

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
September 19, 2000**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)
Jesse Hook
Preston Coiner
Lynne Ely
Linda Winner
Wade Tremblay
Ken Schwartz
Joe Atkins

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. She indicated that the first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes. Ms. Vest commented that the dates on both the August and September minutes needed to be corrected.

Ms. Hook made a motion to approve the minutes as they stood. Mr. Atkins asked what the procedure is to correct minor misrepresentations of what someone has said. Ms. Fenton indicated it is a good idea to perhaps submit in writing any changes necessary to clarify a statement, as minutes are sometimes referred to in subsequent meetings. Mr. Atkins stated he would then submit in writing a change to be made to his comments concerning the Memorial to Free Speech during the July 18th meeting of the BAR.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone wanted to offer further corrections to the minutes. Seeing none, she called for a second on the motion. Ms. Ely seconded. A vote was taken, and the minutes were approved, with Ms. Fenton abstaining.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any issues not on the formal agenda to be raised by members of the public. Seeing none, she closed that portion of the meeting. For the benefit of newcomers, she explained the general rules of procedure for a meeting of the BAR, and then turned the floor over to Ms. Vest to make a presentation on the first item up for consideration.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-9-37
324 West Main Street

Ms. Vest indicated that the proposal is for a series of cosmetic changes to the Adelphia Cable building on West Main Street, including punching in some new windows and doors and filling up some existing windows and doors. She referred the Board members to a notebook submitted by the applicant which contained color photographs as well as color and material samples. She indicated that Staff did not find the changes to be significant, but did find them to be appropriate to the historic district. Staff is requesting further information on the doors and awnings before approval is given.

Ms. Fenton called for any questions or comments.

Mr. Ron Keeney, the architect for the project, indicated he could perhaps clear up a few minor points. Concerning the new awning at the front, he indicated that it is intended to match the two blue awnings that exist further down the building, in the back, as shown in the pictures. Concerning the doors, he stated that they were at the back of the site. Adelphia Cable is planning to build a wall in front of an enormous generator, and the original intention was to put in pairs of 3-0 doors, flush with the wall and of the same color; however, if the BAR prefers, they would be happy to make the doors six-panel, or to paint them to match the blue trim.

Mr. Tremblay asked the architect to clarify if the fence that hides the generator would be replaced with a structure that would go all the way around, and Mr. Keeney confirmed this.

Mr. Keeney indicated that originally, since the generator had been put in without BAR approval, Adelphia Cable had put up the shielding fence in response to the BAR's objections. Now, Adelphia Cable is proposing to do it right, by building a housing for the generator while they are cleaning up the rest of the building. Mr. Keeney indicated that one side of the building is stuccoed, and now the same will be done all the way around, with a more modern product than cement-based stucco.

Ms. Hook asked if the changes would decrease the number of parking spaces. Mr. Keeney indicated that parking would not be affected. He pointed out that the parking lot to the right of the building is a separate piece of property that is not owned by Adelphia.

Mr. Tremblay applauded the clean-up work being done on the building. He then asked whether they were thinking of doing anything about the exposed utility conduits and freon lines on the side of the building.

Mr. Keeney commented that once the existing HVAC units are replaced, the freon lines would be hidden or taken inside the building. However, some of the other lines contain fiber-optic cable, and half of the state of Virginia would be affected if they tried to disconnect and move them. Mr. Tremblay suggested boxing them in, and Mr. Keeney indicated they are planning to do that with EIFS. However, there has to be access to them at ground level, and where the lines turn and go into the building. And further down the building, there is a microwave beaming system that is live all the time, and that would be more difficult to cover, since it cannot be taken off-line at any point.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions or comments from the public or the members of the Board. Seeing none, she closed that portion of the meeting and called for a motion.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to approve the plan as submitted. Mr. Atkins seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Coiner pointed out that there were several people in the audience who had come before the BAR previously, but who were not on the agenda for that night's meeting. General discussion followed, in which it was determined that the applicants had been told to return with better drawings for proposed changes to a roof. Ms. Fenton suggested passing the new drawings out for Board members to look at during the proceedings, and then taking the matter up at the end of the meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-9-38
901 East Jefferson Street

Ms. Fenton indicated the application had been deferred.

The applicants for Certificate of Appropriateness Applications BAR 00-9-39 and BAR 99-6-28, the next two items on the agenda, were not present. Ms. Fenton suggested voting on the former application, and called for Ms. Vest to make a brief presentation.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-9-39
Vending Table for Tea on Downtown Mall

Ms. Vest referred the Board members to a color photograph and to the Staff report. She stated that although the guidelines call for black metal, there have been instances in the past where carts that were not black have been approved, if they were of quality construction and appropriate design. In the Staff's assessment of the application, they felt that was the case in this situation. The application is for an antique table and bench which, although they are not black, are of nice quality and meet the size guidelines. She indicated that they would be removed each day, and Staff feels they would be appropriate, aesthetically, for the Mall.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone had any problems with the application.

Mr. Coiner indicated he did not have any problems, but would like to request that use of the table be restricted to tea, and not soft drinks or any other beverage.

Ms. Fenton indicated that that was not within the purview of the BAR. Mr. Coiner then indicated he was in favor of the application.

Ms. Hook suggested that the BAR should somehow make a note that this was an exception. Ms. Fenton and Mr. Tremblay replied that it should be clear that it is an exception.

Ms. Fenton called for a second on the motion for approval. Ms. Winner seconded. A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton indicated that all of the Board members had had time to look at the drawings for the changes to the roof, and suggested taking that matter up, since some of the scheduled applicants were not present.

For the benefit of members who were not present at the previous meeting, Ms. Vest reviewed the application, indicating that although the structure is hidden from view, it is a designated historic structure. She stated that Mr. Clark had deferred the matter, to give the applicants the opportunity to consider changing the pitch of the roof, rather than changing the height altogether. She then asked the applicants to review the drawings for the Board.

Mr. Gary Davenport, of 114 Lankford Avenue, referred the Board members to an illustration of the house in its present condition, and indicated how he wanted to raise the roof by two-and-a-half feet. He pointed to the ridge and noted the sway in it, stating that the rafters are old and in need of attention.

Ms. Vest and Ms. Ely discussed the fact that the second storey is actually a half-storey, and changing just the pitch of the roof would not help make the room usable.

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

Mr. Coiner asked what the applicants planned to do with the dormer that faces to the west, toward Ridge Street. Mr. Davenport indicated he wanted to make the dormers on both sides of the house symmetrical, since one was currently lower than the other by several feet. General discussion followed, in which he explained that the dormers would be raised along with the roof, but one of the windows would be adjusted in size to make them symmetrical.

Mr. Atkins apologized for not being present at the last meeting, and then asked Mr. Davenport whether or not he planned to reconstruct the roof two-and-a-half feet higher, with all new material. He confirmed this.

Mr. Coiner asked what the applicants were going to do about the aluminum siding. Mr. Davenport indicated he was going to take the siding off the back of the house, so it would be the exact same siding, and reinstall it wherever it was needed. Ms. Tara Heberling, the co-applicant, indicated that eventually, they plan to replace all of the siding with vinyl siding, but could not yet afford that.

Mr. Tremblay commented that, although the house is an historic structure, since it stands alone and is completely invisible, the standard is different than he would perhaps otherwise apply. He suggested that the applicant do what he likes with the house, since raising the roof by a few feet, in his view, would not dramatically change the appearance of the house.

Mr. Davenport commented that no portion of the original structure is visible from the road, and so what they are proposing is like rewrapping a present, not changing the present. He then asked if they would have to go through the BAR process again if, several years later, they decided they wanted to replace the siding.

Ms. Fenton stated that any change visible from the public right of way would have to come before the BAR. She suggested that the applicants bring samples of material they are considering with them to the meeting before buying the material. She stated that if they came in early on in the process, before all details were finalized, the Board might actually help them come up with a better building.

The applicants asked about the procedure for changing the designation of a structure. Mr. Coiner indicated that they would need to petition the BAR to remove the property from historic designation, and then the BAR would have to bring the matter before the City Council.

Ms. Fenton added that the concept behind designating a structure as historic is to bring awareness to a building's history, although a case could certainly be made that a structure is so hidden beneath other additions that it is not worth saving. She commented that she was uncertain how the BAR would respond to such a request, but the Board would entertain it if the applicants desired.

Ms. Vest indicated she wanted to clarify the procedure to un-designate a structure, although there was no precedent for that in the City. She stated that the applicant would petition the Planning Director or the BAR. The petition would then go to the Planning Commission, and from there to the City Council, and it would ultimately be a City Council decision.

Ms. Fenton called for a second on the motion to approve the application. Mr. Coiner seconded. A vote was taken, and the motion was approved, with Mr. Atkins and Mr. Schwartz abstaining.

Ms. Fenton informed the applicants that she had spoken with Mr. Atkins, who would be willing to talk with them if they needed.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-9-40
702 Park Street

Ms. Vest gave a brief presentation. She indicated that the building at 702 Park Street had been built in 1931. The applicants are proposing to replace the existing carport, which is on the corner of Evergreen and Park, with a new two-car garage with a stucco and metal roof. She indicated that Staff went through the guidelines and found the design and material to be appropriate to the historic district and to the house. Therefore Staff supports the proposal, but has requested illustrations of what the windows and french doors will look like, as well as information on whether or not the mullions would be true divided light windows. She added that the windows would only be partially visible from the right of way.

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

Mr. Frazier White, of 702 Park Street, indicated that he had lived at this address for the past 20 years and had grown tired of the ugly old carport. He stated that they plan to build a garage with a standing seam copper roof in its place. He added that the windows most likely would not be visible from the right of way, but part of the garage doors would be. Concerning the windows, he indicated that they had not planned to put in true mullions but just the dividers in the windows, but were open to input from the BAR.

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

Ms. Ely asked why the applicant chose to use stucco instead of brick. Mr. White indicated that they had considered brick, but since the garage would be behind a stand of trees, they felt the stucco would lighten everything up. He added that that was also the reason they planned to put in so many windows.

Ms. Fenton commented that she drove up to the carport, and her feeling was that it would be good to replace it. She stated that the Board has always been in favor of true divided lights, and although the purview of the BAR is only what is visible from the public right of way, she would recommend using them if possible. She stated it would be worth doing, in terms of the way the building would look afterwards.

Ms. Fenton then called for a motion. Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Tremblay seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-9-41
400 East Jefferson Street

Ms. Vest made a brief presentation. She indicated that the applicant is proposing to subdivide a portion of the vacant lot at this location and creatively in-fill it with a very interesting building. Staff looked at the design in the context of the design guidelines, and found it to be appropriate to the historic district in which it would be situated. She stated that Staff is excited about the proposal, particularly the use of traditionally sized red bricks and windows with true divided light, and has requested information on the final details.

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

Mr. Jerry Dixon commented that they plan to do all

that Tarpley mentioned. Concerning the bricks, they plan to use what is called a wire-mold cut, which gives an authentic, handmade look. He distributed a sample of the brick to the members of the Board, commenting that the color would match well with what is already in the area. He stated that they plan to create a townhouse look, in a contemporary manner, using a standing seam copper roof and built-in gutters, with the downspouts recessed to avoid any projections close to the edge of the street. He indicated that they also plan to introduce a sweeping, curved canopy of copper between the buildings, to tie them together and to give them a more functional connection, allowing both buildings to be covered as one comes up the steps. He added that the roof itself would serve also as a screen for the HVAC equipment on the rooftop.

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

Ms. Ely asked what the purpose was in connecting the two buildings. Mr. Dixon indicated that although the use of the two buildings would not be related, the owner of the buildings felt that the proposed construction work would provide a good opportunity to clean up a few things, including repairing and covering the steps.

Ms. Ely then asked if the installation of the new canopy would call for demolishing the original rear porch to the house, and Mr. Dixon confirmed this. He indicated that the porch is in poor condition, and because of the proximity of the buildings, would be inappropriate to the recess that is left over.

Mr. Atkins asked if the building would be abutting the old Progress building, and Mr. Dixon indicated it would be.

Mr. Tremblay asked if the windows on the Progress building would get covered up. Mr. Dixon indicated that the windows currently have glass blocks in them. In response to further questioning, he indicated that there would be zero physical separation between the two buildings, and that a firewall would be put up against the glass blocks.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions. Seeing none, she called for comments from members of the Board.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he had two areas of interest. Concerning the porch, he indicated that now that he understands what the applicant is proposing, he disagrees with its removal. He then indicated that rather than having the copper fascia

on top of the pediment over the entrance, continuing the brick across the top and treating it in more brick detail would be more successful.

Mr. Dixon indicated that in this situation, he disagrees with that. He stated that the parapets were put on the side of the building for a reason, and to continue the brick on the front did not make sense to him.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that brick gables are very common, and the technique of keeping the water out from behind the brick is not an unusual detail. He stated that he feels the brick is a more successful detail extending all the way up the gable.

Ms. Ely asked Ms. Vest what she meant when she indicated Staff recommended approval with traditional windows. Ms. Vest stated she was thinking more about about the material.

Ms. Ely indicated that she had some concerns about the windows. She stated that across the street from the building are two spectacular older buildings, and so she would be happier if this building had more traditional windows.

Mr. Dixon responded that in situations like this, architects generally feel new buildings should not be traditional; they should be contemporary, while reflecting traditional styles. He pointed out that the windows of the buildings across the street have very small thumb-mold trim, about two inches wide, which fits against the brick. He commented that most modern windows that are built today have similar dimensions, although they usually do not have the rounded shape.

Mr. Atkins asked what kind of windows the applicant plans on using. Mr. Dixon indicated that they are looking at Marvin, which is a cladded type window.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any samples of the windows, and Mr. Dixon indicated he did not have any available.

Mr. Tremblay asked if the windows were basically aluminum-clad windows. Mr. Dixon indicated they were, but they would be all white. He added that they would be operable, true divided light windows, set in a casement.

Ms. Fenton commented that she feels the white trim against brick on the McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe building is unappealing, and that it would be more attractive if the windows were trimmed in black.

Mr. Dixon asked if the windows Ms. Fenton was referring to are flush with the brick or recessed. He indicated that on his building, the windows would be set back about four inches, which would help the appearance. He stated that he chose white because traditionally everything in that area appeared to use white windows or trim. He stated that he finds the dark windows on the old bank building on the corner of High and Park to be attractive, however.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were other questions or comments from Board members.

Ms. Fenton asked where the porch ends compared to where the building begins. Mr. Dixon indicated it would end at the property line of the new building, and would be about six feet out from the existing building.

Ms. Ely asked Ms. Vest whether or not they would need a separate application for demolition of the rear porch on the 1920 house, since they were treating the lot as one property. Ms. Vest indicated the Board could treat it all as one application, adding that the applicant's intention to subdivide the rear lot off is a separate issue.

Mr. Atkins asked about the post that appears in the drawing. Mr. Dixon indicated it would be a round, steel post, painted white, and pointed to where it would be on the building.

Ms. Fenton commented that she really likes the building, but is concerned about the removal of the porch off of the existing building, and wonders if there is a way to do both.

Mr. Dixon indicated that the porch would be very intrusive, if it were left in place.

Mr. Schwartz indicated he also was not in favor of tearing the porch down. He stated he would like to reframe the issue by suggesting a motion for approval of the schematic design of the building itself, subject to subsequent review of the windows. However, he would not recommend approving anything to the north of the end wall until the applicant has had time to go back and study the design possibilities of looking at the zone between the historic building and the new building, in a way that might incorporate some of the qualities or detailing or spirit from the existing porch, if not the porch itself.

Mr. Dixon indicated he was trying to figure out how to deal with the design philosophy conflict that was emerging. He asked whether they should be looking at extending the contemporary or the traditional

building.

Mr. Schwartz indicated he understood the applicant's concern. He stated he was uncomfortable tearing down the porch, based on what he saw the applicant offering in exchange, and therefore was suggesting that other alternatives be looked at. He stated that the reason for his motion was to give the applicant an opportunity to consider other strategies to present to the BAR. He stated he was suggesting further study in particular because he was having trouble visualizing how it would all piece together at a very complex joint between two buildings, adjacent to several other historic buildings.

Ms. Ely seconded the motion, with the understanding that the windows, lights and other details would also be coming back to the BAR for review.

Mr. Schwartz indicated he wanted to add one further comment: Namely, that the applicant look again at the treatment of the gable, since folding copper over and making a thick band at the top can turn into an extremely clumsy detail. Mr. Dixon indicated he had no problem with looking into that.

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

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 99-6-28
800 Block West Main Street/Union Station

Ms. Vest reviewed the history of the application, stating that it had come before the Board several times. She indicated that the canopy detail has not changed since the design was approved by the Board in May, but the application now includes the proposal to place three HVAC units on the roof of the addition. Although that is not the ideal location for them, there appear to be no other feasible alternatives available. She stated that the applicant is therefore seeking final detail approval of the canopy, as well as the three new HVAC units.

Mr. Joe Phillips, with Osteen Phillips Architects, indicated that he had three items to present to the Board. Concerning the canopy, he indicated that they plan to follow the materials and methods that were used for the canopies over the Amtrak station. He stated that although they would not replicate the eyebrow shape of the canopies on the Amtrak station, but they would use the same materials on a flat canopy that would protect the walkway from the exterior door to the exit stair. He stated that they are not proposing a copper roof, but rather a fully adhered membrane roof, with copper edge flashing at

the end of the fascia, so that the visible portion of the roof would have the same exposure and material as the new canopies over the Amtrak station: a painted white wood fascia and a painted beaded board soffit underneath the canopy, cantilevered from the wall.

He indicated the second construction detail they have submitted is a more realistic and code-compliant exit stair, made of welded steel. He stated the new design replaces the horizontal rail with appropriately spaced vertical members, and gives a more accurate depiction of the actual construction of the stair.

Concerning the rooftop units, he indicated the mechanical design for them has been done as a design build element with Beck Cohen. He stated that at the last meeting, one of the positive comments was that they had kept the addition massing underneath the eaveline of the existing roof, and so were dismayed to have to consider interrupting that. He then discussed the various alternatives for placement of the units that had been considered, outlining the difficulties with each. The rooftop units are combined air handlers, compressors and fresh air intake vents. An alternative would be to have a split system, but the condensers cannot be placed behind the building because Amtrak will not allow them to drive around the station property to service them; and if they are placed on the ground, they will be visible not only from the road, but from the restaurant as well. He commented that the illustration shows the worse case scenario, which is the visibility of the rooftop units from the Main Street bridge. He described the various problems that would arise from placing the units inside the restaurant, and stated that they had not taken this matter lightly. He indicated that they have decided the best strategy is to place the units on the roof, and paint them a color that will make them appear as unobtrusive as possible. It would be possible to place a screening wall around them, but they feel that three broken up, flat surfaces would be less obtrusive than a single rectangular mass.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the Board.

Mr. Tremblay asked if the large rooftop units are self-contained, and Mr. Phillips indicated they are.

Mr. Tremblay asked if the applicant had looked at getting the same tonnage with a larger number of smaller units in a split environment. He stated that in a split environment, the smaller compressors could arguably be hidden in the same location, without being as obtrusive or causing the problems the applicant described.

Mr. Phillips commented that that alternative had not been explored, so he was not sure if it would be feasible. He indicated that it would likely be more expensive.

Mr. Atkins concurred that it would certainly be more expensive. However, he was in favor of looking at an alternative that would preclude seeing the large units on the rooftop.

Mr. Tremblay stated that it might be possible to locate the units on the ground, and Mr. Atkins commented that even on the roof, the smaller units would be less visible.

Mr. Phillips indicated that there are open clearance requirements between units to allow for servicing and air flow, and so he was not sure if six units would fit in the space available. Mr. Tremblay replied that in apartment settings, it has been possible to place a significant number of units close together, and still meet all of the manufacturer's recommendations.

Mr. Atkins commented that the strategy of splitting the larger air handling unit for each zone into two would possibly allow them to be placed inside the interior space and still be serviced, which would get everything off the roof. He asked whether that scenario had been considered, or whether it had been ruled out.

Mr. Phillips indicated that they have considered placing the three outside condensers along the west wall of the kitchen, but they have not considered a six-system scenario. He stated that he could not speculate whether or not it would be possible to go with six and be able to have adequate clearances.

Mr. Atkins commented it would be worthwhile to pursue his suggestion, if that would allow everything to be removed from the roof, and hence from the view from the Main Street bridge, with the exception possibly of the fresh air intakes.

Mr. Phillips indicated that they have looked at several alternatives for placing fresh air ducts, including placing them on the north side of the building. He stated that there isn't the space necessary to duct from the roof down to the main floor for the makeup. He indicated that although it would be possible to put the condensing units on the ground and the fresh air makeups on the north elevation, the driving consideration is the fact that the air handlers simply cannot be installed and have a functional working system; the building is not

structured to hang those units. He added that the upshot of what he is saying is that the six-unit alternative has not been explored, but structurally and in terms of system costs and support system costs, it is likely to be much more expensive.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any more questions. Seeing none, she called for comments from the Board members.

Mr. Atkins indicated that the reason the Board is asking about alternatives that the applicant may or may not have explored is that the current proposal is unsatisfactory. He stated that they need to decide whether the constraints of the building design, which do not allow the mechanical system to work, need to change to allow to allow a different sort of mechanical system to work.

Ms. Fenton commented that she feels there must be a more elegant solution than what the applicant has presented. Although the economics of it may not be favorable, there ought to be another way to solve the problem.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further comments. Seeing none, she indicated she felt a motion for deferral was in order.

Mr. Schwartz commented that the good news is that the other items in the application look good. He made a motion for approval of the canopy and the stair, and denial of the rooftop units. He commented that he did not know the solution, but he appreciated the possibilities explored by both Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Atkins.

Ms. Fenton asked if Mr. Schwartz was proposing two separate motions, and he concurred.

Ms. Ely seconded the motion to approve the canopy and stair. A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz reiterated the motion to deny the rooftop units, based on their incompatibility with the fabric of the historic district. Ms. Ely seconded the motion.

Mr. Atkins commented that he agrees with the motion, but wants to make it clear to the Board that it poses a major problem, since construction is underway and the applicant has already explored every option that seemed open to him.

General discussion followed, in which Ms. Fenton pointed out that a motion for deferral leaves open

the possibility that the current proposal might be accepted at a later date, if no other solution is found; but a motion for denial is a firmer statement that this is not a possibility. Mr. Schwartz offered to withdraw his motion, if the Board preferred going with a deferral. He stated that if the application is denied, the applicant would have the option of coming back to the BAR with a design solution for the rooftop that was more satisfactory than the current three boxes.

Ms. Fenton called for a vote on the motion to deny. A vote was taken, and the motion carried, 6 to 2.

Mr. Phillips asked for clarification on the motion. Ms. Fenton indicated that if the applicant finds there is no way of avoiding placing the units on the roof, the application could be resubmitted if a screen or an alternative design solution is offered.

Mr. Schwartz added that he was not comfortable with having a project approved under certain expectations and understandings about it conforming with the historic district, and then having it come back with a major deviation from what was approved. He stated that there ought to be an exhaustive study done and presented to the BAR, so that the Board could see in detail the alternatives that have been considered. He commented that he is aware of the cost implications, but the BAR is charged to preserve the historic fabric of the building.

Ms. Fenton asked Ms. Vest if there was any other business to address. Ms. Vest indicated that there was a preliminary concept she wanted to present to the Board about a new building downtown.

Ms. Ely asked if a date had been chosen for the next Worksession. Ms. Fenton suggested choosing a date before hearing the preliminary presentation, and polled the Board members for their availability. October 3rd at 5:00 p.m. was selected as the date for the Worksession, and Ms. Vest commented she would try to secure the basement conference room for that evening.

Ms. Fenton helped the applicant, Mr. Jeff Bushman, set up his model and drawings, and then turned the floor over to him. Mr. Bushman described the area of town depicted by the model. He indicated that the parking lot is currently owned by Charlottesville Contemporary Arts, which is the company that is building the proposed building. He stated the building will be used by CCA, Second Street Gallery and Lighthouse, a non-profit arts organization dedicated to high schools. Although the funding is low, the ambitions are high for the structure. They

have been working on it for four or five months, designing it from the inside out, and have just recently begun looking at exterior elevations. He indicated that they would welcome input from the BAR about the direction that they are taking with the building. He stated that the building will be a Type II fireproof structure, containing two theaters, as well as space for the Second Street Gallery on the first floor, and tenant space for Lighthouse on the fourth floor. He discussed height limitations, and indicated that the current model is almost exactly a reflection of the zoning envelope. The applicants are trying to keep the exterior of the building anonymous and straightforward looking, without a lot of pretense. He indicated that due to the fireproof requirements, the building will have reinforced concrete block as structural walls, with pre-cast concrete planks, similar to the construction of a parking garage. The tenants regard that level of finish for the interior as completely appropriate. He then described the setting of the building on the lot, pointing out the entrances and the exterior terrace on the corner of Second Street and Water Street. He indicated that CCA has begun talking with the City about future extension of the Mall down Second Street, so that this building and Second Street could actually engage and dovetail along the line of the exterior arcade.

Ms. Fenton asked if everyone is in agreement on the design of the interior, and Mr. Bushman that they are.

Mr. Coiner asked where the idea for the exterior stairs came from. Mr. Bushman indicated that that was the idea of his clients. He stated that there is a long tradition of what a theater lobby should be -- that the theatrical experience should begin at the lobby doors -- and so the exterior stairway is envisioned as part of that experience, since it could be decorated with banners on opening nights, for example.

Mr. Tremblay asked for a summary of the exterior materials that would be visible. Mr. Bushman

indicated that the main frame of the building would be three-coat stucco; the base of the building would be another material, possibly darker stucco or limestone; painted steel for railings and the marquee; and either steel or a stucco box for the rehearsal room.

Ms. Winner asked where the heating and air conditioning units would be located. Mr. Bushman indicated that they would be behind a screen up on

the roof. He stated that since the roof terrace might potentially be used for performances, meetings and other events, the noise of the mechanical system is as important an issue as its visibility.

Ms. Hook asked how delivery trucks would access the site. Mr. Bushman indicated they would access the building right from the street.

Ms. Fenton commented that once the building is complete, parking will be freed up on the street, since that space now is devoted to entrances to the parking lot. She added that space could be made for a loading zone.

Mr. Atkins commented that it is exciting that there will be an active set of theaters and galleries in that location. He stated that in terms of urban design, the large two-storey scale portico, where all sorts of interesting things will be happening, will be a really dynamic addition to that corner of the block. He commented that the scale is nice, but he anticipates people having reservations about the stucco material, which is somewhat unfamiliar on the mall. He stated it would also be crucial to get the secondary in-fill in the large openings just right, and asked for clarification on the material choice. Mr. Bushman indicated that much of the secondary in-fill would be steel. Mr. Atkins then said that urbanistically, he is really enthusiastic about what the building would do for Second Street and Water Street, and would personally support the use of stucco.

Ms. Winner commented that she is pleased that the applicant is not proposing brick.

Mr. Tremblay commented that this strikes him as a positive addition to a block that is otherwise characterized by back doors and rear entrances.

Mr. Coiner indicated he would like to see more emphasis on Water Street. Ms. Fenton added that a long term goal of the City is to have Water Street be very much a viable part of the Downtown Mall.

Mr. Bushman commented that the building does make use of the corner, and stated that there would be a lot of activity in and out of a door to a workshop on the Water Street side.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions the applicant wanted to ask of the Board. Mr. Bushman stated the question of materials was his main concern. Ms. Fenton then commented that the BAR is less brick-needing than people presume it to be.

Mr. Schwartz commented that he feels this is going to be a great project. He stated he agrees with the comments of Mr. Atkins and Mr. Tremblay that the secondary and third-order materials that in-fill behind the very simple mask or skin of stucco are the key elements that will make the building extremely successful as a contribution to the City. He stated that merely filling in the blank corner is a terrific improvement to begin with, but ultimately the life of the building architecturally is going to be in the sometimes delicate, sometimes forceful pieces that fill in behind the stucco or stone. He indicated he is very enthusiastic about the idea of the steel and glass system operating in dialogue with the heavier material. He suggested that the Water Street elevation might be improved by making changes to the big window on the left-hand side over the entrance. The other big issue is how the building meets the ground and how it meets the sky, and so the question of stucco is partly a functional question of whether it can withstand the day-to-day abuse that it is going to get on the ground. Lastly, he commented that both a morning view of the building that accentuates the depth of the various elevations, and a night view that illustrates how the building reverses in its use as a performance space, with light emanating out of the big openings, would be helpful to have when the applicant makes his presentation to the BAR or elsewhere. He stated he is very excited about this project, and thinks the addition of the stair to make the street a part of the theatrical experience is a wonderful idea.

Ms. Winner asked about the timeframe for construction. Mr. Bushman indicated that the goal is to start March 1st.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Winner seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.