



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



**Thursday, August 4, 2022
PENDING APPROVAL**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, August 4, 2022, in the Town Hall Council Chambers. Chair Clites called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Town Clerk North called the roll.

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

STAFF: William Moore, Deputy Town Manager/Town Planner
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk
Estee LaClare, Planning & Project Associate

ABSENT: Margaret Littleton

Presentation of 2022 Legacy Award

Chair Clites explained that the Committee recently recommended that awards be given annually to those who had done an exemplary job of preserving, restoring, and maintaining historic buildings in Middleburg, including a Legacy Award. He further explained that the Legacy Award would be given to a person, building or institution that help create the sense of Middleburg. Mr. Clites announced that the first Legacy Award was given to Bill Turnure, who served for thirty plus years on the HDRC, and helped shape it from its infancy. He expressed the Committee’s appreciation to Mr. Turnure for his years of caring about the Town and presented him with the award.

Bill Turnure opined that the members of the HDRC did a great job. He further opined that the Committee, Council, and staff were exemplary and contributed to the community. Mr. Turnure noted that the Committee’s goal was to preserve the architectural nature of the town and opined that they had done a wonderful job of doing so. He advised that what made Middleburg special was its people. Mr. Turnure noted the recently installed new street and directional signage and opined that it looked awesome.

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the July 11, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes as presented.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, and Wright and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Committee Member Littleton
(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

New Business

COA 22-19 (S 22-11): Projecting Sign – 3 S. Madison Street – Washington Fine Properties

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, appeared before the Committee representing the application. He advised that it was the same sign as was approved before, only it was scaled down for their new facility. Mr. Ralph noted that the bracket would need to be raised, as this sign was taller than the previous one in that location. He confirmed the bracket would be black and would not contain lights. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that he did not know who painted the door, as that was not a part of this application.

Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Committee Member Anderson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 22-19 (S 22-11) a request of William Moody for a projecting sign at 3 South Madison Street (Washington Fine Properties).

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Member Littleton

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

COA 22-20: Replacement fascia, soffit & gutters – 113 W. Washington Street – Middleburg Post Office

Mike Morency, the applicant, advised the Committee that he owned the building. He explained that the wooden fascia on the right end was rotted and must be replaced. Mr. Morency advised that he would like to replace it with a PVC material. He noted that it was difficult to get paint to adhere to the OG gutter; therefore, he would like to replace it with a white aluminum OG gutter that was the same style as the existing one. Mr. Morency advised that he also needed to replace the soffit and wished to do so using the same PVC material as was proposed for the fascia. He noted that it would be the same dimension and color as currently existed.

The Committee agreed this was fine as long as the dimensions were the same and the gutter was the same profile. They suggested a different type of gutter could also be considered.

Mr. Morency advised that he was happy to consider a different style. He noted that he had a half round gutter on his house; however, the snow created sag problems with it. Mr. Morency advised that he would prefer a pre-finished gutter.

Chair Clites advised that while a half round gutter was classic, an OG gutter would handle more volume. He suggested an adequately sized half round gutter may function better.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Morency confirmed the remainder of the materials would stay and simply be repainted.

Chair Clites noted that the PVC material tended to expand and contract. He suggested the use of Virale, which was not a PVC material; however, it would look the same and last as long as PVC.

Mr. Morency advised that he was open to anything that worked better.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 22-20, a request of Mike Morency for replacement fascia, soffit and gutters at 113 West Washington Street (Middleburg Post Office), with the clarification that (1) the applicant could use a synthetic product that is smooth and of the same dimension as the wood that's there; and (2) the option to replace the gutter with either a white pre-finished OG or a white pre-finished half round.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Member Littleton

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

Chair Clites noted that at the request of the applicant, COA RS 22-05 would be considered next month.

COA 22-21: Revise Roof Specifications for New Town Hall – 10 W. Marshall Street – Town of Middleburg

Town Manager Davis appeared before the Committee representing the application. He noted that Andrew Moore, of Glave & Holmes, and Bill Downey, of Downey & Scott, were also present to answer any questions the members may have. Mr. Davis explained that the Town spent weeks trying to find a solution that would allow for the use of the approved crimped ridge; however, due to the size and commercial nature of the building, this was a challenge. He further explained that the manufacturer would not warranty it if the ridge was crimped, as they were concerned the panels could pull off due to snow, nor would they use a metal gauge that was UL 90 rated against wind damage. Mr. Davis advised that the Town was requesting approval for a low-profile ridge cap and displayed a sample. He noted that there was a second option (Option B) that was also a low-profile ridge cap; however, it contained a single piece of metal to create a simulated crimp.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Andrew Moore advised that either option would work. He opined that Option B more closely matched the design the Committee previously approved.

Chair Clites noted that the HDRC was generally not in favor of larger commercial ridge caps; however, he opined that the proposed low-profile one was less noticeable.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed to go with the low-profile ridge cap. They expressed a preference for Option B, with the simulated crimp, if the manufacturer would warranty it; however, they agreed they were okay with either option.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee considered few commercial buildings of this nature. He suggested it was important to address this issue for this and future applications. Mr. Clites further suggested the Committee work with the staff in the future to amend the Historic District Guidelines.

The Committee held some discussion of the differences between residential and commercial roofs.

Bill Downey, of Downey & Scott, noted that the Town Hall was classified as a public safety facility; therefore, it was important to have a manufacturer's warranty and to use UL rated materials so the roof would not be compromised.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that in the past, they have avoided the use of faux materials. He suggested they not approve something that would disguise it was something it was not. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines recommended false elements not be created in a historic district. He suggested the need for the Committee to compare the options to the Historic District Guidelines before making a decision.

The Committee noted that the guidelines allowed new materials for new buildings. They further noted that Option B was closer to the original design than just a flat cap. The Committee held some discussion of the two options, including whether adding the simulated ridge would be overkill.

Andrew Moore reminded the Committee that the lines would also be visible on the roof hips. He opined that the simulated ridge was an important detail.

Some members of the Committee opined that the simulated ridge would better define the roof line and would be closer to the design, while others opined that it was not needed. It was reiterated that this was a new building; therefore, the Committee would not be creating a precedent with this approval.

Committee Member Anderson moved, seconded by Chair Clites, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 22-21, a request of the Town of Middleburg to revise the roof specifications for the new Town Hall at 10 West Marshall Street, with Option A or Option B, with a preference toward Option B.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Member Littleton

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

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Andrew Moore reported that he was impressed with the solidity of the structure. He opined that the connection could be felt between the building and its surroundings.

Discussion Items

Chair Clites recused himself, as he had a conflict of interest regarding the next agenda item. Vice Chair Lee assumed the chair.

Pre-Application Discussion: Relocation of Stone Outbuilding & Addition to Principal Structure – 408 E. Washington Street

Tim Clites, the architect, and Chris and Caroline Hersh, the applicants, appeared before the Committee. Mr. Clites explained that he provided a schematic design for the members' review and discussion. He advised that he would return with a detailed final location for the stone outbuilding, as they were not sure whether they planned to move or rebuild it and noted that they were considering three possible locations. Mr. Clites advised that the overhead electric lines needed to be taken into consideration and advised that they were trying to determine whether they could be buried.

Mr. Clites reminded the Committee of the design to construct an addition, which was proposed to be perpendicular to the main house. He proposed that the roofline be like a hyphen between the house and the addition. Mr. Clites advised the Committee that he would like their comments on his initial design. He reminded them that the existing additions were a combination of siding and stucco. Mr. Clites advised that they were proposing the new addition be siding, with all the additions being painted the same as yet

unidentified color. Mr. Clites advised that the windows on the addition would be aluminum clad, with simulated divided lights. He noted that they would also like to replace some of the existing windows. Mr. Clites advised that the standing seam metal roof would be folded at the ridge to match the one on the original house. He noted that he was proposing the gutters be pre-finished aluminum; however, he was looking for the Committee's input on that.

The Committee advised that they liked what they were seeing, with the exception of the pre-finished aluminum gutters. They noted that they looked forward to seeing the final design. The Committee opined that what was proposed for the windows fit nicely. They advised that any location for the stone outbuilding would be fine, as long as it was saved.

The Committee suggested that something jumped out at them regarding the proportion of the materials on the rear chimney. They held some discussion of its design. The Committee suggested the brick be higher and the stone align with the foundation, so it was less visible.

In response to the Committee's comments, Mr. Clites agreed the chimney needed to be weightier at bottom since it was so tall. He confirmed that real stone veneer would be used.

Mr. Clites noted the setback requirements related to historic structures. He suggested the stone outbuilding be relocated so it would be in front of the house and visible.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed that any of the proposed locations would work from a zoning perspective. He opined that the one closest to the roadway may, however, create a safety issue, as it was so close to the driveway.

The Committee opined that either front location would create an interesting gateway. They noted the garage on the lower level of the addition and suggested the elimination of two of the windows to improve the feel of the chimney.

Mr. Clites advised the Committee that he would look at a different scale window. He expressed appreciation for the Committee's input.

The Committee advised that they liked the idea of relocating the stone outbuilding to the front of the property, as it would present a nice approach to the Town's entrance.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the roof on the stone outbuilding was not approved by the HDRC, nor were the vinyl windows on the original structure. He advised that if the stone outbuilding was relocated, consideration needed to be given to its roof.

Chair Clites resumed the chair.

Information Items

2022 Joint Architectural Review Board Awards

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the JARB awards ceremony would be held on September 22nd in Hillsboro. She noted that the members would receive an invitation to it.

Chair Clites and Vice Chair Lee noted that the JARB committee members became more animated when they reviewed Middleburg's applications. Chair Clites noted that Middleburg was at a different scale than the other towns and noted that the review made him realize what a gem it was.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources Workshops

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that she attended three workshops and noted that she provided a summary of them for anyone who was interested.

Quorum – September Meeting

Those members who were present indicated they would be present during the September 1st meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:01 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – August 4, 2022

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

Rhonda North: It's 5:30.

Tim Clites: I'll bring this meeting to order. This is the Thursday, August the fourth, 2022 Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's monthly meeting. The first order of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Here.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton is absent. Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Second item on our agenda is public comments. If anyone is here from the public and wishes to speak to us before we start our regular meeting will pause for a minute. If you're on the agenda, we'll get to you in the order listed. The next item. Having no public comments is something that we're glad to see Mr. Turnure here a couple of well, actually it was when you were on the committee, I think we started talking about how we would recognize people that had worked on buildings in the town and done a kind of exemplary job at preserving and restoring and maintaining historic buildings. And as the committee this year worked on how that award, what that award or recognition might look like, we realized that there's another potential recognition, which is legacy buildings, buildings that have been here a long time and maybe not much has been done to them, but they still kind of help create the sense of Middleburg and along with legacy buildings, are legacy people. I just couldn't wait to say that. [laughter] And or institutions that support the work that we do here, both at the town level and in this committee. So we we created this year two awards of one group was given out a couple of months ago during the month of May, which is Historic Preservation Month. And Mr. Turnure couldn't be here. And so he we waited until tonight, but we have a second award called the Legacy Award. It's the first year that we've done that, and it is to recognize there's only one person building or institution a year. And after I forget 30 how many it was. Bill maybe you remember, maybe you don't want to remember. [off mic] Around 30 or 35, you know, before some of us were born. But something like that no, Bill spent a long time on this

committee, shaped it, I think, from almost its infancy through a lot of projects in town and I'm sure a lot of ups and downs and handed us, I think, a wonderful town that, you know, a lot of credit to him and everyone that he worked with over the years. And so when we asked for nominations from the committee hands down, Bill's name was listed more frequently than anything else. So we're very happy to have him here tonight and recognize and express our appreciation for all of those years of caring for our town. And by the way, we're also happy to hear that you're retired and enjoying a life in South Carolina. And so thanks for taking the time out of a visit here to come and see us and accept this recognition.

Bill Turnure: Well, I'm so happy when I read your email. When you sent that to me, Tim, it almost took me to tears. It was such, so unexpected. You know, my time here was wonderful. And we did such a great job on this committee. I mean, Punkin has probably been here working on this committee as long as I have, if not longer. And the people who have been on this committee, the staff, you know, even the mayors and and the town managers and the zoning administrators, I mean, Will's exemplary, but there's so many David [Inaudible] and oh, and there's so many who really contributed to everything that this committee does. And when the town council set it up, I guess in 88 or 89, it was to preserve the historical nature, architectural nature of the of the town. And I think it's done a wonderful job. And the town council should be given a pat on the back for even establishing this this committee, because it really has done a miraculous job. And look, listen, I got here for and had some lunch. My son works. He's the next legacy. He works here in town for for Tom Wiseman. So he's getting a new feel for what Middleburg really is, too. And it is the people, you know, the people who live here and and work here and and shop here not, you know, it's not the people coming in on the busses and so forth. They mean they see the town. But that's not what it really is. It's deep down it's the heart of the the people who live here that make Middleburg a very special place. And we miss it a great deal. And the people. But we've found a great spot in South Carolina. My golf game is not getting any better. I'm not getting used to the heat anymore, but it's wonderful to be back. It's great to see everybody again. And just the know, just driving over here, I said, God, how many times did I do this? You know, come over to this is town office. And what is going on over here is just blows my mind. So good luck to you all with finishing that. And another thing I noticed today, too, was the street signage and the directional signs which look awesome. That really such an addition to the town. I think that was a nice thing that the town did and we went through several iterations to get to to that final decision. But they look great, too. So anyway, thank you all so much. And again, we miss you all, but we will be back from time to time.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Well, and like we said before the meeting, I think I have to present tonight, so Punkin will be happy for you just to stay [multiple speakers]

Bill Turnure: Well, I wouldn't take that away from her.

Tim Clites: Well, I can't describe the look on some of my committee members face when I landed and they suddenly voted that I would be the next chair. You're not supposed to talk more than two outside of that, but.

Bill Turnure: They'll look to you for the next 30 years. [laughter] Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. [applause] And like we say to other folks, you don't feel like you have to stay all night if you don't want to. [off mic] So. Well, thanks again. We appreciate it very much.

Bill Turnure: Thank you. And this is a note. I just think I mean, not that I was the recipient of this award, but I think this is a really good thing. I think we talked about this before when we started this discussion to really start to, you know, pick some people out who are doing special things around town, not only architecturally but anywhere, to really pick up the momentum of what's going on in Middleburg. I think it's a great thing.

Tim Clites: Well, I had a little comment. Punkin and I they started the JARB Awards back again this year after being dormant for about five years. And so Punkin and I went to that voting for and all. As for those of you who don't know that Loudoun County has a historic oversight committee for the whole county, and then three of the Middleburg being one, three of the incorporated towns have historic districts and so they all nominate projects from their jurisdiction. And then the whole committee gets together to vote on the Joint Architectural Review Board winners for the year. And so we were there. And the one comment that stuck out, which kind of made me chuckle, was one of the people said about signage, Yeah, we can always count on Middleburg to have great signage, right? Anyway, so we'll get to that later in our meeting, we did get a couple of award winners. There's been some really nice things done in town, and so we like the fact that as a town we can actually kind of come back to the community and say thanks for, you know, kind of picking up the mantle that we try to carry here. So thank you. All right. Next order of business approval of the meeting minutes from the July 11th, 2022 meeting. Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes or are there any edits? Seeing none. I would move we approve the minutes as presented.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor. Motion passes. That's what I'm practicing, Bill. I forget to say that. All right. Action item new business COA 22-19 S 22-11 Request of William Moody for a projecting sign at 3 South Madison Street, Washington Fine Properties. And Mr. Ralph, are you here on behalf of the applicant? You're welcome to come up and say hello or just shout if it's easier.

John Ralph: I'll shout if you don't mind.

Tim Clites: That's perfectly fine. Any words of wisdom beyond the application that we are reviewing.

John Ralph: It's honestly, it's the same sign you've approved before for a different location, just scaled down for their new facility. So the only thing that would be the only thing that's really changing is you have to raise the bracket from where it is now currently to clear the sidewalk, appropriately,

Tim Clites: Raise it. And is it it's a slightly bigger bracket or the same size.

John Ralph: I believe it is the same size bracket.

Tim Clites: Same size. It's just taller or higher.

John Ralph: The taller sign, it just doesn't go up. But other than that, it's the same sign. Exact same sign they have now just reduced in scale.

Punkin Lee: And the bracket is black. Correct. Thank you.

Tim Clites: And no lights. All right. Well. Any comment, Cindy?

Cindy Pearson: Looks good. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No. Are they going to paint the door, or no? Do you know?

John Ralph: I can't answer that. I know it wasn't part of this application.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I'm sure.

John Ralph: Yeah, but I mean, it could have been part of this as part of the COA, but it was not. But I know this was also a very, very last-minute thing. Wouldn't surprise me if you saw that next month. Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda?

Linda Wright: No, I think it looks good.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I'm good.

Tim Clites: Bill.

Bill Anderson: I also like the sign. It's good.

Tim Clites: Awesome. I have no comments. If someone makes a motion.

Punkin Lee: Make a motion we approve COA 22-19 S 22-11 Request of William Moody for projecting sign at 3 South Madison Street Washington Fine Properties.

Bill Anderson: Second the motion.

Tim Clites: [off mic]

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Motion passes. Sorry. Forgot to have my mic on. It's on now. All right, next action item COA 22-20 Request of Mike Morency for replacement fascia, soffit and gutters at 113 West Washington Street, the Middleburg Post Office. And I believe Mike is here.

Mike Morency: I am indeed.

Tim Clites: If you want to.

Mike Morency: So I don't know if.

Tim Clites: You want to state your name, they record all this and someone else.

Mike Morency: Happy to do that. I'm Mike Morency. I own the Middleburg Post Office property and the fascia board at the right-hand end facing the building has rotted out and it needs to be replaced. And it was it's a wood and I'd like to replace it with this PVC material, which I believe is indistinguishable from the wood. And obviously the reason being so that we don't have that problem again. And while we're doing that, the gutter we've had a hard time over the years with paint sticking to the to the gutter. It's a galvanized OG gutter that's been on there quite a long time. And so while we're doing that work, we'd like to replace that with white aluminum OG gutter, which is the same style that's on there and probably the soffit needs to be replaced too, and it would be the same material. So this is a sample I got from Middleburg mill work is obviously not the size of the material. We would replace the material with the same dimension material. It's I think a one by six or a one by eight on the on the fascia and probably the same on the soffit. And the dimension would be the same. Just different material, same colors to.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Mike. Cindy, you want to start with any questions or comments?

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any questions at this moment. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Seems pretty straightforward to me.

Tim Clites: Thank you. [off mic] It's fine. Just want to check with everybody.

Linda Wright: No, I'm fine with replacing in-kind, so it looks exactly the same. I think a better material. Be less maintenance for you.

Mike Morency: Right?

Linda Wright: I'm fine with that.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Linda. I think it'd be a nice improvement and look nice. Nice and fresh.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill.

Bill Anderson: I like replacing in kind with this material. Will look just fine as long as dimensions stay the same. As far as the gutters concern if the aluminum gutter is the same profile make sense or a different type of gutter could also be considered not just the typical residential OG. In other words, some half round material that would fit the style with the roof just for consideration.

Mike Morency: Be happy to consider a different, different style. We have a half round gutters on our house and had some problems with snow coming down off the metal roof and causing the gutter to sag. And and so that would be a concern of mine. It doesn't seem to be as much of a problem with the OG, but certainly happy to go either way. But it would certainly prefer a prefinished gutter. And so anyway, it's hard to find someone to do the work these days. And I think that Mark Wright is going to do the work. And so I'd like to go ahead with it, and I can certainly he has a Gutter man. I can ask him what other types of gutter he has and then would I need to come back to the committee for that.

Tim Clites: We could talk about it. I don't. I don't I think if there was half rounds and someone was asking you go to OG, we might I mean, the half round seems like the classic gutter. I mean, the only concern I might have is if this gutter and its volume on an OG is much better, it's going to handle more volume more easily. And so from a how well does it work and function you might to get a half round adequately size might be a step larger than the OG that's here, so you know, on balance it maybe you know, it's kind of that's the question.

Bill Anderson: How much how many downspouts.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And that that you're probably not changing, right. Given the building's been there. So my couple of questions just to understand, make sure I understand so I understand the gutter would come off, the fascia behind it would be replaced and probably some of the soffit at the horizontal. But the freeze and everything against the brick of the building would stay. This would be repainted. Is that right?

Mike Morency: Yes, that's correct.

Tim Clites: And so the only and this has nothing to do with a specific product, but just as someone working in the field, we found the PVC on long runs tends to expand and contract a lot more than there's

another product which is a synthetic called Virale. It's not a PVC material. It's going to be smooth and paint and look the same. I would be open to either of those. I think long term they probably both last as long, but in our experience, something that doesn't expand and contract as much looks a little better over time because the joints will tend to open up, especially with a long run. But again, I think if it's painted white and it's the same dimension, no one's going to notice the difference.

Mike Morency: Well, I'd be happy to.

Tim Clites: Look at that.

Mike Morency: Look at that. And so maybe you could send me the product information on that.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And that's I think the.

Bill Anderson: Gutter man would know about that material.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Or Mark would also know. Yeah. It's just another option to the PVC. For a long time it was PVC seemed like the only option. But we've. All right, so sorry. I'm not here dispensing architectural advice.

Mike Morency: No, I'm open. Certainly open to anything that works better. And so if maybe I can give you a call and or an email and you can let me know what that I'm not familiar with that material, but.

Tim Clites: I'm happy to do that. If the committee is coming again from the committee's perspective. Right, if they would look the same. I mean, our guidelines and thank you, Estee I'm sorry, I didn't even ask for any of your input. I apologize. I need to learn my manners but thank you for your recap at the beginning as it relates to our guidelines. And I think this is interesting now, it's it's old enough that it's actually contributing, and this problem won't go away. So putting more wood up there just means you'll be back in a couple of years because the wood that's there is better than the wood you can buy today. My sensitivity was more around the freeze as it goes along the top of the brick. And I just think, you know, the fact that it's maybe got a little distress and it gets repainted, but it has the kind of layers of paint in the history I think is important. So that's where I was on the whole simple as Virginia says, it's pretty [inaudible].

Mike Morency: There is a lot of paint on there.

Tim Clites: It looks like it's getting another coat. Any further comments from the committee? If not, I would take an motion.

Virginia Jenkins: I'll make a motion to approve COA 22-20 request of Michael Morency for replacement of fascia, soffit, and gutters at 113 West Washington Street the Middleburg Post Office.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: And do we want to clarify?

Virginia Jenkins: Well, there's really nothing to clarify, because you're sort of giving him.

Tim Clites: Well, the way I would clarify it is as opposed to limiting him to PVC we could we could state that he could use a synthetic that is smooth and of the same dimensions as the wood that's there. Does that seem right Will? Because we don't want to specify a product that's not really within our purview. [off mic] And the gutter do we want to? That's the question. Do we are we okay with the OG or do we want to give him the option for either?

Virginia Jenkins: I think the option.

Tim Clites: The option to replace with either a white prefinished OG or a white prefinished half round.

Virginia Jenkins: Did you get all that?

Mike Morency: Yeah, that's fine.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed. Motion passes. Thank you, Mike.

Mike Morency: Thank you very much. And I'd like to say that I haven't met Estee before, but I read the summary that she did before the meeting, and I was impressed with everything that was in there.

Tim Clites: She's a big help to our committee. As are all of the staff. But yeah, Estee is.

Mike Morency: Our town is very fortunate to have all the staff that they have.

Tim Clites: We are. Thank you, Mike. Good to see you. All right. I believe the next item we are on the agenda. Gretchen, if I understand, I make sure no one's here on her behalf. I believe we're going to wait COA RS 22-05 until next month. And so we'll go to item D COA 22-21 request of the town of Middleburg to revise the roof specification for the new town hall at 10 West Marshall Street. We have a sample for us to review. It looks like we have the architect here. How are you?

Mike Morency: See you all.

Tim Clites: Good to see you. Thank you. Hopefully, you didn't come all the way just for this. You were already here. [off mic] Good, good. Well take some home with you. It's different here. It's special mud. So I'll pause for a minute. I don't know which of you would like to review this with the committee. I know we spoke, but I'll let you go ahead and present.

Will Moore: I'll let you have the benefit of my report in there. I'll just highlight that there were two options included in there, and I had some comments on one of those options in particular with potential concerns, with conformance with the guide. But Danny is functioning as the applicant here.

Tim Clites: State your name for the record.

Danny Davis: Yeah, that's right. Daniel Clark Davis. Danny Davis, town manager. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. And committee members. We do have with us our architects Andrew Moore from Glave and Holmes. Also have with us Bill Downey from Downey and Scott, who's our construction manager on this project. Just in case there are any questions about the the efforts we've been through or the challenges with the roof. We did provide you a memo, so I won't read that full item for you. But as noted in here, we spent a number of weeks with our general contractor trying to find a solution for the approved roof, which was a crimped ridge. And due to the size of the project and specifically the commercial nature of the project, we ran into significant challenges specifically with being able to get warranties on this roof and also being able to insure that it would have the UL 90 rating for wind uplift so that it would actually, from the manufacturer have assurances that it won't blow off in a windstorm. And clearly, this being a very

large building facing due north with nothing to buffer it, we have concerns about maintaining both the structural integrity of the roof, but also the weather tight functionality of it as we looked at options. Yeah, that's right. The manufacturer, again, part of their concern was if it's crimped with this size of a roof, panels, individual panels could pull off under the weight of snow. So we did not want to pursue a ridge, a traditional ridge cap option, because we knew that that was not ideal and desirable across the for the for the town. But our the roof manufacturer and working with the architects and the general contractor indicated they have this modified ridge cap, which is, as you see, two and a half inches and with compared to a typical six or ten, sometimes ten-inch ridge cap, very low profile. This would allow us to keep the warranties, keep the assurances that it would not blow off in a windstorm and also protect, really, the taxpayer's investment for a long time. So our request to you, let me point out real quick, this example they provided, this is not the color that was approved. This was just a sample of material they had in stock that they could quickly throw together an example to show the committee. So our request to you would be a modification of the approval to allow this modified ridge cap across the roof. And we're happy to answer any questions that you might have. As as we'll noted, there is kind of an Option B to this suggestion, which would be that there could be a a simulated vertical element added to the ridge cap that would give it more of that kind of crimped look all the way down. The challenge with that is it is a kind of a faux addition to it. So it's trying to make a kind of a fake, a historic look, which I know is not necessarily always desirable, but it is an option if if the committee has a desire to discuss that further, I will also note that Mr. Moore has Andrew Moore with Glave and Holmes did provide one photograph in the packet. It's of the red roof from Darden and that's an example of a modified ridge cap, but it has the vertical element added to it. You can see that specifically if you look closer at the cupola on that example.

Tim Clites: Andrew, what do you think is the most successful solution?

Andrew Moore: Between the two options proposed?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Andrew Moore: I'm actually ambivalent about that. The the option B that we had used on Darden is, I think, a closer match with the the vertical seam that you see most often in this application. It's interesting. I actually was not I had forgotten that when we did the documents for the project, we had proposed a flat seam at the top, which would be closer to this version. So I would say that if you want to try to keep as close to pasta as possible, to the actual design that we put in the documents, this is the way to go. If you're going down the road of the of the. Ridge cap anyway and sort of the falseness of it, if you will, of simulating the the seamed ridge, then it's a personal preference. Do you prefer to see this, which is more in keeping with a flat locked seam, or do you prefer to have the vertical seam? Either one is a solution for a simulated seamed ridge and I don't have a strong feeling one way or the other.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I mean, I think, you know, as a small town, looking at the few roofs here that have been installed with the larger commercial vented, I think that's the thing that that we're least in favor of. And so having not seen this or option B and trying to wrap my mind around the scale of that roof and whether, you know, whether there's I mean, this picture makes me feel like the vertical. You notice it and see it and maybe less notice than is the extra little line of the flat cap. But I'll go ahead and go round the room and let others comment. I just thank you for your input.

Andrew Moore: Yeah, you're welcome.

Tim Clites: Before we debated a little. Cindy?

Cindy Pearson: I'm going to pass and let everybody else speak. And if I have something, I'll come back.

Tim Clites: And feel free to ask questions also, anybody, if there's something that you don't understand about the drawings or the the issues. Virginia?

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

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I'm sort of in the same boat. I'm not as familiar with either one of these. I'd really like to hear what the architects have to say about it before I have a lot of opinion about it.

Tim Clites: Well, I would interrupt.

Linda Wright: Both are acceptable. Absolutely.

Tim Clites: But I would interrupt then as we go around the room, the thing that I notice, if you take this picture of the building at Darden and you zoom in to the cupola at the top where you can see the cap going away from us and you can see it kind of in elevation. And you look at this sample, the question is a simple one would you like the picture or the sample? I think that's the question before us, but I'll keep going around the room. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think it's kind of 50/50. I mean, either a solution will work to get the warranty and keep the roof from blowing away in the wind and all that. But I don't know. I think to me, the simpler it is, the better. This building and the building that's going up are like apples and oranges. So I don't know. I think simplicity would probably work better on this since either one will solve the issue.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill.

Bill Anderson: Just a first kind of question. How many manufacturers rejected the design warranty? A warranty on the design?

Danny Davis: So I know specifically they worked with this one manufacturer. I believe they reached out to a few others, Bill, is that correct?

Bill Downey: The big manufacturers, Engler, for example, architectural metals, they will not warranty the crimped ridge. And they're the preferred supplier manufacturer.

Bill Anderson: With regards to the design, I strongly feel a small vertical at the ridge is something that really stops your eye to me, that's really looks so much better and more traditional in my thinking, and that's what I would go with.

Tim Clites: There you heard the architects.

Cindy Pearson: I have a quick question. Is it the same on both sides of this roof? Is it's the same sample. Okay. Thank you.

Andrew Moore: I would also just kind of can I make one comment.

Tim Clites: Absolutely sure.

Andrew Moore: I just want to call your attention that one of the distinguishing features of the the seamed ridge is that the vertical seams of the panels are folded in. Right. So that's just another distinguishing feature of this low-profile ridge gap that you don't see in the manufactured standard ridge caps where you have that deep shadow line that basically sits at the top of the vertical seam without any kind of [inaudible]. So I just want to point out that that's another layer of approximation.

Tim Clites: Well, my input is and I know the other Mr. Moore says we don't create precedence here, but I think that we do few commercial buildings and this one has brought up an issue when staff brought it to me, I felt it was important that we address it both for the current applicant and for future applicants. And so I think it's good to view it in that perspective so that if and when the next commercial applicant comes in, we can say we do have an approved ridge and hip detail. And and so in that regard, I my preference is to have the vertical seam like Bill mentioned. I think it gets as close to that hand crimped ridge that we're used to seeing. And if it maintains the warranties and the staff and the contractors and the architects are comfortable with it, my thought would be to head that direction. But yes, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Would that be something that we change in our guidelines or add to the guidelines?

Tim Clites: And we could work with staff to decide how we do that. I think I'm not as focused on that tonight as I am just in concept. I think the guidelines are awesome compared to a couple of years ago, and this is something we probably would want to find a way to incorporate. Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Actually, we could if it came to that later on, we could incorporate a very similar detail of an acceptable design. And then that would because on a residential more steep design, well, residential would have crimped, so we might not even get there.

Tim Clites: That's what when we talked to a staff, I said, you know, a lot of the smaller contractors locally that work on residential and small-scale buildings, the warranty really is through them and they're so used to crimping the roofs, they do it and no one's brought the warranty to me up in 20 years. Right. So this is very different, you know, but I think in this case, yes.

Bill Downey: I just want to point out that this facility is considered a class three public safety facility, which really does lend itself to having the maximum amount of warranty that you can and making sure that all of the assemblies are tested under those uplift conditions and have been tested by UL under those conditions. So it's, in my opinion, critical with this type of facility not to ever compromise on the roofing or the envelope assemblies in the event of a hurricane, sustained winds, power outages, this facility will still be operational. Just wanted to bring that to your attention. That's what it's designed to do.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Well, and thank you for. Yeah. Staff mentioned that to me when we talked as well, so. Good. Are there any other comments about this application and if not.

Danny Davis: Mr. Chairman? May I just make one request? If I was just speaking to Mr. Moore, that realizing that the product he's showing from Darden may not have been a direct Engler product. And so as we've been bouncing back and forth, I don't have 100% guarantee that they actually can do the vertical. And I apologize for that. I should have had that. But if you're willing to consider an approval, that would be with a preference. If the preference is for vertical, but the option to go without it if it's not available from them. And I apologize for bringing that up the last minute.

Tim Clites: Well, we want to know it, so you don't have to come back. And I would say that is our strong preference if it's available, unless there's more in the committee than Bill and I. So we're open to the comments from the rest of you.

Will Moore: If I may. Your preference is for the vertical feature. And I don't want to unduly influence you and put myself in. It's fine. But I do want to direct you back to the memorandum, specifically the guidelines and. As you, Mr. Chairman, introduced this particular topic to the committee. I heard you say that you felt like the question at hand was which you prefer, which you like better. And that's a recurring theme. We try to avoid the use of the word like as opposed to how something conforms or does not conform with our guidelines. So now that being said, Andrew brought up an interesting point that I had not really considered before, and that would be that call it the flat cap option, maybe simulating a flat crimp. I didn't really approach it that way. My view of the application as it came in was. It's a ridge cap,

and you probably shouldn't try to disguise it as something that it's not. Now, granted, it's a much smaller scale ridge cap, but if you're viewing flat cap option as a faux crimp seam, I guess in that case either one is pretending to be something that it's not if you view it that way. But it's really a standard of the Secretary of Interior's guidelines to not create false elements when you're working in a historic district. That being, if you have a standing seam, it's an actual standing seam. [inaudible] to not put false projections on an element. And so that was the point of my memo. And just like you to consider how both of these options compare to the guidelines before maybe making a decision rather than just on your aesthetic preference.

Tim Clites: Thank you. That's actually a very helpful clarification. If everyone followed that, I would reinterpret it slightly to say that if just like there are buildings that we allow windows that are not historic, single pane, traditional wood windows, an old historic building that needs new windows has to meet that standard because it is an older part of our fabric. I do think that the guidelines allow for new buildings to use new materials and where our sensitivity is around which of those details and materials are acceptable. So if I understand in simple terms, what Will said is we should. We should come to grips with whether that detail with no seam is the contemporary to today version of a roof we would accept on an ongoing basis for new buildings so that we're not recreating a faux vertical seam. Now, arguably for me the hand crimped, not perfect, a little bit crooked and then option B still won't look the same. But it just depends what you see when you see that old ridge. But I appreciate what you mentioned Will. How do you feel?

Bill Anderson: I won't use a certain word, which I appreciate him saying. Looking at the original design and we have options in front of us as to apparently all these may meet the requirements of the warranty and all the codes. Given that case, the bottom detail that happens to have a slight vertical with it is just a profile of a cap. And I think that is closer to what we originally had than the than the flat cap. So it's what approximates the original design that doesn't meet the warranty and that is the one I believe does.

Tim Clites: Said differently if we approve a hardy siding, it is a new material that approximates a wood siding, not exactly the [inaudible] not quite as thick. It doesn't quite have. Right. And so this is.

Bill Anderson: Like fascia material, isn't it?

Tim Clites: [inaudible]

Bill Anderson: Oh, I do. I do.

Tim Clites: Creating a false sense. I think with a vertical, if it's acceptable, my eyes is still going to see two lines. It's not going to see that the pan go up and come up and get folded, which is what we see on the old traditional buildings. Not everybody's eye is going to see that. [off mic]

Danny Davis: That's why we put a cupola.

Tim Clites: Will, am I getting us off base?

Will Moore: I know that you are. And again, it's not my job to tell you exactly how to interpret the guidelines or the secretary of standards. I just think it's always important that you are evaluating against your guidelines rather than something you may.

Tim Clites: Like or dislike. I appreciate that very much.

Will Moore: That's really important for us to be sustainable as a committee because we are evaluated as a certified local government. We submit meeting minutes every year to the Department of [inaudible]. [inaudible] how much policing they do of that, but it's important that we are always evaluating allocation [inaudible].

Tim Clites: And so I'll just pause for a second without putting them on the spot. Have you run into this in other historic districts?

Andrew Moore: This particular issue? Yes. No, this is the first time it's come up in one of my projects.

Tim Clites: Well, congratulations, team. We're doing good.

Cindy Pearson: I have a question. I'm more visual because I don't sit and look at this stuff like you all do. On the option B with this whatever faux thing, what is what would that be on this?

Danny Davis: An inch above. Just the same color metal piece. That would just be a straight vertical line across every ridge, everywhere this is just how the little vertical. Just one inch, right?

Andrew Moore: Exactly. Yeah, one inch.

Tim Clites: Just one of these seams coming towards us. Pick it up and stick it on the top. That's what we're talking about. So that it looks like a well, that's the question. Or do you keep it clean like this?

Bill Anderson: It's the profile of the cap, just like on a gutter. You have the OG profile; you have a half round. This is just a profile difference here. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: We'll go back. So.

Cindy Pearson: I now see what you were saying. [off mic] Yeah. Once again, they'll all kind of echo what Will said if it's not part of our guidelines. If it is presenting something that's faux that shouldn't be there, then I'm saying it probably shouldn't be there.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic]

Linda Wright: Yeah, it's a tough one for someone who's not an architect, right? And I'm not either. So it is all one continuous piece. So it's not like an added on. It's not a tacked-on thing to make the ridge sit up like that. It's one. Just a profile. I mean, I guess my biggest concern would be what is more historically correct here? What looks the most appropriate? And I wish I was a little more knowledgeable as to which was which.

Tim Clites: So but and there are some ridges in the community that have if you look at the little detail, the top version, which is it goes up and it folds over. So from one side you don't really see anything and the other side you would see something very much like this.

Linda Wright: Because there's a lot of roofline. A lot of detail able to put there.

Punkin Lee: I'm also don't look at this stuff all day. So to me, the example that we have, this one, this building has such a different presence that it kind of carries off all this extra, whereas this building has a whole different presence. I don't know. To me it looks like it's overkill on the roofing. But as I say, I don't you all look at it, you know what you're looking at. But to me, it's. It's kind of too much.

Andrew Moore: Can I make a comment? Absolutely. I was just going to point. I think it's just important to remember that this happens a lot. So all of these lines here on the ridges, on the hips, rather, are really prominent. And that's why we've made such a big point of this being an important detail. [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic]

Bill Anderson: [off mic] closer to me to what was designed originally on one side, when you see the crimp design, because you'd see that line. It doesn't have to be an inch. Could be half inch. You know.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic]

Bill Anderson: It is. But it's going to have.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic]

Bill Anderson: Exactly. And this it just gives a little more definition to the roof. That's the only difference as far as I see. So that would be my preference.

Virginia Jenkins: That's I mean, honestly, roofing is not my deal. So I pretty much go along with what you two say on this one because you're.

Tim Clites: Well, let's just stop for a moment. Yes, we do this all day long. But it goes without saying that I value enormously everybody's input on this committee.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I understand.

Tim Clites: Sometimes we overthink things that just need less thinking. So everything that's been said tonight is equally respected. And I actually included in that is, Will Moore's input about this idea that if it's a new roof, our guidelines do not say recreate history, preserve it. But if it's new, it can be of today. And so one way for us to really understand this in the context of the guidelines is to say this is a roof for a building of today. But if you're going to go to the red, I don't know what the red fox roof is, but if it's standing seam and they want to replace it, this is not an acceptable substitute for a traditional hand seamed ridge as a committee that's the kind of dialog we need to have, not whether we like it or not. Is that right? So then it's a slightly different question to say, as a committee does, is this an acceptable ridge for a building built today in the town.

Virginia Jenkins: As opposed to putting that little piece on top.

Cindy Pearson: And if the Red Fox did come back to us, there's just not a new building. That's right. So they have different standards.

Tim Clites: We have a different standard for preservation of historic structures. And that's important to acknowledge because we're not setting a precedent that suddenly everyone can come in and use this on any building in town. And so for that reason, I am very comfortable if the biggest group of the committee is feeling like this is an acceptable detail. I don't think it's there's enough other aspects of this particular building. And most buildings that have been built in town in the last couple of years that are of today, even though they're sympathetic to the fact that they're in a historic district, I don't think we're off base to accept the and make part of potentially our guidelines, the detail that's in front of us. I'm very interested in whether we can get the vertical seam as an issue of warranty, but that's a separate discussion, right?

Danny Davis: Yeah. It's the the question there is whether Engler manufacturers with [inaudible].

Tim Clites: Which means we could be spending a lot of energy and find out it doesn't matter anyway, right?

Danny Davis: That's correct. And I do apologize.

Andrew Moore: If I can if I can comment the I'm 95% sure you can get it because the reason why the whole question about the warranty was raised up was about this matter. Is the screw through the [off mic]. And this is just a this is a non-standard custom ridge cap that they have fabricated for this particular purpose. I cannot imagine why [off mic].

Tim Clites: Understood. Because Rhonda told you we've never approved a ridge that didn't. And she's right. So thank you, everyone, for the input on this. I'll pause and wait for someone to make a motion. [off mic]

Cindy Pearson: So to make the motion, you would then just choose either option A or option B at the [inaudible] Is that it?

Will Moore: So I would. I would suggest two different options. If the person making the motion prefers option B, I would make a motion to approve either option but with a preference for option B. And then that way, if we find out that it can't be warranted, then we go with option A. But if the person making a motion that the committee prefers option A, the flat cap [off mic].

Virginia Jenkins: Just for clarification.

Will Moore: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: We somebody tell me option A, and which is the one with warranty?

Tim Clites: They're both.

Virginia Jenkins: Both.

Tim Clites: We're only going to accept one with a warranty.

Will Moore: Option A we've been told the warranty option B we haven't been told, but 95% sure that they can. So again, the person make a motion.

Bill Anderson: I'll make a motion for COA 22-21 request of the town of Middleburg to revise the roof specifications for the new town hall at 10 West Marshall Street to approve Option A and Option B with a preference towards Option B.

Tim Clites: Is there a second? I'll second it. All those in favor.

Cindy Pearson: Can it have it clarified again. Please. Can I hear that one more time? Sure. Whoever took it.

Bill Anderson: To approve to approve the the action. Option A or option B with a preference for option B. Both of which we believe probably will warranty.

Tim Clites: All in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed.

Cindy Pearson: Sorry.

Virginia Jenkins: You're opposing.

Cindy Pearson: No. Aye on the first go round. Not aye opposed. Sorry.

Tim Clites: We got Cindy flustered, so I'm going to do that again. All in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed. The motion passes. Thank you. And thank you, everyone, for your input.

Danny Davis: Thank you. We really appreciate it to we do. Appreciate your time and consideration.

Tim Clites: Thank you. [off mic]

Bill Anderson: I have a question to the architect. What did you find when you went out on the site today? Could you give us a kind of your observations?

Andrew Moore: Absolutely. Well, I was impressed with the solidity of the structure, because that's what you see, right now, I'm also you know, part of our design approach from the beginning has been this is janice type country town facing aspect of the town hall. And I think that from where I'm looking from the town hall towards the resort and then looking from the village green back towards the town hall, you can really feel that connection. And then, of course, this building is sitting in the way of our connection to Marshall Street. But looking down the arcade and using a little bit of imagination, I can see how that connection is going to be very clear as well. So it was confirmation that I think that given this site and the limitations of it and the the way and the goals that we're trying to achieve, I think it's successful, but there's the promise there and just hope the contractor speeds up. Rhonda is working on that.

Tim Clites: Best of luck with that. I thought the Ridge discussion was had. [off mic]

Punkin Lee: Everyone comfortable and in their right spots. We go on to discussion item, a pre-application discussion, relocation of stone outbuilding and an addition to the principal structure at 408 East Washington Street. Please state your name.

Tim Clites: Tim Clites. And I'm here with Chris and Carolyn Hersh. The owners and you all have a packet in front of you. It's not a final packet. Wasn't intended to be. The last time we looked at the property, we were focused mainly on the little structure and had started some design work but didn't have it quite ready to review. And so now we have what I would call a schematic design. And tonight we're not we're happy to I'm happy to answer any questions about any part of the design. But I think the intent is to try for me to try to bring together the conversation around the stone structure and the siting. And then just looking at this addition, which is the reason the stone structure needs moved and looking at the scale and massing how it's oriented to the street, any of those kind of bigger questions, obviously, we're happy to talk about, you know, door and window patterning and detailing, but we understand we'll come back with all of that additional detailing in a month or so after getting your input now. And some of the things like the final location of the little stone structure is not it's not firm in our mind. I think we have two options, or three options shown just kind of as again, a continuation of the conversation from last month, a couple of other things that have happened even since we submitted the application. So the stone structure and whether it can literally be picked up and moved or whether it has to be rebuilt, we're not 100% on that. And it may be a little while until we understand what's possible there. And we're also working I think one of the site plans mentions we're working on some of the overhead lines, not the ones that run up Route 50, but the ones that cut across the the agricultural site beside us and actually serve our property and then go in to the back of the next street trying to figure out that's a little more complicated than the first blush. And so we don't know, but we're investigating with the power company whether it's even feasible to bury that line. We'd love to if it's feasible and not completely unreasonable, but that's kind of an ongoing discussion as well. I know power lines don't have anything to do with you all, but just to kind of or your

approval. But just so you have a sense of the issues that we're looking at while we're looking at this addition, you know, in concept, the addition is turned perpendicular to the main house and the scale of it. We work to try to create in the roofline a little bit of a hyphen between the back of the house and the addition. The ridge lines are fairly similar in height. There's a review, the guidelines and looked at little details like do the gutter lines all align or is there some differentiation there? I just we took a first pass at what we thought was an appropriate design scale and alignment and we're looking for your input like we talked the last time. There's a combination of siding and stucco on different parts of the additions to the original brick house, and our thought is to go back on the addition with siding. All be painted the same color and we haven't picked it, but we're still continuing to think probably a light color. The doors and windows on the new addition we're considering simulated divided light. So so they look like other windows that we've looked at here at the committee. We'd like to use a clad exterior for the addition that the rear part of the existing structure has some all-vinyl windows with vinyl or with spacer bar inserts, not mountains. And so we're looking at some of those disappear with the addition and perhaps replacing the few that are remaining so that all the windows have a traditional divided light look. But given that we'd like to use synthetic hardy, hardy [inaudible] siding for the addition and that moldings, trim corner boards, soffits etc., we'd like to consider using a clad window as well, and we haven't gone to the manufacturer yet. It's just a conceptual discussion with you all at this point. Standing seam roof to match the original house with the folded ridge. Sorry. [laughter] And and then on the gutters, we haven't really kind of got to the the final the front of the house has copper gutters and downspouts, but kind of of course, everyone would love to do that everywhere. So we come around the side of the house. The little one-story edition has copper on the front, and it has prefinished aluminum on the back and then the back has a series of different profiles. And so somewhere in there, bringing that all together as part of the final package, my sense is maybe prefinished aluminum, but again, looking for your input on that as well.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: You're welcome.

Punkin Lee: Bill.

Bill Anderson: Well, what I see I like the I guess except for the last prefinished aluminum.

Tim Clites: We may be able to work on that.

Chris Hersh: But we did we did go with the cap, the copper chimney cap.

Bill Anderson: I like it. I look forward to seeing the other elevations. I like the scale of the window openings and I think it's fits very nicely. The, I guess the relocation of the, the small outbuilding. I know again the one that's in front is kind of kind of odd that it would be way up on the front on the other property line in the front yard. But any location is I think is good because saving it. But no, I think this is I find it very, very nice. Will you come back with the other elevations next month? I only have one elevation [off mic] No, we only have one there. That's the plan. I guess we only have one elevation here. [off mic] My computer is shut down.

Tim Clites: This is the elevation that you would see as you came into town. This is the existing. Then go around the back. You wouldn't see this except from if you were down on the lower street by the townhouses and looking up. But you wouldn't see that for sure. And the least obvious elevation is the West elevation which is topped by the stucco addition [off mic].

Bill Anderson: I think in general, it's I have to see the scales here. I think the openings, again, are nice for a house that's new and addition that's new that the windows are large. I can appreciate that. The only thing that jumps out to me is the proportion of materials on the rear chimney. I notice on the house it's the stucco side with it appears to be stone base and then stucco. And in this drawing appears that it could be

bricks showing up above. But there's something about this. It's just my first thought about the scale and proportion of the chimney stone to brick that just doesn't sit right off the bat. Not that it is wrong.

Tim Clites: Is it the materials or just the proportion of it?

Bill Anderson: The slenderness in this ratio to it that that's kind of. But I understand why you want the the windows, which I would really appreciate that those openings in those big rooms. Yeah. It's just the slenderness and maybe it's pardon me. My voice was gone. It maybe it's the amount of stone to brick or brick to stone. I'm not quite sure. But that's the only thing that jumps out of me I think the porch is lovely on the side.

Punkin Lee: Thank you, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Was any one able to see what the history of that little stone building was? Did anybody find anything?

Tim Clites: We haven't found anything yet. We talked to folks at [inaudible]. [off mic] Reached out to Betsy. I didn't realize Betsy's father is a photographer. And has a collection [off mic] The oldest photo we were able to find from Thomas Bach, unfortunately, was in our guidelines when they did the first assessment for the historic district. So it didn't really tell us anything.

Cindy Pearson: Curiosity on that one. But no, I don't have any other questions right now.

Punkin Lee: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I understand what Bill is saying actually about the chimney. I was just visually, you know, the change from the stone to the brick. It just sort of sticks out visually. And I was thinking when I was going just to go through the photographs if it were painted. But then that doesn't make sense.

Tim Clites: It's interesting. The little single-story building that's a stucco foundation that is painted.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm just talking about the brick, painting the brick, as opposed.

Tim Clites: The inspiration for the brick was we have brick chimneys right now on the front of that. So as it came up through the roof is really only, not the only place, but it would be the most prominent place you would see it from the street so it would be brick with the same cab to match the others.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm just trying to think look at it in visually. If it were all brick, if it were all brick, would it make.

Tim Clites: You can study it. And it's a good it's a good.

Virginia Jenkins: Or is it just a balance between the stone and the brick?

Bill Anderson: Yeah, I think the three stories exacerbates the issue.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes, of course. Of course. And you only really are aware of it from the North elevation, which is the back street, right?

Bill Anderson: That's right.

Virginia Jenkins: Know, maybe it's the proportion of the stone to the brick. It seems like there's more brick than stone. Maybe if the brick went up a little higher. It visually, it might change the scale. I'm just. Just you have to play with that in drawings.

Tim Clites: Understood.

Virginia Jenkins: I mean, I understand the slope there. I mean, I don't know what you do. That's why you do what you do. And I do what I used to do. Or I did. I can do it on the inside and not the outside.

Punkin Lee: You good? Linda?

Linda Wright: No, I like the addition very much. I think it looks very appropriate with the house. And I really like Bill said, like the big windows and all of that. I think it's very proportionate to the house and looks nice. I would agree this chimney maybe needs a little study, but other than that I think it looks great. I can't wait to see more details on it.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. When you read the your little item by item on the chimney, it says stone base to align with foundation. So why couldn't it align horizontally with the foundation and have more brick.

Tim Clites: Part of it is that chimney is actually the fireplace is actually on the first floor. But we will study it. How do we kind of keep that? And maybe the whole thing just needs to be a little weightier because it's so tall. It just needs kind of more.

Bill Anderson: It looks like like if they didn't have the windows, a little taper would be the steps.

Punkin Lee: But another thing, since I always get hung on the stone, the foundation, you have veneer stone with similar texture and then chimney you have stone base. So is the chimney real. And the other is.

Tim Clites: So we say, veneer, and I'll clarify. Thank you. It's actually real stone. It's just not a stone wall. It's a concrete wall with a real it's real field stone as a veneer.

Punkin Lee: Right. That's what I thought. But I'd.

Tim Clites: It doesn't structurally do anything, but it looks like.

Punkin Lee: Like real rock. Yeah. And I really like that this little stone house is going to stay. You know, we don't have that many in town, and that's an old house and it's just kind of nice to have carry the story forward.

Tim Clites: So how do you all feel about that? If I can interrupt and ask this question of that site plan. Its location and we started to debate [inaudible] I don't know what is. Well, I don't know that we. I apologize. You might have mentioned this to Jeremy, but we bumped into this question about the guidelines, talking about the setback relating to the historic structures that are in front of the actual building restriction [inaudible] and we noticed next door not that it creates a precedent, but there's that little atone cottage that next to that stone house. And so it just kind of appealed to us. This is kind of a lonely little spot on our site, not that we couldn't enhance it in some other way, but that might be a nice spot to put the stone building so that it is still visible to the passer by. And I guess we haven't really confirmed from a zoning perspective, can we set it closer than the actual building restriction line would you don't need to decide that tonight?

Will Moore: Well, I can answer that so strictly from a zoning perspective so HDRC involvement set aside any of the three locations here would work. My comment from a planning zoning perspective is that the closest location to the roadway might be troublesome from a safety standpoint because it's so close set

right on the edge of the driveway. And if somebody comes in just a little hot, it's very common when you're coming in your first turn into a driveway that the projection of your bumper is over the edge of pavement. And that looks like it would be a dangerous location for that structure. But simply from a zoning perspective, it would be okay.

Tim Clites: And I think what we, the second the location behind the first location actually sets up, there's some mechanical units outside of the existing structure and perhaps we'll end up with some kind of a little screen, whatever it is fence someday. It sets up a nice spot for the second location to not be prominent with the house. But anyways. Open to other comments around that.

Bill Anderson: You know, having either one of those two front locations really kind of creates kind of an interesting gateway to the property. And once you pull in there, you feel like you're in your property and you're not giving up half of the half of your side yard to the street. So it's kind of nice, I think, creating that gateway entrance scale wise. It's nice coming out of town to see it against the house. I think either one of those would enhance the sense of coming into a private. Even the driveway behind it could be different and very nice. Can I can I while I'm talking, go back to one other thing. On this chimney, on the lower level, that space for those big windows is the garage. Well, there's glass, I would assume. I don't know if there are clear story or garage doors that have glass in it. And the storage space behind the garage also has doors, whereas the space also has doors, which I know they could be glass doors, too, so that the windows on both sides of this fireplace wall are really just garage. So it would give a way to at that lower level to mass the wall or the chimney and get some steps. And I think that would make a big difference in the feeling there. And you would have you lost two windows in the garage when you have light coming from others. But anyway, that's it.

Tim Clites: Maybe the windows are a different scale or something. Like it around on the on the east elevation, the little one-story structure actually has little windows in the stone if you look at the photos underneath. So there's other options. But yeah, I agree with [off mic].

Punkin Lee: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Nothing else.

Punkin Lee: Virginia. Linda.

Tim Clites: And again, we're not looking for a motion we're just hearing what's [off mic].

Punkin Lee: I like the the little building to the front to like the second front one. And it would also compliment the little stone house next door. I mean, it kind of. All right. [off mic] And I think the combination will make a really nice approach into town as you come up and around that turn, you've got all that beautiful brick and then lovely stone. I mean, it's what the town's all about. So it's kind of nice. Nice to put it out there for everybody to see.

Will Moore: If I may, Madam Vice Chair, just comments for the Hersh's and Mr. Clites to consider as you look at the stone building, the roof that is on that was not approved. Yeah. And we intentionally did not pursue any action against the Hersh's when they acquired this building. We're so happy that they have it and they're doing good things with the property. But that that roof, along with a couple of vinyl windows that were put on the original structure, obviously did not go through the proper approval process. I'm glad that you're looking at those things, but if you were to consider relocating that stone building and in particular near the street frontage, I would consider what you might do with that with that roof as well. [off mic]

Tim Clites: There's got to be some pretty green asphalt shingles somewhere.

Punkin Lee: Bright green.

Punkin Lee: Any other comments from any other questions from either of you.

Tim Clites: Thank you for the input. This is a nice process for us and we're kind of we're not really much further ahead. We're no further ahead you are than what you're seeing. So we just wanted to short term thank you for allowing this to be a discussion item tonight. [off mic] Likely plan to see you all next month.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. It's going to be nice. Thank you very much. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Thank you all. We are information items Estee.

Estee LaClare: Thank you Chair Clites Just wanted to bring your attention to the JARB Awards brief memo we all attended. So Chair Clites myself and Vice Chair Punkin. We were all there and it was it was an excellent meeting, I thought, and it was a little bit longer than they had initially thought. But we kind of knew that going in. There were 13 different properties that were nominated. We did scale Leesburg back just a tad. They had quite a few nominations. And what Chair Clites said, they did say, Hey, what about Middleburg? Where's your signs? So needless to say, it was a very good meeting. I think everybody is excited too about the function in September, so please mark your calendars. Invitations will be sent out. They're going to be doing emailed invitations and we'll keep you in the loop. So that's September 22nd, I believe it's at six, I think at night. So and 5:30 or six. [off mic]

Tim Clites: I'll drive. I don't drink, so I'll drive, and you can ride.

Estee LaClare: It's at a beautiful. [off mic] Yes. It's called Kalero. And it's I don't think it's very old at all. I'm going to pronounce it properly. It is called Kalero Vineyard. It's on Shorthill Mountain in western Loudoun County. On the fringes of Loudoun County. But it's a barn that they redid and it's past. It's quite far out there, but it looks like a lovely venue and I'm just excited. I think everybody is that they brought it back. So I wanted to bring your attention to that and get it on your calendars if possible. Along with I did listen to the for moving on from there. Unless anybody has any questions.

Punkin Lee: I would just like to say that they went around the room, and they started with Purcellville and then Leesburg and it kind of droned and then they got to Middleburg, and you could just I mean, the people were perceptively like Middleburg. I mean, they were. They were.

Cindy Pearson: Did you straighten them out?

Punkin Lee: They kind of straightened themselves. It was kind of, you know. No, it was. You know, they were just like all of them were like, we love walking to Middleburg. Your buildings are so pretty. You all do such a nice job and it's just very nice and pleasant. And I mean, it was because they were pretty much going you know? Down there. And then we had the two lovely brick buildings. So, I mean, they were very nice about how nice our town is. [off mic] No, there was a definite change in the in the room when our pictures went up.

Tim Clites: I think it was also useful for me to to realize that, like, this is really a place of a very intimate scale. Purcellville and Leesburg are lovely towns, but they're at a different scale. And so and it's like here you blink twice, and you missed it. And so. I understood that a little better, sitting and looking at the other places, what they had recommended. And you just realize, wow, there's, you know, we really hold a little jewel box in our hands. So.

Punkin Lee: But then one of the places nominated by Purcellville was. It's one of Tim's jobs, so we were real proud of him.

Estee LaClare: That was nice. He didn't say anything until the very end. Then there was another property from Loudoun County that was nominated that we actually basically everybody removed because it kind of looked like a big house from Ashburn. And I was surprised that Loudoun County had nominated that. But needless to say, so that was removed from consideration entirely. But if anybody has any questions, please let me know. We'll keep you up to date with emails that the invitations for that event.

Cindy Pearson: So this event. Are they all in the historic district of their towns or is it just any building?

Tim Clites: Yes. And then at the county level, it's in like Goose Creek. The historic overlay or anything that the county staff would work on through their historic department can also be nominated or considered. So, for instance, a building outside of Middleburg that had some oversight at the county level could be nominated. I'm just saying a hypothetical, right?

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Tim Clites: So it was great to kind of get that all started again. Like here, the staff up there worked very hard on kind of pulling it together and trying to organize it.

Virginia Jenkins: And why is it being held elsewhere?

Tim Clites: Because Middleburg didn't offer. [multiple speakers] The county staff is working.

Cindy Pearson: It's really not that hard to get to Hillsboro from here. It's just the roads that. Just country road to get there. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Estee. What about summary for DHR workshops?

Estee LaClare: Yes. So I just want to let you know, I did three summaries. The fourth was actually number three of the workshop. It was redundant. Essentially, it was asking going through the steps of hiring a consultant, which we have already done successfully when we updated our design guidelines. So I just didn't feel that was worthy of our time. But I did brief summaries for all three of those workshops if you all feel so inclined to read about them. I thought they were quite well done and they are planning on doing this from now going forward every year to do like four or five and creating a very large library so that, let's say somebody when I first started here, it would have been great for me as a resource to listen to these different dialogs with experts in the field. So I think it's going to be something very worthwhile. So if you have any questions about the workshops that I summarized, please let me know.

Tim Clites: Meeting quorum September 1st. Anybody not going to make it? September 1st. It's right on like. Yeah. The first day after August. [off mic] Let the staff know if you can't make it so we can adjust. Adjust the schedule if we have to.

Estee LaClare: I'm sorry. What did you say?

Tim Clites: I said let the staff know. It looks like we'll have a quorum. But if that changes, let staff know and. Yeah. Rhonda, any words of wisdom for us?

Rhonda North: Not a thing.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Thank you. Estee adjourned.