



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



**Thursday, August 3, 2023
PENDING APPROVAL**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Monday, August 3, 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
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: William Anderson (excused)
Margaret Littleton (excused)

Councilmember Pearson reminded the Committee and the audience of the process for how meetings were conducted during a COA application that did not involve a public hearing. She noted that the HDRC historically asked the staff to provide a summary of the application and then asked the applicant to provide a briefing. Ms. Pearson advised that at that point, the application went to the Committee for discussion and possible action. She noted that the HDRC meetings were formal government proceedings and, as such, the applicants and audience should not comment during the Committee’s discussion unless a question was asked of them. Ms. Pearson reminded the audience that the HDRC members were volunteers and noted that they worked to create a positive environment during the meetings that was conducive to a productive dialogue and outcome for the applicant. She thanked the members for their time and commitment. Ms. Pearson suggested that if anyone wanted to understand how meetings were conducted, they should speak with the staff.

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the July 10, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

Old Business

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

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that during their last meeting, they held a discussion of stone as a primary cladding material. He further reminded them that they were okay with it for this application; however, they suggested that, for the future, adjacent homes should not have stone cladding. Mr. Moore advised that the application was tabled, as details were needed for how the windows would relate to the stone. He noted that this information was now available.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, agreed with Mr. Moore’s synopsis. She advised that the intent was to not have a bunch of stone houses in The Vineyards section. Ms. Yahn reviewed the window details and advised that the intent was to have a stone sill and lintel that would be of the same material as the stone itself. She further advised that the intent was to have the window in its casing be in-board of the stone face, so it would not sit past the stone. Ms. Yahn reported that the stone sill would be two inches or more in thickness. She advised that she would give the same attention to the header. Ms. Yahn noted that the shutters would be diagonal, with a shiplap gap scenario. She advised that the other details, such as the soffit, were annotated on the plans. In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the casing would be reduced and sit on the painted sill, Ms. Yahn advised that it would contain a small sub-sill like the other windows. She advised that the intent of the primarily clad stone houses was to have an in-board detail for the casing, which was more historically correct. She reported that stone was added to the rear.

Chair Clites noted that according to the narrative, the porch stone, water table and veneers would all be rounded field stone. He questioned whether the same stone and mortar would be used.

Ms. Yahn confirmed it would all be the same stone. She advised that it would be like that used for the chimney on Lot 10. Ms. Yahn further advised that it would be rounder and would consist of larger pieces. She reported that the shutters would be as shown on Sheet A-9.

Chair Clites clarified that the shutters would be the stone house version.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 23-04 with a note that the shutters be per the stone detail and as otherwise submitted.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton

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

COA-RS 23-02: Revisions to Approved COA-RS 22-10 – 800 Old Saddle Drive (Lot 49)

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they discussed this application during their last meeting, with the discussions primarily centering on the three different cladding materials – stucco, board & batten, and stone – on the structure. He opined that the consensus was that there should be a maximum of two. Mr. Moore noted that, outside of the application, the Committee also discussed whether the stone should be lime washed if stone was used on more homes. He reported that the applicant proposed two options – (1) keep the three materials but lime wash the stone; or (2) stucco over the stone so stucco would be on both the left and right flanks of the structure.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, advised that she looked at existing buildings in the Historic District and opined that quite a few of them had more than two different cladding materials. She suggested the Committee take up this question on a case-by-case basis and not set a precedent of limiting it to two materials. Ms. Yahn noted that the homes in The Stables section were larger and advised that the clients wanted other things. She asked for an understanding that the Committee would review this on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Clites suggested the Committee discuss the application first and then discuss the question of the use of two versus three cladding materials. He reminded the members that they should review the application as if it had not already been built.

The Committee noted that the Residences at Salamander Guidelines did not specifically allow for the use of stone as a primary cladding material; although, they acknowledged that they just approved it for the previous application and had approved it in small amounts for others. It was suggested that the question was not whether it should be used as a primary cladding material, but rather was where it should be allowed and the amount. The Committee held some discussion about the application of a lime wash.

Councilmember Pearson expressed a desire to allow the stone to remain as it existed. Committee Members Jenkins and Lee advised that their preference was to use two materials, not three, and that the stone be stucco. Committee Member Wright advised that if done properly, either could be used.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether more stone would be added to the base of the building, Ms. Yahn advised that stone would be added to the risers at the front stoop and the rear of the house. She further advised that stone pilasters were included in the landscape plan.

The Committee held some discussion of limewashing and noted that they were not fans of the lime wash finish at the National Sporting Library & Museum. They suggested lime wash should look almost like paint. The Committee advised that for this application, they would prefer the use of two cladding materials and that the stone section be stucco.

Ms. Yahn advised that her intention was for the lime wash to be the same color as the stucco and that it would be textural. She noted the flat plane of the residence and advised that it needed something that would feel textural. Ms. Yahn advised that she would stucco the stone if that was what the Committee wanted; however, she opined that it would not be inappropriate to have a heavy lime wash finish. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she proposed the lime wash be Revere Pewter in color. She volunteered to do a sample of the lime wash for the Committee's review.

The Committee suggested a sample be required. They agreed the house needed some texture. It was noted that the lime wash should help tone down the fact that there were three materials. They agreed that not setting a precedent of only using two materials was a valid concern; however, they noted that having a patchwork feel was not appropriate. They advised that in this case, the use of three different materials felt like a patchwork quilt. The Committee opined that having stucco on both ends of the house would look better and noted that a heavy lime wash may get close to that appearance. The Committee agreed they were open to looking at a lime wash finish sample and continuing their discussion of the application at the next meeting. They noted the need for the lime wash color to match the rest of the house.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that she would do the sample on the house so they could see how it worked with the other two materials.

Chair Clites noted that if the Committee did not like the sample, they could consider the approval of stucco. He suggested the application be tabled so the members could look at the sample before the next meeting.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee table this current application, allowing the applicant time to install the lime wash finish on the stone that's currently there for the Committee to review for the next meeting.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton

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

New Business

COA 23-20: Updated Security Measures - Middleburg Community Charter School – 101 N. Madison St.

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that security vestibules were being added to the schools throughout Loudoun County.

Bill Brown, of Mosely Architects, advised that they would replace the wood frames with hollow metal ones and would install bullet-proof glass in the doors. He advised that card readers for the doors and phones would also be installed at the entrances.

The Committee agreed the proposed changes would be integrated as well as possible. It was noted that the wooden doors at the Post Office were switched out and that it was difficult to tell they were real without touching them.

Mr. Brown opined that the existing doors were some kind of synthetic wood. He advised that they would match the door color as closely as possible.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Chair Clites, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-20 at the Middleburg Charter School for updated security doors.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton

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

COA 23-21: Artwork for “Survival of the Fittest” Exhibit Banner – National Sporting Library & Museum

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they approved the hanging of a banner; however, the Library had to return each time they changed the artwork. He advised that in this case, the exhibit lenders insisted on being recognized on the banner; therefore, it contained more text than normal.

Claudia Pfeiffer, Deputy Director and Head Curator of the National Sporting Library & Museum, reported that the exhibit would last three months and would cover three-quarters of the museum. She noted that most of it involved large canvases. In response to a suggestion from the Committee that the banner contain less information, Ms. Pfeiffer advised that the information on it was required under their contract with the lender.

The Committee held some discussion of the banners that would be hung on the Town's streetlight poles. They suggested less information be included on them.

Ms. Pfeiffer reiterated that this was a partner exhibition and noted that they had to abide by their contractual agreement.

The Committee noted that while they normally preferred less information on the banner, in this case, the additions provided some context.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-21, a request of the National Sporting Library & Museum, as submitted.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton

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

COA 23-22: Close in Windows Flanking Chimneys – Middleburg Books – 17 S. Madison Street

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that major structural issues were discovered related to the chimney on the north side of the building, which required him to grant administrative approval for its removal. He further reported that the applicant planned to create a faux chimney and replicate everything on the outside. Mr. Moore noted that this was not part of the application. He advised that the owner asked that the two small windows adjacent to the chimney, which were boarded up, be closed in and stuccoed over. Mr. Moore noted that the chimney on the south side of the building also had openings flanking it and advised that the request was to also close those in and to stucco over them.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, explained that it was determined that the chimney on the north side of the building was not resting on anything and that the mortar and pebble dash were the only things holding it up. She advised that it was framed with wood, so it would stay intact due to the pebble dash. Ms. Yahn summarized that the owner would like to remove the adjacent windows and patch the holes, repair the other chimney, and enclose the windows adjacent to it. She noted the old Masonite siding that was on the back of the building that was rotten and advised that this siding material was no longer available. Ms. Yahn questioned whether she would have to submit an application to replace it. In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that the metal chimney cap would remain.

The Committee held some discussion of the windows. They suggested the memory of them should remain.

Ms. Yahn suggested they be enclosed but have a shuttered/louvered appearance.

The Committee agreed that would be in keeping with the history of the building. They suggested the panels should be solid ones that looked like louvers. The Committee further suggested they be painted the trim color of the building.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee regarding the Masonite siding, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that any change would require approval by the HDRC if a different material in terms of form, material or color was used.

Ms. Yahn proposed to install a frame, with a sill and a louvered shutter. She questioned whether the Committee had a preference as to the proposed sill height and opined that two inches was too large.

The Committee noted that using a synthetic material would limit the options. They suggested a small sill be used to help kick the water out of the space.

Councilmember Pearson reminded the Committee that the Historic District Guidelines stated that existing windows should not be removed and filled in if they were visible from the street.

The Committee noted that in this case, the windows were no longer in existence.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-22, allowing the applicant to infill the existing boarded up opening with painted louvers that are painted the window casing color.

Chair Clites clarified that the intent was for the shutter pattern to match as closely as possible.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton

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

(Committee Member Jenkins left the meeting at 6:49 p.m.)

In response to inquiries from Ms. Yahn, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed she did not need to return if she painted the building the same color. He advised Ms. Yahn that the information the Town had on the history of the building could be found in the Historic District Survey that was located on the Town’s website. Councilmember Pearson suggested more may be available at the Thomas Balch Library.

Discussion Items

Salamander House Numbers

Chair Clites questioned whether the members had the opportunity to look at the house numbers and encouraged them to do so.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed this was something that must be addressed. He reported that the Fire Marshall advised that there was no requirement that the numbers be lit. Mr. Moore advised that they must be of a certain height. He reiterated that the numbers required HDRC approval.

Chair Clites reiterated that the numbers were already installed and suggested the members look at them to aid in their discussion. He suggested the Committee must either approve them or identify a solution.

Ms. Yahn noted that the streetlights were about to be installed. She advised that they could be dimmed. Ms. Yahn reported that the Fire Marshall would not allow them to use house numbers that were not on the house. She noted Salamander’s desire that the numbers be visible so renters could see them at night.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised the Committee that there were no restrictions on having house numbers on a monument; and, noted that they could duplicate the ones on the houses. He explained that under the code, if the house could be seen from the street, there must be house numbers on it. Mr. Moore reiterated that this would not preclude there from being duplicative numbers on a monument. He further reiterated that they were not required to be lit.

Chair Clites noted that the numbers were brighter than he expected.

Ms. Yahn reiterated the need to see them.

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reminded the Committee that numbers were typically in a contrasting color.

The Committee noted the need to discuss this as soon as possible. Chair Clites directed that it be an item on the next agenda.

Joint Architectural Review Board (JARB) Awards Ceremony

Planning & Project Associate LaClare announced that Middleburg's nominations were all approved for an award. She noted that Middleburg took all the signage awards. Ms. LaClare advised that a venue was still being sought for the awards ceremony.

Chair Clites reminded the Committee of the Blue Ribbon Award that would be given out and noted that the recipient's project did not have to be located in an historic district.

Salamander House Numbers (continued)

Vice Chair Lee noted that it was difficult to read the numbers because they were lit.

Quorum – September Meeting

All the members who were present indicated they would be present for the September 7th meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – August 3, 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: Do I have to do this tap thing? We'll bring this meeting to order for Thursday, August the 3rd. The Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's monthly meeting. Our first order of business is Roll Call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Here.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson is absent.

Rhonda North: Council Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

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

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Second order of business. We paused just for a minute for public comments. If there's anybody that's here, if you're on the agenda, we'll get to you and everybody, I think. Well, yeah, we'll get to you when your time comes unless you have something outside of our agenda. I believe Cindy has something she would like to share with us. And I just want to remind everybody to speak into the microphone. I know a couple of people mentioned it was hard to hear you Estee maybe you got that feedback. So great not to keep your mic on so we don't talk over each other, but try to remember to turn it on and speak into it.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you. I'd like to take a minute to read the following regarding how meetings should be conducted during a COA application during the HDRC meetings. Sorry, my computer's flashing over here. For non-public hearing related Certificate of Appropriateness applications, the HDRC historically has asked that the staff to give a summary of an application and then encourages applicants or their representatives to offer their own summary and to in particular highlight or explain any items for which they believe the committee members should be aware. Following the applicant's presentation applications then go to the HDRC for discussion with the goal of taking action on them following that discussion. While we have operated in a more relaxed manner, it needs to be remembered that HDRC meetings are in fact formal government proceedings. As such, unless the Chair or Committee Members have questions of an applicant, the applicant or members of the audience should not address the committee or staff or make comments once an application has reached the discussion stage. The members of the HDRC volunteer significant amount of time and their expertise for the betterment of our community. They work hard to create a positive environment during the meetings that is conducive to a

productive dialog and an outcome for applicants, and so that the audience, both physical and virtual and participants, feel comfortable. I want to thank the HDRC Committee Members for all of their time and commitment and to remind applicants, if you need to know more about how the meetings are run to please speak to Will or Estee before or after meetings. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Questions of anyone on the Committee? I also think I believe there's some other Town Council Members that actually find it a hobby to listen to these meetings. I didn't realize that. So if you're listening, we're aware of that. Thanks for your extra time listening. The next item is approval of our minutes from our July 10th meeting is that [off mic]. There you go. Let's turn the microphone on. Say all of that again. Hopefully you heard that. The next item is approval of our meeting minutes from the July 10th meeting. Are there any corrections to the minutes? Seeing none. I move that we approve them as submitted. Second, All those in favor? Aye, aye. Any opposed? Any Abstain. Motion passes. Thank you. Next is action item. Old business COA RS 23-04 request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family residence at 603 Martingale Ridge Drive Middleburg Residence Lot 17. You have all of the links in our document. Estee, is there anything? I know we looked at this or Will, there's yeah.

Will Moore: So just a reminder I highlighted in my memo, but basically at the last meeting after much discussion of the introduction of stone as a kind of a primary cladding. It seemed in my review of the meeting that the committee reached a consensus that it was appropriate on this particular application. You had some discussion about maybe in the future as more homes might be proposed with this, that neighboring homes should probably not shouldn't necessarily have two stone right next to each other much the same way. You wouldn't have two homes of the same primary color next to one another. But it seemed like the takeaway was the application was tabled because there were some details needed, particularly addressing how window openings, for example, would interface with the stone cladding, which you had not seen those. So attachment four, which is the elevations and details that now include some details related to the interface.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And applicants here. Anything you'd like to add?

Gretchen Yahn: I agree with the synopsis at the bottom with regards to the cladding and stone. Neighboring homes in The Vineyards section. I just wanted to stress The Vineyards because we haven't really taken this issue on in The Stables. So I do like that you put The Vineyards, so appreciate that. Again, the intention is not to have a bunch of stone houses over there. So respect to that. Specifically with respect to the details that were requested, I'm going to make reference to sheet A 9 excuse me. Specifically, if you look on this page, we went back on the window detail. So if you looked over the top, it's one, two, three, the fifth one over or the second one in on the left, fifth one over on the right is the window detail at the stone. The intention is to have a stone sill and a stone lintel. That being of the same type of material as the stone itself. So it may have a little more random kind of look to it as opposed to a slate type of material. The secondary item that I would pinpoint on this also is that the intent also is to have this window in its casing to be inboard of the stone face, so it would not be sitting out in the plain of the stone or past it. So hence we put a note about returning the stone back. And then in terms of the sill, again, just noting that it's a random stone, it would be two inches or more. It may have some different thicknesses to it just because it will be stone. And then the same intention on the header is that we have a minimum there. But again, there may be some randomness in and out of it. Excuse me. Sorry, something in my throat, with respect to the top portion as well. Shutter details are next door next to it. The intention would be to have a slightly different shutter detail than what we have on the other products. This one has a diagonal. In all likelihood will be kind of a shiplap very maybe nickel gap kind of scenario. Excuse me. And then we did just kind of we then annotated the details to in terms of the soffit details and the the other details to include kind of just stone. But the intention would be to keep in a shingle siding and stone porch detail that would remain the same. And then our board and batten or stucco detail for the columns would be what we've had out there to date. So we just kind of clarified what the intention would be based on a material.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Does everyone in the committee are you able to zoom in and reference the detail that Gretchen's referring to in our detail sheet?

Gretchen Yahn: Sorry.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. Where do we want to start? You want to start, Cindy?

Cindy Pearson: Sure. I don't have any questions right at this time. Still trying to get this to get in the right spot.

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: All right. Well, let's move on, Virginia. Do you have any?

Virginia Jenkins: No questions yet.

Tim Clites: All right, Linda?

Linda Wright: No, I'm fine with the changes. I like it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: No questions but thank you for bringing the details.

Tim Clites: I have one little question. There's no right answer. It's just a question. When the casing comes down is, is it going to sit on like a painted sill, the color of the casing and then the stone, or is it going to tuck up underneath the way? Because I noticed all the other window details have like a sub sill, but they have an apron. So what is your thought there?

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, it would be just because at the end of the day I have to have that with the window anyway. So there will be a sub sill that will be on it, a very small sub sill.

Tim Clites: Like the other windows?

Gretchen Yahn: Like the other windows.

Tim Clites: But it'll stop kind of a plumb cut with the outside of the casing because it's in stone.

Gretchen Yahn: Exactly.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: I mean the big takeaway on this was that the intention on the these primarily kind of stone houses is that we're going to have an inboard detail of the casing, which I think is a little more historically kind of correct.

Tim Clites: Right Thank you. Yeah. Yeah. Thanks for clarifying that. And then on the committee, everyone understands the little window shutter detail off to the side is the boards and they'll be angled, which is, I think, a new detail. But it is kind of a nice detail. I would agree with other comments. And then, has everyone on the Committee had the chance to review the elevations to kind of see this in the context of the rest that we've seen this house an the massing and all of the other elements. But just to see these details in the context of the rest of the elevation and I'll just pause and wait if anyone has any questions or comments about that. Anyone on the Committee?

Gretchen Yahn: We did add the stone on the rear.

Tim Clites: I saw that. Thank you. And then I only have one other question. It's just I just want to make sure I understand it. In the attached. Where is it the attached images? No. In the narrative, in selections, it shows, and I think I'm sorry, Gretchen, I think you went over this with us the last time and I just forget what the answer was, but I'm looking at the porch stone and water table and then the walls and veneers and it looks like one is a more rounded fieldstone look and the other is a more angular. Do I see that right? Or is that actually the same stone and the mortar just kind of regulates it like that?

Gretchen Yahn: It's the same stone.

Tim Clites: So the sample, just so everyone in the committee can understand the sample with the mortar is what we would expect the outside of this to look like. Is that right, Gretchen, do I understand?

Gretchen Yahn: That is correct. And also just I would say that there you know, you've got the examples out there. If you were to pinpoint one specifically, it would be the chimney that is on the back of Lot number ten, which is kind of a hybridization of these two. There is some more random I mean, some more roundness of it. And there are some larger pieces just because we're going into a larger format.

Tim Clites: Right. Okay. Well, those are all my questions. Again, I'll pause for a minute in case there's any other questions. And if we don't have any, I think and everyone understands it well enough, we can have a motion.

Cindy Pearson: So this is. Will, is the subject is good for the motion. This is not [off mic] in the subject. That's good for the motion?

Gretchen Yahn: Can I?

Will Moore: I'm not quite sure [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: In making a motion is that what you use is what's in the subject?

Will Moore: It's as far as the wording of the motion? Yeah, it actually brings up a larger point. You don't necessarily need to read the entire description. You can just give a motion to approve COA RS whatever the number has to be.

Tim Clites: And then the rest of it.

Virginia Jenkins: And the address.

Will Moore: Don't necessarily need all that.

Cindy Pearson: Did you have something else?

Gretchen Yahn: One thing I just wanted to pinpoint on sheet A6. I just would like to make the note that he showed the shutters in the old kind of genre that they will be what is shown on A9. I just saw that. If you want to include it in the motion.

Tim Clites: Oh well, that yeah, that's an interesting. So it's a different shot on the stucco portion, but a different way of saying it is it's the shutter for the stone house version. Even though the shutters are actually on the stucco if you look at. Yeah. Thank you, Gretchen, for that clarification. If you look at the elevation, there you go. Right.

Gretchen Yahn: I just caught that.

Tim Clites: Cindy, you were it felt like you were ready to make a motion, but no pressure. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: [inaudible] Yeah, let's.

Will Moore: Simply just something along the line with the clarification that the shutters will be.

Tim Clites: For the detail. Right.

Cindy Pearson: All right. I make a motion to approve COA R5-23 dash.

Tim Clites: S.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, I'm sorry. I need my glasses on. RS 23-04 with a note that the shutters.

Will Moore: Per the stone detail.

Cindy Pearson: Per the stone detail. And otherwise stated as.

Tim Clites: Submitted.

Cindy Pearson: Submitted. Thank you. Sorry.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. Next item is an old business item 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. Well.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So this was, I think, subject of some more in-depth discussion at the last meeting. There was a discussion about maybe how many different primary, if you would, cladding materials might be appropriate on a structure, whereas this one, as it is constructed, currently has three different. It has the stucco portion on the left wing. It has the board and batten portion on kind of the primary volume and currently has the stone cladding on the smaller volume to the right if you're looking from the street. So there was discussion about whether having three different materials mixed was appropriate. Well, it seemed that there was consensus, but I don't want to speak for the Committee that maybe a maximum of two would be appropriate. There was also some discussion, I think it may have been outside the context of this particular application about if more stone were used on homes within the development, it might be nice to incorporate a mix where some of them might have Limewashed Stone. So the applicant has returned with two different options for your consideration after the discussion last month. So one would which is option call it option A would keep the materials as they are currently installed. So it would keep three different materials, but it would propose treating the stone portion with that limewash. And then option B would stucco over the existing stone portion so that you would have stucco on both the right and left flanks of the primary retain the board and batten on the primary center [inaudible]. So those are the two different options that the applicant has returned to for further consideration.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Gretchen, anything to add or clarify?

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, I was just reading through the notes here with regards to kind of best solutions and different things out there. A couple of things. One, I spent some time looking around what would be the historic district of Middleburg. We are kind of outside of it a little bit, but there are quite a few that do have more than two type of materials in their kind of in their edifice, so to speak. So I just again kind of question that part of it. I do feel that I don't want to set a precedent of just two because we could get into a garage scenario and have something different that may be appropriate. So I just you know, I just I think we have to take it as a case-by-case basis in terms of these conversations and in terms of these submissions. Understanding this is subsequent to the work that was done. So I totally understand that. But I just I don't want to set a precedent moving out of here that we're only limited to two types of materials on a house. I just, you know, I'm not looking to make a patchwork quilt out there, but at the end of the day, you know, I just don't feel I think that especially in The Stables, it's going to landlock some things that I think are going to be bigger residences excuse me and or, you know, clients that are wanting certain things. At the end of the day, I mean, these people are spending the money that they're spending, and we are managing them and managing the expectations. But at the end of the day, sometimes there are some things that somebody is going to want, either a primary stone and or secondary stone. And so I just I do want to walk out of here more with an understanding of of case by case as opposed to precedent. That's all I'm just saying with regards to this.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy, do you want to start?

Cindy Pearson: Sure. [laughter] Sure. Why not?

Tim Clites: Well, let me just clarify. I think it's important that we start with the application that's at hand. And I think because there's a couple of options, I think it's worth the Committee because this isn't, right this will be a little bit of a dialog amongst us. I think it's worth the Committee sharing their thoughts in the first go round about just the reaction to the options. And let's table for a minute the question of two versus, three versus, four versus. I think it would be easy to get lost. Like we have an application in front of us. We were reminded last month that our responsibility is to view it as if it weren't built. And so I think that that should be the first discussion. And then at the end of that, we could have a slightly different discussion perhaps about whether we want to have recommendations. I just don't want to muddy the waters. So if you want to start with any comments around what's actually submitted for options, that would be great.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Is it in our guidelines? This is a question for you, Tim. More than a question. Do we have the stone? You know, because my understanding is that we don't have in the guidelines that the stone is used as a primary?

Tim Clites: We the guidelines don't state one way or the other. And we have allowed even before the application we just looked at, which was a stone as the primary material. We have approved other smaller secondary garages with small elements of stone. So and stone is part of the approved palette. So my sense is that the use of stone isn't as much the question as the collection of what we're looking at in terms of where it's located and how much of it that kind of thing.

Cindy Pearson: That's what I need to clarify. So with. So to me, this is more of an opinion of mine than as with seeing the different stones. The picture of the limestone. I'm sorry. My computer just isn't going back and forth as quick as my head is tonight. It's probably my head's problem, not the computer. I don't know how to word this. The stone that is Lined looks more out of place than does the regular stone that was used on the building before? The house before? To me, that's a little I don't know what to call it. [off mic] Maybe a giraffe. I was going to say more Halloween ish than a giraffe, but it just doesn't look like it's in place here in town. I don't think we have that type of stone. That's the comment I have for that.

Tim Clites: Okay. And just to clarify, that picture is a crop of the National Sporting Library.

Cindy Pearson: Is it really? [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Yeah. And so, like so let's come back to this question of Lime, because I do think that there's a bit of an artistry to Lime washing and I think that we could work with the applicant to get a sample because often it's much heavier than that and it really gets rid of a lot of the stone in the mortar and it almost looks painted when it's, you know, it's. So I think that's a kind of a different discussion. But your input around like, yeah, [multiple speakers] it is.

Virginia Jenkins: Heavier as opposed to the.

Tim Clites: To the lighter. Right.

Cindy Pearson: Because it just looks really strange.

Tim Clites: Okay. So and appreciate the comments on the Limewash. What are your thoughts about the other options that are presented?

Cindy Pearson: You mean the three, two?

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] 2 A and B?

Cindy Pearson: Yes.

Will Moore: And if I may just?

Cindy Pearson: Please. [laughter] Please.

Will Moore: And I'm not suggesting a course of action, but these are two options for revisions. You would always also have the option to accept it as current.

Cindy Pearson: As is.

Will Moore: So yes, if for some reason you decided the stone in its place as it is, that could be an option as well.

Cindy Pearson: That is my option. I prefer that if that's easy to say. Okay, that's just me.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Appreciate the comments. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Are preferences allowed? I want to make sure I clarify that, that when we discuss something, it's preference. Can we give our personal preference as opposed to?

Will Moore: Right. It's a fine line with this Committee. There's always going to be a level of subjectivity.

Virginia Jenkins: Trust me I know.

Will Moore: [multiple speakers] decisions, but as long as it's within the scope of the guidelines.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Well, then, if that is the case, my preference would still be the two as opposed to three. I think the house is too small. I mean, I'm not a fan of having a lot of different sidings because I

think it gets confused. But because the house is smaller, if you will, I mean, it's not doesn't go on for wings, etcetera. I'd go with B, which is the two.

Tim Clites: With the Stucco.

Virginia Jenkins: With the stucco.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Well and I would have to say I was not here last month for all the conversation, but just in general, I would agree with all the conversation about liming and how it is very difficult to do and do it right and make it look right. So I would certainly agree with those. I kind of go back and forth because of the size, like Virginia said, whether two is enough or if three is too many. If it's done correctly, I think you can pull it off both directions. It's just, you know, again, it's [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: You're looking at a photo of it being done so that I think it's reasonable to assume that that's a [multiple speakers]. No. There's a photo of it. It's a rendering. Think of it as a rendering and we're approving it for the first time. Would we approve that the document that's in Virginia's hand, which is that one. That's our responsibility. Or would we be giving comments to the applicant around some variation of that? You can think about that for a second if you need it. And I'll go to Punkin. Okay.

Linda Wright: You bet.

Tim Clites: Because. Yeah, you did you. Yeah. There was a healthy discussion last month. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: For me, looking at it as it's presented this evening that I think the stone little section looks kind of heavy and just kind of stuck there because they wanted, maybe they wanted stone. So I think proportionally and the size of the building that stucco for the stone part would be more pleasing.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: I have another question.

Tim Clites: Well, we're back around to you, Cindy, so go ahead.

Cindy Pearson: This may go round in circles. So the stone that is there in the picture, will there be more stone added to the base of that building it all.

Gretchen Yahn: So there is at the risers of both the front stoop. Okay. There are stone risers and slate and then on the rear area of the house in terms of the riser, we have about the seven inches or so. You will have the same thing in any steps that are coming off the back doors. There is some stone pilasters that are in the landscape plan that are not shown in this scenario here because they're not really required. But and then you also see on the left-hand side, there's two there's a stoop that has what would be three risers. The top riser being slate-like is applicable in all of our other houses. And then you'd have the stone risers on the two steps coming down. In the context of having it someplace else other than that, that is the context of where it is.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Gretchen Yahn: Can I interject one thing on the liming aspect for a moment?

Tim Clites: We could, but let's come back to that because I think that's probably a deeper discussion. I guess we didn't ask specifically. One of the comments was well two of the comments so far have been not towards the lime, but I think we should discuss it tonight while we're here, because I think it's a worthwhile potential material. But if in this application, there's already 2 or 3 people that are feeling like that's not I mean, I didn't keep track of who was saying what, but then sorry, then we won't weigh ourselves down with a lime discussion. Virginia remind me again you're thinking?

Virginia Jenkins: I like the two sidings but did not bring up the liming. But if you're going to do it. If you all don't agree with me and everybody else votes for the stone, I would do heavy, heavy, heavy almost like it was painted. Yeah. So it didn't stand out? I think.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So it did.

Virginia Jenkins: Having the liming done the way this photograph is, I mean, I'm not a big fan of the sporting library. I'm not a fan of this look.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: In particular, but that's just that's a personal preference.

Tim Clites: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: But if I were going to do liming, if they were going to do liming, if you all were going to do liming, it would be almost painted as far as painted stone. So it doesn't stick out so much. I mean it's just, it's to me it's very jarring. I've been up there to look at it and the whole thing is jarring because there's just too much. And that's, you know, like I said, that's a personal and that's why I prefer having two as opposed to three.

Tim Clites: Two materials and stucco. All right. So let's go now, Linda, you've had a little more time to digest all this. [laughter] You've got to be ready for a comment here.

Linda Wright: Well, I think in general, I would sort of agree with Virginia. If you are going to go with the stone, I would make it almost look painted. I mean, I don't have a problem with the stone, but I would try to make it look like it blends in the house a little more rather than it's sort of tacked on and doesn't quite read with the whole house.

Virginia Jenkins: Very appropriate. Does look like it.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So. And then. Thank you. Punkin. If you don't have anything else, I'll just add. And everyone that was here would remember my comments last month, which summarized shortly or briefly were that when I first looked at the submission and saw the drawings, my thought was it seemed odd to have the stone, the heaviest, most labor intensive, significant material on the least important part of what is essentially part of the front of the house. And so my thought was it needs to go down to something else. And the obvious options are things that are already there. Right. And we talked about stucco. And then after that, as I thought about it, between the last meeting and this meeting, I thought, well, it could also be vertical, it could be the board and batten, but we had a little discussion with the applicant in the last meeting and I think their thought was stucco would be fine. And I think stucco would be fine too. I do think that for me the stone feels a little out of place. And again, we'll talk later about the discussion of more than two materials, which I think maybe gets into what Will mentioned when we discussed last month also having to do with is there any hierarchy to that and so that we do have some. So by straw vote. I think there's a consensus not to limewash this stone.

Gretchen Yahn: Can I interject something, though? Because I've really since the first comment of Cindy, I've had a comment about with regards to the liming that I haven't been able to say anything about.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, we'll pause, and we'll listen. We'll put this on hold for a second and we'll talk about lime washing. Go ahead.

Gretchen Yahn: So with respect to the lime washing, the intention first off would be I mean, this was a picture that was just for liming. With respect to the lime the intention would be that it would be the same color as the stucco, and it would be more of a textural scenario as opposed to a different type of material. You know, the stone with respect to what it is, I don't think it's inappropriate at all to have it be almost like painted, as Virginia was saying, which is what I was going to say to Cindy when she first started to talk about this is the thought process would be to have something that's textural. I mean, you know, I don't think it's inappropriate with regards to the stucco, you know, being one of the issues out there on this model. And I'm just going to throw it out there, is it's a very flat planed residence. There's no porch breaking it up. There's none of that. So, you know, I can understand the color type of scenario with regards to it, but I just feel that we need something textural on something because everything seems very flat, very flat on the front. I'm just going to throw that out. So, you know, that is where, you know, in terms of the liming and if you want it stucco, that's, you know, stucco it, you know, then we'll probably put some vines or something on it because I just feel that it needs to have something that's just in and out more than just flat, flat, flat. That's all I'm saying. So I don't think it's inappropriate to have a heavy lime like painted wash on it to have some kind of in and out shadow lines on something, because there's literally nothing that has shadow lines out there. We're about to put the shutters on. And it has been a comment within our group also about the flat plain nature of the stables look.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Then I have a question. If you're talking about almost painting it. Remind me what the color is?

Gretchen Yahn: So this color here is Revere Pewter, which is this. We've got Bruton White, and then you have the Revere Pewter. The Revere Pewter being the next in the kind of darkest, not darkest, but darker. And then you go into the Rockport Gray being darker, and then the Candle Charcoal being the darkest. So Revere Pewter has a little bit of an undertone of some taupeness to it as opposed to the Bruton White has some undertones and some browns with some grays in it. So.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, then if you're going to paint it. I'm not sure about painting it.

Tim Clites: It'll get painted the color of the rest of the building.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh I thought you said that's what [inaudible].

Gretchen Yahn: No, Like I said, almost like you were painting it. It would still have a wash on it. It would still. But it would almost be rounded on the stone as opposed to it being just so flat as stucco. And again, if you want a sample rendition of it, we can do that for the next meeting. That's fine. I just feel it needs something a little more.

Virginia Jenkins: If you want. If she wants to. If Gretchen wants to do that, I would suggest. I'm sorry to postpone it again.

Gretchen Yahn: It's fine.

Virginia Jenkins: You bring a sample. I think we need almost. Don't you think?

Gretchen Yahn: I'm fine with that.

Virginia Jenkins: You're looking at me as if I'm crazy.

Tim Clites: No, not at all. No, I'm listening.

Cindy Pearson: He's picturing.

Tim Clites: It's hard for me to listen. I have to cover my mouth, or I start talking. [laughter]

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I would request. I would like to request a sample, so we have more of an idea if we're going to do that. I'm still it's still having three. It does bring into question the three having three different types of siding, even though it's painted. But you know, I'm willing to give a little bit.

Cindy Pearson: And may I add on, this is what I didn't finish because my brain went elsewhere. But to your comment, and I think it is because there's not enough stone elsewhere on the house that makes that a little bit of stone look so. Like, woo hoo! I'm over here. On the other ones you've got. I guess it's called waterfall at the bottom? And you've got more patio or more porch and it would or chimney or something and it would pull the stone more into it where this is just like a sore thumb over there. So I see with painting what you're saying that it would kind of pull it and give it the texture or something, but I would like to see it.

Virginia Jenkins: Honestly, I think it's because it's the smallest portion of the house.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, absolutely.

Virginia Jenkins: But know if the stone were honestly in the center and then you had the two wings, whatever. Might be different, but anyway. That's just me. Okay, I'm done.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda, any more discussion?

Linda Wright: I would agree with Gretchen that the texture is a great idea because it does need something because it is very flat until you get some landscaping or something going on around it. But I think it would be good to see a sample.

Punkin Lee: Okay. I agree. I think the sample would help us a lot.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Virginia Jenkins: Visuals. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Okay. No, this is a committee. It's not a committee of one. You know, I agree. We should see a sample of anything that's a new material or a new finish. It's an interesting thing to consider. If we do stone and and it starts to become finished with some kind of a limewash that is the color of the rest of the building, that obviously the really darker versions, that's not going to happen. So it's going to kind of by virtue of doing that, lock us, not lock us in, but dictate to some degree some of the color palette that works or doesn't work for that, because usually lime washes are kind of light as I have seen them. They're kind of light. And so the limewash would help. Tone down the third material, but I think it's good for the Committee to while we have this in front of us, make sure that we're comfortable with, because I would suggest that if this was the application and nothing were built, we would probably be scrutinizing much harder. I think it's valid to say that we don't necessarily need to set a precedent for only two. I think that's a valid comment. I think it's also valid to say that a patchwork quilt isn't desirable for us or the applicant. That's a fairly subjective thing. This feels to me like a patchwork quilt, this particular version of multiple materials. I think we all agree that there's a certain flatness that would be great to improve in the next model. This is the first home in that part of the development and not enough texture. I mean, I haven't

heard anything that anyone here would disagree with. That being said, my personal take still is this particular house would look better if we just stuccoed the end and made it consistent. But I think a heavy wash would get us very close to that. And if the rest of the Committee was comfortable with that, my only thought around not wanting to set a precedent with only two materials would be I wouldn't want to set a precedent with this being either the process or that we would use that frequently, that being stone, the nicest material in the smallest amounts on the least important element, and then find some way to dress it up to make it feel more consistent. Right. To me, there's a certain kind of and I know that's a little bit of the traditionalist in me, but it just it feels a little bit dishonest. So I wouldn't want to say that, well, that's okay to move forward with in the future. I think these other questions that were brought up are valid and probably the applicant would work through and say, well, wait a second, there's some other things we could consider that we haven't as a group. Does that make sense to everyone? Does any?

Virginia Jenkins: May I add?

Tim Clites: Absolutely. Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: My only concern still is if you're going to lime the one, the little wing, if you will, and the rest is that dark? Is that going to work too? I mean, you've got how is that going to balance out? You've got the colors.

Tim Clites: Right. So I think.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm still frankly, I still go back to the two as opposed to three. I'm willing to be open for the third, but I'm not sure with the batten and board and then the stucco being that pewter color and then the white in that little thing.

Tim Clites: Well, I just to clear clarify as I understand it, and Gretchen can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the the limewash that they would put on would be tinted the color of the gray. You can get lime washes in different tones. Well it's built so, so what I would suggest is that it's built and if the Committee was open to that, we could use the next month to look at that option. It wouldn't require us to accept it. We may say that's a great option, not on this building, but that would at least allow Gretchen some time to put the sample together and we could all go out and look at it. I think that's reasonable now. Likewise, if the Committee feels strongly that we should do plan B, that also allows Gretchen to start moving forward and not waste a month doing a sample if the group feels like for this particular application, there is an answer. I think those are slightly two separate things, right. The limewash may be a solution for this in terms of what does the limewash stone look like. Right. I don't want to complicate the discussion, but does that make sense?

Cindy Pearson: And that's with the sample of the stone being I'm going to call painted the gray. Could we have a sample of the board? Do you have a sample of the batten?

Tim Clites: Yeah, she would. Yeah. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: You can see the colors.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: Honestly, I'll probably do it right on here. Because if I go to the next level where it's stuccoed, I'm going to be doing it right on top of it. So I could do it in real time right there.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: And you'll see it because literally this iteration and then stucco would be another code iteration. And so.

Tim Clites: So then thank you for clarifying that. So let's just as a committee then, I think it's also reasonable to verbalize now that and maybe it's a straw vote. Just to be clear, if we don't like the stone, there's at least a majority consensus that stucco would be fine. Right. So that you don't do. Right. In other words, we're not getting things kind of out of sequence. And then, as I understand it, we would, Will can confirm, but we would table until next month. And if that were ready, you could send it through. Staff they could send us all an email, we could drive by and look and that way we would be as informed as we could possibly be. Will, do you have anything to clarify there, or does that seem like?

Will Moore: That's perfectly fine.

Tim Clites: Okay, so I'll make it easy. I move that we table this current application allowing the applicant time to install a limewash finish on the stone that's currently there for the Committee to review for the next meeting.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. Does that work for you? Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you. That's totally fine. Like I said in that sequence [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Perfect.

Gretchen Yahn: I'll give you one real time.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. Action items new [multiple speakers]. Yes. Yeah, they've asked consistently not to go out of sequence because I was doing that and waiting on my own application a month or two ago to go last. And they said the staff asked us to stay in the list as they're received. So action Item New Business COA 23-20 Request of Middleburg Charter School to install updated school security measures to the front vestibule at 101 North Madison Street. Will, Please. Estee, please.

Estee LaClare: Yes. Thank you, Chair Clites. Good evening. And so Bill is with us. He is going to be the architect with the group that will be doing the new security vestibules. And this is what they're incorporating throughout all of Loudoun County and Loudoun County Public Schools is doing this for security measures to upgrade the system and make sure that all of our students and teachers stay safe. So if you have any questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. For the record, this is a formality. Your name and address or business?

Bill Brown: I'm Bill Brown with Moseley Architects and I'm representing Loudoun County Public Schools this evening. And we're doing a number of these they've got a number of architects that are doing them all across all of the schools. And in this instance, it's a little different because it's a historic school. And so we're we're replacing as closely as we can the wood frames with hollow metal frames. And we'll have them painted the same. There's going to be bulletproof glass in the doors, and then we're going to have access card readers, which they already have right now, but they're upgrading the system. There's an AI Phone that they already have an intercom, but we'll be upgrading that to be per the current standards.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Appreciate that. I need to pause for a second. My wife works at Loudoun County Public Schools, but I have no conflict of interest, do I? Okay. Thank you. Just like that's all those rules are like. Oh, yeah. Oh, by the way. [laughter] Thank you. Thank you. Cindy. Yes.

Cindy Pearson: I need to say is it breaks my heart that you have to be doing this, number one. But I know in these day and times that you want everyone there to be safe and you know, it looks like you're doing it to the best of the ability there. You know. So I'm and with it fitting in as well as it can. And I don't think there's anything else to say.

Virginia Jenkins: I totally agree with Cindy. It's fine with me. And I agree that it is a shame that we've gotten to this.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: I don't have any other questions either. I think you've integrated it as well as you can without changing the front facade, so that's terrific. And I would again echo them that it's awful we have to do this, but it's where we are.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I had one question. This approach here in this picture versus what is there now is different?

Bill Brown: We're not touching that. We were I think the person who was rendering it was focusing on the frame and that elevation and sort of, you know, we'll call it artistic license that they sort of left that part off. But we're not touching that.

Punkin Lee: Just checking. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And I did run by this question of wood door. Thank you, staff, for bringing to our attention this question of wood doors versus metal doors. I know a few years ago we had a similar conversation at the post office where we actually asked the applicant to change out some doors that had unintentionally been switched for synthetic of some sort. In this case, when I drove by and just as close as I could drive up to the front door and looked. They are actually fairly nondescript, you'd have to go up and touch them to even realize they are wood. So I don't think the aesthetics of that are [multiple speakers].

Bill Brown: I'm not even sure they are wood because I think they have an embossed surface on them.

Tim Clites: That's what I wondered.

Bill Brown: And I think some sort of, you know, plastic door that has some wood core probably.

Tim Clites: Right. Yeah, it didn't have any redeeming qualities that said, I'm wood try to match me.

Bill Brown: [multiple speakers] Replacement doors from some era.

Tim Clites: 80s or 90s or something right? Yeah. Yeah.

Bill Brown: But we're going to match the green color of them. Yeah. As close as we can.

Tim Clites: That will keep everyone happy. Three kids went to that school, so the green color is important.

Cindy Pearson: May I say that I roamed the halls there in the 50s, So what can I say? [laughter]

Tim Clites: That was before this whole wing was built. Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] I had that for the seventh grade. [laughter]

Tim Clites: That's awesome.

Cindy Pearson: We did not have middle school there.

Tim Clites: Okay. Well, thank you, everyone, for the comments. If there's any other comments, we'll take them or I'm happy to entertain a motion.

Virginia Jenkins: I make a motion to approve COA 23-20 at the Middleburg Charter School for updated security doors.

Tim Clites: I second it. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Bill Brown: Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: Appreciate it.

Bill Brown: Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Estee. Would you turn the AC up?

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah. It's freezing.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, sorry. Yeah, we're freezing. [laughter]

Linda Wright: That's why and you guys have sweaters on.

Tim Clites: Next item. New business COA 23-21 request of the National Sporting Library and Museum for approval of artwork for Survival of the Fittest Exhibit Banner. Estee.

Estee LaClare: Actually this is Will again as well.

Tim Clites: You got to put your names next to these. This is like.

Estee LaClare: It is.

Tim Clites: Where?

Cindy Pearson: It's on the sheet.

Tim Clites: Oh it's on the Memo. Yeah, see I'm reading from the. I got to get the memo open. Hold on. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: Oh, gosh.

Tim Clites: All right. See, I didn't have the. I still don't have it open. Right? That one says Estee too. All right. As I was saying, Will. [laughter]

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I included my standard memo. But you know the drill by now.

Tim Clites: Yes. [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: Approved a banner being in place. And they simply return with the new proposed artwork for your endorsement. I will note that this one does contain a little more text than you might normally be used to. It's my understanding from just some brief email correspondence that the lenders of some of the works insisted on being recognized on the banner. So it may not be [inaudible] a comment, but it is important. I think the Rijksmuseum wants to make sure their name is on there as well [off mic].

Tim Clites: Okay. Yeah, understood. And thank you for that clarification. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I mean, even with the extra type and everything, I think it's going to be quite an impressive banner. As usual. Thank you.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I would agree. I think it's quite striking. It's going to be it's a little different than anything we've had before, so.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I think definitely catch your eye.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, I was just going to comment about because you really can't read it as you go by, but hey, if that's what it takes to get the show done.

Claudia Pfeiffer: We did get an alternate approved because I was very worried about coming to you with a banner with this many words on it, especially with the previous feedback. And it's not really something that we would aesthetically have preferred. I actually tried even to do a banner without any words on it at all, kind of go back old school and they declined that also. So I was able to get them to agree to removing the subtitle as an alternative. If you wanted to consider that as well, I can put it in front of you or we can kind of jive on.

Tim Clites: Can you just hold that up from a distance, please?

Claudia Pfeiffer: Sure. And this is Julie Banner, by the way. She's our new Education and Marketing Manager, and she'll be most likely doing a lot of the presentations as well moving forward.

Rhonda North: Madam, we need your name for the record.

Claudia Pfeiffer: I'm sorry. I'm Claudia Pfeiffer and I am the Deputy Director and Head Curator at the National Sporting Library Museum. It's a pleasure to be in front of you all again this evening. And here we are.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: Thanks. That's the alternative.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Linda Wright: Thank you.

Claudia Pfeiffer: And not surprisingly, we are very excited about bringing this exhibition to town. It will be with us for three months and will be three quarters of the museum. There are 45 artworks that are the smallest ones are there are a few medium sized, but most of them are large or oversize canvases, so they are incredibly striking visions of the Wyoming Wilderness African landscape. A Swedish artist by the name of Bruno Liljefors who does just some amazing wildlife artwork as well. And so it's really it's a really wonderful opportunity for the community to have this make a stop here with us. So we're really thrilled to be able to get it here.

Cindy Pearson: Will you be doing banners, too, or is this just on the.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Yep. So we'll have we're planning on doing three different variations again with and we have half of the town reserved for.

Cindy Pearson: I would really do less on the banners because you really can't read it when you're driving by.

Claudia Pfeiffer: The issue that we're running into is that the exhibition is a partner exhibition between the Rijksmuseum Museum and the National Museum of Wildlife Art. And we're we're basically a loan venue and we've paid for the privilege of this traveling exhibition. We don't have any leverage. So and we have to we have per our contractual agreement, we have to submit every design that we put out there for approval. And so we've worked with NMWA before the Tucker Smith exhibition, if you remember that one, when we were working only with NMWA, we had no concerns. It's this extra layer that, you know, the Rijksmuseum Museum has been, you know, and they're the big you know, they're the big players in town. So they've kind of made this rule for all of us to follow. And I appreciate very much from an aesthetic perspective, the hope is at least the walking foot traffic will be able to read it. Hopefully the images will carry. I think they're striking. We'll work on doing the same kind of approach, a really strong detail of a single animal, clean, minimal lines, not too fussy, so at least that the image portion of it will grab attention and be visible.

Cindy Pearson: Understood.

Tim Clites: Any further comments?

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, sure. Why not? Honestly, usually I think less is more. But I like the addition of the Envisioning Wildlife and Wilderness because it gives some context to it. Whether you can see it when you're driving by or not, I mean, you can, but your eye is caught with the moose. And then. But you'd go, huh? If you don't have the Envisioning Wildlife. Et cetera. So personally, again, I like the inclusion of the extra line.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Virginia, and I think the extra line for all the people that walk the campus is kind of an added explanation. I mean basically when you drive by in a car, the image catches your eye. I

hear what you know. So I think for the people walking and walking the sidewalk on Main Street, you know, a little better explanation. And it helps the people that are the other museums that are contributing.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Absolutely.

Linda Wright: I would agree.

Tim Clites: All right. I move that we approve COA 23-21 a request of the National Sporting Library and Museum as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Council: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain?

Virginia Jenkins: Nope.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: Nice to see you again. Welcome.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Good to see you.

Tim Clites: And last action item COA 23-22 request of Gretchen Yahn to close in two windows flanking the chimney at 17 South Madison Street Middleburg Books. Hold on. And this is Will.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So giving you kind of a heads up earlier prior to the agenda going out via email that Gretchen discovered a pretty major issue with the chimney on the north. Yes, the north side of the building. When she's doing kind of the tenant upfit for the the bookshop that's going to go into 17 South Madison. So I did approve administratively the demolition of the existing chimney. She's going to be framing up properly a faux chimney and replicating everything on the outside. So that's not really part of your approval here. But during that process, I believe the owner asked her to consider or to request approval for the the two small openings where windows were that are boarded up flanking that chimney to be closed in and stuccoed over. And then just today, it occurred to her and appropriately, that there's a chimney on the south side of the building that also has the two openings flanking it. So I've given you a couple photos in hard copy at your spaces. So expanding the application to include the request to close in and stucco over those openings as well.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Gretchen.

Gretchen Yahn: So subsequent to the original, Oh, no, that occurred when we were inside. Just to give a little bit of history lesson. At some point, the addition of this building someone had completely kicked out the chimney underneath of it so that it was corbeled out. So there was this section of the chimney was resting on nothing except some old wood. So that's when I called Will and said, We may have to take this down like right, like now. So it was basically holding it together was the mortar of the bricks and the pebbledash. So what is good news is we were able to determine we took the cap off. And from this juncture to approximately here, someone had gone in and framed with wood, but yet they left the section that was from here to here.

Tim Clites: We couldn't get to it. [laughter]

Gretchen Yahn: So we will not have to deconstruct this. But we did deconstruct everything and play Jenga underneath of there to get all of this scabbing. So it wasn't just we couldn't. We couldn't understand why we were getting so much dirt and debris coming out from we couldn't until we saw it. So this will stay intact with the pebbledash. So the owner came out and said, listen, we've got a couple issues on these other chimneys. Let's try to get them resolved. So the intention is, is to take these to get them boarded up and well, boarded up, get them taken out, framed back in, and then pebbledash and make the patch on this side. And then I'm walking around this morning and he had me come back out there and he said, we also need to fix this chimney because it's basically crumbling. So this one will be a little bit more extensive in terms of repair work. But the intent would be to go in and start to fix the cracks, get the things, but also close in those two windows.

Virginia Jenkins: Just out of curiosity, [off mic] is the fireplace still intact on the inside. So I know not on the north side, but on the south side?

Gretchen Yahn: So we went inside. They've not used it in the intent that we're not going to use it.

Virginia Jenkins: I know it hadn't been used. But it's still there? [multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: So it would not be a utilized chimney. Yes. Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: Whereas the other one is not.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, they just have an opening there. And that was the other thing when we started. What was good about this is the concern was we were going to start getting into the exterior wall and then we were going to have a real big problem. So that was good. But this one needs work. So the intention is, is to go in and get these fixed as well at the same time that we're fixing this. Okay? Question I do have is at the same time there's some siding that was old Masonite siding on the back. This is just a question. If we take the Masonite siding off and I can't even get that siding anymore, which I wouldn't put it up if I could get it. Do I do a second application or is what in terms of the back side because it's all rotten. He wants that off as well. So that's a question as well. Okay. No color changes are proposed here. No textural changes are proposed here. It's just it's some maintenance housekeeping that it's going to have to be taken care of on his part or it's going to not have a chimney any longer.

Tim Clites: So a couple of things. Some of them will. Some of your questions, I think Will can probably answer more clearly than mine. But let's just focus on the window infill just for a second, just to get anybody's comments on that. And then we can either with the staff address the siding so the chimneys are going to stay, which means the little metal caps basically going to stay that's there or on the one that needs repair. If it needs repaired, it'll be repaired in kind, but we'll still see that little cap, the little metal cap.

Gretchen Yahn: That is correct.

Tim Clites: And then my only question first for the Committee and then after I've heard them, I'm happy to hear your input, Gretchen. When I saw this, I wondered for the Committee if it wouldn't be nice to keep the memory of the window there and perhaps use a simply a smoother stucco painted all the same color but with. And if you make it too deep, it becomes a problem because now you've got waterproofing and other issues. And so I don't that was my only kind of question to the Committee. Was it worth trying to keep some of that.

Virginia Jenkins: There's no memory of a window, it's been boarded up.

Tim Clites: I know, I know, but there was a window there.

Virginia Jenkins: When did you see it last?

Tim Clites: No, I'm saying there was. Right.

Virginia Jenkins: Well was.

Tim Clites: There's a memory of a window there right now, which is a piece of plywood or something that's painted.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I know. But, I mean.

Tim Clites: I'm just asking. I don't have a strong preference.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm just curious.

Virginia Jenkins: If you want to close it all in with pebbledash, which is the more textural stucco, that's fine too. It's just a question because my guess is it's not a lot more work one way or the other, right. It doesn't. It's about preserving some of the historic language of an old house. That's why I ask. No different than you've seen brick homes where they change the footprint inside and they go brick in the opening, and they recess the brick just a little because they don't want to go get rid of all the brick and tooth it all in because you're still going to know there was a window there because the new brick doesn't match the old brick. So my question is, is there any thought about that being a nice way to preserve the memory that there used to be a window or a louver there? And I'm okay if everyone says no, just pebbledash it. It's just a question.

Punkin Lee: Why not keep the windows?

Tim Clites: There aren't. Are there any windows there? [inaudible]

Punkin Lee: Well what's behind the?

Gretchen Yahn: If we did a window, we would then have to paint it black on the back side just because it's all been boarded up to the inside because it's this kind of attic kind of space there. They do have some finished space there. They've got I think there's a desk on that side. I would propose one other if you wanted to go that route, which I don't think is a bad route. What if it actually did look like louvers or shutter in that regard?

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, well. After reading the history and going, really, I did not realize that. And then looking at the other chimneys here in town and they do have the louvered windows that I think keeps the history of that building because I think if you cover that up, that's going to knock the heck out of the history of that building. And I think the louvered windows would look spot on.

Gretchen Yahn: Louvered or a well louver a louver I think like I said, the windows [inaudible] going to be issue.

Cindy Pearson: I think it's the windows. I don't know. Red Fox has some. What else did I see today? As you go down the hill not where the Thai place is. The next building, the big house, whoever's that is.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: On one side I could see there's they only have one, but they have one there. There was quite a few around so I'm not sure on what kind. Sorry.

Tim Clites: Let me ask you a question about the term. Louver and window, too me my mind goes to two totally different pictures. A louver my mind goes to if you look at the black shutter and it's got like the little right and it's like take a bigger version of that and put it in the opening. That's like a louver, like you were going to ventilate it or do something versus a window is like maybe what was there, which is probably a window with a little plus gridded muntin in if it was, you know, from a long time ago.

Cindy Pearson: I don't know what to call them. It's what's on the Red Fox. You'd have to look at it and tell me it looks like a window to me, but it looks like it has louvers in it somehow.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: I don't know.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: I know it's a historic. But to me, they're inconsequential. And if you want to do something that looks almost like Louvers, but not, that I'm not opposed to that, but.

Virginia Jenkins: Which would be like a solid panel that just has the texture of a Louver or similar maybe to something like the shutter. Is that what when you said that, Gretchen, is that what you're thinking?

Gretchen Yahn: Yes. Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: And then that would work. Okay.

Punkin Lee: I think the Louver would be better than the stucco recessed [multiple speakers] because that's kind of dressy for this building, I think. I think the Louver, might be.

Tim Clites: Yeah, [multiple speakers] says we patched it, the Louver tells a little bit of a story that's not quite true.

Punkin Lee: Right. It could still be.

Tim Clites: But it could have been. You don't know what's behind the Louver. So I think that's. And with respect to the building, that that would probably be the nicer.

Linda Wright: I would go with the Louver.

Tim Clites: Okay. And then would you all see that being the color of the shutters? I mean, that's kind of obvious, but I'll just ask the question. It's the color of the shutter then, or the color of the [inaudible]? Probably.

Virginia Jenkins: Frankly, I would do it the color of the building.

Tim Clites: The color of the building or the trim. The trim is white. It looks like it's a white. The building is a yellow. The Louver wouldn't if it's made historically, it would have been either that what what do you think, the trim or the shutter color? I would think. The shutter color may be a little dark there.

Virginia Jenkins: I think the shutter would just draw your eye too much. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Trim color. What do you think? The trim color kind of a white louver there would be nice. And any reason. Okay, so. Take a pause. Is that all right? Do you see any issues with that? If the applicant is okay with that as a suggestion. Okay. And then before we go on, let's just pause for a minute. Talk to us Will about replacing siding in kind and whether that needs to come back here or is that an administrative thing? I'll just say, in my opinion, if it was a Masonite siding that had a six-inch reveal, and they were replacing it with a hardy that had a six-inch reveal that was smooth. That is a replace in kind, as close as you can possibly buy it. But you may there may be other things you may want that to actually come back and be looked at.

Will Moore: Any variation, any change in form, material, or color.

Tim Clites: We want to look at? Okay.

Punkin Lee: Okay.

Will Moore: The only exception there is if you're repainting. Something that's faded, obviously, you can't get the exact shade [inaudible].

Tim Clites: Right. Right.

Will Moore: A replacement with a different material we always want you to approve that.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: Can I make one comment here? Would the preference be? Just because I'm trying to think through this and I'm trying to make sure I get this watertight and the whole nine yards, I would propose that I would literally put in a frame with kind of a sill with the louver kind of, you know, a louver with a sill. Is there a certain kind of sill height or anything that you're desirous of? Because I mean, two inch may be too big, but I'm just saying that little space. So I'm just trying to just bring it up just so that I don't care, and I don't have any preconceived notion on what it is. But I, you know.

Tim Clites: Yeah. What's it made out of? It's probably all made out of a synthetic. Right. And so then you're only going to have a certain option for sale? I would say any of those. I mean, I do know they make a thinner they make a thicker. But I think the thicker, you're right, is probably too heavy for that little, the thing is only this big. So a little synthetic sill to kick the water out is the right thing.

Gretchen Yahn: So more of a standard sill as opposed to historical. I just wanted to throw it because the whole intent would be to just get this so it's tight, it's watertight, and we're not going to have any more issues out there. Okay.

Tim Clites: I think that does everyone understand that well enough to be comfortable? Yeah. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Tim Clites: Someone want to go for a motion?

Cindy Pearson: Can I just say one other?

Tim Clites: Yes, I'm sorry.

Cindy Pearson: The other reason, too, as in reading the design guidelines in part of it, and it's stated here in the memo, do not remove existing windows, and fill in the openings on primary elevations visible from a public right of way. So I just wanted to remember that, too, when you're making this decision.

Tim Clites: Right. Yeah. And I guess thank you for that reminder. In my mind, I'm thinking there's not any window there. So it's like, you know, but the opening is there, which I like personally. I kind of like where this has ended up. I think it would be nice.

Cindy Pearson: It will look so much better on the other side too. Instead of nothing.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay.

Punkin Lee: Well, I think that was a good reminder because with doing the Federal Street side, we become more in the public purview. We're walking down Madison, you got to be at the right step to look up and see those old window openings.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Will Moore: It's always a good idea to reference your guidelines.

Tim Clites: I understand. That's yeah. Thank you, Cindy, for doing that.

Cindy Pearson: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: I move that we approve COA 23-22 allowing the applicant to infill the existing boarded up openings with painted Louvers that are painted that window casing color.

Cindy Pearson: Should we have. Sorry. Before we. May I interrupt that?

Tim Clites: Yeah, you can clarify it or interrupt it.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Should she have drawings, or I don't know something brought back on this or this is all good? That's all I need to ask.

Will Moore: If the committee is comfortable with that level of detail, that's fine.

Cindy Pearson: I'm good then. Okay.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you for the clarification. With the intent that they match the shutter pattern as closely as was possible as is available, I think that's reasonable. So we're not going to get big Louver or something out of proportion. But thank you for clarifying. [off mic] So that's a clarification on the motion. Need a second?

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Gretchen Yahn: Can I ask one question? So this is just kind of outside. If this has to be cleaned and painted the same color, is that something you want coming? Like you see how dirty this is? And that's one of the things he mentioned. I'm not saying he's doing it, but he was like, Hey, can this be cleaned and painted? Do I need to come back if it's like the same color or that's a question? [off mic] Okay. And then the next one other thing is this is interesting because Mrs. Morale was asking where she could get information on the building. Where is the best place for her to get information on the building?

Cindy Pearson: Thomas Balch.

Will Moore: Well. So that information if you're referring to where she can get that that's on our website on the historic on the HDRC page, on the town's website of our Historic District survey, which includes all the buildings in the Historic District, is there.

Gretchen Yahn: Would that be the most comprehensive and cumulative, do you think?

Estee LaClare: That one was from 2016?

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Will Moore: That would be the most comprehensive one that we have.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Virginia Jenkins: Now if another resource like the Thomas Balch Library.

Gretchen Yahn: Which one?

Cindy Pearson: Thomas Balch. Okay.

Will Moore: [inaudible] B A L C H. That library in Leesburg is a great resource for additional information.

Gretchen Yahn: Because she's really desirous to be like very knowledgeable about the space. So thank you.

Tim Clites: Can I, before you go, can I just this is a discussion item, so we're we don't have anything in front of us or no action. We talked about the house numbers the last time and I asked this committee to the extent that anybody was awake after dark, which I'm usually not, I am early in the morning, but not at night. But I did go drive through and look at the house numbers and I wonder if anybody else has done that.

Cindy Pearson: I haven't made it at dark. I have driven over quite a few times to look at the other house and look at things. And I.

Tim Clites: During the day?

Cindy Pearson: I'm sorry. When I think of it, it's daytime.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Nighttime, it's gone.

Tim Clites: So I'd like to encourage the Committee to do that so that at some point soon we can have a discussion about them. Will, you weren't here. You probably saw in the notes it wasn't necessarily reviewed or approved.

Will Moore: It was not approved. It is something we're going to have to circle back on.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Will Moore: It's something we'll have to circle back on. Yeah, we've communicated with the fire marshal's office and there is no such requirement. But we will have to circle back on that subject. Certainly none of the lighting of those numbers. We don't include house numbers in approval. House numbers have to go up by code. They have to be a certain height. But the lighting of them, that's a different threshold, which I would determine would require your approval. So again, I need to do some circling back on that. And if the desire is to have those remain, that would be something that would have to come back to you.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I guess my thought was that since there's some up, it allows us to be educated about about something that would have been really hard to understand with a picture. Like a lot of these lights are right. Like the lights in the parking lot behind our building eight or whatever it was 12 years ago, they seemed great until they went up and it was like, oh, this isn't, you know, this isn't what everyone envisioned. So my only thought is applicant continues to build houses, so I don't want to lose track of that because we talked about a couple scenarios which may have to do with dimming them and, but I don't even want to get into any of that. I would like everyone here to go look at them because I think then if you've got some legwork to do, we can have a good conversation with you all and you know, either include that into the approval so that it's been formalized and or find out what the solution is and then make that part of the ongoing approval.

Gretchen Yahn: And I would state also, I mean, they are starting to put the streetlights up.

Cindy Pearson: Yep, I saw them.

Gretchen Yahn: You know, so that's going to be a whole different new ball of wax going out there, too.

Tim Clites: Sure.

Gretchen Yahn: They can be dimmed. You know, we can do them at different hours. I would say that a big thing with regards to it is one with the fire marshal in terms of that comment. The fire marshal would not allow us to do anything that was not on like we wanted to do this off of the house. They wanted something on the house. So that's what I speak to with regards to the fire marshal because I met them out there and they would not allow us to put something on a monument or anything else they wanted it on. Numbers had to be on the house. So then secondarily to that, there's the overriding part of this, which is, you know, this being a branded real estate product that could be rented, and people could be coming at nighttime, there was a desire to have something that would be visible to somebody who had never been to Salamander before and or needed to see a house number. So just keeping those kind of two issues in mind.

Will Moore: And to give a little clarification to that, I don't know if Gretchen, if you had that conversation with the fire marshal's office, it sounds very similar to a conversation that I had with John Ralph who was going to be assisting, as I understand, with house numbers. The requirement is there's no restriction on putting a number on a monument. But it would have to be duplicative if the house can be seen from the street the number has to be on the house, it's a code requirement. And so it may just have to do with first responders. If they could see the house, they're going to be looking at the house [inaudible].

So it has to be on the house. It has to be of a certain size, and it has to be of a contrasting color with the background.

Tim Clites: [multiple speakers] Right.

Will Moore: But that does not preclude a duplicative number from being put at the street. It simply means that if you can see the house from the street, there has to be a number meeting those requirements on the house.

Cindy Pearson: But it does not have to be lit?

Estee LaClare: No. Right.

Will Moore: But that doesn't preclude you from putting a second matching number near the street or on the mailbox or on a monument or something like that.

Tim Clites: Yeah, and the feedback I've received from others is it's the lit part of that that seems to be brighter than would be expected. But I don't want to bias it. But go, just go look at it and then we can talk about it. And there's like, I think Gretchen's mentioned some options. And so yeah, when we talked about it last month, the impression that I was getting just by not really dissecting the conversation was that the lit portion was also required by the fire marshal. And but the part of it being on the house that we've run into that too, you kind of have to. Yeah, there's no real option there and for good reason, right? Because.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, there's two there was two issues being on the house and then secondarily, just being able to what if they call for room service? I hate to say that, but that's part of what this whole process is as well.

Estee LaClare: That's why they have the contrasting colors typically.

Gretchen Yahn: Pardon?

Estee LaClare: Often that's why you have the contrasting colors of the numbers.

Gretchen Yahn: But that's like I said, it's more of a resort type of issue as well. I mean, there is we can't upright anything. So then we get to this kind of downlight. And, you know, this does speak to the night sky. It's not a direct light into anybody's, you know, scenario. So with respect to it, they do need to have some kind of lighting. A contrast is not going to be enough. If somebody's going out there from the perspective of a golf cart or something if they're coming over there. And that is part of the branded real estate, you know [multiple speakers].

Cindy Pearson: That's why we need to circle back around as Will said. So we need to probably get to that as soon as possible. [multiple speakers] doing it in two weeks. And I know.

Tim Clites: I'd like that to be an item, an active item next month because I think, in fairness to everybody, but most importantly to the applicant, let's make sure that we're in a good direction there around all these issues, including theirs, around how they're going to use the property so that we don't have more of them that go up that need some potential for change, I think the more difficult the conversation is. So let's just avoid it. Are there any other discussion items that we want to go over? Thank you, Gretchen. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: If you have difficulties with getting that all together for the next meeting, just let us know. I get it.

Tim Clites: Just Yeah, I mean, just.

Estee LaClare: If I may, for discussion Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Estee LaClare: So I want to just relay that. Mr. Chair Clites and I went to Loudoun County on Monday for our meeting about the JARB Awards and they were very excited for all our nominations. And we're happy that we had so many sign nominees as well, and they were all approved. So.

Tim Clites: We have all the sign nominees.

Estee LaClare: All the sign, yes, we do.

Tim Clites: It's like we're sign prima donnas around here. But anyway.

Estee LaClare: And they're hoping to have the location for the JARB Awards this year, I believe they mentioned in Leesburg, was it am I incorrect? They're still working on it, but they're trying to find a much more centralized location, so we don't have to go all the way out to Hillsboro.

Cindy Pearson: That would be nice.

Estee LaClare: Yes. Yes. So at any rate, it was a good meeting, though.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And they also kind of revitalize reinstated, restarted the Blue Ribbon Award.

Estee LaClare: Yes, the Blue Ribbon Award.

Tim Clites: Which is really interesting because that looks at structures that are kind of really well done that are not in Historic Districts, which is like you know, so you didn't have to do this, but you did. And there were some really nice things.

Estee LaClare: That there were some amazing projects that have happened. One, particularly in Bluemont.

Tim Clites: That I went and drove by that just to see it. [multiple speakers] Because Yeah, it's a house up on the hill just a house that they restored. But they did a really.

Estee LaClare: Amazing job.

Cindy Pearson: In Bluemont itself?

Estee LaClare: Yeah, they did an amazing job. So there's this should be a really good year. I'm excited for this.

Tim Clites: This. Yeah. Awesome. Meeting quorum on this. I'm sorry. Yes, please.

Punkin Lee: I was going to say something about the lights, but Gretchen was getting up and leaving. I have seen them. They're hard to read with that light behind, you can't even tell what number it is. Very hard. It's got a blue cast to it. And they're kind of like, you want to blink because they. You can't read it.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I think it's good to see them in person. Meeting any other discussion items? Meeting quorum for September the 7th. Anybody have an issue at the current time that they're aware of? Get over and confirm.

Punkin Lee: What day is Labor Day?

Tim Clites: And, I don't want to ask a question that the staff is not comfortable answering.

Estee LaClare: It's the week of Labor Day.

Tim Clites: Is Bill, okay? Has anybody heard from Bill?

Will Moore: Bill? Bill is okay. A family member was having a medical procedure.

Tim Clites: I just want to. Yeah, I just wanted to make. We hadn't seen this month or last, and I just wanted to. Yeah. Great. All right, well, then I move that we adjourn. [off mic] Thank you.