

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
April 17, 2001**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)
Linda Winner
Jesse Hook
Joe Atkins
Preston Coiner
Lynne Heetderks
Ken Schwartz

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. She announced, for the record, that she and Mr. Schwartz had been reappointed to the Board, but that, because there was not a new Planning Commission person appointed yet, Mr. Schwartz and Ms. Hook still had their old spots. As soon as the Planning Commission appointed someone new, Mr. Schwartz would take Ms. Hook's place, and Ms. Hook would get her "permanent vacation" from the Board. She then invited members of the public to bring forward matters not on the agenda. Hearing none, she closed that portion of the meeting.

Concerning approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 20, 2001, Ms. Fenton announced that they did not yet have the minutes and therefore would defer that item until the next meeting.

Ms. Fenton recognized Ms. Vest, who stated she did not have a Staff Report on the Court Square Enhancement since this evening's presentation, from which they hoped to obtain Board feedback, was mainly informational. Ms. Fenton then introduced Mr. Huja.

Mr. Huja thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak to them about Historic Court Square. He said that two years ago when the resource task force suggested that the Court Square area be enhanced, the City had applied for an enhancement grant; they had gotten a second one the next year and now had approximately 1.2 million dollars in grants for the purpose. The design and planning process was started by holding an open meeting for citizens, which had been attended by some of the people at this BAR meeting among others. He mentioned dates of May 2000 and September 2000, and said the Project Committee had worked with them as well as the Planning Commission, City Staff and Council. A group called PMN Planners and Architects had been their consultants. He presented a brief visual history of the area depicting the changes which had taken place from 1828 through 1939. Another drawing showed the buildings in the immediate area surrounding the old court house. He stated that the primary objective of the program was to enhance the physical environment and historic character of the area, to make it attractive to residents and visitors. He then discussed the proposed brick sidewalks and crosswalks, and

mentioned that they wanted to emphasize the oldest area of Court Square by expanding the sidewalk there, minimizing parking, and creating a place from which speeches, for instance, could be made. Given available funds, they hoped to "brick" the section of Park Street that traverses the oldest part of the area. They also proposed to renew the lighting, especially in front and on the sides of Park Street, and to make changes to Jackson Park. The plan favored removing all parking from the front so that pictures could be taken of the old court house without showing parked cars. Mr. Huja indicated, on his graphics, alternative areas for parking. He mentioned that old photographs of the court house showed a fountain similar to the one at the corner of Market and 9th Streets, and there was thought of replacing it so that one would be aware, when approaching the Court Square area from High Street, that one had arrived at someplace important. Enhancement of 5th Street was also proposed, to help the tourists and other visitors to more easily get to the Downtown Mall, an idea for which there was no money at present. He passed around the book containing the plan and, along with it, some sheets showing renderings of what the enhanced area would look like. He said the County had agreed to contribute \$250,000 for the park. As the retaining wall around the area was crumbling, he said, a brick retaining wall all around the site was planned. Mr. Huja stated they had just finished the survey and archeological work on the area, mentioning that the archaeologists had found some amazing things under the ground, including the remains of long-vanished buildings on the site. He invited ideas from the Board.

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

Mr. Schwartz enquired if there was wide-spread enthusiasm for the project despite its high cost. Mr. Huja replied that support had been practically unanimous. Mr. Schwartz wanted to know as well if the committee had looked at the connection between the historic jail and the court house, to which the response was that they had, and saw the jail as an integral element. On the master plan, Mr. Huja stated, the access to the jail had been emphasized, the specifics depending upon exactly how the court house building was dealt with.

Ms. Fenton mentioned that the access had been left open in the hope that the jail would be preserved and accessible.

Mr. Coiner asked about the three historical markers and wanted to know if the Historical Society would keep its board. Mr. Huja pointed to an area where an attractive board might be located, but added that they had not designed that part yet. Mr. Coiner enquired if they had considered relocating the fountain from Rockwell Park to Court Square. Mr. Huja said that had been suggested, but he had heard there were many emotional attachments to its present location, not to mention that the fire department wanted it to remain where it was. Mr. Coiner pointed out that in fact it had been donated to the fire department. Mr. Huja said it would be "theirs" anyway as it was the City's and the fire department was part of the City.

Ms. Winner brought up the issue of changes in the street signs. Mr. Huja indicated that the book being passed around contained his ideas for signage, with suggestions for more attractive street signs. Ms. Fenton added that there was a sense that the UVa signs had been so effective, and they could do something of that sort, to be compatible but yet set apart, at the Court Square project.

She and Mr. Huja stated that any design details of signage, et cetera, would come before the Board.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions. Mr. Coiner simply said, "Go do it." Mr. Atkins commented that he would rather see quality in a confined area than to see the "Court Square effect" spread farther than it needed to be. Mr. Huja responded that quality was their prime concern; they didn't want it to fall apart in fifty years.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there were a County representative on the committee. Mr. Huja stated that the County had been invited all along, and that they had come for a short while, then had left. Two presentations had already been made to them, he said. Mr. Schwartz commended City and County on their collaboration, mentioning again how important to the entire project the historic jail was and would be. Mr. Huja noted that ideas were being considered for reuse of the jail.

Ms. Winner saluted Mr. Huja and the group for their wonderful project and expressed how impressed she was with its scope and quality. Mr. Huja stated that it was a community effort.

Ms. Fenton noted that the building was all but hidden by overgrown plantings and she thought much effort would be expended toward restoring visibility to the building.

Ms. Heetderks said she was impressed that the committed was looking at more than one time-frame in the enhancement process, as she had feared initially what she termed the "Ye Oldedification" of Court Square.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-2-5 500 Park Street

Ms. Vest gave a brief report on the proposed renovation of the carriage house at the First Presbyterian Church. She reminded the Board that the First Presbyterian Church, represented by Nancy Roach, had come before them in February about total restoration of the carriage house, a building on the church property which predated the church. The plans had been met with enthusiasm, she continued. In February they had thought the red tile roof could be repaired without replacement, but surprising cost estimates had led them to explore other alternatives. She mentioned she had distributed copies of all correspondence she had received from the applicants, who wanted to consult with the Board concerning alternative roof materials and to request approval. Based on design guidelines, included in the report, Staff had had strong concerns about replacing the red tile with standing seam metal, thinking that would dramatically alter the appearance of the building. They also felt that basically the guidelines had indicated the roof as a character-defining feature of the structure. Thus they could not support the request to use standing seam metal though they commended applicant for the overall restoration.

Ms. Fenton then introduced the applicant to present her point of view.

The applicant expressed disappointment in the roof estimates when they came in, since only a year ago a reputable company had led them to think the tile roof could be repaired for \$4800.00. Now, the lowest repair estimate was \$16,000 without any warranty. She noted that the lowest

cost of completely redoing the roof was \$37,000 and they had a hard time justifying spending that kind of money. They had not given up on the tile roof, and were trying to move ahead with the project anyhow. She mentioned something called "light tile" which they thought should look quite similar and were considering, but for which as yet they had no cost estimate. They had come before the Board to ascertain their other options, hoping for possibly copper or standing seam metal approval, as that would present vertical lines reminiscent of the present treatment. She reminded the Board that after all the building was at least 150 feet back from the road. They did not wish to go in that direction, but had to consider expense. She noted that she had pictures if anyone wanted to look at them.

Ms. Fenton opened the floor for questions. She asked Ms. Vest about low-interest loans and enquired whether they were financing or trying to pay it outright. Ms. Vest replied that it was to be paid. She mentioned a 3 percent revolving loan plan up to \$20,000, but she did not know how a church would be treated as it was neither a residence nor a business.

Ms. Roach stated the church had given them a budget they had to stay within, which every estimate exceeded.

Ms. Hook asked if Ms. Roach had seen a type of cement roof called a "Dura-lite" roof, stating she had seen one and that it looked very good. Ms. Roach indicated she had seen pictures of this type. Ms. Hook wondered if they could get the proper color of tile; Ms. Roach said that, according to her information it appeared that they could.

Ms. Fenton enquired if anyone on the Board had seen this type of roof in person, to which Mr. Atkins responded, "Not knowingly." Ms. Roach reminded them that they hadn't gotten any estimates of cost yet.

Mr. Atkins noted that the original plan had been to repair the existing roof, and the applicant confirmed this.

Ms. Fenton asked what had become of the contractor who had given the church the original estimate. Ms. Roach replied that he now refused even to consider repairing the roof. Ms. Fenton asked with how many contractors they had spoken; Ms. Roach said they had talked with four main ones and she did not know how many separate roof ones. The Chair enquired of the Board if any members knew of someone who worked with these materials. Mr. Atkins mentioned that there were offers to repair, and Ms. Roach quoted the best price of \$16,000 with, however, no warranty, adding that the roof was very small.

Ms. Winner questioned whether there were, in close proximity in that neighborhood, any copper or standing seam metal roofs. Ms. Roach said there were some of standing seam metal but was not sure about copper. She stated that the carriage house roof had once been standing seam metal.

Ms. Fenton called for questions; hearing none, she invited comments. A member of the public enquired if this were one of only two carriage houses left in Charlottesville, the other being on

Oxford Road. Ms. Vest indicated there was one on West Main, and she believed there was another at the Fife house on Cherry.

Ms. Winner asked if, architecturally, the red tile were the common material for such a roof, as she found it odd, to which Mr. Schwartz responded that it was unusual for Charlottesville.

Ms. Fenton invited comments from Board members. Mr. Schwartz stated that he was torn, because the roof's very uniqueness was why it was so memorable. He could certainly see their dilemma, he said, as he had had an old house with a slate roof which, though more common than the tile, presented some of the same problems of upkeep and repair, and that one wouldn't get any warranty on it as one would with a brand new roof of more ordinary material, since the contractors, in fairness, could not control all of the problems that might come up. However, given a conscientious contractor, such repairs were fairly trustworthy.

Ms. Hook enquired whether they preferred to wait for a decision about the roof before they proceeded with the rest of the work, to which the applicant replied that it was all integral with the flashing and everything else; she said she thought they'd "just have to get in there and do it" due to all the repairs, mentioning specifically the brick walk and the parapet. She expressed doubts that the contractor would be willing to do that, or that it was even a wise use of their time.

Ms. Winner asked if the lack of a guarantee or warranty was the stumbling block to roof repair. Ms. Roach confirmed their concern was indeed the lack of warranty, and what the contractor had said about the amount of material that would have to be removed from sides and edges, and that the clips used for securing tiles in place did not hold up very well.

Ms. Fenton reiterated the feeling that this distinctive roof was perhaps too important to change since it defined the structure to such a great degree. She was sympathetic with the applicants' problems of expense but reminded Ms. Roach that the Board had a charge to preserve distinctive characteristics. She suggested that perhaps, as individual members of the community, outside the Board, the Board members could help to find means of funding assistance, but she reiterated that as a Board the BAR's responsibility was the preservation of this unique feature.

Ms. Heetderks stated that she felt the design guidelines were clear, and that the roof was the most important feature of what she called one of the treasures of Park Street, which would otherwise be just "a cute little house."

A member of the public remarked that another house on Park Street had the same kind of tile roof and suggested that that property's owner might provide helpful information concerning repair.

Ms. Fenton asked if Staff would be able to find out whom to contact, and Ms. Vest offered to call the owner. Ms. Fenton also suggested they might ask the mayor and a former Board member who might have dealt with this issue in the past.

Ms. Fenton then invited further comments. Hearing none, she called for a motion. Ms. Heetderks moved, based on the design guidelines, to deny applicants' request to replace the carriage house's tile roof with copper or standing seam metal, seconded by Mr. Schwartz.

Ms. Fenton asked for discussion. Mr. Schwartz said he had gone by the place again the previous day, trying to visualize it with copper or metal, and thought it would look very odd. The tile roof, he stated, was such an interesting, distinguishing feature that substitution would produce a weird and anomalous outcome for the structure itself, the design guidelines aside.

Ms. Fenton called for a vote. The motion carried unanimously and the application was denied. Ms. Fenton remarked that she had never seen the Board so reluctant to deny a request and again offered their help in any way they could. She requested that Ms. Vest assist with that.

Mr. Coiner asked if they needed to address the issue of copper cap flashing on the parapet, and the applicant stated they were withdrawing that request, having decided that would make it look too different.

Ms. Winner brought up the previously discussed "Dura-lite" roof which was similar to the existing tile but the cost of which no one knew. Ms. Fenton assured the applicant that she could return before the Board with a sample of this material as soon as she was able to procure it, stating that no one had denied that material. Ms. Roach thanked the Board, saying that their goal was to bring the carriage house back as it should be. Describing herself as an eternal optimist, Ms. Winner told the applicant she believed they had made the right decision and that somehow they would have the roof as it should be. Ms. Fenton promised they would all come to the fundraiser, and someone suggested a pot-luck supper.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-4-7
215 East High Street / 405 3rd Street NE

Ms. Vest reported that the Village School, which occupied two buildings that had been built together as offices in the 1950s, was looking for a way to unify its internal space by creating a link between the two structures. Staff, she stated, had no problem with that concept, other than the tinted glass which had been proposed, and which the guidelines would not permit for a building in the Historic District. However, the applicant had brought a window sample which she thought might alleviate that concern. She introduced Eric Antmann, architect for the school.

Mr. Antmann explained that the purpose of connecting the two buildings was to provide a single internal space so that students changing classes would not need to go outside from one building to the other. He had brought a sample of much lighter tinted glass, explaining that the window was to be rather large. He stated that on the lower level they proposed to use glass blocks or bricks, for the dual purposes of having diffused light in that space and avoidance of having the students in a "fishbowl." The idea of using mostly glass for the connection was to have something discreet and non-intrusive -- in other words, something that would be as inconspicuous as possible. He noted that more traditional materials, such as brick, for that wall, would create a confusing relationship between the old and the new. At the back side, they proposed to use real stucco to match the existing finish of the building and the interior alleyway

walls. The aluminum frames, he said, would be white, in keeping with the other trim colors on the building. First he and then Ms. Fenton invited questions from the Board and the public.

Ms. Vest asked if the white aluminum frame would be for both the glass blocks and the plate glass, to which Mr. Antmann replied that it would.

Mr. Atkins noted that the glass wall faced east, and queried whether substituting clear glass for tinted would be of concern due to heat gain. Mr. Antmann replied that this wall would get only low morning sun, which would be off the area by late morning or noon when heat gain was the worst.

Ms. Hook wanted to know if the glass blocks would be level with the windows, and Mr. Antmann showed her an elevation depicting this and assured her that they would, saying they were attempting to carry existing lines across and mentioning in particular the mullions and the low sill of the upper windows.

Ms. Fenton asked if the reason for not using glass blocks all the way up was their wanting the upper glass tinted or if there were other reasons. Mr. Antmann said the scale, using all block, would be in his words "a little too much," explaining that the panel was too large for the use of such a small grid all the way up.

Mr. Atkins asked about the color of the fascia panel. Mr. Antmann said it could be white or an anodized bronze; he said they favored the bronze as being more in keeping with the stucco finish in the corridor.

Ms. Fenton called for further questions. Hearing none, she asked for comments from the public or the Board.

Ms. Winner suggested that surely the term "darkly-tinted" in the guidelines meant something, or they would have read simply "tinted." She stated that the glass sample the architect had brought did not look very dark to her. Mr. Antmann commented that other new buildings very near the school had glass which was darker than that which he had shown the Board.

Mr. Schwartz stated he had no problem with this relatively small instance of tinted glass, rather thinking that the guidelines had more to do with larger structures having many windows, such as the McGuire Woods building. He had looked at the drawings wondering about extending the glass block up to the next horizontal to avoid excess heat gain, but it was not a strong preference. He liked the white frames, epoxy and spandrel as blending into the vocabulary of the details on the existing buildings. He expressed his support of the application.

Ms. Hook asked what sort of roof the connection would have. Mr. Antmann responded it would be a flat roof with a slope of an inch per foot. Roof surface would not be visible from anywhere but an adjoining roof. He added that the existing downspout would not be moved; a downspout on the back corner would empty onto the roof and water would run off in a channel off the back, tied into the existing downspout in the rear of the building.

Mr. Schwartz, joined by Mr. Atkins, expressed a strong preference for clear glass, as the energy advantages of tint were negligible in such a small area. He mentioned the disparity between even a light tint and the clarity of the block below it, saying if these matched it would be wonderful. He also mentioned that if there were a solar heat gain problem during the summer they might need some sort of break even with tinted glass, and he thought it would be a shame to put something so "corporate"-looking on a building whose original window treatment was so delicate.

Ms. Fenton stated she found the entire concept awkward. She said perhaps the lighter glass might help. She did not feel, however, that the idea worked, and took some exception to the guidelines' mandate that additions needed to be "different," saying she felt that sometimes there were good reasons for having additions to old buildings resemble the old buildings.

Mr. Atkins described it as two buildings with a space in the middle that had been glassed in, which was what it was, he said, and though it seemed an odd situation now, he thought it could be a "lively" approach and felt comfortable with it overall. Hearing no further comments, Ms. Fenton invited a motion. Mr. Atkins moved approval, seconded by Ms. Winner. Mr. Schwartz reiterated his preference for clear rather than even lightly tinted glass and said he was quite ready to approve but with a very strong encouragement to use clear glass. Ms. Heetderks agreed, calling the tinted glass "corporate and foreboding" as well as "soulless." She felt it would detract from the "village community" atmosphere and aspect of the Village School. Ms. Fenton said she could support the application with the clear glass, but could not with tinted.

Mr. Schwartz suggested a friendly amendment to the effect that the motion for approval would hinge on the use of clear glass, and with the white detail as described. Mr. Antmann accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton thanked the applicant, stating he would be receiving a letter of confirmation soon.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-7-31
308 East Market Street

Ms. Vest reported on the application of Charles Kabbash for construction of a new porch at 308 East Market, which could be accessed from an upper floor apartment. The matter had been denied by the Board in July of 2000 due to concerns of the porch's location in relation to and proximity to Market Street; expense/size of the deck; and the quality of drawings submitted. Since then, she stated, the applicant had retained an architect for assistance with design and presentation issues. Staff, she said, had reviewed the resubmitted application and supported it, feeling that it now met the design guidelines, though the porch remained quite close to Market Street so that that BAR concern remained. Ms. Fenton invited additional comment from the applicant.

Mr. Kabbash said he had met several times with the architect and had liked what he did; even though the porch was going to be about twice as expensive as it was originally, he didn't mind. He said he liked what had been done with the front part, and the fact that the architect had been interested in preserving details of the building.

The architect stated that, for him, the porch's proximity to Market Street was of concern from the standpoint of privacy, both for the City and the residents of the building, which was why the open balustrade Mr. Kabbash wanted had been replaced with a solid panel. He thought that this, plus the height of the railing, cut off any sightline so that no activity or furnishings on the deck could be seen from below.

Mr. Schwartz commented favorably on the ceiling design under the deck, saying it created a very clean surface and that it was a very positive detail even though it was an added expense and unnecessary for structural integrity.

Mr. Kabbash added that the deck had also been changed to waterproof materials, and was to be built "like you would build a house."

The architect stated that their concern had been for anything that could be seen from the street to be finished, painted millwork and that it would age well, which was why they went to waterproof material for the deck.

Ms. Fenton commended the applicant and architect on what they had accomplished. Mr. Schwartz remarked that he had been very skeptical about putting anything there at all from what he had seen the previous time. He expressed delight with the proposal presently before them, saying that the porch fitted comfortably between the two buildings in a very delicate way. He called it a strong proposal.

Ms. Winner voiced agreement with Mr. Schwartz's comments, and added that to her this was a good example of the positive outcome that can result when people care enough to hire professionals for help.

Mr. Kabbash cautioned against too much praise for the architect since, he noted wryly, he had not yet received the bill.

Ms. Fenton invited a motion. Mr. Coiner remarked that he had seen this same concept, in places outside of Charlottesville, that looked really good. He moved for approval as submitted, seconded by Mr. Atkins. The motion carried unanimously. The applicant thanked the Board.

Ms. Fenton indicated that Item G on the Agenda had been deferred, and brought up Other Business.

Ms. Vest announced that the restaurant which was moving into the Jones Wrecker building on West Main had begun installation of a fountain that was going to need Board approval along with some attendant landscaping, and this would probably be on the May 2001 agenda. She also announced that, concerning the marking of the Tax Assessor's records to show people who do research what is a designated historic property, Mr. Tolbert had said they were buying some software that would help with that. Concerning the placement of signs on properties with applications before the BAR, she said they were ordering signs for all manner of applications, BAR ones among them. These would be similar to Albemarle County real estate signs except for those in urban areas, so they were going to change the City Code to require applicants to allow

her access in, so that she could place the signs on the insides of windows. She said Ms. Fenton had also requested she begin reporting to the Board on administrative approvals in the historic districts, and she was simply going to put a written list into their meeting packets. There would be a month's lag, so that the May packet would contain the April list. She stated all they had had this month was replacement of equipment on the Monticello Hotel building rooftop.

Ms. Heetderks asked what was happening on the front of Orbit on Main Street. Ms. Vest replied that they were in the process of trying to deal with that issue, adding that these people had approval only for interior metal work and windows; she said this as well would likely be on the May agenda.

Mr. Schwartz asked if this was what he had spoken of with her. Ms. Vest replied that they had discussed the Mexican restaurant and the architectural-motif stickers on the outside of the windows, that it was the same building but a different issue. Ms. Winner commented that, had the restaurant owners known, they surely would have stuck them on the inside of their windows.

Mr. Schwartz commented favorably on the architecture as it was developing at the Stazzione Restaurant at the former wrecker location. He said also that if the landscaping and fountain were going to be done without respect for or independent of the restaurant, that could be a missed opportunity, and he was glad they would have a chance to approve it. Secondly, he had met recently with the owner of the new structure at 5th and Water, who had asked about some of the additional opportunities he could encourage the architects to explore as to fenestration and so on. He said he had a definite feeling that the owner, Mr. Hunter Craig, was interested in doing something positive with the project.

Mr. Coiner asked Ms. Vest about the time-frame for getting the signs back from the printer. She replied that at the moment she did not know. He mentioned his recollection that the Board had been told last summer or fall that the signs had already been ordered, but Ms. Vest said they had not. She stated that in the meantime she could always make up some signs and post them until they actually got the professional ones. She did not want to promise that they would arrive by May.

Mr. Coiner also enquired about the area near 14th Street, where the City had wanted to remove all the plants and brick the area over. Ms. Vest said she did not think there were any plans for that at present. They had not gotten BAR approval to do anything. Mr. Coiner said he thought the plants were gone, whether taken away or allowed to die.

Ms. Winner inquired about the status of the block near the bank on the Mall. Ms. Vest reported that from what she heard the owner was consulting with architects from out of state on preserving all the facades -- at the corner, the side facade and all the front elevations -- planning to construct new building structures behind the facades. Ms. Fenton stated that they had done borings to see how far down they could go for underground parking.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone knew the status of the Court Study, and recognized Mr. Schwartz.

Mr. Schwartz said the last he heard, there were still the four different sites, and yet another committee was to be implemented to take the next step. This triggered much laughter. Ms. Fenton asked if they could have any say on that committee also, and asked if someone would check and see. Ms. Vest agreed to put in that request the next day, suggesting the Chair write a letter requesting BAR representation on that committee. Mr. Schwartz commented this would be a good thing for the Chair to do; Ms. Fenton said it might be accomplished with a phone call.

Mr. Coiner asked how much authority the BAR had over the Court enhancement. Ms. Fenton replied that her understanding was that the County thought it could do what it wanted without BAR approval; the City attorney said that the BAR had jurisdiction over what the County could do. Ms. Vest added that, historically, they had regulated the County property. Mr. Schwartz remarked that anyone could say they could do anything but that an assertion of fact was not the same as standing, and that as a matter of custom at least the BAR had purview over any City or County project. He said until they were told otherwise, probably by no less than the State Attorney General, they should assume that the spirit of this was that it was in the design control district and thus was under the BAR's purview.

Ms. Vest indicated that the BAR had always governed the design control district and also any change to a site in the City of Charlottesville. Mr. Schwartz remarked that they had all heard this statement coming from people in the County, but they had never seen it asserted in any official way by the County Attorney. He said his inquiry into the matter six months previously was that at that time no one wanted to lift up that rock to see what was underneath. The interest in the issue of preserving the area's historic resources was clear, and the BAR was one of the places where this could be done.

Ms. Fenton asked who was on the new committee or what it was for, but Ms. Vest did not know. She said she would look into it.

Ms. Hook asked about the progress of the Mall study that was being done. Ms. Vest replied that the study to redesign the Mall was not presently funded, although the Mall infrastructure study was ongoing. Ms. Fenton suggested the BAR draft a letter to the City suggesting that they fund the Mall redesign study, because small bits of the area were being redesigned singly, e.g. 5th Street, 2nd Street, the Court area. She feared "design by default" when/if an investor balked on the plans.

Mr. Schwartz proposed a draft of that letter by the May meeting.

Ms. Fenton commented that she had discussed with Mr. Coiner the possibility of adjourning the meeting and then going out to dinner to continue talking, for anyone who wished to do so. Ms. Vest said they could just not adjourn, but simply move the meeting, putting up a notice saying the meeting had been moved to wherever. It was suggested this be done in May.

Ms. Winner moved the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Coiner, and it carried unanimously, whereupon the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.