MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW HELD IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1991

Present:

Absent:

Staff Present:

Peggy Van Yahres, VP Jean Hiatt Todd Bullard Blake Caravati Courtney Sargeant Larry Herbert

M. Jack Rinehart Genevieve Keller Kurt Wassenaar Satyendra Singh Huja Fred Boger Vera Mason Eugenia Bibb

Peggy Van Yahres, Vice Chairman, called the meeting to order at 3.35 p.m.

I MINUTES

Mr. Herbert made the motion that the minutes of the August 20, 1991, be approved with the following corrections:

Mr. Herbert stated that on page two, sixth paragraph down he would like the addition inserted that he is concerned about the inconsistency of having trucks and Ms. Jones' cart provide drinks for the Fridays After Five program.

Mr. Bullard stated that on page two, third paragraph, first sentence, the word "plywood" should be omitted and the words "contact paper" inserted instead. He also stated that in the paragraph before the last one on page two that the word "more" be omitted. On page three, second paragraph down, Mr. Bullard would like his statement to read as follows: "In his opinion, we ought to be careful not to make the Mall too precious and that carts are not permanent". Omit Mr. Bullard's name from the voting record as he left early.

Mr. Caravati stated that on page one, item II second paragraph should read that it was Mr. Curtis Coleman who stated that Mr. Richards had said it was okay to put the cart on the Mall.

Mr. Bullard seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved as corrected.

II CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 91-01-177

225 East Main Street, Exterior Changes, Michael Bednar, Appl.

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report, and concluded by stating that although wooden doors would be preferred, the metal doors are an

BAR Minutes (September 17, 1991) meeting Page Two October 10, 1991

acceptable alternative and staff would recommend their approval.

Ms. Van Yahres stated that none of the members at today's meeting were present when this case was originally discussed.

Mr. Wray, contractor, was present explained that the reason the wooden doors were changed to metal sliding doors was because Better Living, the supplier, sent the frame for the metal doors instead of the wooden ones. The metal doors are only 1/4" smaller than the wooden doors. Mr. Wray stated that Mr. Bednar had no objections to using metal doors.

Mr. Herbert said he had no objection, neither did Ms. Hiatt. Mr. Bullard said he would have preferred wood, but would approve the metal doors. Mr. Caravati said permitting metal doors would set a dangerous precedent. Mr. Kurt Wassenaar, who was not present, had stated that allowing metal doors would bring a new element into the design.

Ms. Van Yahres said the wooden doors would have tied better together with rest of the building, and been painted blue. Mr. Ray stated that the wooden doors were approved as being painted white

Mr. Herbert made the motion to approve the doors as a substitute for wooden ones with no changes. Mr. Bullard made a second motion that the metal doors be approved subject to their being painted white or off-white. Blake Caravati seconded the motion and it was approved by the following vote: Ayes 5 (Van Yahres, Hiatt, Bullard, Caravati, Sargeant: Noes (L. Herbert).

2. BAR 91-09-365

103 Third Street NE - Partition for Drink Vending Machine. Henry Hackett, Applicant

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report, stating that the Pepsi Cola cooler and partition would be placed in an alcove to the right of the entry door. Mr. Boger stated that staff disapproved of this request as the drink machine would become a permanent fixture for this building. He believed a more appropriate approach would be to have a small portable cooler which could be taken into the building at the close of each business day. No-one was present to speak from the public. After a brief discussion, Mr. Herbert moved to deny the application and Mr. Bullard seconded the motion. The motion to deny the application was unanimously approved.

3. BAR 91-09-366

300 Market Street. Fire Stair and Rear Exit - Gerald Wilson, Applic.

Mr. Boger presented the staff report stating that the style of the gate as designed is too fancy for the building's architecture, and a more simple design would be more compatible. No-one was present from the public to speak.

Mr. Bullard asked how one would get away from the building in case of a fire, and wondered whether the Fire Marshall had approved the exit and security gate.

BAR Minutes (September 17, 1991) meeting Page Three October 10, 1991

Mr. Herbert said he has no problem with the fire stair and gate. Mr. Bullard said he would like to see a more detailed drawing of gate. Both Mr. Caravati and Ms. Van Yahres said they would like to see a more detailed drawing.

Mr. Caravati made the motion that the fire stair and gate be approved, contingent upon the Board receiving and approving a more detailed drawing of the gate. Mr. Herbert seconded the motion and it unanimously passed.

4. BAR 91-09-367

104 5th Street, SE. Air-conditioning Unit. Donna Shirbacheh, Appl.

This case was withdrawn by applicant

5. BAR 91-09-368

418 5th Street SW. Renovation/Addition/Demolition. Arlene B. Sweeney, Applicant

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report and stated he had been talking with Ms. Sweeney for five or six years about renovating this property. Mrs. Sweeney is applying for Federal Historic Preservation tax credits. In constructing the new frame addition Mrs. Sweeney is proposing to cut down four trees.

Mr. Boyd, architect, was present and explained that the remnants of the house are not in the best of shape. The proposed bay window will probably end up being a door. There is a dug well on the property which is a rarity in Charlottesville. For the addition they are proposing to build a staircase in the back to allow for two bedrooms to be accessed without having to go through other rooms. There will be a new kitchen. Ms. Sweeney stated that one wall could not be torn down and that it would have to have some sort of underpinning. Mr. Caravati asked if mortar could be copied to represent mortar used for that period when house was built. Ms. Sweeney stated that John Wells, architectural historian, could come and look at property and perhaps consider something else.

Mr. Herbert asked what other type of window would be considered if not a bay window? Mr. Boyd said that a long window might be considered.

On the question of the shed being removed, Ms. Sweeney stated that it was presently full and would prefer to wait until construction is over before demolishing it. She stated that Mr. Wells wants all the wood saved and there must be adequate storage for this purpose.

On the subject of the deciduous tree, Mrs. Van Yahres and Mr. Huja said it should be saved if at all possible. Mr. Stan Sweeney, her husband, who was also present, said the deciduous tree was 2-3-ft. from where the addition would come out, which was too close to allow the tree to stand. Ms. Van Yahres said the tree should be pruned back, but not cut down. Ms. Sweeney said she

Board of Architectural Review Page Four October 10, 1991

would not put the addition up if the tree could not be taken down.

On the question of the bay window on the south wall, Ms. Sargeant asked whether a sliding glass door would be considered instead of a window. Mr. Boyd said he didn't think the State would have a problem with that. Mr. Herbert said the Sweeneys had done a good job with their plans to renovate and would like to see the work proceed. He added he would like to see the deciduous tree saved and would also like to see the final landscaping plans.

Mr. Bullard expressed concern about the possible loss of the deciduous tree. He visited the property and guesstimated the distance of the tree from the proposed addition would be $15-\mathrm{ft}$.

Mr. Caravati said it would be more appropriate to have a landscaping plan and he didn't think tree could be maintained with the addition.

Mrs. Van Yahres said she would look at site again with applicant. She also endorsed the idea of a landscaping plan and said she is not concerned about the cedar trees as they are not in great shape.

Mr. Herbert made a motion that the Board approves the application with the recommendation to applicant that she meets with Mrs. Van Yahres and another member of staff to make an attempt to save the deciduous tree, with the stipulation that she comes back to Board with a more extensive landscaping plan.

Mr. Caravati stated that he would be more comfortable if a qualified arborist took a look at the deciduous tree. Mrs. Van Yahres said a letter from an arborist giving his recommendation as to whether a tree should come down is helpful. Mr. Huja said that he has the final say on whether or not a tree may be cut down. He suggested the applicant stakes out the foundation. Mr. Herbert said he does not want to see the project loss because of concern over trees.

Mr. Caravati said Board should take a vote and approve the application with the recommendation from Board that the applicant meet with Ms. Van Yahres and a staff member to discuss trying to save the deciduous tree, and that the applicant come back to the Board with a more detailed landscaping plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bullard with the following votes: Ayes: Ms. Sargeant, Mr. Bullard, Ms. Hiatt, Mr. Herbert. Noes: Mr. Caravati.

III DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT - There was none

IV OTHER MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

It was noted by Ms. Hiatt that Ms. Keller was at Harvard University and had not officially resigned. Ms. Hiatt suggested that Mr. Boger write and ask what her intentions are in case the Board needs to have another member.

Trenon got arrival

Board of Architectural Review Page Five October 10, 1991

V ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at $4:35~\mathrm{p.m.}$ with Mr. and Mrs. Sweeney, Mrs. Van Yahres and Mr. Boger going directly to the site to ascertain whether deciduous tree could be saved.

FMB/vm