

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
February 21, 2006
Minutes**

Present: Not Present:

Joe Atkins, Outgoing Chair Kate Swenson

Fred Wolf, Outgoing Vice Chair; Chair

Wade Tremblay **Also Present:**

Preston Coiner Mary Joy Scala

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Bill Lucy

William Adams

Mr. Atkins convened the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Atkins called for matters not from the public.

Mr. Lawrence Rothamel, of Georges & Company, Inc., stated they had had an application before the Board for 301 East Market Street on December 20th; the application had been approved. He stated he had been in touch with Ms. Scala because they would like to stamp the concrete instead of having brushed concrete and would also like to color it a grey slate as this would be more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Rothamel was unsure if this could be approved administratively or if it had to be approved by the Board. Mr. Coiner expressed concern about the Board approving this change as the issue had not been noticed and the Board did not typically act on matters from the public. Ms. Scala stated she had not felt comfortable approving the change and felt the Board should comment on it. Mr. Knight expressed concern that this did not fit with the Guidelines which discourage the use of faux materials. Mr. Atkins stated they could table the matter, make a soft recommendation, as if Ms. Scala had E-mailed them, and let her handle it administratively, or vote on it. The consensus of the Board was to make a soft recommendation to Ms. Scala to handle it administratively. Mr. Atkins stated the issues the Board had were the detailing of the edges at the treads and whether it was appropriate at all. Mr. Coiner stated the City used stamped concrete. Mr. Adams stated poured and brushed would look better. Mr. Tremblay stated he would be inclined to give the owner reasonable latitude to make the determination; he did not feel the proposal was inappropriate. Ms. Gardner felt the proposal was inappropriate. Mr. Knight felt it was inappropriate. Mr. Atkins stated the stamped concrete was recommended for horizontal flat work at the risers and treads.

Mr. Greg Brezinski, Project Manager for the design of the Woodard Property project at the corner of Main, Market and First Streets, was before the Board to express their interest in developing a working relationship with the Board. He stated the project would be a mixed use

development. Mr. Brezinski then extended an invitation to the Board to see how the design was proceeding.

Mr. Ryan Mickles, Zoning Inspector, stated that starting March 1st, cafe operators would be setting up their tables and chairs for the beginning of the cafe season. He stated City Council had passed an ordinance that some cafe operators have a detectable bottom placed at the base. Mr. Mickles stated cafe operators had questions about what that detectable bottom should look like. He asked that the Board members pass suggestions on to Ms. Scala who could forward them to him.

B. Election of Officers

Chair and Vice-Chair

Mr. Atkins called for nominations for Chair.

Mr. Coiner stated he had unofficially polled the Board to see who was interested in serving. Mr. Coiner then placed the name of Fred Wolf in nomination for Chair and Syd Knight as Vice Chair and Mary Joy Scala, as City Staff person, as Secretary. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Atkins called the question. The motion carried with Mr. Wolf and Mr. Knight abstaining.

Mr. Atkins congratulated the new Chair and Vice Chair. Mr. Atkins recognized Mr. Adams as his replacement on the Board. Mr. Atkins then turned the meeting over to the new Chair.

Mr. Atkins thanked Ms. Scala and the Board. He stated he had enjoyed working with them. Mr. Atkins exited the dais.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-01-01

1618, 1620, 1622 JPA and 103 Valley Road

Tax Map 11 Parcel 7

Jefferson Commons -- New Apartment Building

Wade Apartments, LLC, Applicant

Mitchell/Matthews, Architects and Urban Planners

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the matter as this was his property. He then removed himself to the audience.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A preliminary discussion had been held at the January meeting. The applicant is seeking approval to build a 19 unit, three-story apartment building with a fourth

floor in the attic which can accommodate 76 residents total. Twenty-six parking spaces are provided under the building. There are 14 surface parking spaces along with the five existing on-site spaces off Valley Road. Materials proposed are a brick veneer; painted fiber cement walls, siding and panels; and charcoal grey architectural asphalt roof shingles. The foundation is articulated with a brick banding and darker mortar. Windows are white vinyl-clad cottage style. The existing rock wall would be retained. The new design replaces the fourth floor with attic dormers. More information is needed on the type of window muntins proposed. Staff suggests another sidewalk entrance on the south side to provide access from the sidewalk to the rear yard.

Mr. John Matthews, of Mitchell/Matthews, stated they had addressed the comments of the Board about stepping the mass of the building down. He stated there were two step downs on the end of the building and two gables had been added on the front.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Ms. Sally Brown, of 110 Shamrock Road, wanted to know the total number of parking spaces. The applicant stated there were 45 spaces.

Mr. Michael Osteen, of 9 Gildersleeve Wood, sought clarification that the heat pumps would be below a retaining wall. The applicant stated they would not be seen.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Ms. Gardner asked if the applicant had considered eliminating nine parking spaces since only 36 were required. Mr. Matthews stated they had not but would consider it.

Mr. Adams asked if the retaining walls were brick. Mr. Matthews stated all the retaining walls would be concrete.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. Michael Osteen commended Mr. Tremblay and the architect. He stated most of the building changes were fantastic. He did express concern the parking spaces.

Ms. Sally Brown stated everything about the project was within Code but she was concerned about the mass of the building. She stated this kind of project would ultimately be the death of the neighborhood.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Heetderks stated this was a fantastic response to the comments from January's meeting. She stated it was greatly improved and was much more residential in character.

Mr. Knight sought clarification as to which roof option the applicant was seeking approval. Mr. Matthews stated they would like the gable roof.

Mr. Wolf stated the proposal was an enormous step forward from the earlier submittal. He thought there might still be some window grouping details to be worked out. He stated it would be nice to find a balance between on-site and street parking.

Ms. Gardner stated the squirrels' nest parking was the least desirable. She felt three spaces could be given back for planting.

Mr. Knight thought the proposal had come a long way since it was last seen. Mr. Knight also preferred the gable roof over the hip roof. He encouraged the applicant to find some measure of differentiation between the JPA and Valley Road halves of the building. Mr. Knight thought the planting plan was acceptable but suggested the applicant think about planting some larger trees.

Mr. Adams stated he had a problem with the mass.

Mr. Lucy stated it was a handsome building which met the Guidelines.

Mr. Wolf stated he was sympathetic to Mr. Adams' comments, but the building did fall within Zoning and the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed new building, with the gabled roof and the amended site design, satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the suggestion that the applicant continue to endeavor to do anything possible to reduce the perceived mass of the building and differentiate between the two halves of the building as the design is finalized. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 6-1-1; Mr. Adams voted against and Mr. Tremblay abstained from voting.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-07

700 East Main Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 160

Van Yahres Associates, Landscape Architects

City of Charlottesville, Owner

Pavilion -- main pedestrian entrance

Mr. Knight recused himself from the matter as his firm had worked on the project.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks approval to add a handicap access ramp at the end of the pedestrian mall into the pavilion. A handicap ramp had been previously approved at a different location. There was also a change in the radius of the planting area to accommodate pedestrian traffic. This solution creates a formal ending to the Mall and a direct entrance from the Mall to the Pavilion.

Mr. Jeff Wilbur, of Van Yahres Associates, stated the criteria in the growth of the design was direct access for pedestrians. To meet grade requirements for the handicap ramp, the design had to extend into the Mall. He stated no green space would be lost. The ramp would have a handrail on both sides.

Mr. Wolf called for questions.

Mr. Coiner asked if there were plans to put in bollards. Mr. Wilbur stated there were.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Adams stated he did not have a problem with the concept. He would like to see more detail.

Mr. Wolf expressed concern about the way the ramp forces people around it. He stated the design seemed to deflect people rather than collect them.

Ms. Heetderks stated she shared some of Mr. Wolf's concerns. Ms. Heetderks wondered if the applicant would be willing to defer to examine some other options. Mr. Wilbur stated the other handicap ramp was scheduled to be built and approval of a conceptual design could change that so stairs could be built in the place of that.

Mr. Adams stated the Pavilion set up a lot of conditions that would be hard to resolve.

Mr. Tremblay supported the concept in general but expressed concern about the floating step.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Public Improvement, moved that they approve the general concept of a handicap access ramp coming off the end of the pedestrian mall into the Pavilion in general concept with the understanding that the applicant will return with some additional information about potential resolution of the floating step issue and also perhaps some additional ideas about somehow resolving the access of the Mall with the access of the Pavilion. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 6-1-1; Mr. Wolf voted against and Mr. Knight abstained from voting.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-01

1435 University Avenue

Tax Map 9 Parcel 76

Charles Adcock, Applicant

Terry Vassalos, Owner

Add entrance to Satellite Ballroom

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks approval to add an entrance in an existing window location, giving access to the alley and to a walkway leading to the rear corner parking lot. Part of the existing window will be retained as a transom. The proposed door will match an existing door. Access to the walkway from the existing door is blocked by a power pole and a wall. There is a precedent for approving replacing a window with a door.

Mr. Charles Adcock was present but had nothing to add.

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

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of how the retained portion of window would be treated. Mr. Adcock stated the metal edging around the four windows would be painted to match. Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the material above the door. Mr. Adcock stated the proposed door was aluminum framed and would be butted against the windows.

Mr. Adams wanted to know the width of the proposed opening. Mr. Adcock stated his belief that it was five feet.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know how tall the door needed to be to reach the eight-paned window. Mr. Adcock stated it would need to be 9 feet.

Mr. Adams asked if this would be a major entrance. Mr. Adcock stated it would be the main entrance.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification of why the applicant wanted to retain the eight window panes. Mr. Adcock stated the character of the building was important to him. He further stated retaining the eight panes gave continuity to the side of the building.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved that they approve the removal of the existing window and the sill and the brickwork below the window with the recommendation that the applicant submit a single unit, steel-framed unit to Staff for administrative approval. Ms. Heetderks seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that steel-framed or aluminum storefront to match in terms of color and the profile was not going to match, but in that area, given the storefront next to it. Mr. Knight clarified to match the other windows in that front. Mr. Knight accepted the friendly amendment. Ms. Heetderks, as seconder, also accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Coiner offered a friendly amendment: Mr. Knight had used the word "suggestion" that he explore these other option; Mr. Coiner felt it should be a requirement.

Mr. Knight and Ms. Heetderks accepted the amendment. Mr. Tremblay sought clarification that the motion was that the applicant remove the window, as it exists, in its entirety and the new unit with the transom would be completely replaced. It was. Mr. Knight suggested the motion be modified to have it come back to the Board for review. Mr. Knight withdrew his motion.

Mr. Wolf moved that they approve the removal of the existing window and the demolition of the sill and the brick beneath it, requiring that the applicant come back to the Board with one of two alternatives which would study either replacing a door with a new transom that is either a steel case door or an aluminum store front door with a finish on the aluminum to match the existing steel case windows which fills the opening entirely (option A); or (B) an option that allows a taller door that goes all the way up to the eight panes that could be maintained and treated as the transom and requires that the brickwork, when the demolition occurs, is actually tooth backed in at the perimeter of the opening; and that any new frame was the same relationship in terms of its depth from the face of the brick back as the existing steel. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess at 7:26 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-02

204 Ridge Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 143

Karina Goldstein, Applicant

Exterior renovations and partial demolition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicants are requesting approval to replace the rear deck and stairway. A porch had been there and was removed without approval. The applicants also request approval to structurally repair the front porch and replace the black steel railing in front with painted wood railings in the same style as the front porch, and to repaint the exterior one of three alternative color schemes. The rear deck would have 1x4 tongue in groove decking and wood railings designed to match the railing on the front of the house. In the future the applicants may want to enclose the lower part of the rear 1910 addition, but they will come back with drawings at that time. Staff recommends that the BAR should address whether the rear deck is appropriate or if the porch roof should also be replaced. All the color choice options are appropriate. The black metal railings leading to the front porch are not appropriate and should be replaced.

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

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that the applicant was aware she was purchasing a property in an historic district. Ms. Goldstein stated she was very much aware.

Ms. Heetderks asked if anything had been salvaged from the demolition of the back porch. Ms. Goldstein stated they had the gingerbread.

In response to Mr. Knight, Ms. Goldstein stated they had demolished the porch by mistake.

Mr. Wolf called for comments.

Mr. Aaron Wunsch, Vice President of Preservation Piedmont, stated there should be communication from the City through some mechanism that this is not the kind of thing you can tear down with immunity. Mr. Wunsch expressed concern about the need for enforcement.

Mr. Knight sought clarification from Ms. Scala that the City was now notifying property owners. Ms. Scala stated "H" had been listed by the existing zoning on the real estate record.

Mr. Knight thought replacing the covered porch would satisfy the punitive aspect of the matter.

Ms. Heetderks sought clarification that the saved gingerbread trim could be reused. Ms. Goldstein said they could.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards for Demolition and Partial Demolition of a structure, and reviewed the City Guideline pursuant, moved that they find that the removal of the rear porch and existing stairs does not significantly alter the historic nature of the property so long as the rear covered porch, deck and stairs, are replaced in a style as closely matching the existing as possible with the provision that the applicant may either replace the stairs as they were immediately prior to demolition or with the landing as shown on and in the configuration shown on the drawings; and that the condition be added that the salvaged gingerbread materials and anything else existing be reused. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 7-1; Ms. Heetderks voted against.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved that they allow the removal of the VDOT installed metal railing in front of the house; that they allow its replacement by the painted wood railing and pickets to match the front porch and that they approve the paint samples for the house as submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Coiner stated there was another issue which had not been addressed. The applicant had installed a heating/cooling unit. Mr. Coiner stated it needed to be screened.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-03

507 Ridge Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 141

David Galgano

Rear Addition and partial demolition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant requests approval to demolish the existing rear portion stairs and a small attached shed and add a two-story rear addition with a rear porch and deck; remove three original and one newer one-over-one window and one door that the proposed addition would cover. The three original two-over-two windows that are removed would be reused in the addition and one new two-over-two wood window would be purchased. The rear door is not original but may be used. The original bead board ceiling, pilasters, and cornice from the rear porch will be reused for the new porch entry. A new railing will match the old railing. The new siding would be clapboard and possibly be original reclaimed clapboard from under the stucco. The roof would be standing seam. The siding would be reclaimed clapboard or shiplap siding. The deck will be 1x6 pressure treated wood; the decking and steps will be painted after they cure. After visiting the site and meeting with the applicant, staff recommends approval.

Mr. David Galgano was present but had nothing to add.

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

Mr. Tremblay applauded the applicant for bringing back to life a house to continue its prominence. Mr. Tremblay stated the changes were compatible with the structure and done in a way that reuses a number of the significant materials in a way that distinguishes the addition but does it in a way that is consistent historically. He stated his support of the application. Mr. Wolf asked if that was a motion; Mr. Tremblay so moved. Mr. Tremblay prefaced the motion with his belief that the items noted for demolition are not significant to the property and as such can be removed without affecting its significance. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-05

123 East Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 245

Keith O. Woodard, Applicant

First States Investors 3300 LC, Owner

Parking Lot Booth

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks approval to build a parking lot attendant's booth on the Market Street Parking Lot behind Wachovia Bank. The booth will be in place two years until the property is redeveloped. The booth is 4x9 with a 7'9" height. The walls are fir posts with smooth MDO board; all painted white. The flat roof is rolled white asphalt material. The pressure treated floor is to be stained off-white. There are two six-pane wood windows. This is a temporary use. Staff recommends the building be painted a grey color to be less obtrusive than the white.

Mr. Woodard was present but had nothing to add. He did state a preference for the white.

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

Mr. Knight asked if the structure would be moveable. Mr. Woodard stated it could be and might need to be from time to time during construction.

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

Mr. Adams expressed a preference for a darker color.

Ms. Heetderks asked if the roof was supposed to be white. Mr. Woodard stated it was.

Mr. Wolf felt that painting it a darker color would conceal the joints between materials. He also stated that if the building goes to a darker color, the roof should be at least a medium grey.

Mr. Coiner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed new parking lot attendant's booth building and site design satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the understanding that the colors have to be approved by City Staff. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Ms. Scala expressed a preference for dark grey with a medium grey roof; windows, doors -- everything -- should be the same color. Mr. Knight expressed concern about the wording of the motion as it did not say anything about temporary. Mr. Knight stated it did not meet City Design Guidelines. He further stated they were approving it simply because it was understood that it was temporary. Mr. Knight asked that they amend the motion to state that their understanding is the building is temporary or that the discussion reflect that understanding. Mr. Coiner stated he had no problem with that. Mr. Tremblay thought the discussion reflected the fact that their understanding was it was a temporary building. Mr. Knight clarified that it was to be removed once the adjoining property redevelopment occurs. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-06

215 East High Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 74

The Village School, Applicant (Chris Hays)

Quartz Partnership, Owner

Entry Courtyard for the Village School

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval to add a new porch and trellis to cover the entry; this would be made of white painted wood and standing seam metal roof. The applicant also seeks to: add a five foot high steel trellis fence enclosure with gate, painted white to match the building trim; expand the existing six-over-six windows in the front of the building with new triple hung windows in the existing masonry openings; add a new entry door and sidelight; replace the existing brick concrete patio with new courtyard constructed with precast concrete pavers in gravel beds; add two benches stained natural finish located under the canopy or integrated in the fence and a large wood table and two benches freestanding in the west courtyard; to remove a large magnolia tree, a dogwood tree and a street tree and replace them with two street trees. This is a contributing building but it is not especially significant historically or architecturally. The design of the new addition is on a permanently visible elevation. The porch trellis is appropriately scaled and the design materials and colors are compatible. The new windows will improve the design appearance of the facade. The color and height of the fence is not compatible; it would be compatible if it were no higher than four feet and had a more subdued color. The tree removal and replacement plan and proposed planting beds will result in a compatible design. Staff recommends that the replacement street trees should be large shade trees. The proposed concrete pavers in gravel beds is compatible.

Mr. James Knorr, representative of the school, explained the concept behind the new design. The current courtyard area has no security and is totally open making it a space they do not want the girls to be in without supervision. This space is meant to be an extension of the learning environment.

Mr. Chris Hayes presented the Board with a revised plant list. He also provided photographs of nearby structures with fences and retaining walls higher than what the Village School proposes. The fence is 80 percent open.

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

Mr. Coiner, citing the stress which seems to be placed on security, stated the east end remained open which seemed to contradict the security issue. Mr. Hayes stated the security was to keep the students from getting in the drive and to protect them from the traffic on High Street. He explained the students are picked up from the east side.

Mr. Coiner stated having the sign incorporated in the fence was not a traditional use of High Street signage.

Mr. Knight asked if all of the proposed plants would be used. Mr. Hayes stated it was a palette to work from.

Mr. Coiner asked if there was a line of sight issue if the fence came out to the sidewalk. Mr. Hayes was not aware of one.

Mr. Wolf called for comments.

Mr. Knight stated he was impressed by the proposal. He stated making the fence a little lower would be helpful.

Mr. Adams expressed a preference to see the fence a darker color.

Mr. Tremblay expressed support for the design. He agreed the fence needed to be less obvious.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, New Construction, and Site Design, moved to that the proposed changes, including the trellis, roof, windows, paving -- with the understanding that specific materials will come back to the Board -- and fence meet the Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following condition that the fence, shutters, and standing seam metal roof use a darker color -- dark green to Charleston green -- to help the fence recede and be compatible with the balance of the structure. Mr. Lucy asked if he would accept an amendment that the height of the fence meet the Guidelines of not more than four feet. Mr. Tremblay stated he would if they could move back to the 4'3" to 4'6" the applicant says would work for them. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf asked if Mr. Tremblay would accept grey colors; Mr. Tremblay stated he would. Mr. Coiner urged Mr. Tremblay to put a height restriction on the fence. Mr. Tremblay amended his motion for the fence to be no higher than 4'6." Mr. Knight accepted the amendment. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 7-1; Mr. Coiner voted against.

Ms. Heetderks left the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

J. Preliminary Discussion

218 West Water Street -- Waterhouse mixed use project

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The previous design was discussed with a cantilever sail at the December, 2005, meeting. The consensus at that meeting was that a portion of 218 West Water Street could be demolished as that part had been built in 1974. The sail has been eliminated from the current design. Additional building is proposed above the former Thomas Tire structure. A lobby and pedestrian entrance has been added on the Water Street and South Street facades. A key design concern is encouraging pedestrian activity and welcoming pedestrians into the building.

Mr. Bill Atwood stated there would be an Open House with the neighborhood at his office to discuss a strategy and dialog. Mr. Atwood stated he would like to know if there was adverse feeling about putting architecture over the tire center.

Mr. Adams asked if Mr. Atwood would supply a section drawing showing through the project through the street on Water Street through one of the houses to the project. Mr. Adams stated the aerial views were confusing. Mr. Atwood stated he would and they would also submit the standard axial.

Mr. Knight stated as long as there was some sort of articulation between what is existing versus what has been added, he had no particular concern with building around and on top of the structure. Mr. Wolf expressed his agreement.

Ms. Gardner stated there were some great opportunities but she did feel for the people on South Street because of the sheer size of the building. She wondered if there was a way to stack everything on the top third toward Water Street to keep Water Street dense.

Mr. Brent Nelson, of 214 South Street, asked if the public could comment. Mr. Wolf stated they could. Mr. Nelson stated he and his neighbors had been interested in seeing this property redeveloped and did not care to see it the way it is. However, they had not been notified of any of these meetings. He expressed concern about what he had seen so far. He stated the neighborhood had not been informed of the open house to see drawings. He asked that the Board request that the Director of Neighborhood Development Services have the ordinance rewritten so that notice is given at this level.

Mr. Jerry Shea, an owner at Lewis & Clark, expressed agreement with the comments given by Mr. Nelson. He stated this was a very important issue for them at Lewis & Clark.

Mr. Coiner stated he had never thought about sending notices on preliminary discussions. Mr. Coiner stated he had never thought the neighbors were not part of the process.

Mr. Atwood stated it was more his fault than Ms. Scala's. It was a difficult balance out of courtesy to the seller; the seller did not want the discussion to go public until the buyer can demonstrate a certain reality. Mr. Atwood apologized to Mr. Nelson and the others.

Mr. Wolf stated the agenda is publicly advertised. It did not go to individual adjacent property owners.

K. Preliminary Discussion

1600 Gordon Avenue -- Addition to Martha Jefferson House

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a two and-a-half story Colonial Revival building built in 1922 as a dwelling. In 1956 it was sold for use as a retirement home; an addition, designed by Milton Grigg, was added the same year. The west wing addition was added in 1974. The applicant seeks to add 12 independent living units onto the grounds as connected structures

around an open court. The new structures would range from one to two and-a-half stories and will match existing materials. The site plan also shows a proposed 25 space parking lot between 1602 Gordon Avenue, the Dabney-Tompson House, an individually designated property.

Mr. Tom Bernier, President and CEO of Martha Jefferson House, gave a history of Martha Jefferson House which was created in 1957 by Hunter Perry. Operating under the auspices of Martha Jefferson Hospital until 2000, it is a nonprofit operation. He stated they would love to be able to face the future of the next 50 years and stay exactly the same, but the realities of the changing market in long term care don't allow that. Ten to 15 percent of the residents of the House are on scholarship.

Ms. Sherry Graves, also representing Martha Jefferson House, stated they wanted to keep the tradition of the main house and set up a courtyard with cottages around it. Most of the proposed buildings are one story; toward the back of the property there will be one two and-a-half story building. She stated they wanted to make sure there weren't any glaring problems with what was done. She presented the Board with an additional drawing depicting the view from Ackley Lane.

Mr. Coiner asked if there had been any neighborhood input. Ms. Graves stated they had applied for site plan approval, so the neighborhood had been notified. She stated a few people came forward who wanted to know why they weren't making it larger.

Mr. Tremblay stated this was located in the University High Density District which usually has student housing. He stated it was not being maximized in terms of its potential density. He stated that was favorable.

Ms. Gardner sought clarification of the plans for buffering the proposed parking. Ms. Graves stated there would be landscaping in the back.

Mr. Knight asked if Martha Jefferson House had any plans for 1602 Gordon Avenue. Mr. Bernier stated the Board was considering what to do. There was no anticipated use at this time.

Mr. Wolf stated that in terms of the building and the building forms and layout of the site and the courtyard, it was in a position with very low impact on Gordon Avenue.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know how many residents would be accommodated. Ms. Graves stated the 12 units could house 12 to 24 people.

Ms. Gardner sought clarification of how much parking would be required. Ms. Graves stated they were meeting, but not exceeding, the parking requirements.

Mr. Adams stated the massing was going to be sympathetic to the original structure.

Mr. Knight stated one of the beauties of the site was its existing plantings. He expressed a hope that the applicants would seek the advice of an arborist. Ms. Graves explained that Martha Jefferson House has an arborist with whom they had been consulting. Mr. Knight suggested the

applicants reconsider the proposed plant list which seemed to favor ornamental plants. He stated there were better tree choices than those proposed. He suggested white ash or red or white oak.

L. Approval of Minutes

November 1, 2005 (Work session)

November 15, 2005

December 20, 2005

Mr. Coiner cited page 7 of the December 20th meeting and asked that Phil Atwood be changed to Bill Atwood.

Mr. Knight moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

M. Matters from the public

There were no further matters from the public.

N. Other Business

Mr. Coiner asked Ms. Scala for the status of the CVS application. Ms. Scala stated she had not heard back from them.

Mr. Lucy asked what was going on with the Conservation District ordinance. Ms. Scala stated she had not done anything further since the last subcommittee meeting. Ms. Gardner asked if the next step was to present to the whole BAR what they had discussed. Ms. Scala stated they should do that.

Mr. Wolf stated he had been approached by someone who was concerned about the Martha Jefferson Hospital/Locust Avenue district being moved down the list for review. The concern was that the hospital building would be sold before the designation of the historic district and demolition could be done or that site plan approval could be received which would be good for five years and would keep them out of BAR review. Mr. Lucy stated MJH had retained a real estate consultant.

Mr. Coiner asked if Mr. Wolf and Mr. Knight were going to meet with anyone concerning the Pavilion. He reminded the Board a decision had been made about a year ago for Mr. Wolf and Mr. Atkins to meet with Aubrey Watts and someone else to talk about some of the deficiencies of the Pavilion. Mr. Wolf stated he would be happy to follow through on what he apparently dropped the ball on.

O. Adjournment

Mr. Tremblay moved to adjourn. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:12 p.m.