

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
March 18, 2008**

Minutes

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Amy Gardner
Brian Hogg
William Adams
Michael Osteen
James Wall
Eryn Brennan

Not Present:

Syd Knight, Vice Chair

Also Present:

Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:03 p.m. He announced that City Council had appointed Rebecca Schoenthal to serve on the Board on March 17th.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- February 19, 2008

Mr. Hogg moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-02-04

700 East Main Street

TM 53 P 160

City of Charlottesville

New Entrance Sign at Charlottesville Pavilion

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This application had been deferred at the February meeting as the Board wanted to see a definite site plan of the sign location in relation to the bench as well as details of the cover for the LCD screen. Elevation drawings had been provided. The height was

changed to six feet to comply with the sign ordinance. The sign is now located nearer to the entrance ramp. The LCD is still an issue for staff.

Mr. Kirby Hutto was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated they tried to address the concerns raised at the February meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know where the LCD screen was in comparison to the center piece of the panel on the rendering. Mr. Hutto stated it would be behind it; the entire black panel would come off.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know whether the locking mechanism for the LCD would be obtrusive. Mr. Hutto stated it would be countersunk and made of stainless steel.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner stated the sign, even though it was relocated, seemed to detract from the view.

Mr. Adams stated he was uncomfortable with the LCD in an exposed location.

Ms. Brennan agreed with Ms. Gardner about the location.

Mr. Wolf thought the sign sat in good relationship to the entrance on that side versus the other. He stated he did not mind the location. Mr. Wolf thought hiding the LCD panel and making it operable only during shows seemed reasonable.

Mr. Hogg thought the proposal addressed the concerns that had been expressed.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Signs and Public Improvements and considering the Sign Regulations, moved to find that the proposed Pavilion monument sign as presented satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves this application. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Osteen had hoped there would be enough people present who were enthusiastic about it so his opinion did not matter; however, he was still very concerned about it responding too much to the transit center and not the amphitheater. Mr. Wolf called a vote by acclamation. The motion failed, 3-4; Mr. Adams, Ms. Brennan, Ms. Gardner, and Mr. Osteen voted against.

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-03-02**

110 East Main Street

TM 28 P 23

Gate Pratt, Applicant/Redlight Management, Owner

Install two structural reinforcing columns on exterior wall of Jefferson Theater

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This building was originally built in 1901 and is on the Downtown Mall. The columns are proposed for the fly loft exterior wall which faces Water Street. The columns would be painted brick red. Other structural columns were added previously on the sides of the building. The alternative would be to place the reinforcements inside; however, the proposal is consistent with the previous alterations. If approved, the color should match the other columns.

Mr. Kirby Hutto stated they had a structural engineer's report that expresses concern about the stability of the back wall. It is unreinforced masonry and it is bowing.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg wanted to know why this work could not be done inside the building. Mr. Hutto stated the biggest reason was cost as it was approximately six times higher than the cost for exterior. Mr. Hutto also stated they would have to perforate the existing wooden fly loft which dates back to 1917 or 1918 as well as perforating the stage and the basement floor.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the size of the proposed columns was comparable to the columns on the sides of the building. They were.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf reinforced Ms. Scala's suggestion that the new columns match the existing. Mr. Hutto asked if the existing columns, which were looking rusty and had paint chipped off in spots, could be painted to match the new columns. Board members and Staff were amenable to that. Mr. Wolf wondered if the columns should match the brick. Mr. Hogg stated they would never match the brick. Mr. Hogg thought a dark red color would be fine.

Mr. Osteen thought the columns on the side worked in a very utilitarian way. However, he felt they were losing something to have these columns on the big back wall. Mr. Osteen felt the detailing was critical.

Mr. Hogg, while appreciating Mr. Osteen's concern, thought it had a very utilitarian quality which would not be undermined by a fairly straightforward installation of columns. He did not think this would diminish the character of the building.

Mr. Wolf agreed with Mr. Osteen's comments, but felt there were already pieces attached to the wall which served a utilitarian purpose. He felt comfortable with the solution.

Ms. Brennan agreed with her colleagues.

Ms. Gardner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Structural columns with the slight alteration of having them painted to match the brick as best as possible, 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. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-03-08

306 & 308 East Main Street

TM 28 P 40

Gate Pratt, Applicant/Jeffrey Kahn

Facade Renovations, New Storefront

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. For 306, the applicant proposes to paint the cast stone white, replace the metal railing with red painted metal spandrel, add a yellow band above the entrance, replace a concrete planter with a new concrete and aluminum storefront display window, and then adding whitening and new sign panels. For 308 the applicant proposes to paint the existing brick and cast stone white, create a new aluminum storefront windows and door, recess a doorway, add a dark blue metal canopy, relocate an existing C'ville sign from 104-106 East Main Street, and add dark blue/light blue painted metal cornice for HVAC screening along the top of the building. Staff believes glass storefronts will be welcome additions to both buildings. Staff recommends against painting the brick or cast stone. The primary colors as proposed are not appropriate on the Mall.

Mr. Gate Pratt, of Limehouse Architects, stated his belief that painting the brick on 308 was an opportunity to break up the massing of the two buildings. The small red sign on 308 is intended to hide a scupper on that building. The cast stone on 306 is already painted.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the red panels would still be required if the signage came down from that area. Mr. Pratt stated they would like to keep them as a design element.

Ms. Gardner wanted to know if the windows were operable for safety. Mr. Pratt stated there was a small access hatch to allow emergency egress, but they were not operable.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wall stated he did not have a problem with the storefronts but he did think the colors were jarring.

Mr. Hogg had no problem with introducing the windows into 308 as it integrated the building nicely into the Mall streetscape. He did think painting the brick would be a mistake. He saw no reason to add the cornice. Mr. Hogg thought the proposed panels undermined the design integrity of 306. He thought the color palette should be dialed back.

Mr. Adams felt the bright primary colors did not belong. He suggested mechanical screening could be done above the plane of the existing parapet.

Ms. Brennan thought this was a great project. She agreed with everything that had been said about color and the painting of the brick. She thought the metal railing could stay or go, but not institute new paneling along there.

Mr. Wolf expressed his support for most of what had been said. He found the colors to be rather bright.

Mr. Pratt asked if he could have conditional approval of the storefronts in order to begin work. He suggested they could remove the screen from the top of 308, remove the railing panels and leave the existing railing. He also stated he would come back with paint colors. He stated they would not paint the brick on 308. He stated he could adjust the vitrine window height to match the heights of the window on 306.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for WHAT, moved to find that the proposed CHANGE satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Moved to approve the addition of the vitrine storefront on property number 306 and the addition of the new storefront openings on property 308, the storefront being anodized aluminum and with the one condition that the transom muntin bar is aligned between the C'ville window and the vitrine, and that the owner has chosen to defer on the addition of the bent metal cornice, the painted metal guardrail, and the Board did not approve of the painting of the brick on property number 308, and the colors would come back to the Board for approval. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Pratt sought clarification as to whether the lighting and scupper cover were okay. Mr. Wolf stated those items were part of the things that were to come back to the Board. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

**F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-03-07
509 2nd Street NE
TM 33 P 18**

**Allison Ewing, Applicant/Mark and Barbara Fried, Owners
New Construction of House and partial demolition of site walls**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was before the Board twice for preliminary review. The stones of the wall slated for demolition would be reused. The front stairs have been removed to make the front door accessible. The solar roof has been set back from the street with a front projecting bay. The roof has been redesigned.

Ms. Allison Ewing was present with the owner Barbara Fried and the landscape architect Pete O'Shea. Besides meeting twice with the Board, the applicant met with the neighborhood twice. In response to the comments from those meetings, the project has undergone significant changes.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know what the lintels of the stone walls were. Ms. Ewing stated they were capstone.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Colette Hall, president of the North Downtown Neighborhood Association, read a prepared statement in opposition of the proposal.

Mr. Fred Schneider, of 506 Second Street NE, noted that his prepared statement should be part of the members' packets for this proposal. He asked that the setbacks be considered for the property.

Ms. Janet Cutler, of 514 North First Street, stated she had asked to see the survey of the property and has not yet received it. She has been told the wall was two feet into the owners' property and would be demolished; she has also been told it was on the property line. She stated there were antique bricks on her side of the wall. She did not want to see that become a concrete wall. She felt the issue of the wall had not been resolved.

Ms. Gayle Foster, of 504 Second Street NE, stated she had sent a letter to the Board which she would not repeat; however, she wanted the Board to know that Ms. Ewing had made an attempt to meet with the immediate neighbors surrounding the site.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg stated the applicant's hard work was evident in the design which was a significant improvement to previous submittals. He was somewhat happier with the proposal but felt a number of issues still needed to be resolved. There were still some scale issues. The louvers made the house look forbidding. The small windows imparted an institutional look. Mr. Hogg

stated the second drive was not sympathetic to the neighborhood. While the concept was going well, Mr. Hogg wanted to see more detail before he could approve the project.

Mr. Wolf stated this was the most successful rendition of the proposal thus far. However, he echoed Mr. Hogg's comments. He thought the second driveway seemed to exacerbate the car's impact.

Mr. Adams agreed this was an improvement. He felt the proportions of the windows were troublesome. The color scheme and detailing of siding was a little too strident. He agreed with Mr. Hogg that more details were required.

Ms. Brennan thought a lot of improvement had been made. She applauded the proposal to reuse the stone.

Mr. Osteen thought the designer had done a good job of responding to concerns which had been expressed.

Ms. Gardner stated she had a problem with the second driveway as well as with the gate on the primary driveway. She thought the use of material was interesting and harmonious.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed Demolition of the stone walls and concrete block walls as specified including the reuse of any stone created from the demolition of site walls satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the demolition application as submitted. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, moved to find that the proposed New Dwelling and associated hardscape satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines in respect to the project's massing, placement of window openings and materiality and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application with those conditions with the requirement or conditions that aspects pertaining to the porch structure, the detail of the intersection of the front bay with the sloped roof behind, the louvered panels on the openings and the security gate at the driveway and the portion of the windows that are set in any stone foundation wall will all come back to the BAR with additional detail for approval at a future point. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Hogg offered a friendly amendment of including colors and finish as they relate to all of the material choices, cornice details, details related to exterior cladding. Mr. Wolf accepted the amendment as did Mr. Osteen. Ms. Gardner sought clarification as to whether the second driveway was being approved; Mr. Wolf stated it would be part of the hardscape. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion passed, 6-1; Ms. Gardner voted against.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess at 7:21 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-03-05

608 Preston Avenue

TM 32 P 14

Bushman Dreyfus Architects/Andy McGinty

Final Submission of proposed rehabilitation including partial demolitions, and Preliminary Site Plan

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is the former King Lumber building and is an Individually Protected Property. A preliminary discussion was held December 18th. The application includes the proposed demolition of part of a rear shed, an existing concrete loading area and partial demolition of the annex walls and roof. Several areas that were windows and doors will be reopened.

Mr. Jeff Dreyfus gave a brief presentation updating the Board on changes since last presentation. Mr. Hunter McCardle of McKee Carson provided supplemental drawings of the landscaping plan.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the building would need repointing. Mr. Dreyfus stated it would need work but it would depend on the surface treatment used.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner thought it was a great project. She liked the use of materials throughout the site. The entrance wall still seemed a little monumental in height and size. The signage should be simpler.

Mr. Hogg agreed with Ms. Gardner's statements. He thought the closing connector was a mistake.

Ms. Brennan agreed with her colleagues. She thought this was a great project.

Mr. Adams thought it was a nice project but that the wall was too high. He thought the landscape plan was too nice and thought it should be simpler and more direct.

Mr. Osteen agreed with everything that had been said.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed Demolition of part of the metal shed, existing concrete loading area, partial demolition of the annex walls and roof and certain openings in the King Lumber building both to restore historic openings and to alter window openings into doors satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and that the BAR approves the demolition application as submitted. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, New Construction, and Addition, moved to find that the proposed Rehabilitation of the King Lumber building and renovation and additions to the metal annex satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the condition that the design of the connector piece be revised to make it more open, that the orientation of the stair be restudied in an effort to reduce the size of the balcony landings, that the elevator be investigated to make it as low as possible, that the color of the steel be returned for Staff review. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf suggested that the investigation of the size of the balcony landings was a friendly request from the Board. Mr. Wolf also offered a friendly amendment that a revised elevation would come back to Staff for approval. Mr. Hogg and Ms. Brennan accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-03-03

534 East Main Street

TM 53 P 76 & 77

Water Main LLC

Construction of metal fire regress stairs, create new door opening, other door opening changes

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The building is vernacular to approximately 1885. The applicant is seeking approval of a metal fire regress stair on the Water Street facade to provide a second exit for the building. Windows near the proposed stair will receive sprinklers and safety glass. The steel will be painted brown to match existing windows and trim. Existing windows do not need to be fire protected and staff prefers a glass transom on the first floor door if interior conditions permit.

In the absence of the applicant, Mr. Wolf postponed the matter to later in the meeting.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-03-06

528 Ridge Street

TM 29 P 267

Otis Lee, Jr.

Replace Windows with sash kits

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Fitch-Gleason House was one of the first houses built on Ridge Street, 1842-50, so it is significant in its age. The building is currently empty and the windows are boarded over. The applicant is requesting permission to replace all the double hung windows with sash replacements by Norco with painted wood exteriors. A new request had been received for the windows to be simulated divided lights with a spacer bar. The historic frames and trim will be retained. All windows would be replaced with two over two windows except four 1950's double hung windows at the rear addition will be replaced with one over one double hung. Two over two wood windows are the best replacement choice.

Mr. Otis Lee, Jr. stated the building had been vacant for two decades and many of the windows are worn down and rotted out.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wondered if there were any original windows remaining. Mr. Wolf sought clarification if this was to know the original pattern or for potential restoration. Ms. Brennan stated she wanted to know which ones might be original and, if original, would they be worth salvaging. Mr. Wolf agreed there was benefit in finding out the original pattern; however, they should shoot for consistency and a coherent approach to the windows.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Replacement window sashes satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-03-09

534 Park Street

TM 53 P 126

David Heilbronner and Lynn Valentine

Window Replacement

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Valentine House, designed by Eugene Bradbury, was built in 1911 with a major renovation in 1940. The applicant is requesting 30 replacement windows to improve energy efficiency, functionality, and appearance. No windows are being replaced on the rear of the house as those were replaced in 1994.

Mr. David Heilbronner stated about one-third of the windows had small cracks. Ninety percent of the windows were inoperable.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know the dimensions of the muntin boards. Mr. Heilbronner did not know.

Mr. Adams expressed concern that the proportions of the windows would be changed.

Mr. Heilbronner explained they had looked at other options but found them to be cost prohibitive. Mr. Wolf stated he understood cost concerns but there were a variety of other options available.

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if all the windows were beyond repair. Mr. Heilbronner stated it depended on what was considered repairable. He stated they could repair all the glass that was broken in the windows, take it all apart and rehang them, reweight them and rope them again, but they would still be left with leaky, drafty windows.

Mr. Wolf expressed his hesitation over using the particular brand. He wanted to know more about how the new window would interact with the old trim. He expressed concern that it would shrink the window by a lot. Although he supported the energy efficiency of the house, he did not want the exterior appearance spoiled.

Mr. Hogg agreed with Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Wolf stated he would feel more comfortable if the matter was deferred for additional information on where it was installed from and what the detail looks like.

Mr. Heilbronner asked to defer.

Ms. Gardner moved to accept the applicant's deferral. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 07-08-10

702 Ridge Street

TM 25 P 65

Giovanna Galfione-Cox, Applicant/Maurice Cox, Owner

Window and Door changes

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The Walters House was built in 1900. The applicant's long term plan is to undo some of the 1950's renovations to the rear of the house. Phase 1 involves replacing windows in the rear one-story, brick kitchen addition that was probably built in the 1920s. The existing southwest window will be replaced with a door and transom.

Ms. Giovanna Galfione-Cox provided the Board with a sample of the window she proposes using. She also provided additional pictures of the house.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the stair would be going away. Ms. Galfione-Cox stated it would in Phase 2.

Mr. Wolf sought clarification that all of the existing brick mold would stay in place. Ms. Galfione-Cox stated it would.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, moved to find that the proposed Window and door replacements 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. Hogg seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

L. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 08-03-01

222 South Street

TM 28 P 95

Michael Stoneking, Applicant/Blue Moon Rising, LLC

Demolition of existing apartment building and Preliminary Review of construction of new 6,800 square foot building

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The rear apartment building was constructed in 1994. The proposed building is separated from the historic building with a courtyard and is two feet higher than the historic building. The existing apartment building is noncontributing; staff suggests it may be demolished. The height and width of the proposed building are appropriate, but the building is larger in mass than the footprint and surrounding historic buildings. The placement of the building is appropriate as are the building materials. Site design and window placement could be improved.

Mr. Wolf suggested they discuss the demolition first.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC AND THE BOARD:

Ms. Mary Cooper Gilliam, 218 South Street, stated she would be happy to see that building gone.

Mr. Hogg, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including the City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed Demolition of the 1994 apartment building satisfies the BAR's criteria because it's not contributing and is not compatible with this property and other properties in this district. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Michael Stoneking gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed new construction.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Brent Nelson, owner of 214 South Street, was very impressed with how the project is designed but was still concerned about the mass. He thought the blank wall needed some type of treatment by possibly carrying details of the courtyard over. He asked the Board to look at the color as it would be important.

Ms. Mary Cooper Gilliam, 218 South Street, stated she would prefer a smaller structure with more garden and green space but noted it was an improvement over what was there.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought the front two-thirds of the building seemed fine pending revisions to the cladding. He thought there was a lot of pattern in the drawing. The southwest corner did not look resolved; a more substantial corner was needed.

Ms. Brennan liked the proposal. She thought it was contemporary, yet appropriate. She was not sure it needed to be that big or exaggerated. The lower floor did need to be enlivened. The stairwell was the most problematic to her.

Ms. Gardner thought it was a mishmash of styles. She did not think it was sympathetic to the neighborhood and did not see it working. She appreciated the courtyard and thought there was potential for a really nice outdoor space. She did not think the material was sympathetic to the neighborhood.

Mr. Adams agreed with much of what had been said. He felt the massing was getting there, but the project needed some unification and attention to the roofing scheme.

Mr. Wolf stated the colliding styles of the stair and elevator tower were the most glaring to him. He stated there was a perception of one too many materials.

Mr. Osteen stated he was most concerned with the stair tower.

**H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-03-03
534 East Main Street
TM 53 P 76 & 77
Water Main LLC**

Construction of metal fire regress stairs, create new door opening, other door opening changes

Mr. Wolf recalled item H.

Mr. Hogg moved to defer 534 East Main Street to the April meeting so the applicant can be present. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf offered a friendly amendment that the applicant confirm an uncovered egress stair can be done. Mr. Hogg accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

M. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

N. Other Business -- Comment on SNL cell tower

Ms. Scala apologized that she had not been able to get any information on that from the Neighborhood Planner. She suggested she send a letter to the Planner informing them the SNL building was next to an historic district and they should be as sensitive as possible to that. Mr. Wolf requested they tell the Board how tall it would be.

O. Adjournment

Mr. Hogg moved to adjourn. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion. Mr. Wolf called the question. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:19 p.m.