

City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
Docket  
April 23, 1980 -- 7:45 p.m.  
Basement Conference Room

✓ A. Minutes

✓ 1. March 26, 1980, Regular Meeting w/Vote

✓ B. Deferred Items

✓ 1. Case No. 80-102 - Inge's Grocery Store - Leslie C. Lafon, Owner  
*Denied 3-2 w/ order to put up for sale* 333 W. Main St. at 4th St., NW  
Demolition Request

✓ C. New Application

✓ 1. Case No. 80-103 - Alteration to 16th District Juvenile Court  
*5-0 w/ stairs paint to match bldg.* E. High Street  
Thomas Wyant - Architect  
*Preapp. Conf.* Stairway addition & door change.

✓ D. Other Matters

✓ 1. Historic Preservation Guide

✓ E. Other Matters brought by the Public not on the Agenda

F. Chairman's Report

G. Review Board Member's Reports

H. Department of Community Development Report

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES  
April 23, 1980 - 7:45 p.m.

PRESENT

Geraldine Watkins  
John Farmer  
Warren Martin  
Jim Herndon  
Ashlin Smith

ABSENT

Ted Oakey  
Ed Lay

A. Minutes

The meeting was called to order by John Farmer in the Basement Conference Room of City Hall. The minutes of the March 26, 1980 regular meeting were approved with the following additional information. Voting at the March 26th meeting was unanimous in all cases.

John Farmer asked if any member of the public wished to speak about any matter before the board during this meeting. Mac Bell expressed his desire to speak about the application to demolish Inge's Grocery Store.

B. Deferred Items

1. Case No. 80-102: Inge's Grocery Store  
Leslie C. Lafon, Owner  
335 West Main Street at 4th Street, NW  
Demolition Request

Mr. Lafon spoke on his own behalf and presented color photographs showing views and details of deterioration of Inge's building. He said that although he intends to develop the original program for the building, he is convinced more than ever of the risk of the building's collapse during construction. This opinion is based on the report of Denwood T. Milley, structural engineer, after a second survey of the site. Because of the strong possibility of collapse, Lafon is continuing to ask for the right to demolish the building; a right, he added, which would be exercised only in the event of the building's collapse. Having the demolition request approved now would simply expedite the progress of the total project.

Since Mr. Lafon cannot begin development of the property right away, he also expressed his desire to make some temporary maintenance changes in the building and put a new fence between it and the Fisher building for purposes of safety and better appearance.

John Farmer then called on Mac Bell to speak to the demolition request. Mac Bell, representing Old Charlottesville, Inc., emphasized the importance of Inge's Grocery Store as a distinguished example of the Federal style of building and as one of the oldest remaining structures on Main Street. From his experiences in restoration work, a seemingly unsound building can prove to be stronger than expected as work on it progresses. For this reason, a demolition request now is,

indeed, premature.

Mr. Bell also offered, on behalf of Old Charlottesville, Inc., a second opinion on the condition of Inge's Grocery Store and the feasibility of renovating it with the intended use differing from the original use of the building.

Mr. Huja next spoke for the Community Development Department of the City. He stated that because of that department's difficulties in finding buyers for old buildings as a part of the redevelopment of West Main Street and Starr Hill, he wanted to encourage Mr. Lafon in every way possible to proceed with his plans for the Inge's site. He therefore encouraged the board to grant Mr. Lafon's demolition request.

Before opening the meeting to the board members questions and discussion, John Farmer expressed the opinion of Ed Lay, chairman of the local Landmarks Commission. Because of the historical significance of this particular building, Ed Lay was in favor of granting the demolition request only if and when it is needed.

Questions from board members then established and clarified the following information:

- a. Mr. Lafon will serve as contractor for the project, and he will employ his sons for some of the work. This family involvement intensifies Mr. Lafon's safety concerns, as related to the risks of building collapse.
- b. Any structure built to replace the Inge's Store would resemble it, not reproduce it.
- c. If the building does collapse, Mr. Lafon will retain as much of the old brick walls as possible, especially in the foundation, and use the old smoke house as well.
- d. Mr. Lafon's only reason for requesting the demolition permit is to expedite the development of the project if the building should begin to collapse.
- e. The Board of Architectural Review will be willing to meet on short notice at the site if the building begins to collapse.

Mr. Farmer then informed the board that because the 60 day time limit on this request will expire on April 26, 1980, the board must vote on the request at this meeting. After clarification from Mr. Huja, it was also explained to the board that a denial of this request would require the owner, Mr. Lafon, to put the building up for sale for a period of time based on the fair market value of the property.

Warren Martin then moved that the demolition request be granted in order to expedite the planning for this site, which the Board of Architectural Review had already approved, and in order to give the developer the flexibility he needs to proceed with the development.

Jim Herndon seconded the motion.

The motion failed to pass. Those voting for the motion were Martin and Herndon. Those opposed were Watkins, Smith and Farmer.

A motion to deny the request for demolition and require the owner to put the property up for sale for the appropriate length of time in accordance with the fair market value was made by Ashlin Smith and seconded by John Farmer. The motion passed. Those voting for the motion were Smith, Farmer and Watkins. Those opposed were Martin and Herndon.

Mr. Farmer informed the owner of his right to appeal the board's decision to City

Council and that he could proceed with temporary maintenance work but would have to return to the board for its approval of his plans for a new fence.

#### C. New Application

1. Case No. 80-103: Alteration to 16th  
District Juvenile Court  
East High Street  
Thomas Wyant, Architect  
Stairway addition and door change

Ms. Roxanne Sherbeck, presented drawings and explained the proposed changes. The stairway addition represents a second story level to the existing fire escape on the west side of the court building, and the door change will be a replacement of existing doors and sidelights at the front entrance with half-glazed doors and sidelights.

Warren Martin moved that a certificate of appropriateness be granted with the condition that the fire escape be painted the color of the building or a color close to that. The motion was seconded by Geraldine Watkins. The motion was passed unanimously.

#### D. Other Matters

1. Pre-application presentation by Randy Rinehart and architect, Stuart Griffin Burgh, for a multi-family development of vacant property at the corner of Hedge Street and Second Street, NE. Based on a survey of existing buildings in the immediate neighborhood, considering site sizes, building heights, architectural styles and setbacks, two alternative building concepts were suggested. The preferred number of units was four with either all units facing Second Street or three units facing Second Street and a fourth facing Hedge Street. Entrance for parking behind the units would be on Hedge Street. The units would be 2 1/2 stories high and resemble town houses with variations in facade designs. With the BAR's approval of the conceptual planning thus far, the owner wishes to request that existing setback on both street requirements be lifted by the Board of Zoning Appeals in order to (1) provide adequate parking for four units and (2) work with the setbacks of existing buildings in the neighborhood.

Warren Martin moved that the board approve in concept a plan that will place all units facing Second Street, NE. Jim Herndon seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously for the motion.

#### 2. Historic Preservation Guide

Mr. Huja presented to members of the board copies of the work completed thus far on this pamphlet, and asked for their opinions and suggestions. The board agreed that from a quick reading the pamphlet seemed to fill the need to guidelines to preservation in Charlottesville. Martin and Farmer requested more time to study the guide, however, and that more time be allowed for the inclusion of student drawings of local architecture to be used as examples of local building styles. Martin also suggested that in the introduction emphasis should be placed on the fact that the contents of the pamphlet are not the law (except where stated) but guidelines only.

Smith suggested that names and telephone numbers of private organizations be deleted from part 5 - Organizations, Functions and Process - because this information will change from year to year. Smith also suggested that to the list of organiza-

tions, a newly formed committee of the local real estate association be added. This committee will be offering assistance and advice to the public in rehabilitating structures.

Ideas for a "colors" policy were also offered by Smith based on reading materials and color charts provided by Ed Lay. The plan of presenting general color philosophies for each building style instead of passing on specific color schemes for each style was recommended by Smtih and other members of the board for inclusion in the guidelines.

Farmer suggested that City Council's commendations of outstanding preservation work in the area be included in the pamphlet also.

E. Chairman's Report

John Farmer announced that City Council on April 21, 1980 voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Landmarks Commission and of this board for recognition of significant contributions to the preservation of buildings in the area.

F. Review Board Member's Reports

Ashlin Smith asked for clarification of procedure in enacting the maintenance and repair section of Article XVI in the city ordinance. Mr. Huja stated that it was the board's responsibility to be aware of violations and to receive notices of such violations from the public. The Department of Community Development and the Department of the Zoning Administrator, do not have the time or people to make a survey of such violations.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:30.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ashlin Smith, Secretary

CITY OF  
CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VIRGINIA  
MEMO



---

**TO:** Satyendra Huja, Director of Community Development  
**FROM:** C. Robert Stripling, Assistant City Manager  
**DATE:** April 23, 1980  
**RE:** Historic Landmark Plaques

---

The City Council has approved the concept of awarding plaques to property owners who have contributed to the renovation of historic buildings. Before proceeding with this program, I would appreciate you:

1. designing an appropriate plaque.
2. estimating the cost of each plaque and estimating the number of plaques which might be awarded each year.
3. investigating the possibility of private organizations which might underwrite the cost of the plaques.

A report on this matter should be submitted no later than May 12, 1980.

*(Handwritten initials)*

*Talked to Bob Stripling 5/9/80  
RLH*

CRS:bb



CITY OF  
CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VIRGINIA  
MEMO

---

TO: Board of Architectural Review  
FROM: Ron Higgins, Planner *RH*  
DATE: April 16, 1980  
RE: Historic Preservation Guide

---

The Historic Preservation Guide is in its final stages of development with the work remaining being; graphics, titles, finished bibliography, a chart and two maps. Most of the work is done for the above items except for some refinement and additions. The titles have been ordered and are expected early next week.

Due to some last minute changes, I have not included the final draft in your package. However, I hope to provide you with at least text in final form by Monday, April 21, 1980. Please be prepared to make final adjustments to this guide, as well as some additions, at your regular meeting on Wednesday, April 23, 1980 since we would like to have this ready for printing before your May 1980 meeting.

I would like this guide to include a policy statement from the BAR concerning colors in the Architectural Design Control District. We have discussed this before and may be able to agree on an accepted list of colors and their use.

If you have any questions or comments please contact me or Mr. Huja before the next meeting.

Thank You

RLH/r1h

CITY OF  
CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VIRGINIA  
MEMO

---

TO: Board of Architectural Review  
FROM: Ron Higgins, Planner *RH*  
DATE: April 16, 1980  
RE: Historic District Preservation Conference

---

Here is some additional information on the above conference, to be held June 6th, 1980 in Richmond, Virginia, including a registration form and agenda. Please fill out the form if you plan to attend and either mail it directly to them or give it to me and I will send it in with the others.

Since I plan to attend also, we may be able to arrange some sort of car pool for the trip.

Thank You.

RLH/rlh





# COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

*Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission*

221 GOVERNOR STREET  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219  
TELEPHONE (804) 781-2141

March 26, 1980

HISTORIC DISTRICT PRESERVATION CONFERENCE  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUILDING  
CAPITOL SQUARE  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA  
JUNE 6, 1980

In response to numerous inquiries regarding architectural review boards, the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission has scheduled a one day conference to be held on June 6, 1980 in Richmond, Virginia. The conference will address a broad range of issues relating to historic preservation. Discussions will include procedures for review boards, design review powers, public relations and the review board, the relationship between the review board and the Landmarks Commission, the Tax Act of 1976, and State and Federal technical services.

Representatives from each architectural review board are invited to attend this meeting and the participation from planning commissions, historical societies, and other interested groups is encouraged.

There is no registration fee. Please mail registration materials by May 16, 1980 to Barry N. Zarakov, Project Director, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, 221 Governor Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

---

I plan to attend the Historic District Preservation Conference.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City: \_\_\_\_\_

List additional names on a separate sheet.  
Please register by May 16, 1980.

# VIRGINIA HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

## HISTORIC DISTRICT PRESERVATION CONFERENCE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUILDING  
CAPITOL SQUARE  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA  
JUNE 6, 1980

All sessions will be held in Room C of the General Assembly Building

- 8:30 A.M. REGISTRATION, Lobby, General Assembly Building
- 9:00 A.M. WELCOMING REMARKS, Tucker Hill, Executive Director,  
Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission
- 9:15 A.M. HISTORIC DISTRICTS - MAKING THEM WORK, Barry N. Zarakov,  
Architectural Historian, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission
- 10:00 A.M. SAFEGUARDING THE HISTORIC DISTRICT - THE ROLE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL  
REVIEW BOARD, John G. Zehmer, Jr., Senior Planner for Historic  
Preservation, Urban Design/Historic Preservation Division, Department  
of Planning and Community Development, Richmond
- 10:45 A.M. Questions and comments
- 11:00 A.M. Break
- 11:15 A.M. SOURCES OF PRESERVATION FUNDING, Marilyn Cable, Preservation Planner,  
Planning Branch, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service
- 11:45 A.M. Questions and comments
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:15 P.M. HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN REVIEW: THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S  
STANDARDS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROJECTS, de Teel Patterson Tiller,  
Architectural Historian, Technical Preservation Services, Heritage  
Conservation and Recreation Service
- 2:15 P.M. Questions and comments
- 2:30 P.M. Break
- 2:45 P.M. PRESERVATION AND PUBLIC SUPPORT, William T. Frazier, Executive Director,  
Historic Staunton Foundation
- 3:30 P.M. PANEL DISCUSSION/QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
- 4:15 P.M. CONCLUDING REMARKS, Barry N. Zarakov

CITY OF  
CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VIRGINIA  
MEMO

---

TO: Board of Architectural Review  
FROM: Ron Higgins, Planner ~~RLH~~  
DATE: April 16, 1980  
RE: Additional information in this package

---

Enclosed under this cover memo are the following items which have arrived from the U.S. Department of the Interior's Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. I hope they will be of interest to you and assist you in giving advise to people who might approach you as a BAR member.

- amendments to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation dated January 3, 1980
- Technical Preservation Services PUBLICATIONS LIST
- HISTORIC PRESERVATION (program leaflet)
- THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES (program leaflet)
- HISTORIC PRESERVATION GRANTS-IN-AID (program leaflet)
- TAX INCENTIVES FOR REHABILITATING HISTORIC BUILDINGS (program leaflet)
- TAX REFORM ACT OF 1976 & REHABILITATION AND THE REVENUE ACT OF 1978 (related information)
  - Proposed regulations
  - Glossary of Terms in TRA of 1976 Sec. 2124
  - Information: Rehabilitation; The Tax Reform Act of 1976 & The Revenue Act of 1978
  - Information: Rehabilitation & The Revenue Act of 1978
  - Information: Technical Corrections to the Tax Reform Act of 1976
  - Review of Rehabilitation Work
  - The New Economics of Rehabilitating Older Buildings
  - Supplement 11593: Rehab Investment Tax Credit information
- ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION ( article )

Thank You

RLH/r1h