



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



**Thursday, July 10, 2023
PENDING APPROVAL**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Monday, July 10, 2023, 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
Virginia Jenkins
Margaret Littleton
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: William Anderson (excused)
Linda Wright (excused)

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the June 1, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

New Business

COA 23-16: Outdoor Dining Furnishings – 19 East Washington Street – Tremolo Bar

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the Historic District Guidelines did not include information on patio furniture. She noted, however, that this fell under the HDRC’s purview.

Jarad Slipp, the applicant, advised the Committee that he executed what he showed the members during last month’s meeting, which consisted of black tables and chairs for their patio space.

The Committee agreed the proposed furniture looked fine.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Slipp confirmed the furniture would all be the same. He advised that the lighting would be portable and would reflect downward onto the tables. Mr. Slipp noted that they would be removed at the end of the night.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-16 as submitted.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

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

COA 23-17 (S 23-09): Projecting, Wall & Directory Signs – 201 E. Washington Street –
Veritas Contracting

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the proposed signs fit within the Historic District Guidelines. She further reported the existing signs would be removed; however, the hardware would continue to be used.

Steve Simons, the applicant, noted that the BAC sign would be eliminated.

The Committee agreed they were fine with the proposed signs and noted that they looked clean.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, reported that the only thing that would be carved in the sign was the name “Veritas”. He noted that he did not like to apply molding due to the required maintenance. Mr. Ralph advised that the stripes would be close together; therefore, it was not practical to carve them.

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-17 (S 23-09), a request of Steve Simons for projecting, wall, and directory signs at 201 East Washington Street – Veritas Contracting.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

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

Chair Clites recused himself and left the dais, as he had a conflict of interest with regard to the next agenda item. Vice Chair Lee assumed the chair.

COA 23-18: Replace & Paint Front Door & Replace Porch Floor – 109 W. Marshall Street –
Clites Architecture, PC

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the application was for the replacement of the front door with a fifteen light one, for the replacement of rotting boards on the porch floor, and for the repairs to concrete to make it more accessible and eliminate safety issues.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Tim Clites, the applicant, advised that originally, the existing door color was supposed to match his company's logo; however, the paint was mixed wrong, and he simply left it as it was. He advised that since the sign with the logo would be beside the door, he would like to use the slightly bolder Orange color. Mr. Clites explained that people would not knock on the door and opined that a door with windows would be more inviting.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-18, a request of Tim Clites to replace and paint the building's front door and replace porch floor at 109 West Washington Street – Clites Architects, PC.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – Chair Clites

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

Chair Clites resumed the chair.

COA 23-19 (S 23-10): New Sign & Post – 16 E. Washington Street – CDMX Bar & Grill

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the existing signpost, which overhung the public sidewalk, would be removed and replaced with a smaller post that would be located closer to the building.

David Ayala, the applicant, appeared before the Committee.

The Committee noted that the sign was colorful and questioned whether it met the Town's regulations.

Planning & Project Associate LaClare confirmed it did. She noted that the colors were a part of the business' branding.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, confirmed he did not bring color samples to the meeting. He opined that the pictures depicted the true colors.

Committee Member Littleton expressed concern that the sign appeared to be too large, and the startling colors did not match the building. She opined that the sign was the maximum size allowed under the sign ordinance.

Mr. Ralph noted that the sign was not even close to the maximum allowable size.

Chair Clites questioned whether the red colors were all the same. He further questioned whether the red and green border went around the whole sign. Mr. Clites questioned how large the existing post was and how far it projected.

Mr. Ayala confirmed the colors were all the same and the border went around the entire sign.

Mr. Ralph advised that he didn't install the current post; therefore, he did not have the details on it. He noted that he was advised to remove it.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ralph confirmed the post would project nine feet from the ground.

Chair Clites opined that the cross bar would be at eight feet, which would place the sign at seven feet six inches. He questioned whether there would be any other signage on the property.

Mr. Ralph advised that while it was not a part of the application, an alternative sign had been designed that involved lettering on the building. He distributed a concept drawing of it. Mr. Ralph explained that he recommended his client delete this from the application so the hanging sign could be approved, as he felt the lettering would not be. He noted that he was only presenting this option for discussion.

Chair Clites opined that it would be easier to consider scaling back the hanging sign if there was additional signage on the building. He noted that the Committee had not asked that colors be changed on other applications.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the sign could be made smaller, Mr. Ayala advised that his personal opinion was that the sign above the door was better than a sign on the old post.

The Committee opined that the issue was the sign's size and sense of scale. It was noted that the previous sign appeared to be 30"x30". They questioned what the sign would look like from across the street and opined that a smaller sign would look better.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ralph opined that it would be possible to make the projecting sign smaller and still allow it to be noticeable.

The Committee held some discussion on the proposed sign dimensions.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ayala confirmed his restaurant had multiple locations and that the proposed sign was different than the ones at his other locations.

The Committee opined that the proposed sign's size was not appropriate and did not match the building.

Chair Clites reminded the Committee that the proposed lettering was not included in the application; however, he suggested they provide feedback on it. He further suggested that a 36" projecting sign was too large and opined that a 30" sign would be better.

The Committee continued to hold discussion as to the size of the projecting sign. Mr. Ralph asked that they allow as large a sign as possible if the applicant was only allowed to have one.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed they would be fine with a sign that was 32"x33". They suggested the building did not need signage across the top of it.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Chair Clites, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-19 (S 23-10), a request of David Ayala for the installation of a new sign and post at 16 East Washington Street, with the amendment that the size of the sign be 32-inches wide and 32-inches high.

Mr. Ralph asked, from a scaling perspective, that the sign be 33-inches high.

Committee Member Jenkins moved to amend the motion to allow a size of 32-inches by 33-inches.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ralph reported that some of the face striping would be carved, the red outside portion was a cove, and the CDMX name would be three-dimensionally raised. Mr. Ralph explained that he was trying to give the impression of a layered look.

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

The Committee noted that a wall was replaced, and lattice was installed in front of the HVAC unit. They questioned whether they would be painted white.

Planning & Project Associate LaClare advised the applicant that he needed to bring the lattice work to the HDRC for their consideration. She noted that any changes in color for exterior materials also needed to be brought before the HDRC.

Mr. Ayala advised that he would paint the fence/wall the previous color, which was black, so he did not have to return with another application. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he confirmed the lattice was white. He advised that he could paint it Black.

Mr. Ralph suggested the color be the same as the previous one so Mr. Ayala would not have to return for an approval. Mr. Ayala confirmed he would do so.

Chair Clites advised that the Committee's unofficial preference was that it be painted Black.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ayala advised that he planned to open as soon as his permits were approved.

COA-RS 23-03: New Single-Family Dwelling – 605 Martingale Ridge Drive (Lot 16)

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the proposed design was for a Vineyard Hybrid II model, with siding. She further reported that it would be Bruton White in color, with Black shutters. Ms. LaClare noted that it would not have a garage initially; however, one was shown on the plans for the future.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, advised the Committee that this was the same model as was approved for Lot 3. She further advised that it would contain siding on the entire structure in Bruton White, like the house on Lot 11.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that there would not be a light for the door on the right elevation and explained that this was just for storage. She advised that the four light door would have a small low-voltage light above it.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee reviewed an application for this design previously. He further noted that this house was between two others that contained different colors. Mr. Clites reminded the Committee that the siding material did not need to change because it was used on the adjoining lot, only the color did; therefore, this application conformed to the design guidelines.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn confirmed there would be windows above on the front elevation.

Chair Clites opined that this application contained the standard details. He encouraged the Committee members to look at the houses that have been constructed. Mr. Clites noted that they had held a previous discussion on house numbers.

Ms. Yahn advised that the house numbers were in the columns and would be in the same location on all the houses. She noted that they were backlit and on timers, so they went off during the day. Ms. Yahn advised that the only option was to put the numbers on the house. She noted the need to appease the Fire Marshall and to have the house numbers visible for renters so they could find the houses. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that the Fire Marshall wanted the numbers to be lit. She reminded the Committee that she wanted the house numbers to be on a monument; however, the Fire Marshall said this could not be done. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn confirmed she did not bring the house numbers to the HDRC for their review. She reiterated that she was trying to meet the Fire Marshall's regulations and advised that the only place they could be located was on the columns. Ms. Yahn advised that Salamander asked that they be located where people could see them.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Planning & Project Associate LaClare confirmed the HDRC had not reviewed the house numbers.

Chair Clites encouraged the members to look at them at night before the next meeting, as this item had not been approved.

Committee Member Jenkins opined that they were "rather bright".

Ms. Yahn advised that they could be dimmed. She reiterated that the Fire Marshall dictated what they could do with regard to the numbering and suggested that if the members had a problem with that, she would have to address it with him. Ms. Yahn suggested that if the Committee members had a better recommendation, they should come to the next meeting with it.

Chair Clites advised the members that they did not need to do that. He noted that the issue at hand was that the numbers had not yet been approved. Mr. Clites advised that he was not trying to bias the members toward a solution, but rather was only asking them to observe what had been done to prepare for a discussion at the next meeting.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn confirmed the streetlights were about to be installed. She further confirmed they were brighter than what the Town installed, would be goose neck lights, and would be on from 8:00-11:00 p.m.

Chair Clites suggested the members look at all the lights at night.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 23-03, a request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family dwelling at 605 Martingale Ridge Drive, as presented.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

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

COA-RS 23-04: New Single-Family Dwelling – 603 Martingale Ridge Drive (Lot 17)

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the entire front and portions of the side elevations would be clad in stone. She reminded the members that up to this point, stone had not been used as a cladding material. Ms. LaClare further reminded them that the Salamander Residences' Design Guidelines allowed for the use of a stone veneer for chimneys and foundations. She recommended the Committee look at the use of this material from a massing and scale perspective.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, advised that the Hunt Box was the smallest model. She further advised that stone was selected for the front and portions of the side elevations, with the remainder being stucco. Ms. Yahn noted that the stucco would be Rockport Gray and opined that it would provide an organic look with the stone and would blend in nicely. She noted that the side elevations were changing in this application and reminded the Committee that normally, the right and left windows went to the ground; however, they were proposed to be raised. Ms. Yahn advised that on the right elevation, shutters were added and the windows were spaced out.

The Committee opined that the stone helped to break up the mass, created a neighborhood feel, and added variety to the neighborhood. They noted that the guidelines started out being strict. The Committee acknowledged that they anticipated the windows could change; however, they noted that new finishes were now being added. They questioned what other changes would be forthcoming.

Ms. Yahn opined that stone was always allowed and advised that it was never her intent to not use it. She further advised that she did not consider its use to be a drastic change.

The Committee noted that the guidelines called for the stone to be used on the chimneys and foundations only.

Ms. Yahn reiterated her opinion that she was always allowed to use stone as a cladding material. She opined that it was never stated that stone would only be used for the water table and chimneys.

Chair Clites reminded Ms. Yahn that before the HDRC started reviewing applications, Salamander's team presented plans based on different exterior schemes. He advised that nowhere during that process did the Committee look at stone as a cladding material. Mr. Clites noted that in Virginia, stone set a certain expectation with regard to appendages. He advised that a small amount of stone was previously proposed in the rear of one of the houses and noted that a comment was made by the Committee that stone was not sympathetic from a historic kind of building language. Mr. Clites reminded the members that they allowed it since it was on the back of the house where it would not be seen. He opined that if stone had been discussed during the design guidelines development process, there would have been discussion as to where it was appropriate from a hierarchical massing standpoint. Mr. Clites suggested the need to have that conversation now.

Ms. Yahn noted that the Hunt Box was not a design option at that time. She questioned whether the Committee was saying it did not want to allow stone as a veneer on the houses.

The Committee advised that they were not saying this and noted the need to have a conversation about it.

Planning & Project Associate LaClare read excerpts from the approved guidelines, as well as provided a summary of the applications. She confirmed that stone as a cladding material was not included in the guideline discussions in 2021 and noted that what was discussed was stucco, lap siding, board & batten siding, and shingle siding. Ms. LaClare advised that the guidelines did not limit stone's application to chimneys and foundations and noted the need to deliberate on its use, as the guidelines were not all encompassing. She suggested this was something that should be deliberated on an individual basis and noted that the use of stone should be considered based on appropriateness, amount, volume, and how it related to its surroundings and the neighborhood context. Ms. LaClare reviewed the acceptable stone that could be used for foundations and chimneys and how it should be installed. She advised that the details should be sympathetic to the design with regard to style and architecture; however, it was not required to be historically accurate. Ms. LaClare noted that she wanted to give the Committee the opportunity to discuss this and reiterated that the use of stone as a cladding material had never been discussed by the HDRC.

Committee Member Littleton expressed concern that if it was approved, everyone would want it. She noted that the next agenda item was a request to consider revising an approved COA to include stone. Ms. Littleton opined that the stone was too heavy and suggested it was hard to visualize it with stucco.

Chair Clites noted that he also reviewed the guidelines and confirmed there was nothing to preclude the use of stone as a cladding material. He opined that it was a question of whether the stone felt too heavy. Mr. Clites advised that in speaking to this application, the stone seemed appropriate on the front for its massing and vocabulary on the street. He noted, however, that he would not say it was appropriate for all models. Mr. Clites suggested the Committee may wish to have a conversation and prohibit having two houses together that were clad in stone. He reiterated that the stone felt nice on this house; however, he noted the need to work out the details around the doors and windows.

Ms. Yahn advised that in terms of the stone scenario, she would do a historic, chunky sill. She suggested she draw some details for the Committee's review during their next meeting.

In response to an inquiry from Ms. Yahn as to whether the Committee wanted to marry the detail to the stucco as well, Chair Clites opined that the stucco detail should be left as already approved. He questioned whether the details on the rake should be changed and advised that he was fine keeping it as it was if it would create a construction problem. He explained that with regard to the windows, the question was whether to use a thick head piece of painted trim or a molded piece. Mr. Clites recommended the corners not be wrapped on the back. He suggested it would be nice if that was stone in order to tell the story that this was an original little stone structure, to which Ms. Yahn agreed.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that the grout would be like the fireplace on Lot 10 in that it would have a very small, raked kind of joint.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the stone building should go to the ground and then the porches be done or whether the stone should be different below the water table, Ms. Yahn opined that they should be the same. She suggested the Vineyard model did not lend itself to the use of stone. Ms. Yahn advised that the intent was to offer stone on a smaller scale in a couple of places.

Chair Clites opined that it would be wonderful if The Vineyards neighborhood was lightly peppered with stone to create variety. He suggested this application be tabled until next month's meeting so the Committee could look at the window details. Mr. Clites further suggested the members advise Ms. Yahn now if they had a problem with the use of stone cladding. (No concerns were raised.) He suggested the members think about what they wanted to do with regard to stone cladding at the next meeting.

Ms. Yahn advised that she had no problem if the Committee said stone should not be used as cladding on houses that were side-by-side in The Vineyards section. She opined that it should be allowed in The Stables neighborhood since those houses were farther apart. Ms. Yahn noted that she would like to lime wash the stone if they did another stone house.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee table this application, until it received further details for the door and window molding in the stone portion, to next month.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

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

COA-RS 23-02: Revisions to Approved COA-RS 22-10 – 800 Old Saddle Drive

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reminded the Committee that the original application called for the house to be clad in stucco. She reported that a request was submitted to revise the materials to a combination of stucco on the two-story wings of the house; board & batten siding on the portion of the house that would contain the great room; and, stone on the smaller volume and the mud/laundry room.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, explained that the owner, Sheila Johnson, wanted a textural change on the elevations. She noted that the elevations also showed barn doors on the front that would go to the stucco elevation and the side of the mudroom elevation and the gable ends, as well as shutters.

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reminded the Committee that they should review the application as if the changes had not been implemented. She noted that this application proposed stone cladding on a smaller volume than the previous one.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that the small LED light fixtures on the front were the ones that had already been installed under the overhang and would shine on the front door. She confirmed they would not be located in the stone.

Chair Clites advised that in reviewing the elevations, the number of proposed materials and their use on the residence felt backward from a historical language perspective. He noted that this was in a different neighborhood, whose inspiration was agricultural structures in the area. Mr. Clites advised that the wings had a different hierarchy and questioned which material came first. He opined that the stone was in the wrong location. Mr. Clites advised that the mix of one type of each material on the facade was not appropriate. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that he did not know whether it should just be one material and acknowledged that there may be a desire to break up an otherwise monolithic appearance. Mr. Clites noted that in general, materials had a pecking order based on quality and whether they would normally be on the original house. He opined that the stone on the previous application felt liked it was rooted in some experience.

Ms. Yahn advised that she would stucco the stone if the Committee only wanted two materials. She opined that in terms of hierarchy, the main box was at the top. Ms. Yahn further opined that there were examples of stone on secondary areas. In response to an inquiry as to why the stone was installed before the Committee approved its use, Ms. Yahn advised that Ms. Johnson asked for it.

The Committee reminded Ms. Yahn that she could not construct something differently than what was approved regardless of who suggested it and noted that stone was not what was approved. They further reminded Ms. Yahn that the Salamander Residences' Guidelines went through an approval process. They noted that any revisions to an approved application must come before them. In response to a comment from Ms. Yahn, they suggested she explain to the owner that revisions could not be implemented without prior approval. It was noted that this applied to all applicants. The Committee suggested stucco be applied over the stone. They further suggested the board and batten be the primary cladding material; although, they acknowledged that it was the least quality of any traditional building material.

Ms. Yahn opined that stucco was the least quality of building materials.

The Committee noted that they were talking about materials of a historical nature. There was some back-and-forth conversation between the Committee and the applicant as to whose opinions mattered and what should be considered. It was suggested that the question of whether there should be a hierarchy of materials should be discussed at the next meeting. The Committee noted that the question before them was the mixing and matching of multiple materials. It was noted for the sake of Ms. Yahn, that all of the Committee members were allowed to have an opinion.

In response to a comment that the color of the board and batten appeared to be too light, Ms. Yahn advised that it was Revere Pewter. She noted that only one coat had been applied thus far.

In response to an inquiry from Chair Clites, Councilmember Pearson suggested the stucco and siding should be the same color.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that the only issue she had, other than the revisions being implemented before they were approved, was that she did not like the use of three materials, as it was confusing. She further advised that she was fine with two.

Vice Chair Lee agreed and noted that two materials conveyed a better appearance. She opined that stone was not well used in this instance. Committee Member Littleton agreed.

Chair Clites noted that, while not bad, the dovetail detail that was built was not shown on the previous drawings and had not yet been approved. He noted the need for it to be added to the final drawings.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee ask for a resubmission of the drawing based on what the Committee had suggested, which was to show the stuccoing of the stone on both ends.

For clarification purposes, Chair Clites noted that the Committee was asking for a resubmission of the drawings before it approved anything.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

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

Discussion Item

2023 JARB Awards

Planning & Project Associate LaClare advised the Committee that the Joint Architectural Review Board (JARB) awards ceremony would take place on September 21st. She noted that the board would meet again later this month and advised that Chair Clites and Vice Chair Lee would be in attendance. Ms. LaClare reported that she was drafting the Middleburg nominations. She advised that the rules for the awards now stipulated that most of the projects for which nominations were submitted should be completed within the last year. Ms. LaClare noted that she reached out to the JARB representative, who said it would not be a problem to nominate a project that was done within the last three years. She advised that she was preparing nominations that were based on the awards the Committee presented earlier in the year, minus the Red Fox Inn, which won the Legacy Award.

Chair Clites reported that JARB was also going to award a Blue Ribbon award to recognize any structure or other things that have been done in Loudoun County, even if they did not occur in a historic district.

Quorum – August Meeting

Committee Member Littleton advised that she would not be available to attend the August 3rd meeting. The remaining members who were present indicated they would.

Town Clerk North reported that it may be possible that the Town would be closed that week in order to move into the new Town Hall building. She advised that if that were the case, the Committee would hold its meeting in the current Town Office, as the staff would be setting up the new building.

It was suggested that Planning & Project Associate LaClare check to determine whether a quorum would be available.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – July 10, 2023

(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: All right. Thank you. Rhonda. We will call this meeting to order the July 2023 on the 10th of July. Middleburg Historic District Review Committee meeting for this month. Thank you, everyone, for your patience. While we missed last week. Our first order of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Present.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson is absent. Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright is absent. Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And again, just a reminder, everyone, to speak into your mic. It'll be easier, maybe with fewer of us here tonight. And we'll go around the room in order like we do regularly. Public comments. Just a brief pause, if you're here for an application, when we get to your application, we'll ask you to come up and introduce yourself. But just before we jump into our regular meeting, just to pause to see if anybody has any general comments for us. And seeing none we'll move on to approval of the meeting minutes for the June 1st. I'm sorry, Mr. Ralph. Did you. Oh, you were just smiling. [laughter] [off mic]. We'll move on to the June 1st, 2023 regular meeting minutes that were submitted in our packet. Are there any clarifications to those minutes? And if not, I move we approve them as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Council: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed or abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. Our first action item is New business COA 23-16 request of Jarad Slipp for an outdoor dining furnishings in the courtyard at 19 East Washington Street Tremolo Bar. And I believe he was here for last month for an informal conversation. So you're welcome to come up if you'd like, and I'll let Estee walk us through any clarifications or changes from what we informally discussed last month, and then we'll allow the applicant to.

Estee LaClare: Just for one clarification, while the guidelines are specifically state anything about patio furniture at this point in time, it is within your purview because of the historic district and the way that this is a prominent storefront right there on Washington Street. So it's definitely within your ability to review that. So I just want to make [off mic].

Tim Clites: Thank you. And for the record, because they record this and live stream it, I don't know who watches live streams, but people do. Interestingly enough.

Jarad Slipp: Tens of people.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So just say hello. And what do we normally ask for Name and Address? [off mic]. Name and address, please.

Jarad Slipp: What address would you like?

Tim Clites: Your business address?

Jarad Slipp: Home address the business address. Mailing address.

Tim Clites: Unless we're coming for dinner, the business address.

Jarad Slipp: So my name is Jarad Slipp. I'm the owner of Tremolo Bar, which is at 19 East Washington Street.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any clarifications you'd like to give to us tonight after the [multiple speakers].

Jarad Slipp: No, we've actually executed everything that we showed you last month, which was just some black tables and chairs for the patio space that was formerly Wild Heart Brewery.

Cindy Pearson: Did you say black?

Jarad Slipp: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: They're silver in the picture.

Margaret Littleton: [off mic] is black.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, thank you. [laughter] [inaudible]

Tim Clites: Okay. Yeah. And I think last month you had mentioned them being black, so. But yes. Text supersedes the image. All right let's go around the room. Cindy, I'll start with you if I can.

Cindy Pearson: That was the only question I had. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Looks fine to me.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think they look good. Thank you.

Jarad Slipp: Thanks.

Tim Clites: And Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think they're fine.

Tim Clites: Great. Well, this is easy. When you came in last month and we reviewed it and discussed it, so we appreciate that.

Margaret Littleton: And they're all the same, right? Because in your diagram, the square tables look like a different chair than the.

Jarad Slipp: I think that was cut and paste.

Margaret Littleton: Whatever.

Jarad Slipp: Yeah. Of the software. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Well, I have no comments beyond what we had discussed last month either. So in order to keep things moving along, I move that we approve COA 23-16. We did talk last month about lighting, and I didn't see anything specifically regarding that.

Jarad Slipp: There's only lighting on the tables, there are little portable lights that.

Tim Clites: It will come in and out? Yeah.

Jarad Slipp: Basically, yeah.

Tim Clites: So when you're not actively in business, they'll be taken inside.

Jarad Slipp: There's no spotlights or anything new.

Tim Clites: All right, thank you. I move that we approve COA 23-16 as submitted.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you.

Jarad Slipp: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Appreciate you coming in tonight. Next is COA 23-17 S 23-09 request of Steve Simons for a projecting wall and directory signs at 201 East Washington Street for Veritas Contracting. Estee.

Estee LaClare: Basically thinking [off mic] everything is as it's stated and fits within all of our parameters and guidelines. So [off mic] basically replacing some of the existing signs that are there using the mounting hardware already that is in place. Just updating it with his own brand [off mic] colors.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Good evening, Steve.

Steve Simons: Hello. Steve Simons, Veritas Contracting one South Hamilton Street. We are the basement office of 201 East Washington.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Thank you. And anything out of the ordinary or particular that you want to tell us about the application before we go around for comments?

Steve Simons: I think the biggest, the biggest plus is we get rid of the big [expletive] can sign that's currently up on the side of the building. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: Explained that way [off mic].

Steve Simons: Seems a little more appropriate.

Tim Clites: Okay, well, I'll wait for everyone to get it open, and then I'll head around the room in the same direction. Cindy, so when you're ready.

Cindy Pearson: No, I'm ready. No questions. Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: Nor I.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Nothing. They're nice and clean. Thank you.

Steve Simons: Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: I think they're fine.

Tim Clites: So just so I understand it, I have a question. It says carved and painted. Which parts? I'm looking at Page nine, which is Veritas contracting and then the little image of it on the stone. What's projecting and what's engraved in?

Steve Simons: That would be a great question for Mr. Ralph behind us here. He's making the sign.

John Ralph: The only thing we can really carve on that, unfortunately, is the word Veritas. So it's essentially, it's a thick paneled sign with the words carved into it. All the little pinstripes and lines just don't lend themselves to doing that very well.

Tim Clites: Okay. So that border is pinstripes and lines, not a carved border of any? [off mic] Yeah. Okay.

John Ralph: I really, I mean, I don't like to put molding outside because it takes a level of maintenance that no one wants to do.

Steve Simons: It is undercover back there, but it has a roof over it.

Tim Clites: And I was only asking because I know. Well, when ours and other signs you actually sometimes like those two little lines mean you would carve like a little reveal into it even if it was [multiple speakers].

John Ralph: We try to carve it whenever we can. They have several stripes and they're really close together.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

John Ralph: And we've already done site signs that are identical, basically.

Tim Clites: I'm not questioning it. I just wanted clarification, so we know. Yep.

John Ralph: I think from a practical standpoint, it wouldn't be appreciated.

Tim Clites: Okay. So I'll pause if there's any other comments or questions, or I'll be happy to take a motion.

Margaret Littleton: [off mic] I make a motion that we approve. Oops. COA 23-17 S 23-09 request of Steve Simons for projecting wall and directory signs at 201 East Washington Street, Veritas Contracting.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Council: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Abstained? Motion passes. Next application is myself, so I will step aside and ask Punkin to conduct this portion.

Punkin Lee: If you'd like to state your name, please and your address.

Tim Clites: Tim Clites, 109, West Marshall Street.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Estee do you have?

Estee LaClare: Oh, thank you. I think that basically clarifies everything. They just want to replace the door with the 15 light wood door along with fixing and replacing some of the boarding that is on the porch because it's been rotted and decayed and then fixing the concrete to make it more [off mic] accessible as well as safety issues.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Excuse me, Mr. Clites, could you not have that door the same color as the previous door? I'm kidding. I think.

Tim Clites: We could actually. The previous door was supposed to be the color of the logo, and the paint got mixed wrong, and I was going to change it. [multiple speakers] And the day we got. No, no, it's an important part of the story. The day it got done, Mark, who lives next door to me, came by and said, Oh, that's such a great color. Wendy would have approved. And I was like, All right, we'll leave it. But essentially, we would like to our logo is right beside the door. We would like to use this slightly bolder orange.

Cindy Pearson: And I like it. That's why I'm being a.

Tim Clites: Picking on me a little. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: So and really our reason for requesting that is not to match the neighboring property, but we continue to have people that come up to the door and for some reason won't knock and they'll just, oh, the door is kind of closed and they turn around and walk away or leave a package outside the door without knocking. And so we just think it would help brighten the inside. But I think it makes it more inviting to be able to see into that space.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, for business.

Margaret Littleton: I agree it would.

Cindy Pearson: No, I have no questions. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No questions.

Punkin Lee: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: It looks fine. I like the new orange or whatever you're calling it.

Punkin Lee: I'm the same. I think your improvements will be very nice.

Cindy Pearson: I think they're needed. Yes. Yes.

Margaret Littleton: Especially the porch. Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: I'll make a motion if you want. I make a motion to approve COA 23-18 request of Tim Clites to replace and paint the front door and replace the front porch decking at 109 West Marshall Street. Clites Architect.

Punkin Lee: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Opposed?

Tim Clites: Thank you. You want to finish? I'll just leave.

Punkin Lee: No. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. We're back to the next order of business is COA 2-19 S 23-10 request of David Ayala.

David Ayala: Yes.

Tim Clites: Ayala.

David Ayala: Yes, sir.

Tim Clites: Ayala for the installation of a new sign and post at 16 East Washington Street, CDMX Bar and Grill. Welcome and Estee you want to walk us through any comments?

Estee LaClare: I would like to point out that they will be removing the post that's currently there that is overhanging the public sidewalk and that's quite large and kind of teetering on the brink and replacing it with a much smaller post that's closer to the building and it will be much more blending into the landscape, if you will.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Welcome. Hello. Name and address for the record.

David Ayala: Yes. 16 [inaudible] Washington Street.

Tim Clites: Say it again.

David Ayala: The area is very new for me. So it's 16 East Washington street.

Tim Clites: Right. And you are, David?

David Ayala: Yes.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Welcome.

David Ayala: Thank you.

Tim Clites: And. So we'll just be boring all night tonight and go the same way. Cindy, you're up.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. It's a colorful sign. And so I was just wondering if it meets our regulations with the sign material. Yes, it does. Okay.

Estee LaClare: [off mic] I also think it's [off mic].

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, it's beautiful, don't get me wrong. And I can't wait. Yeah. Okay, cool. I just couldn't tell with how other ones are usually done. But no, it's great. I have no questions if it meets it.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Do you have the colors? Do you have the colors, John? There doesn't seem to be any other than the picture.

John Ralph: That's interesting. Estee usually [off mic] swatches out of us.

Estee LaClare: I apologize. I did not do that.

John Ralph: I don't see a set in here.

Margaret Littleton: Is the picture pretty true to the color?

John Ralph: Yeah. It should be.

Punkin Lee: An apple green and red.

Cindy Pearson: More like grass.

Punkin Lee: Black and gray.

Margaret Littleton: And black.

Punkin Lee: Right. Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: Margaret.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I love Mexican food. Can't wait. So I can't wait for that. But I think the sign is too large. 36 by 35 is as big as the table's top at Tremolo. And it's such a beautiful building. Beaux-art. It doesn't match. And it's a startling color. But I don't know what we can do about it. I'm sure you've got the you used the max square footage or whatever the formula is, right?

John Ralph: That's not even close to the max.

Margaret Littleton: Right. I think it's too large.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. My question is the red. Is it all the same red? The green's all the same green. Is the red all the same red. The little curlicues aren't. Maybe it's because it's close to the green. It kind of looks like a slightly different.

Cindy Pearson: It looks pinkish.

Tim Clites: It looks pinkish, but it's all the same red. And then the green and the red are actually the border the whole way around it also. That's intentional? That's not?

David Ayala: Correct.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So I think Margaret asked the good question just for scale. Do we know by chance how big the signpost is that's there? Like, how far out does it project? [off mic]

John Ralph: I just don't know the current one. We didn't do it.

Rhonda North: John.

John Ralph: I'll come join. Hi, I'm John from Quail Run. I don't know the current post because we didn't do it. I just know that no one likes it and it's big. And the red bar sushi sign was big and sticking out in the sidewalk. And we were sort of advised that if you want to get anything approved on this building, get rid of the post. So that's what we were going to do.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I like that. I think it's nice. It definitely is more becoming of the sidewalk to have the whole thing set back as opposed to kind of over your head. Do you have any sense and the little image in the bottom left, bottom right corner of page six? Is that pretty close to scale? Because if I understand it correctly, a 4x4 nine-foot cedar post means that what, 2 or 3ft of that would be in the ground? So the crossbar is at about 70?

John Ralph: We call it, a nine-foot post. We say nine feet out of the ground. Out of the ground. And that's our language, sorry.

Tim Clites: Okay. So that everyone on the Committee understands because I think Margaret raises a reasonable point. The crossbar then is at about eight and a half feet.

John Ralph: Or 8 really.

Tim Clites: Or 8ft. And so the sign hangs somewhere from seven, six, to four, six. Which kind of shoulder height and above.

John Ralph: But in bushes.

Tim Clites: Completely back from the sidewalk. It's the only sign for the building. There's nothing to go on the building?

John Ralph: Do you have the page two of this? The discussion item. [off mic] All right. I was wondering about that. This is not part of the application. This is something we were bringing to discuss. The applicant wanted to put letters on the front of the building. I remember this being discussed at some point in the past, and there was a lot of sort of recollection of [inaudible] and people potentially fainting from the thought. So we advised them to pull this because this is a rush, and we need to get this done for them to open. And if they really want to and if you feel like you ever might approve lettering on the façade, we have a proof of how that would work. But I just based on my experience of doing this for quite some time, I don't think that, I didn't have a good feeling that this was ever going to fly, which is why we separated it out. But I'd be happy to show you this.

Tim Clites: I'd like to see it because I think in the context of Margaret's question, I think one sign versus two.

Margaret Littleton: That looks better.

Tim Clites: It would be easier to think about scaling back the post mounted sign if there was additional signage on the building.

John Ralph: I remember someone wanted to put something on the facade of that building years ago and it was it didn't go well there.

Estee LaClare: Would you like me to make copies?

John Ralph: I apologize. I thought that was. [off mic] Supposed to be in a discussion [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: Well, this would be an addition to [off mic]?

John Ralph: Correct?

Margaret Littleton: Oh, it would be?

John Ralph: Well, I mean, that was the thought. So we were only bringing this as a discussion item, not, we wanted to get this approved and get it into production. And I didn't know that that was going to fly as it is or whether you would want to see other options or.

Tim Clites: So I'll just verbalize what's in my mind for the rest of the Committee to hear. I think that it's a reasonable question to talk about the scale of this sign. I think the boldness of its colors is not really as

much as we can comment on it. We can't really ask, and we haven't on other applications asked to change color, but scale and color like the bigger it is, the more of that color you see. It seems to me like now that everyone's seen the signage on the building, that and I'm just telling you what's in my mind that it might be a reasonable thing to consider if this sign were smaller and that signage on the building was agreeable in addition to a smaller sign that that gives them kind of two options. The one is the drive by option and the other is the across the street. Across the street this sign wouldn't necessarily be as visible because it will be from shoulder height to slightly above and it'll be perpendicular to anyone on the other side of the street. So with that brain dump, I'll be quiet for a minute. And I'll start around the room with Cindy and you all can just walk around with any comments.

Cindy Pearson: When you look at the sorry, I went past it. The picture that is in that lower right-hand corner, you know, where it's a little where it shows it above the bush. It still looks like it's going to stick out past the bush somewhat.

Virginia Jenkins: Does to me.

Cindy Pearson: It does to me.

Tim Clites: And I believe that's just a Photoshop.

Cindy Pearson: That's just a Photoshop image.

John Ralph: Degree in Photoshop.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Tim Clites: Because it's below seven feet, it won't be able to stick out past the bush.

John Ralph: The ones that we've had there in the past were always well tucked in and I don't actually know why they ever got rid of that post. I guess they just wanted a bigger one. But there was one nicely sort of tucked in the bushes where it belonged.

Cindy Pearson: So would it be possible to make it a bit smaller and still be as noticeable as you need it. Do you think?

John Ralph: I would think so. I mean.

David Ayala: Can I talk. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Absolutely. You're here to. Yeah. You're the applicant. Sure.

David Ayala: No problem. He's a representative for the designer. But my personal opinion I don't know if you guys approve of this, but that's fine. Two and above to you know, the door. I think it's better for the post because the posts is very old. And sometimes, you know, when people pass the bigger people for me, it's too shorty to that post you know for people pass right there. So and I think the picture you see the tree right there, but I think the sign can go out a little bit for the people. Yeah, I see that. You know, I see the posts when I pass there, I see the posts. He's come down a little bit, so I think it's better than the one in the back, you know.

Cindy Pearson: No, I agree that the post is needed to change. I think that's perfect. I was just you know, I kind of if the sign is as large as my brain is making it seeing a picture of it. But that would you know, the colors are great because it's the, you know, your colors.

David Ayala: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Can I interrupt you?

Cindy Pearson: Sure, please.

Tim Clites: And ask everyone on the Committee to go to page five, and you might need to do it on your screen and zoom in to the front elevation picture in our guideline inventory of property. When you zoom in, you're going to see the previous signpost and sign, not the one that's there now. It appears to be completely off of the sidewalk and have a sign that somewhere probably around 30 inches by 30 inches or 24 by. Do you see the picture I'm talking about?

John Ralph: I don't know that I have that picture.

Tim Clites: On here. It's in our guide. I'm just trying to give everyone a sense of scale.

Virginia Jenkins: Page five.

Estee LaClare: It's the actual survey.

Tim Clites: It's the survey photo from a while ago. But it gives you a sense of scale and what the other potential signage on the building would look like from across the street.

John Ralph: And just looking at it and guessing, I'm going to say that sign is maybe 30 inches at its max.

Tim Clites: Right. [off mic] So you see it.

Margaret Littleton: I don't know [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: I'm just giving us a sense of scale. It's smaller, right? And it's at that lower height, but it also allows.

Virginia Jenkins: What was there before sushi. What was that sign for? Do you know?

John Ralph: Trotters Perk Bistro.

Virginia Jenkins: Who was that?

John Ralph: It was the cupcake lady.

Margaret Littleton: Cupcake lady.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, Oh, Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Just flashback.

John Ralph: That was one of the more interesting things I've ever illustrated on a sign. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: Everything about that was interesting. Bless your heart. And I ran into her not too long ago about a year ago.

Margaret Littleton: Is this, do you have a lot of other restaurants? Is this a chain?

David Ayala: A what?

Margaret Littleton: Do you have other?

David Ayala: Yes, I have.

Margaret Littleton: Locally?

David Ayala: Yes. I have Los Toltecos of Winchester. Los Toltecos [inaudible] Los Toltecos of West Virginia. Yeah. Los Toltecos of Frederick, Los Toltecos [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: And soon to be Middleburg.

David Ayala: Yes.

Margaret Littleton: So they all have this sign.

David Ayala: No. It's a different sign.

Margaret Littleton: Oh, this is a different sign.

David Ayala: Yes. It's this one. That's what I put it here. Because this is bigger and it's too complicated for a big sign.

Margaret Littleton: And John can do anything. I just think it is not appropriate. The photograph doesn't match the building at all. And we all love that building. I would rather see this on your shirt. [laughter] But I don't think that you need to have the writing on the top of the window. That would.

Tim Clites: Well I'm sorry, again, just to interrupt and be clear, I think the writing above the window is not on the application. They're showing it to us in case we would consider it. And we may we should give some feedback on that, so they don't waste the time to come back if we collectively think that's not a good idea. Separate from that, although it could be connected, would be this question of how big does this projecting sign could be. Right? So we think 36 is too big. And we said, well, 30. I mean, at 24, it kind of feels too small for that scale. So is it I mean, is it just 10%? Is it 30 inches square? Is that an appropriate sign? And then independent of whether we add or allow any signage on the building, because they would have to come back for that anyway. So if I understand it, the applicant would like us to approve something tonight so they can get open. And the only thing that we can approve tonight is the application in front of us. And if we want to request an adjustment in size, we should agree on what we think is appropriate for the scale of the building. It is a small [inaudible]. Care about a lot, Right? And then if you say and in addition, don't we've seen that and we don't like that, let's let them know that separately as well. Right. So they don't spend the energy. Is that what you're saying? Your thought is nothing on the building.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Tim Clites: If this could be just a little smaller, we'd be okay with it.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, what is a little smaller?

John Ralph: I would like to not go any less than 30 square. That's not a very big sign, really.

Virginia Jenkins: No, it isn't.

Tim Clites: The bright colors are going to help give it some punch as you drive down the street.

Virginia Jenkins: Well I understand but I mean, they're the colors of the Mexican flag, which is totally understandable that they would use that. And I mean, I wouldn't even be opposed to 32.

John Ralph: Well, if the pulse is that we're probably only going to have one sign, then I would argue that's as big as we can allow it to be without becoming a billboard.

Virginia Jenkins: Also, if it were, let's say it went to 30 by 30. I'm not opposed to having it on the building either. That's just me.

Tim Clites: Okay. So one thing at a time, then let's. [inaudible] Punkin. Additional comments from you.

Punkin Lee: I think a bit smaller, the 30 by 30 and I think that would be enough. That building doesn't need signage on the top would be my opinion. It's got enough going on. It's a beautiful building.

Tim Clites: And so one of you young whippersnappers can now make a motion.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, there's 30 and 30 by 30 and 32.

Tim Clites: Right. It's fairly close in size.

Cindy Pearson: It's okay. So we've got it. Sorry if we've got a 36-inch round. If you take it in four inches. Is that four inches all the way around?

Tim Clites: It's 2 inches all the way around.

Cindy Pearson: So it's two inches all the way around. Is it that much difference when you're looking at a sign from a distance, John?

John Ralph: Every little bit helps, especially when it's their sole form of advertisement.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, I wouldn't take it down too small because it is there, they are on the street. The other. Okay, I'll ask it this way. The other signs that are close by, are they as big? Is there anything because I think the other ones on the building. So maybe that's not a good comparison. The lingerie store.

Virginia Jenkins: Chloe's is over there.

John Ralph: Chloe's isn't very tall because we don't have the roof clearance.

Cindy Pearson: Right.

John Ralph: There's a little Jardin Bagatelle sign, but it's about a square foot.

Cindy Pearson: Maybe.

Tim Clites: If everyone would like to direct their attention.

Cindy Pearson: Yes please.

Tim Clites: Apologize for putting my back towards you. This is 32 inches in diameter.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. [off mic]

Tim Clites: It's right here. [multiple speakers] The sign that we would put out there would be about that high. If I just visually look at how long, you need for hanging from eight feet. So that's a 32-inch diameter.

Cindy Pearson: And what is the 36?

Tim Clites: 36 would be quite, but about the white. Welcome to get up. And come back somewhere else. [off mic] 32 by 32.

Punkin Lee: Yeah, right.

Virginia Jenkins: So would you be happy with 32 by 32?

Cindy Pearson: Could you get all everything in.

John Ralph: Just a tiny bit smaller?

David Ayala: Anyway. But I mean, it's fine.

John Ralph: I think you're going to be okay.

Cindy Pearson: Can you get all the artwork in on a 32 by.

John Ralph: Yeah.

David Ayala: How much? What is the bigger than the post front of the building?

Tim Clites: Some of the other [off mic] but I think you're right. The scale of it and looking at that, you really get a sense of two inches, but it's [off mic] great. So please, if you're so inclined, I will take a motion for this application.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. I'll do it. I make a motion that we approve COA 23-19 S 23-10. And there are more ants, for crying out loud.

Cindy Pearson: Got it. Not anymore.

Virginia Jenkins: Requested David Ayala?

David Ayala: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: For the installation of a new sign and post at 16 East Washington Street with the amended size of 32 wide by 32 high.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And I would like one clarification from Mr. Ralph, which we forgot to ask. We were focused on size. What is carved and raised?

John Ralph: Kind of put one little caveat note on this. It's actually a 35 by 36. So if we go to 32 width, the height is going to be 32.8 or something just scaling proportionately. So from a scaling standpoint, if we could stipulate width or height.

Tim Clites: Maximum 32. How's that sound? Whichever is small.

Cindy Pearson: However it makes it round.

Virginia Jenkins: How about 32.

Tim Clites: 32 by 31.4.

Virginia Jenkins: Why are we changing the way the whole sign is? It's not a round sign as is. [multiple speakers]

John Ralph: I'm just saying, can we just cap either the sign or the width?

Tim Clites: Bring it in [multiple speakers].

Virginia Jenkins: 32 by 33.

John Ralph: Perfect.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. There you go. Okay. Do I need to redo this whole?

Tim Clites: Note, just to clarify which pieces are. It says carved and painted with raised elements. We were so focused on the size, we didn't clarify.

John Ralph: Your favorite question. Yeah. So there's going to be a one-inch-thick piece of material. Okay. Some of the face striping in different colors will be carved in. Okay. The red outside bit is a cove and the CDMX we're actually going to have three dimensionally raised.

Tim Clites: Projecting out.

John Ralph: Yep. Not extensively, but.

Tim Clites: But some.

John Ralph: The sign just lends itself. It looks like it's made of layers. So it should be made of layers.

Tim Clites: Right. Does everyone understand that? And so that is included in this approval that has a motion already on the table. I second the motion. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

David Ayala: Thank you to you guys.

Tim Clites: Look forward to seeing you soon.

Punkin Lee: I have a question on the I know it's not in the application, but where you replaced this little wall there with, you know, pressed wood stuff. Is that going to be painted white to match the lattice that was put up in front of the HVAC?

John Ralph: It's not a question.

David Ayala: I don't see the picture [inaudible].

Punkin Lee: Of the fence.

David Ayala: Oh, the fan?

Punkin Lee: Right.

David Ayala: You say you want to put the.

Punkin Lee: Well, I notice the lattice there was lattice put up in front of the HVAC units.

David Ayala: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: And they were painted. That was painted white. So is this going to paint white to match it?

David Ayala: You guys happy without paint white? [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: I was just asking. It looked for me just fine.

David Ayala: Or just natural wood, you know, like, I don't know, like that color, maybe something good, you know?

Punkin Lee: Does that have to come?

Virginia Jenkins: We even have to discuss; you can change the color of the pencil.

Punkin Lee: Right?

David Ayala: Yeah, because the color is not too important to put something like maybe. What is the stain or something? Like just cover because it's very. Yes, it's a wood you know.

John Ralph: I haven't seen it. So I.

Estee LaClare: If you part of our historic district guidelines if you're going to change colors.

David Ayala: I mean I put it white it's fine for me. Yeah.

Punkin Lee: Was it white before? I can't I can't remember.

John Ralph: I mean, can you paint it the color that it used to be?

David Ayala: Yeah.

John Ralph: Do that.

David Ayala: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: And the lattice they need to match, I guess.

David Ayala: Yes, yes, yes. Tell me what color.

John Ralph: Whatever color it used to be. Just keep it the same color.

David Ayala: Okay? And that way you don't have to come back.

David Ayala: It's a black.

Estee LaClare: Excuse me?

Punkin Lee: [multiple speakers] black. Yeah.

David Ayala: Yeah, I think it's black.

Estee LaClare: Keep it black. But any kind of outside changes, any exterior modifications you make, depending upon if you're going to change them, it needs to be done [off mic].

David Ayala: I'll put it black.

Punkin Lee: But the lattice to match it because the lattice you painted white. So are you leaving painting them both black. [off mic] In front of the air conditioner and the heater right off the patio?

David Ayala: It's white.

Punkin Lee: It's white? Yeah. So are you going to match them, color?

John Ralph: Paint it black.

David Ayala: For the other one? You know that one paint white. This one you want. But because I have to the other one the window is white. You know, I matched all of them. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: It looks like Home Depot Quick fix.

Tim Clites: What color would you prefer it be?

Punkin Lee: Want it Just not white. [multiple speakers] Black, I think, yeah.

Estee LaClare: Yeah, I can follow up with it.

Punkin Lee: All black. Yeah.

Tim Clites: The unofficial preference is all black. [off mic]

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Thank you.

David Ayala: Thank you. Thank you all.

Punkin Lee: Welcome.

David Ayala: Thank you. Thank you so much everyone.

Estee LaClare: Will you. Do you think you'll be coming back?

John Ralph: I don't sense that we will.

Estee LaClare: Okay. I don't need it.

John Ralph: Okay. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Can I ask a question?

Tim Clites: I appreciate it.

Cindy Pearson: When are you opening?

David Ayala: Soon. The whole department coming to inspection? Yeah. He said approved.

Cindy Pearson: Is that your restaurant down on 5606 in the from Ford's Fish Shack. Is that you all too?
[multiple speakers]

David Ayala: The Winchester?

Cindy Pearson: No. Down this way. South Riding.

David Ayala: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: I eat there all the time. Can't wait. It's really good. Margaritas are the best. [laughter]

David Ayala: Very good. So. But thank you, everyone.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Appreciate it. Thank you all for taking the time on that. Next item is COA-RS 23-03 request of Gretchen Yahn for new single-family dwelling at 605 Martingale Ridge Drive Middleburg Residences. Lot 16. Estee.

Estee LaClare: [off mic] So as you've seen, Mr. Moore wrote up the different applications, these different applications. This one is essentially a new application that uses the Vineyard hybrid II design primary cladding and siding, primary color in white and a black accent color for the shutters. And no garage is proposed at all. Possible future garage is indicated on the plan. This is something that I know that you've been looking at. This one that doesn't vary from what was already approved in the design guidelines.

Punkin Lee: Did you notice that this application and the next one are both addressed at 605?

Estee LaClare: Yes. And Miss North kindly pointed that out to us this morning. [off mic] So we'll be back next.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. It's been changed on this one.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Estee LaClare: Thank you.

Tim Clites: And Gretchen, for the record.

Gretchen Yahn: Gretchen Yahn Castle Rock Enterprises. I'll use the sales center. 100 North Pendleton Street, Middleburg, Virginia.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Gretchen Yahn: So this one is basically the same. That's on lot number three, but it's an a version of having siding on the entire structure. And it is Bruton White, which is the same, has the same orientation, same kind of details as you would have on lot number 11, which is indicated as one. Which is my favorite.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any questions at this time.

Virginia Jenkins: Me. No questions.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I have a question. Just because I can't remember. On the right elevation, that door. Is it and it looks like a door. Is there no light to go there? Or is that.

Gretchen Yahn: No, that's just a storage door there.

Punkin Lee: Okay. I couldn't remember I just noted there was no light.

Gretchen Yahn: And the side the other side door that you see that has the four lights in it that actually has a small low voltage just down on [multiple speakers] cell above in the.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I have no questions.

Tim Clites: So not to belabor this application. It is a design that we've seen before with all of the details that we've seen before. I'm stating this just as a confirmation. There's no occasionally some of these designs we've seen the whole design before, but we are adding a dormer or we're changing a window pattern. That's not the case. And so we can see in the site plan that it is nestled between two properties that have a different color, which is one of the planning requirements. And we had always agreed that the material, the siding material did not have to change from lot to lot. It was the color that needed to be the change, and so that conforms to that guideline.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, I have a quick question.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: I can't remember on the front elevation, the windows that are above. That's on that other one, too.

Gretchen Yahn: That is correct.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: So all these details are the standard details. And if you haven't, I would encourage you to take a drive through the neighborhood. Now, there's a couple of houses up. Some of them aren't completely complete, so it's like the shutter is missing. So it looks like, well, that's not what we approved. Well, it's not it's not done. But for the ones that are complete, you can see the shutter and the hardware and things. Some nice little details. So and then you can also see in real three dimensions things like what do the

chimneys look like and what are some of these other details that we've been sweating look like. I do have a question. I don't know if it's appropriate to this application or just to the neighborhood in general, and I don't remember when it came up, but there was a discussion about the and I haven't seen it, so I'm only speaking from memory. There was a discussion about the I don't know if it was the the numbers on the house or on the site, something about numbers and them being backlit and you see it at night is. Can we shed any light on that?

Gretchen Yahn: Have you seen I mean, have you seen it?

Tim Clites: I haven't.

Gretchen Yahn: Pardon?

Margaret Littleton: I have.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. So the numbers on the are put into the column. And then in terms of so they're all in the same location because we couldn't do anything monumental outside of the structure. And then we had to have a backlit led behind them that is then timed. So the only other option was to put the numbers on the house. And then we have no way to meet kind of a daylight or night standard with regards to location or placements.

Cindy Pearson: You said they were timed.

Gretchen Yahn: They're timed? That's correct.

Cindy Pearson: What time do they go off, do you know?

Gretchen Yahn: Well, they don't go off at night. They're from a dark standard because they had to be seen from the fire marshal. They would not allow us to put anything that was not on the structure. So in terms of trying to appease both the fire marshal and to have a scenario that if these are rented, we need to make sure people can see where they're going. And with regards to the fire marshal, this was like the only place we could really kind of put them. If you look at the vineyard, [multiple speakers]. I'm sorry, what?

Virginia Jenkins: Do they need to be lit?

Gretchen Yahn: Do they need to be lit? Yeah, They wanted to have some kind of lighting. The fire marshal.

Tim Clites: They do need to be lit. I guess the question is. [multiple speakers].

Virginia Jenkins: My house isn't lit so.

Tim Clites: Your house doesn't count. You don't have a fire marshal come to inspect it before you move in. You already moved in.

Gretchen Yahn: I had wanted to originally. I had wanted to have a monument that was at each corner that was in stone or slate. [multiple speakers] Then have it so it could be lit from just slightly above. But they said no go. Absolutely not.

Tim Clites: So I think that just to cut to the chase, the question there really is around whether that's something that we actually saw and reviewed or not. And my sense is I don't recall, but I haven't gone back [multiple speakers].

Gretchen Yahn: No, I did not bring it here it's more kind of we were having to meet the fire marshal's regs. I went back and forth as to how we could go.

Tim Clites: [multiple speakers] Sure, I understand that. I understand that meets the regs. It's not the only way to meet the regs. It's the way you. It's the way the regulations got met without our review. So, I think it's more.

Gretchen Yahn: Well, they wanted to have a consistent place, Tim on the houses and the only consistent place on the houses is on the columns. There is no [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: We're not debating the location or the columns we're.

Gretchen Yahn: I understand. I just like there's a lot of thought that was put into this also with Salamander, because Salamander has asked to make sure that people can actually see where they're going with regards to the houses.

Tim Clites: I understand all that. I'm just stating the obvious point which we keep talking around, which is it's not something that we reviewed is all.

Gretchen Yahn: That's fine. I can bring it in if you'd like to.

Tim Clites: Right. I mean, I'm just. Is that true?

Gretchen Yahn: Is that what we. That is correct. That is true.

Tim Clites: I just want to make sure we understand. I do think that everyone I would encourage everyone. You've got to go really early or late at night because the sun stays up longer this time of year than not. So let's try before the next meeting to actually drive through and look at that at night just to see what it is that happened, because I think it's easier to feel like something's a problem because we haven't reviewed it, then actually review it and see if we think it is a problem.

Virginia Jenkins: I think they're rather bright.

Tim Clites: Okay. Well, let's just all go look at that before the next meeting. And actually, if you could ask any other Committee Members that aren't here Estee please do that so we can build some kind of consensus.

Gretchen Yahn: I mean they can be dimmed. But again, I'm going to have to take that by a fire marshal as to I mean, they've been really you know, and I'm just going to point out here and it's not really for this meeting, but, you know, they've really crawled up our behinds and died out there with regards to the Town of Middleburg police when they shut the street down here every day. And I mean, we're over here getting ticketed every day. So, you know, it's something I'm going to be taking up with the town itself. And I think that, that the problem is. [multiple speakers] The problem is, is everybody uses the fire marshal and then when it's time for, you know, to appease the fire marshal, I mean, the fire marshal, unfortunately, is going to dictate a lot of this. Okay. Just because we wanted to do some different things and we're not. And they're like, these are what's going to come down. So I would ask if you have if you think it's too bright, then again, I have to just address it with the fire marshal as to what he wants in terms of it.

Tim Clites: Let's be clear what I'm asking the Committee to do. I'm asking the Committee to go look at the lights when it's dark out. And we will talk about it next month because it's not been approved. And there's more than one way to appease the fire marshal. So to the Committee, I'm asking you to please do

our homework so that before we get another 30 of these, we've actually seen it in living color. And if we're not happy with it, we'll address it then.

Gretchen Yahn: And I would ask you also if you have a better recommendation on how you'd like to see it happen. I would say come with it based on every single house, every single type of location, and then coming up with a consistent location as well.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And so I would say to the Committee, you don't need to spend your time doing that because that's not the issue at hand. The issue at hand is that it wasn't approved. And I think it may be, in fact a wonderful solution that we want to be aware of, like some of the sign lighting that once we saw it, we said, Wow, that's a really elegant contemporary solution. Let's encourage that. So I'm not I don't mean to bias anybody's observations. I'd like you to go observe it so we can talk about it next month. Is that clear?

Estee LaClare: [off mic]

Tim Clites: Appreciate it.

Estee LaClare: I will definitely am happy to send that out via email to Mr. [off mic]. And I plan on going by myself to see it one of these evenings.

Cindy Pearson: Can I ask a question?

Tim Clites: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: Are there streetlights out there? Sorry, I haven't been out.

Gretchen Yahn: No, they're about to be put in.

Cindy Pearson: Are they?

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. And those are going to be brighter than what you even have up there. We do have the gooseneck lights, which again met a standard and these also meet that standard. The gooseneck lights do come on like at 8:00 to like 11:00. Those all through the neighborhood they'll kind of have that kind of so because there's some people who are not there all the time and they want to have, you know, things like it is supposed to be.

Tim Clites: And to your point, that's we should look at everything at night, right? Like all of this like because we spend so much time talking about lights and then it's like, who goes by at 11:00 to see what it looks like? So let's cocktail [off mic]. All right. Well, thank you. Now, just to confirm, we are still on Middleburg Lot 16. We've reviewed it. And so I would move that we approve COA RS 23-03 request of Gretchen Yahn for single family home at 605. Is that address correct? 605 Martingale Ridge Drive as presented.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? The motion passes. Thank you. The next item is COA RS 23-04 request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family dwelling at 60 Clarification three Martingale Ridge

Drive Middleburg residence Lot 17. That's directly to the west of the lot we just looked at and same thing. I'll start with Estee and see if you have any comments for us beyond what we can see in the application.

Estee LaClare: Thank you, Chair Clites. Essentially what this application proposes that the front elevation and four portions of the side elevations, they're to be clad in stone. [off mic] Up until this point in time, you have not seen or reviewed any properties over there in the Residences of Salamander that have that. However, that being said, per the design guidelines for the Residences at Salamander, you had approved the fact that they can use it for chimneys and on the foundation stone veneer. So to keep that in mind when you're reviewing this, this is an entirely new kind of application. And I would say to look at it through eyes of whether or not you found it to be the massing and how it scaling of it on the actual property. Look at it in that kind of viewpoint.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Estee. Gretchen, anything you'd like to add before we go on?

Gretchen Yahn: This is the smallest model. This is the what we're calling the Hunt Box model. To give you a point of reference, the Hunt Box is currently being constructed at the very end, which is on lot number 15 right now. So this would be two up from it. In terms of stone, we picked the smallest box in terms of the front elevation box to have that in its entirety done, front sides and any small amount you would see on the rear. And then having the stucco, we have done some stone and stucco kind of things together on lot number excuse me, Lot number 13 to kind of show the how it kind of comes homogenously together. Lot 13 is what is 608? That is correct. It's kind of a catty corner to this lot. [off mic] Yes. And we picked Rockport Gray, which is what's also on Lot 13, because it does have a very nice, more organic look with the stone than something like white. They kind of blend together a little bit very nicely. So the darker colors look a little bit better with the stone. There is one change that we've made from the Hunt Box that you see. If you were to look at the side elevations, both the right side and the left side in reference to the the windows that we did on lot number 15, those go all the way to the ground. These specifically come up a little bit higher. And then on the right elevation, the windows there mirror that side, that right side on the main box. But we have a little bit of a different floor plan in this one. And that we did a his and her bath. So we had to not make a whole bank of windows. We had to then. So we added the shutters and had the separate windows kind of spaced out.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Hi.

Tim Clites: Hi.

Tim Clites: Well, happy to start with you.

Cindy Pearson: To go personally first. I know it has nothing to do with the application, but I think the stone helps break up some of the sidings, the different things. It just looks and I don't know if you've gotten out and looked at the stonework, which you have. I know it softens things up a little bit, but like I said, that's personal. That's not got anything to do with the application. Yeah. I don't have a question right this minute. I'll listen to other comments and then might bring one up.

Tim Clites: To be clear about what you just said, which you you said it was personal, but I think what you said that's pertinent is that it you waved your hands instead of saying it out loud, so you should say it out loud because it's important for anyone listening and for people to understand. I think what you were talking about or what you seem to express is that this neighborhood has a feel and everything that's siding and stucco, the stone gives it.

Cindy Pearson: Some personality.

Tim Clites: Right?

Cindy Pearson: Some more country feeling to it than the.

Tim Clites: Then along the street?

Cindy Pearson: Yes.

Tim Clites: Right. Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Yes. I guess that's how I would like to comment on that.

Tim Clites: Okay. Because whether you like it or not, I mean, you understand, right?

Cindy Pearson: Exactly. Yes.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Gretchen Yahn: Plan was to get variation.

Tim Clites: Which is. Right. Which is a positive thing.

Virginia Jenkins: So just for me, for clarification, for me, these are the same house. Right? And these are two options?

Tim Clites: No, you're looking at the wrong. We're not to that project yet.

Virginia Jenkins: So I thought we were.

Tim Clites: Oh, no, we are.

Virginia Jenkins: Are we still on the last one?

Tim Clites: Hold for just a moment. There's three total.

Cindy Pearson: This one. This one. [off mic]

Tim Clites: No, not that one.

Cindy Pearson: No, that's what's on mine.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay, hold on. One more. No. This one. Oh, no, it's not.

Tim Clites: Okay so the front that we're looking at is here. And it turns the corner. [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: And this is stucco.

Tim Clites: And then that is stucco, which is here. And the rear elevation.

Virginia Jenkins: Is stucco.

Tim Clites: This portion is stucco [off mic] that the gable ends. That's the front.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

Tim Clites: I'll let you chew on that for a minute. We'll go to Punkin.

Virginia Jenkins: Thank you. I'm glad I'm so with it. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Punkin any questions, observations, comments?

Punkin Lee: I think the stone definitely adds variety. I have trouble with going way back for all the time we spent on the guidelines and knowing and what you all came up with. These are your finishes. This is what you do, this is how they come. And I mean, I can understand window changes because someone doesn't want the bathroom. They want it here and there and you can't have ceiling to floor windows. But when you get into such drastic changes, then what comes down the road? When we started and you started with such rather strict guidelines and now.

Gretchen Yahn: Are you relating to the windows? Are you relating to the stone?

Punkin Lee: No, I'm just. I mean, we're all aware that as someone picked out a house that they may not want to have their interior the way you had planned the exterior. So you might have to change the windows that that everybody. But then to start adding a whole other finish when so much time was given to.

Gretchen Yahn: But we've always been allowed to use stone and that was not that was not off the table.

Punkin Lee: Right. And the chimneys and foundations.

Gretchen Yahn: No, but we've been we are allowed by the proffer to have stone as a veneer. And it's not I mean, I showed siding, and I showed stucco. I mean I didn't not show board and batten. I did not. Those things are all allowed. So to be quite frankly, honest, it's not something that was clandestinely kind of we're sitting back here holding back a veneer. I mean, in the proffers we are allowed to use board batten, siding, stone, stucco. Those are the things we're allowed to use. So whether we've used them consistently on a water table, yes, we will consistently use them on water tables if we consistently use them as a veneer. I mean, our intent was not to not use a stone somewhere. So if that was something that you felt was given out as a veneer of not happening. I'm sorry. Because that's not something that we would have. I mean, it is very clear that we can use those. And to me, that so to me, I'm kind of aghast because at the end of the day, that's not really a conversation that really, we've had. And I wouldn't consider that a drastic change of where we were at. I mean, are you or are you trying to say that there's some other kind of stone or some kind of other veneer or something that would get thrown out? Because that's what, I'm just trying to understand what you're saying.

Punkin Lee: Well, Rhonda I mean, Rhonda, Estee has already said that the stone was chimneys and water tables.

Gretchen Yahn: That's what we've had to date. It's not what we can't use as a veneer. I mean, if someone walked in and I can tell you if someone walked in and said, Hey, we want to use stone on the entire house, we'd look at it in the context of its massing. We'd look at it in the context of what it is, but we wouldn't say that they couldn't do it because it is allowed. So I'm actually kind of taking it back.

Cindy Pearson: Can you clarify that?

Estee LaClare: So let me just I'm going to read through my notes because some things I knew this was going to be an issue. And I tried to combine some of Will's comments, take the design guidelines, and I wrote this all up. And if you just give me a moment.

Gretchen Yahn: My only understanding was is that it [multiple speakers] to date. But I do not understand. I think you need to go back to what the proffer says. And the proffers were that we could use this as a veneer material. We have never stated that we would just do water table and chimneys. That's just not the case.

Punkin Lee: I'm just going for trying to get it right.

Estee LaClare: She would like some clarification and I would ask that you please allow me to speak.

Gretchen Yahn: Then look at it in the proffers and not what's been done to date. That's all I would say.

Estee LaClare: I'm going to read exactly what I. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Yeah, I think what you're missing understanding is that before we started reviewing projects, you did a great job with your team of presenting plans that looked at the different exterior schemes, and nowhere during that process did we look at stone. And so I would suggest that historically stone, when it's found in Virginia, sets a certain expectation to appendages and massing and scale that other materials don't. And so, I'm going to read way into what Punkin's asking because we haven't talked about this. But, my thought when I looked at this particular plan design was we hadn't seen it, but it felt like there was a sensitivity to the front of the house. The original block is stone like it would have been. And that because if you remember a few months ago, we looked at the one project that had a little garage building and then it was decided to take the smallest part of the smallest building and make it stone. And the comment at the time was that's really not sympathetic from a historic kind of building language. But it's at the back of the house. You almost don't see it from anywhere. If you really, really care about it, go ahead and do it. However, if when we were going through the original kind of overall themes we had talked about stone, we would have had conversations about where it's appropriate from a hierarchical kind of massing standpoint. We didn't have those. So what that means is we have to have them today or when that comes up. And I think that's what Punkin is saying. Like it would have been nice to have that when we were going through all of the details that we worked through for months together on sheet.

Gretchen Yahn: It wasn't on there.

Tim Clites: What's that?

Gretchen Yahn: The Hunt Box wasn't in that original kind of conversation. So I mean if you're saying you don't want stone on any of these houses.

Tim Clites: No, stop, stop jumping to conclusions. I'm trying to have a conversation. Drop the defense and let's just talk about this, because we're not the defense isn't helping the conversation at all.

Gretchen Yahn: You're not helping the conversation either, because the proffer is pretty clear with respect to as to what is allowed as a veneer on these houses. Okay. Where can you pull that out?

Estee LaClare: So I would like to do I'm trying to read through what was agreed upon by both Salamander.

Tim Clites: So Estee, go ahead and read that. Thank you.

Estee LaClare: So these are going to be my notes and I tried to do it as concisely as possible because I knew it was going to be. This is something you have not seen before.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Estee LaClare: Yes. So the two applications for the residents, the next one will be along the lines of this as well. One new home and one revision application introduces stone cladding onto portions of these homes, encompassing the majority of the primary volume on the new home, this current one and the new home under review and encompassing a lesser extent in the next application, you will see. This new element that the Committee has not previously reviewed. The pre application meetings with Gretchen in 2021 provided four options, primarily cladding, stucco, lap B&B Board and batten and shingle siding. Nonetheless, Stone is incorporated into the guidelines and is not specifically limited in its application to foundations and chimneys. So I want to make that clear. Please keep in mind we have to be subjective in our analysis of this as well, because the guidelines are not all encompassing. Some of it allows for your subjectivity. So you may need to deliberate on the appropriateness of the amount of stone cladding in any given application, whether its particular elevation seems too heavy or if it's entirely clad in stone, if it just doesn't appear to be the proper amount, if you will, whether or not the amount, the volume of stone cladding appropriate. And then finally, per the design guidelines, colors and materials are to be evaluated for compatibility with the architectural design, neighborhood character and surrounding context. The design consistency is to be evaluated for harmony with the proposed architectural style, quality of workmanship and detailing appropriate color and material selections, location, and impact on the other neighbors. The construction should relate favorably to the neighborhood context, specifically to access views, sunlight, ventilation and drainage, scale size, massing, height, and width of improvements are to be considered in relationship to each of these properties. The foundation, accepting cladding materials include Virginia fieldstone, veneer, stucco, parging or brick veneer. These materials can be installed with or without limewash whitewash depending on the particular home. Siding, all board and batten siding, horizontal siding. And that went a little bit more. But we don't need to go into that as much. The stone, Virginia Fieldstone or a blending matching Virginia Fieldstone shall be used on all stone veneers. It may have a hidden dry laid mortar joint or exposed mortar Joint. Stone shall not be split faced ashlar synthetic stone or other nontraditional materials or joint patterns. Chimneys are allowed to have stone stucco or brick with the same requirements as foundations. So one other thing I wanted to point out when I was reading through everything, the details shall be sympathetic to The Stable vernacular, meaning the style and architecturally, but are not required to be historically accurate. This allows The Stables to be of their Otime while hearkening to a historic precedent as well. And I thought I thought that was a rather poignant comment that when I found those in the guidelines. So I just wanted to clarify that and to give you the opportunity to discuss this because once again, you have not seen this. We have never discussed this, even though we spent quite a deal of amount of time going down to the sales center and reviewing the materials when Gretchen so kindly brought lots of materials and I know that was heavy to do. So if you guys have any other comments and questions, I'm happy to try to answer them to my best of my ability.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Estee.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Punkin any further comments before we go to Margaret? Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: My only comment would be the neighbors. It will be so distinct. Everyone's going to want to do it, I think. And the next one is a revision, right? But they've changed their mind and they wanted to have stone.

Tim Clites: We're not talking about the next one.

Margaret Littleton: Okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: All right. I think it's a little heavy, but it's very hard for me to visualize the stucco with the stone on this little tiny [inaudible]. I will admit that. So it looks heavy. And why doesn't the rear elevation have any stone except for the water table? You still see it, don't you?

Tim Clites: Yeah. So the whole rear edition is set on a stone plinth. Yeah. Yeah. And. Okay. Any other comments? I'm sorry, Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: No.

Tim Clites: No. All right. Thank you. So my comments I actually read through the guidelines myself as well. And Estee, I think your and or your and Will's collective interpretation of them is correct, that there's nothing precluding stone from being used as a cladding material. And I do think that the idea that the buildings create some harmony along the street front, which speaks to what Cindy already mentioned, and I think this question of What? How heavy it feels or doesn't feel is kind of an interesting question, maybe more so to the larger homes, but that's not this application. So I'll just speak to this particular application or this neighborhood. And to me, I thought it seemed appropriate to put stone on this front block because it was the front block. It's a very simple form, right? It's a rectangle with a simple pitched roof, which is something you would see in the country around here. And that's probably what would have been built originally at some point a long time ago. And over time they well may have added, if you go to the rear elevation of this house, they may have added that addition out the back and everything else would have been a porch. And then at some point they enclosed it like you can make this you can spin this whole story about how we got here. Not that that's a requirement of the process, but it does for me help me feel like there's not too much stone for this particular model. It's not something we've studied on other models. So I wouldn't say like out of the chute it's appropriate for every model, but for this particular model, it felt to me like it was appropriately located for its massing and the vocabulary along the street. I do think separate from this, we could have some conversation around like we talked about colors and no two colors can go together. We might also say, well, no two stone houses can go together. There might be another clarification we need to give Gretchen. So when she's talking to people, she says, Oh, hey, by the way, no, you can't do a stone house there. We already did a stone house. I think the guidelines gave some opportunity for things like whitewash. And so we might want to clarify that either proactively or wait until Gretchen has and just be clear tonight, we haven't addressed that. So if someone comes up and wants to put a stone house next to a stone house, we're going to be looking for some suggestions potentially. And I'm just brainstorming with the committee, but my thought was this actually to me overall felt nice. The things that I feel like we don't quite have as ironed out as I would like them to be have to do with the mainly the details around the doors and windows, because we spend a lot of time on that with the other schemes to the extent that we actually have a whole sheet that's like, Oh, when you do stucco, we do this. And if you remember we had a number of healthy discussions around, Oh well, when it's this kind of siding, we want this kind of head trim and when it's that kind of siding. And we were really trying to bring this language of the window trim into the siding vernacular a little bit. And so my ask on this isn't about whether there should be stone or not surprised, as you might be that I would say that. But it was more around it feels appropriate to me, given where it's located. I'm not sure if the whole thing was stone if that wouldn't maybe start to feel heavy and like, Well, how do we get stone? Remember one of the houses they wanted stone around the barbecue under the porch, and we said, No, no, no, that's not that doesn't feel right. You wouldn't have stoned that well, you might have in suburban America, but not in the country. So we ended up siding that. So I feel like for this application, the stone feels like it's in the right spot. I'd love to work on the details around the windows and doors because I think we could do better than just pulling from one of the other vocabularies. And it's probably six- and one-half dozen of another to you Gretchen But like what is the sill material, right? Does it match the little, the little detail on the cap of the water table and that's the sill and we say, okay, that's the detail for I don't know, I don't want to design it here tonight, but I would think we should like we did for the other siding materials. I would think we should have. If you look at sheet three across the top, there's four windows. We probably ought to have a fifth window that says in stone, this is what we should do.

Gretchen Yahn: That's fine. I can tell you that in terms of the stone scenario, we would do more of a kind of a bigger with a bead, with a back band detail on it.

Tim Clites: Right. It would feel better, wouldn't it? All three sides. And then the question is, is it like, is it a historic sill.

Gretchen Yahn: Be a historic sill.

Tim Clites: And then is there a little slip of stone under that? Like because the the veneer is not real thick, but we don't.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, I'd rather not do that just because it's difficult to flash. I'd rather just do a very chunky sill on it [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: It's going to come out over top of the stone.

Gretchen Yahn: Over the top of the stone and dog ear on the stone. So I can draw those details up that you can approve for the next meeting because we're not going to be getting to that at this point.

Tim Clites: No, I'm just no, I just want to have a good.

Gretchen Yahn: That's fine. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: I want to have a good conversation around all these things so you can leave not only with this application. [multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: So the question I've got, though, is do you want to marry that detail onto the stucco as well or do you want to go to the stucco detail that we've always had?

Tim Clites: I'll speak for myself. I think stucco details have been approved and I would keep them the same. I think you might ask the question; do you change the rake on the. I don't know, like, is there any other like I'm not saying you need to, but you could get rid of potentially, but you may say, well that creates construction problems. Let's keep it. I'm fine to keep it. I don't feel as strongly about that as. Does everyone understand what I'm saying? I talk about the window detail. [off mic] The rake is the part that comes down the roof. And right now it's a projected rake with a fascia back. And I think that's probably, from a constructability standpoint, the right thing. What we're talking about around the windows is not is not the thick head piece of painted trim, but a molded which feels right to me too.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, I can do all details on just like we've done for the stone on I mean for the others for this as well. That's not a problem.

Tim Clites: And the only other thing and I know this is a little bit of a pain in the butt, but if you see it from anywhere, it is a dead giveaway to not wrap the corner on the back. So. If you go to your rear elevation, there's a tiny little triangle there. It's mostly up underneath the soffit. So but it's still I understand it's a pain, but it would be really nice if that was stone because then it would it would tell the story. This was an original little stone structure.

Gretchen Yahn: Yep, I agree with you.

Margaret Littleton: What is that?

Tim Clites: So that's on the rear elevation [off mic] So just explain what what this roof is the roof of the front. It's all stone on the front. It wraps the corners.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Tim Clites: I think that little triangle ought to be stone because it's like it was a stone house that we've added this addition and these porches that got enclosed.

Margaret Littleton: That's kind of what I said. You need more stone there.

Tim Clites: Yeah, but we probably wouldn't put any down here because there it's between the columns and it would look like. Right. Yeah. All right. So that's my comments. Now with that said, maybe I'll just pause. Estee anything to add to that or I'd like to go back through with the committee and see if there's any other comments.

Margaret Littleton: Is this building going to have, the grout or going to be?

Gretchen Yahn: It'll be just like the fireplace is on lot number ten above the water table. It's which has a pretty much kind of a very small raked, almost like a grapevine-ish kind of joint. It's very small joint on it. It's got a little bit bigger stone than what you have on the water tables.

Tim Clites: I'm sorry. Say that again. Because when people go out, I'd like them to look at that. [multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: The preferred veneer would be the tapered fireplace that you see on Lot ten.

Virginia Jenkins: Which is Lot ten.

Gretchen Yahn: Lot ten is the first one. That's the sided house. That's blue, gray, dark blue, gray.

Tim Clites: Estee can give all this to us in a little email. So Lot ten we want to look.

Gretchen Yahn: Yes. 602 That is correct. Sorry, I keep thinking that I keep forgetting these are covered over on their numbers.

Virginia Jenkins: The lot is covered over?

Gretchen Yahn: So if you were going past, it on Pendleton and you looked over the tapered chimney and you'll see there's a little subtle difference between the water table, which is kind of like a mortared, kind of a little bit more gloved type of joint versus the fireplace, which was intentional. We kind of took a piece of slate around the bottom and made it so that the top was a little bit bigger kind of stone and had a little bit of a more raked, smaller type of joint.

Tim Clites: And so then the only question that I might add to this conversation to answer next month is if we have this stone building, does it go to the ground and then do the porches and that water table tie in? Like they were like [inaudible], that's an I haven't even thought about that. But now that you're saying the that the the stone has. Would they be different below the water table and above?

Gretchen Yahn: In this case, no. I think they should be the same. They should be the same. And again, it's just a little subtle detail, but the intent is to still kind of keep this datum point of this porches with the little piece of slate to give that kind of water table effect, which we've been kind of carrying those datums around the house.

Tim Clites: Yep. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: So I think all my questions have been answered.

Tim Clites: All right. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I'm good. And thank you for I think we have better clarification going forward for the next person who wants stone and details back from you. You know.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. It's not our intent to have. I will tell you, the vineyard model doesn't really lend itself to stone. So the intent so the intent here got kind of brought forward by the partners who came in from Kiawah and everybody the last month and said, you know, we really think that on a smaller scale, we should lead by example in a couple of little places so that we could have a little bit more stone and a little bit more kind of gentrification happening out on the site, which is what they'd like to see a little bit more of as well.

Tim Clites: So and I could see, I mean, I think it'd be wonderful if in that first little Vineyards neighborhood there was just a light peppering of stone and maybe somebody falls in love with the lime wash like it's a wonderful look and it just gives some variety. Right?

Gretchen Yahn: I totally agree.

Tim Clites: So but before we go, I get sidetracked on that. Margaret, any other comments on this application? No. And then so for this application, we'll table until next month to look at the window details. But we're not asking you to do that in vain. I'm just going to straw poll that we're not going to get the next month and say, no, we don't like stone at all. I just want to straw poll, the Committee. Right. Well, in fairness to the applicant if that's the case, we need to say it now. And then by next month, let's all think about if there's any if we want to create an advance or we want to just agree. If you get two people that want stone side by side, like what do we do? Because with the siding, it was like, Oh, it doesn't matter, pick a different color. We had that rule color changes the surface that it's on can be whatever.

Gretchen Yahn: I personally don't have a problem not having two stone [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Just saying no.

Gretchen Yahn: Just saying no. I have no problem with that.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: Didn't you say originally you didn't want to have houses the same next to each other?

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. And so I have no problem if there's a mandate that we don't want to have two stone houses next to each other. I mean, in The Vineyards, the stables may be different because they're further apart from each other. But in The Vineyard, I think it's totally appropriate to not have two stone houses next to each other. And like I said, I wrote lime wash in big letters before, so that would be an intent of what we'd like to see. If we do another stone, we'd like to see a lime wash on it. So we're all on the same page.

Tim Clites: It depends on how far away it is. It wouldn't have to be, but I just think it's a wonderful look that you see in town and people would.

Gretchen Yahn: I totally agree. Totally agree.

Tim Clites: Okay. So have we given you enough? Great.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So do we need to do a motion, Rhonda? I move that we table this application until we receive further detail for door and window moldings in the stone portion next month.

Gretchen Yahn: Can I ask one question on it? In terms of it, could we because we are going to submit for our permit, but the permit will probably take us a little bit of time anyway, so that's fine. I'll just say because we're not you're not going to not have a meeting next month, right?

Tim Clites: No. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: Just because there was rumor on the street that because this one came a little bit of a different time that we maybe wouldn't have one next month.

Tim Clites: No, it's only a week later.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. All right. That's fine.

Tim Clites: And if you're coming back again, we can put you on the agenda immediately.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Tim Clites: Right. I mean, you are on the agenda because we're deferring, so we need someone to second that.

Cindy Pearson: I'll second that.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy. All in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstained? Thank you. We'll look at that next month. Okay. All right. And are we down to the last before discussion items? So COA RS 23-02 request of Gretchen Yahn for revisions to approved COA RS 22-10 at 800 Old Saddle Drive Middleburg Residences Lot 49. Estee.

Estee LaClare: So just as Mr. Moore had written up, the original application included primary cladding on the entire home and stucco. The revision proposes retention of stucco in the two-story wing of the home, replaced it with board and batten on the primary volume comprising the great room and replacement with stone on the smaller volume, the mud and laundry room on the right side of the elevation. So if you go further in, you can see there are some actual pictures of the structure. So number four underneath the agenda item. And that will give you a better indication as to what we're actually looking at. So the two-story wing is stucco, the primary [off mic] and board and batten, and then the mud laundry room and stone. Over there to the side.

Tim Clites: Gretchen, anything to add?

Gretchen Yahn: No, just that Sheila was having a request to have something be a little bit. She thought it was when she was starting to see the massing on lot number 18. She was just like; I just think I need to have a little bit of some textural change on the elevations.

Tim Clites: And, I'll remind the committee. [off mic]

Cindy Pearson: I'm listening.

Tim Clites: I'm going to wait till they're all on the same page.

Gretchen Yahn: And remember, there's still shutters that go on the front. I mean, big barn doors, I mean, not shutters, barn doors that go on the stucco elevation, the primary elevation and the side of the the mudroom elevation, those all still get barn doors on them, and the gable ends as well shutters.

Estee LaClare: And if I may [off mic] share two things. Just want to remind [off mic], in cases where this occurs, where work has progressed, [off mic] should view the application as if the changes have not already been implemented. And additionally, one other thing I wanted to mention that Mr. Moore put in the bottom of his memo that I think is good. Just to remind yourself as you're reviewing this and differentiation from seeing, this application proposes stone cladding on a smaller volume, not as much as the last application. A much smaller percentage of the home that would be cladded [inaudible].

Cindy Pearson: Are there any light fixtures on the front elevation?

Gretchen Yahn: Just the ones you see there. They've already they're in.

Cindy Pearson: Not on the stone part I mean not [multiple speakers].

Gretchen Yahn: Not on the stone. Again, that's from above and just a small LED above there.

Cindy Pearson: What up under the.

Gretchen Yahn: Under the overhang so it just shines on the door.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Tim Clites: Cindy, you can continue with comments since we'll start with you.

Cindy Pearson: That's the only one I had right now. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comments.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I'm good at the moment.

Margaret Littleton: It's fine.

Tim Clites: And. Well, I'll give you my recap of my process going down through this application just so you can see how ahead of myself I get sometimes, and I start at the top, read the memo, read the revisions, looked at the previously approved elevation set, and then looked at the revised elevation set. And when I looked at the revised elevation set, not even realizing there were photos. So I can honestly say it was without any bias to the photos. I looked at the front elevation and to me based on the language of both these neighborhoods, but that includes this neighborhood around use of material and number of materials on any given residence and hierarchy of material. To me that I looked at the drawing and I thought, well, this is. Feels like most everything that could be backwards is backwards as it relates to any historical language or language that we would expect to see around here. We've already talked about some of that. So I don't think I need to repeat this. And this is, by the way, precedent. Just to remind

everyone, we're in a different neighborhood. This is the Stables neighborhood. I'm going to paraphrase, but I think Estee could find something that suggests that the inspiration for this was the agricultural structures in the area, but that there would be a primary volume with wings that were hierarchical, had a smaller hierarchy or scale or massing and. Yes. We didn't look at stone on any of it. It didn't particularly exclude that. But when I looked at the front elevation, to me, I thought, well, what came first? If it's the barn, we would be hard pressed to find a precedent that has board and batten, which then got a stucco addition and or at some point got a smaller stone addition. So although I can appreciate Mr. Moore's comments around the stone isn't as large in quantity, it's also to me, from any historic or regional vernacular, it's completely in the wrong spot. And we've talked about this previously, both on the application that got built a couple of months ago on a little outbuilding at the back of the outbuilding where we said, well, we don't really see it. It doesn't matter. And then we also talked about that again tonight as it relates to the previous application. So I came to that conclusion before I looked at the photos and my only comment would be, I don't think when I saw the photos, my opinion changed about what seemed to be appropriate. It's a fairly large building, so perhaps mixing materials is appropriate, but it seems to kind of take one of each and put it on the facade. Doesn't to me seem appropriate. But I'm open to everybody on the committee's input because this is not a committee of one.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay, Tim. You're talking about having three materials you don't think are appropriate. Would two be appropriate, or are you going back to one?

Tim Clites: I didn't get into what the solution is in my mind. I because honestly, I didn't realize there was photos there until about 2.5 hours before the meeting. And I was like, photos, wait. And then I realized, oh wait, this is so I had to actually go drive out and look at it as well. Didn't have to I thought it was appropriate thing to do, given that you can actually go see it. I don't know that it needs to be all one. There's something kind of monolithic and potentially heavy about that. So I can respect if it was someone on your team suggested it needed to be broken up, I could understand that. I do think that generally materials have a pecking order of quality and normally the original or the main house, whatever that quality was, it's not usually followed up by things of increasingly greater quality. It's just kind of not part of the vernacular. I understand that. Whether it's a barn or a shed or a house, which is why I like the other stone scheme so much, because to me it felt like it had some it was rooted in some experience that we know. Stone to stucco to infilled porches. So those are my comments around this application.

Gretchen Yahn: Then I would propose we just stucco the stone then and you'll have these stucco. I mean, your hierarchy is your main box. If that's what you're going to do, then your hierarchies, your main box. I don't totally agree with you with respect to your commentary, but at the end of the day, I mean, I could bring you examples of secondary areas that have stone on them as well. Like I said, if you're in a scenario that you want to have and if you think it being all stucco looks better than this and I don't agree with you at all, then I would propose if you want to materials we'll just stucco over the stone. I think there'll be a lot of disappointment from some people at Salamander, but.

Tim Clites: Well, I mean, I don't know. I'm trying to put to the side my disappointment that we're looking at something that got built. And because that's what we're supposed to do.

Virginia Jenkins: We approved the stucco originally.

Tim Clites: That's right. Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: And why was the stone put on before we approved that?

Gretchen Yahn: Because Sheila asked for it to be done and we brought it in. So here's where we're at. I mean, if you want it to be, you know, if you want it to be two materials and two materials, I mean, the stables.

Virginia Jenkins: It's just the idea. I mean, I think we've got to come to the realization that you come here for approval of things, then you can't go and just build something different than what was approved. I don't care who suggests it.

Gretchen Yahn: But it is within the context of the guidelines as well.

Virginia Jenkins: But it isn't because we approved the plans.

Gretchen Yahn: I understand. But I'm just saying. Then do what you want to do. Say what you're going to say. But at the end of the day, it is within the context of doing these things out there. And if they wanted to make an amendment, they made an amendment. I don't care if you say take the whole thing off, then you'll have a real big disappointment at Salamander. But just I mean, you just need to go where you're going to go with it.

Virginia Jenkins: No, that's I think you're missing the point. [laughter]

Gretchen Yahn: I'm not missing the point. I understand.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm trying to be difficult. I'm just saying that we have guidelines that we spent a long time putting together. I mean, over a year, then we've gone through the approval process with you on the different on the general feel of what's going to be built. Then we have an approval of a specific plan that was to be built and you want to revise it, but you did the revisions prior to getting approval, when you've gotten approval for other things prior to building. Do you understand my point now? I mean.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. So.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm not trying to be difficult.

Gretchen Yahn: You're not being difficult. I'm just saying that with respect to the revision, then this is a revision, and you can cast it in whatever light you want to cast it in.

Virginia Jenkins: I think revisions have to come before the.

Gretchen Yahn: I understand. But I'm also dealing with Sheila and them on this one. Sorry. And I'm having to do some things that they're asking me to get done for the holiday season. So I apologize.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, it's not. It's not. I'm sorry. I don't mean it as an apology. [multiple speakers] I don't need an apology.

Gretchen Yahn: It's not. I understand. And it's. I'm here getting this together for you, and that's what I'm doing. But you can cast it as a revision. You can cast it as a stick in your eye. You can cast it as whatever you want. No one is here trying to make it a difficult scenario. And I'm not trying to make it a difficult scenario as well.

Virginia Jenkins: Perhaps if you're just going to have to suggest to Sheila that revisions can't be done without the approval of the Board.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: And it wouldn't be just Sheila that we're addressing this to. It would be anyone that you.

Virginia Jenkins: [multiple speakers] Totally agree. She this was being specific.

Gretchen Yahn: Exactly. Totally agree.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Will it look like the other stucco if you go over the stone?

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, I'll just have to take it off and [multiple speakers].

Margaret Littleton: It better. I think you should take them. You should cover it. You know, stucco it. I agree with you.

Tim Clites: Punkin. Do you have any comments?

Punkin Lee: I think the stucco on the stone also.

Tim Clites: Does anybody have any comments about the prioritization of material? The main block being board and batten, which is the least.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Which is the least quality material that any traditional building in this area is built out of.

Gretchen Yahn: I have to disagree with you on that.

Tim Clites: Well, I mean, what's lesser than that?

Gretchen Yahn: This is supposed to look like a stable. The original stables had board and batten on them and stucco on the sides.

Tim Clites: And that's not what I'm talking about. What's a lesser quality than that? And from a historical perspective.

Gretchen Yahn: I can tell you that from a lesser quality standpoint, stucco is the least quality of any of the materials, to be quite frankly, honest.

Tim Clites: It's interesting.

Gretchen Yahn: I can put it on for \$10 a square foot. I mean, it's the least quality of any building material out there. Siding is more expensive. Board and batten is even more expensive than siding.

Tim Clites: We weren't talking about the cost. We were talking about the historic. [multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: I understand but the Historic nature of it as well. I can pinpoint a bajillion a bajillion barns that have stucco sides to them.

Tim Clites: Oh I don't disagree.

Gretchen Yahn: Why so?

Tim Clites: But they didn't put a stucco addition on a Board and Batten barn. They.

Gretchen Yahn: I can pinpoint a million of them Tim.

Tim Clites: Bring them in.

Gretchen Yahn: I will bring them in.

Tim Clites: 100,000 is a good start. I mean.

Gretchen Yahn: I'll bring them in because I totally don't agree with you with regard to your hierarchy. That is absolutely your opinion. That is your opinion. Your opinion.

Tim Clites: That's true.

Gretchen Yahn: I mean, so I totally disagree with you.

Tim Clites: That's part of the guidelines that's part of it's not just my opinion. The guidelines were written. [multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: The guidelines do not do a hierarchy of materials. They do not.

Tim Clites: They talk about.

Gretchen Yahn: They do not have a hierarchy of materials.

Tim Clites: Okay. [multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: So then you are setting a hierarchy of materials based on what you feel that is totally inappropriate and wrong.

Estee LaClare: If I may, I think that we all have to remember that this is a place of respect and we're all here trying to take and address these matters in a kindly fashion and allow people to speak and Chair Clites I think that you have every right right now to have the floor, sir, and I apologize.

Tim Clites: I think that this is probably the single most discouraging meeting that I've been in in the years that I've been on the board, plus the years between when I stepped off and the 7 or 8 years previous to that, I don't recall ever having an applicant that had complete understanding of the process and been through it multiple times come in without any notification without any, Hey, we have an emergency. Can I slide? We've had we've made plenty of accommodations for all kinds of applications of all sizes of all walks of life of all. None of that really matters. And I find it offensive to then basically be told to just like. But that's not what we're.

Gretchen Yahn: I find it offensive to Tim that every time your opinion is put out here and you don't. I too have sat here and made things better out there and better than what is even shown on a print. Okay. And that you're taking this as your opinion, your opinion every time. And there is nothing, nothing in those documents that gives a hierarchy of materials. There's not.

Tim Clites: So let's go back to what I was talking about. As I was saying, Estee I don't recall a time when an applicant was that unprofessional as it relates to the execution of things that we spent an enormous amount of time working together on. I don't recall that at any level, on any application, anywhere from a sign to a brand-new development of Chins Crossing to I mean, we've had huge projects to the resort itself. I don't ever recall this happening. So the disappointment of that is significant. And I think that my opinion about whether there should be a hierarchy or not probably doesn't matter at all to the rest of you. You all can decide whether that's important or not. I do know that we're supposed to review this as if it hadn't been done, and if that were the case, you would be hearing from me, at least as one member of this committee, the same things that you're hearing now, because I have done everything that I can within my

internal processor to separate the lack of professionalism from the application at hand. So just for full disclosure, so everyone understands that. However, I do think that the question that I'm asking and I'm happy to have it wait until the next meeting around if we have or want or need to clarify a hierarchy of materials. And you all may say it's fine, we don't need to. But there's another question that this particular application brings up, which is the mixing and matching of multiple materials. And I think it's behooves us on behalf of the applicant and a lot more homes that we need to review to as these new things come up, we should clarify them for the applicant and that you don't as a Committee, you don't need to take my lead on any of this. But I am in fact allowed, like the rest of you, to have an opinion and I encourage you to express your opinion. We don't sit here month after month simply to check boxes. We're actually in the unique position among all of the committees that this town has to be allowed and encouraged to have an opinion. So I recommend that people continue to do that. With that being said. Yes, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you, Tim, for that clarification, because I would have never known there's a hierarchy in materials. So me looking at this with a blind eye per se, not knowing all of that, I do see I'm thinking of the Sodolski's barn because theirs has the siding that goes down like this. I don't know what it's called. And then I would see like the Dotson's house right next to it being stucco. I mean, almost there, that close, you can almost spit on both of them. So to me, there is something here that kind of sets that that's okay to have. The bat is a batten here, the stucco here. And I don't have a problem with a little bit of stone that's on that building. I do think it will bring things together. I'm not sure if I'm seeing good in the photo, good paint colors or, you know, the color of the stucco and siding. But usually because, you know, you were saying trying to pick up the right color with the stone, it looks to me like the batting is too light to pick up.

Gretchen Yahn: It only has one coat on it right now.

Cindy Pearson: Is that what it is?

Gretchen Yahn: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: To pick up the colors in the stone is my only problem with looking at that. But like I say, I don't know hierarchy in different things, but. It doesn't to me look that bad if the paint were a different shade, it would bring it together. Or so. And this picture on the it says mud laundry room in stone that you see to the right. It almost looks like that paint is white to me or a very, very light gray.

Gretchen Yahn: It's the Revere Pewter. It's the same color that we have on the lot number 12, which is a stucco house with the same trim color. I think this has more to do with just kind of the xeroxing of it.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: You're more than welcome to come out and look at it.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Oh, definitely. And I did go out to look at it. I just didn't find it. [laughter]

Gretchen Yahn: Oh yeah.

Cindy Pearson: I didn't go far enough, apparently. But that's just my eyes looking at this picture.

Tim Clites: I just want to clarify. What you said, which is your thought is the stucco and the siding are the same color. Ultimately, not in the picture, but ultimately when we're done, they're the same color.

Cindy Pearson: At least the same tone. Yes. See, it looks a lot different when you look at the siding here.

Tim Clites: I know, but I'm willing to understand that's the picture, right. Or it's not completely painted. But what you're saying is it would be the same color.

Cindy Pearson: Yes. And then it would blend with the stone better and it wouldn't look so. Yes, I think the paint shades is making it a little for my eyes, anyway.

Tim Clites: All right. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Hierarchy or not.

Tim Clites: Forget the fancy word. Forget the fancy word if it helps right like I don't know that we need to totally focus on that if.

Virginia Jenkins: No, I understand what you're saying but the only issue I have other than having the revisions done before approval is I'm not sure I like having three different mediums. I think it gets confusing. Two I have no problem with. And you see that around here a lot. But when they start adding more, it gets. I don't know lack of a better word because I can't think addled. Muddled. Muddled is better since joining.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: That was my opinion also that just because we had three possibilities. I think two convey better makes a cleaner presentation than like we have three listed. Let's put three on there. I think the stone in this instance is not as well used as on the house we just did where it definitely makes the statement, this just looks like, okay, we got three, let's use three. So. I would go for two.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I would go for two as well. It sort of looks like a sampler in that you have everything there. So I'm for two.

Tim Clites: Are there any other changes besides the exterior cladding material that we should look at?

Gretchen Yahn: No.

Tim Clites: So the little dovecote detail will get added to the final drawings?

Gretchen Yahn: Pardon?

Tim Clites: The little dovecote detail that got built that's not shown will get added to the final drawings.

Gretchen Yahn: Yes.

Tim Clites: And if you'd like to make that detail a standard detail, I would put it in the set. It's not a bad detail. It's just a shame it wasn't reviewed first. All right.

Gretchen Yahn: And [inaudible] our events for the range so we don't have you'll notice these houses don't have a lot of penetrations through the roofs.

Tim Clites: I like the detail. It's just, again, something that we hadn't reviewed or approved as far as I recall. And well, someone's welcome to make a motion if they would like to do that.

Virginia Jenkins: I think this needs to be brought back to the committee. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Your motion can be whatever you would like it to be. It can be approval. It can be approval with clarifications. It can be resubmit with clarifications.

Virginia Jenkins: I'd like to see it resubmitted.

Tim Clites: You'll need to list clarifications for what you would like to see clarified.

Virginia Jenkins: What I'd like to see resubmitted is what we have suggested, which is stuccoing both ends. Well, stucco on the stone and now.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] wants to make an approval.

Tim Clites: Is there a second?

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: So to be clear, this is asking for a resubmittal of the drawings to show that?

Virginia Jenkins: I think, well, just or even pictures, I mean, just because we don't need to re-invent the wheel.

Gretchen Yahn: I could resubmit the pictures and the drawings. It's not a problem.

Tim Clites: My question is, are you asking for a resubmittal so we then can approve it or are you approving it with a resubmitted drawing?

Virginia Jenkins: I'm not approving anything.

Tim Clites: You're asking for a resubmitted drawing before we approve anything. And is that what your second is?

Margaret Littleton: Yes.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstained? Motion passes. Thank you. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: So you want pictures and drawings?

Tim Clites: Well, the pictures you probably won't want to do. You'll probably want to send the drawing in unless you've got some because you want to get it approved, I would think, before you make the change.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. Got it.

Tim Clites: Awesome.

Margaret Littleton: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Discussion Items 2023 JARB Awards September 21st. Estee.

Estee LaClare: Yes. Thank you, Chair Clites. So the awards are going to be on the 21st of September, and we do have a meeting at the end of the month. Chair Clites and I'm hoping Vice Chair Punkin will be with us together. We're all going to venture forth to Leesburg and go over the nominations. I will, however, not be able to attend this year's because I'm going to be at the Virginia Association of Zoning Officials in Virginia Beach at that time. So [off mic] I know. I actually am really disappointed because it was such a lovely event last year. But at any rate, hopefully we'll narrow it down where it will be taking place. I did want to also mention in regards to the JARB I've begun writing up the different nominations that we have, and I thought it was interesting because originally, they didn't have a stipulations that the projects had to be done within the last year. And then when she sent out the nominations, it did have saying most of the product should have been completed in the last year, but some of ours have not. But I reached out to her along with other people and no one has a problem with any of her nominations. So I'm going to put forward all of them, of course, except for Red Fox, since that's the legacy award. I just wanted.

Tim Clites: I know our nominations already within a three-year window. Anyway, so that's going to.

Estee LaClare: Right. Exactly. Exactly. I just wanted to keep you abreast. So thank you.

Tim Clites: And there is one other thing that came up. We'll send an email to this Committee, and we can share it in the community around the other award that they're trying to [inaudible]. What was that thing called? There's another.

Estee LaClare: The Blue Ribbon.

Tim Clites: The Blue Ribbon. And so we have historic awards for structures that are in the historic district. So US personnel Leesburg and then the county historic district. But what they have is a Blue Ribbon award, which is any. You have to send it out. But basically any structure or there's a few other things that have been done anywhere in Loudoun County, even if you're not part of the historic district that promote preservation history. [inaudible]. It's really a nice way to kind of say, Oh, wait, you know, my husband worked on, or I know somebody that just restored this wonderful old barn or whatever it is that it's not going to get the exposure unless some of us in the community know it happened and can submit it. So I think the lady, Diana sent something out.

Estee LaClare: Diana. She did send out something. And I also saw it in, I believe, Loudoun Now or I got an email about it, but something else that we could maybe I could ask Danny to include in the email blast that he sends out at the end of the week just to get the information out to our residents too, because there could be some nominations for [off mic].

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Estee LaClare: Thank you for that reminder.

Tim Clites: I feel like it's been given.

Estee LaClare: I don't think so. I think you're exactly right.

Tim Clites: August 3rd. Is everybody going to be here?

Margaret Littleton: That's a Thursday. I think it will be on Thursday.

Tim Clites: Yes. [off mic] You will not? Okay.

Rhonda North: So just to let you know, we may be in our new building by then. We may not. We'll have to let you know. There's a possibility we're moving that week. If so, there may be a possibility we just meet here because the town offices would be closed during the move. We're going to close during the move.

Cindy Pearson: I guess maybe you should check with the other two to make sure we're going to have enough people.

Estee LaClare: I'll be saying [off mic] tomorrow. Okay. A couple of them, apparently.

Tim Clites: Do you have to publicly announce if a meeting location changes?

Rhonda North: Yes.

Tim Clites: So many days in advance?

Rhonda North: Well, technically, the meeting location will not change because our address there is 10 West Marshall Street. Our address here is 10 West Marshall Street. So technically, no change in address. [laughter] But yes, we will be notifying you know. Put the word out once we're moved in and the building's open, we'll be advertising widely that that this building is officially closed. And, in fact, they'll take this down fairly quickly. So there won't be any there won't be any question. [multiple speakers] There won't be any question about it.

Cindy Pearson: [inaudible] and I will be out there with sledgehammers. [laughter] Are you joining us?

Estee LaClare: I'm going to take down the staircase.

Punkin Lee: Yeah, well, we had it.

Virginia Jenkins: Do you have a map of all of that? Okay.

Tim Clites: With that, I'm going to move that we adjourn.

Margaret Littleton: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Estee LaClare: Thank you very much.