

SPECIAL MEETING
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
DOWNTOWN BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
NOVEMBER 6, 1984 -- 8:30 A.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT

Jack Rinehart, Chairman
Michael Bednar, Vice Chairman
Carol Troxell
John Allen
Genevieve Keller
Doug Gilpin

STAFF PRESENT

Satyendra Singh Huja
Glenn Larson

Mr. Rinehart called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

A. OLD BUSINESS

1. DBAR 84-9-19
--Reid Grocery Site
Fifth and Main Streets
Replacement Buildings
F&M Partnership, Applicants

Mr. Gilpin stated he was abstaining from discussion and voting on this issue because of a conflict of interest. Mr. Browne gave a brief presentation to the Board on the latest design for buildings to be constructed on the Ried's Grocery Site. He stated that he was submitting elevations for only the three buildings that would be fronting on the mall, and that the plans for the four buildings fronting on 5th Street would be submitted for review at a later date. Mr. Rinehart questioned whether there would be a change in brick between the buildings. Mr. Browne replied that he planned to have some difference in texture, but no brick on the mall elevations would be painted. Mr. Bednar said that Mr. Browne should bring in brick samples, and Mr. Rinehart stated that he hoped trim colors would vary from building to building. Mr. Browne stated that individual storefront design will vary according to the needs of each owner. There was additional discussion about the treatment of the rear facade of the buildings. After this, Mr. Bednar moved that the drawings dated October 26, 1984 and presented to the board by Mr. Browne that day be approved with the following conditions:

1. The subsequent design of individual storefronts, awnings, signs, railings and other details based on tenant requests be reviewed by the board.
2. Samples of brick and trim colors be submitted for review by the Board.

This motion also suggested that more interest and variety be considered in the design of the building's rear facades. This motion was seconded by Mr. Allen and approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the board adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

if needed - 12/27 avoid it

DBAR 11/27

MINUTES 10/23 - OK

11/6 - OK

DBAR 84-10-22 GEORGE SOUTHWELL

marquee - quietly installed

CONDITION - ^{SR} more approval MB - record unanimous

1. later review of treatment of east second story wall behind wall facade with treatment of brick running up the edge
2. mechanical equipment removed from roof
3. review of proposal for treatment of 3rd fl. alley
4. approval of glazing
5. signs and directions
6. ~~approval of exterior lighting + fixtures~~ ^{details of} 24 hour lighting off Market
7. treatment of brick - recess panel or Market as brick difficult to match
8. exterior light fixtures all around
9. color change - color chips be submitted
10. new marquee - contemporary treatment - ^{or authentic match} approve drawing
 - a. contact Richard about feeling

PUBLIC ART -

1. east facade of McSweeney
2. City owned islands in front of City Hall
3. Plaza area of garage - Mill + 8th St.

RE: Jack Letter

12:00

Brickwork notation for approval with conditions

~~1) later review of ~~exterior~~~~

Review of

1) ~~later~~ Proposal for ~~upper~~ treatment of upper wall facade

2) Mech. equip. rent on roof removed

3) Review of proposal for alley from Third Street

4) Landscaping plan submitted

5) Submittal of Signs and directives

6) ~~App~~ Details of lighting for alley off Market Street

7) ~~Treatment of brick~~

Brick infill at Third + Market to be recessed panels

8) ~~light~~ exterior light for the proposal

9) Color and joint ~~style~~ approval

10) New awning on Third Street to be authentic or ~~later~~ contemporary in style. Detailed

Second by Bedner
Approved unanimously.

C) Other business

Status of art & sculpture recommendations
Designated temporary sculpture zones
McBuffy Art Center east lawn, The Islands in
front of City Hall, Mall and Fifth Street side of
Parker Garage. Memorandum to be forwarded
to City Manager.

D) Matter for Public

E) Chair man's report

Since December meeting falls on
Christmas Day, a special meeting
will be scheduled if needed.

F) Board report

G) Dept of Community Development

Adjournment at 12:00 noon.

CITY OF
CHARLOTTESVILLE
VIRGINIA

MEMO

TO: Distribution List
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S. S. H.
DATE: November 19, 1984
RE: Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District Presentation

The purpose of this memorandum is to invite you to attend a presentation on the Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District, given by graduate architectural history students under the direction of Professor Roy Graham. This presentation will be on Wednesday, December 5, 1984 at 7:00 p.m. in Room 153 of the University of Virginia Architecture School.

As you are aware, the listing of the Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places has already made significant impacts, not only in promoting the rehabilitation of fraternity houses, but in further fostering cooperation between the City, the University, fraternities and neighborhoods. This presentation reviews the history of the Rugby Road - University Corner area, analyzes its architectural characteristics and offers recommendations for improvements.

We hope you will be able to attend this presentation. Should you have any questions, please call me or Glenn Larson at 971-3182. Thank you.

GL/gl

Distribution List:

City Council
Planning Commission
Landmarks Commission
Board of Architectural Review
Downtown Board of Architectural Review
Cole Hendrix, City Manager
Ray C. Hunt, Jr., V.P. for Business and Finance, UVa
Robert T. Canevari, Dean of Students, Uva
Jaquelin T. Robertson, Dean, School of Architecture, UVa
Cynthia Leggett, Historic Renovation Corporation
Inter-Fraternitiy Council
Venable Neighborhood Association

CITY OF
CHARLOTTESVILLE
VIRGINIA
MEMO

TO: Board of Architectural Review
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S. S. H
DATE: November 20, 1984
RE: November 27, 1984 Meeting

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform you that the next BAR meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 27, 1984 at 4:00 p.m. in the Community Development Conference Room. Please find enclosed the following materials:

- An agenda for the November 27th meeting
- Minutes of the October 23rd meeting
- Six new applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

In addition, we have been contacted by Mr. Jack Sanford, Jr., who is interested in removing and rebuilding the three buildings on the Peyton property the board reviewed last month. Mr. Sanford has been invited to attend this meeting to further discuss his plans. Family Services Inc. has also submitted plans for the iron railing in front of their building.

Please visit the sites before the meeting, and call me or Glenn Larson should you have any questions. Thank you.

GL/gl

Attachments

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
NOVEMBER 27, 1984 - 4:00 P.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

A. MINUTES

1. October 23, 1984 regular meeting

B. NEW APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 84-11-201
-Carver-Blakey House
105 W. High Street
Repainting of Roof
Huguette DeVos, Applicant
2. BAR 84-11-202
-Jordan-Morgan-Haden House
901 E. Jefferson St.
Installation of Storm Windows
Victoria Fenwick, Applicant
3. BAR 84-11-203
-United Methodist Church
101 E. Jefferson St.
Sign
R.H. McAden, Applicant
4. BAR 84-11-204
-Peyton Apartments
401 Seventh St., Ne
Sign
Catherine Peters, Applicant
5. BAR 84-11-205
-Willow Cottage House
1118 East Market Street
Signs
Geoffrey Pitts, Applicant
6. BAR 84-11-206
-William Jefferies House
909 W. Main St.
Signs
Charles R. Hickox, Applicant

C. OTHER BUSINESS (Old Business)

1. BAR 84-10-197
-Peyton Property
Outbuilding Relocation
2. BAR 84-9-196
-Family Services Building
Iron Railing
3. Development Trends Along Locust Avenue

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

F. BOARD MEMBER'S REPORTS

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

CITY OF
CHARLOTTESVILLE
VIRGINIA
MEMO

TO: Board of Architectural Review
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S. S. H
DATE: November 20, 1984
RE: November 27, 1984 Meeting

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform you that the next BAR meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 27, 1984 at 4:00 p.m. in the Community Development Conference Room. Please find enclosed the following materials:

- An agenda for the November 27th meeting
- Minutes of the October 23rd meeting
- Six new applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

In addition, we have been contacted by Mr. Jack Sanford, Jr., who is interested in removing and rebuilding the three buildings on the Peyton property the board reviewed last month. Mr. Sanford has been invited to attend this meeting to further discuss his plans. Family Services Inc. has also submitted plans for the iron railing in front of their building.

Please visit the sites before the meeting, and call me or Glenn Larson should you have any questions. Thank you.

GL/gl

Attachments

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
NOVEMBER 27, 1984 - 4:00 P.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

A. MINUTES

1. October 23, 1984 regular meeting

B. NEW APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 84-11-201 -Carver-Blakey House
105 W. High Street
Repainting of Roof
Huguette DeVos, Applicant
2. BAR 84-11-202 -Jordan-Morgan-Haden House
901 E. Jefferson St.
Installation of Storm Windows
Bob Victoria Fenwick, Applicant
3. BAR 84-11-203 -United Methodist Church
101 E. Jefferson St.
Sign
R.H. McAden, Applicant
4. BAR 84-11-204 -Peyton Apartments
401 Seventh St., Ne
Sign
Catherine Peters, Applicant
5. BAR 84-11-205 -Willow Cottage House
1118 East Market Street
Signs
Geoffrey Pitts, Applicant
6. BAR 84-11-206 -William Jefferies House
909 W. Main St.
Signs
Charles R. Hickox, Applicant

C. OTHER BUSINESS (Old Business)

1. BAR 84-10-197 -Peyton Property
Outbuilding Relocation
2. BAR 84-9-196 -Family Services Building
Iron Railing
3. Development Trends Along Locust Avenue

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

F. BOARD MEMBER'S REPORTS

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

TO: Historic Landmarks Commission Members
FROM: Jeff O'Dell, Secretary
RE: Minutes of Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting
1 November 1984

The Charlottesville Historic Landmarks Commission met in City Hall on Thursday, November 1, 1984, at 7:30 p.m. Present were Commission members Douglas, Gilpin, Rosalind Hingeley, Edward Lay, Frances Walton and Jeff O'Dell. Commission member Alexander Gilliam was absent. Also attending the meeting were Eugenia Bibb, historic consultant and surveyor, and Glenn Larson of the Department of Community Development.

Commission Chairman Walton called the meeting to order. The minutes for October were approved with corrections. Next, copies of the May and June minutes of the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) and the Downtown Board of Architectural Review (DBAR) were distributed to Commission members.

Mrs. Walton expressed her pleasure at accompanying Professor Lay's architectural history class on a tour of Lynchburg in September. Eugenia Bibb also joined this tour, which was open to all Commission members.

Chairman Walton passed around a copy of Barbalee Diamondstien's book Buildings Reborn: New Uses, Old Places. Ms. Diamondstien had written a letter to the Commission requesting a list of recently renovated Charlottesville-area buildings that might be considered for description in a forthcoming sequel to her book. Mr. Lay proposed a list of projects for consideration and other Commission members suggested other candidates. Among those adaptive-reuse projects suggested were the Monticello Hotel condominiums; the Jefferson-Madison Library (formerly the Charlottesville Post Office); the South Street Restaurant (formerly a warehouse); the Albemarle County Office Building (formerly Lane High School); the Michie Company offices (formerly the Levy Opera House); the Downtown Charlottesville Recreation Center (formerly The Armory); the King Warehouse office complex; Bull Alley Restaurant (formerly Inge's Grocery); Joseph Bosserman's condominium on the second floor of a Main Street commercial building; the Hardware Store Restaurant, on the Downtown Mall; the McGuffey Arts Center, (formerly McGuffey School); and the Towers House United Virginia Bank office conversion on Park Street. The Commission agreed to adopt this list and to send letters to the owners of each of the above mentioned buildings (along with a copy of the City survey sheet on the respective building) inviting them to submit their building projects for inclusion in Ms. Diamondstien's proposed book.

Chairman Walton reported that she met with the Director of the Department of Community Development, Satyendra Huja concerning the Landmarks Commission's control of funds provided the Commission by the City. Because they disagreed on some points, Mrs. Walton met later with Mayor Frank Buck, who requested a letter from the Landmarks Commission explaining its position on the matter. Mrs. Walton said she would write such a letter to the mayor before the next Commission meeting.

Mrs. Walton also announced that she had learned in her meeting with the Mayor that the question of funding for the Landmarks Commission might prove to be an irrelevant one: proposed changes in federal law may require the City to combine all three of its preservation groups, i.e., the CLC, the BAR and the DBAR.

A copy of a letter from Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Director H. Bryan Mitchell describing these proposed changes in federal law is appended to the minutes.

Mr. Gilpin presented a review of major subjects discussed at both the October meetings of the Board of Architectural Review and Downtown Board of Architectural Review. He reported that there will be at least five more fraternity houses participating in the limited partnership renovation program this year; and that work is proceeding on the renovation of the Barringer Mansion, which will probably serve as a "French-Speaking House", i.e., living quarters for selected UVA French students. He mentioned that Tom Hickman applied for and received a certificate of appropriateness to convert the True Pentecostal Holiness Church at 206 West Market Street into apartments. At that meeting, the DBAR adopted a five-point series of recommendations to City Council regarding the approval of artworks placed on City property.

At its October 23 meeting, the BAR gave permission to owner Frank O'Neill to remove the three outbuildings at The Meadows (aka the Peyton Farm; the Carr Place) to make way for development at Seminole Square shopping center. Mr. O'Neill proposed to retain and renovate the main dwelling on the property, and to give or sell the outbuildings to a person who would remove them from the site and re-erect them elsewhere.

This report prompted a wide-ranging discussion by Commission members, who were concerned that the BAR had given its approval for the removal of these possibly important buildings without consulting the Landmarks Commission. Several members resolved to visit the Meadows as soon as possible to determine whether an attempt should be made to keep the outbuildings--which included a 19th century smokehouse, log dwelling and brick-nogged structure at their original sites. Mr. Gilpin reported that it was the opinion of the BAR that these structures were in poor condition and beyond rehabilitation. When he had suggested to the BAR that the building be moved several yards to another site on the property where they would not be in the way of proposed construction, he was told by other Board members that they felt the structures were in such poor condition that this couldn't be done. The Landmarks Commission decided to reserve judgement on the matter pending an evaluation of the buildings by those Commission members planning to visit the site. Then Mrs. Walton suggested that if the buildings did in fact have to be move, that the Commission recommend they be disassembled and re-erected under guidelines that would assure their architectural integrity and preservation. She also expressed her opinion that the BAR should whenever possible prevent owners from neglecting the upkeep of their historic structures, and later demolishing them on the pretext that the buildings have fallen into disrepair.

Mr. Gilpin continued his report on the BAR meeting, mentioning that the Board had objected to placing iron security bars on the Circuit Court Clerk's Office; that the Board had approved, with reservations, the use of storm windows on the H.H. George House at 412 First Street; and that the Board suggested design changes to proposed addition to Temple Beth Israel.

The Commission next discussed the subject of Certificate-of-Merit Awards for renovation projects. Chairman Walton noted, in response to a question, that the Landmarks Commission's jurisdiction over University of Virginia properties is limited to those that were City property in 1939 or before; all other UVA properties fall within the legal jurisdiction of Albemarle County. She expressed her opinion that the Certificate-of-Merit awards should also become an annual event held in the second week in May. Mr. Lay suggested that the Commission, after approving its own list of buildings at the next meeting, submit this list to both the BAR and DBAR for their comments. He suggested that 211 Fourth Street

be included in such a list, and that Commission members be provided with a list of all buildings awarded Certificates in the past--and that this list designate the respective categories of the awards.

Next, the Commission discussed the proposed, but as yet undecided list of fourteen buildings to be designated local historic landmarks. Chairman Walton said she wanted unanimous approval from Commission members of any such list. She also noted that the list could include more or less than fourteen buildings; that the number fourteen was purely arbitrary. These buildings could be either within or outside of Historic Districts, and could be less than 100 but not less than 50 years old. Lists drawn up by each Commission member will be discussed at the next meeting.

Eugenia Bibb next presented a list of 29 City buildings suggested as candidates for an historic and architectural survey. (This list is appended to the minutes.)

Mr. Larson announced that the City had let a contract with archeological research firm in Washington, D.C. to carry out archeological investigations along the route of the proposed McIntire Road Extension.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING: Thursday, December 6, 1984 at 7:30 p.m.
Basement Conference Room, City Hall**

Agenda: Call to Order (Chairman
Approval of November minutes
Chairman's Report
Members' Reports
Surveyor's Report
Old Business--Further Consideration of "The Fourteen Buildings"
Old Business--Certificate of Merit Awards
Old Business--Publication of the Charlottesville Landmarks Survey Book.
New Business
Preparation of January Agenda
Adjournment (Chairman)

PLEASE CALL MRS. WALTON IN ADVANCE IF YOU CANNOT ATTEND ANY MEETING!!!

NOTE: Appended to the minutes is a list of buildings to be considered for Certificate-of-Merit Awards; Eugenia Bibb's list of buildings to be surveyed, and a copy of a letter to Mayor Buck from VHLC Director, H. Bryan Mitchell.

cc: Mr. Huja
Clerk of Council
Ms. Bibb
Mr. E. Stedman Oakey
Mr. M. Jack Rinehart

CHARLOTTESVILLE BUILDINGS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR CERTIFICATE-OF-MERIT AWARDS
(List prepared in June 1984)

Wertland
Kings Warehouse
Inge's Grocery
The Paxton Place
The South Street Restaurant
The Warehouse to be renovated
by Mr. and Mrs. Toledano (South Street)
Murray's Steaks
A house on the East Side of
Ridge Street whose address no one
could remember
The shop in West Main Street
occupied by Margaret Heath
The house at the corner of Virginia
Avenue and 15th Street which belonged
to Johnny LaRowe and which is now
a sorority house
The Gold Dome Realty Office at
Ridge and Dice Streets
The old M.C. Thomas Exchange Store
on the Mall
Central Place
The Condominia behind the McGuffey
School on Beck's Hill
The addition to Holy Comforter Church
Dr. and Mrs. Alford's House
in Park Street
The three fraternity houses presently
undergoing renovation (St. Elmo, SAE,
and Pi Kappa Phi)
Some of the renovation projects
undertaken by Dogwood Housing
Some of the renovation projects in
Belmont undertaken by Mr. Smith
Renovation projects in 8th Street
The old house in Park Street which
has been acquired by the United
Virginia Bank and is being renovated
by Jack Rinehart
The renovation projects in the 1100
block of East Market Street, undertaken
by Dr. Hurt.

BUILDINGS OMITTED FROM SUMMER 1983 CONTRACT IN ORDER TO SURVEY MORE FRATERNITIES:

Valley View Building on the mall - 418 E. Main
The Nook - 415 E. Main
200 E. Market St.
204-206 E. Market St.
308 E. Market
SW corner of Market & 4th
710 E. High Street (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ -storey bungalow)
1400 Rugby Road (corner of Bruce Ave.)

BUILDINGS FROM 1984 LIST; MOST ARE 1881-1896, A FEW PROBABLY BEFORE 1880:

215 4th St. SW
618 Dice St.
311 5th St. SW
213 7th St. SW
green brick building at corner 7th St. SW & Dice St.
several houses near end of Ridge Street

OTHERS:

709 Lafayette St.
320 South First St. - Matacia warehouse, 1920's
213 6th St. NW - elaborate porch frieze
906-908 West Main St. - should be documented because looks older than is
Wertenbaker Apartments on University Circle
Brandon Apartments on Brandon Avenue
pre-subdivision houses in Foxbrook area (one substantially altered this year)
commissary for Updike Brick Yard - Elm Street
downtown Belmont

Log cabin on Broadway

ALSO SEVERAL HOUSES IN FOLLOWING AREAS:

East Market Street
Nalle Street (Fifeville)
Lankford Ave.
between Ridge Street & Fifeville
9th St. NW - Anderson St. area

ANN MITCHELL



MEMBERS

- MRS. KENNETH R. HIGGINS, CHAIRMAN
- MRS. NELLIE WHITE BUNDY, VICE CHAIRMAN
- IN PAUL C. HANBURY
- ALD HAYNES
- W. BROWN MORTON, III
- FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
- RICHARD M. B. RENNOLDS
- FRED W. WALKER
- MRS. T. EUGENE WORRELL

H. BRYAN MITCHELL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission

221 GOVERNOR STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219
TELEPHONE: (804) 786-3143

MEMO TO: Local and Regional Government Officials

FROM: H. Bryan Mitchell

DATE: September 14, 1984

RE: CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 and pertinent Department of the Interior regulations of April 13, 1984 (36 CFR Parts 61.5-61.7), attached is the Commonwealth of Virginia's draft proposal for the establishment of a Certified Local Government program in Virginia. The aim of the program is to afford qualified local governments the opportunity for formal participation in the process of nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places and to provide financial assistance to those local governments to support their historic preservation efforts. The basic premise of the program is that local governments should participate with the state and federal governments in the historic preservation activities mandated by Congress, but that, like the federal and state components, the local component must meet certain criteria in order to participate.

The draft Virginia program has been developed in recent weeks in consultation with various local preservation officials. Our aim has been to design a program which is accessible but which also challenges local governments to improve their historic preservation efforts. The program is based on the general requirements set out in the above noted regulations. Local participation in the program is voluntary.

This draft proposal is being circulated for comment among all counties, all cities, all planning district commissions, and those towns in which we are aware of a local preservation program. We would encourage all counties and planning district commissions to ensure that towns within their jurisdictions that may be interested in this program receive a copy of this draft. The formal comment period runs through November 13, 1984. Appropriate revisions based upon comments received will be made immediately and the proposal will then be submitted to the Department of the Interior for approval. The program can then be implemented around the first of the year. We encourage your careful consideration of this proposal, and we hope that you will submit your comments as soon as possible, so that we might give them the fullest consideration.

We look forward to hearing from you in the coming weeks and to working with you in the months ahead.

Enclosure

HBM/vmm

VIRGINIA CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

I. INTRODUCTION

Established by Congress in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act created a decentralized partnership between the federal government and the states for the operation of the national historic preservation program. This program of identification, evaluation, and protection of historic resources has since been carried out largely by the states. No opportunity was provided in the 1966 act for the involvement of local governments in the national preservation program. In recognition of the need to involve local governments in the preservation program, the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 provides the legal basis for a new federal-state-local preservation partnership. Under this law the State Historic Preservation Officer (in Virginia the Executive Director of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission) and the Secretary of the Interior are directed to certify local governments to participate formally in the national historic preservation program. Specific requirements for certification are also identified by the federal law. Chief among these are administrative and legal capacities in the form of a historic preservation ordinance and a review board to administer the ordinance.

The Certified Local Government program is designed to promote the preservation of historic buildings, structures, objects, and areas as well as prehistoric and historic archaeological sites through the establishment of a working relationship between the local government and the State Historic Preservation Office. This relationship provides the means of encouraging and expanding local involvement in preservation concerns.

Certified local governments will assume not only a role in the identification, evaluation, and protection of the community's historic resources, but also a formal role in the National Register nomination process. They are eligible to apply for a share of the state's annual Historic Preservation Fund allocation and will receive technical and advisory services from the State Historic Preservation Office.

The requirements for the Certified Local Government program in Virginia, the certification procedure, the process for certified local government participation in the National Register program, and the procedure for the transfer of funds to certified local governments are described further in this document.

II. REQUIREMENTS

The National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 which established the concept of the certified local government program contains five broad standards, Items A-E in this section, all of which must be met before the local government can be certified. The federal standards are further defined and amplified below to indicate the specific standards a Virginia local government must meet in order to be certified.

- A. Local governments must enforce appropriate state or local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties. The Virginia program will require the adoption of a local historic preservation ordinance which shall:

LOCAL
ORDINANCE

1. Include a statement of purpose.
 2. Establish a review board to administer the ordinance.
 3. Include criteria for the establishment of historic zoning districts to protect areas, individual structures, and archaeological sites of historic, architectural, or cultural significance.
 4. Set out a procedure for establishing such historic zoning districts which allows the review board, among others, to initiate proposals for such districts. Such procedures shall not include any requirement of individual owner consent for inclusion in the zoning district.
 5. Require clearly delineated boundaries for any such historic zoning districts. For districts (collections of buildings, sites, and structures) listed on the National Register of Historic Places, such historic zoning shall apply to all such districts in the locality and the boundaries of the historic zoning districts shall be consistent with the boundaries established by the National Register.
 6. Clearly define the actions subject to review by the architectural review board including at a minimum:
 - a. review of and decision upon alterations to or relocation of all structures (buildings, bridges, signs, fences, walls, monuments, etc.) or sites within the boundaries established by the ordinance
 - b. review of and decision upon any proposed demolition within the boundaries established by the ordinance
 - c. review of and decision upon all proposed new construction within the boundaries established by the ordinance.
 7. Set forth the standards and guidelines by which the review board shall judge all proposed alterations, relocations, demolition, and new construction brought before it. Alternatively the ordinance shall require the review board to adopt design review standards and those standards must subsequently be approved by formal resolution of the local governing body. Such standards shall be substantially consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects.
 8. Provide that decisions of the review board are binding upon applicants, unless and until such decisions are overturned on appeal.
 9. Specify methods of enforcing the ordinance, penalties for violations, and procedures for appeal of review board decisions by applicants or other aggrieved parties.
- B. Local governments shall establish by state or local law an adequate and qualified review board. Under the Virginia program these review boards shall meet the following criteria:
1. All members shall be appointed to the review board by the local governing body and shall have a demonstrated interest, competence, or knowledge in historic preservation.

2. At least one board member shall be a registered architect with a demonstrated interest in historic preservation; at least a majority of review board members shall have professional training in any of the following disciplines: architecture, history, American studies, architectural history, archaeology, or planning. Local governments may be certified without the minimum number or types of disciplines if they can demonstrate that they have made a reasonable effort to fill those positions. When adequate review of any proposed action would normally involve a professional discipline not represented on the review board, the review board must seek appropriate professional advice before rendering its decision. Information on the credentials of all review board members shall be submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and shall be kept on file locally for public inspection.
3. The review board shall adopt written by-laws that include at a minimum: provision for regularly scheduled meetings at least four times a year, a requirement that a quorum be present to conduct business, rules of procedure for considering applications, written minutes for all meetings, minimum attendance requirements for board members, and requirements for attendance at training sessions by board members.
4. Terms of office for review board members shall be for a minimum of three years and shall be staggered.
5. Vacancies on the review board shall be filled within sixty days.
- * 6. In addition to those duties specified in the local ordinance, the review board shall at a minimum perform the following duties:
 - a. conducting or causing to be conducted a continuing survey of cultural resources in the community according to guidelines established by the State Historic Preservation Office (see Section II C)
 - b. acting in an advisory role to other officials and departments of local government regarding protection of local cultural resources
 - c. disseminating information within the locality on historic preservation issues and concerns
 - d. reviewing all proposed National Register nominations for properties within the boundaries of the locality. If the review of a nomination would normally involve a professional discipline not represented on the review board, the review board must seek appropriate professional advice before rendering its decision (see Section II B 2).

The State Historic Preservation Officer may at his/her discretion and by mutual written agreement with the local government delegate further responsibilities to the locality and/or the review board.

Each review board member is required to attend at least one informational or educational meeting per year, approved by the SHPO, pertaining to the work and functions of the review board or to historic preservation. The SHPO may waive this requirement for just cause in the case of any individual review board member.

The SHPO shall make available orientation materials and training to all review boards designed to provide a working knowledge of the roles and operations of federal, state, and local preservation programs.

- C. Local governments shall maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties. Requirements for the Virginia program are as follows:
1. The locality shall initiate or continue a process approved by the SHPO to identify historic districts, buildings, archaeological sites, objects, or structures within the boundaries of the local jurisdiction. This process must include a systematic survey of archaeological sites.
 2. Survey and inventory efforts shall be coordinated with and complementary to those of the SHPO. The SHPO shall provide initial training and continuing technical assistance for the conduct of such survey.
 3. The locality shall maintain a detailed inventory of the designated districts, sites, and structures under the specific jurisdiction of the review board. For designated districts the inventory shall include information on each structure or site within the district.
 4. All inventory material shall be:
 - a. recorded on forms provided by or approved by the SHPO
 - b. accessible to the public, unless confidentiality is protected by law
 - c. updated periodically
 - d. made available to the SHPO for inclusion in the statewide inventory and for integration into statewide comprehensive historic preservation planning efforts.
- D. Local governments shall provide for adequate public participation in the historic preservation program. Requirements for the Virginia program are as follows:
1. All meetings of the review board must be publicly announced, be open to the public, and have an agenda made available to the public prior to the meetings. Board meetings must occur at regular intervals at least four times a year. Public notice must be provided prior to any special meetings. The board shall allow for testimony from interested members of the public, not just applicants.
 2. Careful minutes of all decisions and actions of the board or in appeals the local governing body, including the reasons and design criteria upon which decisions were based must be kept on file and available for public inspection.
 3. All decisions by a board shall be made in a public forum and applicants shall be given written notification of decisions of the board.
 4. The rules of procedure adopted by the board shall be available for public inspection.

- E. The local government shall satisfactorily perform the responsibilities delegated to it.

Under the Virginia program, the local government shall submit to the SHPO an annual report on the activities of the review board. Such reports shall include but not be limited to such items as the number of cases reviewed, newly designated historic zoning districts, revised resumes of review board members, new appointments to the board, attendance records, and all minutes related to National Register nominations. The report shall also document board members' attendance at educational meetings.

The annual report shall be accompanied by a report on the expenditures of any grant funds received from the SHPO as a part of the Certified Local Government program. The financial report shall be consistent with U.S. Department of the Interior regulations for fiscal responsibility.

III. Certified Local Government Participation in the Virginia National Register Nomination Process

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 the locality shall submit a report to the state preservation office regarding the eligibility of each property or district proposed for nomination to the National Register within their jurisdiction. This report shall include the recommendation of the review board and the chief elected official. The report may be as simple as an affirmation that the property is eligible, or a researched report of length stating why the property should or should not be nominated. The report should concentrate on the property's eligibility under the National Register criteria. Guidelines on how to apply these criteria in the evaluation of an individual property will be provided by SHPO. A copy of the report shall be made available for public inspection within the local jurisdiction.

Failure to submit reports on the eligibility of properties nominated within the jurisdiction will be considered during the annual performance evaluation.

The locality will be involved in the National Register process in the following manner:

- 1a. When the National Register process is initiated by the local government, the local government shall submit to the SHPO evidence of the concurrence of the chief elected official and the review board along with documentation on the property or district to be registered.
- 1b. When the National Register process is not initiated by the local government, the SHPO shall provide to the certified local government necessary documentation on any property within the locality under consideration for nomination to the National Register. Documentation shall include a preliminary assessment of the property's eligibility for the Register.
2. Within sixty days of receipt of the documentation noted in 1b above, the certified local government shall inform the SHPO of its opinion regarding the eligibility of the property. If the chief elected official and the review board do not agree, both opinions shall be forwarded to the SHPO.

3. If both the chief elected official and the review board recommend that a property not be nominated, the SHPO shall so inform the property owners, and the property will not be nominated unless an appeal is filed with the SHPO pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980.
4. If either or both the chief elected official and the review board recommend that the property be nominated, the nomination process shall go forward.

IV. PROCESS FOR CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The chief elected official of the local governing body shall request certification from the SHPO. The request shall include:

1. a written assurance that the local government will fulfill the requirements outlined above;
2. a copy of the local preservation ordinance;
3. a list and accompanying maps of the areas and individual sites protected by the local ordinance;
4. resumes for members of the review board.

The SHPO shall respond to the chief elected official within thirty days of receipt of an adequately documented written request. The SHPO certification of the local government to participate in the national historic preservation program constitutes certification by the Secretary of the Interior, provided the Secretary does not take exception to the certification within fifteen working days after receiving the approved request from the SHPO.

IV. PROCESS FOR MONITORING AND DECERTIFICATION OF CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The SHPO will conduct periodic review and monitoring of certified local governments to assure that each government is fulfilling the required standards. The SHPO shall also review the annual reports submitted by certified local governments, records of the administration of funds allocated from the Historic Preservation Fund, and other documents as necessary.

If the SHPO evaluation indicates that the performance of a certified local government is inadequate, the SHPO shall document that assessment and delineate for the local government ways to improve performance. The certified local government shall have a period of not less than 30, nor more than 180 days to implement improvements. If the SHPO determines that sufficient improvement has not occurred, the SHPO will recommend decertification of the local government to the Secretary of the Interior citing specific reasons for the recommendation.

VI. TRANSFER OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUNDS TO CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The National Historic Preservation Amendments Act requires each state to set aside at least 10% of its annual allocation from the Historic Preservation Fund for pass-through to certified local governments. That act and pertinent regulations leave to each state the determination as to how the money will be distributed.

For 1985 all certified local governments shall receive equal allocations sufficient to defray expenses of sending review board members to SHPO-approved training sessions. Any additional funds set aside for pass-through will be awarded on a competitive basis for specific local projects that meet the federal criteria for survey and planning. In general, eligible projects are those involving the identification, evaluation, nomination, and protection of a community's cultural resources.

Localities receiving funds under this program must:

1. Provide non-federal matching funds dollar-for-dollar;
2. Maintain an adequate financial management system as specified in OMB Circular A-102;
3. Adhere to all federal requirements for use of Historic Preservation Funds.

SPECIAL MEETING
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
DOWNTOWN BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
NOVEMBER 6, 1984 -- 8:30 A.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT

Jack Rinehart, Chairman
Michael Bednar, Vice Chairman
Carol Troxell
John Allen
Genevieve Keller
Doug Gilpin

STAFF PRESENT

Satyendra Singh Huja
Glenn Larson

Mr. Rinehart called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

A. OLD BUSINESS

1. DBAR 84-9-19
--Reid Grocery Site
Fifth and Main Streets
Replacement Buildings
F&M Partnership, Applicants

Mr. Gilpin stated he was abstaining from discussion and voting on this issue because of a conflict of interest. Mr. Browne gave a brief presentation to the Board on the latest design for buildings to be constructed on the Ried's Grocery Site. He stated that he was submitting elevations for only the three buildings that would be fronting on the mall, and that the plans for the four buildings fronting on 5th Street would be submitted for review at a later date. Mr. Rinehart questioned whether there would be a change in brick between the buildings. Mr. Browne replied that he planned to have some difference in texture, but no brick on the mall elevations would be painted. Mr. Bednar said that Mr. Browne should bring in brick samples, and Mr. Rinehart stated that he hoped trim colors would vary from building to building. Mr. Browne stated that individual storefront design will vary according to the needs of each owner. There was additional discussion about the treatment of the rear facade of the buildings. After this, Mr. Bednar moved that the drawings dated October 26, 1984 and presented to the board by Mr. Browne that day be approved with the following conditions:

1. The subsequent design of individual storefronts, awnings, signs, railings and other details based on tenant requests be reviewed by the board.
2. Samples of brick and trim colors be submitted for review by the Board.

This motion also suggested that more interest and variety be considered in the design of the building's rear facades. This motion was seconded by Mr. Allen and approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the board adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

if needed - 12/27 avoid it

DBAR 11/27

MINUTES 10/23 - OK

11/6 - OK

DBAR 84-10-22 GEORGE SOUTHWELL

marquee - quietly installed

CONDITION - ^{SR} more approval MB - second unanimous

1. later review of treatment of east second story wall behind wall facade with treatment of brick running up the edge
2. mechanical equipment removed from roof
3. review of proposal for treatment of 3rd fl. alley
4. approval of glazing
5. signs and directions
6. ~~approval of exterior lighting + fixtures~~ ^{details of} 24 hour lighting off Market
7. treatment of brick - recess panel or Market as brick difficult to match
8. exterior light fixtures all around
9. color change - color chips be submitted
10. new marquee - contemporary treatment ^{or authentic match} - approve driveway
 - a. contact Richard about lighting

PUBLIC ART -

1. east facade of McSweeney
2. City owned islands in front of City Hall
3. Plaza area of garage - Mill + 8th St.

RE: Jack Letter

12:00

Brickwork notation for approval with conditions

~~1) later review of ~~exterior~~~~

Review of

1) ~~later~~ Proposal for ~~upper~~ treatment of upper wall facade

2) Mech. equip. vent on roof removed

3) Review of proposal for alley from Third Street

4) Landscaping plan submitted

5) Submittal of Signs and directives

6) ~~App~~ Details of lighting for alley off Market Street

7) ~~Treatment of brick~~

Brick infill at Third + Market to be recessed panels

8) ~~light~~ exterior light for the proposal

9) Color and joint ~~style~~ approval

10) New awning on Third Street to be authentic or ~~later~~ contemporary in style. Detailed

Second by Bedner
Approved unanimously.

C) Other business

Status of art & sculpture recommendations
Designated temporary sculpture zones
McBuffy Art Center east lawn, The Islands in
front of City Hall, Mall and Fifth Street side of
Parker Garage. Memorandum to be forwarded
to City Manager.

D) Matter for Public

E) Chair man's report

Since December meeting falls on
Christmas Day, a special meeting
will be scheduled if needed.

F) Board report

G) Dept of Community Development

Adjournment at 12:00 noon.

CITY OF
CHARLOTTESVILLE
VIRGINIA

MEMO

TO: Distribution List
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S. S. H.
DATE: November 19, 1984
RE: Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District Presentation

The purpose of this memorandum is to invite you to attend a presentation on the Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District, given by graduate architectural history students under the direction of Professor Roy Graham. This presentation will be on Wednesday, December 5, 1984 at 7:00 p.m. in Room 153 of the University of Virginia Architecture School.

As you are aware, the listing of the Rugby Road - University Corner Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places has already made significant impacts, not only in promoting the rehabilitation of fraternity houses, but in further fostering cooperation between the City, the University, fraternities and neighborhoods. This presentation reviews the history of the Rugby Road - University Corner area, analyzes its architectural characteristics and offers recommendations for improvements.

We hope you will be able to attend this presentation. Should you have any questions, please call me or Glenn Larson at 971-3182. Thank you.

GL/gl

Distribution List:

City Council
Planning Commission
Landmarks Commission
Board of Architectural Review
Downtown Board of Architectural Review
Cole Hendrix, City Manager
Ray C. Hunt, Jr., V.P. for Business and Finance, UVa
Robert T. Canevari, Dean of Students, Uva
Jaquelin T. Robertson, Dean, School of Architecture, UVa
Cynthia Leggett, Historic Renovation Corporation
Inter-Fraternitiy Council
Venable Neighborhood Association

CITY OF
CHARLOTTESVILLE
VIRGINIA
MEMO

TO: Board of Architectural Review
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S. S. H
DATE: November 20, 1984
RE: November 27, 1984 Meeting

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform you that the next BAR meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 27, 1984 at 4:00 p.m. in the Community Development Conference Room. Please find enclosed the following materials:

- An agenda for the November 27th meeting
- Minutes of the October 23rd meeting
- Six new applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

In addition, we have been contacted by Mr. Jack Sanford, Jr., who is interested in removing and rebuilding the three buildings on the Peyton property the board reviewed last month. Mr. Sanford has been invited to attend this meeting to further discuss his plans. Family Services Inc. has also submitted plans for the iron railing in front of their building.

Please visit the sites before the meeting, and call me or Glenn Larson should you have any questions. Thank you.

GL/gl

Attachments

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
NOVEMBER 27, 1984 - 4:00 P.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

A. MINUTES

1. October 23, 1984 regular meeting

B. NEW APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 84-11-201
-Carver-Blakey House
105 W. High Street
Repainting of Roof
Huguette DeVos, Applicant
2. BAR 84-11-202
-Jordan-Morgan-Haden House
901 E. Jefferson St.
Installation of Storm Windows
Victoria Fenwick, Applicant
3. BAR 84-11-203
-United Methodist Church
101 E. Jefferson St.
Sign
R.H. McAden, Applicant
4. BAR 84-11-204
-Peyton Apartments
401 Seventh St., Ne
Sign
Catherine Peters, Applicant
5. BAR 84-11-205
-Willow Cottage House
1118 East Market Street
Signs
Geoffrey Pitts, Applicant
6. BAR 84-11-206
-William Jefferies House
909 W. Main St.
Signs
Charles R. Hickox, Applicant

C. OTHER BUSINESS (Old Business)

1. BAR 84-10-197
-Peyton Property
Outbuilding Relocation
2. BAR 84-9-196
-Family Services Building
Iron Railing
3. Development Trends Along Locust Avenue

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

F. BOARD MEMBER'S REPORTS

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

CITY OF
CHARLOTTESVILLE
VIRGINIA
MEMO

TO: Board of Architectural Review
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S. S. H
DATE: November 20, 1984
RE: November 27, 1984 Meeting

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform you that the next BAR meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 27, 1984 at 4:00 p.m. in the Community Development Conference Room. Please find enclosed the following materials:

- An agenda for the November 27th meeting
- Minutes of the October 23rd meeting
- Six new applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

In addition, we have been contacted by Mr. Jack Sanford, Jr., who is interested in removing and rebuilding the three buildings on the Peyton property the board reviewed last month. Mr. Sanford has been invited to attend this meeting to further discuss his plans. Family Services Inc. has also submitted plans for the iron railing in front of their building.

Please visit the sites before the meeting, and call me or Glenn Larson should you have any questions. Thank you.

GL/gl

Attachments

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
NOVEMBER 27, 1984 - 4:00 P.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

A. MINUTES

1. October 23, 1984 regular meeting

B. NEW APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 84-11-201 -Carver-Blakey House
 105 W. High Street
 Repainting of Roof
 Huguette DeVos, Applicant
2. BAR 84-11-202 -Jordan-Morgan-Haden House
 901 E. Jefferson St.
 Installation of Storm Windows
Bob Victoria Fenwick, Applicant
3. BAR 84-11-203 -United Methodist Church
 101 E. Jefferson St.
 Sign
 R.H. McAden, Applicant
4. BAR 84-11-204 -Peyton Apartments
 401 Seventh St., Ne
 Sign
 Catherine Peters, Applicant
5. BAR 84-11-205 -Willow Cottage House
 1118 East Market Street
 Signs
 Geoffrey Pitts, Applicant
6. BAR 84-11-206 -William Jefferies House
 909 W. Main St.
 Signs
 Charles R. Hickox, Applicant

C. OTHER BUSINESS (Old Business)

1. BAR 84-10-197 -Peyton Property
 Outbuilding Relocation
2. BAR 84-9-196 -Family Services Building
 Iron Railing
3. Development Trends Along Locust Avenue

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

F. BOARD MEMBER'S REPORTS

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

TO: Historic Landmarks Commission Members
FROM: Jeff O'Dell, Secretary
RE: Minutes of Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting
1 November 1984

The Charlottesville Historic Landmarks Commission met in City Hall on Thursday, November 1, 1984, at 7:30 p.m. Present were Commission members Douglas, Gilpin, Rosalind Hingeley, Edward Lay, Frances Walton and Jeff O'Dell. Commission member Alexander Gilliam was absent. Also attending the meeting were Eugenia Bibb, historic consultant and surveyor, and Glenn Larson of the Department of Community Development.

Commission Chairman Walton called the meeting to order. The minutes for October were approved with corrections. Next, copies of the May and June minutes of the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) and the Downtown Board of Architectural Review (DBAR) were distributed to Commission members.

Mrs. Walton expressed her pleasure at accompanying Professor Lay's architectural history class on a tour of Lynchburg in September. Eugenia Bibb also joined this tour, which was open to all Commission members.

Chairman Walton passed around a copy of Barbalee Diamondstien's book Buildings Reborn: New Uses, Old Places. Ms. Diamondstien had written a letter to the Commission requesting a list of recently renovated Charlottesville-area buildings that might be considered for description in a forthcoming sequel to her book. Mr. Lay proposed a list of projects for consideration and other Commission members suggested other candidates. Among those adaptive-reuse projects suggested were the Monticello Hotel condominiums; the Jefferson-Madison Library (formerly the Charlottesville Post Office); the South Street Restaurant (formerly a warehouse); the Albemarle County Office Building (formerly Lane High School); the Michie Company offices (formerly the Levy Opera House); the Downtown Charlottesville Recreation Center (formerly The Armory); the King Warehouse office complex; Bull Alley Restaurant (formerly Inge's Grocery); Joseph Bosserman's condominium on the second floor of a Main Street commercial building; the Hardware Store Restaurant, on the Downtown Mall; the McGuffey Arts Center, (formerly McGuffey School); and the Towers House United Virginia Bank office conversion on Park Street. The Commission agreed to adopt this list and to send letters to the owners of each of the above mentioned buildings (along with a copy of the City survey sheet on the respective building) inviting them to submit their building projects for inclusion in Ms. Diamondstien's proposed book.

Chairman Walton reported that she met with the Director of the Department of Community Development, Satyendra Huja concerning the Landmarks Commission's control of funds provided the Commission by the City. Because they disagreed on some points, Mrs. Walton met later with Mayor Frank Buck, who requested a letter from the Landmarks Commission explaining its position on the matter. Mrs. Walton said she would write such a letter to the mayor before the next Commission meeting.

Mrs. Walton also announced that she had learned in her meeting with the Mayor that the question of funding for the Landmarks Commission might prove to be an irrelevant one: proposed changes in federal law may require the City to combine all three of its preservation groups, i.e., the CLC, the BAR and the DBAR.

A copy of a letter from Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Director H. Bryan Mitchell describing these proposed changes in federal law is appended to the minutes.

Mr. Gilpin presented a review of major subjects discussed at both the October meetings of the Board of Architectural Review and Downtown Board of Architectural Review. He reported that there will be at least five more fraternity houses participating in the limited partnership renovation program this year; and that work is proceeding on the renovation of the Barringer Mansion, which will probably serve as a "French-Speaking House", i.e., living quarters for selected UVA French students. He mentioned that Tom Hickman applied for and received a certificate of appropriateness to convert the True Pentecostal Holiness Church at 206 West Market Street into apartments. At that meeting, the DBAR adopted a five-point series of recommendations to City Council regarding the approval of artworks placed on City property.

At its October 23 meeting, the BAR gave permission to owner Frank O'Neill to remove the three outbuildings at The Meadows (aka the Peyton Farm; the Carr Place) to make way for development at Seminole Square shopping center. Mr. O'Neill proposed to retain and renovate the main dwelling on the property, and to give or sell the outbuildings to a person who would remove them from the site and re-erect them elsewhere.

This report prompted a wide-ranging discussion by Commission members, who were concerned that the BAR had given its approval for the removal of these possibly important buildings without consulting the Landmarks Commission. Several members resolved to visit the Meadows as soon as possible to determine whether an attempt should be made to keep the outbuildings--which included a 19th century smokehouse, log dwelling and brick-nogged structure at their original sites. Mr. Gilpin reported that it was the opinion of the BAR that these structures were in poor condition and beyond rehabilitation. When he had suggested to the BAR that the building be moved several yards to another site on the property where they would not be in the way of proposed construction, he was told by other Board members that they felt the structures were in such poor condition that this couldn't be done. The Landmarks Commission decided to reserve judgement on the matter pending an evaluation of the buildings by those Commission members planning to visit the site. Then Mrs. Walton suggested that if the buildings did in fact have to be move, that the Commission recommend they be disassembled and re-erected under guidelines that would assure their architectural integrity and preservation. She also expressed her opinion that the BAR should whenever possible prevent owners from neglecting the upkeep of their historic structures, and later demolishing them on the pretext that the buildings have fallen into disrepair.

Mr. Gilpin continued his report on the BAR meeting, mentioning that the Board had objected to placing iron security bars on the Circuit Court Clerk's Office; that the Board had approved, with reservations, the use of storm windows on the H.H. George House at 412 First Street; and that the Board suggested design changes to proposed addition to Temple Beth Israel.

The Commission next discussed the subject of Certificate-of-Merit Awards for renovation projects. Chairman Walton noted, in response to a question, that the Landmarks Commission's jurisdiction over University of Virginia properties is limited to those that were City property in 1939 or before; all other UVA properties fall within the legal jurisdiction of Albemarle County. She expressed her opinion that the Certificate-of-Merit awards should also become an annual event held in the second week in May. Mr. Lay suggested that the Commission, after approving its own list of buildings at the next meeting, submit this list to both the BAR and DBAR for their comments. He suggested that 211 Fourth Street

be included in such a list, and that Commission members be provided with a list of all buildings awarded Certificates in the past--and that this list designate the respective categories of the awards.

Next, the Commission discussed the proposed, but as yet undecided list of fourteen buildings to be designated local historic landmarks. Chairman Walton said she wanted unanimous approval from Commission members of any such list. She also noted that the list could include more or less than fourteen buildings; that the number fourteen was purely arbitrary. These buildings could be either within or outside of Historic Districts, and could be less than 100 but not less than 50 years old. Lists drawn up by each Commission member will be discussed at the next meeting.

Eugenia Bibb next presented a list of 29 City buildings suggested as candidates for an historic and architectural survey. (This list is appended to the minutes.)

Mr. Larson announced that the City had let a contract with archeological research firm in Washington, D.C. to carry out archeological investigations along the route of the proposed McIntire Road Extension.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING: Thursday, December 6, 1984 at 7:30 p.m.
Basement Conference Room, City Hall**

Agenda: Call to Order (Chairman
Approval of November minutes
Chairman's Report
Members' Reports
Surveyor's Report
Old Business--Further Consideration of "The Fourteen Buildings"
Old Business--Certificate of Merit Awards
Old Business--Publication of the Charlottesville Landmarks Survey Book.
New Business
Preparation of January Agenda
Adjournment (Chairman)

PLEASE CALL MRS. WALTON IN ADVANCE IF YOU CANNOT ATTEND ANY MEETING!!!

NOTE: Appended to the minutes is a list of buildings to be considered for Certificate-of-Merit Awards; Eugenia Bibb's list of buildings to be surveyed, and a copy of a letter to Mayor Buck from VHLC Director, H. Bryan Mitchell.

cc: Mr. Huja
Clerk of Council
Ms. Bibb
Mr. E. Stedman Oakey
Mr. M. Jack Rinehart

CHARLOTTESVILLE BUILDINGS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR CERTIFICATE-OF-MERIT AWARDS
(List prepared in June 1984)

Wertland
Kings Warehouse
Inge's Grocery
The Paxton Place
The South Street Restaurant
The Warehouse to be renovated
by Mr. and Mrs. Toledano (South Street)
Murray's Steaks
A house on the East Side of
Ridge Street whose address no one
could remember
The shop in West Main Street
occupied by Margaret Heath
The house at the corner of Virginia
Avenue and 15th Street which belonged
to Johnny LaRowe and which is now
a sorority house
The Gold Dome Realty Office at
Ridge and Dice Streets
The old M.C. Thomas Exchange Store
on the Mall
Central Place
The Condominia behind the McGuffey
School on Beck's Hill
The addition to Holy Comforter Church
Dr. and Mrs. Alford's House
in Park Street
The three fraternity houses presently
undergoing renovation (St. Elmo, SAE,
and Pi Kappa Phi)
Some of the renovation projects
undertaken by Dogwood Housing
Some of the renovation projects in
Belmont undertaken by Mr. Smith
Renovation projects in 8th Street
The old house in Park Street which
has been acquired by the United
Virginia Bank and is being renovated
by Jack Rinehart
The renovation projects in the 1100
block of East Market Street, undertaken
by Dr. Hurt.

BUILDINGS OMITTED FROM SUMMER 1983 CONTRACT IN ORDER TO SURVEY MORE FRATERNITIES:

Valley View Building on the mall - 418 E. Main
The Nook - 415 E. Main
200 E. Market St.
204-206 E. Market St.
308 E. Market
SW corner of Market & 4th
710 E. High Street (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ -storey bungalow)
1400 Rugby Road (corner of Bruce Ave.)

BUILDINGS FROM 1984 LIST; MOST ARE 1881-1896, A FEW PROBABLY BEFORE 1880:

215 4th St. SW
618 Dice St.
311 5th St. SW
213 7th St. SW
green brick building at corner 7th St. SW & Dice St.
several houses near end of Ridge Street

OTHERS:

709 Lafayette St.
320 South First St. - Matacia warehouse, 1920's
213 6th St. NW - elaborate porch frieze
906-908 West Main St. - should be documented because looks older than is
Wertenbaker Apartments on University Circle
Brandon Apartments on Brandon Avenue
pre-subdivision houses in Foxbrook area (one substantially altered this year)
commissary for Updike Brick Yard - Elm Street
downtown Belmont

Log cabin on Broadway

ALSO SEVERAL HOUSES IN FOLLOWING AREAS:

East Market Street
Nalle Street (Fifeville)
Lankford Ave.
between Ridge Street & Fifeville
9th St. NW - Anderson St. area

ANN MITCHELL



MEMBERS

- MRS. KENNETH R. HIGGINS, CHAIRMAN
- MRS. NELLIE WHITE BUNDY, VICE CHAIRMAN
- IN PAUL C. HANBURY
- ALD HAYNES
- W. BROWN MORTON, III
- FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
- RICHARD M. B. RENNOLDS
- FRED W. WALKER
- MRS. T. EUGENE WORRELL

H. BRYAN MITCHELL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission

221 GOVERNOR STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219
TELEPHONE: (804) 786-3143

MEMO TO: Local and Regional Government Officials

FROM: H. Bryan Mitchell

DATE: September 14, 1984

RE: CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 and pertinent Department of the Interior regulations of April 13, 1984 (36 CFR Parts 61.5-61.7), attached is the Commonwealth of Virginia's draft proposal for the establishment of a Certified Local Government program in Virginia. The aim of the program is to afford qualified local governments the opportunity for formal participation in the process of nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places and to provide financial assistance to those local governments to support their historic preservation efforts. The basic premise of the program is that local governments should participate with the state and federal governments in the historic preservation activities mandated by Congress, but that, like the federal and state components, the local component must meet certain criteria in order to participate.

The draft Virginia program has been developed in recent weeks in consultation with various local preservation officials. Our aim has been to design a program which is accessible but which also challenges local governments to improve their historic preservation efforts. The program is based on the general requirements set out in the above noted regulations. Local participation in the program is voluntary.

This draft proposal is being circulated for comment among all counties, all cities, all planning district commissions, and those towns in which we are aware of a local preservation program. We would encourage all counties and planning district commissions to ensure that towns within their jurisdictions that may be interested in this program receive a copy of this draft. The formal comment period runs through November 13, 1984. Appropriate revisions based upon comments received will be made immediately and the proposal will then be submitted to the Department of the Interior for approval. The program can then be implemented around the first of the year. We encourage your careful consideration of this proposal, and we hope that you will submit your comments as soon as possible, so that we might give them the fullest consideration.

We look forward to hearing from you in the coming weeks and to working with you in the months ahead.

Enclosure

HBM/vmm

VIRGINIA CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

I. INTRODUCTION

Established by Congress in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act created a decentralized partnership between the federal government and the states for the operation of the national historic preservation program. This program of identification, evaluation, and protection of historic resources has since been carried out largely by the states. No opportunity was provided in the 1966 act for the involvement of local governments in the national preservation program. In recognition of the need to involve local governments in the preservation program, the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 provides the legal basis for a new federal-state-local preservation partnership. Under this law the State Historic Preservation Officer (in Virginia the Executive Director of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission) and the Secretary of the Interior are directed to certify local governments to participate formally in the national historic preservation program. Specific requirements for certification are also identified by the federal law. Chief among these are administrative and legal capacities in the form of a historic preservation ordinance and a review board to administer the ordinance.

The Certified Local Government program is designed to promote the preservation of historic buildings, structures, objects, and areas as well as prehistoric and historic archaeological sites through the establishment of a working relationship between the local government and the State Historic Preservation Office. This relationship provides the means of encouraging and expanding local involvement in preservation concerns.

Certified local governments will assume not only a role in the identification, evaluation, and protection of the community's historic resources, but also a formal role in the National Register nomination process. They are eligible to apply for a share of the state's annual Historic Preservation Fund allocation and will receive technical and advisory services from the State Historic Preservation Office.

The requirements for the Certified Local Government program in Virginia, the certification procedure, the process for certified local government participation in the National Register program, and the procedure for the transfer of funds to certified local governments are described further in this document.

II. REQUIREMENTS

The National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 which established the concept of the certified local government program contains five broad standards, Items A-E in this section, all of which must be met before the local government can be certified. The federal standards are further defined and amplified below to indicate the specific standards a Virginia local government must meet in order to be certified.

- A. Local governments must enforce appropriate state or local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties. The Virginia program will require the adoption of a local historic preservation ordinance which shall:

LOCAL
ORDINANCE

1. Include a statement of purpose.
 2. Establish a review board to administer the ordinance.
 3. Include criteria for the establishment of historic zoning districts to protect areas, individual structures, and archaeological sites of historic, architectural, or cultural significance.
 4. Set out a procedure for establishing such historic zoning districts which allows the review board, among others, to initiate proposals for such districts. Such procedures shall not include any requirement of individual owner consent for inclusion in the zoning district.
 5. Require clearly delineated boundaries for any such historic zoning districts. For districts (collections of buildings, sites, and structures) listed on the National Register of Historic Places, such historic zoning shall apply to all such districts in the locality and the boundaries of the historic zoning districts shall be consistent with the boundaries established by the National Register.
 6. Clearly define the actions subject to review by the architectural review board including at a minimum:
 - a. review of and decision upon alterations to or relocation of all structures (buildings, bridges, signs, fences, walls, monuments, etc.) or sites within the boundaries established by the ordinance
 - b. review of and decision upon any proposed demolition within the boundaries established by the ordinance
 - c. review of and decision upon all proposed new construction within the boundaries established by the ordinance.
 7. Set forth the standards and guidelines by which the review board shall judge all proposed alterations, relocations, demolition, and new construction brought before it. Alternatively the ordinance shall require the review board to adopt design review standards and those standards must subsequently be approved by formal resolution of the local governing body. Such standards shall be substantially consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects.
 8. Provide that decisions of the review board are binding upon applicants, unless and until such decisions are overturned on appeal.
 9. Specify methods of enforcing the ordinance, penalties for violations, and procedures for appeal of review board decisions by applicants or other aggrieved parties.
- B. Local governments shall establish by state or local law an adequate and qualified review board. Under the Virginia program these review boards shall meet the following criteria:
1. All members shall be appointed to the review board by the local governing body and shall have a demonstrated interest, competence, or knowledge in historic preservation.

2. At least one board member shall be a registered architect with a demonstrated interest in historic preservation; at least a majority of review board members shall have professional training in any of the following disciplines: architecture, history, American studies, architectural history, archaeology, or planning. Local governments may be certified without the minimum number or types of disciplines if they can demonstrate that they have made a reasonable effort to fill those positions. When adequate review of any proposed action would normally involve a professional discipline not represented on the review board, the review board must seek appropriate professional advice before rendering its decision. Information on the credentials of all review board members shall be submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and shall be kept on file locally for public inspection.
3. The review board shall adopt written by-laws that include at a minimum: provision for regularly scheduled meetings at least four times a year, a requirement that a quorum be present to conduct business, rules of procedure for considering applications, written minutes for all meetings, minimum attendance requirements for board members, and requirements for attendance at training sessions by board members.
4. Terms of office for review board members shall be for a minimum of three years and shall be staggered.
5. Vacancies on the review board shall be filled within sixty days.
- * 6. In addition to those duties specified in the local ordinance, the review board shall at a minimum perform the following duties:
 - a. conducting or causing to be conducted a continuing survey of cultural resources in the community according to guidelines established by the State Historic Preservation Office (see Section II C)
 - b. acting in an advisory role to other officials and departments of local government regarding protection of local cultural resources
 - c. disseminating information within the locality on historic preservation issues and concerns
 - d. reviewing all proposed National Register nominations for properties within the boundaries of the locality. If the review of a nomination would normally involve a professional discipline not represented on the review board, the review board must seek appropriate professional advice before rendering its decision (see Section II B 2).

The State Historic Preservation Officer may at his/her discretion and by mutual written agreement with the local government delegate further responsibilities to the locality and/or the review board.

Each review board member is required to attend at least one informational or educational meeting per year, approved by the SHPO, pertaining to the work and functions of the review board or to historic preservation. The SHPO may waive this requirement for just cause in the case of any individual review board member.

The SHPO shall make available orientation materials and training to all review boards designed to provide a working knowledge of the roles and operations of federal, state, and local preservation programs.

- C. Local governments shall maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties. Requirements for the Virginia program are as follows:
1. The locality shall initiate or continue a process approved by the SHPO to identify historic districts, buildings, archaeological sites, objects, or structures within the boundaries of the local jurisdiction. This process must include a systematic survey of archaeological sites.
 2. Survey and inventory efforts shall be coordinated with and complementary to those of the SHPO. The SHPO shall provide initial training and continuing technical assistance for the conduct of such survey.
 3. The locality shall maintain a detailed inventory of the designated districts, sites, and structures under the specific jurisdiction of the review board. For designated districts the inventory shall include information on each structure or site within the district.
 4. All inventory material shall be:
 - a. recorded on forms provided by or approved by the SHPO
 - b. accessible to the public, unless confidentiality is protected by law
 - c. updated periodically
 - d. made available to the SHPO for inclusion in the statewide inventory and for integration into statewide comprehensive historic preservation planning efforts.
- D. Local governments shall provide for adequate public participation in the historic preservation program. Requirements for the Virginia program are as follows:
1. All meetings of the review board must be publicly announced, be open to the public, and have an agenda made available to the public prior to the meetings. Board meetings must occur at regular intervals at least four times a year. Public notice must be provided prior to any special meetings. The board shall allow for testimony from interested members of the public, not just applicants.
 2. Careful minutes of all decisions and actions of the board or in appeals the local governing body, including the reasons and design criteria upon which decisions were based must be kept on file and available for public inspection.
 3. All decisions by a board shall be made in a public forum and applicants shall be given written notification of decisions of the board.
 4. The rules of procedure adopted by the board shall be available for public inspection.

- E. The local government shall satisfactorily perform the responsibilities delegated to it.

Under the Virginia program, the local government shall submit to the SHPO an annual report on the activities of the review board. Such reports shall include but not be limited to such items as the number of cases reviewed, newly designated historic zoning districts, revised resumes of review board members, new appointments to the board, attendance records, and all minutes related to National Register nominations. The report shall also document board members' attendance at educational meetings.

The annual report shall be accompanied by a report on the expenditures of any grant funds received from the SHPO as a part of the Certified Local Government program. The financial report shall be consistent with U.S. Department of the Interior regulations for fiscal responsibility.

III. Certified Local Government Participation in the Virginia National Register Nomination Process

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980 the locality shall submit a report to the state preservation office regarding the eligibility of each property or district proposed for nomination to the National Register within their jurisdiction. This report shall include the recommendation of the review board and the chief elected official. The report may be as simple as an affirmation that the property is eligible, or a researched report of length stating why the property should or should not be nominated. The report should concentrate on the property's eligibility under the National Register criteria. Guidelines on how to apply these criteria in the evaluation of an individual property will be provided by SHPO. A copy of the report shall be made available for public inspection within the local jurisdiction.

Failure to submit reports on the eligibility of properties nominated within the jurisdiction will be considered during the annual performance evaluation.

The locality will be involved in the National Register process in the following manner:

- 1a. When the National Register process is initiated by the local government, the local government shall submit to the SHPO evidence of the concurrence of the chief elected official and the review board along with documentation on the property or district to be registered.
- 1b. When the National Register process is not initiated by the local government, the SHPO shall provide to the certified local government necessary documentation on any property within the locality under consideration for nomination to the National Register. Documentation shall include a preliminary assessment of the property's eligibility for the Register.
2. Within sixty days of receipt of the documentation noted in 1b above, the certified local government shall inform the SHPO of its opinion regarding the eligibility of the property. If the chief elected official and the review board do not agree, both opinions shall be forwarded to the SHPO.

3. If both the chief elected official and the review board recommend that a property not be nominated, the SHPO shall so inform the property owners, and the property will not be nominated unless an appeal is filed with the SHPO pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 1980.
4. If either or both the chief elected official and the review board recommend that the property be nominated, the nomination process shall go forward.

IV. PROCESS FOR CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The chief elected official of the local governing body shall request certification from the SHPO. The request shall include:

1. a written assurance that the local government will fulfill the requirements outlined above;
2. a copy of the local preservation ordinance;
3. a list and accompanying maps of the areas and individual sites protected by the local ordinance;
4. resumes for members of the review board.

The SHPO shall respond to the chief elected official within thirty days of receipt of an adequately documented written request. The SHPO certification of the local government to participate in the national historic preservation program constitutes certification by the Secretary of the Interior, provided the Secretary does not take exception to the certification within fifteen working days after receiving the approved request from the SHPO.

IV. PROCESS FOR MONITORING AND DECERTIFICATION OF CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The SHPO will conduct periodic review and monitoring of certified local governments to assure that each government is fulfilling the required standards. The SHPO shall also review the annual reports submitted by certified local governments, records of the administration of funds allocated from the Historic Preservation Fund, and other documents as necessary.

If the SHPO evaluation indicates that the performance of a certified local government is inadequate, the SHPO shall document that assessment and delineate for the local government ways to improve performance. The certified local government shall have a period of not less than 30, nor more than 180 days to implement improvements. If the SHPO determines that sufficient improvement has not occurred, the SHPO will recommend decertification of the local government to the Secretary of the Interior citing specific reasons for the recommendation.

VI. TRANSFER OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUNDS TO CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The National Historic Preservation Amendments Act requires each state to set aside at least 10% of its annual allocation from the Historic Preservation Fund for pass-through to certified local governments. That act and pertinent regulations leave to each state the determination as to how the money will be distributed.

For 1985 all certified local governments shall receive equal allocations sufficient to defray expenses of sending review board members to SHPO-approved training sessions. Any additional funds set aside for pass-through will be awarded on a competitive basis for specific local projects that meet the federal criteria for survey and planning. In general, eligible projects are those involving the identification, evaluation, nomination, and protection of a community's cultural resources.

Localities receiving funds under this program must:

1. Provide non-federal matching funds dollar-for-dollar;
2. Maintain an adequate financial management system as specified in OMB Circular A-102;
3. Adhere to all federal requirements for use of Historic Preservation Funds.

MINUTES OF THE CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
NOVEMBER 27, 1984 -- 4:00 P.M.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT

Ted Oakey, Chairman
Bob Moje, Vice Chairman
Michael Bednar
Doug Gilpin
Rob Freer
Larry Herbert
Elizabeth Booker

ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Glenn Larson

Mr. Oakey called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and called for consideration of the minutes.

A. MINUTES

1. November 27, 1984 -- Regular Meeting

There being no corrections to the minutes, a motion was made for approval by Mr. Bednar. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gilpin and approved unanimously.

B. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 84-11-201

--Carver-Blakey House
105 W. High Street
Repainting of Roof
Huguette DeVos, Applicant

In his staff report, Mr. Larson explained that Mrs. DeVos was not aware that BAR approval was necessary before she could repaint the buildings roof. Mr. Bednar moved to approve the application with the condition that the BAR review all future proposals for repainting the roof even if it is for the same color. Mr. Gilpin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. BAR 84-11-202

--Jordan-Morgan-Haden House
901 E. Jefferson St.
Installation of Storm Windows
Victoria Fenwick, Applicant

Mr. Larson staff report stated no objection to the proposed storm windows. Mrs. Fenwick showed the board an example of the storm window, indicating that it would match the color of the existing window trim. Mr. Bednar moved approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gilpin and approved unanimously.

3. BAR 84-11-203

--United Methodist Church
101 E. Jefferson Street
Sign
R. H. McAden, Applicant

A representative from the Methodist Church explained the need for a sign advertising the churches preschool. After some discussion it was agreed that a flush mounted sign would be more appropriate than the projecting sign applied for. Mr. Moje moved that the sign be approved with the following conditions:

- A. The dimensions, materials, and design of the sign be the same as shown on the application.
- B. The colors be the same as shown with the beige matching the trim color on the church.
- C. The sign be mounted on either side of the churches East High Street door.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gilpin and approved unanimously.

- 4. BAR 84-11-204
--Peyton Apartments
401 Seventh St., NE
Sign
Catherine Peters, Applicant

Mr. Larson stated that the staff had some concern about placing a projecting sign on this building, and suggested that the applicant consider putting another sign on the freestanding pole in front of the building. After some discussion the board agreed that the location as proposed in the application made some sense as the office was the only one on that side of the building. Mr. Moje moved approval of the application as submitted, this motion was seconded by Mr. Freer and approved unanimously.

- 5. BAR 84-11-205
--Willow Cottage House
1118 East Market Street
Signs
Geoffrey Pitts, Applicant

Mr. Larson indicated that staff had no objections to this application. Mr. Gilpin stated that a cypruss sign may not be seen on the building as proposed. Mr. Bednar moved approval of the application as submitted with the exception that the signs be painted rather than left a natural finished and that the color be approved administratively. This motion was seconded by Mrs. Booker and approved unanimously.

- 6. BAR 84-11-206
--William Jefferies House
909 West Main Street
Signs
Charles R. Hickox, Applicant

Mr. Hickox requested that his application be withdrawn, and that action of the board be deferred until a new design could be submitted.

C. OTHER BUSINESS (Old Business)

- 1. BAR 84-9-196
--Family Services Building
Iron Railing

Mr. Bednar moved that the application be approved as submitted with the condition that the railing be painted black and that rails be placed at both sides of the porch. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gilpin and approved unanimously.

- 2. Development Trends Along Locust Avenue

After a brief discussion of this report, the board agreed that a decision on action should be reviewed by neighborhood residents. It was agreed that the local neighborhood association would be contacted.

3. BAR 84-10-197

--Peyton Property
Outbuilding Relocation

Mr. Oakey introduced Jack Sanford. Mr. Sanford was attending the meeting to explain to the board his interest in relocating three outbuildings from the Peyton property to land he owns on Garth Road. He had been working with Mr. O'Neill on arrangements to do this. Mrs. Frances Walton, representing the Charlottesville Historic Landmarks Commission, expressed the Commission's concern about the action of the BAR allowing the dismantling of the three structures in question. She explained that the Landmarks Commission felt these structures to be of historic significance and thus should not be torn down. There was then a discussion about the extent of BAR review on properties that have been subdivided. Mrs. Walton expressed her opinion that the board should have review power over all structures proposed at the Seminole Square Development because all this property was once part of the Peyton Estate. Mr. Higgins explained the site plan and subdivision process as it related to architectural design control. It was agreed that in order to avoid future confusion that the Landmarks Commission receive agendas for the BAR and DBAR before their meetings take place. It was also agreed that Mr. O'Neill, the owner of the property should be contacted to further discuss the fate of the three outbuildings.

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

There was none.

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

There was none.

F. BOARD MEMBERS' REPORT

There was none.

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

There was none.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.