

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
April 19, 2005**

Minutes

Present: Absent:

Joe Atkins, Chair Syd Knight
Fred Wolf, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Amy Gardner
Lynne Heetderks
Bill Lucy
Kate Swenson

Also Present:
Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Atkins convened the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

A. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Scala stated the draft minutes had not yet been received. Mr. Atkins continued to the next item on the agenda.

B. Matters from the public

There were no matters from the public.

**C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 05-03-03 (Deferred from March 15, 2005)
East side of Fifth Street, Southwest
Tax Map 29 Parcel 11
Create mural on retaining wall
Alia Anderson, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The retaining wall is adjacent to The Station restaurant. The applicant had not been present for the March meeting at which the BAR had approved the mural in concept. Staff has determined the wall is located in the City right of way, but the mural would not require City Council approval. Staff feels this is an ideal location and recommends approval.

Ms. Alia Anderson explained that the artist's style was the use of reclaimed tile scraps. The mural would be designed and implemented over a weekend when the artist saw the materials which had been gathered. The theme is food, markets and flowers.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public. There were none. He then called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Coiner asked if there was a participation fee. Ms. Anderson stated each person would pay \$150; the project budget was coming from each person involved.

Ms. Swenson sought clarification of how the theme was established and who was the community involved in the project. Ms. Anderson stated the community was friends and coworkers of hers who felt there was a need for community-based art. She explained the theme had come from Gabe Silverman who felt the theme should stick with the Main Street market area. She further stated that Mr. Silverman would be sponsoring several students from the Living Education Center and Virginia Tile would be sponsoring several members from the Fifeville Neighborhood.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner, while supporting public art, expressed reservations about supporting a project that he did not know how it would look. For that reason, he would vote against the mural.

Ms. Swenson felt design was both a process and a product and that the process of the design seemed to be well thought out and carefully considered.

Mr. Wolf felt a substantial number of people from that community should be involved in it so that it doesn't feel like something that has been placed into someone else's neighborhood.

Ms. Swenson moved to approve the application as submitted for a community mural that will draw on the donated materials that Virginia Tile and other local sources under the guidance of Isaiah Zagar and with potential community engagement for the creation of a mural to revitalize the street. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins offered a friendly amendment that it meet the public art section of the guidelines in public improvements considering the place making role of any new features. Ms. Swenson and Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried, 7-1; Mr. Coiner voted against.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-02

1 Gildersleeve Wood

Tax Map 11 Parcel 20

Replace and enlarge front porch

Art and Sue Keyser, Applicants

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks to replace the existing porch with a larger porch with painted fiberglass columns and with a standing seam copper roof with a pitch change just above the eave. The main issue was whether the design of the roof is appropriate to the Dutch Colonial Revival style of the house. The second issue was the use of fiberglass instead of painted wood or composition columns.

Mr. Atkins called for questions of the applicant from the public and then from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that the gutters would also be copper. Mr. Keyser stated it may not be done because they have brand new guttering and gutter guards.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and the Board.

Mr. Wolf stated there seemed to be a slight difference between the front elevation and the perspective drawing; the front elevation implied a gentle curve rather than a hard break in the roof. Mr. Wolf felt the difference was important as the front elevation seemed more appropriate and in keeping with the style of the house.

Ms. Swenson felt this porch roof style was potentially a good style. Ms. Swenson wondered if the Board could approve from a perspective sketch.

Mr. Coiner wondered if the Board could require the applicants to provide a final drawing to staff. Mr. Atkins felt they could ask that of the applicant; he also stated the option of assuming the proportions were correct in the elevation provided and the final product would be according to that drawing. Mr. Wolf felt they could use the drawing provided with the application rather than having a measured drawing brought back.

Ms. Gardner expressed concern about fiberglass columns on a house of this era.

Mr. Wolf moved that they approve the application as submitted, finding the proposed changes compatible with the property and other buildings in the district specifically regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 1, 9, and 10 and the Guidelines for Additions C, D, F, and G, provided: one, that the drawing that is labeled as View of Porch on Keyser House, which is the frontal elevation, is used as the prevailing image in terms of the appearance of the porch roof; two, that the existing roof eave is not damaged by the proposed porch replacement; three, that the columns be of wood rather than fiberglass; and, four, that any paint chip samples be brought back for staff approval; the approval of the Low-E film, which is to be on the interior of the windows, is approved with the understanding that it is effectively clear and unperceivable. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-06

315 East High Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 67

Landscape plan for City Circuit Courthouse

City of Charlottesville, Owner

John B. Mann, Landscape Manager

City of Charlottesville, Applicant

Ms. Scala suggested the Board hear this later in the meeting as the Landscape Manager had been called out of town. She stated he had asked that the Board review the application. Ms. Scala also had comments from Syd Knight who also was not present.

Mr. Atkins concurred with Ms. Scala's suggestion.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-04
112 Fourth Street Northeast
Tax Map 53 Parcel 56
New entry door
Main Street Associates, LLC, Owner
Bruce R. Wardell, Architect, PC, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking to replace the exterior storefront-type door with a new, custom mahogany and glass door and sidelight and door trim. The existing outer door trim, transom, and header are to remain. The proposal retains the original door opening. The new design uses materials compatible with the property and the district. Staff recommends approval.

David Zimmerman, of Bruce Wardell Architects, had nothing to add but was present to answer questions.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification of the dimension of the sidelight glass, presuming it to be approximately six inches. Mr. Zimmerman concurred that it seemed to be six inches.

Mr. Tremblay moved to approve the application as submitted, finding that the proposed changes are compatible with the property and with other buildings in the historic district specifically regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 1, 9, and 10, and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, specifically Facade Improvements, number 6. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner expressed his support for the application and stated he would also support it if the applicant wanted to put the address above the door rather than on the door. Mr. Tremblay accepted that as a friendly amendment as did Mr. Lucy. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-07
1700 University Avenue
Tax Map 9 Parcel 141
Replace front stairs, walkways, and Chancellor Street side stairs
St. Paul's Memorial Church, Owner
Albiston Associates, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Staff met with a church representative in May, 2004, to discuss possible administrative approval of changes to the steps and walkways. Staff had E-mailed Board members to see if they agreed to administrative approval; however, several expressed concerns with replacing the brick landing, replacing the handrails, and with using precast stairs rather than cast in place stairs. Based on those concerns, staff informed the applicant that administrative approval would not be granted for precast stairs or a concrete landing. The current application is to replace the front walkway stairs -- consisting of 13 steps, a landing, and five more steps -- the

six steps to Chancellor Street, the walkway around the front and west side of the building leading to the preschool area, and the two steps to the preschool. The existing brick landing would be replaced with a new brick landing in the same herringbone pattern laid in mortar, they would maintain the brick cheek walls, they will refinish and reinstall the black handrails. They propose to replace the stairs with precast concrete stairs in order to keep the same detail shown on the church's stone steps in provided photographs. They plan to replace the exposed aggregate concrete walkways with natural color, broom finished concrete. The applicant should be commended for trying to match and improve the existing conditions, especially keeping the brick cheek walls and refinishing the handrails. A more traditional natural color concrete is preferred over the previously suggested pink color. Staff was unable to provide guidance on the use of precast stairs versus cast in place stairs. Staff felt setting the brick in sand would lengthen the life of the brick.

Ms. Louise Gallagher presented additional photographs to the Board.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and the Board. There being none, he called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Wolf felt the precast stairs made perfect sense.

Mr. Wolf moved to approve the application as submitted, finding the proposed changes were compatible with the property and other sites of the historic district, specifically regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 1, 5, and 6, and the Guidelines for Site Elements which include walls and fences number 1, and walkways and driveways number 1. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. Mr. Tremblay offered a friendly amendment of offering the applicant the option of setting the brick in sand. Mr. Wolf and Ms. Swenson accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-06-05

East Water Street and East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Transit Center and Amphitheater and Mall Extension (Design Changes)

WRT & ftl/ Architects

In the absence of a representative from the architects, this matter was deferred to later in the meeting.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-08

1601 University Avenue

Tax Map 9 Parcel 100

New plastic projecting sign

David M. Austin, Performance Maintenance for Starbucks Coffee Company, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Starbucks is requesting to replace the wood projecting sign, which was stolen, with a plastic projecting sign on the same corner bracket. Other signs on the property are a wall sign on Elliewood Avenue and a hanging wooden sign over the front entrance. Staff would have approved a wood or composite replacement sign administratively; however, the applicant chose to come before the Board to request the plastic version. Staff recommends wood or MOD composition-type material or metal. Internally lit signs are not permitted in historic districts.

In the absence of the applicant, Mr. Atkins queried the Board with regard to proceeding with the application.

Ms. Heetderks found it hard to imagine what the applicant could say to make the Board approve the sign since it was clearly in violation of the Guidelines.

Mr. Atkins called for comments or questions from the public. There were none. Mr. Atkins then called for comments or questions from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks moved to deny the application as submitted, finding that the proposed plastic sign is not compatible with the property and other buildings in the historic district specifically regarding Ordinance standard number 1 and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Signs, number 6. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson asked if the applicant could submit an application for a wooden sign to be approved administratively; Ms. Scala concurred. The motion carried unanimously.

With the presence of representatives from WTR and ftl, the Board revisited item H.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-06-05

East Water Street and East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Transit Center and Amphitheater and Mall Extension (Design Changes)

WRT & ftl/ Architects

Ms. Scala stated the applicants had submitted an E-mail, of which the Board had received a copy.

Mr. Ed Kopp, Acting Project Manager for the Transit Center and an employee of McDonough Bolyard Peck representing the City, stated the first item was a proposal to amend the approval of modular concrete block wall on the large retaining wall on Water Street by requesting the use of Redi-Rock as approved within the amphitheater; they sought to use that for appearance and consistency.

Item two was a proposal to use a Southern Yellow Pine in place of Douglas Fir; the applicant had a sample for the Board. This proposal was also to meet LEED requirements.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification as to when the LEED concept had been considered. Mr. Antonio Fiol-Silva stated it had been early in the process. Ms. Swenson expressed pleasure that the applicants were taking the LEED approach since this would be the first LEED project in Charlottesville.

Mr. Kopp stated bids had been received and, even though cost may not be a concern to the Board, the project was over budget and they were seeking ways to reduce the costs.

Mr. Fiol-Silva stated the Lebanese Cedar could not be recycled for use as wood trim because of the length of the material and the way it would weather. They proposed mahogany instead. Mr. Fiol-Silva also stated they sought to use mahogany for the windows for consistency.

Mr. Fiol-Silva stated they wanted to have the sunscreen revert back to being an aluminum sunscreen. Mr. Kopp stated there was a proposal to replace the copper roof on the bus canopy with a TPO membrane.

Mr. Kopp stated the fifth item was to use the same handrail as that proposed for the Amphitheater.

Mr. Kopp informed the Board that the paved pedestrian connections from the Mall to the Amphitheater, even though it had been shown on some common plans with the Amphitheater, was not within the design of the Mall or the Transit Center.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Atkins stated there was confusion between the Transit Center project and the Amphitheater Project about the sculptural seat wall and pathway. He expressed concern that this was abandoned by both projects since it was an approved and expected component of the project. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated this was firmly outside the scope of the Transit Center project.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Ms. Heetderks was frustrated by the proposal. This building was a radical departure from what is normally approved in an historic district. It had been approved on the basis of its materials which were considered to be compatible with the historic district. One by one, those features are disappearing, leaving a building which is not warm and inviting anymore. She would not approve the replacement of the sunscreen with aluminum, nor would she approve replacement of the bus canopy roof from copper to membrane. She also had serious reservations about the Yellow Pine.

Mr. Wolf felt the Douglas Fir was the better, more appropriate material. He agreed the bus canopy should be copper and the sunscreen should not be aluminum.

Ms. Swenson stated she would not have approved the Redi-Rock if there had been ample samples or pictures of the material.

Mr. Tremblay felt there was no obvious difference between the Yellow Pine and the Douglas Fir. He expressed concern about obsessing over it and wondered what difference it made if it worked.

Mr. Atkins suggested the Board first consider the modular concrete block substitution and the handrail design to match the Amphitheater.

Mr. Tremblay moved approval for the use of the modular block consistent with what they had already approved, and with the railing system it would be consistent throughout. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner stated the Redi-Rock had been approved with the condition that they be able to finish the top in a manner that was acceptable to the Board; it was his understanding that they had not yet developed how they would finish it. Mr. Atkins' key issue was consistency; he thought those details and handrails should be the same. Ms. Swenson concurred that they should vote for consistency but she expressed concern about the newness of Redi-Rock as a material. Ms. Swenson wondered if they should defer that until the process was completed by the Amphitheater designers. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated they stood ready to accept whatever the Board told the Amphitheater designers so they could be consistent with them. Mr. Atkins offered a friendly amendment that using the same material consistently through the two projects is approved pending final solution of the caps. Mr. Tremblay accepted the amendment. Ms. Swenson would like to vote for consistency but was not prepared to put a vote forward to the Redi-Rock. Mr. Wolf was apprehensive about voting for something he had not seen, but would vote that the railing be consistent. Ms. Gardner concurred with Mr. Wolf. Ms. Heetderks concurred also and wondered if they should defer the matter until they could see a sample of the material. Mr. Tremblay withdrew his motion.

Ms. Gardner moved to defer making a decision on items 1 and 5 until they saw a sample submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion passed, 7-1; Mr. Atkins voted against.

Ms. Heetderks moved to deny the use of Southern Yellow Pine in place of Douglas Fir; to deny the use of aluminum for the sunscreen; and to deny the replacement of the copper on the bus canopy with membrane. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Ms. Scala asked if the motion included the aluminum around the windows. Mr. Atkins felt they needed to include that in the motion. Ms. Heetderks stated she would include denying that as well. Ms. Gardner accepted the amendment. The motion passed, 6-2; Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Atkins voted against.

Mr. Atkins called for a recess at 7:06 p.m. The Board reconvened at 7:26 p.m.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-05

230 Court Square

Tax Map 53 Parcel 104

Front porch, signage, and shutters

Townsquare Associates, LLC, Owner

Candace M.P. Smith, Architect, PC, Applicant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. 230 Court Square is an 1820 storehouse that was absorbed into a 1961 renovation; the only remaining evidence of the older building is the upper rear. The applicant proposes to add a new porch at the front entry. Signage is proposed in two locations, on the entablature and tenant signage on the wall beside the entrance. New shutters painted green-black are proposed sized to match the sash opening. Since the building is fairly recent, the only issues are whether the proposed design and materials are compatible with the district. An old photograph shows there is precedent for a simple porch and shutters at the location although they may not have been in place in the mid-1800s. The materials are consistent; however, the design seems somewhat grand for the Court Square area. Of the three suggested designs, the hip roof design is more in keeping with the simple 19th century Court Square architecture. The signage meets the ordinance and is compatible in size, location, color and materials, but staff recommends the tenant sign should be made of one consistent material. Shutters should be operable.

Ms. Candace Smith presented the Board with photographs of other buildings in the vicinity with wrought iron railings. Ms. Smith expressed her preference for the design with the railing above the roof rather than using a hip roof because it complements the area of Court Square that has black wrought iron railings on numerous areas and because the slope of the hip roof requires a lower entablature.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the shutters would be operable. Ms. Smith stated they would.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Ms. Heetderks agreed with Staff's assessment of the hip roof as she found it to be more compatible with the certain restraint of that particular section of Court Square.

Mr. Coiner echoed Ms. Heetderks' comments.

Mr. Atkins stated his tendency would be to approve any of the schemes and leave it open to the applicant to choose.

Mr. Lucy also felt all of the schemes were appropriate.

Mr. Tremblay shared Mr. Atkins' sense and would be agreeable to either of the two general concepts and would like to give the applicant latitude.

Mr. Atkins stated he would be willing to accept the applicant's approach of having consistently sized signage of various materials. He stated the shutters seemed appropriate.

Ms. Swenson moved to approve the application as submitted with the choice of A, B, C, or proposed, with the option to add operable shutters being that the proposed changes are compatible with the property and other buildings in the historic district specifically regarding Ordinance Standards number 1, 2, 4, and 7 and Guidelines for New Construction and Additions,

Roofs and Materials. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment expressing a strong preference for scheme B. Ms. Swenson and Mr. Tremblay accepted the amendment. The motion passed, 7-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

K. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-03

223-A Fourth Street Southwest

Tax Map 29 Parcel 42

Demolition of building

Piedmont Housing Alliance, Applicant

Ms. Swenson stated she would abstain from this application as she is an employee of the Piedmont Housing Alliance.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Smith-Reaves House is an individually protected property which was built in 1866 through 1870. Piedmont Housing Alliance is requesting to demolish this house and the non-designated house behind it on a separate parcel to make way for a subdivision of four small lots into three larger, equally-sized lots on which they would build affordable housing. Members' packets contained applicable guidelines from the Standards for Demolition with Staff responses to the guidelines. Staff recommends the request be deferred until a structural report can be reviewed. Staff would recommend the structure be rehabilitated if possible. Ms. Scala directed the members' attention to a map of the Fifeville area showing individually protected properties.

Mr. Mark Watson, Director of Project Development for Piedmont Housing Alliance, presented the members with information packets to ensure they had all current information and surveys. He informed the Board of his background working in historic preservation including his work in the mid-1980s as a member of the project team which restored the Bullfinch section of the Massachusetts State House. He stated he did not take historic designations lightly and he understood the Board's obligation to protect this house. Mr. Watson then explained what was within the information packet he had just provided which would demonstrate why demolition was the best choice: a survey showing the house encroaches another lot; the structural engineer's report; several Order of Corrections; Code violation notices to the former owner; termite report; existing conditions; the revitalization proposal. He then listed several reasons for demolition: one, structural deficiencies including roof decay and structural roof failure, floor structures failing; two, the history of Code deficiencies over the past two to three years including decayed wood and structural deterioration, insufficient load bearing capability, wiring deficiencies, collapsing rear porch roof and deteriorated foundation support; three, evidence of termites, Powder Post beetles, as well as damage to the joists, beams, and flooring from rot; four, encroachment on the adjacent lot. Mr. Watson further stated joist systems in the front and rear sections create variable ceiling heights that dip to 6'9"; the staircase does not meet Code; chimney clearance is inadequate; the current T-111 siding was installed by the previous owner to obscure the severely deteriorated wooden siding; and sewer lines exit the northern wall of the house 18 to 24 inches above the finished grade. The process of restoration on this house would be very costly and would yield a home that would be substandard from Code and livability

standpoints. The house would have to be stripped down to the stud frame; the roof and roof structure removed and reconstructed; the joist structure would need to be strengthened, if possible; new footings and foundation would need to be constructed at a new non-encroaching location and the house would have to be reset; the chimney would need to be removed; stud walls would need to be assessed for decay and deterioration and repaired or replaced as necessary; new wiring, plumbing, HVAC and insulation would need to be installed; sheet rock would need to be installed, finished, and painted; new interior trim and doors would need to be installed as well as cabinets, counter tops and appliances; a bathroom configuration would need to be created; new flooring would be needed throughout the house; new exterior sheathing and house wrap would need to be installed; new roofing material, flashing, gutters and downspouts would need to be installed; if customary historical restoration materials and methodology were to be used in the reconstruction, high maintenance wood windows, siding and trim and paint would be required. Estimated cost for a complete and historically accurate restoration would be 150,000 and 175,000 dollars. Combined costs of acquisition and restoration could reach over \$250,000 but the restored house would yield only 1080 square feet and probably appraise for \$166,000; therefore it would be difficult to sell to another buyer. Mr. Watson opined they would need to carefully measure, photograph and otherwise record the house using a qualified architectural historian, carefully deconstruct and salvage all possible historical and recyclable components and make use of them in constructing a replacement house. He suggested recognition of the house by placement of a permanent marker.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public.

Mr. Ben Ford, of Preservation Piedmont, asked for clarification of the applicant's plan as the terms "demolition" and "relocate" had been used. Mr. Watson stated it would eventually be demolished.

Mr. Aaron Wunsch, also of Preservation Piedmont, wanted to know if the encroached upon property also belonged to PHA. Mr. Watson stated it did.

With no further questions from the public, Mr. Atkins called for questions from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if PHA knew this was an individually designated property when they purchased it. Mr. Watson stated they did not.

Mr. Coiner expressed concern that should the house be rehabilitated there would be little of the original house remaining.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the house would need to be deconstructed before it could be renovated or restored. Mr. Watson concurred.

Mr. Coiner stressed that if the house currently did not meet Code, it would not have to meet Code. He stated there were certain things which might be recommended by the structural engineer, but they did not have to be done.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that a majority of the issues for demolition could be resolved by moving the structure. Mr. Watson stated they were unsure how well the house would take be picked up. He further stated moving the house would mean the new foundation would bring the house up 18 inches off the finish grade which would change the house.

Mr. Atkins asked if the applicant could redistribute the plat lines. Mr. Watson stated they would only be able to get two houses which would consist of the restored house and one new house.

Mr. Coiner asked if a PUD zoning would help with the issues of the lot size. Mr. Watson stated a PUD zoning would bring out several other issues including storm water management. Mr. Atkins reminded the applicant PHA had used PUD zoning for its Tenth and Page project. Mr. Watson stated the problem was this house was in very bad shape.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public.

Mr. Ben Ford, of 117 Amherst Commons and member of Preservation Piedmont, read a prepared statement to the Board in opposition of the proposal. He requested they deny the demolition permit. He expressed concerned with the precedent that this demolition would create if it were granted because it was cheaper than rehabilitation.

Mr. Aaron Wunsch, of 338 Monticello Road, stated he was an architectural historian. He stated the problems of the house were comparable to houses of a similar age of construction. He felt the precedent would be extremely ominous to take this house down for the reasons supplied.

Ms. Jacky Taylor spoke in opposition of the proposal. She stated half the history of Ridge Street would be lost if this house was gotten rid of.

Mr. Daniel Bluestone, of 501 Park Hill, stated the biggest responsibility of the Board of Architectural Review was to protect historic structures. While he felt sorry that PHA was holding the bag on this property, he felt a lot of the justifications for demolition came from engineers who had only been charged with demolishing the building and not with looking at it for rehabilitation.

Mr. Ben Patrick, one of the architecture students working on the project, stated they had not been charged with a design project of demolishing the house. His question of the Board was that if PHA could not find it within their economic means to rehabilitate this house for sale at an affordable level, who would.

Mr. John Qualling, professor in the School of Architecture, reiterated they had not gone into the project charged by PHA to tear down a house. He stated they were concerned about the development encroachment. He felt what was proposed was a positive change to bring in more affordable housing at a single-family home scale to reinforce Fourth Street.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner stated this was the sixth individually protected property to come before the Board in less than five years. He further stated that protected properties are a Zoning issue and are not shown in the tax assessor's records nor are they shown in title; without checking Zoning, a property owner would not know they had a protected property.

Mr. Lucy felt the issue was what would remain of the historic structure if rehabilitation was attempted.

Mr. Atkins stated that, under Code Chapter 31, rehabilitated properties at the discretion of the building official could have nonconforming components. He felt there was space for two new houses to be built and the Smith-Reaves house to be rehabilitated. Mr. Atkins felt the water damage problems and infestation problems do not point toward demolition even though they would challenge the rehabilitation effort.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that the entire property, not just the house, was designated and the Board would have architectural review control over what was built. Ms. Scala stated the property would have to be undesignated through a rezoning process. Ms. Scala further stated that until that was done, anything rebuilt on the property would be subject to BAR approval.

Ms. Heetderks stated there were seven elements to consider when considering a demolition, this proposal does not meet six of the criteria including there is no public necessity and the applicant has another purpose for the property.

Mr. Wolf stated if this wasn't a protected property, he would have no problems proving or understanding why it should go. He further stated that just driving by looking at it from the street, he had a hard time understanding why this structure shouldn't be demolished; looking at it from the perspective of being a protected property however, it would set a bad precedent to allow demolition for convenience.

Mr. Lucy stated it was worth noting they did have other properties to consider and how they handled this property would impact the others.

Mr. Wolf stated he would prefer to defer the matter so the applicant could look at it from another perspective. Ms. Heetderks felt they needed to vote for or against the proposed demolition; if they voted against, the applicant could return with another proposal.

Mr. Atkins, referring to the historic survey, stated those things which were still present were significant and serious but it was half and half.

Ms. Gardner stated it was a difficult decision. She expressed frustration at the idea that rehabilitation would leave very little of the original structure.

Ms. Heetderks moved to deny the requested demolition based on Ordinance Demolition Standard 2(a)1456 and Demolition Guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried, 4-3-1; Mr. Tremblay, Mr. Wolf and Ms. Gardner voted against, while Ms. Swenson abstained.

Mr. Coiner, as a member of Preservation Piedmont, felt it was time for the leadership of Preservation Piedmont to encourage the City to get the individually protected properties listed.

Ms. Swenson stated sections 1, 2, and 3 were all part of 223-A; she thought the historical and structural report agreed that section 1 is the oldest section. She thought there could be a partial demolition of sections 2 and 3 which were even more rickety.

Ms. Swenson queried the Board about the possibility of pouring a new foundation and moving the house next door. Mr. Wolf and Mr. Tremblay expressed support of that idea. Mr. Coiner stated he would reserve judgment until he saw the possible reconfiguration of the house.

Members of the Board asked for a brief recess, whereupon the Board stood in recess from 9:14 p.m. to 9:21 p.m.

L. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-09

200 West Water Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 79

Extend patio, bordered with retaining walls and plantings

Mono Loco, LLC, Owner

Formwork Design LLC, Architects

Ms. Cecilia Hernandez, of Formwork Design, explained that the site had originally been a gas station; when the conversion was made, there had been no requirement to remove the gas tanks. The likelihood of coming across submerged tanks was very high. The architect had come up with a solution they hoped would retain the spirit of the original proposal but would elevate the deck over the extension of the patio. None of the dimensions of the planting strips changed; however the material on Second Street was now proposed to be a slat wall. Ms. Hernandez provided a sample of the wood. The proposed plantings are more subdued than originally proposed. The plantings provide some screening.

Mr. Atkins called for questions from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Atkins sought clarification that the treads of the steps were pressure treated. The applicant concurred.

Mr. Atkins called for comments from the public and then the Board.

Mr. Atkins stated the applicant had seemed to address Mr. Knight's concerns. Ms. Scala stated she had shown plans to Mr. Knight who had seemed fine with it.

Mr. Wolf shared the concern about using pressure treated wood but he did think it did a good job of trying to put a nice edge at the street.

Ms. Swenson felt there needed to be a clear indication where pressure treated lumber was allowed.

Mr. Wolf moved to approve the application as submitted with the specific note that the use of the pressure treated wood on the deck floor is acceptable: a, because it is a horizontal surface; b, because it is bounded on the public right of way edges by a material other than that; and, c, because the surface is fairly obscured and has low visual impact due to the furniture on it; and that they find the changes compatible with the property and the other sites in the district, specifically the Guidelines for Site Elements, which would be plantings, numbers 1 through 7, and walkways and driveways item number 1. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. Ms. Swenson offered a friendly amendment that if the client wanted to change that pressure treated decking material to a real wood that would be perfectly acceptable. Mr. Wolf accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

M. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 04-12-03 (Resubmitted for window changes)

100 West Main Street/107 First Street South

Tax Map 28 Parcel 19

Renovate Storefront

Lexie Boris, The Terraces, Applicant and Ludwig Kuttner, K Holdings LLC, Owner

Mr. Wolf stated for the record that previously he had not participated in discussion on this project because at one point his firm had worked on this building; they no longer were. He felt he could participate without bias. Mr. Coiner reminded the Board that they had asked Mr. Wolf to participate on prior occasions.

Ms. Lexie Boris stated the original submission had shown the two windows as being asymmetrical; they now wished to do them exactly like the others on First Street.

Ms. Swenson moved to approve the proposed changes to the windows on First Street South as submitted finding that the proposed changes are compatible with the property and other buildings in the historic district, specifically regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Standards number 9, Ordinances 1, 2, and 4, the Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Facade Improvements, number 6. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-04-06

315 East High Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 67

Landscape plan for City Circuit Courthouse

City of Charlottesville, Owner

John B. Mann, Landscape Manager

City of Charlottesville, Applicant

With the absence of the applicant, Mr. Atkins thought the Board would not address this item.

Ms. Scala stated Mr. Knight had expressed strong comments to Ms. Scala that the proposal was overdone and should be more professionally designed and have fewer azaleas. He had expressed a preference for hedge, grass and trees only. He felt it did not meet the dignity of the building.

Ms. Swenson made a motion to defer in the absence of the applicant. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins stated the applicant had requested feedback from the Board. Mr. Atkins stated they had Mr. Knight's written response and suggested adding the general concurrence of the Board to simplify. Ms. Swenson and Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

N. Discussion: Individually Protected Properties

Mr. Atkins asked that they discuss this at a later time.

O. Discussion: 2005 Preservation Awards

Mr. Atkins expressed his appreciation for the four people who made recommendations. He supported the recommendations.

Ms. Heetderks asked that Splendor's be considered as something other than a rehabilitation.

Ms. Swenson asked that the Music Resource Center be considered as an adaptive reuse.

Ms. Swenson felt the Paramount Theater should be given an award.

Mr. Atkins moved to amend the handout from Ms. Scala to include Hospice House as an award nominee for rehabilitation, The Music Resource Center for an award nominee for adaptive reuse, Splendor's for an award nominee for Facade Rehabilitation, 400 East Market Street as an award nominee for Window Replacement and Restoration, the Paramount Theater as an award nominee for Preservation, and the Johnson Controls Building as a nominee for new construction. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

P. Matters from the Public

There were no matters from the public.

Q. Other Business

Mr. Atkins asked the Board members to refer to their packets regarding the Guidelines. May 2nd was specified as a deadline for written comments.

Ms. Swenson felt there should be a work session about Tenth and Page.

R. Adjournment

Mr. Coiner moved to adjourn. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:04 p.m.