

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

Present: Not Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair Kate Swenson

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Wade Tremblay **Also Present:**

Preston Coiner Mary Joy Scala

Amy Gardner

Lynne Heetderks

Bill Lucy

William Adams

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Ryan Mickles, the Zoning Inspector, reminded the Board he had been before them in February to discuss detectable bottoms in the cafes. He stated he had met with cafe owners. He provided the Board with pictures of examples under consideration by cafe owners.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know the involvement level of the blind community and suggested they be involved in the planning stages. Mr. Mickles stated a member of the blind community had brought the issue to the attention of the City. Mr. Mickles also stated they were trying to meet ADA requirements.

Mr. Bill Atwood presented the Board with results from meetings with South Street and Lewis and Clark neighborhoods.

B. Preliminary Discussion

225/227 14th Street Apartments – Sadler Court Apartments, LLC

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property is located in the Venable Neighborhood ADC District. There are four non-contributing structures on site which are to be demolished. The applicant is submitting a new apartment complex for discussion. The apartment buildings front on Fourteenth and Fifteenth Street and on Sadler Street.

Mr. Trey Steigman, the owners representative, provided a topography exhibit as a supplement to the materials already provided for the Board.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Lucy sought clarification as the text description referenced the remaining two upper floors while the picture just presented seemed to show three floors. Mr. Steigman stated the drawing was a representative sample of a different project.

Mr. Coiner asked if a material other than vinyl had been considered. Mr. Steigman said they had not. Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant had read the Guidelines as to recommended materials; Mr. Steigman had not. Mr. Coiner urged him to do so before making a final submission.

Mr. Wolf asked if the proposed shingles were asphalt. Mr. Steigman stated they were. Mr. Wolf also wanted to know if the window light pattern was simulated. Mr. Steigman stated they had used three-pane windows in other projects and proposed that for this project. Mr. Wolf wanted to know what material was proposed for the retaining wall. Mr. Steigman stated it was to be step block.

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the placement of mechanical units. Mr. Steigman stated some would be rooftop units, but they were also looking at racking units, which would be screened, to be located on the interior courtyard area.

Mr. Wolf asked if the columns and guardrail on the front elevation was to be fiberglass. Mr. Steigman believed so.

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

Ms. Heetderks stated the proposed materials were not usually approved by the Board. Hardiplank would be preferable to vinyl. Simulated divided light windows with muntins applied on the outside and spacer bars within were preferred. She stated vinyl shutters had never been approved. Ms. Heetderks stated there had been limited approval of fiberglass depending on the context. Ms. Heetderks stated this was the first large scale building being seen by the Board for this District so this would be the precedent. She was not happy with materials which were prohibited or strongly discouraged.

Mr. Knight expressed concern about the way the buildings and parking were located on the site plan. He urged the applicant to look at the Guidelines which are clear on how the massing and street frontage of buildings should reflect the prevailing buildings in the district. Mr. Knight encouraged the applicant to think of the open spaces within the site.

Mr. Steigman stated he would look at the Guidelines. He stated the beauty of the site plan was the accessibility. The parking level was all accessible to the mobility impaired as were the ground floor units on both buildings. He stated their intent with building placement had been to not create a wall across Sadler.

Mr. Wolf concurred with Ms. Heetderks' about the materials. He reiterated that the Guidelines say that fiberglass should not be employed. Mr. Wolf stated they would probably not allow Redi-Rock or step back block as a material for the retaining wall; he suggested a brick veneered cast wall or block wall.

Mr. Tremblay expressed his empathy for the architects who had designed the project thinking they were not subject to the Board's purview. He hoped the Board could work with the applicant to avoid a significant redesign.

Ms. Heetderks encouraged Mr. Steigman to get a copy of the new construction Guidelines since the Board was bound by those Guidelines.

Mr. Adams felt the parking underneath seemed problematic.

C. Preliminary Discussion

101,105,107,111 East Main Street -- Keith Woodard

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant proposes a Mixed Use Development.

Mr. Greg Brezinski, architect for the project, was present with Michael Borg of Humphries & Partners.

Mr. Michael Borg gave a presentation to the Board. They were proposing a nine-story structure. Floor plans had been provided in the members' packets. The structure would have retail and parking on the first floor. The second floor, the Market Street entry, would have office or mixed use. The remaining floors would be residential. Materials under consideration were brick, glass, and capstone.

Mr. Brezinski stated one of the buildings was built in 1886; the other around 1960. He stated they wanted to bring back the fabric of the building. The buildings represented the important contributions of significant businessmen to the Charlottesville economy. He stated there was not enough documentation to restore the facade; however, they were planning to recreate the texture of the facades.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Mr. Aaron Wunsch, of Preservation Piedmont, asked if the middle facade replaced or overlaid the older facade. The applicant stated it replaced it. Mr. Wunsch expressed his disappointment that a project which had been fought by City preservationists for years had come back under a new guise. He felt the buildings, which were perfectly usable, were the cornerstones of the Downtown Historic District.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Coiner asked if two vertical elements were necessary to turn the corner. The applicant explained the more dominant element was on the Market Street while something much more restrained was being done on the Mall street side so the corner element was a special place that could be architecturally significant.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know what materials were being considered. The applicant stated they were considering: brick, storefront glass as well as curtain wall glass, metal for the canopies in the upper columns.

Mr. Wolf asked if spandrel was to be included. The applicant stated if the curtain wall was taken all the way up, some spandrel-like elements would be required.

Mr. Lucy sought clarification of how the step backs would be met. The applicant stated the step backs were being exceeded on the Main Street side. The Market Street side had a similar attitude. The applicant stated the only thing projecting into the set back is the corner element.

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

Ms. Heetderks asked if the applicant was considering maintaining as many original materials as possible on the ground floor interiors or if they would be gutting everything. The applicant stated they would be looking into preserving the original materials.

Mr. Knight stated he was impressed with the way the project was developing. Reading the Guidelines and looking at the compatibility and rhythm along the Mall, Mr. Knight thought there were some good things happening. He stated he was a little apprehensive about the corner elements.

Mr. Lucy stated one of the important parts of the Mall structures was their small size with openings averaging 25 feet. He felt this was a very nice effort to maintain a continuation of small structures even in a quite large structure.

Ms. Heetderks expressed a preference to see more reference to local structures, such as the Monticello Hotel and the Wachovia Tower, while not being a reproduction of those buildings.

Ms. Genevieve Keller, a downtown resident, was glad the architects were cognizant of the history of the buildings. She expressed a desire to see as much of Charlottesville's history interpreted as possible. However, she was disappointed there was an approach to facadism rather than preservation of historic fabric and buildings. She stated if this was a precedent, they would lose so much of the character and richness of the Downtown.

Mr. Wolf stated he was taken by the design approach while being sympathetic to the issues and concerns expressed. He felt the different variations on the treatment of the facade on the Main Street side were good. He expressed concern about the corner element at Market and First since he did not think that corner warranted that strong or big of a move.

Mr. Adams expressed concern about some of the scale elements since most of the experience of the building would be on a pedestrian level. He felt some of the larger scale items may need to recede while smaller scale items needed to take precedence.

Mr. Tremblay applauded the applicant for the process they undertook.

Mr. Lucy stated one of the strengths of the arches was that the parking access disappeared.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-12-01

Downtown Mall -- 200 block West Main Street

Newsstand Kiosk Redesign

Stephen Russell, Applicant/City of Charlottesville, Owner

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is in the Downtown ADC District. The Board had approved the design for a newsstand at the December meeting; color and signage was to come back to the Board for approval. The new design is slightly longer and wider than the original. The proposal is now for a wood frame, painted MDO sidewall panels, painted wood trim, and a painted metal roof. Two roll down security doors of bronze colored aluminum slats will cover the magazine display. Signage is proposed for both ends but not the sides. The proposed newsstand is generally compatible with the historic district. Staff needs to see the color chips before recommending the colors. In general, the proposal meets the Guidelines.

Mr. Stephen Russell explained the original design was not cost effective. He stated the proposal meets the aesthetics and material requirements of the Mall Guidelines.

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

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the newsstand would no longer be moveable. Mr. Russell confirmed that it was not.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know what the doors were made of. Mr. Russell stated his belief they would be MDO. Mr. Coiner then asked if the doors were hinged or sliding. Mr. Russell stated they would be hinged.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Knight stated he remained impressed by this proposal and thought it was a worthy addition to the Mall. He thought it met all the Guidelines and was in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Wolf agreed with Mr. Knight. He stated if the new roof was hipped on all four sides, it would have a thinner profile.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Public Improvements, moved to find that the proposed newsstand satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the suggestion that owner consider a hipped roof on

both ends. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that a color sample come back to Staff. Mr. Knight and Mr. Lucy accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Knight informed the Chair that he had to leave the meeting. Mr. Knight left the meeting at 6:42 p.m.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-02-04

1600 Gordon Avenue

Tax Map 9 Parcels 14 and 16

Martha Jefferson House, Tom Bernier, Owner/Applicant

Martha Jefferson House Addition -- Independent Living Units

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Martha Jefferson House is a contributing structure in the Rugby Road/Venable Neighborhood District. The original structure was built in 1922. It was sold for use as a retirement home in 1955. A Preliminary Discussion was held at the February meeting and found the addition would meet the Guidelines and would be compatible with the District. The applicant seeks to add 12 independent living units as connected structures around an open courtyard. Existing materials would be matched. The landscape plan indicates one large ash and one large magnolia would be preserved. Oaks and boxwood are proposed in the parking lot. Staff finds this is an appropriate addition to the existing building and asks that window details be submitted for approval and lighting should be fully shielded.

Ms. Sherry Graves, on behalf of Martha Jefferson House, made a presentation to the Board. The existing house has a true slate roof; to keep costs down and to not have to design to carry that weight, the applicants propose using a synthetic slate. Ms. Graves provided the Board with samples of the synthetic slate.

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

Mr. Adams asked if the gutter and downspout would be copper. Ms. Graves stated her belief that they were.

Mr. Wolf asked if a brick head would be used for the windows. Ms. Graves stated it would not, instead they would match the existing precast fill.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner stated his pleasure with the use of the man-made slate. The Board had been encouraging people to use it but no one had.

Mr. Adams stated this would be a nice addition.

Mr. Wolf felt the presentation had been very thorough. He felt the proposal was very sensitive to the existing building.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, moved to find that the proposed addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Heetderks left the meeting, 6:58 p.m.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-03-01

1700 University Avenue

Tax Map 9 Parcel 143

St. Paul's Memorial Church, Applicant and Owner

Rear entrance improvements

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The church was built during 1924-27 and was designed by Eugene Bradbury. It is a contributing structure. An application to replace the front stairs, walkways, and Chancellor Street side stairs was approved 19 April 2005. The applicant seeks: to upgrade the back entrance to full handicapped access and drop off area; to improve the drainage in that area; add a small roof and concrete pad for a waiting area; replace a door with a wood door similar to the existing but with glass panels and opening out -- the existing transom would remain; and add a small brick wall to conceal the trash area. The applicant is seeking approval of any of three options that vary in cost. The changes will provide a needed service, will improve the appearance, and are located in an alley area where they are not very visible. In general, Staff recommends approval of any of the options.

Ms. Louise Gallagher stated this part of the building was added in the '50s. She stated they were trying to get the exterior up to grade and to allow for access both in and out of the building. This was the obvious place to put the handicap access.

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

Mr. Coiner asked if there were drawings of the three options. Ms. Gallagher stated there were not.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know the height of the brick wall. Ms. Gallagher stated it would be one foot above the dumpsters.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Wolf stated his belief that any of the three options would be suitable.

Ms. Heetderks reentered the meeting, 7:08 p.m.

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

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-03-02

1406 Grady Avenue

Tax Map 5 Parcel 88.1

Veliky, LC, Owner/Gate Pratt, Architect

Create dormer(s) for attic bedrooms

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The property is in the Rugby Road/Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The applicant seeks approval to create one or two dormers for attic bedrooms. Two options are proposed: a metal shingle shed or asphalt shingle, hipped. Both options have exposed rafter tails and deep eaves. Option A is 8 feet wide, shed roof dormer with metal roof, wood lapped siding painted white and wood double hung windows. Option B is two shed roof dormers. Option C is a single 8 foot wide hip roofed dormer with asphalt shingles to match the existing roof, wood lapped siding painted white and wood casement windows similar to the existing window. Option D would be two of the hipped roof dormers. The windows will be either historic salvaged to match existing details or they will be new windows with either true divided lights or simulated with interior/exterior muntins with spacer bars. Although the Guidelines discourage adding dormers on visible elevations, there is precedent in the neighborhood for adding attic dormers to this style of bungalow. The Board should comment on the number of dormers and the roof form options. Either choice of materials is in keeping with the Guidelines and the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Gate Pratt stated this was a modest house which had been purchased for student housing. He stated the owner preferred the single window shed roof option. The applicant was seeking a way to add light and air into a remodeled room.

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

Mr. Coiner asked if the dormer would also add head room. Mr. Pratt stated it was not the driving force, but it would do that as well and make it a more useful room.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know why the dormer on the front would not be mimicked on the back. Mr. Pratt explained there may be an effort to expand out the back.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay applauded the owner for the proposal. The dormer would allow for a very attractive room. He stated it retains much of the character of the house and is consistent with other, similar houses in the neighborhood.

Mr. Coiner stated he only had issue with designing from the inside out, in that the exterior design would be dictated by what they want to use the attic for.

Ms. Heetderks stated it was a clear violation of the Guidelines: "Dormers should not be introduced on visible elevations where none existed originally."

Mr. Adams stated the shed option was not in keeping with the architecture of the building. He stated the hipped options would help retain the original mass of the building better.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to make sure the applicant had the option of going with the 12 foot width on the dormer if it was needed with the hip roof.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know which option Mr. Adams was recommending. Mr. Adams stated C or D could be rendered in sympathy with the existing building.

Mr. Wolf stated that while the Guidelines did reference dormers not being introduced on visible elevations, this proposal was for a side elevation. With the sensitivity and stylistic continuity that it had with the existing structure, he was more in favor of C.

Mr. Adams, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed dormer, scheme C with hipped roof, satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the modification that the face wall of the dormer moves back away from the eave. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Adams asked if, in terms of the siding in the dormer, it should match whatever is under the asphalt shingles as well. Ms. Gardner offered a friendly amendment to have the windows line up as well. Mr. Adams and Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried, 5-2; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Coiner voted against.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-03-04

410 East High Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 39

County of Albemarle, Owner(Ron Lilley)/DJG, Inc., Architects

Albemarle County Courthouse sally port and partial demolition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Courthouse, which is dated 1803 in the rear part, and the adjoining office building, 1939, are contributing structures in the North Downtown ADC District. A preliminary discussion was held July 20, 2004. The preliminary drawings are much different than the final proposal. The previous BAR comments included: to preserve the steps to the office building at all costs; maintain the leading edge of the existing arch; reverse the swing of the gate to swing out, not in; shorten the length of the sally port and keep the back wall as the chiller pit wall; match the materials of the enhancement project; and to conduct an archaeological survey of the site. The applicant seeks approval to add a sally port to the Clerk of Court annex, former County Office building. The existing brick steps will be demolished as well as part of the breezeway wall and part of the newly constructed perimeter brick wall at the sidewalk. The existing brick stair landing will remain. A new brick patio will be constructed above the sally port and new brick steps and a concrete landing will be added to match the existing, but they will be out further from the building. The chiller pit wall will remain with a new brick wall extending to the sidewalk. The existing brick arch will remain. The new brick wall with jack arch, precast concrete wall cap and iron gate to match the existing gate will align with this wall. The new gates will swing out. The rear sally port wall extends 10.5 feet beyond the chiller pit wall. The sally port area will be paved with brick pavers. The applicant is requesting a more enclosed version with high entrance wall and patio above the sally port for the safety of the officers and prisoners. At issue is the removal of the existing brick steps. Staff recommends an archaeological study prior to excavation; the applicant thought a study had been conducted.

Mr. Ron Lilley, of the Albemarle County General Services Office, was present with Donald Booth and Trace Higgins of DJG. He stated the archaeological study did exist and was done by cultural resource people as part of the original Court Square improvements. The area for the proposal does not show as an area of archaeological significance. Sheriff Robb and Captain Bulwinkle were present to answer any operational questions.

Mr. Donald Booth stated an archaeological study had been performed prior to the Court Square renovations; no culturally significant resources were identified within the footprint where the sally port is proposed. He stated Ms. Scala had sent the preliminary comments from 2004 and they had tried to address each of those in the submission before the Board. The one area which was impacted is the stairs and bottom landing of the existing stairs which egress the second floor of the annex. The goal of maintaining the back wall of the chiller pit is physically limited by the size of vehicle the Sheriff and his staff utilize to transport detainees to the courthouse area.

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

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of what patio would be removed. Mr. Booth explained that the existing upper landing would remain; the stairs coming down from that landing would need to be removed to facilitate a covered, secure area for offloading and on loading of detainees. The stairs would be relocated and constructed in similar detail and manner.

Mr. Coiner then sought details of two vertical elements in the brick depicted in the drawing the Board had. Mr. Booth stated those were the sloping walls that tie into the existing Court Square improvements.

Ms. Heetderks asked if the brick stairs were original. Mr. Coiner stated they did not appear to be.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the top of the precast would be the same elevation as the new patio. Mr. Booth stated it would.

Mr. Coiner stated it was unfortunate that society had reached a point where sally ports and all this protection was needed. He stated the current situation involved the vehicle blocking the side and often being left unattended, which hindered blind people walking up the street. Mr. Coiner further stated the gates were a big issue before and this proposal sets the gates back which was a plus for the neighborhood.

Ms. Heetderks wanted any approval conditioned on review of the archaeological report.

Mr. Adams agreed with Ms. Heetderks. He stated the scheme could be okay but it would rely a great deal on the development of the details like paving patterns and what happens at the edge of the upper landing.

Mr. Wolf asked if the 8'4" opening to the sally port driven by the vehicle size. Mr. Booth stated it was. Mr. Wolf stated there were smaller garage door openings and clearances in public parking garages and wondered if there was any way to drop the proposed size. Mr. Booth stated they knew the size of the current vehicle, but they did not know what size the next transport vehicle would be so they were trying to design the opening around the current maximum van size that could be purchased.

Mr. Coiner asked if there would be lighting. Mr. Booth stated there would be surface mounted lighting interior to the sally port but held back at the rear wall where the prisoners would be loading and unloading.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed partial demolition and new sally port satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Lucy wanted to know if the additional details Mr. Adams had mentioned required a motion. Mr. Wolf stated it could be an amendment to the motion. Mr. Tremblay stated he would welcome an amendment which would request the details and he thought they would want to be

very specific about what details they were looking for. Mr. Coiner mentioned lighting. Mr. Adams suggested: construction of the brick patio over the sally port, especially the edge; if the stair was going to match what was there exactly -- Mr. Booth stated it would; whether the handrails would be at 42 inches -- Mr. Booth stated the existing railings were at 42 inches. Mr. Tremblay clarified it was the detail of the patio and the lighting beneath the sally port. Ms. Heetderks stated the demolition approval ought to be conditional upon receipt of a satisfactory archaeological survey, which may or may not be the survey which had already been done. Mr. Tremblay sought clarification of "satisfactory." Mr. Wolf suggested it would be one which they had receipt of as opposed to be told of. Ms. Heetderks suggested satisfactory was someone doing a test dig and determining that it was not affected. Mr. Coiner wanted the credentials of the person who said it was not significant. Ms. Scala stated she could bring the report back to the Board for them to determine if it was satisfactory. Mr. Tremblay amended his motion to include the details of the patio, the lighting beneath the sally port and the archaeological study done of the area to determine its appropriateness. Mr. Lucy seconded the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 05-11-04

405 Ridge Street

Tax Map 29 Parcel 133

Jeffrey and Susan Lanterman, Applicants

New construction to replace cottage in rear

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The house was built in 1891 and is in the Ridge Street ADC District. The scale, mass and overall design concept of the second house was approved in November 2005. This is an accessory building. The applicant had been asked to bring back a simplified design that did not detract from the main house addressing the modest changes suggested and a site plan showing the final position of the second house and all the improvements between the two houses. The previous drawing had been included in the members' packet for comparison of the proposal. Previous discussion comments included: a need for window details and that two-over-two would be appropriate; color samples; simplify the porch on the east side; correct the roof line that does not agree with the plan; the house should comply to five foot setback requirements; show fencing and gates; and apply for a waiver to have a gravel rather than paved driveway. The proposed materials for the accessory dwelling are Hardiplank siding and a standing seam copper roof. The proposed windows are Marvin, or similar, two-over-two painted wood with simulated divided lights. The paint chips submitted are Downing Sand for the siding and Rookwood Red for the trim. An E-mail had been received earlier in the day that the applicants agreed to change the side yard setback to five feet as required by the Zoning Ordinance. Materials are appropriate. Staff opinion is that the proposed second house should be simple and subordinate to the main house. Information still needed includes: site plan that shows the proposed building meeting the minimum five foot setbacks;

and a window sample. The applicants' gravel driveway waiver will be handled separately by the Neighborhood Planner.

Mr. Jeffrey Lanterman provided the Board with the updated site plan showing the five yard setback.

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

Mr. Wolf asked what the square footage would be. Mr. Lanterman stated it was roughly 1650.

Mr. Lucy sought clarification of the gravel waiver. Ms. Scala stated a paved driveway was required; if someone wanted a gravel driveway, they needed to apply for a waiver. She further stated Mr. Lanterman had submitted the form. Ms. Scala stated Mr. Tolbert would or would not approve the waiver.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay applauded the owner for the care of work done on the main house and on designing an elegant dependency.

Mr. Adams asked if the intent had been for the building to be a dependency. Mr. Lanterman stated it would be a place for his mother to live.

Mr. Wolf was struck by the square footage of the proposal. He stated the simplifications and modifications of the roof line helped simplify the volume. He suggested letting the soffit run back up underneath or doing exposed rafter tails since the look of the eaves had less of the look of a backyard dependency or small cottage. Mr. Wolf suggested this would help address the scale.

Ms. Heetderks liked Mr. Wolf's point about the exposed rafter tails.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed accessory dwelling satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and with other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with exposed rafter tails as recommended. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Ms. Heetderks reiterated that Ms. Scala had asked for a window sample. Mr. Lanterman stated it would be the same window as approved for the main house. Mr. Tremblay stated that if it was what they had already approved, he was comfortable with that. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-03-05

422 East Main Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 52

Townsquare Associates, LLC, Owner/Marthe Rowen, Architect

Renovate facade and add windows in blocked up openings on Fifth Street

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is the old A&N building. The applicant wants to: renovate and repair the facade; install new aluminum-clad wood windows in the blocked up openings on the Fifth Street side; repair and replace the existing stucco sign panel; replace the existing metal soffit and wall panels with cement fiber panels; and paint throughout. The new windows will not be custom made to fit the opening but will have a flat wood filler in the arch. Three of the new windows are double hung one-over-one. Two of the new windows are hinged on the side. The proposed changes are compatible with the building and the historic district. Staff will need to approve the color chips. All signage must receive a separate sign permit.

Ms. Marthe Rowen stated the two awning windows were no longer going to be used.

Mr. Adams asked if that meant the opening would not be reopened at all now. Ms. Rowen stated that was correct.

Ms. Rowen stated the proposal consists primarily of repairing only and renovating the front sign panel and installing the windows in the existing openings on the side.

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

Mr. Coiner sought clarification of the material to be used for the flat wood filler. Ms. Rowen stated she imagined it would be plywood.

Mr. Lucy wanted to know how many windows would be opened. Ms. Rowen stated they would only be adding three windows.

Ms. Heetderks asked if the applicant would consider custom windows with arched tops. Ms. Rowen stated she would not. Ms. Rowen also explained that in 90 percent of the windows seen in the arches on the Downtown Mall, the arches were done not for decorative purposes and, then as now, it was expensive to have a lenthil. She stated this was a historically accurate way of doing it.

Mr. Coiner suggested that whatever was used above the windows be something that did not show the grain.

Mr. Adams wanted to know what color was planned. Ms. Rowen stated they would submit paint chips when they got that far in planning.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed facade renovations and new windows satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other

properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the reduced number of windows to be opened as stated by the applicant and that colors and signage and lighting will return for further review. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Approval of Minutes:

January 17, 2006

Ms. Heetderks moved to approve as submitted. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

February 21, 2006

Ms. Heetderks asked that these minutes be deferred until the next meeting as they had been sent by E-mail and she had not yet been able to print or read them. Mr. Coiner stated he could not print the format in which they had been sent. Mr. Wolf agreed with Ms. Heetderks' suggestion.

L. Matters from the public

There were no matters from the public.

M. Other Business

Mr. Coiner asked if Ms. Scala had talked with Mr. Tolbert about the application fees. Ms. Scala stated she had and that he had said that should be handled within the budget.

Mr. Coiner stated that, as May was National Preservation Month, he would like to see the Board come back with nominee suggestions at the April meeting.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know the progress on Individually Designated properties. Ms. Scala stated a new intern would be starting the process of notification of property owners to see if they were interested in having the properties designated.

Mr. Lucy wanted to know the status of the Conservation District. Ms. Scala stated that Lisa Kelley was working on the language of it.

N. Adjournment

Mr. Tremblay moved to adjourn. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:37 p.m.