

**City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
October 18, 2005  
Minutes**

**Present:**

Fred Wolf, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay

Preston Coiner

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Syd Knight

Bill Lucy

Kate Swenson

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda**

Mr. Wolf called for any matters from the public not on the agenda. There were none.

**B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application -- Appeal referred back to BAR**

**BAR 05-08-01**

**401 East Main Street**

**Tax Map 53 Parcel 59**

**Use wine barrels to define outdoor seating area**

**Vavino, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This Certificate of Appropriateness Application had been before the Board in August; approval was denied because the applicant was not present. The appeal went to City Council on September 19<sup>th</sup> and was returned to the BAR since Council felt the Board should have an opportunity to discuss it with the applicant. Staff recommended that the

intent of outdoor cafes was that they be kept uniform, neutral, restrained in design, and compatible with the urban feel of the Mall. The existing seating area meets that intent without the barrels; staff had suggested locating the barrels inside the building.

Ms. Kristy Shaps, one of the owners of Vavino, presented the Board with photos of the wine barrels and a drawing of the proposal. She stated the barrels were intended to define the outdoor seating. Since the establishment is a wine bar, they felt using barrels as planters would be an interesting way to show off the flowers. She also stated the Blue Light used barrels as planters to define its seating area.

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

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification the applicant would consider a finish for the unfinished barrels. Ms. Shaps concurred.

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

Mr. Coiner felt as strongly as he had in August that this was not appropriate.

Ms. Heetderks, stating she had not been present at the August meeting, expressed concern that the barrels would be an obstruction in the middle of the Mall. Ms. Shaps stated the barrels would be within the defined seating area and not out into the Mall. Ms. Heetderks stated she was not against the concept but would prefer fewer barrels and expressed a preference for two finished barrels.

Mr. Knight felt it was not a matter of taste or personal opinion; the proposal did not meet the Guidelines: "All elements should be of the same color, materials, and design character." "Use of treated lumber and unfinished wood is not allowed." "Planters should be compatible in terms of design, scale, materials, and color with other elements of the cafe; planters may not be constructed of unfinished wood." Ms. Shaps queried the existence of items on the Mall not meeting that description; she was informed that certain portions of the Mall had been grandfathered in.

Mr. Wolf had not been at the August meeting but stated he would have agreed with the vote. He stated the important part was the spirit of the Guidelines which he thought dealt with preventing large areas of public space used commonly by the City becoming privatized by signage or imagery pertaining to one business.

Mr. Lucy felt there were two confusing conditions: grandfathered conditions and surprises. He suggested the Board be provided with some mapping that shows which conditions are grandfathered.

Ms. Heetderks wondered if the other Board members would consider just one or two barrels at the entrance. None of the members could offer support for her idea.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, Vending and Cafes, moved that the Board of Architectural Review find that the plan as submitted to them does not satisfy the BAR criteria and are not compatible with the Mall and that they deny the application. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6-1-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against and Ms. Swenson abstained from voting. Mr. Wolf sought clarification that the applicant could appeal the decision to City Council; Ms. Scala concurred. Mr. Knight stated that applicants had, in the past, approached individual Board members to discuss what may be appropriate and how to reconfigure the plan.

### **C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-10-03**

**1001, 1005, 1009 Wertland Street**

**Tax Map 4 Parcel 317, 316, 315**

**Demolish four houses**

**Ronald Keeney, Applicant/John Craifak, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. 1001 Wertland was built in 1922; 1005 Wertland was built 1890-1895; 1009 Wertland was built in 1889 and has a rear cinder block apartment which was built mid-20th century. Having consulted the criteria in the Standards and Guidelines for Demolitions, staff believed the cinder block apartment was not significant enough to save. However, staff recommended the other three not be demolished. A significant part of the value of these structures was the siting of them with the large front setbacks.

Mr. Ron Keeney was present. He stated this matter was a financial pressure issue from the University. While Wertland Street maintains a historic status, the project has been being looked at for three or four years. The area has been rezoned to University-Medium Density. The property has a potential of 69 dwelling units by right under the new zoning. He stated the proposal appears to have the financial pressure support from Council to go on and do that in spite of the historic nature.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public. There being none, he called for questions from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the owner had considered building behind the houses. Mr. Keeney stated that had been considered under the previous zoning and would be difficult due to the slope of the property.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification of what changed the historic status of the property in the owner's mind since it was not brought forward under the previous, lower density zoning. Mr. Keeney stated it does boil down to finances. He stated it would have been a questionable project under the previous zoning.

Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant or owner had consulted the Guidelines to be able to convince the Board, point by point, that they were right to request demolition. Mr. Keeney stated they had been through the Guidelines. Mr. Keeney further stated his belief that there were not any structural conditions that justify taking the buildings down; he conceded the age of the buildings and their significance. He stated they had been occupied by students which took wear and tear on the buildings. He thought ultimately it came down to the rezoning by which it was felt political pressure was behind moving forward with the project. Mr. Keeney stated it was a mixed message to have an historic overlay district that has been rezoned to a relatively high density. Mr. Coiner, having read the Guidelines and the details of each property, stated he would vote to deny demolition since each property met the criteria to be protected. Mr. Coiner stated economic development is not the bailiwick of the BAR. Mr. Keeney stated they did not have an argument to take down these historic houses other than the fact that City Council seems to be giving a green light to the fact it should be a higher density. Mr. Coiner thanked him for his candor.

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

Ms. Heetderks stated this was one of the least compelling arguments for demolition. She could not concur that Council was throwing out the Guidelines by doing this rezoning. She expressed concern about the precedent this would set. She felt they should send a clear statement that these three houses did not meet the criteria for demolition.

Mr. Tremblay concurred that the cinder block apartment was not contributing and he could support its demolition. However, he would have to agree with the other opinions about the houses.

Ms. Gardner stated that because someone could build to a certain density, did not mean they had to build to a certain density.

Ms. Swenson disclosed she had worked a little bit on this project and had investigated what it would mean to move the houses or to combine the properties. She agreed there was zero merit to the application.

Mr. Knight stated their consideration was strictly based on the merits of whether the Guidelines for Demolition had been met. He stated they had not.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Demolitions, moved to deny this request for demolition of 1001, 1005, and 1009 Wertland Street, finding the demolitions do not satisfy the BAR's criteria; the mid-20th century cinder block structure may be demolished. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-10-05**

**315 and 313-317 West Main Street**

## **Tax Map 32 Parcel 198 and 197**

### **Demolish two buildings**

**Kimley-Horn and Associates, Applicant**

**Mooney West Main Street, LLC, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Staff had consulted the criteria in the Standards and Guidelines for Demolitions. Real estate records show the properties having been built in 1936 and 1957. Based on all the criteria and Standards, 315 West Main was altered enough and is not distinguished enough that it could be demolished. She stated 313-317 should not be demolished. Staff recommended 313-317 be incorporated into a redevelopment plan.

Mr. Kurt Cooper with Kimley-Horn stated the owner's grandfather built the building in 1938. He stated they concur that the corner building was built in 1957. Significant remodeling had been done over the years.

Mr. Russell Mooney stated the corner building, which he called the showroom, was built in 1957. Mr. Mooney also stated the buildings were not numbered correctly; 315 West Main Street was the older building. He stated 313-317 was actually considered to be 301 West Main. Mr. Mooney stated the older building was called the shop building. An addition was put on the rear of the shop building in 1947. In 1951, two bays were added to the west as well as a parts room to the rear. The front of the building was changed in 1961. He stated the building was in very bad condition with cracks in the wall from the expansion and contraction of the footings. To build the building back to what it was originally would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.

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

Mr. Tremblay reiterated for clarification that the building was expanded to the rear and then to the west and that a variety of changes were made to windows and doors during the '50s and '60s. Mr. Mooney concurred. Mr. Tremblay stated it was a building that had been in transition since its construction.

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

Mr. Coiner stated his disappointment that the application did not make arguments for all the points of demolition. Mr. Coiner stated a structural report would help him in making a decision.

Mr. Tremblay stated addressing the various aspects of demolition would have helped.

Mr. Lucy did not believe either building was a contributing structure. Mr. Lucy was unaware the Downtown District boundary went that far and felt it should not. He felt the layout of the building was inappropriate to the way the street should develop. He stated the building did not meet any of the criteria for the way Downtown functions and it was not appropriate.

Ms. Heetderks disagreed with Mr. Lucy. She felt the building was in keeping with West Main. She did want to see a structural report.

Mr. Knight agreed that it did not make sense that this was considered part of the Downtown District. However, the shop building was part of West Main and was in character with the historic automotive 1950s character of that strip. Mr. Knight felt there was an appropriate and possible adaptive reuse of the structure. He also expressed a desire to see a structural report for the shop building.

Mr. Wolf concurred with Mr. Knight. He also wanted to see a structural report.

Mr. Tremblay asked if they could put forth a motion on the showroom and have further discussion on the shop building. Mr. Wolf concurred.

Mr. Tremblay moved that they approve the demolition of the showroom building, known in this application as 315 West Main Street, noting that it is of such recent vintage that it does not meet the criteria of the historic structure and is appropriate for removal. Mr. Knight seconded the motion and asked that they clarify that 315 is the way it is listed in the application and that was the way it was discussed. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tremblay suggested the applicant withdraw the second part of the application to give them flexibility on timing to choose whatever course of action they choose to pursue whether that be developing the engineering report or considering other options. The applicant requested deferral of the second portion of the application. Ms. Swenson felt more attention to ways to think about the project in the application would be appropriate. She wanted not only something that would speak to the structural analysis but also something that would speak to the other Guidelines for Demolition. Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner concurred with Ms. Swenson that there are many criteria to consider beyond the building being in bad shape.

## **E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-10-01**

**513 Dice Street**

**Tax Map 29 Parcel 63.1**

**Exterior restoration of dwelling**

**Jane Covington, Applicant**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Board had seen an application to remove the chimney and replace the roof on this property last year. This application was to renovate the property in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standard. The applicant had done tax credit buildings before. The application was to remove the vinyl siding and asbestos shingles and restore the weather board. Brick work will be repaired using brick salvaged from on site or Old

Virginia brick if necessary. The metal roof would be replaced with a standing seam metal roof crafted on site. The vinyl windows will be replaced with true divided light, six-over-six wood windows. The hollow metal basement door will be replaced with an older solid wood door. Ms. Scala commended the applicant's investigation of the property.

Ms. Jane Covington stated the building had been raised from a story and-a-half to a two stories in the late 1800s or early 1900s. The Greek Revival front entrance is in poor condition and obscured by the siding. Ms. Covington had spoken with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and they asked that she keep the house with two stories.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know how she would deal with the chimney. Ms. Covington stated the north chimney was cracked and remedial repairs would be made to it. A contractor wanted to rebuild the upper portions of the south chimney. She hoped to stabilize it from the inside.

Mr. Knight sought clarification of the replacement brick if necessary since "Old Virginia" is a company and not a style. Ms. Covington stated she would be using the Old Virginia brick provided by Allied.

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

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and that the BAR approves the application enthusiastically. Ms. Swenson seconded the motion. Mr. Knight appreciated what the applicant was doing but was uncomfortable with an assurance the applicant would do her best on the brick. Ms. Covington stated she would use salvaged brick only on the exterior. Ms. Heetderks amended her motion to state it was with the understanding that brick salvaged from the site will be used on the exterior of the chimneys. Ms. Swenson accepted the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess, whereupon the meeting stood in recess at 6:27 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 6:46 p.m. Ms. Swenson did not return to the meeting.

## **F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-06-01**

**601 Park Street**

**Tax Map 53 Parcel 4**

**Comyn Hall -- Details for New Construction of Condominiums**

## **Frank Stoner, Stonehaus Inc, Applicant**

### **JABA, Owner**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This application had been before the Board in July at which time the BAR approved the overall plan but asked the applicant to come back with the site plan, planning materials, exterior lighting, signage, and more details on the windows, samples, materials and colors. The Board did not approve replacement of windows in Comyn Hall waiting documentation of existing conditions. The current application included a site plan with proposed landscaping, the proposed exterior lighting fixtures, the window information and the roof information. The applicant proposes to replace all the windows in Comyn Hall and in the 1908 addition to the rear with the same type of aluminum clad wood windows they want to put in the new construction. The contractor's report on the slate roof of Comyn Hall and the metal roof on the 1908 addition states they need to be replaced. The applicant proposes a black asphalt shingle roof to match the new construction. Staff feels the two trees in the Park Street front yard should be protected adequately during construction. The lighting must meet the City's shielded lighting requirement. If the Comyn Hall and 1908 addition windows are too deteriorated to repair, staff recommends wood windows as replacements. If the Comyn Hall roof needs to be replaced, it should be replaced with real slate or metal. The 1908 addition roof should be replaced with a metal roof.

The applicant stated tree protection would be outlined better on the final site plan. He also stated the property owner to the north, Mr. Bud Treacle, had requested additional buffering from his property.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Mr. Garrett Smith, a property owner along the west line, asked for additional buffering due to the extra traffic at the garage.

Mr. Bernie Davis, of 234 Wine Street, wanted to know why notice was not given to property owners in the area. Ms. Scala stated they did notify all abutting property owners. He then expressed concern about the excess parking. The architect stated they had exceeded the required parking; they were providing 24 spaces when only 12 were required. Mr. Davis also expressed concern with the drainage. Mr. Coiner stated the drainage issue was not one they dealt with but it should be checked during the site plan review. Mr. Coiner stated the best contact would be someone in the engineering department.

Mr. Knight requested additional information about the roof on the 1908 addition. Mr. Jim Lucas, with Neilsen Builders, stated they were probably going to have to repair 25 percent of the sheathing due to rotting over the years. He stated a lot of the slate shingles had cracked or fallen away.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.



Mr. Garrett Smith wanted to make the point that the original roof should be preserved in slate as much as possible.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks expressed her distress over the slate disappearing. The roof is extremely prominent and the slate roof is a defining architectural characteristic. She stated the Guidelines do allow for faux slate replacement as needed since the replacement of true slate is often prohibitively expensive. She stated they had, in some cases, approved standing seam metal. She believed they had explicitly stated previously that the roof of the 1908 addition be either preserved or replaced with a metal roof.

Ms. Gardner agreed with Ms. Heetderks.

Mr. Knight felt there was some advantage in distinguishing between the addition and the original structure. He felt there was a great deal of value in distinguishing the original structure from the addition. The applicant asked if amending their application so that they used a standing seam field bent roof on the existing Comyn Hall and the 1908 addition would be acceptable. Mr. Knight stated he would accept that. Ms. Gardner referenced the standards for review of construction alterations, number 2, which stated the removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features that characterize a property will be avoided; she felt the roof needed to stay the way it was. Ms. Gardner felt strongly that they should keep it simple and put shingles where there were shingles and standing seam where there was standing seam.

Mr. Tremblay stated his belief that they had allowed latitude in situations with slate to include standing seam as an alternative. Mr. Coiner stated they had allowed standing seam based on the permanence of the roof. However, he stated the Comyn Hall slate roof was a defining characteristic of the building.

Mr. Tremblay moved to approve several options on the original structure, Comyn Hall, which is to replace the existing slate roof with either new slate, faux slate of undetermined character at this point -- the Board would like to hear more about it if the applicant chooses this option -- or standing seam, being either turned metal that you paint, or copper, either one would be acceptable; and that shingles as proposed on the new addition are appropriate; and per the applicant's recommendation, that the applicant go with the standing seam option on the 1908 addition. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called for discussion. Mr. Lucy sought enlightenment on the history of permitting or encouraging asphalt shingles in historic districts especially in a building which could be around for another 150 years. Mr. Tremblay felt there had been an effort to distinguish additions in all respects and to allow them to be architecturally different to some degree. The motion carried, 6-1; Mr. Coiner voted against.

Mr. Wolf suggested they move on to the windows.

Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the windows were aluminum clad wood windows.

Mr. Knight sought clarification of where these windows were proposed. The applicant stated the cottage style windows were proposed for the new addition; the 1908 addition would have cottage style replacement windows; the original structure would have one-over-one similar to the existing.

Mr. Coiner requested they vote on the three window applications separately.

Mr. Tremblay moved that they permit the use of the aluminum clad wooden windows with appropriate simulated divided lights as the Board has approved on previous applications in the new addition to Comyn Hall. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Coiner moved that they allow the use of the same manufacture of windows for the cottage style design in the 1908 addition. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Knight pointed out that a strict interpretation of the guidelines would require that wood be replaced with wood. Ms. Heetderks referenced guideline 11: Do not use inappropriate materials or finishes that radically change the sash, muntin configurations, or appearance of the frame. Ms. Heetderks stated the 1908 addition was not subsidiary to the main part of Comyn Hall. She felt they should be consistent with the Guidelines and require wood windows in the same sash configuration in the 1908 addition. Mr. Wolf concurred with Ms. Heetderks. Mr. Tremblay felt the wing was subsidiary. He also stated they had allowed clad windows as replacement windows in contributing structures. Mr. Knight did not feel the proposed windows were a sin on the addition. Mr. Garrett Smith stated, from the neighborhood's perspective, whatever they got would be an improvement since currently there were cheap aluminum storm windows covering the windows. After considering the elevation, Mr. Wolf stated he would be willing to concede on the 1908 addition. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried, 5-2; Ms. Heetderks and Ms. Gardner voted against.

Mr. Tremblay asked if there was a comparable all wood, non-clad window from the same manufacturer that would be consistent with what the applicant wanted to do. The applicant stated there was.

Mr. Wolf stated he would find a pre-finished wood clad window acceptable. Mr. Tremblay sought clarification of "pre-finished." Mr. Wolf explained it was a wood window with the paint finish factory applied and has a much longer life.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion that they approve, on the main Comyn Hall house, replacement windows, wood with a factory applied finish, one-over-one, as requested by the applicant. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (7-0). There was discussion about having a construction detail on the hyphen window area come back to the BAR for approval. The consensus was to circulate the detail to the BAR members prior to administrative approval.

Mr. Wolf asked that they move on to the lighting.

Ms. Heetderks asked if there was an elevation showing the placement of the lighting. The applicant stated they were still working on the lighting. The goal was for subdued lighting.

Mr. Knight sought clarification of the placement of bollards. The applicant stated they would be along the walk and at the storefront. Bollards along the rear drive would be shielded so they only threw light towards the driveway.

Mr. Tremblay clarified that the request before the BAR was only for the building lighting.

Mr. Tremblay moved they approve the lighting as submitted for the building structure. Ms. Heetderks thought they usually received a lighting plan and stated she would be more comfortable if they had a plan. Mr. Knight expressed concern about the bollard lights on the front walk and concurred that a lighting plan would help. Mr. Tremblay clarified that his motion was limited to just the building lights, not the landscaping bollards. Ms. Heetderks sought clarification the applicant proposed using can lights inside the porch and asked if the applicant intended using any of the other fixtures on the historic structure. The applicant did not know but stated the intention was to not have them unless absolutely needed. Ms. Heetderks stated that was why she wanted a lighting plan because she was not comfortable with "if it's needed." Mr. Knight expressed support of Ms. Heetderks' request as he also would like to see where the lights were going. Mr. Tremblay amended his motion to approve the fixtures as submitted and allow the applicant to come back once they have settled on a site plan lighting plan that is acceptable from the other parts of the City and run that by the Board. Ms. Heetderks asked if he would amend his motion to be approving the fixtures as submitted for the new construction. Mr. Coiner asked the applicants if they planned to place any of the fixtures as wall mounted fixtures on the historic building. The applicant stated he did not believe so and that the lights would not be seen from the street; they were not planning currently to put any lights on the building other than possibly at the garage entry. Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion as amended. The motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Tremblay left the meeting at 7:53 p.m.

Mr. Wolf called for discussion of the planting plan.

Mr. Knight thought the plan was very restrained and was a great improvement on what they saw when it first came to the Board. He thought it was perfectly acceptable.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that the boxwood hedge, which was shown on the plan, would be removed. The applicant concurred that it would be removed to the existing Comyn Hall. The applicant stated shrubs would be added in.

Mr. Wolf suggested the hedge be retained along Park Street.

Mr. Knight moved that they approve the planting and site materials as submitted finding them in keeping with the guidelines and the general character of the neighborhood with the request that the applicant consider reestablishing the boxwood hedge but it was not required. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Wolf asked if they needed to approve the trash structure. Ms. Scala stated they could.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that it would be painted brick. The applicant concurred. Mr. Wolf also asked what material would be used for the cap under the wooden pergola. He was informed it would be brick.

Mr. Wolf moved that the trash enclosure, the details as presented, are consistent with the other portions of the addition and the new construction as well as the original house and the character of the surrounding neighborhood, and moved that they approve it as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

## **G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-10-04**

**614 East High Street**

**Tax Map 53 Parcel 111**

**Add shutters to new addition; replace front door; paint windows, shutters and door**

**Silvercrest Asset Management, Applicant**

**City and County, Owners**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property is owned jointly by the City and County which is leased by the applicant. The applicant proposes adding shutters to the 1970s addition to make the more contemporary addition blend in with the front building. The shutters would be painted dark green and the window frames and trim wall would be painted white. The glass door and solid glass transom would be replaced by a six panel wood door and the transom would be divided into six lights. Staff recommends replacing the front door and transom along as they do not affect the size of the existing. The paint colors are traditional and appropriate in the location. Shutters may not look appropriate with the windows in the addition. If permitted, the shutters should be wood mounted on hinges and sized to fit the windows.

Mr. David Haymar was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated they wanted to soften the institutional look currently presented by the back of the building. The shutters would be custom made wood shutters which would be operational. Mr. Haymar stated they also wanted to paint the roof slate gray; it was currently brown.

Mr. Wolf called for questions.

Mr. Wolf asked if shutters would be put on the two staggered windows. Mr. Haymar stated they would not.

Mr. Wolf asked if the transom would be a true divided light. The applicant concurred.

Ms. Heetderks thought the proposal was admirable but did not think the shutters would be successful unless the windows were replaced. Mr. Haymar stated they could not do anything to change the windows which they also did not like.

Mr. Knight concurred with Ms. Heetderks. He felt the shutters would draw attention to the windows, but not in a good way.

The applicant stated the shutters could be made to match the alignment of the windows rather than be consistent with the front shutters. Mr. Wolf felt the shutters should pertain to the windows and not the other shutters.

Ms. Heetderks was skeptical but willing to look at it. She would be willing to defer if the applicant would come back with a drawing. Mr. Knight concurred.

Mr. Wolf also wanted to see a drawing come back.

Ms. Gardner thought the dark shutters with the off center piece could work. She suggested painting the trim of the windows a complementary color to the dark green so the windows recede rather than popping out.

Ms. Heetderks moved to approve the replacement of the door as submitted as well as the replacement of the transom with the specification that it be a true divided light wooden transom as submitted and also to approve the colors as submitted and to defer on the issue of shutters pending additional information. Ms. Scala asked if administrative approval would be allowed if the applicant decided to change the white trim to a grey as suggested by Ms. Gardner; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Wolf felt that would be acceptable. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-10-02**

**1607-1611 University Avenue**

**Tax Map 9 Parcel 99**

**Extend patio and remove part of planter**

**Shops Under the Ash LLC**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Ms. Scala had been informed that the applicant would not be able to attend and extended his apologies. The ash tree has died so the applicant proposes to extend the patio by removing part of the brick planter. The new brick will match the old. The applicant wants to plant a new tree in the smaller, remaining part of the planter. The applicant was suggesting either a willow oak or red maple.

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

Mr. Wolf sought Mr. Knight's opinion on the tree suggestions. Mr. Knight stated either was acceptable. He also stated nothing planted there would ever be the size of the ash.

Ms. Gardner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district and that the BAR approve the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

**BAR 05-10-06**

**116 Second Street, Northeast**

**Tax Map 33 Parcel 243**

**Replace Market Street door**

**VMDO Architects, PC, Applicants**

**Second & Market Development, Owners**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The YMCA building is circa 1909. The applicant seeks to put in a new frameless glass storefront door with a sidelight to replace the existing pair of three-paneled wood doors and a five-light transom. The central hanging lantern will be removed and a new stainless steel quarter-inch canopy is proposed with the address laser cut out in the front face. Staff recommends the transom, which matches the transoms in the end bays, be preserved. If allowed, the new doors should fit the existing door opening. The canopy could be added and removed without damaging the building and is generally acceptable; a separate sign permit is required.

The applicant was not present.

Mr. Lucy felt the applicant should be represented.

Ms. Heetderks concurred with Ms. Scala that there was no justification in removing the transom.

Ms. Gardner felt the building was an icon for the Downtown Mall. She felt there was not enough detail in the submittal to make a decision to remove the existing door.

Mr. Coiner did not feel the design was compatible with the rest of the building.

Mr. Knight moved to defer judgment on this application until next month in order to give the applicant time to prepare more background and justification and to show up and talk about it in person. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **J. Discussion: Future Historic Districts**

Mr. Wolf suggested deferring the discussion in the absence of Mr. Atkins, Mr. Tremblay and Ms. Swenson.

#### **K. Approval of Minutes**

20 September 2005

Ms. Heetderks moved to approve as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion which carried, 5-0-1; Ms. Gardner abstained from voting.

#### **L. Matters from the public**

There were no matters.

#### **M. Other Business**

Ms. Scala stated they needed to discuss the conservation district and individually protected properties at the next work session.

Mr. Coiner felt they should not have cancelled their last work session. He felt they were not doing their job as a Board as well as they should be.

Mr. Knight suggested they meet for a work session on November 1<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Gardner suggested they E-mail some possible dates for a meeting.

Mr. Coiner asked if the music pavilion was not supposed to have planted ivy on the walls. Ms. Scala stated they were going to. Mr. Coiner asked if they were going cut in at the bottom to allow for some dirt. Mr. Knight stated ivy grows up, not down, and there was concrete right up to the base of the wall.

#### **N. Adjournment**

Mr. Coiner moved to adjourn. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:49 p.m.