

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
October 20, 1998**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton: Chair
Joseph Celentano
W.G. Clark
Jessie Hook
Brent Nelson
James Oschrin
Kenneth Schwartz
Dawn Thompson
Linda Winner

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

At 5:00 P.M. Ms. Fenton convened the meeting.

Mr. Clark indicated that Ms. Fenton's speech at the City Council Meeting was very elegant.

113-117 East Main Street: Wachovia

Staff presented the report.

Tom Keogh of Train and Spencer Architects introduced himself. He indicated that at the last meeting they submitted changes to the design of the new building. He indicated that the changes included the introduction of a blind loggia on the North Elevation. He indicated that the board approved the changes with the condition that the blind loggia be omitted and that the full loggia be returned. He indicated that they have come back to the BAR to reconsider the blind loggia. He indicated that there are two issues driving the request. First, He indicated that there is a need for the contiguous floor plates on the 3rd and 4th floors. He indicated that they are able to pick up 4 ½ offices. Second, he indicated that Wachovia has made the decision that the parking deck will be sold for future development. He indicated that given those considerations the blind loggia is the best option.

Mr. Oschrin asked how deep the blind loggia would be.

Mr. Keogh indicated that the rear bricks would be open full two feet. He indicated that the dimensions of the brick are proportionate to brick piers on the front façade.

Mr. Celentano asked if the Mall façade had a true loggia.

Mr. Keogh answered yes.

Mr. Keogh indicated that they looked at removing the Mall loggia. He indicated that the local client fought to keep it.

Mr. Oschrin asked how deep the full loggia would be if they were to use a full loggia on the north side.

Mr. Keogh answered about six feet deep. Mr. Keogh indicated that building is three stories on the Mall with a stepped back fourth story.

Ms. Winner asked Ms. Vest if there is anything about the project that is in violation of the guidelines.

Ms. Vest indicated that she did not interpret anything in the guidelines to be in conflict with the proposal. She indicated that the board had already determined the building to be appropriate. She indicated that the question for the board is whether the blind loggia would change that.

Mr. Clark indicated that he thought it was very clever of the applicant to introduce an exception to protect them. He indicated that he admires the design. He indicated that loosing the loggia is something that the client will regret. He indicated that the blind loggia seems silly. He indicated that if they are to reface the north side of the building, why not use a more normal pattern of windows. He indicated that the new loggia represents a substantial change in the building. He indicated that it seems sufficient that a more substantial study be done. He indicated that a perspective sketch from the corner showing how the building turns the corner would be helpful. He indicated that if he were in the applicant's shoes he would feel strange. He indicated that this is the full loggia is the best alternative.

Mr. Keogh indicated that when building in the historic district the challenge is to meet the guidelines while developing a hierarchy of what is important. He indicated that due to economics certain things happen. He indicated that this may not be the ideal architecture but that it is an amenable situation. He indicated that they feel that this is a strong building that they can stand behind.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the building that may be built in the parking space.
Mr. Keogh indicated that there is an alley. He indicated that Wachovia would potentially retain some space for parking purposes. He indicated that they would likely continue the alley around the site.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the alley is below grade.
Mr. Keogh answered yes.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the further study of the loggia would hold up the project.

Mr. Keogh indicated that it would hold them up. He indicated that the project is being bid out in packages. He indicated that they need to move forward with this issue.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he agrees with Mr. Clark's comments and consideration of the blind loggia. He indicated that they may need to look at this issue slightly differently. He indicated that everything else they have done on this project has demonstrated that they are very capable and that he would trust the architects to make the changes.

Ms. Winner moved to approve the blind loggia as presented on the plans dated September 2.

Ms. Fenton asked the board members to comment on the proposal.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he has no new opinions to add and that he concurs with previous comments.

Ms. Hook indicated that she is a little surprised by the change.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that Mr. Celentano trusts the architect to go back and revisit the loggia. He indicated that he thinks it is better not to have a gesture at all. Mr. Oschrin indicated that he would like it if the architect goes back to the original design. He indicated that he would like to see other alternatives to the loggia. He indicated that the submittal is rather gutsy.

Mr. Keogh indicated that it is not intended to be gutsy.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that it is important to give a customer a choice.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she did not have a specific problem. She indicated that she is withholding judgement to see what the consensus of the board turns out to be.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he does not feel strongly. He indicated that this sounds like it could have been useful in protecting the southern loggia. He indicated that he does not think that this is an improvement. He indicated that he will not vote for it, but that he does not feel strongly.

Ms. Winner indicated that there is a question about what is ideal and what is practical. She indicated that the role of the board is not to pick what is ideal but to pick what is practical and within the guidelines. She indicated that there is nothing amiss about the concept in relation to the guidelines but that this is just not what we might choose, if given the choice.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that we should gravitate towards things that are better.

Ms. Fenton indicated that this is not something that she is strongly opinionated on. She indicated that there is a strange mood among the board this evening.

Ms. Vest indicated that she recommends that if the board vote in favor they express that they are doing so because they find that this is appropriate based on the guidelines and that if they vote against it they express that they find it inappropriate based on the guidelines.

Mr. Clark indicated that it was a loggia and now is not. He indicated that at one point it stops being real and starts being motifal. He indicated that he thinks it is inappropriate to portray and loggia that is not a loggia.

Mr. Nelson asked if the applicant has a problem getting rid of the real loggia and using a different window treatment. He asked if they want to use the fake loggia because they think that the appearance of a loggia is important? He asked if they would be interested in re-doing the window system.

Rick Brannon of Wachovia bank indicated that redoing the design would impact the project severely.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the blind loggia was a compromise between the owner and the architect.

Mr. Brannon indicated that the bank needs the square footage. He indicated that they want it to be an attractive building and that it will be attractive even with the blind loggia.

Mr. Clark indicated that the building is overlooking a city park. He indicated that the building is becoming an important piece of the landscape.

Mr. Keogh indicated that the blind loggia was based on a square footage demand. He indicated that with the sale of the parking lot it doesn't make sense to go back to the full loggia. He indicated that he still feels comfortable with the construction of the blind loggia, based on the timetable for future development of the parking lot.

Mr. Clark indicated that it seems often that the board is put in this position. He indicated that they need alternatives to be presented. He indicated that in the case of another recent project the board was not presented with alternatives. He indicated that if they had been presented with alternatives they may have been able to help.

Ms. Winner moved to approve the plan as submitted on September 7.

Mr. Schwartz asked if a seconder could abstain from voting.

Ms. Fenton answered yes.

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

OXO Restaurant

Ms. Vest indicated that the applicant had been before the board several months ago with changes included covering over the existing CMU walls with stucco. She indicated that the applicant was back to ask to remove the CMU walls altogether.

Alice Kim introduced herself and indicated that she was before the board with more changes. She indicated that they were going to omit the sign. She distributed to the board a written summary of the items that were approved. She indicated that she was back to ask for approval of the removal of the CMU wall. She indicated that when she was before the board last time she believed that they needed the walls as a solid barrier for ABC requirements. She indicated that they have since learned that the barrier need not be so substantial and that there is no height requirement. She indicated that she would also like to remove the awning. She indicated that there is paint splattered on it. She indicated that she would also like to remove the lamps. She indicated that they would also like to remove the existing trees and replace them with Holly bushes. She indicated that she wants to create a simple focal point. She indicated that she wants to change the window. She indicated that originally they had wanted folding doors that totally open. She indicated that she likes the idea of space. She indicated that she now wants to ask for a 7' by 10' picture window.

Ms. Fenton asked the applicant why she was removing the awning rather than replacing it.

Ms. Kim indicated that cost was the reason she was not replacing the awning. She indicated that the current color does not go with the building. She indicated that she has long range plans to remodel the patio. She indicated that she would like some sort of covered patio.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the color of the building has changed.

Ms. Kim indicated that the color would be changed again to light gray.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the changes should be brought as a formal proposal.

Oliver Kuttner indicated that Ms. Kim really wants to do something nice with the building. He indicated that she can't do it all right away but that she is really working on it. He indicated that he believes that the board will see her a lot. He indicated that removing the CMU wall from his point of view is good. He indicated that it is important to have a dialogue. He indicated that if you walk by the building you would see what she is talking about. He indicated that project will become better and better. He indicated that he is happy that she is there. He indicated that two restaurants have failed in that space and that before Brasa the building was empty for 15 years. He indicated that he makes his comments as a member of the public and as a neighbor.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is impressed with the enthusiasm and attention to detail the applicant has put into the project. He indicated that he understands why she wants to take

down the wall. He indicated that the current site is unfriendly and that the shrubbery is more attractive.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he follows all the changes except for the removal of the trees. He indicated that he thinks the applicant should keep the trees and prune them.

Mr. Oschrin asked when the picture presented was taken.

Ms. Kim indicated that the picture was taken the day before.

Ms. Hook indicated that she agrees about the trees. She indicated that if the wall is removed the applicant could be faced with a little plot of ground. Ms. Hook indicated that she is unsure about the removal of the awning. She indicated that the awning does not look good the way that it is. She asked if it could be painted some other color.

Ms. Kim indicated that the awning is canvas and cannot be painted.

Ms. Hook indicated that she prefers an awning.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the proposal might look like something from the TV show Dallas where there were never any trees and that it may look a little sparse. He indicated that it might be a case of reversed landscape engineering. He indicated that he is concerned about the removal of the trees when we do not know what the trees are. He indicated that the Holly might end up looking like landscaped spinach. He indicated that the awning might provide a useful place to stand.

Ms. Kim indicated that she is unsure of the cost to replace the awning.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the cost will be about \$500.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the board needs more information and cannot make a determination.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she suggests that the application be deferred. She indicated that the application had gone beyond 5 minutes.

Mr. Clark indicated that he disagrees and the applicant should have the benefit of the board's feedback. He indicated that the project has shown great restraint. He indicated that it is a clean design. He indicated that it was a simple building with automotive use and that it has been returned to its roots. He indicated that in recent years the building has been hilarity.

Ms. Kim indicated that she wants the building to look very different from the way that it looks now.

Mr. Clark indicated that he supports the project. He indicated that he does not believe that the awning and little things should constitute anything to hang the project up.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the project has gone beyond five minutes and that we need to stop doing to the five-minute items.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the application with the following elements: removing the CMU Wall, removing lights, removing awning, and installing the new window and excluding the removal of the trees.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he objects to removing the wall.

Mr. Celentano moved to accept the application as submitted with the exception of the removal of the trees.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

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

321-323 E Main Street: SNL Securities Building
Staff presented the report.

Adams Stuphin of Train and Spencer Architects introduced himself. He indicated that the request for the new windows was client driven. He indicated that they feel that the windows are appropriate.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the application is no problem.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the windows were added because of a change in interior program. Mr. Stuphin indicated that the fifth floor will be executive offices and reception area and it will benefit from the windows.

Ms. Hook indicated that the windows do not look symmetrical.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he does not have a problem with the lack of symmetry.

Mr. Stuphin indicated that the façade is loosely based on the 4th Street façade.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the sign is proportional and symmetrical but that the façade becomes awkward. He indicated that he forgot how this was centered on the block.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the window pattern seems appropriate given the stepping of the building.

Mr. Nelson moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with Mr. Celantano, Mr. Clark, Ms. Fenton, Ms. Hook, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Schwartz, and Mr. Clark voting in favor and with Mr. Oschrin voting against.

212 Wine Street

Staff presented the report.

Margaret O'Reilly, architect for the applicant, introduced herself. She indicated that the project has been before the Board of Zoning Appeals. She indicated that the BZA's recommendations drove what they could do with the site. She indicated that the originally, the winemaker's house faced south. She indicated that there is a simple floor plan with entry at ground level. She indicated that they selected the hipped roof to try to minimize the mass. She indicated that the structure is two stories at the rear. She indicated the design of the front façade is intending to respond to the context of the winemaker's house. She indicated that the house is situated tightly on the setback lines and that there is a porch on the rear of the house. She indicated that they added a decorative dormer for compatibility to the original front of the winemaker's house. She indicated that they will use 4" vinyl siding and traditional window sizes and pattern. She indicated that a new house to the rear of the house is stucco with cedar.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he has not seen the site and does not know where Wine Street is.

Ms. Fenton indicated that Wine Street is off of Park Street.

Ms. Hook indicated that the house will take up a large percentage of the lot. She asked how much land is surrounding the nearby houses.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that house complies with zoning setbacks on the front and side and will be consistent with the other houses on the street. She indicated that there will be a sense of open space around it. Ms. O'Reilly pointed out the photographs of the surrounding homes.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the board has just gotten through a major project in which the board wanted to understand the context of the neighborhood. He indicated that the site plan is lacking. He indicated that there is nothing to show where the house is in relation to its context. He indicated that this house will have a definite impact on the winemaker's house. He indicated that they don't have enough information. He indicated that they need something showing the footprints of the adjoining buildings on the adjoining lots.

Mr. Nelson asked Ms. Vest what the charge of the board is in reviewing this project.

Ms. Vest indicated that the house will be built on a legal lot that was designated as a part of the original winemaker's parcel. She indicated that it is a legal parcel with a building right. She indicated that because of the small lot size, the owner received a mandate from the BZA, which has driven the building footprint. She indicated that the BZA decision is

legally binding. She indicated that the board's charge is to review the design for appropriateness to its context and for impact on the adjacent historic structure.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that the BZA required that the house be parallel to Wine Street. She indicated that the house has been designed to the maximum dimension allowed by the BZA.

Mr. Oschrin asked the applicant if she knew about the historic designation when she bought the house.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that the applicant owns the winemaker's house.

Ms. Hook indicated that the board's responsibility is to look at the impact on that house.

Mr. Oschrin asked why the BZA required that the house be one story on Wine Street.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that original plan was for a 1 ½ story house and that the neighbor did not want it to be too high.

Mr. Celentano asked if this is a speculative project.

Ms. Byfield indicated that she sold the winemaker's house to move into this one.

Mr. Clark indicated that the texture of the neighborhood is considerable. He indicated that the houses enjoy a lot of relief. He indicated that in comparison this house looks incredibly hermetic.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the proposed vinyl siding will exacerbate that problem. She indicated that in her neighborhood there is a big difference with houses with vinyl siding and the houses with wood.

Mr. Nelson indicated that a lot of what we see is a direct result of size constraints. He indicated that when he looks at the front elevation he really has a problem with it. He indicated that the two sides of window treatments seem out of balance. He indicated that there is a proportion problem. He indicated that the windows at the right and the door seem to be out of proportion.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that the window groups are centered at the bays.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the house could desperately use a front porch. He indicated that issues of terrain really impact the look of the building.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that the intent is to include an at-grade entry.

Mr. Nelson indicated that landscaping is part of the purview of the BAR. He indicated that given the nature of this project, he definitely wants the board to review landscaping.

Ms. O'Reilly asked Mr. Nelson if he wanted to see plant materials or locations.
Mr. Nelson answered both.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that she can come back to the board with that information.

Mr. Nelson indicated that with that many steps on the front of the building, there may be an opportunity for a railing.

Ms. O'Reilly asked if it is important to show that level of detail
Mr. Nelson indicated that it will be helpful to show details up front.

Mr. Nelson indicated that what they have done is bare bones. He indicated that details become even more important. He indicated that front porch lights may help.

Mr. Oschrein indicated that this is an example of the house that zoning built. He indicated that he encourages the applicant to look at Seaside Florida to get ideas of more ways to deal with tight zoning requirements.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that homes in Seaside have a much higher per square foot budget.

Mr. Oschrein indicated that the rear of the house is more interesting.

Ms. O'Reilly asked the board for any thoughts on ways to improve the texture.

Mr. Oschrein indicated that there are a lot of little things that they could do. He indicated that landscaping would help.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that vinyl siding is inappropriate in the context of the adjoining historic properties. He indicated that he echoes the previous comments that about the vinyl siding. He indicated that the back element is more successful. He indicated that the shortened kitchen window does not relate to the scale and proportion. He indicated that the window wants to have a vertical proportion and that this presents a less stately façade upon approach, which is arguably the more important side.

Mr. Clark indicated that in relation to the flatness of the front façade it would be helpful to have a depth. He indicated that he suggests that the applicant produce site plans.

Mr. Schwartz indicated it would benefit from some depth. He indicated that he would suggest that the applicant produce site plans and that she needs to produce something that demonstrates the house's location in context. He indicated that he recommends that they come up with an absolutely beautiful porch design and make a case to the BZA that coming out of the BAR process a porch is absolutely critical to the compatibility of the house.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that a porch would be a very good thing. He indicated that this is an interesting design problem. He indicated that the board has reviewed other examples

of residential infill. He indicated that this requires a lot of ingenuity. He indicated that this will improve the house and it will improve its compatibility. He indicated that the fake dormer is not enough.

Ms. O'Reilly asked what would happen if the BZA turns down the request for a front porch again.

Mr. Clark indicated that a recess in the entry hall could produce a kind of depth that could be helpful. He indicated that removing the fake shutters would also be helpful. He indicated that the shutters look cheap. He indicated that the applicant could consider a pediment vent.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the board could pass an overall motion that depends completely on a front porch and ask for a porch to be considered by the BZA.

Ms. O'Reilly indicated that it would be helpful to get enough approval to proceed with construction.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the applicant needs to do more work at the level of the site and its context. He indicated that there is substantial design work that needs to be done on the front elevation.

Ms. O'Reilly asked how much area should be covered on the site plan.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the site plan should include the adjoining properties.

Mr. Schwartz moved to defer the application with the following specific concern that the application has not been fully represented with regards to its site and context and with the concern that the front elevation needs to be further considered with the three ways that have been suggested to begin looking at it. HE indicated that there is a tremendous amount of opportunity.

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

Ms. Fenton indicated that she is willing to go before the BZA to ask for the porch.

218 W Water Street Downtown Tire Garage

Oliver Kuttner, applicant, indicated that the stairs need to run off past the old Downtown Tire repair shop. He indicated that there are presently four overhead garage doors. He indicated that he will get rid of the alley. He indicated that this cuts into the existing major retaining wall and he will rebuild something there.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he likes this drawing, but that he has got to have more stuff to look at.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that the board had a problem with the hotel because of the way they approached things. Mr. Kuttner said that if he does not get approval for the project now he is not going to build anything else downtown.

At this point, Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Clark left the meeting.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he does not think that he is asking too much.

Mr. Nelson indicated that nobody else has been given the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that Mr. Kuttner has withdrawn his application.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he will reconsider and that Mr. Nelson is correct.

Mr. Charles Dickey of Bruce Wardell Architects indicated that he is unaware of the history of the project with the board.

Ms. Martha Gleason indicated that she likes the idea being presented.

At this point, Mr. Oschrin left the meeting.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that in this part of his life he sees the board as a major obstacle. He indicated that he asked for feedback on the Woolworth's building and held a meeting and nobody came.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there are nine people on the board and that expecting every member to come to a site meeting is unreasonable.

Ms. Hook indicated that as a member of the board she sees the role of the board is not to shoot something down but to help the applicant.

Mr. Nelson indicated that there is a perception about the tone of the board and people don't like having to come to the board.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the proposal is a tremendous improvement.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that waiting another month for approval is a problem.

Ms. Fenton then asked Ms. Vest to present the report.
Staff presented the report.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he lives on South Street and that he is pleased. He indicated that he first thought that he was redoing the main building. He indicated that he is very pleased and that the building is a real eyesore. He indicated that this is a big improvement. He indicated that the windows with mullions reminded him of the nearby

Security Storage building and of the windows on Water Street on the back of the Hardware Store building. He indicated that this is a positive step forward.

Mr. Nelson indicated that although it is not in the board's pervue, he is curious what the applicant anticipates will go in the apartments.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that there is a good chance it will be a Doctor's office.

Mr. Celentano asked if the changes are new structure or if they are being applied to the outside façade.

Mr. Dickey indicated that everything is completely new. He indicated that they will infill with existing windows.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board will need to review the materials.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he would like to have the board select a group that can meet to discuss the issues as they come up.

Ms. Winner indicated that the board will want to see color and material samples.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he has decided the basic layout for the building. He indicated that he needs approval and that the tenants want to move in by March.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he would like to have a committee of two or three people to decide the final approvals. He indicated that he is on a budget and that he just needs to get on with it.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the board has tried to make a policy not to have separate subcommittees. He indicated that the board members like what they see but that they need more information. He indicated that they need to see floor plans and the other elevations. He indicated that he does not think he can approve this based on this little information.

Ms. Fenton indicated that everybody really like what they see and that the requirement is for more detail. She indicated that it is moving in the right direction. She indicated that they will have to see the side elevations.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the applicant has done a great job on the front of the building. He indicated that they will need to look at the back and give it the same treatment.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he wants a nice building. He indicated that he would like to be able to resubmit in one week or two weeks. He indicated that a month is too long to wait.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he encourages the applicant to take the success of the front of the building and bring it around to the back.

Ms. Winner indicated that she hates for the project not to happen but that she does not see how it can happen with this information.

Mr. Nelson indicated he realizes that the system needs improvement.

Ms. Winner moved to defer the application.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he does not have time for this anymore.

Ms. Hook indicated that she shares the enthusiasm of the group and that she doesn't feel that its fair to ask for a vote based on this drawing alone without an idea of what it will look like from the other sides and without the details.

Ms. Hook moved to defer the application until the following meeting with the understanding that it may be considered before then if board members are willing to meet before that next meeting.

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

Wertland Street Historic District

Ms. Vest indicated that the first meeting was held with property owners and interested citizens on October 14. She indicated that the board can consider voting to recommend the Wertland Street Historic District. She indicated that if the board votes to recommend the district, it will go to the Planning Commission for further consideration. She indicated that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing before making a recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Fenton indicated that most property owners in the district were opposed and that most involved with preservation were in favor of designation.

Ms. Winner indicated that despite good efforts board members and staff didn't seem to be able to convince property owners that designation would be in the interest of their interest.

Mr. Celentano indicated that Mr. Stultz brought up a good point about the city supporting the historic districts. He indicated that the city could consider supporting property owners in historic districts with some funding for infrastructure.

Ms. Fenton indicated that a suggestion is that the city could lessen the amount of parking required for infill.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the undergrounding of utilities ties into Mr. Stultz's point.

Ms. Hook indicated that there are ways the city can help. She indicated that it is not the board's responsibility. She indicated that the city could

Ms. Gleason indicated that houses in the other historic districts have been established over a number of years.

Ms. Gleason indicated that most long time owners are gone from the district.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the property owners question of what they will get for the district speaks to what the city can do in a partnership and commitment.

Mr. Celentano indicated that this applies to both developers and owners of existing buildings. He indicated that the city can support the properties through infrastructure.

Ms. Gleason indicated that she is not against the homes being used for student housing and that she is against the houses being torn down.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the question for the board is weather they recommend the adoption of the Wertland Street Historic District.

Ashlin Smith indicated that she would like to recommend that they designate the district. She indicated that she makes the recommendation as a member of Preservation Piedmont. She indicated that formal protection is needed. She indicated that they don't want to trample individual rights. She indicated that perhaps they and the city can do more over the years to make the designation a positive.

Ms. Gleason indicated that she agrees with Ms. Smith.

Adam Goldman indicated that there is a Design Control District on West Main Street and buildings are still being demolished. He asked what is stopping there is to stop demolition if the board designates Wertland Street.

Mr. Nelson indicated that what the board has learned is that a design control district doesn't prevent houses from being torn down.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there is a question about the objectivity of engineer's reports when the applicant has hired the engineer. She asked if there was a way to get funding for the BAR to have a structural engineer's report.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the board could request staff to draft an ordinance change exploring having structural engineer's reports from an engineer hired by the BAR.

Ms. Gleason indicated that in the case of the Levy Opera House, the owners had a structural engineer's report, which said the building was not sound. She indicated that a group of preservationists had an engineering professor from UVA conduct a structural engineer's report which showed the building was sound.

Ms. Winner indicated that she supports that idea.

Ms. Fenton indicated that this is something that they should recommend.

Mr. Nelson moved to approve the adoption of the Wertland Street Design Control District.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the building at 1215 Wertland Street could be torn down and there could be an opportunity for a new building that contributes to the district.

Mr. Nelson amended his motion to include the apartment complex at 1215 Wertland Street.

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

Ms. Fenton indicated that the Toledano appeal is scheduled to go before council on November 2. She indicated that she would be out of town at that time. She indicated that she hoped there would be a volunteer willing to speak to the council.

Ms. Winner indicated that the vice-chair may wish to do that.

Approval of Minutes:

Ms. Hook moved to approve the minutes of July 21, 1998, August 18, 1998, and September 15, 1998.

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

Ms. Fenton moved to no longer permit the five-minute interjections at the beginning of the meeting.

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

Mr. Nelson indicated that speakers should be asked to introduce themselves before they comment.

106/108 South Street

Ms. Vest indicated that she had received a letter from Bert Lampert of Jim Grigg's office indicating that they had researched the feasibility of incorporating the wires. She indicated that incorporating the wires is not feasible. She indicated that the architect's client is a tenant in the building and not the building owner. She indicated that she had

asked the city attorney's office for input on this issue. She indicated that Craig Brown had written her a memo advising the board that he does not think that it is within the BAR's purview to attach a condition about a proposed change to an existing condition.

Mr. Celentano indicated that as an architect, when he works on a project that effects a building in a major way, the building as a whole is looked at as a part of the project. He indicated that he sees this issue in the same way.

Ms. Winner indicated that the board should have a conversation with the attorney on this issue in the future.

Ms. Fenton moved to take the advice of the city attorney to remove the condition and to discuss the issue in further detail with the city attorney.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

The motion was denied with Ms. Fenton and Ms. Winner voting in favor and with Mr. Celentano, Ms. Hook and Mr. Nelson voting against.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he feels there should be a drawing like the map in the Wertland Street study included with every application.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there should be a better process for the Preliminary Hearing. She indicated that staff should send a letter after the preliminary hearing stating a list of the items that they must bring before they are permitted to return to the board.

Mr. Goldman asked about the preliminary hearing process.

Ms. Fenton indicated that he don't have specific requirements for the preliminary hearing.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he understands that what we are looking for in a preliminary conference is a concept and not a detailed design or drawing.

Mr. Goldman indicated that there is a time element involved.

Mr. Celentano indicated that as an architect he is used to the fact that there is an approval schedule for whatever locality you are working in.

Mr. Nelson indicated that as a landscape architect he deals with this everyday. He indicated that the city process is known in the business as being a relatively efficient process.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the city's process is not unusual or excessive.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with Ms. Fenton's comment.

Ms. Winner moved to adjourn the meeting.
Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.