

City of Charlottesville

**Board of Architectural Review
Special Meeting
March 4, 2003**

Minutes

Present:

Linda Winner
Lynne Heetderks, vice-chair
Joan Fenton, Chair
Allison Ewing
Preston Coiner
Cheri Lewis
Sydney Knight
Joseph Atkins (arrived late)

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala, Neighborhood Planner

James Tolbert, Director of Planning and Development Services

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

A. Matters from the Public

There were no matters from the public not on the agenda.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 03-02-03
5th and Water Streets
Tax Map 28 Parcel 51**

Amendment of Previous Approval for Renovation of Grand Piano and Furniture Building

Fifth and Water Streets LLC, Applicants/ Stoneking/Von Storch, Architects

Staff explained the applicant was requesting a change in the Water street façade that was different from what the Board of Architectural Review approved on February 18, 2003. The windows would have to be shifted 20 inches to the left due to a structural column. The renovation was originally approved by the Board of Architectural Review with the stipulation that the tinted glass, color "A" would come back for approval, and also the plastic awnings.

Steve von Storch made a presentation regarding the Water Street façade; the tinted glass, which he compared as only slightly darker green than clear float glass; and the plastic awnings, of which he did not have a sample. He said the awnings would be a frosted, pale green, wavy plastic, and showed several samples that had similar characteristics.

There were no public comments.

The Chair suggested discussing the three items separately.

Cheri Lewis moved to accept moving the windows in the Water Street façade.

Syd Knight seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Lynne Heetderks said she had a problem with the tinted "A" glass.

Allison Ewing said she was OK with it because this building is different.

Linda Winner had no objection.

Joan Fenton had no problem. She owned several stores facing south, and understood the problem of controlling the sun.

It was noted that the SNL building covered up all the windows from the inside, which looks worse than tinted glass.

Linda Winner moved to accept the tinted glass.

Allison Ewing seconded the motion.

Preston Coiner asked the architect to be more specific about the color.

He said it was Pilkington blue-green.

The motion passed 7-1 with Heetderks opposed.

The awnings were discussed. Cheri Lewis asked if the rendering was incorrect because it showed four awnings on the 5th Street elevation, not three as the Board of Architectural Review had approved. Steve von Storch acknowledged it was a mistake.

Lynne Heetderks said the guidelines stated that aluminum or plastic awnings were inappropriate in the historic district.

Joan Fenton suggested that a material that provided more shade and protection from the sun might be a better choice.

Preston echoed Lynne Heetderks' comment about the guidelines. He asked if the awning attached to the building.

Cheri Lewis asked if the awning diverted water.

Steve von Storch explained that the awnings did several things. They provided a layer of structure, created shadows with the fluted glass, and provided cover and UV protection. They are not as much about signage and protection as much as they are a part of the architecture; a light-handed installation.

Allison Ewing asked about damage from the elements.

Steve von Storch said the frosting would hide any surface damage.

Joseph Atkins arrived during the discussion of the awnings.

Lynne Heetderks moved to deny the plastic awning request based on the guidelines.

Cheri Lewis seconded the motion.

Allison Ewing said she preferred the plastic to canvas; it's a nice detail. She had some concern over degradation over time.

Linda Winner noted that technology had changed since the guidelines had been developed.

Joan Fenton said her thought was to deny but to discuss the technology change when the Board of Architectural Review reviews the guidelines at an upcoming work session.

An unidentified property owner of the train station across Water Street (Neal Sansovich) said he liked what the architect was trying to achieve.

Preston Coiner said we agree but this is in the guidelines.

The motion to deny the awning material passed, 4-3-1 with Joan Fenton, Cheri Lewis, Preston Coiner and Lynne Heetderks in favor; Syd Knight, Allison Ewing, and Linda Winner opposed; and Joseph Atkins abstaining.

C. Discussion

**350 Park Street, Levy Building
Tax Map 53 Parcel 108 and 109
Permanent HC Ramp
City of Charlottesville, Applicant**

Staff explained that the temporary sally port for the County Sheriff at the Levy Building was brought to the Board of Architectural Review at its February 18, 2003 meeting for information

and comments. As a public safety need, Board of Architectural Review approval was not required. At that meeting, the Board of Architectural Review asked to see the handicapped ramp if it was to be made permanent. The applicant is now requesting approval of a permanent handicapped ramp in the same area.

Tom Meek with the City Public Works, Facilities Management, said the ramp had cheek walls of brick, inside and out, with a concrete ramp. The brickwork was capped with cast stone. The existing front handrails on the Levy Building are not sufficient and would be replaced to match the handicapped rails.

There were no public comments.

Syd Knight asked where on the existing building was there cast stone? It was determined to be on the windowsills.

Lynne Heetderks confirmed that the handrail would come back to the Board of Architectural Review when they knew what it would look like.

Preston Coiner asked if the sally port mesh and supports were both black. Staff answered yes, as did Tom Meek.

Allison Ewing got up to look at the ramp details more closely.

Joseph Atkins said he is OK with the cheek wall, cast stone cap, and rail. He suggested they might not need a guardrail if it is only 15" high.

Tom Meeks said they wanted to hide the handrail.

Syd Knight said he is bothered by the cap. He noted the bad example of a pre-cast cap on the east side of the armory building. He said you see a lot of low walls of that sort with brick caps along High Street – he would go with brick.

Syd Knight moved to approve the permanent handicapped ramp and cheek wall with the stipulation that the cap be changed to brick.

Cheri Lewis seconded the motion.

Joseph Atkins asked if the City is welcoming the suggestion? Tom Meek said yes, it would be less expensive.

Preston said he liked the cap stone.

Lynne Heetderks said she agreed with Syd – she doesn't want attention drawn to the ramp.

The motion passed unanimously.

D. Preliminary Discussion

Water Street and East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Discussion of Transit Center

City of Charlottesville, Applicant/ Wallace Roberts & Todd (Antonio Fiol-Silva), Architects

The Board of Architectural Review had seen the Transit Center plans previously, but the minutes of that discussion could not be located.

Jim Tolbert introduced the consultants from WRT in Philadelphia, Antonio Fiol-Silva and Ignacio Bunster-Ossa. He said plans were discussed 6-8 months ago. Since then, they had been considering doing something different with the amphitheater. They need to coordinate the two plans, and work with CTS on what works best for them.

The consultants will present two things – the Transit Center and their work on the mall. A lot of that falls under the purview of the Board of Architectural Review. He said the Board of Architectural Review members should let them know at this time anything that they don't like or that they really do like.

Antonio Fiol-Silva presented a power point presentation of the Transit Center. He noted the difficulty of solving the design problems in that location: providing a terminus for the mall, possibly a landscaped zone like Halprin originally envisioned.

Preston Coiner asked about materials.

Antonio said they want to pick up the brick of the warehouses; will explore using soapstone from local quarries. He wants to use sustainable, including local, materials. There are a lot of transparent areas facing south and west. Solid materials are used to control views and for energy reasons. The observation deck is just a roof. The lower roof may be sod.

Joan Fenton remarked the deck is a great location for a café. She noted the problem of kids climbing on roofs downtown.

Preston Coiner asked about a wall shown adjacent to the Merrill Lynch building.

Antonio said it should not be there. They hope that a building will be developed there to make the transition more elegant. They said a switchback ramp for handicapped access would eat up the entire space.

Joseph Atkins said the large canopy that made an "L" toward the amphitheater is attractive. He noted the brick masonry box seems to float above the transportation area in the Transit Center – he will be interested to see what holds it up.

Antonio noted that under the box is a cozy area in which to sit.

Joseph Atkins said the stair in the plaza and building will make the design. He asked about elongating it; making it more gradual. He feels less comfortable with the green swoosh with water, the scale, and where that's headed. He hoped the building for toilets adjacent Belmont will not become a mega- structure.

Joan Fenton noted the free speech monument was not built within the given time period and will have to come back to the BAR for re-approval.

Jim Tolbert said the City Council approved it with the idea to integrate it into the project. It has become a "place." There will be an 18" podium (soapbox) in front of the fountain.

Atkins commended them for incorporating the monument into the whole design.

Syd Knight said he is impressed with the building; they are moving in the right direction. He likes the connection between the exterior and interior: the stairs penetrating the walls. He is concerned with the mall, and some of the other exterior spaces. He strongly urges them to respect the mall; it is such a strong space. They are layering a different move on top, perhaps not the best transition of mall to Transit Center to amphitheater. He would like to see more done with the mall in your control.

Syd Knight continued that the consultants talked about the million-dollar corner and cross-axis – he said they should emphasize the cross axis and mall. He said to be careful about the swoosh. The mall was not sensitively handled previously for the construction under the bridge. He said to think of the juncture as a threshold, not a hard line.

Allison Ewing echoed Joseph Atkins' thoughts on the landscape. She acknowledged it can be difficult with all the topographic pieces coming together. She asked how it can be stronger?

Ignacio said they are influenced by Halprin's counterpoint – an explosion of the larger landscape.

Joseph Atkins said you are right on if you consider it an urban park – the amphitheater comes right to the steps of City Hall.

Jim Tolbert said the amphitheater will be much different – a roof on top covering 3,000 people; the stage will be raised up.

Syd Knight said an urban park is the right approach. He wouldn't try too hard to force a naturalistic form. What is needed is an urban park with urban form.

Allison Ewing said you need visual strength, a stage or dense trees. She asked if there would be openings in the large massed areas. She missed the friendliness and detail on the side where retail area meets the mall.

Antonio said it has not changed – it will still be see-through and pavilion-like.

Preston Coiner asked about a time frame.

Joan asked if the final would be coming to the Board of Architectural Review in May? She asked what does the group think? Is the shape OK? Glass and brick?

Cheri Lewis said she wants to see red brick like the warehouses. Public buildings in Charlottesville are brick.

Lynne suggested carefully reviewing the guidelines for materials.

The consultants next talked about mall improvements.

They plan to take the wiggle out of the fire lane.

They will use the mall space for more benches and bring back the dark granite in original Halprin designs. On the second street crossing- they will widen the sidewalks with a single lane roadway, rumble strips of cobbles, bump to mall level, bollards, fencing, and a medallion in the brick design.

They may retrofit planters with benches. The chairs not for sleeping. They may move vendors to 3rd or 2nd street (prescribed zones). They could lease carts and store them in the parking garage.

Lighting currently detracts from storefronts. They also want to minimize clutter on mall.

Joan Fenton asked for Board of Architectural Review comments.

Ignacio said the trees were originally staggered to allow for wandering. They propose to use a slightly different color brick for fire lane.

Allison Ewing suggested removing the black steel sculptures.

Joan Fenton said the merchants want the payphones returned to the mall.

Ignacio said "utility zones" will be established, on side streets paved like the mall, for newspaper boxes, telephones, and possibly trash storage overnight.

Joan Fenton said talk to businesses to get feedback, especially the folks who have cafes.

Allison Ewing said she was not tied to the existing street furniture. The planters are out of scale.

Preston Coiner disagreed – the planters look great with tall plants.

Allison Ewing noted the issue of preserving the night sky with downward-directed lighting.

Preston Coiner asked about sand-swept brick.

Cheri Lewis liked the idea of locating carts off the mall between VNB and Bank of America.

Preston Coiner likes a mixture of carts and tables.

Allison Ewing said carts come to the Board of Architectural Review but not tables.

E. Approval of Minutes:

January 21, 2003

Joan Fenton asked the Board of Architectural Review to consider minutes of January 21, 2003.

Cheri Lewis said she didn't say the last sentence, 3rd paragraph, page 4. She said to replace it with "the architect created openings in the building more appropriate to the façade."

Cheri Lewis moved to approve the minutes as revised.

Syd Knight seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved unanimously as revised.

F. Other Business

Preston Coiner remarked that Lynne Heetderks and Mary Joy Scala did a good job with the appeal before City Council of 413 Park Street's roof.

He said he and Joe Atkins reviewed the guidelines two years ago but nothing was enacted.

The Board of Architectural Review asked for a work session to look at the guidelines. Preston Coiner said we should do them ourselves. Joan Fenton suggested an intern to assist.

Preston Coiner said this body also needs to look at the zoning. The Board of Architectural Review requested a copy of the proposed zoning for historic districts and Board of Architectural Review.

They asked about the plan in the proposed zoning ordinance to post notices on buildings regarding Board of Architectural Review.

Allison Ewing asked about submittal requirements.

April 1, 2003 was chosen as the date for the work session at 5 p.m. They suggested having dinner while they work. They will discuss the guidelines and submittal requirements.

What is in the guidelines that we want to change? What do we want to see?

If the submittal is not correct, they have 7 days built in to the review to get the information in.

Preston Coiner asked about Charlie Kabash's connector, between 3rd and 4th Streets, said it still needed to be painted.

They asked if the proposed zoning ordinance changed the way the Council is to conduct a Board of Architectural Review appeal- will they still consider the Board of Architectural Review's recommendation?

Check the demolition provision in the new ordinance – something akin to Lankford Avenue.

They discussed receiving a letter from Fran Lawrence. Mary Joy said his letter says he is planning to speak at the March 18 meeting during the open public comments time.

G. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Special Meeting
March 4, 2003**

Minutes

Present:

Linda Winner
Lynne Heetderks, vice-chair
Joan Fenton, Chair
Allison Ewing
Preston Coiner
Cheri Lewis
Sydney Knight
Joseph Atkins (arrived late)

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala, Neighborhood Planner

James Tolbert, Director of Planning and Development Services

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

A. Matters from the Public

There were no matters from the public not on the agenda.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-02-03

5th and Water Streets

Tax Map 28 Parcel 51

Amendment of Previous Approval for Renovation of Grand Piano and Furniture Building

Fifth and Water Streets LLC, Applicants/ Stoneking/Von Storch, Architects

Staff explained the applicant was requesting a change in the Water street façade that was different from what the Board of Architectural Review approved on February 18, 2003. The windows would have to be shifted 20 inches to the left due to a structural column. The renovation was originally approved by the Board of Architectural Review with the stipulation that the tinted glass, color "A" would come back for approval, and also the plastic awnings.

Steve von Storch made a presentation regarding the Water Street façade; the tinted glass, which he compared as only slightly darker green than clear float glass; and the plastic awnings, of which he did not have a sample. He said the awnings would be a frosted, pale green, wavy plastic, and showed several samples that had similar characteristics.

There were no public comments.

The Chair suggested discussing the three items separately.

Cheri Lewis moved to accept moving the windows in the Water Street façade.

Syd Knight seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Lynne Heetderks said she had a problem with the tinted "A" glass.

Allison Ewing said she was OK with it because this building is different.

Linda Winner had no objection.

Joan Fenton had no problem. She owned several stores facing south, and understood the problem of controlling the sun.

It was noted that the SNL building covered up all the windows from the inside, which looks worse than tinted glass.

Linda Winner moved to accept the tinted glass.

Allison Ewing seconded the motion.

Preston Coiner asked the architect to be more specific about the color.

He said it was Pilkington blue-green.

The motion passed 7-1 with Heetderks opposed.

The awnings were discussed. Cheri Lewis asked if the rendering was incorrect because it showed four awnings on the 5th Street elevation, not three as the Board of Architectural Review had approved. Steve von Storch acknowledged it was a mistake.

Lynne Heetderks said the guidelines stated that aluminum or plastic awnings were inappropriate in the historic district.

Joan Fenton suggested that a material that provided more shade and protection from the sun might be a better choice.

Preston echoed Lynne Heetderks' comment about the guidelines. He asked if the awning attached to the building.

Cheri Lewis asked if the awning diverted water.

Steve von Storch explained that the awnings did several things. They provided a layer of structure, created shadows with the fluted glass, and provided cover and UV protection. They are not as much about signage and protection as much as they are a part of the architecture; a light-handed installation.

Allison Ewing asked about damage from the elements.

Steve von Storch said the frosting would hide any surface damage.

Joseph Atkins arrived during the discussion of the awnings.

Lynne Heetderks moved to deny the plastic awning request based on the guidelines.

Cheri Lewis seconded the motion.

Allison Ewing said she preferred the plastic to canvas; it's a nice detail. She had some concern over degradation over time.

Linda Winner noted that technology had changed since the guidelines had been developed.

Joan Fenton said her thought was to deny but to discuss the technology change when the Board of Architectural Review reviews the guidelines at an upcoming work session.

An unidentified property owner of the train station across Water Street (Neal Sansovich) said he liked what the architect was trying to achieve.

Preston Coiner said we agree but this is in the guidelines.

The motion to deny the awning material passed, 4-3-1 with Joan Fenton, Cheri Lewis, Preston Coiner and Lynne Heetderks in favor; Syd Knight, Allison Ewing, and Linda Winner opposed; and Joseph Atkins abstaining.

C. Discussion

350 Park Street, Levy Building Tax Map 53 Parcel 108 and 109 Permanent HC Ramp

City of Charlottesville, Applicant

Staff explained that the temporary sally port for the County Sheriff at the Levy Building was brought to the Board of Architectural Review at its February 18, 2003 meeting for information and comments. As a public safety need, Board of Architectural Review approval was not required. At that meeting, the Board of Architectural Review asked to see the handicapped ramp if it was to be made permanent. The applicant is now requesting approval of a permanent handicapped ramp in the same area.

Tom Meek with the City Public Works, Facilities Management, said the ramp had cheek walls of brick, inside and out, with a concrete ramp. The brickwork was capped with cast stone. The existing front handrails on the Levy Building are not sufficient and would be replaced to match the handicapped rails.

There were no public comments.

Syd Knight asked where on the existing building was there cast stone? It was determined to be on the windowsills.

Lynne Heetderks confirmed that the handrail would come back to the Board of Architectural Review when they knew what it would look like.

Preston Coiner asked if the sally port mesh and supports were both black. Staff answered yes, as did Tom Meek.

Allison Ewing got up to look at the ramp details more closely.

Joseph Atkins said he is OK with the cheek wall, cast stone cap, and rail. He suggested they might not need a guardrail if it is only 15" high.

Tom Meeks said they wanted to hide the handrail.

Syd Knight said he is bothered by the cap. He noted the bad example of a pre-cast cap on the east side of the armory building. He said you see a lot of low walls of that sort with brick caps along High Street – he would go with brick.

Syd Knight moved to approve the permanent handicapped ramp and cheek wall with the stipulation that the cap be changed to brick.

Cheri Lewis seconded the motion.

Joseph Atkins asked if the City is welcoming the suggestion? Tom Meek said yes, it would be less expensive.

Preston said he liked the cap stone.

Lynne Heetderks said she agreed with Syd – she doesn't want attention drawn to the ramp.

The motion passed unanimously.

D. Preliminary Discussion

Water Street and East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Discussion of Transit Center

City of Charlottesville, Applicant/ Wallace Roberts & Todd (Antonio Fiol-Silva), Architects

The Board of Architectural Review had seen the Transit Center plans previously, but the minutes of that discussion could not be located.

Jim Tolbert introduced the consultants from WRT in Philadelphia, Antonio Fiol-Silva and Ignacio Bunster-Ossa. He said plans were discussed 6-8 months ago. Since then, they had been considering doing something different with the amphitheater. They need to coordinate the two plans, and work with CTS on what works best for them.

The consultants will present two things – the Transit Center and their work on the mall. A lot of that falls under the purview of the Board of Architectural Review. He said the Board of Architectural Review members should let them know at this time anything that they don't like or that they really do like.

Antonio Fiol-Silva presented a power point presentation of the Transit Center. He noted the difficulty of solving the design problems in that location: providing a terminus for the mall, possibly a landscaped zone like Halprin originally envisioned.

Preston Coiner asked about materials.

Antonio said they want to pick up the brick of the warehouses; will explore using soapstone from local quarries. He wants to use sustainable, including local, materials. There are a lot of transparent areas facing south and west. Solid materials are used to control views and for energy reasons. The observation deck is just a roof. The lower roof may be sod.

Joan Fenton remarked the deck is a great location for a café. She noted the problem of kids climbing on roofs downtown.

Preston Coiner asked about a wall shown adjacent to the Merrill Lynch building.

Antonio said it should not be there. They hope that a building will be developed there to make the transition more elegant. They said a switchback ramp for handicapped access would eat up the entire space.

Joseph Atkins said the large canopy that made an "L" toward the amphitheater is attractive. He noted the brick masonry box seems to float above the transportation area in the Transit Center – he will be interested to see what holds it up.

Antonio noted that under the box is a cozy area in which to sit.

Joseph Atkins said the stair in the plaza and building will make the design. He asked about elongating it; making it more gradual. He feels less comfortable with the green swoosh with water, the scale, and where that's headed. He hoped the building for toilets adjacent Belmont will not become a mega- structure.

Joan Fenton noted the free speech monument was not built within the given time period and will have to come back to the BAR for re-approval.

Jim Tolbert said the City Council approved it with the idea to integrate it into the project. It has become a "place." There will be an 18" podium (soapbox) in front of the fountain.

Atkins commended them for incorporating the monument into the whole design.

Syd Knight said he is impressed with the building; they are moving in the right direction. He likes the connection between the exterior and interior: the stairs penetrating the walls. He is concerned with the mall, and some of the other exterior spaces. He strongly urges them to respect the mall; it is such a strong space. They are layering a different move on top, perhaps not the best transition of mall to Transit Center to amphitheater. He would like to see more done with the mall in your control.

Syd Knight continued that the consultants talked about the million-dollar corner and cross-axis – he said they should emphasize the cross axis and mall. He said to be careful about the swoosh. The mall was not sensitively handled previously for the construction under the bridge. He said to think of the juncture as a threshold, not a hard line.

Allison Ewing echoed Joseph Atkins' thoughts on the landscape. She acknowledged it can be difficult with all the topographic pieces coming together. She asked how it can be stronger?

Ignacio said they are influenced by Halprin's counterpoint – an explosion of the larger landscape.

Joseph Atkins said you are right on if you consider it an urban park – the amphitheater comes right to the steps of City Hall.

Jim Tolbert said the amphitheater will be much different – a roof on top covering 3,000 people; the stage will be raised up.

Syd Knight said an urban park is the right approach. He wouldn't try too hard to force a naturalistic form. What is needed is an urban park with urban form.

Allison Ewing said you need visual strength, a stage or dense trees. She asked if there would be openings in the large massed areas. She missed the friendliness and detail on the side where retail area meets the mall.

Antonio said it has not changed – it will still be see-through and pavilion-like.

Preston Coiner asked about a time frame.

Joan asked if the final would be coming to the Board of Architectural Review in May? She asked what does the group think? Is the shape OK? Glass and brick?

Cheri Lewis said she wants to see red brick like the warehouses. Public buildings in Charlottesville are brick.

Lynne suggested carefully reviewing the guidelines for materials.

The consultants next talked about mall improvements.

They plan to take the wiggle out of the fire lane.

They will use the mall space for more benches and bring back the dark granite in original Halprin designs. On the second street crossing- they will widen the sidewalks with a single lane roadway, rumble strips of cobbles, bump to mall level, bollards, fencing, and a medallion in the brick design.

They may retrofit planters with benches. The chairs not for sleeping. They may move vendors to 3rd or 2nd street (prescribed zones). They could lease carts and store them in the parking garage.

Lighting currently detracts from storefronts. They also want to minimize clutter on mall.

Joan Fenton asked for Board of Architectural Review comments.

Ignacio said the trees were originally staggered to allow for wandering. They propose to use a slightly different color brick for fire lane.

Allison Ewing suggested removing the black steel sculptures.

Joan Fenton said the merchants want the payphones returned to the mall.

Ignacio said "utility zones' will be established, on side streets paved like the mall, for newspaper boxes, telephones, and possibly trash storage overnight.

Joan Fenton said talk to businesses to get feedback, especially the folks who have cafes.

Allison Ewing said she was not tied to the existing street furniture. The planters are out of scale.

Preston Coiner disagreed – the planters look great with tall plants.

Allison Ewing noted the issue of preserving the night sky with downward-directed lighting.

Preston Coiner asked about sand-swept brick.

Cheri Lewis liked the idea of locating carts off the mall between VNB and Bank of America.

Preston Coiner likes a mixture of carts and tables.

Allison Ewing said carts come to the Board of Architectural Review but not tables.

E. Approval of Minutes:

January 21, 2003

Joan Fenton asked the Board of Architectural Review to consider minutes of January 21, 2003.

Cheri Lewis said she didn't say the last sentence, 3rd paragraph, page 4. She said to replace it with "the architect created openings in the building more appropriate to the façade."

Cheri Lewis moved to approve the minutes as revised.

Syd Knight seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved unanimously as revised.

F. Other Business

Preston Coiner remarked that Lynne Heetderks and Mary Joy Scala did a good job with the appeal before City Council of 413 Park Street's roof.

He said he and Joe Atkins reviewed the guidelines two years ago but nothing was enacted.

The Board of Architectural Review asked for a work session to look at the guidelines. Preston Coiner said we should do them ourselves. Joan Fenton suggested an intern to assist.

Preston Coiner said this body also needs to look at the zoning. The Board of Architectural Review requested a copy of the proposed zoning for historic districts and Board of Architectural Review.

They asked about the plan in the proposed zoning ordinance to post notices on buildings regarding Board of Architectural Review.

Allison Ewing asked about submittal requirements.

April 1, 2003 was chosen as the date for the work session at 5 p.m. They suggested having dinner while they work. They will discuss the guidelines and submittal requirements.

What is in the guidelines that we want to change? What do we want to see?

If the submittal is not correct, they have 7 days built in to the review to get the information in.

Preston Coiner asked about Charlie Kabash's connector, between 3rd and 4th Streets, said it still needed to be painted.

They asked if the proposed zoning ordinance changed the way the Council is to conduct a Board of Architectural Review appeal- will they still consider the Board of Architectural Review's recommendation?

Check the demolition provision in the new ordinance – something akin to Lankford Avenue.

They discussed receiving a letter from Fran Lawrence. Mary Joy said his letter says he is planning to speak at the March 18 meeting during the open public comments time.

G. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Special Meeting
March 4, 2003**

Minutes

Present:

Linda Winner
Lynne Heetderks, vice-chair
Joan Fenton, Chair
Allison Ewing
Preston Coiner
Cheri Lewis
Sydney Knight
Joseph Atkins (arrived late)

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala, Neighborhood Planner
James Tolbert, Director of Planning and Development Services

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

A. Matters from the Public

There were no matters from the public not on the agenda.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 03-02-03
5th and Water Streets
Tax Map 28 Parcel 51**

Amendment of Previous Approval for Renovation of Grand Piano and Furniture Building

Fifth and Water Streets LLC, Applicants/ Stoneking/Von Storch, Architects

Staff explained the applicant was requesting a change in the Water street façade that was different from what the Board of Architectural Review approved on February 18, 2003. The windows would have to be shifted 20 inches to the left due to a structural column. The renovation was originally approved by the Board of Architectural Review with the stipulation that the tinted glass, color "A" would come back for approval, and also the plastic awnings.

Steve von Storch made a presentation regarding the Water Street façade; the tinted glass, which he compared as only slightly darker green than clear float glass; and the plastic awnings, of which he did not have a sample. He said the awnings would be a frosted, pale green, wavy plastic, and showed several samples that had similar characteristics.

There were no public comments.

The Chair suggested discussing the three items separately.

Cheri Lewis moved to accept moving the windows in the Water Street façade.

Syd Knight seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Lynne Heetderks said she had a problem with the tinted "A" glass.

Allison Ewing said she was OK with it because this building is different.

Linda Winner had no objection.

Joan Fenton had no problem. She owned several stores facing south, and understood the problem of controlling the sun.

It was noted that the SNL building covered up all the windows from the inside, which looks worse than tinted glass.

Linda Winner moved to accept the tinted glass.

Allison Ewing seconded the motion.

Preston Coiner asked the architect to be more specific about the color.

He said it was Pilkington blue-green.

The motion passed 7-1 with Heetderks opposed.

The awnings were discussed. Cheri Lewis asked if the rendering was incorrect because it showed four awnings on the 5th Street elevation, not three as the Board of Architectural Review had approved. Steve von Storch acknowledged it was a mistake.

Lynne Heetderks said the guidelines stated that aluminum or plastic awnings were inappropriate in the historic district.

Joan Fenton suggested that a material that provided more shade and protection from the sun might be a better choice.

Preston echoed Lynne Heetderks' comment about the guidelines. He asked if the awning attached to the building.

Cheri Lewis asked if the awning diverted water.

Steve von Storch explained that the awnings did several things. They provided a layer of structure, created shadows with the fluted glass, and provided cover and UV protection. They are not as much about signage and protection as much as they are a part of the architecture; a light-handed installation.

Allison Ewing asked about damage from the elements.

Steve von Storch said the frosting would hide any surface damage.

Joseph Atkins arrived during the discussion of the awnings.

Lynne Heetderks moved to deny the plastic awning request based on the guidelines.

Cheri Lewis seconded the motion.

Allison Ewing said she preferred the plastic to canvas; it's a nice detail. She had some concern over degradation over time.

Linda Winner noted that technology had changed since the guidelines had been developed.

Joan Fenton said her thought was to deny but to discuss the technology change when the Board of Architectural Review reviews the guidelines at an upcoming work session.

An unidentified property owner of the train station across Water Street (Neal Sansovich) said he liked what the architect was trying to achieve.

Preston Coiner said we agree but this is in the guidelines.

The motion to deny the awning material passed, 4-3-1 with Joan Fenton, Cheri Lewis, Preston Coiner and Lynne Heetderks in favor; Syd Knight, Allison Ewing, and Linda Winner opposed; and Joseph Atkins abstaining.

C. Discussion

350 Park Street, Levy Building Tax Map 53 Parcel 108 and 109 Permanent HC Ramp City of Charlottesville, Applicant

Staff explained that the temporary sally port for the County Sheriff at the Levy Building was brought to the Board of Architectural Review at its February 18, 2003 meeting for information and comments. As a public safety need, Board of Architectural Review approval was not required. At that meeting, the Board of Architectural Review asked to see the handicapped ramp if it was to be made permanent. The applicant is now requesting approval of a permanent handicapped ramp in the same area.

Tom Meek with the City Public Works, Facilities Management, said the ramp had cheek walls of brick, inside and out, with a concrete ramp. The brickwork was capped with cast stone. The existing front handrails on the Levy Building are not sufficient and would be replaced to match the handicapped rails.

There were no public comments.

Syd Knight asked where on the existing building was there cast stone? It was determined to be on the windowsills.

Lynne Heetderks confirmed that the handrail would come back to the Board of Architectural Review when they knew what it would look like.

Preston Coiner asked if the sally port mesh and supports were both black. Staff answered yes, as did Tom Meek.

Allison Ewing got up to look at the ramp details more closely.

Joseph Atkins said he is OK with the cheek wall, cast stone cap, and rail. He suggested they might not need a guardrail if it is only 15" high.

Tom Meeks said they wanted to hide the handrail.

Syd Knight said he is bothered by the cap. He noted the bad example of a pre-cast cap on the east side of the armory building. He said you see a lot of low walls of that sort with brick caps along High Street – he would go with brick.

Syd Knight moved to approve the permanent handicapped ramp and cheek wall with the stipulation that the cap be changed to brick.

Cheri Lewis seconded the motion.

Joseph Atkins asked if the City is welcoming the suggestion? Tom Meek said yes, it would be less expensive.

Preston said he liked the cap stone.

Lynne Heetderks said she agreed with Syd – she doesn't want attention drawn to the ramp.

The motion passed unanimously.

D. Preliminary Discussion

Water Street and East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Discussion of Transit Center

City of Charlottesville, Applicant/ Wallace Roberts & Todd (Antonio Fiol-Silva), Architects

The Board of Architectural Review had seen the Transit Center plans previously, but the minutes of that discussion could not be located.

Jim Tolbert introduced the consultants from WRT in Philadelphia, Antonio Fiol-Silva and Ignacio Bunster-Ossa. He said plans were discussed 6-8 months ago. Since then, they had been

considering doing something different with the amphitheater. They need to coordinate the two plans, and work with CTS on what works best for them.

The consultants will present two things – the Transit Center and their work on the mall. A lot of that falls under the purview of the Board of Architectural Review. He said the Board of Architectural Review members should let them know at this time anything that they don't like or that they really do like.

Antonio Fiol-Silva presented a power point presentation of the Transit Center. He noted the difficulty of solving the design problems in that location: providing a terminus for the mall, possibly a landscaped zone like Halprin originally envisioned.

Preston Coiner asked about materials.

Antonio said they want to pick up the brick of the warehouses; will explore using soapstone from local quarries. He wants to use sustainable, including local, materials. There are a lot of transparent areas facing south and west. Solid materials are used to control views and for energy reasons. The observation deck is just a roof. The lower roof may be sod.

Joan Fenton remarked the deck is a great location for a café. She noted the problem of kids climbing on roofs downtown.

Preston Coiner asked about a wall shown adjacent to the Merrill Lynch building.

Antonio said it should not be there. They hope that a building will be developed there to make the transition more elegant. They said a switchback ramp for handicapped access would eat up the entire space.

Joseph Atkins said the large canopy that made an "L" toward the amphitheater is attractive. He noted the brick masonry box seems to float above the transportation area in the Transit Center – he will be interested to see what holds it up.

Antonio noted that under the box is a cozy area in which to sit.

Joseph Atkins said the stair in the plaza and building will make the design. He asked about elongating it; making it more gradual. He feels less comfortable with the green swoosh with water, the scale, and where that's headed. He hoped the building for toilets adjacent Belmont will not become a mega- structure.

Joan Fenton noted the free speech monument was not built within the given time period and will have to come back to the BAR for re-approval.

Jim Tolbert said the City Council approved it with the idea to integrate it into the project. It has become a "place." There will be an 18" podium (soapbox) in front of the fountain.

Atkins commended them for incorporating the monument into the whole design.

Syd Knight said he is impressed with the building; they are moving in the right direction. He likes the connection between the exterior and interior: the stairs penetrating the walls. He is concerned with the mall, and some of the other exterior spaces. He strongly urges them to respect the mall; it is such a strong space. They are layering a different move on top, perhaps not the best transition of mall to Transit Center to amphitheater. He would like to see more done with the mall in your control.

Syd Knight continued that the consultants talked about the million-dollar corner and cross-axis – he said they should emphasize the cross axis and mall. He said to be careful about the swoosh. The mall was not sensitively handled previously for the construction under the bridge. He said to think of the juncture as a threshold, not a hard line.

Allison Ewing echoed Joseph Atkins' thoughts on the landscape. She acknowledged it can be difficult with all the topographic pieces coming together. She asked how it can be stronger?

Ignacio said they are influenced by Halprin's counterpoint – an explosion of the larger landscape.

Joseph Atkins said you are right on if you consider it an urban park – the amphitheater comes right to the steps of City Hall.

Jim Tolbert said the amphitheater will be much different – a roof on top covering 3,000 people; the stage will be raised up.

Syd Knight said an urban park is the right approach. He wouldn't try too hard to force a naturalistic form. What is needed is an urban park with urban form.

Allison Ewing said you need visual strength, a stage or dense trees. She asked if there would be openings in the large massed areas. She missed the friendliness and detail on the side where retail area meets the mall.

Antonio said it has not changed – it will still be see-through and pavilion-like.

Preston Coiner asked about a time frame.

Joan asked if the final would be coming to the Board of Architectural Review in May? She asked what does the group think? Is the shape OK? Glass and brick?

Cheri Lewis said she wants to see red brick like the warehouses. Public buildings in Charlottesville are brick.

Lynne suggested carefully reviewing the guidelines for materials.

The consultants next talked about mall improvements.

They plan to take the wiggle out of the fire lane.

They will use the mall space for more benches and bring back the dark granite in original Halprin designs. On the second street crossing- they will widen the sidewalks with a single lane roadway, rumble strips of cobbles, bump to mall level, bollards, fencing, and a medallion in the brick design.

They may retrofit planters with benches. The chairs not for sleeping. They may move vendors to 3rd or 2nd street (prescribed zones). They could lease carts and store them in the parking garage.

Lighting currently detracts from storefronts. They also want to minimize clutter on mall.

Joan Fenton asked for Board of Architectural Review comments.

Ignacio said the trees were originally staggered to allow for wandering. They propose to use a slightly different color brick for fire lane.

Allison Ewing suggested removing the black steel sculptures.

Joan Fenton said the merchants want the payphones returned to the mall.

Ignacio said "utility zones" will be established, on side streets paved like the mall, for newspaper boxes, telephones, and possibly trash storage overnight.

Joan Fenton said talk to businesses to get feedback, especially the folks who have cafes.

Allison Ewing said she was not tied to the existing street furniture. The planters are out of scale.

Preston Coiner disagreed – the planters look great with tall plants.

Allison Ewing noted the issue of preserving the night sky with downward-directed lighting.

Preston Coiner asked about sand-swept brick.

Cheri Lewis liked the idea of locating carts off the mall between VNB and Bank of America.

Preston Coiner likes a mixture of carts and tables.

Allison Ewing said carts come to the Board of Architectural Review but not tables.

E. Approval of Minutes:

January 21, 2003

Joan Fenton asked the Board of Architectural Review to consider minutes of January 21, 2003.

Cheri Lewis said she didn't say the last sentence, 3rd paragraph, page 4. She said to replace it with "the architect created openings in the building more appropriate to the façade."

Cheri Lewis moved to approve the minutes as revised.

Syd Knight seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved unanimously as revised.

F. Other Business

Preston Coiner remarked that Lynne Heetderks and Mary Joy Scala did a good job with the appeal before City Council of 413 Park Street's roof.

He said he and Joe Atkins reviewed the guidelines two years ago but nothing was enacted.

The Board of Architectural Review asked for a work session to look at the guidelines. Preston Coiner said we should do them ourselves. Joan Fenton suggested an intern to assist.

Preston Coiner said this body also needs to look at the zoning. The Board of Architectural Review requested a copy of the proposed zoning for historic districts and Board of Architectural Review.

They asked about the plan in the proposed zoning ordinance to post notices on buildings regarding Board of Architectural Review.

Allison Ewing asked about submittal requirements.

April 1, 2003 was chosen as the date for the work session at 5 p.m. They suggested having dinner while they work. They will discuss the guidelines and submittal requirements.

What is in the guidelines that we want to change? What do we want to see?

If the submittal is not correct, they have 7 days built in to the review to get the information in.

Preston Coiner asked about Charlie Kabash's connector, between 3rd and 4th Streets, said it still needed to be painted.

They asked if the proposed zoning ordinance changed the way the Council is to conduct a Board of Architectural Review appeal- will they still consider the Board of Architectural Review's recommendation?

Check the demolition provision in the new ordinance – something akin to Lankford Avenue.

They discussed receiving a letter from Fran Lawrence. Mary Joy said his letter says he is planning to speak at the March 18 meeting during the open public comments time.

G. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
March 18, 2003**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Allison Ewing
Syd Knight
Linda Winner
Lynne Heetderks

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 4:59 p.m.

A. Matters from the public

Ms. Fenton called for matters from the public not on the agenda. There being none, she closed that portion of the meeting.

B. --Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 03-03-01
402 Park Street/Sun Trust Bank
Tax Map 53, Parcel 115
Repair Parapets
SunTrust Bank, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to repair five parapets from which the brick coping is coming loose and falling. A pressure treated 2x8 will be installed on top of the parapet and a metal coping will be placed over the top to have a secure fastener. Staff recommends approval. The metal should be painted the same color as the roof.

Mr. Traye Hogge, speaking on behalf of SunTrust Bank,

presented the Board members with the inspection report and design plan.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the public. There being none, she closed that portion of the meeting. She then called for questions from the Board members.

Mr. Knight sought clarification as to where and how much coping would be replaced. Mr. Hogge explained it would be the center. Mr. Knight also wanted to know why brick was not being used this time. Mr. Hogge explained that the contractor had said they could no longer get the size of brick needed and would

not be able to match the color since that particular brick is no longer made. Mr. Knight wanted to know what the metal was. Mr. Hogge stated it was a metal which was pre-painted to match the existing roof.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know how much of the metal would be exposed. Mr. Hogge explained that it would be two inches.

Ms. Fenton asked the architects on the Board if this was standard procedure. Mr. Atkins stated the proposal was probably the best technical solution and solves all the problems. He further stated that he did not think it would present an aesthetic problem.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Knight felt troubled by the proposal and would rather see the brick replaced.

Mr. Tremblay stated that he was not troubled by this and that the detail would be unnoticeable.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins made a friendly amendment that the applicant look once more at the option of replacing the brick. The friendly amendment was accepted. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-03-02

221 East Main Street/Sal's Pizza

Tax Map 33, Parcel 235

New Silver Outdoor Furniture

Joe Finazzo, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant has been operating an outdoor cafe on the Mall since 1987. A previous Certificate of Appropriateness application was approved in February, 1999 for cafe furniture. The existing tables and chairs are white plastic. The applicant is seeking approval for nine silver metal tables and matching chairs. The tables are adjustable in height; the chairs are bar height. The guidelines for vending, cafes and signs state that all elements -- tables, chairs, planters and trash containers -- should be of the same color, materials and design character. Black is the dominant color of Mall elements and it or other dark colors are preferred. The existing furniture does not meet the guidelines; the proposed furniture is similar to other furniture recently approved on the Mall and is preferable to the white plastic. Staff recommends approval of the silver furniture and recommend that as the white tables are replaced the replacement should match the silver metal furniture.

Mr. Finazzo was present and stated that Ms. Scala had said all that needed to be said.

Ms. Fenton called for questions.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know the time schedule for replacing the white plastic. Mr. Finazzo was not sure since none needed replacement due to wear and tear.

Ms. Fenton asked if the applicant would be able to match the proposed furniture as replacements were needed for the white plastic. Mr. Finazzo stated he could lower the height of the silver tables. Ms. Fenton asked if the applicant could replace the white tables with any silver table or if the previous approval allowed him to continue to replace that with white plastic. Ms. Scala stated it had been a suggestion on her part. Mr. Finazzo stated he would like to keep the white since that was what had been used since the start of his business.

Ms. Fenton called for comments.

Ms. Ewing made a motion to approve the application. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-02-04

420 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 51

Renovation of Grand Piano and Furniture Building

East Mall LLC, Applicant

JD Architectural Studio, Ltd., Architects

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The front portion of the building was being considered in the proposal. The existing building is from the late 1960's; the original front was destroyed by fire in April 1967. The facade is Colonial Revival. The applicant is seeking approval to add a third floor to the front section and to make exterior renovations. The proposed use includes ten new residential units along with commercial units. Guidelines for additions, materials, features, openings and architectural details were considered and were listed in the Board members' information packets. The new addition is designed to be distinguishable from the existing building in style, color and materials. The contemporary style is simple and unobtrusive. The color scheme is pleasing and will work well with the more contemporary colors on the rear portion of Grand Piano. The synthetic stucco-like finish is not recommended by the guidelines, but there is precedent for its use on the Downtown Mall.

Ms. Heetderks called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Atkins asked if all the windows were non-operable. He was told they were operable.

Ms. Heetderks asked why EIFS (external insulation and finishing system) was chosen instead of brick for the third floor. The architect had seen no purpose in doing brick over cinder block.

Ms. Fenton wanted to know why the staircase was placed in a different manner than other stores on the Mall. She was informed that it was because the applicant was trying to save the storefront.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public. There being none, she called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Ewing expressed concern over the visibility of the third floor from the Mall. She would like it to be visually quieter with the punched openings having some sort of visual support for the block and a cornice more in keeping with the warehouse

look.

Mr. Coiner thought the setback should have been bigger.

Ms. Heetderks stated concern over the setback, the color and the material. She stated that the guidelines suggested avoiding the use of synthetic sidings in the Historic District.

Mr. Knight was troubled by the use of Dryvit and would like to see the color and material toned down.

Mr. Tremblay stated he was not offended by the color

or materials.

Mr. Atkins echoed previous comments about the setback,

the storefront door and the cornice.

Ms. Winner had no problems with the colors but stated

that the guidelines were clear in regard to faux stucco.

Ms. Fenton expressed concern about the setback, stating that the front could use a little more setback.

Mr. Atkins wanted the members' opinions regarding the more commercial looking windows on the third story. Ms. Ewing stated the building should go with the punched warehouse look.

Ms. Ewing made a motion to defer so that the architect can look for an alternative solution for the EIFS, reconsider the setback, the cornice line, the configuration of the windows, the

entrance, and the other issues addressed this evening. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-1, with Ms. Winner voting against.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 03-03-03
400 East Jefferson Street
Tax Map 53, Parcel 46
Renovations
Candace deLoach, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A Certificate of Appropriateness Application was approved 17 July 2001 to replace the front porch with a wooden railed porch and to approve windows in the dormers; shutters were denied. The house is middle class vernacular architecture of the early 20th century and is one of the few remaining examples of a mansard roof in the City. The proposal is to replace the front brick porch with wood columns to match the back porch; to replace the original railing on the upper porches; a balustrade around the rooftop; to change the

existing stair handrail to a wooden bracket design; add two new dormers on the alley side of the building; replace all dormer vents with arched windows; raise the dormer heights to match the proportions of the lower windows; add panel-type shutters to all windows; replace the upper front door with a 15 pane door; paint the brick in a historic whitewash manner; add a gas lantern on a post; remove existing light fixtures; mount decorative iron brackets for shop signage; move an existing antique sign from neighboring property to this property; remove an exterior grill and screen in a lower left arched window and replace with glass; and remove existing rail. The applicant is proposing many changes; some are historically correct, some may or may not be consistent with the original. The Board members had a written report detailing which items were and were not recommended by staff.

Candace deLoach was present to answer questions.

Ms. Fenton called for questions.

Mr. sought the purpose for the balustrade. Ms. DeLoach stated it was to bring it back the way it used to be. The purpose had not been to create a balcony.

Ms. Ewing asked which changes would be historically correct. Ms. Scala could not speak to that issue.

Ms. Ewing asked what kind of windows would go in the dormers. Ms. deLoach stated her hope to find old windows.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the public and the Board.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern that this was an attempt to make the building something that it isn't. It is a 1925 building which is trying to be converted to a 19th century building.

Mr. Atkins stated he was relying on the landmark report and it's statement that the verandah, though heavy in design, were appropriate to a house of this date.

Ms. Heetderks stated that she was glad that someone was taking the building in hand. However, one of the guiding principles of the guidelines is to avoid false historicism. She expressed concern that some of the proposed additions changing the inherent nature of this building and the purpose for which it was considered historic in the landmark survey.

Mr. Tremblay stated this was taking a somewhat ugly building and making it look a lot better.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know how one could tell the brick on the porch was newer. Ms. deLoach stated one could tell by looking. She also stated her belief that the front and back porches would have been matching with wood spindles. Ms. Fenton asked if any Board members had looked at the brick. Mr. Coiner had but could not tell a difference.

Ms. Ewing stated if the back porch was historic, then perhaps the front porch should look similar to provide consistency.

Mr. Knight stated he had no problems with the columns or railings on the first floor.

Mr. Tremblay asked if the railings had to meet current Code. Mr. Coiner stated that the Building Inspector had allowed a variance from the current 42 inches called for by Code.

Mr. Atkins asked if the applicant could return with a more articulate measured drawing of the one proposal after discussion. Ms. Fenton asked if there was a consensus.

Regarding the fourth item of the proposal, the BAR was against the railing.

Regarding changing the existing stair handrailing, Mr. Atkins felt they should allow some flexibility. Ms. Fenton suggested checking with the City Code in regards to that handrail.

Regarding doors and windows, Mr. Knight sought clarification that the proposal mirrors the opposite side of the building. Ms. Heetderks expressed concern with arched windows. She also

expressed concern that the mansard roof would be affected. Ms. Heetderks, Ms. Ewing and Mr. Coiner felt the windows should be square.

Regarding shutters, Mr. Tremblay stated shutters had been approved before. Ms. Heetderks referenced prior minutes to state that the motion was approved without the shutters. Ms. Heetderks referenced the guidelines, Section 4, Paragraph

(a), number 8: Use shutters only on windows that show evidence of their use in the past.

Regarding the replacement of the upper front porch door with a 15 pane door, Mr. Knight stated that was an improvement.

As regarded new paint, no one was in favor of the proposal.

Regarding the gas lamp and post on the front building, more detail was wanted including a picture from the lamp manufacturer.

Regarding the removal and replacement of existing light fixtures, there was no opposition expressed.

As regarded the suspension of a gas lantern from decorative brackets, more detail was sought about the brackets.

Regarding the removal of the exterior grill and screen and removal of existing railing, there was no opposition expressed.

Ms. Fenton called for any further Board comments. Ms. Heetderks asked if the BAR should vote point by point or recommend deferral and have the applicant return. Ms. Fenton expressed the possibility that the applicant make a presentation

at the work session to be held 1 April. Mr. Coiner did not want the work session to be sacrificed since it was important. Mr. Coiner also reminded Ms. Fenton that votes could not be

taken during a work session.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion for approval of items one through three with the caveat that the final approval of the size of the columns come to staff to meet guidelines -- presumably ten or 12 inch columns -- and with a preference for a straight spindle design. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner sought clarification that all pickets would be vertical. Mr. Tremblay concurred. Mr. Knight expressed a preference for approval of the design detail to be with the BAR. Mr. Tremblay amended his motion to come back to BAR as opposed to staff. Mr. Knight accepted the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Heetderks made a motion to deny the X-railing on the rooftop based on the guidelines, Section 4, Paragraph (e), number 8 and Section 4, Paragraph (b), number 6. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve the change the

existing stair handrail. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Knight made a motion to accept the addition of the two dormers on the driveway side. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Ms. Heetderks made a motion to deny the replacement of the dormer vents with arched windows and raising the dormer height on the basis of Section 4, Paragraph (a), number 5 about cutting larger openings in existing window openings. Mr. Coiner

seconded the motion. Mr. Tremblay asked that they approve a rectangular window opening. Ms. Heetderks retracted her motion. Mr. Tremblay made a motion that the BAR allow the applicant to replace the dormer vents with rectangular windows.

Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Tremblay made a motion to allow the shutters to be applied to the house as the applicant's requested, but not on the doors. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. Mr. Knight asked if they were being approved for the dormers. Mr. Tremblay stated he was excluding the dormers. Ms. Heetderks stated she would have to vote against a motion that was that broad. Mr. Coiner and Ms. Ewing also stated they would not support the motion. The motion failed. Mr. Tremblay made a

motion to approve shutters on the front windows only, not including the dormers nor door. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion failed. Ms. Winner made a motion to accept replacing the doors. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The

motion carried unanimously. Ms. Fenton asked for a motion to deny the paint. Ms. Heetderks made a motion to deny based on

Guideline Number 4, Paragraph (f). Ms. Ewing seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Ewing made a motion to approve the lighting and signage. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Ms. Fenton reminded the BAR that there was a note to ask for administrative approval. Ms. Ewing restated her motion to approve with administrative

approval of the details. Mr. Tremblay stated his understanding that the BAR had wanted to see a picture of the gas lantern. Ms. Ewing added the phrase "including a picture of the gas lantern." Ms. Fenton clarified that the motion was only

covering points 12 and 13. Ms. Ewing restated her motion to approve items 12 and 13, gas lantern on post in front of buildings and remove the existing light fixtures from the front and west elevations contingent on staff approval of the photo of the gas lantern. Mr. Atkins seconded the amended motion. Mr. Knight stated a preference for approval to come back to the Board rather than staff. Ms. Ewing restated the motion to approve items 12 and 13, gas lantern on post and the

removal/replacement of existing light fixtures from the front and west elevations contingent on BAR approval of the details and photos provided. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay moved for approval of item 14, suspend gas lanterns with decorative brackets subject to the confirmation of how the gas line would be incorporated in the design. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-2, with Ms.

Heetderks and Mr. Knight voting against. Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve items 15 and 16. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Ms. Winner made a motion to approve items 17 and 18. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 03-03-04
603 Watson Avenue
Tax Map 47, Parcel 43
Addition
Timothy and Jody Pruett, Applicants
Douglas Gilpin, Architect

Ms. Scala gave the staff report stating she had provided the Board members with the applicable guidelines in their packets.

Mr. Douglas Gilpin provided the BAR with photographs of the proposal. The addition would be to the back of the house and would be virtually invisible from Davis. There would be a window modification seen from Park Street.

Ms. Fenton called for comments.

Mr. Atkins expressed appreciation for the applicants coming before the Board for a preliminary discussion.

Mr. Tremblay was struck by the limited visibility of the plan while increasing the functionality of the home.

Mr. Atkins stated he felt it was subordinate to the main house. Ms. Ewing felt it was not. She would prefer a design where the main house had primary focus.

Ms. Fenton stated that it seemed that with the lack of visibility and with appropriate materials it would be something the Board would be comfortable with.

G. Discussion of Previous Approval

BAR 02-08-29
909 West Main Street
Tax Map 31, Parcel 169
Elevation Changes and Porch Reconstruction
Gabe Silverman, Applicant

Ms. Scala stated that approval had been granted for facade changes on 15 October; two letters protesting the approval had been sent to the BAR. Those letters were from Preservation Piedmont referencing two new enlarged door and window

openings on either side of the first floor historic entrance, a lengthened side porch addition and expanded door opening on the second story facade. Margaret H. MacLaughlin wrote that

modern glass doors that were installed in place of the original sash windows do not belong in this 19th century building.

Ms. Winner sought clarification on what was at issue. Ms. Heetderks stated the question was how to respond to the concerns raised by the letters. Ms. Ewing felt they did not often have adequate drawings to review proposals. She felt this was a

matter to be gone into during the work session. Mr. Atkins expressed gratitude to Preservation Piedmont for its diligence and for the letter of 18 February from Benjamin Ford. Ms. Heetderks stated she had received a phone call from a member

of the public complaining about the approval.

Ms. Fenton recognized Benjamin Ford of Preservation Piedmont to address the BAR. Mr. Ford stated he found it difficult to understand the decision made to approve 909 West Main Street. He felt the decision making process may have been flawed from

the beginning. The BAR had only received a two sentence background report from the City on September 4th. No relevant contextual information was provided about the structure.

Mr. Coiner stated more information had been provided at the meeting.

Mr. Ford stated that the same report had referenced only two design guidelines. He felt a third guideline which would have been appropriate was chapter 4, number 4: Retain all elements,

materials and features that are original to the building or are sensitive when remodeling and repair is necessary. Ms. Fenton felt that had been corrected since Ms. Scala was providing them with more information.

Mr. Ford sought the Board members who were present at the 15 October meeting to explain why they voted to approve the proposed changes to the facade in light of the design guidelines that were submitted by the staff report and also in light of

the additional guideline he had mentioned.

Ms. Fenton thought it was a very difficult question. Perhaps some of the issues addressed are not specifically everything that is in the guidelines, but are of broader context. She was torn by the City designating it as a retail area and how to make that consistent with that building. She stated she had always had a sense of what is a guideline that you have to follow, what is a

guideline that you should follow, what is a guideline that you are asked to interpret. She further stated that if the third guideline had been emphasized, she might have gone the other

way. Ms. Fenton stated that store fronts do change.

Mr. Atkins stated that the role of the BAR had been historic preservation but that over time it had taken on a broader range of compatibility, suitability, appropriateness within a given

district. He admitted he had made a mistake in focusing on the addition of a column allowing for the fact that Mr. Silverman enlarged the porte-cochere and missed it that the railing stayed

where it was with no column underneath it.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern that the BAR was a little too accommodating of people who want to adaptively reuse

buildings. She wondered how the BAR should respond to the letters. Ms. Scala stated she acknowledged the letter.

Mr. Coiner asked Mr. Ford if he had met with anyone about the make up of the Board being changed. Mr. Ford stated he had met with Jim Tolbert whose office was looking into the legality of making changes to the ordinance in terms of the composition of the Board. Ms. Fenton stated she would like to have a member who is an architect with a preservation background.

Mr. Ford acknowledged that some Board members refer to the guidelines more often than others. He asked if a greater adherence to the guidelines could be made. Ms. Fenton stated they would discuss that at the work session.

H. Approval of Minutes

February 18, 2003

Ms. Winner made a motion to approve the minutes as Presented. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

March 4, 2003

Mr. Coiner stated Ms. Lewis had asked him to make corrections: page 2, the fifth item from the bottom, Ms. Lewis thinks she said awning not shade; page 6, regarding the brick for the transit

center she said red brick. Mr. Knight made a motion to approve as amended. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called again for matters not on the agenda.

Mr. Fran Lawrence was present regarding a group home at 1328 Riverdale Drive. He had researched the property and was seeking to delist the property. The property was not on the 1976 list of historic properties. A 1981 survey identified an 1837-1840 cabin that was enclosed within an addition. On the front of that was a 1912 Colonial Revival facade. A rezoning request in 1985 does not mention the property as historic; nor is it

mentioned in 1987 when the rezoning request is approved. The structure was renovated in good faith. In 1993 the group home sought approval to connect the front structure to a cottage in the

back; approval was granted. At that time it was stated that the 1837/1840 house is gone; it was removed during the course of the 1988 renovation.

Ms. Heetderks asked if the 1912 facade was all that remained of the historic structure. Mr. Lawrence concurred.

Mr. Coiner stated his opinion that it was a legal question that needed to be worked out with the City Attorney. Ms. Ewing felt that they should see the criteria for delisting. Ms. Scala stated her belief that a delisting was a public hearing matter.

Ms. Fenton stated they could not make a decision at this time. Ms. Winner stated if it had been added by mistake, it should be delisted. Ms. Ewing had not been able to find specific criteria

for delisting. She also stated she would like to see documentation and criteria showing the reason for listing no longer existed. Ms. Fenton asked if he would be willing to do archeological digs prior to doing any construction. Ms. Heetderks stated it would help if there was no hint of what he intended to do with the property following delisting.

I. Administrative Approvals

520 East Main Street/East End Apartments -- removal of brick facade for public safety

Ms. Fenton did not call this item. There was no item J on the agenda.

K. Other Business

Ms. Fenton called for other business. There was none.

L. Adjournment

Ms. Winner made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Ewing seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:36 p.m.