

Special BAR Meeting: Amphitheater
October 5, 2004
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room

5:00 p.m.

Present: Staff:

Joan Fenton, Chair Mary Joy Scala
Joe Atkins Bill Letteri
Lynne Heetderks, Vice-Chair Jim Tolbert
Fred Wolf Judy Mueller
Syd Knight
Preston Coiner
Cheri Lewis
Katie Swenson
Wade Tremblay

Applicants:

Bill Lenart
Ken McDonald
Tim Thiel
Kirby Huttel
Lula Blackwell
Coran Capshaw

Mr. Capshaw made a brief statement regarding the proposed uses of the amphitheater: free Fridays, movies, arts & crafts festivals, nationally-known acts, and a public park 300 days of the year. He left the meeting.

Ms. Scala explained previous approvals to put the meeting's discussion in context.

Mr. Lenart spoke about the proposal: Same mall brick, 2 paths to expanded arrival area, axial to mall and tunnel; seating walls differentiate mall level from sunken aisle. Retaining walls on sides, lower retaining walls are brick, wraps to stage, brick edging, vertical treatment, ramp system, and sloping planes with railings. Seating benches horizontally and vertically with brick.

Eliminated rail along café box area except in sound box – added one additional step.

Ms. Blackwell discussed the strong mall axis, you see a tunnel in front of you to reinforce the axis, restated in lines. Shapes come from the intersection of those lines, 6 ft. apart, with lines radiating from the center of the stage equals a finely textured pattern in concrete, rendered in sandblasting, local aggregate. Wider bands – main pathways will be the exposed aggregate (same as used in the transit center).

Integrally-colored concrete – smooth-troweled and sandblasted. Brick bands on the risers as well as on the treads, 18” high. There are three- 18” high bands and one 36” band. The planters, also 18” high, are also brick.

An elevation of Avon Street showed the tunnel and a concrete wall with bands of brick every 24” – brick set in after the wall is cast. Repeat 8” concrete cap found on existing brick wall. The north wall has the same brick planters and brick bands.

We liked the maze but like this idea too, particularly the texture.

Mr. Lenart said the new strategy mediates the new transit center and older tunnel. Not radically different materials and scale.

Ms. Blackwell discussed the planting plan and moveable planters similar to the existing but fiberglass so lighter weight. Ivy on walls, Deodora cedar, low evergreens, Skimmia, cherry laurel, columnar Ghinkgos. Two rows of trees along Avon Street with evergreen ground cover. Planters in moveable planters – magnolia “little gem” and coral bark Japanese maple.

Ms. Fenton asked if there is water on site.

Mr. Lenart replied yes.

Ms. Swenson asked where the planters go in the summer?

Ms. Blackwell said probably around the port-a-johns (behind the Annex and Rec. Center). We have reduced the number of planters and have eliminated the topiaries.

Mr. Thiel showed a slide show of examples of materials used on the Downtown Mall, concrete interspersed with large brick areas. Chains used to delineated café type areas. Intersections are concrete. Moveable planters. Black chain around fountain, need for strong structural material, terracing by the Omni, 1-1/2” round pipe railing, black chairs. Will upgrade the temporary Fridays’ fencing.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone from the general public had questions. There were none.

She asked if the BAR members had questions.

Mr. Wolf asked about drainage and storm water.

Mr. Thiel said part of the City’s relocation project, new outfall to artificial detention on Lexus side. Normal lawn area, all vertical walls have under drains.

Mr. Wolf asked if there would be no exposed drainage?

The applicant said there would be ribbon drains along the footings to allow intermittent collection.

Mr. Coiner asked where the concessions set up?

Mr. McDonald said near the transit center. Temporarily, during the 1st season they will set up on 7th Street.

Mr. Knight asked about the finish on the vertical concrete. He was told it would have a light sandblasted finish.

Mr. Wolf asked about control joints.

Mr. Lenart cautioned about too much scoring. Like the scale adjustments of brick banding, right now – orderly.

Ms. Swenson asked the size [of the polygons] of concrete? She noted that it looks like a busy drawing but they are really large areas (6ft. x 6 ft.)

Mr. Coiner asked if they have chosen the stage material, but was told no.

Mr. Lenart said the stage will be concrete – not sure what color.

Ms. Fenton asked about approval of the plantings.

Ms. Swenson asked about the resolution of the walkway and rail where it connects to the bridge?

Mr. McDonald said that was in WRT's contact.

Mr. Letteri said the form and location have been established. There will be poles supporting the tent that will clear that location.

Mr. Coiner asked about temporary fencing?

Mr. McDonald mentioned post and cable, will be set up the day of, then go away. Lighting is not fully addressed.

Ms. Heetderks asked the color of the checkerboard pattern.

Ms. Blackwell said no more than two colors. Two textures and one color, plus the aggregate paths.

Ms. Swenson asked if the rail would be around the sound booth at all times?

The answer was yes. Mr. Lenart said there would be stair rails. During shows there will be temporary rails with sleeves implanted – holes plugged off-season.

Ms. Fenton asked if the temporary rail comes back to the BAR for approval? Put into motion what is coming back.

Ms. Lewis said the BAR has not yet seen any railing.

Mr. Atkins asked about the larger walls on the perimeter – striated brick – are they using a header course?

Are the ramp walls along the stage of brick?

The answer was a 4” brick band. The remaining walls are 36”, 18”, 18”, 18” – all brick with treads and risers. 18” planters are completely brick.

Ms. Fenton asked for other questions.

Mr. Atkins said when you tuck under the walkway...

Mr. Lenart said the seat wall wraps around to the handicapped ramp area.

Restrooms for the amphitheater are on the upper side of the transit center; other restrooms for transit center are in the transit center.

Mr. Atkins said the remaining issue is of scale, but we approved previously so must set that aside...

The walls are well-addressed with the possible exception of paving... two textures, two surfaces of concrete throughout.

1/3 – 2/3 rule: if 1/3 different material - brick or stone. Guidelines suggest brick or concrete paving units or a scored concrete. Although the pattern changes, it is the same color. The outer ring invited a different material.

Mr. Wolf said what is missed is more casual opportunity for seating for families. Some green parking systems exist – difficulty is to get light under canopy...pedestrian traffic and vehicular traffic...

Hard to get around the quantity of hardscape. I appreciate this strategy – like better than previous, but a lot of concrete. Relinquish part of back to more green area?

Ms. Swenson said contractual arrangement – size of canopy – we argued over the rear portion but canopy dictated grass would not grow there. For the record – people love that grassy space.

Mr. Knight – appreciate all that has been done. A great deal of improvements.

Agree with Mr. Atkins and Wolf – the nature of the beast. When size was agreed on, a lot of options went out the window. Far better than last time – have concerns, not answers. Visual patterning – like pavement pattern, am concerned about that juxtaposed with the banded walls. A bit much? Look for simplicity in walls, bowl area is greatly improved, poured concrete colored,

scored, still problematic in long run. Concrete is one of the least durable materials – it cracks, spalls, flakes, and chips over time.

Utility repairs will require patches that won't look like the original. It won't look like this for long. The walls also cause me heartburn.

Mr. Tremblay – but you will see it in pieces, not like the drawing.

Mr. Atkins discussed the graphic noise – pattern vs. the striping. Guidelines go to materials, unit pavers or brick. Perhaps outer band should be a unit paver to elevate the quality of materials. A 2 ft band gives a sense of scale, dramatic improvement. Worry about the resolution of the 2 ft band – not too many raw edges – with topography, transition points need to be handled carefully.

Ms. Swenson – are brick walks an option?

Answer – looking at whole palette.

Ms. Swenson – this is a very large paved space. Maybe walls are a place to simplify. If walls receded would be helpful.

Mr. Lenart – we discussed the importance of vegetation as an acoustical blanket – banding allows walls to stand alone but ivy will mitigate large area. Two layers – green buffering sound.

Mr. Knight – point well taken – I'm rooting for the ivy. Perhaps modulating dimension – also look at an opportunity to look at this whole thing as one level, then this whole thing as one level... maybe everything below the band is brick.

Mr. Lenart – a real study – creates spaces to unify entire environment.

Mr. Tremblay more landscaped than exists today – neat environment especially when the tent is in place – meets my test of what a City park should look like.

Ms. Fenton – concrete amphitheater at UVA works as a park.

Mr. Wolf – between grass and brick. Dedicated circulation?

Ms. Fenton – it is allowed – granted permission to do by Council – can we approved it? Comments form the public?

There was none.

Mr. Atkins- it would improve the project and make it more appropriate if outer most ring were unit pavers? Brick or concrete pavers?

Mr. Wolf – prefer concrete pavers. If brick, some benefit conceptually – reduces perception of scale. This paving pattern does not bother me.

Mr. Knight – Agree with Mr. Wolf – not another material introduced (concrete precast pavers). Unified approach to pavement makes sense – under tent most of the year. Still wrestling with what they are asking to be approved.

Ms. Swenson – should walls be brick? Brick provides neutrality – action is somewhere else.

Mr. Coiner and Mr. Tremblay – no comments.

Ms. Lewis – like bands of brick in the retaining wall. Lining up with Ms. Swenson and Mr. Atkins introducing more brick. Brick has a mitigating effect. In general like the Belmont Bridge brick brought into walls- like planters – good shape – portable weight/material. Like step up retaining walls each level.

Mr. Wolf – Also think the treatment of walls drastically improved by brick coursing. All brick would be great – would quiet down the graphic noise. Paving pattern acceptable. Visually the perception that it is dramatically different will go away. Like color of concrete they are showing. Brick seat walls make a big difference. Only thing – better sense of arrival with two paths but seems like a little bit of collision- could be more there in terms of how two things meet.

Ms. Heetderks – Structural issue using brick paving on upper level?

Mr. Lenart – yes, heavy cranes, etc.

Ms. Heetderks – make walls entirely brick.

Mr. Lenart – complicated – existing brick on bridge – pattern, color... ivy on the wall. Spalding problems on brick.

Ms. Swenson – tenuous moment in application – lack of perspective how bowl meets walls. Discomfort of approving and hoping it won't be too loud, etc. Want conservative background and neat central feature.

Mr. Atkins – railing, site metal (?), lighting, color palette. Three samples of texture and color and B.D. (?) Prefer gray sample and aggregate if colors are accurate. Final coordination of elements, top of wall, how all materials come together. Drawings representative of other side for our purposes.

Better to have a foil - brick with concrete - against Belmont Bridge.

Paving pattern is bound on all sides by brick check walls or exposed aggregate.

Mr. Thiel- ribbons can happen at floor elevation.

Mr. Atkins – planting swaths

“Winter Beige” 1/2 sandblast, 1/2 smooth. Like darker color of concrete.

Mr. Knight – Simplification of graphic pattern – one material rather than banding.

Mr. Atkins – Move to approve amphitheater project as submitted particularly with respect to public improvements section of the guidelines: streets/ walks/curbs, guideline # 7; walls and fences, guideline #2, character and scale. Preface by reference to Ms. Fenton’s comments residual concerns with scale, private use of public amenity have been given by lease agreement. Scale of tent and conceptual scale of Amphitheater overall seating numbers – approaching being inappropriate in terms of scale. Brick and stone, unit paving or scored concrete, meets guidelines.

The applicant should come back to the BAR for approval of aggregate and sandblasted concrete base; sample for color and texture of brick and mortar; railings, lighting, final coordination of elements, top of wall. Banding of brick in concrete as previously discussed. Would look favorably on planting plan.

Brick walls 18” and 36,” check walls of ramp, facing walls on stairs, brick band and concrete on large walls.

Mr. Wolf – 2nd the motion

Ms. Lewis made an amendment that was not accepted.

Mr. Atkins : Accept banding as drawn with request to perhaps revisit banding and revisit top of wall so they are carefully designed.

Mr. Knight – and the level of detail required of other applicants.

Motion passed 7-2, with Heetderks and Knight voting against.

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
October 19, 2004**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair
Lynne Heetderks, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Fred Wolf
Cheri Lewis
Katie Swenson

Absent:

Joe Atkins
Syd Knight

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Ms. Fenton convened the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

A. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Fenton called for amendments to the 21 September 2004 minutes. Ms. Lewis stated that Mr. Ackerman's name was listed on page 2 as Jay; it should be Dave Ackerman. Ms. Lewis also asked that the first sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 8 read: "Ms. Lewis expressed concern over whether the non owner-occupied properties were given notice of the proposed district."

Ms. Heetderks moved to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Matters from the public

Ms. Fenton called for matters from the public not on the formal agenda. There were none.

C. Preliminary Discussion

305 East Jefferson Street – new ATM structure

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The matter had been before the Board on July 20th; at that time a request for a new walk up ATM and portico on the front of the building was denied. The applicant seeks to pursue a freestanding ATM structure in the back where a dogwood tree is located. Ms. Scala had visited the site and asked the applicant to consider placing the ATM in the back of the building where there was a cutout; the interior layout of the building will not allow that. Ms. Scala felt the applicant would need to provide a sidewalk access to the ATM.

Mr. Frank Ebbert, representing BB&T, presented the Board with supplementary information. Besides building issues, the applicant did not want to use the cutout space due to safety and security issues.

Ms. Fenton called for feedback from the members.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that Scheme 2 was preferred. Mr. Ebbert concurred.

Ms. Swenson expressed concern about how the building next to BB&T would be affected.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the proposed position of the ATM. Mr. Ebbert explained the ATM machine would face the drive-through lanes; the face of the ATM would be in the center of the building.

Ms. Lewis asked if the applicant would consider locating it on the parking lot side to lessen the lighting. Mr. Ebbert explained the lighting would be cones of light and would not have a big affect on the area.

Mr. Coiner asked that the resubmittal show both sides to the structure.

Mr. Wolf found it preferable to have the door on the opposite side of the structure. He preferred Option 7 except for the split roof.

Ms. Fenton sought and received consensus from the members regarding: placement of the door on the opposite side; and materials mimicking the look of the building.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-10-02

106 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 22

Replace C'ville storefront

Gate Pratt, Limehouse Architects, LC, Applicant, and Rob Jiranek and Bill Chapman, Owners

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property had been before the Board in October 2003; approval had been granted for removal of the horizontal brown strip and for the C'ville sign. The applicant seeks to: replace the existing storefront with a new clear anodized aluminum and glass storefront; paint the exterior stucco white; back light the existing sign with white neon; move the existing stone pavers in the area between the Mall and the existing recessed doorway. Staff suggested using at least two colors in the storefront to highlight the architectural elements. Staff suggested retaining the masonry area under the existing storefront rather than having the glass come all the way down.

Mr. Gate Pratt, of Limehouse Architects, stated the intention was to renovate the lobby and give more space inside.

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

Ms. Swenson wanted to know what strategy was planned for dealing with the requirement for protecting the entrance from the weather. Mr. Pratt stated he would consult with the owner about whether he preferred a canopy or to recess the entrance.

Ms. Fenton felt it might be better for the applicant to return at a future time since he needed to rethink the entrance.

Ms. Swenson thought the idea of bringing the glass from the funky angle out to the street was great.

Ms. Lewis felt back lighting the sign would not be a problem. She suggested the applicant consider staff's proposal of a dual color scheme to bring out the architectural elements.

Ms. Heetderks moved to defer on this application to give the applicant additional time to consider weather protection for the entryway and other issues as mentioned. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-10-03

709 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcel 156

Modify Starr Hill storefront

Starr Hill Restaurant, Applicant, and Jessie Hook, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant plans to modify the existing brewing equipment room into a new cafe space. The applicant seeks to create a more open storefront by replacing the existing fixed transparent glass window with an operable system of glass panels capable of opening in warmer months. The applicant would retain the existing glass block transom and limestone base. The proposed design is functional and appealing; it is compatible with the building and district. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Jim Rounsevell was present to answer questions.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification if the base in the proposed was the same as the existing. Mr. Rounsevell stated it was.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the applicant had a sample of the proposed glass. Mr. Rounsevell did not; however, it was manufactured by the same company that did the system for Escafe.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve as submitted and request the applicant consider moving the star to the far western storefront window. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-10-04

408 East Market Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 54.1

Replace awning and alter door panel -- Maclin Building

408 East Market Condo Association, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting: to replace the existing red canvas awning with a copper awning; remove the existing front glass and replace that with smaller panels of patterned translucent glass with a dark bronze anodized frame. Ms. Scala stated the glass had already been replaced at the time of application. Staff felt copper was an appropriate material for the canopy. Ms. Scala stated the applicant had said the side canopies, which were in bad repair, would be replaced with cloth canopies in a color to match the copper. The 6x6 inch fir posts and the downspouts would be enclosed in 1x10 inch fir boxed trim. Staff felt the top, hidden, gutter should also be made in copper and all of the wood parts of the canopy should be painted. Staff would like to review and approve the recessed lighting. The scale and material of the new aluminum storefront is appropriate. The Guidelines do not address patterned glass; clear glass in the exterior wall would have been more in keeping with the surrounding area.

Mr. Larry Howard, president of the condominium association, stated the cloth canopy kept getting vandalized and damaged and the cloth would also allow leakage into the building. He stated the glass had been replaced because it didn't work anymore and was leaking; the glass company was supposed to have installed clear glass.

Ms. Fenton called for questions or comments from the public. There were none. She then called for questions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification if approval should have been sought to replace the glass. Ms. Scala affirmed it should have been. Mr. Coiner then asked why approval had not been sought. Mr. Howard stated his assumption that it had been taken care of. Mr. Howard apologized to the Board.

Ms. Heetderks recognized the complications with property owners and associations and proper notice being given, the problem confronting the Board was that they must consider this project as if none of it had been done. The Guidelines did not address patterned glass, but they did address clear versus tinted. The Guidelines state do not use tinted or mirrored glass on major facades of the building.

Ms. Lewis felt that a residential building might have a good reason, for security reasons, to have an obscure type of glass. She was prepared to give some leniency as far as the obscured feature of the glass.

Mr. Wolf respected Ms. Heetderks' comments but felt some leniency towards the patterned glass.

Ms. Fenton asked for comments and concerns about the awning.

Mr. Wolf thought the copper awning made sense. He was less sure about the columns encased in fir and how that related to the language of the rest of the building.

Ms. Swenson agreed with Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Tremblay was also uncomfortable with the wood column.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the replacement windows, existing storefront glass panels and front glass with smaller panels of patterned or blemished obscure glass as has already been altered on the building and defer to allow the applicant to return with more details on replacing the existing red canvas awning with a copper awning. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson stated a preference for a motion that said they wholly support the use of copper on the roof and they were concerned about the columns and how they relate to the rest of the building. Ms. Lewis accepted that friendly amendment as did Mr. Tremblay. Ms. Fenton called the question. The motion carried 6-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

Ms. Fenton stated the applicant should provide more detail in the next submittal. Mr. Coiner stated they needed to see what the building would look like on all sides. Ms. Lewis added that a front elevation from Market Street was needed. Mr. Coiner also asked that dimensions be shown.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 04-10-05
107 Fifth Street Southeast
Tax Map 28 Parcel 51
Comprehensive Sign Application
Fifth and Water, LLC, by Steve Von Storch, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Board has the ability to waive or modify the requirements of the Sign Ordinance by approving a comprehensive signage plan. The applicant is asking for six projecting signs and two wall signs. Staff thinks the projecting signs are fine. The number of signs does not appear excessive and works well on Fifth Street. Wall signs are not normally allowed above the second story window sill or 20 feet height, whichever is less. The aggregate area of signs is excessive for one parcel.

There were no members of the public to speak to the matter.

Mr. Mike Stone King provided the Board a full sized projecting sign.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the Board.

Ms. Swenson reminded the Board of the situation regarding York Place and the importance of designing a good sign package that accommodates the needs of the users. It was appropriate to

encourage the buildings that were providing a lot of different economic opportunities for small businesses. She wholly supported the use of the number of signs and she also supported the way they hang out from the building and their general design.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification to how far out of scale the signage was. Ms. Scala explained that the signs may not be out of line on an individual basis. The total aggregate area of all signs for one parcel in the Downtown Corridor is 60 square feet; the aggregate of the proposal is over 100 square feet. Ms. Scala suggested keeping each wall sign 25 square feet.

Ms. Heetderks expressed concern about staff's concerns about granting variations from the ordinance easily since this was only the second comprehensive signage application.

Ms. Lewis was in favor of limiting the wall signs to 25 square feet.

Ms. Swenson left the meeting at 6:18 p.m.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the projecting signs as presented in the application. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Lewis moved to defer on the wall sign to incorporate comments from the Board. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting stood in recess at 6:21 p.m.

Ms. Fenton reconvened the meeting at 6:33 p.m. in the NDS conference room. Mr. Coiner suggested they skip to Item I on the agenda.

I. BAR Elections

Mr. Coiner suggested holding elections in January 2005 after new members had been appointed to the Board and due to the absence of three members.

Ms. Fenton sought clarification if that were a motion to defer. Mr. Coiner concurred. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried, 5-0-1; Ms. Fenton abstained from voting.

Ms. Lewis stated she wished to reverse her previous feeling that there should not be a member of the Planning Commission on the BAR based on comments by Board members about the connection between the Charlottesville Planning Commission and BAR.

J. Appoint Oakhurst Circle Historic District sub-committee

Ms. Lewis nominated Ms. Swenson, Mr. Atkins, and Mr. Knight to the three-person Oakhurst-Gildersleeve sub-committee. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Matters from the public

There were no matters from the public.

H. BAR Bylaws Amendments

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. She had entered the bylaws onto the computer and updated state codes, which had changed. The bylaws were then sent to the City Attorney for review. Suggestions made by BAR members had been included.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of bylaw 2.4. Ms. Lewis stated any meeting involving at least three members was a public meeting and needed to be noticed. Ms. Fenton felt the issue was whether an applicant could come to a work session and present a change to a previous submittal without it having been noticed. Mr. Coiner felt a work session involved conversation. Ms. Lewis felt a special meeting was a not regularly scheduled monthly meeting at which matters are taken up. Mr. Coiner shared Ms. Lewis' concern about voting on an application, which had not been noticed. Ms. Fenton asked if the bylaws could include that if an applicant was asked to come back with details, the Board may approve those details during the matters not on the agenda. Mr. Coiner stated that was not noticed. Ms. Fenton asked if deferred items could be listed on the notice as possibly coming back. Mr. Wolf felt that made the potential for a long running list of items, which have been deferred and may not have come back. Ms. Lewis felt a continual notice would defeat the notice requirement and could be subject to a lawsuit. Ms. Lewis expressed concern about combining work sessions and special meetings; work sessions should continue to be a place where there is no official action.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern about applicants staying seated in the back of the auditorium during the question and answer period. Ms. Lewis suggested 4.2 say after the staff has presented the case, the applicant shall be asked to proceed to the podium and given the opportunity to speak first.

Ms. Fenton felt the members should be given more notice than three days for amending bylaws. Ms. Lewis suggested two weeks notice.

Ms. Heetderks felt the 24-hour notice mentioned in 2.6 was not long enough.

Ms. Lewis asked if Ms. Kelley could be asked about notice requirements.

L. Other Business

Mr. Coiner stated a replacement needed to be found for Ms. Fenton on the Revolving Loan Fund. Mr. Wolf would replace Ms. Fenton on 1 January 2005.

Ms. Heetderks stated there were several properties on Preston Avenue for which she was interested in pursuing individual historic designations. She sought clarification on the process. Ms. Scala was trying to get a list of all properties the Board would like to designate. Ms. Fenton suggested a meeting between Ms. Heetderks, Ms. Scala and the NDS intern; perhaps they could be a committee to recommend additions or removals of properties from the list. Ms. Lewis felt

individual designations should be a matter of public record that people could access; the most logical place would be on the tax record.

Ms. Lewis stated she would not be at the November meeting and would be off the Board in December. She stated it had been her pleasure to serve on the Board and she reluctantly gives it up. She felt the Board was a professional group of people and the caliber of the people was incredibly high and the discussions were fair to applicants but also safeguard the resources of the City. Ms. Lewis also stated Ms. Fenton was a really great Chair. Ms. Lewis thanked Ms. Fenton for her level of dedication and everything that she did for the City. Ms. Fenton thanked Ms. Lewis for having been on the Board.

M. Adjournment

Ms. Lewis moved to adjourn. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Ms. Fenton called the question. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:28 p.m.