



**TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**



**Thursday, July 11, 2022
PENDING APPROVAL**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, July 11, 2022, in the Town Hall Council Chambers. Chair Clites called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Town Clerk North called the roll.

PRESENT: Tim Clites, Chair
Punkin Lee, Vice Chair
William Anderson
Virginia Jenkins
Margaret Littleton
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

STAFF: William Moore, Deputy Town Manager/Town Planner

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the June 2, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes as presented.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, Littleton, and Wright and Councilmember Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

New Business

Chair Clites left the dais as he had a conflict of interest related to the next two agenda items. Vice Chair Lee assumed the chair.

COA 22-15: Removal of two accessory structures – 408 East Washington Street – Chris Hersh

Tim Clites appeared before the Committee as the architect on the project. He reviewed the properties and the existing structures located on them, including a stone accessory structure and a tree they were proposing to remove in order to allow for an addition to the house. Mr. Clites explained that before moving too far ahead with the addition’s design, they thought they would appear before the HDRC to get their thoughts.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Clites advised that the stone structure was in fairly poor shape and noted that it had sat for years with no roof. He advised that it was not used for any purpose.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Chris Hersh, the property owner, advised that the floor consisted of some stone and dirt.

Mr. Clites acknowledged that the HDRC did not like to discuss the removal of old structures such as this one. He suggested that one option would be to use some of the stone in the new addition. In response to an inquiry from the Committee about the possibility of keeping the stone structure, Mr. Clites advised that the only other location for the addition would require the removal of the existing parking. He confirmed that looking at other locations was an option and questioned whether the addition could be placed on the adjacent agricultural parcel, which the property owner also owned.

The Committee opined that while the stone building was not as old as the house, it did have historical significance. They suggested that relocating it may provide an advantage for the property as a whole.

Mr. Clites acknowledged the Committee's concerns and reiterated that he wanted to hear their thoughts before proceeding with a design. He advised that he would then return with a complete design.

The Committee opined that the stone structure looked more historic than the home. They noted that it was located on the entrance into Middleburg. The Committee suggested it be relocated and used as a garden structure or as a part of the addition. They acknowledged that while they did not like trees to be removed, this one was too close to the house. The Committee opined that Mr. Clites would come up with a clever design to reuse the stone structure or the stone itself.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Clites reported that according to the Historic District survey, the stone structure was "contemporary". He opined that it was contemporary to the house, as opposed to being contemporary to today. Mr. Clites noted that a second accessory structure, located on the agricultural lot, was also contemporary. He suggested the old beams in that structure be reused as well, if they were salvageable. Mr. Clites opined that the second structure did not add to the lot or the historic house. He advised that as to the stone structure, something unknown was causing it to shift.

Mr. Hersh advised that since purchasing the property, he had watched a crack in the stone open up further. He expressed concern that the structure could crumble if he tried to relocate it.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Clites confirmed the stone structure's use would be consistent with the zoning if it was relocated to the agricultural lot. Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed it was possible to relocate the structure to that lot.

The Committee suggested that photographs be taken of the structure for historic reasons.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to the reason for the removal of the second accessory structure, Mr. Hersh advised that the plan was to use the property to house a horse and explained that its removal would allow them to view the field. He noted that there were also structural concerns associated with it.

The Committee expressed concern that if the agricultural lot was sold in the future, the link between the house and the stone structure could be lost. They expressed hope that it could be relocated on its existing lot.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed the agricultural lot was also located in the Historic District. He questioned whether the applicant was seeking an approval at this time.

Mr. Clites advised that they were only looking for an assessment and opined that the Committee was inclined to salvage and relocate the stone structure. He advised that he would study this and spend time looking at the addition, the stone structure and how they related. Mr. Clites confirmed they were definitely looking to remove the second accessory structure. He noted that it was located within the setback; therefore, it could not be easily rebuilt.

The Committee held some discussion of the proposed location of a running shed for the horse.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the removal of the other structure and conditionally approve the removal or relocation of the stone structure.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, Littleton, and Wright and Councilmember Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain – Chair Clites

Absent – N/A

COA 22-16: Repointing & addition of outside mount caps on masonry chimneys – 408 East Washington
– Chris Hersh

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that an amendment was received that called for the caps to be stainless steel and would be powdered coated black.

Tim Clites, the architect for the project, reported that they identified the need to put something on both chimneys. He explained that he liked the way caps protected the structures over the long term and created less visual clutter.

The Committee opined that the proposed caps were fine. They suggested it would be nice if the material was copper.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Clites confirmed the arrestors would be stainless steel. He opined that they could be powder coated as well. Mr. Clites advised that as to the material, the issue with copper was the price. He suggested the Committee approve both materials and advised that he would check on the price for copper.

Mr. Clites advised the Committee that the mortar would be a lime based one because of the softness of the brick. He noted that they would pick a mortar color that was a good match.

Committee Member Anderson moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 22-16, a request of Winston's Chimney Services for repointing and adding outside mount caps on both masonry chimneys at 408 East Washington Street, as discussed in either powder coated black for the cap or copper and with the mortar to match the existing.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, Littleton, and Wright and Councilmember Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain – Chair Clites

Absent – N/A

Chair Clites resumed the Chair.

COA 22-17 (S 22-10): Projecting sign – 7 East Federal Street – The Willow

Hannah Lessard, the applicant, appeared before the Committee. In response to an inquiry, she advised that the sign would be hung on the existing brackets. Ms. Lessard advised that it would be eight feet off the ground and would be hung perpendicular to the building. She acknowledged that it was currently a single-sided sign and advised that she was disputing that it was supposed to be double sided.

The Committee agreed the sign was beautiful and would be a nice addition to the building.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 22-17 (S 22-10) as submitted.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, Littleton, and Wright and Councilmember Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

COA 22-18: Replacement Windows & Removal of Rear Addition – 11 South Madison Street

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that he sent an email earlier in the day containing letters from the project architect and structural engineer supporting the request to remove the elevated rear addition. He reported that wood windows were being proposed on the front elevation on Madison Street and aluminum clad windows were being proposed for the second story on the north and south elevations. Mr. Moore noted that there were limited views of the latter elevations. He advised that once the addition was removed, the rear windows would be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Moore questioned whether the Committee wanted to subject the rear windows to the same scrutiny as the front ones in terms of replacement windows if the addition was approved for removal.

Steve Simons, of Veritas Contracting, appeared before the Committee representing the application. He noted that the rear elevation was three stories above the grade; therefore, it was more elevated than the Madison Street side of the building. Mr. Simons opined that given their location, the windows would not be noticeable. He noted that one of them would be blacked out, as it was in the middle of the bathroom shower and would be closed off from the inside of the building. Mr. Simons explained that they were keeping it only for the appearance of the building on the outside. He opined that as to the addition, it was a life safety hazard. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Simons advised that there would be three apartments in the building.

The Committee acknowledged the safety hazard associated with the addition and advised that they did not have a problem with its removal. It was suggested that the wood windows be carried everywhere on the building since it was a historic building. The Committee acknowledged the applicant's concern about maintenance of the wood windows given the tight space on the south side of the building; however, they noted that there were wood windows available that could be accessed from the inside.

Mr. Simons noted the maintenance issues associated with having wood windows on the north and south elevations. He advised that they were proposing to refurbish the existing frames and sills and explained that the new windows would be inset into the existing wood. Mr. Simons advised that they were trying to maintain as much of the appearance of the origin fabric of the building as possible. In response to inquiries from the Committee, he advised that the ivy, metal stairs and oil tank would all be removed.

The Committee agreed they had no problems with the proposal for aluminum clad windows on the sides.

Chair Clites noted that if the wood casings and frames were kept, with the windows being placed inside the frames, this would mean that two and a half inches of glass would be lost on either side at the top. He questioned whether this was an issue for the Committee.

Mr. Simons advised that the proposed windows minimized the sash size and would result in the loss of one and $\frac{3}{4}$ inches of glass on each side. He confirmed that some would also be lost on the front windows in order to keep the existing light pattern.

The Committee and the applicant held some discussion of the details for the front windows. Mr. Simons advised that because they were being custom made, he could ask about reducing the size of the framing to minimize the loss of glass.

The Committee continued their discussion of the window details. In response to an inquiry, Mr. Simons confirmed the trim would be painted white.

The Committee noted the missing stone wall on the rear of the building and questioned whether it was possible to install a window there.

Mr. Simons explained that there were two doors in that location at one time. He further explained that their proposal was to install a painted trim detail at the bottom that would look similar to a flat panel with molding in the center. Mr. Simons opined that the opening looked larger than it actually was and advised that it was only thirty inches. He explained that the new windows would align to the right of the existing ones. Mr. Simons noted that they would not know whether there was a masonry header or steel lintel above the opening until they removed the addition. He explained that the goal would be to infill with stone across the top to get to the same head height as existed for the other windows, to insert the new window, and to construct a wood panel below it. Mr. Simons advised that they were not trying to cover up the fact that there was a door at that location and opined that this would speak to the history of the building.

The Committee held some discussion of the eave and gutters on the rear of the building.

Mr. Simons advised that the roof line was actually below the existing roof. He noted that, from the perspective of the back of the building, he installed 31 micro lambs thus far in order to brace the second floor because the structure was so deficient.

Chair Clites summarized the Committee's comments related to the windows. Mr. Simons advised that if he discovered something unexpected, he would return to the Committee.

Chair Clites further summarized that the Committee was okay with the removal of the addition; that the side windows in the north and south elevations could be split 50/50 and they were less concerned whether they were aluminum clad or wood; and, that the preference was for wood windows on the front.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Simons clarified that as to the rear windows, if they replaced the casings, they would probably use a cement product that would be impervious to water damage.

The Committee continued their discussion of the windows. They suggested the full replacement of the windows, with the front and rear windows being painted wood and the north and south elevation windows being aluminum clad. They noted that as to the cement casings, they preferred something smooth, as they did not like wood grained anything.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 22-18, a request of Steve Simons of Veritas Contracting for replacement windows and the removal of an elevated rear addition at 11 South Madison Street, as follows: the addition on the rear can be completely removed, including the stairs; the front façade second story windows will be completely replaced to match the existing as closely as possible using a painted wood window; the rear façade windows will be completely replaced with a wood painted window to match as closely as possible with smooth panels below the two windows that are infilling where the doors exist; and, that the side windows on the north and south be replaced with an aluminum clad complete replacement with a synthetic painted trim to match as closely as possible.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, Littleton, and Wright and Councilmember Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed a demolition permit was not required for the removal of the addition as it was considered to be minor.

COA-RS 22-04: New single-family dwelling – 601 Martingale Ridge Drive – Middleburg Salamander Lot 18

Gretchen Yahn appeared before the Committee representing Salamander. She noted that the Committee had an annotated map showing the colors of the houses that have been approved to date and advised that the purchasers had been very understanding of the mandate to not have the same color houses next to each other.

Ms. Yahn advised that shiplap was being proposed on the grill and the sections that were bumped out on this house and noted that this was not a material that had been presented to the Committee for their review in the past. She advised that they were also proposing a V-groove on the ceilings, in keeping with the modern Farmhouse look, and noted that this was also something that had not been presented to the Committee before. In response to an inquiry, Ms. Yahn confirmed the shiplap would just be a detail element and would not be on the entire façade. She advised that this house would be in Burton White stucco, with Burton White trim. Ms. Yahn further advised that the muttons, roof, gutters, and shutters would all be black. She noted that the house on the other side was the same color; however, it resonated to be a bit more modern, so the houses would have a different feel. Ms. Yahn reported that the proposed house would have a pool and spa. She explained that because the lot was larger, there would be a bigger turn area in the driveway. Ms. Yahn advised that this project would include a pergola feature; however, she would submit that application separately. In response to inquiries from the Committee, she confirmed the pool decking would be flagstone. She advised that the spa would be eighteen inches above the pool elevation. Ms. Yahn noted that the pool was larger than the previous ones presented to the Committee. She advised that this lot was located on the back side of the subdivision, by the berm.

Ms. Yahn reminded the Committee that her goal was to keep things as level to the ground as possible; therefore, they were trying to match the purchasers’ desires to the lots. She advised that the Committee would see the first Vineyard hybrid design next month. Ms. Yahn reported that thus far, the purchasers have increased the amount of landscaping and opined that the Committee would be happy with the results.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA RS 22-04, a request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family dwelling at 601 Martingale Ridge Drive as submitted.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, Littleton, and Wright and Councilmember Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

Ms. Yahn advised the Committee that they really did not want to have house numbers on the houses and noted that she planned to meet with VDOT and the County Fire Marshall to address emergency response issues. She explained that they preferred to handle the house numbering through the landscaping.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised Ms. Yahn that under the Town Code, if the house could be seen from the street, the house numbers must be placed on the structure itself. He noted that they could do as many supplemental numbers as desired and advised that there were specifications for those. Mr. Moore opined that the majority of the houses in the subdivision, including almost everything in the Vineyard section, would be required to have house numbers on the houses.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn confirmed there would be a central mail structure, as opposed to individual main boxes at each house.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised Ms. Yahn that the house numbers had to meet the minimum height and stroke width requirements. He further advised that they had to be in a contrasting color to the surface to which they were affixed. In response to an inquiry from Ms. Yahn, he confirmed they did not have to be illuminated.

Ms. Yahn asked that if the members had any suggestions related to the house numbers, they send them to her. In response to a suggestion that she contact local artists for ideas, Ms. Yahn advised that she may pursue metal numbers using a bridle theme.

Chair Clites advised that he liked the v-joint and opined it would be acceptable to use the other side for the clapboard houses.

Quorum – August Meeting

It was noted that a quorum would be present for the August 4th meeting. Chair Clites asked the members to let the staff know if they would not be present.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – July 11, 2022

(Note: This is a transcript prepared by a Town contractor based on the video of the meeting. It may not be entirely accurate. For greater accuracy, we encourage you to review the video of the meeting that is on the Town's website – www.middleburgva.gov)
July 11, 2022 HDRC Transcript

Tim Clites: All right. We'll bring this meeting to order. If everyone can remember to shut your mic off when you're not speaking into it, and we'll take turns, so we don't speak over each other. It's Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's meeting for Monday, July the 11th, 2022. The first order of business is Roll Call.

Will Moore: Mr. Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Present

Will Moore: Mrs. Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Present.

Will Moore: Mrs. Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Present.

Will Moore: Ms. Wright.

Linda Wright: Present.

Will Moore: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Present.

Will Moore: Chairman Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Will Moore: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Present.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Next order of business is pause for a minute for any public comments. If you're here tonight for an order of business, we'll get to you in the agenda. But just pause for a second. It looks like everyone's here for an action item. Yes. Okay. Moving forward, then we'll approve the meeting minutes from the June 2nd, 2022 regular meeting, as everyone had a chance to review them. And are there any comments or clarifications? Seeing none. I move that we approve the June 2nd 2022 regular meeting minutes as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: All opposed? Any abstain. Thank you. Motion passes. The next action item. We have the next two items. Actually, I'll have to step aside so I can present on behalf of the applicant. So I'll turn the meeting over to Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: [off mic] And I have with me Chris, his son and Jeremy from my office is also working with me on this project. I don't know. Y'all are a small room. You're welcome to leave me sitting up here by myself. You're welcome to come and sit with me. I will. Chris and his wife, Carolyn, bought the property a couple of months ago and have moved in and started to get familiar with not only the house but the property they own both the parcel that is in the application tonight, the residential and the agricultural parcel that's beside it. And as I'm sure you've all seen, they've been working to do things like try to get rid of the bamboo, which it looks like it's going to be a bit of a fight. That stuff doesn't die easy cleaning up the lot. And then we've just started some initial design work and really our biggest first question came up fairly quickly around this little stone structure that's directly behind the brick home. We looked at a few options. I don't know if you all had the chance. If you didn't, you're welcome to kind of take a walk over there. It's an interesting little place to pull in and out of, but they pull in and park kind of behind the building and the driveway goes straight into additional parking. So that would be on the west side of the lot. We looked at kind of an early quick design, sketches, the rear of the house as being the only place to put an addition, obviously, both because of the historic nature of the House and also because that's where the additions are now. They're kind of a series of porches, in addition, some of which have been enclosed in the kitchens and a kind of narrow little porch on the east side of the rear of the home. And then there's a two-story addition, all of which is stucco on the west side. And so when we looked at the options that the ability to kind of build to the West and go into the rear yard is both constrained by the tree, but also would leave the little stone structure in kind of an awkward spot where there's no easy way. The kind of the goal of the addition is to instead of having the home with the kitchen facing what essentially is a cross, that little house that we looked at a couple of months ago that sits lower than it. And you kind of look into the back of the townhomes. The idea is to do an addition that's perpendicular so that their view from the kind of the main kitchen bedroom space is towards this open parcel that's beside them. So as we looked at how that happens, the little stone structure, of course, sits not quite perfectly in the center of that rear distance, but it does sit in the way. And so just before we get too far, let's come in and talk to you all about what the options are for that structure. Included in that also is the question of the tree, which we haven't spent time with. An arborist to look at but to verify seems perfectly healthy. But it's also significant enough, it's probably my guess is it's getting close to its end of its lifespan. More importantly, its roots sit right next to the little stone structure and obviously in addition, out the back wouldn't really be possible keeping the tree. [off mic]

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Should we just go around the room and everyone offer their comments?

Bill Anderson: This accessory structure next to the tree, is it what is it useful now?

Tim Clites: Nothing. It was a I don't know if you can see it as you come into town from the east. And so for years it sat with no roof on it. And that eastern facade is actually in the worst shape of the elevations. The stone is in fairly poor shape. It's not used for anything right now.

Bill Anderson: Does it have a floor? A dirt floor? Does it have a concrete floor?

Chris Hersh: There's some stone and dirt.

Bill Anderson: So it's flat with this with the it's not like an old drop down, walk down step of a pump house or anything like that.

Tim Clites: Not like an old spring house or anything like that. And the door actually faces the back of the building, of the house. So we've debated a couple of things. I mean, obviously, as we all know from a historic perspective, it's no nobody's favorite conversation to have to say we want to remove an old little structure like this. So we've started to look at the design of an addition. We're really aware that above the foundation level, we want to have the materials be sympathetic and less prominent than the brick that's there on the front facade. But we thought there could be some opportunities to reuse some or all of the stone in either that structure or talk about some other some other options for.

Bill Anderson: Did you look at alternate designs for not removing this for the addition to the house?

Tim Clites: We haven't spent a lot of time on that or the proposed additions, really. We just kind of did a first pass to say where might we put it if we go to the west the problem is that as you pull in, you're basically taking away your available parking by doing an addition if I don't have the pictures.

Bill Anderson: Yeah, I saw the site plan.

Tim Clites: Yeah. If you look at the site plan, you can see that.

Bill Anderson: Have you? So we haven't really thought about if this is the only scheme for the additions that make sense relocating this small little stone building.

Tim Clites: We have discussed that also and I think that that's one of those. I think it's definitely an option. I mean, we're kind of interested in this. If if that's the case, the question quickly comes to mind, does it have to stay on this site, which is a fairly small site, or could it move to the agricultural site? I don't know that we it's kind of like a coin toss at the moment because we haven't really dug into that too deeply.

Bill Anderson: I was just read again, Will's in a brief and you know, as part of even though it theoretically might not be as historic as the building, it also has a significance. So relocating it if this is the only alternative viable alternative for addition and I can understand, you know, things have to be done then maybe look looking at it because of as Will points out, it's, you know, it's an accessory building to a historic building. And relocation might be more of an advantage for the property as a whole.

Tim Clites: Sure. And we wouldn't be opposed to that. I mean, that's kind of you know.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: First of all, I am so thrilled that you have taken an interest in that property. It's just it's a wonderful house, especially the basement like that. I've been in it. So I'm with you a little bit than that. I love the stone, and I wish you could make the addition part of it or part of the addition. But it's just in the wrong place, isn't it? I can understand the tree. Unfortunately, I'm a tree hugger. But if it's got to go, it's got to go. And I know you'll come up with good ideas, Tim. But I really like the stone.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you. I mean, I. After we started sketching, I thought, I really. I really want to come and get your input on the options because and as long as we understand what you think is or isn't possible, then we wouldn't do any of this until we actually came back and presented a full. I think I said that in the memo. Right. We'd come back with a full design. So you really understand and we kind of potentially approve those together, right? So that one's dependent on the other. So we don't kind of get ahead of ourselves.

Margaret Littleton: To me, it almost looks older than the brick, therefore more historic. And it is the entrance into Middleburg. I don't know. You'll come up with something clever, but we're on the right path.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah. I think the little stone building is really quite quaint and nice. And if it could be moved or reused somehow as a little garden structure or potting house or something as part of the design would be nice. The tree is definitely way too close to the house, so I can understand wanting to take that down and what maple trees do when the roots all come up so much as they get older. I can understand. I mean, I don't want to see it go either, but I don't think you have much choice to do anything but that. But I would agree too, if it could be moved or redone and used on the property as another little accessory structure would really be nice.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm pretty much in agreement with everybody else. But honestly, that tree is right in the middle of everything. It's got to go, unfortunately. And it's a shame. I mean, it is a cute little building. And if it could be reused, that would be wonderful. But. I'd go along with what everybody said. Other than that.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Yes. And I agree with Margaret. Yes. Thank you for being there and doing what you're doing. We all. Everybody goes by and goes, oh. That looks so good. You're welcome. You know, I am not a historian that believe me. But some of those little houses were used for kitchen back in the day, a kitchen or smokehouse or something like that. So I don't know if you've checked with the library in Leesburg. The [inaudible] library is that the name of Thomas [inaudible]. That's it. They sometimes have history on this kind of thing. And there's a gentleman in Saint Louis, too, that is really good with history. I cannot come up with his name right now, but that might be worth a little bit to look at. And but I get it. If it's not stable too, that you have to do something with it. And of course, it has to be right where. What can you say? Right in the middle of everything. So there's just like no way to get around it. But, you know, I'm sure you all will come up with something very clever either to use it or move it or those rocks. I don't know. But the tree. Yeah.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Do you have any idea how old that little stone building is?

Tim Clites: No, and Will, I think the survey just said it was contemporary.

Punkin Lee: Right.

Tim Clites: My reading of that was more contemporary, more to the old structure than contemporary to today, because I think it describes the oh, we didn't talk about the other little structure on the agricultural lot beside it that clearly is.

Punkin Lee: Contemporary.

Tim Clites: Contemporary to today. And there's a couple of old beams that you can't even really tell did they bring them in and build it out of that or were they here? Or because it's all sits kind of on a concrete slab. And so the thought was that actually would be a nice thing to remove. Maybe we use some of the old beams if they're salvageable. But to me that didn't feel like it added much of anything either to the lot that it's on or to the historic structure beside it.

Punkin Lee: No, I think that's was this back to the little stone house? Was there an existing footprint under it, a foundation or anything? I mean.

Tim Clites: [inaudible] just right to the. I mean that typically that's the old stone structure. Just built right on the dirt. There's something because Chris has noticed, even in the few months they've been there, that east side, it's moved even since they've been there. So there's something and it seems odd to say that might be the tree because it doesn't make logical sense that it would be because of the trees on the west side of the stone structure. But that east side is continuing to move a little bit.

Chris Hersh: It's been a little surprising to us watching the kind of the crackle on that side open up and somebody's taken [inaudible] cement and tried to patch it out, but even then, it's continued to open. So moving to a question and then a concern is if it crumbles as we're moving it, then kind of the expense and the challenge. And then the second one is the agricultural lot might be a really nice place to put it if it's can withstand the move. And so it would be can we move it off the residential lot and put it on agricultural lot. And that's another question.

Punkin Lee: Can that be done Will? Before we beat it to death.

Will Moore: What its use would be on the agricultural lot as.

Tim Clites: It would be consistent with the zoning, and we wouldn't move it over there and create a pool house out of it or something. Right. But I respect what you're saying, right? Yeah. There's different setbacks there.

Will Moore: And I think, in short, the answer is yes, it's possible.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I would just suggest taking some really good pictures of it that we could have for historic reasons. And if it has to, if it goes down because that last rain, we had that was really bad, that rain came from the east. And and I'm sure that didn't help it at all because it tore up everything that it hit that way. But if we [inaudible].

Punkin Lee: Any comments on the other structure? And Bill.

Bill Anderson: Yeah, the other structure on the agricultural lot and the reason to raise it would be just aesthetics or is there a plan for this lot that would require it to go down?

Chris Hersh: Our plan on the in itself is agricultural. We have my wife has a horse and our plan is to be able to bring the horse occasionally on weekends and have it in the paddock area. It's more opening up to where you potentially could see that as well as use the space. There's also beams in it, that the footings of the beams are tipped. So for us it's also a structural concern.

Punkin Lee: Okay. Any other comments on the second structure? Tim.

Tim Clites: I don't know that we need an answer tonight around whether it goes on the agricultural lot or the lot that we're on. I mean, I think we would want time to study that unless you all had a strong feeling one way or the other about the need for it to stay on the lot that represents the house versus being on the lot adjacent to it.

Bill Anderson: I do. I was just going to say if, for instance, in the future the agricultural lot is sold off and then the the link between the house and the small little structure might may be lost. So I would think

it would be at all possible if it's going to be relocated. And I really hope it would be would be on the same lot just so that kind of protects it.

Tim Clites: I didn't even. Does the agriculture a lot considered part of the historic district. I didn't even look at that. I would assume it is because part of it would touch the district. So that would put the whole lot.

Will Moore: One of these. I'll confirm that.

Punkin Lee: I think that was a good statement Bill just made keep it, if possible, in relationship to the House because if it was like a summer kitchen or just whatever. It tells a better story because it's not a spring house. You could understand that if you moved it to agriculture and it actually had the spring house aspect. But any further comments or what else do you need from? This is good. How do we sign off on this Will?

Will Moore: So the agricultural lot is part of the historic district. So I guess the question is, are you seeking an approval for either or both [off mic].

Tim Clites: I don't know that we need a formal approval so much as your honest kind of assessment of whether it sounds like everyone's more inclined towards salvage and relocate. So let's let us go study that. And I think we would show that in the context of the addition, because that's not going to be a one meeting meeting either. Right? We're going to want to spend some time with it. I mean, it's like we're it goes without saying that we're really excited to be part of this project, too. It's like the entrance to the town. So we'll want to spend some time looking at not only the addition, but the little structure and how those things all relate. So as long as, I mean, we don't want to go forward with that work and come back in a month or two and find out, no, it has to stay where it is. That wouldn't work so well. But I think the general consensus seems to be that it could be relocated. And and it's our job to show you what that looks like and how that goes with the additions that we might plan.

Punkin Lee: But the other structure definitely wants to be removed.

Tim Clites: I think it does. I mean. Yeah. And the idea with the addition is that it would like I say, it would go kind of towards the north so that you would have a view across. And it's a little interesting because right now they can actually go out and use that structure as if it were part of their side yard to the residential lot, even though it's in that agricultural lot. And so it's not like we could easily I'd have to look at the setbacks. I don't think we can even easily rebuild that structure. I think it straddles the setback for that lot. So our intent really is an aesthetic one to open it up so that it's kind of a nicer view to the field and a nicer view.

Bill Anderson: We have the same thought. Anybody you had horses here knows that if you're going to put a horse on this lot for even a short period of time, you're going to need a running shed. So, I mean, there's your running shed right there.

Tim Clites: But you probably wouldn't put it there, right? You probably wouldn't put it there.

Chris Hersh: I wouldn't feel safe.

Bill Anderson: Depends on how close you want to be to your horse? [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: So I think having talked to Mr. Hersh's wife previously, the intent would be to come back at some point in time for a new running shed on the property. So I guess back to the question with the structure on the agricultural property, understanding that the Stone House relates to the addition in order

to do an addition that would have to be removed. But do you want to go ahead and get the approval to remove the other structure?

Tim Clites: Now it's up to you all. If you wanted to approve removal of the other structure and the tree and condition the final solution of the stone house on our further development. I'm comfortable with that too. I feel like your input gives me enough comfort that we can we can move forward and come back with some ideas.

Punkin Lee: Tim phrased that so well. Could that be the motion?

Cindy Pearson: Want to come up here make that motion real quick and then go sit down?

Will Moore: Just to be clear, you do not have to include the tree in your motion.

Cindy Pearson: You don't have to, ok.

Will Moore: So the agricultural structure to remove and to stone house to be removed or relocated. Conditional.

Tim Clites: Review of the addition, I would think review the additions and changes to the property.

Punkin Lee: Is there a second?

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Punkin Lee: All those in favor say aye.

Everyone: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Opposed. Motion passes. Thank you. And Kim has the next one. Next one is COA 22-16 request of Winston's Chimney Services for repointing and adding outside mount caps on both masonry chimneys at 408 East Washington Street.

Will Moore: And Madam Vice Chair before sorry, before you go forward, I did drop this off. Mr. Hersh gave this to you beforehand. The materials in the packet indicated the cap would be stainless steel, but the plan now is for it still to be stainless, but then to be powder coated black.

Punkin Lee: Tim, would you like to tell us more about that?

Tim Clites: [inaudible] was the biggest. We identified the need to put something on the chimneys. And and this is a really a personal preference of mine that even though these are I would describe them as being more contemporary to today than traditional to the structure. I really like the way a complete cap protects the structure long term and creates less visual clutter. So I suggested to the Hersh's let's let's look at this as an option, because I think any kind of cap is a contemporary today thing, right? And so I feel like this does a better job of protecting. And at the same time, it's not you know, I think the black will still be fairly quiet over time.

Punkin Lee: Bill.

Bill Anderson: I think these are going to be fine. They would have been really fabulous if they were copper kind of to match the roof. That would have been kind of a first choice. But I think they'll look good. Is the arrestors stainless? Screens. The arrestor screens.

Tim Clites: They are. And I can't remember. I think I think you can get those I'll have to check. I think you can get those coated as well.

Bill Anderson: It would probably would look better. Don't see any stainless. Does it have any type of cap on top of the flu? I mean, nothing interesting. Anyway, copper if that's not an option to get a.

Tim Clites: Well you know honestly the only thing I would guess is that that option has a price concern. But if you wanted to approve both, I think we could go ahead and ask and see.

Bill Anderson: I mean, I think it'll look better, but I think it will be more expensive.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: No comment. It's fine.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I'm fine with those two, either in the powder coated black or copper. I'm fine with those.

Punkin Lee: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree.

Punkin Lee: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comment.

Punkin Lee: I agree too the copper would be lovely, but the powdered black would be fine too.

Will Moore: So you're fine with the [inaudible] selection as well?

Punkin Lee: Oh yeah. I think everything is.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I'll change. I mentioned this after this got submitted the mortars really more around a color which will match the mortar that's there probably won't be flamingo. I think we're going to need to do a lime-based mortar because of the softness of the brick. So we'll talk to the chimney. Obviously, the goal is to have it blend in. Right. And they pick the mortar color that they thought was a good match. But I'm not really comfortable with Portland on this old structure. So.

Punkin Lee: Is there any other discussion on this? Do I have a motion?

Bill Anderson: COA 22-16 Request of Winston's Chimney Services for Repointing and adding outside mount caps on both masonry chimneys at 408 East Washington Street to approve as discussed in either black for the cap, either in powdered coated black or copper. And the issue of the mortar [off mic], to match existing. Good luck.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Punkin Lee: All those in favor say aye.

Everyone: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Opposed. Motion carries. Thank you and thank you all for making a lovely entrance to town.

Chris Hersh: Oh, thank you very much.

Punkin Lee: Watching the bamboo progress over everything.

Chris Hersh: Thank you all very much.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Thank you.

Tim Clites: [off mic]

Hannah Lessard: I'm Hannah Lessard. Thank you for your time today.

Bill Anderson: I think the signs are quite beautiful.

Hannah Lessard: Thank you.

Bill Anderson: I don't have any problem with it. It seems large, but it's within [inaudible].

Will Moore: I think any time you see somebody holding a sign. We should have the picture of her.

Hannah Lessard: It looks a little bigger next to me than to the building. [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: I agree. I think it's lovely.

Hannah Lessard: I designed it myself, so this is really exciting.

Bill Anderson: Yeah. Very nice.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think it's very nice to have seen it through the window and it looks nice. Where is it going to hang? Did I miss where the brackets or what kind of bracket there is?

Hannah Lessard: There's brackets that are already on the building. They were existing. So it's just chains that are sort of attached to their it hangs about like eight feet off the ground and perpendicular to the building. So you right now it's single sided. So you see it when you're coming from the Thai restaurant side. But I'm in the process of disputing that it was supposed to be double sided.

Will Moore: If you look carefully at the photos, they don't highlight it too well. But if you were to look at the front of the building, the existing bracket is on the upper left. You have to kind of.

Punkin Lee: Oh, I got it now. It's right on top of that roof. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I think it's beautiful. I think that'll be a nice addition to the building.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda, Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree. I've seen the sign in the window, and I thought it was really pretty. Good job.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No, I have not. No other comment. Welcome.

Hannah Lessard: Thank you.

Tim Clites: I have no comments either. So I'll move that we approve. Send me a backup here to the COA 22-17 S22-10 as submitted. Second. All those in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed. Any abstain. Motion passes. Thank you. Welcome to town.

Hannah Lessard: I appreciate it.

Tim Clites: Next order of business here COA 22-18 request of Steve Simons of Veritas Contracting for replacement windows and removal of an elevated rear addition at 11 South Madison Street. Welcome, Steve.

Steve Simons: Thank you Tim.

Tim Clites: Introduce yourself. State your name. So this little thing records it and picks it up.

Steve Simons: Steve Simons, Veritas Contracting.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Will, do you want to give us any comments?

Will Moore: I think Estee's captured the application pretty well in the memo she has provided. The you have hard copies. I sent you electronically just earlier today, letters from both the project architect, as well as a structural engineer in support of the request to remove the elevated rear addition. In terms of the second story, Windows, he's proposing all wood windows on the front elevation along Madison Street. Aluminum clad for the second story on the north and south, which are the tight alleyways between the buildings. So really limited view on those but then aluminum clad as well on the rear which those will be exposed once the if you do approve the removal of the addition, they would be visible from a public way. So that might be the one thing to consider is is the viewpoint from the rear of the building. Should you subject that to the same scrutiny that you would to the front of the building in terms of you would typically require replacement windows.

Tim Clites: Sure. Thank you, Steve. Any kind of a well put together application? Thank you. Any comments you want to share with us?

Steve Simons: Yes, I would just point out that on the rear elevation, which is the east facing elevation, that side of the building is about three stories above grade back there. So it is very much more elevated than it is on the Madison Street side of the building that faces back into a parking lot back there. That then that parking area continues all the way back to the adjacent street. So while it is visible from a public way, you'd have to you're going to be only about 300, 350 yards from the building before you notice it. At that elevation, it's my opinion that you wouldn't notice that those windows were anything but white. You wouldn't be able to discern what the material was on those windows. And one of the windows in question back there is actually going to be a permanently affixed window because it's actually in the middle of a shower in the bathroom. It already was in the shower. We're going to close it off from the inside of the building and we'll paint it black on the back side of it. And so it's not visible from it. But we want to put the window back just to keep the appearance of the building on the outside on that as far as the the

removal of the structure is concerned. And I apologize for the late submittal from the architect as well as the engineer. It was the earliest we were able to get them to write them. We think we feel it's a life safety hazard back there. Those those that structure was being used as a bedroom or sleeping space previously with the previous tenants. These will be apartments again that W.P. Investments is trying to put some affordable housing back in town. And we want to avoid that being the future use potentially of those because of the way the the egress was set up between the two rear apartments you had to traverse from one apartment to the other apartment space, crawl across a bed to even get to the fire escape. And the fire escape didn't have a landing. So you basically opened a door that swung in with a hook latch. And then you, if you were lucky, you would hit the first step. So the whole thing is just a it's a hot mess, to use a vernacular term.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Steve.

Virginia Jenkins: How many apartments are there? 2?

Steve Simons: There's three altogether. There's one on the Madison side and there are two in the rear.

Tim Clites: Bill, should we start with you again?

Bill Anderson: Sure. I get first with regards to the letter from the architect and the structural engineer. It seems to be very clear that it is a pretty unsafe condition aside from the exiting, which is the whole code issue, that really isn't our purview. So I understand the need of the desire to want to raise that portion of the building. And I really don't have a problem with it. I don't. Second items on the submittals, on the windows. I see that in the front. You've matched the number of lights in the second-floor windows and on the back six over six, which I think some of the side windows have seems fine. I, I would love to see the wood windows carried everywhere on the building since it's an historic building. Taking note that yes, maybe from a distance they all look white, even if it was vinyl. We just have a would really rather see a wood window in there.

Steve Simons: One of our concerns, Bill, was that access to those windows to maintain them from the outside of the building, the alleyway on the south side of the building is only about three feet. So getting a ladder into that to have to maintain those windows would be a real challenge on the north side of the building. There's all kinds of power lines over there that also gives us some pause about being able to maintain those windows. And then it's 45 feet up to the the rear elevation. And that's why we decided not to use the wood windows on those three facades.

Bill Anderson: I can understand that, although they do have windows that can you can provide access from the inside to get at the outside, not to remove them, obviously, but to access them. I understand that.

Steve Simons: We are keeping the the existing frames. We're going to refurbish the existing frames and sills. So these will be inset into the existing wood after the repairs are done to the structures. So we're trying to maintain as much of the appearance of the original fabric as we can.

Tim Clites: Thank you Bill.

Margaret Littleton: I have no problem with the windows. I think it makes a lot of sense and get rid of that addition is dreadful. And hopefully the Ivy or whatever that vine is.

Steve Simons: That's got to come off too.

Margaret Littleton: Um, no, it needs help, so I think it looks good.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. Good.

Punkin Lee: I think taking off that addition will just make that building so much nicer and safer. I do have a question. This metal stair that's on there now, does that stay?

Steve Simons: No, ma'am. That will come off as well. And we actually removed the oil tanks that were stored out back because they were no longer being used. So we disposed of those.

Punkin Lee: And I think keeping the. The frames. Repaired on the back then. And, you know, it's kind of a nice trade, 5050 for that, putting the wood windows back in.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I would kind of agree with Punkin. I'm not too hung up on the windows on the sides just because of the issues with that. But it might be nice to keep the wood on the back as is visible from the screen and then getting rid of the additions. The greatest thing ever.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'll go along with anything on the windows. And I'm really pleased that taking off the back. I mean, it's been an eyesore for a long time. If you ever drive back, there and it looks even worse in the pictures.

Steve Simons: It's not pleasant for sure.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I agree. And I can't imagine how cold it was up there because it looks like there was nothing.

Steve Simons: Just a baseboard heater in that space.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, dear. It's a wonder. Gracious, I'm glad everybody's fine. Yeah. And the Ivy. And I wonder how much damage to everything you're going to find when you do get that off of there.

Steve Simons: Well, the good news is the building is stone, so hopefully that it's just a surface issue.

Cindy Pearson: Hopefully. Hopefully. Yes. But I'm okay with the windows. Whatever work needs to be done with those to make it work nicer, easier for you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy. My only question with the windows is one that we bump into on occasion. We say we're keeping the casing and the frame. If if the detail that's submitted is going inside that existing frame, that means we're going to lose about two and a half inches of the window on either side at the top.

Steve Simons: Right. So the windows that we selected, we tried to minimize the sash sizes as much as we could on those. And I think we'll lose an inch and three quarters total on each side of those.

Tim Clites: On each side.

Steve Simons: Correct. The front windows don't because we're we're well, you are going to lose some on the front. But in order to keep the light pattern on the front with the wood windows and not wholesaling, changing out the historic fabric that was on the front of the building, we thought that was a good tradeoff on the front. So you are correct with your assessment that.

Tim Clites: Yeah, and it's something we've debated here before, right? Like does it look better to keep the old casing that maybe it's original or maybe it's not and, and then have a window that feels like a sash pack that got installed inside that and kind of lose that proportion in that glass or to salvage maybe the casing. And go back with a window that actually is more like sash size to the size of the sashes that are there. And I don't know if that creates any additional problems with the I mean, I know it's a little more work, but. Does it make sense what I'm asking?

Steve Simons: So because we're going to remove the on the on the jam of the window, we're going to remove the stops that are on there. We're going to leave the brick mold that's on the outside. We're going to leave the sill in the sub sill. We shouldn't lose too much in width on the overall window. It should really, because we've sized them pretty tight. We've got to leave a little bit of space for insulation between the existing jams and the new jams, but that the jam would be three quarter inch material. And then if we leave a quarter inch air gap between the existing jam and the new jam, that would give us an inch and a quarter on each side. So two- and one-half inches over. Overall, I think our I'd have to calculate our net glass on the windows, and I can that's certainly something I can provide to the board. And we could find out exactly what the delta is between an existing window and as far as the square inches of glass versus what is currently there.

Tim Clites: So help me with that. Maybe I'm just not looking at the detail right, because there's a what page am I on. There's a detail down in the submittal as you get down into customer, customer approval, [inaudible] exhibit D as in dog double hung vent. And that looks like the vent goes over to say a three-quarter inch frame. But the other details that are before that appear like there's I mean the dimensions says, two and 3/8.

Steve Simons: So you're looking at exhibit D that shows the double hung with the asterisks.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Versus the would double hung spiral balance head detail let's say from [inaudible] for the parrot windows there that the pack is like it would be that much inside of the casing.

Steve Simons: Well, because the the parrot windows are actually going to be custom made for that. We can inquire about reducing the the size of this of the framing around that to minimize any loss of sash or glass square inches on those.

Bill Anderson: Tim. Yeah, what about particularly in the front, a total replacement? I mean, what's the delta there? You just basically.

Steve Simons: Well, that's a great question, Bill. We have a fair amount of of repair to do on the existing sills. We have to pull them out of the [inaudible]. So the difference really being, again, our goal was to try to maintain the existing look of them. And when you put a replacement window in or a new window in, the details aren't quite the same. So we could certainly because of those front windows have to be custom made. We can look at having that two- and one-half inch sill fashioned or having that be identical to what it is.

Bill Anderson: Yeah. When I look at the photo, which I can't seem to get back here again. Yeah. Exhibit F, I just don't see any uniqueness to the window. To the trim, to the frame. Tim, do you?

Tim Clites: [off mic]

Bill Anderson: And the work you have to do to.

Steve Simons: Yeah. It's really just a, it's a one by four frame around it with it's got a piece of bed molding that's, that's a separate piece that's, that goes around the masonry opening. So there's plus the two and a half inch [inaudible].

Bill Anderson: From a labor point of view, it seems like. Especially when you're renovating inside. Anyway, that's what I think would be the way to go. But that way you keep the. Well, we think you have more chance of keeping the.

Steve Simons: Size of the openings. Yes.

Tim Clites: I would jump in and say I would agree with that. Let me pause for a minute and see if anyone else has any comments or questions about what we what we just discussed or anything else. I do have another question after we're done with this.

Cindy Pearson: One quick one. The bars that are on the window that are under that piece on the top. Is that really still there?

Steve Simons: Let me get you your picture here.

Cindy Pearson: [inaudible] one existing porch frame where you can see up under it if you look below it. There's bars on that window. I was thinking it was part of the jail years ago. But that's the next building. Yeah.

Steve Simons: No, those bars are still there. That's on the carpet shop. That's downstairs on the first floor. Those are. And I think that's the only window that has those bars on that. I'm not sure. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: It also might have been the window where the pharmacy kept their medication.

Cindy Pearson: Good thinking. Well, you're going to find some surprises.

Punkin Lee: I do have a question.

Tim Clites: Go ahead. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Once the windows of choice are installed, is all the trim going to still be white or are you coming back with a.

Steve Simons: No, it'll still be white. We're going to paint it.

Punkin Lee: Kinda everything as it is. Just a fresh coat.

Steve Simons: Correct?

Tim Clites: My question beyond the windows in the rear we can install a window. There's a piece below it. What are you thinking to do there? I'm sorry. There's a piece of. I am not clear. A piece of the stone wall missing. What is your thought?

Steve Simons: Were the two were the two doors were.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Steve Simons: So that the idea below that is to come up with. It would be a trim detail at the bottom of that that would be painted the same color as the rest of the trim on the building. I would envision that probably would look something similar to a flat panel with with some kind of molding around the center of it. That's the same size as the window opening. If you look.

Tim Clites: If you look at the interior pictures.

Steve Simons: Right after exhibit I.

Tim Clites: You would there's one that's got a green. There's a sack of pot. I don't know what it is mortar, [inaudible] so that opening gets one window in it.

Steve Simons: That opening does look a lot larger than it actually is. It's is the perspective of the picture. It's only it's only a 30-inch opening. So did you have.

Tim Clites: No, just those 30 inches of windows going to go side to side. The ceiling is going to come out and then whatever. But the new window would align with the existing windows that you see there?

Steve Simons: To the right [inaudible].

Tim Clites: And so then there would be some some kind of above, below. I mean, you're almost not going to know till you rip the addition off what you're left with.

Steve Simons: Correct. Because we don't know if there's any kind of a masonry header above that opening yet.

Tim Clites: Or steel lintel or something that doesn't look great that you have to.

Steve Simons: So the goal would be to to infill that with stone across the top to get back down to the same head height that we have on the other windows, insert the window and then right below it would be to do a wood panel at the bottom of that. We're not trying to cover up that there was a door there. Yeah, I think that still speaks to the history of the building itself.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And I guess I don't I didn't even have a feeling yet about whether it should be. I just has to be something, right?

Steve Simons: So that was the intention that it would be.

Tim Clites: You can see the it looks like it steps down. Does it step down or are you stepping over a gap in the floor there. It steps down. Okay.

Bill Anderson: I also I guess until you pull the addition off, as you said, you really don't. I guess you would try to mimic the eave and the gutters that's on the front of the building in the back. But you don't know what you're going to get.

Steve Simons: This roof line is actually below the existing roof. And it's got a fairly flat [inaudible] on the top of it. This is all below that. Perspective at the back of the building. We've put 31 micro lambs in that building so far because the structure was. Inside the building. It was so deficient.

Bill Anderson: To brace the second floor.

Steve Simons: To brace the second floor. Yeah, it's a beam. Yes, ma'am.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you for taking one of our old buildings and working on it. So gracious.

Tim Clites: So should we run through any other comments? Should we run through a recap, maybe just to kind of see if we're. We have some alignment. I mean. Go ahead.

Bill Anderson: Are you clear about what the rear is going to look like on the top floor?

Tim Clites: Not completely, but I'm also realistic that I'm not sure anybody can tell you to tear that thing off. So it's almost like if they're going to order a window that's the same size as the windows that are there, to me that feels logical enough that, you know, once it's pulled apart, do we do we have Steve come back with a little panel sketch like do again up there on the second floor? Do we care about what the actual panel looks like or is it the casing that comes down that, you know, the wall below it is probably not as thick as the stone wall. You're going to do a frame wall, which means the panel is going to be recessed. So if you look at that, if you look at the picture of the little door opening, right, you can imagine that that has a window in the upper part and then just a flat panel below it. And then you've got some kind of a wood or a stone sill at the bottom of that, which is going to tell the story that there used to be a door here.

Bill Anderson: Right, exactly.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And I'm okay with that on the back because, you know.

Bill Anderson: Okay. I'm okay with that, too.

Tim Clites: And you know, I know you guys have worked on enough old buildings. If you uncover something totally out of whack.

Steve Simons: We would bring. [multiple speakers] We would bring that back to your attention and discuss with all.

Tim Clites: Patching and things to do when you pull that structure off. But that's pretty typical, right? So it sounds like the consensus of everyone is that happy to see the addition go. I'm going to paraphrase, but everyone's welcome to jump in and correct me. It sounds like the general consensus is that the side windows to the north and the south maybe split 50/50 or less concerned about whether they're clad or wood, but the front and the back seem to be a preference for wood. That's just I'm just paraphrasing what I think I heard, but everyone could one at a time clarify and then someone can make a motion.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. I was okay with if there. Is it vinyl? Aluminum in the back if. [off mic] Sides for sure. But on the back. So there could be care for them easier. I don't think it would be that. You don't think so? Yeah. It's the majority rules.

Tim Clites: So then I will ask a question about the aluminum on the back. Just to clarify, if we have an aluminum sash on the back, we're probably not going to do aluminum casing. You're going to do some kind of a painted casing and panel below it.

Steve Simons: If we're replacing the casings, then yes, we would probably probably wouldn't use wood in this case. We would probably use something a barrel or a PVC painted that wouldn't be PVC, but either barrel or cement product that is more impervious to to water damage and long-term maintenance on there. The bathroom window. I mean Bill had a good point they do make window package that you can you can tilt in and service the windows in the case of the bathroom on the back that won't be the case because you won't have access to it. It'll be tile in front of it. [off mic]

Tim Clites: My mind just goes to a clad window in if there's a panel and there's trim and you have to paint it anyway. One of the other things that we've discussed here as a committee is that although painting is no one's favorite project, it does require because it requires some level of effort. It does freshen up a facade now and again. Right. And it does require a little care. I don't know if that's completely applicable to the back. If it was all replacement windows and there were no panels, I could potentially. I think that the cloud, you're not going to notice it, but like the clad windows on the side, they're going to be clad. You're still going to have some kind of a scribal trim. You're not going to do a clad trim there.

Steve Simons: Correct.

Tim Clites: Right.

Steve Simons: If it's the preference to have the wood windows on the front end, the back in the north and south elevations because they're not accessible and not visible. Could be clad. We certainly would be open to that that suggestion or that determination. And compromise for everybody.

Cindy Pearson: And what I had just said about the aluminum or whatever it is to that does turn a color after years. And like you said, when you can paint, you can freshen up. It's not only it's almost a dirty stain that just won't go away with a yeah. So I agree with that. At least you can paint the other and make it come back to life.

Tim Clites: And synthetic, if you get behind on the paint, at least it's not going to the trim wouldn't rot up with wood. You're going to. Yeah. They would have to keep up with it. Right. So if anyone feels like they have that all in their hand, I'd entertain a motion.

Bill Anderson: [off mic]

Tim Clites: I would think that should be the standard for any of the wood windows.

Bill Anderson: [off mic]

Tim Clites: I mean, and the point is, on the side windows is probably easier to knock to take the whole window out and put in your clad window and trim it and be done.

Steve Simons: Yeah, it could be right.

Tim Clites: I mean, because otherwise you're going to do a replacement, the whole nailing flange and how you flange that. And that's a mess. I mean, that's long term. That's probably not the way you want to do it.

Steve Simons: We were just trying to be empathetic to the.

Tim Clites: I understand. We appreciate that. Right. But when you really think through it. So what we're saying is full replacement, front and rear and painted wood and clad full replacement on the north and south sides.

Bill Anderson: [off mic]

Tim Clites: And it could be I mean I think it's something some smooth and we don't like we don't like wood grained anything so.

Steve Simons: Be like a hardy panel.

Tim Clites: Y'all playing chicken on me now? Come on. All right, here we go. Let me get back to the starting point here. I move that for COA 22-18 request of Steve Simons of Veritas Contracting replacement windows and removal of an elevated rear addition at 11 South Madison Street be approved as follows. The addition on the rear can be completely removed, including the stair, the front facade second story windows will be completely replaced to match the existing as closely as possible using a painted wood window, the rear facade windows will be completely replaced with a wood painted window to match as closely as possible with smooth panels below the two windows that are infilling where the doors exist, and that the side windows on the north and south be replaced with a aluminum complete replacement, aluminum clad with a synthetic painted trim to match as closely as possible.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Steve Simons: Thank you very much for for hearing our concerns.

Tim Clites: All in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed, any abstain. Thank you. Motion passes.

Steve Simons: Thanks very much, guys.

Cindy Pearson: Good luck. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: You have to go through to get like a demolition permit and then a hearing and all that for.

Will Moore: No, not for a minor [inaudible].

Punkin Lee: For the demolition like that.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic]

Tim Clites: Next order of business COA RS 22-004 Request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family dwelling at 601 Martingale Ridge Drive, Middleburg residence, lot 18. Welcome, Gretchen.

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you, guys. How are you guys doing? I'll be better if I owned a concrete company. I'll tell you that much.

Cindy Pearson: Moving a lot of dirt out there. Yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: Dirt is the easy part. Concrete, not so much right now. So lot 18. I do not know. Will, did you annotate the color-coding map that you were doing? Thank you. I appreciate that. Because mine, when I when I copied it, came out as green, I was like, oh, no. Okay. So in keeping first off, with our mandate of not having homes next to each other that have the same color, you can reference the map that Will has done a beautiful job of annotating. I will tell you that what's nice is that Lot 18 is going to be coming in next month and Lot three and completely different kind of colors in terms of the Rockport Gray and stuff. So we've been really the owners have been very good at understanding this mandate of not having the same thing next to each other, both texturally and and color wise. So that kind of checks that one little box, so to speak. I did bring just to digress for one moment, I know sometimes there's been this kind of question mark. I was able to get this from from [inaudible], which is the ship lap that will be on the sections that are the bump out. This is not something I think you guys had seen before. The differentiation is it provides this kind of smooth, but I'm going to call this very minimalistic type of which by virtue of paint will have a small crack. But that's okay. That's what it's supposed to have versus, and

you can see it almost as in a flat plane versus what would be our siding product product and then indoor or stucco product have a totally different kind of scenario to it. So we do get that subtle delineation on both our grille and on our bump outs. The other thing that I hadn't had before we've discussed it just a little bit, just on the ceilings, is we have this V groove that goes on the ceilings. You have the beaded kind of scenario. Ours is going to be in keeping with a little bit more modern kind of farmhouse will be kind of the the v you can flip it either way this being a little more fussy, this being a little more kind of clean in terms that just they brought them to him the other day and I thought I'd bring them since the ship lap is not something we've looked at a lot. Very subtle. It's a very subtle detail on there, but I think it'll speak volumes in terms of just.

Tim Clites: What it is, just a detail we have. We only use that and detailed elements, right? It's not a whole facade.

Gretchen Yahn: So no, it's just those, like I said, the grill of the and the bump out areas and that'll hold true with all of them out there. So that was just a little digression there. This client, they will have stucco on this one, hence the Burton White stucco with the trim color being the matching. In terms of it, this client's a little more on the modern side. Hence, in keeping with the black mutttons that we have throughout the project, the black roof that we have throughout the project, we will have black gutters on this one excuse me, and they will have the black shutters on this one. So it'll have a little bit more of I call the modern kind of farmhouse kind of look to it. What's nice is, is that the one that is Burton White on the other side. And what I should say which is on the other side, that one was a stucco residence. So it's going to have a little bit of different character just by virtue of it being sited in this color versus the stucco, you know, the stucco will look resonate a little bit more modern, whereby the sided one will have a little bit more of that kind of wink and a nod to the classic Virginia vernacular farmhouse kind of look. So even though they are of the same color, they're going to have a little bit of a different feel to each of them. And Tim can probably speak to that a little bit more, but it is a very subtle kind of difference in terms of the feeling of them. These people will have a pool and a spa and as you can see from the grading plan and hence the the plat that we do for you guys, these people do have a family. So this is the reason they chose this lot just so we could do a little bit bigger area for their turn around for their drive area there. When we come to the pergola, we will submit on that separately. It's not something that we they will definitely be doing some kind of pergola feature, but we'll submit on that separately once we get a little bit further along here. Just so you know.

Tim Clites: Cindy, you want to start? Any questions or comments on this application?

Cindy Pearson: I don't. It's. I'm sorry. My screen just really froze up. But no, I have no comment right at this moment. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No, it seems fairly straightforward.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia. Linda.

Linda Wright: The pool decking again is flagstone, right?

Gretchen Yahn: Yes. Some people are looking to do some grass inlay in some of it to kind of keep because the sidewalks are going to be flagstone and grass to kind of bring that in and be a little softer as well.

Linda Wright: And is the spa on that one raised or same elevation as the pool?

Gretchen Yahn: It'll be 18 inches above. Just because with those spas, it's a lot. I'd rather be flush, but a lot of times older people and the like like to be able to sit and get into the spa and having it down at deck level sometimes that's no good. So it is 18 inches above. Grandpa go boom. [laughter]

Linda Wright: I'm there. Other than that, I think it looks great.

Tim Clites: Thank you Linda. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: No question so far. Looking looks good.

Gretchen Yahn: We've been starting to get things a little more [inaudible].

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Where is the pool? Where the one is?

Gretchen Yahn: If you look on the one plan, it's. It says pool deck, it says pool 20 by 56.

Margaret Littleton: Sorry. I'll look. [off mic] First one. I got it. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: So in keeping with everybody else's kind of genre, this is the same. It has that U-shape in terms of with the garage to the one side, this pool is a little bit bigger than the other pools, which is another reason why they picked this lot.

Margaret Littleton: Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: This is a back side lot, by the way. It's one of the first ones to go on the side. That's going to be to the berm.

Margaret Littleton: All right. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I don't have any comments right now.

Gretchen Yahn: Bill got a plan specifically for him with that east, north and south. In red.

Tim Clites: Personalized service. I like that.

Bill Anderson: [off mic]

Gretchen Yahn: You're welcome. Like I said, that was all Lori's doing. That was my assistant. She's like Bill needs his plan. I was like, Ok. One thing that'll be nice. And I know this doesn't speak to so much what you guys look at, but I've been doing a lot of trying to get things as level to the ground as possible. You know, some of these things will have a little bit of some bolder action to tuck some things on the side and the like. But we're really trying to with people that are wanting to do pools and like keep them on these flatter lots, keep everything up to the ground also because we don't want railings. So we've been really kind of when the people come in, you know, speaking to the fact that a certain lot may be better for them than another type of lot out there. So we're not seeing a lot of just, you know, retainage and all this kind of stuff, which we don't want to see. So just FYI, so sometimes that's what speaks to the different lots to the clients.

Bill Anderson: [off mic] Is that significant?

Gretchen Yahn: It just kind of does it for scale.

Bill Anderson: [off mic]

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. It's just for a scale issue, just to kind of give a scale of how things. Sometimes they stick people. Sometimes they stick cars. He had artistic license, I guess.

Tim Clites: I don't have any comments except on the garage. The first time I looked at the front elevation before I looked at the plan, it read to me between the garage door and the window, there's a vertical line. It read to me like those facades were in different planes. But then I looked at the plan and realized it's that's one plane on that elevation in the rear is where it steps in, right. Yeah. And so that. It's not a big deal stucco.

Gretchen Yahn: [off mic]

Tim Clites: But I didn't have any other comments.

Gretchen Yahn: Next month, we'll get our first hybrid.

Tim Clites: The first what?

Gretchen Yahn: First vineyard hybrid in here.

Tim Clites: Which is a massing we haven't seen. Right. Well, we saw it a long time ago, but we haven't seen the whole package.

Gretchen Yahn: That's correct. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Cool.

Gretchen Yahn: And I will say, and I will reinforce again, the clients have been very good about. They've all really upped their landscaping amounts. I think you're going to be happy with everybody's part of what this is about is the outside inside. So they're really respecting that and they're really kind of getting into it. So no one's been like, Oh, don't increase my landscaping allowance. They've all been like, Yeah, just go ahead and put another place card holder on it.

Tim Clites: That's awesome.

Gretchen Yahn: Which has been good.

Tim Clites: Make a big difference. Yeah. Well, I'll mosey around the room one more time. Any comments, Cindy? Virginia? Linda? Punkin?

Punkin Lee: No all good, thank you.

Tim Clites: Margaret? Bill?

Bill Anderson: No.

Tim Clites: Very well. I move that we approve COA RS 22-04 request of Gretchen Yahn for new single-family dwelling at 601 Martingale Ridge Drive as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any Opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you, Gretchen.

Gretchen Yahn: Can I ask a question of everybody while they're here? We have been working, trying to work towards getting signage for the individual lots. We really don't want to do house numbers on the house. You know, we've been looking at some different types of scenarios. One, we're going to meet VDOT, obviously an emergency ingress egress with the fire marshal. But the question is, and I'm just throwing this out there to everybody that's here in terms of it's not so much a cost issue, it's just an aesthetic issue. We want to do something with landscaping and the like. So if anybody's thinking about that or is like, hey, you know, I think this would look great, I welcome anything. I mean, we've looked at everything from taking Slate. The problem with Slate, which I'd love to do, but it doesn't illuminate, so you can't see it. So we've been kind of wrangling around. So because we want something to look really nice, obviously this street signs and stuff will kind of carry the same M.O. of what's here in Middleburg, but we're really not wanting to do numbers on the house because it just doesn't look that great.

Will Moore: If I may, and I can't remember if you and I touched on this before or if it was Lori and I if the house can be seen from the street, numbers on the structure itself are required by code, and there's a certain spec for that, a supplemental number. You can do as many supplemental ones out front as you want, but if it can be seen from the street, which the majority of these will, once you get over into the western portion on some of the larger lots that have the flag lots, they'll be set back. It may not be the case, but pretty much everything in the vineyard section, you're going to have to put on it.

Gretchen Yahn: So is that location something you guys want to approve? I mean, again, I have they're all going to be in the same kind of genre, and they've all got to be. So is that something you guys want to see? Is that I'm just I'm throwing it out there because I have no clue.

Margaret Littleton: They're going to have mailboxes.

Gretchen Yahn: No, we're going to have they're going to have a mail. They're going to Central Mail House. Sounds kind of sexist when I say mail house. They're going to have a structure that will support mail coming in. I'll be politically correct. Yeah, there's a central structure.

Bill Anderson: Yeah. They're not going to have mail delivered to their home.

Gretchen Yahn: No, we don't want a bunch of mailboxes out there.

Bill Anderson: And I'm. No, I didn't mean my mailbox. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. So there's that's something we're working on right now with the common area, stuff that will get submitted, but that's was proffered at the end over there.

Will Moore: It's at the intersection. So [inaudible] Drive that we're working on right now at the far west end of that where the T's into Chestnut Street.

Bill Anderson: So we're going to have a place where people could drive in and park and.

Gretchen Yahn: It'll be kind of drive off, you know, so their mail can get dropped and they could have a key and they can. And then that way, if their packages are there and things like that, it can all be in one central spot. Yeah, I'm sure UPS will do a wingding or job on. Yeah. [off mic]

Tim Clites: We'll think about.

Gretchen Yahn: So do you want to see what the house numbers are? Again, I don't care... [off mic]

Will Moore: There's a spec of minimum height and stroke width that they have to be it has to be a contrasting color to the surface of that it's put on.

Gretchen Yahn: Do they have to be illuminated? I don't want to have. [off mic] Good.

Will Moore: And if you look at the you look at the color map, which is attachment six on the far-left hand side, you can see the little box here.

Tim Clites: So for your color palette, you probably need a light color and a dark color, right? Whatever that is. Obviously, the dark one can be black, but I don't know what you do for the light one.

Gretchen Yahn: I know. We're going to. We're playing around with it now. Actually, John Ralph's been working with us on it so we can have something that can be.

Will Moore: That's who I had the conversation with.

Gretchen Yahn: I think you had it with John. Yeah. So it just we've been mulling it about because we just don't want to be some multicolored Technicolor crap out there. You. So that's what we're trying to roll through.

Tim Clites: So anybody that has an inspiration.

Gretchen Yahn: Lay it on us. I'm all about it. Just email me.

Tim Clites: I would add this was not part of your application, but the V joint I like. I also think I just speak for myself. This isn't for the application, but the clapboard houses you could use the other side and I think it would be perfectly acceptable. It is a little more traditional, but that's probably of the group of homes you have. It's probably the most. But if they were all the same, I think that's fine.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, we could ask the client.

Tim Clites: I mean, if a client really got hung up on it, I don't think we would be hung up if you decided to flip that around.

Gretchen Yahn: All right. Well, you're going to start to see stuff framed here soon.

Cindy Pearson: Thought on the house numbers might be totally off the wall, but we do have many artists that can come up with a something that would maybe not look tacky, might go towards it, and it could maybe go for each building. It wouldn't have to be light or dark because of the background of whatever was used. You'd have to speak to some artists that.

Gretchen Yahn: Do something with metal, kind of with the bridle kind of theme on it and stuff. I mean, that's what we've been kind of playing around with a little bit and stuff. But like I said, I'm all about inspiration. This is a group collaboration on this one, just because I just it just has to look right. And, you know, sometimes stuff can just look like and has to all resonate the same through there. And the dark and

the light is a little bit of a kind of an issue which we could get through with powder coating and stuff like that, too. So.

Cindy Pearson: There's good old wrought iron numbers. [off mic] Won't show in the dark, but.

Gretchen Yahn: And it's. [off mic] Yeah, I think it's going to have to be almost a placard kind of scenario made that we can have it in the same place at the same spot. [off mic] Yes, we could. And that just sticks out. [off mic] Yes. So it's good. Is everybody coming to the opening? We'll do that next Tuesday. Yeah. 4:30. Yeah, 4:30. You guys are going to be. You should have gotten your invites. [off mic] I think you should have. We sent the email. It was yeah it was done by email. If you didn't will you let Will know because I think we had to kind of bring it to a central point and then kind of send it out. So if you didn't, it's going to be 4:30. It will be starting at the resort. It'll go from like 4:30 to 5:30 and then cocktail party afterwards at the resort.

Will Moore: I'll send you.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. So if anybody didn't get it, please, please let Will know because you all are definitely on the list. And if there's anybody else, you know, that's just let me know because we tried to make sure everybody was on it. All right. Thank you, guys. We look forward to seeing you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Discussion items. Do we have a meeting quorum for August the fourth? Unfortunately, Virginia is here. You said that. [off mic] Looks like we have a quorum. Very good. Let staff know if that changes. And have a good July.