

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
November 17, 1998**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton: Chair
Joseph Celentano
W.G. Clark
Jessie Hook
Brent Nelson
James Oschrin
Kenneth Schwartz
Dawn Thompson

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest
Ron Higgins

At 5:00 P.M. Ms. Fenton convened the meeting and explained the meeting format and process.

614 Park Street: Burke Residence

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they received a letter in their packet about the copper siding. She indicated that the copper siding has been approved.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions or comments from the board or the public.
There were no questions or comments.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the new window as submitted.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Vending Cart: Thai Restaurant

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton asked where the Thai! Restaurant is located.

Jay Punyanita, applicant, indicated that it is located on 29N.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Punyanita if he planned to bring the cart in every day and remove it at night.

Mr. Punyanita answered yes.

Coy Barefoot asked if vendors apply to locate in a specific place on the Mall or if it is a random free for all.

Ms. Fenton indicated that carts can locate wherever they choose on the Mall. She indicated that it is the charge of the board to review the look of the cart. She indicated that if you have a permit you can set up anywhere on the Mall. She indicated that it is starting to look like a flea market.

Mr. Barefoot asked if vending is permitted year round?
Ms. Vest answered yes.

Ms. Hook asked if the cart conforms to the size limitation.
Ms. Vest indicated that the height, length, and width of the cart may each be a maximum of 10 feet.

Mr. Punyanita indicated that the cart is 8 feet by 4 feet.

Mr. Oschrin moved to approve the cart.
Mr. Clark seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

106/108 South Street: Saddle Up
Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they have done a beautiful job on the interior of the building and that she is impressed.

Mr. Clark moved to remove the condition to remove the conduits and to ask the applicants to paint the boxes beige.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he had hoped that the side of the building would be painted. He indicated that the front was painted. He indicated that the building looks good but that it is unfortunate that there is no paint on the side.

Mr. Francolini indicated that he would see if the owner of the building would be willing to paint the side of the building.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he lives on that street and that he sees the site everyday. He indicated that a while ago windows were installed in the side of the building that are very beautiful.

Mr. Francolini indicated that he just leases part of the building.

Mr. Higgins indicated that he would talk to the building owner about painting the building. He indicated that it would be a logical time to ask.

Footlocker: 100 W Main Street
Staff presented the report.

Mr. Celentano asked the applicant if they plan to renovate the rest of the façade. Buddy Thompson, applicant, indicated that Footlocker has no plans for the façade at this time. He indicated that he is just the general contractor. He indicated that the board could write some letters to Footlocker encouraging a new façade.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the project is coming before the board after the fact. He indicated that this seems to happen a lot. He indicated that there have been times when that happened and it has been the wrong thing to do.

Mr. Higgins indicated that it is an education process that is on going.

Mr. Oschrin asked Mr. Higgins about the sign on the Footlocker Store. Mr. Higgins indicated that the sign is a replacement consolidation sign. He indicated that the Woolworth's sign was grossly non-conforming. He indicated that the new signs are a 30% reduction in size. He indicated that they could have replaced the Woolworth's Letters with Footlocker Letters. He indicated that staff talked them into removing all the signs and replacing them with the smaller sign. He indicated that legally the city has no purview over a replacement that is a copy. He indicated that they have challenged that and that they have lost. He indicated that the 700 square foot sign was replaced with a 250 square foot sign. He indicated that the replacement issue is a different issue than a newly erected sign on a new project.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that it seems that if there is a sign that is very non-conforming and unfortunate the ordinance could be changed so that the board reviews the signs.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the process is designed so that people are encouraged to do replacement consolidation signs. He indicated that in 1993 the process was redesigned to be more user friendly.

Ms. Fenton indicated that if there is a sign that is outside of the normal process, the board could be brought into it.

Mr. Higgins indicated that in the case of a sign that does not conform, the city does not have the same legal authority as with a new sign.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the ordinance could be changed.

Mr. Higgins indicated that this is one example of replacement consolidation. He indicated that the city has gotten a whole lot of mileage out of it and that there are hundreds of good examples.

Mr. Nelson asked if the sign is an interior lit sign.

Mr. Higgins indicated that it has a backlit panel not an illuminated panel. He indicated that it is similar to the lights used on a bank teller. He indicated that all the old signs that were removed were interior lit signs.

Mr. Clark indicated that there is nothing here that is unapprovable. He indicated that the smaller glass lights are certainly less elegant. He indicated that if they had seen this in a complete package before the work was done they could have made a choice between the sizes. He indicated that it is possible to get larger tempered and laminated glasses. He indicated that he would have suggested a larger size. He indicated that it is regrettable that it is coming after the fact. He indicated that it subverts the process.

Mr. Tabackman asked if a building permit was required for the windows.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the building permit was received for the whole store. He indicated that the applicant believed that they were replacing the existing windows with new windows.

Mr. Clark asked if an architect was involved with the project.

Mr. Thompson answered yes.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she suggests that the application be deferred while plans for the whole building are worked out.

Ms. Vest indicated that the store is open with a temporary Certificate of Occupancy. She indicated that temporary CO's can be extended to a maximum of 90 days.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he concurs with Mr. Clark's comments. He indicated that he has reservations about approving the project today.

Ms. Hook indicated that she supports deferring the application.

Mr. Clark indicated that he has no problem approving the windows. He indicated that it is the process that is maddening. He indicated that the windows were installed before drawings were presented to the board. He indicated that next month they will be presented with another surprise. Mr. Clark indicated that they have talked about this issue before.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the concern is not being ignored. He indicated that there was not intentionally a lack of drawing before the work was done. He indicated that the punitive issue is really not the purview of the board. He indicated that people are caught without approvals everyday. He indicated that the city's approach is to stop the project and send it through the process. He indicated that this is the nature of planning issues. He indicated that this was an honest mistake and not an attempt to subvert the process. He indicated that he apologizes and that there is some level of embarrassment for the staff when these things happen as well. He indicated that it is an educational process that occurs over time.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he does not feel punitive but that he does have confusion about the application and the building. He indicated that many have visited the site and that he is very positive about the site being improved and about the private investment that is being put into it.

He indicated that there has been a lot of communication with the property owner and the architect and it is ironic that it was perceived as maintenance.

Lisa Murphy indicated that the property owner is not in control of the Footlocker space.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agrees with Mr. Clark that if it came before the board in a sequence he would have chosen the larger panes of glass.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the tenant removed the panes without the owner's knowledge.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it would be helpful to look at the building as a whole and to defer the application.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he is in favor of deferral.

Ms. Thompson indicated that if she were called on to vote she would abstain. She indicated that it is difficult to vote for approval after the fact.

Ms. Fenton asked how long a temporary CO could be issued for.

Ms. Vest answered up to 90 days maximum. She indicated that timeframe allows for two more regular monthly BAR meetings.

Mr. Schwartz moved to defer the application for 60 days.

Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Murphy indicated that when Footlocker signed the lease they decided not to make any change to the outside of the building. She indicated that they did not know that any changes were being made to the outside of the building.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she would like to see the board write to Footlocker to ask them to look at the whole of the building.

Mr. Nelson asked what the city does on a regular basis to notify property owners about the requirements of the BAR.

Mr. Higgins indicated that they have done a mass mailing in the past. He indicated that they need a better way to educate the public. He indicated that they are working on a lot of issues related to this. He indicated that maintenance is any replacement that puts something back exactly as it was and that any change has to go through the process.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would like to see some way that new property owners are contacted when they purchase a new property. He indicated that there are property owners, particularly in residential areas, who do not know that they need approval for certain things.

100 W Main Street: Demolition and Preliminary Conference

Giovana Galfione, applicant, introduced herself. She indicated that she knows how important this redevelopment is for the Downtown Mall. She indicated that she is aware that this is a preliminary proposal and that her application was loaded. She indicated that she put a lot of information in front of them. She indicated that she has given the proposal a lot of thought and has been working on the proposal for more than a month. She indicated that she has included several different ideas and different options.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she researched the history of the site. She indicated that she included Sandborn maps and photos from Holsinger's collection. She indicated that in 1907 there was a handsome building on this site with massing similar to the Young Men's Shop holding down the corner of the block. She indicated that Lafayette Theatre was in the middle of the block. She indicated that on the 1929 Sandborn map there is a three-story building with concrete slab and steel joints on the front of the lot. She indicated on the map the portion of the footprint that corresponds to the oldest part of the building. She indicated that the extension to Water Street was added in 1965. She indicated that the front of the building was also remodeled at that time. She indicated that the historic information shows the character that Main Street once had and that has been lost. She indicated that character has been reinvented through the pedestrian quality. She indicated that the Mall has gained a smaller scale, more pedestrian oriented quality. She indicated that Main Street's role as a thoroughfare can be shifted to Water and Market streets. She indicated that the character of the block can be extended.

Ms. Galfione indicated that with the development of the Water Street parking lot and the City Market, 1st Street will become a major pedestrian link between the City Market and the Mall. She indicated that the quality of 1st Street is not very inviting and that it is not pedestrian oriented. She indicated that the existing condition is a 230' blank wall on the Woolworth's side with a few shops on the other side. She indicated that the goal is to create street life by creating a relationship between the building and the people. She indicated that they need to create retail stores accessed from the street level. She indicated that most of the retail space exists below street level. She indicated that the 1st Street façade is broken up into specific sections. She indicated that Footlocker expands in the back of the block for the first portion of the block. She indicated that they tried to activate as much of the lowest level of the building as possible. She indicated that she was concerned about taking a lot of street space for the purpose of activating those spaces. She indicated that the spaces cannot be used without being activated somehow. She indicated that they propose lowering the sidewalk in a 50ft by 8ft space.

Ms. Galfione pointed out the Axonometric drawing to show the sidewalk cut. She indicated that the street is 32 feet wide and that they are proposing an 8 foot wide cut. She indicated that the street could be completely reoriented for pedestrians. She indicated that the utilities need undergrounding.

She indicated that a main issue that she has studied is the massing along 1st Street. She indicated that 1st Street will occupy 3 or 4 different uses, not just one use. She indicated that other sidestreets are being developed to a variety of uses and that the most successful streets offer a series of activities. She indicated that she has broken down the massing into three distinct parts. She indicated that the first piece is the corner piece. She indicated that the second piece is small

Mr. Higgins answered that it is not in the plans yet, but that the more you look at the Water Street development the more importance this access begins to take on. He indicated that the Planning Commission has already remarked that there is an opportunity to extend pedestrian access from the City Market to the Mall.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is torn about the blank wall on the side of the Footlocker store. He indicated that he is not sure if he likes it or if it would be better if something more was done with it. He indicated that he wonders if there is something that could be done to the side of the building to create texture.

Ms. Galfione indicated that they have considered adding relief to the blank wall with a new material.

Mr. Clark indicated that it could be improved with trees. He indicated that he wished he had a map of Main Street to see the relationship of Central Place. He indicated that the characteristic of stepping along the street is very graceful and reminds him of Central Place. He indicated that the stepping on 1st Street would show better if it was shown within a context including Central Place. He indicated that there is the question of what will happen if, in the future, we decide to drive on these streets again. He indicated that this issue is not in the board's purview, but it is a question.

Mr. Clark indicated that often grade changes occur within a building and not on the street. He indicated that this grade change might enliven the street. He indicated that he would suggest pulling the change into a longer area. He indicated that the more diminutive the area is, the more apologetic it becomes and the less it contributes to the street.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she pushed for the smaller recession for fear that a larger area would get so bogged down in the approval process. She indicated that it may be easier to get approval for a smaller area and the property owner likes to do projects quickly.

Mr. Clark indicated that the owner should stop doing things so quickly.

Ms. Murphy indicated that the idea is to turn to retail uses to help bring the street to life. She indicated that with retail it is necessary to have street frontage. She indicated that the hurry is always crucial because any wait is time without rent being paid.

Mr. Celentano asked how high Store I is.

Ms. Galfione indicated that it is 9 feet from floor to ceiling.

Mr. Oschirn indicated that City Market is integral to the project as a whole. He indicated that they need to see diagrams of how all these things relate. He indicated that plans for City Market are essential to what they are trying to do. He indicated that he embraces the whole idea. He indicated that his concern is that he doesn't want to look back after the Water Street site is developed in a certain way and realize that the development should have been done differently.

Mr. Higgins asked if Ms. Galfione had studied the Mall facade.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the elevations were distributed at the meeting as an addendum to the application. She indicated that she knew that she left the elevation out of the packet and that it is a challenge because of the existing condition. She indicated that she has presented solutions ranging from the minimum to the more complex. She indicated that the 1st illustration is the minimum solution. She indicated that the 2nd becomes more massive. She indicated that the 3rd implies collaboration between the tenant, the owner, and the board. She indicated that the volume is pushed back 20 feet. She indicated that the awning can be connected with cables. She indicated that the facade could be pushed back from the corner of York Place.

Mr. Celentano asked if the loggia turns the corner.
Ms. Galfione answered yes.

Ms. Fenton asked if the lease with Footlocker gives the owner any control of the front.
Ms. Murphy indicated that Footlocker has total control over that portion of the building. She indicated that they will need to have permission from Footlocker to make any changes to that facade.

Mr. Nelson asked if they have any feel for how Footlocker will respond to these proposals.
Ms. Murphy indicated that Footlocker's position has been to do as little as possible. She indicated that they made it clear that they would not change the exterior of the building and that they were shocked that Footlocker changed the windows.

Ms. Hook asked about the location of the air conditioners and electrical equipment.
Ms. Galfione indicated that they will be located on a terrace that is not visible from 1st Street or the Mall. She indicated that they will be pushed back against York Place.

Dan Phillips introduced himself and indicated that he is representing the Commerce Building.
He indicated that they are happy to see something better going into this space. He indicated that their concern is parking. He indicated that with the addition of York Place and the Water Street Studios they have seen the parking fill up. He indicated that another large building full of people will add to the vitality of the area but will also increase the parking demand. He indicated that when the City Market is developed we will loose even more parking.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she understands that the Water Street idea will include parking.
Mr. Higgins indicated that any development at that site would replace existing parking and likely add parking. He indicated that the development would have at least two levels of parking.

Mr. Phillips asked if extra parking would be required for this building. He indicated that the residential units will bring in extra cars. He indicated that the existing parking is full and it is often full at night.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the extra cars would get absorbed into the existing parking Downtown.

Mr. Oschrim asked about the use of the parking garage on Water Street.

Mr. Higgins indicated that it is not full all the time. He indicated that as the new residential element increases downtown the garage will likely absorb those cars. He indicated that in terms of monthly parking during business hours that garage is just about maxed-out.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she is looking for direction on the general massing and articulation of the building.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there are really two issues: The issue of the demolition permit and the issue of new construction.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that it is a splendid and terrific building. He indicated that it looks like a building that was developed incrementally over time. He indicated that he likes the part over Footlocker less. He indicated that he would like to see that piece be bigger. He indicated that he understands that there are structural limitations. He indicated that he recommends that the recessed entry be a grander thing and not a hole that is squeezed in. He indicated that it is an interesting issue and a wildcard from the preliminary point of view.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she has no problem with demolition and that the project has evolved beautifully. She indicated that the front still needs a little more work. She indicated that she is willing to help with anything that the board can do to give support and make that happen. She indicated that she would like to see the front redone.

Mr. Celentano indicated that it is hard to look at the street development without looking at all the information, such as utilities and traffic. He indicated that he had several comments on the massing. He indicated that buildings on downtown sidestreets tend to have a clear front on the Mall and a clear side. He indicated that he likes this distinction. He indicated that the blank wall on the side of the Footlocker tells you that there is a clear front and side. He indicated that he likes the elevation and the collection of buildings. He indicated that the central block piece is successful. He indicated that the corner piece is less convincing.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the corner piece is proposed in response to the need to close that corner.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he wonders if there needs to be that many pieces in the 1st Street elevation. He indicated that he likes the Main Street proposal in that it tries to integrate the modern horizontal slab.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he applauds Mr. Kutner and Ms. Murphy for investing in a good architect. He indicated that this is one of the most complex and interesting projects that the board has seen. He indicated that it is exciting to see how something that it underutilized and non-contributing can be changed over time through investment and design. He indicated that he was initially skeptical about cutting into the ground. He indicated that he agrees with the comments about the more gracious recession. He indicated that in Perspective 1 the north seems too heavy. He indicated that if no excavation is done on that side, screening is workable. He indicated that he understands the concern about the pedestrian access being reversed. He indicated that he votes for a more gracious recession in the street. He indicated that this example

does not allow someone in a wheelchair to get down to the shops. He indicated that he appreciates the possibility of Solution C to be integrated. He indicated that what is put on the upper level of the Footlocker will need to be integrated with the rest of the building.

Mr. Clark indicated that he echoes the other comments. He indicated that Mr. Celeniano's comment about the sidewalks is worth listening to. He indicated that they have tried to fragment by the massing and that it is successful. He indicated that lots of materials have been used and he wonders if all the materials are necessary. He indicated that the best investment of time can be put into photos and perspectives and into understand the project within the fabric of the city.

Ms. Hook indicated that she is enthusiastic about the project. She asked where deliveries will be made.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the main lobby entrance on Water Street will act as a delivery entrance.

Ms. Hook indicated that the street is dark at night. She asked if streetlights would be added? Ms. Galfione indicated that the redesign of the street could not be without landscaping and lights of the same quality as on the Mall.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is very enthusiastic about the project. He indicated that he commends Mr. Kuttner and Ms. Murphy for hiring an architect with such obvious talent. He indicated that in his initial comment about the blank wall he was unsure and that he is no longer unsure about the wall. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Celeniano's comment and that there is a nice sense of front and side of the building. He indicated that it is a nice design element. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Clark's comment about the trees and that the trees will give something to look at from the street. Mr. Nelson indicated that he encourages the applicant to build a model to show the two sides of the street. He indicated that he suggests a pullout model so that the building can be pulled out and plugged in throughout the process. He indicated that the Planning Commission and City Council will have an obvious say in this development and a model may be very helpful during that process.

Mr. Nelson indicated that in the past they have learned that they cannot tie the issue of demolition to the specific building they endorse.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is struck by the development of specific issues and he hopes for continued successful collaboration between the owner and the architect.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she appreciates that work that has gone into the project. She indicated that she is partial to the Solution C with the cabled awning. She indicated that it reflects 19th Century commercial storefront facades.

Mr. Clark asked why demolition cannot be hinged on the quality of the new project. Ms. Fenton indicated that legally the city and board cannot require the owner to build a building. Mr. Clark indicated that the demolition permit could be withheld until working drawings are received.

Mr. Higgins indicated that this would make sense from a historic preservation standpoint that the owner still has no obligation to build a new building.

Mr. Clark indicated that he appreciates this and that they can be assured that it is a good faith project after reviewing the drawings.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they are happy to take time to get a quality design. She indicated that holding up demolition would be a problem. She indicated that practically speaking this is the time to go forward with demolition.

Ms. Fenton indicated that right now they are digging out the interior of the building. She indicated that the question for the board is, as a preservation issue, is there any feeling that this is a building that they need to protect.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the board should not tie demolition to a specific design. He indicated that the question is, do we want to preserve this building as is. He indicated that it is not necessarily the role of the board to tie demolition to the new building design.

Mr. Celentano indicated that it is the role of the board to make sure that what goes in is better than what is there now.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the role of the board is to decide if this building should be preserved as it is.

Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Higgins if he is saying that it is not necessary to review the new plans with the request for demolition.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the board still has two separate issues to deal with: the demolition and the new design. He indicated that the board has control over any change to a vacant site. He indicated that the board should look at the demolition criteria and should not base demolition on the idea of good design.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they have presented some working drawings. She indicated that it doesn't make sense for them to wait on demolition until the working drawings are completed. She indicated that whatever building goes up in its place will need the board's approval.

Mr. Clark indicated that he is convinced. He indicated that he is excited by the project and that demolition is a reasonable request. He indicated that what the project enjoys is being seen as a whole project.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they need preliminary feedback in order to be able to go and ask for permission to lower the sidewalk.

Mr. Oschrin asked if after demolition is complete there is a standard for what the demolition site must look like.

Mr. Higgins indicated that there are requirements that the site is cleaned up and is not a hazard.

Mr. Oschwin asked Ms. Murphy when she anticipates starting construction. Ms. Murphy indicated that they hope to start in 3 months but that if it takes 6 months to get the best design and to get approval for the plans then they are willing to wait.

Mr. Higgins asked Ms. Galfione if the 1929 multi story building was in existence on or after 1958.

Ms. Galfione indicated that it does not appear to have been in existence in 1958.

Mr. Higgins asked how many residential units would be added. Ms. Galfione indicated that there would be 28 residential units.

Mr. Higgins asked how much square footage they have on the lot. Ms. Galfione answered about 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Higgins indicated that current zoning allows a zoning density of 5 units. He indicated that if the 1929 building was in existence in 1958 they would not have to go through the special permit process. He indicated that they will have to go through the special permit process. He indicated that the special permit process could take several months.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they are prepared for this and that they may use the apartments as offices until the special permit is obtained.

Mr. Oschwin moved to approve the application for demolition. Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she hopes that the applicant will come back with further drawings. She indicated that any information that she can get from the city about the sidewalk will be appreciated.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it would be wonderful if staff could meet with the representative of the Commerce Building to address his concern about parking. He indicated that as the Planning Commission representative on the board he will be sure to point out the concern to his colleagues on the Planning Commission.

Ms. Fenton indicated that communication with the applicant has been good and that she thanks the applicant for coming.

218 West Main Street: DOWNTOWN TIRE GARAGE

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Murphy, applicant, indicated that they are no longer going up, they are now going down. She indicated that there are two scenarios and that they are seeking approval for both scenarios. She indicated that the first scenario is without a drive through. She indicated that there is a slope for handicap access to two of the retail fronts. She pointed out the drawing with the two drive

through bays. She indicated that they want to start construction in a month and that they want approval for both scenarios.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the tenant would be a bank regardless of the whether or not there was a drivethrough.

Ms. Murphy indicated that there would not be a bank tenant, just the possible bank drive through. She indicated that the other spaces would be retail.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the plan drawing confuses him. He indicated that he does not understand where on the front of the property the cut would start. He indicated that he does not see the drawing in plan view.

Mr. Celentano indicated that Sheet Three is a plan drawing.

Mr. Higgins indicated that the property is asphalt from the sidewalk. He indicated that there is a concrete apron around the building. He indicated that the cut would be contained within the concrete apron.

Ms. Murphy indicated that the parking will still be in front of the building.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is still having a hard time understanding the cut. He asked if the cut starts at the back of the city sidewalk.

Ms. Murphy answered no. She indicated that the cut would be contained to the concrete apron around the building.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the design has changed since the last submittal.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they are trying to bring this side of the Mall alive and to improve the site. She indicated that staying within the existing structure was less of a financial risk.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it is currently a one-story garage. He asked if it would stay one story. Ms. Murphy indicated that it will be a two-story structure.

Mr. Nelson asked if, when they excavate, they are going to have handicap access to the bottom level. He asked if it would be stairs to the bottom level. Ms. Murphy indicated there would be stairs and a ramp.

Mr. Nelson asked if the drive through would be one way. Ms. Murphy answered yes.

Ms. Thompson asked if there would be a left turn into the building. Ms. Murphy indicated that cars would pull in from Water Street. She indicated that a benefit of having the bank is that they will upgrade the parking lot. She indicated that it is a good lease that will allow for upfits that are nice and quick.

Mr. Clark indicated that the area that is to be recessed is now a concrete slab. He asked if they are also demolishing the footings and the columns. He indicated that this question is not in the board's purview, but it is something to be aware of.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they can work around the footings. She indicated that some areas have already been dug up to get the lifts out.

Ms. Fenton asked if somebody from the city has looked at the plans.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they will have to get a building permit to do the work.

Mr. Clark indicated that the plans do not indicate building structure.

Ms. Murphy asked if structural issues are for the building inspector.

Mr. Clark answered yes. Mr. Clark indicated that they should have a structural engineer look at the plans.

Mr. Celentano asked Ms. Murphy about the materials on the elevations.

Ms. Murphy indicated that the new windows and doors will be wood. She indicated that the steel in front will be painted green or black. She indicated that the outside facade will be covered in new stucco. She indicated that the existing garage bays are turning into windows.

Mr. Celentano asked about the material on the lower level on the elevation.

Ms. Murphy indicated that that material would be concrete. She indicated that they also plan to use concrete planters.

Mr. Oschtrin indicated that the site has been used in the past as a service station. He asked if the site had been checked for contamination.

Mr. Higgins indicated that when the property was originally renovated, large tanks were removed. He indicated that thousands of dollars has been spent on mitigation.

Ms. Fenton indicated that all the windows are existing windows that are being reused. She asked if the windows are in good condition.

Ms. Murphy answered yes.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the admits he is disappointed that the applicants did not go through Allied Transfer building. He indicated that he has concerns about the HVAC unit on the top of the building. He indicated that he looks at the unit everyday and that it is very intrusive.

Ms. Murphy indicated that the existing units are black and ugly. She indicated that they need to be painted or to be enclosed. She indicated that she has no problem having that be a stipulation of approval.

Mr. Nelson indicated that, as another aside, there has been a tremendous amount of graffiti on the side of the building for about 6 months. He indicated that he sympathizes with the problem and feels that the police need to do something about it. He indicated that they might want to

contact Wachovia. He indicated that Wachovia had a large piece of graffiti on a very old brick wall. He indicated that they used a process and got all the graffiti off in one day.

Mr. Nelson asked if the windows are the same as the Young Men's Shop windows. Mrs. Murphy indicated that they are the same windows but that they are just fixed windows, not outswinging windows.

Mr. Nelson indicated that windows on the Young Men's Shop have never been finished. He indicated that molding has never been put on them. He indicated that he does not understand why molding was never put on them. He indicated that he is concerned.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he would love to see something developed on this site. He indicated that the first proposal was a real step forward. He indicated that he has concerns about the architectural language proposed for this addition. He indicated that he is worried about the pit. He indicated that it does not make as much sense to go down as it did to go up. He indicated that he does not support the proposal as presented.

Mrs. Murphy indicated that the slope is the same as the parking lot. She indicated that the idea is to bring retail into the space. She indicated that, in terms of marketing retail, a storefront is really important. She indicated that this is a step in the right direction. She indicated that the slope on the backside of the building is not that extreme.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he has the feeling that what they are looking at is schematic. He indicated that the plan does not show the space in the front of the building clearly with the sidewalk. He indicated that he does not have enough detail in the drawings to make a final approval.

Mrs. Fenton indicated that she feels similar and that there is not enough information.

Mr. Oschrim indicated that he is struck by the contrast between this proposal and the last proposal. He indicated that it is terrific to think of the building as more than it is. He indicated that he thinks it may be better to simply wipe the slate clean. He indicated that he understands that he needs to make a specific comment on this proposal. He indicated that he cannot make a determination about this proposal because the drawings are not adequate.

Mr. Clark indicated that he agrees with the others. He indicated that this is something that he senses is a nice project. He indicated that the level of information on the drawings makes it hard to understand. He indicated that he wished that the quality of the presentation was improved.

Mr. Clark indicated that the board needs to see plans of the buildings showing the structure and they need to see a plan showing the context, the sidewalk, roads, and edges. He indicated that each type of drawing that they need is here. He indicated that the drawings are missing elements that they need to see. He indicated that the depression is not drawn onto the site plan.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the drawings need to show how the proposal relates to the parking.

Ms. Murphy indicated that she handed in the application on time and did not hear anything from the board. She indicated that different areas of downtown are going up in value at different times. She indicated that this site does not have the same potential as 1st Street. She indicated that they are trying to help the area come up gradually. She indicated that the potential for this to go on and on, there are expenses incurred. She indicated that the building could be a profitable building if used as a car repair place. She indicated that it doesn't do a whole lot for the neighborhood in its current condition. She indicated that they are thinking about the big picture. She indicated that they are making an attempt to work with the board. She indicated that she called Ms. Vest many times after the board received their packets. She indicated that Ms. Vest did not receive any negative feedback about the application materials. She indicated that there was a one-week period that changes could have been made to the drawings.

Mr. Clark indicated that he personally called the architect last month after the meeting and told him that the project was beautiful. He indicated that the problem was with the application. He indicated that the quality of the project has suffered.

Ms. Murphy indicated that Mr. Kuttner did stay until the end of the last meeting and that he is trying to make the project work.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that his problem is not that they don't have enough information. He indicated that he reviewed the information when he got it. He indicated that he could piece it together and that as a design proposal he does not support what has been presented. He indicated that he is concerned about the compatibility of the depression and he is concerned about the mixture of languages that have been used. He indicated that he is unsure of the way that it pulled together as an architectural expression. He indicated that he thinks that it would be wonderful to see the building developed for retail uses.

Ms. Murphy asked Mr. Schwartz if the drawings presented are acceptable. Mr. Schwartz indicated that he does not think that the board is in a position to tell applicants that they must hire an architect to prepare the application for them. He indicated that his concern is that this is not a good design proposal.

Ms. Murphy indicated that the materials are exactly the same materials that were presented at the last month. She indicated that the one difference is that they are no longer building up but they are digging down. She indicated that heard the board members say that they could not approve the application because the drawings could not be deciphered.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the last drawings that were presented were more convincing. He indicated that the board had some questions about that elevation and they needed other elevations.

Mr. Oschirin indicated that the draft minutes indicated many positive comments about that proposal.

Ms. Murphy indicated that she understands that the board liked the last design and liked that Bruce Wardell prepared the drawings. She indicated that she had not received any feedback about the elevations before the meeting.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it did not become clear what was happening in the front of the building until the meeting.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the burden is on the applicant to convince the board.

At this point, Mr. Schwartz left the meeting.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board gets the packet one-week before the meeting and it takes several days to review all the materials. She indicated that she understands that the issue is that people feel that they are not getting their questions answered. Ms. Fenton indicated that her feeling is that the first proposal is more exciting and more interesting. She indicated that it is the applicant's prerogative to present what they want to do. She indicated that there are certain issues that are not answered.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it is important to reiterate that staff's job is to check and be sure that the packet contains all the correct materials and to be sure that the materials are accurate. He indicated that the problem is that the drawings are not completed and that the plan of the building does not show how the project relates.

Ms. Murphy indicated that she is asking the board members if they saw the problems with the drawings a week ago.

Mr. Clark indicated that the burden is on the applicant. He indicated that what is lacking is the site plan. He indicated that he does not have a problem with the elevations. He indicated that he couldn't tell how the proposal relates to the street. He indicated that he recommends that we not get at war and that the applicant submit a drawing that shows the relationship of the recession to the street wall.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she really would like to see something happen with this building. She indicated that it is unfortunate that it takes applications 30 days to get approval.

Mr. Oschrin moved to deny the application.
Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

McGuire Woods Building: Preliminary Conference

Greg Brazinsky, applicant, introduced himself. He indicated that he was designing a 3000 to 5000 square foot addition to the McGuire Woods building. He indicated that the building consists of a series of additions. He pointed out the different additions on the plan drawing. He indicated that the building was occupied by McGuire Woods and Battle. He indicated that his clients intend to lease the building and that they have to make some changes to bring it up to code. He indicated that they are adding handicap access and an elevator and staircase and that

they will also add a second elevator. He indicated that he is looking for preliminary feedback. He indicated that they are not proposing any change to the 1820's addition and the hyphen. He indicated that they are proposing a 3300 square foot addition that is stepped back on the upper stories. He indicated that the upper floor forms an atrium office space. He indicated that he is creating a cap for the building. He indicated that currently the buildings don't terminate themselves.

Mr. Nelson asked if there was an elevation showing the addition from East Jefferson Street over the original building.

Mr. Brazzinsky indicated that his approach has been to show a perspective from the Courthouse Square.

Mr. Celentano asked if there is an occupiable space in the gable.

Mr. Brazzinsky answered no.

Mr. Celentano indicated that in terms of the massing, the mid-block gable seems to be a little foreign. He indicated that it would be nice if he could achieve some type of setback of the new addition form the brick facade. Mr. Celentano indicated that maintaining the traditional edge and giving a little bit of setback will give a little more freedom to do something modern. He indicated that things on roofs in the downtown area are simple.

Mr. Brazzinsky indicated that there is a small setback from court square.

Mr. Celentano indicated to respect the masonry boxes that are there now.

Mr. Clark indicated that the drawings are not serving the applicant well. He indicated that it would be valuable to see how the proposal looks from the street front and from Jefferson Street to the Mall. He indicated that the building to the south has a lot to do with the composition. He indicated that there is a lovely progression of stepping down along 5th Street. He indicated that this is a strong vertical intrusion. He indicated that they might be better off with a low parapet rather than a gable roof. He indicated that something a little more modern could seem fresher.

Mr. Oschtrin asked Mr. Brazzinsky if there was a chimney.

Mr. Brazzinsky indicated that there was a simple gable roof.

Mr. Oschtrin asked about the fenestration on the left piece.

Mr. Brazzinsky indicated that it is a steel structure with a glass plane. He indicated that this is a modern intrusion and the challenge is how do you bring the modern intrusion in with the rest of the design.

Mr. Oschtrin indicated that he has no problem with the massing of the tower. He indicated that

Mr. Brazzinsky indicated that he is trying to let the building stand on its own.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she would prefer for the door to be in keeping on the street. She indicated that understands they are trying to tie it in with what it on top. She indicated that the door reminds her a little of the modern door to the Virginia National Bank office on 3rd Street. Mr. Celentano indicated that he likes the idea of some modern presence on the street. He indicated that the most important issue is how the door is detailed. He indicated that it could be a street frame door with Mahogany.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the cornice projects and asked if that has to remain. Mr. Brazinsky answered no.

Mr. Celentano indicated that perspective drawings looking down the street with the addition would be useful.

Mr. Nelson indicated that perspectives are good. He indicated that the most useful thing for him would be an elevation drawing of all the buildings along 5th Street.

Mr. Celentano indicated that an elevation of Jefferson Street, drawn to 16th scale would be helpful.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he agrees that drawings from Jefferson Street would be helpful and that he recommends a drawing from the Jackson monument.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Brazinsky if there is anything else that he needs to know. Mr. Brazinsky asked the board if they would be open to materials other than brick.

Mr. Celentano answered yes, definitely.

Ms. Fenton indicated that less traditional materials get a mixed reaction and that this board is more open than previous boards.

Mr. Tabackman indicated that the board is really looking for quality of materials.

Mr. Nelson indicated that they are looking for compatibility in the use of materials.

Mr. Oschrin moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Fenton seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved. At 8:30 the meeting was adjourned.