

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
19 September, 2006
Draft Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Lynne Heetderks (arrived 5:09 p.m.)
Brian Hogg
Bill Lucy
William Adams

Not Present:

Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Amy Gardner

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:01 p.m.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. If pulled, minutes will be discussed at the end of the agenda, but applications will be discussed at the beginning.)

1. August 15, 2006 Minutes
2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (previous approval expired)

BAR 04-04-03
1018 West Main Street
Tax Map 10 Parcels 66 and 69
Demolish two additions to Patton Mansion
University of Virginia Foundation, Applicant

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-04
17 University Circle
Tax Map 6 Parcel 67

Andrew Carter, Applicant
Resurface driveway with stamped concrete

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-06
343 Fifteenth Street NW
Tax Map 9 Parcel 116
John Tiedeman, Applicant
White privacy fence

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-02
421 East Main Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 62
Irvin Santiago, Applicant for Java Java
Replace rear door; add ventilation units

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-04
Tax Map 53 Parcel 39.1
Jackson Park
City of Charlottesville, Owner
John B. Mann, Landscape Manager, Parks and Recreation Department, Applicant
Replace and add new landscape materials for Linda Peacock memorial

Mr. Wolf called for the consent agenda. Mr. Hogg asked that the minutes be pulled. Mr. Coiner stated there had been an E-mail from Mr. Knight asking that item 3 be discussed. Mr. Wolf stated items 1 and 3 were removed.

Mr. Coiner moved for approval of the Consent Agenda Items 2, 4, 5, and 6. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-1; Mr. Hogg recused himself because of a conflict on one of the items.

B.3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-04
17 University Circle
Tax Map 6 Parcel 67
Andrew Carter, Applicant
Resurface driveway with stamped concrete

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property is located in the Rugby Road/University Circle/Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The house was built between 1906 and 1912. It has

been undergoing registrations for two years. The applicant requests permission to resurface the existing gravel driveway with stamped concrete similar to an existing driveway at 1835 University Circle. Staff feels it meets the Design Guidelines and recommends approval.

The applicant had nothing to add.

Mr. Wolf called for questions.

Mr. Hogg wanted to know how the outside edge of the new driveway would be treated as it related to a neighboring driveway. Mr. Carter stated the grade would need to be changed between the two driveways. He further stated there would be a four inch curb put on the downhill side of the driveway to keep stormwater from the neighbor's driveway.

Mr. Wolf stated the fact that the precedent had already been set in the neighborhood made him comfortable with the stamped concrete. He did express concern about how the edge would be handled.

Ms. Heetderks joined the meeting at 5:09 p.m.

Mr. Hogg stated he would not have been able to tell the driveway at 1835 was concrete.

Mr. Tremblay stated a concrete driveway was superior to asphalt in most cases. He felt the stamping provided a very attractive solution.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, moved to find that the proposed driveway 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. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-04

100 West Jefferson Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 180

Christ Episcopal Church, Applicant

Replace front porch decking and handrails

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This structure, once known as the Magruder Sanitarium, is a contributing structure in the North Downtown ADC District. The applicant requests approval to replace the painted wood front porch decking and both sets of painted wood steps with grey ChoiceDek composite decking and to add a matching white painted wood handrail on the left side of the front steps. This is a significant building in a prominent location. The Guidelines support replacing the painted wood porch decking and steps with the same material.

Mr. Sam Edwards stated the existing deck had been badly damaged by age and a leaky gutter and is hazardous. The proposal would be for something identical with the exception of an additional handrail for safety purposes. Composite materials were chosen to reduce maintenance costs.

Mr. Coiner applauded the applicants for the work they have done maintaining the building. He stated the building was too significant to have a composite porch. He did not see that maintenance of the wood would be a great issue. He stated he could not support anything except a tongue and groove traditional flooring.

Ms. Heetderks cited Guideline 3.6 -- Deteriorated historic features should be repaired rather than replaced. When the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture of the visual qualities and, where possible, materials -- in support of Mr. Coiner's comment.

Mr. Wolf felt the composite would have a very different appearance from a painted wood floor.

Mr. Tremblay stated this was a significant structure but he did not think it was a landmark. He felt a porch was not an area that couldn't be replaced easily down the road. He stated he had seen this used in houses of similar character.

Mr. Adams felt using gapped wood would cause more problems. He thought it would be possible to use a synthetic material with the tongue and groove. He stated painted wood would look better.

Mr. Wolf asked if the applicant would consider seeking a deferral to look into an alternative substitute. The applicant asked if they could get approval for the replacement as long as they used a wood or a tongue and groove composite. Mr. Wolf stated the tongue and groove would have to come back to Staff with the understanding that it could be brought back to the Board if Staff felt it necessary. Mr. Adams suggested the applicant consider the Tendura brand. Mr. Edwards stated they would appreciate having some guidance toward what they needed to do.

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 deck and step replacements in painted wood or with a tongue and groove composite material to be approved by Staff with recommendations from the Board and a new painted wood handrail satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with that condition. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Coiner stated the motion as worded put him in an awkward position because he would not vote for the composite material but he would vote for wood. The motion passed, 6-1; Mr. Coiner voted against.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

**BAR 06-08-03
600 Block of East Main Street
Tax Map 53 Parcel 60**

Satyendra Huja
"Sister Cities" sculpture location

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The City of Charlottesville participates in a sister city exchange program with several cities in Bulgaria, France, and Italy. The applicant seeks approval of a specific location in front of City Hall for a Sister Cities sculpture. The sculpture is not subject to BAR approval for the artwork, but it will consist of two figures approximately 4 feet and 6 feet tall made of Virginia soapstone. The currently proposed base is a half circle of approximately 40 square feet of concrete that is the same color and texture as the band of concrete to which it will attach at the edge of the Mall bricks. The proposed location is in a landscaped area to the right of City Hall. A 1 foot by 3 foot descriptive plaque would be in the ground. Staff is concerned about finding a location that will not make the sculpture look like an afterthought. Other areas have been considered including the landscaped area near a magnolia tree on the west side of the entrance to City Hall, the Plaza on Water Street near the Transit Center stairs, and a location to one side of the City Hall entrance doors. If this location is chosen, Staff suggests the landscaping be modified to incorporate the statue into the composition. Mr. Knight had been on the committee that met to discuss the sculpture. He thought the base and location needed more design work. Mr. Knight thought the scale was too small for the Mall. He felt the base needed to be upgraded and more information was needed on any changes proposed for plantings and other elements surrounding the sculpture. He thought if it was intended to be permanent, then it should be more substantial.

Mr. Satyendra Huja stated this was a good location and that they had looked at four or five different locations. He agreed that landscaping should be incorporated.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know the significance of the statue. Mr. Huja explained the symbolism of two sisters was meant to celebrate the relationship of the four sister cities.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know why the committee did not want to put the sculpture directly on the Mall. Mr. Huja stated they were worried it would be in the way or that it would be damaged.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant was aware of any proposed or pending changes to that end of the Mall. Ms. Scala stated there should be adequate room for the sculpture.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if there was a site plan. There was not.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board members.

Mr. Coiner stated his initial reaction was that it did not meet some of the Guidelines. He expressed concern about the scale. He expressed a desire to consider this as a preliminary discussion.

Mr. Adams stated he was having a problem with the geometry and placement. He wanted to see a site plan.

Ms. Heetderks wondered if the site to the left of City Hall would be better.

Mr. Adams agreed that site would be less problematic. He felt the proposal needed to be integrated into a landscape plan.

Mr. Wolf wondered what it would look like without a base as that seemed to serve as a distraction. He felt it would be more subtle and more elegant if it sat in a landscaped area.

Mr. Adams agreed the sculpture should be integrated with a landscape plan.

Mr. Lucy stated being able to walk around it and touch it would be a very nice feature and would add to the mall experience. However, he felt it should not be at the City Hall end of the Mall.

Ms. Heetderks stated she was not keen on the idea of putting it on the Mall at that end of the Mall because there was already too much there with the Pavilion, the carousel, the Free Speech wall and the benches.

Mr. Hogg expressed a preference for a simple circular base rather than the two-level base shown in some of the renderings.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-01

113 Sixth Street NW

Tax Map 32 Parcel 170

Ebenezer Baptist Church, Applicant

Addition of elevator; partial demolition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The building was built in 1908 and is a contributing structure in the West Main ADC district. The applicant seeks approval to erect an exterior elevator to provide handicapped access to the second story church sanctuary. The elevator would be attached to the rear of the church vestibule in an area that is not visible from the street. The applicant proposes to remove a stained glass window located at the rear of the second story vestibule to accommodate the elevator doorway. The window width would not be altered, but the brick area below the window would have to be removed to provide access. The elevator is prefabricated with anodized aluminum frame and steel or Plexiglas panels. The Guidelines for Rehabilitation recommend altering the building in this manner. There does not appear to be a viable alternative. The proposed elevator is not compatible with the building or the district but it does provide needed handicapped access and is located in the least visible location on the site. There is a concern that the elevator is accessed by an area which is owned by another property and if it were blocked off, there would be no way to get to the elevator. More detailed drawings would be required if the application was granted.

Mr. Lucy sought clarification that the elevator would not be visible from the street. Ms. Scala stated it could not be seen from Sixth Street and an adjacent building blocks it from Main Street.

Mr. Michael Moore, President and Owner of Blue Ridge Mobility, stated his company was the installing company for the elevator platform at issue.

Leeman Bates, Pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church was also present. He stated a census had determined that 54 percent of the congregation was over the age of 55. Access to the church had been a long-standing issue.

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

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know how the elevator shaft would be attached to the building. Mr. Moore stated the shaft supported its weight vertically and would be bolted into the ground and into the building.

Mr. Moore stated the stained glass window was their biggest challenge. He stated their carpenter, who was noted for restoration of older buildings, would be getting the window out in one piece to preserve it.

Mr. Wolf asked if they had considered placing the elevator internally. Mr. Moore stated they had but there was no viable location for the elevator doorway.

Ms. Heetderks wanted to know if the congregation was prepared to store the window and any bricks that were removed to allow restoration should the elevator be moved at any point in the future. Pastor Bates stated the whole idea was to retain the integrity of the window.

Mr. Coiner asked if the church had a place to install the window even if it was not an exterior wall. Mr. Hogg stated he had seen cases where the congregation had built a light box and used a window as a decoration in the community room.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if there were color options for the anodized frame. Mr. Moore stated it could be made almost any color and could be matched to the existing brick. Mr. Moore stated they usually prefer to use as little steel as possible and more Plexiglas. The Plexiglas would be smoky rather than clear.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know how many people could fit in the elevator. Mr. Moore explained it had a weight capacity of 750 pounds which would allow for a handicapped person in a wheelchair and an attendant. He stated it was limited use and limited access.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

Mr. Eugene Williams, of 620 Ridge Street, and a member of Ebenezer Baptist Church for 68 years, read a prepared statement in opposition of the proposal. He stated the window was a piece of history and was dedicated to the Mary Ann Lewis Club, the Ever Ready Club, the Helping Hand Club; the presidents of those clubs was also listed on the dedication. He stated nothing should be removed from the historical Ebenezer Baptist Church before a site plan has been presented to the Board of Architectural Review.

Pastor Bates stated he had met with descendents of the people mentioned on that dedication and they were in full support of the proposal. He further stated the names would be preserved once the window was taken off.

Ms. Bernadette Whitford Hammond, a lifelong member of Ebenezer Baptist Church, stated Mary Ann Lewis was her great-grandmother. She stated her family was in full support of the lift because there were so many church members who were unable to attend because they could not get up the stairs into church.

Dr. Venable S. Page, a lifelong member of the church and a descendant of Mary Ann Lewis, stated the whole family supported the elevator. He stated they had family members who could not come to church because of the steps.

Mr. Kenneth Page, of 205 Fifth Street SW, stated his grandfather was one of the founders of Ebenezer Baptist Church. He stated his family had always supported the church. He further stated his wife was unable to get up the steps easily. He stated his family was in support of the elevator.

With no one else from the public wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Coiner stated the Guidelines allow for latitude in providing barrier-free access. He stated the need for an elevator or a lift far outweighed the Guidelines concerning the stained glass window. He hoped the window could find a prominent home within the church.

Mr. Tremblay stated he was swayed by the need of the parishioners to have access to the church. He realized this was an imperfect solution but there was nothing more obvious that could be done.

Ms. Heetderks stated part of historic preservation was preserving historic fabric and part was preserving institutions. This church is more significant because it remains this congregation than if this church was something else. With the congregation's commitment to preserving the window, and hopefully the brick, Ms. Heetderks expressed her support for the application. She stated an interest in seeing an architect's recommendation as to whether there might be some other way to do this; if the recommendation was that this was the way to do it, she would be in support of this.

Mr. Lucy stated his support of the application due to the already well-stated reasons.

Mr. Hogg agreed the options to achieve this goal were very few. He encouraged a dark anodized color especially if the glass was smoky.

Mr. Adams expressed his support and agreed with everything that had been said.

Mr. Wolf also agreed with what had been said. He expressed his appreciation for the careful and thoughtful explanation. He expressed a preference for a solid anodized panel rather than the Plexiglas.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, New Construction and Additions, moved to find that the

proposed partial demolition and exterior elevator satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, with the understanding that the elevator will be aligned centrally within the existing stained glass window opening, that the stained glass window and any brick that is removed will be preserved within the church by the church, with details of the elevator to be approved by staff, and that the BAR approves the application. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting stood at recess at 6:39 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 6:44 p.m.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-06

West Main between the Blake Center and Northern Exposure

Tax Map 10, Parcels 60, 61, 81.1, 82

University of Virginia Foundation

New building and parking garage

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Preliminary comments were made at the 15 August meeting. The step back on the clinical building has been altered per the Board's input. The applicant eliminated the covered walkway. The curtain walls on the clinical building and the storefront windows have been changed to have a strong horizontal design that may not be as compatible to the other buildings on West Main Street. No drawings have been submitted for the west and south sides which is required for final approval. The applicant's letter states the elevations may not be final; however, the BAR must approve final versions. The changes to materials and set backs are more consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends partial approval of the submittal for massing and footprint based on what has been submitted and that the Board offer additional comments or recommendations for future submittals; the applicant can then request a deferral and return with final elevation drawings for all four sides.

Mr. Tim Rose, CEO of the UVa Foundation, stated this was a phase of a larger project which would include the creation of a cancer center that would go where the West Garage is currently located. He reiterated there had been many changes made based on the comments of the Board at the August meeting.

Mr. John Matthews, of Mitchell Matthews Architects, was present with Jim Snyder and Mark Atwood to answer any questions the Board had. He stated they had attempted to incorporate a majority of the feedback received at the prior meeting. The parking deck would be built first, followed by the bridge, and then the building. The clinical building and parking deck would use the same brick; it would be similar in color to McKim Hall.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the upper level windows were operable. Mr. Matthews stated they were currently fixed. The windows were aluminum clad, simulated divided light.

Mr. Adams asked if the applicant had considered a screen wall around the parking garage. Mr. Matthews stated they had considered it but had not reached a consensus. He further stated there was very little space along there.

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

Ms. Heetderks agreed the Board should consider the garage and building separately. She was unhappy that none of the parking was underground. She expressed a preference for at least two levels underground.

Mr. Lucy thought the changes were positive. He thought the phasing would be awkward.

Mr. Tremblay complimented the Foundation and the architect for their responses to the suggestions made in the earlier meeting. He stated the garage was significantly improved.

Mr. Coiner had no comments.

Mr. Adams stated he was uncomfortable with the mass of the parking garage; he thought it was huge. He stated it had gotten better but was still uncomfortable with its geometry on Eleventh Street. He expressed a desire to see more screening. He suggested a reduction in mass of the garage by at least one floor.

Mr. Wolf stated great strides had been taken. He stated he had not understood this project would be done in phases and expressed concern that the parking garage would be sitting there for an extended time before the building was built. He stated the railroad side of the building did not need to be dressed in brick. Mr. Wolf reiterated his concerns about the parking preceding the clinical building in the street edge.

Ms. Heetderks asked that they handle this as two separate projects as Staff had recommended. She also felt the garage was too big and expressed a desire to see more of the parking underground. She wanted to see something done to it so it looked less like a parking garage.

Mr. Tremblay moved that they approve the design of the garage as submitted with its current alignment with Eleventh Street and with the requirement that the brick banding extend from the top two floors down two additional levels on the West Main Street exposure. Mr. Lucy asked if he meant levels 3, 4, 5, and 6, since the top level did not have brick. Mr. Tremblay stated he would accept that if those were the correct numbers. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that would include that while they approve that in the concept, they would request additional study of if, in fact, there was any way to break up the scale of those openings by injecting some intermediate pieces that would help to bring some scale to that and that the applicant would come back to the Board with that. Mr. Tremblay accepted the friendly amendment as did Mr. Lucy. Mr. Adams stated he would not support it unless there was a reduction in mass. He felt it would change the city in this area and set in motion other changes. Mr. Wolf called for a vote by acclamation. The motion carried with Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Adams voting against.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the massing and footprint of the West Main Street clinical building satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application for massing and footprint, as well as the material palette that the architect has submitted, with the understanding that the applicant will come back to the Board with further details pertaining to the curtain wall, window systems, and physical samples of the materials. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a vote of acclamation. The motion passed.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from July meeting)

BAR 06-07-04

524 East Main Street

500 Block East Main Street Mall

City of Charlottesville, Owner/Virginia Discovery Museum, Applicant

Carousel sign

Ms. Scala stated the Board had a copy of the new proposed design as well as the old design. She stated the applicant had tried to meet all of the comments of the Board.

Ms. Peppy G. Linden, Executive Director of the Museum, stated they had changed the size, shape, font, color, text, and material based on feedback from the Board. The sign would be mounted on the fence.

Mr. Coiner asked that the sign be put lower.

Mr. Coiner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Signs, Awnings, and Cafes, moved to find that the proposed carousel sign satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves this application as submitted as well as the already installed security signs. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess, whereupon the meeting stood recessed at 8:06 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-09-03

524 Valley Road

Tax Map 11 Parcel 72

Richard Ward, Applicant

Seek approval for existing addition

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant is seeking approval for an existing addition built without a building permit and without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant replaced the roof, extended the rear wall up to eight and-a-half feet to match the height of the adjacent two-story rear wing and enclosed the new addition. The exterior siding and windows are vinyl. The new roof is asphalt shingle. The main house is brick. An older two-story rear wing appears to have painted wood siding. The first floor rear wing, which is under the recent addition, appears to have vinyl siding. While approval is being sought after construction, the applicant did comply with most of the Design Guideline criteria with the exceptions of the shallow pitch of the new roof line as well as the choice of materials for the siding. The new windows appear to be six over six vinyl with simulated divided lights on the interior. If the addition had not already been built, Staff would have recommended Hardiplank siding painted to match the first story addition below.

The applicant was present but had nothing to add.

Mr. Wolf called for questions.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the new roof came all the way across. Mr. Ward stated it matched the existing roof line. Mr. Ward explained he had gone up on the roof and his foot had gone through the roof. He removed some of the shingles, plywood and rafters which were rotten. He stated in his need to put a roof on, he had been negligent in not getting a permit.

Mr. Coiner stated this was a terrible situation to be in.

Mr. Hogg asked if a window had to be turned into a door to gain access to the new structure. Mr. Ward stated he had not; he had removed two studs.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if this was a contributing structure. It was; however, Mr. Ward stated he had been unaware of that fact.

Mr. Hogg stated the precedent was bad. However, with the additions that had been grandfathered on the building, the alteration's affect on the change of the character of this building was negligible. He expressed a desire for the windows to be true divided light and of a different material rather than vinyl.

Mr. Wolf agreed that vinyl was not usually allowed in the historic design control districts.

Mr. Coiner asked if there had been any calls from the neighbors. Ms. Scala stated there had not been.

Ms. Heetderks stated they were charged to look at it as if it was not built. She stated there was no way this would have gotten through as it was built. She felt uncomfortable to retroactively say it was done and say it was all right.

Mr. Wolf moved with some reluctance to the fact that the application had come before them after the project had already been constructed, but recognizing the idiosyncratic nature of the previous

additions to the back of this building, will approve the application as submitted with the following conditional changes to the existing structure to bring it into compliance with what would have been previously required had they reviewed the application prior to construction, which will include: a, correcting the eave and overhang on the back of the building so that the eave is continuous across the length of the back; b, replacing the two new windows with insulated windows that are simulated divided lights with the muntin bars attached on the outside of the glass not sandwiched between the glass; and, c, that on the north facade that a portion from the corner back to the door, at the applicant's discretion, is furred out so that the corner matches the other corner and is at 90 degrees and that the overhang is obscured except at the door. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-09-05

1115 Wertland Street

Tax Map 4 Parcel 305; Tax Map 4 Parcel 312

Mitchell/Matthews Architects, Applicant/Wade Tremblay, LLC, Owner

New construction

Mr. Tremblay recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant was seeking a preliminary discussion of a four-story with basement multi-family building, brick foundation, fiber cement siding with horizontal boards and shingles, vinyl clad wood windows with vinyl window casing and asphalt roof shingles. The Board will need to see all four elevations for final approval as well as a color perspective drawing. The site design needs attention including retaining wall material and height and sidewalks connecting the proposed building to Wertland Street and adjoining properties. The materials meet the Guidelines except aluminum clad windows are preferred over vinyl clad.

Mr. Dawes, with Mitchell Matthews Architects, gave a presentation to the Board.

Mr. Hogg stated this was the first document showing the building in relationship to any existing building in the neighborhood. He stated there was no context to the historic buildings on the site. He stated this building could go anywhere. He expressed a desire for a series of site plans showing how this building relates to the historic properties. He stated there was no discussion of the air conditioning system for the building. He stated it would be helpful to have a ground floor plan and a floor section. He felt they should look at the scale of the building and the proportions of the windows and doors.

Mr. Adams stated he could echo some of Mr. Hogg's comments. He hoped the grade from Wertland would help screen the building. He suggested three separate building masses would be better than one under one giant roof. Mr. Adams also expressed a preference for a darker color as the color and trim could help visually reduce the mass of the building.

Mr. Coiner and Ms. Heetderks had no comments.

Mr. Wolf stated the rendering perspective view and elevations were compelling to him.

Mr. Adams encouraged the use of big trees in the landscape plan to try to help bury the building.

B. Consent Agenda

1. August 15, 2006 Minutes

Mr. Hogg stated his name should be spelled B-R-I-A-N. Mr. Coiner stated the name in the third item from the bottom of page 4 should be Mr. Brent Nelson. Ms. Heetderks moved to approve as amended. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

J. For Your Information

Proposed demolition of 503 Valley Road Tax Map 11 Parcel 35 University of Virginia Rectors and Visitors, Owners

Mr. Wolf asked what was required of the Board on this matter. Ms. Scala stated that they needed to read it.

K. Other Business

There was no other business.

L. Adjournment

Ms. Heetderks moved to adjourn. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:37 p.m.