



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



**Thursday, June 3, 2021
PENDING APPROVAL**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, June 3, 2021, in the Town Hall Council Chambers. Chair Clites called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

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
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk
Estee LaClare, Project & Planning Associate

Approval of Minutes

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the minutes of the May 6, 2021 regular meeting.

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.) (by roll call vote)

Action Items

Old Business

Residences At Salamander Design Guidelines

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they saw the first version of the guideline updates last month. He further reminded them that they included the addition of guidelines that would be applicable to the R-3 section and the addition of graphics to the guidelines that were applicable to the R-1 section. Mr. Moore noted that the Committee requested the opportunity to review the updates further before adopting them.

Chair Clites reminded the Committee that they would review each structure, including the details of the design, as they were submitted. He noted that these were only the guidelines and reminded the members that they were not approving specific designs.

Gretchen Yahn appeared before the Committee representing Salamander. She advised that she anticipated submitting the first application for The Vineyard section within thirty days, once they had recorded lots.

Chair Clites suggested that Salamander provide detailed drawings as soon as possible, even if they did not have recorded lots. He noted that this would give the Committee extra time to review the details.

Ms. Yahn confirmed they had five detailed drawings and questioned whether she should bring those in now or just the ones for The Vineyard.

Chair Clites suggested that if Salamander had the detailed drawings for the houses that would be constructed in The Vineyards section, they be brought in for review during the next meeting. He further suggested the procedure for the review would be similar to the procedure used when the Committee reviewed a regular Historic District application.

Ms. Yahn reminded the Committee that the R-3 section, known as The Vineyards, contained small lots, including six that were very small. She advised that the house design was modified for the latter lots using a front-to-back design. Ms. Yahn noted that they also had a second hybrid design that was even smaller. She opined that once the Committee viewed the first design iteration, it would simply be a matter of looking at the colors and materials, as the remaining items would all be the same. Ms. Yahn advised that The Stables plans were similar in that they included a design plan and a hybrid.

Chair Clites asked that as the properties developed, the applications include the information on the adjoining houses so the Committee could see how they would relate to each other.

Ms. Yahn reminded the Committee that the plan was to identify a color for each lot, as well as the veneer materials, so adjoining houses would not look the same.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee adopt the Residences at Salamander Design Guidelines dated February 22, 2016 and revised through April 27, 2021.

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.) (by roll call vote)

New Business

COA 21-13 (S 21-08): Projecting Sign & Window Signs – 7 East Washington Street – Tully Rector

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the applicant was seeking approval of a 5.6 square foot painted and raised border projecting sign that would be installed on an existing bracket. She distributed color samples for the window signs.

Patty Callahan appeared representing the application. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she advised that the gold color would be used for the lettering on the inside of the windows.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Planning & Project Associate LaClare confirmed the height of the projecting sign was greater than 7.5 feet.

The Committee agreed they liked the sign and lettering and noted that they were elegant.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 21-13 (S 21-08), a request of Karen Jackson for a projecting sign and window signs at 7 East Washington Street.

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.) (by roll call vote)

COA 21-14 (S 21-09): Projecting Sign – 10 South Liberty Street – May Aesthetics, LLC

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the proposed sign would be four square feet and painted white, with gold lettering. She advised that it would be installed on the existing bracket.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Planning & Project Associate LaClare advised that she did not have a sample of the gold color. She noted that the sign was already in place and opined that it had more of a matte finish. Ms. LaClare advised that she could request a color sample if the Committee was concerned about it.

The Committee agreed they were fine with the color so long as it was not too shiny and was a matte or bronze color, as opposed to yellow, as the building was a neutral color.

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 21-14 (S 21-09), a request of Kristin May for a projecting sign at 10 South Liberty Street – May Aesthetics, LLC.

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.) (by roll call vote)

COA 21-16 (S 21-10): Projecting & Wall Signs – 19 South Madison Street – Raymer’s Homemade Candy

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the proposed projecting sign would be an 8.33 square foot carved sign that would be painted and installed on the existing bracket. She noted that the proposed 19.9 square foot wall sign would also be carved and painted and would be installed on the side of the building. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the reason for the larger amount of signage was that the building was located on a corner lot and because of their location on the building.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, advised that the projecting sign would only be visible from one street, which was why a second one was proposed. He noted the photograph that was provided to indicate how the 3-D chocolate would be depicted on the sign. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that he did not know whether the awnings would be removed from the building; however, there was no plan to use them for signage. In response to concerns expressed regarding the black color, Mr.

Ralph noted that the color was a part of the business' brand. He advised that he would use satin paint unless the Committee indicated otherwise. In response to concerns expressed by the Committee regarding the wall sign's size, Mr. Ralph reported that what was proposed was what was allowed under the Town Code. He reiterated that the design was based on the business' logo.

The Committee opined that the size of the wall sign was not compatible with the building. They suggested it should be no larger than the window and should not be as high as proposed.

In response to concerns expressed by the Committee about the size of the projecting sign, Mr. Ralph reported that it was 30"x40" and was the same size as the previous sign. He noted that it would be installed on the same bracket. Mr. Ralph agreed with the Committee's recommendations regarding the wall sign.

The Committee reiterated their concerns regarding the black paint and suggested it be a flat paint.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ralph advised that the R on the sign would look like a big, embossed candy, with the remainder of the lettering being carved.

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 21-16 (S 21-10), a request of Raymer's Homemade Candy for a projecting sign and wall sign at 19 South Madison Street with the following conditions: (1) flat black paint be used so the sign is not shiny; (2) the wall sign on Federal Street be lowered and the size be compatible with the existing window; and, (3) the wall sign should align horizontally with the window on the right side of the chimney mass, with a size no larger than that window.

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.) (by roll call vote)

COA 21-17 (S 21-11): Freestanding Sign – 12 South Pendleton Street – Provender, LLC

Planning & Project Associate LaClare advised the Committee that it was unclear as to whether the sign would be located on private property and noted the need to ensure it was not in the public right-of-way.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, advised that it was a small two-tone gray sign that would be installed on a small gray post.

The Committee agreed they liked the sign and opined that it was attractive. They noted that there were other structures in the yard that had not received approval.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised the Committee that he spoke with the property owner, who would file an application for those items. He opined that it was fine to approve the sign application independent of those items.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 21-17 (S 21-11) for a freestanding sign for Provender LLC, with the stipulation that it be located on the property itself.

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.) (by roll call vote)

COA 21-18 (S 21-12): Projecting Sign, Wall Sign & Information Kiosk – 11 West Washington Street – McEneaney Associates Realtors

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the Committee could not approve the application as presented as the signage exceeded the maximum allowed square footage. He noted that he notified Mr. Ralph of this issue.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, advised that the two signs were within the allowable limit. He further advised that the applicant was arguing that the literature case was not a sign if it was unbranded; however, if it was, they acknowledged it would not be allowed. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that the property owner's priority was the projecting and wall signs.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the literature case met the definition of a sign; therefore, it was a sign.

The Committee noted that this was the oldest building in town and opined that it was too special to be desecrated with signs. They questioned how the signs would be affixed to the bricks, which were deteriorating, and expressed concern that this would affect the building. The members agreed they were fine with the projecting sign. They questioned how the wall sign would be lit.

Mr. Ralph noted that there was access to electricity inside the building at both sign locations. He advised that he would install the lights on the bracket for the projecting sign, with the bracket being installed using four screws. Mr. Ralph explained that a small wire would be run through the wall, in the mortar, for the lights. He advised that as to the wall sign, the lighting brackets would come off the sign; therefore, this sign would only require the use of four bolts to mount it onto the building. Mr. Ralph reiterated that there would also be a small wire through the mortar for the lights.

The Committee suggested the bolts be installed in the mortar, not the brick. They noted that the mortar could be rejointed; however, the bricks could not be repaired. Mr. Ralph agreed and noted that the mortar was stronger than the bricks.

The Committee questioned whether it was necessary to light the wall sign and suggested it was not appropriate for this building. They noted the projecting sign, which would be at the entrance, would be lit.

The Committee held some discussion of the colors of the signs. Mr. Ralph noted that they were the same colors as on the applicant's previous signs.

The Committee noted that two lighting options were presented for the wall sign. They suggested that if that sign would be lit, they needed to agree on an option.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee they were tasked to act on the application before them. He noted that they could work cooperatively with the applicant, and if he was agreeable, it was fine to approve changes to it. Mr. Moore cautioned them that absent an agreement from the applicant, they could not make a motion to omit the lighting on the wall sign.

Mr. Ralph advised that he was okay with the approval of the side sign without lights, as he believed his customer was willing to live with that. He suggested that if he were not, he could always reapply for them.

Committee Member Wright moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 21-18 (S 21-12), a request of McEearney Associates Realtors for a projecting sign and wall sign and no kiosk, as submitted with no lighting on the wall sign on the side of the building and no kiosk.

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.) (by roll call vote)

COA 21-19: Artwork for Field Notes – Walter Matia Exhibit Banner – National Sporting Library & Museum

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that years ago, they approved the banner display, including the size, on a hidden frame. He noted, however, that any new artwork must be approved. Mr. Moore reported that this exhibit was set for display on June 18th.

The Committee noted that the exhibit included the display of sculptures on the lawn. They agreed they liked the banner.

Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 21-19, a request of the National Sporting Library & Museum for approval of artwork for “Field Notes – Walter Matia” exhibit banner.

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.) (by roll call vote)

COA 21-20: Construction of New Town Hall and Demolition of Existing Town Office Building – 10 West Marshall Street – Town of Middleburg

Deputy Town Manager Moore thanked the Committee for their pre-application discussions and opined that they had been helpful. He noted that the formal application was now before them; however, they were not being asked to act during this meeting as a public hearing was required on the demolition of the existing Town Office. Mr. Moore noted that this public hearing was scheduled during the June 17th special meeting. He reminded the members that they must now review the application in a formal manner.

Andrew Moore, of Glave & Holmes, appeared representing the application. He noted that there had been changes to the design since the agenda packet was distributed. Mr. Moore reviewed the north elevation drawings and noted that in response to the Committee's suggestions, the cupola was repositioned to the center of the building, directly over the entrance. He advised that the character of the entrance was changed by raising the pediment to differentiate it from the remainder of the building and introducing a shed canopy over the door. Mr. Moore noted that the Hardie plank siding was eliminated from the project; therefore, the exterior materials now consisted of only stucco and stone. He advised that the stone water table was lowered to the ground level, apart from at the public entry door, where it remained higher. Mr. Moore noted that the patio door leading into the Council Chambers was reduced to a single door. He opined that these changes would help eliminate any confusion as to where the building's entrance was located.

Mr. Moore reviewed the east elevation drawings and noted that the cupola was now centered on the public entry door. He advised that the entry to the arcade from Marshall Street was changed, as suggested by the Committee, by introducing a pavilion and removing the cupola, leaving just the weathervane.

Mr. Moore reviewed the south elevation drawings. He noted that the roof over the Police Department's secure entry door was now a shed roof, which de-emphasized it as an entry point. Mr. Moore reiterated that the entrance design for the pavilion was elevated, as recommended by the Committee. He noted the location of the flagpoles in the Town pocket park. Mr. Moore suggested the very top of the cupola should be visible from behind the apartment building on Marshall Street. He reviewed the west elevations and noted that little had changed.

Mr. Moore reviewed the proposed lighting for the project. He noted that the pendant and sconce lighting would consist of the same carriage style fixture and would be adapted to meet dark sky requirements, similar to the Town's existing streetlights. Mr. Moore advised that there would be three pendant lights on the east side of the building and two wall sconces on the north one, as well as recessed lighting in the arcade.

In response to concerns expressed regarding the brightness of the existing streetlights, Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the glass could be frosted; however, it would reduce what was already a limited amount of lighting. Town Manager Davis noted that the temperature of the lighting would be 2700 kelvin; therefore, the light would not be too white. In response to inquiries regarding whether the lighting could be dimmed, Andrew Moore reminded the Committee of the need for a certain amount of light for safety and security purposes.

Kevin Fallin, of Downey & Scott, advised the Committee that the solar lights were fully programmable; therefore, the power output could be adjusted.

Andrew Moore advised the Committee that the shaft of the solar streetlights was the solar panel and would contain the batteries. He noted that the fixture would be thirteen feet tall.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Fallin advised that the batteries could last up to three days on a single charge in the event of cloudy weather. He reiterated that the power output could be adjusted if needed to make them last longer. Mr. Fallin advised that the lifespan of the battery was robust; however, he would have to check on the warranty. He noted that they have used them on other projects.

Chair Clites noted that solar was an issue the Committee needed to address in the Historic District Guideline updates.

Andrew Moore reminded the Committee that the columns and trim were proposed to be a composite material that would be milled and shaped to look like wood. He advised that the columns would be a fiberglass reinforced polymer (FRP); therefore, they would be solid. Mr. Moore noted that the doors would be FRP and aluminum doors that would contain simulated divided lights where there was glazing. He advised that they would be painted the trim color. Mr. Moore noted that some of the doors would contain transoms. He advised that they would have a dark bronze decorative hardware.

The Committee asked that the Town shy away from wood grain trim. They noted that they previously required the Post Office doors to be wood.

Mr. Moore confirmed the trim would have a smooth, painted finish. He advised that while they have used wood doors in commercial applications, they found them to be problematic from a maintenance standpoint.

Mr. Moore advised that the stucco material would be EFIS in a smooth finish. He noted that the stone had not yet been selected; however, it would be locally sourced or reminiscent of locally sourced stone. Mr. Moore advised that it would be a brown stone laid in an irregular ashlar pattern, with the color of the mortar to be dictated by the color of the stone. He asked that the Committee set conditions regarding the stone so the project could move forward.

Mr. Moore advised that the windows would be wood casement windows, with simulated divided lights. He noted that if the Committee would allow the use of aluminum clad windows, he would endorse that.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to why the Hardie plank was removed from the project, Deputy Town Manager Moore explained that it was in response to an HDRC comment that stucco was a more elevated material.

Andrew Moore advised the Committee that the roof would be a standing seam metal roof, with crimped seams, including at the ridges. He further advised that the gutter would be a half round gutter, painted to match the building's trim. Mr. Moore noted that the roof would contain snow guards and that there would be cast iron boots for the downspouts.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Moore advised that he thought the feedback provided by the Committee during the last meetings was good.

The Committee advised that they were very pleased with the revised design. They suggested the pendant and sconce lights could be more significant given that the building had simple elements.

In response to a suggestion from the Committee that the windows contain large frames, Mr. Moore explained that the windows would be set into the masonry so it would return to them. He noted that this would create a shadow line that would be lost if the windows were moved forward and framed. The Committee agreed this was acceptable and suggested a shadow line be added to the drawings.

In response to an inquiry as to why casement windows were proposed, Mr. Moore advised that they were less formal.

The Committee expressed a preference for wood doors for those that would be used by the public. They agreed the service doors did not need to be wood. The Committee suggested the need for real stone and offered to help find local sources.

The Committee suggested the weathervane be removed from the cupola as they did not believe two were needed on the building. They also offered the following suggestions and noted that they would not be offended if they were not included in the design plans: (1) change the color of the base of the cupola to match the roof; (2) add faux windows to the end of the elevations on the east side of the building; and, (3) add a sister window to the west elevation.

In response to an inquiry, Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that a public hearing was required whenever a building was demolished. He suggested the public could also comment on the design of the new building at the same time. Mr. Moore reviewed the process for conducting a public hearing with the Committee.

Andrew Moore noted that the Committee would consider allowing the use of aluminum clad wood windows in the Historic District when they held their guideline update discussion. He advised that he would endorse allowing the use of aluminum clad doors as well.

Chair Clites called for a brief recess. He called the meeting back to order at 7:47 p.m. and asked for a roll call. All the members were present, with the exception of Committee Member Anderson.

Discussion Items

Historic District Guidelines Update

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reminded the Committee that they had a list of open-ended items that she needed clarification on so the updates could proceed.

Deputy Town Manager Moore asked how the Committee wanted to articulate how standing seam metal roofs should be crimped at the ridge and how they should be vented. The Committee noted that the description contained in the Town Hall Project application was a good one and suggested it be used as the basis for the articulation. After some discussion, the Committee agreed to delete the reference to metal shingles from the draft guidelines.

(Committee Member Anderson returned to the meeting at 7:55 p.m.)

Planning & Project Associate LaClare questioned how the Committee wished to handle plaques.

Bill Frazier, of Frazier & Associates, noted that there have been signs erected over the years that commemorated an event, date or name of a building; however, they rarely survived on most buildings. He questioned whether the Committee wished to allow new plaques on buildings in the Historic District.

The Committee suggested the guidelines focus on historical markers on commercial buildings. They further suggested a design and size be selected that must be used. The Committee recommended the markers not be included in the sign allotment.

In response to inquiries from the Committee as to their experience, Kathy Frazier, of Frazier & Associates, advised that usually plaques were a part of a wayfinding system or interpretive signage. She suggested the Town develop a program and allow property owners to participate in it. Mrs. Frazier noted that plaques were a way to tell a story.

Mr. Frazier suggested the Committee review requests on a case-by-case basis to determine size, placement, and materials to be used for the plaques.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether this was the appropriate time to address this, Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested the guidelines focus on a program. He noted that the Committee may receive an occasional odd plaque application; however, he opined that it was not critical to address those in the guidelines. Mr. Moore noted that they could always do an addendum to them in the future.

The Committee noted that they only received such applications about once every fifteen years; however, they suggested the need to be prepared when they did. They agreed to address this after they adopted the updates.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee about the use of aluminum clad wood windows in new buildings in a historic district, Mrs. Frazier confirmed this was appropriate under the federal guidelines for historic buildings. She noted, however, that it would not be for historic buildings.

Mr. Frazier advised that other jurisdictions allowed them as today's wood windows did not last fifteen years. He noted that the only issue was that they should not contain flat muntins. Mr. Frazier advised that as to historic buildings, under the federal guidelines for historic buildings, if half of the windows were deteriorated beyond repair, new replacement windows should be allowed; however, he recommended they be wood. He suggested that in that case, the muntin did not need to be an exact match.

Chair Clites suggested the guidelines be written to allow them so long as they did not contain grills between the glass.

Committee Member Anderson advised that in his experience, aluminum clad wood windows were acceptable; however, vinyl windows were not. He opined that if fifty percent of the windows in a historic building were not repairable, the Committee should expect them to be restored. Mr. Anderson acknowledged that this could be expensive.

In response to a suggestion to discuss the guidelines for new construction, Mrs. Frazier advised that they had started work on some illustrations for the Committee's consideration. She opined that there was only one location on Washington Street where there could be new construction, unless demolition occurred, which was unlikely. Mrs. Frazier suggested that Federal Street presented the most opportunity for it. She opined that there was no historical context in the locations where new construction was possible. Mrs. Frazier advised the Committee that shed dormers were used a lot in new construction and noted that this was the case in Middleburg. She questioned the Committee's thoughts on them.

The Committee discussed the Planning Commission's plans to hold a design charrette for the redevelopment of Federal Street and noted that this issue was bigger than the Historic District Guidelines.

Mrs. Frazier agreed with the need for a master plan for the redevelopment of Federal Street. Mr. Frazier suggested they provide language related to new construction for the guidelines but exclude graphics. The Committee agreed this was a good approach.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Frazier as to whether the guidelines should include a section on temporary tents, Planning & Project Associate LaClare suggested those be addressed in the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Frazier advised the Committee that they had everything they needed from them. He further advised that the next time they reviewed the updates, they would include the text, graphics, and designs.

Chair Clites displayed samples of a wood window; an aluminum clad wood window; and, simulated divided lights between two panes of glass, which was more energy efficient. He advised that ninety-five percent of his projects now utilized aluminum clad wood windows. Mr. Clites suggested that if the Committee was comfortable allowing them, the guidelines should be specific as to what would be allowed. He suggested the new Town Hall was a perfect example of a building where aluminum clad wood windows should be allowed and noted that all the other exterior components would be synthetic.

Committee Member Anderson advised that he was okay allowing aluminum clad wood windows to be used in the Historic District on new construction. He noted the Town Hall Project and opined that the only issue with the use of synthetic materials was for the columns. Mr. Anderson suggested those would have to be assembled on the site, as it was difficult to find a prefabricated one in a traditional design.

June 17th Special Meeting

With the exception of Committee Members Littleton and Anderson, the members indicated they would be available to attend the June 17th special meeting.

Discussion - Town Hall Project (continued)

Committee Member Anderson questioned why casement windows were proposed, as opposed to double hung windows, which were more traditional.

Town Clerk North advised the Committee that she would talk with the architect to see whether there was a reason he proposed casement windows.

Chair Clites suggested that double hung windows be shown on one of the elevation drawings so the Committee would have an idea as to what they would look like.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – June 3, 2021

(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)

Tim Clites: We'll bring to order the meeting of the Middleburg Historic Review District Review Committee for Thursday, June the 3rd.

Rhonda North: And Mr. chair. If we could please do a roll call for the folks who are doing the transcriptions.

Tim Clites: Ok, we don't need to read the document we've been reading, but we'll do a roll call. And I think we should also, if you could remind us that the hours since we do still have committee members online, if we could do a roll call at the hour like we've been just to keep track of who's still available on the committee.

Rhonda North: Sure.

Tim Clites: So we'll do a roll call.

Estee LaClare: Good evening, Estee LaClare, Planning and Project Associate.

Will Moore: Will Moore, Deputy Town Manager.

Virginia Jenkins: Virginia Jenkins.

Margaret Littleton: Margaret Littleton.

Punkin Lee: Punkin Lee.

Tim Clites: Tim Clites.

Linda Wright: Linda Wright.

Cindy Pearson: Cindy Pearson.

Rhonda North: Rhonda North, Town Clerk.

Tim Clites: And online.

Bill Anderson: Bill Anderson.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. Thank you. The first order of business is approval of the minutes from our May 6th regular meeting. Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes and are there any comments or corrections? There's no comments or corrections I'll entertain a motion.

Margaret Littleton: So moved.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: We'll let you do a roll call, vote Rhonda.

Rhonda North: Yes sir. Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approve.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We have a large agenda tonight before we start, if anyone's here that is not on the agenda, that wishes to mention anything in a public comment to the historic district we'll pause for a moment. Those of you that are on the agenda we'll get to you in order. Thank you. First order of business is action item old business proposed update to the residences at Salamander's design guidelines, Estee.

Estee LaClare: [off mic] Will.

Will Moore: [off mic] So if anyone might want to address, so just reminder to the committee just last month [inaudible] Design committee [inaudible] previously the prior year adopted the design guidelines, primarily focused on the [off mic] section of the development. So what the applicant is proposing here is introducing guidelines that will be applicable to the R3 section. And then in addition, just updating some of the graphics, but not necessarily [off mic]. You got your first look at this last month, and you will [off mic] be able to spend some time with it over the past month just to review it. [off mic].

Tim Clites: Thank you. Do you have any updates or further clarifications for us?

Estee LaClare: No.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So just to remind the committee of the process with obtaining a guideline that's not part of our historic district guidelines but is specific to this applicant and their 49 residences on the property. And it is a guideline. So as each structure formally comes before us with a specific lot in mind, we will be given the opportunity and responsibility to review that design. At that point we'll get into the more typical level of detail that we would expect for a submission. And so the guidelines are not intended to be thorough and exhaustive in a lot of detail but a guideline. And I think that's important for us to be aware of so that we don't feel like we're approving the exact specific designs that are noted as representative of where the applicant intends to go with the design. So we've all had a little more time to review that. Should we maybe keep the formality of our previous meetings? And we'll just go around the room from left to right as we sit, and I'll just ask for any comments. Starting with Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any comments at the moment.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I have none either.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: None.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: I like the changes they made, and I don't have any others. [off mic]

Tim Clites: And Bill, have you heard the discussion, do you have any comments that you'd like to share with us?

Bill Anderson: Oh, no, no comments. But will you make sure that the microphones are on when you speak? I couldn't really hear Will very well.

Tim Clites: Thank you for that. Well, I will say also that I don't have comments beyond the ones shared previously, and I know you all are working on some of your first submissions where we'll look at the designs and in more detail.

Gretchen Yahn: So the intention is that once we get recorded lots, then we will be able to submit here very shortly. But I would say within the next 30 days, the first vineyard plan, full plan so.

Tim Clites: Great. And and I guess I would suggest, like I think I suggested in the last meeting, even if you don't have a recorded lot, but you do have the detailed drawings showing us, you know, so that we can get started in that, I think it will give us some extra time, which we always appreciate.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Tim Clites: And I don't, you know, expect that to be any more difficult than any other application. But so even if you're not ready with a recorded lot to say, this is the design [multiple speakers] see on this lot. I think we're going to be more interested less in the actual sighting and more in the details.

Gretchen Yahn: Right. Well, would you want because we have, we have pretty much all the detailed drawings, which there's five detailed drawings. Do you want them? Just kind of can we bring them all in and then you could start to work through them, or do you want us to bring in the vineyard first? And that's just a question.

Tim Clites: I think you should, as I understand it that we have to review every structure. So I think if the vineyard is the first house and you're intending that to come first, then go ahead and bring it back for the next meeting.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Tim Clites: Even if you don't have it finally located on a site.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Tim Clites: Because what we have done and I want to make sure the committee is comfortable with this, but we have it going in and and kind of carefully tried to craft an exact process for the kinds of drawings and the level of detail. I think our understanding and expectation is similar to what we would look at elsewhere in this. Right. So with that in mind, there'll be, you know, samples of products and cut sheets for windows and details for your columns and shutters and overhangs and kind of all of the normal things that we would see so [multiple speakers]. Yeah, I would think, if you're ready, we're ready to start reviewing that.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. And the way that I will say that it's going to work, just to kind of preface what we've got is the majority of the R3 lots, The Vineyard lots will be The Vineyard product. And that being and these lots being small, we actually have them cited already because we didn't have a lot of room to move on these. When we started to formulate and put them on the lots, it became clear to us there was probably about six lots that we had to modify because they were not as wide. So we had to go more of the front to back kind of scenario. So we're calling that kind of The Vineyard hybrid one, which you'll see. And then what we did is we did a vineyard hybrid two, which is a modification of the regular hybrid plan, but a little bit smaller. So you'll see. And so the way that we're going to be, the way we've marketed it and the way that it'll be is there's three plans with the exception of each lot. You know, obviously, it'll be the color which we will be submitting each time. But the plan itself will be a vineyard or a vineyard hybrid one or a vineyard hybrid two. And then it gets down to the minutia of what is the veneer? You know, all the roofs are going to be the same. All the stone is going to be. So it'll be pretty once we get through this. Like you were saying, this first kind of thing, the first iteration of the drawing, it'll be pretty easy, I think, after that, because then it's going to come down to just colors and the veneer. And, you know, in terms of whether it's board and batten or whether it's going to be stucco or the like. And then The Stables will be this similar whereby they'll be The Stable plan and then they'll be a Stable hybrid plan, which is a little bit smaller stable plan. Though it's the siding again, has been done because the topography is such that there's really only certain places it can go. So we've already done pretty much all of that in terms of the siding, but it'll come in with each one of them. So I think it'll be once we get through the first iteration, it will be pretty, you know, easy peasy for everybody.

Tim Clites: And the only other thing, I guess, that we talked about that will you know, the first one will be a house with no neighbor. But as you develop the neighborhood, the the more of that you can share with us, the more we be able to give you any comments that we might have around how it you know, how a site relates from one site to the next. And I'm sure that you're thinking of that as you're laying out driveways and access. And parts of that we won't have a lot of oversight in. But just the general, you know, kind of [multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, the driveways are all set as well because the concrete [inaudible] will be going in. So what we will also do is for you guys, is we will put on a site map, you know what the historical color is on each lot so that because, you know, we don't want to have them like two same colors together. So that way you'll be able to look at that and then you'll also be able to look at what is the, you know, veneer material on this one an color, because that's going to have a lot to do with, you know, kind of a little bit of this homogenization, but also not having everything look the same as well. So I'll put that together for you in an electronic format so that we'll always have that updated for you guys as well.

Tim Clites: Great. I think that'll be useful. Any additional comments? Bill, I'll start with you since you're remote.

Bill Anderson: No, it sounds very good, like we had talked about before.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any additional comments from the committee? If we have none, I believe the next order of business would be to approve the guidelines as submitted so that when they start bringing in projects where actually the guidelines [inaudible] advance of that. Is that right did I say [multiple speakers]?

Will Moore: [off mic] if that is the direction of the committee there is a. Sorry microphone. There is a draft motion in the staff report that accompanies this item.

Tim Clites: Ok, thank you. Should open that up. [off mic]. Okay, are there any further questions from the committee? Is there any part of the process that anyone's uncomfortable with? [off mic]. Is there any part of the process moving forward that anyone's uncomfortable with or has questions about? Thank you. OK, well, I will entertain a motion unless we have more feedback for the applicant or other questions.

Cindy Pearson: I'll make the motion. I move that the HDRC adopt The Residences at Salamander Design Guidelines, dated February 22nd, 2016, and revised through April 27th, 2021.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Rhonda.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approve.

Tim Clites: Thank you all. Thank you [inaudible].

Gretchen Yahn: We'll all get with you on the submission process.

Tim Clites: Thank you [off mic].

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you guys. Thank you. Good to see you [inaudible] How are you?

Tim Clites: Thank you. I should have said this before you all got started. There's a huge agenda, and so everyone that's here for old business or new business, welcome to town. In case I forget to do that, as we run down our list. [laughter] We suddenly feel like a big town when we look at this agenda. But we're not. So we're happy you're here. And with that, we'll go into our new business. And the first item in new

business is COA 21-13 (S 21-08) a request of Karen Jackson for projecting sign and a window sign at 7 E Washington Street for Tully Rector.

Estee LaClare: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Clites. The applicant and [inaudible] is here [inaudible] represented. They're requesting a five-point six square foot painted and raised border projecting sign installed on the existing bracket on the building's façade. And I found some additional updated pictures and paint sample for the vinyl lettering inside on the different walls, stating the hours of business.

Patty Callahan: And the name Tully Rector.

Tim Clites: How very fancy.

Margaret Littleton: I guess they're all the same. [multiple speakers] All right, just keep one.

Punkin Lee: Oh, give me one. [inaudible]

Virginia Jenkins: I'm assuming that 460C Pantone Color is that gold strip.

Patty Callahan: That's the color of the window letter, the lettering on the it'll go on the inside of the window.

Virginia Jenkins: On the window, not the signage. [off mic].

Patty Callahan: Thanks.

Estee LaClare: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: My only question is one that's obvious, and I believe OK, which is we're OK with the bottom height of the façade as it relates to the existing bracket? We're above the seven feet requirement. Yeah, I mean, we should be. It's an interesting bracket.

Estee LaClare: Right.

Tim Clites: The sign doesn't look particularly deep from top to bottom. No. [off mic] So we can keep the process moving. I'll start, Bill. Do you have any comments on the Tully Rector application?

Bill Anderson: No comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No, I think it's a very nice sign. And I like the lettering for the window.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I like it very much.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: No, I think it looks great and I agree with Virginia I like the lettering in the window, because those are such big windows. It's kind of nice to focus on something other than your beautiful merchandise. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I think it's very nice, simple, elegant, very nice addition to the windows there.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I have nothing to add. I think it looks great.

Patty Callahan: Thank you.

Tim Clites: If there's a motion, I'll be happy to entertain it.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay I'll make a motion for COA 21-13 (S 21-08) for Karen Jackson, for the projecting sign and window signs at 7 E Washington Street.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approve.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I guess I'm supposed to say motion passes. Is that what Mr. Turnure used to say?

Rhonda North: Yes, sir.

Tim Clites: Motion passes we're on a roll.

Patty Callahan: Thank you all.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you Patty.

Tim Clites: Thank you for coming.

Punkin Lee: It's gonna look nice.

Tim Clites: Next order of business, COA 21-14 (S 21-09) request of Kristin May for a projecting sign at 10 South Liberty Street Athletics LLC. [off mic]. Aesthetics I tripped on my tongue I apologize. [laughter] [off mic]

Estee LaClare: Thank you very much Chairman Clites. The applicant's requesting a four-foot square foot painted white with gold lettering projecting sign installed on an existing bracket on the building façade. I did reach out to the applicant and the person who produced the sign and emailed in the information. Are they on the call?

Rhonda North: Is John Ralph?

Estee LaClare: No it's the Sign lady was the woman's name.

Rhonda North: John Ralph is the only one that I have on there.

Virginia Jenkins: I gotcha.

Estee LaClare: [multiple speakers]. So it's down on 10 South Liberty Street. It's right by the public restrooms, the town public restrooms.

Punkin Lee: Is this gold like Karen's gold we just saw, or do you know I mean. There's no sample in here?

Estee LaClare: And I'm afraid I don't have a sample of it based other than the example that they sent us.

Virginia Jenkins: That looks brown.

Estee LaClare: And they do have it up in the window. Those pictures I included in your write up, the sign is already there. It looks very similar to that gold, but I don't know if that is, in fact, that gold.

Virginia Jenkins: This picture?

Estee LaClare: Yes, and then there's I went down and took some pictures.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, I see.

Margaret Littleton: I think it looks softer. It's not a [inaudible] gold,

Punkin Lee: You can see it through the window.

Estee LaClare: That'd be more mate looking. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: This one. You can see because this looks kind of browny red.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah, yeah.

Punkin Lee: But that's gold.

Margaret Littleton: Oh, OK.

Punkin Lee: See [inaudible] the window.

Margaret Littleton: Oh, all right.

Punkin Lee: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: I gotcha. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Bill, do you have any comments?

Bill Anderson: No comments at this time.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No, I don't have any comments, but it's hard to tell, you know, what shade that really is. I don't know that that makes an enormous amount of difference.

Estee LaClare: I'm happy to follow up with the applicant and ask for a color sample if it's a concern.

Margaret Littleton: I think it'd be better not being shiny personally.

Virginia Jenkins: No, you mean mate?

Margaret Littleton: Yeah, real gold, I think would be too much.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh I agree.

Margaret Littleton: So what I'm looking at, I think looks fine. But it does look brown.

Rhonda North: But it's a gold. [laughter].

Margaret Littleton: It's bronze.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. Any other comments? [multiple speakers]. Arm wrestle for it you two.

Margaret Littleton: It looks great.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I mean, as long as it's more gold than that yellowy kind of I mean orangey you know.

Estee LaClare: It's not. No, it's definitely not that.

Punkin Lee: Because the building's kind of neutral. So, I mean, it's not like it's got anything to fight with.

Estee LaClare: Based upon appearance it blended from what [inaudible].

Punkin Lee: I think it'd probably be fine. It's certainly high enough off the. [laughter] [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I think it's fine. I'm fine with that.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comment.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. I have no further comments either, so I think it's fine.

Margaret Littleton: I'll do it. I make the motion that we approve COA 21-14 (S 21-09) request of Kristin May for a projecting sign at 10 South Liberty Street May Aesthetics.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approve.

Tim Clites: Motion passes. Next order of business is COA 21-16 (S 21-10) Request of Raymer's Homemade Candy for a projecting sign and a wall sign at 19 South Madison Street.

Estee LaClare: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Clites. I believe John Ralph with Quail Run Signs is on the line. If you have questions. Essentially, they're asking for an 8.33 square foot painted and carved projecting sign installed on the existing bracket on the building, along with a carved and painted wall sign. That's about 19.9 Square foot on the side of the building.

Tim Clites: And Estee, if I can ask the question just to confirm, I'm sure you have it in the documents, but the reason this particular property has this amount of signage available is because it's a corner lot?

Estee LaClare: And it has [off mic] and it has the yes, the corner lot and the [off mic] buildings [off mic] façade there.

Punkin Lee: Air conditioner. [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: So the hair place. Maybe it's that building I don't know.

Virginia Jenkins: Punkin. The window unit, is this the hair place [off mic] the air conditioning sticking out?

Punkin Lee: No, that's Tom Hays' little window that he had on the left of the door.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, okay.

Punkin Lee: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: I see OK, thank you.

Tim Clites: Bill, if I can, I'll start with you for comments.

Punkin Lee: Does John have anything? [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: I'm sorry John Ralph, I should have asked the applicant. John, do you have anything to add? Thank you Punkin.

John Ralph: I'm not sure that I have anything that I can add. The only thing I guess I would clarify, we're reusing a sort of unusual bracket location, which is really only visible from one side of Madison Street because of the column, which is why they want that in unit or the one on the end of the building as well, which is visible from sort of all sides of the intersection. Really that's all I can say. We did give you an example a small photo underneath the proof of how we're talking about the big three chocolate. If it was done for someone else. Other than that, I'm here to answer any questions.

Punkin Lee: I have a question, John, it's Punkin what's happening with the awnings, because they already have Thomas Hays on them, are they? You have nothing in here about the awnings. Are they taking them down or changing?

John Ralph: I honestly could not answer that question. I know that was not their intention to use the awnings as signage. I don't know what their plan is as far as replacing them or getting rid of the Thomas Hays component.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: They have to come to us to do something. [multiple speakers] come back.

Punkin Lee: Right that's why I was. Putting the bee in his bonnet. [laughter]

Tim Clites: So I'm sorry, I'll go again, Bill, I interrupted you.

Bill Anderson: No, no comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I'm the bad guy.

Cindy Pearson: No, say it. I think we're thinking the same thing.

Margaret Littleton: I don't like the black.

Estee LaClare: So, that is part of their branding. That is their brand. And the.

Margaret Littleton: Is it going to be shiny?

Estee LaClare: I don't know.

Margaret Littleton: But it's startling.

John Ralph: It is in the shiny question.

Margaret Littleton: [laughter] Sorry John.

John Ralph: By default is satin unless you choose to do something otherwise.

Margaret Littleton: Well, satin is better. [multiple speakers]. So that's their logo. [multiple speakers]. Along the side of the building, it's really startling.

Virginia Jenkins: It looks like a sore thumb.

Punkin Lee: It does.

Margaret Littleton: Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Does it need to be that big, John? That's [inaudible] 5 feet high.

John Ralph: I mean, we were pulling it, you know, basically what's allowable by code under that. You know, it doesn't have to be anything that's just what the customer would like. The thing is we could [inaudible] the end of the building, obviously. And unfortunately, I heard some references, and it is stark, but it's also their logo and not their first location. So we're not creating some new dynamic here, [off mic] it is part of their branding.

Tim Clites: Thank you, John. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I mean, the small sign, I think, but that one on the side of the building, just because of the size and the color of the building itself, there's nothing really compatible about the, it looks kind of billboardy. [multiple speakers] I don't know. Plus, if you're driving up that hill at 40 miles an hour, like most people, either you're going to get, you know, t-boned at the intersection or look at the sign. So I think they better be smaller would probably be nicer.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I hope the car that you're driving up the hill is going to stop at the stop sign.

Cindy Pearson: There's no stop sign up the hill.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh coming up the hill.

Punkin Lee: All right.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. I'm going to go in order since we're going around the room just to keep it organized. My comments were, I think the wall sign on the gable end as you come up the hill is uncomfortably large. And I didn't really know how to give a comment without giving a directive, but it seemed to me like at a minimum, it ought to be no larger than the windows. If you look at that elevation, the

window is kind of a black eye into the side of the structure. And and that's the first thing that jumped out at me. The contrast of white and dark, I don't know that I had a whole lot that I felt we could comment on there. I think also the location, because you are coming up the hill, it probably wouldn't need to be as high on that elevation and still be very visible. It's not like you can see that from a great distance away because it's higher. And then my only other comment was, I think I didn't go over I should have with a tape measure. But the projecting sign image looks to me to be smaller than I think the actual sign is 30 by 40. So that's a fairly large sign hanging next to that window as well. And you only see it from one side. But the scale of that also felt large to me. Those were my comments. Linda.

Linda Wright: I totally agree with you on the larger sign on the side of the building. I don't think it should be any bigger than the window on the lower right. And what if the sign dropped down and lined up with the window over here and got smaller, maybe on the left side of the chimney? It just seems up too high and just doesn't sort of fit with the building.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: That was my. It just sticks out like a sore thumb there. It's just the wrong out of kilter. I agree maybe with Linda, if you bring it down and maybe made it the skinny taller would not look so bad and make sure it's not the shiny black. You said satin. I'm sure that's pretty good. And I agree with you Tim that the sign right there that's awfully big. That one doesn't look that big. Maybe just the size of the both [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Let's clarify, you say that one doesn't look that big. You're looking at which sign [multiple speakers].

Cindy Pearson: Oh, now I'm looking at the one on the bracket.

Tim Clites: Next to the columns.

Cindy Pearson: Next to the columns. That the one that we see doesn't look as big as it stated, 30 by 40 inches.

Tim Clites: Correct. Thank you, Cindy. John, can you give us any comments based on what you've just heard from the committee?

John Ralph: Yes. I'll do the easy one first, which is the projecting sight out front, 30 by 40 is using the existing bracket. And it's the exact same size of the Tom Hays Sign that use to be there. On the other one on the end unit. I'm in total agreement. I love the symmetry of bringing it down to the window height and the window dimension, and I think it would look a whole lot better exactly as you recommended. OK. And I'm sure the customer would have no problem with that.

Tim Clites: Thank you, John, for that input. I'll go around the room quickly and just see if there's any other comments, Bill.

Bill Anderson: All those comments, I think covered all. I don't have any additions.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] Oh, thank you. I have no other comments. I mean, and I just think it's because it's black and white. It is a little more startling. We're not used to seeing that in the historic, but it is their branding, so. I can't take that away from them.

Tim Clites: Yeah, and I think managing its location may help manage the aesthetic as well.

Virginia Jenkins: Definitely will help it.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I'd like to see the paint flat.

Tim Clites: Ok, thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think on the side of the building, reducing the size and lowering it will make a vast improvement because I think we're having trouble with something on that blank wall that's so stark.

Virginia Jenkins: It's a little jarring.

Punkin Lee: It's very jarring. So I think reducing the size and lowering it will be a great help.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I would agree with Margaret. I think the flatter and whatever we can do to make the paint not so commercial looking. So I think the flatter paint is something not so shiny and I really would love to see it shrunk and move down on the side.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And Cindy,

Cindy Pearson: What does the artisan confections chocolatier sign? Why is that there? Is that part of this, too?

Punkin Lee: It was just for the lettering, I think.

Cindy Pearson: OK.

Punkin Lee: The carved part I thought.

Cindy Pearson: John, is that on there for a reason?

John Ralph: Yeah, I mentioned it earlier. I just wanted to show you what parts are carved; what parts are raised.

Cindy Pearson: Oh sorry.

John Ralph: The center R of the Raymer's is going to look like kind of a big, embossed candy, OK, much as we did on the artisan confection sign below. The rest of it would be carved in. You often ask what [inaudible] raised, so I thought I'd give you that representatively.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, thank you. I didn't catch that earlier. No other comment. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy. Thank you, John, for the clarification. So with all those comments, if someone is up to the challenge of making a motion and I'd take the time to just clarify each of the components that you've heard so everyone understands them.

Punkin Lee: Go ahead. You're good at [multiple speakers]. Yes, you go ahead.

Margaret Littleton: Let's not waste time. Wait a minute let me find it. I'm sorry

Punkin Lee: You want the there it is.

Margaret Littleton: I make a motion that we approve COA 21-16 (S 21-10) request of Oh God, Raymer's Homemade Candy for projecting sign and wall sign at 19 South Madison Street with the comments of perhaps a flat black paint so that it would not be shiny even with, you know, just not shiny and that the wall sign on Federal Street be lowered and the size compatible with the existing window. Is that good?

Will Moore: May I make a suggestion before a second is added?

Tim Clites: Please.

Will Moore: Because language is really important when making this so we should clarify whether these are comments and the word perhaps I think was [off mic] or whether these are actually conditions of approval.

Margaret Littleton: I'll say condition.

Will Moore: Perfect. Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: Thank you. Sorry.

Will Moore: No, not at all.

Tim Clites: And to clarify your condition for lowering the wall sign, it's that it will align horizontally with the window on the right side of the chimney mass. Is that right. So it's not just lowering, but it's actually aligning with that window.

Margaret Littleton: Correct. Is it the same size?

Tim Clites: And the size is no larger than that window. I just want to make sure we're very clear because we're not giving dimensions.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Tim Clites: If everyone understands the requirements, then I guess we can.

Margaret Littleton: Is that good with John? John's gone.

John Ralph: It's absolutely clear. It makes perfect sense to me. I certainly understand your intent.

Tim Clites: Thank you, John. Is there a second?

Punkin Lee: Second.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approve.

Tim Clites: Motion passes, thank you all. Thank you, John.

John Ralph: Thank you. I'm staying around.

Tim Clites: All right. Next order of business is COA 21-17 (S 21-011) Request of Kurt Baier for a freestanding sign at 12 South Pendleton Street Provender LLC. Estee.

Estee LaClare: Yes, thank you. Chairman Clites. John is actually representing the applicant on this application as well. If he would like to [off mic]. Now the one that we do need to note the rendering show an approximation of the post location, but it is currently unclear if the proposed location is on private property as is required. So the exact location of the post will need to be coordinated with the town prior to its installation to ensure that it's not extending it to the right away. You have to get that.

Tim Clites: And is that something we should list in any approval that we have or yeah, just to be doubly clear. Yeah, thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: Where is the location? [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: Here next to her little garden. That's the [multiple speakers].

Punkin Lee: Oh, you can hardly.

Virginia Jenkins: So that's a right of way.

Will Moore: Well, there's right of way and then there's private property and the arrow is not is not locating it precisely enough to be sure. So, you know, any approval should be conditional on it being field located and the town approving the location before they actually install.

Virginia Jenkins: OK.

Will Moore: And that's to protect them from having to come out and redo it, reinstall it.

Virginia Jenkins: Ok.

Tim Clites: John, any comments for us before we run through the committee?

John Ralph: I think it's pretty cut and dry, it's quite small, it's two-tone gray sign with a gray post set where it can be. I don't know what else I could add other than answering the questions, one might have.

Tim Clites: Thank you, John. Bill, do you have any comments?

Bill Anderson: I do not. No comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: My only comment is I love the sign. [laughter] I think it's very cool.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I approve. I like it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Virginia, it's one of the prettiest signs we've seen.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I would agree, but I'll keep moving. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I would agree. It's very attractive.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. And Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I have no comment. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So I believe we then would entertain a motion. And just to remember, the motion needs to include let's see, where would we find that. At the it needs to include the clarification of its location. Which I think Estee typed in the report in here somewhere.

Punkin Lee: How do you say the name of that? Provender. [multiple speakers] Does this relate at all to the structures in the yard that we had the question about?

Will Moore: I'm sorry,

Punkin Lee: Approval of this sign, because last time we talked about the structures in the yard that hadn't. Just curious.

Will Moore: Yes, I've opened up conversations with the property owner and she will be coming in soon to file appropriate applications. So there's a couple of structures plus a fence that has been erected at the rear adjoining the bank parking lot. So I've began those discussions, so we'll get her in here soon.

Punkin Lee: So should this be approved before the rest of it is? I mean, I'm just asking before we fall in a pothole.

Will Moore: I think this is fine to leave this independent of those.

Punkin Lee: Okay just asking.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin, for clarifying that.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, you want a motion. I make a motion to approve COA 21-17 (S 21-011) for a free-standing sign for Provender LLC with the stipulation that it will be located on the property itself. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia. Is there a second.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: Margaret, thank you.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approve.

Tim Clites: Motion passes, thank you. Next order of business, COA 21-18 (S 21-12) Request of I'm going to say this wrong, [inaudible].

Rhonda North: McEneaney.

Tim Clites: Associates Realtors for a projecting sign, a wall sign and information kiosk at 11 West Washington Street. Estee.

Will Moore: So, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I noted in my staff report and I'm hoping the applicant might have an update for you. So as noted in here, you could not approve the application package as it's being presented right now because it exceeds the maximum allotment of sign area. So I did send communication to that effect to Mr. Ralph along with his assistant. And I'm hoping we might have an update here from him this evening.

Tim Clites: John Ralph represent. All right, John, do you have an update for us?

John Ralph: Sure. We actually we vetted this by Will, and we got sort of we were 100 percent confident answer back, so we went ahead and rolled with it. The two signs, the building is quite narrow, and the two signs are the cap of what they're allowed in square footage based on the width of the building. What

they're requesting and I mean, they're arguing, and I know we by precedent tend to call a literature case a sign even though it isn't really, but it doesn't fall under anything else. So we were trying to propose an unbranded no McEneaney very small literature case just because they don't have any other place to really advertise, and they don't have any other windows to show what they're selling so versus sandwich boards versus putting a large TV in the front window. It seemed like a reasonable accommodation. If you're calling it a sign, then they can't have it and they understand that. But they were hoping that unbranded perhaps it would be considered some architectural detail that is not a sign so that it's not competing with their allowable square footage of signage.

Tim Clites: Understood, John so, thank you, just so I understand that I think I did if we were to review this application for just the projecting sign and the wall sign around the corner tonight, that would be the first two items of priority for the owner.

John Ralph: That is correct. However, the owner and I explained this to him because the precedent as long as I've been working with Will and with the administrators in the past, you guys, I think pretty much have always considered a literature case a sign because there is just no other thing they fall under. So, I mean, obviously, signage is important. They're already open and they don't want to hold up their approval to fight over a literature case. It just hey wanted me to ask basically if there is any other way, we could classify it so they could have some way to display properties for sale in the front of the building.

Tim Clites: Understood. So I'll give my comments about the whole package, notwithstanding that it's over the allowable. And that is to me, I think the wall sign is would be the easier thing to give up if I was in that building because all of the other realtors in town do have some ability to have this little display. But I wanted to ask you because you represent the owner and if the owner has a priority, we should understand that so that potentially we could move on the pieces.

John Ralph: And they would choose because of the excellent visibility of that wall sign. I think they would choose the sign before the literature case.

Tim Clites: Ok, thank you.

John Ralph: That was actually sort of their very first priority is that very obvious place with a little gooseneck light, just everyone heading that direction sees it very nicely. The other side of the building is not so obvious and not so clear.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So with that, is there any other comments were headed around the room? Start with Bill.

Bill Anderson: I'm not quite certain. Is the application then amended to just do those two signs?

Tim Clites: Correct.

Bill Anderson: Are we amending the application?

Tim Clites: Correct.

John Ralph: I think [inaudible] it's kind of a Will / John, question, is there any discussion of this? Can there be a discussion of it, or should we just move forward with signage? [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: There's no discussion of it. A literature case is a sign. And just to clarify, it's not because it doesn't fall under anything else. It literally is a sign we have a definition for sign that's included in the zoning ordinance and a literature case meets that definition. So it is a sign.

Tim Clites: And that's the way we've treated them in the past. So understanding the priority of the projecting sign and the wall sign, I think we ought to go around the room and give comments and or ask questions related to those two signs. Bill.

Bill Anderson: So, yeah, so I understand then it'll be just projecting sign and the wall sign, not the literature sign, so that seems fine to me.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Do you have any comment on those two signs?

Bill Anderson: No I do not.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no problem with the two signs, the one on the building and the hanging sign. I'm not terribly fond. I know I'm not supposed to give an opinion of the kiosk.

Tim Clites: It's no longer part of the application, and so it doesn't.

Virginia Jenkins: Ok then I have no problem with the rest of it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I vote for the projecting sign and it's one of the cutest, oldest buildings in Middleburg. And it should not have any kind of whatever that thing's called. I'm sorry about the advertising, but I think they should have known that before they rented it. It's just a door. It's very, very old.

Linda Wright: It is the oldest.

Punkin Lee: That's right.

Margaret Littleton: It's just too special to junk up.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia.

Margaret Littleton: Margaret.

Tim Clites: Margaret, Susie. [laughter]

Virginia Jenkins: Whomever.

Punkin Lee: I'd be curious how you would affix that side wall sign to those bricks that are, you know, basically coming to dust. [multiple speakers] And why would you want to, you know, desecrate that wall for lack of a better word and then put lights on it? I think as everyone states, it's a very special building in town and it has its limitations. I mean, the projecting sign, I think is fine. I just think that wall with lights on it is. What it's going to do to the building.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. I'll skip over myself and go to Linda. [multiple speakers]

Linda Wright: No I would agree with Punkin's comments. I'm fine with a projecting sign, but this is a very, very special building in this town. And I think trying to do that, particularly a lit sign there, really takes away from its history and what it should look like.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I agree with those comments. I think the front side on that front street is fine, but the one on the side of the building, is it really necessary? Would be my question to them. You know, you're walking down the street, you're not really looking at that side of the building. You'll see what the building holds and if it does, you know, do damage to the brick and etc., it's just not really necessary. But I would say no on the one on the side.

Tim Clites: So thank you, Cindy. And just to clarify, I believe I just heard two slightly different things. So I'd like to clarify for the committee when we talk about the side sign. I first heard that. I think I heard that perhaps it should be unlit. And then there was a further conversation about that sign itself. And so my comments would be that my first concern was how to light that both of these signs through the old brick, exactly as Punkin mentioned. And, you know, there's a little diagram that shows it coming in from the inside of that wall and drilled through so that there's just a light affixed to the outside. My sense would be on the wall mounted sign unlit. It would be OK, because I think the amount of effort required to tap into the mortar is probably minimal. And on the projecting sign, assuming that the electricity can be brought to that sign not by going up the wall, but by coming through the wall at the attachment to the bracket, I think those lights hanging off the bracket would be OK. But those are my comments for the committee. And with all of that, John, do you have any input for us?

John Ralph: Well, just a couple of things, there is electricity readily accessible inside at both locations, we already verified that because obviously we know we can't tack a bunch of holes into this. By putting the lights on the bracket in the front all we have are basically the four [inaudible] screws that hold the bracket and a very small wire passing through the wall. We put that through the mortar. It's very nondestructive. On to the end unit. If the customer is very concerned about lightning, they really want these sides lit and they're not saying garishly just lit. I can put those brackets, so they are engineered to come off the sign and don't permeate. You know don't have to go through the building so that all we would then have are the four bolts holding the sign to the wall. And that way we're not knocking any more holes in anything. And that would satisfy the customer's need. And your obvious concerns about a very cool old building, which actually, by the way, they started with wanting individual letters and I said there was absolutely no way that was going to fly. For a variety of reasons. But I think I could very easily engineer one or two small lights to come off the sign instead of coming, you know, I could bracket it to the sign so that I didn't have to put any more holes in the building. I feel like that might be a good accommodation for everyone's concern.

Tim Clites: And then the penetrations would be through the mortar.

John Ralph: I just need for attachment corners to attach the sign and one very small low voltage wire that can go through the mortar to get inside.

Bill Anderson: At the bolts of the sign.

Virginia Jenkins: I have a question. This is Virginia.

John Ralph: The sign would bolt to the building, the light would bolt to the sign, correct.

Bill Anderson: And just mentioned the bolt can go through the mortar not the brick itself.

John Ralph: Absolutely.

Bill Anderson: So, no, bolts through [inaudible]

John Ralph: A building that old, the mortar is actually stronger than the brick anyway.

Bill Anderson: That's not the point. You can can. You can read rejoin the brick wall, but you can't replace the brick.

John Ralph: No, I agree that we're saying the same thing.

Tim Clites: Ok, thank you, Bill. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have a question. This is Virginia. On the sign that's affixed to the side of the building, what is the reasoning behind having lights? Or the need for lights.

John Ralph: Essentially dark town, dark street, dark sign, no streetlight nearby, nothing that really lights the sign up and it won't be visible without something.

Punkin Lee: One in the picture. A streetlight in the picture.

John Ralph: That streetlights not lighting that sign.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, but that's not the main sign for the building anyway. The main sign is going to be the hanging sign, am I correct?

John Ralph: I would argue they're both main signs, but one of them fairly well obscured by the front portico from that direction.

Virginia Jenkins: I just don't think after looking at this again, I just don't think it's necessarily appropriate for lighting on that kind of a sign on build on the building itself. It just doesn't. I don't know if.

Punkin Lee: The building is so small and narrow, and you've got the main sign where you go in lit. It seems like overkill on the light for such a structure.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, I know, I just don't see the necessity, but that's.

Bill Anderson: I also agree with Punkin.

Tim Clites: Sure, Margaret. [laughter] [multiple speakers]

Rhonda North: I can see I'm going to have to separate those three next time. [laughter]

Tim Clites: It won't help. I believe what I'm hearing just to try to keep the conversation moving. But clear, I believe what I'm hearing is some consensus among the committee around the projecting sign and perhaps our clarification to the wall sign. So if that's the case, someone the one thing I didn't hear, this is a black and white sign, like a previously reviewed sign. It is of a different scale. But if the concern exists for a previous black sign, perhaps the same. [multiple speakers] Where do you see the actual colors? [multiple speakers] It's a dark blue. Ok, I apologize.

Will Moore: The green is apparent on the projecting sign. I think, John, is it correct that the on the wall sign the line underneath McEneaney Is that green?

John Ralph: It is. It is actually green. Unfortunately, it's been reproduced, and sent around in pdf enough times that you can't see it. Yeah, it is the same McEneaney dark blue as before and it has that light green color just for accent and it is white.

Tim Clites: So I apologize for having that wrong and.

John Ralph: It absolutely looks black by the time you reproduce it a few times.

Margaret Littleton: So which light are you all liking. There are two options.

Tim Clites: They have two options for the wall sign. As I understand the application, the projecting sign has [inaudible]. [inaudible]

Margaret Littleton: That's fine but these two.

Punkin Lee: That's for the wall. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: If if the walls sign continues to have lighting, we would need some agreement on the option.

Linda Wright: But that's clear.

Tim Clites: I think if you make a motion, we'll find out if we have consensus.

Linda Wright: Let's see, let's give it a whirl here then hang on. Go back to where we are here.

Will Moore: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I do want to make a clarification. So you are tasked with acting on an application as it comes before you if you were able to work cooperatively with an applicant. And we'll use the example of the Raymer's Candy application that just happened before, and the applicant's representative was agreeable to some of the changes then that's fine. And that's perfect. Where I would caution you at this point. It seems that some members are opposed to the lighting of the wall sign, but absent agreement from the applicant to that condition, you should not make a motion with that condition. In other words, you should talk that through with the applicant. The thoughts on the lighting. If the applicant is not agreeable to omitting the lighting, then you would need to act on the application as it is before you. Is that clear?

Tim Clites: It is. And thank you for that clarification. So we did not get ahead of ourselves. So, Mr. Ralph, I'm not speaking for the whole committee, but it does seem like there's some agreement among some members to delete the light on the wall sign.

John Ralph: I think I could speak for the committee with great security or great, great confidence that the front sign would be fine. The side sign would be fine without lighting. I think the customer [inaudible]. I think the customer is being open in that space would be more than willing to live with that. If they're not willing to live with that, then they can reapply for some sort of change in the future. But I think they would rather have it approved at that level, which it seems to be what the committee would approve.

Tim Clites: I appreciate that, John. And yes, obviously, if that's of great concern, we would be happy to talk to the applicant again in a future meeting. Thank you Will, for clarifying that for us. Appreciate it. I think Linda was about ready to say something.

Linda Wright: We will try this. I make a motion we approve COA 21-18 and S21-12 request of McEearney Associates Realtors for a projecting sign, wall fine and no information kiosk. As submitted with no lighting on the wall sign on the side of the building [inaudible] and no kiosk.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Wright or Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve. [laughter]

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approved. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: The motion passes. We're just past the hour. And so I think everyone present in the meeting is obviously still present. Bill, you're still on the call.

Bill Anderson: I'm still here.

Tim Clites: Thank you, sir. Let's go ahead and work through the next two items. And then at the end of that, we'll take a small five-minute break so everyone can stretch. The next item is COA 21-19 request of the National Sporting Library Museum for approval of artwork for, quote, Field Notes, Walter Matia end quote, exhibit banner.

Will Moore: Thank you, Chairman. It's been a little while since one of these came before you. But just a quick reminder of a few years ago, there was the approval given for the the banner display on the side of the Vine Hill mansion at this size eight by 12 and with a hidden frame. The process is that each time they introduce new artwork, they come to you for an endorsement and approval of that artwork prior to display. So on the final page of the attachment, you see the proposed artwork for the display that's set to begin June 18th.

Virginia Jenkins: Is it the turkey?

Tim Clites: Thank you, Will. We run around the room, Bill, do you have any comments?

Bill Anderson: Not at this time.

Tim Clites: Thank you, sir. Virginia?

Virginia Jenkins: No comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: No comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Silly comment is I strongly urge everyone to go. There are seven of these sculptures on the lawn. They're beautiful. So that's my comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you Punkin. Linda.

Linda Wright: Mp. it's beautiful.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'm hearing no comments but positive comments. Is there a motion?

Punkin Lee: I make a motion we approve COA 21-19 request of the National Sporting Library and Museum for approval of artwork for Field Notes. Walter Matia exhibit banner.

Linda Wright: Second.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson

Bill Anderson: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Approve.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Approve.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Approve.

Tim Clites: Thank you all motion passes. The next order of business, COA 21-20 request of the town of Middleburg to construct a new town hall and demolish the existing town hall building at 10 West Marshall Street.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Clites. Andrew Moore from [off mic]. Just quickly, thank you on behalf of the town for engaging in a number of pre app discussions we've had to this point, they were extremely helpful. So this now is a formal application before you for your consideration and Andrew will walk you

through the application package. As I noted in my report, even though it's a formal application, we are not requesting action at this meeting. We require a public hearing any time an application involves demolition. Plus, with significant new construction not required by the ordinance, we oftentimes will still schedule a public hearing. So we have scheduled that public hearing for your special meeting on June 17. So, again, not requesting any action here, but as needed to begin to address this application and maybe a more formal manner than the informal pre application discussions. We will begin that process this evening with you. And with that I will turn it over to Andrew.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Welcome.

Andrew Moore: Thank you. It's lovely to be here with you in person. Yeah. I can actually make eye contact and see, it's wonderful. So what I've got for you tonight is an updated presentation. I will do my best to try to identify a few things that have changed since the package that you received and also to try to walk you through what is involved in the design since we last spoke. It's been nice to be able to have some dialog back and forth. And I think that where the design has advanced is actually be improved by the comments. So that's always happy. So without further ado, let me walk you through where we are with this, by the way, is that audio that I'm speaking is that coming from somewhere? Do I need to speak into a microphone?

Rhonda North: The mics on. You're fine.

Tim Clites: Ok, Bill, can you hear OK.

Bill Anderson: Yes, I can.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Andrew Moore: I don't think I do I have my I don't have my mic on here. [off mic] Great. OK, thank you. I just wanted to check. OK, so we'll start first with the building elevations. And this is the North elevation and some of the notable changes. Perhaps the most notable change is the repositioning of the cupola. We studied a number of options and ultimately arrived at placing the cupola at the kind of symbolic center of the building and where it might appear in a civic building. So it's directly over the entrance that leads to the parking lot on the north side, as well as located in the central portion of the massing of the building. As you'll see as we walk around the the various elevations. The the other kind of notable change, I would say, is that we change the character of the entrance. So the entrance here, I'll point with my cursor, which is the entrance that would lead to the council chambers from the parking on the north side of the building. We raise the pediment so that there is a differentiation between the Cornish line of that entrance piece and the remainder of the building. And we also change the character in just a bit. Introduce this shed canopy over the doors, which you'll see is a motif, happens a couple other places on the building. And then we also eliminated the Hardie Plank altogether on the building. So it's now just two materials, the stucco and the and the stone. The other major change we made was we lowered the stone water table from the from the water so sorry, from the windowsill height down to the base of the building. So it just has this kind of nice ground level stone base. And then we only pop it up in one place, which is again at the at the entrance. So slightly elevated importance. So lots of lots of cues and clues that that's the main entrance to the building. Another move in that vein, in our previous design, we had a pair of double doors that led to the council chambers off of the porch and we had to change that to a single door. So, again, downplays the idea that maybe there's entrance confusion, but yet maintains that a connection from the council chambers to that porch so we can allow some interchange and during events and so forth. I think that covers the major changes on this elevation. I'm going to continue to walk around the building and then.

Will Moore: Maybe one thing to note, and it's not included in your package up included in the updated you can see that the position of some of the lighting [inaudible].

Andrew Moore: That's correct, yeah. Thank you for that. And I'll get to the lighting after we go through the elevations, and we can circle back and talk about locations. So, yes, pendent light fixtures shown here, sconce light fixtures shown here. So this is the east elevation, and you see that relative position of cupola that is directly located [inaudible] main messing of the building. The other major change that we've made is changing the nature of the entrance towards Marshall Street. We had some comments last time about changing the emphasis a bit there, elevating the emphasis a bit. And so what we've introduced is the idea of a kind of a modest pavilion that would be located and connected to the main messing of the building, sort of drawn toward Marshall Street. And you can see how that works from a side here. Same idea of raising the [inaudible] line for that piece of it above the adjacent cornice and, you know, symbolically making it more important. And we've also changed the what used to be a cupola to just being a base for a weathervane. So we've got a connection really symbolically to the the the cupola, which you can see beyond and then the entrance point that leads towards Marshall Street or emphasis towards Marshall St. So this is the Marshall Street entrance. I mention that motif of the covered canopies over certain doorways, you see another example of that here. This is that limited access doorway that leads directly into the police station. The idea is that we're deemphasizing that as an entrance point and we have actually elevated the entrance by isolating this kind of colonnaded pavilion on the right side of the plan. We've ghosted in the location of the flagpole that was in front. The flagpoles which are located in front of the building and then a couple of cues for just relating this elevation to what's around it, this dash line here represents the property line that moves forward as you come towards Marshall Street. So basically from about where my cursor is to that property line represents the frontage of the current town hall building as it faces on Marshall Street. And then we ghosted in an idea of a box that represents the apartment building. And I'll caveat this by saying that it's not really a true representation of how that would look in real life. Your perspective view is actually bigger than what I'm showing here. But this if you were to project straight on elevation what that apartment building does to the facade of the town hall, that's what it would actually represent. Again, you can see the addition of the cupola on this side and probably from a perspective standing on Marshall Street, looking back over it, you would start to see the top of that cupola

Danny Davis: Can I say one thing real quick. You said it from the east elevation. But in terms of the entrance here, one of the comments we heard was kind of strengthening the columns just a little bit to be a bit different than the other columns that you saw on the porch or the arcade. Again, some of that has changed because it no longer continues to the West, but it does draw or provide a little bit more than emphasis that we had heard at the last meeting.

Andrew Moore: And then finally, the Western elevation, which hasn't changed a great deal other than you can now see the articulation of the Marshall Street Pavilion, the cupola beyond, and how the building is shaping up. So moving on to lighting, these are the light fixtures that we are proposing for the project, and it kind of requires a number of images to illustrate our intent because frankly, we don't have the marketing image of the actual fixture that we like to use. So let me walk you through the two images on the left represent our design intent for the fixture. So there is a pendent version and a sconce version of the same fixture, the actual fixtures shown on the left here would not meet the dark skies requirement. But this manufacturer has adapted their fixtures to meet dark sky, and you can see an example of that on the right. So this is a carriage style fixture that shows how it's adapted. So you have the LEDs light source actually in the cap of the fixture, and then there's a hurricane shade that is below that with frosted glass that reflects some of that light. But the light source is entirely in the cap.

Cindy Pearson: It's a kind of similar to our streetlights.

Andrew Moore: Yes, similar to your streetlights. The location of the little plan below shows the locations of these light fixtures, so the larger three dots would represent the three locations for pendant fixture, and they were showing two smaller dots that would represent locations for the sconces. [off mic] That's the eastern side of the building.

Danny Davis: Under the walkway.

Andrew Moore: I can walk back to that elevation to show you where they. So they would occur here under the Marshall Street entrance. They would, here. The entrance that takes you to the police station and the town offices and then one here facing the parking lot.

Tim Clites: So just a pause [off mic]

Andrew Moore: We would do, recessed lighting in the underside of the porch of the arcade. So just wash it with light but no decorative fixtures.

Cindy Pearson: If I may. Our streetlights are kind of blinding a little bit from that top part. Is there any I don't know. I don't know if that's needed on this. I know we need light and I know you need to project light somehow. Just wanted to state that concern.

Andrew Moore: Yeah, you know, I think that's a quality that would be shared by pretty much any streetlight that meets the dark sky requirements. You know, you have to have the the light source. So it's not projecting horizontally at all. And that means that it's going to be, by definition, above you projecting down. So regardless of its style, that would be a kind of a necessity

Punkin Lee: And the streetlights, because if you're close and happen to look up, it's like.

Cindy Pearson: And sometimes when you're driving at a certain angle it hits you. You if they can just bring that side that goes around the light on the top down a little bit more. bring it down.

Andrew Moore: The quandary you get in is that the more you bring the edge down, the more you're getting cut off. And so you're not projecting. So you would have to have them every 10 feet or something to be able to. And expensive. Yeah, I agree. It's a you know, the traditional acorn type fixture or ones where the light source is actually, you know, behind glass, you know, you can mitigate that light by putting frosting on it. And and it's not in your eyes so much. But then you're not complying with dark skies. So it's kind of catch 22.

Will Moore: You can't have these. Well, I'm not sure about the two pictures on the left, but like our streetlights, for example, you can get those frosted glass on the outside. But again, anything you do to diffuse that gets your spread of light down and that those pictures already they have a limited spread as it is. So we chose specifically to go with the clear glass and the second point. But I want to make, and sounds a little tongue in cheek, but it's really not meant to be. We've heard that a lot that like when you look at the streetlights, they're blinding. If you look up at any light you're blinded. [multiple speakers] the streetlights first went in, they were so new, and people were looking directly at them a lot. Those comments have almost completely subsided. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] So I understand

Danny Davis: And if I may, I may be speaking without full knowledge. I don't know the color temperature of the streetlights, but I think they are a little bit wider than what we're talking about here, because we are looking at a 2700 Kelvin which is the soft orange [inaudible].

Will Moore: At most our streetlights are 3000. Which is still a fairly good quality, but not as good [inaudible].

Danny Davis: So we want to make sure that we weren't doing any kind of bluish or stark white. [off mic]

Andrew Moore: Well, yeah, I guess that's a it's maybe an operational question. You know, if these fixtures are intended to be you know, provide safety and security and access to the building is that something? I mean, the town would have to make a decision about how you wanted to manage that. You know, it's an after-hours thing, they go off, you know, I mean, you can certainly control. [off mic] Yeah, that's a good question.

Tim Clites: [off mic]

Andrew Moore: Well, I know that for a fact that you can get fixtures like for stairwells that dim and then when the person enters the stairwell, they brighten back up. So maybe a lightings control question that we could use for not just these fixtures, but the other fixtures that are illuminating the arcade. We can look into that.

Tim Clites: I think that might help soften the whole appearance of [off mic].

Punkin Lee: Plus, you're entering Salamander, so do, I mean, to be compatible and pleasant. I think you don't want a big lit, look like a big box parking lot.

Andrew Moore: Sure.

Kevin Fallin: With regard to the solar lights, we haven't talked about those yet, but the solar lights are fully programmable and can do exactly what you just said. They can be adjusted based on a percentage of power output through an app, and they can be programmed based on time of day to switch from one power to a different power.

Rhonda North: And for those of you who don't know, this is Kevin Fallin. Kevin's with Downey and Scott. They are our construction management firm. [off mic]

Will Moore: I just confirmed our streetlights are 3000 Kelvin. So these would be the slightly warmer version.

Andrew Moore: And to continue Kevin's theme, the fixture on the right side of your of your of this slide is the streetlight that we're looking at. So what's notable about it is that that shaft of the cylinder of the pole is actually solar PV panel. So it collects solar energy and there's no wiring for these fixtures. They would be sitting out there powering themselves.

Margaret Littleton: How tall are they?

Andrew Moore: These are these are 13 feet tall, 13 to 14 feet tall.

Margaret Littleton: That's the top. Doesn't look proportioned to me.

Andrew Moore: Well, the that the pole is fatter than you know than it would be normally. And that's because of that surface area needed for the for the solar panels.

Cindy Pearson: And does it have backed up? Oh, sorry. So we have cloudy days for 30 days in a row. Does it have something.

Kevin Fallin: I think I can answer that. So we just did a project using a similar picture down in Fredericksburg. The solar panels feed batteries that are located inside and the batteries can last up to three days typically. So even if you have a cloudy day, you've still got battery storage. You can adjust the power output if you wanted to, but they're specifically designed to last more than a single charge. So if

you had a whole day's charge and the batteries were full capacity and then you had clouds for two or three days, you'd still be able to have lights.

Punkin Lee: How frequently do the panels have to be replaced?

Kevin Fallin: I have to double check on the lifespan warranty of them, but they're pretty robust. There's about a three-inch strip where the curvature of the panel connects, and that is turned away from the sun based on the solar projections so that you maximize the panels. So each location is a little different, but they're pretty stout and they are about that big around in order to accommodate the panel wrap and the batteries inside. Yes, sir, Riverfront Park, which is just about to open up there's photos online, there's been a few articles about it. I can send you some pictures. We're using a different style fixture there. We've got 19-foot-tall fixtures with the straight arm and the LEDs are a brighter color. But it's the same manufacturer.

Tim Clites: [off mic]

Andrew Moore: OK. Just got a few more, so this is another slide showing exterior materials, and this is about the columns and the trim on the on the building. So for our trim, we're proposing to use a composite wood Ameritech is a brand name of that. It's basically a composite wood that is rot resistant and but is milled and shaped just like wood is. For the columns we would propose a FRP or fiberglass reinforced polymer. They're very durable and they're very solid. So, you know, they feel like a substantial material and then on the, so basically, that's the slide. You just see the various applications of it, the square columns, and the trim. For doors, we are contemplating the use of FRP and aluminum doors for their durability and for their operations over time, and then they would be equipped with simulated divided light where there's glazing. And again, you sort of have to picture the totality of these series of images to come up with the door that's actually shown on our elevation. So the bottom left and the one right above it show examples of the panelization scheme that we have in mind. But they would all be a painted color like our dover white accent color that we have been proposing. And then you see the middle, teal-colored doors which show the you know, they represent the divided lights and the transom condition, as does the FRP door on the right, which shows a little bit closer to the light pattern that we have shown our elevations. And then finally, we're proposing a dark bronze hardware poles. And this is a variation from the package that we sent earlier. We selected a little more decorative pole to show you instead of the more utilitarian room we had shown you earlier.

Will Moore: We will, since you didn't have the benefit of advance review of a couple of minor modifications, we will get this package out to you tomorrow and [inaudible]

Tim Clites: Do you want us to [inaudible] questions as you go?

Andrew Moore: Feel free.

Tim Clites: Two questions. [inaudible] Generally on trim, we try to shy away from wood grain. I'm sure based on your design you were already thinking that. [inaudible] On the doors and stuff, interesting, I was trying to think what building it was, I think it was the post office that [off mic] not wood although the windows that we're looking at if we go to the next page are not wood. [off mic]

Andrew Moore: Yeah, yeah, I'll just build on that just a bit, that our intent for all of the products is that they would have a smooth painted finish. So any time you're seeing texture, wood, grain, that's just the marketing image that we've showing. So what we would actually specify would be smooth painted. One comment on the FRP, we have used wood doors for commercial projects before and just found that they're really problematic for a maintenance standpoint. So it's certainly doable, you know, but we would advise the town to consider, you know, for a commercial building with a high degree of use. It's a challenge. So moving on to other exterior materials, so the collection of images on the left is intended to

show intent for the stucco and the stone. So we're showing a master wall product which has a smooth limestone finish for the stucco. The middle image is not intended to show the stucco texture is intended to show the relationship between stucco and stone for water table. And then the bottom two images are showing a general intent for the stone. We have not actually selected a stone product yet. We're still working on that. But the idea is that it is either sourced locally or reminiscent of stone that is sourced locally. And we've shown a couple of images that are in the range of what we're looking at. So we're thinking this sort of cool to brown range of stone and then an ashlar pattern laid up, you know, irregular ashlar. So as I was coming in today, I was noticing a lot of the variety of stone. [off mic] I came in. Yeah. From this direction. [off mic] Yeah, yeah. Yeah. So, I mean, you know, you see all the loose laid stone walls around and even in town, the bases of the buildings, you know, I think that's our intent, you know, to find a within that bracket, something that's reminiscent of this area. But, you know, until we actually get a stone selection in hand, that's going to dictate the mortar color. And we're happy to work with, you know, staff or you guys at some future point to kind of put your stamp of approval on that. But for the sake of, you know, getting the action from the committee, what we would like is, you know, let's set a condition, whatever you want, however you want to term it around, images or around intent or, you know, something so that we can move forward and maybe not have that hold up the approval. So I just put that out there for your consideration. On the windows, we're showing a casement style window divided into lights as shown. There's a single version and a double version in a couple of cases. And currently, as Tim mentioned, we're showing it as a true wood window. But we understand you may have some conversations about aluminum clad. And, you know, we would certainly endorse that if that's the committee's intention, you know, to maybe change the guidelines. We use it a lot. But, you know, wood windows are certainly available and that's what we have currently shown.

Danny Davis: Is it valid for us to discuss briefly the stucco [inaudible] system.

Will Moore: I think it's important for the community to understand what's being proposed. So even with the term stucco seems to be used broadly sometimes. But just to be clear, what is being proposed here is actually is [inaudible], not a true hard stucco. [off mic] I would guess if a truck hits our building, it's going to dent it a bit [laughter] [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: I'm like, why did you take away the Hardie Plank? Because it kind of made it all a little bit different and divided and is it cost?

Andrew Moore: No, no, that's a good question. It really came down to when we when we made the move on the insurance on that northern side, you know, I guess maybe this is in my own mind, but I felt like that the stucco was a elevated material over the Hardie Plank and that the Hardie being a less formal material. And it seemed like when we were emphasizing this as an entrance point, that it seemed a little strange to have a less formal material be flanking the most formal entrance piece of this facade.

Will Moore: And we received some committee comments directly to that effect, was that there was some concern about having that material at the primary entrance point. So I think this change is a reflection of responding to those comments.

Andrew Moore: I think we're getting closer to the end here, but this is our roof slide that shows the standing seam. It's acknowledging that our intent is to specify field seams, including the ridges, so they're [inaudible] and not ridge caps. We also intend to put half round gutters on the projects and the color of that would be painted. So that's a painted aluminum gutter to match the trim. And then we would put on snow guards in a traditional configuration, as you can see the example here, and cast-iron downspout boots for the downspouts.

Cindy Pearson: When you say a painted aluminum gutter, does that mean it will have to be repainted? No, it's baked in color?

Andrew Moore: Yeah, [inaudible] coated. Very durable. That's it. So loved to have questions, comments.

Tim Clites: I have a really direct one. Is there anything that you would not have changed, that you changed from our last meeting as the architect?

Andrew Moore: I mean, that I did.

Tim Clites: That you prefer [multiple speakers]? Yeah. And then why. Yeah. And why?

Andrew Moore: I don't think so. No, no. I mean, I think this has been a generative process. I think that that, you know, the feedback that I've gotten from your committee has been good. So I don't have any regrets about where we are right now.

Tim Clites: Thank you. It's a group effort, so I'll speak last. [laughter] You want me to go first? Ok. Yeah, well I guess I would. My comments are simple. Thank you. I mean, I think I feel like the broader group of this committee threw a lot of things your way that maybe weren't cohesive all the time. But I was personally pleased with the update, I thought it I thought it was particularly the entrance to me start started to feel like I know where I need to go if I'm on foot and I know where the front door is when I arrive via car. And I think that feels much more successful than he did the last time. And I like the other details that you felt like the little roofs over the doors, I think they had kind of a modest feel to some of these entrances that are that are nice little brackets are kind of a charming part of our vernacular in this area and yeah, really, I was having to really search for something that I would critique based on our input previously, and I have one small, small little thing, but I'm just going to let everybody else talk and see if anybody. No, that I just. And thank you also for adding this next layer of detail for all of the, you know, columns, doors, and windows and and finishes. This is really helpful as well. And just so the committee is reminded, we're not acting on this tonight, there is a public meeting, so just comments. Bill, do you have any comments?

Bill Anderson: Do I have any comments. [laughter] First I think it's just terrific to see an architect that is open to suggestions and takes those suggestions and comes up with even some better ideas and suggestions. And I think that what I see happening here I'm personally as an architect, I'm very pleased to see the changes that have been made to put up the North elevation for a moment. I mean, I could go around the building and point out those things that we talked about, and you changed it. I really do think it's great. I think lowering the water table, letting the windows float more proportionately helped the building a great deal. Obviously, the cupola and its location is just just terrific. The proportions of the building, I think, are just seem a lot better now in simplifying it to the two materials. I don't have a problem with that at all. I think let the building be simple. But in some of the details, like in the trim and all that, that will be where the building will have more become more special. The I do have a couple of comments that just as again, as an architect that pop out at me. I think it was discussed here a little while ago how important the lighting and I think some of the lighting, like in New York [inaudible] the down lights are going to be terrific. If the elevation is accurate, I think the the pendent lighting in the sconces on the entrance are really too small. I think on a building that has simple elements; the lighting could be really much more significant. Not in terms of a lot more money spent, but a lot more special feel for the building. So I [inaudible] I really think woulda, coulda, the building could surely handle lights that are larger. The windows. Again, I the fact that the building's proportions to me are so much of a lot better. The only thing I would pops out at me is that windows have a very modest frame around them in the elevation. And given the fact that the material is [inaudible] now a new large frame could be actually made from the [inaudible] material giving the windows just slightly more the pronunciation about them looking [inaudible] punch opening. So that's the one comment I would have with regards to any changes on the elevation of it in the lighting is that the frames on the windows could to me, could use proportionately a larger material around it, and that could be done with [inaudible]. So there wouldn't be any extra cost. I agree with Tim. I think it's very important not to have metal or aluminum doors on this building. This is I realize it's a commercial building and those materials will hold up a great deal better

than wooden doors, excuse me. Yes, wood doors. But the feel of a wood door for a building in Middleburg to me is very important. It's where the public touches the building for the first time. It it keeps the sense of more historic type of environment of the building then the aluminum or a metal door. So I think it's very, very important. And for those that worry about stucco versus [inaudible] I think that shouldn't really be a problem. We have no control over the, I think the colors that are built into the material, so it doesn't have to necessarily be painted. We could provide a second color around an entrance if we wanted to and it's a repairable with less cracks if done properly then stucco would have. So I don't think there should be any issues with that. I think that's generally my comments. And again, I thank the architects for the changes they made. I think they're all great improvements.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. Appreciate it.

Andrew Moore: Can I can I make a response.

Tim Clites: Yes, please.

Andrew Moore: Bill, I appreciate the comments is really, really helpful. I did want to address the windows around question just to make sure that the design intent is understood. So these are currently intended to be windows, as if they're set into a stucco clad masonry so that the heads and the jams are actually returned. The stucco returns back into opening the windows, set back with a brick mold around it so that you get a nice shadow line back in there. So there would be a change to it would be, you know, to make it properly detailers if you had a surround around it, you would actually bring the window forward, which I think you would lose some of that shadow line So that's just a consideration.

Bill Anderson: So I can understand that. I get that in detail that most people looking at this elevation, including myself, can tell how the windows were set in. That might be something that you enlarge, or you blow up because it doesn't have a shadow line and then I can see on this, but I can I see your point. And if that's the case, that would work too. But I couldn't tell that from this elevation.

Andrew Moore: Granted, yeah, that's we'll make that change.

Bill Anderson: Good job though.

Andrew Moore: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with Bill about the doors, I like the idea of wood doors I think would be more in keeping. And the windows I only have one question and maybe it's silly. Is there a reason to use casement?

Andrew Moore: That just is a design selection. It could be could be a different style. Casements tend to be a little less formal if you will. You know, they're kind of a. I'm curious about your your reaction.

Virginia Jenkins: I mean, I'm just not a big fan of casement. I mean, I like French casement windows. [off mic] [laughter] So I can't understand me again. I think this is, you know, preference. Yeah,

Margaret Littleton: I think they always break. [laughter]

Tim Clites: In the next meeting can we not sit these two together? [laughter]

Rhonda North: I think that's an excellent suggestion.

Margaret Littleton: And I like the wood idea very much. The sound of it even when it shuts is better. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Will Moore: Mr. Chairman, if I may, just before we go on from that, I'm hearing a lot of preference for wood doors. Is it worthwhile segregating out and Andrew, if you go to the south of elevation, please, we do have three service doors kind of tucked in behind the apartment building. [inaudible]

Tim Clites: I think what people are responding to is this. It's like hardware right. You can put really nice hardware on some much more affordable things because that's what you touch. And so we are in town kind of sensitive to the feel of the doors that people would come through, the service door, the police side, the other side. I think they could be more durable and that would be fine. We're really talking about the doors the public uses on a regular basis. Thank you for clarifying that. [off mic] Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree with the wooden doors also, but I thank you very much for lowering the water table. I think the whole it just is it's a lot softer looking than all that and then the other. I think that's really nice. And thank you for doing that. I just hope when you get to the stone that you get, everybody's got their hang up, get real stone and not just pick a color and go to a place that produces stones. So it's just all looks like it's venire and not real stone from here. Yeah. I mean, there's plenty of stone around [off mic].

Rhonda North: Virginia's volunteering.

Punkin Lee: [inaudible] plenty of stone walls around that people will sell. Yeah. And then you get the variety of stone of what you see here and not just I mean everything perfect.

Andrew Moore: Kevin, don't listen. But we could could look at that. [laughter] He's trying to figure out how we're going to bid it you know. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: I think that's important. I mean, if we're doing the stone, people comment on our stone walls and it's part of us. And so I think the further the more steps you take from being authentic, then, you know, why are we spending all this [inaudible]?

Andrew Moore: I mean, is it a crazy idea for you guys to help us find the source?

Tim Clites: I was just going to I was just going to offer that at some point if it's helpful, it's a bit of a craft of the area. There are people that are like in any craft there are people that are better versed at where to get and how to do. The benefit of what we have is an adjustment is there's less of it. And so I think really making that just a really nice line at the bottom of the building would be worth. Yeah. And some of us would be happy to help you all find a couple of sources.

Andrew Moore: I mean, I'd be all for it. And we I mean, we have to be mindful of the procurement regs and all that. But, you know, if we can work it out, that would be fantastic to have, you know, stone that came out of that field here.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you very much.

Linda Wright: I agree with the wood front door as well, and I think to Punkin's point, the stone selection is crucial. There's lots of other ones that look very fake and out there on every subdivision house, you see around and that is not what we're looking for, but I think the improvements on the design are great. I think you've done a great job,

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda.

Cindy Pearson: I don't know if I just woke up when this is I guess this is a oh, yes. This side. Is that the west side of the building?

Andrew Moore: This is the south side. Yeah. Facing Marshall Street.

Cindy Pearson: Ok, the three doors, are they doors under that little.

Andrew Moore: They are.

Cindy Pearson: And that goes into the police department?

Andrew Moore: No, those are into service areas of the building,

Rhonda North: Mechanical rooms, electrical rooms.

Cindy Pearson: And on the very end down there. That is not a window. That is a

Andrew Moore: Correct. Yeah, it's a blind opening. Yeah, There's a wall that actually intersects at that point that would make it awkward. So we've just completed the composition with [inaudible]

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, no, I like the three. It's just like did they run out of money? [laughter]

Danny Davis: And the same on the on the West elevation. We had three blank one or whatever you call them. We don't have windows right behind the dais in the Council room.

Cindy Pearson: Oh yeah. That's probably a really good idea. I wouldn't want to get shot sitting in New Jersey. No, I just have one and I might get things thrown at me on this one. Do we need two weathervane? I like, I love where you have moved this too, [inaudible] getting the weathervane on the front side of the building. I have no clue what else it could be or if it's really necessary at that point, because if you go to the front, that Marshall Street view. Straight on Marshall view, you have one [off mic] Yeah, I think that's such a. And you really don't want to draw people into it now. I mean, it's showing in the old front of the building, but I don't know, I just that was me.

Virginia Jenkins: It might be a little redundant.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Yeah. And I like that horse, but I don't like him that much.

Will Moore: Some of the thought from the design team was that, you know, that's where the cupola was. I think we heard you loud and clear that a cupola doesn't belong there. A cupola does have traditional placement, but we're still responding to this idea that we need to give some prominence to that entry point. And granted, we've done it in I think a couple of different ways. But that was just it was yet one other clue and responding more so than just what we heard from this committee but from the public when we first rolled this out. We need that to be very well signaled to pedestrians. We need it to be very clear that that's the main entry point. So we thought it was still important to have something above, but clearly not a cupola. So this was kind of.

Cindy Pearson: I like the flags there on that side. [off mic] I like where the flags are. You know that that helps on that end, but it's. [off mic] What did you just say? [off mic] Oh, there you go. That was easy.

Punkin Lee: I like Cindy's point.

Cindy Pearson: I knew we kept you around for a reason, Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm entertaining.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: I think this whole group is rather entertaining to our visitors. [off mic] I think, yeah, it's the weathervane and it still gives it a direction but doesn't look like you weened it from the big one and stuck it there. [laughter]

Andrew Moore: So was that a consensus to eliminate the weathervane from the cupola?

Virginia Jenkins: I don't know. One, two, three, four.

Margaret Littleton: We're talking about this one.

Punkin Lee: Yeah. Just yeah. Go with that or something like that. [inaudible] Right that that's the dominant [inaudible].

Margaret Littleton: You could do a fox. I mean, that's part of the.

Tim Clites: So this is my observation about the two weathervanes is in real life, it will be very hard to stand and see them both from anywhere. This elevation. We're looking at that building. If we stand on the other side of the street, the perspective, I think I could be wrong, but that cupola is further back than our vantage point would allow us to see. So just I'm fine if we only go to one weathervane, I don't have a strong feeling one way or the other. But if the decision to do that is solely based on the fact that we don't need two, I think you're going to it's going to be hard to stand in a spot and see them both, except maybe as you get up past that building and you're close to the little garden area, right yeah, where Danny's hand is, you might stand there and see them both. But from the other sides of the buildings, I don't think you'll see them both. So I don't feel strongly one way or the other. And actually, I'll just run through my comments because they're pretty simple. And if you didn't do any of them, I wouldn't be the least bit offended. But if you want to start on the North elevation, I very much like everything [inaudible] My mind immediately said, I'll go back and do what, is there something. So I looked then at the cupola on the community center and its base is the color of the roof and then the cupola. And it's a really subtle [inaudible]. So if you kept it all white, you wouldn't hurt my feelings at all. But to me, it made it feel like it was a little less spire like and more cupola like. So that's a small comment there. And the next elevation, the east elevation, I like it the way it is, but I also like [inaudible] windows or faux windows kind of filled in windows and so it doesn't feel incomplete without them at the end. And maybe it's too much to add them there. But if we go to the third elevation, which is the south elevation, we see the double window [inaudible] the elevation and then the fourth elevation, we see the three. And I don't know if that one lone little window would feel better if it had a sister its same size or not. I don't I honestly, I'm struggling to find a comment. So if you kept it just the way it was, it's probably fine. But I do like the fact that you've introduced that element, especially on this facade, where otherwise be very plain. And so I don't know if by adding another just my first glance, I was like that that one little window feels a little alone. Would it be happy if it had kind of a companion?

Andrew Moore: We can look at that.

Tim Clites: Those are my comments.

Andrew Moore: Yeah, that specific thing. We actually looked at it both ways and ended up selecting this partially because of the asymmetry of the porch versus the conference room, you know.

Tim Clites: There's no wrong answer, I don't think. And if you're if you all say that's your preference, I'm comfortable with that.

Andrew Moore: It's the council toilet right there.

Tim Clites: Put a window in. [laughter] [multiple speakers] But like others, thank you very much for all your work on this. I think it looks great. I hope you answered the question by first asked honestly.

Andrew Moore: I wouldn't show you anything I was prepared to be proud of.

Tim Clites: Now so this can we just unless there's any other comments can we just shift to can you walk us through the public meeting? Give us two minutes. It's been a long time since we've had a public meeting.

Will Moore: A public hearing, not a public. A Public meeting almost implies that there is a big presentation, that it's feedback. We've done that previously with early iteration. We have another program for July which will roll out the more refined plans. But so it's a public hearing. It's , A it's required any time there's a full demolition proposal. So we're required by ordinance to have that. And while we're at it, if any member of the public wants to come and comment on the proposed new building as well as far as the design. We would have that, so there's a simple script for how to walk through it, but it's basically we'll just introduce the application, maybe doing an abbreviated run through of the elevations, open up the hearings so that the public if anybody's interested and attends to make comments that you can hear from the public, you close the public hearing and then we would proceed on with the more detailed discussion and deliberation. When will that be? Two weeks from now. The 17th.

Tim Clites: And do we make a comment when someone is we don't, there's not comment made back, correct?

Will Moore: Correct, correct. Not during the hearing, but you always have the discretion at the end of the hearing if you want to get clarification from somebody, we're not quite so formal as maybe council in those strict rules. So it's permissible to have some sort of engagement with speakers generally you would get through the hearing first and then go back to someone to kind of get some clarification on what you said. Or maybe they ask a question. Maybe it's a simple answer we could give them.

Tim Clites: Thank you for reviewing that for us. It's been a while, I think since we've done anything like that so. Thank you. Do you have any questions for us?

Andrew Moore: I don't.

Tim Clites: How are things going? How is your client? [laughter]

Andrew Moore: The best. The best I've ever had.

Cindy Pearson: Never a dull moment.

Andrew Moore: I will say then again that, you know, as you're progressing with your conversation about the windows, the type, you know, again, we would endorse the consideration of an aluminum clad window and also just, you know, FYI, our standard mode for one of our common modes for specifying windows is also use aluminum clad doors, wood doors. So on the outside, it's an aluminum cladding, but the wood, the door construction is still wood. So you have that weight and heft. So, you know, I would just maybe as you're considering that as a package, as a suite, you know, commercial grade exterior

aluminum clad wood windows and the corresponding doors. You might see that as a suite just. But we'll do it however we need to do it.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you.

Andrew Moore: Ok, thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you for coming the whole way up.

Andrew Moore: I'm glad to do it. I'm so glad to have the excuse. [off mic] I'll just fill up my trunk every time I go through enough.

Tim Clites: So I'm going to recommend a quick four-minute pause, five-minute pause. I believe you're going to get Frazier and Associates. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Let's run through roll. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: What.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Tim Clites: Tim.

Linda Wright: Linda.

Cindy Pearson: Cindy.

Tim Clites: Bill. Bill's no longer with us.

Rhonda North: Bill is no longer on the line.

Tim Clites: Thank you all. All right. Rhonda.

Rhonda North: Rhonda's here.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Are you going to introduce us to Frazier and get them started?

Rhonda North: That would be Estee.

Tim Clites: Estee is going to do that all right. Yes. Estee you're up.

Estee LaClare: Kathy and Bill, they have been on, I think, for quite some time and found the discussion in regards to the town office project very illuminating. I heard I spoke numerous times today and I put together a list of some of the open-ended items that we still need further clarification and revision so that we can progress in this process. I took your comments from the last time I went through, and these were the different areas that we needed to further discuss. I also transferred all the documents with the edits and changes to them today as well. So that was [inaudible]. So if we want to start with, you have wanted to discuss and review the guidelines and I included the draft text listed below because I didn't actually know what portion of the roof guidelines you wanted to further discuss or clarify.

Kathy Frazier: I'm just wondering, can you all hear?

Estee LaClare: Yes.

Kathy Frazier: But you can see, you don't have a camera.

Tim Clites: We can hear you.

Bill Frazier: Ok. Good evening, everyone. Look forward to being with you again. And let's dive right in. I know you've had a long evening. So let's start. Maybe you can give us a little more background on the roof guidelines.

Will Moore: I think one element of it, and I don't think it was necessarily the entirety, but was just how to word, how to articulate the idea of doing the crimped edge at the ridge instead of a ridge cap. So I think that was part of it.

Kathy Frazier: That is pretty typical.

Bill Frazier: OK, we can do that.

Estee LaClare: Yeah, that was one aspect. But there was just basically discuss about the roof. I went through this. I don't know where you would like to change things.

Virginia Jenkins: I think it was the metal roof The metal roofing.

Tim Clites: I think primarily it was the metal roof with that, with the ridge that is hand folded, or field seamed crimped and not capped. And then I think the other I don't know that we need to get into it in the guidelines, but in fact, there are requirements for preventing roofs. And so if we don't allow for the vent, it either, then has to be gable vents or perhaps, yeah, there needs to be some comments about how to traditionally add venting in rooflines.

Estee LaClare: That's the second bullet point, and you had said you would look into possibly writing up [off mic].

Virginia Jenkins: OK. I have a question on this list, what what metal shingles? Have I missed something somewhere? What are metal shingles?

Tim Clites: I don't know that we have any in the town right now. There are certain periods of architecture where.

Margaret Littleton: Gingerbread houses. [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: But are they metal?

Tim Clites: It looks like slate, but it's actually metal, it's cut in shapes. I don't know if we have any of those in town.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't think we do. [off mic]

Bill Frazier: Would you like to delete that?

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, I think the delete it.

Bill Frazier: Ok, and then you all want to tell us other ways that you prefer the roofs are vented because we certainly don't want those large ridge caps. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Yeah, and I think I guess those two, now that I'm reading this again and my memory's coming back to me a little bit, there's two parts to the standing seam metal. You all know you've driven around the area, the traditional, you know, pan width without any fold or articulation in the pan and then the standing, seam that crimped seam by seam and not capped or battened in any way. I think we take for granted that all of our standing seam roofs look the same around here, but we ought to articulate that in our guidelines. So I'm happy to help just put that together too. Actually the town hall, that application. I think they did a pretty good job of it. They showed the folded seam, and they showed the and they articulated the crimping at the ridge.

Estee LaClare: Thank you.

Bill Frazier: Yeah, and, you know, there are some of the new precoated heavier steel roofs that are painted that are folded and crimped, you know, with the machine, it's not done like a traditional roofer would have done 50 years ago. Right. But they don't have any ridge caps. It looks very traditional when they finish up. Are you familiar with those? Do you all use those?

Tim Clites: Yes. That's, I think what we're talking about. So perfect. We're on the same page.

Bill Frazier: Yeah, good. OK, well, just send us some notes and we'll clarify when we write that or add to this. To talk about when we're talking about standing seams and crimps and vents. Ok.

Estee LaClare: The third one was further discussing the historical plaque designs and standard potentially guidelines for in case someone would like to put one on a building. You had said that it might be a good idea to consider some options and limit what is available or establish some guidelines so that people have a common template to work with.

Tim Clites: What do you all think about that?

Bill Frazier: Well, I think the primary thing when we said that was where signs that were already on a building that might commemorate some event or a date of erection or some kind of name of the building or like we said, commemorative tablets and so forth, that they are that those existing signs are rare survivors on most buildings and hopefully they could remain. And even if they related to some business name that was no longer there, for example, in our town, we have some brass and copper bank names from 1903 on a building. The bank, of course, has changed its name about every two years now, but they have not taken those plaques down. They are sort of a one foot by one foot copper and brass historic plaque. So that was the intent of that. Now, I guess the other issue is, are you talking about, you know, the policy or the design of adding new plaques, you know, like some towns have plaques on all the buildings saying it's a historic building or whatever number, whatever that's been put on more recently. And I know Alexandria did that for a while. So.

Kathy Frazier: And that's kind of a system. They decide that they want to mark the building and they come up with a plaque. It's a system almost. Yeah.

Bill Frazier: We have the African American community in Stanton right now suggesting that there are certain historic businesses that were African American that they would like to acknowledge with a small plaque on, I don't know, half a dozen buildings around downtown. So that would be a new thing to add, but the city certainly just going to work on that project. But not that's not. That's different from the existing historic sign or a historic plaque that's already on the building. So I'm not sure. Tell us what you like, clarified, or added to that number nine [inaudible].

Tim Clites: I guess I'll share what I think we were focused on. And hi, Bill. We see that you've logged on again.

Bill Anderson: Yes. I'm sorry I had to leave there.

Tim Clites: That's all right. We're in the process of looking at the guidelines with Frazier & Associates. So my thought was that we get it out in front of someone that would come to the historic review committee and request in under the signage ordinance, the right to put up a historic plaque commemorating something about the building, and that instead of waiting until that came before us, we pick a plaque design and size and perhaps even state that it's not added to the square footage of the building. But you're allowed one to commemorate the square footage of the sign ordinance. In other words, it's not a sign for a new business or an old business from a classic signage marketing. But it's an identifier. It's a historic marker. And we we decide they're going to always look like this if you want one in town, our town has the following historic marker system approved.

Virginia Jenkins: Ok, you have you're talking about like a bronze plaque. Which you already have approved with the what was it, the policeman thing. So it's there.

Tim Clites: The question is, did we make that? Is that the standard by which I mean, that's a big plaque with a bunch of words on it. I'm talking more about. Well, I'm not sure what I'm asking the question.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't understand. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: McEneaney building. We're all that's such an old thing, that old building that if it had a little plaque on it that designated that.

Virginia Jenkins: Oldest building in Middleburg.

Punkin Lee: Something that should conform with a certain size. Yes. And then other things like the the bigger one was a whole different thing. Building commemoration should follow probably a certain size.

Estee LaClare: Kathy and Bill, what have you run into in your experience.

Kathy Frazier: Well, you know, what's shows up for me is that, you know, we do signage systems too. It's almost like a component that would be part of a wayfinding or a public sign system that a lot of community will have interpretive signs, they'll have plaques that the design that kind of all goes together with the system. And so that's one thing versus design guidelines and sort of giving guidance to the property owner about what they can do with a commemorative sign. you see it more as a system where a community decides they want to have markers that really talk about the history of our community. And there's a consistent design that's vetted through you all in the town. And it happens. And then the property owners go and participate [inaudible]. So that's kind of two different things.

Bill Frazier: Yeah, yeah. We did a system in Stanton probably 30 years ago [inaudible] Stanton 40 years ago, where we did small plaques with significant historic buildings that had [inaudible] or that have certain original features. And they were all the same size, and they were small, and they were black and white, and they were anodized with historic photographs on them. But that, again, was a system and that was done by Historic Stanton, the city of Stanton, and then that was installed with the permission of the property owners. That's one system that Kathy's talking about. If owners can't come to you individually and want some kind of plaque put on to commemorate some historic event or person associated with the building, then that is sort of almost like a case by case basis where I think you all would maybe have a maximum size and then you would have to review the placement, location, materials, and there are companies, you know, that make these commemorative historic type plaques and, you know, [inaudible]

this property is something. Smith House is on the National Register of Historic Places, this property and something is a Virginia landmark. The state used to give out plaques when they you got listed aluminum plaque with black lettering. So those two types of systems are already you see on buildings I don't recall if you all have any of those or not. Those are what a property owner would purchase and order those. So there's lots of different aspects to how this could occur.

Kathy Frazier: It's an opportunity to actually tell your story.

Bill Frazier: Yeah, that would be one way to actually create a historic, you know, sort of interpretive signs to talk about certain aspects of the architecture or the history of the community. That would be a town, a town sponsored project it sounds like. The other thing could be, would you all review if someone bought a plaque saying this property is on the National Register of Historic Places or something historic, something historic district. Would that be something that you all would review before you would let them put that on the building? The same thing with the Virginia landmark. There's only a couple of buildings in town that could do that individually. Yeah, that's another aspect of this issue. I don't know how we write some things about size location. You all review that I think on a case by case where an individual that's a sign system.

Tim Clites: And so I guess. I know this that actually helped a lot. Thank you very much. And again, I'll speak mostly I've been holding up a couple of images as you've been speaking. And one is the plaque that just says very simply, this property has been placed on the National Registry of Historic Places by the United States Department of the Interior. I think that's a more rare situation than what I was looking into the future and thinking about, which is, you know, a plaque that might say, well, I'm looking at one from Henrico County historic preservation program, Clark Palmer House circa 1819 with additions. You know, it's just a little oval plaque. My question really is, is now the time? Are we are we focused on something we could do later or is now the time while we're rewriting this part of the ordinance to pick that and say, if you want to do that in our town, here's what we would like it to look like and and we're done. And then when someone comes in, we can say, oh, we actually had that program in place. Here it is. It needs to be bronze with a black background or whatever it is, and it can state the following. And it doesn't contribute to your signage requirements because it's a plaque and we've already kind of crossed that bridge. So Will, I don't know, you tell me, how important is this that we focus on this now versus maybe have it as something that we could pick up later?

Will Moore: I think it following up on Bill and Kathy's comments specifically Kathy's it really, we're really thinking more of something programmatic than acting on individual applications. You might get the one off like you did with the the American Legion plaque honoring the police officer. But I don't think it's critical to address in the guidelines at this point.

Tim Clites: All right, good. Well, that's.

Virginia Jenkins: It could be an addendum.

Will Moore: Yeah, [inaudible] program, maybe it's an addendum or maybe it's just a separate program.

Punkin Lee: That's already what is occurs about every 15 years. There's usually about a group that thinks it would be nice to do plaques because I've gone through two of them and they haven't materialized. So it's a kind of like the locust, you know. [laughter] they come around. So I think we're better to be prepared [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: I want to ask Punkin to clarify what she just said, because this is important. You think we're better to be prepared, so we should finish the documents and have that is something that we work on and then could add in when when we've reviewed it. I mean, I feel like I want.

Punkin Lee: I think so. Then it's done. I mean, it's like the murals, you know, that kind of thing, because something that we can.

Tim Clites: We can proactively work on [multiple speakers] without the pressure of an applicant. OK, but is it OK to defer that so that we can keep going with the guidelines? So let's do that. Let's keep it on a list to work on once we're done with the guidelines.

Estee LaClare: Definitely will be, that's what is wonderful about this concept. We can make these additions as they innumbrated last time with the numbering. You can add and take away as needed. So I definitely can add that on there.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. [off mic].

Estee LaClare: And then the next one was going to be the window advancements and potential changes to guidelines, which our chairman brought window examples.

Tim Clites: I don't know that we need to jump into the examples right at the moment. But let's just ask our consultant the conceptual question that I think I posed the last meeting, which is if we're building a brand-new building in our historic district. Is it ever appropriate to have aluminum clad windows with authentic, authentically detailed, you know [inaudible] on the inside out simulated divided lights because that building is new circa 2021 or 2022 or what do you see other historic districts doing?

Kathy Frazier: And even with the, you know, the federal guidelines for historic buildings and you're doing new buildings and like what you just said, it has they call it contemporary compatible? You know, they're not saying you have to go reconstruct a new building like it was built 200 years ago. But they acknowledge that they are new materials and that actually what can be done with new construction, it's you know, it's when you're dealing with a historic building in a historic district and, you know, windows are getting replaced, that shouldn't be replaced with a new material. So if they're original historic wood windows, so it's fine to use contemporary material.

Bill Frazier: Yeah, and Glave I think we was saying that, that the Glave and Holmes firm was saying that, that they typically would use that in their more commercial or institutional in this case building. And that's been our experience as well for new buildings in historic districts. And most of our guidelines in other communities allow people to use those more sturdy, sturdier, and better materials because the wood today and so many of the wood windows, as you all know, is just new growth wood. And that doesn't last very long. I think we told you all when we put in [inaudible] windows in an addition we made to the rear of our house, three of them we've had these Arbitron to consolidate to replace the lock in less than 15 years. And I know that one of the architects I spoke with, and he's done work for the owners of Middleburg had said that they found a firm in Canada who make wood windows. I forget they make them out of mahogany or a similar very high-quality material, and then they literally paint and bake the paint on. And he said they've had [inaudible] up to 15 years with those. I don't know if that's true or not. But in most new construction today, when we're even doing our own projects in the historic district, we're able to use clad windows, fiberglass. A lot of people are coming on with that. The vinyl stuff and the flat [inaudible] inserted in that kind of business. Is a no. New construction. Yes. But like Kathy said unless if you have a historic building and the owner wants to replace all the windows, at least the federal standards are, you do a survey. And that's why we put that form in the back of all your windows and it's over half of them are deteriorated beyond repair. Then you may elect to use to select new windows. But in that case, then it's up to you all to decide shouldn't they still be wood, which we would suggest they likely would be, because it's a historic building and you're trying to match what's there. The Park Service, for example, does not require that the profile of the muntin's and all of those details have to be exactly done. They acknowledge that that's not going to happen today.

Kathy Frazier: It needs to be as close as you can get it.

Bill Frazier: But they allow some variety there. It doesn't have to be an exact custom milled window.

Kathy Frazier: But as you know, more and more window manufacturers are getting better, better, better at it. So it's not hard to find something that's compatible.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you. It does, and I appreciate your input very much. We do have a couple I have a couple of corner cut offs of both wood, double hung and the same manufacturers clad version just for us to look at. Probably at the end of the meeting, we can I can talk to the committee about some of the details, at least that we have for this one manufacturer. I think what we're would want to be aware of is, is how to write the guidelines with enough clarity that that it's clear we don't we don't accept them until you know, grills between the glass. I don't think the vinyl detailing ever has looked good, at least in any window I've seen. I think my experience is like yours. Aluminum is is fairly consistent and the fiberglass is coming a long way. We started to use more of that. Also, Bill, just if I can ask you, what would do you have any comments on any of this?

Bill Anderson: On the windows [inaudible] the aluminum has a much sharper, you know, definition to it and the vinyl, I still see problems with vinyl and deterioration at corners of vinyl windows. So, yeah, I would like the guidelines not to allow that.

Bill Frazier: I think they say that that they're not allowed. So we agree with you. Yeah. And the reason they call them replacement windows.

Kathy Frazier: Because they have to be replaced.

Bill Frazier: They can't be repaired you know, where a wood window can be repaired, individual pieces, we've done that a lot. So anyway.

Kathy Frazier: I think, we'll double check how we've written that. I think they just want clarity.

Bill Frazier: We also put a couple of links to websites in there that go into a lot more detail about windows and window replacement. And I would suggest you all, just as members, you may want to click on those links and read a couple of articles. They go into a lot more detail that we put in the guidelines, so that'll give you a lot of ammunition and background for historic windows and why so many of the new products are not appropriate and the view that maybe would be mostly for new construction or in addition to that, for example, in the rear of the building, you might consider that as well. That's all-new construction.

Bill Anderson: Your point about the historic building, when less than 50 percent of the windows are deemed non repairable, the cost I found of having someone really do repairs on windows, especially if it's a windows that have a curve to them to extraordinarily expensive. There's nothing to be done about it, I guess. But I must say it makes it it's so hard on the ownership of these buildings to make that. But that's one of the problems of historic buildings.

Bill Frazier: And the state goes the state is really strict about that. And of course, they have to review everything we put in here and tell us that it meets their guidelines, federal guidelines because you're [inaudible] from the state. And you're right, it's really challenging. If you've got a 1920 commercial building and they've got a three or four one over one windows in the back that have rotted or need a lot of repair, that's not the same as that 18th century brick. There was no windows. So there have to be adjustments. But they don't do that. It's one size fits all when they review that stuff, you know. Generally. But yeah, we yeah. And I think some some boards probably and you're probably like most of them, they are a little more flexible than the preservation police of Richmond and Washington would like and sometimes you have to be, but we'll leave it there.

Tim Clites: I think that helps me. Any questions specific to windows from the committee or should we keep moving with the next item on the agenda? I guess next is new construction observations and there's a list of things that you'll walk us through.

Kathy Frazier: Yeah, so and we started working on the illustrations as we began to show you samples in our last meeting, and we started to look at how we illustrate guidelines for new construction. And quite frankly, when you look at Washington Street, there's like one site that maybe there will be at the gas station that somebody decided they wanted to build a building on where the gas station is probably the only site on Washington and then Marshall is pretty residential oriented. And most of the buildings that are facing the street and there's parking on the interior of the block. And so I kept looking and looking. And then you got a Federal and that's where there are more opportunity for new construction. And that street is more utilitarian. You've got a lot of new construction on that street. And I guess I was interested to hear what I mean, you know, what kind of guidance we can give you about it, because it's also contextual. You know, when you're doing new construction, you're looking at the historic buildings all around that site wherever you're building and where you have build-able sites, there isn't a tremendous amount of historic context. So it's kind of a dilemma. And I was just wondering if you all have any thoughts about that. Obviously, you've had a lot of new construction on Federal [inaudible]. Well, yeah. Yeah. On Washington, you've had some very good new construction that fit in really nicely. And but it's pretty much done. There really isn't any place else. I mean, there are a couple of 1940s buildings with parking areas in front, like if somebody were to take those down and want to build something bigger, you know, that's a possibility that I'm kind of thinking that's not likely. So it seemed like the opportunity for new construction was on Federal. I just wonder if you all had any thoughts about that.

Bill Frazier: I would just add briefly that, you know, on Washington, you have so many, you know, it's just so rich with small scale appendages and [inaudible] and setbacks, a little bit of stone, a little bit of landscape, and it's very random. But yet it has a very interesting order. And it's not like your typical, you know, Main Street you find somewhere in a bigger, bigger town. But then that's not real practical someone is building a new half a block long office building or apartment building. And so but then, you know, some law firm wanted to come in and said, look, I've got a two and a half story Georgian copy that looks just like the one on the edge of town. And can I build that on Federal for my offices. Do you want a pseudo-Georgian building sitting there? Do you want to a little organically, sort of grown building like [inaudible] on Main Street, or do you want something that's going to be larger and still break it up and let it look like a still one ownership and one building? So those are just some of the issues we were grappling with.

Kathy Frazier: And I have another thought of and just in studying your community, a lot of the new construction, the dormers are shed dormers. not [inaudible]. And so you have a lot of that. And you even have added it's been kind of clever on some of the older buildings, maybe like a house. There'll be an addition on the back and then shed dormers were put in to increase the interior space. So that's definitely been something that the shed dormer has been used a lot. So I don't know, just kind of curious what you all. Do you have any thoughts? I mean, suggestions?

Cindy Pearson: I believe I'm right, Will, come on back. But we were going to have a charrette on Federal Street, and we weren't able to have it because of COVID. So [off mic]

Estee LaClare: It's a design charrette and we were going to basically bring a number of parties together to discuss how we wanted to look at Federal Street and design it or redesign it or redevelop it, if you will with connectivity. Yeah, but that was put on hold due to covid because we could not gather at that point in time and per some of our right ups, I think we pushed that to August, I believe.

Cindy Pearson: At least, I'm sure. So I would say that might have to go on hold as it will come back to maybe clarify that for us.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I think it's an excellent question. It takes me back to the days when I sat on the planning commission, and we were talking about what the underlying zoning was there and whether that zoning would need to or should change based on the needs of the town and the community. Right. So I think it's probably a bigger issue than just a historic guideline.

Estee LaClare: So they're talking about like the connectivity, there's a lack of sidewalks, [inaudible] gutters, some of the. For instance, the dry cleaner over in that section on Federal could potentially down the road maybe look at redevelopment of some sort. So that's what the charrette was going to explore and bring lots of.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm sorry, I don't know the word charrette.

Tim Clites: The best way to describe it is when a group of people get together and brainstorm the potential.

Virginia Jenkins: I have never heard that word in my life.

Estee LaClare: No, but it's a great question because I seriously had to because they were talking about, I'm like, I don't know what they're talking about.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic]

Tim Clites: [multiple speakers] We need a wiser architect than me, but I think it relates or refers to when architects used to have deadlines and they would was it a cart or something? It's a French term that refers to a cart that you had to put your design in to take for it to review. And you would be doing a charrette because you sit in the cart [multiple speakers] [off mic]

Tim Clites: That's the contemporary version. [off mic] [laughter] There's been so back-to-back to the question at hand. I think that's an excellent question. I don't think we can I don't think we can resolve that in this guideline. But I think it should be part of if we're going to do something in August or this fall, that'd be great.

Estee LaClare: And maybe what we do then is after the charrette, we establish all that due to the fact that we can't these guidelines are going to be different from the ones we have. These are going to be living documents where we can add and change things as we go along, and then we can incorporate those findings into it and update it to make it a very functional day to day document. So I think that's a good way to handle that.

Tim Clites: I would agree.

Kathy Frazier: That's great because, you know, that's kind of what we were thinking, that it really needed some master planning. So it's terrific that you're going to do a charrette.

Bill Frazier: Yeah, we can leave our written guidelines in there, obviously, for new construction. But, you know, the generally what we're talking about in these historic districts for example if we were talking about a building on Washington, you know, there's a very established context there and that's what we drew the whole a whole lot of buildings and that you would be referring and studying those forms scaled mass height, width, material, openings, orientation and so forth, when you designed a new building to fit in. But like I think everyone's agreeing maybe graphically, we're going to probably not step back a little bit and wait for you all to resolve that issue, because I think what you all talked about in terms of the zoning and the master plan and the vision for that area would then result [inaudible] they could fit these

guidelines for that area. It's almost like partially urban design comes first and then the guidelines reflect that.

Kathy Frazier: And where the guidelines might help that master planning process, we really define a lot of what makes Middleburg Middleburg. And so you could be taking those components defined in the guidelines to help inform the master planning charrette processes. [inaudible] [multiple speakers]

Bill Anderson: Once the zoning is done yeah.

Tim Clites: Perfect. That's a good approach. Yes.

Bill Frazier: The graphics that Kathy was saying that we're continue to working on graphics, you saw samples of our stuff, you'll see.

Kathy Frazier: We've been working on all that. And we've got to the new construction and that's when we kind of went oh. Okay, what do we do? We'll keep moving along. And now that we have to text back from you, we can start getting that into to the layout of the document, in the grading photographs [inaudible].

Bill Frazier: Yeah. And I think for the new construction guidelines, we can talk about the context for Washington and Marshall and Federal to a certain extent, and we can say here are the guidelines that, you know, that we recommend for a new building in the historic district. However, these three streets or some areas are quite different. Their context is quite different. And we can describe their context in a paragraph and and explain that. And we're going to go into we're going to have some more diagrams about context to describe the context of the district. So we'll give [inaudible]. [off mic]

Bill Anderson: I think that was me.

Kathy Frazier: Can you still hear us?

Bill Anderson: I can.

Bill Frazier: Yeah, ok. OK, so I just wanted to let you know we're not. We can go pretty far with this and maybe we don't have some graphics for the Federal Street area, but we can do a lot. So I do want to think we're just going to leave that section of the guidelines out. We won't to do that.

Estee LaClare: That sounds like a good plan. I think that incorporates it.

Tim Clites: I think that's a good approach, and just so everyone kind of has the picture of why this is important, if you go down Madison Street and turn right on Federal everything to the left or most of what's to the left has a very different feel than the other streets that we're talking about. And so when we turn to the left and we think about if someone were to come in where George White and redevelop that now's the time for us to start to think about what that might look like, not in this guideline, but in the next, you know, a couple of months or a year or so. So thank you for bringing that to our attention.

Bill Frazier: There's one other thing that wasn't on the list, that we just I just wanted to bring up you mentioned about these temporary tents. We've got to ask you the question. How do you want to deal with that?

Estee LaClare: Right Will had suggested that we hold off on dealing with that because we'll deal with that with the zoning ordinance and get into that there.

Bill Frazier: Ok. Well, that's all we have, but we you know, you all have anything else, let us know this is that I know a long process for you all and this is probably the best set of edits we've received, the best coordinated set of edits we've received in some time and appreciate all the work that you all went into to do that at this first draft. And we'll make all those edits and then the next version will be with the graphics laid out in InDesign as [inaudible].

Tim Clites: We await the final draft. You're welcome. Estee gets all the credit for that. She's done all the hard work.

Estee LaClare: No, I cannot take it because you all have been dedicated and they're still here and it is now 8:30 at night and this is becoming way too routine. So we appreciate your dedication. And Bill and Kathy, thank you very much to

Estee LaClare: You're a great team. You all did a great job. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Good night.

Kathy Frazier: Just a moment. [off mic]

Tim Clites: I can show you the windows. But since it's informal.

Rhonda North: Cannot discuss as a group, anything outside.

Tim Clites: So since we can't discuss as a group. Yes. Thank you, Rhonda. Why don't you just give me three minutes. I won't take a long time, but I'll use the samples that we have to give you a quick preview of some of the things that we've been talking about. [off mic] When we ask someone to give us a painted wood window, what they're going to give us and what we would accept often is not a window where the sash has a weight and chain, but it actually has a kind of jam liner and that allows the upper sash and the lower sash to move inside the window. It's not a detail, you see, because we get these little sections through the window like that. And that's what we approved in our committee [inaudible] this is what it looks like. So traditional windowsill, sash. Perhaps, an added [off mic] this is a brick mold for our different casings. This one is particularly has a name because it was often used in brick construction. And so all of the wood that you see on this side of the window you're on the outside the window I'm on the inside would get painted whatever color is approved. A wood window. Most major manufacturers make their base model out of pine. And as you just heard it is absolutely true the pine is growing faster and faster and meaning they're harvesting it as it grows and it's just not great quality. So if you were to look at the closest match to that window from the same manufacturer and there are a handful of manufacturers that do a fairly good job of this. This is the painted clad version. The cladding is aluminum. The reason aluminum is, in my opinion, better than, say, a vinyl is because these corners and these edges are nice and crisp and sharp. [inaudible] The vinyl also doesn't have a nice seam. That seam actually looks [inaudible]. The vinyl that's that going to be at an angle or it's going to have some glue it's just messier. So this is a clad window that would be the sister to this wood window. From the distance you are away from it. You could look and tell which was which, but you'd have to really look because some of the subtle differences are you notice there's an extra little piece here that's not over here. This piece and this piece exists the same. And the reason for that has to do with getting a screen into a clad window versus in a wood window. They drill a little hole like this and the screen actually attaches. [off mic] From about fifteen or twenty feet, ninety five percent of the world wouldn't notice the difference. In all of these. Whether there would or clad you can muntin width. This is the little piece that goes on the outside and inside of the glass and all of the major manufacturers of windows put a little piece of metal in here. It's called a spacer bar so that when you look through that window at an angle, I can't see you. Right between these pieces of glass and so that's called SDL or simulated divided light. And the reason it's simulated is in an old window that muntin went the whole way through and that's a single piece of glass. It's super energy inefficient. And now we have that little sandwich of glass with a gas filling and that's super energy efficient. So a window

like this, you can get the same glass in a wood painted window, that we can require that it will meet the energy code. But the question I pose that I think is worth considering so we just looked at an application earlier tonight and we looked at synthetic columns. We looked at what technically is synthetic stucco. We looked at synthetic trim. And then we said, but we want a painted wood window, very different than the doors, which I think we all have this consensus that it's worth replacing the door every 15 years if you have to have that feel of a solid door that you touch and feel. The windows on many commercial structures aren't used as much as you might use a window in your house. And so the idea of having them be wood and be a fairly significant maintenance issue is one that I thought was worth considering. Not that our work matters. It's mostly residential, but in the residential area, our work right now, about 95 percent of our projects are clad in some form. There's a whole bunch of other things we can get into around the casings and how the casings actually fit. One of the things that you'll actually notice sometimes in a clad release you see this little piece that sticks forward, the window actually goes in the wall and back to this point and then the casing goes on the outside. And it's one of the problems of a clad window. If you trim it in the field as they use that term, the casing sits like this, and you see this extra little scene. It's one of the giveaways of a clad window. If you use their clad window product, you get a little [inaudible]. For instance, on a commercial building, they went off and go ahead and pick from whatever manufacturer or manufacturers they were considering, and they actually use a clad casing as well. And it's because these things are designed to interlock and have a very clean determine. Window industry uses a sightline and sightline is really the way I describe it is what do you actually see when you look at it? Where do you see the little seams in the corners in the [inaudible] This has what's considered to be a clean sight line. That's the architectural way of describing we think it's pretty decent window. I did just by chance bump into Andrew on the street and he saw me carrying this in and so why are you carrying that in. And he listed off four or five manufacturers. One of the things we'll have to be careful of as a committee is if we like or think this product is worth allowing in new buildings. Will one of them be very specific about the kinds of things that we allow and don't allow. For instance, the muntins between the glass. we just write our guidelines to say that's just never allowed. The width of the muntins, they can actually go [inaudible]. You know, this you often see in like a two over two double home window that have a big fat muntin because it's a big piece of glass. And historically, that's how much structure they needed to kind of bridge that. So we can these clad windows can replicate even things as wide and as authentic as that if someone's designing and trying to meet a certain style in their building. So this is the ring of for this manufacturer, they can get as small as that, which is like the really traditional federal windows, little six over six windows, they these tiny little muntins. So they can do that. This is the most traditional or standard size 72 inch. Just the way [inaudible] to show you all. There's a lot of flexibility within a clad window. There are some limitations visually, but I think for new buildings, it's worth us considering. And it sounds like that's what our consultant, both our consultant for historic guidelines and also the architect that's working on the town, I think we should decide this independent of the town's project. But there's a perfect example of where we are allowing synthetics on every piece of the building except this one component.

Cindy Pearson: Do you have a window back there? [inaudible]

Tim Clites: Yeah so, the window back here? Yeah, this is this is I just picked this up and show you. So now you're 15 feet away from a clad window. It's got it's got a big casing on the outside and particularly suited for this area. The top sash has an inch and an eighth muntin in the bottom one has a seven eighth inch muntin just so you can see the different scale. This is what the detail would look like if you ignore this round piece. This is what a clad window looks like. And [inaudible] sash, a different manufacturers then the one I'm showing you not that it's manufacturer specific in their showroom [inaudible] side by side and from Punkin to I, you had to stand. You had to guess which one was which. When you look at the seams, you know, so some manufacturers do a very good job and it's become so architectural and historic community has pushed them to do so.

Estee LaClare: That was very good thank you.

Cindy Pearson: I'm sorry, I'm terrible with names, Andrew, thank you. He said something about a door similar that it had wood and then a different color.

Rhonda North: Aluminum clad door.

Tim Clites: It would be built just like this. It actually would be thicker because it needs more structure. This would be taller, but if you cut through it would look like this. It would have clad on the outside it would be a wooden frame [inaudible]. It feels like.

Cindy Pearson: He said it would have the heaviness that you want with the door.

Tim Clites: And it takes away the doors that so often are used in the [off mic] plastic both sides just they just feel. Yeah, [multiple speakers] [off mic]

Tim Clites: All right, what can we do to wrap up Bill? Do you have any comments? I know. I guess you would. Sorry, I had my back to you the whole time. Do you have any comments related to clad windows that you can share?

Bill Anderson: I thought, as I said before, that the aluminum clad windows to me are because of the crisp lines and less maintenance. I think there is a color. You have less opportunity to pick colors. Normally you have to go with a manufacturer's standard or pay enormous prices to get a custom color. But that was a terrific presentation. One thing you mentioned through, all the other materials on the exterior trim are also basically, you know, man-made composites, things like the trim along the, underneath the roof. Really? There's so much opportunity there given to what manufacturers make. There's never really a problem. I think the problem is when they try to pick columns with the capitals and the bases and the manufacturing, especially not in a traditional design, manufacturers have very little choices. So to get what we want, it's going to have to be probably put together and made for the job, because if we pick from what they have, I don't know how happy we'd be with that. But anyway, that's one of the problems there.

Tim Clites: Yeah, absolutely. You're absolutely right. Related to the town hall projects. The details we'll look at later OK, that's all I have, that's for show and tell, and I'm not trying to convince you all one way or the other, I did just think it's kind of useful to see this some of this stuff in living color. And what do we have else to go over this evening? Quorum for our next meeting. Do I have to be sitting in my chair to do this? All right. Who's going to be here? [off mic]

Bill Anderson: It is June 17?

Tim Clites: Yes. Two weeks from now. Yes.

Bill Anderson: I can't confirm I'm going to be available.

Tim Clites: All right, well, let Estee or Will or Rhonda know in the next week, if you can. Just so we're sure we have a quorum if it's a public meeting that will be kind of important. All right, somebody,

Bill Anderson: Can I bring up a question. Not to I know everybody wants to go home, but I thought I forgot who brought it up on the group here. But when they were looking at the elevations of the proposed town hall, somebody brought up the idea of [inaudible] mentioned and not double hung. Given that you were talking about windows I don't think that issue was really discussed very much. Do you think it's important to discuss that? It won't change the proportions on the grand scale, but it might be more of a nod towards a more traditional Middleburg with double hung. Again, it wasn't discussed but we may want to talk about that if you all think it's important. [off mic]

Tim Clites: I'm sorry, it was a valid question we had never brought up. [off mic]

Bill Anderson: Someone brought.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic]

Tim Clites: Well.

Bill Anderson: Sorry, it would be a very, very simple thing for the architect because this cad to show an elevation for double hung windows for consideration. Just so just a thought.

Rhonda North: I'll talk to the architect and see if there was a reason that he proposed the casement over the double hung. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Yeah, if he if he just took the front elevation, I think that most prominent is North from the garage or from the parking. Yeah, they just did one study. I think that would be enough for us to feel. [off mic]. Yeah, I think so. All right. Thank you all. We're adjourned. Thank you for all your time this evening.