

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
May 19, 1999**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton, Chair
Joe Celentano
Brent Nelson
Dawn Thompson
Jay Oschrin
Kenneth Schwartz

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

At 5:00 P.M. Ms. Fenton convened the meeting. She explained the procedure for the meeting.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is missing pages 2-3 of the April minutes.
The board agreed to defer approval of the minutes until the end of the meeting.

Brass Plaques on the Downtown Mall

Staff presented the report.

Zapp McConnell, applicant, introduced herself. She indicated that she is ready to install the plaques and she is just waiting for an answer from the board. She indicated that she has gotten the go ahead from Gary O'Connell and just needs the board's approval.

Mr. Celentano asked where the plaques would be located.

Ms. McConnell indicated that the plaques would be installed on brick closest to the drain that is flat. She indicated that they had also considered removing the brick and pouring concrete.

Ms. Fenton asked if she was aware that the Mall bricks may be removed and rebricked.

Ms. McConnell indicated that Public Works has agreed to maintain the plaques once they are installed.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the plaques need to be constructed of a real heavy duty brass.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Celentano if the issue required further BAR review.

Mr. Celentano answered no, but that he would like to comment that he hopes that Public Works will use a very heavy duty brass plaque.

Mr. Celentano moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

410 East Jefferson Street

Staff presented the report.

Candace DeLoach, applicant distributed a drawing of the proposed staircase. She also distributed drawings of similar types of staircases.

Ms. Fenton asked about the railing.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that the railing will be a traditional railing that goes all the way into the bricks.

Mr. Nelson asked about the material of the steps.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that the steps would be brick selected to match the house.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that she is trying to bring the house back to what it should be and to make it historically correct. She indicated that the existing stairs are non-original and look out of sorts with the house.

At this time, Jay Oschrin arrived.

Mr. Nelson asked about the detail in the center of the stairs.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that the idea is for the detail to appear like a window although the house does not actually have a walk in basement. She indicated that the idea is to make it feel like the lower level is being used.

Ms. Fenton asked if they were using the building as an Inn.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that it is to be a bed and breakfast and an antique shop.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is thrilled to see the work be done and he commended the applicant on the project. He indicated that he has long wondered about the windows on the house. He indicated that it is great that they are redoing the windows. He commended the applicant for putting the shutters back on the building.

Mr. Celentano indicated that, with regards to the stair design, the finishing elements are important. He indicated that pedestrians will pass closely by the stairs on the street and it will be important that the staircase is crafted as it was originally. He indicated that the photos show the different ranges of how they might accomplish that. He indicated that a curved stair can be constructed in good and bad ways and the details are important. He indicated that he would like to have more information about the stairs.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that the brick mason who will do the work is currently working on the interior. She indicated that the board is more than welcome to come and see the work that he is doing on the interior. She indicated that she is open to suggestions.

Mr. Celentano indicated that an all brick curved stair can be difficult to construct. He indicated that he would want to see a description including materials.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that if there are concerns about all brick, she is open to other suggestions.

Mr. Nelson indicated that in some of the other examples the proportion of the stairs are wider. He asked if the steps would have a wider proportion than what is shown. He indicated that he would encourage widening the proportion.

Ms. DeLoach indicated that the ironworker drew the drawing and it was intended to show the details and not the proportions. She indicated that she can have her architect do a more accurate drawing. She indicated that they considered a wider staircase but that it spanned nearly three windows and that it looked a little massive and took up virtually the entire yard.

Mr. Nelson indicated that there may be a compromise solution.

Ms. Thompson asked if there were paint samples of the warm gray and the red colors.

Ms. DeLoach answered yes and showed the samples to the group. She indicated that the building next door has roughly the same grey trim.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the project is wonderful. He indicated that his only concern is the particularity of the how the stair is made. He indicated that a more accurate drawing will help the applicant to avoid surprises during the construction process. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Celentano that he is not sure about the brick use. He indicated that the detailing of another material may turn out to produce a cleaner and more handsome stair.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application with the condition that the application submit a detailed stair drawing to Tarpley Vest for administrative review.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

212 Wine Street

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Byfield, applicant, indicated that the front window serves no functional purpose. She indicated she has another idea for the side window. She indicated that she could take one half of a double hung window and elongate it while still allowing the stove to be functional. She showed a drawing of the proposed new side window. She indicated that it would really help her if the board approved both the option of no window and the option of the new window.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would prefer to see the window but he could support either one. He suggested that if the window is eliminated, the applicant might consider some landscaping to soften that blank wall.

Mr. Oschrein asked why she was requesting the semi-circular window.

Ms. Byfield indicated that she prefers the look of the window. She indicated that it softens the entire front side of the house.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application as submitted.

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

Mr. Schwartz indicated that his motion was for both window scenarios.

817 W Main Street

Staff presented the report.

Jeff Daniel, applicant, indicated that the door sits between two entrances. He indicated that the tea room wants to have access to the upstairs. He indicated that there are two entrances and that the door will be bricked up about four feet and a landing will be built level with the window. He indicated that there will be three to four steps up to the front of the restaurant. He indicated that another possibility for the deck is to cover it with a canvas awning. He indicated that the main entrance to the restaurant will still be at the front.

Ms. Fenton asked the applicant how far towards the railroad tracks he owns.

Mr. Daniel indicated that he owns the arial rights stretching out towards the railroad tracks. He indicated that the long-term plan for the property is to build a larger addition.

Mr. Daniel indicated that the deck would be constructed of pressure treated lumber.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the issue of the door confuses him.

Mr. Daniel indicated that the restaurant will use the door to the left of that door. He indicated that eliminating the door will allow them to make the upstairs accessible from the interior.

Mr. Celentano asked about the landing.

Mr. Daniel indicated that the landing will be the same height as the infill brick, about four feet from the street.

Mr. Nelson asked if the driving force behind the removal of the door is the steepness of the stairway. He asked if the stairway would have to be rebuilt all the way up.

Mr. Daniel showed him on the drawing where the existing stairway would remain and where the new stairway would be built.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he is uncomfortable with the issue of the door. He indicated that it may be possible to remove the door without infilling the space with brick. He indicated that another material may maintain the look of the opening. He indicated that it would be better to have a materal other than shingle for the roof of the porch. He indicated there are existing canopies on the front of the building and, depending on how solid and weather tight they want to the porch to be, canopy may be an option. He indicated that a standing seam metal roof would be better than the shingles.

Mr. Daniel indicated that the porch is not the long-term plan, but that it will be there for at least 5 years.

Ms. Fenton asked if they are keeping the existing door on the porch side.

Mr. Daniel answered yes.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he has concerns about removing the door on the front in relation to the way that the building relates to the street. He indicated that he is reluctant to support the application based on the limited drawings. He indicated that he supports the idea of the decking on the side. He indicated that this is an interesting idea. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Celentano that he should reconsider the roof material and that standing seam metal is the best solution. He indicated that he is concerned about the treatment of the decking. He indicated that the view from the bridge is important and he does not think that he could support the idea of plain pressure treated wood. He indicated that the wood needs to be stained.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that, if done well, the side porch could be a nice improvement. He indicated that a canvas awning would be perfectly acceptable but it is not going to last 5 years. He indicated that 5 years could also easily turn into 10 years, in which case, standing seam would be a better choice. He indicated that he is very enthusiastic about building something. He indicated that he definitely recommends against asphalt shingles. He indicated that he is uncomfortable with the bricking of the door because it changes the way that the building interacts with the street. He indicated that the internal configuration is not in the purview of the board, but that it is relevant in terms of understanding the door. He indicated that he is not comfortable with the proposal in its completion. He indicated that the door could also be left as is. He indicated that there needs to be a bit more documentation and it needs to be depicted in a way that we can understand more completely.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she would like to see a rendering of the changes, rather than just the verbal description.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Daniel what the timeframe is for when they hope to open the restaurant. Mr. Daniel indicated that they would like to open the tearoom as soon as possible and that the door is an integral part of the stairwell construction.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they were willing to attend an interim meeting on June 1 at 5 PM. Four members presents indicated that they are willing to attend an interim meeting.

Mr. Nelson made a motion to defer the application until further information is provided.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the project shows great opportunity. He indicated that with a little more thought they could make something really great out of this space. He indicated that it is worth doing a little more study.

Mr. Nelson moved to defer the application until further information is received with the concerns that more detailing is needed on the deck and the railing, further study of the roof is needed, and alternatives to the stairway and infill need to be explored.

Mr. Schwartz added that two elevations of the deck, from the two visible sides, are necessary and the elevations should show the details of the rail and of the eave. He indicated that, in terms of the

door, it is appropriate to ask for something to better understand that space, such as a section drawing.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that detail is important and he needs to see how the lines come together.

Ms. Thompson asked about access to the outside when the door is removed.

Mr. Daniel indicated that the other existing doors would remain. He indicated that there would be four feet of infill and then the window opening.

Ms. Thompson asked if the upstairs would be accessed through the restaurant.

Mr. Daniel answered yes.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it would be helpful to show this information in plan view.

Mr. Oschrin seconded Mr. Nelson's motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Daniel if he knew the minimum amount of time it would take him to produce the additional drawings.

Mr. Daniel indicated that he could be ready as soon as it meets with the board's schedule.

110 10 1/2 Street

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he believes that the previous application was withdrawn before it was denied. He read a letter submitted during the previous review of this proposal.

Mr. Spencer indicated that he is not familiar with the documentation. He indicated that when issues come up, their door is always open. He indicated that his firm has a commitment to history. He indicated that, throughout the history of city building structures have been replaced. He indicated that in Charlottesville some decisions have been made that are perhaps not in the best interest of the community. He indicated that sometimes structures are removed and they are not replaced with something that has a commitment to the city. He indicated that Wyn Owens has a commitment to the city. He indicated that every property that Wyn has touched has had a positive result and has been a welcome addition to the city. He indicated that Wyn's vision goes beyond creating another surface parking lot. He indicated that at this time, he needs to incorporate additional parking for Team Tires. He indicated that he is in a position to incorporate additional parking behind the building. He indicated that the structure is designated as contributing but that designation does not necessarily mean that this is a structure of great importance.

A question was asked about Wyn's long term vision for the site.

Mr. Spencer indicated that Wyn is not in a position to offer a vision with architectural drawings but it is a similar vision to his project at the Coca-Cola building. He indicated that this is a preliminary review and he is interested in getting the board's response. He indicated that he is there to talk and listen and gain some level of understanding about how the board feels about this issue.

Mr. Oschrin asked what Mr. Owens has planned to replace the building.

Mr. Spencer answered that he would create a parking lot. He indicated that the business needs the additional parking. He indicated that this is an opportunity to create more parking without degrading the character of W. Main Street. He indicated that there is a disparity in the scale of the structure and of the remainder of W. Main Street. He indicated that removing the structure would allow Mr. Owens to maintain the viability of Team Tires.

Mr. Nelson indicated that at the last review it was estimated that the demolition would allow for the creation of 14 to 15 new parking spaces.

Ms. Fenton stated that she believes that at the last review it was expressed that it is against city policy to tear down buildings for parking.

Mr. Spencer indicated that there is an issue of what is a more appropriate use for the property. He indicated that in this case, removing an old element makes sense.

Mr. Nelson asked if Mr. Owens owns British Oxygen.

Mr. Spencer answered yes.

Mr. Nelson asked if the lower site towards 10th Street has been explored for parking. He indicated that this site is not visible from W. Main Street.

Mr. Spencer indicated that Mr. Owens needs a more immediate solution. He indicated that his attitude is that he will eventually recompose the entire area.

Ms. Fenton indicated that, at this point there is no concept of what would happen.

Mr. Spencer indicated that he is exploring whether or not he can do something to enable Mr. Owens to conduct his business affairs in a superior fashion.

Mr. Nelson said that the question is whether or not they can tear down an historic structure for temporary parking.

Mr. Eldon Wood indicated that he tends to favor holding tenaciously onto the fabric of the city. He indicated that, if this is to be a long range plan it seems to be lacking in imagination to tear down the one structure of aesthetic value on the site.

Mr. Spencer indicated that he doubts if anybody present would live in the building. He indicated that the question is how can we make the circumstances for the community work. He indicated that he has done work in Newport Rhode Island. He indicated that in Newport, the fabric is so thick that there is no sense of desperation to save structures that are not historic. He indicated that they have designed new elements that have enhanced the character of the living city.

A member of the public indicated that she is uncertain about the full plans. She indicated that if there is a possibility for a mixed-use development then maybe this house would be an interesting addition to the development. She indicated that it seems shortsighted to demolish it at this point.

Martha Gleason indicated that many beautiful homes on W. Main Street have been torn down and replaced with what was to be temporary parking. She indicated that the temporary parking remains.

Mr. Spencer was asked if there was anybody living in the house.

Mr. Spencer indicated that he was not aware of anybody living there.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the eloquence of the argument is such that Mr. Spencer has started to believe it himself. He indicated that he cannot believe that we are talking about this again and that it is a terrible idea. He indicated that, whether or not it is coming on the heels of the Marriott is beside the point, but he is surprised that it is being presented.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he does not understand the concept of creating a design control district and then permitting buildings to be moved outside of that district. He indicated that unless you are going to move buildings within the district it doesn't make sense to move them. He indicated that he doesn't understand tearing down a building to build a surface parking lot. He indicated that the house represents a style that is typical to the era of 1883-1893. He indicated that residential buildings often make for good commercial uses. He indicated that the board is working with the owners of the Mosque to develop a design that is appropriate to the neighborhood. He indicated that it does not make sense to tear down the fabric of the neighborhood to build a temporary parking lot. He indicated that there is no way he could support the proposal.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he agrees with a lot of what Mr. Spencer said about cities evolving and buildings being replaced with other buildings. He indicated that the value of the existing house cannot be evaluated without knowing what would go up in its place. He indicated that, from his perspective, the two issues are tied together. He indicated that it wouldn't necessarily be out of the question to demolish the house.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the board should be willing to consider each case on its merits. He indicated that as far as BAR review is concerned, a demolition and a new design proposal are really two separate issues. He indicated that in the case of two recent demolition requests, for Wachovia and the Woolworth's site, the applicants showed a commitment to an investment at the site.

Mr. Nelson indicated that in other cities there is dense development around smaller scale buildings. He indicated that keeping the building wouldn't necessarily preclude dense development.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she is concerned that the applicants are putting the horse before the cart. She said that she cannot support a demolition for parking.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the site has tremendous potential. He said that the topography has at least one floor level of change. He indicated that to look at the property, as a whole would be more exciting.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he disagrees with Mr. Oschrin and that he is pleased that the property owner has provided the board with this information. He indicated that it makes sense to get a read from the board at this point.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she appreciates Mr. Owens accomplishments and the need for parking. She indicated that they didn't designate buildings as contributing in an arbitrary way. She indicated that there are so few vernacular Charlottesville buildings left in this corridor. She indicated that the example of the Dabney house on W Main Street is a more dramatic example of replacing a residential building with parking. She indicated that this is a less dramatic example, but none the less, the reason that the board is assembled here and the reason they serve in this capacity is to protect these buildings.

409 3rd Street

Staff presented the report.

Ron Keeney, architect, said that the material is to be a hardy plank. He said that the roof is too flat for a shingle and they will probably use a sheet metal. He indicated that the windows will imitate the existing. He stated that they will try to get a trim that matches the existing. He stated that they will use wood, double hung windows.

Mr. Nelson asked if the windows would have true divided lights.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they hadn't planned to use true divided lights unless the board insists on it.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the Design Guidelines call for true divided lights. He indicated that it is a good plan, but it is important to use true divided lights. He indicated that the slope of the roof is a legitimate design solution.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he wonders if it would be possible to relocate the columns of the existing porch to the corner of the new addition.

Mr. Keeney indicated that he thinks it could be done. He indicated that the new addition is roughly the height of the porch.

Mr. Celentano indicated that over time porches are often infilled. He indicated that he would suggest articulating the siding to look like infill material. He indicated that some vertical articulation might suggest that they were porches that have been enclosed.

Mr. Keeney was asked how close the blank wall would be to the adjacent building.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they would leave a 3 or 4 foot access alley.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she also wonders if the columns could be reused. She indicated that she is having a problem with the blank wall.

Mr. Keeney indicated that the blank wall is located three feet from the adjacent blank wall.

Ms. Thompson asked about the roof and soffits.

Mr. Keeney indicated that they will be finished to match the previous porch. Mr. Keeney indicated that the existing brick wall obscures much of the project.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she has no problem with the blank wall. She indicated that a new window might help the interior by providing some additional natural light.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application with the condition that the windows be wood with true divided lights and the roof be metal.

Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

110 10 1/2 Street

Staff presented the report.

Seth Warner, architect, indicated that the building is commercial in scale. He indicated that they have chosen square windows. He indicated that they plan a garden fronting 10th Street at this time. He indicated that they don't want to give up the right to create parking there in the future. He indicated that as the interior program is developed they may need to make minor adjustments.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it is normal to make minor adjustments throughout the course of the project. She indicated that she is happy to see the changes and she hopes that they are happy with the changes.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is very excited by the changes. He indicated that the building looks like it has a sense of purpose and relates to the street. He indicated that he likes the contrast of the proposed building with the existing structure. He indicated that the building has a more contemporary nature but is in keeping with the neighborhood.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the proposal is a big improvement. She indicated that the 10th Street entrance has a classic look to it. She asked if there were paint samples.

Mr. Warner indicated that design is of stucco and brick.

Mr. Nelson asked about the railing material.

Mr. Warner indicated that it is to be a brick combo.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is pleased with the way that this has developed. He indicated that the building presents itself in a direct way. He indicated that the area of opportunity is in the detailing. He indicated that he is pleased with the strategy. He indicated that this is a good investment and that the greater investment in quality detailing will make a big difference.

Mr. Celentano indicated that this is an interesting and difficult property with 10th Street being so industrial.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there would be glazing in the hyphen. He indicated that glazing would allow lights in at the joint. He indicated that they may want to look at it and think about the possibilities. He indicated that there is an opportunity to get a subtle introduction to the language.

Ms. Fenton indicated that once they obtain approval they are welcome to come back to the board with changes.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is impressed with the applicant for listening carefully to the comments of the board at the last meeting and for responding so well and for hiring a skilled architect.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board and the applicants share the common goal of creating a great building.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approval the application with the condition that the detail resolution on the 10th Street walls and rails, entrance, cornice, materials, and colors be submitted for final review.

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

212 Riverside Avenue

Staff presented the report.

The applicant, Mrs. Catlin, indicated that Jim Grigg designed the first addition as well as this addition. She indicated that the new addition has been differentiated from the original addition by a different roofline. She indicated that she is pleased and excited by the design.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he has admired the house for a number of years. He indicated that when he first looked at the plans the lack of a window on the addition caught his eye. He indicated that the additions are successfully asymmetrical. He indicated that the lack of a window adds to what they have already done.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he thinks it looks great and the design is successful. He indicated that the Planning Commission has worked on the issue of middle income housing and they have encouraged this type of investment in existing properties. He indicated that it is great to see this type of project being done in Woolen Mills.

Mr. Nelson moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

800 Block W Main Street: Union Station

Staff presented the report.

Doug Gilpin, architect, indicated that a restaurant will eventually go into the main Union Station building. He indicated that in the near future, several exhibits are planned for the space. He indicated that they have to do something with the roof.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that he looked at the condition of the slate. He indicated that repair of the slate was possible. He indicated that they were faced with the decision of asphalt or slate for the roof. He indicated that they chose the same roof that was used on the baggage building.

Mr. Nelson asked if they were replacing the entire roof.

Mr. Gilpin answered yes.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she understood that it was not the entire roof, but just a portion of it.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that the building has a gable roof and that there is also a section of flat roof.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she understands that most of the roof will be obscured from view when Phase II is built.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that the roof will be visible from the West Main Street Bridge and from 7th Street.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the developers were interested in tax credits.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that tax credits would not be used for the project.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that at the last meeting the board agreed to place an item on the agenda to talk about the way that the guidelines were written in terms of including both slate and asphalt shingles. He indicated that this roof is very prominent. Mr. Schwartz indicated that he understands that asphalt was required for 1025 Wertland Street in order to obtain tax credits.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that in the Wertland case the issue was that if a number of historic properties experience that change, the district could be revoked.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he understands that cost issues are involved.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that the GAF Slateline would cost \$8000, a prefabricated metal roof would cost \$17,000, and a slate roof would cost \$33,000.

Mr. Celentano indicated that there is not really a one to one comparison.

Ms. Thompson asked if the applicants would be interested in using the revolving loan fund for the project.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the property as a whole is a site of tremendous public and private investment. He indicated that asphalt is not everyone's first choice for the roof.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that within the existing guidelines there is room for interpretation.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it would be helpful to understand the project in its entirety.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that he is only involved in the Amtrak portion of the project.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that this is a major site for the community and thankfully, a wonderful developer is steering the process.

Ms. Thompson indicated that it is possible to defer the application to look at other solutions.

Mr. Gilpin indicated that the developers are not going after the tax credits. He indicated that they would like the board to go ahead and make a decision, rather than defer the application. He indicated that they are requesting that a decision be made tonight.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is interested in deferring the decision until the June 1st meeting.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he didn't really feel sure what the solution is. He indicated that putting in an asphalt roof at this location is a huge mistake.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her interpretation of the guidelines makes it difficult to require slate.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with Mr. Celentano's sentiment that asphalt is a mistake. He indicated that the roof is very visible. He indicated that the fact that the guidelines allow asphalt weakens our case.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that if we change the guidelines we will not be in this predicament in the future. He indicated that this is one of the community's most sensitive and creative developers. He indicated that the board has granted approvals that are precedent for this. He indicated that if the board approves the roof and it goes forward, the community will scream. He indicated that one way to look at it is that it is not an irreparable application. He indicated that it is not a change that precludes slate in the future. He indicated that it is a \$25,000 investment, not counting the life cycle costs. He indicated that the total investments in the property are going to be huge.

Mr. Celentano indicated that one of the most important characteristics of historic buildings are their roofs. He indicated that in Charlottesville it is important that this building have the right kind of a roof.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the question for the board is how to interpret the current guidelines.

Mr. Gilpin asked if the adjacency of the Amtrak building with a different roof material is an issue for the board.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the baggage roof is noticeably lower and shielded by the big building. He indicated that he does not think it is as important to unify those two roofs.

Ms. Thompson indicated that when the original baggage building roof came up people and the board felt strongly that this roof was a separate issue.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her understanding was that Mr. Silverman felt that it was rational based on what the roofer's said to him.

Ms. Thompson indicated that the Design Guidelines refer to cases of extreme financial hardship. She asked if this was a case of extreme financial hardship.

Mr. Celentano indicated that in order to determine if this is a case of extreme financial hardship costs estimates have to be considered. He indicated that it has to be proven to him that this is a case of extreme financial hardship.

Mr. Nelson indicated that, in the case of the 1st Street house, the board was heading towards requiring standing seam metal or slate and that the applicant proved a hardship. He indicated that the applicant used a three-dimensional shingle.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the board is faced with three options: approve, deny, or defer. He indicated that there are a couple of issues that are topics of collaborative discussion. He indicated that the issues of extreme financial hardship is an outstanding issue. He indicated that there is also a question of other public investment possibilities that might help to make this a really great investment. He indicated that he had always assumed that the proper roof would be put back on this structure.

Mr. Nelson moved to defer the application until the mid month meeting on June 1st.

Mr. Schwartz added the following friendly amendment to the motion: In the spirit of cooperation, the board would like to open up the discussion, as quickly as possible, to what opportunities exist to come up with a solution for the roof.

Ms. Fenton asked the board if they would like to approve slate now as an option for the developers. Ms. Vest indicated that slate is an existing material and that replacing it with new slate wouldn't not require BAR approval.

Ms. Thompson indicated that between now and the next meeting, investigation can be done as to weather or not there is a way to come up with additional funds.

Mr. Celentano indicated that by voting to defer, the board is sending a message that they may still be open to an asphalt roof.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the implication of Mr. Celentano's comment is that if they endorse a deferral they will show a potential for acceptance of asphalt.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were enough votes to carry a motion for approval. The answer was no.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her interpretation of the guidelines makes her feel compelled to accept. She indicated that she is willing to go with a deferral until they can get more information.

Mr. Nelson indicated that if they defer the issue, he would like to have the developer present at the next meeting to address the question of whether or not there is a financial hardship.

Ms. Fenton indicated that in her conversations with Mr. Silverman, he felt that there was a rational for using the asphalt.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the city played a role in obtaining the ISTE A grant. He indicated that it does not seem inappropriate for the city to take an interest in the roof and in the issue of financial hardship.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he believes that the City Council would be interested in seeing an appropriate solution.

Mr. Schwartz moved to defer the application to provide an opportunity to shed some light on the issue of extreme financial hardship. He indicated that the developer is encouraged to share with the BAR any and all options for a slate roof.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the chair might want to consult with the City Council on this issue.

Mr. Nelson seconded Mr. Schwartz' motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Schwartz said that he hopes the deferral will be presented in the positive way that it was offered.

Ms. Thompson asked the group if they could do some research and try to come up with some other financial alternatives.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that informally there is a roll to play in talking to people from the city. He indicated that it is an important issue and they can raise the question of whether there is something the city can do. Mr. Schwartz indicated that part of what is nerve racking is that Mr. Silverman will be anxious about the timing of the roof, with the Bailey opening occurring in September.

Other Business

Mr. Gilpin indicated that, to follow up with the board, 1025 Wertland Street is receiving tax credits and the owner is putting in wood windows and a slate roof.

Mr. Schwartz announced that Mr. Gilpin has just been made a fellow of the American Institute of Architects

Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation

Ms. Thompson indicated that the as far as looking at the visual prominence of the roof, the Union Station roof is about as prominent as you get.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it is not legitimate to differentiate between residential and commercial roofs but that it may be more appropriate to address the issue of visual prominence.

Ms. Thompson indicated that there were two contrasting scenarios and it was pretty clear that the other roofs had little visual prominence.

Ms. Fenton indicated that they need to review the current application within the guidelines that are presented. She indicated that the guidelines don't quite fit the needs of the city. She indicated that the board can't come up with a clear consensus on how to interpret the existing guidelines. She indicated that it wasn't until the group had to apply the guidelines that they became aware of the problems that existed. She indicated that they want to revise the guidelines so that the issue will be clearer in the future.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her understanding was that Mr. Silverman is looking at the work as repair.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it is important to get the language that they used in addressing the issue into the minutes of the April meeting.

Ms. Thompson indicated that they are facing the very beginning of an onslaught on W Main Street. She indicated that people will challenge the guidelines and the board needs to be prepared to stand their ground.

At 8:00 P.M. Mr. Schwartz moved to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.