

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
April 21, 2009
Minutes**

Present:

Fred Wolf, Chair
Syd Knight, Vice Chair
Amy Gardner
Brian Hogg (arrived at 5:07)
William Adams (arrived at 5:08)
Eryn Brennan
Rebecca Schoenthal

Not Present:

Michael Osteen
James Wall

Also Present:

Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director, NDS
Mary Joy Scala

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

Mr. Todd Bullard, of VMDO Architects, wanted to briefly introduce the BAR to the YMCA project. Mr. Bullard explained City Council wanted the Board to act as an advisory body to Council.

Mr. Hogg joined the meeting at 5:07 p.m.; Mr. Adams at 5:08 p.m.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes -- October 21, 2008
2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-03-02
420 West Main Street
Tax Map 29 Parcel 11
A. Cagene, Owner/Alloy Architecture & Construction, LLC, Applicant
New fence and other patio changes
3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-04-03
5 Gildersleeve Wood
Tax Map 11 Parcel 18
Paul Lyons and Deren Bader, Owner
Remove oak tree

Mr. Wolf noted the minutes were not included in the consent agenda.

Mr. Hogg moved approval. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 09-04-01

University Avenue and 14th Street NW

Tax Map 9 Parcel 160

Phi Eta Sigma Honor Society, Applicant/Buckingham Branch RR, Owner

Brick both RR abutments; mosaic mural on north RR abutment wall

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This had been before the Board in November at which time the applicant requested deferral. The applicant had been told to talk to the public to get public support and to talk to The Corner Merchant's Association and UVA; the applicant has. The project has been altered to build brick archways and to use ceramic and glass tile mosaics. The City would also like to join in this project to install brick on the south abutment of the bridge as well and to add lighting to the bridge for safety as well as decoration.

Mr. Tolbert stated this had become a city project with the applicant as a partner due to a request from The Corner Merchant Association to improve the appearance of the Corner. The City would be improving sidewalks and refurbish any lighting which needed it.

Mr. John Pappas stated the idea was to connect two communities which have become disconnected.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the applicant would be using real brick or a brick veneer. Mr. Pappas stated it would be real brick from Moore Masonry.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan stated she had initially supported this project. She thought getting the community input had helped. She thought it met the Guidelines.

Mr. Hogg disagreed with Ms. Brennan. He thought the structure existed in the context of many contributing buildings. He thought the intent was admirable and he did not want to detract from the good intentions behind the proposal. Mr. Hogg stated this project was

introducing a whole set of architectural features and vivid colors. He expressed concern about outlining the structure of the bridge with LED lights.

Mr. Adams thought the proposal was remarkably accomplished; however, there was a point at which industrial pieces that move through the city with a brusqueness and brawn that does not want to be pasted over or decorated. He stated this would not contribute to the calm that sets up some of the other significant pieces that happen down the street. He stated he could not support this.

Mr. Knight agreed with Mr. Adams. He stated he was adamantly opposed to the project as he saw it. He thought it was admirable and earnest, but it was essentially misguided. Mr. Knight thought there was a real value in the interpretation of the bridge as an historic structure.

Ms. Gardner thanked the applicant for taking the time to seek the opinions of the merchants. She thought the application was thorough, earnest, and well intentioned. She felt this would add a layer of Disney to The Corner.

Ms. Schoenthal stated she had not supported it previously, nor did she support it now.

Mr. Wolf expressed his appreciation for the abstract quality of the murals which had been presented. He thought this diluted the character of some of the pieces that had integrity.

Ms. Schoenthal, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Public Improvements, moved to find that the proposed mural does not satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is not compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR does not approve the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6-1; Ms. Brennan voted against.

**D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from March 17)
BAR 09-03-04
322 14th Street NW
Tax Map 4 Parcel 287
Keith O. Woodard, Owner
Replace and enlarge 2 basement windows; replace and widen door**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. At the March meeting the Board accepted the applicant's deferral and requested additional information. The applicant did speak to the building official. Because this is an historic building, the existing door will be allowed to remain in the existing opening. Both windows will be made taller by extending the bottom.

Mr. Anthony Woodard was present on behalf of Keith Woodard. He stated they were trying to finish off the basement unit.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if there was any kind of image of the door. There was not.

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

- E. Certificate of Appropriateness Application (Deferred from Feb. 17)
BAR 09-02-06
213 2nd Street SW
Tax Map 28 Parcel 76
Bang!/Gowa, Applicant/Two Chefs, LLC, Owner
Add new deck**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant submitted a revised design for a new exterior dining area. The applicant proposes blue stone or brick pavers on the existing concrete and steps. One of the three dogwood trees will be removed. The revised design uses more traditional materials. The landscape beds make the design work and should be maximized.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, provided a landscape pattern to the Board.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Brent Nelson sought clarification of how many dogwoods would be removed. The applicant stated only one would be. Mr. Nelson wanted to know what the tree was being replaced with. The applicant stated it was not being replaced.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight wanted to know if the applicant was submitting the pavement in preference to brick. The applicant stated it was in preference to brick but he would accept brick.

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if there was any room to consider the addition of a small tree. The applicant explained removing the tree was to gain access.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the fence articulation was vertical or horizontal. The applicant stated it would be horizontal.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Brent Nelson stated this was an improvement over the previous submittal; however, he was concerned about the removal of the tree. He also noted the diagram was not correct in showing the location of existing trees. He stated the area had a barren tree canopy. He felt the tree should be replaced with a better tree.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought this was a thoughtful response to the Board's comments on the previous submittal. He thought the sign placement was appropriate. He stated he would support the proposal.

Mr. Knight stated he had not been impressed with the first submittal. He thought this application met the Board's comments about keeping this more as a front yard. Mr. Knight thought this did not affect the building, so he could support this proposal.

Ms. Brennan thought the hedge and fence presented an odd appearance.

Mr. Adams thought it was a tremendous improvement. He expressed a preference for brick over bluestone.

Ms. Gardner thought the applicant had done a great job in responding to the Board's previous comments and that this was a huge improvement. She expressed concern about the fence and thought a hedge would be a better way to solve the problem.

Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for bluestone and suggested there be more emphasis on the hedge than on a fence.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, New Construction, and Additions and for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed outdoor dining area as presented in the plan this evening with the bluestone pavement does satisfy the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in this district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the suggestion that the fence be simplified and that a detail be

submitted to staff for approval. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-1; Ms. Brennan voted against.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-04-04
1901 E. Market Street
Tax Map 55A Parcel 149
Jonathan and Robyn Fink, Owner
Relocate shed on site

Mr. Wolf recused himself from this matter as his firm has been involved with this project in the past.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is an Individually Protected Property, the Piereus Store, was built between 1835 and 1840; the shed was built prior to September, 1902. Prior to 1976, the shed roof was changed from gable to shed. In 1994, the BAR approved an addition to the rear of the shed. In August, 2007, the Board reviewed a possible demolition of the shed, accepting the applicant's request to defer. The current application is to move the shed to another location on site, demolish the newer addition, and to restore the shed roof to the original gable configuration. There has been some evidence the shed could date to 1870-1880; the shed materials are mid-19th century. The property is on the state and national registers. This property, the adjacent house at 202 Riverside Avenue and the Woolen Mills Church are anticipated to form the core of the proposed Woolen Mills historic district. Moving this building would affect the historic building on this property and others nearby as well as the district character. However, the shed would be compatible and attractive in its new location. If it is relocated, it should be placed on the same tax parcel and out of the hundred year flood plain boundary. The shed has been altered over the years and the plan in moving it is to restore it to the original design. The standards for moving a structure are similar to those for a demolition; however, the Guidelines are slightly different.

Ms. Cheri Lewis, Esquire, was present on behalf of the applicants. Jerry Matyiko has been contacted to move the shed. Ms. Lewis reviewed the standards. She stated the building did not represent an infrequent, first or last remaining example of any particular architectural style or feature. Moving the shed would allow it to be preserved. Ms. Lewis asked that those who were present in support of the application to stand; approximately a dozen stood. Ms. Lewis asked Dr. William Heath to give a brief presentation to the Board.

Dr. Heath stated the value of the shed would be enhanced by moving because it would be on better ground and in better surroundings.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the building would remain on the protected parcel. Ms. Lewis stated it would.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Ms. Beverly Catlin, of 202 Riverside Avenue, asked that this request be denied. She then read a prepared statement in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Dimitra Costan, of 202 Riverside Avenue, stated this was an historic structure. She asked the Board to think about integrity. She stated that outbuildings and dependencies have been allowed to disappear. Ms. Costan expressed concern that this shed would disappear to the Fink's backyard. She stated Charlottesville has a tremendous history. Ms. Costan cited one of her history students who compared moving the shed to an act of vandalism.

Dr. Greg Gelburd, of 1612 East Market, thought preserving the shed in a different location on East Market Street was a better placement.

Mr. Bill Maloney, of 1909 East Market Street, spoke in favor of the proposal. He stated Mr. Fink had done a good job on the restoration and addition to his house.

Mr. Fran Lawrence, of 1721 Chesapeake Street, seconded the comments of Ms. Catlin and Ms. Costan. He stated moving the shed was not necessary for its repair. This shed has been before the Board twice before and both times the Board has affirmed the importance of this structure to the property.

Ms. Lydia Brandt, of 1322 Chesapeake Street and an architectural historian, stated this shed was built at the same time as the tavern which is the oldest extant commercial building in the district. Due to its location adjacent to the tavern, this was the most regularly used outbuilding. The tavern had a key role in the development of Woolen Mills and this building is central to the history of the tavern.

Mr. David Puckett, of 1509 East Market Street, spoke in favor of the proposal. He stated historic buildings can fall into disrepair and that would be far worse than a loss of significance of place.

Mr. Aaron Weunsch, of 338 Monticello Road, stated this building represented one of the last surviving examples of its type in the City. Moving the building would diminish its

historical integrity through loss of original materials and by changing the building's relationship to the house. If the building were moved, he recommended measured drawings as well as some basic archaeology.

Mr. Jon Fink stated he had support from the neighborhood. He stated the shed is compromised and deteriorating. It would be moved to a pastoral setting among 100 year old boxwoods and mature dogwoods where it would be part of the pedestrian and automotive viewshed.

Ms. Victoria Dunham, president of the Woolen Mills Neighborhood Association, stated there was opposition from the neighborhood. She expressed concern about demolition by process.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Gardner thought the proposal which had been before the Board previously had been a reasonable offer. She felt the Guidelines for moving and demolition were being met. She stated she was comfortable with the placement.

Mr. Hogg stated the building had been altered prior to Mr. Fink. He stated the main building was significant and this building was subordinate. Mr. Hogg wanted to see details of the restoration because there needed to be a balance between what is repaired and what is replaced.

Ms. Brennan felt this was a difficult decision. She thought the building could be repaired in situ. She saw no public necessity for the move. She thought restoration should be carefully considered.

Mr. Knight appreciated the concern expressed over this matter. He had looked through the Guidelines and had not been able to find a compelling reason to deny the application. He stated it was not integral in its current location. He thought it would be a reasonable compromise to allow it to be moved with two provisions: one, the HABS guidelines be fully followed; and, two, that the Board get more information on the proposed alterations to the gable roof.

Ms. Schoenthal expressed support for the move but the rehabilitation would need to come back to the Board.

Mr. Adams found the application acceptable, but the move should be documented.

Mr. Hogg assumed the move would include demolishing the previously approved garage addition.

Mr. Hogg having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for moving, moved to find that the proposed moving of the shed satisfies the BAR's criteria and Guidelines and is compatible with this property and that the BAR approves the demolition of the garage addition as submitted, conditioned upon the building being documented to HABS standards prior to its move and the proposed renovation of the building being submitted also prior to the move. Ms. Schoenthal seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-1-1; Ms. Brennan voted against while Mr. Wolf had recused himself from the matter.

**G. Preliminary Discussion and Special Use Permit Recommendation
BAR 09-04-11
135 Madison Lane
Tax Map 9 Parcel 148
Virginia Delta Upsilon Alumni Association, Applicant/ Woughlin Company,
Owner
New Construction**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. There is an existing noncontributing structure on the property which does not require Board approval for demolition. This application is for a new fraternity house.

Mr. Ben Thompson and Mr. Clark Gathright, of Daggett & Grigg Architect, were present to answer any questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if real jack arches were proposed. Mr. Thompson stated they would be.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought the applicants' fundamental assumption was correct. He stated this was a place for traditional architecture. He expressed concern about the proportions of the front facade. He thought the design suffered from being too solid with too few windows and the proposed windows were not large enough. Mr. Hogg stated the front door was too solid and should have transoms or sidelights. He thought the front porch should be brick or stone, not concrete. Mr. Hogg did not think a standing seam metal roof was appropriate. He thought copper was nicer.

Mr. Adams thought it was a great opportunity in the idiom.

Ms. Brennan agreed with her colleagues and expressed a preference for true divided lights.

Ms. Schoenthal thought the proportions made the building seem squatty.

Mr. Knight agreed with his colleagues. He thought the Special Use Permit was well warranted. He appreciated the simplicity of the site plan but suggested the applicant consider more details of what happened along the street.

Mr. Wolf thought it was a great use. He thought there were great points about the fenestration patterns. He thought the back of the building would be visible through buildings from Rugby and more attention should be paid to the back.

Ms. Gardner moved to find that the proposed Special Use Permit to allow a fraternity at 135 Madison Lane in a proposed new building will not have any adverse impacts on The Corner ADC District because the proposed new building is subject to the BAR. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 09-04-02

110 10 ½ Street NW

Tax Map 10 Parcel 47

Curtis-Alexander LLC, Applicant

Rehabilitate exterior; partial demolitions; remove two trees

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This contributing building in the West Main ADC District was constructed in the 1880s. This was last before the BAR in September, 2008, at which time the Board denied a request for demolition. City Council upheld the BAR's decision on appeal. The property was since purchased and the new owner intends to preserve and restore it. The proposal seeks to remove inappropriate additions, restore the original structure, and add traditional details. The rear stairs should be painted wood.

Mr. Preston Coiner stated there were two slight changes to the submittal. Item 4 had requested replacing three front porch posts with two, however, two would not provide enough support so he wished to use four posts to create a three bay railing. Item 15, the relocation of the gas meter, would cost 4- to \$500; the applicant did not want to shoulder that cost.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know if the applicant was going to keep the chain link fence on the side. Mr. Coiner stated the chain link fence was on the adjacent property as a security measure.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight thought this was a worthwhile application. He appreciated Mr. Coiner's willingness to rehabilitate this building. He thought the additions which were being removed were of little consequence to the original structure.

Ms. Brennan thought it was a great application and supported all changes to the front porch.

Mr. Wolf applauded the research and investigation Mr. Coiner had put into the property. He supported the application as is.

Mr. Hogg thought it was a wonderful application.

Ms. Brennan, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Site Design, moved to find that the proposed rehabilitations, partial demolitions and tree removals do 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. Coiner asked the Chair for the motion to be amended to allow him to change the posts on the front porch from his original application. Ms. Brennan and Mr. Hogg accepted this amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

- I. Preliminary Discussion**
 - BAR 09-04-10**
 - 107 W. Main Street #3**
 - Tax Map 33 Parcel 257.3**
 - Jayson B. Collier, Owner**
 - Addition to Condominium**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This request was to add a 400 square foot addition with a rooftop terrace; the addition would be two storeys above the main level. The new

elevation faces an alley and will not be visible from any adjacent street except First Street.

Mr. Jayson Collier was present to answer questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wanted to know how the segue between old and new would be achieved. Mr. Collier stated it would need to be demolished down to a certain point of suitable bearing. He was thinking about running a vertical row of bricks. He stated he would bring samples back for approval.

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the hardiplank wall would be visible. Mr. Collier stated it would only be seen from the top floor of Miller's.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought it seemed appropriate. He suggested getting rid of the railing.

Mr. Adams thought it was a nice project.

Ms. Brennan stated that, given the lack of visibility, she had no problem with the proposal.

Mr. Wolf noted there was general support for the project. He thought it was a strong project. Mr. Wolf saw no big problems with it.

Mr. Wolf called for a brief recess, whereupon the meeting stood recessed at 8:07 p.m.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

**J. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-04-08
433 North 1st Street
Tax Map 33 Parcel 103
Malcolm and Ruth Bell, Owner
Demolish garage**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a contributing property in the North Downtown ADC District. The applicant wants to demolish the 1927 garage. The garage is simply

built and has some deterioration. The garage does not match the house. The building was not in good condition.

Mr. Malcolm Bell stated the garage had been enlarged at least twice, possibly three times. He stated all nine piers were tilting and the building could not be used as a garage any longer.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

There were no questions from the Board.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought this was a reasonable presentation of the building's condition. He was not certain this was essential to the streetscape. He did not think it would detract from the character of the house to remove the garage.

Ms. Brennan stated the garage was not visible and met the Guidelines for demolition.

Mr. Wolf found the structure intriguing. However, due to the documentation suggesting the level of compromise to the structural integrity, he could support demolition.

Mr. Knight, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Demolition, moved to find that the proposed complete demolition of the garage does satisfy 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. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

K. Preliminary Discussion

BAR 09-04-09

100-102-104 Oakhurst Circle and 1616 JPA

Tax Map 11 Parcels 1,2,3,4

Tenth & Main, LLC, Owner/Wolf Ackerman Design, Architects

Rehabilitations

Mr. Wolf and Ms. Gardner recused themselves from this matter.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This project was last before the Board in March for preliminary discussion on new construction. This preliminary discussion was for

rehabilitation of four historic structures. All four will be renovated. The conversion will include a complete interior renovation in conformance with Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mr. Dave Ackerman provided the Board with drawings and color samples. He stated the colors were based on the Sherwin Williams historic colors. He stated the vinyl siding would be removed from 104 Oakhurst Circle.

Mr. Hunter McCardle, of Water Street Studio, stated the most notable site changes were the terrace garden; stone was proposed. The second most notable change would be at 1616 JPA where the existing front yard would be preserved.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Hogg thought the two stucco buildings were unusual because they were Colonial Revival/Craftsman. He thought an olive color might be okay.

Mr. Knight thought the Guidelines discouraged them from painting stucco, but thought it was appropriate in this case. Mr. Knight appreciated the calming of the submittal from its previous iteration.

**L. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-04-07
604 14th Street NW
Tax Map 4 Parcel 3
14th Street LLC, Owner/Daniel J. Veliky, Applicant
Partial demolitions and new addition**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a vernacular structure in the Rugby Road ADC District. The applicant wants to remove two small, existing rear additions and add a new rear addition containing 238 square feet for a new bedroom and bath. The original rear kitchen addition will be maintained. The new addition will fill in the ell shape. One of the two windows in the existing bedroom will be moved to the new addition. The new work will use stucco walls and standing seam metal roof to match the existing. The proposed demolition request is acceptable. The proposed new addition is well done in terms of scale and materials.

The applicant, who did not identify himself for the record, explained he was trying to make the building easier to lease. He stated he was trying to maintain the streetscape and remain in character with the building that was already there.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf wanted to know if the eave detail of the original house would be carried over to the addition. The applicant stated they were not planning to.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams did not think this would be seen from the street. He thought the roof could be framed so lines would be different and more sympathetic to the cottage.

Mr. Hogg thought the submission met the Guidelines for size, scale, massing, and materials.

Mr. Wolf, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, New Construction, and Demolition, moved to find that the proposed changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and others in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**M. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 08-05-03
1704 Gordon Avenue and 419 17th Street NW
Tax Map 9 Parcel 2
Development Management Too, LLC, Applicant/Wassenaar Design Group,
Architects
New construction final details**

Mr. Wolf recused himself from the project.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was last before the Board in February when they approved the scale and massing with the condition that it come back to the BAR with more site plan details, facade details, color palette, material choices, the Gordon Avenue facade, and the planning for the Gordon Avenue design where you enter the building. Some shrubs have been removed from the revised plan, but all major landscaping is still intact. All four units in the Gordon Avenue side building enter a single front entrance to an interior hallway.

Mr. Kurt Wassenaar stated the Gordon Avenue facade had been redesigned and the building had been pulled back a little bit.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Knight sought clarification that the lampposts were residential scale. Mr. Wassenaar confirmed they were.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan stated it appeared the applicant had addressed the Board's earlier concerns. She supported the application as proposed.

Mr. Knight echoed Ms. Brennan's comments. He interpreted the building as complying with the Guidelines.

Ms. Brennan, having considered the standards set forth within the City Code including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and for Site Design, moved to find that the proposed new building details satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Mr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion passed, 4-2-1; Mr. Adams and Mr. Hogg voted against while Mr. Wolf had recused himself from the matter.

- N. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 09-04-05
306 E. Main Street
Tax Map 28 Parcel 40
East Main Investments, LLC, Owner/John Voigt, Applicant
Remove 2nd floor storefront; facade alterations**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This property, built by Johnson, Craven, & Gibson, is located on the Mall next to the Bank of America building. On March 18, 2008, the Board approved the addition of a vitrine storefront for the structure; that has been completed on the first floor. The applicant wants to remove the aluminum storefront and horizontal metal panels of the second floor storefront. These will be replaced with a stucco facade with wood french doors. The design should respect the bank and the established context of 306 and 308 E. Main Street.

The applicant was present and had nothing to add.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no questions from the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Adams wanted to know if the applicant had looked at the original drawings to see if these pieces scheduled for replacement were part of the original design. The applicant stated there were no original elevation drawings to their knowledge.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Brennan wondered if adding Renaissance Revival elements was false historicism. She thought a more modern contemporary facade might be more appropriate.

Mr. Wolf expressed concern about having approved the vitrine since it seemed at disjuncture with the second floor proposal. He thought the vitrine should be reconsidered.

Mr. Hogg stated this was a better building than it was given credit for. He thought the infill was becoming two different pieces causing the frame to lose its meaning. The infill was detracting from the later building and the historic building. He stated he could not support this application.

Mr. Knight strongly agreed with Mr. Hogg's comments. He was hard pressed to imagine an aluminum storefront has having any exceptional elements of any sort. He stated he could not support the application as submitted.

Ms. Gardner wondered why inserting Renaissance classical references into this modern building had seemed appropriate to the applicant.

The applicant asked for deferral.

Mr. Knight moved to accept the applicant's deferral. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- O. Preliminary Discussion**
 - BAR 09-04-06**
 - 218 W. Water Street**
 - Tax Map 28 Parcel 84**
 - Waterhouse, LLC, Owner**
 - New construction massing changes**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This was a revised plan for the Waterhouse project. The previous plan received site plan approval and a building permit. The new project eliminates the South Street townhouses. Green roofs and water catchment elements are being added.

The applicant stated all of his projects onward would involve water catchment. He explained the project was being affected by a "spite strip." He stated the South Street elevation had been changed considerably. The existing parking lot would be closed, covered, and greened.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Brent Nelson stated he owned a house across from this site. He commended Mr. Atwood for contacting him and Ms. Gillam to discuss the proposed changes. However, Mr. Nelson expressed concern with the South Street treatment as he deemed it inappropriate to the point of absurdity. He stated Bill Atwood had done some wonderful work, but this was not. He felt this was a concrete bunker with vines.

Ms. Mary Gillam agreed with Mr. Nelson that the South Street facade looked like a bunker. She stated this did not encourage street life downtown.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Wolf thought it was a shame that the side that took the cut was the clean, rational, elegant side. He thought it seemed oddly under structured in relationship to the tower. Mr. Wolf agreed wholeheartedly with the neighbors. In its current iteration, he could not support what amounted to a bunker. Mr. Wolf expressed a preference for a more inventive, creative way to do a green parking lot.

Mr. Adams felt additional drawings were necessary. He agreed with much of what Mr. Wolf had said.

Mr. Hogg agreed the South Street facade was not successful in this iteration. He stated this building was the introduction to the commercial district so the storefront of the first design was great.

Ms. Brennan agreed with the neighbors about the South Street elevation. She felt it did not meet the Guidelines.

Mr. Knight asked the applicant to aim higher. He thought one of the beauties of what had been done before was that it reinforced a neighborhood that has a tenuous quality to it. He was troubled by the bay shaft capital arrangement of the tower.

P. Matters from the public not on the agenda

There were no matters from the public.

Q. Other Business

Mr. Wolf noted there was information in the members' packets about the Look Film Festival.

R. Adjournment

Mr. Wolf moved to adjourn. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:39 p.m.