

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
June 20, 2000**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)
Ken Schwartz
Jesse Hook
W.G. Clark
Preston Coiner
Joe Atkins
Lynne Ely
Linda Winner
Wade Tremblay
Also Present:
Tarpley Vest

Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. She suggested waiting until a few more people arrived before moving to approve, correct or amend the minutes.

Ms. Fenton then asked if there were any items to be raised by the public not on the formal agenda. Seeing none, she closed that portion of the meeting and called for one of the applicants already present to make a presentation. She reviewed the rules of procedure for the benefit of any newcomers, and then indicated that Ms. Vest would be introducing the application.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-28
Tax Map 53 Parcels 57 & 58

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that several changes to store fronts on 5th Street Northeast are being proposed. She referred Board members to the packet, which listed the changes in writing along with the appropriate design guidelines. She indicated that Staff sees no problems with the proposed changes, but wants more information on the nature and appearance of the material and the color

of the awning.

Ms. Fenton asked the applicant if she had anything to add. The applicant indicated that in terms of material, they are planning to use glass set in a wood frame, similar to what was used before.

Ms. Fenton asked if the windows on the alleyway were existing windows. The applicant indicated that the small ones are the original windows, but the larger window closest to the road differs from the original design.

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

A member of the public asked about the sign on the building. Ms. Fenton indicated that there is an existing sign that says, "Oriental Rugs," and added that the rules call for keeping existing signs on buildings, although she was uncertain of the age of these particular signs.

Ms. Vest indicated that the "Signs" section of the design guidelines states that an effort should be made to preserve historic signs.

The applicant indicated that she would have no objection to leaving the "Oriental Rugs" sign on the building.

Mr. Clark asked about the location of the window, and Ms. Fenton pointed it out to him on the corner of the building. Mr. Clark suggested that since that is where the facade joins onto the wall, it might not be a bad idea to shift the window back so that it does not destroy the bond between the two walls. He added that that is a technical, rather than an aesthetic, consideration.

Ms. Fenton closed the question portion of the meeting and called for comments from the general public. Seeing none, she closed that as well and asked if the Board members had any comments on the overall design.

Mr. Clark thanked the applicant for having such an accurate drawing of the building.

Ms. Fenton commented that it was her understanding

that the wires were put on the building without the permission of the owner, and asked if the applicant knew who had put them up, and if they were newly added. The applicant indicated that she did not know. Ms. Fenton suggested that a motion be made to address this issue, but indicated she was unsure how this works in terms of right-of-ways with Virginia Power and the building.

Ms. Vest indicated that she had talked to the City Attorney about this, and it would really depend on the initiative of the owner to pursue it. She stated that a lot of buildings downtown have old easements that allow utilities to be present, and research would have to be done to determine whether or not that was the case on this building.

Ms. Fenton suggested making a motion that, if it is found no easement exists on this building, the BAR would require that those wires be removed. She added that the placement of utilities is an issue that keeps coming up downtown, and so putting this in a motion would give them the opportunity to question this issue.

Mr. Clark commented that the motion is complicated by the fact that the applicant has agreed to study moving the window. Ms. Fenton stated that the Board could approve everything except the window and the painting over of the sign. She added that they would also like to see a sample of the awning, but that could be something approved administratively.

Mr. Clark indicated he would move for approval, based on the submission of a new window placement for Staff approval, a method for not destroying the painted sign, and a proposal for an awning. He added that they would request that the owner check with Virginia Power to see if the placement of the wires was something agreed to or opposed, and that the Board would be happy to back her up or to write a letter of support for removal of the wires.

Mr. Atkins seconded the motion, and Ms. Fenton called for any discussion.

Mr. Coiner said he was unclear what Mr. Clark was saying about the sign. Mr. Clark stated he was requesting that the applicant show Staff and the Chair their method for dealing with painting the

building while not eradicating the sign. Mr. Coiner asked if it is certain that the sign cannot be painted over, and Mr. Clark indicated he didn't know.

Ms. Fenton stated that the applicant would have the option to come back before the Board if they learn that it is permissible to paint over the sign, and would like to do so. General discussion about the sign followed.

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

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-22
Vending Cart on Downtown Mall

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that the cart in this application meets design guideline requirements for mobility, color, and size. She added that the stainless steel body of the cart is something that the Board has previously approved, as well as something that the Health Department generally prefers when there is food involved, and therefore Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Fenton asked if the applicant had anything to add.

Mr. Gary Grunau, one of the applicants for the cart, indicated that they would be selling sorbet. He stated that the cart would be self-contained, with self-generated power for the freezers.

Ms. Fenton called for any questions of the applicant. Seeing none, she closed that portion of the meeting and called for comments on the design. No comments were raised.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the application. Ms. Winner seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-23
214 Lankford Avenue

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation on the application to renovate a house on Lankford Avenue, which is an individually designated historic site, although it is not located within an historic district. She indicated that part of the house dates back to 1871,

while the balance of the house was built around the turn of the century and modified over the years. The asbestos siding has been added, and the porch detailing on the front of the house appears to be from 1906. She commented that the applicant is doing a major renovation to the house, both to the interior and the exterior. She indicated that the applicant is seeking approval for several new elements. If it is possible to preserve the original clapboard, the applicant will do so, but as that does not seem possible at present, he is seeking approval for Hardiplank siding. She stated that the applicant is also looking at replacing the roof, although the roofing material has not been decided upon yet. There is a side porch that he would like to construct, as well as a deck along the back of the house. Also, some new windows are proposed along the side, the details of which are listed in the Staff report. Ms. Vest indicated that Staff did not have any problems with the proposed changes based on the design guidelines, but did have concern about replacing the front porch details and columns with new ones, since the current porch is in fine condition structurally and is listed as an original element in their files.

Ms. Fenton asked if the applicant had anything to add.

Mr. John Watkins indicated he would like to make the two front porch columns a little more elegant. He stated that he and his wife did not know the house was an historic preservation site when they bought it, so having to go through the BAR process is somewhat of a shock for them. He stated that their intention is to have a house that looks like the architect's plans, and that they are working with Fred Oesch to design an attractive house that looks like it belongs in the neighborhood. He added that the neighborhood is quite eclectic, and that the surrounding houses include a cinder block house, a Victorian house and an old log cabin underneath vinyl siding.

Ms. Fenton asked whether or not the applicant had indicated earlier that the siding in front could be saved, while that in back could not. Mr. Watkins stated that they intend to save all the clapboard siding they can. They plan to take the asbestos siding off, and from what they can see so far, it

appears they can salvage all but the siding in the rear. Wherever it cannot be saved, they are seeking the Board's permission to use Hardiplank.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the purview of the BAR is only what is visible from the public right-of-way, and so changes to the back of the house may not even require their approval.

Ms. Fenton called for any questions for the applicant from either the general public or the members of the Board.

Ms. Ely stated she was unfamiliar with Hardiplank siding. Ms. Vest indicated that it is a synthetic material that is designed to look like clapboard, and added that there is an example of it in the historic district, on the rear of an apartment building on South Street. She stated that it resembles wood more closely than vinyl siding does.

Ms. Fenton asked if Hardiplank siding has ever been approved by the Board. Ms. Vest commented that the example she just cited is the first instance she knows of that it was approved by the Board.

Mr. Clark commented that Hardiplank siding is used a lot in new construction, and that it is a close replica of wood with much better paint-holding characteristics than wood.

Ms. Ely asked if the half-round window on the plan is original or something they want to add to the house. The applicant indicated that that is something they plan to add, and that they are seeking approval for everything that is on the plans. He added that they intend to put stained glass in the window.

Mr. Coiner asked if the plan shows double doors opening onto the deck on the eastern and western elevation, and the applicant stated that it does.

Mr. Coiner asked if the applicant had considered retaining the columns in the front, as they are. Mr. Watkins replied that if the Board would like him to retain the columns, he would accept the Board's approval of all of the other columns looking the way they look. He stated that the only reason he would want to replace them with wood columns would be so that they would fit in with the columns on the other

side. If he is allowed to replace the columns, he would like to take the original ones inside the house.

Mr. Coiner commented that he prefers the look of the smaller columns to the big ones.

Mr. Atkins asked if the applicant is requesting the Board to approve either standing seam metal or shingles. Mr. Watkins replied that that would be helpful. He indicated that so far, the estimates they are getting to put the standing seam metal on are \$15,000 or \$20,000 more than really good, thick shingles, but that they would prefer to use metal, if it is not cost-prohibitive.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the Board has approved certain types of shingles before, and so if they do approve them in this instance, they can let those shingles be part of the approval package.

Mr. Tremblay recommended the CertainTeed Grand Manor shingle, which he has used successfully in the past. He indicated that it very much replicates the look of slate.

Mr. Clark commented he was unsure whether the building code of the City addresses this or not, but he feels that the slope of the roof is too shallow, technically, to use shingles on. He stated that it can be and often is done, but it is not a good idea, and therefore he would lean toward using a metal roof. He added that he did not see any indications on the plan for ventilation, and was worried that the decorative windows are replacing louvres or ventilators.

Mr. Watkins indicated that the part of the house that has an attic is ventilated, and that for most of the places they have gabled, the ceilings have been opened up.

Ms. Winner asked if the Staff report contained any information on colors. The applicant replied that it did not, but he had some pictures she could see, if she wanted to get an idea about what colors are being considered. He passed out the photos, and then indicated he would like to get permission to come back to Staff once specific colors have been chosen from the palette indicated.

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

Mr. Schwartz commented it is great to see the love and care and attention that is being put into this property. He indicated that his only concerns address the front elevation of the original body of the house. He is very much in favor of maintaining the existing columns, even if that means a shift to some other column in the new construction. He stated that this will send a clear signal about the parts that are being restored and the parts that are being added to. He then commented that a lesser concern is the half-circle window. He indicated he would prefer to see the front elevation retain the existing porch and eliminate the half-circle window, in the interest of retaining the integrity of the original three-window indentation.

Ms. Winner asked if Ken's comment about the window was a matter of personal preference, or if it was actually something the Board could rule on. Mr. Schwartz indicated the suggestion was made in the interest of retaining the historic integrity of the front elevation.

Ms. Fenton stated she is not familiar enough with the appearance of Hardiplank to know how to vote on it. She suggested that the Board ask the applicant to restore the original weather board, and if that is not feasible, to come back with a sample of the Hardiplank. She added that this applies to the three sides of the house; the back is out of the Board's purview.

Ms. Ely commented she agrees with Mr. Schwartz on the column issue. She stated that the columns should be retained not only because they are original to the house, but because they match the house much better than the big, heavy, formal columns proposed by the applicant.

Mr. Tremblay commented he feels the major renovation being undertaken here sends a great message about restoring a property. He then asked about the distinction between voluntarily putting a property on the national historic register, which allows the owners to continue to do anything they want, versus

being designated a stand-alone, single property historic district.

Ms. Fenton commented that it is an individually designated house, which goes back to the point that the realtor, in admitting that they knew it, had a legal responsibility to disclose that to the purchasers.

Ms. Vest indicated that the historic designation is part of the zoning, and that in Virginia, disclosure laws do not cover zoning. She added that work is being done, however, to devise a better way to inform realtors and the general public about all the designated properties in the districts, including flagging this on the deed and in the tax assessor records.

Mr. Watkins commented that he would like to revisit the issue of the half-window. He stated that many of the homes up on Ridge Street have half-windows and stained glass windows, and so while the original front of the house may not have had that feature, it is in keeping with other houses in the area. He added that he did not regard the question of adding the window to be in the same league as that of retaining the original columns.

Mr. Schwartz offered an enthusiastic motion for approval, with the following stipulations: that the approval is contingent upon the applicant retaining the existing front porch columns; the applicant presents and reviews the siding color with Staff; that the applicant notes the Board's strong preference for the standing seam roof as opposed to the asphalt roof, but leaving him that option; and finally, and that the front facade does not include the half-window.

Mr. Schwartz added that he understood the applicant's point about the window, but the historical front elevation is a small portion of what will eventually be an elaborate estate, and so he did not regard it as too much of a stretch to ask that the front porch and the simplicity of the existing front mass be retained.

Mr. Clark commented that he completely agreed and seconded the motion.

Mr. Watkins stated that he is worried about having a very simple front. Ms. Fenton indicated that the time for discussion had passed, and called for a vote from the Board. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Vest asked for clarification on a portion of the motion, namely whether the request that the applicant present for review the siding color includes either Hardiplank or restored clapboard, or if one or the other is preferred. Mr. Schwartz commented that he should have been clearer, but he was trying to give the applicant the option to use the Hardiplank if the existing wood cannot be restored.

Ms. Vest then asked about the use of asphalt shingles versus standing seam roofing. Mr. Schwartz indicated that the use of asphalt would have to be approved by Staff, based on Staff's experience with numerous examples of high quality asphalt shingles that fit into the historic district.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-25
400 East Main Street

Ms. Vest gave a brief presentation, mentioning a proposal for the building that had come before the Board previously. She indicated that the earlier application to punch a series of wood-framed windows into the side street elevation of the old Enterprise Travel building had been approved by the Board, but with a concern expressed by Mr. Schwartz about the residential quality of the proposal, which he regarded as not the most appropriate use for the area. She indicated that the new tenant has reviewed the old proposal and attempted to take the Board's concerns into account, and for that reason as well as the design guidelines, Staff feels the proposal is appropriate and in keeping with what the Board was looking for.

Mr. Jay Kessler, the applicant, indicated that they have tried to follow the guidelines that were established a couple years ago when the other proposal was looked at. He stated that there are fewer windows now because of the current occupant's needs. He indicated that the building originally was a gift shop, with cabinets all down the sides, and then had different uses over the years, but now bringing light into the building is to the advantage of the current tenant, and so the applicant feels the

outside of the building will be cleaned up significantly with this new proposal. He stated there are also plans to repair the coping at the top, to keep water penetration out of the Main Street wall and to keep the paint on better. The windows on the second floor of the building will remain, and a few on the Main Street side that have been filled in will be reopened. He then indicated that he had brought a sample of the windows, which he presented to the Board. He stated that the windows proposed are not the requested true divided lights, but they have a spacer in the center and the majority will be up above sight line from the outside.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone had questions for the applicant.

Mr. Atkins asked whether or not the arrangement of the windows is governed by plan. Mr. Kessler stated that in trying to control the costs, they eliminated some of the windows from the original proposal and tried to space the remaining ones out equally. He stated that the original proposal had been for a bank lobby, which had fewer work stations, a different occupancy load and a different feel inside. He indicated they had considered not putting any windows at all down the side, because full light in a room of heavy computer use is problematic. The proposal reflects these concerns and the balance they tried to reach between getting enough light and not interfering with the visibility of computer screens.

Mr. Clark asked how the windows are supported, in terms of the lintel. Mr. Kessler stated that they plan to use cut-in bond beam blocks, since it is a cinder block building, and that the continuation of the bond and the blocks will be what is noticed, rather than a precast concrete lintel. He added that the sills will be painted brick.

Ms. Fenton asked the applicant what materials will be used on the new door. He replied that the door will be aluminum clad exterior with wood interior and will match the windows in appearance.

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

Mr. Tremblay stated that the proposal strikes him as

a reasonable adaptation of an old browse gift shop.

Mr. Clark commented he is saddened by the proliferation of aluminum clad windows in Charlottesville, notably on the new hotel on West Main Street. He stated that it would be preferable to use a real wooden sash or something modern that does not pretend to be true divided light.

Ms. Fenton stated that she agreed with Mr. Clark's comments, and that the precedent for earlier boards was to only approve true divided light windows. Both the Hampton Inn and the new Marriott went forward without approval from the BAR. She commented that the addition of aluminum clad windows cheapens the appearance of a building.

Mr. Kessler stated that the reason they used this type window is because it was the type of window approved the last time the proposal came before the Board. He indicated that his own preference is for a sealed, mullion window, and that he would gladly come back before Staff with such an alternative.

Mr. Clark stated he was not suggesting a sealed window as much as simply trying to get away from the stylistic characteristics of the aluminum clad model. He added that the preference against sealed windows has to do with the desire of people who wish to open the windows or have an escape route in case of fire, rather than aesthetics.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she would not be in favor of the proposal coming back for administrative approval, but would prefer it to come before the BAR again.

Ms. Winner stated that she agrees with the comments about the windows. She feels Staff approval may have been based upon miscommunication, since the Staff report mentions true divided lights, which are not being used.

Mr. Schwartz stated the use of true divided light windows can become expensive and complicated, and is probably inappropriate in this particular kind of commercial setting. He stated that a better aesthetic result can be achieved by using either fixed windows, or operable windows without the fancy, residential scale muntins. He commented that he has

no objection to the pattern or the design of the proposed fenestration, but he does have concerns about the aluminum clad model, and so he feels it is appropriate to revisit this issue to come up with an alternative.

Mr. Schwartz then asked the applicant if he was successful in getting rid of the electrical conduit that comes down the wall on the south end of the building, as it did not appear on the drawing. Mr. Kessler indicated that he would draw it on there the next time, but that he did not get rid of it because that is what provides service to the entire building. Mr. Schwartz commented that the Board is not in a position to insist on its removal, but it would be nice if at some point it could be moved underground, as it detracts from the attractiveness of the building.

Mr. Atkins commented that an easy way out of the problem may be to go with no divided light and a full sash. He stated he would prefer this type of window to the type A, horizontal long span lintel opening, even if it would require using more of the former.

Mr. Kessler stated that the current fenestration pattern is based upon needs inside the building to have significant wall space.

Mr. Clark made a motion to deny this specific proposal, with a request that the windows on the west façade of the building be restudied and resubmitted to the Board. Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

Ms. Fenton called for any discussion.

Mr. Atkins suggested attaching some guidance for the resubmission onto the motion. Ms. Vest clarified that generally they are trying to include a justification for the denial in all of their motions, for the benefit of others who will read them.

General discussion followed on how to amend the motion. The applicant commented that he found the denial confusing, since the windows used were based on preferences expressed by the Board at an earlier meeting rather than his own preferences. He stated that he did not want to guess at a new design and hope for approval, and that he would like clear guidance from the Board.

Ms. Fenton suggested having a vote on the motion and then trying to come up with some guidance for it, either at the meeting or afterwards with members of the Board.

Mr. Schwartz indicated he wanted to offer a friendly amendment to the motion. He stated that the basis for denial is that the applicant has presented a window which is not using true divided lights, which is what the guidelines call for.

Ms. Fenton called for a vote. All but Mr. Tremblay voted in favor of the motion.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the Board is comfortable with wood divided light windows, or windows that match the front of the building. She then asked whether Board members would be comfortable with just glass windows that do not open.

Mr. Kessler commented that the issue may actually be mullions versus no mullions. He indicated that the front of the building has no mullions, and he does not particularly like them for this type of usage, so would be comfortable not using them at all. He asked whether he has the choice to use them or not.

Mr. Atkins commented that if the technical denial is based on the divided light, the way to obviate that problem would be to go to the one-over-one double hung windows. He stated he would even accept the aluminum clad windows because they don't have the intricacies of the muntins, but that he is probably in the minority with this opinion. He added that the windows could be doubled up in the same pattern where the A-type is now and that would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. Kessler commented he wanted clarification on one other issue, namely whether or not the windows need to be operable. Mr. Atkins indicated the choice is up to the applicant, but as an architect, he thinks operable windows would be an asset in a building of this character.

Ms. Fenton asked how many Board members have difficulty with the use of aluminum windows. Mr. Clark indicated that as a matter of policy, he does not feel it would be particularly helpful to vote for

or against the use aluminum windows altogether, since there might be an incredibly beautiful, simple, inexpensive aluminum window available that he would have no objection to. He added that fixed windows could be done aesthetically and inexpensively as well, and therefore does not feel comfortable having to vote against a particular material as a matter of policy.

After general discussion, Ms. Fenton indicated that the issue hinges on the quality of the proposed design, as opposed to the Board issuing a point blank yes or no. She stated that the applicant is free to approach Board members individually with ideas or samples to get feedback prior to returning before the Board with the next proposal.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-26
222-224 Court Square

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that since the proposal calls for demolition of a part of the building, they went through the legal notice of a demolition and used the review criteria for demolition, based on the advice of the Zoning Administrator. She stated that the structure is a bathroom, apparently, and although it is not mentioned in any historic files, its footprint appears on the Sanborn Map from the 1920s. The building has clearly been there since this time, but it may be even older. She indicated that the building is in poor condition and is frequently broken into by vagrants, which is a safety concern because of the fires being built in it. She commented that this is a difficult decision, and so she would like to go easy on her recommendation and leave questions of demolition up to the Board.

Ms. Marybese M. Johnson, the applicant, described the structure and indicated that the door and the window have been destroyed by vagrants. She stated that there is a sewage line in the building, but there is no access to the main building, and so it must have served as an outdoor restroom earlier in its history. She commented that if permission is granted to take the building down, the old brick will be recycled for use in the basement of the main structure.

Ms. Ely commented that she looked at the 1920 Sanborn Map and could not find the little building on there,

but since Ms. Vest did find it on the 1920 map she got from engineering, it is probably safe to say the building was built during the '20s. For clarification, she pointed out that the building is the tiny little appendage on the map, and not the larger structure to which it is connected.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Seeing none, she called for comments from the general public.

Mr. Gabriel Silverman commented that he owns the historic little corner building near the structure in question, and suggested that it might be more in the spirit of what they are trying to achieve downtown to put up a gate to block entrance to the structure, rather than tear it down altogether.

Ms. Johnson asked how that would work to Mr. Silverman's advantage. He replied that it would not be to his advantage, but it would be to the advantage of the fabric of the historic building to keep the structure intact, if possible. He commented that the biggest threat to his building and to hers is the presence of the vagrants, and a gate might solve that problem more satisfactorily than demolition.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Silverman to clarify the location of the proposed gate, and he pointed out that his building is on the property line and the gate would run between the two buildings. He then added that, in one sense, he would love to see the little appendage gone, because that would provide a better view for his tenant. He suggested giving the tenant an opportunity to use the space to plant flowers.

Mr. Atkins suggested that since the building has no use, the immediate problem might be solved by bricking up the opening so nobody can get in there. Mr. Silverman and Ms. Johnson pointed out problems with that idea, and Mr. Atkins responded that bricking up the building would serve to keep out vagrants but would preserve the structure for future use, should the need arise.

Mr. Coiner commented that he could vote either way on the application, but he is uncomfortable talking about allowing demolition because of vagrants. He stated that installing a gate or bricking up the door

and window both seem like acceptable solutions.

Mr. Tremblay commented that this appendage is a 1920s addition that is virtually invisible, and so he has no problem tearing the structure down and cleaning up the area, as long as the bricks are preserved and reused.

Ms. Ely commented that she agreed with Mr. Coiner, and that philosophical problems with the idea that because a building cannot be secured, that justifies tearing it down.

Ms. Winner commented that because someone added an ugly and inappropriate 1920s addition to an 1830s building, that doesn't mean that it should stay there. Vagrants or no vagrants, she would support demolishing the structure.

Ms. Ely asked the applicant if the addition is attached to the building or completely free-standing. Ms. Johnson replied that it is attached.

Mr. Clark commented that he does not believe the structure does anything architecturally for the building or the space. He stated that putting up a gate is a possibility, but he would go ahead and vote for demolition of the building.

Ms. Fenton observed that the precedent has been that the Board has approved demolition of additions in order to restore an original structure. In this instance, removal of the appendage would serve to enhance the original structure, and so she would also support demolition.

Mr. Atkins stated that he appreciated the public comment that they should look out to protect the grain and the historical nature of the building, but in this case, he agrees with other Board members that this structure is too small and insignificant to worry about preserving.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve demolition of the structure, with great care to the adjacent structures. Mr. Tremblay seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Vest indicated that the application for rehabilitation of 416-418 East Main Street had been

withdrawn and that the applicants would likely return in July, after regrouping.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-29
221 & 219 West Main Street

Ms. Vest commented that this building, a garage, is actually visible from Market Street. The applicants are proposing doing a renovation and second story addition to the building, so that it becomes a usable office space. She indicated that the guidelines call for major additions to be reviewed under new construction. She stated that although Staff did not perceive any major issues, they were unfamiliar with the wall system being proposed and so have requested further explanation, which the applicant has provided. She added that Staff also requested more information on the second floor windows.

Mr. Jim Rounsevell, the architect for the project, reviewed the material he had brought at Ms. Vest's request. He indicated that the building is located behind Brown's Lock and Safe, buried in the middle of the block, and is not very visible from the major streets. Using a model, he outlined the plans for a light-weight wall system which would be used to allow light to diffuse into the space while limiting the view of the backsides of the surrounding buildings, especially from the mezzanine that will be added. He then discussed the visibility of a window on the corner of the building.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone had any questions for Mr. Rounsevell.

Ms. Ely asked about the color of the stucco on the lower half of the building. Mr. Rounsevell replied that he was planning to go with just the natural color of the stucco.

Ms. Winner asked if the entire facility would be used as office space, and Mr. Rounsevell replied that it would.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from the Board.

Mr. Clark commented that he feels that the project is fresh and lively with respect to that area, and that almost any other approach there, given the context, would be silly. He added that he really appreciates

the fact that the architect took the trouble to provide a model, even for this tiny project.

Ms. Winner commented that the written report is well done and quite helpful.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he feels it is a great proposal also. He stated that this particular material provides an extraordinary diffused light which will contribute greatly to the space. He added that he feels that this project is one that grows out of its circumstances with great creativity and great care and therefore will be very important once it is built, in that it will show people downtown that there are several different ways to approach design problems within the unique circumstances that exist there.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve to application. Ms. Winner seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Silverman commented that it has been a wonderful experience to watch the changing of the guard over the years, and he feels that this is one of the finest boards he has been a part of bringing projects into. He stated that this project was an attempt to recapture territory that had been lost over time, and to make a statement that hopefully would inspire owners of surrounding properties to reassess what is actually present and available downtown for use as a garden or a really nice space to hang out, instead of just letting automobiles take it over.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-30
300 West Main Street

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that the proposed exterior changes are minor, in the scope of the whole project. They consist of new store front windows, new light fixtures, the new fence mentioned in the previous presentation, and a third floor window the owner wants to replace with a door. The latter will be consistent with the other materials and barely visible from the street. She indicated that she has pulled out some guidelines for the windows and the fence, and commented that the changes seemed to be in keeping with the guidelines.

Mr. Gabriel Silverman, the applicant, indicated that

they had considered putting the door in several different locations, and although the interior space would have been more efficient with the door to the right, they felt it was more appropriate to put it in the middle.

Mr. Coiner asked what the reason was for using a divided light door. Mr. Silverman commented that it was the architect's feeling that that would give a more human scale to the entrance. He indicated that the original building had used the true divided lights above.

Ms. Winner asked if the lighting fixtures are on Ridge Street, beside the door. Mr. Silverman indicated that they are on both the West Main Street side and the Ridge Street side doors, and will replace the large lights there. He commented that the architect felt it was important to put something there that was not overpowering. He stated that the fixtures are black with frosted glass, and he feels that they might prove to be too small.

Ms. Fenton commented that there are several lights being suggested for the Court Square enhancement that go on a building, and recommended that Mr. Silverman take a look at them.

Ms. Fenton asked about the height of the lights, and he commented that they are twelve inches tall.

Ms. Ely asked about the wooden panels on the front of the building that show up on the simulation, and Mr. Silverman replied that they will be coming off.

Ms. Vest asked if the lights have a residential brightness to them. Mr. Silverman stated that the streets have so much light already, these fixtures are being used just to announce the entrance and so are not very bright.

Mr. Atkins commented that the Photo Shop simulation of the job is very effective. Ms. Fenton agreed, and suggested using it as a sample to show to people ways that they could present their proposals.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-6-24
100 14th Street NW Unit/1397 W Main Street

Ms. Fenton announced that the applicant had not yet shown up, but BAR rules do not require the applicant to be present. She then asked Ms. Vest to go ahead with the presentation.

Ms. Vest indicated that Andrew Vaughan, the applicant, is moving Orbit Billiards downstairs into the old Espresso Corner building and wants to replace the existing store front windows on both sides with a window glazing system which will act as a garage door, creating an open air experience in the cafe space. She provided an example of the system for Board members to look at, and stated the applicant is working with the existing window openings to minimize the amount of work and the intrusion. She indicated that at first she had pursued this as a matter for administrative approval, but Mr. Higgins had felt it was more a design change than a window change and recommended that it come before the BAR. She indicated that the second proposed change involves extending the existing cafe to the edge of the landscaped area and decking it all the way across. She passed out a sketch of the proposed change and commented that it will exactly match the existing cafe.

Mr. Tremblay commented that the change will be small, allowing the applicant to add three or four tables at most.

Ms. Fenton commented that the building on the other side, the Subway, has similar decking with the plantings in the middle.

Mr. Atkins commented that the way to the door will need to be kept open. Ms. Vest indicated that the applicant has met with Grover and they have worked it out to retain an ADA access to the building. She added that she is uncertain how the wood decking slopes to meet the sidewalk.

Ms. Fenton asked the Board members if they had anything they wanted to discuss about the proposal, or if they felt comfortable voting on it yet.

Mr. Atkins indicated he would feel comfortable discussing the windows and deferring on the terrace

until there is more information. He added that it will be a great place to eat.

Mr. Schwartz commented that if the applicant were present, he would ask him why he is not going all the way down to the terrace with the windows, because that would help create a fun environment, like Escape which opens up to the outdoors. He stated that he really regrets that the applicant is not present and would move for deferral until next month, with an encouragement that the applicant return so they can discuss both of his exciting ideas. He added that he has no objection to the current proposal, but wants to know why the applicant is not providing access to the expanded patio from the inside.

Ms. Fenton commented that perhaps the applicant chose this option because he thought he couldn't get approval for the other, because cost did not seem to be a significant enough deterrent.

Mr. Schwartz reiterated that he would move for deferral because the Board requires additional information on the window strategy and the patio. He added that the applicant would need to provide drawings for the patio, to better explain the proposal.

Mr. Clark commented he does not want to be in the awkward position of insisting that every applicant have an architect, but he feels the present drawings are not detailed enough to adequately explain the idea.

Mr. Schwartz commented that the patio will be on a very public street, and so it is a matter of public concern how he negotiates the elevation change and satisfies ADA.

Ms. Fenton asked if a motion for deferral had been put forward, and Mr. Schwartz confirmed this. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, and added a friendly amendment that the motion for deferral be issued to the applicant with great enthusiasm for the general idea. Ms. Fenton added that the motion should also include the Board's preference that the windows open all the way down to the ground.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Atkins asked Ms. Vest a question about procedure, namely whether they should call her beforehand if an applicant's drawing doesn't make sense, and she stated that this would be helpful.

Ms. Fenton called for the next item on the agenda, the Mall Underground Study. Ms. Vest indicated that she did not yet have enough information on this to be able to address the Board. She commented in general terms that the City is looking at the underground infrastructure to the mall, which ultimately might impact the street trees on the mall, and so the City would like the Board's input.

Ms. Fenton stated she wanted to inform the Board of several projects going on. She indicated that the City is asking for a design for the 2nd Street mall crossing. She does not know how they are coming up with a design, but she understands that they are open to suggestions. She then informed the Board of the activities of the Court Enhancement Committee and the Court Facilities study meetings, and suggested that the Board members follow developments and voice opinions ahead of time. She stated that she believes that the judges have final decision in the matter; that if a decision is not reached, the judges in the state of Virginia can make a decision and make it happen.

Mr. Clark asked if anyone has considered reusing the federal building. Ms. Fenton indicated that that is being considered, but the feeling is that it will take a long time to get a decision on that. She stated that if Market Street is used, then there will be the possibility of continuing into the federal building.

Mr. Tremblay commented that the rooms in the federal building are small and not very amenable to being converted to court use. Ms. Fenton replied that they could be used as offices to complement the courts.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he is on that committee, and it is his understanding that if the City and County are unable to come up with a solution to provide court space, then it falls to the judges to decide. He stated that the City and County are looking for recommendations from the committee so that they can decide, as the political elected body, what is in the best interest of the community. He

indicated that there are three site strategies being considered: 1) On High Street, where the Juvenile/Domestic Relations Court is, 2) Building everything on Market Street, encompassing Guadalajara, the convenience store and the open parking lot, and 3) Using both of those sites, and dispersing the program. He commented that he feels someone from the BAR should be on any one of these public committees that the City empanels.

Ms. Fenton gave a short report on the business corridor district meetings, stating that they are looking at the downtown historic area, Ridge Street, and other districts as well.

Ms. Vest commented that the City's website is helpful in keeping up with all of the different initiatives and committees.

Mr. Coiner commented that although the Corridor Study looks like a fun exercise, it doesn't seem to have much merit.

Ms. Fenton asked if the Board members had any changes or amendments they would like to make to the minutes from three previous meetings. Ms. Hook indicated she was not present at the May 16th meeting. It was also noted that Mr. Tremblay may have been misidentified as Mr. Toscano in several instances.

Ms. Fenton suggested approving the minutes separately. Following appropriate motions, the May 9th minutes were approved, and the May 16th were approved with the corrections noted above. For the June 6th minutes, the following addition was suggested by Mr. Schwartz, to be placed at the end: "No actions were taken at this meeting. All of these issues will be revisited when the project is presented formally before the Board of Architectural Review." A point was also raised that only a few people actually went to look at Oliver Kuttner's windows, and the minutes should be amended to reflect that. Mr. Schwartz suggested that the minutes might indicate that three members of the BAR were invited by Oliver Kuttner into his building. After further discussion about portions of the June 6th minutes, Mr. Schwartz recommended deferring approval until next month, to give Board members a chance to review the minutes and make suggestions, and the Board members concurred.

Mr. Clark made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Atkins seconded the motion.

Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:54 p.m.