

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review

April 25, 2000

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)

Ken Schwartz

Jesse Hook

Preston Coiner

Joe Atkins

Lynne Ely

Linda Winner

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

Jim Tolbert

At 5:02 p.m., Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the March 21, 2000 minutes.

Ms. Ely indicated that her name had been spelled incorrectly, and that in a number of places, her comments had be mis-attributed to Ms. Winner, and vice versa. She added that she had marked the corrections and would give them to the reporter.

Ms. Ely moved to approve the minutes subject to

amendment. Ms. Winner seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any items that the public would like to raise before the Board.

Lyn Rushton, of 841 Wolftrack Road, stated that she is curating an exhibition for the Bayly Art Museum. She indicated that this will involve commissioning artists to create artworks which will respond to the history of the area, and then gave general background information on the project, including naming numerous prominent locations where art projects have already been approved. She stated that she was coming before the Board to request approval of a specific project proposed by one of her artists, namely a piece called

"Monticello Canto" which would portray Monticello and the faces of local historical personages such as Lewis and Clark, Madison, Monroe and others. The artist has proposed to paint this either on the white wall on the side of the A&N building or on the Chroma Tech building. She indicated that Gabe Silverman has given initial approval, but that they want to go through all the proper channels to get the project approved.

For the benefit of the Board, Ms. Fenton explained that the Chroma Tech building is located on 2nd Street SE between Water and Main.

Ms. Rushton indicated that the exhibition will open June 16th and go through the summer. She stated that she hopes to have a lot of publicity and to bring a lot of people to Charlottesville for this show. She then added that if there is a problem with painting directly on the buildings, the artist is willing to paint on a cloth which can be hung in front of the wall.

Ms. Fenton asked about the current exterior on the walls of both buildings. Ms. Rushton indicated that

she is certain one is white painted brick, and believes the other is unpainted red brick.

Ms. Fenton stated that this type of issue has not come before the Board before, and asked if the Board members felt comfortable voting now or if they would prefer to defer the matter.

Ms. Winner asked if there were any guidelines about public art. Ms. Vest said not specifically, but that there are guidelines about paint colors being appropriate.

Ms. Fenton commented that at earlier meetings, it had been decided that paint can be covered over and so should not be a subject of nitpicking; however, if an exterior is unpainted, then the question should be given more careful consideration. She asked if there were any problems with the proposal, or if the Board felt comfortable making a motion that the project be done on any surface that is already painted.

Ms. Hook asked what the size of the painting would be. Ms. Rushton stated it would be at least as large as the wall of the room they were in.

Mr. Atkins apologized for being late, then asked if there were any time constraints on when an answer would be needed. Ms. Rushton stated that the artists hope to create the works in late May and need appropriate notice.

Ms. Winner asked why the project is temporary. Ms. Rushton stated that the paintings are part of an exhibition, and the weather would wear the paint off with time. She added that if the painting were done on cloth, the cloth could be given to the City or whoever has funded it.

Ms. Hook asked whether oil or acrylic paint was going to be used. Ms. Rushton replied that the artist hopes to do digital printing, in which case it would be done on cloth; otherwise, he would hire a crew of mural painters to paint the wall.

Mr. Coiner asked if the motion to approve could include a requirement to paint over the project at a certain time.

Ms. Vest suggested granting temporary approval.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve the project through November 1st, with the stipulation that Staff coordinate with Bayly Art Museum on the final size and location of the painting, understanding that the approval is for the side of the A&N building. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-4-17

210 W Water Street

Ms. Vest made a short presentation. She indicated that the applicant is putting in a new restaurant and wishes to make improvements to the old Farruggio's building, namely to the outdoor patio and the rooftop structure. She stated that he also wishes to add new windows to the front and the rear of the building and to replace a single door with a double door. Staff supports the proposal overall and feels that the roof change will be an improvement to the site, but final approval will be contingent upon what the window details look like.

Ms. Fenton commented that Oliver Kuttner, who owns

the building next door, has been wanting to paint over graffiti on the side of the building, and that it would be good if Mr. Garcia could coordinate with Mr. Kuttner to do the work at the same time.

Mr. Garcia commented that the present owner of the building, Mr. Farruggio, has treated the graffiti with a chemical solvent to make it easier to remove, but it was agreed that repainting might be the best option. He then made a brief presentation to the Board. He stated that he had the elevation drawing and pictures of the rear, for the windows, and added that he would like to trim the windows and french doors in a dark green color. He commented that the trellis over the front was going to be stained with transparent white stain, so the texture of the wood would still be visible, and that he planned to have ivy growing over the trellis. He stated that the door to the left of the patio has a blacktop entrance, and that he would like to replace that with brick to match the interior of the patio.

Ms. Fenton asked if either the public or the Board had any questions for the applicant.

-- Mr. Coiner asked the applicant to address the trim

color again. Mr. Garcia indicated that initial plans had been to paint the whole front white, but that now he would like to trim the windows and doors in dark green.

-- Mr. Coiner asked if the trellis had been designed yet. Mr. Garcia replied that it would be supported by 4-by-4s, with a 1-by-6 style trellis coming off of each side, open to the patio and to the front.

-- Ms. Vest asked if the applicant intended to brick the whole walkway entrance or just the area in front of the door. He replied that he wanted to brick the whole walkway.

-- Ms. Fenton asked if there was a photo of the windows available. He stated that he had pictures from a catalogue.

-- Mr. Atkins asked about the windows being cased in vinyl. Mr. Garcia replied that they had vinyl casing, but were wood on the inside. He added that the factory white vinyl would be painted over in dark green.

-- Ms. Fenton asked if the windows were true divided windows. Other Board members replied that they appeared to be single pane windows.

-- The applicant commented that the door on the right of the building is a double french door, and that he

planned to match that on the left with a single door.

-- Mr. Atkins asked about the size of the opening behind the wood. Mr. Garcia replied that there is wood on either side of a brick pillar, and that the double french doors will take up most that wood. The changes will be inserted into the wood, not the brick.

-- Mr. Schwartz asked if wood windows were available in the same design as the vinyl clad ones. Mr. Garcia said he believed so.

-- Ms. Fenton commented that usually the Board tries to recommend wood instead of vinyl.

Ms. Fenton then called for comments from the general public. As no comments were made, she closed that portion and called for comments from Board members.

-- Mr. Atkins commented that the one thing missing from the drawing was the relationship of the openings to the beginning and the ending of the wood. Mr. Garcia indicated that the double french doors would take up most of the wood that is there now, but that there would be wood filler from the single door to the brick on the right. Mr. Atkins indicated that he was concerned how the left over wood would be resolved with the new openings, and that he feared

there would be little pieces of it that would be hard to patch or fill. He asked if taking all the wood off would help or hinder the applicant. Mr. Garcia replied that it might be better to brick it all in.

-- Ms. Fenton voiced her approval of the proposed improvements, adding that she would prefer wood over vinyl windows.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve, with two conditions: that the applicant use wood windows painted the color that has been submitted, and that Staff approval be sought for the trim strategy on the new doors. Mr. Atkins seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-4-19

408 Ridge Street

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She stated that the applicant is doing extensive renovation to her residence on Ridge Street, and that she is before the Board because, for various reasons, she has replaced the existing columns with narrower columns and Staff felt that was enough of a change to require Board approval. She added, however, that Staff approves of

the changes, as they are not a significant aesthetic departure and are balanced by the extensive work she is doing to the rest of the residence.

Ms. Fenton commented to the new members of the Board that procedurally, work done without permission is to be regarded as the same as work not yet done. She added that the idea is for the Board not to be punitive, but to attempt to be fair and consider all sides of the issue.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

-- Mr. Coiner asked the applicant if she was aware that she needed BAR approval on anything that she did. Ms. Frasier replied that she had not believed BAR approval would be necessary for a replacement as opposed to adding something different.

-- Ms. Fenton commented that when initial permits are given, someone should inform applicants of BAR procedures.

-- Ms. Fenton asked if the columns that were put up were chosen because they were commercially easier to make. The applicant replied that the ones she chose were the closest in terms of style and size that were

commercially available, and that having identical columns custom made had proven to be cost prohibitive.

-- Mr. Atkins asked who blew the whistle. Ms. Vest explained the process that Ms. Frasier had gone through getting permits, and then added that the inspector had pointed out the replacement of the columns to Ms. Vest as something requiring BAR approval.

-- Ms. Winner commented that going by the criteria that called for the Board to consider this as a new proposal, she would give her approval for the replacement of the columns.

-- Mr. Coiner indicated he agreed with Ms. Winner.

-- Mr. Schwartz stated he would agree also, but with one note: The proportion of a column and its spacing can be critical on a structure, and there are classical rules on how the two work together. He indicated that in this instance, because the column spacing is wider than usual on the adjacent buildings, there is a degree of flexibility in design that would allow him to approve the columns as they exist now on Ms. Frasier's home.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public.

-- Mr. Eugene Williams, of 620 Ridge Street, stated that he has been involved in restoration on five or six houses on Ridge Street. He commended Ms. Frasier's work on 408 Ridge Street, but stated that it is important to note that historic district guidelines on restoration require that replacements must duplicate the features that came before. He pointed to changes in the porch and the relation of the columns to those on adjacent houses, and stated that this is a prime opportunity for the BAR to do a serious review. He criticized Ms. Frasier and the contractor for not following through and getting all the proper permits. He then showed the Board examples of detrimental changes that were made to homes on Ridge Street before the area became an historic district. He stated that there should not be preferential treatment, and that the same pressure that is put on people in other historic districts should also be put on residents and builders on Ridge Street. He then suggested that the Board also look at what he considered to be deterioration of the 610 Ridge Street residence.

-- Ms. Cheryl Williams Blanton, born in Charlottesville but currently a non-resident, stated she was delighted that Ridge Street has been made an

historic district, but is not excited at all that standards are being lowered there. She commented that she agreed that columns are perhaps the most important part of the exterior of a structure, but did not agree that spacing between columns allows for extra leeway in design standards. She stated that she would like the minutes to reflect that the BAR is lowering the standards on Ridge Street to support its approval of the current effort under consideration. She stated that she and her father have spent millions in the area to restore appropriately, and so would like clarification why other properties are not asked to restore appropriately.

-- Mr. Schwartz indicated he would like the record to reflect that he did not ever use the expression, "lowering the standards," and that he does not like it when a member of the public recasts a statement in a way that does not accurately reflect what he said. He stated that his comments about spacing between columns had to do with the language of classical architecture, and that across Charlottesville, houses tend to use a wider spacing than is found in classical architecture. He stated that this observation is not a commentary on what is better or worse, but that it has to do with the nature of

historic residential construction in Charlottesville.

He stated that there is no lowering of standards involved here, and that was never included in any of the commentary. He agreed, however, that detailing on how restoration is conducted on properties is extremely important, and that is a challenge that faces every home builder, contractor and architect in the historic districts.

-- Ms. Blanton commented that the custom-made columns were not that expensive, and so did not pose much of a challenge, in her view. She stated that she would like to have in writing instances where columns have been permitted to be reduced in size in other historic districts in Charlottesville.

-- Mr. Schwartz stated that he was happy sticking with the words that he offered originally, and said it was not appropriate for other people to place words in another person's mouth.

-- Ms. Frasier explained the process she went through in seeking permits, and stated there was no intent to avoid getting the proper permit for changes to the front of the house.

-- Mr. Otis Lee, of 406 Ridge Street, commended Ms. Frasier for taking on a job that was urgently in need of repair. He stated that the renovations have

helped the properties on either side of her house, and though the changes may not be architecturally perfect, they are aesthetically pleasing and represent the surrounding milieu quite well.

Ms. Fenton closed the public comment portion and called for comments from the Board.

-- Ms. Winner reiterated her comment that if this were a new item being proposed, she would recommend approval as she does not find it to be in violation of the standards she would apply in any historic district.

-- Ms. Fenton stated that she drove down the street without looking at numbers and could not tell which house had the new columns. She commented that this is not an historic restoration, as the applicant is not looking for historic credits or landmark credits from the state or the federal government, and therefore the only question is, is it appropriate? She stated that she feels the look and the materials are appropriate and regards the change as an improvement to the property.

-- Mr. Atkins stated that he appreciated the concern that was expressed about preserving good architecture. In regard to the issue of lowering the

standards, he commented that the Board is not charged to measure the restoration of this property as one would a national landmark, but to determine that there has been a good faith effort to respect the building while choosing appropriate, reasonably-priced materials. He cited examples that support a certain flexibility in residential architecture, then stated that he would have supported this column replacement had it not already been done. He commented that although it is not the issue before the Board, the question about the brick base is a relevant one. He asked the applicant if the original porch had had brick piers at the corners beneath the porch beams.

-- Ms. Frasier replied that there had been brick beneath the porch, but also latticework around it on the sides.

-- Mr. Atkins stated that the wood post at the corner has more to do with a contemporary wood deck; typically, the porches have brick piers.

-- Ms. Fenton commented that the columns could be approved with the understanding that there would be brick beneath the porch.

-- Ms. Vest indicated that the understanding the applicant has with the building inspector is that

everything on the porch is being exactly replaced,
and the only deviation at this point are the piers.

She stated that unless unforeseen problems emerge,
the Board can assume that they are going to put the
porch back exactly as it was. She said she would be
happy to work on this issue at Staff level and would
bring it back before the Board if necessary.

-- Ms. Fenton suggested that if the materials cannot
be replaced, that there then be a replacement
lattice.

-- A member of the public stated that it is not
matter of not being replaceable. He stated that the
brick pillars can and should be replaced, and the
lattice should run from one brick column to another,
as is found on houses all along Ridge Street.

-- Ms. Ely commented that the replacement pillars did
not jump out at her when she drove down the street,
and that she felt the materials and design of the
pillars are appropriate for the historic district.

She stated that she would have approved the
replacement before and would approve it now.

-- Ms. Hook commented that she supports Ms. Frasier's
assertion that having custom-made columns is cost
prohibitive.

-- Mr. Coiner said he would echo everyone else's

comments.

-- Mr. Schwartz said he had nothing to add.

Mr. Coiner moved to approved the application as submitted; Ms. Ely seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwartz stated he wanted to add an amendment with regard to the brick piers. He suggested adding a provision for the applicant to work with the building inspector and Staff to try to achieve brick piers that would closely resemble the original brick piers.

Mr. Coiner and Ms. Ely accepted the amendment. A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton clarified the nature of the approval and the amendment for the applicant, and then commented to Mr. Williams that perhaps at one of the BAR Worksessions, he could take members on a walk along Ridge Street to point out the perceived problems.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-4-20

632 Ridge Street

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She stated that the applicant is proposing some exterior changes to a

residence, namely the removal of an historically and aesthetically insignificant exterior staircase that had been put up in the mid-1980s and the bricking up of an entrance that had been punched in the brick wall. She stated that Staff's only concern is the manner in which the brick work is done, and that they would like more information on the bricks and mortar to be used.

The applicant, of Fitzgerald Company, stated that he had nothing to add but that he does have a copy of the brick that the contractor proposes to use.

Ms. Fenton commented that the last time the Board addressed something like this, a sample of the brick was made available on-site so that it could be viewed next to the original material. Board members could go by the site, and then call Ms. Vest to indicate whether or not they approved of the material.

The applicant presented the Board with a photograph that shows the proposed bricks stacked up next to the wall of the building where they plan to brick in. He indicated that they are trying to collapse the apartment units into two-bedroom units to make the

residence more suitable for long-term families, and in order to do that, they want to brick the openings so they will comport with the outer mortar and brick. He added that they intend to brick point the entire building so that it all configures into the Jeffersonian style. He stated that the stairwell had been removed by the contractor before permission to do so had been secured, but that his company is aware that BAR approval is required for such changes. He added that the removal of the stairwell, however, would make the building more pleasing architecturally.

Ms. Fenton called for any questions of the applicant.

-- Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant had investigated the possibility of using used brick rather than new brick. The applicant stated that they would prefer to use used brick if they could find it.

-- Mr. Coiner asked if he was proposing simply to block in the door and window, or to cut out the half bricks and interlock them. The applicant replied that they plan to do the latter.

-- Ms. Fenton asked if the City has used brick available. Ms. Vest stated she was not aware of any.

-- Mr. Coiner commented that the new brick may be

superior in quality to old brick.

-- The applicant indicated that in an earlier project nearby, they had wanted to retain the original brick but could not do so because it was so deteriorated.

-- Ms. Ely stated that she is aware that there are different types of bricks, such as wire cut bricks and those that are made to look antique, and asked what type of brick this was that the applicant was presenting to them. The applicant indicated he did not know.

-- Mr. Atkins commented that a wood-molded brick might be the best way to get the desired irregularities in texture in a new brick.

-- Mr. Coiner commented that a brick sample board can be obtained from a company like Allied and taken to the site to match up brick types.

-- Mr. Atkins asked if it might be better to replace the opening with a window instead of bricking it up, given the difficulties of patching a hole successfully. The applicant indicated that there is no need for windows where the holes are located, and that architecturally, the building will look better with the brick.

-- Ms. Winner asked if the applicant was going to repoint the brick all around so that the mortar will

be the same, and he confirmed this.

Ms. Fenton called for further questions from the Board or the general public.

The applicant indicated that he wanted to add one further point. He stated that they hope to remove two awnings on the north and south side of the porch, because the awnings have struck the windows there.

As there were no further questions, Ms. Fenton closed that portion and called for comments from the general public. Seeing none, she closed that portion and opened the floor to comments from the Board.

-- Mr. Coiner asked if the proposal still stands for the Board members to go to the site and look at the brick. Ms. Fenton replied that the suggestion is that the Board can approve the brick as shown, and then visit the site within a week to view the sample and let Ms. Vest know if there is a problem. If a problem arises, new samples could be brought to the site, but she stated that this is preferable to deferring the decision.

-- Mr. Schwartz commented that he doubted the hole could be bricked in to make it look like part of the original wall. He suggested cutting away the brick

above the hole up to the eaveline and rebricking the whole vertical panel, rather than trying to interlock bricks and fill in just the hole.

-- Mr. Williams commented that he thought interlocking brick is more structurally sound, and suggested that the motion say something about consulting the applicant's contractor.

-- Mr. Schwartz agreed that if interlocking can work seamlessly, it is the best way to do it.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion for approval of the brick-in portion on the south elevation and for the stair removal. He stated that the bricking in could either be done through an interlocking of matching bricks and mortar, or through an in-fill panel going all the way from ground up to the eave in a continuous vertical panel, to be decided in review with Staff with bricks and mortar on-site.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

Ms. Fenton called for discussion.

-- Mr. Atkins stated he wanted to make an amendment to include following through on the tuck-pointing of the brick with the same mortar, which will increase the chances of making the whole wall uniform.

-- The applicant expressed budget concerns in relation to doing the vertical in-fill up to the eaveline.

-- Mr. Coiner commented that the savings in labor from not having to interlock the brick might be enough to offset the cost of doing the vertical in-fill up to the eaveline.

-- Mr. Schwartz commented that he suggested filling in from ground to the eaveline because of a notable sag in the building where the hole had been punched in before.

-- Ms. Winner asked Mr. Schwartz if the motion is worded in such a way that the applicant, in consultation with Staff and the builder, can make the decision based upon financial concerns. Mr. Schwartz stated he was uncomfortable with that, given the sizable sag in a portion of the building.

-- Ms. Fenton commented that if there is a considerable difference in cost, the applicant can always return in three weeks with a second application.

-- Mr. Coiner asked if approval could be subject to review by the building inspector, so a return trip back to the Board can be avoided. Ms. Vest stated that the proposal is for further consultation with

the planning staff in consultation with Board members.

-- Ms. Fenton indicated she wanted to add a friendly amendment that the Board allow the awnings to come off of the front of the building.

-- Ms. Vest stated she wanted to clarify that if the applicants determine they cannot do the vertical in-fill from the ground to the roofline, the issue would then need to come back before the Board, and Mr. Schwartz confirmed this.

-- Ms. Fenton added that the motion as it now stands is for the in-fill to go from the floor to the roof, with either interlocking or without, but with a preference for the non-interlocking. The final decision is being left to the discretion of Staff in consultation with the contractor.

-- Mr. Atkins said he would rather no preference be indicated, and Mr. Schwartz concurred.

Ms. Fenton called for a vote, and the amended motion passed unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-4-18

1115 1/2 Wertland Street

Ms. Fenton noted that the applicant still had not shown up, but called for Ms. Vest to go ahead and give her presentation.

Ms. Vest stated that this small apartment building is not visible from Wertland Street, but it is from Page Street and therefore it falls within the Board's purview. She indicated that it is the Board's mission to consider the impact on the Wertland Street historic district, particularly in relation to adjacent historic structures. She commented that in Staff's assessment, the building itself does not contribute to the historic district in its current state, but the proposed gable roof form does seem to relate more to the surrounding historic structures. She added that the roof material and the siding have both been previously approved.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for Ms. Vest, since the applicant was not present.

Ms. Vest commented that previously she had requested more information about the windows and doors and the asphalt shingles, but it had not yet been provided.

Ms. Fenton stated that the Board has the option to defer or to approve if the materials are ones that have already been seen and approved for other buildings. She called for any questions or comments.

-- Ms. Ely commented that she is not comfortable approving vinyl siding in an historic district. She added that she understands the point that it is not visible from Wertland Street.

-- Ms. Fenton commented that the Board's purview is only what is visible from any public right-of-way.

-- Ms. Vest commented that the applicants argued with Staff about the building's visibility, and because the issue is debatable, Staff has been conciliatory on the materials.

-- Ms. Hook commented that the building is visible from the right-of-way if you search for it, but not just in passing, and Mr. Schwartz added that with the changes to the roof, it will be more visible.

Ms. Fenton asked the Board whether they would like to see the materials or whether they would like to vote based on the information available. Mr. Schwartz stated that if the materials match materials that have been previously approved, then he would feel comfortable approving the roof addition.

Ms. Hook made a motion that the addition be approved, provided that the materials match those used in previous projects in the historic district, and that no new material is introduced.

Mr. Atkins seconded the motion, but said he wanted to add that the materials used should be the ones presented previously to the Board as part of the application.

A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called upon the Board to set a date for the next BAR Worksession.

Ms. Vest informed the Board members of the scheduled topic for the Worksession and referred them to their packets for further information. She proposed as a tentative date, Tuesday, May 9th, from 5 until 7 or 7:30.

Ms. Fenton asked if the Board wished to tentatively approve the date, and the Board agreed.

Mr. Atkins proposed a Worksession to look at when or how guidelines have been approved and what tactics may be used to amend or augment them.

Ms. Vest commented that City Council charges the BAR to uphold the guidelines, and any amendments to the

guidelines have to go through City Council.

Mr. Atkins commented that he brought the issue up because he sympathized with criticisms brought up by developers at an AIA Forum on Preservation and Demolition concerning lack of clarity in the guidelines.

Ms. Fenton suggested that this Worksession topic be put off for three to five months, as several Board members are new and perhaps have not had the chance to gain a wide enough perspective.

Mr. Coiner asked if a walking tour is considered a public meeting, and Ms. Fenton replied that it is.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the Board needed to elect a Vice-Chair.

Mr. Schwartz stated he wanted to interject that the Court Facilities Study Committee is having its next big public meeting on May 11th. He was unsure of the location, but asked the Board to watch for the notice. Ms. Fenton added that the Court Enhancement meeting will also be taking place. General conversation concerning scheduling and notification followed.

Ms. Vest stated she wanted to mention the Commercial Corridor Study that is going on. She indicated that this corridor study will be important for the BAR, as it will make economic and urban design recommendations.

Mr. Tolbert commented that the first two meetings took place last night and that morning, and both of them were largely economic reports. He then outlined for the Board the schedule and the goals of the Commercial Corridor Study.

Ms. Fenton called for the Board to elect a Vice-Chair. Mr. Schwartz nominated Lynne Ely, who commented that she was concerned about her level of experience. Ms. Fenton called for any other nominations. Seeing none, she closed the nominations and called for a vote. Ms. Ely was elected unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called for someone to speak to the Board about the Presentation Awards.

Mr. Tolbert indicated to the Board that the City Manager had approached him recently about reinstating a program to give Preservation Awards each year. He indicated that the City Manager would like the BAR to

choose an awardee each year, and then have a well-publicized joint presentation of the award by City Council and the BAR at a City Council meeting. The City Manager has suggested that they award not just a certificate, but a bronze plaque that could actually be put on the building. Mr. Tolbert suggested starting this program in May and arranging to give the awards during Preservation Week in the following years.

Ms. Fenton asked if any of the Board members had any particular projects they would like to nominate for a Preservation Award.

Mr. Tolbert indicated that the Board needs to decide on categories and criteria for the award before actually nominating a project.

Mr. Atkins asked for the date of Preservation Week, and Ms. Vest informed him it was the second week in May.

General discussion followed about various projects that were noteworthy.

Mr. Schwartz suggested giving an award to a project this May, and then announcing generally that the BAR will be seeking nominations for an expanded program of recognition in the coming year. This would give

the Board time to develop appropriate categories and criteria. He indicated that he would like to nominate Wachovia Bank for this year's award.

Ms. Fenton suggested giving this award, and then taking up the Preservation Award program as an issue at the next Worksession.

The Board members discussed the positive ramifications of this project on the public image of the BAR.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to give a Preservation Award for the historic tower of the Wachovia Bank.

Ms. Vest asked if this award would recognize the architects as well as the bank.

Ms. Hook commented that it would be nice to make it clear that Wachovia had appeared before the BAR. Mr. Schwartz concurred, stating that this is an example of a project that went through the full process with the BAR.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Tolbert addressed the Board about the agenda cut-off period for Staff, stating that it is close to the BAR meeting date, which makes it difficult to

prepare reports and send out notices in a timely manner. He suggested that they attempt to transition to an earlier cut-off period, perhaps two weeks earlier than it currently is, to give Staff members adequate time to do their jobs.

Ms. Fenton voiced her support for the transition, but suggested that if an application is incomplete, the applicant then might be given three to five days to bring in the rest of the application.

General discussion about the time frame used by Boards in other communities followed.

Ms. Hook made a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Ely seconded the motion.

Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.