

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE**  
**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**April 20, 2010 – 5:00 p.m.**  
**City Council Chambers - City Hall**

**Present**

Fred Wolf, Chair  
John Sydney Knight, Vice Chair  
William Adams (arrived at 5:07 P.M.)  
Preston Coiner  
Henry Fairfax Ayres  
Eryn Brennan  
Brian Hogg (arrived at 5:03 P.M.)  
Rebecca Schoenthal (arrived at 5:19 P.M.)

**Not Present**

Michael Osteen

**Also Present**

Mary Joy Scala  
Laura Purvis, Intern (NDS)

Mr. Wolf convened the meeting at 5:02 P.M.

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes)**

There were no matters from the public.

**B. Consent Agenda**

- 1. Minutes –**  
August 18, 2009;  
September 15, 2009;  
November 17, 2009;  
December 15, 2009;  
January 19, 2010;  
March 16, 2010

There were no changes to the minutes.

Mr. Wolf made a motion to approve the consent agenda. All were in favor. Mr. Coiner voted “yes” on the March 16 minutes and abstained on all of the others.

### **C. Projects in Non-Compliance (status report)**

Ms. Mary Joy Scala noted that 503 West Main St. will be submitting a plan for the May meeting to reconstruct the chimneys. Some new trees and a fence going in on Oakhurst Circle will come before them.

### **D. Previously Considered Items**

#### **1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 07-12-04

112 W. Market Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 254

Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless, Applicant/ First Street Church

Project, LLC, Owner

Garden project with five raised beds and cool weather covers

Mr. Wolf stated that his firm is involved in the renovation and construction of the project and relieved himself from the discussion.

Ms. Scala stated that this project is on the same property as an application they reviewed in October 2009 for the day shelter in this building. The current plan, on the east side, calls for keeping an existing dogwood, crape myrtle, and redbuds. That was all that was shown on the original plan and this adds to that design. The applicant proposes to install five raised planting beds on the east side of the property on 1<sup>st</sup> St N.W. Three of the beds will be for vegetables and two will provide planters for two of the existing trees. They have submitted an alternative plan that shows the two trees in mulch beds instead of in the raised beds. The plan to construct the raised beds is to construct them of slate dry laid one foot wide and two feet tall. The three vegetable beds will be six feet by ten feet. When subtracting the one foot of the slate on both sides it will be a four by eight planting space. The proposal to add the cold weather covers includes two designs. Either six millimeters plastic stretched over galvanized steel tubes or 1/8 inch tempered glass in an aluminum storefront frame. Discussion and recommendations; plastic while less expensive is of questionable durability and is not compatible with the property or district. The glass covers are durable, but expensive according to the applicant to both purchase and maintain. Her suggestion is to use clear lexan which may be an appropriate substitute for the glass. The aluminum storefront frame would give a neat appearance. The planting beds around the trees may not be necessary. Mulched beds contained with a narrow metal edging would be sufficient. She tried to find out from the

landscape architect who did the rest of the property design what his plan was for the five London plane trees along East Market St., but she did not hear back from him. It would be best to coordinate these trees with whatever is going to be put around the new trees on Market St. The applicant is represented by Lena Zentgraf and Khaki Demac.

Ms. Janet Matthews, the owner's representative, stated that the trees along Market St. will be mulched. She also feels that the Lexan is an excellent alternative.

There were no public questions

Mr. Hogg asked what the intention of executing the previously approved landscape design.

Ms. Matthews stated that the sod is down from the previous design and the tree are being planted on Friday.

Mr. Hogg asked if the screening material for the concrete retaining wall will be in place shortly.

Ms. Matthews stated that they had to wait because of the weather and the sod needs time to cure.

Mr. Coiner asked if there is a setback issue with these structures.

Ms. Scala believes that there is not downtown.

Mr. Coiner asked if on the west side of the church the rain barrel is capturing water or does it just go to the drain.

Mr. Matthews advised that was correct.

Mr. Coiner asked if that was the intent of the rain barrel or just from a lack of a spigot to capture the water.

Ms. Matthews advised that this water would be used for the garden beds. If the garden beds get approved they will use the captured rain water to water plants and seedlings.

Mr. Coiner asked if the drain now runs from the rain barrel to the city drain.

Ms. Matthews said this was correct.

Mr. Coiner confirmed that she would change it.

Ms. Matthews said they would put a spigot in the rain barrel.

Mr. Knight asked if the slate is going to be dry stacked.

Ms. Matthews advised this was correct.

Mr. Knight asked how whichever method she uses for the greenhouse portion of the structure is going to be attached to the slate.

The applicant said that they would drive metal stakes in the corners and then build on top of that. It will be set on four corners and would not be truly attached. She doesn't feel the materials would do well touching.

Mr. Knight asked why this location in particular.

The applicant stated that this side of the building get really good sunlight and it is right outside of their kitchen entrance for easy access to pick things daily and maintaining watering. There is a spigot directly in one corner of the building there and at the top of the hill. It would be a good way to prevent some of the run off that is coming from the top part of 1<sup>st</sup> St. to the sidewalk entrance to their backdoor. There is a distinct grade. There were no comments from the public

Mr. Coiner would like to see the trees mulched. The money they save on that slate could be put towards glass instead of plastic.

Mr. Knight doesn't see any issues as far as the guidelines go. It's a simple project and they are keeping it as such. He agrees that the two existing trees should just be mulched for arboricultural reasons. He feels the Lexan would be substantial and appropriate. He supports the project given these considerations.

The applicant asked if in terms of keeping the mulch in place being so close the sidewalk would some sort of metal be appropriate. It will also prevent people from crossing over the mulched area as a short cut.

Ms. Scala thinks they may need something to keep the mulch off of the sidewalk.

Mr. Hogg stated that he appreciates the good intentions behind the proposal. He thinks it has a vernacular quality particularly with the greenhouses in place that wouldn't enhance the character of the building. He does not support this.

**Mr. Knight made the motion having considered the standards set forth within the city code including city design guidelines for site design, he moved to find that the proposed site changes 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 with the provision that Lexan be used rather than the plastic and that the planters around the two existing trees be eliminated. The motion was seconded by Mr. Coiner. The motion passed 4-1-2. Both Mr. Hogg and Mr. Adams voted against the motion. Mr. Wolf had recused himself from the matter.**

## **E. New Items**

### **2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 10-04-02

113 West Main Street

Tax Map 33 Parcel 259

Charles Hendricks, The Gaines Group, Applicant/ West Mall, LLC,

Charles Lewis, Owners

Stair tower, painting, vegetation screens, canopy

Ms. Scala stated that the BAR last saw this on February 16 when they approved the application to replace an existing garage door with aluminum storefront doors, unblock some windows and add new double hung windows, and repaint the previously painted Market St. façade. The applicant now wants to install a canopy over the entrance doors; a storefront door and an existing door to the right of that. Option 1 has two separate roofs that are divided by a green screen divider. Option 2 has one roof over both doorways. Option 3 has one roof over the left doorway and also a green screen. The second thing they propose to do is install a vegetative screen along the property line abutting the day shelter and also on the roof. The property line screen would be four feet from the top of the adjacent retaining wall. It would be about six feet from the grade. It would extend from the building out to the Market St. sidewalk. The roof screen is intended to provide privacy and security. It would be the same height as the proposed stair tower which is ten foot eight inches from the roof or seven foot, seven inches above the parapet. They also want to construct a grey stucco stair tower above the existing roofline which would provide access to a new roof deck. They want to paint the brick façade. They are proposing to paint two facades; the partially painted one that faces Market St. This is the one that they said would be fine to paint the last time the applicant was there. They want to also paint a previously unpainted brick wall facing 2<sup>nd</sup> St. to hide mismatched mortar repairs.

Ms. Scala stated that the metal canopy proposals meet the guideline requirements for canopies constructed from rigid material. Painting the previously painted brick façade had been approved with the request that the color closely match the brick. She submitted a butterscotch color that she feels is too bright for Market St. Market St doesn't currently have any bright colors present like on Water St. They need to find a color that more closely matches brick as was suggested previously. There are lime based paints that would mitigate moisture concerns associated with painting brick. That would be a good place to use a lime-based paint. The BAR should not approve painting the previously unpainted brick surface that faces 2<sup>nd</sup> St. It has been badly repaired over the years, but that would create a precedent for future requests if they say it's OK to paint a brick wall just because it has been badly repaired. It should be completely repointed instead of repainted. The applicant shows examples of vegetative screens, but she thinks he really needs to say what type it will be so the BAR will know the details of the screen because there are a couple different types shown in the application. The vegetative screen along the property line creates a problem because it is proposed to be six feet tall in a location that is essentially a front yard on Market St. She feels it should be terminated at a logical place behind what would be the front of the church. Perhaps at the concrete landing for the fire escape. The one of the roof is fine.

Mr. Charles Hendricks is representing the applicant, the Gaines Group. Mr. Hendricks stated that he is the architect on the project. He explained the handout he passes out changes the canopy design slightly. Connectors have been added to the back of the building to match that of the day shelter next door. He also passed out pictures of the day shelter canopy. In addition to the canopies it has a section cut showing the vegetative screen height. They would for it to end at the end of the existing brick retaining wall. He also included the cut sheet for the vegetative screen. For the canopy they prefer option 1 as it calls out the public versus private entrances to the building. It provides an opportunity to give definition to the space while protecting the occupants from weather as they enter the dwelling. Option 2 loses the spatial definition between the public and private. Option 3 does not offer any weather protection for the private. The vegetative screen along the property line runs perpendicular to the street. It is not a street front fence. The appropriate place to stop this vegetative buffer is at the end of the existing brick retaining wall and not the bottom of the fire escape. Ending the vegetative buffer at the bottom of the fire escape only makes sense while standing in the courtyard of the neighboring property. Those driving or walking along Market St. will immediately identify with the ending of the vegetative screen at the end of the retaining wall. This buffer provides a vertical buffer to soften the hardscapes that exist in this area introducing more green along Market St. It is environmentally sensitive, aesthetically pleasing, and should be approved as submitted to the end of the retaining wall. He noted that as he walked down Market St. the precedent of painting the brick has already been

set. He showed photos and noted a number of other buildings that are painted on two sides on Market St.

Mr. Wolf stated that the issue is whether unpainted masonry is allowed to be painted.

Mr. Hendricks noted that the blue building he mentioned was unpainted masonry that was painted after the BAR was in existence. He was not sure of the year it was painted, but the precedent has already been set. Ray Gaines, his partner, was devastated when the blue building was painted due to a family connection.

Mr. Wolf noted that he was not sure what the guidelines were at that time. That building came back to them to repaint that building and there was a lot of discussion on how to paint it. This discussion is not about whether are any painted buildings downtown.

Mr. Hendricks stated that as far as repointing the brick to bring it back to a cohesive whole, there are at least six different bricks on the façade. Repointing the bricks will highlight how bad that façade looks as it exists now. He feels that painting the brick will bring it back to a cohesive whole and make it look better and more aesthetically pleasing as one is traveling up Market St. The paint color they selected is from a building on Water St. that was recently done. They pulled this color selection from within the BAR review district.

Mr. Wolf asked for any public questions and there were none.

Mr. Coiner asked if there is a line of site ordinance as far as the vegetative screen is concerned.

Mr. Hendricks advised that there is no parking space there and that parking is currently not allowed in that driveway. The end of the vegetative screen is beyond the sidewalk by about five feet back from the sidewalk. The retaining wall doesn't go all the way to the sidewalk.

Mr. Coiner stated that there may not be any regular parking but there would be a delivery drop off point. Mr. Coiner also asked if the retaining wall is part of this property or part of the church property.

The applicant advised that it is his retaining wall.

Mr. Coiner stated that on the prior application were they just given permission to paint the area that had previously been painted?

Mr. Hendricks advised that it was.

Mr. Coiner asked if the verticals for the canopy will have plates on the bottom that will not be sunken into the concrete. He is concerned about underground utilities.

Mr. Hendricks advised that they would be bolted down.

Mr. Hogg asked if they were removing part of the concrete wall to make a planting bed. Mr. Hendricks said it is to allow for the vegetative screen between the two spaces or for the vegetative screen that goes out. It needs to be about two feet wide. It is just enough for the vegetation to grow.

Mr. Adams asked if there would be a gravel bed or would it be mulched.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it would be mulch.

Mr. Adams asked if it would go to the end of the brick retaining wall.

Mr. Wolf asked if it was about 12-15 feet back from the sidewalk.

Mr. Hendricks doesn't think it is that far. It is about 5-10 feet back. The vegetative screen would not end at the sidewalk.

Mr. Hogg asked if the covers on the canopies are pitched towards the building.

Mr. Hendricks stated that they are pitched towards the vegetative screen on Option 1.

Mr. Hogg stated that they appear to be pitched back towards the building.

Mr. Hendricks stated that they are not. They are pitched in towards the vegetative screen so they can collect water down the screen into the vegetation.

Mr. Hogg asked if they are flat.

Mr. Hendricks stated that they pitch in and are flat otherwise. The corrugation runs the opposite way of the way one would think it would.

Mr. Wolf asked if there is something in the tie rod connection that has been added is serving a purpose. It seems like the structure of it is handled with the supports below it.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it was an aesthetic decision.



Mr. Adams is the windows were going to be replaced.

Mr. Hendricks advised that they were not. Just the windows that didn't exist anymore were being replaced.

Mr. Wolf asked if the privacy screen on the roof is also the green screen attached to the stair tower. He also asked if it is attached to the face of the stair tower which is set back.

Mr. Hendricks advised that it is the same. It is at the face of the newer part of the building where the building steps now. There is a natural step on the building where the existing building had burned down and it was rebuilt.

Mr. Hogg asked why the stair tower is so tall at 10 feet, 8 inches.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it is being measured off of the roof deck. There has to be some structure to elevate the new roof deck off the existing membrane.

Ms. Brennan asked what type of vegetation is being proposed.

Mr. Hendricks said that it will be a vine that will thrive in the climate.

Mr. Wolf confirmed that the applicant's preference is for some coverage over the residential entrance. He suggested that they in some way recess the door to create a small niche instead of the canopy.

Mr. Adams asked what the elevation of the sidewalk is in relation to the church.

Mr. Hendricks advised that it is relatively flat.

Mr. Wolf asked if there were any public comments. There were no public comments.

Ms. Schoenthal supports the canopy part of Option 1. She doesn't see where the vegetative wall meets up well with any of the BAR's guidelines for walls and fences. They need to see a better drawing for the roof to determine scale.

Mr. Hogg agrees with Ms. Schoenthal about the roof. The height seems a lot. He suggested that the green screen go on the front of the bulkhead. He prefers Option 3 for the canopy. He doesn't like the two different heights. The orange is too bright for the painted wall. They should consider a mineral paint.

Ms. Brennan appreciates what they are trying to accomplish. They should not cover up the historic brick with a green screening wall. She feels the butterscotch paint is too bright and unpainted wall should stay unpainted.

Mr. Coiner feels that the vegetative screen is important to that location because of the number of people that congregate there. The guidelines do allow for a screen, but he was concerned about the line of sight. He thinks they should not paint the unpainted brick. Option 1 meets the guidelines and wouldn't detract from the character from the building.

Mr. Wolf stated that the applicant can defer and pull all of the thoughts presented tonight together.

Mr. Adams thinks a more minimal scheme would be better. Signage and lighting could be important. He prefers the single canopy and a reduction of the mass on the roof.

Mr. Wolf stated that the multiple heights on the porch piece could be simpler. He likes Option 2 or 3 more than 1. The green screen piece should be lower. The unpainted brick on the side shouldn't be painted and there could be an alternative coating. The other color needs to be toned down.

Mr. Knight stated that he doesn't see the logic in the low vegetative screen being in front of the wall.

Mr. Wolf asked how often the supports for the green screen would occur.

Mr. Hendricks stated that they would be six foot panels.

Ms. Brennan asked what color the corrugated metal would be.

Mr. Hendricks stated it would be grey.

Ms. Brennan would like to see a darker color for the corrugated materials to match the approved windows.

Mr. Hogg thinks the back would be a loading dock and the metal corrugated material would be appropriate. Option 2 or 3 would be fine, but not Option 1.

The applicant said that he would defer and resubmit the application.

**Mr. Wolf moved to accept the applicant's deferral. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously: 8-0**

Mr. Wolf suggested that the applicant speak with the church about the wall and screen in a way to create continuity.

### **3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 10-04-01  
611 Park Street  
Tax Map 53 Parcel 1  
Rebecca Treakle, Applicant/ James E and Rebecca Treakle, Owners  
New driveway, site work, patio, replace existing deck

Ms. Scala stated that the BAR saw this property in 2003 when a replacement roof was approved. The applicant would like to make changes to the Wine St. side yard and the rear yard of the property. Also proposed are two parking spaces, a ramp on the west side of the property, and Belgard Cambridge pavers. A two foot band of tan banded cobblestones will be mortared to a new concrete footer along Wine St. A ramp will provide access to the rear yard off of Wine St. The gates at the bottom of the ramp are iron gates. Some of the proposed items are in the city right of way. The applicant has been informed that they are not allowed to use gravel within 20 feet of the street right of way. The ramp should be made of alternate material.

Ms. Treakle stated that the iron gates were on the property when it was purchased. It is a double gate made of wrought iron.

Mr. Wolf asked for any public questions. There were no public questions.

Mr. Hogg asked why the ramp is so wide.

Ms. Treakle stated that it needs to be that wide in order to dump mulch in the back yard. There is no off street parking.

Mr. Wolf expressed difficulty in reading the provided materials.

Mr. Hogg has walked around the house and feels that the proposed changes are reasonable. 15 ½ feet seems wide for the driveway.

Mr. Hefren stated that it is that wide because of two fixed points that are present.

Public comments:

Ms. Diane Wilson stated that she lives at 236 Wine St and has a view of the back of the house. She likes the improvements.

Mr. Wolf stated that a solution for the ramp is two tracks with a drive aisle and grass in the middle.

Mr. Knight supports the back yard work because it is out of view. The proposed wall could be simplified. He is opposed to the materials being used.

Mr. Hefren stated that the in and out design was intended to create planting beds.

Mr. Wolf stated that formalizing the parking space makes sense. The wall should be simplified. Some refinements and consistent documentation are needed. He would not support until he has that additional information.

Mr. Hogg thinks the applicant should take the comments and revise the design.

Ms. Schoenthal wanted to know if it was possible to approve the back portion of the proposal.

Mr. Wolf said that it was possible to hold off on the retaining wall, parking space, entrance materials, and ramp. The applicant could come back for later approval.

Mr. Ayres suggested that the new walls should look like the old walls with no cap at all.

Mr. Wolf stated that the changes to the south of the house which includes the sitting area, the water feature, the pathway, the revisions to the existing deck, and the fireplace could be approved as is. But, not the retaining wall, parking area, and ramp.

**Mr. Wolf made a motion that having considered the standards set forth within the city code including city design guidelines for site design and new construction and addition, he moved to find that the proposed changes which shall include the sitting area, the water feature, the pathways, the revisions to the deck, and the fireplace feature on the south side of the house are approved as presented. However, the retaining walls, the pergola, the parking area and its adjacent ramp and retaining wall are not approved as submitted and are required to come back to the BAR. Those changes associated with the areas to the south of the house are compatible with this property and others in the district and the BAR will approve the application with the modifications stated. Mr. Knight seconded the motion and**

**asked an additional request that when the stipulated areas do come back to the BAR, that they come back in the form of measured site drawings at an appropriate scale with sufficient detail to fully explain such things as elevations and detailing on all of the elements such as the walls and the pavement. Mr. Wolf accepted the modifications to his motion. The motion passed unanimously: 8-0.**

#### **4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 10-04-04  
215 East High Street  
Tax Map 33 Parcel 74  
Altenergy Incorporated, Applicant/ Quartz LLP, Owner  
Installation of photovoltaic modules on the Village School roof

Ms. Scala stated that the project proposes to add ten photos that to the roof that would not be visible from the street. One letter was sent in support of the project.

Levon Bullard stated that the pictures the BAR received would be the same as what will go up.

Mr. Hogg asked if the project is visible from 2<sup>nd</sup> St.

Mr. Bullard said that they walked around the entire building. The project sets back far.

Mr. Wolf asked for any public questions.

Mr. Wolf said that he would support the project.

**Ms. Brennan made a motion that having considered the standards set forth within the city code including city design guidelines for new construction and site design, she moved to find that the proposed rooftop photovoltaic satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the district and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. The property owner is advised to return to the BAR with a screen design for the roof mounted mechanical equipment. Mr. Hogg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously: 8-0.**

#### **5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 10-04-05  
705 Park Street  
Tax Map 52 Parcel 58

Kate Snyder, Alloy Workshop, Applicant/ Greyson and Ariana Williams, Owners  
Construction of new exterior stairs and landscaping

Ms. Laura Purvis advised that the BAR last saw this property at their August 19, 2008 meeting. At that time they approved an application to re-enclose the side porch, paint the house, and maintain wood stairs. The applicant proposes to add new painted wood railings to the front stairs and the side stairs off of the addition. New brick walls will be installed on two sets of exterior brick stairs as a landscaping feature. A new iron railing would be installed to replace a current metal railing on the steps leading to the rear of the house. There would be removal of one or two bushes. There would be some new plantings and new brick stair in the south west rear corner of the house.

Ms. Kate Snyder said the wooden railings replicate the existing details of the house. On the side stair the detailing has been scaled down.

Mr. Wolf asked if there were any public questions.

Ms. Colette Hall, the President of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, lives at 101 Robertson Lane. The front of the house where railings are proposed only has four steps and not five as directed by insurance.

Ms. Snyder advised that the applicant is willing to put in three steps with no railing.

Ms. Hall is concerned with the front door and porch area. The previous owner wanted to make some changes with the railing that the BAR denied. Feels the railings should look different.

Mr. Wolf stated that there needs to be some continuity.

**Mr. Wolf made a motion that having considered the standards set forth within the city code including city design guidelines for site elements and rehabilitation, he moved to propose that the 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. Ayres seconded the motion. It passed unanimously: 8-0.**

## **6. Preliminary Discussion**

BAR 10-04-06  
301 5<sup>th</sup> Street SW  
Tax Map 29 Parcel 104

Mitchell/Matthews, Architect/ Michael and Ashley McMahan, Owners  
Shed and addition demolitions, new addition and site work

Ms. Scala stated that the BAR saw this property on August 18, 2009 where they approved to rehabilitate the house. They did not approve the front door. The new request plans to demolish the rear block and wood frame addition and two free-standing storage sheds. They propose to construct a new rear wood frame addition and repairs to the existing structure. The property should be considered as part of the neighborhood.

Ms. Roselyn Matthews states that the proposed demolition is in the rear of the property and off of the side street. There is a connector the existing structure. They have minimized the view of the project from the front.

Mr. Wolf asked for questions from the public.

Mr. Garrett Rowser, 590 Dice St., asked if he would be able to see the plans being that he is a neighbor.

Ms. Brennan went on a site visit with the applicant.

Mr. Knight reiterated that the owner is not doing anything to the original structure, but is making an addition.

Mr. Wolf asked for public comments. There were no public comments.

Mr. Hogg stated that getting rid of the stuff in the back is a good idea. He feels that this one is excessively large.

Ms. Brennan stated that the addition would need to be reduced.

Mr. Wolf stated that the project needs a smaller footprint.

Ms. Schoenthal stated that the protected property should be seen first. The new addition is overwhelming to the property.

Mr. Wolf called recess at 7:39 P.M.

Mr. Wolf reconvened the meeting at 7:46 P.M.

## 7. Preliminary

BAR 10-04-03

1901 East Market Street

Tax Map 55A Parcel 149

David L Puckett/FPW, Applicant/ Jon Fink, Owner

Move historic shed, Shed/porch/addition demolitions, and new addition

Ms. Scala stated that the BAR last saw this property in December 2009 when they approved the documentation and reconstruction drawings for the shed that was previously approved. The applicant wants to add a rear addition to the existing house. There will be a garage, a storage space, a wine cellar, a luthier studio, and a guest room over the studio. She has received four letters in opposition to the project from Preservation Piedmont, Victoria Dunham, twenty six Woolen Mills residents, Jillian Galle, and Aaron Wunsch. Cheri Lewis gave her a letter addressing the civil suit going on.

Mr. Wolf advised that his firm was involved with this property, but that he can stay objective.

Ms. Brennan advised that she is on the Board of Preservation Piedmont. They took a vote about the letter that was submitted on behalf of that organization. She recused herself from that vote so that she could speak on it tonight.

Mr. David Puckett stated that the owners want a three part project.

Mr. Wolf asked for any public questions. There were no public questions.

### Public comments:

Ms. Beverly Catlin in opposition of project.

Ms. Allison Ewing in opposition of project.

Ms. Gillian Kyles in opposition of project.

Mr. Coiner said that the 1990's plan doubled the footprint and this is doubling it again.

Mr. Hogg suggested that the applicant build on other parts of the property. The addition is immense. He would prefer square door openings to arched door openings.



Ms. Brennan stated that the project doesn't meet the guidelines. There is no unity or coherence.

Mr. Knight stated that the scale of the project is a problem.

Mr. Wolf feels that the scale of the project is too much.

**F. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 5 minutes)**

No public matters.

**G. Other Business**

1. Create subcommittee to review ADC Guidelines

Ms. Scala stated that they need volunteers to create a subcommittee of three members to get through changes of guidelines. Ms. Brennan, Mr. Coiner, and Mr. Wolf volunteered. Ms. Brennan feels that Mr. Osteen would be good for the subcommittee.

**H. Adjournment**

Mr. Hogg moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously: 8-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 P.M.