

City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review

May 16, 2000

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)

Ken Schwartz

Jesse Hook

W.G. Clark

Preston Coiner

Joe Atkins

Lynne Ely

Linda Winner

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

Jim Tolbert

Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.

She asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the April 25, 2000 minutes. Seeing none, she called for a motion. Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve, Ms. Ely seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton reviewed the agenda for the meeting and

went over the rules of procedure for the benefit of any newcomers. She then asked if there were any items to be raised by the public not on the formal agenda.

Seeing none, she moved on to item C on the agenda, Park Street Traffic Calming. Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that this item is not part of the regular BAR approval process, but is being brought before the Board for review in an advisory capacity. She stated that at an earlier meeting, the Board had expressed concern related to landscape design, and since that time, Staff has gone into design plans in greater depth. She indicated that several experts were present to make a more detailed presentation, and that design guidelines had

been included in the packet for reference by the Board.

Dan Painter addressed the Board concerning the results of the Landscaping Committee meetings. He indicated the committee was made up of representatives of the Park Street neighborhood, along with himself, Heidi Misslbeck, Shea Ferrari, representatives of the Parks Department and other interested people. He referred the Board members to the handouts, indicating that the design shown there received no negative comments from the last neighborhood group meeting and was the design they would like to move forward with, subject to input from the BAR.

Ms. Heidi Misslbeck, a Landscape Architect with the City, indicated that one of the main considerations for traffic calming is having a heavy element at the start of every bulb-out, to make it easier for the cars to see it. Referring to the preliminary drawings in the packet, she went over specific landscaping plans, showing where the center median will move over. She stated that the major problems were salt tolerance, sight lines, trying to meet with

the community's desire for something of a pedestrian scale to enhance the Park Street experience, and the Park Department's desire for low-maintenance landscaping. She then went over the criteria she used in choosing the plants along the roadway.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for the applicants from either the Board or members of the public.

Ms. Ely asked if these changes would affect any on-street parking on Park Street. Mr. Painter replied that most of the changes would be made in between existing on-street parking, with a loss of only five parking spaces from the bypass area all the way down to High Street.

Ms. Ely asked if there had been any attempt to coordinate with the landscape architects who are working on the Court Square enhancement project. Ms. Misslbeck replied that she had spoken with a representative of the enhancement project about landscaping plans, with most of the discussion centering around lights. However, as lights have not been proposed along Park Street, and the landscaping

changes that have been proposed are fairly far from Court Square, she feels that the projects are dissimilar.

As there were no further questions raised, Ms. Fenton closed that portion of the meeting and called for comments from the general public. Seeing none, she then called for comments from Board members.

Mr. Clark apologized for the strong opinions voiced at the last meeting the applicant attended, but reiterated his concern about the lack of stop signs or stop lights along Park Street. He suggested that periodic stop signs would allow people to access the street more easily from driveways or side streets, and asked why traffic planners were unwilling to impede traffic along Park Street in a normal fashion.

Mr. Painter stated that those were valid points, and indicated that there is a high likelihood that at some point within the next few years, a signal will be added at the Melbourne intersection. He commented that placing a signal at the bypass has also been considered, but indicated that stopping cars on the ramps for more than a few seconds would tend to back

traffic up onto the bypass, and a solution to that problem has not yet been found. He added that transportation engineer guidelines do not call for the placement of stop signs to create gaps in traffic, but only to regulate conflicts in traffic flow. Traffic calming techniques are employed to slow traffic in areas where there is not enough volume coming from side streets to warrant the placement of stop signs.

Mr. Clark stated that these comments are an interesting contrast to public comments that it is impossible to get onto Park Street from a side street or driveway.

Ms. Misslbeck commented that the plan that is before the Board is one that has been voted on and approved by the Park Street neighborhood and the community.

Mr. Clark asked Karen, a member of the public, to confirm whether or not the community had been unsuccessfully requesting stop signs over the past ten years. She stated that the public request for stop signs was the impetus behind coming up with the present design solution, which has gone through an

extensive validating process.

Ms. Fenton asked if the concern that is being voiced is that the solution being offered is not the best option. Mr. Painter responded that it is a matter of a difference in opinion.

Ms. Fenton asked the Board members if there were any comments on elements of the proposed design.

Mr. Coiner commented that he has observed that American Boxwoods often end up getting too big and having to be cut down, and he asked about their growth rate. Ms. Misslbeck replied that they are slow growers, but a problem that may arise is salt tolerance.

Ms. Ely commented that she often walks along Park Street, and while she thinks these changes may contribute to the pedestrian experience along the road, she is concerned that they may obscure the view of the houses from the street. Ms. Misslbeck replied that she doesn't think that that will be a problem.

Ms. Vest asked about the length of the bulb-outs. Mr.

Painter replied that they varied from 20 up to 80 feet, and Ms. Misslbeck corrected him, pointing out some that were 10 feet long.

Mr. Toscano asked how much staff it is going to require to keep these new plantings watered over the next three years they will require to become established. Mr. Painter replied that the Parks people have stated that they are concerned with increasing landscaping areas that they have to maintain for that very reason. He added that city management agrees that these additions will be city amenities and worth the necessary expenditure for staffing.

Mr. Toscano stated he wanted to confirm that these plantings would be on a maintenance schedule, particularly for watering, and Mr. Painter indicated that they would be. Mr. Toscano added that there have been instances where dogwoods and other plants have been planted in neighborhood right-of-ways, and maintenance has been left to the property owners, not always with good results.

Ms. Misslbeck stated that the Parks manager had

wanted the new plantings irrigated, but because of occasional drought conditions, the policy has been that anything municipal should not be irrigated; instead, each island will have a hook-up for water trucks.

Ms. Fenton commented she has trouble envisioning the end result, and would probably side with W.G. in preferring to see crosswalks and signs for pedestrians, but she hopes it turns out well.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-3-16

858 West Main Street/Peyton Pontiac

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that this project had come before the Board before, and at that meeting, several concerns were raised, namely how the façade fit into context of the neighborhood and the street; the loss of the industrial quality of the existing building within the context of the neighborhood; the use of the arch windows and the danger of fake historicism; and questions about the historical fabric of the building and what remained. She reiterated that the building is designated as non-contributing, and with that

designation, the Board is charged to make sure that anything new will contribute to the district, but is not charged with the preservation of the building.

She indicated that Staff feels that the applicant has responded to the specific concerns of the Board and therefore supports the project. Staff has requested further information on the rooftop screening, and would like to see a brick sample, preferably a more traditional, smaller brick.

Ms. Fenton turned the floor over to the applicant and asked him to identify himself for the record.

Mr. Ray Gaines, the architect for the project, introduced himself and Woody Parrish, an employee in his office, and stated that Woody would make the bulk of the presentation. He indicated that a few material samples were available for the Board to review.

Mr. Parrish handed out copies of drawings of the prior condition of the building to members of the Board. He indicated he would like to thank the Board members who took the time to provide them with valuable input, and added that he would like to make

it clear that nobody who participated in the process should be held responsible for the use that was made of their advice. He commented that he wanted to look first at the site, stating that they had investigated the possibility of purchasing one or more of the adjacent parcels or doing structured parking in the rear, but decided ultimately to demolish the one-storeyed structure in the back to provide surface parking for the building, and place the remainder of the parking inside on the first floor, in the east bay. He stated that they did not feel this would be a viable project without some outside parking. He indicated that the current plan is to put offices on what remains of the ground floor and on the second floor, and then to add a third floor to the building for four apartments. Concerning the automotive and industrial history of the property, he indicated that they had carefully considered leaving the concrete frame exposed, but as the grittiness of the industrial look was not consistent with their client's goals for the building, they opted to clad the frame in brick and metal panels, keeping in mind the merits of a spare, rectilinear design. He reviewed plans for the building on all four sides, then addressed the Board concerning the materials

they are proposing to use. He indicated that in the current plan, they are considering using the lead-coated copper panels that were used on the third floor of the Wachovia bank addition. He did not have a sample, but showed Board members an advertisement with a photo of the material. He stated that the canopy on the corner entrance of the building will be made of aluminum shapes and glass. Concerning the brick sample, he indicated it had been selected only to show color, and that they would be perfectly happy to follow the Board's suggestion to use standard-size brick. He stated that mechanical engineering work had not yet been done for rooftop mechanicals, but that the plan is for condenser units to be placed near the center line of the roof and concealed with screening.

Ms. Fenton indicated that that feature would only need to come back before the Board if the units are visible from the road.

Mr. Parrish indicated that the proposed glazing system is not exactly represented by the sample he brought with him. He stated that they intend to use clad, direct-set windows similar to those used on

Temple Beth-Israel and those proposed for the Downtown Rec Center by Bruce Wardell. He indicated that all of the windows will use fixed glazing, but that on the third floor in the outer bays, they intend to use operating casements.

Mr. Gaines questioned Mr. Parrish about the operating casements, and Mr. Parrish indicated there will be sash in those.

Mr. Parrish pointed out on the drawing that three of the apartments will have balconies.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for the applicant from either the Board or the general public.

Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Parrish about the window detailing in the packet, and he indicated that that is a correct representation. He stated that they will employ 7/8ths narrow bars, with a center divider and fairly thick glass.

Ms. Winner asked how many apartments would be on the third floor, and Mr. Parrish responded that there

would be four.

Mr. Atkins asked if only the left-most bay on the Main Street façade is for parking. Mr. Parrish replied that two bays are for parking, the left one and the one next to it, with the stair coming down and discharging in the second bay. They discussed the arrangement, and Mr. Parrish made it clear that the parking would not be visible.

Ms. Fenton closed that portion of the meeting and called for comments from the general public. Seeing none, she closed that and called for comments from Board members.

Mr. Toscano commented that he likes the presentation, and Mr. Preston echoed his opinion.

Ms. Ely asked if the conceptual rendering portrays the original condition of the building. Mr. Parrish replied that that particular drawing indicates plans that were never actualized, but that the other drawings show the building in its original condition.

Ms. Ely commented that the current proposal addresses her concern about referencing the original character

of the building, but that she is not fond of Dryvit.

Ms. Fenton indicated that previous Boards have been against Dryvit, before she or Tarpley became involved in the BAR. She stated that on several projects, Dryvit was not allowed, or at least there was a lot of contention about its use.

Mr. Parrish asked why Dryvit was not approved. Ms. Fenton replied that it is not a durable enough material. Ms. Ely commented her concern is more aesthetic, and that she feels Dryvit is an unattractive material.

Mr. Atkins asked if the Dryvit would be used in the full outsulation method, where the insulation is glued onto the outside. Mr. Parrish replied that it would.

Mr. Atkins commented that he has concerns about Dryvit at the base level of the building, as the material is particularly weak in terms of impact resistance. Ms. Fenton echoed that concern, commenting that once there is a problem with it, there is no way to ensure that it will be repaired.

Mr. Parrish commented that replaceability had been a concern with other more expensive materials they had considered earlier.

Mr. Atkins commented that he appreciates the axonometric drawing and feels the result is much improved from the last proposal. He added that he agrees with Tarpley's earlier comment and would enthusiastically prefer standard-size brick. He stated he would prefer cast stone or an architectural recast concrete material, in panel form, in place of the Dryvit or the Centuria metal panel. Likewise, he is willing to accept the level of detail as it is, but would have preferred concrete detailing at the top of the column, to finish the first two levels and allow the third level to be further differentiated. He added that as a possibility of recalling the building's older life as a car dealership, Mr. Parrish might consider making some of the parking visible from the street.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he feels this plan is a tremendous improvement. He stated that he is enthusiastic about the windows that he sees at the

Temple Beth-Israel, but is concerned about the snap-in muntins. Mr. Gaines commented that at the temple, the muntins are permanently adhered. Mr. Schwartz commented that the fine grain of the detail takes on a great deal of significance in this case, because of the expansive windows, and that he views the proposed strategy as very strong. He stated that he is not comfortable with the window sample that is before the Board, but completely supports the strategy. He added that the operable casements on the uppermost level, as a strategy for the apartment level, makes perfect sense, but he is concerned about there being two units per side piece, as that detail might add unnecessary heaviness at the top. He commented that a single casement might look cleaner, with the operable frame around it, but no intermediate frame jamming it up in the middle. Concerning Joe's suggestion to continue the rhythm of the windows in the parking bay, he commented that that would produce a more consistent elevation and would provide a nice touch, to be able to look in and see the car use. He stated he was completely opposed to the use of stucco, as it is not an historical material for commercial structures by and large. He commented that he likes the way the corner entry has

been developed.

Ms. Winner commented she wanted to add her gratitude for the effort that has been put in to respond to the Board's concerns. She stated she shares some of the concerns about the windows, but feels that the fenestration pattern is a big improvement upon the earlier arches that had been proposed.

Ms. Fenton commented that she agrees with most everything that has been said. She asked the applicant if he is aware that the brick is going onto city streets. Ms. Vest replied that there is a four-and-a-half inch encroachment, but that Staff is aware of it and nobody has any problems with it. It is an administrative concern that the City Manager can address.

Mr. Clark complimented the applicant on the new design. He then asked if the 40-foot height requirement is hurting him in his plans, adding that the building looks like it could use another foot on top. Mr. Parrish replied that the requirement is constraining him. Mr. Clark commented that he would support an appeal to the height limitation to allow

for the extra foot.

Ms. Fenton added that in previous cases, the Board has offered to give support in writing to help applicants appeal the height requirement.

Mr. Clark commented that the apartments would profit from having extra ceiling height. He then added that an outstanding feature of the original building is that the frame was monolithic, and asked if the applicant has considered using brick cladding on the spandrels. Mr. Parrish replied that they had at an early stage, but had moved away from it. Mr. Clark commented that the movement away appears to have been hampered by cost concerns and availability of materials. Instead of opting for Dryvit, he suggested that the applicant consider a simple, single-material building, and asked that he consider the use of brick spandrels.

Mr. Clark asked the applicant why he opted to remove the elevator penthouse. Mr. Parrish pointed out where the penthouse extended beyond a particular plane, and stated that after considering pulling off the cladding and painting it white or pale blue, they

decided it would be less troublesome to remove the whole structure than to deal with a problematic portion of the penthouse. Mr. Clark commented that the view from the building is going to be outstanding, and so it would be nice to provide a rooftop terrace for the tenants. He then added that the sample of green that was brought before the Board looks fabulous inside, but would be much brighter in full sunlight, and so he recommended dampening the color down with some more black.

Mr. Toscano commented that in his experience, the lack of operable windows in offices usually comes back to haunt you. If only from a marketing point of view, he encouraged the applicant to consider incorporating windows that can be opened to let in fresh air from time to time.

Mr. Parrish asked if the Board had any reaction to the lead-coated copper panels that have been proposed for use on the spandrels. Mr. Clark replied that he did not think the lead-coated copper was successful on the examples provided, and reiterated his preference for a monolithic material.

Ms. Fenton asked if going back to the brick would cause any huge concern. He replied he did not think it would.

Ms. Fenton called for one of the architects to make a motion. Mr. Clark replied that his motion would be a congratulatory one, but as there are further details he is interested in seeing, he would prefer if someone else made the final motion.

Mr. Schwartz suggested moving for approval, subject to some conditions -- namely, traditionally sized bricks; further study of the fenestration system to ensure match with the Temple Beth-Israel; further study of the strategy of the spandrels and other members that are between the frame elements; consideration of installing windows where the cars are going to park; and a consistent sill-line along Main Street. He added that he would like to indicate formally in the motion that the Board is willing to support in writing any variance in height beyond the zoning limit that the applicant feels is architecturally necessary.

Mr. Clark asked if Ken is suggesting that if the

applicants follow all of the recommendations just mentioned, they will be free to go forward. Mr. Schwartz indicated he is trying to frame a motion that makes it clear that the Board approves of the scheme, but feels that another visit back in a month will be necessary to answer the questions raised at this meeting.

Mr. Parrish commented that their time frame has changed, as they have no tenants ready to sign a lease at this point. He stated that construction may be further down the road than anticipated, so they may not be able to return next month, but would do so when they were ready.

Ms. Fenton called for a second on the motion. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Ms. Vest asked if the motion contained an option for garage level windows, or a condition that they be installed, and several Board members responded that it is a condition.

Mr. Clark commented that installing windows on the

garage level is a considerable safety measure, as anyone in the garage could be seen from the street.

Ms. Fenton asked the Board if she should write a letter with Tarpley to request that the applicant be allowed to make the building taller. Mr. Gaines commented that he felt that such a letter would be very helpful.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR-00-5-22

100 Block W Water Street/City Market Site

Ms. Fenton commented that the Board has previously approved painted murals, but has not approved murals of tile.

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She stated that this is the second Bayly Art Museum exhibition project to come to an historic district. The proposal is to put a tile mural on the concrete wall of the parking lot near the City Market off of Water and Second Street. She indicated that the proposal was brought before the City Manager, who granted temporary approval, formally for three to six months, but informally until the wall comes down for new

construction, perhaps in 12 months. She indicated that there is one design guideline that relates to public art, namely that it have a place-making role in the historic district. She stated that the artist has provided some color illustrations and samples of the tile that will be used.

Ms. Fenton asked if project was considered temporary because the wall was going to come down or because the tile was going to be removed. Ms. Beryl Solla, the applicant, responded that it is because the wall is coming down; she would happily put up the tile but not remove it.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the Board members. Seeing none, she closed that portion and opened the floor to public comments. As no comments were raised, she called for comments from Board members.

Mr. Toscano asked what the experience has been with this type of tile staying in place. He stated that in his experience, thin-set tile in the bathroom setting does not stay in place very well. Ms. Solla replied that she uses a thin-set mortar and sands it,

and that the tile should remain in place until you take a sledge hammer to it.

Ms. Winner asked the applicant for information on the project that is referenced in Richmond. She replied that it is on 177 Belt Boulevard, the second precinct police station that was just completed the past winter, and it is still standing.

Ms. Ely commented that the whole project could be enhanced if the wall were given a coat of paint. Ms. Solla indicated that on the piece downtown, she is going to be using a grey grout which will relate to the wall, and added that even if the wall is painted, it is going to get dirty again.

Mr. Coiner commented that the guidelines did not give him much help with this. He stated that he does not like the fact that the project is on an angle, and added that something needs to be done to the wall. Because he does not have guidance from the guidelines, he indicated he will probably vote against the application.

Ms. Ely asked Tarpley what would happen if the Board

approves the project on a temporary basis, and then the wall is not torn down by the City. Ms. Vest replied that if the Board grants only temporary approval, the artist may not be interested in pursuing it, but that is an option for Board members.

Ms. Winner asked if this project should be considered under signage rules. Ms. Vest replied that it qualifies as public art, as it is not advertising anything.

Mr. Coiner asked if the tile could be applied to something that was then attached to the wall. Ms. Solla replied that it could, but added that a big issue in public art is who owns it. She offered that a piece is designed for a specific place and it becomes part of the character of the place, regardless of the change of ownership. She stated that she would not be willing to do this project if she were going to be required to tear it down, because it entails a lot of work and is being done for free.

Mr. Coiner commented that he is confused about the size, since the application says one thing and the

Staff report says another. Ms. Solla replied that it is three feet tall and six feet wide.

Mr. Clark commented that he is going to vote against the project. He stated that this is the public domain, and he does not feel they have a right to appropriate parts of it to specific expressions. A graffiti artist would be thrown in jail for painting on the same wall.

Ms. Solla commented that as a public artist, she thinks about these things and she reads about them, and she feels that art can help define a sense of place, just as architecture and landscape can. She stated that she believes public art defines a city like Paris or Charlottesville, and pointed to the uniqueness of Monument Avenue in Richmond. She commented that she does not consider her work to be comparable to graffiti, and although she respects Mr. Clark's opinion, she does not agree with him.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he agreed with Mr. Coiner that the design guidelines are a little confusing in this area, but he also feels that it is possible to comment on public art as art. He stated that his

vote against the project is based on the art itself and what he feels is the inappropriate use of the profile of Jefferson. He would like the piece a lot more if Jefferson weren't there, or if the work were more abstract.

Ms. Ely commented that she had a similar initial reaction to the design. She stated she is personally tired of Thomas Jefferson, and that the place chosen to create the work has little historic connection with him.

Mr. Toscano commented that he likes the project and feels it will give life to the bland, ugly wall there. He added that the project will only be up for a year, and referenced the murals that were done on West Main Street.

Ms. Winner commented that she is a very strong proponent of public art and wishes that Charlottesville had more. She indicated that she too is weary of the Jefferson visage, but feels that putting the artwork up would be an improvement on the wall. She added that the Board members need to educate themselves further about public art.

Mr. Atkins commented that he felt the place-making aspects of the piece may not be the most important considerations.

Ms. Vest commented that the applicant developed the design independently of the guidelines. Ms. Winner added that the artist responded to what had been requested by Bayly Art Museum, and Ms. Vest concurred.

Mr. Atkins commented that he would vote to approve the piece on a temporary basis because he feels its allusions to the City Market are stronger than to Jefferson, and because he would like to support Bayly Art Museum's efforts in general.

Ms. Fenton commented that she is going to support the project because she likes the idea of public art and she does not see anything in the application that would make her feel it is inappropriate.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he agrees with Ms. Winner that the Board needs to discuss public art issues further.

Ms. Fenton suggested discussing this at the next Worksession, then called for someone to make a motion. Mr. Clark made a motion to deny the application, which Mr. Schwartz seconded. A vote was taken, and three were in favor of denial. Ms. Ely made a motion to approve the application with the understanding that the project would be up no longer than one year. Mr. Toscano seconded.

Ms. Vest commented that there are two issues: First, the Board of Architectural Review's Certificate of Appropriateness, which they are being asked to approve; and second, the City Manager has to approve, separate from the historic district status, anything that happens on City property. She added that the City Manager has offered, in writing, three to six months approval for the project.

Ms. Solla indicated it was her understanding that the City Manager was saying to her that the project was not going to be up forever, and that she should not expect it to be up for more than three to six months.

Ms. Vest added that the City Manager has commented

verbally that realistically, the wall won't be disturbed for the next 12 months. General discussion about amending the motion for a specific time period followed.

Mr. Schwartz asked the Board members if they were aware that there is a possibility the wall might remain up for two to five years, and reiterated his discomfort with Jefferson's profile being part of the design. Discussion followed concerning whether or not that portion of the piece could be left out, considering the nature of the exhibition.

Ms. Ely rescinded her original motion for approval and requested that someone else make a motion. Mr. Toscano made a motion to approve the mural as presented, without the Jefferson visage; Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

Mr. Coiner asked if the City can pull the piece down after six months, if the artist is unwilling to do so herself. Ms. Solla commented that the jack-hammered wall would look worse than it currently does.

Ms. Fenton clarified that the motion is to approve

the mural without the Jefferson visage for the life of the wall. A vote was taken, and the motion carried, with five voting in favor, and three against.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-5-22

800 Block West Main Street

Ms. Fenton indicated that the original application had come before the Board a year earlier, but it had been denied. The applicant has now returned with changes to the proposal.

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that there had been issues with some of the materials that were submitted the previous year. In particular, there were concerns related to the proposed canopy that was to house the outdoor dining. She indicated that in response to those concerns, the applicant had eliminated the canopy altogether, which Staff considers a positive step. She stated that overall, Staff is supportive of the proposal, but is still waiting to see samples of materials and colors.

Mr. Joe Phillips, with Osteen Phillips Architects in

Charlottesville, Virginia, addressed the Board concerning the application. He indicated that one of their primary concerns was not to intrude upon the main body of the Union Station by cutting out corners or in any other way as they developed the dining areas on both floors. He reviewed the history of their development plans over the past two years. He indicated that at an earlier BAR meeting, a suggestion had been made to distinguish the addition from the original building by developing a different vocabulary of materials, but after consideration, they have opted to continue the language of the original building. He cited the example of the Amtrak station addition to support this decision, and added that the volume of building that they are doing is too minimal to merit a new vocabulary. He indicated that they are proposing a brick addition, with the enlarged section on the first floor being brought up to two floors and extended to the south, behind the elevation. He added that they are keeping a canopy to cover the entrance onto the rooftop dining area over to the exit stair. The stair itself will be steel and unenclosed, in keeping with the steel construction of the railings around the second floor parapet. He stated that the canopy will be

similar in materials to the canopies that are over the existing train station. He indicated that the vocabulary of the brick arches will be carried over to the addition in the form of inset panels, rather than actual openings, and the ornamental courses will be continued around the building, as was done at the Amtrak station. He stated that the brick of the new addition will be painted to match the color that the brick is being painted now, which is shown on samples he distributed to the Board. He indicated the railing is going to be cleaned and painted gloss black, along with the stairs, and added that the roof of the addition will be a fully-adhered EPDM roof. A conductor head and down spout will be on both the south side and the north side, which is not shown on the elevation contained in the application.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Clark asked if the code requires that the exit stairs be covered. Mr. Phillips indicated that the Fire Marshal is requiring that they put the canopy over it. The presence of the canopy will allow them to build the stair as an exterior stair. He

indicated that the applicant will be required to keep the stair clear in case of snow, but as it is purely an exit stair and will not be used typically for ingress and egress, local code officials have permitted the architects to keep it unenclosed.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he noted that they had eliminated the exterior cooler that used to be to the west, which he regards as a huge improvement. Mr. Phillips indicated that they have pulled back everything they have been able to over the course of the last year.

Mr. Atkins asked if head height on the addition is dictating that the parapet coping go all the way up to the top. Mr. Phillips indicated that they are coming off of a five brick point at the corner of the building, to avoid having to do any demolition along that fascia and cornicework. He stated that, in terms of the elevation, this will require one of the canopies to be flat. Mr. Atkins asked if the roof framing could come down any further, and Mr. Phillips replied that it probably could not.

Mr. Clark commented that he was having difficulty

reading the drawings in terms of cardinal directions and asked several questions of Mr. Phillips to orient himself. Mr. Clark then asked what is in the southern part of the addition. Mr. Phillips replied that it contains coolers above and below, and that the applicant has very stringent requirements in terms of the storage needs of the restaurant.

Mr. Atkins asked what the depth of the inset panels would be. Mr. Phillips replied that it would be two or three inches.

Ms. Winner asked if umbrellas were going to be placed over tables on the rooftop dining area, and if that was something for the Board to be concerned about.

Ms. Fenton replied that only tables on city streets fall within the purview of the BAR.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the general public. Seeing none, she closed that portion and called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Clark commented that the upper part of the addition on the north side of the building has some awkwardness with the façade, and suggested this might

be caused by an insistence on maintaining the symmetrical disposition of the opening that goes out onto the dining deck. He asked if it would be possible to pull the toilets back toward the exit shaft and make the entrance out onto the dining deck on the north side of the deck.

Mr. Phillips commented that they prefer the current approach because of the existing opening. He stated that they could offset it some, and that there would probably be enough space in the bathroom to step it back, but he was unsure if they could pull it back to the area indicated by Mr. Clark. He added that they could also consider ways to break the floor line.

Mr. Schwartz commented that this plan is a huge improvement over what the Board has seen before. He stated that he does not share Mr. Clark's concerns about the massing, and feels that the drawings show a pretty gracious treatment of the existing hall. He added that the only question in his mind is about the canopy, which he could not visualize.

Mr. Phillips stated that it will be painted white wood fascia, flat construction, with a copper roof

that turns over so that there is an edge of copper coming across. Mr. Schwartz commented that he feels it is a good intention, but the drawings are not sufficient to convey this. Mr. Phillips apologized for not having a three-dimensional view for them.

Mr. Schwartz commented that the plan shows many very sensitive decisions, including lowering the floor line to make the railing work, and voiced his support of the application.

Mr. Atkins commented that he has a general aversion to doing a lot of brickwork to do an inset panel, particularly on the north or Main Street elevation. He conceded that the drawings might give the feature more prominence than it would have in actuality, but questioned if there might be another way to bring the belt course around without making a window where you really don't want one. He suggested a smaller, more modest window could be made to work with the bathroom plan.

Mr. Phillips commented that bringing the stream course around at the mid-level of the main station is something they want to do, but in terms of the inset

panel, he feels they need something there to relieve just the flat volume. He is reluctant to go exploring with sizes and proportions, given that they would be dealing with one single element in the whole composition.

Ms. Ely commented that she likes the proposal. She stated that she thinks it respects the building and the way it has morphed over time. She added that she was a little confused by the inset panel concept, especially considering the three-brick "eyebrow" on the east elevation that hinted at the presence of a window being there originally.

Mr. Clark commented that he is very happy with the proposal.

Mr. Atkins asked if any one else had any hesitation about the brick inset. Ms. Fenton commented she would rather see something else there. Mr. Atkins commented he would like to see a small punched opening, coordinated with the layout of the bathroom, in keeping with the other small arch.

Ms. Fenton commented that this plan is a huge

improvement from what was presented before, and requested that someone come back before the Board with a more detailed drawing of the canopy.

Ms. Winner commented she likes the proposal very much. She had been concerned about the multitude of different materials at the initial presentation, and stated that she feels this plan is much more pleasing to the eye.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve the application, with a submission to the full Board on the canopy to follow. Ms. Winner seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton called the next item on the agenda. Mr. Tolbert made a brief presentation on the Preservation Awards program. He indicated that he had drafted a resolution to recognize Wachovia and the architect, as well as a memo outlining the beginning of the criteria to help establish an ongoing process for recognizing projects. He commented that the main thing the Board members need concern themselves with at this meeting is reviewing and tweaking the resolution to recognize Wachovia as the first

Preservation Award recipient.

Ms. Fenton commented that as Wachovia had already been selected as the recipient, the only question is whether anyone wants to change the wording of the resolution in any area.

Mr. Schwartz suggested that Train and Spencer Architects be contacted about the award before deciding whether or not to highlight one of the architects individually. He added that similarly, Wachovia may prefer to have "Inc." or some other designation placed after their name. Mr. Tolbert indicated he would like to do that, and Mr. Schwartz commented that otherwise he was pleased with both the resolution and the memo.

General discussion on presentation of the resolution followed.

Ms. Fenton asked whether awards would go to projects completed within that year, or if they would encompass other years. Mr. Tolbert stated he thought the policy would be to do it for that year, but for the first time around, some earlier projects might be

included.

Ms. Winner asked what was meant in item 3 when it states that awards should be based on merit. Mr. Tolbert replied that the intent of item 3 is that awards are given every year, but that does not necessarily mean there will be a project in every category, if there is not one that merits an award.

Mr. Schwartz commented that on the fourth "Whereas," he would say, "The Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review," and just do it once, to distinguish them from Albemarle County. On that note, Ms. Vest suggested removing "the Historic landmarks Commission" from the resolution.

Mr. Tolbert indicated that a motion was not necessary at this point, and Ms. Fenton closed that portion of the meeting. She then called for Tarpley to give the Staff Report.

Ms. Vest said she did not have much to report. She indicated that people felt the Worksession last week was useful, and they had discussed the possibility of doing another Worksession concerning the application

of standards and guidelines. She stated there is also a possibility that Grover Smiley will speak about maintenance codes as they relate to old deteriorated buildings. General discussion followed concerning scheduling the next Worksession. June 13th, 5:30 p.m., was selected as the time for Mr. Smiley to make a Worksession presentation, with June 6th set as an alternate date.

Ms. Fenton asked if the Board members had anything else to discuss.

Ms. Ely brought up the issue of the site tour with Lee Danielson, indicating she had gotten no substantive response to the request that the tour be a public meeting. Ms. Vest informed the Board that three Board members together constitutes a meeting, which would be illegal without Ms. Vest knowing and giving notice, and so it was proposed at the last Worksession that one or two Board members at a time meet with Mr. Danielson. However, Mr. Danielson and Mr. Beights have indicated that they do not want to go with a public meeting, in the interest of keeping the tours with Board members simple and free of distractions.

General discussion concerning regulations governing public meetings and the tour itself followed. Mr. Schwartz suggested that the Board draft a letter outlining the Board's position on the most prudent course of action. He echoed Mr. Tolbert's suggestion that the tour be a public event at which Mr. Danielson could address the BAR on the mall in front of the building, followed by an opportunity for small group tours. Ms. Fenton proposed that someone make a motion to this effect. After further discussion, it was agreed that the meeting outside would be public, with restricted access tours afterwards for members of the Board who have not yet seen the building. Ms. Winner seconded the motion. Discussion followed whether or not tours should be taken by individual Board members independently of the public meeting. Mr. Tolbert commented that Board members meeting privately with the builder or architect could give the sense of impropriety to members of the public who did not know what was going on, and he warned them to be careful of tainting the process in that manner.

Mr. Atkins indicated he would like it to be part of the letter that the Board pitch in a formal way what

form Mr. Danielson's presentation would take. Mr. Schwartz suggested giving him 30 minutes to address the BAR.

Ms. Fenton called for a vote on the motion, and it carried unanimously.

The Board members then discussed their daily schedules in terms of availability, and compiled a list of all of their current phone numbers and email addresses.

Mr. Schwartz encouraged BAR members to keep coming to the Court Square meetings. He also encouraged them to purchase Ed Lay's new book, *The Architecture of Jefferson's Country*.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Fenton seconded the motion.

Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.