

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
November 28, 2006
Minutes**

Present: Also Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Mary Joy Scala
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Wade Tremblay
Preston Coiner
Amy Gardner
Lynne Heetderks
Brian Hogg
William Adams
Michael Osteen

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:06 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. Minutes – September 19, 2006

2. Minutes – October 17, 2006

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-11-03

811 West Main Street

Tax Map 31 Parcel 184B

Ntelos Network, Inc.

Install antennae and concrete pad

Mr. Wolf called the consent agenda. Mr. Coiner asked to pull the minutes until the end of the meeting.

Mr. Wolf called the question for approval of the consent agenda. The vote was unanimous.

C. Preliminary Discussion

400 Altamont Street -- Replace windows on sun porch

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This contributing property is located in the North Downtown ADC District. It is dated approximately 1940. The rear sun porch faces McIntire Road. The applicant submitted photos to show the existing condition of the windows. Formal application has not yet been made, but the applicant seeks direction from the BAR as to whether replacement will be permitted and, if allowed, what type of replacement window to use.

The applicant, Mr. Mark Kavit, stated the other wood windows in the house had a beautiful patina. He had worked in restoring the windows and had no plans to change those windows. The windows at the back of the house, which did not match the other windows, were in poor shape and had been for the 20 years he lived there. There was no insulation in the house and that particular room gets extremely cold which contributes to high heating bills. The wood is rotted away and some of the panes are broken. One store in town had recommended PVC windows. Another choice was extruded aluminum over wood. Mr. Kavit stated that at some point in the future they would like to remove the aluminum siding, insulate the house, and install HardiPlank siding.

Mr. Tremblay wanted to know if the room was part of the original house or an add-on. Mr. Kavit did not know but believed it to be part of the original.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know if the applicant had reviewed the Guidelines on windows. Mr. Kavit stated he had, but they were confusing.

Mr. Hogg stated this was clearly a porch that had been enclosed. The photos demonstrate the deterioration of the windows. He stated vinyl clad windows were an issue for the Board.

Mr. Wolf stated vinyl clad windows have been allowed. He suggested remaining true to the profile of the authentic window would be appropriate. Mr. Wolf stated the Guidelines have frowned on PVC. His preference would be aluminum clad, but the brick mold be wood.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from October 17)

BAR 06-10-02

420 Park Street

Tax Map 53 Parcel 120

Edward H. Bain, Jr., Applicant

Tree removal

Ms. Scala stated the matter had been deferred from the October meeting to allow the applicant to get a second opinion regarding the health of a large white Ash tree. No new information has been received from the applicant.

Mr. Bain stated he had not requested a second opinion. His expert had reviewed his report and looked at the tree again and found nothing unchanged. Mr. Bain had consulted with Mr. Larry Stewart, formerly of this area and now an associate professor at Ohio State's Agricultural Technical Institute. He has not looked at this particular tree but has done extensive work with Ash trees. This tree has reached its maturity. Mr. Stewart also thought the tree might have a restricted root area due to the structures around it.

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

Mr. Knight had hoped to receive justification other than an arborist's general feeling. He had wanted substantive information on why this tree needed to come down. He had not seen that information at the last meeting and did not see it at this meeting. Mr. Knight was opposed to any motion which would allow removal of this tree without a more specific case being made for it.

Mr. Coiner expressed disappointment that a second opinion had not been sought.

Mr. Tremblay expressed concern about the safety issues previously presented and stated he would vote for removal.

Mr. Wolf respected the opinion of the additional people cited, but he respected the opinion of Mr. Knight also.

Mr. Knight reiterated he was not seeking a second opinion, but compelling information as to specific structural or arboricultural information about that tree.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed tree removal does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. The motion passed, 8-1; Mr. Tremblay voted against.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from August 15)

BAR 06-06-02

1401 Gordon Avenue

Tax Map 5 Parcel 83

Brad Booker and Laurie Veliky, Applicants

Construct four bedroom unit to rear of existing structure

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The intention is to match the materials of the existing house. Since August the application has been amended as follows: the addition is now rectangular; the height has been reduced; the roof forms simplified; the addition is separated from the main building by two black metal gates; the front porch is now the full width of the building and has been redesigned to resemble the secondary porch of the main house; additional windows have been added to the west, north and south elevations; the site plan has been altered so the new driveway now necks down to 12 feet near the street; sidewalks have been added internally to the site to connect the parking area to the kitchen entrance and also between the addition and the main building; two shade trees and a Dogwood have been added to the landscaping. The addition has been designed in an effort to be compatible with the main structure and surrounding buildings. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Laurie Booker stated they had taken the issues they felt would make the project better and made the changes.

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

Mr. Wolf wanted to know how the new roof would be vented. Ms. Booker did not know.

Mr. Knight wanted to know if this had gone through site plan review. Ms. Scala stated this project did not require site plan review.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Knight felt there were many questions directed toward the site plan such as screening of the HVAC, screening of outside trash facilities. Zoning and parking should be resolved with the City.

Mr. Coiner felt the applicant was at a disadvantage as her husband, who usually dealt with the Board, was not present and neither was the architect.

Ms. Heetderks stated there still was not quite enough information and they seemed to be heading toward deferral.

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about some details of the site plan. He was also concerned about the parking and the vertical proportion of the new street façade.

Mr. Wolf wanted to see: samples of the windows and whether they were simulated or true divided light; information about paint color of the trim; and an example of the brick.

Ms. Booker asked for deferral of the proposal.

Mr. Coiner moved they accept the request for deferral. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-07-06

201 Avon Street

Tax Map 58 Parcel 1

Croxton Collaborative Architects, PC, Applicant

New construction

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. A preliminary discussion was held on August 17th. On November 6th City Council approved a Special Use Permit on the site to allow increased density. Reduced setbacks were allowed on South Street and Avon Street. One condition of the Special Use Permit was that no more than 75 percent of the gross floor area of a mixed use building would be devoted to residential use. The site plan approval is subject to BAR approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The application is for a nine-story plus basement level, parking level, and roof top pergola appurtenances, mixed use residential/commercial building. A six-room boutique hotel has been added since the Board last saw the submittal. The proposal is for a red brick building with white banding in certain locations. Staff suggests if the application is satisfactory, the BAR should address only the concept of massing at this meeting. Staff has requested an additional perspective drawing from the northwest corner.

Mr. Randy Croxton, of Croxton Collaborative Architects, presented the Board with some additional documentation of the opposite side of the building. He stated a much more clear, solid base of the building had been created based on comments from the Board.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Mr. Zach Earl, owner of two neighboring properties, wanted to know what stage they were at as he had only recently found out about the proposal. Ms. Scala explained the site plan had been approved subject to approval of this Certificate of Appropriateness Application. She stated this was the last step. Mr. Earl stated this was a large, austere building and he expressed concern about the impact on the community. Mr. Wolf explained the role of the Board was to decide based on it as a contextual response, which included its impact on the other contextual and culturally important parts of the architectural fabric in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if the applicant was attempting to match the brick color. Mr. Croxton explained the brick would be a variegated red/brown rather than the monolithic black originally proposed. Mr. Croxton stated they proposed to use recycled brick.

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

Ms. Heetderks did not think the shoulders were particularly effective on the building. She stated there needed to be some articulation of some sort of the massing behind the structure to respect it.

Mr. Hogg shared Ms. Heetderks' concerns about the relationship of the courtyard's elevation and the Beck Cohen building. He also expressed concern about using the recycled brick on a building of this size.

Mr. Adams stated it was great to have this level of design, but he felt it was too big for where it was. He thought it would have a negative impact on the small-scale industrial neighborhood. He stated it seemed rather dead around the building.

Ms. Gardner agreed with Mr. Adams. She thought there had been progress since the first meeting.

Mr. Wolf wanted to see a similar attitude taken toward the two corners that make the inside face that frames Beck Cohen. He expressed concern about the way the brick changes language.

Mr. Knight shared some of the concerns about scale and massing.

Mr. Wolf stated there were enough questions about the massing and the articulation that he did not feel comfortable approving the massing and saying they would work on the details. He stated that, given the scale of this building, this is one of those projects that is going to require extensive consideration and review.

Mr. Coiner moved that they defer the application until December. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-04-05

310 West Main Street

Tax Map 32 Parcels 197, 1998, 199

The Rebkee Co., Owner/Carter & Burgess, Applicant

CVS Mixed-Use Project

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is the third design for this site. Preliminary discussions were held in April and July. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for a proposed design for a CVS drugstore at the corner of Ridge Street-McIntire Road and West Main Street. The proposed 13,000 square foot building appears two-story, but is a single story drug store with a 1,924 square foot mezzanine proposed. The stepped roof is mainly flat, with two end gable projections and a corner tower. The proposed building materials are mainly brick veneer

with fiberglass reinforced polymer pilasters and trim, a cast stone base, asphalt shingled roof, striped fabric awnings, aluminum storefront windows with translucent glass or with solid panels, and decorative metal panels and canopy. A site design concept plan has been submitted. Vehicles access the rear surface parking area and drive-through window from Ridge Street-McIntire Road or Fourth Street entrances, and may exit only via Fourth. Wider brick sidewalks with street trees are proposed along both frontages, leading to a single corner entrance. Along Ridge-McIntire a cast stone retaining wall borders the sidewalk street. This is a very important corner in downtown Charlottesville, and this site deserves a significant building. Building to the property line, massing and height of the entire building are important, as well as how this large building is articulated in a way that reflects the significant architecture in downtown Charlottesville and West Main Street. Traditional Charlottesville materials, such as brick and cast stone, are appropriate in this location. The metal panels and canopy are appropriate. The unpainted fiberglass columns and trim are not appropriate. None of the windows appear to be functional; fake windows are not appropriate, nor is the use of glass that is not clear. The two-story glass panels that cut into the frieze are not appropriate. Blank walls along street frontages are not appropriate. The seventy-foot gap in building to the west of the drugstore is not appropriate. More details are needed for the building elevations, including door and window details. The site plan lacks topography and detail. There are not enough details on the loading/trash area or on the masonry wall along the west property line. Lighting, signage and colors also need discussion. The applicant has made some positive changes, but the submittal still does not respond to major concerns discussed at the last meeting. The applicant does not want to consider this submittal as a preliminary. The BAR may partially approve the concept and massing if the Board determines that it meets the guidelines and is appropriate to the setting. The BAR may wish to offer additional comments or recommendations for future submittals. The BAR could ask for changes and defer for one month, or could deny the application.

Mr. Russell Mooney, a lifelong resident of the area, is the owner of the property. He stated he did not want to use this as a residential property. He also did not want to rent the property to boutiques. He wanted a single tenant. West Main Street needed something that would bring traffic to it.

Mr. Rob Hargett, of The Rebkee Company, stated his company was the statewide developer for CVS. There was no national prototype for CVS. He stated they were making an effort to get this project done in a way that is satisfactory to the Board.

The project architect, who did not identify himself for the record, expressed his belief that this third application meets the submittal requirements in terms of level of detail. This third proposal is a combination of the previous proposals. He stated he did not like the wall and would prefer a curb cut to provide access to the service courtyard. However, City Planners and Zoning Administrators do not want a curb cut at that location.

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

Ms. Heetderks asked if the applicants had read the Guidelines regarding materials. The architect replied in the affirmative. She asked if he was aware he was in pretty clear violation of: 3.15,

Materials, 1, 5, and 9; 3.11, Windows, 1, 5, and 8; 3.13, Street level design, 1; 3.8, Scale, 1; 2.7, Site, (C)8 and (C)10. She asked if he was aware that he was not close to meeting any of those Guidelines. The applicant reiterated they were aware of the Guidelines. He stated several Commissioners had suggested the Guidelines were just that and were not a requirement.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if creating a fill that allows the tractor trailers to come in was what necessitated a 12 foot wall. The applicant stated the wall was to screen the activity.

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

Ms. Heetderks stated they had spent an immense amount of time on this project and she did not know when they had had an applicant who was less responsive to basic elements in the Guidelines. Ms. Heetderks cited 3.11, Windows, 8: Avoid designing false windows in new construction, as one example of several Guidelines. The Guidelines on Materials make it clear you aren't to use fiberglass, but there was fiberglass all over the place. She did not see any alternative but to move to deny based on the Guidelines she previously mentioned.

Mr. Hogg stated the arrival of these national chain drugstores in historic districts has been a problem for a lot of historic district commissions. A fundamental quality of a retail building in an historic district is display windows, not translucent glass.

Mr. Osteen stated he had no problem with CVS on the site, it just needed more activity on the street. The site is zoned Mixed Use and this proposal is for one use. It is zoned two-stories minimum and this is a one-story building.

Mr. Knight stated this technically meets the City requirement according to the City Attorney. [See also January 16, 2007 minutes for clarification.] However, it still must meet the Guidelines. He stated the applicant was meeting the letter of the law but not the spirit or intent. This design tries to impose itself on the site rather than adapting to the site.

Mr. Wolf felt the project was being designed from the inside out. He stated the Board was charged with promoting what was best and coherent for the street.

Ms. Gardner having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed building and site plan do not satisfy the BAR's criteria and are not compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR denies the application based on the Standards and Guidelines that were aired during the discussion, notable, Site Plan, Massing, Scale and Materials. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called vote by affirmation. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess, whereupon the meeting stood recessed at 8:16 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 8:36 p.m.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-11-01

1811 Lambeth Lane

Tax Map 5 Parcel 50

Theta Delta Chi Fraternity

Front steps repair and landscaping

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing structure in the Rugby Road/University Circle/Venable Neighborhood ADC District. The applicant seeks approval to replace damaged front stairs with new, precast concrete treads, add a new soapstone walkway, remove an existing conifer in the front yard to expose views of Lambeth Field, add new holly shrubs as front foundation plantings, add some Skip Laurel shrubs to the side yard and a new seven foot high brick masonry garbage enclosure with cast iron gates. Last year the BAR approved the use of precast concrete stairs for the front of St. Paul's Church on the Corner. The replacement stairs, soapstone walkway and new landscaping are appropriate. Staff questions the removal of the healthy tree unless it is replaced with a deciduous shade tree. The location and materials of the trash enclosure while appropriate, Staff suggests the height should be reduced so the building is not obscured.

Mr. Ben Levny, of Page Southerland Page Architects, was present with Ron Garrett, a member of the renovation association, and Michael Boyd, the general contractor. The structure is over 100 years old. They wanted to make these improvements in preparation for the 150th fraternal anniversary.

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

Mr. Osteen wanted to know why the existing shrubs needed to be removed. Mr. Levny stated they were a bad use of space for the yard; they were overgrown and too large.

Mr. Coiner wanted to know the reason behind a preference for cast iron gates. Mr. Levny explained they had been chosen rather than wood for the high use area. Mr. Coiner expressed concern that cast iron would break easily; the applicant stated they had no problem using another material.

Mr. Knight asked to see an elevation showing specifics of the masonry wall for the trash enclosure. The applicant did not yet have elevations, but would provide them.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know what would be done with the current trash area. Mr. Levny stated it would be returned to its original purpose as a recreational area for the house.

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

Mr. Osteen expressed concern about taking out the existing shrubs. He thought routine maintenance could be started.

Mr. Knight also did not see a compelling reason to take those out as they were in scale. He wanted to see more information. He liked the concept of the trash enclosure and would be comfortable with having Staff approve it.

Mr. Tremblay, as a neighboring property owner, applauded the House for taking steps to improve the aesthetics.

Mr. Wolf thought seven feet might be too tall for the trash enclosure wall.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design Elements in Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following conditions and modifications: one, that the existing yews on the front of the house flanking the portico stay in place; that the soapstone walk be extended the full width of the stairs; and that the details on the masonry enclosure for the trash cans, and the gates showing such things as the pattern of the gates, the bond, the material, the cap detail come back for approval by Staff. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Osteen offered a friendly amendment that, if the trees are to be taken down in front, a deciduous shade tree be planted in place. Mr. Knight and Mr. Coiner accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-08-06

West Main Clinical Building

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

University of Virginia Foundation

Final approval of new construction

Mr. Hogg recused himself from the matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board on September 19th when the Board approved in concept the application for the parking garage with two additional levels of brick on the West Main elevation and additional study regarding a way to break up the horizontal spandrel openings. The massing and footprint of the clinical building were approved with the material palette with the condition that details would come back on the curtain walls, material samples, and a detailed section through the cornice. City Council approved a Special Use Permit on 6 November. The site plan has been approved with conditions including the condition of BAR approval. Details on the cornice were provided as well as detail on the storefront and curtain wall

of the clinical building. The use of green screens on the garage have been studied and rejected as have the addition of vertical elements on the garage. Additional brick has been provided on the north side of the garage on one level, which is not consistent with the BAR's approved motion at the last meeting. All brick has been removed from the south elevation that faces the track except for the east and west elevators and the two easternmost columns. Any motion to approve the details should clarify the Board's intent by specifically accepting only one additional level of brick.

Mr. John Matthews, of Mitchell Matthews Architects, was present with Mark Atwood, of Odell, and Todd Marshall, with the University of Virginia Foundation. He stated there had been five suggestions made previously and they were there to address those items.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

Mr. John Russell sought clarification that the green strip had been rejected. Mr. Matthews explained it had been a request for them to study the use and the application of the green screen. After studying it, they felt it was not appropriate in this application. Mr. Russell also sought clarification that all the brick on the south side of the building facing his client's property would be removed. Mr. Matthew stated the Board had asked them to put more brick on the side facing West Main Street; in return, the Board was prepared to allow them to eliminate some of the brick along the railway line.

Mr. Wolf called for comments.

Mr. Russell wanted the Board to understand there was an intervening property between this project and the railroad.

Mr. Wolf expressed his appreciation for the attempt to adjust the brick. He wanted the brick to be included on the next level down on the north elevation.

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 final details of the West Main Street clinical building and garage structure 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. Knight seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that they include an additional level of brick on the second level of the parking on the north face. Ms. Gardner stated that other developers in town were taking every effort to bury parking to minimize a structure, to help us forget our cars, and that UVa, the largest company and factory here is not making any effort. She felt one more row of brick would help the building for those few people who would see it. Mr. Wolf felt it was a small concession for a building that has been granted numerous allowances. Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Knight accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called a vote of affirmation. The motion passed, 6-2-1; Ms. Heetderks and Mr. Adams voted against while Mr. Hogg had recused himself from the matter.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-04-03

218 West Water Street

Tax Map 28 Parcel 84

Waterhouse, LLC, Owner/Atwood Architects, Inc., Applicant

East Elevation and South Street landscaping

Ms. Gardner recused herself from the matter and left the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks final approval of details for the Waterhouse project including South Street Area 1, the townhouses, and Water Street Area 2 West, the tower, Water Street Area 2 East, the green building addition. The application includes a revised design for the townhouse yards. Each unit would have a small yard bordered with an evergreen hedge and a concrete planter that includes a Serviceberry tree and mixed plantings. The design is intended to mimic the yards on the south side of South Street. Final color choices are still pending.

Mr. Mark Kestner, of Atwood Architects, was present with Jen Trompeter, of Mickey Garson. Ms. Trompeter stated she had met with Mr. Knight at the site to discuss what could be improved in the design.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the public.

A member of the public, who did not identify herself for the record, sought clarification that deciduous trees would be used. Ms. Trompeter confirmed that deciduous trees would be used.

Mr. Wolf called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Knight asked Ms. Trompeter to explain why simply hedge and not fence in addition to hedge. He also wanted to know if the trees could be brought further into the grass strip closer to the street. Ms. Trompeter explained that on South Street some people used fences and some used hedges. She felt like the hedges were more appropriate for the architecture. She stated a picket fence didn't seem to fit the contemporary nature. A fence also seemed out of scale for the area. The planters had been moved forward to make room for larger trees.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the public.

The member of the public, who had not identified herself, stated the other side of South Street looked like cottage gardens. This side looked a little less steady and very artificial.

Mr. Wolf called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Osteen felt the trees would be better served being in the lawn rather than on the structure.

Mr. Knight stated the whole front yard was very shallow and the buildings taller than those on the other side of the street. He expressed a preference for a slightly larger tree.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Site Design Elements and for New Construction, moved to find that the proposed Waterhouse project details satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application, specifically the townhouse yard areas and east elevation details as submitted with the modification of choosing a larger deciduous shade tree, and pulling them out into the turf area closer to the street, and that the final exterior color choices come back to the BAR for approval. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. The motion passed, 7-0-1; Ms. Gardner had recused herself from the proceedings.

K. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 06-11-02

1108 West Main Street (Preliminary Discussion)

Tax Map 10 Parcels 64 and 65

William Atwood, Applicant/John Bartelt, Owner

New Construction at Sycamore House

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks comments on a proposed seven-story Mixed Use addition to the Sycamore House. Sycamore House is a contributing property located in the West Main Street ADC District. It was built in 1947. The Kane furniture building located on the adjacent property to the west is also contributing. The new UVA parking garage is proposed to be constructed to the rear of the property. A Special Use Permit will be required for the height proposed.

The applicant stated the building was originally the Jefferson School of Commerce. He stated they intend to build a food court there. They also intend to build two floors of parking underground. One level would be commercial offices and then residences above.

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

Ms. Heetderks felt this was a great solution for preserving it.

Mr. Knight wondered if the building would be better if the applicant did not have to work around the contributing structure. Mr. Knight stated one of the concerns with the building adjacent to this was the step back, extruded zigurat form.

Mr. Hogg felt adding six stories to a two-story building had a significant effect on the character of the building. He also wanted to have a discussion with the applicant about the materials for the project.

Mr. Wolf felt the gap and the corner created between the existing sycamore were more valuable as street frontage.

Mr. Adams expressed a desire to see something a little more in scale. He also wanted to see a plan with more details.

Ms. Gardener returned to the meeting at 10:02 p.m.

L. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 06-11-05

309-311 East Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 23

Art Keyser

Paint unpainted brick side walls

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant seeks to paint two brick side walls that are currently unpainted. The building is partially visible from the Downtown Mall. The applicant proposes a gray-green color currently on the front of the building. Staff recommends against painting unpainted brick in the Downtown Mall area.

Mr. Art Keyser stated the building has a leak which he cannot find. He has replaced the roof twice. He has calked everything possible and pointed up brick.

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

Mr. Coiner wanted to know why the applicant thought this would stop the leak. Mr. Keyser stated he had tried everything else.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what the roof was. Mr. Keyser stated it had been tar gravel but was now rubber.

Mr. Wolf was concerned that painting the building would not solve the leaking.

Mr. Adams stated painting the wall could accelerate the demise of the brick wall by trapping moisture inside. He suggested using a clear sealant.

Mr. Tremblay expressed sympathy for Mr. Keyser's perspective how little of this was visible from any place.

Ms. Heetderks, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, moved to find that the proposed painting of the true brick walls does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district; however, the application of a clear sealant coat would be compatible and that the BAR denies the application for painting as submitted. Mr. Coiner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf thought the idea was to approve the motion. Ms. Heetderks withdrew her motion.

Mr. Tremblay, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitations, moved to find that a clear coating of the two brick walls does satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application at the owners' choice. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

M. Matters from the public not on the agenda

200 East Main Street -- preliminary sketches.

Mr. Oliver Kuttner gave a brief presentation. There would be three floors of retail, and a restaurant patio upstairs. One section is set up to be a hotel or cheap housing.

Mr. Wolf stated he was intrigued by the model Mr. Kuttner had for the building.

Mr. Knight expressed concern about a phased approach. He stated he would like to see the whole thing.

Mr. Osteen also expressed concern about phasing.

N. Other Business

Mr. Wolf stated the minutes would be considered at the next meeting.

O. Adjournment

Ms. Heetderks moved to adjourn. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:52 p.m.