

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

**Minutes**

**Present:**

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

**Also Present:**

Tarpley Vest

At 5:00 P.M. Ms. Fenton convened the meeting. Ms. Fenton stated that she has requested that preliminary conferences be held until after all other business has been conducted. She indicated that preliminary conferences can take up a lot of time and keep the board from getting to important issues.

Ms. Winner agreed that Ms. Fenton's idea is a good one.  
Mr. Nelson indicated that it is logical.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she received a letter from Oliver Kuttner with copies for the board. She distributed copies of the letter to board members.

**100 W Main Street**

Ms. Vest presented the staff report.

Giovanna Galfione, architect, presented a massing model to the board. She indicated that she has met with staff and that she thinks that the time is ripe to get approval for the front portion of the building. She indicated that she is confident that the massing is set and that there are not many other possible massing moves to be made. She indicated that the design details and materials for each portion of the building will be submitted at a larger scale. She stated that she anticipates that most of these details will be ready for submittal for the next BAR meeting.

At this point, Dawn Thompson arrived.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the sidewalk issue has been one of the most challenging aspects of the project. She indicated that she has done a lot of work on her own for the sake of exploration and for

her willingness to respond to feedback from the board. She indicated that she has explored making a larger gesture in the lowering of the street in the section drawings. She stated that the model shows the recession with the least impact. She indicated that a more gradual lowering can be pursued if this is something that everybody agrees upon and the different interests can come together to make it happen.

At this point, Mr. Oschrin arrived.

Ms. Galfione indicated that before she worked on the scheme with the larger lowering, she got some more technical information. She indicated that it is hard to find specific answers about the water and sewer, but there is between 4 and 5 feet on top of the sewer. She indicated that the implications place a limit on how the recession may be expanded. She indicated that the required 15 ft. fire lane has been maintained in the drawings and that lampposts and trees have been included. She indicated that there is some distance from the wall of Woolworth's that will allow the use planters, trees, or bushes to create some kind of layer along the wall. She indicated that a buffer provides a ramp for handicap access to the lower plaza. She indicated that a series of lampposts could be included along the north and south portion of the street and that they will create a layering of elements. She pointed out the plan drawing and indicated that access for deliveries and temporary parking has been included in this scenario. She pointed out the section drawing and indicated that from the center of the lowered plaza a person can go up the ramp towards Main Street or up the steps. She indicated that it may be possible to create seating with benches along the ramp to become less obtrusive

Ms. Galfione indicated that most of the massing has not changed since the last meeting. She indicated that there is a variation on the corner piece between Water and 1<sup>st</sup> Streets. She indicated that she is trying to respond to comments from board members about the lack of continuity around the corner of the building. She indicated that she has tried to address those comments and to create a transparent wall that grows up towards the corner and projects out. She indicated that the central piece has been adjusted to an arched system of windows which now tries to be a little more coherent. She indicated that there are framed big pieces of glass that are a little more defined. She indicated that the upper front portion is pushed back 20 feet. She indicated that the front piece is designed to create a loft condition instead of simple apartments. She indicated that the façade on the Mall is derived from one of the solutions presented previously.

Ms. Galfione stated that the design is still developing. She indicated that she is confident that articulating the massing along 1<sup>st</sup> Street is critical and the right approach. She indicated that each piece has a separate character. She indicated that she thinks she is on the right track and that she is open to discussing it. She indicated that some coherence is proposed by some common gestures. She indicated that the first floors are open and transparent with large big open glass panels continuing from Water Street and the top floors have punched windows. She indicated there is coherence to the series of setbacks on the top of each part and that the setbacks can be further addressed with some type of trellis system.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she still has research to do on the materials. She indicated brick will be the primary material. She indicated that it is important to introduce other materials. She stated that they are considering using cast stone, which is a very flexible material.

Ms. Galfione pointed out the plan and stated that the relationship to Central Place was discussed at the last meeting. She indicated that the recession on 1<sup>st</sup> Street is at a much smaller scale, with a series of steps leading down to a plaza. She stated that this scale is more coherent to the scale of the street. She indicated that, as Mr. Kuttner addressed in the letter, they cannot afford to build the larger, more ambitious scheme. She indicated that the only way that it can be built is through a public/private partnership and that Mr. Kuttner is willing to participate as long as he doesn't have to wait too long.

Ms. Fenton asked if the city has been approached with the concept.

Ms. Galfione answered no. She indicated that if there is support from the BAR, they are willing to continue and is willing to meet to see if it is possible. She indicated that it may not be possible in a timely fashion and they would like input on the smaller lowering of the sidewalk, which Mr. Kuttner is willing to pay for.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there are a couple of pieces to the proposal that the applicant is looking for: First, approval of the massing over the Footlocker Store; Second, feedback from the board on the lowering of the sidewalk; and Third, feedback on the overall direction of the building. She stated that the most crucial piece is the approval that they are here for.

Mr. Celentano asked the applicant if she is just seeking approval for the massing over Footlocker. He asked her what she considers to be the "massing".

Ms. Galfione indicated that the approval could be under the condition that the materials and details be submitted at a later date. She indicated that she considers the volume and setbacks to be included in the massing.

Mr. Celentano asked about the façade in front of the Footlocker Store.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the façade cannot be changed without Footlocker's approval.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he wants to know more about the piece above the Footlocker.

Ms. Galfione indicated that there will probably be terrace to the building wall.

Mr. Celentano asked if this was important in terms of the massing issue to know if the terrace will be there or not.

Ms. Galfione answered yes.

Mr. Neslon asked if an alternate paving material would be used on 1<sup>st</sup> Street.

Ms. Galfione answered that it should be considered as a whole and that it could be landscaped and paved.

Mr. Nelson asked if the windows on the Water Street side would be working single panel windows.

Ms. Galfione answered yes, all the windows are to be operable. She stated they did not choose double hung windows because they would contradict the more modern look of that piece of the design. She indicated that windows will be shown in detail with the next submittal.

Ms. Fenton asked if the massing is approved, in what the timeframe is the applicant prepared to bring back the rest of the project. She indicated that the board is being asked to do this piecemeal

and she understands the urgency of the roof leaking. She asked if there is a deadline and timeframe for the rest of the project to be presented.

Ms. Galfione answered that she plans to present most of the materials details at the February meeting.

Ms. Fenton asked if the entire roof of the building is leaking.

Ms. Galfione answered yes. She stated that the only other solution is a temporary roof, which is very expensive and impractical.

Mr. Celentano asked what Ms. Galfione understands approving the massing would allow them to do.

Ms Galfione indicated that approval of the massing would allow them to build the structure over Footlocker.

Mr. Celentano asked if this approval would include the openings.

Ms. Galfione answered that would be useful to have approval of the openings.

Ms. Hook asked when Footlocker would be required to give their permission to do this work.

Ms. Galfione answered as soon as possible.

Ms. Hook asked if they had been approached.

Ms. Galfione indicated that Mr. Kuttner is working on this. She indicated that the management is very wide and it is a complicated process.

Ms. Fenton asked if there is a possibility that, even if the board gives approval of the massing, nothing would be done before the next meeting because of the need for Footlocker' s approval.

Ms. Galfione answered no. She indicated that Footlocker only controls the façade in front of the store and nothing above the store.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the lower of the street would limit vehicular access.

Ms. Galfione answered no because the recession would only be 8 ft.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that lowering the street will involve public approval He asked if there are for legal reasons for the 8-foot recession, from a code standpoint or if the decision was based on aesthetics.

Ms. Galfione answered that the decision was made for aesthetic reasons. She indicated that they could create a 5 foot stair, but that would be a narrow hole.

Mr. Oschrin asked where the ramp access would be.

Mr. Galfione answered that entrance would be from the main lobby.

Mr. Oschrin asked there if there have been previous BAR projects that received massing approval.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the previous board liked to look at projects in their entirety.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the massing is pretty much shaped by the structural supports.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he is uncomfortable with approving the massing at this stage. He indicated that this is really preliminary. He indicated that to his knowledge the board has not ever come back and reversed themselves between a preliminary and a final submittal. He indicated that this proposal makes him more nervous than usual. He indicated that according to Mr. Kuttner's letter the architect is drawing something that the applicant does not even approve of. He indicated that the whole thing is strange.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the drawing is an exploration and a response to what was requested by the board.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the letter from Mr. Kuttner states that he did not authorize the architect to draw it and he will not pay for it.

Ms. Galfione indicated that there are two scenarios for the street but the building will be essentially the same. She indicated that Mr. Kuttner also likes the larger cut but that he cannot afford to pay for it.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that in either case the city will need to be involved because it will be a taking of property.

Ms. Winner asked if the massing has been determined by the underlying structural supports. Ms. Galfione answered yes. She indicated that the upper level cannot be expanded.

Ms. Winner stated that the massing could not be changed much from what is presented. Ms. Galfione agreed that the massing could not be changed over Footlocker.

Mr. Oschrin asked what the scale of the model was. The answer was 1 inch equals 20 feet.

Ms. Winner asked Ms. Vest if staff found the massing to meet the guidelines. Ms. Vest answered yes and that this was included in the staff report. She indicated that there is a section in the guidelines that addresses stepping back the upper stories. She indicated that this massing seems to meet that guideline.

Mr. Fenton indicated that the question for the board is if they are willing to approve the massing and if they are willing to look at the front piece as a separate entity or to look at the property as a whole. She indicated that the front piece is defined by Footlocker and the board is being asked if they are willing to look at that piece as a separate entity.

Ms. Thompson asked why the board could not approve the entire design. Ms. Fenton answered that they could, but that they have not been asked. Ms. Galfione indicated that she is seeking approval for the volumetric design without the specific materials and details.

Mr. Neslon asked if looking at the massing includes looking at the architectural elements. Ms. Galfione answered no, but that they are looking for approval for the opening system. Mr. Celentano indicated that the approval would not include the mullion pattern or material of windows.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he is deeply concerned that the entire development hinges on whether there is a street front basement entry and the owner has not approached the city about lowering the sidewalk. He indicated that he is concerned about closing the street to traffic. He indicated that they should not go ahead and approve the massing when the entire design could change.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he does not think that this is a concern at all. He indicated that he does not see how the street affects the massing.

Ms. Galfione indicated that if for some reason the street cannot be lowered she is confident that they can find a design solution.

Ms. Fenton indicated that board must determine if the front piece holds on its own. She asked the board if the front piece seems to be a reasonable thing to do if nothing were done to the back of the building.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that a small change can have a ripple effect. He indicated that he is not in favor of looking at a development like this piecemeal.

Ms. Galfione indicated that even if they choose not to deal with the street level change she is confident that she would still come to the board and work out a good design solution.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the drawings on the wall represent a change from what they received in their packet. He indicated that the three large opening are an improvement.

Mr. Nelson asked, hypothetically, what they would be left with if the massing were approved and the development did not happen.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she cannot answer that question. She indicated that general support has been shown for the project. She indicated that we have to start somewhere.

Ms. Fenton asked for comments from the board members.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agrees with Ms. Winner that the front portion has a limited range of available options for the massing, based on the building structure. He indicated that he is not yet comfortable with all the elements of the design and he is not sure if he understands yet all the full qualities of the design proposal. He indicated that he is nervous about the terrace piece. He indicated that this piece will have a prominent look from the pedestrian level on Main Street. He stated that it presents something really unusual along the Mall and he wonders whether it would be a cleaner resolution to simply have the setback and not to have the tray coming forward. He indicated that he is also concerned about the horizontal piece that goes across along First Street. He stated that he is personally comfortable trying to help in any way that they can in trying to see if it is

possible to move forward. He stated that he also shares other peoples anxieties about such a major investment and a really significant project downtown. He stated that if it continues to head in a direction where each element is approved on a piece by piece basis that makes him very nervous. He indicated that the front piece is unique because of the constraints of the structure. He indicated that he would be uncomfortable approving the other elements of the scheme one by one. In terms of the overall scheme, he indicated that he does prefer the more generous stair sequence.

Mr. Schwartz asked if it is possible to have a little bit more continuity among the various elements. He indicated that there are several pieces along 1<sup>st</sup> Street. He indicated that he understands the uniqueness of the corner and he thinks that it is a very nicely resolved solution to the scheme and he understands why she would want to celebrate that. He indicated that all the other elements along the way are a little at cross-purposes with such a coherent idea.

Ms. Galfione asked Mr. Schwartz if he had any objection to the central tallest piece on 1<sup>st</sup> Street. Mr. Schwartz indicated that the variation of the surfaces and the articulation of the pieces are his concern in the rear portion. He indicated that there are five separate pieces in a relatively short stretch of real estate. He stated that this has him a little concerned and yet he understands the design to have variety. He indicated that it is a difficult balance to achieve.

Ms. Galfione indicated that the block is 230 feet long and that the other side of the street contains three buildings.

Ms. Fenton stated that she agrees with Mr. Schwarz that she has no problem approving the front massing. She indicated that she has difficulty with the terrace. She indicated that she willing to approve the massing but that she would like approval to be contingent upon all other elements being approved in a timely manner.

Ms. Galfione indicated that approval of the first part is an emergency.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the applicant has done a wonderful job. He indicated that he loves the detail of the sidestreet, which could be just a long expanse of brick wall. He indicated that he loves how it looks as if it has been there for 100 years. He stated that the is anxiously awaiting the detailed elevation drawings. He indicated that he is comfortable with the massing and that the project is heading in a good direction. He indicated that the massing has not changed much since the last meeting.

Ms. Galfione indicated that there are three options relating to the cut in the street: 1)no cut 2) a small cut 3) a large cut. She indicated that in order to speak with the City about the cut, she would like a clear statement about how the BAR stands on both the large and small cuts. She indicated that it would be helpful to know which cut is preferred.

Ms. Fenton asked the board members if they would be willing to support the concept of a cut of either size. Ms. Fenton, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Celentano, Ms. Winner, Ms. Hook, Mr. Schwartz, and Ms. Thomson indicated that they would be willing to support a cut of either size. Mr. Oschrin indicated that he was not willing to support the cut at this time.

Ms. Galfione indicated that it is possible to have either the larger or smaller scheme. She indicated that she can go with this information to the City and explore whether the technical issues can be addressed.

Ms. Fenton suggested that the applicants go now to the City with preliminary approval from the BAR so that when they come back to the BAR they will have a good sense of where they stand with the City.

Mr. Oschrein indicated that an intrusion into the public right of way may need to go to a public hearing and that could slow the process down.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she is glad that she started the process hearing and that she can now go to the City with the BAR's support of the concept.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the applicants have preliminary support for the cut from the BAR and that the scheme with the larger cut is the preferred scheme.

Mr. Oschrein indicated that he has a dissenting opinion. He indicated that taking the road is a potentially bad idea.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he had a comment regarding the letter from Mr. Kuttner to the board members. He indicated that several months ago when the board was shown preliminary sketches of the proposed cut the drawings were incomplete and there was no three dimensional representation of the scheme. He indicated that the drawings in no way made a convincing argument for the cut. He indicated that he was extremely nervous about cutting into a public right of way at that point. He indicated that some board members have now changed their position because of the drawings and the three-dimensional study that has been presented. He indicated that the public benefits of the recession have been explored. He indicated that change in opinion of the board members is the result of new and more complete information.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the original scheme also showed a walled in area that is different from the more recent presentation.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that there have been a lot of changes since the original meeting and there was nothing that was encouraging about what they saw originally relative to the street. He indicated that he supports the more generous opening if that is a possibility. He indicated that the letter also makes him nervous because he does not think that the BAR should be negotiating entirely on the part of any private individual. He indicated that they are there to approve and disapprove and to provide whatever they can in the form of recommendations. He indicated that he does not think that implies that the city is then responsible for paying or for improving something and that, as Mr. Oschrein implied, it is really a public issue.

Mr. Oschrein indicated that he concurs with Mr. Schwartz's comments. He indicated that if it can be done he recommends the larger cut. He indicated that his view is not just from an architectural standpoint but from the view of the entire city and from a master planning perspective. He



indicated that he has a big concern about limiting vehicular access on the side street. He indicated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Mall crossing have been very successful. He indicated that cutting into the road will eliminate the future possibility of opening up that street to cars.

Mr. Oschrin asked Ms. Galfione if the site is all one lot.  
Ms. Galfione answered yes.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that if they were two separate lots they could be treated as two separate applications. He indicated that he is concerned that it would be terrible precedent to approve one part of the project without approving the entire project. He indicated that they do not have the detailing that they need. He indicated that if the applicant is not ready to present the entire proposal that is his problem and not the board's problem. He indicated that he does not feel that the board has a responsibility to fast track the project. He indicated that he would like to review the project as a complete proposal or not at all.

Ms. Hook indicated that she agrees with most of the comments that have been made. She indicated that she is willing to approve the first phase over Footlocker.

Mr. Oschrin asked Ms. Hook if she was willing to approve the first phase of massing based on what she sees in the presentation. Ms. Hook answered yes.

Mr. Celentano indicated that on the issue of approval he has no problem approving the massing but he has concern about some of the details including the openings and mullion patterns. He indicated that in looking at the plan he understands that it is really four separate buildings. He indicated that it gets more convincing as the proposal develops. He indicated that the applicant has done a good job of responding to the comments. He indicated that the idea of a loft space above Footlocker sounds good.

Mr. Celentano indicated that on the subject of the partial approval he thinks that work that has been done up to this point has developed a level of trust and that he feels comfortable approving the massing on a partial basis.

Mr. Celentano indicated that, regarding the street issue; he prefers the scaled down solution. He indicated that the scale of that gesture doesn't seem to need to be big

Ms. Galfione asked if the cut on the model looks scaled back enough to him.  
Mr. Celentano answered yes, but that it could be scaled back even more.

Ms. Winner indicated that she is very comfortable approving the massing. She indicated that, as stated in the staff report, the massing is determined by the structure and the massing meets the Design Guidelines. Ms. Winner indicated that she agrees that that the applicant should be asked to bring back the entire project for approval at the next meeting.

Mr. Nelson asked Ms. Galfione if she was seeking approval for the window elements with the massing.  
Ms. Galfione answered yes.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he shares the same concerns about approving the project in pieces. He indicated that he could support the approval of the massing with Ms. Fenton's request that the remainder of the project is submitted at one time. He stated that he maintains his excitement about the project.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she would be very pleased to vote in favor of the design as presented. She indicated that she is reluctant to vote only on the front part. She indicated that it could conceivably be left as just the front part of the building and this is a big concern.

Ms. Galfione indicated it is in the business interest of her client to build as much as possible as soon as possible.

Mr. Nelson asked if the upper portion would be accessible through Footlocker.  
The answer was no.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the rear of the property would have to be developed in order to access the space above Footlocker.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he supports the motion suggested by staff in the report with a statement that the project must be submitted in its entirety.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the massing arrangement of the northern section of the building to permit construction to begin on this portion of the site with the understanding that the design and materials of all exterior elevations must be reviewed and approved by the BAR in their entirety in conjunction with the remainder of the project at the next review.

Mr. Oschrin asked how they can build with just a massing approval.

Ms. Vest indicated that this approval will allow the applicants to go ahead and start putting the structure in without knowing specific design details of the exterior elevations. She indicated that this will help the applicants to start to address the roof issue. She indicated that this will allow them to get a phased building permit.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Schwartz to define "entirety."

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he understood entirety to be the full property as described on the tax parcel.

Ms. Fenton indicated that entirety also means the design and material of all exterior elevations.

Mr. Celentano amended to the motion to add the following:

Our understanding of massing is the outside envelope of the building including the placement of the openings and excluding the terrace and the trellis elements.

Mr. Schwartz stated that it is the board's understanding that they have not approved the elements beyond the primary mass of this north wing. He indicated that they do not want to confuse the applicant about what has been approved. He indicated that they are trying to accommodate the applicant.

Ms. Winner seconded Mr. Schwartz's motion as amended.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he thinks this is a terrible mistake that the board will regret for a number of reasons. He indicated that nature of trying to wrestle with motion and including a requirement to submit the entire project next time sends the wrong message. He indicated that this good deed will not go unpunished. He stated that he is opposed and that he requests that the applicant come back to the board with a full set of plans so that he will have a better idea of what the proposal will look like.

Ms. Galfione indicated that approval of all could be tied to the front portion of the building.

Ms. Galfione asked the board if they were comfortable approving the massing as a whole.

Mr. Oschrin asked if that had ever been done before.

Ms. Vest indicated that the new Wachovia Building received conceptual approval and the applicants returns with the specific design details and materials.

Ms. Fenton asked Ms. Vest to include a floorplan marking the area with massing approval be sent to the applicant.

Ms. Vest responded that she would include such a plan with the approval letter.

Ms. Fenton asked for a vote on the motion on the floor.

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

## **BAR APPLICATION PROCEDURES**

### **Second Meeting:**

Ms. Fenton indicated that she would like the board to consider conducting a second meeting each month for applicants who need to come back to the board with details or minor changes. She indicated that if Wertland Street District is adopted, this will add even more properties to the already busy schedule. She asked the board members to indicate if they are in favor of this idea and if they are willing to attend. She indicated that the concept is to allow applicants who have already appeared before the board to come back in two weeks rather than a month. She indicated that the meeting will not be used for new business, unless it is an extreme emergency, such as a roof that has collapsed.

Ms. Fenton asked all willing board members to vote in favor of the second meeting.

The second meeting was unanimously approved.

### **Approval of Minutes: December 15, 1998**

Ms. Fenton indicated that in the case of the South Street appeal the motion for denial did not include clear reasons for why the application was denied. She asked that in future motions for denial, a clear reason for denial be included in the motion. She asked the board members to carefully review all the minutes. She indicated that the comments in the minutes were not as clear about the problems with the application as the board members had been at the meeting.

Mr. Nelson indicated that Ms. Fenton did an outstanding job in handling the last City Council appeal.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agrees with Mr. Nelson and that Ms. Fenton's presentation was very impressive.

Mr. Celentano indicated that within the architecture community there is a lot of concern about the recent appeals. He indicated that a petition is circulating in support of the BAR. Indicated that the local chapter of AIA is conducting Architecture Week in April. He indicated that this will include a panel discussion on the topic of design review. He indicated that this is an opportunity for the BAR.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she has given issue a lot of thought. She indicated that she and others have considered resigning. She indicated that if they resigned there would be new people in the same position with the same problems. She suggested that the BAR host a public forum with the community to discuss the BAR process. She indicated would be is an opportunity for developers, architects, preservations, city councils and anyone else to come forward and express their views about the process. She indicated that she would like suggestions on ways to structure the meeting.

Ms. Winner indicated that there may be model communities whose BAR's are supported by the local government..

Ms. Fenton indicated that she would like the board to do some research before architecture week begins on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that there is some risk to overreacting to what has happened. He indicated that appeals happen very infrequently.

Ms. Winner indicated that looking at other communities can broaden our vision of what is possible.

Mr. Nelson indicated that there is some misinformation about what the BAR is involved with and this may be a chance to educate the public.

Ms. Hook indicated that we are in a time of great change within the community with several recently established historic districts. She indicated that we may not have gotten the information out effectively.

Ms. Winner indicated that there is a great opportunity for an educational program.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he had two corrections to make to the December minutes. He stated that on page 3, third paragraph the last sentence should read: "He indicated that the applicants went to the BZA and did all the **right** things."

Mr. Nelson stated that on page9, second paragraph, third sentence should read: "She indicated that she **is** concerned **that the** applicant will go to council and show this to be a tempest in a teapot."

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the December minutes with amendments.  
Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### Checklist of Requirements for Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Vest indicated that she is still seeking feedback on the checklist from the board.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the board could go ahead and approve the checklist for a limited period of time and that the board could get feedback on how the list is working.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the checklist as presented for a three-month period. He indicated that after the three-month period, Ms. Vest could report back to the board on the checklist.

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

#### 418 East Jefferson Street

Mr. Greg Brazinsky, architect, presented the proposal. He indicated that the building represents 5 additions. He indicated that the Court Square building is the oldest and that the McQue building was built in 1920. He indicated that he came before the board in November with a conceptual idea. He indicated that he got comments about the mid-block gable. He indicated that he has met with John Wells that has brought dramatic changes to the project. He indicated that with a split level building there is a question of fenestration and how you interface. He indicated that because it is no longer occupied by a single tenant it must be handicap accessible. He indicated that elevator is pushed back and this is part of the dictate from VDHR. He indicated that the district lists the site as three separate buildings and the buildings are representative of the period in which they were built. He indicated that he had to achieve a major setback in order to differentiate the work. He indicated that he had to do something above the building that disappears to most of the public. He indicated that his question was how to resolve the two coming together. He indicated that it is a non-elevation from the front. He indicated that he must keep the impact to a minimum from the front.

Mr. Oschrin asked if he was adding one floor.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that he is adding one floor on the three-story piece and two floors on the two-story piece.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that it is a big move to punch through the wall. He indicated that simple solutions work well in an area that is orthogonal in nature.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that the mass has a visual perception of being light. He indicated that the mass has a tendency to bend and he is trying to use lighter materials. He indicated that the addition has to setback far enough that it is not easily seen.

Ms. Fenton asked if the backside is open.

Mr. Brazinsky answered yes and that it is a terrace. He indicated that he is thinking about picking up the terrace texture on the other side to penetrate as a means of playing it back and forth.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he missed the first presentation and that the applicant did a good job of explaining the context and sequence. He indicated that he served with John Wells on the art and architecture review board and that this is an important issue for the board. He indicated that it makes sense to do the setback as it has been done and he understands the issue of the issue of the integrity of the street. He indicated that he is concerned about how that idea gets developed in its subtlety and detail. He indicated that it is good to think comprehensively and to suppress the impact of the addition and asked the exterior wall. He indicated that on the issue of details there is a question about how the wall is developed. He indicated that details make a huge difference between something that is very good and something that is not successful.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he agrees that details are very important and that he is a little concerned.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that the wall needs to create no significant impact from the street.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the massing makes sense. He indicated that there is enough variation and that it is a convincing part of the roofscape of downtown. He indicated that a porch structure is read as lighter and attached but distinguished as a structure or as infill.

Mr. Brazinsky asked if he heard Mr. Celentano say to deal with the element as a porch structure. Mr. Celentano indicated that it would be better if he broke it up. He indicated that a combination of all white pieces with varied roofline but tied together would leave the street element but break this up.

Mr. Brazinsky asked if the curve or the angle is an issue.

Mr. Nelson indicated that each board member should have a change to finish comments.

Ms. Winner indicated that she lives in the neighborhood. She indicated that she would be charmed to live close to this site as presented. She indicated that this is a delightful departure that does not smack you in the face.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the idea of a non-building sounds like a mistake. He asked why design something that you don't want to see. He indicated that the applicant has done this very successfully. He indicated that he like the improvements that he sees that that the contemporary elements are used successfully with traditional. He indicated that he is pleased with the proposal.

Ms. Thompson indicated that she agrees that the detailing is important. She indicated that she tends to be more traditional. She indicated that roofline in this part of town and the bend of the window is startling to her at this time. She indicated that she could become accustomed to it. She indicated that the details would be the determining factor.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the brick would be painted white.

Mr. Brazinsky indicated that they would sandblast the brick to give more articulation. He indicated that the building has many texture and faces and that texturing can achieve that, possibly in a different way. He indicated that he wanted to achieve the use of light.

Ms. Hook indicated that it takes time to get used to the proposal. She indicated that she is willing to get used to it.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her strongest concern is the view from Court Square. She indicated that as long as the impact from there is not strong, she is supportive.

Ms. Fenton indicated that there is consensus of support and that the details will make the project.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she will not be present at the February meeting and indicated that Mr. Nelson will chair the meeting.

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

Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Schwartz announced that Mr. Celentano has just been named the president of the local AIA chapter.