

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
September 18, 2001**

**Minutes**

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)

Craig Barton

Linda Winner

Lynne Heetderks

Preston Coiner

W.G. Clark

Wade Tremblay

Joe Atkins

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. After welcoming everyone, she asked if anyone had any matters to present to the Board that were not on the formal agenda. Hearing none, she closed that portion of the meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-9-24  
Historic Court Square Enhancements

Ms. Vest indicated that design guidelines for public improvements in historic districts were listed in the Staff report. Staff found that the project did meet those guidelines and enthusiastically recommended approval.

Mr. Satyendra Huja gave a brief presentation. He stated that one of the primary purposes of the project was to enhance the historical character of Court Square for the people who work there and live there. He said that they had consulted with architects and community members in coming up with their plans, and they were now seeking approval so they could get started on the project.

Jeff Stodgel, an architect and planner with a background in historic preservation, explained that the project really consisted of a series of enhancements to the pedestrian environment on Court Square. He indicated that the improvements they were

recommending as part of this specific proposal had gone through some fine tuning and development over the last year, with some elements related to budget and others to additional work with the committee. He showed the Board a booklet which included a series of detail recommendations on how to handle curbing, sidewalk paving, street paving, curbing gutters, crosswalks and lighting.

Going street by street, he then outlined the proposed enhancements. At the intersection of High Street and Park Street, he indicated that they proposed to build a new pedestrian crosswalk composed of granite stripes and a brick paving infill. They also recommended brick paving all along Park Street and the sidewalks, with granite curbs and gutter pans. He cited the historic use of brick paving in Charlottesville and the desire to try to link and enrich the historic brick façades around Court Square as the inspirations behind this recommendation. He then described changes in parking along Park Street and around Court Square.

At the intersection of Park Street and East Jefferson, the applicants recommended the same basic treatment all the way up to the crosswalk at Fifth Street, to try to keep that entire street environment up to the standard they were creating on Park Street. He stated that in the area past the crosswalk at Fifth Street, they had wanted to continue with the brick sidewalks on either side of East Jefferson, but for cost reasons, they were going to shift back to asphalt paving. They felt this transition could be made meaningfully at this point since it was past the primary façade of the courthouse. He added that if they had more money, perhaps they could come in and talk about more brick paving throughout, but at present they did not believe they had the funding to do that.

After describing similar paving details around Court Square, he indicated that a portion of the project had special funding attached to it and they were going to have to see if they had enough to do both utility burial underground as well as surface improvement. With regard to pedestrian lighting improvements, they were recommending Colonial-style as opposed to Victorian-style sidewalk light fixtures because the architecture around the square is a combination of Colonial, Colonial Revival and

Classical Revival styles.

Concerning the wall around Court Square, he indicated it was in varying states of disrepair and in need of replacing. The applicants proposed using brick, in keeping with improvements to the streetscape and sidewalks. He referred the Board members to a detail in the booklet depicting the proposed design.

Mr. Huja added that they were proposing two low walls to hide the parking lots, as well as some landscaping, if the property owners could be convinced. They were not sure they had enough money to do all proposed changes, but they were going to do as much as they could with the money they had and were hoping to start construction in the spring.

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

Mr. Tremblay asked what the budget was for the project. Mr. Huja indicated that at present, they had \$2 million in hand. Mr. Tremblay asked how much they needed to accomplish everything, and Mr. Stodgel replied that they were working on that.

Mr. Coiner asked if their design showed the parking meters at two feet from the street. Mr. Stodgel stated that they were not planning any parking meters, so any reference to them in the plans should be ignored. Mr. Coiner made it clear that if any parking meters were proposed, they could not block the sidewalk to that degree.

Mr. Coiner then inquired whether or not the historic signs on the northwest and southeast corners of Court Square would remain in place, and was informed that one would stay in place and the second would be relocated.

Ms. Heetderks remarked that they had indicated that part of the planning for the Court Square enhancement was to make the area more friendly to pedestrian traffic, and in the initial stages the applicants had talked about blocking off Sixth Street at the other end and putting brick paving in so that it could serve as a little amphitheater for tour groups. She noted that that had not happened, however. Mr. Huja responded that they originally had planned to do that, but the property owners had not wanted to

change the traffic pattern in that area. However, one property owner had recently requested that they look into that option, so they would be taking that up again in several weeks. Mr. Stodgel added that if they did follow through with their original proposal, that would make their plan even stronger, but changing traffic patterns on Sixth Street would take a while to work out.

In response to a question from Mr. Clark, the applicants indicated that no more than two parking spaces would be lost.

Mr. Atkins asked for clarification on the plans to put up low walls around the parking lots. Mr. Stodgel replied that they wished to introduce some shielding of the cars from the street environment through the installation of low brick walls and a degree of landscaping. The property owners had made no objections to the walls, but had not yet commented on the landscaping.

Ms. Heetderks asked whether they planned to move or replace the kiosk. Mr. Stodgel replied that they were still working on that. They did plan to move it over so that it lined up on the end elevation of the front addition to the courthouse, but depending on availability of funds, they would either like to improve it or redesign it entirely. In order to do that well, they would need to talk to the people who use it.

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

Mr. Clark commented that, while it might be outside the purview of the Board, it seemed to him that there was room for maybe as many as 15 or 16 more parking spaces. He noted that over the past few years, the City had lost parking spaces numbering in the hundreds, and he wondered if brick sidewalks were really worthwhile if people were unable to get to them to walk on them. He hoped that every consideration would be made to get as many parking places around Court Square as possible. Concerning the plans to replace all of the concrete sidewalks, he reminded the Board members that the University of Virginia had undertaken a program many years ago to do just that, and the result, in his opinion, hurt rather than improved the University landscape. He

stated that one of the things he loved about Charlottesville was its lack of pretense, and he cautioned against becoming too self-conscious.

Mr. Coiner commented that he did not like the ratio of granite to brick; the brick overwhelmed him. He also did not think the new entrance to Jackson Park was inviting.

Ms. Winner commented that brick sidewalks were not very pedestrian friendly, particularly for women in high heel shoes. She was aware of several communities that had gone back to asphalt or cement from brick because so many people had complained that walking on brick was unpleasant. Mr. Huja replied that if bricks were laid correctly, they did not pose problems, which was something they had learned in bricking the Downtown Mall.

Ms. Heetderks commented that she would like to see a lot of the money dedicated to undergrounding the utilities, and Mr. Huja indicated a significant proportion would be.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the project, seconded by Mr. Tremblay. A vote was taken, and the motion passed six to one.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-9-25  
2nd Street SE and Water Street

Ms. Vest gave a brief presentation. She reminded the Board that this proposal for a stucco building had come before them in September of 2000 and had been well received by them at that time. Since then, the applicants had come back with several design changes, for which they were seeking BAR approval. She pointed out that the current design did exceed the height limit, so it would need to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a height variance. Any approval from the BAR would be contingent upon approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Staff did have some reservations about the appropriateness of the metal cladding material and the new fenestration pattern as they related to the design guidelines for this type of building in this location. The applicants had been requested to bring samples of the materials.

Ms. Fenton reminded the Board that Mr. Schwartz had

asked that the original drawings be made available this evening.

Mr. Will Prinner introduced himself as a member of the Board of Directors of Charlottesville Contemporary Arts and a founder of Live Arts and Lighthouse. He stated that about three and a half years ago, a group was formed for the express purpose of building a permanent home for Live Arts, Second Street Gallery and Lighthouse. Up to this point, they had conducted very quietly a capital campaign to fund the building, but would soon go public with it to raise the final funds needed. He explained that they realized there were a number of aspects of the project that would challenge the sensibilities of the residents of Charlottesville, but the design was deliberate and was the product of several years of study of the needs and goals of the theater. Ms. Fenton reminded him that the presentation should concentrate on architectural details of the exterior of the building, so he turned the floor over to one of the architects.

An architect from Bushman Dreyfus directed the Board to a model of the building and to a watercolor illustration of the Water Street façade. In response to a question from Mr. Clark, he indicated that the model was current. He showed the Board members a sample of the zinc titanium oxide material, which could be purchased pre-weathered or fresh from the mill. In six months to a year, the unweathered zinc would achieve a weathered look, but the first option could be purchased for a little more money. Concerning the base of the building on Water Street and around the corner on Second Street, he indicated that one of the primary concepts was transparency and openness to the street. The light fixtures were recessed so that the light itself would be apparent, but not the source. After describing several other details, he directed the Board members to illustrations showing the building in the context of surrounding structures and then asked if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Clark asked about the dimensions of part of the building, and the architect indicated that they were aiming for seven feet height in that area. In response to further questioning about apparent discrepancies in the dimensions shown, he responded that there were a lot of unresolved details of the

building that would be addressed by the first of October.

Mr. Clark then asked about what he considered an arbitrary termination of one of the lines of the building, saying that it could terminate closer to the street. The architect responded that it could, but the current design reflected certain structural demands.

Mr. Coiner asked if the drawing was to code or to the height they desired. The architect referred them to several drawings, saying that one represented the version which exceeded code requirements by 13 inches. He explained that that design still left 18 more inches of guard rail to deal with -- either in a plate glass corona or a cheaper, less attractive painted railing around the top of the building -- so what they preferred to do was just raise the parapet itself and let it serve as the guardrail for the roof terrace.

Mr. Coiner asked the architect to explain several openings on the Water Street elevation of the building, and the architect complied.

Mr. Clark asked about the modular masonry material. The architect explained that it was concrete masonry with a grain and texture very much like granite.

Ms. Heetderks inquired about the impetus for changing from the stucco to the metal cladding. The architect explained that with the fairly radical plan changes since the previous presentation, the combined costs of effective glazing and sun control in the new design had proven to be cost-prohibitive. He added that the metal cost as much as copper per square foot, and the manufacturer was very supportive in terms of how to detail it, how to build it, et cetera.

Ms. Fenton asked if the whole building could be done in stucco, and the architect explained that there was already a lot of stucco, namely in the high zones set back on the fourth floor. She asked what the alternatives to metal cladding would be. He indicated that he had looked into stucco, but had determined that, without the artificial introduction of color, it would appear monotonous to have so much stucco on such a large structure. He suggested that

the metal material would provide an interesting surface, in terms of the reflection of light and the changing shadows from the seams, and would serve well to keep water from entering the wall.

Ms. Winner inquired about the rooftop heating and air conditioning units. Pointing out the location of the units on the rooftop, he stated that he did not believe they would be visible at all.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions.

A member of the public asked if there would be a glare issue if the applicant went with the non-weathered metal. He indicated that there might be initially.

Hearing no further questions, Ms. Fenton called for comments from the general public or the Board.

Mr. Coiner commented that he did not like receiving one thing in the package and then having something else presented.

Mr. Clark indicated he was delighted with what he called an "elegantly conceived" design. He thought the building would be a beautiful addition to the city, and one of its only memorable modern structures.

Ms. Heetderks commented that she wanted to read from the guidelines for the sake of the members of the public. She indicated that it was the BAR's duty to interpret the design guidelines rather than impose their own aesthetic, and therefore, in light of the guidelines which called for sensitivity to the character and human scale of the historic district, she had a number of concerns about this proposal, particularly the massiveness of the structure and the industrial feel of the material.

Mr. Atkins commented that he regretted that in the change from the old version to the new one, the hustle and bustle of the innards of the building that had been expressed in the loggia had been mostly lost. He understood that the applicant was relying on the light quality and the material being luminous as a substitute for the liveliness of the two theaters on the upper level. Although the ground level still retained some of that energy, he did not



find the final result to be as satisfying or exciting. He added that he thought the scale of the store fronts was appropriate to downtown.

Ms. Fenton commented that she had a problem with the material, which she thought was too massive and in too sharp contrast to the brick wall next to the building. She added that she would not oppose this new design, but did prefer the original.

Mr. Clark made a motion to accept the proposal as submitted, seconded by Mr. Barton. A vote was taken, and the motion was turned down. Ms. Fenton called for an alternative motion.

The architect indicated he wanted to make a few comments. He voiced his agreement with Mr. Atkins' observations, saying that they had held onto that corner loggia "for dear life." Although it was not apparent in the drawings, the "milling about" aspect was actually enhanced in the new design since the windows opened onto the concession bar on two levels of the lobby. He pointed out that the drawing was also deceptive in that it did not make clear actually how much space was at the Second Street corner entrance.

Mr. Coiner asked the architect if they could make the project work if they used the preweathered material, and he responded that they were going to try, but until the contractors returned their bids, they were unable to say one way or the other.

Ms. Winner asked again how long the metal would take to weather naturally. The architect indicated he could not say for certain, but six months was a good estimate.

General discussion among the Board members then followed concerning the materials. Mr. Coiner indicated he was uncomfortable with there being shiny metal on the building for any length of time, and Ms. Winner stated her problem was more with the amount of metal on the building. She stated she liked the "funky, industrial warehouse" feel of the design, but did not think it belonged on that street. Mr. Clark disagreed with her, stating that the building would serve as a reminder of the past. Mr. Barton commented that he found the use of the material to be quite well proportioned.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted, with the provision that the metal cladding be artificially aged, seconded by Mr. Tremblay.

Ms. Fenton clarified that Mr. Clark was referring to the model that had been submitted rather than the drawing.

Ms. Winner asked if the motion required the applicant to come back if the preweathered material could not be used initially, which Mr. Clark confirmed.

A vote was taken and the motion carried, six to two.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-9-26  
411 N 1st Street

Ms. Vest gave a brief presentation. She indicated that some changes had come up for the applicant and the architects since the submittal of the application, but she did not think they should be faulted for that since the deadline was now 21 days in advance instead of 10 and there were some difficulties in adjusting to that. Concerning the proposal that had been submitted, she stated that it met with the design guidelines and would be a lovely addition to the building. The only issue that had come up was with the shutters, since the guidelines only allowed for their installation on buildings that could be shown to have had them in the past, and she was not aware in this instance if that was the case. Staff nevertheless outlined the kind of shutters they would like to see if any were used.

Ms. Katherine Swenson, the applicant, referred the Board members to the last page of their packets, which showed that the windows had previously borne shutters. Personally, she thought that shutters would be great for the house and she hoped the BAR approved them. Concerning the changes that had been made since the submittal of the application, she indicated that they were in fact a simplification and she hoped an improvement of the design. A second porch had been removed, and the design now stood as a brick portion which tied back into the main roof, with the double-storied porch being used to bridge the gap between the old brick and the new brick. She indicated the design would allow a lot of natural

light into the house, which currently was rather dark.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone had any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she called for comments from the general public or the Board.

Mr. Coiner commented he had been by the house and had seen evidence of the former shutters. He did not particularly like the fact that shutters could not be put on both sides of the two front windows. Concerning the addition, he indicated he would prefer something other than brick. Ms. Swenson responded that clapboard could be used, but she was interested in seeing if they could make the brick work first.

Ms. Fenton commented she was amenable to either material, as was Mr. Schwartz, with whom she had spoken earlier.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve either brick or clapboard, as well as all details included in the application. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-9-27  
215-219 East Main Street

Ms. Suzanne Staton, president of the Board of Paramount Theater, introduced herself and the other applicants to the members of the BAR.

Mr. Coiner suggested that they first consider the portion of the application that dealt with the demolition of the façade. Ms. Vest explained that the applicants were seeking a certificate of appropriateness to remove the existing metal façade from the Strawberry building in order to do exploratory research. Staff supported that, with the condition that a façade be returned to the building. General discussion followed, in which Ms. Vest clarified that the removal of the façade at this point should be treated as an exterior change, rather than an outright demolition.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve the removal of the façade, seconded by Mr. Barton. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Tom Johnson, of Martinez and Johnson Architects, then made a presentation on the history of his firm's involvement in the project and the proposed changes to the exterior of the theater. He indicated that this was a tax credit project, since the exterior would be restored, and went on to describe the stage house addition they were investigating and the rebuilding of the Strawberry building annex to the right of the main marquis entrance. He explained that the building had had a fire and several other interventions since it was built, and they were exploring it to determine exactly what had happened with it over the years. Concerning the fly tower, he indicated that it would be slightly less than 50 feet, which would raise the height of the building by 40 percent.

Mr. Jeff Dreyfus then made a presentation on the exploratory investigation of the Strawberry building. He indicated that they would like to use it for public space, namely in the expansion of the lobby, as well as for administrative spaces on the upper levels. Using several photographs, he explained to the Board that the building had originally been three stories, but the upper levels had been lost in fire. In exploring the building, they hoped to find enough restorable historic material present to qualify for a tax credit, which would be a sizable amount of money, but they were not yet certain what they were going to find or whether they could meet the standards of the state and federal agencies. He then presented the Board with a number of illustrations and did a brief overview of the proposed changes to the building, including the new location of the box office and the construction of an open loggia on the second floor. Still unresolved was the issue of the mechanical equipment, which the architects understood needed to be addressed.

Concerning the fly wall, Mr. Johnson indicated that they were still trying to determine certain structural and pragmatic constraints posed by the existing building, but with regard to the input of the BAR, they were seeking comments on materials and the level of articulation.

Ms. Fenton opened the floor to questions and comments from the general public and the Board.

Ms. Fenton asked if the fly wall was lower than

originally had been discussed. Mr. Dreyfus commented he thought it might be taller, and Mr. Jim Regal added that they had worked with their theater consultants and come up with the smallest area that they could utilize such that the theater would still function as a legitimate stage theater. Mr. Dreyfus then indicated that the usual height is 65 feet for most theaters, but in this instance they had been able to reduce it by almost 20 feet, as they were very aware of the context of the building and were doing everything they could to minimize its visual impact on the mall.

Ms. Fenton asked if, in order to qualify for the historic tax credit, they had to have the upper part look different, or if it could match the rest of the structure, and she was informed that there is usually a preference that additions be distinctive from the historic part of the structure, but the applicants would be entering into extensive discussion with the Parks Service about this. One of the applicants added that their idea was for the upper portion to be similar to the rest of the building, as well as contextual with the Downtown Mall, but beyond that they were open to input from the Board.

Mr. Clark commented that he thought the picture was unfortunate in that it looked apologetic, and that he felt that this was an opportunity to indulge in the fact that they were adding something new to the building that was going to change its character.

A member of the public asked if it was possible to set part of the structure back from the facade, and the applicant indicated they might have to due to some structural considerations.

Mr. Coiner inquired if the fly wall would take up the ground level area to the west of the building on Market Street. A representative from Martinez and Johnson informed him that they had to keep that space open because the Central Place building had an easement on the property and needed to be able to exit their patrons along the little pedestrian alley. He then described the reconfiguring necessary for them to add a fire stair to the theater.

Mr. Atkins asked if the fire stair needed to go all the way up the building, and the applicants confirmed this.

Mr. Barton, noting that one of the few "Colored Entrances" still extant in a theater building in the South was located on the 3rd Street facade, asked the applicants to expand on how they planned to treat this fairly significant architectural feature. Mr. Johnson responded that many of the theaters his firm had dealt with still had segregated entrances, but this was one of the few that was done in an elegant way. The applicants were still discussing how to recognize it, whether through letting it serve as a special community subscriber entrance, or by calling attention to the history of the feature through a plaque or a write-up in the literature.

Mr. Barton commented that his hope was that in subsequent meetings, as the applicants had the opportunity to develop the design, they would include that as part of the scheme to be presented to the Board. He felt that this feature was a critical part of the project, with a significant segment of the community interested in seeing it preserved.

Ms. Fenton called for further comments from the Board, and each member advised the applicants on what they would like to see, emphasizing a change in materials to bring out the upper portion of the theater and paying special attention to the Market Street facade.

Ms. Fenton remarked on inspiration that might be drawn from recent projects in Williamsburg.

Mr. Barton commented he wanted to echo his colleagues' concerns about the balance between material and articulation of the mass, and requested that in future presentations more information be given about how the necessary mechanical systems would be screened.

Ms. Winner commented that she was intrigued with the variations the applicants had already come up with for the annex building and commended them on their creativity.

Ms. Fenton thanked the applicants and urged them to feel free to contact any members of the Board if they had questions or concerns.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the Board take up approval

of the minutes before some members had to leave.

Mr. Coiner remarked that on page six of the minutes, the word "probably" should be struck as it was his understanding that the architect was definitely going to replace the panels due to poor workmanship. Similarly, on page 12, he requested that the word "bronze" be struck from the reference to the gate.

Mr. Coiner then made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Heetderks. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone had any matters they wanted to bring up under Other Business before some of the Board members had to leave.

Mr. Clark announced that he had noted a change made to the gothic arches in the Kuttner building that had not come before the BAR.

Mr. Coiner suggested holding a workshop to review the guidelines sometime during the Fall.

Ms. Fenton reminded the Board that interviews of the group of people being considered to do the redesign of the mall would take place in mid-October, and suggested that the Board select a date to make a presentation to the group on proposed guideline changes. After some discussion, the Board members decided upon Thursday, November 8th at 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Heetderks inquired about the Preservation Awards. Ms. Vest responded that in addition to Preservation Awards, they had also decided to do Planning Awards that the Planning Commission could give out. For both, they were going to run public ads in December to solicit nominations from the community, with the awards to be decided upon in March and presented formally during Preservation Week in May.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-7-19  
100 14th Street NW

Ms. Vest indicated that she had nothing new to report with regard to this application other than what was in the packet.

Mr. Edward Pelton, one of the artists who made the

metal piece for Orbit Billiards, referred the Board members to a letter he had written that was contained in the packet. He stated that for a number of technical reasons, the metalwork could not be moved indoors, but he also felt that aesthetically it belonged on the exterior of the building. He closed with comments about his company and the contributions they hoped to make to the city of Charlottesville.

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

Speaking on behalf of Mr. Schwartz, Ms. Fenton indicated that he was very much opposed to the metalwork remaining on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to approve the metal piece as it was, seconded by Mr. Tremblay.

Mr. Atkins commented that he also had been contacted by Mr. Schwartz and felt obliged to call everyone's attention to Mr. Schwartz's remarks in the last meeting. That having been said, he was going to vote in favor of the piece, noting that it was lightly fastened onto the exterior and was not a formidable projection outside of the building.

Mr. Barton commented that in his brief tenure on the Board, he had only seen two cases in which someone intentionally or unintentionally subverted the process of the BAR, requiring the members to go through the charade of pretending the change had not been made. In this case, he did not have a substantive problem with what had been put on the building, but he did not feel comfortable having to pretend that the item was not there, so he was going to vote to reject it. He offered his apology to the applicant, but added that there are clearly outlined guidelines that people need to be encouraged to follow.

Ms. Fenton suggested that at the next worksession, as part of the review of the guidelines, they make a suggestion to the City that there be some sort of fine levied against an applicant that does not follow the guidelines, which then separates that from the actual approval.

Ms. Winner commented that the reason she was going to



vote for the application was that the role of the BAR was to sustain the integrity of the architecture of the city, so while she respected the procedural guidelines and thought they were important, she did not want to vote against something for procedural reasons that she would have voted for under normal circumstances. She thought that to do so would be to deprive the city of potential architectural contributions.

Mr. Coiner commented that as the BAR, they had the right to reject proposals and should not be considered "bad guys" when applicants take the risk of ignoring procedure.

Ms. Fenton called for a vote. The motion was approved, five to three.

Ms. Vest commented that Staff had a proposal being considered by the City Attorney's office to incur a fee for applicants coming before the BAR, which would be waived for applicants who submitted everything in proper sequence.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-2-4  
208 South Street

Ms. Vest reported that the new architect on this project had several changes that needed to come before the BAR. Staff had reviewed the design guidelines and could not find a problem. Ms. Vest wanted to point out, however, that the project was partially visible from the street from several angles, but was screened from the railroad view.

Mr. Barton commented that he wanted to excuse himself from the meeting at this point, as his firm was involved in this project and it was also time for the regular meeting of the Planning Commission. Ms. Fenton thanked him and he exited the room.

Ms. Giovanna Galfione, the new architect for the project, reviewed the parts of it that had already come before the Board. She indicated that one of the main changes to the addition on the back was that the porch had been moved to the side. Also, the roof had been converted to a terrace, which came out of the need for a fire escape from the second and third floor. She then described a dormer on the west side

of the house as well as another fire exit, saying that a lot of the reworking had come out of the need for the fire exits. The main portion of the house that would be visible from the public right-of-way was the addition on the second floor level, which would carry through a lot of the same materials and detailing as the rest of the house.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions or comments for the applicant. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the application as submitted, seconded by Ms. Heetderks. The motion was unanimously approved.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 01-9-28  
100 West Jefferson Street

Ms. Vest reported that the building on the corner of Jefferson and First Street had been purchased by Christ Church for use as office space. The porch on the rear of the building was in need of reconstruction, and in the process of doing that, the applicants wanted to seek approval to enclose the lower portion and remove the lattice on the upper portion. Based on the guidelines, Staff did not have any objections to this proposal. She added that the windows would be wood with no mullions, which was slightly different from the existing windows but still compatible with the structure.

Mr. Robert Nowell, a representative of Christ Church, pointed out that the windows actually matched several on the upper level. He explained that the façade would be wood siding, perhaps a low profile cedar. To his knowledge, the only wood on the building was the gables; the rest was brick. He then presented the Board with an illustration showing the work they wanted to do to the rear of the building.

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

Mr. Atkins asked if the upper portion was going to be re-railed. Mr. Nowell confirmed this, adding that they were also going to put in new flooring.

Ms. Winner made a motion to approve the application

as presented, seconded by Mr. Coiner. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton made a request that in future meetings, the items that appear to be fairly quick be placed at the beginning of the agenda, so the applicants would not have to wait.

Mr. Coiner asked Ms. Vest if she had gotten any feedback from the public on the posting of the signs. She responded that she had received several calls from people who were curious about them, but nothing more than that.

Ms. Fenton asked Ms. Heetderks about the press releases announcing BAR meetings, and general discussion followed concerning the responses they generated, the need to get the agenda and packets on time to Board members, and the possibility of including on the agenda the items approved administratively by Staff.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to adjourn, which was unanimously approved.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

