

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

JUNE 28, 1988

PRESENT:

Rob Freer
Margaret Van Yahres
Douglas Gilpin
Jim Hiatt
Don Sours (Late)
Larry Herbert

ABSENT:

Robert Moje

STAFF PRESENT:

Fred Boger

Mr. Freer called the meeting to order at 4.02 p.m. and called for the consideration of the minutes.

A. MINUTES

1. The minutes of the April 26, 1988 meeting were unanimously approved with the following correction: change L988 to read 1988 in the 3rd line down from the top of the page.
2. The minutes of the May 24, 1988, meeting were unanimously approved with the following correction: change "of" to read "for" in second paragraph, third line of item D.

B. APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 88-3-303
222-224 Court Square
New Roof
Dan Phillips, Applicant

Mr. Boger stated that Jefferson National Bank has submitted a deed restriction to guarantee the shingles on the front half of the roof at 222-224 Court Square. The City Attorney's office has reviewed the deed restriction and finds it acceptable. Staff recommends approval of the deed restriction with a change to include the complete roof since slate on the back half of the roof was removed without the Board's approval. Mr. Gilpin moved to accept the deed restriction and to include in it both the front and back of the roof. The motion was seconded by Mr. Herbert and passed by the following vote: ayes - Messrs. Freer, Herbert, Gilpin and Hiatt (4). no's - Mrs. Van Yahres (1). Abstention - none.

2. BAR 88-6-305
1204 Rugby Road
New Addition, Fence
Warren Hepburn, Applicant

Mr. Boger stated that Mr. Hepburn submitted an application to construct a new addition to the main dwelling, a deck, and a wooden fence along the front property line (Rugby Road) and the southside property line (Mason Lane) at 1204 Rugby Road. The new addition will be used for a living room and a master bedroom. The siding on this building will be painted "Dover Grey," the

shutters Charleston Green and the trim an off-white.

Staff has reviewed the plans for this project and has no major problems with the proposed addition. However, we do have the following comments on the deck and fence.

1. To construct the deck as proposed will require the removal of one tree. The Board must decide if the removal of this tree is necessary.
2. The deck should be painted or stained instead of being left natural.
3. The owner recently purchased this property and started constructing the fence without being informed that the property was subject to the Design Review Ordinance. The Realtor selling this property was aware of this fact but apparently did not inform the new owner. There should not be any gaps under the fence and it should be painted or stained. The corner of the fence will have to be modified because Section 31-254 of the City Code states that no fence, wall, plantings, etc. shall be erected or planted "within the area formed by the intersection of right-of-way lines at such corner lots and a straight line joining the right-of-way lines at points which are twenty feet distance from the intersection of the right-of-way lines at the corner of the lot."

Mr. Gilpin said he has a serious problem with the proposed addition. The existing structure is a "Queen Anne" style building, and the most important identifying feature of this architectural style is its asymmetrical facade. The "Queen Anne" style building has a rambling characteristic. The proposed addition would create a symmetrical facade which is not appropriate for this dwelling. Mr. Warren Andrews, S.L.D.C., the Architect representing the applicant, stated that Mr. Hepburn's dwelling has been added on to several times. Also there are numerous examples of "Queen Anne" style buildings with symmetrical facades.

Mr. Gilpin said the proposed addition would duplicate the existing structure which is not recommended by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, which have been adopted by the Board as its guidelines with which to review exterior changes to historic buildings in the City. Mr. Gilpin identified the following standards and guidelines which this proposed addition violates:

(a) Standards

- #3 All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.

- #9 Contemporary designs for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design if compatible with the size, sale, color, materials, and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.
- #10 Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structure shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

(b) Guidelines

- Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character-defining interior spaces rather than installing a new addition.
- Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.
- Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building, and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.
- Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.
- Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.
- Placing new additions such as balconies and greenhouses on non-character-defining elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.
- Designing additional stories, when required for the new use, that are set back from the wall plane and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

Mrs. Van Yahres said the existing trees are an important feature of the site. We need more information on the trees to be removed, such as size, type, health, etc., and the reason for their removal. Also the proposed fence is not in keeping with the character of the dwelling or neighborhood.

Mrs. Hiatt said the proposed addition is attractive but has problems with adding it to the dwelling as proposed. Also she has serious concerns about the fence. It is not attractive.

Mr. Sours said the Board has twice rejected a proposed wood fence along the front property line for a dwelling on Park Street. At that time the applicant indicated the proposed fence would cut down on noise, and screen the dwelling from traffic along Park Street. The Board found that a natural wood fence was not appropriate along the front property line. The Board recommended a landscaped fence in lieu of the wood fence. Although the proposed addition is attractive, it is not in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's guidelines on additions.

Mr. Herbert said he feels the same way as the other members of the Board on the proposed addition and fence. Mr. Herbert said he finds the fence offensive and not appropriate for this historic property.

Mr. Freer said the Board needs more information on the trees and should make every effort to save the trees which are proposed for removal. Also he finds the fence objectionable, and the overall design of the addition does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

After further discussion the following motions were made:

- (a) Mr. Sours moved to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the fence because the Board finds the design, height, and use of natural wood to be inappropriate and incompatible with the historic structure and site. Consideration should be given to using a natural landscaped fence, wrought iron, brick wall or various combinations of appropriate materials. The wood fence recently erected may remain for sixty days to allow the applicant sufficient time to resubmit a new proposed fence. At the end of the sixty-day period (August 29, 1988), this fence must be removed.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Van Yahres and unanimously passed by all members present.

- (b) Mr. Sours moved to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition and deck for the following reasons:
 - i. The proposed addition will duplicate the exact form, material, style and detailing of the existing historic structure so that this new work appears to be part of the historic building. Designing new additions in this manner is contrary to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings which the Board has adopted as its guidelines for exterior work on historic buildings and sites in the City.

- ii. The two trees to be removed are significant fixtures of this site. Before the removal of these trees can be considered, additional information will have to be provided. The information needed is the species of tree, size, present condition and a statement explaining why these trees have to be removed. The Board recommends that every attempt be made in this new proposal to save these two trees.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gilpin and unanimously passed by all members present.

3. BAR 88-6-306
201 E. High Street
New Storm Doors
R. Stedman Oakley, Jr., Applicant

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report. Mr. John Anderson, Jr. was present and discussed with the Board two changes in the application. After a brief discussion, Mr. Gilpin moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the storm doors with the following conditions:

- a. Each of the two storm doors to be used on the front will have two glass panels (one in the top half and the other in the bottom half).
- b. The style of the storm door on the rear will be Windsor instead of Federalist style.
- c. The storm doors will be painted Charleston green, the same color as the existing doors.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Hiatt and unanimously passed by all members present.

4. BAR 88-6-307
200 15th Street, N.W. and
204 14th Street, N.W.
Tree removal and Demolition
Caroline Taliaferro, Applicant

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report and stated that a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the cottage and removal of the two large oak trees should be denied unless another solution is reached between the property owner and Board.

Mr. Sours said the Board has met on the site, and discussed with several people the development of this property, and each time the Board has indicated that both the cottage and trees should be saved. After a brief discussion with Mr. Robert Downer, attorney for the applicant, Mr. Sours moved to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the dependency structure (cottage) at 200 15th Street, N.W. and to remove the two large oak trees at 204 14th Street, N.W. The reason for this denial is that the Board finds that the preservation and protection of this historic and architecturally significant structure and

site, and the public interest, would best be served by requiring the owner to postpone such demolition and tree removal pursuant to Section 31-140.2 "Restrictions on Demolition or Removal" of the City Code.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Van Yahres and unanimously passed by all members present.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Freer stated at the June 6, 1988, meeting of the Charlottesville Historic Landmarks Commission, that the following structures were proposed for Certificate of Merit awards.

- a. The stone house at 2027 Minor Road - sensitive addition.
- b. The Coffee Exchange on the Downtown Mall - restoration.
- c. 205 East High Street - rehabilitation.
- d. 511 Ridge Street - rehabilitation.

We have been asked to discuss these nominations at our next meeting to see if they are appropriate.

A brief discussion was held on how to notify property owners that their property was historic. Mr. Sours moved to have staff send a letter to property owners, titling companies, etc. notifying them of historic properties in Charlottesville. The motion was seconded by Mr. Herbert and was unanimously passed by all members present.

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were none

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

There was none

F. BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS

There were none

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

There was none

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m.