

**Packet Guide
City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Regular Meeting
December 20, 2022, 5:30 p.m.
Hybrid Meeting (In-person at CitySpace and virtual via Zoom)**



Pre-Meeting Discussion

Regular Meeting

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda [or on the Consent Agenda]

B. Consent Agenda

1. [Meeting minutes March 15, 2022](#)

2. [Certificate of Appropriateness Application](#)

BAR # 22-12-02

116 West Jefferson Street, Tax Parcel 330183000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Jefferson Street Properties, LLC

Applicant: Kristin Cory

Project: Porch reconstruction, alterations to rear addition

3. [Certificate of Appropriateness Application](#)

BAR # 22-12-03

1513-1515 University Avenue, TMP 090080000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Lloyd's Building, LLC

Applicant: James Zehmer/University of Virginia

Project: Replace built-in gutters w/hanging gutters, install new asphalt shingles.

C. Deferred Items

4. [Certificate of Appropriateness](#)

BAR # 22-11-03

507 Ridge Street, Tax Parcel 290141000

Ridge Street ADC District

Owner/Applicant: Kimberly and Clayton Lauter

Project: Demo backyard shed/cottage

Project: New residence on vacant lot

5. [Certificate of Appropriateness](#)

BAR # 22-09-04

0 3rd Street NE, TMP 330020001

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Scott Loughery

Applicant: Candace Smith, Architect

D. New Items

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR # 22-12-01

300 Court Square, TMP 530096100 North

Downtown ADC District Owner: Eagle Tavern, LLC

Applicant: Candace DeLoach

Project: Exterior alterations

E. Other Business

7. Staff questions/discussion

- DT Mall NRHP update
- BAR rep to DT Mall Committee

F. Adjourn

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
March 15, 2022 – 5:00 PM
Zoom Webinar**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Due to the current public health emergency, this meeting is being held online via Zoom. The meeting process will be as follows: For each item, staff will make a brief presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, after which members of the public will be allowed to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves, and give their current address. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to speak. Public comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

Members Present: Cheri Lewis, James Zehmer, Robert Edwards, Breck Gastinger, David Timmerman, Clayton Strange, Jody Lahendro

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner, Remy Trail

Pre-Meeting:

Staff went over the meeting agenda. Mr. Gastinger did speak with the Wertland applicant regarding the preliminary discussion.

Mr. Gastinger had questions about the minutes from the July BAR meeting. Mr. Gastinger asked that some changes be made to those minutes.

Ms. Lewis recused herself from one of the preliminary discussion due to representing the applicant before the BAR on past projects.

The Chairman brought the meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No Comments from the Public

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from July 21, 2021
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 18, 2022
3. **Certificate of Appropriateness**
BAR 22-03-01
1835 University Circle, TMP 060069000
Rugby Rd-University Cir-Venable ADC District
Owner: Meg Conklin and John Jay
Applicant: Mary Wolf / Wolf-Josey

Project: Landscaping

4. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 20-03-02

223 East Main Street, TMP 33023400

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Labace, LLC

Applicant: Tony Labace

Project: Replace storefront

Mr. Gastinger made the Motion to Approve the Consent Agenda with three edits to the July, 2021 BAR Minutes (Second by Ms. Lewis) – Motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

N/A

D. Preliminary Discussions (including questions from staff)

5. 1301 Wertland Street, TMP 040303000

Wertland Street ADC District

Project: New residential building

- Kevin Schafer and Design Develop introduced the project for a new residential building on 1301 Wertland Street.
- The existing lot is a large agrarian lot and the relationship with this house is an anomaly to the street.
- The driveway has disconnected the house from its historic front. There was an effort to save some large trees.
- The current house sits pretty far back from Wertland Street and still does have a drive aisle on 13th Street that cuts in front of the house.
- One of the opportunities for this property was to straighten the drive aisle and get it out from in front of the house and move the historic building towards Wertland Street.
- It would give it a presence on Wertland Street and maintain the relationship with 13th Street (its historic driveway).
- It would provide an opportunity on the rear part of the site to add a building on the rear part of the site behind the historic building.
- A precedent that the applicant to the BAR was the Varsity Hall at UVA. It was moved to a different location, repaired, and renovated.
- The applicant is seeking feedback from the BAR regarding this potential project.
- There would have to be two COA applications needed for this potential project: One for moving the historic structure and one for the new residential building.
- Staff did note that there are tax credit opportunities available for this project. Staff did recommend doing the COA applications separately.
- Members of the BAR did provide the feedback on what the applicant could do to improve the project/make the project feasible.
- There is a lot of work that has to be done to stitch this project together. The applicant wanted to make sure to have positive feedback from the BAR before starting the work.

6. 32 University Circle, TMP 060094000

Rugby Rd-University Cir-Venable ADC District (non-contributing)

Project: Window replacements

- Staff presented this proposed window replacement project for this building.
- The guidelines are 'silent' on window replacement on a non-contributing building/structure.
- A previous applicant from Court Square at the Monticello Hotel was asked to make a window replacement plan.
- According to Mr. Zehmer, UVA has been restoring windows on the historic buildings rather than replacing windows.
- After much discussion with staff, the BAR recommended that staff work to protect the character of those things that are historic on the building.
- The decision reached by the BAR was that any changes made to the building (window replacement) will require a Certificate of Appropriateness from the BAR.

7. 1901 East Market Street, TMP 55A149000

IPP within the Woolen Mills HC District

Project: Rear addition

- Staff reminded the BAR that this project should get the same attention as a contributing structure and building in an ADC District.
- Ms. Lewis recused herself due to a conflict of interest of having represented the owners of this property in previous COA applications.
- Staff presented the renderings of what the rear/suggested addition to this property.
- Staff did emphasize the importance of the roofline and elevations between the original house, the 2002 addition, and the new rear, suggested addition.
- One of the things that is successful with the 2002 addition is that there is a hyphen.
- With the proposed addition, an elaborate hyphen would be good for the proposed addition.

8. 111 14th Street NW, TMP 090074000

Rugby Rd-University Cir-Venable ADC District (non-contributing)

Project: Proposed Mural

- The purpose of this preliminary discussion is whether a mural would be an appropriate addition.
- One of the suggestions was to move the mural closer to 14th Street and not be as close to the door.
- The guidelines do state that there should be no painting on unpainted brick.
- There was a precedent with the painting of Heather Heyer on brick.
- One of the reasons for the applicant wanting to paint this mural is because there is currently graffiti there.
- The idea is to preclude people spray painting graffiti on this wall.
- Staff is going to recommend to the applicant that they find a different place or what the sacrificial coating does.

The meeting was recessed for ten minutes.

Staff met with the design team of the Courts Complex Project to discuss the feedback that was received from the BAR. An application for the Courts Complex Project will be submitted in April. It was a very positive meeting with the design team.

Staff is hoping to bring to the BAR next month six structures for a proposed historic conservation district. The CH Brown Historic District would be at 12th and Rosser on the north end of the Tenth and Page Neighborhood. The next step is to talk to the property owners about the architectural, character defining

features that are important. That will be coming to the BAR with a recommendation from the BAR on the change in the zoning and change to the Design Guidelines. This district is going to be in memory of Reverend Brown, who designed many houses in Charlottesville. The idea is to start with these six houses. The idea is for this to come before the BAR in April, 2022.

E. Work Session

Zoning Ordinance Revisions

James Freas, NDS Director

- The zoning rewrite project has begun and it is a three part project.
- The first part is the diagnostic and approach phase.
 - Staff and the consultant team is reviewing the current zoning and where the current zoning is out of step with best practices in zoning and the adopted Comprehensive Plan.
 - That approach will be documented in a report that is going to be released in the middle of April.
 - Feedback will be collected on the report and finalize the report to share with the Planning Commission and City Council by the end of June.
 - The drafting of the zoning ordinance will happen in the course of the summer.
 - The draft zoning ordinance will be released at the end of September/beginning of October.
- The next part is receiving feedback/input with a goal of a final draft of a zoning document by the end of 2022 with an adoption a year from now.
- The zoning ordinance should be an approachable and readable document. That is going to be the guiding principle going into the drafting process.
 - The new zoning ordinance will have a lot of illustrations, tables, charts, and it will use simple language.
- Staff is going to look at what role the BAR is going to play in the zoning rewrite and the ADC Districts within the zoning rewrite.

F. Other Business

Staff Questions/Discussion

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 22-12-02

116 West Jefferson Street, Tax Parcel 330183000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Jefferson Street Properties, LLC

Applicant: Kristin Cory

Project: Porch reconstruction, alterations to rear addition

Application components (please click each link to go directly to PDF page):

- [Staff Report](#)
- [Historic Survey](#)
- [Application Submittal](#)

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Staff Report
December 20, 2022**



Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 22-12-02

116 West Jefferson Street, TMP 330183000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Jefferson Street Properties, LLC

Applicant: Gordon Johnson, Peter Johnson Builders

Project: Front porch reconstruction, alterations at rear elevation



Background

Year Built: 1913 (the rear structure is contemporary)

District: North Downtown ADC District

Status: Contributing

The Revercomb House follows the Colonial Revival style. The front porch was removed in 1974.

Prior BAR Reviews

January 2011 – BAR approved CoA for fencing under the rear porch and breezeway.

January 20, 2021 – BAR deferred the request. Applicant unable to attend the meeting.

February 17, 2021 – BAR approved CoA with conditions. (BAR # 21-01-06) Reconstruction of the north porch and misc. alterations to the contemporary rear addition.

Application

- Applicant Submittal: Elevations and Plans for 116 West Jefferson Street, dated 12/08/2022 (two sheets).
- BAR staff notes summarizing proposed changes vs work approved in February 2021. (For general reference only; not in lieu of the submittal drawings.)
- Photographs from the January 2021 report. (Additional photos in staff report.)

Request for a CoA for reconstruction of the front porch, construction of painted wood stair at the connector (rear hyphen), installation of new door at the connector, and minor alterations to contemporary rear addition.

Note: CoA for reconstruction of the front porch approved (7-0) in February 2021 has expired. That component of this request is unchanged from the prior submittal and approval. Staff report and submittal: http://weblink.charlottesville.org/public/0/edoc/798377/2021-02_116%20W%20Jefferson%20Street_BAR.pdf

Discussion

Front Porch Reconstruction

To the extent possible, the reconstruction will rely on the information available in the photographs, the matching components that remain on the house, and nearby porches of a similar period. The existing brick porch, metal rail and light fixture above the entrance will be removed.

- Dimensions: Photos and the shadow lines on the brick provide the width and height. The proposed reconstruction generally conforms to the original dimensions.
- Columns: (Similar to the columns at 406 Altamont Circle.) *
 - Capital: Photos indicate Angular (*Scamozzi*) Ionic.
 - Shaft: Smooth. Round columns at the front. Square, engaged columns at the walls.
 - Base: Appropriate for Ionic column.
- Trim/Cornice: Match existing profiles and dimensions of the existing cornice. *
- Railing (top rail, bottom rail, and pickets): Detail cannot be determined from the photos and the railing at the rear porch are not original. Recommend that new will match or be similar to the Colonial Revival style railing at 406 Altamont Circle. Painted. Color: TBD. * (Note: The new rail will be at height that conforms to the current building code requirements.)
- Roof: Original roof was standing-seam metal. New roof to be standing-seam metal.
- Gutters and Downspouts: Original porch had built-in gutters; new gutter type not specified. In lieu of the built-in gutter, if not replicated, staff suggests a detail similar to that approved for 201 East High Street. *
- Flooring and steps: 1 x 4 or 1 x 6 wood flooring. Height of the floor will be similar to that of the existing brick porch. Painted. Color: TBD. *
- Apron trim at porch deck and step risers: 1 x wood and a profiled trim beneath the overhang of the flooring and treads. Apron face to align with the plinth of the column base. Painted. Color: TBD. *
- Ceiling: Beaded-board with simple cove or crown at entablature, similar to existing ceiling at rear, upper porch. Porch ceiling will be above—and encroach onto—the brick arches above the entry and two windows. Painted. Color: TBD. *
- Porch framing and piers: Wood frame on brick piers. BAR should clarify locations and details for brick piers. Staff recommends square piers of red brick (similar to the house); located beneath and aligned with each front column. *
- Lighting: No fixture(s) indicated. BAR should apply the following condition: For any exterior light fixture, the lamping will have a Color Temperature not to exceed 3,000K, preferably dimmable, and will comply with the City’s “Dark Sky” ordinance. Applicant will provide to staff cut sheets for the BAR archive.

Note: Except for the cornice detail, in the event of an unknown detail, applicant shall look to existing conditions on houses of a similar period, such as 406 Altamont Circle.

* - Indicates references in the Appendix.

Rear – Building Connection (hyohen)

Construct painted wood stairs and install new door at west elevation. Railing detail to match rear porch.

Rear – Contemporary Structure

- South Elevation: Remove two windows, existing door, and canopy. Install two larger windows.
- North Elevation: Remove window and wall section. Install double doors and window.
- West Elevation: Remove one window. Install new door in opening.

Staff Recommendation

Front Porch Reconstruction: Staff recommends approval with the same conditions and clarifications from the February 2021 CoA.

- Front porch will have a standing-seam roof and gutter detail similar to that in the staff report.
- Approval references the narrative, clarifications and photographs included as supplemental in the staff report
- Applicant will submit for staff review the proposed column capital
- Applicant will provide for staff review details on the porch railing and pickets and any proposed exterior light fixtures

New stairs and door at connector and alterations to contemporary addition: Typically, the installation of new windows and doors requires a high level of scrutiny and review. Given the age of this structure and the builder-grade quality of its materials, staff does not believe additional specificity is necessary for the new doors and windows. Staff recommends approval with the following condition of approval (also from the February 2021 CoA):

- Applicant will provide for staff review cutsheets for alterations to the windows and doors at the rear contemporary addition, with the understanding that the windows will not be vinyl, but may be wood, aluminum-clad wood, or fiberglass composite.

New French door at rear porch (1st floor) and new six-panel door at the east elevation (basement) of 1913 house: Staff recommends approval with the following condition of approval:

- On the 1913 house, the two new doors (frame and trim) will not alter the height, arch, or width of the existing masonry opening. Necessary brick repairs will be toothed-in, not saw cut, and use an appropriate mortar mix (lime vs Portland cement). The historic windows removed will be retained on the site and properly stored to allow later re-installation, if/when that occurs.

Suggested Motion

Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed front porch reconstruction and exterior alterations at 116 West Jefferson Street satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves [the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- Front porch will have a standing-seam roof and gutter detail similar to that in the staff report
- Approval references the narrative, clarifications and photographs included as supplemental in the staff report
- Applicant will submit for staff review the proposed column capital

- Applicant will provide for staff review details on the porch railing and pickets and any proposed exterior light fixtures
- Applicant will provide for staff review cutsheets for alterations to the windows and doors at the rear contemporary addition, with the understanding that the windows will not be vinyl, but may be wood, aluminum-clad wood, or fiberglass composite.
- On the 1913 house, the two new doors (frame and trim) will not alter the height, arch, or width of the existing masonry opening. Necessary brick repairs will be toothed-in, not saw cut, and use an appropriate mortar mix (lime vs Portland cement). The historic windows removed will be retained on the site and properly stored to allow later re-installation, if/when that occurs.

Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines

Review Criteria Generally

Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that, in considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

- (1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and
- (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:

- (1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;
- (2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;
- (3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;
- (4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;
- (5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;
- (6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;
- (7) Any applicable provisions of the City's Design Guidelines.

Pertinent guidelines from the Secretary Of The Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties - Reconstruction

- **Recommended:** Recreating the documented design of exterior features, such as the roof form and its coverings, architectural detailing, windows, entrances and porches, steps and doors, and their historic spatial relationships and proportions.
- **Not Recommended:** Omitting a documented exterior feature, or rebuilding a feature but altering its historic design. Using inappropriate designs or materials that do not convey the historic appearance.

Pertinent ADC District Design Guidelines

Rehabilitations:

C. Windows

- 1) Prior to any repair or replacement of windows, a survey of existing window conditions is recommended. Note number of windows, whether each window is original or replaced, the material, type, hardware and finish, the condition of the frame, sash, sill, putty, and panes.
- 2) Retain original windows when possible.

- 3) Uncover and repair covered up windows and reinstall windows where they have been blocked in.
- 4) If the window is no longer needed, the glass should be retained and the back side frosted, screened, or shuttered so that it appears from the outside to be in use.
- 5) Repair original windows by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Wood that appears to be in bad condition because of peeling paint or separated joints often can be repaired.
- 6) Replace historic components of a window that are beyond repair with matching components.
- 7) Replace entire windows only when they are missing or beyond repair.
- 8) If a window on the primary façade of a building must be replaced and an existing window of the same style, material, and size is identified on a secondary elevation, place the historic window in the window opening on the primary façade.
- 9) Reconstruction should be based on physical evidence or old photographs.
- 10) Avoid changing the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows by cutting new openings, blocking in windows, or installing replacement sash that does not fit the window opening.
- 11) Do not use inappropriate materials or finishes that radically change the sash, depth of reveal, muntin configuration, reflective quality or color of the glazing, or appearance of the frame.
- 12) Use replacement windows with true divided lights or interior and exterior fixed muntins with internal spacers to replace historic or original examples.
- 13) If windows warrant replacement, appropriate material for new windows depends upon the context of the building within a historic district, and the age and design of the building. Sustainable materials such as wood, aluminum-clad wood, solid fiberglass, and metal windows are preferred. Vinyl windows are discouraged.
- 14) False muntins and internal removable grilles do not present an historic appearance and should not be used.
- 15) Do not use tinted or mirrored glass on major facades of the building. Translucent or low (e) glass may be strategies to keep heat gain down.
- 16) Storm windows should match the size and shape of the existing windows and the original sash configuration. Special shapes, such as arched top storms, are available.
- 17) Storm windows should not damage or obscure the windows and frames.
- 18) Avoid aluminum-colored storm sash. It can be painted an appropriate color if it is first primed with a zinc chromate primer.
- 19) The addition of shutters may be appropriate if not previously installed but if compatible with the style of the building or neighborhood.
- 20) In general, shutters should be wood (rather than metal or vinyl) and should be mounted on hinges. In some circumstances, appropriately dimensioned, painted, composite material shutters may be used.
- 21) The size of the shutters should result in their covering the window opening when closed.
- 22) Avoid shutters on composite or bay windows.
- 23) If using awnings, ensure that they align with the opening being covered.
- 24) Use awning colors that are compatible with the colors of the building.

D. Entrances, Porches, and Doors

- 1) The original details and shape of porches should be retained including the outline, roof height, and roof pitch.
- 2) Inspect masonry, wood, and metal or porches and entrances for signs of rust, peeling paint, wood deterioration, open joints around frames, deteriorating putty, inadequate caulking, and improper drainage, and correct any of these conditions.
- 3) Repair damaged elements, matching the detail of the existing original fabric.
- 4) Replace an entire porch only if it is too deteriorated to repair or is completely missing, and design to match the original as closely as possible.
- 5) Do not strip entrances and porches of historic material and details.
- 6) Give more importance to front or side porches than to utilitarian back porches.

- 7) Do not remove or radically change entrances and porches important in defining the building's overall historic character.
- 8) Avoid adding decorative elements incompatible with the existing structure.
- 9) In general, avoid adding a new entrance to the primary facade, or facades visible from the street.
- 10) Do not enclose porches on primary elevations and avoid enclosing porches on secondary elevations in a manner that radically changes the historic appearance.
- 11) Provide needed barrier-free access in ways that least alter the features of the building.
 - a) For residential buildings, try to use ramps that are removable or portable rather than permanent.
 - b) On nonresidential buildings, comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act while minimizing the visual impact of ramps that affect the appearance of a building.
- 12) The original size and shape of door openings should be maintained.
- 13) Original door openings should not be filled in.
- 14) When possible, reuse hardware and locks that are original or important to the historical evolution of the building.
- 15) Avoid substituting the original doors with stock size doors that do not fit the opening properly or are not compatible with the style of the building.
- 16) Retain transom windows and sidelights.
- 17) When installing storm or screen doors, ensure that they relate to the character of the existing door.
 - a) They should be a simple design where lock rails and stiles are similar in placement and size.
 - b) Avoid using aluminum colored storm doors.
 - c) If the existing storm door is aluminum, consider painting it to match the existing door.
 - d) Use a zinc chromate primer before painting to ensure adhesion.

APPENDIX

116 west Jefferson – original porch



Existing cornice at 116 West Jefferson Street. New porch cornice to match.



Cornice at 116 West Jefferson St


116 West Jefferson Street (Existing)



Original porch at 116 West Jefferson Street




Illustrative porch detail for 116 West Jefferson Street: Dimensions and proportions should match or be similar to 406 Altamont Circle and/or appropriate to the period. The BAR should discuss specific dimensions, if necessary.




116 West Jefferson Street (existing) – note ceiling board and trim



Ceiling at rear porch (upper) - 116 West Jefferson St.



Original porch at 116 West Jefferson Street.



Column capitol



Original porch at 116 West Jefferson



406 Altamont Circle

406 Altamont Circle



406 Altamont Circle



406 Altamont Circle – note ceiling board and trim



Detail from porch reconstruction at 201 East High Street. [Reference is to gutter condition only.]

201 East High Street: Porch Cornice
Drawings submitted for BN-20-0076
Modification per BAR CoA 7/16/2019

Submitted

Revised detail 4 on Sheet A-3

Add simple crown mould, similar profile and proportions to that shown in Fig 7 of the July 2019 BAR submittal (below). Available, stock profile is fine.

FIG. 7

Not to Scale

STANDING SEAM MTL. ROOF - 20" PANEL
 UNDERLAYMENT AS RECOMMENDED PER ROOFING MANUF.
 5/8" PLYWD. OR OSB
 ROOF TRUSSED @ 24" O.C.
 2 x 4 SUB FASCIA
 MTL. ROOF EDGE
 6" COPPER HALF ROUND GUTTER
 1 x 6 FASCIA
 SOFFIT BD.
 DENTIL CROWN MOULD - MATCH EXIST.
 1 x 12 BOTH SIDES



Revised

*** PER BAR 7/16/2019**

PORCH CORNICE DETAIL TO MATCH EXISTING

2 1/2" 12
 SIMPSON H2.5A OR SIMPSON SDWC TRUSS SCREW (SDWC 15600) TO EACH TRUSS
 1 3/4" BED MOULD
 BEAM - SEE PLANS
 DRIP CAP MOULD BOTH SIDES
 BED MOULD BOTH SIDES
 1 x 4 - BOTH SIDES
 BLOCKING AS REQ.
 COLUMN CAP FLASHING
 RIP FROM 1 x 4 BOTH SIDES
 SOFFIT BD.
 COLUMN

New French door at rear porch to be similar to existing door at 111 Altamont Circle:




Not to scale



EXTERIOR ELEVATION - SOUTH
116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/02/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



EXTERIOR ELEVATION - WEST PORCH ELEVATION
116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/02/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



EXTERIOR ELEVATION - NORTH ELEVATION
116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET


12/02/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



EXTERIOR ELEVATION - NORTH FACADE OF ADDITION AT NEW STAIR

116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/02/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



PLAN AT NEW EXTERIOR STAIR

116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/02/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



EXTERIOR ELEVATION - WEST

116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/08/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



EXTERIOR ELEVATION - SOUTH AT BALCONY

116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/08/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




EXTERIOR ELEVATION - EAST

116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/08/2022

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



PARTIAL BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN

116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET

12/08/2022


SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




Reconstruction of
front porch



No changes




Feb 2021



Dec 2022

South Elevation—Contemporary Addition

BAR staff notes intended only to illustrate changes from Feb 2021 to December 2022 submittal.



Install larger windows

REAR ELEVATION: NEW
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Feb 2021

Remove door and canopy


Move window down.
Repair wall to match.

(New stairs at
connector)




EXISTING ADDITION TO HISTORIC STRUCTURE
NEW PAINTED WOOD STAIR, GUARDRAIL TO MATCH EXISTING PORCH
RELOCATE EXISTING WINDOW, INFILL SOING TO MATCH EXISTING


EXTERIOR ELEVATION - SOUTH
116 WEST JEFFERSON STREET
12/02/2022
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



Feb 2021



Dec 2022



East Elevation



Adjacent window. Similar

Remove connector.



Feb 2021

Connector remains



Install door.

Dec 2022



North Elevation—from W. Jefferson



West Elevation—from 2nd Street NW (looking SE)



South Elevation—Rear Addition



West Elevation—from 2nd Street NW (looking NE)



East Elevation—from W. Jefferson



East Elevation (looking NW from rear)



Rear Porches



Cornice Detail



Rear Porch Detail



Cornice Detail

Above Front Door (North Elevation)





Rear Addition—Siding



Rear Addition—Window (typ)

LANDMARK



SURVEY

IDENTIFICATION

Street Address: 116 West Jefferson Street
Map and Parcel: 33-183
Census Tract & Block: 1-314
Present Owner: Family Services of C'vill-Albemarle
Address: 116 West Jefferson Street
Present Use: Offices
Original Owner: J. C. Revercomb
Original Use: Residence

BASE DATA

Historic Name: Revercomb House
Date/Period: 1913
Style: Colonial Revival
Height to Cornice: 21.5
Height in Stories: 2
Present Zoning: B-3
Land Area (sq.ft.): 47.5 x 116.5
Assessed Value (land + imp.): 8310 + 5370 = 13,680

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The Revercomb House, until recently, was one of the fine examples of the Colonial Revival style. The floor plan is similar to Stanford White's Carrs Hill at the University. Built of brick that was once penciled so that the mortar joints would appear more even, the two story, three bay residence boasted of a handsome veranda with four Ionic columns with diagonal volutes, so characteristic of revival capitals, and a strong modillioned cornice that added sophistication to an otherwise ordinary structure. With this veranda gone, the Federal style entrance with fan and sidelights of beveled leaded glass loses much of its original elegance. On the interior the original doors, woodwork, and mantles are also typical of the Colonial Revival. The most interesting and unusual interior detail is the open spool-work lunette in the archway between the entrance and the stair hall.

HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION

In 1878, Elisah Gilmer bought the property from B. L. Powell (ACDB 69-4). Gilmer sold the property and the small one story brick structure to Mrs. B. G. Leterman in 1903 (DB 14-304). In 1909, J. C. Revercomb bought the property (DB 20-483) and in 1913 razed the older structure and built the present house. The house remained in the Revercomb family until 1972 when the Family Services of Charlottesville-Albemarle, Inc. purchased it. The veranda was removed in 1974.

GRAPHICS

P-34(L)

P-34(R)

CONDITIONS

Average

SOURCES

Miss Virginia Revercomb
City Records

NAME: REVERCOMB HOUSE

116 W. JEFFERSON ST.

Name: _____
County/City: _____

VIRGINIA HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION



116 West Jefferson Street - *Revercomb House* c.1913 - Photos from City Historic Survey (1970s -1980s)




116 West Jefferson Street - Revercomb House c.1913 - Photo from Google street view (June 2018)



116 West Jefferson Street - Revercomb House c.1913 - Photos from City Historic Survey (1970s -1980s)



116 West Jefferson Street - *Revercomb House* c.1913 - Photos from City Historic Survey (1970s -1980s)



East elevation



West elevation

116 West Jefferson Street - Revercomb House c.1913 - Photos from City Historic Survey (1970s -1980s)



Front (north) entrance



Rear (south) elevation

116 West Jefferson Street - *Revercomb House* c.1913 - Photos from City Historic Survey (1970s -1980s)



116 West Jefferson Street - *Revercomb House* c.1913 - Photos from City Historic Survey (1970s -1980s)



Front porch



Rear elevation

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 22-12-03

1513-1515 University Avenue, TMP 090080000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Lloyd's Building, LLC

Applicant: James Zehmer/University of Virginia

Project: Replace built-in gutters w/hanging gutters, install new asphalt shingles.

Application components (please click each link to go directly to PDF page):

- [Staff Report](#)
- [Historic Survey](#)
- [Application Submittal](#)

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Staff Report
December 20, 2022**



Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 22-12-03


1513-1515 University Avenue, TMP 090080000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Lloyd's Building, LLC

Applicant: James Zehmer/University of Virginia

Project: Replace built-in gutters w/hanging gutters, install new asphalt shingles.



Background

Year Built: c1896 and 1927

District: The Corner ADC District

Status: Contributing

The building combines the c.1896 Minor house with a 1927 commercial building added facing University Ave. The house was two stories tall, triple pile, and constructed of brick with a high-pitched hip roof, still visible at the rear of the building. (Historical survey attached)

Prior BAR Review

February 17, 2016 - BAR approved (8-1) CoA for alterations to the south façade, including new storefront. Modifications to three large openings to come back to the BAR (for administrative approval) and paint color selection.

June 20, 2017 – BAR approved (6-0) CoA for a mural on the east elevation.


Application

- Applicant's submittal: Narrative, photos, and drawings, dated December 1, 2022 (17 pages) and supplemental photos, dated December 20, 2022 (5 pages).


Request CoA to, at the rear portion of the building, replace the built-in gutters with hanging gutters and install new asphalt shingles to replace existing.

Discussion

Staff recommends approval with a condition that the new hanging gutters will retain the existing profile of the upper cornice, per the rough sketch below. (Similar to the CoA condition applied to the porch roof at 201 E. High Street, July 2019.)



Proposed Work



Suggested Motion

Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed roof alterations at 1515 University Avenue satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition with a condition that the new hanging gutters will retain the existing profile of the upper cornice. (Similar to the CoA condition applied to the porch roof at 201 E. High Street, July 2019.)

Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines

Review Criteria Generally

Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that,

In considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

- (1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and
- (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:

- 1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;
- 2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;
- 3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;
- 4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;
- 5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;
- 6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;
- 7) Any applicable provisions of the City's Design Guidelines.

Pertinent ADC District Design Guidelines

Link to [Chapter 4 Rehabilitation](#)


E. Cornice

- 1) Keep the cornice well sealed and anchored, and maintain the gutter system and flashing.
- 2) Repair rather than replace the cornice.
- 3) Do not remove elements of the original composition, such as brackets or blocks, without replacing them with new ones of a like design.
- 4) Match materials, decorative details, and profiles of the existing original cornice design when making repairs.
- 5) Do not replace an original cornice with a new one that conveys a different period, style, or theme from that of the building.

- 6) If the cornice is missing, the replacement should be based on physical or documented evidence, or barring that, be compatible with the original building.
- 7) Do not wrap or cover a cornice with vinyl or aluminum; these substitute materials may cover up original details and also may hide underlying moisture problems.

G. Roof

- 1) When replacing a standing seam metal roof, the width of the pan and the seam height should be consistent with the original. Ideally, the seams would be hand crimped.
- 2) If pre-painted standing seam metal roof material is permitted, commercial-looking ridge caps or ridge vents are not appropriate on residential structures.
- 3) Original roof pitch and configuration should be maintained.
- 4) The original size and shape of dormers should be maintained.
- 5) Dormers should not be introduced on visible elevations where none existed originally.
- 6) Retain elements, such as chimneys, skylights, and light wells that contribute to the style and character of the building.
- 7) When replacing a roof, match original materials as closely as possible.
 - a. Avoid, for example, replacing a standing-seam metal roof with asphalt shingles, as this would dramatically alter the building's appearance.
 - b. Artificial slate is an acceptable substitute when replacement is needed.
 - c. Do not change the appearance or material of parapet coping.
- 8) Place solar collectors and antennae on non-character defining roofs or roofs of non-historic adjacent buildings.
- 9) Do not add new elements, such as vents, skylights, or additional stories that would be visible on the primary elevations of the building.



AERIAL VIEW

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022

1515 University Avenue History Overview

- 1896: Minor House was built
- 1927: Commercial building was added to front of Minor Court House, completely removing the front facade. A pressing and cleaning business occupied one of the 3 rear storefront spaces facing Minor Court Alley. In the two storefronts facing University Avenue, Jameson's Bookstore occupied the east half and The Cavalier Diner occupied the west. Boarding rooms occupied the second floor.
- 1944: Cavalier Diner closed. The party wall was removed and Jameson's Bookstore expanded to encompass the large first floor space we know today.
- 1957: Jameson's Bookstore was replaced by Lloyd's Rexall Drug Store.
- 1983 & '84: Lloyd Building is listed on the Virginia Landmark Register and National Register of Historic Places as part of the Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District.
- 1994 - 2014: Lloyd Building was converted into Student Book Store.

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



1896 Sanborn Map

The 1896 Sanborn shows minor development in the area of the site, mostly large dwellings and support structures along University Avenue. The Site itself has one dwelling, built by Kate Minor in 1896.




Figure 9. 1896 Sanborn Map of the site.

1902 Sanborn Map

The 1902 Sanborn shows little change in the vicinity of the Site as compared to the 1896 map. There have been some minor modifications to nearby dwellings, but no significant changes to the Site or surrounding property. The Site itself still only has one dwelling.




Figure 10. 1902 Sanborn Map of the site

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



1907 Sanborn Map

The 1907 Sanborn shows that development is increasing on surrounding properties. Several large dwellings are located to the west and some of the existing buildings have been enlarged.




Figure 11. 1907 Sanborn Map of the site

1913 Sanborn Map

The 1913 Sanborn shows the Site looking similar to the 1907 map. There has been some increased development in the area of the Site, with new dwellings being constructed, but no change in the Site itself.




Figure 12. 1913 Sanborn Map of the site

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



1920 Sanborn Map

The 1920 Sanborn still shows the Site prior to existing development.




Figure 13. 1920 Sanborn Map of the site

1929 Sanborn Map

The 1929 Sanborn shows the existing building has been added to the front of the Minor House on Site. The building is noted as housing several stores, including "cleaning and pressing." The second floor is noted as being used for "rooming." There is a wired glass skylight near the center of the building. Bourbon Place (aka Minor Court Alley) borders the site to the east and the small stores at the back of the building front on this alley. A small pedestrian passageway separates the building from the businesses to the west.





Figure 14. 1929 Sanborn Map of the site.

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA


December 1 2022



1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022





Citation: Holsinger Studio Collection, ca. 1890-1938, Accession #9862, Special Collections, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
 Catalog Record: <http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/uva-lib:744806>
 Online Access: <http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/uva-lib:1051372>
 Page Title: Cavalier Diner
 Under 17USC, Section 107, this single copy was produced for the purposes of private study, scholarship, or research. Copyright and other legal restrictions may apply. Commercial use without permission is prohibited. University of Virginia Library.

Citation: Holsinger Studio Collection, ca. 1890-1938, Accession #9862, Special Collections, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
 Catalog Record: <http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/uva-lib:744806>
 Online Access: <http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/uva-lib:1051789>
 Page Title: Cavalier Diner, Charlottesville
 Under 17USC, Section 107, this single copy was produced for the purposes of private study, scholarship, or research. Copyright and other legal restrictions may apply. Commercial use without permission is prohibited. University of Virginia Library.

HISTORIC IMAGES

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
 CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



COURTESY CLEVELAND WEBBER



The Corner parking lot, behind the shops and restaurants on University Avenue




HISTORIC IMAGES

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



Architectural Details - Minor House



1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022

Architectural Detail Similarities



1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022

Original Appearance of Minor House may have resembled 105 West High Street, c. 1900



1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



South Elevation - University Avenue Street View

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



South Elevation - University Avenue Street View
Note rear portion of building not visible from street

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA


December 1 2022



East Elevation - Wertland / 15th Street NW View
Note rear portion of building not visible from street

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



Previous Slide Location of View

1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022



Proposed Work



Existing South Elevation

Replace asphalt shingle roof in-kind with architectural shingles.

Remove Philadelphia gutter, install 1/2 round hanging gutter, painted white to match trim.




Existing East Elevation


1515 UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

December 1 2022











Architectural And Historic Survey



Identification

STREET ADDRESS: 1515 University Avenue-
MAP & PARCEL: 9-30
CENSUS TRACT AND BLOCK:
PRESENT ZONING: B-2
ORIGINAL OWNER: Kate Minor
ORIGINAL USE: Residence or Boarding House
PRESENT USE: Drug Store, Apartments
PRESENT OWNER: John D. and Evelyn H. Lloyd
ADDRESS: "Glenorchy" Rt. 250 West
Charlottesville, Va

HISTORIC NAME: Minor Court Building (C.M.R.A.)
DATE / PERIOD: 1896 and 1927
STYLE: Vernacular
HEIGHT (to cornice) OR STORIES: 2
DIMENSIONS AND LAND AREA: 47.2' x 209' (9865 sq. ft.)
CONDITION: Good
SURVEYOR: Bibb
DATE OF SURVEY: Fall 1980
SOURCES: City/County Records
Sanborn Map Co. - 1896, 1907, 1920, 1969

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The Minor house is two storeys tall, triple pile, and constructed of brick laid in 5-course American-with-Flemish bond on the sides and rear. It has a high-pitched hip roof now covered with composition shingles, with projecting eaves, boxed cornices, and Philadelphia gutters. The original chimneys have been removed. There is a small, steep gable covered with pressed tin on each side of the house: centered on the east side, over the western half of the rear elevation, and over projecting bays on the facade and west side. The projecting bay on the west side is semi-octagonal, and spool brackets support the overhanging corners of the roof. Windows are double-sash, 1-over-1 light, and segmental-arched at the first level. There is a pair of 4-over-4 light attic windows in each gable. A one-storey veranda originally extended from the projecting bay to the east end of the facade. The flat-roofed commercial building replaces the veranda and extends to the street. It is two storeys tall and three bays wide. Construction is of brick laid in stretcher bond. The facade is of pressed brick. The facade is arcaded, with round arches with keystones springing from a corbelled string-course at window-top level. The area below the arches has been filled in and covered with a massive metal sign. There are two separate doors, flanked by pilasters, in the entry recess in the center bay, indicating that the building was once divided into two store rooms. Narrow wooden pilasters also flank the display windows in the side bays. There is a segmental-arched pair of double-sash, 1-over-1 light windows in each bay at the second level. There are matching corbelled brick cornices with mousetoothing above the storefront and just below the plain concrete-capped parapet. The parapet cornice continues along the east (Minor Court) side of the building. A narrow space separates this building from the one on the west. The first bay on each side of the building is similar to the facade. There is a large thermal window at the first level on the Minor Court side. Most of the windows at the first level have been closed; there is a single window in each bay at the second level. The entrance to the stair hall serving both old and new buildings occupies the last two bays of the commercial building. The corbelled storefront cornice above it continues over the three storefronts (two now bricked up) which have been cut into the east side of the Minor house.

HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION

Miss Kate Minor purchased this lot from Raleigh G. Minor in 1894 (ACDB 102-296) and built the house in 1896, according to tax records. At her death in 1918 she willed it to her sister Anne P. Minor (City WB 2-131). J. H. Irving and Harry H. Robinson, who conducted the University Grocery a block away, bought the house from Anne Minor in 1926 (City DB 55-235) and built the large commercial building onto the front the next year. Jameson's Bookstore occupied the western store room, and later the combined store room, from 1927 until the mid-1950's. Lloyd's Rexall Drug Store has occupied it since that time. The Minor house was used as a boarding house for University students for many years, and there are still rental rooms on the second level. The first level is used by the University Cafeteria as a kitchen and storeroom. The Minor Court Building was awarded to Irving's estate when Irving & Robinson's holdings were partitioned in 1940 (DB 104-142). The present owners purchased it from his heirs in 1964 (DB 253-94 and 98).
Additional References: City DB 227-213; City WB 4-199.

SIGNIFICANCE


The Minor House is the last of several large residences built around the turn of the century along University Avenue across from the University Grounds. Most were rooming or boarding houses for students.

UTM: 17/719340/4212490

*Architectural And Historic
Survey*



Graphics



Page No. 1

IPS (INTEGRATED PRESERVATION SOFTWARE)

06/24/1996

City of Charlottesville - Rugby Rd.-University Corner H.D.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORIC RESOURCE
RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY FORM

DHR Identification Number: 104-0133-0055

Other DHR Number: 104-70

Property Date(s) 1927

PROPERTY NAMES

Minor Court Building

EXPLANATION

Historic/Current

County/Independent City: Charlottesville

State: Virginia

Magisterial District:

Tax Parcel: 9-80-2

USGS Quad Map Name: CHARLOTTESVILLE WEST

UTMs of Boundary:

Center UTM:

Restrict location and UTM data? N

ADDRESSES

Number	Thoroughfare Name	Explanation
1515 -	University Avenue	Current

Vicinity: Town/Village/Hamlet: Charlottesville

Name of National Register Historic District:

Rugby Road-University Corner Historic District

Name of DHR Eligible Historic District:

Name of Local Historic District:

Physical Character of General Surroundings: City

Site Description/Notable Landscape Features:

Fronts directly on University Avenue, on corner site with alley along east side leading to parking lot in rear.

Ownership: Private

NR Resource Type: Building

WUZITS

Seq. #	# of	Wuzit Types	Historic?
1.0	1	Commercial Building	Historic

TOTAL: 1

Historic: 1

Non-Historic: 0

PRIMARY RESOURCE EXTERIOR COMPONENT DESCRIPTION

Component	#	Comp Type/Form	Material	Material Treatment
Cornice	2	Corbelled	Brick	
Roof	0	Parapet		Not visible
Walls	0	Masonry	Brick	Common Bond
Window(s)	0	Plate Glass	Wood	w/ Fan lights
Roof	0	Hipped	Asphalt	Shingle
Walls	0	Masonry	Brick	5-course Amer.Bond
Window(s)	0	Sash, double-hung	Wood	1/1
Cornice	0	Boxed	Wood	
Window(s)	0	Sash, double-hung	Wood	2/2
Dormer	3	Gable-roofed	Wood	Shingle
Chimney	1	Exterior side	Brick	Common Bond

INDIVIDUAL RESOURCE INFORMATION

SEQUENCE NUMBER: 1.0

WUZIT: Commercial Building

Primary Resource? Yes

Estimated Date of Construction: 1927

Source of Date: Site Visit/Written

Architectural Style: Commercial Style

Description:

This building combines a c. 1896 house with a 1927 commercial building added to the front of the property. The dwelling, known as the Minor House, is two-and-one-half stories with a hipped roof edged by a boxed cornice; the brick walls are modified five-course American bond, with a Flemish-bond row alternating with the five courses of stretchers. There are three gabled dormers still visible, faced with wood shingles and lit by paired four-over-one double-hung wood sash; a full-height bay window appears under the dormer on the east facade. The original chimneys were replaced by a brick exterior chimney. The commercial addition is two stories tall and three bays wide, with brick walls in common bond. Each floor has a corbelled cornice. Windows on the second floor are paired one-over-one with segmentally-arched lintels. The first floor has a recessed center entrance with two doors, flanked by plate glass display windows; the doors and windows are topped by semi-circular fanlights framed by a brick course and topped with keystones. The fanlights rise from a molded brick stringcourse; on the outer edge of each window is a recessed rectangular panel defined in brickwork.

Condition: Good-Excellent

Threats to Resource: None Known

Additions/Alterations Description:

Building consists of two sections, with 1927 commercial addition not predominant. The Minor House to the rear of the addition has had many alterations, including the loss of its porch, chimneys, and changes in fenestration; also, three large storefronts were cut into the west wall, but have been filled in with concrete block. The commercial addition was modernized probably in the 1960s, with a storefront that included a huge sign covering the fanlights, and panels filling in the lower portions of the plate glass windows. Since 1983 the facade has been restored (Bibb 1980; O'Dell 1983).

Number of Stories: 2.0

Interior Plan Type:

Accessed? No

Interior Description:

Relationship of Secondary Resources to Property:
None.

DHR Historic Context: Commerce/Trade

Significance Statement:

Minor House is the last remaining residence of several on the Corner in the late nineteenth to early twentieth century, which generally served as rooming houses for University students. The house was built by Miss Kate Minor in 1896 (Bibb 1980). In its present form the Minor Court Building represents the evolution from the largely domestic, turn-of-the-century appearance of the Corner to an area that is predominately commercial. The 1927 addition, now the dominant part of the building, combines typical 1920s commercial design features with Classical Revival components, and is compatible with other historic buildings in the area. The building contributes to the historic district.

GRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION

Medium	Medium ID #	Frames	Date
B&W 35mm Photos	14648	03 - 04	3/10/1996
B&W 35mm Photos	14648	11 -	3/10/1996
B&W 35mm Photos	14648	09 -	3/10/1996

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA

Sequence #: 1.1 Bibliographic Record Type: Survey, Other
Author: O'Dell, Jeffrey M.

Citation Abbreviation:

Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission (VHLC) Survey

Notes:

Sept. 1983. VDHR Archives.

Sequence #: 1.2 Bibliographic Record Type: Map
Author: Sanborn Map Company

Citation Abbreviation:

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, Charlottesville, VA

Notes:

Published by Sanborn Map Company, 1907, 1913, 1920, 1929, 1941, 1969.
University of Virginia Library Government Documents.

Sequence #: 1.2 Bibliographic Record Type: Survey, Other
Author: Bibb, Eugenia

Citation Abbreviation:

City of Charlottesville Architectural and Historical Survey

Notes:

1980. On file, City of Charlottesville Department of Community Development.

Sequence #: 1.3 Bibliographic Record Type: NRHP Form
Author: O'Dell, J.M., w/Charlottesville Community Development staff
Citation Abbreviation:

Rugby Road-University Corner Historic District NR Nomination

Notes:

1984. VDHR Archives.

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EVENTS

Date: 3/10/1996

Cultural Resource Management Event: Reconnaissance Survey

Organization or Person: Smead, Susan E.

ID # Associated with Event:

CRM Event Notes or Comments:

MAILING ADDRESS

Honorif:

First : Evelyn H.

Last : Lloyd

Suffix :

Title :

Company: et al.

Address: 103 Easthaven Court

City : Charlottesville

State: VA

Zip : 22901- Country: USA


Phone/extension:

Individual Category Codes:

Mailing Address Notes:

Surveyor's Notes:

CHARLOTTESVILLE



SCALE : 1" = 100'

SECTION:

9

9-80

B-2
47.2 x 209 (9865)

incl minor lifeboat kitchen

Jameson's - Lloyd's & minor Court

253- 98 ^{94x98} ✓	John D & Evelyn H. Lloyd	1964	plat 253-97
224-20	Sue Dwing, Phillips, et al	1961	WB 4-99
104-142	Lucy H. Dwing & Per N.B. Jr Dwing & Robinson		plat 104-146


built 1927

2 storage, 21 rooms, apt & store

1964 - comp shingle roof

house: 1896

store on front: 1927 (1920 Sanborn)





VIRGINIA
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

File no. 104-70
Negative no(s). 5072 (24)

SURVEY FORM

Historic name	Common name
County/Town/City Albemarle, Charlottesville	Lloyd's Rexall Drug Store
Street address or route number 1515 University Ave.	
USGS Quad Charlottesville West, Va.	Date or period C. 1925
Original owner	Architect/builder/craftsmen
Original use stores	
Present owner	Source of name
Present owner address	Source of date
	Stories
Present use store	Foundation and wall const'n
Acreage	
	Roof type

State condition of structure and environs good

State potential threats to structure
Note any archaeological interest

Should be investigated for possible register potential? yes ___ no X

Architectural description (Note significant features of plan, structural system and interior and exterior decoration, taking care to point out aspects not visible or clear from photographs. Explain nature and period of all alterations and additions. List any outbuildings and their approximate ages, cemeteries, etc.)

1515: brick (stretcher bond); 2 story with attic; flat roof; 3 bay; Commercial Vernacular. C. 1925. Corbelled cornice above 1st and 2nd floor windows, wood ventilation grill in attic, 2 large semi-circular arches with keystones and projecting brick imposts now hidden by metal commercial sign. Recessed 2-door entrance in center framed by pilasters. 1st floor windows plate glass with wood dado below, 2nd floor paired one over one light sash under double segmental arch.

Interior inspected? no

Historical significance (Chain of title; individuals, families, events, etc., associated with the property.)

1907 Sandborn shows small frame building on site.

1920 Sandborn shows small frame building used as Press store

original building divided into two stores

east - Mr. T. Jamieson's Book store til 1957

west - Cavalier store of Charles Smith

large soda fountain

in rear was Cavalier Pressing Club (cleaners)

Irving estate built building.

Published sources (Books, articles, etc., with bibliographic data.)

Primary sources (Manuscript documentary or graphic materials; give location.)

Names and addresses of persons interviewed

Plan (Indicate locations of rooms, doorways, windows, alterations, etc.)

This image shows a full page of blank graph paper. The grid consists of small, uniform squares formed by thin, light blue lines. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the page.

This image shows a full page of blank graph paper. The grid consists of small squares formed by thin, light blue horizontal and vertical lines. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Name, address and title of recorder
Karen Kummer U. of Va. Arch. History Grad. Student

March 1980



VIRGINIA
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION
HISTORIC DISTRICT SURVEY FORM

File No. 104- 133 -55
Negative no(s). 7296

Page 2 of 2

Street address 1515 University Ave.
Town/City Charlottesville

Historic name Common name Lloyd's Rexall Drug Store

- Material
- ☐ wood frame (siding: ☐ weatherboard, ☐ shingle, ☐ aluminum, ☐ bricktex, ☐ _____)
 - ☐ brick (bond: ☐ Flemish, ☐ stretcher, ☐ _____ course American, ☐ _____)
 - ☐ stone (☐ random rubble, ☐ random ashlar, ☐ coursed ashlar, ☐ _____)
 - ☐ log (siding: ☐ weatherboard, ☐ shingle, ☐ aluminum, ☐ bricktex, ☐ _____)
 - ☐ stucco ☐ cast iron
 - ☐ concrete block ☐ terra cotta
 - ☐ enameled steel ☐ glass and metal
 - ☐ other: _____

Number of Stories	Roof Type	Roof Material
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 1/2	<input type="checkbox"/> shed <input type="checkbox"/> mansard	<input type="checkbox"/> slate <input type="checkbox"/> tile
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 1/2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> gable <input type="checkbox"/> gambrel	<input type="checkbox"/> wood shingle <input type="checkbox"/> pressed tin
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> pediment <input type="checkbox"/> parapet	<input type="checkbox"/> composition <input type="checkbox"/> not visible
	<input type="checkbox"/> hipped <input type="checkbox"/> flat	<input type="checkbox"/> standing seam metal
	<input type="checkbox"/> other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> other: _____

Dormers	Number of bays — Main facade
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> shed <input type="checkbox"/> hipped	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 7
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> gable	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 8
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> pedimented	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> _____

Porch	Stories	Bays	General description
<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	1 (center) 2 4	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	1 (side) 3	

Building type
<input type="checkbox"/> detached house <input type="checkbox"/> garage <input type="checkbox"/> government <input type="checkbox"/> industrial
<input type="checkbox"/> detached town house <input type="checkbox"/> farmhouse <input type="checkbox"/> commercial (office) <input type="checkbox"/> school
<input type="checkbox"/> row house <input type="checkbox"/> apartment building <input type="checkbox"/> commercial (store) <input type="checkbox"/> church
<input type="checkbox"/> double house <input type="checkbox"/> gas station <input type="checkbox"/> railroad <input type="checkbox"/> _____

Style/period	Date	Architect/builder
--------------	------	-------------------

Location and description of entrance

Miscellaneous descriptive information (plan, exterior and interior decoration, cornice/eave type, window type and trim, chimneys, additions, alterations)

Date 9-83 File No. 104-130

Name 1515 University Ave.

Town Charlottesville

County

Photographer

Contents 1 + 2



Jameson - Lloyds & Minor Court (now Todd's)

104-142

7/1/1940

partition of real est. of Harry H. Robinson & J. H. Dwing, who
"conducted various businesses" under names "Dwing &
Robinson" & "Univ Grocery"

Dwing dec 1936 (WB 4-199)

~~to Lucy H. Dwing~~ Dwing estate is
to Robinson:

a) lot w/ impts on N side Univ Ave bought fr Samuel B. Chandler
est. 1922 (40-241)

b) lot w/ impts on N side Univ Ave bought fr Ann M & P.
Minor 1926 (55-235), ~~except~~ except part to Dwing
to Dwing estate:

a) "that part of Minor property upon which the Minor
Court bldg is situated" & lot behind it & strip east of bldg
& west of ~~the~~ center line of alley

55-235

6/2/1926

contract 4/21/1926

^{Minor} Ann M & P. Minor → J. H. Dwing & H. H. Robinson \$27,000

tract w/ impts on N side Univ Ave

bounded on west by AN Peyton, now EM Page, & others,
on E by Dwing & Robinson

same as property R L Minor → Kate Minor by 2 deeds
ACDB
102-296 & 112-184, & willed by her to Ann Minor (City WB 2-131)

WB 2-131


will of Kate Minor, spinster
all to sister Anne Minor

dec
1915, 1918

- ACDB
112-184
8/29/1898
- Miss Kate Minor → SE Chancellor, R C Minor, F P Dunnington,
W E Polson, Miss Sallie Doswell
"being owners of property bet C & O RR & Staunton Trk &
draining toward City of Knoxville"
sewer rights thru property
- 102-296
12/22/1894
- Raleigh C. Minor (S) → Kate Minor \$1400
.45' on epta of Univ Ave
bounded on W by Mrs M C Anderson & E by Raleigh C Minor
part of ACDB 100-165, 1893, MC & RD Anderson → Minor
- 100-165
2/15/1893
- MC & RD Anderson → R C Minor \$2400
tract .52 acre bounded by Univ Ave, R L Carter, ^(on E) Anderson residence ^(on W)
C & O
reverses right to remove bldgs on property

104-146

1940



A. N. Peyton

Minor Court Bldg

Poligneto Bldg
55-235
40-241

Anderson Bros

Sheppe

C & O RR

University Ave

15 steps
& 4' walk

Minor Court

1926	Dick Anne Minor	40'	^N minor	$3200 + 7000 = 10,200$	
		45'	^N "	$3600 + - = 3600$	
1927	Dwight & Robinson	40'	"	$2200 + 7000 = 10,200$	for Anne Minor
" , 28		45'	"	$3600 + - = 3600$	"
1928	"	40'	"	$3200 + 20,800 = 24,000$	impts added
1894	R.C. Minor	80 p	minor (1 v)	$500 + 0 = 500$ 0 + 500	for MC Anderson
1895	" "	40	" "	$250 + 0 = 250$	off 250 to minor
" , 96	Kate	"	" "	" " "	for Minor
1897	" "	"	" "	$" + 3500 = 3750$	impts added

01300092

Minor Court Bldg

Lloyd's facade

2 storeys, 3 bays at each level

stretchers band, pressed

~~stone~~ water table
storefront: recessed cent ent.

round arches w/ stone or conc. keystone spring
fr corbelled stringcourse; arches now filled

in w/ white ~~concrete~~ ^{boards} & covered w/ huge sign
windows flanked by narrow wooden pilasters
2 doors flanked by pilasters

once 2 storeys: sep doors, signs of a sign on left
corbelled storefront cornice w/ mouse-toothing
(not entabl or fringe)

at 2nd level: ^{seg arched} per 1/1 wind w/ conc sill in each bay

same cornice repeated above 2nd storey

plain conc-capped parapet

sides:  shape

usual facade treatment cont 1 bay on W - narrow alley or space
" " " " " " E - thermal wind 1st

upper cornice cont on E

single windows 2nd, some smaller closed ones 1st, 11 bays
apt ent in last 2 bays, where storefront cornice picks up
again & cont across house


not pressed brick

Minor house

- East E side re-bricked in stator up to storefront cornice
 " " torn up into 7 wide bays at 1st level
 (1 store, 2 CB-d up)
 E - 7 bays at 2nd level - sl $\frac{1}{1}$, ^{pr in center bay} wooden sills, irreg
 E - 5-c am-up - Film at 2nd
 boxed cornice & plain frieze, proj lines
 on east gable: pressed tin, or. $\frac{4}{4}$ attic wind w/ sl tin
 roof comp shingles
- Redr ^{steep} ~~near~~ hip roof; ^(w plane cont) gable over W half, matches E; Philagotton
 5-c am-up - Film
 openings irreg, reg-arched at 1st, most closed

West proj bay w/ gable at front - semi-act, spool brackets at
 at cornice

Front proj bay (or pair) w/ gable at W end



Date 3/10/96 File No. 104-133-55
Name Minor Court Building
Town Charlottesville 1545 University Ave.
County _____
Photographer S. E. Smend
Contents 4 exterior views



Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR # 22-11-03

507 Ridge Street, TMP 290141000

Ridge Street ADC District

Owner/Applicant: Kimberly and Clayton Lauter

Project: Demo backyard shed/cottage

Application components (please click each link to go directly to PDF page):

- [Staff Report](#)
- [Historic Survey](#)
- [Application Submittal](#)

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Staff Report
December 20, 2022**



Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 22-11-03

507 Ridge Street, Tax Parcel 290141000

Ridge Street ADC District

Owners/Applicants: Clayton & Kimberly Lauter

Project: Demolition of shed/cottage



Background

Year Built: Cottage/shed (House constructed c1895)

District: Ridge Street ADC District

Status: Contributing

The Gianniny-Bailey House contributes to the series of Victorian residences along Ridge Street that date to the 1890s. This two-story, two-bay house was originally weatherboard, now covered with stucco. Notable features include a semi-octagonal projecting bay on the front façade, and Eastlake trim on the second story porch. The structure in the rear was built as a servant's cottage.

Prior BAR Actions

- March 2005: Approve painting of unpainted stucco.
- February 2006: Approve partial demolition and addition.
- May 2017: Approve roof and built-in gutter replacement.
- August 20, 2019: Approve frame-mounted, ground level, photovoltaic system in rear yard.
- November 15, 2022: BAR deferred action re: demo of cottage/shed (BAR # 22-11-03).
Link to the BAR meeting video. Discussion begins at approx. 01:30:00.
<https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzezuuv3iclkx1a?b=zws6izrpegx6m7ox2o8i>
Link to November staff report and submittal, see pg. 70: [BAR meeting packet - Nov 15 2022](#)

Application

- Submittal: Photographs of structure with additional notes and photos by staff. (See page 70 of pdf: [BAR meeting packet - Nov 15 2022](#))

Request CoA for demolition of an approximately 10-ft x 12-ft, single-story, wood-framed structure in the rear yard.

Discussion

Note: No substantive changes to the November 15, 2002. Revisions are highlighted.

Staff visited the site on November 3, 2022 and found the cottage to be in poor condition, but not at immediate risk of collapse. (See attached photos and summary.) Owners plans to construct an accessory dwelling unit near/at the location of the cottage; however, they also expressed that regardless of the ADU project, they do not wish to incur further expenses necessary to stabilize and maintain the cottage. With that, the owners have expressed willingness to allow relocation of the structure to another site, should someone express interest in acquiring it and provided the BAR approves the move.

As summarized below, the design guidelines recommend against approving this request. However, should there be an opportunity to relocate the structure to another site—likely a property not under BAR purview--staff suggests the BAR consider allowing that move as a solution that preserves the structure (or, at least, precludes immediate demolition) and avoids a potentially contentious appeal to Council (should a demo CoA be denied), and/or avoids actions that might result in leveraging civil fines.

Note: Staff refers to the following provisions of the City Code only as a matter of full disclosure and for information only, not to suggest a possible a path or outcome, nor to provide an enforceable interpretation of the Code.

Per Sec. 34-277 (*Certificates of appropriateness; demolitions and removals*), the BAR must approve the razing or moving of a contributing structure, except *upon the determination of the building code official that the building or structure is in such a dangerous, hazardous or unsafe condition that it could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious injury*. Having no such determination by the City, that exception does not apply. Additionally, failure to obtain the necessary approval for demolitions, the owner is subject to a civil penalty *not to exceed twice the fair market value of the building or structure, as determined by the city real estate tax assessment at the time of the demolition, razing or moving*. (Sec. 34-86(b). See *Appendix* of this staff report.) The City's current assessment for this structure is \$2,700. (Reference J. Davis email of Nov. 9, 2202.) As such, the fine could not exceed \$5,400.

Per Sec. 34-281 (*Maintenance and repair required*), the owner of a contributing structure shall not shall allow it to *fall into a state of disrepair which may result in the deterioration of any exterior appurtenance or architectural feature so as to produce or tend to produce a detrimental effect upon the character of a major architectural design district or the life and character of a contributing structure or protected property*. In a violation of this requirement, the owner is subject to a civil penalty of \$200 for the first violation, and a civil penalty of \$500 for each subsequent violation. (Sec. 34-86(a)(10), see *Appendix* of this staff report.)

Per Sec. 34-285 (*Approval or denial of applications by BAR*) and should the BAR deny the CoA, the applicant may appeal to Council and seek further remedy per **Sec. 34-286** (*City council appeals*). (See *Appendix* of this staff report.)

Should the BAR approve the demolition request, staff recommends the following condition (included in the suggested motion below):

- Applicant will provide for the BAR record documentation of the existing building. [In addition to the photos provided, documentation will include dimensioned floor plans and elevations.]

Suggested Motions

Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed demolition at 507 Ridge Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines for demolitions and that the BAR approves the application [as submitted with the condition that the applicant will provide for the BAR record documentation of the existing building].

or [as submitted with the following modifications/conditions: ...]

Denial: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed demolition at 507 Ridge Street does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines for demolitions and that for the following reasons the BAR denies the application as submitted:...

Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines

Review Criteria Generally

Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that in considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

- (1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and
- (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

Pertinent Standards for Review of Demolitions:

Sec. 34-278. - Standards for considering demolitions.

The following factors shall be considered in determining whether or not to permit the moving, removing, encapsulation or demolition, in whole or in part, of a contributing structure or protected property:

(a) The historic, architectural or cultural significance, if any, of the specific structure or property, including, without limitation:

- (1) The age of the structure or property;

Staff comment: The house and cottage were constructed in 1895 by Edgar Gianniny, the proprietor of the Gleason Hotel on West Main. (Passing through several owners, the property was acquired in 1940 by Grover Bailey, whose family occupied the house until 1962.) The available Sanborn Maps suggest the cottage was relocated at least once on the property.

- (2) Whether it has been designated a National Historic Landmark, listed on the National Register of Historic Places or listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register;

Staff comment: The house and cottage (VDR #104-0025-0019) are listed as contributing structures to the NRHP-listed *Ridge Street Historic District* (VDHR #104-0025). The VCRIS record indicates the property was found ineligible for individual listing. The cottage is identified as *one of the three surviving servants quarters in the Ridge Street Historic District*. [Note: Staff has been unable to identify the locations or conditions of other, similar structures. None yet found in review of City surveys and NRHP listing for properties in the *Ridge Street Historic District*.]

From the NRHP listing. <https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/historic-registers/104-0025/507> [Ridge]: (Gianniny-Bailey House); frame (stucco covered weatherboard); 2 story; 2 bays; high pitched hip roof with pedimented gables over 3 projecting bays; one story veranda on north bay. Victorian Vernacular. 1895.

- (3) Whether, and to what extent, the building or structure is associated with a historic person, architect or master craftsmen, or with a historic event;

Staff comment: Nothing evident in the available records. The builder is not known. The initial owner was Edgar Gianniny, the proprietor of a local hotel.

Servant's cottage: The City's 1994 survey identifies this structure as a *servant's cottage*. According to the US Census and City Directories (between 1900 and 1960) and the City survey, we know the property changed ownership six times and until 1950 was primarily occupied by multiple renters. From the census record, two of the earliest owners had a servant listed in their household; however, neither lived at 507 Ridge Street for those census years. (See the Appendix.) Staff believes reference to a *servant's cottage* most likely originated with Edgar Gianniny, who reportedly constructed the house in 1895. We cannot determine if Gianniny ever lived here initially; he sold the property in 1897 and in 1900 the house is occupied by a renter. (Curiously, Gianniny does not appear in the 1900 census and the 1910 census lists no one at 507 Ridge Street.) Gianniny reacquired the property in 1901. The biennial City Directories indicate he occupied the house in 1902 and 1904, so we can assume this was between 1901 and 1905. (In 1906, the house is sold to and occupied by Charles Apple.) Per the 1910 census Gianniny lives at 1116 East Market Street, and in the household is Ellen Johnson, age 60, listed as a servant. Also in 1910, Apple has moved to the area near Fry's Spring, and in his household is John Scott, age 15, listed as a servant. It is possible both Gianniny and Apple while living at 507 Ridge Street employed a servant who occupied the cottage. However, the historical record suggests the cottage, if used as a servant's quarters or occupied at all, was likely only from 1895 to 1897 and from 1901 to 1909. [Note: Further research might provide more conclusive evidence.]

- (4) Whether the building or structure or any of its features, represent an infrequent or the first or last remaining example within the city of a particular architectural style or feature;

Staff comment: The structure is unique in its origin as a *servant's cottage*; however, its style, elements and materiality are very common throughout this district and the City.

- (5) Whether the building or structure is of such old or distinctive design, texture or material that it could not be reproduced, or could be reproduced only with great difficulty; and

Staff comment: The building material is easily reproduced.

(6) The degree to which distinguishing characteristics, qualities, features, or materials remain.

Staff comment: The structure will be razed (though, the owner may allow its relocation to another site). The applicant has expressed that—unless the building is relocated--salvageable materials will be retained and incorporated (likely as interior elements) in a planned accessory dwelling unit in this location.

(b) Whether, and to what extent, a contributing structure is linked, historically or aesthetically, to other buildings or structures within an existing major design control district, or is one of a group of properties within such a district whose concentration or continuity possesses greater significance than many of its component buildings.

Staff comment: The features are less elaborate and ornate than surrounding, similar-period structures; however, the design and materiality are generally consistent with those buildings.

Location: While Sanborn Maps are not reliable for precise scale and dimension, they are generally reliable for spatial relationships. The earliest maps showing this property indicate that between 1902 and 1920, the cottage was located on the south parcel line. On the 1920 map the cottage is either not shown or has moved farther back along the south parcel line. On the 1965 map (and on the 1966 aerial photo) the cottage is at its current location along the north parcel line.

(c) The overall condition and structural integrity of the building or structure, as indicated by studies prepared by a qualified professional engineer and provided by the applicant or other information provided to the board.

Staff comment: No study/report submitted by applicant.

(d) Whether, and to what extent, the applicant proposes means, methods or plans for moving, removing, or demolishing the structure or property that preserves portions, features or materials that are significant to the property's historic, architectural, or cultural value; and

Staff comment: The structure will be razed (though, the owner may allow its relocation to another site). The applicant has expressed that—unless the building is relocated--salvageable materials will be retained and incorporated (likely as interior elements) in a planned accessory dwelling unit in this location.

(e) Any applicable provisions of the city's Design Guidelines [Chapter 7: *Moving and Demolitions*].

Staff comment: See below, under *B. Demolition of Historic Structures*

Pertinent design guidelines re: Demolitions

Link: [Chapter 7 Moving and Demolition](#)

A. Introduction

Historic buildings are irreplaceable community assets; and once they are gone, they are gone forever. With each successive demolition or removal, the integrity of a historic district is further eroded. Therefore, the demolition or moving of any contributing building in a historic district should be considered carefully.

Charlottesville's Zoning Ordinance contains provisions that require the property owner to obtain approval prior to demolishing a contributing property in a historic district or an Individually Protected Property (IPP).

The following review criteria should be used for IPP's and (contributing) buildings that are proposed for demolition or relocation.

Plans to demolish or remove a protected property must be approved by the BAR or, on appeal, by the City Council after consultation with the BAR. Upon receipt of an application for demolition or removal of a structure, the BAR has 45 days to either approve or deny the request. If the request is denied and the owner appeals to the City Council, the Council can either approve or deny the request. If Council denies the request, the owner may appeal to the City Circuit Court.

In addition to the right to appeal to City Council or the Circuit Court, there is a process that enables the owner to demolish the building or structure if certain conditions have been met. After the owner has appealed to City Council and has been denied, the owner may choose to make a bona fide offer to sell the building or structure and land.

The property must be offered at a price reasonably related to the fair market value of the structure and land and must be made to the city or to any person or firm or agency that gives reasonable assurance that it is willing to preserve and restore the property. City Council must first confirm that the offering price is reasonably related to the fair market value.

The time during which the offer to sell must remain open varies according to the price, as set out in the State Code and the Zoning Ordinance.

If such a bona fide offer to sell is not accepted within the designated time period, the owner may renew the demolition request to City Council and will be entitled [to a CoA that permits demolition].

B. Demolition of Historic Structures

Review Criteria for Demolition

1) The standards established by the City Code, Section 34-278.

Staff comment: See comments above: *Standards for considering demolitions.*

2) The public necessity of the proposed demolition.

Staff comment: Demolition is not a public necessity; the building has not been condemned or deemed unsafe.

- 3) The public purpose or interest in land or buildings to be protected.

Staff comment: See comments above: *Standards for considering demolitions*, item a.

- 4) Whether or not a relocation of the structure would be a practical and preferable alternative to demolition.

Staff comment: See comments above: *Standards for considering demolitions*, item d.

- 5) Whether or not the proposed demolition would adversely or positively affect other historic buildings or the character of the historic district.

Staff comment: See comments above: *Standards for considering demolitions*, item d. Additionally, relative to the VLR/NRHP *Ridge Street Historic District*, per discussions with VDHR staff, November 4, 2022, removal of the cottage/shed would not cause the primary structure (house) to become non-contributing, nor the historic district to be de-listed.

- 6) The reason for demolishing the structure and whether or not alternatives exist.

Staff comment: See comments above: *Standards for considering demolitions*, item d.

- 7) Whether or not there has been a professional economic and structural feasibility study for rehabilitating or reusing the structure and whether or not its findings support the proposed demolition.

Staff comment: See comments above: *Standards for considering demolitions*, item c

Guidelines for Demolition

- 1) Demolish a historic structure only after all preferable alternatives have been exhausted.
- 2) Document the building thoroughly through photographs and, for especially significant buildings, measured drawings according to Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Standards. This information should be retained by the City of Charlottesville Department of Neighborhood Development Services and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.
- 3) If the site is to remain vacant for any length of time, maintain the empty lot in a manner consistent with other open spaces in the districts.

Appendix: Related City Code Sections

Sec. 34-285. - Approval or denial of applications by BAR.

- c) Upon denial of an application (approval of an application with conditions over the objections of the applicant shall be deemed a denial), the applicant shall be provided written notice of the decision, including a statement of the reasons for the denial or for the conditions to which the applicant objects. Following a denial the applicant, the director of neighborhood development services, or any aggrieved person may appeal the decision to the city council, by filing a written notice of appeal within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision.

(9-15-03(3); 12-17-12(1))

Sec. 34-286. - City council appeals.

- a) An applicant shall set forth, in writing, the grounds for an appeal, including the procedure(s) or standard(s) alleged to have been violated or misapplied by the BAR, and/or any additional information, factors or opinions he or she deems relevant to the application. The applicant, or his agent, and any aggrieved person, shall be given an opportunity to be heard on the appeal.
- b) In any appeal the city council shall consult with the BAR and consider the written appeal, the criteria set forth within section 34-276 or 34-278, as applicable, and any other information, factors, or opinions it deems relevant to the application.
- c) A final decision of the city council may be appealed by the owner of the subject property to the Circuit Court for the City of Charlottesville, by filing with the court a petition at law, setting forth the alleged illegality of the action taken. such petition must be filed with the circuit court within thirty (30) days after council's final decision. The filing of the petition shall stay the council's decision pending the outcome of the appeal; except that the filing of the petition shall not stay a decision of city council denying permission to demolish a building or structure. Any appeal which may be taken to the circuit court from a decision of the city council to deny a permit for the demolition of a building or structure shall not affect the right of the property owner to make the bona fide offer to sell referred to in subparagraphs (d) and (e), below.
- d) In addition to the right of appeal set forth above, the owner of a building or structure, the demolition of which has been the subject of an application appealed to the city council, shall, as a matter of right, be entitled to demolish such building or structure if all of the following conditions have been met:
 - (1) The owner has appealed to city council for permission to demolish the building or structure, and city council has denied such permission;
 - (2) The owner has, for the applicable sale period set forth herein below, and at a price reasonably related to the fair market value of the subject property, made a bona fide offer to sell the building or structure, and the land pertaining thereto, to a person or legal entity that gives reasonable assurance that the building or structure will be preserved and restored; and
 - (3) No bona fide contract, binding upon all parties thereto, shall have been executed for the sale of such landmark, building or structure, and the land pertaining thereto, prior to the expiration of the applicable sale period.
 - (4) If all of the foregoing conditions are not met within the applicable sale period, then the city council's decision denying a permit shall stand, unless and until that decision is overturned by the circuit court. However, following expiration of the applicable sale period, a property owner may renew his request to the city council to approve the demolition of the historic landmark, building or structure.
- e) The time in which a property owner may take advantage of the rights afforded by subparagraph (d), above (the applicable "sale period") shall be as follows:
 - (1) Three (3) months, when the offering price is less than [\$25,000.00].

[...]

Sec. 34-86. - Schedule of civil penalties.

- a) Any violation of the following provisions of this chapter shall be subject to a civil penalty of two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for the first violation, and a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for each subsequent violation arising from the same set of operative facts:

- (10) Any violation of Article II, Divisions 1—5, sections [34-240](#), et seq., regarding requirements for overlay districts.
- b) Any person who demolishes, razes or moves any building or structure which is subject to the regulations set forth within [section 34-277](#) or [section 34-340](#) without approval of the BAR or city council, shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed twice the fair market value of the building or structure, as determined by the city real estate tax assessment at the time of the demolition, razing or moving.
- (1) For purposes of this section, the term "person" shall include any individual, firm, partnership, association, corporation, company or organization of any kind, which is deemed by the Charlottesville Circuit Court to be responsible for the demolition, razing or moving.
 - (2) An action seeking the imposition of the penalty shall be instituted by petition filed by the city in the Circuit Court of the City of Charlottesville, which shall be tried in the same manner as any action at law. It shall be the burden of the city to show the liability of the violator by a preponderance of the evidence. An admission of liability or finding of liability shall not be a criminal conviction for any purpose.
 - (3) The defendant may, within twenty-one (21) days after the filing of the petition, file an answer and, without admitting liability, agree to restore the building or structure as it existed prior to demolition. If the restoration is completed within the time agreed upon by the parties or as established by the court, the petition shall be dismissed from the court's docket.
 - (4) The filing of the action pursuant to this section shall preclude a criminal prosecution for the same offense, except where the demolition, razing or moving has resulted in personal injury.
- (9-15-03(3); 10-18-10(1); 11-21-11(2); 12-17-12(1))

507 Ridge Street - Servant's Cottage c1890s

NRHP listing: ***Ridge Street Historic District***

www.dhr.virginia.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/104-0025_Ridge_St_HD_1982_Final_Nomination-1.pdf

507 Ridge Street: (Gianniny-Bailey House); frame (stucco covered weatherboard); 2 storey; 2 bays; high pitched hip roof with pedimented gables over 3 projecting bays; one storey veranda on north bay. Victorian Vernacular. 1895. (see survey sheet for additional details)



City survey 1970s/80s

507 Ridge Street - Servant's Cottage c1890s



City survey 1994

*servants cottage:
1-storey, gable roof, white weatherboarded
prob 1 room*

This house has one of the three surviving servants' quarters in the Ridge Street Historic District. The Gianniny-Bailey House is important to the streetscape and the District.

507 Ridge Street - Servant's Cottage c1890s






Oct 2022



507 Ridge Street - Servant's Cottage c1890s

Oct 2022





GIANNINY-BAILEY HOUSE



STREET ADDRESS:	507 Ridge Street
MAP & PARCEL:	29-141
VDHR FILE NUMBER:	104-25-19
CITY FILE NUMBER:	364
PRESENT ZONING:	R-3
ORIGINAL OWNER:	E. M. Gianniny
ORIGINAL USE:	Residence
PRESENT USE:	Residence
PRESENT OWNER:	Lottie Scott
ADDRESS:	507 Ridge Street Charlottesville, Virginia
HISTORIC NAME:	Gianniny-Bailey House
DATE/PERIOD:	1895
STYLE:	Vernacular Queen Anne
HEIGHT(to cornice)OR STORIES:	2 storeys
DIMENSIONS AND LAND AREA:	60' x 225' (13,500 sq. ft.)
CONDITION:	Good
SURVEYOR:	Bibb
DATE OF SURVEY:	Fall 1980, Revised 1993
SOURCES:	City Records Mrs. Lottie Scott Mrs. E. A. Talley (Mabel Apple Talley)

GIANNINY-BAILEY HOUSE

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

This house is two storeys tall, two bays wide, and double-pile, set on a low foundation. The original weatherboarding has been covered with stucco, significantly altering the appearance of the house. The trim is painted green. There is a semi-octagonal projecting side bay on the east facade, a rectangular projecting bay on the north side, and a projecting pavilion to the rear. The high-pitched hipped roof has steeply pedimented gables over the three projecting bays and another centered over the southern elevation. The roof is covered with standing-seam metal, painted red, and has Philadelphia gutters, projecting eaves and verges, and a boxed cornice. Brackets with a sunburst motif support the overhanging corners of the gable over the semi-octagonal bay. The sunburst motif is repeated at the peaks of the gables. The rear gable is weatherboarded; the other three are covered with pressed tin. There is a pair of 9-over-9 light tinted glass attic windows in the west facade gable, and a single, plain 1-over-1 light window in each of the others. There are two interior capped chimneys. Other windows are double-sash with architrave trim, 1-over-1 light on the facade and 2-over-2 light elsewhere. The one on the verandah has a panelled spandrel, suggesting that it may originally have been a triple sash window. A deep one-storey verandah covers the northern bay of the facade and wraps around the corner to a side entrance in the projecting bay on the north side. It has a medium-pitched truncated hipped roof covered with standing-seam metal with boxed cornice. The original spool frieze and simple balustrade are gone, square posts have replaced the attenuated Eastlake posts and brackets, and the floor and steps have been replaced with concrete. The wide entrance door in the northern bay has nine lights over three panels and a three-light rectangular transom. Beside the door there is a small double-sash window with one large light bordered by small lights. A small second storey porch is set on the roof of the verandah at window-sill level. It has a nearly flat roof, and it has retained its spool frieze, attenuated Eastlake posts with brackets, and turned balustrade. The second storey hall window gives access to the porch. There is a one-storey hipped-roofed back porch beside the projecting rear pavilion. Interior trim is symmetrically moulded with corner blocks. The three-flight open stair in the entrance hall has a decorated rail and paneled wall. The six fireplaces with Victorian mantels have been closed. There is a one-storey, gable-roofed, white weatherboarded servant's cottage behind the house.

HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION

E. M. Gianniny purchased this lot in 1895 (City DB 6-13) and built the house the same year, according to tax records. He sold it to E. M. Buck in 1897 (DB 8-331), then bought it back in 1901 (DB 12-103), and sold it to C. S. Apple in 1906 (DB 17-336). Ida L. Birch bought the house from Apple in 1915 (DB 27-487). Her husband, who had inherited it from her (WB 2-229), lost it during the Depression (DB 69-52, 86-128). E. I. and Mollie F. Bing owned it from 1935 to 1940, when they sold it to G. C. Bailey (DB 102-334). The Bailey family lived there for 22 years before selling it to Mrs. Lottie Scott in 1962 (DB 333-430). The weatherboarding was covered with stucco sometime between 1915 and 1962.


STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

This nicely detailed Vernacular Queen Anne residence is typical of the houses built on Ridge Street in the 1890's. The loss of many of them makes the remaining ones more important. The little second-storey porch, which has retained its Eastlake trim, is especially noteworthy.

This house has one of the three surviving servants' quarters in the Ridge Street Historic District. The Gianniny-Bailey House is important to the streetscape and the District.

GIANNINY-BAILEY HOUSE
507 RIDGE ST.

VDHR FILE NO. 104-25-19



SUSAN E. SMEAD
PRESERVATION ASSOCIATES OF VIRGINIA

JANUARY 1994

29-141

60x225 (.13500

R-3

507 Ridge St.


333-430 Lottie Scott ^{same} 1972
 233-459 ~~Barley~~ 1962
 102-33? B. C. Bailey

highway
 plat 8-331

1-fam, 2 storeys, 7 rooms, 1 1/2 baths
 conc. block found., stucco walls, metal gable & hipped roof, basement
 "old"

cheap concrete
 frame cottage 10' x 12'
 1971 - 1/2 bath
 1976 - storage shed

Diagram



16.2
 17.2
 33.4

10/2/19

Mrs Scott

stusco before bought

→ come to door — has German shepherd

* Giaming - 1895 - 1906 = 11 yr

Apple - 1906 - 1915 = 9 "

Birch - 1915 - 1935 = 20 "

Bailey - 1940 - 1962 = 22 "

Scott - 1962 - 21981 = 219 yr

5-5581 Bailey

507 Ridge St

233-459

~~102-334~~

1962

Gunner C & Myrtle M. Bailey → Lottie Scott

\$12,500

102-334

5/21/1940

E I & Marg E Bing & Mollie F. Bing (5) → C C Bailey
same as 86-128

86-128

7/11/1935

Pers NB, under 1930 deed of trust for F. H. Birch, widower,
(69-52) → E. I. Bing & Mollie F. Bing, at auction \$3500
lot of impts W side Ridge St

69-52

same as ~~27~~ 27-487

& will of Ida L. Birch, 1919, WB 2-229

27-487

10/14/1915

C. S. & Genevieve W. Apple → Ida L. Birch

\$4500

same as 17-336

17-336

5/24/1906

Ella M & E B Banning → C S Apple
house & lot on west side Ridge St
same as 12-103

\$4000

12-103

8/12/1901

EM & Delia C Buck → EM Banning
lot w/ "house & other impts"

\$3000

same as 6-13

Delia B. Scribner & husb → Ella M. Banning

8-331

8-331

11/12/1897

Edgar B & Ella M Banning → EM Buck
same as 6-13 house & lot

(trade for farm)

6-13

4/8/1895

Delia B & W Scribner → EM Banning (now S. B)
lot (no mention of house) on west side Ridge St
part of ACDB 85-398, 1885, & EM Wolfe est → Scribner

\$1000

Tax

1895 3rd Arlie B. Scribner

w Ridge

$$1000 + 2000 = 3000$$

1896 " "

"

$$500 + " = 2500 \text{ \$500 off to Binning}$$

" E B Binning

"

$$700 + 1800 = 2500 \text{ for Scribner}$$

504 Ridge

2-story, 2-bay 2nd, 3 bay 1st
low found, cov w/ conc
stucco w/ med green trim

high-pitched hipped roof, red ss m, gutters, boxed cornice
gables over semi-prot proj 5 bay facade, ~~on~~ rect proj w bay N side
centered on S side,
sunburst corner brackets w/ pendants; ^{repeated} zigzag in gable peak;
^{pressed tin} ~~sunburst~~; per 9/8 2 stained glass attic windows in front gable,
diag reg 1/1 in 5

2 int capped chim

nd semi-prot bay
windows 1/1, arch trim, 2/2 sides
one in proj bay on porch has expanded to ✓

deep 1-story veranda wraps around NE corner bet proj bays
rather high hipped roof, matches
sq posts prob replace ^{bracketed} ~~h~~ callake, as 1 pilaster remains
no balustrade or fence
conc flr steps

ent - wide door 9/8 / 3 panels

3-l rect transom

side door 1/1 bordered w/ small / panels

on 2nd storey porch set on porch roof

1 bay of facade

nearly flat roof

spool bays, bracketed E cast-iron posts, V in turned bal
no floor at window sill level

stair window on facade 1/1 bordered w/ small

wants picture

3 fl open stair, dec rail, paneled below
sym moulded trim w/ corner blocks

arch trim

rear wing gable-roof, w B gable w/ $\frac{1}{1}$ and

end back porch in ell - 15, ^{red} hip roof, exposed rafter ends

~~see~~ servants cottage:

1-storey, gable roof, white weatherboarded
prob 1 room

old picture 507 Ridge St c1906 or 1907

weatherboarded, appears to be light color w/ white trim
low foundation

1/1 windows

veranda: 3 wide steps

5/5T hips roof, boxed cornice

Eastlake posts, open (or gird?) frieze, simple balustrade

2nd storey porch: same cornice, frieze, posts, but turned balustrade



CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

"A World Class City"

Department of Neighborhood Development Services

City Hall • P.O. Box 911
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
Telephone 434-970-3182
Fax 434-970-3359
www.charlottesville.org



April 8, 2003

Mr. Edward W. Wayland
c/o 913 East Jefferson Street
Charlottesville, VA 22901

**RE: 507 Ridge Street
Virginia Historic Landmark Designation**

Dear Ed:

We were surprised to learn that the above referenced property is not already on the State's Landmarks list, as it is on the local and national register designations. I am happy to lend our support for designation of this house/property on the Virginia Landmark's list.

This house, known as the Gianniny-Bailey House, dates from 1895, and represents the Victorian style residences built on Ridge Street in the 1890's. The loss of many such residences makes this house an important remaining resource. Such details and features as the Eastlake trim on the second story porch represent items which are rarely seen on homes in Charlottesville. Finally, this house/property has one of the very rare servant's quarters remaining in structures from this era.

I hope this helps to confirm the significance of the structure to the Charlottesville and Virginia Landmarks collection. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 970-3995. Best of luck in obtaining this well-deserved designation.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. Higgins, AICP
Planning Manager

RLH:sdp



Date JAN 1994 File No. 104-25-19
 Name LIANNIN-BAILEY HOUSE, 507 RIDGE ST.
 Town CHARLOTTESVILLE
 County _____
 Photographer ANN C. HUPPERT
 Contents 3 EXT. VIEWS OF HOUSE, 1 OF
SHED

Property Information

Property Names

Name Explanation
Function/Location
Historic/Current

Name
Dwelling, 507 Ridge Street
Glanny-Bailey House

Property Evaluation Status

DHR Evaluation Committee: Not Eligible

This Property is associated with the Ridge Street Historic District.

Property Addresses

Current - 507 Ridge Street

County/Independent City(s): Charlottesville (Ind. City)
Incorporated Town(s): No Data
Zip Code(s): 22902, 22903
Magisterial District(s): No Data
Tax Parcel(s): 290141000
USGS Quad(s): CHARLOTTESVILLE EAST

Additional Property Information

Architecture Setting: Urban

Acreage: No Data

Site Description:

DHR Staff 2020: The Gianniny-Bailey House is located on the northwest side of Ridge Street, just south of the intersection of Ridge Street and Oak Street. A sidewalk and concrete retaining wall run along the eastern end of the property, between it and Ridge Street. A set of concrete steps lead from the sidewalk to a walkway leading to the front porch.

Surveyor Assessment:

1980/1994: This nicely detailed Victorian residence is typical of the houses built on Ridge Street in the 1890s. The loss of many of them makes the remaining ones more important. This little second story porch, which has retained its Eastlake trim, is especially noteworthy. This house has one of the three surviving servants quarters in the Ridge Street Historic District. The Gianniny- Bailey House is important to the streetscape and the District.

1993: E. M. Gianniny purchased this lot in 1895 (City DB 6-13) and built the house the same year, according to tax records. He sold it to E. M. Buck in 1897 (DB 8-331), then bought it back in 1901 (DB 12-103), and sold it to c. s. Apple in 1906 (DB 17-336). Ida L. Birch bought the house from Apple in 1915 (DB 27-487). Her husband, who had inherited it from her (WB 2-229), lost it during the Depression (DB 69-52, 86-128). E. I. and Mollie F. Bing owned it from 1935 to 1940, when they sold it to G.C. Bailey (DB 102-334). The Bailey family lived there for 22 years before selling it to Mrs. Lottie Scott in 1962. The weatherboarding was covered with stucco sometime between 1915 and 1962.

DHR Staff 2020: This building is a contributing resource to the Ridge Street Historic District.

Surveyor Recommendation: Recommended Not Eligible

Ownership

Ownership Category
Private

Ownership Entity
No Data

Primary Resource Information

Resource Category: Domestic
Resource Type: Single Dwelling
NR Resource Type: Building
Historic District Status: Contributing
Date of Construction: Ca 1895
Date Source: Written Data
Historic Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Historic Context(s): Architecture/Community Planning, Domestic
Other ID Number: No Data
Architectural Style: Victorian, Queen Anne
Form: No Data

Number of Stories: 2.0
Condition: Good
Threats to Resource: None Known
Cultural Affiliations: *No Data*

Cultural Affiliation Details:
No Data

Architectural Description:

1982: frame (stucco covered weatherboard); 2 storey; 2 bays; high pitched hip roof with pedimented gables over 3 projecting bays; one storey veranda on north bay. Victorian Vernacular. 1895.

1980-1994: This house is two storeys tall, three bays wide, and double pile, on a low foundation. The original weatherboarding has been covered with stucco, significantly altering the appearance of the house. The trim is painted green. There is a semi-octagonal projecting side bay on the facade, a rectangular projecting bay on the north side, and a projecting pavilion at the rear. The high-pitched hipped roof has steep pedimented gables over the three projecting bays and another centered over the southern elevation. It is covered with standing seam metal, painted red, and has Philadelphia gutters, projecting eaves and verges, and a boxed cornice. Corner brackets with a sunburst motif support the overhanging corners of the gable over the semi-octagonal bay. The sunburst motif is repeated at the peaks of the gables. The rear gable is weatherboarded; the other three are covered with pressed tin. There is a pair of 9-over-9 light tinted glass attic windows in the gable on the facade, and a single plain 1-over-1 light window in each of the others. There are two interior capped chimneys. Windows are double-sash with architrave trim, 1-over-1 light on the facade and 2-over-2 light elsewhere. The one on the veranda has a paneled spandrel, suggesting that it may originally have been a triple sash window. A deep one-storey verandah covers the northern bay of the facade and wraps around the corner to a side entrance in the projecting bay on the north side. It has a medium-pitched truncated hipped roof covered with standing-seam metal with boxed cornice. The original spool frieze and simple balustrade are gone, square posts have replaced the attenuated Eastlake posts and brackets, and the floor and steps have been replaced with concrete. The wide entrance door in the northern bay has nine lights over three panels and a three-light rectangular transom. Beside the door there is a small double-sash window with one large light bordered by small lights. A small second storey porch is set on the roof of the verandah at windowsill level. It has a nearly flat roof, and it has retained its spool frieze, attenuated Eastlake posts with brackets, and turned balustrade. The second storey hall window gives access to the porch. There is a one-storey hipped-roofed back porch beside the projecting pavilion. Interior trim is symmetrically moulded with corner blocks. The three-flight open stair in the entrance hall has a decorated rail and paneled wall. The six fireplaces with Victorian mantels have been closed.

January 1994

Exterior Components

Component	Component Type	Material	Material Treatment
Chimneys	Interior Central	Brick	Corbeled
Structural System and Exterior Treatment	Wood Frame	Wood	Weatherboard
Roof	Complex	Metal	<i>No Data</i>
Windows	Double-hung	Wood	<i>No Data</i>
Porch	Wrap-Around	<i>No Data</i>	Posts
Foundation	Solid/Continuous	Stucco	<i>No Data</i>

Secondary Resource Information

Historic District Information

Historic District Name: Ridge Street Historic District
Local Historic District Name: *No Data*
Historic District Significance: Ridge Street Historic District has been listed in the National Register of Historic Places since 1982 as a part of the Charlottesville Multiple Resource Area form, which recorded much of the city's historic architecture. An administrative error left the district off the Virginia Landmarks Register, but interest in state rehabilitation tax credits prompted city officials to seek designation in 2003. The residential district occupies four blocks just south of downtown and contains historic structures dating from the mid-1800s through the 1890s. Its ridge-top location attracted wealthy families who built stately Victorian-style houses there. The Ridge Street neighborhood was integrated even before the Civil War. A free black man owned property there as early as 1842 and, when the street was extended, its southern end was one of the city's most fashionable African American neighborhoods. The district is relatively unchanged and remains a cohesive black community.

CRM Events

Event Type: DHR Evaluation Committee: Not Eligible

DHR ID: 104-0025-0019
Staff Name: DHR Evaluation Committee
Event Date: 5/1/2003
Staff Comment

Angie Edwards presenting:
Gianniny-Baily House, 507 Ridge St. Charlottesville, Tax Act File Number 2003-072, DHR File Number 104-0025-0019.
This resource, a contributing building in the Charlottesville-Ridge Street Multiple Resource Area, was evaluated as locally significant under Criterion C (Architecture); the committee recommends that the resource is not eligible for listing with 28 points.

The committee encourages the applicant to pursue a district nomination, especially as such a nomination is already in place, and has never been presented for VLR listing.

Event Type: Rehabilitation Tax Credit

DHR ID: 104-0025-0019
Staff Name: DHR
Event Date: 4/11/2003
Staff Comment

Denied - Tax Act File No. 2003-072

Event Type: Survey:Phase I/Reconnaissance

Project Review File Number: *No Data*
Investigator: Eugenia Bibb/Susan Smead
Organization/Company: City of Charlottesville
Photographic Media: Film
Survey Date: 1/1/1994
Dhr Library Report Number: *No Data*
Project Staff/Notes:

Neg #13471, fr 11/14 - Jan 1994
Original survey by Eugenia Bibb in the fall of 1980

Event Type: Survey:Phase I/Reconnaissance

Project Review File Number: *No Data*
Investigator: Susan Smead & Eugenia Bibb
Organization/Company: DHR
Photographic Media: Digital
Survey Date: 1/1/1994
Dhr Library Report Number: *No Data*
Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Bibliographic Information:

DHR Staff 2020: Data based on 1978 and 1993 survey forms.





Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:

No Data

Property Notes:

No Data



Approximate
Not to scale

Painted wood siding applied to 2x4 framed wall with bead-board applied on interior.


Siding appears original, with some lower sections replaced with cedar siding. Trim, soffit and cornice appear original, but cannot determine; minor repairs evident.

Wall studs, sill beam, upper plate, ceiling joists, and roof rafters appears original, with several areas of visible termite damage. Ceiling joists have nail patterns consistent with a simple ceiling, possible heavy paper or thin paneling.

Plywood flooring over wood floor joists, of which several are modern. Structure set on stacked brick piers.

Door and windows appear original; in poor condition, but salvageable.

Where it remains, skipped board sheathing on roof rafters appears original; but in poor condition. Original roof no longer extant. Currently plywood sheathing with wood shakes and metal drip edge. Ridgeline is sagging in center. Leaks are evident, especially at the chimney.



Approximate
Not to scale



This house has one of the three surviving servants' quarters in the Ridge Street Historic District. The Gianniny-Bailey House is important to the streetscape and the District.



servants cottage:
1-storey, gable roof, white weatherboarded
prob 1 room




507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022




1902 Sanborn Map

Cottage?




1913 Sanborn Map

Cottage?




1920 Sanborn Map

Cottage?



c1965 Sanborn Map

Cottage





507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022







Not period
elements






507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022






507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022








507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022




507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022




507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022





507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022



507 Ridge Street - BAR staff photos Nov, 3 2022





Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR # 22-09-04

0 3rd Street NE, TMP 330020001

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Scott Loughery

Applicant: Candace Smith, Architect

Project: New residence on vacant lot

Application components (please click each link to go directly to PDF page):

- [Staff Report](#)
- [Application Submittal](#)

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Staff Report
December 20, 2022**



Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR 22-09-01

0 3rd Street NE, TMP 330020001

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Scott Loughery

Applicant: Candace Smith/Architect

Project: New residence



Background

Year Built: n/a. (According to available information, parcel has never been developed.)

District: North Downtown ADC District

Status: n/a

Prior BAR Review

September 20, 2022 – BAR held preliminary discussion re: new residence.

Link to meeting video. Discussion begins at 02:30:00.

<https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzezyv3iclkx1a?b=nvdouryu5aooh1orqwx>

Link to Sept 20, 2022 submittal, see page 100: [Sept 20 2022 BAR Packet](#)

October 18, 2022 - BAR reviewed new residence; accepted applicant's request for a deferral.

Link to the BAR meeting video. Discussion begins at 0:03:30.

<https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzezyv3iclkx1a?b=uzjazbhfohchjty5hs6f>

Link to October 18, 2022 submittal, see page 27: [October 2022 BAR packet](#)

November 15, 2022 - BAR reviewed new residence; accepted applicant's request for a deferral.

Link to the BAR meeting video. Discussion begins at 0:45:00.

<https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzezyv3iclkx1a?b=zws6izrpegx6m7ox2o8i>

Link to November submittal, see page 51: [BAR meeting packet - Nov 15 2022](#)

Application

- Candace M.P. Smith, Architects PC submittal for Loughery Residence:
 - Narrative and List of Attachments. (2 pages)
 - Drawings SP-1, A-1 through A-8, dated 12/5/2022. (9 pages)
 - Conceptual Landscaping Plan and Planting List. (2 pages)
 - 3D renderings. (5 pages)

- Material List and Color Palette. (16 pages)
- Existing Site Plan and Photos. (7 pages)

CoA request for a three-story, single-family residence and detached garage on vacant parcel.

Discussion

For the summary of the staff's comments re: the design guidelines for *New Construction and Additions*, see the October 18, 2022 staff report, under *Discussion and Recommendations at: 0 3rd St NE - October 18 2022 BAR packet*

This will be the BAR's fourth discussion of this request. At each of the prior meetings (September 20, October 18, and November 15) and in correspondence to the BAR, several neighboring property owners expressed their questions and comments regarding the project. The applicant has been responsive to the BAR's questions and recommendations.

Staff recommends approval of the CoA, acknowledging the alternate liriopse selection, see below.

Landscaping Plan

* = On the City's Tree/Shrub List and/or not considered invasive in Virginia.

Note the revision below to the liriopse selection.

- Trees:
 - *Amelanchier* – Serviceberry *
 - *Acer palmatum 'Osakazuki'* - 'Osakazuki' Japanese Maple (matched pair) *
- Shrubs, Evergreen:
 - *Ilex crenata 'Green Lustre'* - 'Green Lustre' Japanese Holly *
 - *Azalea 'Pink Pearl'* - Azalea 'Pink Pearl' *
 - *Abelia 'Rose Creek'* - 'Rose Creek' Abelia *
- Shrubs, Deciduous:
 - *Itea virginica* - Virginia Sweetpea "Henry's Garnet" *
 - *Pyracantha coccinea* – Firethorn *
 - *Hydrangea paniculata 'Limelight'* - 'Limelight' Hydrangea *
 - *Hydrangea paniculata 'Little Quick Fire'* - 'Little Quick Fire' Hydra *
 - *Liriopse Muscari* will be substitute for the *Liriopse spicata 'Big Blue'* indicated on the Landscape Plan. [Staff: *Liriopse spicata* is noted as invasive by the City of Alexandria and Arlington County. (www.invasiveplantatlas.org/subject.html?sub=11562) From the applicant's note to staff: *Liriopse spicata* is a running type of liriopse and could spread, although the brick walls will contain it. However, *Liriopse Muscari* is a non-running, "clumping" variety that will not travel outside the brick walls. There are a couple varieties of *muscari*; the client will select one of those variants.]
 - *Stephanandra incisa* - Cutleaf Stephanandra *

Suggested Motions

Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the new residence at 0 3rd Street, NE satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application [as submitted with the alternate liriopse noted in the staff report].

or [as submitted with the alternate liriope noted in the staff report and with the following modifications/conditions: ...]

Denial: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the new residence at 0 3rd Street, NE does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown, and that for the following reasons the BAR denies the application as submitted: ...

Criteria, Standards and Guidelines

Review Criteria Generally

Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that, in considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

- (1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and
- (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:

- (1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;
- (2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;
- (3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;
- (4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;
- (5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;
- (6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;
- (7) Any applicable provisions of the City's Design Guidelines.

Links to the Design Guidelines:

[Chapter 1 Introduction \(Part 1\)](#)

[Chapter 1 Introduction \(Part 2\)](#)

[Chapter 2 Site Design and Elements](#)

[Chapter 3 New Construction and Additions](#)

Pertinent Guidelines for New Construction and Additions include:

D. Massing and Footprint

[...]

- 2) New infill construction in residential sub-areas should relate in footprint and massing to the majority of surrounding historic dwellings.
- 3) Neighborhood transitional buildings should have small building footprints similar to nearby dwellings.
 - a. If the footprint is larger, their massing should be reduced to relate to the smaller-scaled forms of residential structures.

- b. Techniques to reduce massing could include stepping back upper levels, adding residential roof and porch forms, and using sympathetic materials.

[...]

E. Height and Width

- 1) Respect the directional expression of the majority of surrounding buildings. In commercial areas, respect the expression of any adjacent historic buildings, which generally will have a more vertical expression.
- 2) Attempt to keep the height and width of new buildings within a maximum of 200 percent of the prevailing height and width in the surrounding sub-area.

[...]

- 5) Reinforce the human scale of the historic districts by including elements such as porches, entrances, storefronts, and decorative features depending on the character of the particular sub-area.

F. Scale

- 1) Provide features on new construction that reinforce the scale and character of the surrounding area, whether human or monumental. Include elements such as storefronts, vertical and horizontal divisions, upper story windows, and decorative features.

G. Roof

1) Roof Forms and Pitches

- a. [...]
- b. Neighborhood transitional buildings should use roof forms that relate to the neighboring residential forms instead of the flat or sloping commercial form.
- c. [...]
- d. [...]
- e. Shallow pitched roofs and flat roofs may be appropriate in historic residential areas on a contemporary designed building.
- f. Do not use mansard-type roofs on commercial buildings; they were not used historically in Charlottesville's downtown area, nor are they appropriate on West Main Street.

2) Roof Materials: Common roof materials in the historic districts include metal, slate, and composition shingles.

- a. For new construction in the historic districts, use traditional roofing materials such as standing-seam metal or slate.
- b. In some cases, shingles that mimic the appearance of slate may be acceptable.
- c. [...]
- d. [...]
- e. If using composition asphalt shingles, do not use light colors. Consider using neutral-colored or darker, plain or textured-type shingles.
- f. [...]

J. Porches

- 1) Porches and other semi-public spaces are important in establishing layers or zones of intermediate spaces within the streetscape.

L. Foundation and Cornice

- 1) Distinguish the foundation from the rest of the structure through the use of different materials, patterns, or textures.
- 2) Respect the height, contrast of materials, and textures of foundations on surrounding historic buildings.
- 3) If used, cornices should be in proportion to the rest of the building.
- 4) Wood or metal cornices are preferred. The use of iron may be appropriate where the location is not immediately adjacent to pedestrians.

M. Materials and Textures

- 1) The selection of materials and textures for a new building should be compatible with and complementary to neighboring buildings.
- 2) In order to strengthen the traditional image of the residential areas of the historic districts, brick, stucco, and wood siding are the most appropriate materials for new buildings.
- 3) [...]
- 4) [...]
- 5) Synthetic siding and trim, including, vinyl and aluminum, are not historic cladding materials in the historic districts, and their use should be avoided.
- 6) Cementitious siding, such as HardiPlank boards and panels, are appropriate.
- 7) Concrete or metal panels may be appropriate.
- 8) Metal storefronts in clear or bronze are appropriate.
- 9) The use of Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS) is discouraged but may be approved on items such as gables where it cannot be seen or damaged. It requires careful design of the location of control joints.
- 10) The use of fiberglass-reinforced plastic is discouraged. If used, it must be painted.
- 11) All exterior trim, woodwork, decking and flooring must be painted, or may be stained solid if not visible from public right-of-way.

N. Paint

- 1) The selection and use of colors for a new building should be coordinated and compatible with adjacent buildings, not intrusive.
- 2) In Charlottesville's historic districts, various traditional shades of brick red, white, yellow, tan, green, or gray are appropriate. For more information on colors traditionally used on historic structures and the placement of color on a building, see Chapter 4: Rehabilitation.
- 3) Do not paint unpainted masonry surfaces.
- 4) It is proper to paint individual details different colors.
- 5) More lively color schemes may be appropriate in certain sub-areas dependent on the context of the sub-areas and the design of the building.

O. Details and Decoration

- 1) Building detail and ornamentation should be consistent with and related to the architecture of the surrounding context and district.
- 2) The mass of larger buildings may be reduced using articulated design details.
- 3) Pedestrian scale may be reinforced with details.

CANDACE M. P. SMITH ARCHITECT, P.C.

202 SIXTH STREET NE
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902
TEL.: 434.963.4500
FAX: 434.979.1936
WWW.CMPSARCHITECT.COM

NARRATIVE AND LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
for
Board of Architectural Review
Meeting December 20, 2022
Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Re: New Residence near Hedge Street and Park Plaza (3rd St. NE, Parcel #330020001) in Charlottesville, VA—"0 Third Street NE"

Narrative

The parcel for this proposed new residence is a vacant lot with complex grading and site restrictions. Existing grades slope 7' north down the street in front of the property, and slope up as much as 12' along each corresponding side. The site restrictions include a required access easement to the apartment building behind the lot, and there is a utility easement along that same southern edge. A power pole near the southern corner of the lot connects lines that traverse in front of the property near the sidewalk and across to both the downhill and uphill neighbors. These lines prohibit the opportunity for large street trees, but a serviceberry tree is planned at the corner of 3rd Street and the easement, and Japanese maples flank the front porch entry.

A three-story home is proposed, with a ground floor largely embedded into the back slope and only accessible from the northern side of the property. The first floor above is provided with a walkout to a rear terrace. The finish first floor is below the adjacent rear grades so a brick retaining wall is planned along the property line, with either a metal guardrail (for the high grades above) or a 6' fence may be added at that rear property line to provide privacy for the rear terrace. A detached accessory structure is also proposed at the rear of the property, similar to many neighboring properties.

Regarding **exterior materials**, the exterior walls are proposed with a red brick foundation, and Hardie Plank horizontal, smooth siding above at the first and second floors. Red brick is also proposed at all the retaining walls and the front walkway and stairs from the street. Red brick piers and solid wood gates provide an enclosure to the rear terrace as well as the lower, side courtyard that will be used to access the garage area. Asphalt is planned for that lower courtyard and for the required easement on the southern edge. Roofing will be architectural/dimensional shingles on sloped hips roofs, including the front porch. There are also double story porches on the north and south sides. Like the front porch, they will have solid panel railings for privacy and consistency. Windows will be SDL double-hung windows, in black fiberglass with 1x4 casing at the Hardie Plank walls. French doors with SDL divided lites will be used at porches, and solid wood doors with a porthole will be used for the front door and the upper front porch door. The garage doors will be solid paneled of similar pattern as the gates. The rear terrace will likely be stamped/stained concrete or bluestone if the budget allows.

A **conceptual landscape plan and planting list** has been provided that now includes some native plants such as the Virginia Sweet Spire flanking the driveway on the northern edge next to the downhill neighbors. A brick retaining wall and metal pickets above (to create the 3'-0" guardrail from the courtyard side) is planned with consideration of the downhill neighbors for screening but also retention of some daylight. Pyracantha is planned at the inside corners of that retaining wall and is planned to be trained across the railing for perennial screening. Hollies are planned below the two Japanese maple that flank the front porch entry, and hydrangeas are envisioned for the edge against the required southern easement. Ground cover in the courtyard will complete the front walkways, and likewise is planned to hold the steep bank that exists at the northwest corner of the property.

The **3d virtual model** has been updated with the brick & siding exteriors, conceptual plantings, and various views are attached. A list of materials and paint colors are also included. Paint chips for preferred selection and the alternates listed will be available for viewing at the meeting.

List of Attachments

1. Drawing of existing site conditions showing grades, site limitations, property lines
2. 3D view of topography of undeveloped site and photographs to and from property
3. Site plan with ground floor plan (at front of property) and first floor footprint at the rear terrace. Ground, first, second and roof plans are also provided.
4. Exterior elevations show all building faces and include the view from the front street and side easement with the panelled gates/fence, as well as without the gates for full view of the house faces. An additional view from the property line at the downhill neighbor is included to show the retaining wall along that edge.
5. Wall sections for porch details, main house cornice, and railing details are included
5. Conceptual landscape plan and planting list
6. Material selections for roofing, brick, etc.

New Residence for
BAR Submittal 12-2-22 for

SCOTT
LOUGHREY

NEAR HEDGE ST.
& PARK PLAZA


SITE PLAN
& PLAT

DATE: 12/5/22
DRAWING SCALE: AS NOTED
PROJECT NO: 2204
REVISION DATE:

© CANDACE M.P. SMITH ARCHITECT, PC 2022

SP1

1 OF 9



2 PLAT
SP1 N.T.S.

1 SITE PLAN
SP1 1/8" = 1'-0"

PLAN PLAT
NORTH NORTH

TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FROM
PLAT SURVEY BY VIRGINIA LANDCRAFT
DRAWING 22-027, DATED MARCH 19, 2022



New Residence for
BAR Submittal 12-2-22 for

SCOTT
LOUGHREY

NEAR HEDGE ST.
& PARK PLAZA


FIRST FLOOR
PLAN

DATE: 12/5/22
DRAWING SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
PROJECT NO: 2204
REVISION DATE:


© CANDACE M.P. SMITH ARCHITECT, PC 2022

A2

3 OF 9



2
A2
REAR (WESTERN)
PARTIAL FIRST FLOOR PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"



1
A2
FRONT (WESTERN)
PARTIAL FIRST FLOOR PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"



New Residence for
BAR Submittal 12-2-22 for

SCOTT
LOUGHREY

NEAR HEDGE ST.
& PARK PLAZA


SECOND
FLOOR
& ROOF
PLAN

DATE: 12/5/22
DRAWING SCALE: AS NOTED
PROJECT NO: 2204
REVISION DATE:


© CANDACE M.P. SMITH ARCHITECT, PC 2022

A3


4 OF 9




2 ROOF PLAN
A3 1/8" = 1'-0"
PLAN PLAT
NORTH NORTH




1 SECOND FLOOR PLAN
A3 1/4" = 1'-0"
PLAN PLAT
NORTH NORTH




4 CORNICE DETAIL
A4 1-1/2" = 1'-0"




2 GATES & PIERS AT FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION
A4 1/2" = 1'-0"




1 FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION
A4 1/4" = 1'-0"




3 RAILING DETAIL
A4 1-1/2" = 1'-0"



2 ACCESSORY STRUCTURE - WEST ELEVATION
A5 1/4" = 1'-0"



3 ACCESSORY STRUCTURE - EAST ELEVATION
A5 1/4" = 1'-0"



1 REAR (WEST) ELEVATION
A5 1/4" = 1'-0"

New Residence for
BAR Submittal 12-2-22 for

SCOTT
LOUGHREY

NEAR HEDGE ST.
& PARK PLAZA


SIDE (NORTH)
ELEVATION

DATE: 12/5/22
DRAWING SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
PROJECT NO: 2204
REVISION DATE:


© CANDACE M.P. SMITH ARCHITECT, PC 2022

A6

7 OF 9



1 SIDE (NORTH) ELEVATION
A6 1/4" = 1'-0"



2 SIDE (NORTH) ELEVATION @ PROPERTY LINE
A6 1/4" = 1'-0"

New Residence for
BAR Submittal 12-2-22 for

**SCOTT
LOUGHREY**

NEAR HEDGE ST.
& PARK PLAZA


**SIDE (SOUTH)
ELEVATION**

DATE: 12/5/22
DRAWING SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
PROJECT NO: 2204
REVISION DATE:


© CANDACE M.P. SMITH ARCHITECT, PC 2022

A7


8 OF 9




1 SIDE (SOUTH) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"




**2 PIERS AT REAR TERRACE -
SIDE (SOUTH) ELEVATION**
1/4" = 1'-0"




1 SECTION AT FRONT PORCH
A8 1/2" = 1'-0"



2 SECTION AT SIDE PORCHES
A8 1/2" = 1'-0"



3 SECTION AT REAR PORCHES
A8 1/2" = 1'-0"



**LOUGHREY RESIDENCE
PLANT LIST**

November 25, 2022

Trees:

- 1 Amelanchier – Serviceberry
Single stem, 10 ft. height
- 2 Acer palmatum ‘Osakazuki’ – ‘Osakazuki’ Japanese Maple
(matched pair)
7 ht. height

Shrubs: Evergreen

- 14 Ilex cremate ‘Green Lustre’ – ‘Green Lustre’ Japanese Holly
24”-30”
- 4 Azalea ‘Pink Pearl’ – Azalea ‘Pink Pearl’
15”-18”
- 9 Abelia ‘Rose Creek’ – ‘Rose Creek’ Abelia
24”-30”

Shrubs – Deciduous:

- 10 Itea virginica – Virginia Sweetpsire
‘Henry’s Garnet’
24”
- 4 Pyracantha coccinea – Firethorn
5 gallon
- 2 Hydrangea paniculata ‘Limelight’ – ‘Limelight’ Hydrangea
30”
- 4 Hydrangea paniculata ‘Little Quick Fire’ – ‘Little Quick Fire’ Hydrangea
24”
- Liriope spicata ‘Big Blue’
1 gallon
- Stephanandra incisa – Cutleaf Stephanandra
3 gallon











CANDACE M.P. SMITH ARCHITECT, PC

202 SIXTH STREET NE

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902

TEL: 434-963-4500

WWW.CMPSARCHITECT.COM

New Residence for Scott Loughrey
0 3rd Street NE

For BAR Meeting 12/20/2022

Exterior Paint & Other Colors

		Preferred Scheme	Alternate Scheme
Roofing *	Fiberglass shingles	Black/gray	Black/gray
Gutters & Downspouts	Prefinished half round gutters & round downspouts	Prefinished Black	Prefinished Black
Window Frame & Sash*	Double hung	Ebony (Black) (Marvin Elevate)	Ebony (Black) (Marvin Elevate)
Doors (Porthole & Garage) *		Behr "Alpine Trail"	Benjamin Moore Color Preview "Black Knight" 2136-10
Trim & Posts*		Behr "Norwegian Blue"	Benjamin Moore Color Preview "Nimbus Gray" 2131-50
Siding	Hardie Plank	Behr "Half Sea Fog"	Benjamin Moore Color Preview "Smokestack Gray" 2131-40
Front Porch Railings	Solid panels (or metal pickets)	Behr "Alpine Trail"	Benjamin Moore Color Preview "Black Knight" 2136-10 (if solid panels) or Black Metal (if metal pickets)
Other Railings	Solid panels	Behr "Alpine Trail"	Benjamin Moore Color Preview "Black Knight" 2136-10
Gates	Solid panels	Behr "Alpine Trail"	Benjamin Moore Color Preview "Black Knight" 2136-10
Brick *		Red/maroon	Red/maroon

*See Material Selections.

Material Selections
Roofing: Atlas Roofing <i>Pinnacle Pristine Colors</i> "Pewter"
Gutters & Downspouts: Prefinished black half round gutters & round downspouts
Windows: Marvin Elevate "Ebony" with simulated divided lites, stainless spacer bars
French Doors: Marvin Elevate "Ebony" with simulated divided lites, stainless spacer bars
Custom Porthole Doors: Custom, painted, fir doors
Garage Doors: Overhead Door "Signature Carriage" custom wood door
Posts/Columns: Culpeper Columns dressed and painted with 1x4 bases
Siding: Painted fiber cement board lap siding, Hardie Plank, 6" exposure
Brick: General Shale "Buckingham Tudor"
Light Fixtures: Nancy B's House of Lights Item Id: 612971

Pinnacle® Pristine

High Performance Meets Designer Colors



Smart, Beautiful, Durable...
Why Choose Just One?

Atlas Pinnacle® Pristine architectural shingles offer a wide variety of beautiful color options to complement your home's exterior.

Together, with the power of Scotchgard™ Protector and a warranty that covers damage from winds up to 130 mph, your Pinnacle® Pristine roof will stay beautiful and provide superior performance for many years to come.



Black




Pinnacle®Pristine Colors



Black




Coastal Granite



Hearthstone



Pewter



Summer Storm




Oyster



Pearl*




Copper Canyon



Heather



Majestic Shake



Weathered Wood *Shown on cover




Weathered Shadow



Morning Harvest



Tan



Green



Sunset

• Limited regional availability. Please contact your local supplier.



Marvin Elevate™ collection

WINDOWS + DOORS





Double Hung windows with Window Opening Control Devices

DOUBLE HUNG

- Equipped with a standard full screen; optional half screen is available.
- Tilt latches are ergonomically designed and easy to operate making tilting and cleaning effortless.
- Sash lock provides a positive detent, reassuring user that the window is either locked or unlocked.
- Up to PG50 performance rating.
- Equal, Cottage, and Reverse Cottage sash provide a variety of looks and checkrail heights.
- Available in standard and special sizes up to 4 feet 6 inches wide by 7 feet high.
- Coordinating Picture and Transom windows also available.
- Double Hung Insert option features $\frac{3}{4}$ inch insert replacement frame with through jamb installation and up to PG40 performance rating.



DOUBLE HUNG



DOUBLE HUNG INSERT



Available with IZ3
(Excludes Insert option)



Inswing French door in Bronze with Northfield hardware in Oil Rubbed Bronze

INSWING FRENCH DOOR


- Secure and stable stainless steel multi-point locking system.
- Precision built in $\frac{1}{64}$ inch increments.
- Available in 1, 2, or 3-panel configurations.*
- Multiple configurations up to 6 feet wide by 8 feet high.
- Bronze or Beige sill available.
- PG30 performance rating standard.
- PG50 performance rating optional on 1 and 2-panel configurations.



INTERIOR



EXTERIOR



SILL DETAIL SHOWN IN BRONZE



Available with IZ3

* 3 panel configuration is achieved by mulling multiple frames together to create an assembly.

THERMAL PERFORMANCE

DOUBLE HUNG

GLASS DESCRIPTION	DIVIDER	U FACTOR	SHGC	VT	CR	ENERGY STAR	CANADA ENERGY STAR
11/16" IG Low E3/ERS Arg		0.24	0.21	0.48	46	N, NC, SC, S	1, 2
	SDLS < 1"	0.24	0.19	0.42	46	N, NC, SC, S	1, 2
	SDLN < 1"	0.24	0.19	0.42	46	N, NC, SC, S	1, 2
	GBG	0.24	0.19	0.42	46	N, NC, SC, S	1, 2
11/16" IG Low E3/ERS Air		0.27	0.21	0.48	42	N, NC, SC, S	1
	SDLS < 1"	0.27	0.19	0.42	42	N, NC, SC, S	1
	SDLN < 1"	0.27	0.19	0.42	42	N, NC, SC, S	1
	GBG	0.27	0.19	0.42	42	N, NC, SC, S	1
11/16" IG Low E3 Arg		0.27	0.21	0.49	57	N, NC, SC, S	1
	SDLS < 1"	0.27	0.19	0.43	57	N, NC, SC, S	1
	SDLN < 1"	0.27	0.19	0.43	57	N, NC, SC, S	1
	GBG	0.27	0.19	0.43	57	N, NC, SC, S	1
11/16" IG Low E3 Air		0.31	0.21	0.49	53	S	
	SDLS < 1"	0.31	0.19	0.43	53	S	
	SDLN < 1"	0.31	0.19	0.43	53	S	
	GBG	0.31	0.19	0.43	53	S	
11/16" IG Low E2 Arg		0.28	0.32	0.54	56	N, NC	1
	SDLS < 1"	0.28	0.28	0.48	56	NC	1
	SDLN < 1"	0.28	0.28	0.48	56	NC	1
	GBG	0.28	0.28	0.48	56	NC	1
11/16" IG Low E2 Air		0.32	0.32	0.54	53		
	SDLS < 1"	0.32	0.29	0.48	53		
	SDLN < 1"	0.32	0.29	0.48	53		
	GBG	0.32	0.29	0.48	53		
11/16" IG Low E1 Arg		0.29	0.52	0.60	56	N	1, 2
	SDLS < 1"	0.29	0.47	0.53	56	N	1, 2
	SDLN < 1"	0.29	0.47	0.53	56	N	1, 2
	GBG	0.29	0.47	0.53	56	N	1, 2
11/16" IG Low E1 Air		0.32	0.52	0.60	52		1, 2
	SDLS < 1"	0.32	0.46	0.53	52		1
	SDLN < 1"	0.32	0.46	0.53	52		1
	GBG	0.32	0.46	0.53	52		1
11/16" IG Arg		0.43	0.59	0.62	45		
	SDLS < 1"	0.43	0.53	0.55	45		
	SDLN < 1"	0.43	0.53	0.55	45		
	GBG	0.43	0.53	0.55	45		
11/16" IG Air		0.45	0.59	0.62	43		
	SDLS < 1"	0.45	0.53	0.55	43		
	SDLN < 1"	0.45	0.53	0.55	43		
	GBG	0.45	0.53	0.55	43		

----- Product Select -----

Collections and Product Lines: Elevate ▾

Door or Window: Doors ▾

Product: Elevate Swinging French Door ▾

----- Available Options -----

Surface: Wood-Ultrex

Wood Species: Pine or EQ

Impact Zone: No ▾

Panels: 0

Divider: SDLS < 1" ▾

Spacer: Stainless Steel

Glass: Insulated Glass ▾

Coating: Low E2 ▾

Gas Fill: Argon ▾

Energy Factor	Value (range)
U Factor:	0.29
Solar Heat Gain (SHGC):	0.24
Visual Transmittance (VT):	0.40
Condensation Resistance (CR):	62
Energy Star:	N, NC, SC, S
Energy Star Canada:	
U Factor Canada:	1.65

CPD Number(s): Show CPD #s

Signature[®] Carriage Wood

COLLECTION



Custom crafted wood doors provide
distinctive charm and unmatched luxury

The Genuine. The Original.



Villa Madre Series

Note:
Previous model
numbers and panel
styles are noted in
parentheses in gray.

*Capturing the romantic lines and distinguished flare of old world estates,
Villa Madre Series doors exemplify elegance and style.
Doors provided unfinished, in paint-grade or stain-grade wood.*

Model 9960 Premium Construction (Insulation* standard)





Horizontal Overlay (H)
(580 Ortega)

Vertical Overlay (C2)
(580 Medina)





Vertical Overlay (C3)
(580 Pizarro)

Vertical Overlay (C4)
(580 Cruz)

Square
top



Arched
top




Model 9940

Standard Construction (Insulation optional)


Villa Madre Series, Model 9960, Vertical Overlay (580 Pizarro),
3PS- Three Pane Square Top windows with speciality glass, decorative hardware

**Horizontal/Grooved
Overlay (HG)**
(570 Castille Grooved)

Square
top



Arched
top



See additional window options on page 14.

*Insulated R-value 4.75. Overhead Door Corporation uses a calculated door section R-value for our insulated doors.





DISCLAIMER: It is impossible with only a few units to illustrate all colors, color percentages and harmless imperfections that may occur in a full brick shipment. Therefore this sample is intended to represent general color range and texture only.

www.GeneralShale.com

Buckingham Tudor
Lightweight Engineer 603500-4852
Roanoke, VA

SEE INFO ANT NOT CE ON BACK





Q

1807 Seminole Trail Ste 102
Charlottesville, VA 22901

C


[434-975-4448](tel:434-975-4448)
Fax: 434-974-5644



www.nancybshouseoflights.com
office@nancybshouseoflights.com



LED Outdoor Wall Sconce




Item ID: **612971**

Finish: **Bronze**

Width: 6.00"

Height: **18.00"**



Bulbs

Voltage: 120 V

Qty.	Type	Base	Watt	Incl.	Source	LM.	CCT	CRI	Avg.Life	Dim	Beam
1	PCB	PCB Integrated	20.00 W	Yes	LED	1700.00 lm	3000 K	80 CRI	-	-	-

Details

Safety Listing: **cETLus**

Safety Rating: **Wet**

Glass: **White**

Canopy: 1T"x5.25"


Extension: **4.00"**

Weight: **3.42 lb**

*Please be advised that all prices and information shown here are subject to verification by our showroom personnel.
In the event of a discrepancy, we reserve the right to make any corrections necessary.*

<https://lights.nancybshouseoflights.com/brand-16/sku-612971/led-outdoor-wall-sconce>

1/1




3D Topo
Proposed New Residence
Scott Loughrey
0 Third St. NE
BAR Submittal 12/20/22




Existing Site Photos
Proposed New Residence
Scott Loughrey
0 Third St. NE

BAR Submittal 12/20/22

Standing near
or just above
new Finish
1st floor





Apartment behind property

Downhill
Neighbor



Steep
slope



Apartment behind property



Old Hedge Street Easement



Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR # 22-12-01

300 Court Square, TMP 530096100

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Eagle Tavern, LLC

Applicant: Candace DeLoach

Project: Exterior alterations

Application components (please click each link to go directly to PDF page):

- [Staff Report](#)
- [Historic Survey](#)
- [Application Submittal](#)



Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 22-12-01
300 Court Square, TMP 530096100
North Downtown ADC District
Owner: Eagle Tavern, LLC
Applicant: Candace DeLoach et al
Project: Exterior alterations



Background

Year Built: Farish House 1854; Annex (south wing) c1880. (Historical surveys attached.)
District: North Downtown ADC District
Status: Contributing

Prior BAR Reviews

November 15, 2022 – Preliminary discussion of this request. BAR #22-12-01

Link to the BAR meeting video. Discussion begins at approx. 02:58:00.

<https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzezyv3iclkx1a?b=zws6izrpegx6m7ox2o8i>

Link to November submittal. See page 142: [BAR meeting packet - Nov 15 2022](#)

Request

- Applicant's submittal:
 - Site history and project narrative with photos. (8 pages)
 - Barry Moss, AIA drawings *300 Court Square Renovations, Zebra Carriage Hotel*, dated December 13, 2022. (4 sheets).
 - Renderings. (5 sheets)

CoA request for exterior rehabilitations and alterations to historic hotel, including reconstruction of historic east portico and construction of a two-story terrace over the rear courtyard.

From the applicant's narrative, including responses to Nov 15, 2022 BAR comments:

300 Court Square – Front of building, North-Facing

- Remove four smaller windows, investigations point to these windows as not original, infill with brick. Remaining windows will be centered and symmetrical. We will provide additional close-

up photos of the brick and window interactions. We believe these [four windows] to not be original. (photos 1-4.)

- In response to concerns that board members have regarding the request to unevenly apply whitewash to the exterior of the building, there is evidence that the entire building was painted white; we would like to invite board members to look at the revised sample on the exterior near the tavern entrance. We have added red wash to the lime wash to warm it and make it blend the various mortars and brick repairs.
- Requesting to use a lime mortar on the brick repairs. [Staff note: In prior discussions with the applicants, staff noted that the repairs to the existing masonry would be considered maintenance and repair, provided the work would comply with the BAR design guidelines for Masonry, from Chapter IV-Rehabilitations.]
- Window mullions, casings, sashes, fascia, railing and door trim to be painted “Gray Owl” Benjamin Moore - 2137 60.
- Shutters, balcony railings, and upper eave to be painted “Braemer” No BS14C35 - by Fine Paints of Europe. Please see sample on actual building.
- All exterior doors to be painted - “Green” – BS 16C39 by Fine Paints of Europe.
- Install four handmade copper gas lanterns flanking both sides of ground-level windows: French Quarter Lantern by Bevelo. (photo 15)
- Install three handmade copper gas lantern pendants on the two balconies and above the front entry door. (photo 16)

Items to be submitted to the City of Charlottesville for approval – in all three instances, we are requesting to install a hotel amenity placed on city property:

- Install four flush-mounted landscape lights in sidewalk to up-light plantings and illuminate pilaster detail. Since this is city property, we will obtain their permission prior to installing. [Staff note: See *Discussion and Recommendations*.]
- Install black and white canvas awning with Greek Key pattern that extends from door to street. Awning is supported by copper poles and illuminated from within. Because this is city property, we will obtain their permission prior to installing the awning. [Staff note: See *Discussion and Recommendations*.]
- Install steps from the landing of the portico on the 6th Street side. May we suggest that we will not build anything until we have the city’s permission, which would hopefully happen during construction or offer up that we will build the steps such that they could be removed if not approved? [Staff note: See *Discussion and Recommendations*.]

East Side of building – 6th Street

- Please see dimensional drawings of the portico as designed. Because this is designed to incorporate the existing fire escape, we ask that it is approved as drawn for functionality. Please refer to dimensional drawings submitted. [Staff note: See *Discussion and Recommendations*.]
- We have elected to use electric lamps on the 6th Street side. We heard [Mr. Gastinger’s] concern and are reducing the number of gas lanterns used to only those on the North facing exterior (as previously submitted).
- All exterior doors to be painted “Green” No BS 16C39 – Fine Paints of Europe
- We will be installing an electric light fixture at the gift store entry.

Rear of the building – Not Visible from 6th Street

- A two-story trellised wall will be built against the neighboring equipment building [to west, rear of Monticello Hotel] to hide the AC chiller on top. Two-story terrace to be built over the courtyard to screen satellite dishes from the room views. Please see submitted dimensional drawings of this structure.
- Trellised terrace to be painted “Gray Owl” by Benjamin Moore – 2137-60.
- A wooden deck will be built to the same level as the first-floor ballroom.
- In consideration of the use of Bermuda Shutters, which garnered a lot of conversation, we will not use shutters on the south side of the annex building and would like to use Bermuda shutters only on the back side of the building which is not visible from the street.

Discussion and Recommendations

Staff commends that the BAR refer to the criteria in Chapter II - *Site Design and Elements*, of Chapter III - New Construction and Additions (specifically, Additions), and Chapter IV—*Rehabilitation* (including section L. Rear of Buildings).

Staff comments:

Removal of four windows, north elevation

Re removal: We cannot say when these windows were installed, only that three were there in 1915. Per the design guidelines: *Retain original windows when possible*. The Secretary’s Standards allows for *Removing windows from other historic period*, provided they are properly documented and a recommendation they be stored.

Re: infill of openings: If windows are removed, the BAR should determine how the masonry opening will be treated. (For example, if infilled with brick, should the it be toothed-in with matching bricks and coursing or in a manner that makes the infill evident?)

General Repairs (Wood trim, doors, windows, etc. and masonry).

See Appendix re: staff’s discussions with the applicant [from October 2022] re: work that could be completed without review as routine maintenance and repair.

Awning at the north entrance

Due to encroachment into the City right of way, a CoA should include a condition that construction requires resolution of that encroachment.

North entrance – replace doors

No issues. Existing doors and trim are not original. (See photos in Appendix.)

Trellis, terrace, deck at rear courtyard

No issues.

East Portico

The metal fire escape will be retained and incorporated into the portico, if constructed. Second, due to possible encroachment into the City right of way, a CoA should include a condition that construction requires resolution of any encroachment. Additionally, the CoA assumes the design will not require significant alterations due to building code requirements.

BAR should discuss the design options:

- Using available information and period examples, attempt to reasonably replicate the original. (See photos in Appendix.) BAR should discuss if [*non-historic*] upper section should mimic the lower or be distinct from it. (See also the photos included in the November submittal.)
- Treat the portico as a new element entirely and design accordingly.

Color palette (see photo in Appendix)

No issues with proposed palette or with similar variations, if there are changes.* The BAR should discuss the options regarding the masonry wash—red or white. Due to the necessary repairs to the brick and evidence that the walls had been painted, staff supports either wash. (* Per the design guidelines, colors for Greek Revival & Gothic Revival: Walls and trim are usually white with deep bright green trim or yellow walls with white trim and green shutters and doors.)

Light Fixtures (as luminaries)

Copper lanterns to match or be similar to those presented with the November 2022 submittal (photos 15 and 16).

For electrical lighting (including up- and down-lighting at the pilasters), staff recommends condition that all lamping be dimmable, have a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and a Color Rendering Index not less than 80, preferable not less than 90. (Staff is not aware of any lamping requirements--brightness, glare, etc.--that apply to gas fixtures.)

Re: up-lighting in the sidewalk. Approval should include a condition that installation requires resolution of any encroachment into the City right of way.

Decorative features (Wall lamps, flag poles, signage, railing planters, etc.)

Per the design guideline (Rehabilitation, under Entrances, Porches, and Doors): *Avoid adding decorative elements incompatible with the existing structure.* BAR should discuss appropriateness, including how the components will be anchored into the masonry.

Operable shutters

Extant hardware indicates there had been shutters. Staff finds the style/design appropriate and recommends a condition that the new shutters be wood, painted, have operable hardware, and must be properly sized for the openings.

Bermuda shutters

While not a traditional window treatment for Charlottesville, they will be only on the rear elevation. Additionally, installation is reversible and will not permanently alter the historic windows, nor obscure them any more than traditional shutters. (Note: Regardless of the latter, staff would not support these shutters on other elevations.)

Mechanical units

Applicant should indicate locations and appropriate screening of exterior mechanical units.

Misc.

BAR should require removal of obsolete wires, cables, and conduits from the exterior walls.

Suggested Motions

Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed alterations and rehabilitations at 300 Court Square satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application [as submitted].

or [as submitted with the following modifications/conditions: ...]

Denial: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed alterations and rehabilitations at 300 Court Square do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with this property and other properties in the North Downtown, and that for the following reasons the BAR denies the application as submitted: ...

Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines

Review Criteria Generally

Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that, in considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

- (1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec. 34-288(6); and
- (2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:

- (1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;
- (2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;
- (3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;
- (4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;
- (5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;
- (6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;
- (7) Any applicable provisions of the City's Design Guidelines.

Pertinent ADC District Design Guidelines

[Chapter 2 Site Design and Elements](#)

[Chapter 3 New Construction and Additions](#)

[Chapter 4 Rehabilitation](#)

Appendix

Routine maintenance and repair items, as discussed with applicant October 2022.

Wood: Repair, paint wood trim, ceilings, flooring, doors, windows, and railings. If necessary, replacement of any trim will match existing profiles. Wood or cement board is acceptable, no vinyl. If all new material is necessary i.e. at the wood cornice—review with BAR staff.

Masonry: Point up and replacement of bricks, where necessary, will be consistent with the ADC District Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation (Chapter IV). With a significant amount of brick requiring replacement, staff recommended the new at least match the size, texture, and coursing of existing, acknowledging an exact match was unlikely and anticipating the brick walls will receive either a red wash or lime wash, subject to BAR approval.

Shutters: BAR will support re-installation (there is existing hardware); however, must be wood, painted, with operable hardware, and BAR must approve the type/style,

Doors and Windows: BAR approval required for any removals, replacements, or alterations.

East Portico: BAR approval required for design. Staff suggested a recreation should reflect the original (per old photographs) or a new design could be contemporary, so that it reads as a modern addition. Staff noted that the fire escapes are outside BAR purview.

General:

- Resolve if any property line and/or City right of way encroachments that might impact the new work.
- Obtain a sidewalk closure permit prior to beginning the work. (BP not required for maintenance and repair.)
- Staff encouraged removal of obsolete wires, cables, and conduits.

Holsinger photo (1915):

<https://search.lib.virginia.edu/sources/images/items/uva-lib:1043135?idx=0&x=0.388&y=0.401&zoom=1.146>







Color palette



The Zebra Carriage Hotel

A Luxury Boutique Hotel

300 Court Square, Charlottesville Virginia

BAR Submittal for review on November 15, 2022 – RESPONSES TO BAR COMMENTARY –

Requesting Design Approval at December 20, 2022 meeting

COURT SQUARE HISTORY

The original 300 Court Square building was a simple wooden framed building constructed around 1791 and housed The Eagle Tavern. The Eagle Tavern could seat 200 patrons. William P. Farish had already developed a stagecoach line in 1845 when he purchased the property and erected the current building in 1854. The Farish House Hotel soon thereafter became a major stagecoach stop. After the Civil War, federal occupying forces used it as a headquarters for two years. 300 Court Square has long been used as a gathering spot on court day for food and rest. Travelling peddlers sold products along the porch on monthly court days. Public dances and celebrations echoed through the large parlor halls. Operating as a hotel, also under the name, The Colonial Hotel, until the 1960's, 300 Court Square was later converted into offices and apartments.



PHOTO OF BUILDING AS IT EXIST CURRENTLY



HOLSINGER'S 1915 PHOTOGRAPH

Historic Court Square has long been the center of Charlottesville. The City's courthouse has been in continuous use for over 200 years and is one of America's most historic. No other courthouse has been used by three early American Presidents at the same time. Local elections were held here, and the County Court conducted business with the help of young attorneys and magistrates such as Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe. Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Monroe, along with James Madison later became Presidents and could at times be seen here together.



ARCHITECT'S RENDERING OF BUILDING

Amended Submittal – Responses to November 15, 2022 submitted proposal

300 Court Square – Front of building, North-Facing

- Remove four smaller windows, investigations point to these windows as not original, infill with brick. Remaining windows will be centered and symmetrical. We will provide additional close-up photos of the brick and window interactions. We believe these to not be original. See photos 1-4.
- In response to concerns that board members have regarding the request to unevenly apply whitewash to the exterior of the building, there is evidence that the entire building was painted white; we would like to invite board members to look at the revised sample on the exterior near the tavern entrance. We have added red wash to the lime wash to warm it and make it blend the various mortars and brick repairs.
- Requesting to use a lime mortar on the brick repairs.
- Window mullions, casings, sashes, fascia, railing and door trim to be painted “Gray Owl” Benjamin Moore - 2137 60.
- Shutters, balcony railings, and upper eave to be painted “Braemer” No BS14C35 - by Fine Paints of Europe. Please see sample on actual building.
- All exterior doors to be painted - “Green” – BS 16C39 by Fine Paints of Europe.
- Install four handmade copper gas lanterns flanking both sides of ground-level windows: French Quarter Lantern by Bevelo. (photo 15)
- Install three handmade copper gas lantern pendants on the two balconies and above the front entry door. (photo 16)

Items to be submitted to the City of Charlottesville for approval – in all three instances, we are requesting to install a hotel amenity placed on city property.

- Install four flush-mounted landscape lights in sidewalk to up-light plantings and illuminate pilaster detail. Since this is city property, we will obtain their permission prior to installing.
- Install black and white canvas awning with Greek Key pattern that extends from door to street. Awning is supported by copper poles and illuminated from within. Because this is city property, we will obtain their permission prior to installing the awning.
- Install steps from the landing of the portico on the 6th Street side. May we suggest that we will not build anything until we have the city’s permission, which would hopefully happen during construction or offer up that we will build the steps such that they could be removed if not approved?

East Side of building – 6th Street

- Please see dimensional drawings of the portico as designed. Because this is designed to incorporate the existing fire escape, we ask that it is approved as drawn for functionality. Please refer to dimensional drawings submitted.
- We have elected to use electric lamps on the 6th Street side. We heard Breck’s concern and are reducing the number of gas lanterns used to only those on the North facing exterior (as previously submitted).
- All exterior doors to be painted “Green” No BS 16C39 – Fine Paints of Europe
- We will be installing an electric light fixture at the gift store entry.

Rear of the building – Not Visible from 6th Street

- A two-story trellised wall will be built against the neighboring equipment building to hide the AC chiller on top. Two-story terrace to be built over the courtyard to screen satellite dishes from the room views. Please see submitted dimensional drawings of this structure.
- Trellised terrace to be painted “Gray Owl” by Benjamin Moore – 2137-60.
- A wooden deck will be built to the same level as the first-floor ballroom.
- In consideration of the use of Bermuda Shutters, which garnered a lot of conversation, we will not use shutters on the south side of the annex building and would like to use Bermuda shutters only on the back side of the building which is not visible from the street.

PHOTOS 1 -4 ORIGINAL WINDOW – NOTE MORTAR AT EDGES



UNORIGINAL WINDOW – NOTE MORTAR AT EDGES










300 COURT SQUARE RENOVATIONS
ZEBRA CARRIAGE HOTEL
DECEMBER 13, 2022
BARRY MOSS, AIA

NEW 2-STORY PORTICO;
SEE SHEET A-1 FOR
NOTES AND DIMENSIONS



REPLACE EXISTING DOORS WITH HISTORIC FRENCH DOORS

8'-1"

1 NORTH ELEVATION
A2 1/4"=1'-0"

NEW CUSTOM PTD. WOOD BERMUDA SHUTTERS
ON REAR OF 300 COURT STREET ONLY



2 SOUTH ELEVATION
A2 1/4"=1'-0"

REFURBISH EXISTING WINDOWS, TYPICAL

(3) NEW SURFACE-MOUNTED FLAG POLES AND MOUNTING PLATE

REMOVE (4) NON-ORIGINAL EXISTING WINDOWS, REPAIR BRICK TO MATCH EXISTING

NEW CUSTOM PTD. WOOD SHUTTERS WITH HARDWARE

NEW CUSTOM AWNING WITH BLACK & WHITE GREEK WAVE PATTERN
AND BRONZE/COPPER POLES. INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED.

NEW GAS LANTERNS



PAINTED STEEL TRELLIS JOISTS 2X12 GALV. STL. TUBE




3 SOUTH SECTION
A2 1/4"=1'-0"

300 COURT SQUARE RENOVATIONS

ZEBRA CARRIAGE HOTEL
DECEMBER 13, 2022
BARRY MOSS, AIA















LANDMARK



SURVEY

NOTE:
1976 SURVEY
DATA.

IDENTIFICATION

Street Address: 500 East Jefferson Street
Map and Parcel: 53-96.1
Census Tract & Block: 1-112
Present Owner: Joseph T. Norris
Address: Box 591, City
Present Use: Offices and Hotel Annes
Original Owner: George L. Peyton
Original Use: Hotel

BASE DATA

Historic Name: The Farish House
Date/Period: 1854
Style: Greek Revival
Height to Cornice:
Height in Stories: 3
Present Zoning: B-3
Land Area (sq.ft.): 72 x 116
Assessed Value (land + imp.): 20,380 + 21,270 = 41,650

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The Farish House is an example of the Greek Revival style of architecture which characterized buildings of the 1850's. The structure is three stories high with a recessed pavilion providing a sheltered entrance. The pilasters are used to define and elaborate these changes in the wall plain. The capitals of the pilasters are formed out of molded brick, a refinement not seen at the Levy Opera House or the Abell-Gleason House. Typically, the windows are treated with paneled spandrels. The walls are constructed of American bond (i.e. all stretchers) brickwork, one of the first examples found in the city.

HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION

The site upon which the Farish House stands has always been used for public entertainment. Benjamin Brown and David Ross bought the lot from Thomas Walker and built the Eagle Tavern on this site prior to 1791. It was a typical eighteenth century tavern with a wide front veranda and four chimneys. The fate of the tavern is not known, but the existing structure is stylistically datable from the mid 1850's. When the Hotel was sold to William Farish in 1863, it was already known as the Farish House. Subsequently it has been known as the Hotel Colonial until 1925. Deed references: ACDB 47-206, 62-494, 63-489, City DB 1-309, 7-67, 11-350, 13-249, 13-331 (See Monticello Hotel for post 1924 deed references).



CONDITIONS

Average

SOURCES

City/County Records
Alexander, *Recollections*, p.27.
Illustrated Edition, *Daily Progress*,
1906.



VIRGINIA
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

File no.
Negative no(s).

SURVEY FORM

Historic name	Common name
County/Town/City AUBURN/CHARLOTTESVILLE	
Street address or route number 100 CORKY SQUARE ANNEX	
USGS Quad CHARLOTTESVILLE/EAST	Date or period
Original owner	Architect/builder/craftsmen
Original use	
Present owner	Source of name
Present owner address	Source of date
	Stories
Present use	Foundation and wall const'n
Acreage	
	Roof type

State condition of structure and environs **FAIR**

State potential threats to structure
Note any archaeological interest

Should be investigated for possible register potential? yes ___ no **/**

Architectural description (Note significant features of plan, structural system and interior and exterior decoration, taking care to point out aspects not visible or clear from photographs. Explain nature and period of all alterations and additions. List any outbuildings and their approximate ages, cemeteries, etc.)

BRICK (7 COURSE AMERICAN BOND);
2 STORY; HIP ROOF; 6 BAYS. VERNACULAR. C. 1880. NORTH WALL
ABOUTS EAGLE TAVERN. ENTRANCE ON
NORTH FACE. COLONIAL REVIVAL
ENTRANCE WITH FLUTED PILASTERS,
PEDIMENT, 4-LIGHT TRANSOM. 6-PANEL
FLAT-PANEL DOOR. WINDOWS WEST
WALL: 1/1 SASH WITH SEGMENTAL
ARCHES. BOX CORNICE.

Interior inspected? **NO.**

associated with the property.)




Sources and bibliography
Published sources (Books, articles, etc., with bibliographic data.)


Primary sources (Manuscript documentary or graphic materials; give location.)

Names and addresses of persons interviewed

Plan (Indicate locations of rooms, doorways, windows, alterations, etc.)



Site plan (Locate and identify outbuildings, dependencies and significant topographical features.)





Name, address and title of recorder

MARGARET DAVIS

UVA

Date

April 1980



1 SECTION THRU PORTICO
A5 1/2" = 1'-0"

2 DETAIL
A5 1 1/2" = 1'-0"

6. Staff questions/discussion
 - BAR awards 2022
 - DT Mall NRHP update
 - Cafe space – string lighting