

**BAR MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
Regular Meeting  
August 20, 2024 – 5:00 PM  
Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Space & virtual via Zoom)**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Due to the current public health emergency, this meeting is being held online via Zoom and in person at City Space. The meeting process will be as follows: For each item, staff will make a brief presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, after which members of the public will be allowed to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves and give their current address. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to speak. Public comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

**Members Present:** Jerry Rosenthal, Kate Tabony, Breck Gastinger, Ron Bailey, James Zehmer, Carl Schwarz, Cheri Lewis, David Timmerman

**Staff Present:** Kate Richardson, Jeff Werner, Remy Trail

**Pre-Meeting:**

Introductions: New BAR members- Jerry Rosenthal & Kate Tabony  
New NDS/Preservation staff-Kate Richardson

Discussion on two properties on the agenda-

1. The Water Street elevation of 316 E. Main St., as to whether zoning ordinances would allow for the installation of a roll up garage door in lieu of the current commercial entry doors.
2. Discussion about why the owners of 7 Gildersleeve Wood are changing the front entry, and how old the plans appear. Members wondered if the original entry elements could be preserved with the new alterations, but felt the structure overall was not an outstanding architectural example within the Oakhurst ADC.

The Chairman called the meeting to order 5:30 PM.

Mr. Whitney (Vice-Chair) has left. A motion was made to make Mr. Timmerman the Vice-Chair – Ms. Lewis. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passed 7-0. Mr. Timmerman has been named Vice-Chair.

Jerry Rosenthal and Katie Tabony were introduced as new members of the BAR.

**A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.**

No Public Comments

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

**Mr. Schwarz asked to move 627 Cabell Avenue from the Consent Agenda.**

**Mr. Gastinger moved to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 7-0.**

1. Meeting Minutes – May 21, 2024

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR # 24-08-01

0 Park Street, Tax Map Parcel 520051000

(Rear parcel at 745 Park Street)

North Downtown ADC District

Owners/Applicants: Karen Vajda and Kevin Riddle

Project: New house. [CoA approved March 2024. Design has been modified.]

C. **Deferred Items**

NA

D. **New Items**

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR # 24-08-05

627 Cabell Avenue; TMP 050105000

Rugby Road, University Circle, Venable Neighborhood ADC District

Owners/Applicants: Neighborhood Investments, LLC/ Caleb Slabach, CEO Cornerstone General Contractors, LLC

Project: Construction of rear, two-story porch

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Request CoA for construction of a two-story porch on the side (north) elevation of the post-1965 rear addition to the original house.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from The Public

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** – Staff has recommended a condition that the deck boards be tight fit with no gaps. I want to make sure that was ok with the applicant. My understanding is that if they are tightly fit, you would have to find a way to drain the deck. I want to confirm that was ok with you. This does not seem like a necessary requirement.

**Mr. Werner** – I agree this is not in a location. It is not something I need to replicate a historic porch. If it was spaced, that is fine with me.

**Caleb Slabach, Applicant** – The fastener system occasionally requires some spacing. I understood from the BAR’s requirement that we would be using square edge boards. Is that correct?

**Mr. Schwarz** – That is part of the condition that has been written.

**Mr. Slabach** – That being the case, we would only have a small 8<sup>th</sup>-inch maximum expansion requirement between the boards. We still have a code requirement. It is my understanding for a slope away from the building. It would be very minimal. It would not be specifically for the watershed. We could accommodate a minimal gap between the boards.

**Mr. Schwarz** – My question was if you guys are ok with the staff’s condition or not. What you are describing sounds fine to me.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed two-story porch at 627 Cabell Avenue satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the request with the following conditions recommended by staff:**

- **The proposed railings will be wood, composite material, or metal. Painted. No vinyl or plastic.**
- **The cement board trim and material will be installed with the smooth side exposed; no faux-grain.**
- **The porch decks can be Trex-type decking, provided it has a smooth surface, no faux-grain, and is square-edged to fit tight, similar to T&G flooring; no gaps like on a wood sundeck.**
- **Owner must address the deteriorated conditions of the historic house, particularly the front porch (due both to its condition and the removal of the Corinthian columns, which was not approved by the BAR), otherwise design staff will refer the matter to the Zoning Administrator for enforcement.**

**Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 7-0.**

**4. Certificate of Appropriateness**

BAR # 24-08-04

809 Locust Avenue, Tax Map Parcel 510019000

Martha Jefferson HC District

Owner: Sarah and Thomas Shafran

Applicant: Rosney Architects

Project: Addition and alterations to the primary elevation

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Request for CoA to construct a second story addition on a single-story residence.

**Julie Dixon, Applicant** – Our belief is that this gives this house a much stronger street presence. What it is attempting to do is work with this Spanish California. We are trying to stay within that edge. We are doing that with the use of clay tiles and the stucco exterior that the current house has. We feel like we are ‘beefing’ that up with this addition and the increased and more appropriate scale of that center volume will improve its relationship with the street and the surroundings. It is architecturally very simple. We are hoping in the details to enhance the personality of a Spanish California style that might set that house apart in a nice way.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from the Public

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

No Questions from the Board

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

**Mr. Schwarz** – My one concern is that there is no front door facing the street. There was not one to begin with. They are not making the condition any less compliant in that sense.

**Mr. Zehmer** – The entrance is off to the side at one end. There is something on that front elevation. It feels like it is missing something.

**Mr. Schwarz** – It is also the difference between one of our Design Control Districts and the Historic Conservation District, where it is more about the massing and the scale.

**Mr. Bailey** – On the other hand, the building is so far back from the street, the front door would not be that significant of a presence in any case.

**Mr. Zehmer** – The parameters of this district are not as strict.

**Motion – Mr. Gastinger – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the alterations to 809 Locust Avenue satisfy the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson HC District, and that the BAR approves the request. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 7-0.**

## 5. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR # 24-08-02

7 Gildersleeve Wood, Tax Map Parcel 110017100

Oakhurst Circle-Gildersleeve ADC District

Owners/Applicants: Mary and Scott Prior

Project: Construct entry portico

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Request CoA for construction of a portico at the front entrance.

## QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

## QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

**Mr. Timmerman** – I am curious where the drawing came from and its relationship with your house.

**Scott Prior, Applicant** – We have been in the house nearly 25 years. The previous owners had a local architect draw these up. They never went ahead with the building. As part of the sale, we have these architectural drawings if you want them. Decades later, we are using them. The architects gave 3 different renderings. The previous owners agreed on the one that they advanced to blueprints. That is the same style we liked as well. It would be like what is shown there. We replaced the stairs years ago. The stairs that are depicted in the pictures will be kept in place. Instead of having a bullnose, they are just regular, square brick stairs. The dimensions are a slight bit wider. The other change is that we are planning on doing this without railings. We are under the impression that to codes, it does not require railings. We have never had railings in 25 years. That will be the only change. It is a standing seam roof, which will match our existing house. The current storm door is about to fall off. We are going to replace that with an exact replica but in mahogany. I believe that is known as a Richmond storm door. It will be pretty much exactly as depicted there.

When the neighborhood first went to historic district standards, in the review of each individual house, it stated that our house was not contributing to the historic nature. It was built in 1955 and is newer than most of the rest. Over the years, we have tried to add some details and make it look more historical. We put the standing seam metal roof on it. We built a stone wall out front that ties into the stone walls in the rest of the neighborhood. We have done a few things to try to integrate it more into the historical nature of the neighborhood. We plan on staying in that house. We are going to use very good materials and build it to high standards.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Did you look at incorporating this existing door surround and still putting a roof over it?

**Mr. Prior** – We did. The existing pilasters are rotting in places. We do want it to be slightly wider. We considered that. We felt trying to pull those off and move them out might have them disintegrate. As they stand, they are in rough shape. One of the reasons we are doing this project is that everything has been out in the elements for 70 years. The stoop, storm door, and pilasters are going.

**Mary Prior, Applicant** – The pilasters have disintegrated at the bottom.

**Mr. Prior** – We did consider that. One change that is depicted in the blueprints is that we are opting for smooth columns as opposed to fluted. Across the back of the house and one side, it has all smooth columns. We are trying to tie all that together.

**Mr. Zehmer** – You said that you are going to match the roof with a standing seam metal roof. Does that mean you will be employing a mechanically fastened hand crimped ridge detail?

**Mr. Prior** – That is what we have on the existing roof. I don't think we will have snow catchers on it.

**Mr. Zehmer** – What I want to avoid is a snap-on ridge cap.

**Mr. Timmerman** – Are you going to replace the light?

**Mr. Prior** – The side light, in one of the architectural drawings, has a hanging light hanging from under the apex of the ridge line. With moving the columns slightly out, that will cover the holes where the side light currently is placed in keeping with the colonial theme.

**Mr. Rosenthal** – What are the rules on railings going up the stairs?

**Mr. Schwarz** – For a guardrail, the walking surface must be 30 inches off the adjacent ground. I don't think they need a guardrail. It is up to the permit office if they need a handrail. If they build it new, they probably would have to put in a handrail.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Since they are proposing not to put one, we are not going to rule on what it should look like. It is up to the building official to decide whether he is going to require handrail.

**Mr. Werner** – It would be simple if they wanted to add one.

**Mr. Prior** – Staff sent us a sample. It is like the railings you see at UVA. If it was required by insurance or code, we would be happy to do that.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Pending on how this turns out, if that is a requirement, that could be approved or done administratively by staff.

## COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

**Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed portico at 7 Gildersleeve Wood satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Oakhurst Circle-Gildersleeve ADC District, and that the BAR approves the request. Second by Mr. Timmerman. Motion passes 7-0.**

### 6. Certificate of Appropriateness

BAR # 24-08-03

316 East Main Street, Tax Map Parcel 280042000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Biggs Hardware Store LLC

Applicant: “Hock” Hockensmith, Howard Hanna/Roy Wheeler Realty

Project: Water Street elevation: Remove commercial entry doors, install garage door.

**Jeff Werner, Staff Report** – Request CoA to remove the commercial entry doors (installed in 2008) at the Water Street elevation and install a roll-up garage door to accommodate vehicle entry.\* The style of the new door has not been selected.

**Ms. Lewis** – You said that the application is to go back to a rollup door.

**Mr. Werner** – I keep using rollup door more generically.

**Ms. Lewis** – Do we know that a rollup door was ever there?

**Mr. Werner** – The 70s door looks like a rollup door. There is the rollup door that curls up at the top. There is a garage door.

**Ms. Lewis** – There is type written that is unidentified. There is a report in here that is historic, typewritten. There are handwritten pages on a yellow legal pad and there is typewritten. There is no attribution what those are. It is in the file. Halfway down, it does say it was a warehouse door. It does not say it was vehicular door.

**Mr. Werner** – It is hard to say.

**Ms. Lewis** – It was used to something large or volume of something in there. It does not necessarily say it was a garage door. Somebody has bracketed that language on that page. I am on page 136. With the history of this, we do not necessarily think it was vehicular from the beginning of the time that this building was constructed.

**Mr. Werner** – The window in the center has a large stone sill on it. The opening has not been altered from what I could tell. It is hard to say. My best guess, given pictures of old doors we have seen around town, it was probably a wood door. The diagonal material seems to have been popular around town. It was possibly hinged. We just don’t know.

**Mr. Hockensmith, Applicant** – With that picture on the right, that is what the door looked like before Octagon remodeled it in 2008. They put in the double-glazed doors for Urban Outfitters, who leased the space from the beginning to their specs. I have had half a building vacant for 14 months. I struggled with a lot of people who would ask the question: How do we get stuff delivered to the property? I would say, like everyone else, you double-park in the street and haul up in a cart. I finally got a couple of people interested if I could provide some way to get goods and merchandise into the building without double parking, they might be interested. Let me see if I can get the BAR to think about going back to what it was like before 2008. I looked at garage doors. I like a rollup idea like in a residential use where they go up on a track. It would not work. A rollup door would work. That is a door I had looked at. A proposal was made to me to put that door in. I would want something dark that is unobtrusive and not stand out as you drive or walk by. I would be very dark and plain, no glazing. It would be close to what was there 10 years ago. I would have to make room inside. I must make room to get a truck in off the street. Right now, there is a floor in the way. We need to take that out. There is still a curb cut there. The curb cut is reserved. The city will lose 1 parking space. There is a half-space that is not used. That could be divided up in the other 3 spaces.

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Questions from the Public

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Gastinger** – I am assuming that you would need to remove the transom so that it looks pretty much like what we see in the 75.

**Mr. Hockensmith** – The rollup canister would go on the other side of those windows at the top.

**Mr. Gastinger** – You could keep those.

**Mr. Hockensmith** – The picture that we are showing with the photoshop.

**Mr. Gastinger** – The intention is to match the color of the storefront windows that you have on the rest of the property.

**Mr. Hockensmith** – It comes in a choice of 3 colors. One of them is not dark like the window around where my first sign is. That was changed when Octagon did the building. They made it that dark. It was approved then. I just want to do it dark. If I could get that color, I would be glad to get it. They don't make it that way.

**Mr. Gastinger** – What color are you proposing?

**Mr. Hockensmith** – Gray. It is a medium, dark gray. It would be closer to the glazing on the existing doors. It would be closer to that color.

**Mr. Zehmer** – How tall are the operable leaves on the existing doors?

**Mr. Hockensmith** – 9 feet.

**Mr. Timmerman** – How wide is the door?

**Mr. Hockensmith** – 8.9 feet. The door would just fit in there with no room to spare. A truck would have a challenge to back in there. Creating enough space inside, they can do it.

**Mr. Schwarz** – They would do a 90-degree turn from the middle of Water Street and back in?

**Mr. Hockensmith** – Yes. They could pull in front-ways. They can do it either way. Urban Outfitters had that double door used for their employees only. They did not have the retail customer come and go in out of that.

**Ms. Lewis** – They used that as a retail space.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Would you be open to looking or doing more research on other vendors that might offer a color?

**Mr. Hockensmith** – I would. I would also find out of trying to paint it. I could get a painter to spray paint it.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No Comments from the Public

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Gastinger** – From my perspective, a loading door on Water Street is wholly appropriate. I am inclined to support the proposal. It would be preferable that the door match the color of the window trim on the rest of the building as closely as possible.

**Mr. Timmerman** – It is a bit unfortunate. It feels like it goes the wrong way from how Water Street has been developing as an active pedestrian zone. It sounds like a use that is important from where you are currently. I would not get in the way. The placement of where the door comes up, it should not be visible through the transom. I don't know how that is going to work. You don't want to be able to see.

**Mr. Hockensmith** – I could put a blank partition on the back of that. I must have a carpenter redo the whole interior to mount the door onto, not affecting the brick. Nothing will be seen. It will have to be prepared for the door people to install the garage door. That rolled up cabinet will go on the inside back that far from the glazing. Will you be able to see it? I would be willing to put something on the existing doors now. Do that on the top so you could not see that.

**Mr. Zehmer** – Was your original intent to retain the transom light?

**Mr. Hockensmith** – Yes. I asked a garage door installer if we could save the light. He said that you could. He did not say anything about hiding it from seeing it outside. I am going to glaze it.

**Mr. Werner** – I did not know if the height would allow it.

**Mr. Zehmer** – The picture from the previous condition from 1970s seemed to appear that the door sat behind the wall itself. You sealed it at the back edge of the wall, which I think would be appropriate. I don't feel you must retain the transom. There was an earlier question that suggested you might. I don't think that is something that I would require. I tend to agree with Mr. Gastinger that a darker color would be more suitable to match the other windows. I see this as a service entrance. Historically, it was a service entrance. You have a personnel entrance adjacent to it. It seems that there is the scale, and the fenestration dictates what is supposed to go through this portal. I agree that it is appropriate. Staff did some research and found what may have been an example of historic service entrance doors. Those are no longer here. A modern rollup garage door is the modern equivalent of those service doors. It makes sense that we are applying our modern standard to this historic building. Nobody is going to be confused and think that rollup door is historic. It is a



question of: Do we want to require it? If we are going to move forward with this, would we require that the transom stays?

**Ms. Lewis** – I agree with Mr. Timmerman. Installing or reinstalling a garage door is compatible with the district. As far as Water Street is concerned, it is a place that has increasingly been pedestrian friendly, less vehicular friendly. I noted that the city's garage has no entrances for vehicles on Water Street, which is amazing for a large-scale building. Both of those entrances were relegated to the side streets of Second and Fourth. It could have been easy to have wide turn lanes off Water Street. It was an effort to make Water more pedestrian friendly and less vehicular. There have been lots of developments along Water Street that have tried to make it less of a drive-through experience with the back garages and back loading docks on Water. It has been delightful to see Water Bird make their space into what was a parking lot and to what was facing Water and more businesses. With the peeks that we have had of a pedestrian experience on Water, this seems to be taking a step back. I don't think it destroys the district. I want to note that there has been some effort to make this not the back door of the Downtown Mall. I think Water was going in that direction. I find it regrettable that we would be rendering a space that was used by humans, even if it was just for an entrance for employees into a purposeful vehicular only entrance. Once you put a garage door up there, no human is going to walk through it again. I understand there are other apertures. That is my only concern about this. I would love to see Water encourage more of that frontage.

**Mr. Rosenthal** – Are you planning to take trash out this way?

**Mr. Hockensmith** – No. The trash comes down the hallway from a trash storage room on the same level as that, down and through that single pass-through door. To the left, between the No Parking cabinets on the wall and my release sign on the window. There is a door with 317 above it. That is now the entrance for people. It goes into a hallway, goes back to an elevator. Beyond that, there is a trash room. They bring the trash out through that door and put it out for pickup. That would not change.

**Mr. Schwarz** – The character of Water Street has changed. It is evident on this block. With the building to the right of it, it is clear that those 3 entrances have all been changed from vehicular entrances and warehouse entrances to being something that is more pedestrian friendly, pedestrian oriented. I struggle with the idea of going backwards, even though there was a garage door there. It is taking the character of the street backwards from where it has gone and where we want it to go. Since the rewriting of the zoning code, we are now tasked with also looking at our Comprehensive Plan in looking at and evaluating these applications. The Comprehensive Plan is very focused on reducing vehicular use, increasing pedestrian use, making spaces more pedestrian friendly. Our community vision statement for land use urban form and historic and cultural preservation, there is a line that says the city will 'prioritize transit-oriented development smart growth infill and adaptive reuse policies to address housing needs, climate change goals, reduce vehicular travel, and support walkability and bikeability.' Reinstating that curb cut and allowing vehicles to pass over the sidewalk is counter to that. With objectives for mixed-use areas, 'promote and encourage design elements that enhance community livability such as active uses at the ground-floor level along key street frontages.' This doorway was an active use. It was a retail storefront. It is now proposed to be a warehouse use, a storage use, a vehicular use. Encourage compact block and street networks. A built environment that facilitates walking, biking, and bus riding.' This is going backwards from that. I know we are supposed to ignore the zoning code on this. I think there is a zoning issue at the end of the day. Even ignoring that and with a lack of guidelines to fall back on. I am going to fall back on our Comp Plan. I can't approve this.

**Mr. Bailey** – It would be inappropriate for this board to take the zoning rules into account. That would be taken up by someone else. To approve or disapprove something outside of our guidelines would be wrong.

**Mr. Schwarz** – My comments were from the Comp Plan, not the zoning ordinance.

**Mr. Bailey** – That is not what we are looking at.

**Ms. Lewis** – In our consideration, we are permitted to look at the Comprehensive Plan and its description of districts, streets, and sub-areas.

**Mr. Werner** – It is the matter of the glazing being once piece. The introduction of vehicular traffic and that this would facilitate traffic.

**Mr. Hockensmith** – The city bought the building next to ours. It is an all-glass front and back with a glass elevator on the front. It is not historic. I am thinking that we are trying to preserve the look on the Water Street side, not make it any more modern. It is utilitarian for our use.

**Motion – Mr. Bailey – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to approve a CoA for the installation of a garage door at the Water Street elevation of 316 East Main under the following conditions, which will satisfy the BAR’s criteria:**

- **that the door be painted a dark bronze to match the color of the existing trim [color on current door and adjacent openings].**

**Second by Mr. Gastinger. Motion passes 6-1. (Mr. Schwarz with the objection).**

The meeting was recessed for 5 minutes.

## **E. Other Business**

### **7. Presentation: Downtown Mall Tree Study (Wolf Josey Landscape Architects)**

- There were multiple committees involved in the development of the Downtown Mall Tree Study.
- The presentation covered the history and timeline surrounding the different stages of the downtown pedestrian mall.
- Only 43 downtown pedestrian malls remain today, including the Charlottesville Downtown Mall.
- There were 109 trees that were looked at-above ground, at ground, and below ground.
- Willow Oaks are the dominant trees on the Downtown Mall.
- The Maple trees that were planted in front of Central Place in 2009 have failed.
- 12 percent of the trees have been removed and approaching 15 to 20 percent of the trees eventually being removed.
- Many of the trees were impacted by café heaters during the pandemic and had heater wounds.
- About 18 percent of the tree canopy is going to be lost. When projecting out 5 to 10 years, there will be another 5 percent of tree canopy loss.
- Mr. Zehmer asked about the lifespan of a Willow Oak. According to the presentation, the lifespan is about 80 years.
- Mr. Josey went over possible short-term solutions to extend the life of the current trees.
- A large tree maintenance program was set up for maintenance of the large tree on the Downtown Mall.
- Mr. Josey also went over long-term solutions to maintain and add to the tree canopy and the different funding options and possibilities.
- This presentation will be presented to City Council in September.
- Ms. Lewis asked about why the city has not replaced the trees in front of the Central Fidelity Bank. Staff did say that those trees slowly died.
- Mr. Rosenthal did ask about the cost per phase for replacing trees using the different approaches.

- Mr. Zehmer did inform Mr. Josey about making sure to answer the questions about cost that will be important to City Council.
- Ms. Lewis did bring up the Boulder, Colorado Downtown Mall and how there have been no national chains or outlets on the Charlottesville Downtown Mall.
- Staff did bring up that there are other trees outside of the Downtown Mall that are not in the best of shape and how to reflect possible changes to the Guidelines.
- There should be discussion within the CIP budget regarding the replacement of trees. Work should be done within the next 5 years.
- Staff did remind the BAR that the BAR is regarded as the stewards of the Downtown Mall.

**Motion – Mr. Zehmer – The Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review would like to express a sincere thanks to Wolf Josey and support implementing their tree preservation plan for our National Historic Landmark Downtown Mall and would like action taken on this imminently. Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 7-0.**

#### **8. Staff questions/discussion**

Recent administrative approvals summary.

Looking ahead. Sept work session: Design Guidelines for Café Spaces

- Chapter V- Signs, Awnings, Vending & Cafes, Section E. Outdoor Cafes

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.