



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



**Monday, October 2, 2023
PENDING APPROVAL**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Monday, October 2, 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
William Anderson
Virginia Jenkins
Margaret Littleton
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

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the September 7, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

New Business

COA 23-24 (S 23-11): New Hanging Sign – 10 N. Pendleton Street – The Massage Stop

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that while not depicted as such in the photograph, the proposed sign was hexagon shaped.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Kerry Minter, the applicant, confirmed the sign’s background would be beige. She explained that the sign would hang under the existing one. Ms. Minter noted that the color may be off slightly and advised that it would be lighter. She further advised that the lettering would be a brownish color, trimmed in gold.

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the application indicated the sign colors would be taupe, gray, and orange, with the lettering being gray with an orange outline.

The Committee advised that they were fine with the proposed sign. They opined that it would be nice if the sign hung straight. The Committee suggested the plaque was larger than the sign.

Ms. Minter advised that the proposed sign was twenty-eight inches, which was the same size as the sign above it. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she advised that the letters would be carved.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-24 (S 23-11), a request of Kerry Minter for the installation of a new hanging sign at 10 North Pendleton Street – the Massage Stop.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

COA 23-26 (S 23-12): Projecting Sign – 15 E. Washington Street – Feminine Pilates & French Instruction

Kathryn Knepper, the applicant, displayed the actual sign for the Committee. She reported that it would be installed on the existing bracket.

The Committee opined that the location was confusing; however, the sign was fine.

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Committee Member Anderson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-26 (S 23-12), a request of Kathryn Knepper for the installation of a projecting sign at 15 East Washington Street – Feminine Pilates & French Instruction.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

COA 23-27 (S 23-13): Projecting Sign, Vinyl Window Signs & Awning – 5 S. Madison Street – Federal & Black

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the application was for a projecting sign, with raised elements, that would be two-sided and installed on a new bracket. She further reported that the application also included Antique White window signs to be applied to the door's side window, and a black awning.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, reported that the sign would be a three-dimensional urethane one. He further reported that the awning would be plain. In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ralph advised that the awning would be square. He confirmed the sign would contain 23 karat gold leaf; however, he opined that it would not be bright as it would be in the shade. Mr. Ralph reported that the sign would be sideways and reiterated that it was two-sided. He confirmed the bracket was under the shutter and explained that the proposed location would not block the view of the surrounding signs. Mr. Ralph advised that the sign would be mid-height so all three signs could be seen.

The Committee agreed the proposed sign was attractive. They opined the awning needed a hem so it would cover the transom window. They suggested the awning be dropped to cover the transom and opined that it would give the shop more definition. The Committee noted that two options were proposed with regard to the size of the sign and suggested the larger one be used, as it was more compatible with the others.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-27 (S 23-13), a request of Rebecca Kidder for a projecting sign, vinyl window signs and an awning at 5 South Madison Street, Federal & Black, with the awning having a drop valance added to it to cover the transom window and that the sign be the larger sign.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

COA 23-28 (S 23-14): Wall Mounted Sign – 6 North Madison Street – B.W. Furlong & Associates

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that this application was for a painted, carved Extira sign that would be located next to the door.

Dr. Jill Copenhagen, the applicant, explained that they were a part of the veterinary clinic.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, reported that the horse logo would be carved, the outside trim would be painted black, and the major lettering would be carved on the sign. He advised that the Preston Pink color would only be used for the “Rock Lane Management” wording and opined that it would be difficult to see.

Dr. Copenhagen explained that the pink was for their insignia, with the “Rock Lane Management” lettering being burgundy.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ralph advised that the Middleburg Museum signs would be located to the left and right of the proposed sign. He confirmed there were no plans to replace the faded red awning at this time.

The Committee agreed they liked the proposed sign.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Anderson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-28 (S 23-14), a request of Caitlin Furlong for the installation of a wall mounted sign at 6 North Madison Street as presented.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

COA 23-29 (S 23-15): Projecting Sign & Window Signs – 17 S. Madison Street – Middleburg Books

Planning & Project Associate LaClare reported that the proposed sign was a two-sided carved, painted Extira sign that would be installed on a new bracket. She further reported that the vinyl window signs would be gold leaf.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, advised that the window sign would be real gold gilded on the glass, which would involve a three-day installation process. He opined that it would be amazing once complete. Mr. Ralph advised that the wall mounted sign would be installed above the railing, as there was not a lot of space for it. He noted that due to the railing, it would not be possible to walk under the sign. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that the Dark Night color was a dark blue.

The Committee agreed they liked the sign.

Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-29 (S 23-15), a request of Mary Beth Morell for the installation of a projecting sign and window signs at 17 South Madison Street.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

Chair Clites left the dais, as he had a conflict of interest regarding the next agenda item. Vice Chair Lee assumed the Chair.

COA 23-30: Supplemental Materials & Window Revision – 408 E. Washington Street – Clites Architects

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they approved an application for an addition, with the applicant to return with the small details. He further reminded the members that last month, they discussed a request to amend the east elevation to add a window to the second story, as well as two side lights to the open windows on the ground floor.

Tim Clites, the applicant, and Chris Hersh, the owner, appeared before the Committee representing the application. Mr. Clites distributed paint color chips and advised that the patina green color was proposed as the metal roof and other door colors and noted that it would match the front door. He reviewed the proposed hardware for the carriage doors. Mr. Clites noted that two options were being proposed for lighting. He explained that because they were proposing to use screen that would take lateral pressure for the porch, a railing would not be required. Mr. Clites advised that as to the rail on either side of the steps, he was proposing something that was more contemporary in order to make it disappear.

Committee Member Anderson advised that he liked the proposed colors and hardware. He opined that one of the lights was not the same quality as the other and suggested the use of the first one. Mr. Anderson further opined that the proposed screen was terrific. He advised that as to the railing, he preferred a design with traditional elements and opined that what was proposed was not for this house. Mr. Anderson suggested a metal rail was not in keeping with the house and suggested a traditional wood one would be lovely.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with Committee Member Anderson. She suggested that if a wood rail was not used, a turn should be added to the end of the metal rail.

Councilmember Pearson agreed with Committee Member Anderson regarding everything with the exception of his comments on the rail. She agreed a turn should be added to the metal rail.

Mr. Hersch explained that the reason for the proposed metal rail was to make it disappear when looking out from the living room.

Committee Member Jenkins agreed with Committee Member Anderson regarding everything with the exception of the rail. She opined that what was proposed would blend into the background. Ms. Jenkins agreed there should be a finished edge at the end of the rail.

Committee Member Wright advised that the rail was her only concern. She opined that what was proposed was the best option.

Vice Chair Lee opined that the door and fence were compatible.

The Committee held some discussion regarding the proposed rail.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised the Committee that the Historic District Guidelines were not specific with regard to railing design and noted that all of the references to railing included vertical rail with metal balusters in them. He noted that there was no specific call out that if an iron rail was used, it must have vertical balusters.

The Committee continued their discussion of the rail.

Mr. Clites requested that the motion include whatever kind of railing the Committee was comfortable with so they would not have to return.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that it would be difficult to grant an approval of something else without having an idea of what that would be. He noted that no alternative was proposed.

The Committee acknowledged that it would not be possible to add a turn to the proposed rail, as a turn was a wrought iron detail. They noted that since the rail would not be visible and it met the guidelines, they were okay with what was proposed.

Deputy Town Manager Moore cautioned the Committee to be careful in how they phrased that the railing met the guidelines. He explained that the guidelines were clear that what was proposed was not appropriate throughout the Historic District. He noted, however, that it was appropriate for a modern addition that had limited visibility from a public right-of-way.

Committee Member Anderson moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 23-30, a request of Clites Architecture for approval of supplemental materials for, and a window revision to approved COA 23-25 for an addition at 408 East Washington Street, with the following condition – the light fixture be Option 1.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – Chair Clites

Absent – N/A

Chair Clites resumed the chair.

Old Business

COA-RS 23-02: Revisions to Approved COA-RS 27-10 – 800 Old Saddle Drive (Lot 49)

It was noted that the applicant was not present. The Committee agreed to discuss the request and determine where they were with regard to it.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reviewed the history of the application. He reminded the Committee that during their last meeting, they reviewed three possible levels of lime wash and generally agreed the applicant should try it using the lightest possible wash for their review. Mr. Moore reported that the lightest possible version (25%) was placed on the stone and advised that this was what was currently before the Committee.

The Committee held considerable discussion regarding the lime wash. They noted that what was done was not really a lime wash and opined that it looked opaque. The Committee questioned whether a precedent would be set if they approved this application.

Deputy Town Manager Moore questioned the precedent that would be set. He reminded the Committee that the question of having three primary cladding materials on one structure was not a part of the Residences at Salamander Guidelines. Mr. Moore suggested that if the Committee was opposed to this, it should be added to the guidelines. He reminded the members that they were under no obligation to approve the application simply because the work was done prior to the application being submitted. Mr. Moore suggested they treat it as if the work had not been done. He further suggested that if they felt what was proposed was a good solution that would be appropriate elsewhere, it was acceptable for them to approve it. Mr. Moore advised that the Committee should not grant favorable treatment or be punitive because the work was done prior to an application being submitted and reiterated that they should view it as if the work had not yet been done.

The Committee questioned whether they would be obligated to approve three primary cladding materials elsewhere if they approved the application.

Deputy Town Manager Moore explained that if an identical application was received for another property, and the Committee had approved this one, they would need to articulate why it was appropriate in one circumstance, but not the other. He reminded the Committee that every application was an individual one. Mr. Moore reiterated that if they approved this one and the exact same application was received for another location, the Committee would need to give a reason for why they would not approve the other application unless there was something different about that application. In response to questions from the Committee, he suggested that if they felt only two cladding materials were appropriate, they could seek to revise the guidelines to that effect before another application was received. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that under the zoning proffers, the HDRC and Salamander must work together to develop the guidelines by which applications were evaluated. He opined that this was an important discussion as there were many more houses to come before the Committee.

The Committee held some discussion as to how to address the application before them. Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that while it would have been better to have had the discussion about three different cladding materials last month, the applicant had no guarantee of approval of the lime wash. He noted that the question was whether the Committee felt the limewash worked. Mr. Moore opined that the members were rethinking the question due to the precedent an approval would set.

The Committee continued their discussion of the precedent that would be set by granting an approval.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested it would be helpful for the Committee to know whether the developer would be amenable to revising the guidelines to prevent three different cladding materials on a house in the future. He opined that this could influence how the Committee voted on the application before them. Mr. Moore noted that the current discussions were valuable. He encouraged the Committee to table consideration of the application until the applicant could be present.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether it could deny a future application for three primary cladding materials if they approved this one and the guidelines were not revised, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the guidelines were not so detailed that they did not leave room for subjectivity. He reminded the Committee that there was nothing in them to prohibit the mixing of materials. Mr. Moore advised that he was not saying that if they approved the application before them that they would always be obligated to approve future applications; however, if the application was exactly the same as this one, they would have a hard time justifying their denial of a future application.

The Committee continued their discussion of the application. Chair Clites encouraged the members to think of the application as if it was a new one. He questioned whether they would have approved three primary cladding materials in that case. Mr. Clites further questioned what their comments would have been and advised that this was what their comments should be now. He questioned how the Committee felt about having three different primary cladding materials, all in the same color, at this location.

The Committee agreed they would not have liked it and would have suggested there only be two primary cladding materials. They opined that it would have been ideal if the center had been stone and the wings stucco.

Chair Clites opined that the discussion had been a useful one. He summarized that if the Committee was asked to vote at this time, the majority would vote for stucco on the wings.

Deputy Town Manager Moore encouraged the members to not vote and explained that they could not vote on such a change unless the applicant consented to it. He suggested they defer action until the applicant could be present. Mr. Moore opined that based on the Committee's comments regarding color, there may be other options the Committee could consider rather than denial or forcing the applicant to stucco over the stone.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee table COA-RS 23-02 to the next meeting.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

Quorum – November Meeting

The Committee members advised that they would be present for the November 2nd meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – October 2, 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: Bring this meeting to order. Middleburg Historic District Review Committee Regular meeting for the month of October. It's Monday, October the 2nd, 2023. First order of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: And we will pause for a moment for any public comments, if there are any. If you're here for an action item, we'll give you a chance to speak when we get to your action item. And so, seeing no public comments, just remind everyone to speak into the mic, keep the mic on and we'll try not to speak over each other as best we can. We're getting better at that. So, thank you. I don't think it's my reminders. I think it's just practice. Approval of the meeting minutes for September the 7th, the regular meeting of our HDRC minutes as submitted. Are there any comments or corrections? Move that we approve as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any abstain or nays? Motion passes. Action item Old Business. The applicant is not here. Should we wait and go? Is the applicant here?

Will Moore: She's not.

Tim Clites: Not.

Will Moore: I would skip for now.

Tim Clites: We'll skip this application and come to it if she arrives. Or we can go at the end. Is anyone here for the old business action item? You all here for new business? All right. We'll go to new business on our action items. COA 23-24 (S 23-11) request of Kerry Minter for the installation of a new hanging sign attached to a projecting sign at 10 North Pendleton Street. The Massage Stop. It's almost a tongue twister. It's just I'm not good at reading things. Estee.

Estee LaClare: Thank you, Chair Clites So, Mr. Minter's here, if you'd like to join us at the table, his application is fairly straightforward. I did do a I tried to put a photo simulation of the actual sign, but one thing I wasn't able to do it in the hexagon shape that it is actually going to be. So, I kind of put it underneath it. It was a rectangle shaped, but it's cut out so it will be a hexagon underneath from the projecting [off mic]. So, I wanted you all to know and be aware of that.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: Is it white?

Will Moore: Correct?

Estee LaClare: Yes.

Tim Clites: And good evening.

Kerry Minter: Good evening.

Tim Clites: For the record, just state your name and.

Kerry Minter: I'm Kerry Minter.

Tim Clites: Kerry Minter. Is that good enough address? Yeah, fine. Thank you. And so, we're looking at this photo. I think it's the last photo in the group. And the hexagon you show in a different color. Is that right?

Estee LaClare: Yes.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Let's start with Bill. We'll go that direction.

Bill Anderson: I read no comment. It's fine. I mean, that is my comment. It's fine. Looks good.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: I'm just a little confused. Is it? It's going to be a hexagon. Okay. And the beige is the background. The beige color. Okay. So, you'll have to move the black hangers over to the top of the hexagon, right?

Kerry Minter: It's going to hang underneath.

Margaret Littleton: Underneath it?

Kerry Minter: Holes drilled and screwed in hanging on.

Margaret Littleton: Right. Well, I'm glad the white is going because I didn't think they looked good together at all. [laughter] So, okay, it looks good.

Kerry Minter: Now, one thing we want some so the color might be a little off. Is that okay, like?

Margaret Littleton: Darker or lighter?

Kerry Minter: What's that? What did you have beige like?

Margaret Littleton: I call it beige.

Virginia Jenkins: Taupe?

Margaret Littleton: Taupe.

Kerry Minter: Probably just lighter. I don't think it's going to be darker, but maybe a little.

Margaret Littleton: You want [multiple speakers] to be darker. Okay. And the little squiggle is black.

Kerry Minter: Everything else is pretty much the same. Okay. Just to let you know.

Margaret Littleton: All right. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank. Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Welcome. What is the color of? What are the letters? What color are they going to be? It's kind of hard to tell because we. Do You have colors? Did you bring the color?

Kerry Minter: I don't [00:05:00] have with me. It's kind of like brownish trimmed in gold. I think. Is that how I had it?

Estee LaClare: If I may, the way it was described per his applications, taupe, gray and orange into the sign design. So, the lettering is based upon what was written from your the gentleman who's going to be making the sign for Mr. Minter. It stated it would be had an orange outline with a gray inside of the lettering.

Virginia Jenkins: That'd be the taupe. I think that lettering is the taupe, it sounds like. Isn't it? I think in the gray might be the design at the bottom.

Kerry Minter: Would you like me to go grab some pictures, because when it comes to colors, I mean, like there are so many colors.

Tim Clites: Let me pause just for a second. Do you have the sign already made?

Kerry Minter: No.

Tim Clites: No.

Kerry Minter: After this meeting, I'll probably give him a call tonight or tomorrow, and then I'll proceed. But I have pictures of the sign that what it should look like. It's out there. If you want. I can grab it real quick.

Tim Clites: Sure. Why don't we put this.

Will Moore: I think it's the same picture [multiple speakers]. Yeah.

Kerry Minter: Yeah, you have it? Yeah. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Okay.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah. It seems to me that that same Taupe color.

Tim Clites: Punkin, do you have any?

Punkin Lee: I have no question. Trouble with the colors, I was just wanting to make sure we knew what color was where. Yeah, I think the combination is fine. Just curious.

Kerry Minter: Oh, okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I don't have any real heartburn with it. I think my first reaction when I saw it as I was wishing it was another oval, so the sign looked like they were the same [inaudible] [background noise], almost on the same thing, and it just repeated itself. But now that I know that the white is going away and it's going to be smaller than that, I think I'm okay with that.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you, Linda. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm okay with the hexagon shape, and it seems like from what I'm gathering, the paint colors are fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I get what Margaret was saying about moving the holes because on the picture, but I think the sign is bigger than what the picture is showing. Is that what it is? So, it will fit right down on there. Okay. Gotcha. And no, I'm good with it. Nice. Welcome.

Kerry Minter: Thank you. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Thank you. Yeah, I guess my only comment was, although if you look at the VIP Nails above, the hangers at the top of it are actually splayed at an angle. So as much as it seems like with this sign below, it would be nicer if they hung straight. But I don't know if we can figure that out based on this photo shop of the sign. Do you think the plaque is going to be a little bigger than what's in the image, or do you think it's pretty close?

Kerry Minter: 28 inches all around is the length of VIP is 28 inches.

Tim Clites: Okay. So then if everyone can imagine this, 28in, that would be point to point left or right.

Kerry Minter: Right.

Tim Clites: So, it'll be the same. So, it is going to be a little bigger and likely those hangers would be closer to straight, right? Because the flat at the top is going to get wider as the panel gets bigger.

Estee LaClare: Yes, that's correct. And I apologize. I tried my best to try to make a simulation. However, my skills need a little improvement. [laughter]

Tim Clites: No, we appreciate the effort. That's right. It helps us critique it. And so, all of these colors are painted on or flat. There's nothing projecting, is that right?

Kerry Minter: But the lettering is embedded. Is that what you're asking?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Kerry Minter: It's inside the wood.

Tim Clites: Yes. Okay, great. That will make it more interesting and a little more three dimensional. That would be nice. Yeah. Well, I'll just pause for a minute to see if there's any other comments. And if there's not. Someone could make a motion.

Virginia Jenkins: I'll make a motion. I make a motion to approve COA 23-24 (S 23-11) request of Kerry Minter for the installation of a new hanging sign at 10 North Pendleton Street. The Massage Stop.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: Second by Linda. All those in favor? Aye. Any opposed? Any abstain? [00:10:00] Motion passes. Thank you.

Kerry Minter: Yes.

Tim Clites: Welcome. Oh, come on. We weren't going to be that tough on you now, were we?

Cindy Pearson: Go make that phone call.

Kerry Minter: So that's it? You're done. You're done. [laughter]

Tim Clites: We need everybody to be that happy at the end of their meeting, right? That's a goal. All right. COA 23-26 (S 23-12) request of Kathryn Knepper. I said it wrong. Did I say it right? [off mic] Never. Never. Welcome for the installation of a projecting sign at 15 East Washington Street, Feminine Pilates and French Instruction. You're welcome to come up to the table.

Linda Wright: Yeah. She's got the whole thing.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, well, there you go.

Kathryn Knepper: How are you?

Linda Wright: That's cute.

Kathryn Knepper: Maybe I'll put it there.

Tim Clites: Oh, no. You have to bring it up. We have to see it. Just kidding.

Kathryn Knepper: You want the close up?

Tim Clites: Yeah, on the table. That would be great.

Kathryn Knepper: On the table.

Tim Clites: Sure. Just hold it up for us to see. All right. Don't you want to see the sign? I mean, why? Why? Look at that.

Kathryn Knepper: There we go. I'll kind of pivot it. Hopefully we like it.

Tim Clites: Perfect.

Kathryn Knepper: Hopefully I'll set it down here.

Tim Clites: Okay. Estee.

Estee LaClare: Essentially, she's applying for a projecting sign, and I don't know if she needs anything else to add towards it. She brought it to us in the flesh, if you will. In the board.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Is there anything you'd like to add? For the record, you're supposed to state your name.

Kathryn Knepper: Okay. Yes. Kathryn Knepper. Pronounced it right. So, it's going on an existing bracket. It's been there for a long time. I basically am right above Terry Parker van, so it's right above like atelier design decor. But yeah, I mean, the brackets very stable. Obviously, it's been there a really long time. My dad said it was has been there for over 50 years and we're just hanging it with these stainless-steel hooks. There's some little hooks for the hooks, so we're going to hang it on, so it'll be hung by Old World woodworking, so I won't be doing it myself. It'll be nice and safe. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I like the sign, and I think it's clear where it's going to go. It meets all the requirements. I understand. So, I have no problem with that at all.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think it's fine that you go in the door that has the white paper on. Even though it's the [inaudible] right on the window.

Kathryn Knepper: Oh.

Margaret Littleton: A little confusing.

Kathryn Knepper: Yes. Yes. Okay. I get the question.

Margaret Littleton: How do they get in?

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] gray door.

Margaret Littleton: Is that where the door is?

Punkin Lee: It's just office really.

Margaret Littleton: Oh, okay. No, I think it's fine. Make it secure. [laughter] It's way up there.

Kathryn Knepper: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think it's fine too. Welcome.

Kathryn Knepper: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I think it's very attractive. It'll be nice there.

Kathryn Knepper: Oh, good.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: Virginia. I was just thinking about having more interesting signs in town, and this is one of them.

Cindy Pearson: There it is. Yeah.

Kathryn Knepper: That's great. Thank you. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Nice. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No Questions. Thank you. Welcome.

Kathryn Knepper: Great.

Tim Clites: Awesome. I don't either. I like it. Anybody like to make a motion?

Margaret Littleton: [inaudible] I'll make a motion to accept the COA 23-26 (S 23-12) request of Kathryn Knepper for the installation of projecting sign at 15 East Washington Street, Feminine Pilates and French Instruction.

Bill Anderson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All Members: Aye.

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

Kathryn Knepper: So, do I leave as well or?

Tim Clites: You can stay. It's really exciting. It gets better.

Kathryn Knepper: [inaudible] But thank you guys so much.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, come on it's so. [off mic]

Kathryn Knepper: This will be up soon. Thanks.

Estee LaClare: All right.

Tim Clites: Next. Item of business COA 23-27 (S 23-13) Request of Rebecca Kidder for a projecting sign, vinyl window signs and an awning at 5 South Madison Street, Federal and Black. Is [00:15:00] the applicant or the sign man is here?

John Ralph: Federal and Black?

Estee LaClare: Yes, Federal and black. The applicant is was unable to attend the office here instead.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Estee. Anything else?

John Ralph: John Ralph for the applicant.

Estee LaClare: So, they're requesting approval of a two sided 8.83ft² carved with raised elements, exterior projecting sign hung from a new bracket, and then antique white vinyl window signs totaling about 1.595ft² to be applied to the door side window and the shop's name store hours and put their merchandise in along with the black awning [off mic].

Tim Clites: Thank you. And before we dive in, Mr. Ralph, can you walk us through on the sign which parts are raised or carved?

John Ralph: I think your material details just say HDU, if I'm not mistaken. On page one. [off mic] I don't know if we're all on the same page one anyway. It's actually an entirely urethane sign. So, it's fully three dimensional. It's trim molding, separate cap piece, the whole thing.

Tim Clites: Okay.

John Ralph: It's as 3D as you get.

Tim Clites: Awesome.

Cindy Pearson: Is that the one you're talking about on the page that has Washington Properties and Yeah?

John Ralph: So, the reason you have the Washington Fine Properties/Posh Pixies is this unit's really tiny width wise, but because it's part of a sort of a triple building, we did a study for Estee and Will showing that the building isn't using that much of its signage. And they were able to work out a way to not have them limited to basically a postage stamp of a sign. And otherwise, it would actually, in between the two other new signs flanking, it would look pretty bad.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

John Ralph: The awnings plain, it's not branded, so it's nothing to do with signage or square footage. It's just.

Cindy Pearson: Now on the. Do you mind?

Tim Clites: Sure. Cindy, you can start and come this way.

Cindy Pearson: So, on the second picture over where the street is, it has the. What's it called? The awning has. What's that called?

John Ralph: Scallops?

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, kind of. Is it that or is it the flat one that's shown on the other one?

Virginia Jenkins: It's not scallops.

John Ralph: The one on the right is actually a metal roof.

Cindy Pearson: That's a roof?

Virginia Jenkins: That's like a seams.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, it's a.

John Ralph: It's a standing seam roof.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. So that's not it.

John Ralph: No, that is not. I'm a little confused by that picture, but no, it is. It is an absolutely plain, square awning.

Cindy Pearson: Good because I thought scallops.

John Ralph: No scallops, no stripes, no.

Cindy Pearson: Anything? So, it wouldn't look good there, though, because there's just a little bit of room. But I think the plain one would be okay. And on the sign that gold is that I'm going to you probably know what I'm saying when I say that is that the Dinwiddie sign gold? Have you noted the Dinwiddie signs as you go out the road?

John Ralph: We did them, but.

Cindy Pearson: They're so bright when the sun shining on them, you can't look at them.

John Ralph: I mean, this is real 23 karat gold leaf.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

John Ralph: So, it's about as bright as it gets. Keep in mind, that's a really dark street under a bunch of trees. They don't get any light, but there's nothing. There's nothing much more reflective, actually, than gold.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. And when you get of course, this doesn't have as many letters as Dinwiddie Farm does, but when you get a lot, it just reflects really badly when it's way bright.

Virginia Jenkins: But it's also dim.

Cindy Pearson: True. True.

Virginia Jenkins: So, when you're driving by, you get it's probably more [off mic].

Cindy Pearson: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: Where this is above.

John Ralph: Well, it makes me want to drive home that way and look now.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, do with your lights on especially. You'll go kind of like.

Virginia Jenkins: I have a question. I'm just.

Tim Clites: Cindy, are you done?

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, I'm sorry.

Cindy Pearson: So, it's awning, door, window, and that. Yes, I'm finished for now. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia is just itching.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm just chomping at the bit.

Tim Clites: Virginia, you're up.

Virginia Jenkins: I just have a question. I'm a little confused and that's not unusual about where it's located. I see the bracket location on one. The bracket location.

Tim Clites: There is one image that's a little confusing. It makes it look like a flat wall sign. [multiple speakers]

John Ralph: The sign is put sideways on there so you can see where it is.

Tim Clites: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I know you're showing it flat on one picture, but I know it's. Is it flat or is it sideways?

John Ralph: It is sideways. It's two sided.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. So, it's going to be sideways. But I'm talking about the height because when I'm looking at the double. Well, [00:20:00] when I'm looking at the double picture, I can't do it all at once. The bracket location is just under the shutter.

John Ralph: Correct.

Virginia Jenkins: But then in the next picture, on the same page, it looks like it's lower down. And maybe that's just me not understanding.

John Ralph: I think. I mean, we've called out heights for it relative to the signs around it as well. We were sort of trying to fiddle where basically if you're standing at the stoplight, at what height do you put it that it both conforms to the rules and is not totally blocked or blocking the two around it.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. So, it's a little higher than the other two.

John Ralph: So, it is it's actually middle height. If you look at the real estate firm is the lowest. This is middle. And then Posh Pixie's is taller.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

John Ralph: And as you look down the street, you actually can see all three.

Virginia Jenkins: So, it's sort of going [inaudible].

John Ralph: We'll keeps some harmony among the neighbors.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Is that it? Linda.

Linda Wright: I think it's all very attractive. I have no questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We're getting there. We're getting there. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I'll make it simple. I think I'm with Linda. I think it's going to look very nice. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think the awning needs a little hem. It just looks like a shoot.

John Ralph: Same color hem?

Margaret Littleton: Sure.

Tim Clites: Can I ask a different question?

Margaret Littleton: Come down to the sill, Huh?

Tim Clites: Can I ask you a different question related to the awning? If it were lifted up. So, the bottom was at the top of the transom. Is that the picture you're looking at? Would that help it so that the awning.

Margaret Littleton: Right. So, you want the light to come in?

Tim Clites: I'm just asking, would that be enough, or would you still want a hem?

Margaret Littleton: I would like a hem down to the door. The bar that goes.

Bill Anderson: Transom.

Margaret Littleton: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: The bottom of the transom.

Margaret Littleton: It just looks.

John Ralph: Yeah. Block the transom entirely and just add a hem to it. Leave it where it is.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah right.

Tim Clites: That's why. Yeah, that's why I'm asking for clarification.

Margaret Littleton: That's what I think would.

Tim Clites: You're saying cover the transom. Put a hem on it.

Margaret Littleton: Correct. I think that would look a little. I don't know. It looks very stark to me. Do you agree?

John Ralph: I think it's a good detail and actually a half-covered transom, I think would look better if we just went ahead and covered it.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. A half-covered transom it is now.

John Ralph: As it is now.

Margaret Littleton: It is half now.

John Ralph: Right. Without your addition.

Margaret Littleton: I don't like that.

John Ralph: Right. That's what I'm saying.

Margaret Littleton: Put a hem on it.

John Ralph: Let's just cover it the whole way and make it look intentional.

Margaret Littleton: That's what I would suggest.

Tim Clites: Any other comments? No. No, Thank you, Bill.

Bill Anderson: I think the sign is very handsome. I wish the awning what you could say about the awning. I think the awning in the bottom right would be really wonderful to have, but apparently, it's not on the table. So, I agree with Margaret saying something to give it a little bit less of an eyebrow and a little bit more of something more special. It just doesn't have that same detail and finesse that the sign itself has. You're right about dropping a little element off. It would help somewhat.

Tim Clites: And just. [off mic].

Bill Anderson: It does.

Tim Clites: I'm not pushing this in a direction by re-asking the question, but since the two of you have focused on the awning first the little picture has the opening and then the splayed roof or the little hem on it, which is actually probably a piece of wood. Starts at the it appears to start at the top. It doesn't cover the window. So, my question around the transom is whether we want the awning to cover the transom or for all of that to sit above it.

Margaret Littleton: I think it would look better to cover it.

Tim Clites: To cover it.

Bill Anderson: I think if you. Do you mean drop the edge down?

Margaret Littleton: Yeah, get rid of that right there.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah. Just drop it down. Okay. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Yeah, instead of raising it.

Bill Anderson: Right.

Tim Clites: I just want to see where you two are before we go back through the rest of the room since you started.

Bill Anderson: I think raising it would make it more unusual.

Tim Clites: Okay?

Bill Anderson: And not in a good way.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Understood. All right.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with Margaret, that it should cover the transom. You know whether however, they do it, because I know exactly what you're saying is you get too many lines going this way. It sort of takes away from a nice, clean look that the sign has.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah. You want to focus on the sign.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Okay. And Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I [00:25:00] think also, if the awning is dropped, it gives that particular shop a definition because when you stand across the street, it's just a row of transoms a row door. So, if you drop the awning, then you have that kind of mental break.

John Ralph: And it's small so it just kind of brings everything down to its small scale.

Virginia Jenkins: I think everybody's on the same page.

Tim Clites: Okay. And there is one other question that I'd like everyone to those of you on the computer, this may be easier than paper. We were given two options for the actual overall size of the sign, and they're shown between Washington Fine Properties and Posh and Pixies. Just for reference, there's a larger and a smaller version of this sign. It's a very subtle difference but thank you. I'm on page 11 and 12 of 15. If you kind of straddle the space between them, you can see them both at the same time. Go down this way. [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: I can't see both.

Tim Clites: Just pinch your screen in a little. Yeah, just pinch. And I'll just give my only comment I think I would keep with the larger sign. It feels more compatible with the other signs in the scale of what's good. But thank you for doing this. It helps see that.

Virginia Jenkins: That's the one on Proposal one.

Linda Wright: Yeah. Yeah. Now I got you.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with you, Tim.

Linda Wright: I think the larger one is better, too.

Punkin Lee: Definitely the larger one.

Margaret Littleton: Larger one.

Bill Anderson: Larger.

Tim Clites: Right. Is there any other decision or someone want to make a motion?

Cindy Pearson: Well, I'll try to make that motion to approve COA 23-27 (S 23-13) Request of Rebecca Kidder for a projecting sign vinyl window signs and an awning at 5 South Madison Street, Federal and Black, with the awning having a hem added to it.

John Ralph: Valance?

Cindy Pearson: A drop. A valance. [off mic] A drop. Okay.

Tim Clites: Right. That would be sufficient to cover the.

Cindy Pearson: Cover the transient transom window. Okay. Sorry. Wrong language. [off mic] And the larger sign. Is that. Okay?

Tim Clites: Size Proposal number one. And it's been seconded. Second, all those in favor?

All Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any oppose? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you all for the input. [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: Are you going to stay there?

John Ralph: I don't know if I have to say that I haven't seen the agenda.

Tim Clites: Next Order of Business COA 23-28 (S 23-14) request of Caitlin Furlong for the installation of a wall mounted sign at 6 North Madison Street. Estee.

Estee LaClare: This is a fairly straightforward application. There are going to be doing another painted and carved exterior sign to be mounted on the wall next to the front door. And Mr. Ralph was representing them as well.

Tim Clites: Okay. Are you here as the applicant?

Jill Copenhagen: I'm Dr. Jill Copenhagen. I'm one of the veterinarians that's part of the practice.

Tim Clites: Well, welcome. If you have anything you'd like to add, you are more than welcome to come up as well.

Jill Copenhagen: I think I've just seen the digital images that you guys have.

Tim Clites: Okay. [laughter] Awesome. Mr. Ralph, anything you'd like to add before we?

John Ralph: Well, Tim, I know you're going to ask.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Which.

Tim Clites: Go ahead.

John Ralph: So, as it's not spelled out, we'll carve the horse logo in. The outside trim in black will be painted on and we'll carve at least the major lettering. Give it some depth.

Tim Clites: And can you confirm for me before we go around the room, I see a Burgundy and a Preston Pink and a Neutral Gray and a Black. And I'm sorry, it didn't strike me as to which goes where.

John Ralph: Preston Pink is just the Rock Lane Management. It's just so small. It's hard to see.

Tim Clites: Okay. And so, on the little insignia on the hind quarter of the horse is that the pink and the Rock Lane Management is pink or is that a typo?

John Ralph: Oh. [laughter]

Jill Copenhagen: I thought that the insignia on the horse [00:30:00] is the pink. And then I thought Rock Lane Management was also Burgundy.

Tim Clites: It looks like it's all Burgundy except for the brand on the horse.

John Ralph: Okay.

Jill Copenhagen: Yeah.

John Ralph: We're going to override my previous comment. [laughter] Yes, it is. It is just the horse brand so to speak.

Tim Clites: So glad you came. All right. Has everyone, can you. Has everyone seeing that now?

Cindy Pearson: Yes.

Tim Clites: Okay. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I had the same question, so I'm glad you brought that up. I'm sorry. I'm trying to get this to scroll. So, is this the same building that the museum is in?

John Ralph: It is.

Cindy Pearson: It is. So, the museum has signs over this?

John Ralph: It actually has signs to the left and to the right of it.

Virginia Jenkins: Are they next door? I mean.

Cindy Pearson: You go in the same door as the museum?

John Ralph: No. You go to the door to the right.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, to the right.

John Ralph: There's a sign above that door and there's a sign to the far left of the unit, which is actually to the left of this door.

Virginia Jenkins: But didn't we? Wasn't that all reds and pinks too, that we were having a discussion about? Are these the same colors?

John Ralph: No, these are their proprietary logo colors, unfortunately.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

Virginia Jenkins: So, it'll be very festive. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: It's going to be a pink street. That's Okay.

John Ralph: At the end of the day, it's a pretty compact, mainly gray sign.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And it's tucked in pretty well too.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, I'm looking at. [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: All right. Cindy any, [multiple speakers]

John Ralph: In the totality of the rest of the building this is pretty minor.

Tim Clites: Yeah, that's all right. I just wanted to make comments.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm just. It's just a profusion of pink. That's all.

Tim Clites: Well, most of this is Burgundy. That little pink is just the little piece.

Virginia Jenkins: Fusion of reds. I'm sorry.

Tim Clites: Yeah, this is true. All right. Linda.

Linda Wright: No comments. I think it's fine.

Tim Clites: You wore the right scrunchie tonight.

Linda Wright: Yeah. [laughter].

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I just have a question about the awning. Is that staying? Because that's yet another faded red. [laughter] I'm just asking. I mean.

John Ralph: Yeah, I don't think there's any agenda to replace it at this point.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: That was my question as well. I like the awning and it has a hem.

Virginia Jenkins: I like the awning.

Margaret Littleton: And I on the picture. It looks like it complements. It's the same hue that your paint, your red horse. I like it. Very nice.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill.

Bill Anderson: I like this. I like the awning also. I like the sign. I like the logo. Just a general comment. If the lettering was white on gray, it would be able to be read from a little bit better distance than the red or the Burgundy on the gray. But that's their choice. How well, they want it read. That's the only comment.

Tim Clites: Yeah, and that's a good observation. It does feel very much like a pedestrian scaled sign more than someone driving by. But given the location in town, you're probably not driving by and pulling over quick, right? [multiple speakers] Yeah, right, right, right. Understood. Now.

John Ralph: I think one parked car and that's all over with anyway.

Linda Wright: Very true.

Tim Clites: Any additional comments? I move that we approve COA 23-28 (S 23-14) request of Caitlin Furlong for the installation of a wall mounted sign at 6 North Madison Street as presented.

Bill Anderson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All Members: Aye.

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

Virginia Jenkins: You're back.

Tim Clites: A busy man here. COA 23-29 (S 23-15) request of Mary Beth Morell for the installation of a projecting sign and window signs at 17 South Madison Street for Middleburg Books. Estee.

Estee LaClare: Thank you Chair Clites. So, they are requesting approval of a two sided 2.81ft² carved and painted exterior projecting sign in Gold Leaf and Sherwin-Williams Dark Knight to be hung with a new bracket. And then they also applied for some vinyl window signs as well to highlight this [off mic] power. The end goal. [off mic] 13.5ft² of storefront signage.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Mr. Ralph, anything to add?

John Ralph: I [00:35:00] think my only caveat would be it's not actually the window glass is actually going to be real gold, not vinyl. So, it'll be fully gilded on the glass.

Tim Clites: Do you do that on the inside or the outside? Just [multiple speakers].

John Ralph: You can do both. The inside is better.

Tim Clites: Does it last? [inaudible] right.

John Ralph: So, it's actually if you've ever seen, it's a three-day process, which is why people don't want us to do it very often, because you have to you have to glue it one day, gild it the next day, and then paint on top of it the third. And there's really no speeding that up.

Tim Clites: That's awesome.

John Ralph: But there's no substitute for how cool it is.

Margaret Littleton: There's a glare of a glass would kind of [off mic].

John Ralph: Not badly, though. I mean, that's good. Gilding on glass is pretty amazing.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah, it sounds neat. I think they're beautiful.

John Ralph: The sign we had to do a little redirect with the designer who was actually in Chicago and had never seen the building. But it's above the railing. We were running into clearance problems and, you know, to be able to walk under it, we don't really have a lot of space to put the sign in such a place. But since we have within eyesight of that Thomas Hayes sign was Ramer sign is Old Ox [inaudible], all of them are below height because they're above railings. So we just.

Tim Clites: So, you can't walk under it.

John Ralph: Correct?

Tim Clites: Understood. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Is the sign color the background is it on the. Our pictures it looks like a dark greenish color. Is it black?

John Ralph: It's called Dark Knight.

Virginia Jenkins: It doesn't look.

Cindy Pearson: It's a greeny blue.

Virginia Jenkins: It's like the color of the inside, right?

John Ralph: I believe so, yes.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Gotcha.

John Ralph: It is dark.

Cindy Pearson: It is dark. Okay. And once again, I have the concern of the gold reflection, but I've heard you so.

Tim Clites: Looks good. Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I like it. Very attractive.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I would agree. I think it's just that whole building just lights up now. It looks so different. It's just clean and nice and it's very attractive.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree. I think everything she's done has been pretty amazing and certainly gave a new face to that part of the building. So, I think it looks great.

John Ralph: It's wonderful inside.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I like it very much.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: Same here. I think it looks it looks terrific.

Cindy Pearson: And to have South Madison Street full. I know. Woot.

Virginia Jenkins: Again, just like the old days.

Tim Clites: All right. No comments from me. So, if someone would like to give us a motion.

Punkin Lee: I will. I make a motion. We approve COA 23-29 (S 23-15) request of Mary Beth Morell for the installation of a projecting sign and window signs at 17 South Madison Street.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. I'm gonna step down for this next application.

Margaret Littleton: Good job.

John Ralph: Thank you all.

Cindy Pearson: Have fun John.

John Ralph: See you all.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Linda Wright: [off mic] Yeah. Go by Dinwiddie. [laughter] Yeah.

John Ralph: It's rare somebody complains about them being too nice. I'll take it, though.

Tim Clites: Well, we can. Sure, you didn't come here for just to sit in the back.

Punkin Lee: Estee.

Punkin Lee: Oh, thank you. I'm actually going to defer to Mr. Moore. I'm going to defer to Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members, you have the memo on this. Essentially, when the original approval for the addition to the property was done a year ago, there were a few small details that were noted at that time that they would return for. So those are included some colors, some lighting. But in addition to that, packaged with this application is also the revision that you discussed last month. Ms. Littleton was not here for that one, of course, but this was the revision to the east side elevation where they're going to add a window to the second story and two side lights to the open windows on the ground floor. But I'll let Mr. Clites walk you through the details of those.

Tim Clites: I would imagine, of this. Hi, Tim Clites and Chris Hersh with me tonight, the owner. There's [00:40:00] a couple of things maybe that you'll want to spend some more time on than others, either via our explanation of them. We tried to be clear. We do have some larger swatches of the color with a backup color, and we brought a sample chip of the roof metal color, which is to match the front roof. We actually found when we got to the rear roof and got up there, you can't really see it from anywhere. It was a darker green having to do with a replacement during the hailstorm from a few years ago. But we decided we liked this patinaed green. It also matches the front door that's there now, and that would be a color that we would put on other doors. So, a couple of colors we can show you in person tonight. We've got some hardware to look at and the carriage door handles again, that'll be down around and kind of almost out of sight. But it is part of the overall exterior. I've got a couple of one light with two options and then we have a screen porch, both an area and that porch where we're going to use a code compliant screen. So, we don't need a rail even though it's above the ground. There's a code compliant screen that will take the lateral pressure required for a safety rail. And then we do have a little piece of railing on either side of the steps that come from this pair of doors down to the grade. We're looking to talk about those as being a little more contemporary than you would think about on a traditional home like this. For two reasons, one is trying to visually make them disappear. If we could, we'd go without railings completely. But then also just kind of acknowledging that this is an addition. And there are although it's sympathetic to the house, we think it was at least a question we wanted to discuss with you all and the color scheme I already went over. So, with that, I think there's kind of a number of things to unpack, but we'll just be quiet and let you discuss or ask us questions.

Punkin Lee: Bill. Do you want to start?

Bill Anderson: Sure. I guess just going through on page 5, the color. I really like that color myself. I think it'll look good on this house. I agree with the hardware. It's even though I see the house as so many traditional elements. I think that type of handle still will look good for the carriage doors. On the lights, I think the light on the lower of the two is to me doesn't have the same quality appearance that I think this house would deserve a light like the one above it. I think it's a higher quality feel this the one below as you see it anywhere. The screen, the mesh infill screen I think is terrific because it really does give you the openness of a well not a screen for almost like a deck, but yet you're on a screen porch. I think they're terrific. I don't know. I've never seen one tested. So, with a, you know kid going full force through it but.

Tim Clites: Or a dog.

Bill Anderson: Or a dog, I forgot. [laughter]

Chris Hersh: That's the more realistic.

Bill Anderson: Or two dogs.

Tim Clites: Or two dogs. [laughter]

Bill Anderson: Two dogs. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Or three.

Bill Anderson: Good point. I can see that.

Tim Clites: Do you know this family anyway.

Bill Anderson: But it's I think it'll be terrific to have it looking out into that that side yard area. On the railings, it's the I really like the design of the house. Excuse me? The addition to the house which has these traditional elements. I mean, even though the doors and the windows are more they're not quite traditional, but really a nice feel. I don't think that this type of railing, which I've used myself over the years in different locations. But for this house I think since this railing doesn't really or two railings doesn't really obstruct in my view, the view you have when you're up on the upper level or when you're coming down, they're apart. It's not like the screen porch where you'd have railings in front of you. They're descending away from you. And [00:45:00] the metal railing to me is just not in keeping with the house where a traditional railing, probably a wood railing would really look lovely against the backdrop of this house. That's just my personal feeling. I mean, I'm sure these are code compliant and meet the you know, I guess our requirement our guidelines. Which is really a question. I don't think we've used it anywhere. These in the town seen railings like this but that was really my only comment of what I would really change because I really think all the rest is it looks terrific. And that's it.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I am on the same page with Bill. I like the handles. I like number one light fixture. The screening is fascinating, and I would prefer I had two questions for the railing I think wood would be the best. But if you don't want to do that, do some sort of little turn, maybe at the end of the railing, which kind of fits the house more. Just some sort of little decoration of some variety. It's very stark. It doesn't go away, I don't think. But it's very nice.

Punkin Lee: Cindy. [inaudible]

Cindy Pearson: Green is green to me. Not my favorite color in the world, but I think it looks nice there. Good with that door handle and the number one choice and the screen. I think that looks good, too. At first, looking at the railings, I thought, Oh, that's a little different for here. But then, sorry, my computer just went haywire to take away my picture. Out of place but then I kind of like it because then you don't see as much of it, and I get where you're going with that. And maybe what Margaret just said, adding a little something would finish it a little more. But I think it's unusual. And I get what you're trying to do there is not see a lot of the same coming down.

Chris Hersh: There's one area where if it's okay to.

Cindy Pearson: Sure.

Chris Hersh: To that to the right, if you're looking at the elevation on the right side, the railing would go across there. And that's really where the railing is going down really could be many things, but it's the railing going across that if you're sitting in the living room, you're going to be looking at a wrought iron fence or wood fence or railing.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, I see what you're saying.

Chris Hersh: So, the idea was to try to make it disappear.

Cindy Pearson: Right?

Punkin Lee: Okay. Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. I really like the green. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: I was in a hospital where they had green all the time.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, but that's a different green, that's all. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: And the carriage handle doors. The carriage door handles are great. And I too, like the first light. It's different. It's got a little more oomph to it. And the screen. Now with the railings, I'm not as opposed to the railings as everybody seems to be. And the only reason I say this is because I was looking it's the eastern elevation. So, anybody who's unless you're standing at the house, you're not going to see it. You're really not going to see it. You're not going to as you're driving by. Because of the way it's done. You may see the tops, but you're not going to see the whole thing. So, I think it sort of blends into the background a little very well. But I do agree with Margaret, I would like to see a little more finished edge to it at the end. Other than that, I think it looks great.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I love the green. I think that's great. With all that, I like the first light fixture like everyone else. Like everyone my only heartburn was kind of thinking about the fence as well. And I certainly understand you wanting to see out and not look through the pickets because I deal with people with out all the time as well and not wanting to do that. I know just through experience with this kind of fence, if you have little people. Can't reach the top. You grab those wires and my daughter fell and went to grab it when she was falling on the steps and just slit her hand right open. They can be a little on the dangerous side, but I certainly understand the want to open that up and it's very hard to do and meet code [00:50:00] and do anything and do a picket or something that works. So. This is probably the best of all the options.

Chris Hersh: That's right. I was thrilled to find the screen just to be able to get rid of the pickets.

Linda Wright: I wrote that down. I thought that looked really nice. [laughter] Interested in that one.

Cindy Pearson: We'll all be down to test it out for you.

Chris Hersh: Come on welcome to. And we couldn't afford a copper roof, so the patina green was what the option was.

Linda Wright: I like that. It's very traditional. Yeah. Yeah.

Punkin Lee: Are you good?

Virginia Jenkins: Are you done?

Linda Wright: Yes, I'm done. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Yes, thank you. I had a question on the light. Is the actual light up under there? Just asking. I like the green. I kind of felt the door handle and the fence were compatible because they're totally kind

of modern. Modern. A little more nod to somewhat contemporary than. But I think they work. They work well together. So that's all I had. And any further, Bill, do you have any?

Bill Anderson: Yeah, I'm just a little clarification that maybe I didn't read. There's no plan. So, I couldn't really see where the railing is except on the little perspective on slide 13. Yeah. The railing to the left. I understand. That's so you don't fall off the edge. There's a grade difference. And the railing to the right in that perspective goes up along that edge and turns to go back towards the screened porch. Is that correct? Or how many feet?

Tim Clites: Well, if you look at this.

Bill Anderson: If you have in plan.

Tim Clites: I apologize. There's the steps coming down.

Bill Anderson: Right. So, it's what? Three feet. Okay. So, it only blocks a wood railing that would only block four feet of you just. Okay. Just wanted to make that point.

Tim Clites: And I. Go ahead.

Chris Hersh: Well, if you're sitting in the living room, that's kind of where you're going to be looking out either through the screened porch or through that area in the dining room. So, it is going to be noticeable. And being quite candid I personally wouldn't like I would go with metal as opposed to wood.

Tim Clites: And that was one of the questions I would have is getting ready to suggest also is given the front of that home with the brick and the history, it would seem like a black metal rail if you wanted the traditional pickets would be the next option in lieu of the cable rail in my mind. But I'm open to kind of hearing your input. Because we do in all of the options that we've looked at, we've envisioned that being black. So that visually, even if you have to look through it, it disappears more than something that would be painted the trim color.

Will Moore: If I may, Vice Chair Lee. Just in response, Mr. Anderson made an inquiry earlier as to whether the railings would be in compliance with the guidelines. The guidelines are not as specific on certain designs for railings. There are multiple references to railings, mostly existing ones within the district. All of the visuals do have the vertical, the metal balusters in them. And so, there are no illusions to this type of more modern one in the guidelines. But there's no specific call out that if you have an iron railing, it must have vertical balusters.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. I think also you added all those windows to have more openness. So, if you start putting a fence that's got more, that's too busy, then you've kind of defeated the purpose of adding the windows. That's just my opinion. Did you get that?

Tim Clites: No, I'm sorry. Say that again.

Punkin Lee: You added the extra windows to bring the outside in. So, if you're sitting in the house looking out because you've added more visibility, then why would you want [00:55:00] a fence that's like.

Linda Wright: Heavy rail.

Punkin Lee: Heavy rail in front of your.

Tim Clites: And I apologize. I didn't bring this because I didn't get the chance to talk to the owners about it. They do also make this wire or rail system with vertical wires as opposed to horizontal, but it has the

same contemporary look. Right. You could say slightly less contemporary, but it's essentially the same material.

Chris Hersh: From my standpoint, the whole reason for the addition, besides maybe some space, was to capture the view as you look out over that field and anything that hampers that, for example, we realize that the walls were larger and there was an opportunity for more windows. So, we've, you know, backed up and gone through that and worked with you all to make sure that that was acceptable to everybody. So, in terms of the railing, to me, the less obtrusive is honoring the kind of the nature view that you get from that house. And anything that's more enclosing kind of defeats part of what the purpose was and what the vision was for the addition and for the property. Just throwing that out there.

Punkin Lee: Does anyone have anything else to add or? No other comments?

Cindy Pearson: I know that was done. [laughter]

Margaret Littleton: A couple of them were done.

Punkin Lee: I think Virginia will not be making the motion. Anyone else like to make the motion?

Tim Clites: If I could interrupt just to ask. I think if it's possible, we would like the motion to include a railing that you're comfortable with so that we don't have to come back unless, as we talk to the owner, there's a strong aversion to that. So as opposed to leaving us with the potential that, you know, you don't want to approve that particular rail. It would be great to have an approval of some kind of rail.

Punkin Lee: Are you convinced that railing will not be approved?

Tim Clites: I'm not. I'm just suggesting that because in my mind, there's. Yeah, there's some other things that if we needed to, we might be able to do. But I just think they get more complicated. So maybe I'll be quiet.

Will Moore: I think it might be difficult to approve. Something different without an example of what it might be. That would be the one challenge with doing what Mr. Clites is suggesting, because you don't have an example of what that alternate railing might look like.

Punkin Lee: I agree. So, our choice is to approve as presented or approve, except for the rail, if they want to change it and have to come back.

Tim Clites: We could do that.

Will Moore: I think those if those are the two options, I think yes.

Linda Wright: Should we poll everybody first before you make a motion to see if anyone has?

Tim Clites: The other thing we could do is we could make this a plant or [multiple speakers].

Will Moore: To that end, I'm guessing Mr. Anderson is trying to find a picture of a typical black railing. But, you know, the question is, does it have a turn on the end of it? What's the spacing of the balusters or are they all square balusters or are they round balusters? Those are generally the kind of details you would ask for.

Tim Clites: Now you do the pickets on this.

Punkin Lee: Is it possible to take a poll, go person to person and see if they want to turn or leave it?

Tim Clites: And then here. [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: Because the first question is on the railings that are presented, maybe that's the first question or a more traditional one. And then if a traditional one, do you prefer it to have a turn on it. [inaudible]

Linda Wright: And I'm not sure either when you're talking about doing a turn on the end, I don't think they're manufactured that way. That's a wrought iron detail. I don't think you can have that done right.

Margaret Littleton: Is it a flat top or rounded, the rail?

Chris Hersh: It's flat.

Virginia Jenkins: And there's no.

Tim Clites: Yeah, there wouldn't be like a lamb's tongue that they would add to that, like a traditional. [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: Kind [01:00:00] of thing that they? Any options.

Tim Clites: It's because it's contemporary set of details.

Margaret Littleton: I don't think anyone is going to see it driving by.

Virginia Jenkins: No, I don't either. That's why that was one of the reasons. And I'm sorry but I'm talking into my mic is on. You can't hear me because otherwise it's up my nose.

Linda Wright: Hold it.

Rhonda North: It doesn't have to be really close to your face.

Cindy Pearson: And I just put mine on. So, you're good.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, why, thank you. [laughter]

Punkin Lee: So, before we have a motion, would you like to do you feel that we need to have a comment whether the railing stays the same or not?

Cindy Pearson: I'm good with it staying as it is.

Virginia Jenkins: I'll comment. I don't mind the railing as is. If there's some way the end can be go into each other. Or does it come over?

Tim Clites: I think that's a question. Yeah, that actually.

Virginia Jenkins: Because it would look more finished if it was.

Tim Clites: Looking at the image it doesn't it doesn't have a curlicue. It does have. [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: Forget the curl.

Tim Clites: No, it doesn't do that. It actually extends the rail, extends past the.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, forget the idea of a curl, but the way it looks. It comes out over the edge of the. Is there any way that it meets to have it so it would meet?

Tim Clites: Probably not. Okay. The way it gets connected, it needs both sides of the.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I understand, but I was just wondering if the vertical could come out a little further to be hooked up.

Linda Wright: It's a stock fence. It's not a custom fence.

Tim Clites: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Got it.

Linda Wright: I'm okay as it is.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm okay as it is.

Margaret Littleton: I'm fine.

Punkin Lee: All right.

Bill Anderson: Just for clarity, if the railing is presented does not violate any of the guidelines, and if the owner really wants to go with that, I don't see any reason not to. It's not. It's just a sure. I mean, there's no violation here, so.

Virginia Jenkins: It's not as if it's going to be right in our face anyway. So, I don't think anybody's even going.

Bill Anderson: I'm going to look for it now. [laughter]

Virginia Jenkins: Go right ahead.

Will Moore: I would be I would be very careful in your phrasing in that manner. And because as you just phrased it there, somebody with a commercial storefront who's right on Washington Street and their steps are right on Washington Street, could apply for this same rail and try to apply the same logic. And I don't think I think the guidelines are clear enough in their illustrations that this particular application is not generally appropriate throughout the district. I think what you're considering now is with this particular application on this new modern addition, and its maybe limited visibility from the public right of way. Whether or not you would be weighing this, I think this would clearly not be appropriate. And I think that's well said. I think that's well said. I agree. Just if you are to approve this, I think that needs to be clear that you're making that approval based on certain circumstances.

Chris Hersh: I would even add to that, just with the like, I would never consider changing the wrought iron at the front of the house because it's part of the architectural aspect of the house. So, to fit with blocking that.

Punkin Lee: You want to do the motion, then since you got.

Bill Anderson: No.

Punkin Lee: Go ahead. You got the verbiage, Bill go ahead.

Bill Anderson: No. I don't know. Okay. Well, it's actually okay. Okay.

Will Moore: That's right. Option one, I think, was white.

Bill Anderson: COA 23-30. Excuse me. Request of Clites Architectural approval supplemental materials for and a window revision to approved COA 22-25 for an addition to 408 East Washington Street to be approved with a following conditions. Light fixture. What option one? And that's it. That's the only condition.

Cindy Pearson: I don't know how to say this. We did not discuss a window revision, did we?

Bill Anderson: We discussed it last time.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, okay. Sorry. Yeah, I [01:05:00] did not hear what he said earlier. Right. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Is there a second?

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor say aye.

All Members: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Chris Hersh: Thank you all very much.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: That's confusing.

Chris Hersh: That's awesome. Thank you all very much.

Bill Anderson: Thank you. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Well, may I ask, on that motion we just did, should we have added that something about the limited vision?

Will Moore: I don't think so. I think it's captured well enough in the record of the discussion, which will be part of the minutes as well.

Punkin Lee: So, your comment will be in the minutes, correct?

Will Moore: Yes.

Tim Clites: Take it, we've got another one.

Chris Hersh: Oh, is this yours?

Tim Clites: No, I don't know whose it is. I think it's yours. Thank you.

Chris Hersh: Thank you guys very much.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay, bye. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Thank you all.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes. [off mic]

Linda Wright: We have to go there.

Virginia Jenkins: Do we even really need to have Gretchen here for this.

Tim Clites: No, I would. Well.

Will Moore: It's you face these circumstances sometimes, and depending on the circumstances of the application, you may choose to move ahead or table it. It's completely up to you.

Tim Clites: I would like to go back to that application and go around the room once and then we'll see where we are. Does that sound agreeable to everyone here?

Linda Wright: Sounds very agreeable.

Tim Clites: Great. So old business COA-RS 23-02 request of Gretchen Yahn for revisions to approved COA RS 22-10 800 Old Saddle Drive Middleburg residence, Lot 49. And I don't know that there's much need to go through the details, but, Will just briefly get us through to where we are today.

Will Moore: Sure, so just repeating for the record, I think you're all aware of this. This original approval was back in February for this home during construction, which is ongoing, at least on the interior certain changes were made to the cladding of the building. So, the original approval was proposed that all three of the volumes would be in stucco and in the field, they constructed the left side, the wing in stucco. They clad the primary volume in board and batten, and then they did the smaller volume on the right-hand side as you're looking at it in stone. So there was much discussion over the last several months about whether or not mixing of three primary cladding materials would be appropriate. There were some mixed views on that. There were also some mixed views on whether a stone application on that smaller volume would be appropriate. But over the course of discussion, another option as opposed to possibly stucco going over the stone was brought up that possibly there could be a lime wash or a coating put on the stone in lieu of going with stucco. So last month three different options were presented. There were very small applications of the wash applied to the rear of the stone. And you talk those over at your meeting last month, and the kind of general feeling was it would be worth trying a wash on the entirety of the stone volume, but going with kind of a lightest version possible, knowing that if you wanted something that was a little more opaque, you could go back and do additional applications. So, she did kind of the lightest version of that lime wash on the stone volume, and that is what you're presented with this month.

Tim Clites: Thank you. No.

Bill Anderson: I also went out and looked at it again today and I have no problem with its appearance. But if that doesn't look like a real, what [01:10:00] I would consider a real light lime wash. But having said that, I don't have a problem with its appearance. I think it looks good with the house.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Bill Anderson: And what percentage was this? Do you remember? This was?

Will Moore: She called it 25.

Bill Anderson: 20%. But it almost looks opaque.

Will Moore: But. Yeah, but it is.

Bill Anderson: You know, looks fine to me.

Tim Clites: Great. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I like the application. I think I like the textured look very much. I like it all being one color. And I think landscaping will definitely enhance. And you won't. It'll be very pretty. But I have a comment in that for future applications, we have spent a lot of time with our guidelines, and it wasn't fair, almost, it's not the right word to just go and do it without asking us, without a permit. And we would never have had all these discussions. But as it turned out, I think it looks very nice, but I think next time, I mean, we are setting a precedent, and I don't think that's good.

Will Moore: So, and again, sorry, I'm very particular to the words that we use, especially a word like precedent. And I'm not sure what precedent you're referring to. So, if the precedent is that you don't want three primary cladding materials, that's not part of the guidelines, but maybe that's something that we need to add to the guidelines. You're under no obligation to approve this just because it was done without approval. So, if you feel really strongly that there should not be three primary cladding materials on here, you should not approve it. You should not feel like you're being forced to accept a stone portion of the home with a coating on it just because it was done prior to approval. So don't feel that way if you feel strongly. However, if you feel now seeing this, that it is okay, that it is appropriate, then it's worthy of approval. You still would have had these discussions, whether it was applied for or not. You would have had discussions, whether it was presented before they made the change or not, whether or not it's appropriate to have three materials, whether or not if you do that, it's appropriate to have stone on that certain wing. So please do not sit there and think just because somebody did something before filing the right application, that you're forced to give it favorable consideration that you wouldn't otherwise give it, because that's not the case.

Tim Clites: Can I clarify what you just said?

Will Moore: Yes.

Tim Clites: I believe I understand it, but to say it in my terms, additionally, by approving this, we are not setting a precedent that we have to approve it again.

Virginia Jenkins: No, that's not what he's saying.

Tim Clites: And that's a question. That's the precedent that I heard Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: You know, my precedent is that it should have been approved.

Virginia Jenkins: Prior to being done.

Margaret Littleton: Prior to being just done.

Linda Wright: Right. [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: Prior to being changed. I think that's more the key.

Tim Clites: But I think what Will's saying that by approving this now in the future, if someone doesn't follow a plan, we have not set a precedent that we accept that not following a plan, that is not a precedent.

Will Moore: Correct? Correct.

Tim Clites: That is correct. That is not a precedent.

Will Moore: That is correct. It is not a precedent. You're right. You should be looking at this as if it's not done yet. And if for some reason you feel strongly that it's not appropriate, you should not vote to approve it, even though it's already been done, and even though it might be a costly fix for the person that they should not get favorable consideration simply because they did something without asking first. However, if you feel like it's actually a good solution. That could potentially be appropriate in other locations, even throughout the Staples neighborhood, then it's certainly okay to approve it. I think the admonishment has been made numerous times, but every once in a while somebody still goes and does something prior to approval. But you still need to go through these steps, and you should never, as a body feel obligated to approve something just because fixing it would be costly for the applicant.

Tim Clites: Or approve it because they did it out of sequence.

Will Moore: Right.

Tim Clites: We should not feel obligated to do that either. All right. So, let's hold that thought. That's great. So, let's.

Will Moore: Neither you're neither [01:15:00] giving them really favorable treatment that they otherwise wouldn't have got. But you're also not being punitive. You're not saying, well, you didn't ask first so no, we're not going to approve it. You should still measure a reasonable explanation as to why something is not being approved. Your job is not to be punitive. I get to be punitive sometimes. It's not fun. Trust me. So, if you're thinking it would be fun to slap somebody's wrist, it's not. But yeah, they shouldn't get one way or the other. It should just simply be viewed as though it hasn't happened yet. And would you approve this? Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: Thank you. I have a question on that.

Tim Clites: Go ahead.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes, I have a question. Just to clarify, if we approve this, this doesn't mean we would be willing to approve other models that are doing the same thing.

Will Moore: I think.

Virginia Jenkins: I think that may be the precedent that you might be referring to. I'm not sure.

Will Moore: I think you would need to be able to articulate why it's appropriate in one circumstance and not in another.

Virginia Jenkins: Because if we but if we approve this particular house, the, you know, the different mediums that are being used, does that mean that we would have to approve others that came before us for that with that kind of like.

Will Moore: It depends on what the similarities are or what the differences are. You know.

Virginia Jenkins: This is where the rub is. So, I mean, is it if we say it's okay for this and. I mean, if I had my druthers. No, this house, but because I think that's too many mediums being used.

Will Moore: That's an important discussion point. Now.

Virginia Jenkins: So, but if we approve this one, does that mean we would automatically have to approve other houses that are going up with three different mediums that are.

Will Moore: I think that's too broad of a question. Is it going to be another house that has stucco on this wing? Board and Batten in the middle.

Virginia Jenkins: That's what I mean.

Will Moore: And a washed stone of the same design? Unless you can articulate a reason why it's okay in one location and not another. But maybe, maybe it is. Maybe that one is in charcoal gray and you're like, No, that's just way too much with that dark and it's way too dark on the stone. So, it's hard to answer because you're probably not going to get this exact house anywhere else there there's going to be some differentiation. But if this exact house were proposed elsewhere in the stables, you would need to be able to articulate why you would be denying that one when you approved this one.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, this is a fear.

Will Moore: Now, if it was proposed directly next to it, we could say no, we've already had discussions that we're not going to cite the same house.

Virginia Jenkins: So, let's just say they came up with a house design that has stucco. Stone stucco board and batten. I don't care whichever way you want to put it. And we don't approve that one. Coming up, whatever it may be, if it comes up. Can they come back at us and say, but you approved this one.

Will Moore: It depends.

Virginia Jenkins: And then would what kind of defense is it?

Will Moore: Is it the same arrangement of the materials?

Virginia Jenkins: I don't know.

Will Moore: Left to right. Is it the same color? Is it the same degree of wash on the stone? Because every application is individual. All I'm saying is if this exact application came in, in a separate part of the Stables development with you having approved this one, unless there's something really different about this one that's a street over, you would need to have some very good reason to articulate as to why it's not appropriate there.

Cindy Pearson: And is there anything we could add to the motion to approve it that would make this be the only circumstance that it's.

Will Moore: I think that's a really bad idea because that's implying that it doesn't meet your guidelines. Okay. If you say that.

Cindy Pearson: I understood.

Will Moore: Now, the option would be if you feel really strongly that a home should only have two primary cladding materials t [01:20:00]hat's not currently part of your guidelines. Then maybe you revise

your guidelines before the next application like this comes in. And then there's a reason why it wouldn't be approved here, because we saw this. We approved it based on our guidelines at the time, but then we changed our guidelines because we felt after that application that only two primary cladding materials.

Virginia Jenkins: Is there anything in the guidelines about how many different materials can be used in one?

Estee LaClare: No there's not. [off mic] Based upon your conversation with what Mr. Moore just said, I think, looking at the guidelines might be an option.

Cindy Pearson: And to revisit the guidelines is that their group and our group being together to try to work this out to come to a conclusion.

Will Moore: It would require both the developer and this committee agreeing on the changes.

Virginia Jenkins: To change the guidelines.

Will Moore: Yes.

Tim Clites: Well, let's understand, the guidelines were written and submitted by the developer for our review and approval. Right. Is that that's the way that.

Will Moore: Yeah. And to take that a step further. [multiple speakers] No, it's. No, it's completely.

Virginia Jenkins: Salamander.

Will Moore: So, it was a proffered condition of the rezoning of the land that the two bodies would work together to develop the guidelines by which the applications would be evaluated. So, if you're going to revise them, I would interpret that to mean that the two bodies would need to work together on a revision as well.

Virginia Jenkins: Sorry.

Will Moore: No, no, it's really important. It's a really important discussion. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: It is important.

Tim Clites: Because a lot of houses to build.

Will Moore: Yeah, there are many, many more homes to be built yet.

Punkin Lee: I think we have ourselves backed in a real corner here because we somehow during the conversation trying to stick to the rules and not be punitive. We have now the paint is pretty close to the corner. And it is because, you know, we're like, okay, then let's try this. Or, you know, and nobody really wanted I don't believe wanted to go that way. But then kind of one of those things it's done, and you know but then there are too many more under the same guidelines to come. [multiple speakers] The person just had that one house and got kind of off the track one and done. We're not one and done. We got 40 some to go. So how do we get out of this position? Granted another house in another spot there, but they're basically only, what, three styles of houses. So. Not like we're going to have multiple choice of a new presentation.

Margaret Littleton: You could just tell her to take the stone away and paint it. Stucco.

Bill Anderson: Okay that would be the way to do it.

Will Moore: I mean, that is an option. I just would have felt better had that direction been given to the applicant maybe last month or the month before, because it seems that we've encouraged her to go down this route.

Punkin Lee: Oh, I agree with you.

Will Moore: The washing. But there that being said, there was never a guarantee of approval with it either.

Virginia Jenkins: But we did mention stucco.

Will Moore: Oh, yes. Yes. That was mentioned.

Virginia Jenkins: If the paint colors or whatever the wash didn't work, I mean that was.

Will Moore: Yeah. So, the question then is, did the wash work or are we rethinking a number of materials.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] Because of the guidelines? I think it's an issue.

Tim Clites: Because of the precedent that you're worried about setting. It's an issue because. Right. Yeah. I mean, we want to tie that back to if, in fact, this approval of a three clad material by virtue of approving it, we set a precedent that we're stand the chance to have this be contentious discussion moving forward. That's something we should debate tonight and decide. Remember that this application was approved as a complete stucco building.

Punkin Lee: Correct.

Tim Clites: And so, if we were I'm sure there are some committees in our position that would just say just do what was approved. Right. And that's not considered punitive by saying that that's what was approved. I think because it's up and we do have in our small little community sign applications that come in, [01:25:00] the Sign's built. Right. And we try very hard. And I think I want to acknowledge and respect everyone's efforts to not be punitive. By the same token, I think it's a very legitimate thing to also not paint ourselves into the corner of as we now have a less consistent vocabulary on the exterior. Even though this isn't part of the historic district. It was something that we worked for months on. I think there's some other things that we see in this that are valuable to the applicant and to us and to the work that's yet ahead of us, which is this stone I'll just we didn't even get around the room and I apologize, but I'm just going to say it looks nice. I think. We never considered an all stone house and we approved one. And I think that I could get behind that as a finish for certain.

Bill Anderson: It's a painted stone.

Tim Clites: Whatever this is, I could get behind it, whatever it is, right? Like I could get behind it. That's different than this question of in this particular model, is there an underlying line that we don't want to go beyond. And it sounds like the question really isn't, Is that a nice finish by itself? I think what I'm seeing is what I'm hearing is we're saying that's a nice finish, but in the context of one home with three different finishes and setting that as a precedent that we then have, that's a question.

Will Moore: If I might make a suggestion, because I think just from what I'm hearing, I may be wrong. The way this discussion is going, it might be helpful to know if the developer would be amenable to considering revising the guidelines for future applications to limit the number of primary cladding

materials. I could be wrong, but maybe that's something that's worthwhile to actually have an applicant representative here before you actually take action on this application that's before you, because that could potentially influence the vote. If I think this has been a it's been a good process in a way, even though we would always prefer things don't happen in this order. It's been interesting to see how this particular volume on this home has evolved with your discussions with seeing the different three different types of what I'll call them washes continue to its paint, but the three different types of paint and then giving the direction that, okay, put the kind of the lightest that 25% coat on there so we see how it goes. It's I think it's been valuable because I don't think if this had come in as a brand-new application that you would probably have had that level of detail of discussion on how best can you manipulate that to maybe make it work. So, I think there's been some value in that. But before you would take action on this application, because I think it's still a little bit up in the air, I think it would be valuable to have the applicant's representative present. And at that time, you could also, if you were considering going down that route of possibly asking for a revision to the guidelines, you could also have that discussion with a representative of the developer. Those two might feed in well with each other. Again, just a suggestion. I guess the main thing I'm saying is I'm encouraging you not to take this has been out there and open for a while and it's going to be at least a few more months before they would even be close to occupancy. So, I think you still have time. There's no rush on making this decision, if that's helpful.

Virginia Jenkins: I have two questions. If I can remember them now. If we leave the guidelines the way they are and they come in with a plan for a house that doesn't suit what we think, even though it's let's say it's different materials and we don't approve it. Can we not approve something? I mean, under what constraints are we?

Will Moore: Well, so it's difficult to answer because your guidelines are never going to be so detailed [01:30:00] that it doesn't involve some level of subjectivity. If they were, there would be no reason to have the committee because the guidelines would be that black and white, they'll never be that black and white. When I say that there's nothing in the guidelines that prohibits the mixing of materials right now, that's true. But by that same token, let's say on one single elevation, somebody came in and had four different materials and upper quadrant here, something that's like totally bananas. You would never approve that, and you'd be fine saying that's not approvable. So, I'm not telling you that if you were to approve this as it is, that you would always in perpetuity be obligated to approve applications with three different primary cladding materials. All I'm saying is if you saw this exact same application, this exact same model with the exact same application materials and colors, not three different colors, you would have a hard time justifying denying that particular application and that one only because every other one is going to have their own specific circumstances.

Virginia Jenkins: My next question, I do remember if let's say we approve the next plan, whatever it may be, and there's a change made without it coming here. You know, I think we'll probably be a little more jaded in our views.

Tim Clites: I think I wouldn't worry about that until that's a bridge we have to cross.

Virginia Jenkins: No, I understand. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: I totally respect what you're saying. Right.

Virginia Jenkins: But if we say okay on this one, does it make it seem like we might say okay again on the next one if there if there is one where they change something without coming.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Virginia's question because I think we've been very agreeable on trying to extend suggested ways to get out of this hole she got herself into. And the solution still did not comply with our suggestion. So, we're still getting bulldozed. And how do you get out of it? Yeah, I realize each thing is individual and you have but at the end of the day it's kind of like fighting city hall.

Virginia Jenkins: We are city hall.

Punkin Lee: I know, But you know. Politeness is fine, but how are we going to get out of this?

Tim Clites: Can I ask everyone just to back up for a minute and think about the possibility that this is a new application? It's a new application. Forget all the conversations back and forth. And the first question, just answer in your mind without saying it out loud is would you approve this the way it is presented? And the second question is, if we were starting the meeting tonight, what would be your comments about what you would change? Just pause and think about that for a second or two and make your own decision. Because whatever that answer is, that's what we should be doing. Essentially. I know what it is for myself, but I'm one of there's eight of us. Is there eight of us here? Yeah, six. Seven of us. Right. Like each of us should. That's the way we should be looking at this. So. All right, Cindy, this application is in front of you. What would your comments be?

Bill Anderson: Before you answer that, more specific, if this is coming to us in a black and white image.

Tim Clites: Right?

Bill Anderson: Black and white image.

Tim Clites: That's right. Yeah.

Bill Anderson: And [multiple speakers] colors. All right.

Tim Clites: Yeah, just drawings. Right. These are the materials we're going to use, and we're going to paint it. What is this paint [inaudible]. No, it's not the Revere. It's the.

Bill Anderson: It's gray. Gray, white. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: We see the drawing, and we're going to paint it this color.

Linda Wright: Yeah, right, right.

Tim Clites: We're going to use these materials in these locations and we're going to paint it all the same color. What would your I mean, that's really the question. What would your comments be?

Cindy Pearson: Well, I'm, I'm [01:35:00] going back to our conversations of it. The hierarchy of the materials. And I would say that it's not set correctly with that. And that according to the guidelines as we have them. Well, that's not true because it doesn't say how many yet. Wow. This is really opened up some thought.

Tim Clites: But you would start to have that conversation. Right?

Cindy Pearson: Right.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, Virginia, what would you what would you be talking about?

Virginia Jenkins: I still go back to that little wing on the end. I think it. I wouldn't like it, honestly.

Tim Clites: But what would? [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: How would I change it?

Tim Clites: What would you be suggesting?

Virginia Jenkins: I would be suggesting that that be stucco.

Tim Clites: Stucco. What would you be commenting on or not, Linda?

Linda Wright: I would be in the same boat. I think it should have been stucco in the beginning. But now that we are where we are, now that it is all the same color and.

Tim Clites: But that's not what we're doing. It's not what we're talking about, but I just want to know what.

Linda Wright: I think originally, as it was approved, it was stucco on both ends.

Tim Clites: And the middle.

Linda Wright: And the middle.

Tim Clites: And the middle. But that's not what I'm asking. What I'm asking. What I'm asking is this is your presentation in black and white. We're going to paint it all this color. And what would your comments be?

Virginia Jenkins: Why would you have all these?

Tim Clites: That's what your comment would be.

Linda Wright: And if it's all one color, I think it's fine.

Virginia Jenkins: No, I would say, why are you using.

Tim Clites: We're not debating it. We're going to each person. Punkin. What would you be saying?

Punkin Lee: I would say that the two wings should be of the same material and not presented as three options. Stucco would have been my choice, not stone.

Margaret Littleton: That's exactly what I would say. Sorry.

Tim Clites: And Bill, what would you?

Margaret Littleton: Stucco on both sides.

Bill Anderson: Well, I would look at the drawing and understand the color, because color has everything to do with the decision, not necessarily the underlying texture. The siding and the rough texture of the stone to me are just enhancements of the color. So, I wouldn't have a problem with it. I think it gives it a more a richer for one color building, gives it richer fabric to the building. Okay. I don't mind it at all. But when you look at it, if you're just looking at it black and white, I can surely understand why you look at it and go, Oh, this is all so different. We did. And somebody says it's going to be this color. But that's different than seeing a picture when it's all. And then you see the texture on the stone, you know, versus the texture of stucco. I think it's richer, but.

Punkin Lee: Would you have had stone on both wings. So, they matched. Not have three materials. That's the question.

Bill Anderson: You know, if this was all stucco, to me, that's blah. Especially if it was painted all you know, it's just stucco. This has a richness to it.

Virginia Jenkins: To me the rich.

Bill Anderson: I wouldn't have a problem with it in these colors.

Virginia Jenkins: To me, it would have been ideal would if the center would have been stone and the two wings stucco. To me that would be the ideal. [laughter]

Bill Anderson: So that throws another curve.

Margaret Littleton: So, what do we do?

Tim Clites: Well, I don't know if that was useful to anyone else. It was useful to me. Because we may take Will's advice and ask the applicant to come back to discuss this, so we don't set a precedent if we were voting tonight. What I heard is that the majority would ask it to be stucco and we would move on. And actually, what I believe we've heard from the applicant is they would be okay with that solution. So, I think that's worth acknowledging out loud so that if they come back next month or talk to staff and they say, we want to do that to put this behind us, they at least know we've informally polled this group. And I think, Bill, your comments are actually spot on. If this was one of the darkest colors on stone, we'd all be cringing. That's just not part of this vocabulary. Right. And so. If this is the time to have that other further discussion, then this is the time to do that. But it does feel [01:40:00] like in that kind of informal try to be unbiased and express your opinion. What I heard was the majority of you were saying stucco on both wings. We could vote on that tonight. And give our reasons why. And then the applicant could decide to come back because that was part of earlier discussions with the applicant. Let's do.

Will Moore: I would encourage you not to vote, even though I agree. She informally said if I have to stucco it, I will. I don't know that that is a resounding commitment to it. And you have to act on the application that's before you, unless there's consent of the applicant to make a change.

Tim Clites: Understood.

Will Moore: So, you can't direct, no, you have to change that wing to stucco, and we vote to approve that.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, then we do need to defer because the applicant.

Will Moore: I think that's the best thing to do. All right. It does bring up and I'm not trying to force your hand one way or the other, but I think it's important to have the conversation. What Mr. Anderson said and what you. Mr. Chairman maybe expounded on a little bit. Is that it sounds like maybe this, at least in Mr. Anderson's view, maybe this actually would be okay, given the choice of materials and colors that it seems to work. And sometimes you're not going to have the benefit of being able to figure that out with your elevation drawings and just a color sample over here. You won't. And that's why I said that even though this has been painful up to this point, I think it's been a valuable process because you, I may have learned something. Maybe you've learned something that maybe mixing three materials is okay, depending on what those materials are and depending on the color choice. And if you were to ultimately approve this particular application that's captured in the narrative that, hey, if you came in with this exact same design stucco board and batten stone, but it was in the charcoal gray, we don't think that's going to fly because it's just going to be way too dark but given the choice of specific colors. So, I think there are options other than outright denying or other than kind of forcing the applicant to stucco over it. If you're satisfied with the outcome based on this process, that you could potentially approve this without setting

too much of a precedent, except if the exact same house came in a street over on the cul de sac, you would probably need to consider approving that with the same colors and mix of materials.

Tim Clites: Right. And so, then the last thing that I think we could be prepared to discuss, which is just a tie in with what you just said, and thank you for that. And what I heard from a couple of my colleagues is that the material location and scale or the sense of what would have been done historically matters at some level. Right? No different than I can't think of ever seeing a black painted stone house. But you see a lot of white ones and a lot of yellow ones and a lot. Right. Like so that's a.

Punkin Lee: That's a black [inaudible] going.

Tim Clites: I know, but. Right, but that's a useful thing to discuss with the applicant so that they're not working with one of their clients and then coming to us and not understanding maybe why we're not willing to approve that darker color and or that arrangement. So okay, then I believe we're moving to what's it called, table. To table until next month. That's a motion to do so.

Cindy Pearson: I'll make a motion that we table. I don't have the number in front of me.

Will Moore: That was the motion.

Tim Clites: That was the motion.

Cindy Pearson: That was the motion. I'm sorry. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Second.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All those. That's beautiful. All those in favor?

All Members: Aye.

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

Will Moore: Thank you for that discussion.

Tim Clites: And last thing, beyond now, having had that motion, I actually think it was worth all the effort to have these discussions, because that would have been really some of this would, you're right, would never have come out of just looking at a little swatch or having a conversation pre-application. So, I think because there's more homes ahead of us than behind us, I think it's valuable to see some of this and talk through it. All right. Thank you. What do we have? Discussion items any?

Margaret Littleton: We discussed.

Tim Clites: Are we done? All right. A meeting quorum for November the 2nd. Shoot any [01:45:00] conflicts to Estee. If you have them. Oh.

Cindy Pearson: Did you say November?

Tim Clites: Can you believe it? I move that we adjourn. [off mic].