

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
February 17, 1998

Present:
Joan Fenton
Jay Oschrin
Brent Nelson
WG Clark

Staff Present:
Tarpley Vest
Ron Higgins

Ms. Fenton, Chair, explained that there was no quorum present, but that the board would begin with preliminary discussions of Virginia National Bank.

VIRGINIA NATIONAL BANK

Staff presented the report.

Madison Spencer, applicant, then described his intentions for the project. He indicated that the bank intends to occupy 400 East Main Street and that they intend to renovate and rehabilitate the facade. He indicated that they intend to open up the fourth street facade with new windows and that they intend to create office space above the first floor. He indicated that they intend to use muttoned windows in keeping with the architectural character of the Downtown Mall. He indicated that the existing Fourth Street facade is blank to the drainpipe.

Ms. Fenton asked if there was a picture of the original facade available.

Mr. Spencer indicated that there is no picture available.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the changes were just to the side wall.

Mr. Spencer indicated that they moved from double hung windows to larger windows. He indicated that they were creating additional fenestration on the side elevation.

Mr. Spencer indicated that they intend to strip and repaint the exterior. He indicated that they had not selected colors yet and that they would submit colors for administrative approval at a later date. Mr. Spencer indicated that they intend to submit signage for the corner of the building. He indicated that the facade will improve Fourth Street.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the two squares on the elevation drawing.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the squares were intended to show the location of the signage.

Mr. Oschrin asked Mr. Spencer if they had any specific ideas for clocks.

Mr. Spencer indicated that they will provide specific clock images for review at a later date.

Mr. Nelson asked where the mechanical units are presently located on the building.

William Adams of Train and Spencer Architects indicated that there are four units. He indicated that three are located on the roof and are not visible from the street. He indicated that the fourth unit is located in the alley behind the building. He indicated that the fourth unit is visible from the alley but not from the street.

Ms. Fenton then opened up the meeting to comments from the public. No comments were made. She indicated that this is a preliminary conference and that no votes are necessary, just feedback from the board. Ms. Fenton asked the board to comment on the proposal.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is glad to see something happen to this building. He indicated that this building has been a proud building in the past. He indicated that the visibility of mechanical units is a concern with all buildings and that there are a lot of visible mechanical units on the Downtown Mall.

Mr. Clark indicated that the design is an improvement to the west facade of the building and that the proportions will help the building.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the proposal was good. He asked Mr. Spencer about the flagpole.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the vertical flagpoles tend to wrap and that they intend to cant the flagpole.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the proposal looks very good.

At 5:20 Dawn Thompson and Jessie Hook arrived and a quorum formed.

Ms. Fenton asked the applicant if he intended to receive preliminary review of the application.

Mr. Spencer indicated that he intended to receive preliminary review.

Ms. Thompson asked if she was commenting only on the direction that the applicant had taken.

Ms. Fenton indicated that this was a preliminary conference and that the board could agree if the concept looks good.

Mr. Spencer asked if it was possible to submit for final approval at the specially scheduled meeting next week.

Ms. Vest indicated the application could be included on the agenda of the specially scheduled meeting.

LEE PARK

Staff presented the report.

Kay Frazier of the Parks Division introduced herself and the application. She indicated that a private citizen had been instrumental in the rehabilitation of the park. She indicated that she and the citizen had walked through the park and she had been able to see the park through someone else's eyes. She indicated that she noticed the poor condition of the infrastructure of the park. She indicated that the park was to be included in garden week this spring. She indicated that a private citizen had donated funds for the new benches and trash cans. She indicated that they wanted to develop a long range vision for the park. She indicated that the Parks Division chose Gregg Bleam Landscape Architects to develop the plan because of historical background, design, and context of the park. She indicated that Hallie Boyce of Gregg Bleam Landscape Architects would present the plan. Ms. Frazier indicated that the Parks Division required approval of the benches and trash cans in order to prepare for Garden Week.

Hallie Boyce presented the application. She provided a brief history of the park. She indicated that the park land was donated to the city by Paul McIntire. She indicated that the Robert E. Lee statue was designed by Walter Blair. She indicated Boxwood were planted around the base of the statue in the 1950's. She indicated that the park was McIntire's expression of the ideals of the City Beautiful Movement. She indicated that the statue depicts Lee riding east towards Richmond. Ms. Boyce indicated that by 1976 Boxwood were encircling the statue.

She indicated that they intend to return to the original intent of the statue as an object within the park. She indicated the plan is intended to make the park usable for residents and attractive for tourists. She indicated that the current site furniture is not placed in an organized fashion. She indicated that there are three types of furniture currently in the park: concrete benches, wooden benches, and tables and chairs.

She indicated that they propose the removal of the existing plantings around the statue, and propose replacing them with an evergreen ground cover and seasonal bulb plantings. She indicated that the proposal includes an 18" guardrail which is intended to encourage the public not to trod on the plantings. She indicated that they intend to remove the existing lighting. She indicated that the current diagonal path on the north side of the statue may not be replaced. She indicated that this would create more usable space for festival days. She indicated that the current park is all path and no place. She indicated that they intend to remove a Norway Spruce and a Dawn Redwood. She indicated that the Dawn Redwood obstructs the view from the street and is incongruous. She indicated that they intend to replace the Boxwood at the main entrances. She indicated that the Boxwood are becoming diseased.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they had any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Nelson asked what ground cover they would be using around the base of the statue.

Ms. Boyce indicated that they intend to plant Periwinkle.

Mr. Nelson asked if all of the existing furniture would be removed from the park.

Ms. Boyce indicated that they intend to remove all the furniture eventually. She indicated that there is not enough money to remove all the furniture now. She indicated that they will remove the wood benches first. She indicated that some concern has arisen over the tables and chair. She indicated that they may replace the existing tables and chair with metal tables down the road.

Mr. Nelson asked about the removal of the walkway on the north side of the church.

Ms. Boyce indicated that removal of that walkway is a long-term goal and is part of another phase of the project.

Mr. Nelson asked why the walkway was originally built.

Ms. Boyce indicated that the walkway terminated at a bench.

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant what her proposal was for and what she was asking approval for.

Ms. Boyce indicated that she needed approval of the bench design and trash receptacle design. She indicated that the bench design was chosen based on the design of the original Lee Park benches. She indicated that the original intent was to only have benches in the park. She indicated that there seems to be an outcry for tables and chairs.

Ms Fenton then opened the discussion of the trashcans and benches to the public.

A resident of the downtown area indicated that Lee Park is the most used and abused of any place. She indicated that she likes the simplicity of the plan and that she wants the statue to predominate in the park. She indicated that the plan may open up the statue to abuse. She indicated that maintenance is very important and that aesthetics and history are also important. She indicated that we need to be practical. She indicated that she is delighted that this group is here making improvements to the city. She indicated that the concrete benches are classic and simple. She indicated that the 18 inch fence around the statue will not keep people out. She indicated that adults and children abuse the statue. She indicated that her primary concern is protecting the statue.

Ms. Boyce indicated that a long term proposal for uplights around the statue will strongly light the statue.

The resident indicated that three spotlights by the Historical Society have been broken and unless the lights by the statue are obscured the same thing will happen there. She indicated that people really enjoy the concrete tables. She indicated that the chairs are terrible.

Ms. Hook asked if the benches could be moved about the park.

Ms. Boyce indicated that the benches would be secured.

Ms. Fenton then asked the BAR to comment on the proposal.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is thrilled about the project. He indicated that he is sorry the discussion is limited to the trash cans and the benches. He indicated that the furniture in the park now is a detriment to the appearance of the park. He indicated that then the benches were set in concrete it was a big change for the better and that there is less vagrancy in the park. He indicated that it is important to secure the furniture. He indicated that he would like to see metal used throughout the park.

Mr. Clark indicated that he completely supports the project. He indicated that the statue was intended to be on a simple stand with no flowers or shrubbery.

Ms. Hook indicated that it is a good idea. She indicated that she does not want to override the statue and that plantings can detract a little from the statue.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she approves of the whole direction.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he had three comments. He indicated that he doesn't like the Norway Spruce but that he does like the Dawn Redwood. He indicated that he strongly suggests trimming the Redwood instead of removing it. He indicated that the chess tables should stay and that the seats should be replaced. He indicated that concrete stools would be nice. He indicated that the furniture should not be removed until there is a replacement. He indicated that he approves of the benches and that the benches are appropriate. He indicated that he rejects the placement of the benches and that the benches belong on the sidewalk. He indicated that he strongly suggests placing the benches on the sidewalk.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she agrees that the tables should not be removed until there is a replacement. She indicated that she realizes that aesthetically it may be better to remove the benches, but that they should not be removed unless they will be replaced.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with Mr. Oschrin on the placement of the benches. He indicated that there is dirt around the benches. He indicated that security is an issue and that ground lighting will help. He indicated that lighting is very dim. He indicated that police patrol of the park is important.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the benches and trash cans as presented.

Mr. Oschrin moved to amend the motion to stipulate that the benches be placed parallel to the sidewalks.

Mr. Clark indicated that he made a motion to accept the benches and trash cans, and that it is not appropriate to tell the applicant where to place the benches.

Ms. Frazier indicated that they need to get the benches on order for Court Days and Garden Week.

Mr. Clark made a motion to accept the benches and trash cans.

Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Espresso Cafe

Staff presented the report. Ron Keeney, applicant, presented the project. He indicated that they intend to open up an 18' foot area of the front of the building to place 6-8 cafe tables. He indicated that they intend to create an open air cafe off of the walkway and to pull the cafe space back within the building. He indicated that they intend to remove the storefront glass panel. He indicated that the storefront is currently mounted glass and glass block windows. He indicated that they intend to replace the central glass block panel with a glass plain in order to achieve a consistency across the three arched pieces. He indicated that the wooden frame needs repair and repainting. He indicated that the front of the building would consist of a tiled floor area with a new wall 18' into the building space. He indicated that the new wall would be a wood framed storefront wall with 2 inch square individual glass planes set in cherry panes. He indicated that the actual cherry materiel to be used is subject to price.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they had questions.

Ms. Hook asked the applicant if he plans to strip the brick pillars on the storefront.

Mr. Keeney indicated that he intends to strip the paint and leave the brick exposed.

Ms. Hook asked how they planned to strip the paint.

Mr. Keeney indicated that he intend to strip the paint by hand using chemicals.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he likes the glass block panel and asked Mr. Keeney is he would consider removing all the glass and having no glass there at all.

Ty Harris indicated that there may be a problem with water coming in at an angle.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the building was south facing. He indicated that other buildings in the area have awnings and that the cafe space may get very hot.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the building is south facing and that they intend to install ceiling fans in the cafe space.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he does not like the single light window. He indicated that the cherry paneling is an expense that the applicant does not need to incur. He asked the Mr. Keeney about the slope of the floor in the cafe space.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they intend to install a tile floor with drains.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the color rendering and the exterior facade elevation presented by the

applicant did not seem to match.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the two drawings were produced on two different dates and that the color rendering is more accurate.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were comments from the public. There were no comments from the public. Ms. Fenton then asked for comments from the board.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he felt that the single light arched glass window pane is offensive.

Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Keeney about the existing material on the inner wall.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the inner wall would be new construction.

Ms. Thompson asked if the doorway on the existing storefront would be removed.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they will remove the door but not the door frame.

Ms. Hook indicated that she had no criticism of the proposal. She indicated that the glass blocks are distinctive.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they debated on whether to leave the glass block or to improve the facade by making the three panels consistent. He indicated that it is easier to replace the middle window panel than to replace the two side panels.

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant if he would consider semi-circular windows with muttons.

Mr. Keeney indicated that would be historically correct.

Mr. Clark indicated that he thinks that the cafe will be nice and that the applicant has created a loggia off the street. He indicated that the circular windows will be hokey and will appear to be historical when they are not. He indicated that removing all the glass and opening up the building entirely makes more sense. He indicated that the cafe space will be very hot and that an awning may help. He indicated that the heat was not their business. Mr. Clark asked about the tile for the floor of the cafe.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they intend to use 3/8" tile and that they have not chosen the color.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Keeney if the proposal would compromise the structure by opening it up to moisture.

Mr. Keeney indicated that it would not compromise the structure and that an existing concrete deck is in place.

Mr. Clark indicated he was surprised by the Cherry paneling. He indicated that the texture of the corner is increasingly metal and glass. Mr. Clark asked the applicant if he would consider

putting glass in instead of the cherry paneling.

Mr. Keeney indicated that Espresso Cafe National made the decision to use the Cherry paneling.

Mr. Clark indicated that he does not think that this wall is in keeping with the building. He indicated that it makes sense to replace the wall with something very modern. He indicated that the integrity of the corner is more important than the image of the store owner.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he thinks this is an exciting project and that he is glad to see something is happening with this building. He indicated that he is concerned about the front arched glass windows. He indicated that it would be better to take the glass out of the top arches. He indicated that leaving the glass in the three arched windows will make the rest of the storefront look like windows without glass panes, rather than an original design element. He indicated that he is concerned about the proposed cherry wall and that he would prefer to see something more modern.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it would be nice if the glass panes were removed. She indicated that the applicant should save the glass, and if heat or rain became a problem they may decide to put it back in. She indicated that she is not sure about the back wall and that the applicant should return to the board with material samples.

Mr. Keeney indicated that he can propose new materials for the wall to his client. He indicated that the wall is intended for the customers inside the cafe space.

Mr. Clark indicated that he suggests replacing the wall with a glass wall. He indicated that the applicant should return to the board with a properly drawn street elevation.

Ms. Fenton asked the applicant if it would be helpful to receive a partial approval for the exterior.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they will need to work from the interior forward.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he proposes the board does not accept this proposal and that the applicant resubmit to the board next week. He asked the applicant if they were anticipating problems with vagrancy.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they intend to place grillwork across the face of the storefront. He passed out pictures of the proposed grillwork for the board's review and comment. He indicated that they need to secure the space.

Mr. Clark indicated that he recommends resubmission of clean and accurate drawings.

Mr. Clark made a motion to defer the Espresso Cafe application to the specially scheduled meeting during the last week of February.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Wachovia

Staff presented the report.

Kirt Train of Train and Spencer Architects, applicant, presented the application. Mr. Train indicated that Wachovia Bank recently merged with Jefferson National Bank. He indicated that the bank needs more office space. He indicated that Wachovia Bank intends to remain in Charlottesville and at its present location. He indicated that the bank requires additional space. He indicated that the 1920's structure must be modernized to accommodate the needs of the bank. He indicated that the existing facility has inadequate elevators and that they need to improve the aging plumbing system.

He indicated that they intend to construct a 4 story addition along the west facade utilizing the site of the current annex buildings. He indicated that the four story addition has been designed to be compatible with the existing historic fabric. He indicated that the two annex buildings are not considered a part of the historic fabric of the district. He indicated that the construction of the addition allows for additional office space and larger contiguous spaces. He indicated that people who drive to the bank will be able to enter the building from the rear parking lot. He indicated that the buildings will share a central elevator and one mechanical system. He indicated that they want the tower to be the image of the bank and they want the new building to remain vertical in orientation and not to function as an L offspring of the tower. He indicated that the new building is intended to blend with the vertical component of the tower and to make a transition to the rest of the block.

Ms Fenton asked the board if they had questions for the applicant.

Mr. Oschrin asked why on the facade drawing the third building from the left was drawn with the original facade.

Mr. Train indicated that at this time they are just focused on the east end of the block.

Ms Fenton asked what thoughts the applicant had about the western buildings.

Mr. Train indicated that plans for those buildings were undetermined. Mr. Train indicated that they drew the facade elevations with the assumption that someone may renovate the western buildings. He indicated that when designing the four story addition, they looked at the buildings with the correct facades.

Mr. Nelson asked if there was an elevation available of the back of the addition.

Mr. Train indicated that there is a 1/2 level difference between the mall and parking area. He indicated that some movement from level is necessary.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is pleased to see the removal of the metal parapet. He asked if there is mechanical equipment behind the existing parapet.

Mr. Train indicated that there is mechanical equipment there now, but that it will not be visible.

Mr. Nelson asked if the addition will have its own mechanical equipment.

Mr. Train indicated that they don't know yet. He indicated that engineers are currently working on the project scope.

Mr. Nelson asked Mr. Train about plans for the parking deck.

Mr. Train indicated that the parking deck and the end buildings are not on the same schedule. He indicated that they are currently looking at the feasibility of the parking deck. He indicated that they need to clear the building before they clear the deck. He indicated that they feel they can split the project into stages and that they are exempt from parking requirements on the project.

Mr. Nelson asked if the second level of the parking deck will be level with Market Street.

Mr. Train answered that conceptually, the 2nd level will be level with Market Street.

Mr. Clark indicated that the applicant mentioned that work on the parking deck and the corner buildings are on the same schedule. He indicated that he would like to know what work is planned for the corner buildings.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were comments from the public.

Mr. Paul Grady, a resident of Albemarle County, indicated that he would like the bank to restore the two 1970's buildings sell the buildings to someone who will restore them. He indicated that he would like to see a four story parking garage along Market Street with shopping on the first floor, which would contribute to the continuity of the street. He indicated that JNB/Wachovia owns a parking lot on 4th Street NE which the city would love to have for parking.

Mr. Train indicated that they do not agree with the idea of a parking garage looking over Lee Park. He indicated that a two story parking structure with a building above is ideal for the site.

Mr. Grady indicated that they could put a building on the lot fronting Market Street.

Mr. Train indicated that if a building were built on the front of the lot, it would make it difficult to build ramps in the back. Mr. Train indicated that plans for the parking lot are down the road.

Mr. Grady indicated that the Bank should use the valuable air space.

Mr. Train indicated that it is a valuable site.

Mr. Tabackman indicated that the bank application has gone in a better direction. He indicated that the program has changed. He indicated that he applicant has responded to the communities suggestions. He indicated that he is happy with the solutions.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is pleased to see where the applicants have come. He indicated that four stories create an appropriate transition and that they will soften the effects of the tower. He indicated that he applauds the use of scale. He indicated that he is concerned about the destiny of the buildings on the corner.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were objections to demolition of the 1960's buildings.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he had no objections to the demolition of the 1960's buildings.

Mr. Clark indicated that he wasn't on the board for the first submittal of the project. He indicated that one reason he is on the board is because of the last application. He indicated that the last application is something that should never happen to the city or its texture. He indicated that he is concerned that this proposal is not part 1 of a 2 part scheme that will endanger the 1920's buildings. He indicated that solidly and imploringly this better be step 1 of 1. He indicated that he does not understand the garage. He indicated that he finds the loggia with awnings curious. He indicated that the loggia is elegant and that they might consider no awnings. Mr. Clark asked if the demolition of the adjacent structure would endanger the 1920's buildings.

Mr. Train indicated that they will underpin the buildings. He indicated that they will not put structure down near the other buildings.

Mr. Clark asked the applicant if they would guarantee that if damage to the 1920's buildings occurred during construction that they would repair the damage.

Mr. Train indicated that he did not know the answer to that question at that time.

Ms. Hook indicated that she had no comment on the application.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she agrees that this concept is a big step in the right direction. She indicated that the facade on First Street is important to Charlottesville. She indicated that she thinks that retaining the older buildings is a good move.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the applicant has gotten the big things right. He indicated that the proportions of the 4 story building are good. He indicated that it is its own building and not an extension of the tower. He indicated that the board would need to see more details for final approval. He indicated that he likes the loggias but that they need more attention. He indicated that he was curious about the finish.

Mr. Train indicated that the building is brick. He indicated that when the building is cleaned it will be yellow brick.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she appreciates that the applicant listened to the community. She indicated that the proposal is in keeping with the fabric of the block. She indicated that the applicant should be applauded for listening to the community.

Ms. Hook made a motion to adjourn

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion

The motion was unanimously approved.

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
February 24, 1998

Present:

Jay Oschrin (Vice-Chair)
Joe Celentano
Ken Schwartz
Linda Winner
Brent Nelson
Dawn Thompson

Staff Present

Tarpley Vest

At 5:40 the meeting began. Mr. Oschrin indicated that Ms. Fenton was unable to attend and that he would be chairing the meeting.

Lafayette Restaurant: Cafe Furniture

Staff presented the report. Ms. Jordan, the applicant, indicated that Lafayette is seeking a cafe space on the mall. She indicated that the space immediately in front of her restaurant is occupied by the Hardware Store Restaurant Cafe.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he had no questions at that time. He asked the applicant where the space on the Mall would be located.

Ms. Vest indicated that the applicant does not yet have an approved space on the mall.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he was curious about how an applicant goes about applying for a cafe space on the mall.

The applicant indicated that they left room for the Board to provide input on the black or dark green color. She indicated that they hope to stick with the dark green chairs and tables. She indicated that they want to give the applicants the opportunity to provide input on the color of the bollards and chain. She indicated that they could use dark green for all the elements, or they could use black for the chain and bollards.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he had a question about the size of the space to be used.

Ms. Vest indicated that the size of the spaces are up to the City Council

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant if the color of the green furniture and umbrellas were the same.

The applicant indicated that the furniture may be slightly deeper green than the umbrellas.

Ms. Thompson indicated that in the past there has been an issue of the weighting of the bollards. She indicated that it is important that the bollards are weighted properly for safety. Ms. Thompson indicated that review of plant material is in the pervue of the BAR. She indicated that in the past, there have been problems with plant material

being poorly maintained. She indicated that it is important that the plant material be properly maintained.

The applicant indicated that keeping the plant material watered and attractive is very important to them.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she mentioned that issue only because in the past poorly maintained plant material did become an issue with the BAR.

Ms. Jordan indicated that she agrees that it is very important to maintain the plantings on the mall. She indicated that the idea for the plantings, chain and bollards came directly from the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the furniture proposed is fine. He indicated that the items that surround the cafe are just as important as the furniture.

Ms. Jordan indicated that they intend to follow the elements from the other cafes, including the Mudhouse and Hamilton's.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve the furniture as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1) The plant material will be maintained.
- 2) Administrative approval by Ron Higgins of the bollards, chains, and other furnishings.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion
The motion was unanimously approved.

Bashir's Gourmet

Staff presented the report, indicating that the applicant proposes black metal tables and chairs like those found at Peshwa and Hamilton's.

Mr. Bashir Khalafa indicated that the furniture was chosen based on the furniture of other cafes. He indicated that all the elements will be black metal.

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant where the cafe space is to be located.

Mr. Khalafa indicated that they are located across from the Nook.

Ms. Winner asked about the dates that the cafes open on the Mall.

Ms. Vest indicated that the city allows the cafes to open on April 1. She indicated that BAR approval is the first step in obtaining a new cafe space. She indicated that BAR approval of furniture is required in order to be have a cafe application placed on the City Council agenda. She indicated that each of the applicants hope to receive cafe spaces in time for the summer season.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the businesses pay rent for the cafe spaces.

Ms. Vest indicated that they pay \$1 per square foot per year.

Mr. Nelson asked about the color of the planter to be used.

Mr. Khalafa indicated that they had originally considered a white planter. He indicated that the planters would be black.

Mr. Nelson asked what the planter would look like.

Mr. Khalafa indicated that they intend to use rectangular plastic planters designed to look like clay planters. He indicated that this type of planter is available at Loew's. He indicated that if the planters are a problem, they will skip them.

Mr. Nelson indicated that they do not have enough information on the planters.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the meeting was open for comments from the public.

Mr. Oschrin asked for final comments from the board.

Mr. Nelson indicated that they do not know what the planters will look like. He indicated that he is not very comfortable with that.

Mr. Khalafa indicated that he could exclude the planter from the application.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that a recurring problem of the BAR is insufficient information from applicants. He indicated that almost every applicant does the same thing. He indicated that they just need more information.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is uncomfortable asking for things like this to be administratively approved. He indicated that he suggests that they not approve the planters and if the applicant come back to the board for review of the planters.

Ms. Winner indicated that the board could approve everything but the planters. She indicated that the applicant could go on to city council. She indicated that if the applicant wants to add planters, he could come back to the board with the planters.

Mr. Nelson moved to approve the application excluding the planters.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion

The motion was unanimously approved.

Four Acres

Staff presented the report. Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant to speak to the changes that have

been made since the initial submission to the board.

Ms. Reeder, applicant, indicated that the original proposal was to build a wing addition to match exactly the 1980's wing. She indicated that they also proposed a 2nd story space. She indicated that they needed a link for the second story addition. She indicated that they were working to resolve that issue when she originally met with the board. She indicated that raising the roof line resolved the issue on the west side. She indicated that the east wing looked unfinished. She indicated that they are now proposing increasing the original proportions of the roof pitch. She indicated that the roof pitch of the east addition is too shallow and that the proportion was rather shallow. She indicated that they intend to build over the roof to build a better proportion. She indicated that the new roof pitch will create a second story connection. She indicated that rather than detracting from the original building, this proposal adds to it. She indicated that proposal has evolved in response to questions generated at the preliminary meeting with board members.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he thinks the proposal is great. He indicated that the applicant carefully considered issues that came up. He asked if the ridge could be placed under the cornice completely.

Ms. Reeder indicated that the ridge would be completely under the dentals.

Mr. Celentano indicated that this was a good way to deal with the issue.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the three side windows in the higher model.

Ms. Reeder indicated that the second window would be closed... She indicated that on the back side the window would be open.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the roof drawing was accurate representation of the sill.

Ms. Reeder indicated that the perspective drawing distorted it and that the sill would be several inches away.

Ms. Winner indicated that she was impressed with the improvement of an already good application.

Ms. Reeder thanked the group for their input.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it is exciting to see and old structure so beautifully cared for.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he applauds the applicant's work. He indicated that he would like to express excitement about the investment in the property. He indicated that it is nice to see this property receive so much attention.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she is disappointed that she didn't have the opportunity to see the site. She indicated that she is impressed with the presentation. She indicated that she had a question about the massing on the north facade.

Mr. Celentano made a motion to approve the application as presented at the meeting.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Espresso Cafe

Mr. Keeney, applicant, indicated that he hoped to address with additional drawings the issues raised at the previous meeting with the BAR. He indicated that the owners propose removing the glass on the storefront and repairing the marble with the marble samples provided. He indicated that currently there is storefront glass on each panel. He indicated that they initially proposed removing the glass block panel. He indicated that there was some objection to removing the glass block. He indicated that they are neutral on that issue. He indicated that they are willing to leave the three arched panels as is; they are willing to replace the central glass block panel to match the other two panels; or they are willing to remove all three glass block panels.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they intend to construct an interior wall recessed 18" within the storefront. Mr. Keeney indicated that the new wall could be viewed through the storefront. He indicated that his display drawings represent several choices for the wall. He indicated that they intend to construct the wall of wood paneling with a natural finish. He indicated that if there were objections to this proposal, they would be willing to choose the brick veneer option. He indicated that a third option was a glass wall. He indicated that they were not particularly in favor of the third option. He indicated that at the previous meeting he put an option on the table about ornamental security grills. He indicated that he did not need approval for the grills immediately.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he missed the previous meeting.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the issues the BAR looked at including the 1/2 circle of glass block, the tile floor of the cafe space, and the marble. He indicated that the marble is a replacement for pieces that have chipped off.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the marble is old and in need of repair. He indicated that they prefer the natural cherry for the inner wall.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the BAR review is just for what is visible. He indicated that the review is just for the interior enclosure. He indicated that aspects the board liked at the previous meeting included stripping the paint to its natural color.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the board discussed the grates.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that they did not really discuss the grates.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the issue of heat inside the cafe space came up at the previous meeting. He indicated that the issue is not necessarily a part of the design review. He indicated that the

adjacent buildings have awnings.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the space is due south. He indicated that the other buildings have awnings to protect the material in the storefront display windows. He indicated that the sun angle will be high and will only project back into the space a couple of feet. He indicated he is not as concerned about heat build up as the adjacent stores. He indicate that they prefer not put awnings on the storefront.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the grates are a big issue. He indicated that the grates are a dilemma and that they propose opening up the building to an outdoor cafe, which will be very nice on the corner. He indicated that the grates are a foreign language and an anti-social way of protecting from the possibility of people using a space which you have gone to the trouble of opening up. Mr. Schwartz indicated that neither grates presented are a problem but that he objects to any grates here whatsoever. He indicated that he may be convinced otherwise. He indicated that he sees the grates as a contradiction to opening up the space to the street and then locking it off.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they don't know for sure if the grates are necessary. He indicated that he felt is was necessary to put something on the table for the board to consider.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is glad that Mr. Keeney put the grates on the table.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that an alternative to the grates may be glazed cafe spaces.
Mr. Schwartz indicated that of the three options he had a question about the back facade.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the original proposal was for a cherry paneled wall. He indicated that the sentiment on the board that they did not like the natural cherry look. He indicated that the Espresso Cafe is trying to achieve a cherry and wrought iron look. He indicated that they can do a cherry or a natural wood finish.

Mr. Celentano asked the applicant about the interior walls.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the walls would be exposed red brick. He indicated that they tend to leave the walls exposed. He indicated that they intend to strip the white paint on the brick piers. He indicated that the brick will wrap around the space and bring you into the interior..

Mr. Celentano indicated that he shares Mr. Schwartz's concerns about the grate. He indicated that for the interior wall conceptually he likes the big glass piece. He indicated that the mullion window pattern doesn't seem to work as well with the outer facade. He indicated that he is advocating a mostly glass facade but done in cherry.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he encourages as transparent a wall as possible.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the wall is far back within the building, He indicated that it is unlikely

this will be seen from the street.

Ms. Thompson asked if the third proposal was for a completely glass elevation.

Mr. Keeney indicated that it is a glass elevation, but that they are intending a cherry door.

Mr. Nelson asked if an option on the front wall was to remove the glass from all three 1/2 circles.

Mr. Keeney indicated that removing all three panels was feasible, although not the most desired option. He indicated that he doesn't believe that the wood frames would hold glass block in all three panels.

Mr. Nelson indicated that if the 1/2 circle glass panels remain it will look like a window in which the glass has been removed from the bottom and has been left at the top, rather than appearing as an original design element. He indicated that he shares Ken's concern about the ornamental grill.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he has no problems with the materials shown.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agrees with Mr. Celentano in the desire to see predominantly glass.

Mr. Oschrin asked how much marble is missing.

Ty Harris of Espresso Cafe indicated that about two or three feet of marble is missing.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he does not think that the marble is a very good match.

Mr. Harris indicated that the marble sample was obtained from Oliva and Sons and it was as close as they could come.

Ms. Thompson asked if they had checked with other sources for marble.

Mr. Harris indicated that he checked with recyclers. He indicated that they found nothing closer than the sample. He indicated that Mike Oliva indicated that there was no way to find anything closer.

Ms. Thompson asked if the applicant had checked in Richmond for a better marble.

Mr. Harris indicated that he had not checked in Richmond.

Mr. Keeney indicated that Mr. Oliva has the largest source of contacts in the area.

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant if they had considered replacing all of the marble.

Mr. Harris indicated that they wanted to ask for approval for this first.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the marble sample will look terrible.

Mr. Celentano

Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Harris if he had tried Tom's Trading Company.

Mr. Harris indicated that he did try Tom's Trading Company and did not find a closer match.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they would be happy to look for additional sources for the marble.

Mr. Celentano asked the applicant what will be done with the sill.

Mr. Keeney indicated that he intends to insert a piece where the glass is being removed. He indicated the area will be sanded and repainted.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she is concerned about the arches. She indicated that she would hate to see the glass block removed. She indicated that the glass block is a nice feature. She indicated that removing the glass in the other two panels would create a loggia effect. She indicated that she encourages leaving the center glass block.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the glass block is mostly intact, although some of it is mismatched. Mr. Keeney asked if the applicants had a preference about the glass panels

Ms. Thompson indicated that it would be better to have no glass on either side of the glass block.

Mr. Celentano asked about the door frame and the chalking.

Mr. Harris indicated that they intend to leave the door frame and chalking.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he thinks it is a good argument to leave the glass block and chalking in. He indicated that he agrees with the idea of popping out the glass on the two adjoining bays.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he suggests leaving the central panel or adding wings.

Mr. Keeney indicated that he would have to "beef up" the wooden frames on the other bays, because it is deteriorated badly and cannot support the glass block.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that heaters were mentioned previously.

Mr. Keeney indicated that heaters to be as unobtrusive as possible. He indicated that the heaters will not be visible from the street.

Ms. Thompson asked if they considered putting coils under the tiles.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they did consider coils, but that ramping from the sidewalk made this

difficult.

Mr. Celentano proposed a motion to leave existing glass block and remove the glass panels on both sides and to seek a better match for the marble.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the applicant may replace the entire marble. She indicated that the marble is fine on its own, but does not match. She indicated that replacing all the marble may be a better and easier approach.

Mr. Celentano indicated that with respect to the inner wall the predominately glass with cherry frame (drawing version C) with no approval of tile.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that Mr. Celentano had made a motion addresses the exterior glass, the inner cherry and glass wall, the grills and the tile.

Mr. Harris asked the board about the paint color.

Mr. Celentano asked which paint color would be used.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the pilasters on the exterior facade would be stripped to the original brick and the middle section would be painted a creme color.

Ms. Winner asked if the mortar of the brick was similar to the beige color.

Ms. Thompson asked how high the paint color would go on the facade.

Mr. Keeney indicated that it would go up to the sign tethering.

Ms. Thompson asked if everything would become cream except the brick piers.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the answer was yes.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the letters on the sign.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they intended to use solid letters.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he suggests that the board weigh in on the sign letters.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the sign and paint may be part of the motion.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he likes the cream. He indicated that he is tired of white paint.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she had no preference on the paint.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agreed with the use of cream paint.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agreed.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he thinks that the paint should be white and he indicated that he liked the signal lettering style.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the sign is helping the language of the existing architecture to read through the supports. He indicated that he would like to weight in on the sign. He indicated that the dark band made a dramatic gesture that ties in meaningfully with the marble.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the results of the motion will be crafted into a plan. He indicated that the project won't be done until there is a full set of plans.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he thinks that the paint should be white.

Ms. Winner indicated that white and beige paint is a matter of personal preference and a taste issue.

Mr. Celentano indicated that to him the paint is an issue of the vocabulary of the building.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the board could vote on the paint color. He indicated that the cream ties in nicely.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the application
to leave the existing glass block in the middle and to remove the glass on either side;
and to replace the marble entirely or get a better match;
and to approve the predominantly glass and cherry storefront;
and without approval of the grills;
and with paint approved as submitted or white with tryglyths on the sign the same color.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the application to be approved was shown on patio elevation C, as modified.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

Virginia National Bank

Mr. Oschrin indicated that Virginia National Bank received preliminary review from the board at the previous meeting.

Mr. Madison Spencer, applicant, introduced himself and Mr. Mark Giles, president of Virginia National Bank, and Mr. Hunter Craig, Chairman.

Mr. Spender indicated that indicated that they intend to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness application after receiving preliminary approval at the previous meeting. He indicated that the display board represented elevations and changes they had made since the

previous meeting. He indicated that the intent was to open side elevation of 400 East Main Street on 1st Street, creating a bold emphasis on the banking floor. He indicated that the previously received packages depict the mall front adjustment to a mullion window arrangement. He indicated that this window arrangement is in keeping with the proposed 4th St. elevation. He indicated that the blocks with crosses represent the potential location of signage. He indicated that the cross blocks do not represent the scale of the sign. He indicated that due to the speed with which they need to move forward with the project, they are not currently seeking approval for the signs. He indicated that they intend to rework the front cornice and they intend to solve a waterproofing problem. He indicated that they intend to refurbish and repaint the facade. He indicated that they have no color commitment at this point. He indicated that they intend to execute a color sample on site. He indicated that they also intend a lighting scheme which is not represented on the display. He indicated that the lights will not be copper, but will either be complementary to the colors of the facade or nickel plated. He indicated that there will be lamps along the second story of the side elevation above the signage. He indicated that the lamps will be painted the same color as the portico on the facade so that they will disappear into the facade. He indicated that they intend to illuminate the flag. He indicated that lamps will add a cheery aspect on 4th street and will improve this important avenue to the mall. He indicated that this will benefit the bank and the public.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the bay window on the 4th street elevation.

Mr. Spencer indicated that there is a bay window. He indicated that they are working within the constriction of the building itself. He indicated that the additional fenestration will create some sense of added depth. He indicated that the bay will fall within the limits of the facade and will not project. He indicated that the bay window will fall within the dimensions of the window construction.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is nervous about a bay projecting out beyond the surface of the building. He indicated that he thinks they have made a nice improvement to an entirely dead wall, but that he is concerned about the bay. He indicated that the applicants have introduced activity to the wall with the fenestration and that he thinks that they have made a good set of decisions. He indicated that there is plenty of animation. He indicated that if the bays projected out it would be too much. He indicated that this would be a domestic treatment on an institutional building. He asked if the front surface of the bay is coplanar with the existing brick.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the bay is coplanar with the existing brick.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the sill is planar.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it sounds great. He indicated that the new detailing and getting the corbelling and the flashing working together is a subtle but important improvement.

Mr. Nelson asked about a light on the drawing.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the light on the second floor is for the signage.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the line on the drawing of the side facade.

Mr. Spencer indicated that this is an existing condition and that it is piping for the HVAC system. He indicated that engineers are currently studying the building. He indicated that he would like to eliminate it in the future, but for now, they have to live with it.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he would like to throw an issue out for discussion. He indicated that he has anxiety about the tight mullion and mutton fenestration pattern. He indicated that this pattern evokes a residential feel to the building. He indicated that it has a residential feel to it. He indicated that he questions the windows and wonders if some other pattern might be more appropriate, such as a modular window that might make more sense and might be more institutional.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that in general the strategy is terrific. He indicated that the development of the windows is the only point of debate that he would have and that the windows are prominent. He indicated that the bank is establishing a presence on the mall which is more than residential.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he has a similar feeling about the windows.

Mr. Celentano asked about the new details being presented. He asked if these details were for the side or the front.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the details are representative of what will occur in both places.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the uplights would be unobtrusive. He indicated that the uplighting seems a little odd. He asked what the lights would be lighting.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the uplights would be unobtrusive. He indicated that have intended to strike a balance between lighting the facade and the flagpole itself.

Mr. Nelson indicated that another successful example of uplighting on the mall is Hamilton's.

Mr. Celentano asked about the flagpole.

Mr. Spencer indicated that the intend is to cant the flagpole.

Mr. Schwartz move to approve the application as presented with the following comment: That the architect and bank will consider further refinement possibilities of the fenestration particularly with respect to the front entrance and the principle windows on the side elevation. windows on the side elevation and fenestration at the entrance.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Schwartz indicted that he would like to add that lights are great.

Rapture, Inc.

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Thompson indicated that there were several chair presented in the pictures. She asked which chair styles the applicant intended to use.

Andrew Vaughan, applicant, indicated that he is open to any of the three chairs presented.

Ms. Winner asked if they intend to use umbrellas.

Mr. Vaughan indicated that they may use umbrellas similar to the umbrellas at Bagby's.

Mr. Thompson asked if the area would be chained off. She indicated that they will need to get approval for any bollard and chains that will be used.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the application shows three types of chairs. She asked the board if they would like to stipulate which chairs to use.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that agrees there should be one type of chair, particularly because the cafe would be in small area.

Ms. Thompson indicated that it would be best to have one type of chair.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that either of the two simpler chairs would be fine with him.

Ms. Winner made a motion to approve the furniture with one of the two simpler chairs in dark green or black.

Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to adjourn

Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.

At 7:50 the meeting was adjourned.