

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
June 19, 2001**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)
Ken Schwartz
Craig Barton
Linda Winner
Lynne Heetderks
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
W.G. Clark
Wade Tremblay

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. She deferred the approval of the minutes, noting that the April 17 minutes had already been approved and that the May 15 minutes still needed approval. She then called for matters from the public that were not on the formal agenda to be presented.

Ms. Vest introduced Paula Figgatt, who had applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for communications equipment on top of Monticello Hotel at 500 Court Square. The Certificate of Appropriateness Application was denied by the Planning Manager, primarily due to the location. The applicants have chosen to appeal his decision to the BAR. The decision to appeal came after the agenda had been set, and that was why it was being treated as a matter from the public.

Ms. Fenton asked for a brief presentation to determine openness to the proposal. Ms. Paula Figgatt with Shenandoah Tower Service explained that her company was hired by General Dynamics to do the site acquisition leasing and zoning portions. The site was identified in September of the previous

year, and they were informed that they would need a building permit only, a Certificate of Appropriateness. They were made to understand that the process was merely a formality, and carried on under the assumption that it would be approved given that there were four five carriers already approved on that rooftop. She indicated that she had materials showing the proposed equipment, which had been moved to an area where it would be less visible.

Ms. Fenton asked for comments from Board members on whether they wanted to continue with this issue. Ms. Figgatt explained that she had people with her who could answer any questions that might possibly come up, and added that they were originally on the agenda but had been taken off due to some misinformation. Ms. Fenton suggested that the matter be deferred to the end so that the issues actually on the agenda could be addressed.

Mr. Schwartz appreciated it being brought to the Board and said he would like more time to review it. He would rather defer it to next month.

Ms. Fenton agreed that she would like more time to consider it and asked for a motion. Mr. Schwartz made a motion to defer until next month, seconded by Mr. Barton. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton thanked Ms. Figgatt and asked for other items not on the agenda.

An applicant planning an addition to a house on First Street said she wanted to begin construction soon and was asking for comments from the Board. A Holly tree would be cut down but a Hemlock kept. She wanted to enlarge the kitchen and make a play area. On the ground floor she wanted to build a terrace and put in a hot tub. Because all work would be on the back of the house, construction would be seen from Second Street but not from First. She referred the Board members to an elevation which showed a trellis on the south side, a kitchen with a new roof and a gable end with large windows.

Ms. Fenton asked about the material. The applicant responded that, in order to be consistent with the existing house, it would be wood siding. They felt it was important to maintain the scale of the area; however, they did not want the addition to look

"slapped on" to the large house.

Mr. Clark asked what proportion could be seen from the street. The applicant referred to one area only. The other applicant explained that during the winter one could see a little more from Second Street, but during the summer months when the trees are full it would be difficult to see the back of the house.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, she called for comments from the Board members.

Ms. Winner inquired about the roofing. The applicant responded that the roofing would be the same as the house. Ms. Fenton commented that the Board would be happy to see the same materials used.

Mr. Clark saw no reason not to proceed with the plans.

Ms. Fenton advised the applicant to call her or other members of the Board for feedback anytime during the process.

Sue Weber, resident of Locust Avenue in the Maplewood Cemetery area, asked for the Board's support in the approval of the cemetery's historic designation. The area, she assured, offers "great history" from the early town and the early city of Charlottesville. It could be lost due to negligence and vandalism and thus needs the City's protection.

Andrei Scanner from City Central, a cafe on the mall, wanted to get some outdoor seating approved. They planned to add six tabletops and eighteen bistro chairs to their front side, located in the S & L Securities building. The outdoor seating would give them more of a restaurant look. He assured the Board that they were out of the fire lane and that they had been approved by the Health Department. They would like to use the blue chairs rather than the black and sought the Board's approval on that issue. He noted the many blue shirts in the room and concluded it must be a favorable color.

Ms. Vest remarked that the design guidelines for cafe furniture demand that they be dark solid metal or plastic. Any deviation from those guidelines would need approval from the Board.

Ms. Fenton inquired about the material. Mr. Scanner explained that it was a resin compound. The chairs would be heavy but portable, and would be outside only during hours of operation.

Ms. Fenton asked if the area was marked by anything around them. Mr. Scanner said there would be no marked boundaries, as they wanted to create a natural buffer with some potted plants. He described it as an unweighted lounging area, one step up from benches. Ms. Fenton asked about the potted plants, and Ms. Vest remarked that there were no guidelines for them. Ms. Fenton suggested the Board just give administrative approval.

Ms. Winner asked if there were other sidewalk furnishings near City Central. The closest furnishings, Mr. Scanner responded, were Immigrant Soul's green Rubbermaid setting with checkerboard placemats.

Mr. Clark moved for approval, seconded by Mr. Barton, and the motion was unanimously approved. After some discussion of how to move on the planters, Mr. Clark amended the motion to leave the approval of the planting design to Staff. It was unanimously approved.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION 01-6-8
Market Street Parking Garage

As there were no other matters from the public not on the agenda, the Board addressed the Certificate of Appropriateness Application for Main Street Retail Spaces in the Market Street Parking Garage. Ms. Vest explained that the final details needed to be worked out and that the planning staff was enthusiastic about the design.

Mr. Bruce Wardell presented two alternative strategies for the project. He explained that the Market Street Parking Garage has appropriated renovation money to add four retail spaces that will bring the spaces out to the face of the mall as well as to do some interior renovation.

In the first alternative, Mr. Wardell proposed the possible enclosure and modification of the elevator,

as the interior renovation included bringing handicapped accessibility to the interior of the building. The current elevator does not meet the handicapped accessibility requirements. The proposal was to modify the cab of the elevator, giving it a double entry. This would prevent having to install a 24-foot ramp in that space.

The common opinion was that the faade treatment should at least occur along the entire face of the mall side of the building, if not around the corner up to the stairs to the Social Security Office. The possibility of expanding the Post Office lobby would allow for that. Mr. Wardell reminded the Board that, being adjacent to Fridays After Five, the location has become increasingly important and that the faade of the parking garage was not inspired. A previous proposal suggesting a canvas canopy below the windows of the Social Security Office did not take advantage of the available opportunity. The expression of the building, he explained, was actually two stories tall. A canopy system could extend up to the point where one could see the demarcation. It would unify that section of the building and could also serve to identify the garage for visitors who do not frequent the mall.

In the first strategy, the idea was to establish a series of brackets coming out just underneath the bottom of the parking deck 4 or 5 feet that would hold individual steel canopies that are over the store fronts. It would be a consistent expression all the way down the mall. The suspension system, whether by cable or rod, could become an area where one could hang banners. He also suggested the possibility that one percent of the two million dollar allocation be reserved for the commission of a permanent artistic installation for that part of the building.

Referring to sketch number five, Mr. Wardell pointed to an area that was dark and suggested the canopy could be lifted up rather than sloping out to allow for more sunshine. They would establish a system of guttering, lighting and a place for the store fronts' signage. At night, it would lighten the dark area of the mall and would enliven that end of the mall with the four retail spaces. If the City decides to go forward with the enclosure of the lobby, extending the Post Office, they would have a consistent faade

all the way down that portion of the mall.

In the second alternative, brackets would start just under the parking deck. A series of cables would come out of them and suspend a steel member that has a cross section. Under that cross section one could mount lighting or a giant awning on the building itself. That section, in turn, would suspend a lighter, smaller canopy over each of the store fronts.

In the first strategy, they were imagining every bay of the garage having the same expression. In the second option, they wanted to make a distinction between the retail spaces and the public spaces. The retail spaces would have a high bar and a piece of steel would drop down at both the Post Office and the two story lobby of the Parking Garage, designating different entries and usage on that façade. Both of those systems could turn around and start up Fifth Street as well. They imagined that corner having the same kind of expression.

In review with the City, there was talk of having the ability to mount brackets at the top level of the garage and having a long fabric that would completely obscure the façade.

Mr. Wardell then explained that they would like a discussion of the ideas. Because the extra scope of work at the elevator and the Post Office were not in their original plan, they also requested guidance from the Board back to the City as to whether these changes would be worth pursuing. He asked the Board's opinion on which of the two strategies would be more appropriate, so that they may further define it enough to formally present it in a month and deal with remaining administrative items. He explained that the City asked that they get S & L in that space by March 1 of the following year. They are scheduled to finish the construction documents August 12 and have construction underway in September with five months before occupancy for S & L.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions from the public and the Board. A member of the public asked which of the alternatives had more resonance with Mr. Wardell's group. Mr. Wardell deferred his response to that question until some discussion had been had.

Ms. Fenton asked for comments from the general public. Hearing none, she called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner observed that whoever did the drawings preferred B because B was the better drawing. Mr. Wardell told the Board that he did the drawings for A, and that the person who knew how to do perspective drawings did B.

Ms. Fenton commented that she was excited about the project as it plans to transform the worst area of the mall into something exciting. She suggested that they plan to block the direct light from the sun coming into the retail windows in that area. She also noticed that many architects do not include the signage details in their plans until the end, and told Mr. Wardell that signage detail was a major concern for retailers. Mr. Wardell told the Board that both plans have allowed for signage already. He explained that their present vision of the upper portions of the building included expression for the city and the mall in general rather than advertising for the individual retailers.

Mr. Atkins expressed his preference for B. He did, however, want the store front to reveal more of the brick pier on the lower level and suggested that they explore the store fronts' infill with different glazing systems before resorting to the aluminum. Mr. Wardell referred to the store front designs in Strategy A and said that could certainly be incorporated into Strategy B.

Ms. Winner asked if all of the store fronts had to be identical. Mr. Wardell responded that they did not have to be identical. The design required store fronts to be based on the same system but allowed for each to be configured differently.

Mr. Clark expressed his dismay that modern store fronts did not match the elegance of old store fronts and wondered if they could consider an alternative framing system. He believed that the upper system would be textural and elegant and said it would be nice for the entire building to express that. He was also skeptical about the banners, because they would start off being exciting and then would grow dirtier and dirtier. He remarked that either system was exciting enough on its own not to require the

addition of banners.

Mr. Wardell explained that in their own discussion the banners took on a tone of caricature, and they had thought of using sandblasted glass or something more architectural and crafted instead. He then said that they were considering covering the brick below the canopy at the pedestrian level as the brick was not that interesting or attractive.

Mr. Atkins cautioned Mr. Wardell on the infestation of the garage. Mr. Clark said that in Paris, the store fronts were run beyond the structure, so that glass laps over the facade by a foot or more, and the whole thing looked quite elegant to him. Mr. Wardell said that they would have to find out where their property line is, to determine how far they can come out.

Mr. Coiner commented that he favored the second alternative as well as the incorporation of the Post Office into the store fronts, but he was unsure whether the levels in front of the Post Office would be handicapped accessible. Mr. Wardell explained that their current solution was a gently ramped surface and steps near the Post Office boxes. It was the most difficult piece of the building to make accessible.

Mr. Coiner asked about railing near the elevator. Mr. Wardell responded that the railing represented what they would have to do if they did not do the mall entrance into the elevator; they would have to have some ramp system that goes down into that space. He then said that the end space could become a cafe, and if it were partially enclosed, it could be an amenity that would serve as year-round outdoor seating.

In response to further questioning from Mr. Coiner, Mr. Wardell clarified the logistics of the double-door elevator and the renovated handicapped accessibility.

Mr. Schwartz agreed that the key is the store front. He preferred the first alternative, as it appeared simpler, but his major concern was the banners. The suggestion of using sandblasted glass or art at the upper level interested him. He did not like the ramp intruding into the space of the mall, and was in

favor of the entire frontage being developed over time.

Mr. Wardell thought it would be beneficial if the Board would communicate that concern to whomever in the chain needed to hear it. Mr Schwartz said that there were obvious design advantages to it and agreed that it would be appropriate for the BAR to say so.

Mr. Clark asked why the ramp could not be placed in the interior. Mr. Wardell explained that it could be, but it presented problems for one of the retail spaces to be able to access the two-story interior space.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to support the continued development of the retail level of the Parking Garage and to strongly endorse the integrated treatment of the entire facade along East Main Street. It was seconded by Mr. Tremblay, who suggested adding the word "enthusiastic." A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously. Ms. Fenton made arrangements to work on the letter to the City.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION 01-6-9
1901 East Market Street

Ms. Vest introduced Jon Fink, owner of 1901 East Market and applicant for Certificate of Appropriateness for additions to the historic building, a former tavern. She indicated that the addition met the design guidelines and did not appear that it would have any physical impact on the building. Staff was happy to see the choice of compatible, high quality materials appropriate to an historic structure.

Mr. Fink explained that in restoring the house years ago, they were very pleased with the original architectural work. They simply preserved and enhanced what they found. In designing the addition, they wanted to keep the same feel but expand the living space. They had decided to wrap a staircase forward as a transition between the old and the new. He showed the view from East Market Street, commenting that the boxwoods and dogwoods would largely conceal the new addition during construction.

Ms. Fenton opened the floor for questions from the general public or Board members.

Mr. Clark asked about the materials of the addition. Mr. Fink planned to use copper on the roof, old brick on the addition and possibly glazed panels of glass on the transition.

Atkins asked about the windows. Mr. Fink commented that he did not have any drawings, but they planned to use modern windows, double-hung and double-glazed. They would probably match the scale and scope of the gables on both sides. He pointed to a little window and said it would be converted to a large picture window with double-hungs on either side.

Hearing no further questions, Ms. Fenton closed that portion of the meeting and called for comments from the general public. Hearing none, she invited comments from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay commented that he used to work in that neighborhood in the late '60s and noted that the transition of the neighborhood since then has been amazing.

Mr. Schwartz said the decision to use the stair and the translucent frameless window with glazing would be a good way to add onto the historic property without competing. He thought it introduced a different language to the home.

Mr. Fink gave more detail, saying that they were stepping down the addition. The first one would be on ground level to give more living space. He commented that the ceilings in the tavern portion were about 7 feet; in the general store portion, about 10 feet; and upstairs, they were quite low. Therefore, stepping down through the central core would add more headroom and living space.

Mr. Clark asked if Mr. Fink had considered using a flat roof on the addition, rather than using one that looked like the existing one, to add further differentiation. Mr. Fink gave his preference for the gables as they would provide headroom that the flat roof would not. He added that, personally, the overall aesthetic did not appeal to him.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve as submitted,

seconded by Ms. Winner. It passed unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 98-11-52
100 W Main Street

Ms. Fenton announced the next item: the arched doorways on First Street in the old Woolworth's building. She recalled that the BAR had asked them to be removed previously and explained that she had asked Ms. Vest to research the option of it being presented before the BAR again.

Ms. Vest commented that there was a perception that applicants have to wait one year after applying to the Board before they can resubmit an application, but that is true under state law only for rezoning special permits. She found nothing in the City Code that would prevent applicants from coming before the Board with the same application more than once within a calendar year.

Ms. Vest reminded everyone that in October of 2000, the Board reviewed a number of the project's details, one of which was the Gothic arch doorways leading to the basement area below Foot Locker. Those were details denied by the BAR. The owner knew they were not approved. He installed them at his own risk. The owner wished to present them before the Board again with further details for approval. Staff did not have a recommendation as the Board already made a recommendation in their previous vote.

Ms. Fenton asked for information on the issue of appealing and what the City Attorney said. Ms. Vest explained that the City Attorney said the Board may make a motion deciding whether or not to hear the application. He said that they are not legally obliged to hear the application. Ms. Fenton added that they could have appealed 10 days after the initial turn-down. She understood that if the Board hears it, it can be appealed to counsel; if the Board does not, it cannot be appealed to counsel. She asked Ms. Vest if that was the case. Ms. Vest clarified, adding that she did not feel that the applicants desired to take it to the next level. She understood that if the Board members were not open to it, the applicants would correct the problem.

Ms. Fenton asked the Board if they wanted to hear the application. Mr. Barton excused himself from the

motion. Mr. Tremblay moved to hear it, and Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwartz understood that they normally consider items as if they had not already been constructed; he asked about the procedure of considering an item they have already seen. Ms. Vest recommended using the same judgment used previously: Whether or not it was an appropriate feature to the building itself.

Mr. Schwartz commented that while he agreed with the spirit of the motion, he was uncertain as to how they should function in this unique circumstance and, for that reason, would not vote for the motion. He stated he was very much interested in proper process.

Mr. Coiner said that he would not vote for the motion because they did not approve the arched doors previously, and the applicant had agreed to take them down. Mr. Clark concurred.

The applicant asked if she could say something and Ms. Fenton replied in the negative.

Ms. Winner said she was confused, because she did not think they were able to see them before because they were somehow not uncovered or not in place. Mr. Clark argued that they were not supposed to be in place. Ms. Winner felt that as a public body, they should give the public and the people who are engaged in projects that affect the community as much opportunity as possible to get the best project possible. This would include taking the opportunity to review new information.

Ms. Heetderks asked if anything had changed. Ms. Vest said that it was no different, except that the doorways that had been a drawing were now physically in existence. Mr. Tremblay considered that to be a notable difference. Ms. Vest mentioned the keystones as the only change to that elevation, and Mr. Coiner pointed out that they were very visible in October.

Mr. Tremblay repeated his motion to hear the applicant's proposal. The motion was denied, six against hearing the proposal, two for hearing it, with one abstention from Mr. Barton. Ms. Fenton thanked the applicant.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-6-11
120 East Main Street

Ms. Fenton announced the next item on the agenda, a framework design for a new store front.

Ms. Vest introduced the applicant, stating that a restaurant was being moved into the building. She explained that although the existing materials of the store front were not particularly lovely or historic, and therefore could be replaced, it was important that the configuration of the original store front be preserved.

Mr. Robert Nichols explained that the store front doors and the glass to the left of the doors were all new material. An entrance on the right side of the building leading to the upstairs space was not in the scope of the project. Mr. Nichols added that in addition to putting in new materials, the door would be moved from its original position to the right 2 1/2 feet in order to provide seating to the left of the doorway.

One priority, he explained, was lighting or luminosity, and for that reason, they had chosen to suppress the aluminum store front in the forward plane, hiding the aluminum channel up into the soffit. The glass itself would rest on a small channel cast into architectural concrete. The doors, at 3 feet into the base of the building, had aluminum frame around them and were essentially two three-foot leaves with large paneled glass. Referring to a drawing, he explained the placement and installation of the glass.

He then indicated that the signage would be etched in glass, and its illumination would come from an edge lighting mechanism up in the soffit. Thus, there would be no lighting on the exterior of the building projecting onto that surface. The only exterior lighting not shown on the drawing would be two recessed lights which would light the ground. The previous restaurant's sign, a large painted green piece of plywood, would be replaced with a series of wood panels wrapped in lead-coated copper.

Ms. Fenton asked for a sample as she was not used to the term "lead-coated." Mr. Nichols did not have

one. Mr. Atkins said it was common, and Mr. Coiner indicated it looked like galvanized steel.

Mr. Barton asked if the color in the rendering reflected his intention for the color of the lead-coated copper as well as any of the metal finish materials in the concrete. Mr. Nichols said that the metal finish would be quite gray. The aluminum that is appearing would be in the door frame and around the door, but there would be no metal in the forward plane. Mr. Barton then asked if the concrete would be colored, to which Mr. Nichols responded by showing a sample of it.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions from the general public or Board members.

Mr. Clark asked what happens in the sections above the glass, wondering if the original store front went up to the cornice. Mr. Nichols explained that the plywood piece would remain. Mr. Clark wondered if he had considered taking the glass to the ceiling, and the applicant replied that they had decided to work within the boundaries that had been established.

Hearing no further questions, Ms. Fenton called for comments from the Board members.

Mr. Atkins commented that it looked beautiful, and that such changes were needed to jolt it out of such bad luck. Mr. Clark suggested that the light would change the karma.

Mr. Schwartz asked whether the framed piece surrounding the existing door on the right side was part of their construction. Mr. Nichols explained that it was existing and was not in the scope of work. Mr. Schwartz inquired about its material, and Mr. Nichols replied that, as it existed, it was painted blue. Mr. Schwartz wondered if it would be exactly as it currently appeared even after all of the construction. Mr. Nichols said that it would.

Mr. Schwartz then explained to the Board that it is important to coordinate that one piece with the total façade. Otherwise it may wind up looking like a "not in the scope of the work" piece playing dramatically within an otherwise beautiful and coordinated façade. While he supported the work of Mr. Nichols, he felt the details on that corner required resolution. Mr.

Nichols agreed and mentioned he had been discussing it with the owner of the building.

Mr. Schwartz suggested making a motion that would assist Mr. Nichols' discussion with his client. Mr. Atkins moved to approve the application as proposed, urging the inclusion of the existing store front door in the work, recognizing that if it was not, it would have to come back before the Board.

Mr. Schwartz requested that the bottom right corner come back before the Board either way, with the understanding that it must be integrated into the scheme. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins amended the motion to clarify that the proposal must return to the Board with regard to that corner.

Ms. Vest asked if they were free to proceed. Mr. Schwartz indicated he supported the motion only with the understanding that the bottom right corner had to return to the Board.

Mr. Clark commented that he liked the language of the motion. It expressed their excitement over the design, that it would set a new standard for store front design in Charlottesville, but that they wanted to see the other door.

Mr. Atkins sympathized with Mr. Schwartz. The removal of the existing store front would force them to deal with that, at least the side that's edging the door.

Mr. Barton noted inconsistency between the way it was represented and the way it was described in the text. It said "existing to remain," but was drawn as if it were a proposal. He suggested that they make a motion to that effect, indicating that the corner in material, palette and concept should be sympathetic to the rest of the design.

Mr. Atkins moved to approve everything as presented except the corner, with the request that they proceed with the approved design and bring back the resolution of the corner. Mr. Coiner accepted the amendment. Mr. Nichols clarified that what he would bring back may be one of two things: the resolution of construction or new work with a whole new entryway.

Ms. Fenton asked for further comments.

Ms. Heetderks said her first reaction was that she loved it and thought it would add a lot to the mall. She did not like, however, the way the application seemed to ignore the top half of the building;

Mr. Clark mentioned that the panels do begin to match the rhythm of the rest of the building. While she agreed, she still did not buy it and said that she would vote against it for that reason.

Mr. Atkins commented that his feeling of confidence and satisfaction about the design had to do with the overall system on the mall which allowed the store front opening to be framed with somewhat ornate moldings.

Ms. Fenton said that she also did not like it at first. She mentioned having a similar building which she did not like and for that reason she felt she could not object to this building.

The vote was then taken, and the motion passed eight to one.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-6-12
633 W Main Street

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She explained that the applicants were interested in removing some parking spaces to introduce an outdoor patio seating area with a veranda in the back as well as a tower piece. They would also like to add an entrance off the side of building and some shutters. Staff had no problem with most of the proposal, but there was some concern over the appropriateness of adding the tower element to the historic district.

Architect David Puckett proposed taking the first 28 feet of existing parking lot and putting out a terrace with a veranda across the back edge, separating the wall between the sidewalk and the terrace. To do that they would need to add a door between the existing front part of the bar and the eating area in the existing restaurant. There would be four parking spaces remaining.

The applicant David Elkins clarified that there were actually about ten parking spaces and that four of them would be taken out, leaving six.

Mr. Puckett explained their plans for adding the outdoor terrace. They would use a two-by-six treated deck that would be stained. Pointing to a graphic of one Southern Culture building wall, a stucco masonry bearing wall structure, he said they would add a door there and some shutters. They were considering adding some blind fenestration or closed shutters that would suggest more of a courtyard and would add to the façade. He explained that the terrace tower would have some tables in it and would be a place where people could come in out of the sun or the rain. The existing parking lot would be graded to allow for drainage of rain water.

Their theme was a Carribean, southern United States type of decor. The tower concept came from a kind of house in Haiti that could be found in either a rural or an urban context. He explained that the design sought to treat a stucco façade with a limited articulation. The plants would connote a coolness even in bright sunshine. They would have the ability to have a semi-enclosed space or veranda. The color palette would join the whole piece together.

He explained the layout of the terrace, indicating that the existing palette of materials would include painted brick and painted stucco with a base finish in tan or whiter tan. Washes would be applied to that to create a patina suggesting character and age. The roofing material would be corrugated metal, and the rest of the trim would be wood and paint.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions.

Mr. Tremblay asked about the lighting. Mr. Puckett answered that the lighting would be incandescent, and would be located in the rafters just inside the tower.

Mr. Barton was confused about the last paragraph of Attachment E which said that the tower would extend 10 feet above the fascia line of the veranda. Mr. Puckett explained that the drawing was out of scale. From floor to fascia was 9 feet, so the tower would be about 12 feet. Mr. Barton indicated that his own calculations came out to 16 feet, which was a significant difference.

Mr. Barton then inquired about proposed renovations

to the existing façade. Mr. Elkins responded that they would paint to match. The existing building had shutters at one time, and there was a possibility of adding them back. He added that the arch gave a Caribbean feel, and the color scheme would be carried all the way through by painting both walls.

Regarding the steeple, Mr. Elkins commented that the parking area sits directly across West Main Street from the brick Baptist Church, which has its own steeple. He found it an interesting symmetry, having different versions of a steeple across from one another.

Mr. Atkins asked if the tower opened from the underside. Mr. Puckett said that it was simple to have it do so.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there was a way to get from the back parking through the veranda to Main Street or if it would be a solid wall. Mr. Puckett showed where the access would be.

Mr. Atkins had a general question about decking. Mr. Puckett indicated they had looked at three separate materials, but the stained concrete and Trex had been cost prohibitive compared to treated lumber.

Mr. Coiner asked whether the roofing of the tower would be the same as the roofing on the building. Mr. Puckett assured him it would be.

Ms. Fenton closed the questions and opened for comments.

Mr. Schwartz recalled the concern over Monsoon's stucco divider between the street and the dining area. They were concerned with the solidity of stucco and its tendency to close off relationship between the sitting area and the sidewalk and the street, and they determined that it worked better to keep it more visually open. He was therefore concerned with the proposed stucco base, essentially adjoining the restaurant next door which has a relatively low brick face.

Mr. Elkins explained that he wanted that visual connection as well, but he also wanted a strong psychological protection from the street for his customers. He mentioned that the top 4 feet of the

wall would be wrought iron. Mr. Schwartz said that was exactly what the owner of Monsoon had said, commenting that that same idea reversed makes it somewhat foreboding for the public on the street entering the restaurant. He would be more convinced if it were open metal lattice detail, rather than the solid stucco base. Mr. Elkins said he would be comfortable changing the proportions, making the larger portion of the wall lattice and a smaller portion of the wall stucco.

Mr. Clark reminded everyone that this was not in the country or in Haiti, that this was on Charlottesville's Main Street. He had some questions about having a treated deck as a public space on a city street. The wall's advantage would be that it obscured the treated wood from the street. Mr. Elkins said that it was more than just treated lumber, and it was not just a deck. The idea was that the facade would create a courtyard effect. His goal was to have the deck be a neutral element during the dining experience.

Mr. Clark expressed his belief that the dining patio would be fabulous, improving both the restaurant and the street. He said, however, that he found the design overwrought. He did not like the Caribbean steeple. Putting it across the street from a real steeple would be an injustice. The tower would be a commercial structure that should not be related to the Baptist church. If it were in New Orleans or Haiti, it would be one thing. When a business' image projection starts to rub shoulders with the town's characteristic architecture, however, he had trouble with it. He felt this proposal was "Disney Land," or thematic, and would greatly benefit by the removal of the steeple. He thought the arrangement could be elegant; it was a little stylized for him, but then again, he explained, he was a modernist.

Mr. Barton commented that Mr. Clark had been eloquent on the inappropriate use of the steeple for that location, keeping it relative to the First Baptist Church across the street. He suspected that a cleaner line across the back might be as powerful a signature for the restaurant as a steeple might be.

Mr. Coiner liked the stucco and the wrought iron at the proposed height. He thought it would create a true courtyard. He would be disappointed in seeing

the treated lumber, but he would get over it when he was full from eating. While looking over the proposal, he was excited about it but became overwhelmed by the steeple element. He could not identify the reasons as a professional; he simply did not like it. It looked almost like an afterthought.

Ms. Fenton asked for other comments. Ms. Heetderks appreciated Mr. Clark's comment about a legitimate landmark being trivialized by having something similar across the street. She was more offended by the dishonesty of having a tower without any real purpose.

Ms. Fenton believed that everyone was enthusiastic about the outdoor dining. The details of the separating wall needed to be worked on. Obviously, she noticed, the tower was something very special to Mr. Elkins. To the Board, however, that connection was not there. To them, it appeared to be more of an intrusion. Mr. Elkins said that no offense was taken. The tower was a whimsical afterthought.

Mr. Tremblay liked the concept of the separation, but he wanted clarity on the proportions of the lattice. He urged them to reconsider the Trex product. He has used it and believes it to be superior product to treated wood. It would be double the cost on the material, but the installation would be exactly the same. The wood would also save some restraining problems down the road.

Ms. Winner understood that the applicant wished to create the ambiance of the Southern culture dining experience but believed the tower unnecessary for such an effect. It could be done through other means, such as with the plants and the other creative details he had mentioned.

Ms. Fenton asked for a motion. Mr. Elkins said that his goal as a business owner was to get some version of outdoor dining in the works as soon as possible. Ms. Fenton told him that at times their motions allow some partial approval.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve the design as submitted with the exception of the tower, being open to the resubmission of alternative elements, though the general consensus would be against further additions. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion.

Ms. Fenton asked if discussion of the wall height needed to be brought back or placed within the motion. Mr. Tremblay understood the height of the stucco to be 2'8" inches, to which he gave his consent. Mr. Clark pointed out that the wall had been drawn at four feet. Mr. Tremblay then suggested it be put in the motion as 2'8" inches.

Ms. Fenton asked for other comments. Mr. Schwartz commented on the logic of a 2'8" inch height of the wall, as any higher would close in the area. He noted that the context of the earlier discussion was really the question of how one could find a balance between a comfortable dining experience and the public street.

Mr. Clark clarified that, for him, the solidity of the wall was not at issue. A 12-foot solid wall with a patio behind it would be perfectly fine. He believed that the wall suffered because it was fussy. It had too many materials. He did not know what the steel work was doing. Given the ambiance of the wonderful restaurant, he felt the wall could be simplified to the restaurant's advantage.

Ms. Fenton asked for further comments. Ms. Winner commented that the money saved from not building the tower could be used for the Trex. Mr. Coiner said a simpler wall would do the same.

Mr. Barton wished to include "2'8" inches of stucco" into the language of the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion was approved eight to one. Ms. Fenton thanked the applicant and said he could come back with any changes.

Ms. Fenton called for preliminary discussion of Maplewood Cemetery's designation as a Minor Architectural Design Control District.

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. Ms. Fenton commented that she was excited about the detail in the report.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions about the report.

Ms. Vest said that they were interested in having

discussion on it, and then seeing a proposal for action on it in July. It would essentially be a change to the zoning ordinance and map, as it would be the designation of an historic property. The proposed change would then go to the Planning Commission at their meeting in August; following their recommendation, the proposal would proceed to City Council on the fourth Monday of August. Ostensibly, the process could be completed before Labor Day. Ms. Vest expressed hope that it would be.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions or comments. Ms. Heetderks asked Ms. Vest what this specific designation would mean for BAR's role with this property. Ms. Vest said that, without having buildings on it, the designation of this particular property would be an honorary recognition. The City of Charlottesville applies this designation not only to buildings and structures but also to the sites on which they are placed. This would include any site featuring any visible changes to walls, trees, landscape features, walkways and, obviously, headstones. Any features beyond the building structures would need to be maintained to the standard of administrative approval, and any change to those would need to come before the Board. Should a gigantic tree out there need to come down, for instance, it would have to come before the staff and Board, and the same would be true of any alterations that were made to walls or any other features.

Ms. Heetderks said the only concern with gravestones would be that they not be neglected, or that they be repaired. Ms. Vest agreed.

Mr. Clark raised the point that there is no standard for maintaining property in the historic district.

Mr. Coiner said that they could not control the condition of a headstone that existed presently. If one should break in half, there would be nothing the BAR could do about it.

Ms. Vest said that, while BAR would not own the headstones, the designation would provide for a higher level of maintenance than usual. With historic property in the city, the building official is given a little more teeth to ensure maintenance for the garden, paint and basic historic preservation. She repeated that it would mostly be

an honorary designation, however.

Ms. Fenton believed the hope was that it would bring enough attention to the property to increase the pressure for it to be maintained in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Atkins inquired about the downsides or problems. Ms. Vest answered that any changes would need to come either to the Staff or to the Board for approval.

Ms. Fenton asked for a motion. Ms. Heetderks made a motion to enthusiastically approve, which was seconded by Mr. Barton. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay mentioned that some Civil War veterans, presumably Confederates, are buried in that cemetery. He then asked what the policy was on the display of the Confederate flags on the graves. Ms. Vest indicated she did not know it was being questioned. Mr. Tremblay explained that, in another Virginia community, the town manager had refused to allow them; a suit was taking shape. The issue had just popped into his head, and he was curious. Ms. Vest said she would research the policy.

Ms. Heetderks mentioned that each plot is individually owned. Ms. Winner said that other communities with similar situations, such as in Asheville, North Carolina, where O. Henry and Thomas Wolfe and all manner of people are buried, the city had done a beautiful job of maintaining the site.

Ms. Fenton asked if there was other business. Ms. Vest mentioned that the materials on the metal work outside of Orbit did not come to her in time to be included in the packet. It would be included in July.

Ms. Heetderks asked Ms. Vest whether the fence put around the property of Carriage House on Lyons Court Lane was something that they should have seen. Ms. Vest said she would check on it. Mr. Coiner commented it did not look like what he thought it would.

Ms. Fenton reminded Ms. Vest and another that they would meet with Maurice Jones sometime in the next month.

Mr. Coiner asked Ms. Vest about the status of getting signs up. Ms. Vest said that post Fourth of July, she would be provided with that information.

Mr. Coiner asked Ms. Vest if she knew the status of listing protected properties on tax roles. Ms. Vest said she did not. Ms. Fenton asked who would be responsible for making that happen. Ms. Vest told her Jim Tolbert.

Mr. Schwartz asked if they could get a different room for the meetings. Ms. Vest replied that she would try.

Mr. Coiner said he was confused about the tree on the mall. He believed the City was not looking for approval of the tree but rather for the Board's feelings on it. Ms. Vest said that the City came to the BAR for approval of the introduction of a new species. After the BAR turned it down, the City replaced the tree with the exact same tree, which qualified as maintenance and did not require BAR approval. Mr. Coiner's perception was that the City spent a great deal of time and energy on the tree project. Mr. Tremblay asked him if he had read the follow-up note from Jim Tolbert. Mr. Coiner said that it was contradictory to what was presented, which was that it was a safety issue.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were changes to be made on the May 15 minutes. Ms. Winner said she was not listed as present, though she was. Ms. Heetderks asked for a clarification on page 23: Parks and Recreation did not say they would put up a chain-link fence or spotlights. These were possibilities which the community had been concerned might happen. Mr. Barton said that on page 3 he recused himself from the Certificate of Appropriateness Application for 418-420 West Main Street.

Ms. Fenton asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve the minutes and then to adjourn. The minutes were approved with the noted corrections.

Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

* * * * *

