

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
March 17, 1998

Present:

- 1 Joan Fenton (Chair)
- 2 Joe Celentano
- 3 W.G. Clark
- 4 Brent Nelson
- 5 Ken Schwartz

Staff Present
Tarpley Vest

At 5:10 Ms. Fenton convened the meeting and introduced herself. She explained the procedures of the meeting. She indicated that for several of the simpler applications on the agenda she would provide the opportunity for any objections or questions and then asked for a vote.

Jefferson Madison Regional Library
Staff presented the report.

Mr. William Lyons, applicant, indicated that they intend to cover one section of the dirt path with groundcover, not the whole path. He indicated that they intend to encourage people to use the sidewalk instead of walking up the hill.

Ms. Fenton asked the applicant if there were any questions or objections.

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant who he was.

Mr. Lyons stated his name and that he is the general manager of the library.

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant why they believe that groundcover will keep people from walking across the yard.

Mr. Lyons indicated that they believe that the groundcover will encourage people to walk around the tree or to stay on the sidewalk. He indicated that in the original plan they had more groundcover towards the front.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the extension of the landscaping would be nice. He asked the applicant if they had considered some type of attractive ornamental iron chain such as the ones used around the grounds of the University. He indicated that he had a comment about the trees that are planted at the site. He indicated that the Hawthorns look as though they are coming out of the ground. He indicated that the root ball is exposed and that he fears that they might not survive.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the proposal would not work to keep people off, but that he would approve it. He indicated that he doesn't see why they don't just go ahead and make a path there. He indicated that if people want to walk there they will.

Mr. Clark indicated that the applicant did not ask for suggestions and that he asked for approval for the groundcover.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve the application.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

401 Ridge Street Roof Replacement

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the weight of the copper roof.

The answer was that it is 16 ounce copper.

Mr. Celentano asked if the roof was to be standing seam.

The applicant answered that it was to be standing seam.

Mr. Celentano made a motion to approve the application.

Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

City Hall Planting Plan Amendment

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Blean indicated that they had originally intended to use the Century Ginko tree but they had anticipated that it would be a difficult tree to find. He indicated that they have been able to find that tree and that they would like to use that tree. He showed a picture of the tree and he indicated that the trees are also located on Third Street. He indicated that they have a beautiful color.

Ms. Hook asked if they are male trees.

Mr. Blean indicated that they are male.

Mr. Oschrin asked if they had changed the design of the plan.

Mr. Blean indicated that they had not changed the design.

Mr. Clark moved to approve the application.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Lee Park

Hallie Boyce of Gregg Bleam Landscape Architects presented the application. She indicated that at the previous BAR meeting she had presented the plan and asked for approval for the new trash cans and furniture. She indicated that she was now asking for approval of the plantings as presented and that she was asking for conceptual approval of the lights and for the paving. She presented the board with a plant list.

Ms. Boyce indicated that the original intend for the park as conceived by Paul McIntire was to donate the land to erect a statue to Robert E Lee, with a secondary use as a park. She indicated that they intended to look at the statue within the overall space for the park. She showed a picture by Holsinger of the park before the statue was placed on its pediment. She indicated that the ground plane was plain. She indicated that the idea was for Lee to be displayed as riding across the fields towards Richmond.

At 5:20 Linda Winner arrived.

Ms. Boyce indicated that the park is predominantly lawn and trees. She indicated that the current lighting is street lighting with two cobra lamps in the center on axis with the statue. She indicated that the millstones in the park are from Jefferson's mill.

She indicated that the proposed plan includes removing the Japanese Holly and transplanting four Boxwoods to the corner of the park where the existing Boxwood are diseased. She indicated that in the center of the park at the statue they propose Periwinkle and seasonal bulbs and a guardrail of no more than 18 inches. She indicated that the look of the lighting still has to be designed. She indicated that they don't propose the actual fixture today but just approval for the concept. She indicated that they would like to remove the path to make greater use of the green space for festival days.

Mr. Celentano asked about the purpose for the hedge along Jefferson Street.

Ms. Boyce indicated that they intend to separate the sidewalk from the park.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he had a question about the plantings at the base of the statue. He asked if they considered eliminating the plantings, allowing people to walk close the statues.

Ms. Boyce indicated that they had considered that idea. She indicated that the city wished to maintain the plantings for reasons of color.

Mr. Nelson asked if the Spruce tree and the power pole would come out at the same time.

Ms. Boyce answered yes.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the pathway to be removed. He indicated that he sees the reasoning for removing the path. He asked the applicant if they believed that the people would beat down a path. He asked what they planned to do about that.

Ms. Boyce indicated that originally designed to be symmetrical. She indicated that there was originally a Weeping Willow. She indicated that the path seems to be in the way, particularly for Festival Days.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the placement of the benches.

Kay Frazier of Parks Division indicated that the police like the bench arrangement and that on festival days they need all the uninterrupted room they can get. She indicated that placing the benches on the outside really helps.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the application.

Ms. Fenton asked if anything about the benches would be included in the motion.

Mr. Clark asked why we were discussing the benches again.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it is up to the applicant to decide what is appropriate.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that at the last meeting the applicant was in a rush to order to benches. He indicated that the benches are part of the plan.

Ms. Fenton asked for comments from the public or the board.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he thinks the project is in good hands.

Mr. Clark made a motion to accept the application as presented this evening.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Virginia National Bank

Madison Spencer of Train and Spencer Architects indicated that there had been a change of direction for the Virginia National Bank Project. He indicated that the Williams Corner Bookstore has become available for the bank. He indicated that the intention is to reposition the 1/2 round windows and the doorway on the 3rd St. facade leading to a residential space. He asked the board if there would be an opportunity to arrange for a quorum to meet and review the project so that they may move forward. He indicated that this is a historic structure and that they wanted to apprise the board that they will be engaged in some alteration.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she suggests that the applicant arrange to meet board members individually, rather than trying to get a quorum sometime in the next four weeks. Ms. Fenton indicated that the applicant was before the board to ask to arrange a quorum, to apprise the board of their intent, and to get some feedback on the proposal. She asked the board members if there would be an opportunity for a quorum anytime in the next two weeks.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the project sounds exciting. He indicated that it is of sufficient public interest that it should be part of a regularly scheduled meeting. He indicated that time should be given for the board to comment on the meeting. He indicated that he is unable to attend a meeting in the upcoming weeks.

Mr. Clark indicated that he completely agrees with Mr. Schwartz. He indicated that if every applicant put the board in this position they would be meeting all the time.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he also agrees and that they should dismiss the application until they have drawings. He indicated that arranging a special meeting sets a precedent.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the applicant is welcome to call members and get input unofficially.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that this input is unofficial and potentially at risk

Espresso Cafe

Ron Keeney of Keeney and Company Architects indicated that he had received additional input from the police department. He indicated that they have determined that this is unacceptable and that the space will be rousted. He indicated that he was before the board again to clarify what they have intended regarding the security grills. He indicated that there were three elements which may be different from before. He indicated that the cafe would be open long hours. He indicated that they are proposing grills to be hinged so that they open from the inside. He indicated that the grills are to be closed from about Midnight to 6 AM. He indicated that he had a second element to present to the Board. He presented white 1/2 inch rods. He indicated that these were an alternative to the black rods. He indicated that the difference is that this is seen as a grillwork applied on the inside of the framework rather than something bold.

Ms. Fenton asked if the grillwork would swing inward.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the grills would swing inward and park folded in behind the wall. He indicated that the grill would become a part of the white woodwork.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he would let Mr. Schwartz speak to the perception of the grills. He indicated that he had comments about the grills. He indicated that black wrought iron is an appropriate grill material. He indicated that he has no problem with black and that he prefers the black wrought iron.

Mr. Keeney indicated that if the board is comfortable with the black that is an option.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is totally opposed to the wrought iron. He indicated that it is the wrong thing to do. He indicated that he referred to them at the last meeting as anti-social. He indicated that the grills bring something totally foreign to the fabric of this architecture. He indicated that he will not support the grills. He indicated that the grills are absolutely wrong. He indicated that a way to achieve the open space which has been used in New York City and

throughout Europe is to use a glazed design surface at the street. He indicated that this has been done below Eastern Standard on the Mall.

Mr. Clark asked how wide the opening was

Mr. Keeney indicated that it was three feet wide.

Mr. Clark asked why the casement would be a problem.

Mr. Keeney indicated that it would be a large unit of glass for employees to lift every morning and evening.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he thinks the gate is wrong and a contradiction. He indicated that it is a bad decision.

Mr. Clark indicated that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz and that he doesn't understand why they can't put a simple casement over the windows. He indicated that they might find this alternate useful on rainy days.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the goal is to have an open space during open hours.

Ms. Winner indicated that she agrees with Mr. Schwartz's feelings about the message it sends as compromising the architecture of the building. She indicated that she would like to explore any other possibilities. She indicated that she is not ready to take action until she hears if there are other options.

Mr. Keeney indicated that an option would be to develop something that appeared as a series of window frames that cross the openings.

Ms. Winner indicated that she doesn't know if she agrees that black would be more acceptable to her.

Mr. Keeney indicated that there is black grillwork on the corner covering the entrance to two alleys.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she is opposed to the design. She indicated that she is more in favor of basic wrought iron grills and that the best alternative is the cage with bifold.

Ms. Hook indicated that she doesn't not like the design and that she objects to the circular effect of the windows.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he doesn't like the design but that it is not the board's job to design the project for the applicant. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz's comments.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he suggests some sort of shuttered windows. He indicated that the casement's very convoluted and that he rejects this proposal.

Mr. Keeney asked the board if a pattern of 2/3 res. glass parapets that folded out of the way would be reasonable.

Mr. Clark indicated that this is reasonable, but that the craftsmanship will be important. He indicated that this will be important regardless of whether wrought iron or a glass condition is used. He indicated that if the applicant presents beautifully crafted iron gates they might feel differently. He indicated that a high quality presentation indicating high quality design would probably help the case.

Ms. Fenton indicated that to expand on Mr. Clark's point, if the applicant proposes something beautiful and wonderful that will really enhance the building, that will help the case. She indicated that her sense is that the board will prefer to see glass windows. She indicated that if the police don't want the windows open and the BAR doesn't approve of the security grills, a third option is to leave the panels in place.

Mr. Celentano indicated that this is an interesting idea and that he would encourage the applicant not to give up.

Mr. Keeney asked if any grillwork is acceptable.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he doesn't know if we are in a position to say that. He indicated that the applicant should come back to the board. He indicated that the applicant has a opportunity to do something incredible. He indicated that the originally proposed Cherry paneling would have cost a lot of money. He indicated that money could be shifted to the front of the building.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion that the application be denied.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Moondance

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Nelson indicated that there were no photos with the application. He indicated that this is a real problem.

Mr. Celentano asked if they were replacing any furniture.

John Slaughter, applicant, indicated that all the furniture would be the same.

Ms. Thompson asked if the applicant would be using any of the same furniture that has been there for a number of years or if any furniture would be replaced with new furniture.

Mr. Slaughter indicated that the furniture would be the same.

Mr. Nelson indicated that black and dark green have been identified as dominant colors. He asked if the board shouldn't be working toward the same uniformity for this space.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she proposes giving the applicant a one year approval.

Mr. Nelson asked the applicant if there was a reason that there were no pictures.

Mr. Slaughter indicated that the cafe has been there for six years.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the applicants are spending money to refurbish and that it comes with some risk to the applicant. He indicated that from a property owner's standpoint it can get to where a review committee can be perceived as onerous. He indicated that the board needs to find a better way to do this.

Ms. Thompson indicated that when the Design Guidelines were established a lot of furniture was already in cafes on the mall. She indicated that she thinks it is a good suggestion to let the furniture go for one year. She indicated that it doesn't have to be white.

Ms. Vest indicated that she wasn't sure of the validity of a one year approval.

Mr. Oschrin made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

Ms. Hook indicated that the new wait station and planters could be painted black.

Ms. Winner indicated that the applicant could phase in new furniture.

Mr. Clark indicated that he would like to make a recommendation to consider painting the planters and wait stand black.

Ms. Fenton asked for a vote on Mr. Oschrin's motion.

Mr. Oschrin's motion was unanimously approved.

Wachovia

Kirt Train, applicant, introduced himself and indicated that he was representing Wachovia Bank.

He indicated that he was before the board last month with a preliminary submittal and that now he was before the board seeking a final Certificate of Appropriateness. He indicated that the bank was before the board over the past summer and at that time they were trying to fulfill Jefferson National Bank's space needs. He indicated that since then, Jefferson National Bank merged with Wachovia Bank and that the current proposal is for Wachovia's Western Regional Headquarters. He indicated that the programmatic needs are fundamentally different from those of Jefferson National Bank. He indicated that they have re-examined the block and that they propose restoration of the Jefferson National Bank Tower and a new four story addition. He indicated that the addition will follow the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines for renovation. He

indicated that the four story addition is to be spaced on the site immediately adjacent to the bank tower. He indicated that the site contains non-historic buildings which do not contribute to the fabric of the mall. He indicated that the bank will divest itself of the property at the end of the block. He indicated that they intend to deal with their parking needs in the rear of the building. He indicated that the new building fits into the street wall meeting the square footage requirements of the bank. He indicated that the new additions will allow the bank tower to stand out as the image of the bank.

He indicated that the materials to be used at the base of the addition are of granite and limestone, as with the tower. He indicated that they propose articulation so that it doesn't look like an immediate articulation of the tower. He indicated that the tower windows will be painted and the windows on the addition will have a natural wood finish. He indicated that the addition will have the same window pattern with double hopper windows. He indicated the top is coped with bluestone. He indicated that they have chosen a simple palette of materials and that the facade materials would be identical from the front and back. He indicated that the lobby is not an exact restoration but that it contains the spirit and feel of the original lobby.

Mr. Clark asked about the cornice on the tower.

Mr. Train indicated that it is as fiberglass material typically used in restoration

Mr. Oschrin asked about the accuracy of the rendering.

Mr. Train indicated that the elevation drawings are accurate and the rendering is skewed.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he wished he had more information. For instance, he would like information on the walkway in back. He indicated that he would like to see what is back there.

Mr. Oschrin asked what the drawing presented are for. He indicated that they are not construction drawings and asked the applicant if they are purely schematic.

Mr. Train indicated that yes they are schematic drawings.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the materials for the doors.

Mr. Train indicated that they had not received costs yet for the wood doors and that they intend to use antique storefront or metal doors.

Mr. Celentano asked about the space behind the windows.

Mr. Train indicated that there is ATM banking in the main lobby now. He indicated that there is a problem in that because of the special historic character of the existing lobby they can't cut it off for 24 hour ATM use. Mr. Train indicated that the entire ground floor would be retail uses.

Mr. Nelson asked about the color of the brick.

Mr. Train indicated that they are trying to match the color of the existing brick. He indicated that there will be added material coping to the brick face to give it a rough texture.

Mr. Nelson asked if the cornice would be around the entire building.
Mr. Train answered yes.

Ms. Fenton asked for questions from the public.

Albert Tabackman indicated that the information kiosk on the mall in the picture appears to be moved.

Mr. Train indicated that they only moved the kiosk in the picture so that the building would be visible and that there was no other intent behind it.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there were two issues to consider: demolition and replacement, and the rehabilitation.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he likes what he sees. He indicated that he likes the way they treated the Market Street side of the addition so that it doesn't appear just the rear of a building.

Ms. Hook indicated that it looks like it should be fine and that she has no objections to anything.

Ms. Thompson asked where on the building the granite appears.

Mr. Train indicated that the first two and a half feet of the building are on a granite base. He indicated that the limestone is on top of the granite because limestone stains and that this design will carry on from the tower.

Ms. Winner indicated that the applicant made a good case for demolition in the written document. She indicated that she has no concerns about approving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Clark asked the applicant if he thinks the striped brick is an improvement to the lower face of the building.

Mr. Train indicated that he does not want it to look as a junior to the tower face. He indicated that the solid limestone base responds to the tower.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that there are positive aspects to the proposal. He indicated that allowing the western buildings to remain is positive. He indicated that the 1960's buildings are a mess inside. He indicated that the applicant has proposed a consistent integration of the whole block and that this works very well. He indicated that the subtlety and distinction of the base is positive.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he supports most of the moves being made in the proposal. He indicated that he has concern about the way that the cornice is made. He indicated that the restoration is exciting and that he assumes that applicants goal is to continue to identify the original fabric.

Mr. Train indicated that the restoration will be in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and that they are allowed to substitute materials as long as the appearance is the same.

Mr. Celentano indicated that they intend to remove the elevator tower at the back of the building and that is fantastic. He indicated that on the four story addition ground floor, the idea of activity on the street is important. He asked if there was any type of cornice on the addition.

Mr. Train indicated that they are keeping the textural quality but are trying not to interpret the tower so literally.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the changing plane on the tower is appropriate.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that there is concern aside from the refinement of the base including concern for the condition of many details on the mall. He indicated that he needs to know the exact way that the windows are set into the wall and the way the sills are created. He indicated that details are important and a wonderful event. He indicated that he is eager to see how the refinements play out on the mall.

Mr. Clark indicated that he recommends giving preliminary approval and that when the applicant has final drawings they can receive final approval. He indicated that details are important.

Mr. Train indicated that last summer the board discussed the possibility of developing a subcommittee to follow the details of a project.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the question is how do we get this application approved and still approve the details as they come up.

Ms. Thompson indicated that in the past they have typically made material approvals on site.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there are still a lot of details and that the project isn't finalized yet. She asked the applicant what their timeframe is and what they are asking for today.

Mr. Train indicated that they haven't settled on a final schedule. He indicated that they can come back as the design develops but that they would like to move on with the project.

Mr. Clark indicated that it seems the applicant has completed preliminary design approval and that they need to specify the entrance loggia. He indicated that he would like to make a motion that they resubmit that loggia. He indicated that he reviews the application with enthusiasm. He indicated that the project will be good and that they have a chance to make it really good. He indicated that the applicant needs to obtain one more stage of approval.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they would like to vote to allow demolition.

Mr. Train indicated that he had a comment on the issue of tying the demolition to the building permit. He indicated that there is a two to three month inefficiency and that they can't move into

the existing buildings. He indicated that delaying demolition would cost them a lot of time. He indicated that demolition is inherent to the project.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there was prior discussion to require bond for the new buildings. She indicated that the board learned that this was not something that they could do. She indicated that the bank has shown an intent to build a building at this site. She indicated that they should start with the demolition issue first.

Mr. Train indicated that until they approve demolition they can't have construction.

Mr. Nelson indicated that even a building permit is not assurance that a building will be built.

Kenton McCartney, representing Wachovia Bank, indicated that at the end of this week Wachovia will move everyone out of the tower office and move them to the 5th St. facility. He indicated that the employees can't come back downtown until the space is finished. He indicated that the bank must build this building in order to remain downtown.

Mr. Train indicated that anywhere else they would come the board and do the demolition work. He indicated that the review process is costing them a lot of months and that they don't want to exacerbate it with months more time.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the board make a motion on the demolition and preliminary approval on the building. She indicated that she thinks that they are really separate issues.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the demolition contingent upon the fact that adequate support and underpinning is provided for the 1920's buildings to ensure that they are not lost.

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

Mr. Train asked Mr. Clark if we would like for a structural engineer to provide information about demolition issues.

Mr. Clark indicated that was not necessary.

Mr. Train indicated that they can't do one aspect of the project without the other and that they would have to keep coming back. He indicated that the Secretary of the Interior has to approve of the addition.

Mr. Clark indicated that he reviews this proposal with enthusiasm, but needs to see the final detailing including the cornice.

Mr. Clark made a motion for preliminary approval.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Vending on the Downtown Mall

Ms. Fenton indicated that she would like to ask the board members to look at the issue of vending on the Downtown Mall. She indicated that currently dark skirts on card tables are approved. She indicated that she would like the board to be aware of what is existing on the mall. She indicated that the board may want to make recommendations for vending on the mall and that may be done in May.

Ms. Winner asked about Licenses for vendors on the mall.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the current rule is that vendors have to have a table with a skirt and they may only vend between 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM. She indicated that there are no regulations on where or what the vending may be. She indicated that the issue being discussed is in the look of the vendors on the downtown mall. She indicated that she would like to have people look at the issue.

417/419 Park Street

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he understands the recommendation and that it is a very complicated roof with a lot going on. He indicated that he is not comfortable the way the roof is described as "tin". He indicated that the roof should be a traditional standing seam metal roof. He indicated that a copper roof would be great. He indicated that a refinished metal roof would be quite incompatible with this delicate piece of architecture.

Mr. Hardy indicated that he intended to use standing seam metal for the roof. He indicated that the bank on the corner uses the modern metal roof. He indicated that the building is a very contemporary structure.

Ms. Winner asked about the TV antennae's on the building.

Mr. Hardy indicated that he doesn't intend to remove them at this time.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that this is an historic building and asked if the applicant if he would like to get rid of the antennae with the new roof.

Mr. Hardy indicated that he would like to get rid of the antennae but tenants may be using the antennae and so he can't get rid of them.

Ms. Fenton indicated that because the antennae is an existing condition, the board can't require him to remove it.

Ms. Winner made a motion to approve the roof as a copper or standing seam tin roof.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is pleased that the applicant is replacing the roof and that the asphalt looks unfortunate.

Other Business

Ms. Thompson indicated that she had noticed that the Hard Times Cafe facade looks pretty bad and that the facade that the board denied is right behind the glass facade.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the applicant duplicated the existing storefront windows and that the second facade is considered interior work. Ms. Fenton indicated that she would like for the board members to review the approval letters that go out to applicants.

Ms. Fenton indicated that above the Gemstone Collection the property owner has placed the original windows behind the new solid glass panels. She indicated that this is not what the board approved.

Mr. Celentano indicated that what you see from the street is what matters.

Mr. Winner asked how they secured the windows in place.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board should look at the windows and make a decision about what action to take.

Mr. Nelson indicated that Mrs. Hamlett's roof on North First Street was approved with three dimensional asphalt shingles. He indicated that he thinks that it is very successful and that board members should go by and look at it.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board may want to consider getting the manufacturer's number for the shingles. She indicated that they could offer them as shingles that were previously approved.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he has been on a state board and that they encouraged applicants to talk to other agencies that had successfully used other materials.

Ms. Hook indicated that it is a good idea to give out more than one name.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he doesn't want the board to make it policy because people need to be pushed a little, and we should encourage them to use higher quality materials than asphalt.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it depends on the particular circumstances of each applicant.

Mr. Nelson indicated that a landscape architecture perspective is a part of the board and that aesthetic details are as important as details on a building.

Ms. Fenton indicated that in the case of Lee Park, the applicant wanted approve for a complete landscape plan and so provided more time for discussion.

Ms. Hook indicated that the job of the board is not to tell applicants what to do, but what they may do.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agrees that landscape details are important.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she limited the Lee Park discussion at the last meeting because they were only seeking approval for the furniture.

Ms. Winner indicated that the board should use their name tents.

A suggestion was made for the board to have larger name plates.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it would be nice for the public to see the applications that will be discussed at a meeting. He indicated that a board could be created in the public hall space of City Hall to display the current applications.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that Mr. Nelson had a very good suggestion.

Mr. Nelson indicated that this idea could also be applied to the site plan review process.

Ms. Winner indicated that this would allow people to feel a connection to the community and to feel in the know.

Ms. Winner indicated that this would allow people to feel a connection to the community and to feel "in the know" about the BAR.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that this would provide other city commissions and City Council the opportunity to look at it.

Ms. Vest indicated that there was an opportunity for a training session on either April 14th or April 28th with a city attorney and a representative of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. She asked the board if there were specific issues they would like to have addressed.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she was interested in getting information from the city attorney on how the board can enforce non-compliance and on where the board may be overstepping their authority.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to adjourn

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion

The motion was unanimously approved.