concerned with cost as with aesthetics.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the board has been faced with the issue of roof material quite a bit. He indicated that they have been presented with a product called Slateline which is a dimensional shingle. He asked if they have considered that shingle. He indicated that slateline has a more irregular pattern to it and they offset the shingles to make it look more like a slate roof.

Mr. Clark indicated that he understands that they are sustaining roof leakage but that the synthetic product sounds very interesting and he wishes that they were able to see a sample of it. He indicated that it is not their position to judge which material should be used but it is their position to judge whether a particular material is successful.

Oliver Kuttner indicated that the building is adjacent to the Court House and right in the heart of the City's most historic district. He stated that if it was his building he would put a real copper or slate roof on it.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he does not have an objection to the use of the asphalt. He indicated that he would like to see the shingle look as three dimensional as possible and that there are enough roofs going up that don't have the three dimensional look.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Nelson if he preferred the Slateline.
Mr. Nelson answered yes.

Mr. Celentano suggested that Ms. Vest could approve a superior shingle if Ms. Murray goes to the bank and gets approval to use another shingle.

Ms. Fenton stated that, as a neighbor, she would like to see a better shingle used.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that copper is very cheap right now. He told Ms. Murray that she really should look into the price of copper. He stated that there is a window of time that copper will be cheap and there could be a real merit to pursuing it.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the Timberline as submitted with the recommendation that the bank consider the Slateline dimensional shingle for administrative approval by Ms. Vest.

Mr. Clark stated that he is sorry that the Burt's Best synthetic shingle was not presented and that a synthetic slate product might be very interesting.

Ms. Fenton asked Ms. Murray if they are in dire need for approval or if they could come back in December.

Ms. Murray indicated that they are not in dire need at the moment but that the roof could start leaking again at any time.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board could ask Ms. Murray to request the use of the slateline rather than telling her to use it.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the Timberline as submitted with a request that a more substantial shingle be considered.

Mr. Celentano stated that he feels comfortable calling out the slateline by name.

Mr. Celentano moved to deny the Timberline and moved that the slateline or a superior material may be administratively reviewed and approved by staff. He stated that he is willing to review the shingle with staff.

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

503 W Main Street: Replace metal roof with Asphalt shingles
Staff presented the report.

John Periolet, applicant, stated that he would be happy to go with a darker shingle or something more muted. He stated that you can't really see the roof much from the street.

Mr. Celentano asked if the porch roof would also be replaced with asphalt shingles.
Mr. Periolet answered yes and that both roofs would be uniform.

Ms. Hook asked, since the applicant is planning to renovate the structure anyway, if replacing the roof with copper would be in his best interest anyway.

Mr. Periolet answered that they have explored that possibility extensively and it is not financially possible. He stated that he did the original renovations to the building in the 1980's. He said that the decision to put the liquor store across the street has caused an economic decline for the entire area. He indicated that the building is no longer economically viable. He indicated that his only other option is to patch the metal. He stated that it is a beautiful building and that he would hate to leave a patched roof.

Ms. Fenton asked if he had considered using the revolving loan fund.

Ms. Vest told Mr. Periolet that he could apply for a 3% interest loan from the city for up to \$20,000 for a new roof.

Mr. Celentano indicated that it will be very difficult to do the porch roof in shingles because it is so flat. He said that he hears what Mr. Periolet is saying about patching a metal roof but that the metal roof is important to this building. He indicated that he would rather see a patched metal roof than a shingle roof. He indicated that if the applicant is trying to hold on to the building until the economics of the area change then a patched roof is an option. He stated that once shingles go onto the roof they will not come off.

Mr. Periolet indicated that he has already done some patching and painting of the metal roof. He indicated that, due to the age of the metal roof it needs to be replaced. He indicated that they replaced 1/2 the roof with the renovation. He stated that, due to the age of the metal, the paint is peeling. He indicated that, as the owner, he is unhappy with the appearance of the roof. He stated that he thinks that the shingles will look quite nice in conjunction with the other buildings in the district that have new shingle roofs. He indicated that the city assisted with several residential renovations in the adjacent neighborhood and each of the projects have shingle roofs.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would love to see a metal roof at this site but that he also understands what it is like to be an owner of an old house and he also is aware that the board has approved other shingle roofs.

Mr. Clark indicated that he does not think that the board should be in a position of making votes precedent. He stated that he understands what Mr. Nelson is saying but that they have to be careful about making votes precedent.

Ms. Winner asked about the porch roof.

Mr. Periolet said that the metal is in good condition and so they would keep the metal and paint it to match the shingles. He said that he loves the building but that he cannot afford to put a metal roof on it. He said that he cannot even sell the building for its assessed value.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she is torn. She indicated that the metal porch roof is difficult with the shingles. She said that it is really beautiful to see a metal roof there and that in the next couple of years the economics of the area are going to change.

Mr. Periolet indicated that a couple of years is very optimistic and that real estate experts say that it will take about 10 to 20 years to see significant economic change.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he has seen a number of older houses that have metal porches with slate roofs. He said that, in those cases, the porches have been painted gray. He stated that the combination works fine but that the color is important.

Mr. Periolet indicated that their intent had been to shingle the entire roof.

Mr. Clark indicated that no roof with under 30% slope should be shingled. He said that he wasn't certain of what the city's requirements are, but that shingling such a flat roof is a very bad roofing practice.

Mr. Nelson asked how the other board members feel about the color of the shingle. He asked how they could frame a motion to assure that the color of the shingle is appropriate.

Mr. Periolet stated that he would also prefer to go with a gray shingle.

Mr. Nelson stated that a darker shingle would draw less attention to the roof change.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve a dimensional shingle in a dark gray color.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Approval of Minutes: October 19, 1999

Ms. Winner moved to approve the minutes with the addition that her name be listed as present.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

800 East Market Street: New Canopy for Downtown Recreation Center

Ms. Winner moved to approve the canopy for the Downtown Recreation Center.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

BAR Bylaws

Mr. Nelson noted that the meeting time should be changed from 3:30 P.M. to 5 P.M.

Mr. Nelson noted that the bylaws refer to an annual training session for board members. He stated that he would like to request a training session.

Ms. Fenton stated that she attended a meeting with other city leaders to go over the guidelines for demolition and that the resolution of the meeting was that a request to demolish a historic building should be separate from a request to build.

Mr. Nelson said that the bylaws stated that the annual meeting is held in July of each year. He indicated that July is a difficult time and that it may be better to change the annual meeting to September.

The other board members present agreed with Mr. Nelson's suggestion.

100 W Main Street: Woolworth's Development

Staff presented the report.

Giovanna Galfione, architect, stated that there were five issues raised in September that were left to be approved. She stated that the main issue is the upper volume along 1st Street that has been brought forward on the façade. She indicated that they have agreed to backpedal and that the upper

volume has been pushed back. She stated that the second unresolved issue is the issue of the two cuts. She explained that the cut has become one final bay in a series of bays along the walk. She indicated that it is a reconfirmation of the original massing. She indicated that there is a material change on the façade with the elimination of the steel. She indicated that the setback is now 3 ft. where it was 8 ft. She indicated that there has been some articulation of the setback and the street level has been redesigned. She explained that there was a steel framing but that exposed steel is an issue for the owner. She stated that she feels that eliminating the steel is a legitimate request and that she has pushed back that element 12 inches from the plane of the façade.

Ms. Galfione indicated that a secondary concern was that there is too much language along the façade. She pointed out that the central bay is at a lower setback to allow a more independent entrance to the stores and to the handicap access. She indicated that they would be willing to accept recommendations on this issue from the board. She indicated that the upper floors have been revised to create a more centralized motif on the upper façade. She explained that the upper apartments will be multi-level apartments. She indicated that she had introduced round windows and that the top floor will have a cantilevered wooden cornice. She explained that Mr. Kuttner has original brackets from a train station that will be used for the eave.

Ms. Galfione pointed out the corner element on the drawing. She indicated that the steel structure had been the main motif and that without that she was left to explore several options. She indicated that she continued the corner and changed the brick to stucco. She indicated that the bay windows are a more traditional way to turn the corner.

Mr. Nelson asked how the basement doors will work.

Ms. Galfione pointed out the entrance to the lift. She indicated that the hallway is an extension of the public lowered plaza.

Mr. Nelson asked about the doors under the Footlocker.

Ms. Galfione indicated that they are setback and stepped down.

Mr. Nelson asked about the front stairway.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the stairs are shown conceptually and that they will be as light as possible.

Mr. Clark asked if the building code will require a roof on the stair.

Ms. Galfione answered that she did not think so.

Mr. Nelson asked if the yellow area on the Water Street elevation is stucco.

Ms. Galfione answered yes. She indicated that they want a consistent motif for the upper stories with setback volumes.

Mr. .Celentano asked if the existing brick sidewall would be painted.

Ms. Galfione answered yes. She indicated that the bricks are not in great condition and that they will experiment with colors.

Mr. Nelson indicated that this is an exciting project and that it is developing in the right direction. He indicated that the design is a much simpler, more classic look. He indicated that he likes the circular and round elements carried across with the horizontal of the existing piece. He indicated that he thinks that the terrace is a great way to break up the façade. He indicated that he is unsure about the stucco and about the corner piece.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the corner piece is a wooden fascia that comes out and becomes the base of the series of wooden brackets that go around. She indicated that this is a reinterpretation of what was proposed before in metal. She indicated that she has seen this type of cornice application around town, such as on the Young Men's Shop building. She indicated that the Young Men's Shop example is much heavier than what they are putting up there now.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he likes seeing the revival of this type of cornice work.

Ms. Galfione indicated that this is a more modern and less elaborate way of doing it.

Ms. Winner indicated that the design is very aesthetically pleasing to the untrained eye and that it looks lovely. She indicated that she is glad to see the marriage of the residential and commercial space and she is glad that the cut in the street is much lower. She indicated that she prefers this design to the September version, which had too much going on.

Mr. Clark indicated that he admires the Woolworth's section of the building. He indicated that his prejudice is that there is too much going on. He indicated that usually on the Charlottesville sidestreet there is a single material with few openings. He indicated that he fears speaking of traditional elements that are not necessary traditional to Charlottesville. He indicated that the corner piece worries him the most. He indicated that he agrees that the proposal is much better than September but that the materials, motifs and features could be even further resolved.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she doesn't necessary agree with the comment about the sidestreets. She indicated that there are some sidestreets that have much more articulation and that she is trying to do the best to match the design to the needs. She indicated that the corner piece is an attempt to follow up the request that the buildings have a presence on the street.

Mr. Clark indicated that the conflict is over what is attractive to the building versus what is attractive to the city.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that for the Mall to prosper it needs to grow. He indicated that in order to get a critical mass on the Mall the sidestreets need to develop. He indicated that the corner building in Staunton really adds to that city. He indicated that Water Street needs all the help it can get.

Mr. Clark indicated that he has a particularly strong reaction to the corner treatment because he has seen it done badly and he has only seen it done well a few times.

Mr. Celentano asked what the material of the middle cornice is.
Ms. Galfione answered cast stone.

Mr. Celentano indicated that there is simplicity to a sidestreet and that cornice seems more like a palazzo in the middle of the block.

Mr. Celentano asked about simplifying the connector piece with the brick.
Ms. Galfione asked Mr. Celentano if he would support keeping the setback.
Mr. Celentano answered possibly.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it may be better in brick. She indicated that she is a big fan of 4th Street, which is the only sidestreet that really works for business. She indicated that She likes the shape of the corner but she is not sure if the detailing is the best. She indicated that she hopes that they will continue working on the detailing so that it is something really wonderful.

Mr. Nelson indicated that, on the issue of sidestreet development, Charlottesville had a history of department stores and those days are gone. He indicated that they are creating a place that people will want to be on the sidestreet.

Mr. Celentano indicated that now that wood has been introduced it is important to keep the infill under control. He asked about the storefront materials.

Ms. Galfione indicated that they are looking at wood for the first storefront. She indicated that the Saddle Up storefront on South Street is successful.

Mr. Celentano asked if all the windows and materials will be painted the same color.

Ms. Galfione answered yes. She indicated that they are looking at something less drastic than white or black.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the application as submitted with the condition that materials, finishes, windows and doors be submitted for final approval .

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

603 Farish Street

Ms. Vest indicated that the applicants presented two designs for two additions at two subsequent meetings and that the first design was never approved but the second design was approved. She indicated that the second design had a simpler roof form than the first. She indicated that construction is underway and the roof framing appears to be based on the first unapproved set of drawings rather than the second approved drawings. She indicated that the work has been stopped on the project and the owner is before the board in hopes of getting approval for the existing construction so that he can move forward.

Mr. Clark asked if an architect was involved with the project. He indicated that the drawings had an architect's seal.

Mr. Tatum indicated that he produced the drawings and that the architect on the drawings in an architect that they work with often and the logo is a part of the template in his computer.

Mr. Clark indicated that, although it is not a concern of the board's, the AIA would not approve of this practice.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the issue in question is the roofline.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the complexity of the roof was a concern in the first design and that second design was in direct response to the BAR's concern.

Mr. Clark indicated that this project was in some contention with the neighbors and he is concerned about reviewing it without it being a part of the published agenda.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the difficulty he is having is that construction is underway but is not yet finished. He indicated that the roofline has not been carried down yet but that it will be continued down the side of the building. He indicated that the eave line will match what is on that side. He indicated that the roof will match the approved drawing when it is completed.

Mr. Clark indicated that he is trying to determine the cause of the variation to what we agreed to.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the final building will be the same as the approved drawings.

Ms. Vest indicated that the difference between the approved drawing and what is being built is the angle of the roof. She indicated that the angle that has been framed is the same as the angle on the first set of drawings. She pointed this out on the two sets of drawings.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the it is unclear which set of drawings they are building from.

Mr. Celentano asked if there was a drawing of what is actually being built.

Mr. Tatum indicated that the approved drawings are what is being built.

Ms. Vest indicated that she and Ms. Misslebeck inspected the site and the construction appeared inconsistent with the approved drawings.

Ms. Fenton indicated that Mr. Tatum will need to show Ms. Misslebeck and Ms. Vest that the building is being built according to the approved drawings and if he is not able to do that than the board will need to review the changes.

Bylaws

Ms. Fenton asked the board members to review the proposed changes to the bylaws so that action can be taken to change them at the next meeting.

At 7:00 Ms. Fenton adjourned the meeting.