## MINUTES OF THE

## BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

MAY 28, 1991

Present:

Absent:

Larry Herbert
Todd Bullard
Blake Caravati
Margaret Van Yahres
Kurt Wassenaar
Jean Hiatt
Courtney Sargeant

Staff Present:

Fred Boger

Mr. Herbert called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

## A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 91-04-358A

540 Park Street, New Cottage Mr & Mrs. Tatum, Applicants

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report and made the following comments:

- a) The revised plans reflected some of the changes suggested by the Board at its April 23, 1991 meeting.
- b) The roof of this cottage should be metal in order to be compatible with the main house.
- The plans submitted are alright for conceptual approval only. Detailed drawings for the cottage and all of its exterior features must be provided for final approval. The applicants have submitted several plans in the past for a second building on this part of their property, and each of these plans lacked enough details for final approval. Detailed drawings should include the windows, cornice board, spindles, louvers, wood siding (if used), porch posts, steps, location of air-conditioner, railings, landscaping, gutters, drain pipes from gutters and location, porch, glass color, piers, etc. The plans as submitted are not of the quality that the Board has required in the past for new buildings.

Mr. & Mrs. Tatum were present, and they presented the revised plans to the Board. They said that in response to the Board's comments at the last meeting to their proposed cottage, they were submitting two drawings.

The first drawing shows revisions as suggested at the last meeting while the second shows some variations, which Mr. & Mrs. Tatum preferred. Their greatest difficulty is the suggested metal roof which, even for a small cottage

BAR Minutes (May 28 1991 Meeting) Page Two June 18 1991

is quite expensive. Since the cottage does not front on the Historic District and previously the Board approved shingles, they wished to proceed with the red fiberglass shingles as originally proposed.

Mr. & Mrs. Tatum also pointed out to the Board that as part of the subdivision of their property, they are required to put in a sidewalk along Farish Street. If this requirement is not waived by the Planning Commission, it will result in the loss of most all of the trees along their property line on Farish Street.

After reviewing and discussing the two proposed concepts, it was the consensus of the Board that the revised design was more appropriate than the original design. The Board proceeded to discuss in detail the revised cottage design.

Ms. Van Yahres said she preferred a metal roof to a fiberglass shingle roof because it would be compatible with the existing house and the character of the Historic District. Mr. Bullard said he, too, preferred a metal roof but not as strongly as Mrs. Van Yahres. Mr. Caravati said he would like to see the final details for the cottage before making a decision.

Additional comments made were:

- Windows should meet code requirements
- The PVC lattice was shown. The Board preferred a wood lattice instead Concern was expressed about the embossed block. The Board preferred the use of concrete brick instead
- The spindles can be vertical. The Board needs to see their detail
- The exterior walls are to be stucco

Following the discussion, the following motions were made:

Mr. Wassenaar moved that due to the exceptional trees along Farish Street, the Board would not support the installation of curbs, gutters and sidewalks.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Hiatt and passed by the following vote: Ayes 6: Noes: 0; Abstentions 1 (Caravati).

Ms. Van Yahres moved to approve the conceptual design of the cottage with the following conditions:

- The final elevation drawings with details must be submitted for review and approval
- The applicants are to explore the costs of a galvanized roof, tin roof versus the cost of a fiberglass roof, and report back to the Board on their findings. The Board will make a final decision on the roof material at that time.

BAR Minutes (May 28, 1991) Page Three June 18, 1991

- The applicants are to research the costs of constructing a concrete embossed brick foundation versus a concrete brick foundation, and report to the Board their findings.
- The cottage is to be aligned with Farish Street
- The windows are all to be the same, double hung, one over one. The details for the windows are to be submitted.
- The parking area as shown on the site plan is acceptable

Mr. Wassenaar seconded the motion and it passed by the following votes: Ayes: 6; Noes: 0; Abstentions: (1) (Caravati)

2. BAR 91-05-359

406 & 410 Dice St., New Wall, City of Charlottesville

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report. After a brief discussion, Mr. Wassenaar moved to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness because the materials and design of the wall were not appropriate and compatible with the two historic buildings. There are other materials such as split face block that can be used for the wall which would complement these two sites.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Caravati, and unanimously passed by the Board members.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

FB/vm