

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
August 18, 1998

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair) *(J. Fenton)*
Joe Celentano
Jessie Hook
Brent Nelson
Ken Schwartz *(K. Schwartz)*
Linda Winner *(L. Winner)*
W.G. Clark *(W.G. Clark)*

Also Present
Tarpley Vest

At 5:05 Ms. Fenton convened the meeting. She indicated the format of the meeting would include a report from staff, a report from the applicant, and an opportunity for comments and questions from board members and from the public.

Historic Markers in Charlottesville

Coy Barefoot introduced himself and indicated that he is the chair of the Historic Resources Task Force. He indicated they definitely know that Georgia O'Keefe lived in the house on Wertland. He indicated that the house should be saved. He indicated that he speaks for the whole historic resources task force ~~that~~ that the board should do whatever they can do to save the houses on Wertland. He indicated that the house is important to the fabric of the community. He indicated that the task force is in the process of erecting a number of historic markers and that they hope to erect two markers a year. He indicated that the first two markers will be at First Baptist Church on Main Street and on Court Square. He indicated that the marker on Court Square will commemorate the ride of Jack Juett. He indicated that they have plans to erect five local markers. He indicated that the five marker sites are:

- 1) Albemarle County Courthouse
- 2) University Corner:
- 3) Wachovia Bank Tower
- 4) Fountain on Downtown Mall
- 5) Vinegar Hill: (sign will be located near the ice rink.)

He indicated that the signs will look like the existing marker in Lee Park. He indicated that the goal is to install about 5 a year unit about 35 sites have markers.

Mr. Huja indicated that the BAR has already approved the sign in Lee Park. He indicated that the other signs will have the same format as that sign.

Ms. Fenton asked if they would like the BAR to make a motion to approve more signs that are the same as the ones in Lee Park.

Ms. Hook moved to approve more historic marker signs to be very similar in nature to the

existing sign in Lee Park.

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

Ms. Winner asked Mr. Barefoot if the task force had plans to produce a flyer with information on it.

Mr. Barefoot indicated that the task force is producing a booklet.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would like to remind the BAR that it is difficult for the audience to hear in the basement conference room.

Regal Cinemas Vending Cart

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton asked if there was an applicant present. There was no applicant present.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the BAR simply approves the look of the cart.

Ms. Winner asked how long the vending cart would be out on the Mall.

Ms. Fenton indicated that all vendors are permitted from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM and that vending carts may not be left out overnight.

Ms. Winner moved to approve the cart as submitted.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Durango Bagel Door

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they have discussed in the past the fact that color is something that can be easily changed.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he was on the subcommittee who originally approved the door. He indicated that the committee felt very strongly that the new door should help to carry the elements on the east side of the storefront over to the west side. He indicated even though there are different uses to the building the existing hardware should be on the outside of the building.

Mr. Nevelos indicated that the original hardware says push on it even though the new door will pull outwards.

Ms. Fenton asked who was on the subcommittee.

The answer was Mr. Neslon, Mr. Oschrin, and Ms. Thompson

Mr. Celentano asked about the finish of the door.

Mr. Nevelos indicated that the door is Mahogany with a clear finish. He indicated that push hardware is used on the interior of the door and that it can be seen through the window.

Mr. Clark indicated that there is trouble with requiring the applicant to put additional hardware on the door. He indicated that it become motifal.

Mr. Huja indicated that the board usually does not allow natural wood.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the two storefronts on the building across the mall from Durango Bagel have a wood finish.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that that he agrees with Mr. Nelson that the door should be black but that he agrees with Mr. Clark that the additional hardware is unnecessary.

Ms. Winner indicated that she agrees that the additional hardware is unnecessary and that she is not opposed to the existing door.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that both doors are perfectly acceptable but that a black door operates more consistently with the surrounding black door.

Mr. Celentano indicated that Mahogany is a rich material and that he would hate to see it painted.

Ms. Hook indicated that she agrees with Mr. Celentano.

Mr. Clark moved to accept the door in its present state.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with Mr. Clark, Ms. Winner, Mr. Celentano, and Ms. Hook voting in favor and with Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Nelson voting against and with Ms. Fenton abstaining.

OXO Restaurant: Water Street

Staff presented the report.

Alice Kim, applicant, indicated that the goal is to improve the street presence of the restaurant and to make it more elegant. She indicated that the budget has been cut and they may not be able to use the sliding doors presented in the application. She indicated that they would like approval for the sliding doors and for a new window.

Collette Brown, architect, indicated that they are seeking approval for all three scenarios presented at the meeting. She indicated that they would like approval to replace the window units on the west side with either a mullionless window, a casement door, or with a window that appears to be fixed panel doors.

Mr. Clark indicated to Ms. Brown that she could ask approval for one scenario and come back to the board if that changes.

Ms. Brown indicated that the budget is unclear but that it will be clear very soon and that they will need to proceed before the next BAR meeting.

Ms. Brown indicated that there are several improvements proposed to the site plan. She indicated that there are CMU walls surrounding the courtyard and adjacent to the ramp. She indicated that they intent to remove the walls along the ramp and replace them with steel piperail painted.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the modifications to the building seem minor and reasonable and represent an improvement. He indicated that the elimination of the arch is also an improvement. He indicated that the two lamps look handsome and appropriate. He indicated that the two changes on the façade are improvements and are relatively minor.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he sees nothing but improvements.

Mr. Celentano asked Ms. Brown about the decision to remove the existing windows.

Ms. Brown indicated that the single painted windows are more in keeping with the industrial feel of Water Street. She indicated that the original building had large clean openings.

Mr. Nelson moved to approve the application as presented including each of the alternatives presented.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

106 South Street: Saddle Up

Staff presented the report.

Jim Grigg, applicant, indicated that the building would be a saddlery and antique gun store. He indicated that the application included a new storefront element and three new awnings. He

indicated that the three awnings would be used to unify and tie the building together and to hide the existing electric meters. He indicated that they intend to paint the stucco a more attractive color and to paint the new wood trim white. He indicated that they would apply for a sign permit at a later time.

Ms. Hook asked about the electric meters.

Mr. Grigg indicated that it was not feasible to move them to either side of the building.

Ms. Hook indicated that there are a lot of wires on the front of the building.

Ms. Fenton asked if the owner had considered burying the wire.

Mr. Grigg indicated that this client has a 20 year lease on the building. He indicated that it is unclear who owns the conduit. He indicated that he would be happy to find out if it would be possible and how.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there may be matching funds available for burying wire.

Mr. Nelson asked if the existing windows on the side would be blocked from the inside. The answer was yes.

Roulhac Toledano asked if staff requested a drawing of the Garrett Street Elevation.

Ms. Vest indicated that there are no proposed changes to the Garrett Street elevation.

Mr. Neslon asked Mr. Grigg if the west side of the building would be painted.

Mr. Grigg indicated that both sides of the building would be painted.

A member of the public asked about the possibility of boxing in the conduits.

Mr. Grigg indicated that he feels that boxes would look worse on the building. He indicated that painting out the conduits would help them to disappear more.

Mr. Clark indicated that he agrees with the concerns. He indicated that the issue is not just the meters but also the conduit.

Ms. Winner indicated that the project will be a vast improvement for the building.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it is a wonderful proposal. He indicated that his only concerns are the wire and conduit. He indicated that it seems like now is the opportunity to address the problem. He indicated that he suggests getting all of it or as much as possible located within the building.

Mr. Grigg indicated that he shares this opinion. He indicated that it would be useful for him to get approval for the project with certain recommendations.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is less concerned by meters than he is by the conduit and the flying wires.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he shares Mr. Schwartz' concerns.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he also shares Mr. Schwartz' concerns.

Ms. Hook indicated that they may make a requirement that the wire be removed.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application on the condition that the wire be incorporated inside the building.

Ms. Vest indicated that it is problematic for the board tie approval of changes to an existing

condition.

Ms. Winner indicated that the board could make a strong recommendation.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Grigg if a strong recommendation would be effective.

Mr. Grigg indicated that he felt that it would be effective.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application with the condition that the conduits be incorporated inside the building.

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

100 W South Street: Rooftop Addition

Staff presented the report.

Betty Driscoll, architect, indicated that the front roofs are now totally contiguous. She indicated that she is responding to previous requests of the BAR. She indicated that the elevation represents the most the building will be seen from the front.

Mr. Nelson asked about the windows on the west elevation.

Ms. Driscoll indicated that the west elevation is the only place where the original fenestration has been retained.

Ms. Driscoll indicated that was is there now does that over common walls. She indicated that maintenance leaks continue to be a problem and an expense. She indicated that the addition adds more space to the penthouse apartment and that it increases the income. She indicated that the addition makes the penthouse reasonable as a space. She indicated that the addition seems to be in the right place. not to do such an aggressive intervention on the roof. She indicated that there is a desire to protect the existing roof without introducing more leaks. She indicated that the library is below the addition and that there is a desire to protect the library.

Mr. Clark indicated that if this addition was built to protect the roof he couldn't imagine a worse thing to do. He indicated that the addition is bearing on a roof membrane and not affording space. He indicated that this is not a strategy to improve the roof.

Oliver Kuttner indicated that in older buildings there are often two roofs in place. He indicated that if the upper roof is bad and you cut through the roof in any place the water will travel and leak. He indicated that if they were to penetrate the roof they would have a problem. He indicated that the board needs to understand that building owners don't always have the money to reroof the entire building.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he is trying not to consider the building as an existing building but as a new proposal. He indicated that it is difficult to propose it in its current state as new. He indicated that the issue of the roof would have been solved if it was before the board as a new project.

Ms. Hook indicated that she does not disagree with Mr. Celentano. Ms. Hook indicated that the board has seen this application in May, June, and July. She indicated that the applicants have satisfactorily addressed these issues and concerns. She indicated that the board has lead them to believe that this submittal is what they were to do.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he does not agree with Ms. Hook. He indicated that the board was trying to explore an extremely weak proposal. He indicated that at each presentation the applicant has addressed the issues. He indicated that the board must ask if this is a positive addition to the structure. He indicated that this structure looks as if a temporary structure was moved. He indicated that he commends the architect and that she is struggling with a difficult situation. He indicated that he concurs with Mr. Celentano.

Ms. Winner asked Mr. Schwartz if there was any possibility of a building here?

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz. He indicated that what the board has been looking for all along is a justification for the rooftop addition and an improvement over a poor concept.

Ms. Driscoll indicated that from Mrs. Toledano's point of view, she supports herself with the building. She indicated that the addition increases the income of the building. She indicated that

the addition makes the rooftop apartment reasonable as a space. She indicated that the addition seems to be in the right place. She indicated that the question has been how to make the addition acceptable to the board. She indicated that she has believed that if it is discreet and subtle that would be enough to legitimize its existence. Owners point of view and community members point of view.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her initial point of view is that this was not a good project. She indicated that she had wanted to see something presented that she could say looks good. She indicated that if she looks at this as a fresh new proposal she doesn't think that it really fits on the building. She indicated that she owns and rents in historic buildings. She indicated that she is sympathetic to making a living off of a building. She indicated that she has struggled with the repercussions. She indicated that one of the most difficult things is that you do feel sympathy for the applicant.

Mr. Clark indicated that Ms. Fenton speaks for him as well.

Mr. Schwartz moved to deny the application as submitted.

Ms. Toledano indicated that she helped to develop the guidelines. She indicated that she has held off on going to City Council because she doesn't support going over the BAR. She indicated that the building is a vernacular building and was not architecturally designed. She indicated that she was advised in 1983 by the BAR that rooftop protrusions should be utilitarian. She indicated that the staff has approved the addition each time. She indicated that she needs to use her roof.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that staff does not approve applications and that staff makes recommendations. He indicated that the job of the BAR is to approve appropriate additions to historic buildings.

Mr. Clark seconded Mr. Schwartz' motion.

Ms. Hook indicated that the applicant has met the board's aesthetic requirements.

The motion passed with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Clark, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Celentano, and Ms. Fenton voting in favor and with Ms. Hook and Ms. Winner voting against.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that when the parking lots on Water Street are built up no one will ever see the building again.

Fridays After Five Storage Shed

Teresa Harris , applicant, introduced herself. She indicated that she was from the Charlottesville Downtown Foundation and that they needed storage shed to store Friday's After Five Equipment. She indicated that she intended to erect the temporary shed behind the armory. She indicated that the shed would be less than 150 square feet.

Ms. Fenton asked Ms. What she needs to be stored.

Ms. Harris Indicated that they currently store construction cones

Ms. Fenton asked where the equipment is currently stored.

Ms. Harris Indicated that the supplies are currently stored in the Water Street parking garage. She indicated that there has been damage to the equipment and water damage. She indicated that the storage shed is to be temporary. She indicated that they are currently negotiating to rent a space for storage. She indicated that they need temporary approval.

Ms. Fenton asked what temporary meant. She asked Ms. If they planned to remove the shed and store it in a storage unit.

Ms. Harris indicated that they planned to use the storage shed for approximately a year. She indicated that they need something right away.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any other approved temporary structures downtown.

Ms. Vest indicated that she was not aware of any approvals for temporary structures.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that the Foundation could by a trailer to store the equipment. He indicated that the trailer could be removed and brought in as needed. He indicated that when they no longer need the trailer they could sell it.

Ms. Harris indicated that she does not think that they could bring the trailer in each Friday night. She indicated that they have cleaning supplies, which requires shelves.

Ms. Winner indicated that she does not think that the shed will look worse than a dumpster.

Ms. Fenton indicated that dumpsters are only permitted downtown by a temporary permit.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he understands the dilemma. He indicated that he is uncomfortable introducing this kind of shed into a major public center or any location publicly visible to the Downtown Mall.

Mr. Clark asked if there was any place within the City to store the equipment such as the basement of the Armory.

Ms. Harris ndicated that there is an open area storage area in the Armory Basement with city equipment such as tractors with large blades. She indicated that there is no storage area within the city.

Ms. Fenton asked about the gazebo on the Mall.

Ms. Harris indicated that the Kiosk is open M-F 11-2 and that it contains only small shelves.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the trailer would not work. He indicated that he has the same concerns as Mr. Schwartz about putting something this major in such a visible spot. He indicated that the best option is an enclosed storage space in a nearby building.

Ms Harris indicated that they have looked and that there is no storage available in the area.

Ms. Fenton asked if they had asked the Jefferson Theatre for storage space.

Ms. Harris indicated that that is a long way to haul the supplies on the Mall.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he is concerned about this type of structure.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they are trying to be sympathetic and that it is a matter of looking at precedent.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that the city owned property under Avon Street could be used. He indicated that this area is out of site.

Ms. Fenton indicated that that area is out of the jurisdiction of the BAR.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it is extremely bad precedent to have these kinds of sheds appearing anywhere in the Downtown Mall area.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the board is faced with approval or denial of the proposed shed. Mr. Schwartz moved to deny the shed.

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

Ms. Vest asked the board if any storage structure with a different appearance would be acceptable at this site.

Mr. Celentano indicated that a structure designed as an addition to the building would be appropriate.

1200 Block West Main Street

Ms. Fenton indicated that the proposal for the Marriott Hotel includes two buildings that are designated as Contributing on Main Street. She indicated that 1212 Wertland Street is not protected.

Mr. Burrell Saunders, applicant, indicated that they have investigated other possibilities. He indicated that he understands that these have been preliminary meetings and that he intends to make a formal submission to the board at the September meeting. Mr. Saunders indicated that the proposal has been scaled down. He indicated that the previous application included a two story parking deck that extended to Wertland Street. He indicated that the first level of the deck was to be at grade and that the second level was to be subterranean. He indicated that the original proposal included parking behind the Bed and Breakfast. He indicated that they considered the possibility of moving the Wertland house forward. He indicated that they determined that this was not feasible because the house is in delicate condition and it has heavy masonry walls. He indicated that they have developed a more complicated garage structure. He indicated that the new presentation shows removing the two Contributing structures and leaving the Wertland House as is. He indicated that there is a four story parking garage. He indicated that there is an entrance off of Main Street with a porte cochere. He indicated that there is a separation between the guest's rooms and the garage structure, allowing the rooms to receive light and air. He indicated that they developed an English garden behind the Bed and Breakfast. He indicated that there is an existing archway on the Bed and Breakfast building that is presently obscured by a hedge. He indicated that at the previous meeting there were concerns about the scale of the new building. He indicated that the building was five stories so that it could fit within the zoning envelope. He indicated that they reduced the height of the building. He indicated that scale is a big issue. He indicated that they dropped 10 rooms to 137 rooms in order to drop the hotel one story. He indicated that the floor to floor height is 9 feet.

Mr. Saunders indicated that they intend to use a worn looking brick that will fit into the area.

Ms. Fenton asked if they plan to sell 1212 Wertland Street.

Mr. Stiffler indicated that they are hotel developers. He indicated that it is better to let somebody from the community preserve the house.

Mr. Nelson asked about the width of the L shaped drive.

Mr. Saunders indicated that the drive is 24' and allows people to be dropped off at the front of the hotel.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the drive is wider than the two sidestreets. Mr. Nelson indicated that the applicants have come back with another demolition proposal. He asked if the demolition was essential to the project.

Mr. Saunders answered yes. He indicated that they need a front door onto Main Street. He indicated that they have revised the plan to save the Wertland Street house. He indicated that they have compacted the site as much as possible.

Mr. Stiffler indicated that one alternative they considered was to move the Contributing buildings to the site of the Wertland Street house. He indicated that they feel that the Wertland House is the house most worthy of saving. He indicated that one of the contributing houses could not make the move and that the other house would be questionable to move.

Mr. Nelson indicated that anytime there is a discussion about whether a building can be moved, a professional hired by the BAR is needed to give an opinion.

Ms. Winner asked about the undergrounding of utilities on that block.

Mr. Saunders indicated that they are all for undergrounding and that they have done that in other communities.

Mr. Clark indicated that placing parking within four feet of the Wertland House is curious site planning. He indicated that the site plan also shows tearing down an old Oak Tree at the corner of 12 1/2 and Main. He indicated that the project might be too big for this site. He indicated that if the project were distinguished with incredible design that would make a difference.

A member of the public indicated that she is concerned about the traffic issues on West Main Street. She indicated that the hotel could establish a presence on Main Street with the entrance on 12th Street.

Mr. Stiffler indicated that the entrance will be a right in only and will be one way.

The member of the public indicated that people will still have to turn left off of Main Street and that this will back up traffic.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he thinks that it is a nice thing that a hotel is going there. He indicated that, regarding the two buildings on Main Street, in this country people sometimes get stuck on historic preservation when things aren't really historic. He indicated that he wonders if it is possible to sink the parking into the ground more.

Mr. Saunders indicated that the parking structure is already subterranean. He indicated that there is a creek and storm drainage running through the property.

A member of the public indicated that she has concerns about the parking deck directly behind the house on Wertland. She indicated that the water table is surely down far enough to recess the parking. She indicated that they were able to recess the parking at 200 East High Street. She indicated that instead of ascending parking we should be thinking more and more of descending parking.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with the comment, particularly with the density issues involved.

Eldon Wood indicated that he is a former member of the BAR and a current member of the Planning Commission. He indicated that West Main Street lost the building that was the Milton Grigg office to the Hampton Inn. He indicated that several years ago he was with the group that undertook the designation of West Main Street. He indicated that there is a real irony to tear down these buildings for a hotel for people to stay in when they come to get a feel for historic Charlottesville. He indicated that there are blocks of vacant space, which are not utilized on West Main Street. He indicated that this is out of balance. He indicated that he is upset that we have to use this tactic to get buildings. He indicated that the Baptist Church next to the site is the University Baptist Church and not the First Baptist Church.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that the parking lots along West Main Street are not available for

development. He indicated that he doesn't think that the houses on West Main Street are worth saving.

Mr. Wood indicated that the two houses are a part of the fabric of the city.

Mr. Stiffler indicated that they plan to build a high quality expensive building. He indicated that they have to look at the project in light of the alternatives. He indicated that the hotel represents something that will be here for a long time.

Ms. Kay Peaslee indicated that it grieves her that we allow old buildings to deteriorate. She indicated that buildings are torn down because they are run down. She indicated that she questions why they are run down in the first place.

Mr. Nelson indicated that this is a very interesting comment. He indicated that there are city ordinances on the books. He indicated that the question is whether the ordinances are strong enough and whether they are enacted enough.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board should have a worksession and should look at the ordinances.

Ms. Winner asked the applicant if they have given some consideration to moving the house on Wertland Street.

Mr. Saunders indicated that the house is in delicate condition and probably wouldn't survive a move. He indicated that the house can be restored but that they felt like it would be a rough move.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Saunders if he was looking to find out the mood of the BAR and if this is a project worth continuing.

Mr. Saunders answered yes. Ms. Fenton asked the board members to comment on the presentation.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he appreciates the challenge. He indicated that there needs to be an appropriate balance between change and growth. He indicated that the structures make Charlottesville what it is. He indicated that the proposal has to address the issues of scale and that they have attempted to address the issue. He indicated that he is concerned about the two houses on Main Street. He indicated that they are essentially proposing a street in the middle of a small block. He indicated that this is a planning issue. He indicated that the use on Main Street is hugely problematic. He indicated that he is really worried about the impact on JPA and University Avenue. He indicated that the 25 square foot mid-block cut works well internally but is problematic for the city. He indicated that an issue that is important to address is what this means on the context of the larger environs. He indicated that he is very uncomfortable with the decision that the houses on West Main have to be demolished.

Mr. Saunders indicated that the city's planning study sent a message that the city was leaving this an open area.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it is very important to look comprehensively at traffic.

Mr. Saunders indicated that he is here to find out if he has a real possibility for the project.

Mr. Clark indicated that the fundamental problem is that there are two Contributing structures that are important to the history and the memory of the neighborhoods. He indicated that he is unwilling to see the houses torn down.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he shares Mr. Clark's sentiments. He indicated that he suggests the applicant get a topo of the city to show the project in the context of the neighborhood. He indicated that he is sorry that they feel they have to take down the houses. He indicated that the board has asked to see the impacts on the neighborhood. He indicated that the two houses are a significant part of the neighborhood. He indicated that the driveway in and out of the hotel looks like a road. He indicated that the hotel could have entry and exit from the side streets. He indicated that there should be more underground parking. He indicated that he cannot support the project as shown with the tearing down of the two houses on West Main Street.

Mr. Celentano indicated that master plan issues are central. He indicated that it is important that the building is a type that could get approved for West Main Street. He indicated that the issue is that this building could set the precedent for West Main Street. He indicated that the effort to

reduce the scale is good. He indicated that he has trouble with the back side, with maintaining the house and residential scale on Wertland. He indicated that the design doesn't work for him with the mass of parking behind the house.

Ms. Hook indicated that she does not want to impede progress but that she also does not want to pay the price for progress. She indicated that the buildings are designated as Contributing and that there is a sense of a friendly neighborhood not a business environment with no historic significance. She indicated that the changes we make are irreversible. She indicated that she would like to think about the creative use of the houses. She indicated that she doesn't like to think of the block as just a business environment.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she has surprised herself. She indicated that she first thought there was no way she would approve the project. She indicated that at this point her opinion has changed. She indicated that she would chose to save the Wertland House . She indicated that she does not like the way the entrance feels like a street. She indicated that the garage is a little massive. She indicated that she hopes that the applicants will not give up. She indicated that the garage is problematic.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he questions whether they have really saved the Wertland House with the garage right behind it.

Ms. Winner indicated that she really appreciates the efforts that have been made by the applicants. She indicated that they are obviously sensitive to the community. She indicated that loosing the two houses alone would not keep her from supporting the proposal. She indicated that she shares the concerns about the traffic and the parking.

Ms. Fenton indicated that this is not a final decision and that two members are not present.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that adjusting the entrance would not be enough to make him comfortable with approving the demolition.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the Nassau Inn in Princeton, New Jersey was preserved as an inn and is important to the fabric of the community. He indicated that the mid-block access in principle makes him very uncomfortable.

Mr. Clark indicated that if the applicant was to adopt a strategy of using only the east west bar, stylistically it could be a little more modern. He indicated that the building could be lighter and more transparent.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Clark if he had no objection to something modern.

Mr. Clark indicated that he had absolutely no objection to something modern. Mr. Clark also indicated that a shorter building is not necessarily a better building.

Mr. Saunders indicated that the city has a document on the market that shows a four story structure.

Mr. Clark indicated that that is a good criticism.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that there is also a document identifying two Contributing structures on the sight. He indicated that the new element on Main Street is challenging. He indicated that with the protection of the two structures on Main Street he is very comfortable with a higher scaled building with an east to west orientation.

Mr. Saunders indicated that a higher structure isn't allowed by the Zoning Ordinance and that they need a certain number of rooms.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would be very comfortable with a taller building if it were to save the two houses on Main Street. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Clark's comments and that the building need not look so historic and could have more freedom in the design.

Mr. Saunders indicated that there are plates in the document that show this arrangement.

Mr. Huja indicated that City Council and the BAR adopted the Design Guidelines within the past year.

Mr. Clark asked what would be on the first floor fronting Main Street.

Mr. Saunders indicated a restaurant would occupy the first floor on Main Street. He indicated that the second floor would contain 8 rooms.

Mr. Clark indicated that if they could put the restaurant into the houses he would be more comfortable. He indicated that if they added an extra floor to the rear it would more than make-up for the lost floor.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that in 50 years neither house will stand. He indicated that all over the world old houses are being saved as facades. He indicated that he doesn't think that the facades of these buildings are that great. He indicated that the facades could be saved.

Mr. Stiffler indicated that you seldom see wood framed houses used for façade. He indicated that in regards to weather the new building is modern or more traditional, if the guests are coming to stay in Charlottesville at this site they are looking for a more traditional hotel. He indicated that the city needs a hotel right downtown.

Mr. Nelson indicated that there is an empty lot on the corner of 12th Street where a house was torn down. He indicated that this is a possibility to move the building.

Mr. Stiffler indicated that his focus has been on replacement value. He indicated that they are looking at the highest and best use of the property. He indicated that the two wood frame houses are not historic contributing and that the new building is contributing.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board has responded to the presentation with a mixed reaction. She indicated that they could appeal the decision to council. She indicated that the charge of the board is only to look at how it looks from the street. She indicated that she feels that this is certainly an option that they can pursue.

Mr. Saunders indicated that they are trying to hear the board's concerns and incorporate them into the reality of their commercial needs.

Ms. Fenton indicated that if this project were done on a vacant lot it would be a wonderful asset to the community. She asked if there is an alternate site they would consider.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the board appreciates the work that has been done and that they have to give them a realistic response.

100 East Main Street: Woolworth

Oliver Kuttner, building owner, indicated that he wanted to explain the situation with the Woolworth Building to the BAR. He indicated that the Woolworth Corporation has 16 years left on their lease. He indicated that they have 60 divisions. He indicated that Footlocker is one of their divisions and that it will be opening in the front portion of the building in September. He indicated that if he wants to do anything else with the building, he must do it by September. He indicated that he is currently putting steel in place in the building in order to give himself the option of building future additional stories on the building. He indicated that the building has not been designed yet. He indicated that he doesn't know how many stories he would like it to be.

Martha Gleason asked if the building would contain condos for sale. Mr. Kuttner indicated that he was interested in rental apartment units and not condominiums.

Mr. Clark indicated that the board had recently struggled with a submission because a structure was built before it was approved.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that some people might be concerned by the work that they see. He indicated that he is currently just taking care of the steel support in front of FootLocker.

Ms. Fenton asked if there would be any physical changes to the outside of the building.

Mr. Kuttner answered no. He indicated that he is repairing the parapet roof.

Ms. Fenton asked if that was to be maintenance work and if he would put everything back to the original.

Mr. Kuttner answered yes.

Ms. Hook moved to adjourn the meeting

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

At 8:00 the meeting was adjourned.