



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



**Thursday, March 7, 2024
PENDING APPROVAL**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, March 7, 2024, 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: Danny Davis, Town Manager
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk
Erick Moore, Planning & Project Associate

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the February 1, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

New Business

COA 24-03: Artwork for Exhibit Banner – National Sporting Library & Museum

Town Manager Davis reminded the Committee that this was a standard process for the banner on the National Sporting Library & Museum’s building.

Claudia Pfeiffer, Junior Deputy Director and Head Curator of the National Sporting Library & Museum, appeared before the Committee representing the application. She advised that their new exhibit would consist of eighty-four works of art, most of which would feature sporting dogs.

The Committee agreed they liked the proposed exhibit banner. They opined that it was better than others from the past that had so many words they could not be read.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-03 as submitted.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

Ms. Pfeiffer introduced Mason Heard, the new Graphic Design Associate for the National Sporting Library & Museum.

Town Manager Davis introduced Erick Moore, the new Planning & Project Associate for the Town of Middleburg. He noted that Mr. Moore had experience with a number of jurisdictions, including Franklin and Warren Counties, the City of Winchester, and the Town of Mount Jackson.

COA 24-04: Alterations & Additions – Rick & Susan Sierra – 100 N. Madison Street

Town Manager Davis noted that the Committee had a comprehensive memorandum that contained an overview of the project. He reminded the members that the property was one of the most important ones in the town, as it contained quarters for enslaved persons on the original estate of Levin Powell. Mr. Davis noted that importance of preserving the primary structure. He advised that the request was to make alterations and additions to the stone structure. Mr. Davis noted that the memorandum called out a few particular items for the Committee’s attention, including the windows, in particular the size and massing of them compared to those in the original structure. He advised that the historic survey for the property and the history of the original structure were also included in the agenda materials.

Sue and Rick Sierra, the applicants, and Tom Gilbert, the architect, appeared before the Committee representing the application.

Mr. Gilbert advised that as he worked with Deputy Town Manager Moore on a boundary adjustment plat, the question arose as to what was the front and what was the rear of the house. He explained that the plans were based upon what Mr. Moore said were the front, rear and side yards. Mr. Gilbert advised that the front was where the driveway came up and noted that it faced the side gable of the house. He explained that because accessory dwellings were not allowed in the front yard, they were limited as to where they could place the driveway. Mr. Gilbert advised that they were proposing to place the garage to the west behind the stone structure. He noted that the remainder of the additions, which would include the living room, master suite, mud room and laundry, would also be in this area.

Mr. Gilbert advised that the property owners wanted to be sympathetic to the old structure; therefore, they were not proposing to place anything in front of or on the other side of it. He noted that there was already an addition on the side where they proposed their addition. Mr. Gilbert advised that they tried to keep the addition subordinate to the original structure. He noted that the original stone house had two floors; however, it had a fairly low ridge line. Mr. Gilbert explained that they were proposing a ridge line for the addition that was not higher than the original stone house and was approximately twenty-inches lower, with everything coming off it being lower. He further explained that they tried to break up the mass of the addition with bump outs and changes in the roof plane, with the intention that the addition would look like something that was added onto over time. Mr. Gilbert noted that while the garage was a big rectangle, its ridge was only fourteen feet, eight inches off the slab; therefore, it was very low.

Mr. Gilbert reminded the Committee that the original house had stucco. He advised that the addition, which he estimated was built in the 1980s, contained EIFS. Mr. Gilbert opined that the original windows in the stone structure were replaced in the 1980s and advised that they were not in good shape. He noted that he would like to discuss replacing them with either an all-wood window or a composite product. Mr. Gilbert opined that the industry was moving in the direction of composite windows and suggested that over time, only clad products would be available. He noted that he had a fall back of an all-wood window if needed.

Mr. Gilbert advised that he was proposing Hardie plank lap siding, with a six-inch smooth face, for the proposed addition in order to keep it low key. He reported that the trim would be simple 4x4 corners and the cornices would also be simple. Mr. Gilbert advised that he was not proposing anything that was elaborate because the original stone house had very little elaborateness to it. He noted that he was trying to keep the addition as low key as possible.

Committee Member Anderson noted that this was a very important site. He opined that the plan made sense given how the property was entered. Mr. Anderson advised that one of the things that jumped out at him, without going into colors and materials, was the size of the roof. He opined that the elevation of the garage elevated its importance over the front door, which was next to it. Mr. Anderson suggested the garage roof seemed large in terms of scale when compared to the older house. He questioned whether the roof could be modified to give less importance to the garage and more importance to the entrance. Mr. Anderson advised that the other thing that jumped out at him was the difference in the proportion of windows in the original house versus those in the proposed addition. He acknowledged the reason for the number of windows; however, he advised that their scale did not reflect the importance of the original house. Mr. Anderson opined that the windows seemed to be heavier. He questioned why they did not go to the ground in the piano room and noted that it had one of the most protected views of the property.

Committee Member Littleton advised that she also found the rooflines to be disturbing. She questioned whether Mr. Gilbert considered having only a one bay garage, as opposed to a two bay one. Ms. Littleton expressed concern that the proposed plans took away from the charm of the original house. She agreed the windows in the proposed addition were incongruous with those in the original house. Ms. Littleton opined that it was important to keep the feel of the original house.

Mr. Gilbert explained that he tried not to have more gables, as he thought they would look busy. He further explained that he was trying to keep the design simple.

Vice Chair Lee opined that the proposed addition looked like a long line of windows, which didn't help the original house. She acknowledged that the addition would come in at an angle and that the owners wanted to keep the view; however, she opined that the design seemed disjointed.

Committee Member Wright advised that the massing also bothered her because it was so much bigger than the original house. She opined that adding dormers would make the addition busy and call too much attention to the roof. Ms. Wright stressed the need not to overwhelm the original house. She noted that the other members already identified her concerns.

Committee Member Jenkins agreed. She advised that the original house was one of the greatest in Middleburg and expressed a desire to make the addition fit better.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Gilbert explained that they were trying to create a cover over the main door without putting a gable on it. He further explained that he tried to place the gutter so it would pull water away from the house.

Councilmember Pearson noted that she did not like the way it stuck out at that location.

Chair Clites asked that the Committee look at the application in relation to the Additions section of the Historic District Guidelines. He noted that the guidelines recommended additions be located on the rear elevation to minimize their visibility from the street; however, he advised that in this case, the applicant did not have many options as to location. Mr. Clites reminded the Committee that the house was not right on the street. He opined that the proposed addition fit in that the form and integrity of the historic building would be unimpaired if the addition was removed in the future. Mr. Clites advised that his comments had already been mentioned. He noted the little roof that stuck out over the entry and suggested it be pushed back so it would not appear as a new roof coming out of the original building. He noted that while this may seem like a minor thing, this was a significant building in Middleburg. Mr. Clites suggested a short, narrow connector could serve as a link between the old and new structures. He further suggested the need to limit the size of the addition so it would not visually overpower the existing building. Mr. Clites advised that the addition should be subordinate. He suggested that having the volume in a horizontal fashion made the square footage of the addition look bigger than the existing building. Mr. Clites opined that when looking at it flat on, it looked out of scale. He noted that when looking at the addition from the Town Hall Parking Lot, which was the only place it would be visible, it was clear that it filled the side yard. Mr. Clites acknowledged that the applicants were not trying to change the original orientation of the structure; however, they were proposing to change the front door. He opined that the door would not ever be the front door and suggested this was how people would exit the house to enjoy the view, as there would be another entrance that would be used on a daily basis. Mr. Clites noted that under the guidelines, the new design should not use the same wall, plane, roofline, cornice height or identical materials and that the new work should differentiate the old from the new. He agreed this was being done through materials. Mr. Clites noted that the guidelines also stated that there was no specific formula for the design of an addition and that it could be in any architectural style. He opined that keeping the guidelines in mind was useful as the Committee members considered their input. Mr. Clites reminded the members that under the guidelines, an addition to a historic building could be more contemporary than the building and noted that this often manifested itself in how much glass was there. He agreed with the comments offered by the members; however, he noted that he wanted to give the applicants something more substantial to work with. Mr. Clites suggested the Committee review the 3D models provided by the applicant and opined that this would help them understand the issue of massing. He questioned whether the applicant's intention was to keep the existing addition as it was, with the roofline being eight inches below the original structure's.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed it was. He suggested that the one on the stern could be changed if necessary.

Chair Clites advised that he was okay with keeping it as is.

Mr. Gilbert explained that he was maintaining the height of the back wall for the original structure in the inside of the addition. He noted that the trusses would be seven feet eight inches in height.

Chair Clites questioned whether, during the design process, any consideration was given to sliding the gable to the right and opined that this would give more space to the historic building.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Gilbert confirmed the outside color would be a simple white.

The Committee suggested the color be softer to go with the stone color.

Mrs. Sierra advised that the existing stucco color clashed with the mortar in the stone. She opined that going with white for the addition would allow the stone house to shine. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mrs. Sierra advised that there would be no shutters on the proposed addition.

Committee Member Anderson opined that the entrances were one of the most difficult parts of the project and noted that he understood why the applicants proposed what they did. He suggested the entrance needed more work. Mr. Anderson further suggested the scale of the windows in the proposed addition, when compared to the scale of the existing house, should be considered further. He opined that they seemed awkward. Mr. Anderson agreed the stucco color needed to be warmer.

Chair Clites noted that the color would also help manage the scale of the proposed addition.

Committee Member Anderson noted that when driving into the front of the proposed addition, the garage doors were the biggest thing that would be seen. He agreed the right color could help mitigate this; however, it would only go so far. Mr. Anderson suggested something like the addition of shutters would also help to create scale for the addition.

Vice Chair Lee expressed concern that the proposed addition swallowed up the old house.

Mr. Gilbert noted that he struggled with the windows. He advised that one of the walls was only seven feet tall, which affected the size of the window that could be used. Mr. Gilbert agreed the windows were starting to overpower the elevations and explained that this was because there was not a lot of wall height. He noted that the windows that were triples did not necessarily have to be triple. Mr. Gilbert noted, however, that they were egress windows.

Committee Member Wright opined that the addition, as it came out in the back, was tight to the stone building. She questioned whether it could be moved more into the center of the mass without affecting the floor plan. Ms. Wright opined that it would help the massing issue if the addition were moved to the right.

Mr. Gilbert explained that the room was an extension off the original addition. He advised that if it was shifted over, everything would fall like a domino.

Committee Member Wright acknowledged that shifting the addition would not fit with the floor plan. She reiterated her concerns about the scale and massing, and the windows for the addition. Ms. Wright opined that the windows were too large.

Mr. Gilbert suggested that if they installed French doors in the back of the addition, the windows would not need to go out as far as proposed. He further suggested that another option was to retain the windows and panel the bottom to look like a door. Mr. Gilbert explained that the property owners did not want people going through the piano room to get to the backyard. He further explained that they wanted them to go out the side door to access the patio. Mr. Gilbert noted that this was driving that decision.

Committee Member Jenkins agreed with the comments that had been offered. She opined that a warm beige color would not draw the eye to the addition as much as the white did. Ms. Jenkins further opined that a warm beige color would allow the house to appear to be not as massive. In response to an inquiry from the architect, she suggested he find a Hardie plank color that was close to the color of the stone.

Chair Clites opined that the little porch that did not overlap the historic structure was welcoming and was at a proper scale. He noted that due to the low eave lines, the addition felt more linear than dimensional due to the height of the wall. Mr. Clites reiterated that the scale of the little entrance felt appealing. He agreed with Committee Member Anderson that the entry by the garage door, which would be the primary entrance, could be improved.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Gilbert about pushing the entry to the gutter line where the gable end was at the stone, Chair Clites advised that he didn't know the exact solution; however, he noted that it grabbed his eye. He explained that where the gutter came over the stone corner felt like the addition was starting to encroach on the historic fabric in a way that did not feel nice. Mr. Clites opined that it was starting to wrap around the little stone structure. He suggested there was a different way to address that entrance to make it feel more like an entrance and pull the eye away from the garage. Mr. Clites opined that the simplicity of the elevation was nice on one level; however, on another, it did not give the eye something prominent to look toward. He advised that as to the elevation that faced west, which contained all the glass, he questioned the right proportion of glass. Mr. Clites questioned whether it was just an issue of the glass or whether it was that a level of architectural ornamentation would be helpful. He asked the Committee whether they felt more detail would help. Mr. Clites expressed an understanding of the applicant's intent to keep the addition simple and quiet.

Mr. Gilbert explained that due to the head height, the addition was like a long, thin cottage. He advised that there was not a lot of give in terms of how it needed to fit.

Chair Clites noted that scale was important. He advised the Committee that the windows were standard window height; however, the roof line was right there. Mr. Clites advised that the addition was very compact, with a low ceiling. He opined that on paper, this made the addition look much longer and larger than it would actually be.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the applicant could consider having a little porch with a roof over the door, Mr. Gilbert advised that it would have to be a flat roof. He noted that he gave consideration to this; however, once sketched, it did not work.

Mr. Sierra advised the Committee that they did not want to do anything to the stone house other than to repair it and make it more attractive by replacing the windows and roof.

Chair Clites noted the incredible views from the property. He opined that the Committee needed to respect that the applicants were trying to respect the old stone building.

Councilmember Pearson noted that landscaping would help break up the addition and keep it from looking so stark.

Committee Member Anderson noted that the proportions of the windows and door on the back elevation of the stone house were to a beautiful scale and advised that this was the scale the Committee was talking about. He noted that even though the stone building had limited height, the proportions were still lovely.

Mr. Gilbert noted that the living room space was in the stone house and that the addition would step up from it. He explained that they were fighting with the window head height of the existing structure versus the window head height of the addition. Mr. Gilbert noted that it would not be as busy as was depicted by the elevation drawings, which showed the trim and everything else. He questioned whether the Committee would allow for a casement window versus a double hung one on the old house.

Chair Clites advised Mr. Gilbert that the Committee would prefer a double hung window in the historic house; however, he suggested they may allow something different in the addition. He noted that the Historic District Guidelines called for additions to be different and distinct. Mr. Clites suggested this was something for the applicants to think about. He noted that he did not know whether the Committee would rule out the use of casement windows for the addition; however, they would be looking for a certain consistency to them. Mr. Clites suggested there would also be conversation related to their proportion.

Mr. Gilbert explained that if the double and triple double hung windows were casement windows instead, the proportions would change, and they could still meet the egress requirements. He advised that even if two of the windows were removed, he would still need one that was for emergency egress. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he explained that he would need to have an egress casement, which did not contain a muntin. He further explained that the Building Code required 5.7 square feet of area so a fully packed firefighter could get into the house for a rescue.

Chair Clites suggested the Committee provide the applicants with specific comments regarding the glazing. He further suggested they review the remainder of the packet in order to provide feedback.

The Committee reviewed each proposed item individually. With regard to the foundation stucco coating over a smooth concrete foundation, with color that would match the siding, it was noted that the Committee had approved James Hardie concrete siding in the past. It was further noted that the Committee had already commented on the massing issue. The Committee noted that the corner boards were proposed to be smooth painted 3.5-inch five-quarter corner boards.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Gilbert confirmed the siding would be one color and the window trim, corner boards and soffit would be a different color.

The Committee noted that the window trim would be a simple trim with a historic sill. They further noted that the exterior door trim would also be five-quarters by four. They noted that the gutters would be pre-finished white and that the soffits would be a smooth finish Benton that was painted. The Committee noted that the windows were proposed to be Anderson A Series Fibrex double hung windows. They held some discussion of the fascia trim and gutters.

Chair Clites noted the lack of a spacer bar on the windows and advised that this was not in keeping with the Historic District Guidelines. He advised Mr. Gilbert that while it was a subtle thing, it was something the HDRC cared about.

Mr. Gilbert displayed a sample window. He reiterated that the window industry was moving toward composite products. Mr. Gilbert explained that this manufacturer put 40% wood fibers into the system and was trying to keep the restored look. He advised that they also included molding that went around the window. Mr. Gilbert asked for the Committee's feedback on their proposal to install the proposed composite window in the historic stone structure. He noted that they would be white in color. Mr. Gilbert opined that with the one-foot step back, it would look like a traditional window. He acknowledged that the Historic District Guidelines recommended everything be wood on the historic structure; however, he advised that he would like to use this alternative. Mr. Gilbert questioned where historic districts were going with regard to these types of products now that they were better.

Chair Clites suggested the Committee discuss the windows in the historic structure separate from the ones in the proposed addition. He reminded the members that in the past, when they looked at historic structures that contained their original or very old windows, they would say they were a key contributing feature of the building. Mr. Clites noted that in this case, the existing windows were not ones the Committee wanted to keep and opined that what was being proposed was an improvement. He questioned whether the members felt this was an acceptable window in the stone structure. Mr. Clites noted that the window had a brick mold, which the Committee would expect in a stone structure. He advised that he was comfortable using the same window in the stone structure as would be used in the addition because it would not replace historic glass windows that contributed to the structure.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed they were comfortable using the composite window for both the historic structure and the addition, since it would not be replacing historic windows. It was noted that the entire existing window would be removed, with the replacement window being maximized to the masonry opening.

The Committee resumed their review of the building materials. It was noted that the entry foyer door would be a painted wood door, the door on the other side by the piano room would match the windows, and the garage door would match the windows as closely as possible. The Committee agreed the garage door should have some detail to break up its scale. They noted that the roof would be black or dark bronze, depending on the color scheme.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the gutters should also be dark bronze, Mr. Gilbert advised that the property owners' preference was dark bronze because they felt it blended with the stone better.

The Committee noted that the corrugated downspouts were proposed to be white. They further noted that the gable wall attic vents would be painted composite vents with a screen. They further noted that there would be roof mounted attic vents and opined that those would not be visible. The Committee noted that they liked the proposed light fixture.

Chair Clites summarized the Committee's comments. He opined that the outstanding question appeared to center around the glazing, including the proportion, amount, and scale. Mr. Clites opined that there was consensus that the front door should be more apparent as a front door. He opined that the Committee did not feel strongly about the garage door.

Town Manager Davis noted the comments related to the roofline not being broken up and questioned whether this was something the Committee wanted to consider further.

Committee Member Anderson advised that while he did not want to design it, there was a suggestion that the entrance be recessed slightly and that the roofline come up to almost the height of the existing stone building's eave line, with that section of roof either being heightened or changed from the garage. He opined that this would identify the entrance and provide shelter. Mr. Anderson suggested the entrance experience was important. He further suggested that walking past the existing stone house to get to the entrance would be wonderful.

Mr. Gilbert advised that he experimented with the idea; however, he purposely did not place a different gable on the garage, as he thought it would make it look more important.

Chair Clites advised that he would be happier with something in the architectural detailing so visitors would be aware of the location of the front door. He opined that the solution should not come out on the stone. Mr. Clites noted that the entrance was already recessed a little. He advised that for him, the additional overhang that lapped out on the stone felt awkward. Mr. Clites acknowledged that the garage could not be pushed back further because of the tightness of the site. He suggested additional study was needed.

Mrs. Sierra advised that based on the history of the house, the front door was really the door that faced the Salamander Resort. She expressed hope that people would come through that door and go into the parlor. Mrs. Sierra advised that she and her husband would probably use the door where they parked their cars.

Chair Clites agreed it would be tricky to get the doors right because of the location of the driveway and parking.

Mr. Gilbert noted the manner in which the front elevation met the gutter line at the stone house and the other roof pitched down. He advised that he needed to ensure the water came off the roof in that area and advised that if a gable was constructed, it would trap the water. Mr. Gilbert advised that as to the fenestration in the back, which was predominant, it contained smaller windows in the bedrooms off the back of the garage. He opined those were fine size wise and suggested the ones on the elevation be

adjusted or replaced with doors to change their proportions. Mr. Gilbert advised that if he went with a casement window, he could reduce the proportions. He noted that other than the quantity, the window issue was height and size in order to meet the Building Code requirements.

Chair Clites advised that he liked the triple windows in the master bedroom. He suggested the glass in the main room be less linear and more vertical. Mr. Clites noted the three different sized windows at the gable and advised that this did not bother him. He noted that the two double hung windows were similarly scaled, so they became a long element. Mr. Clites noted that he was looking for something that was felt vertical and more defined.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed this made sense to him and opined that the structures would be happier because there would be more wall area.

Mr. Clites opined that a little corner was needed in this area. He noted that the other elevations appeared to contain a lot of roofs; however, he opined that they would not be visible from anywhere. Mr. Clites noted that two of them would disappear since the roof would be dark.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Gilbert confirmed he had adequate input; although, he questioned how they could pursue a color selection.

After some discussion, the Committee asked that Committee Members Littleton and Jenkins meet with the applicant to help them identify a different color for the addition. It was noted that the colors would still need to come to the full Committee for their approval.

Mr. Sierra questioned whether there was anything else, aside from the colors, that needed further study.

Chair Clites opined that it was the colors, the glass, and the entry. In response to an inquiry from Mr. Gilbert, he polled the Committee regarding the proposed window. It was noted that the proposed composite window would contain brick mold. The Committee agreed they were fine with it, as long as it was recessed, and the entirety of the existing windows were removed.

Mr. Gilbert advised that the walls were sixteen inches thick; therefore, the windows would be set back five- to six-inches.

Mrs. Sierra questioned whether the Committee had a preferred color for the house so she could start exploring colors. She noted that they were trying to move things forward so they could move into the house.

Chair Clites suggested Mrs. Sierra look at the stone or mortar for a color inspiration and noted that there were probably twenty different colors in them. He advised Mrs. Sierra that the Committee would not hold them up for something like paint colors.

Committee Member Littleton advised Mrs. Sierra that she and Committee Member Jenkins would schedule a time to come to her house to meet with her. She noted that she would bring along a fan of colors for discussion.

Mr. Gilbert expressed appreciation for the Committee's input.

COA 24-06: New Fence – Town Hall – Town of Middleburg – 10 W. Marshall Street

Town Manager Davis reminded the Committee that they previously approved the Town Hall Project. He further reminded them that it contained a board-on-board fence around the mechanical and electrical equipment. Mr. Davis advised that the staff realized this type of fence would be useless for a variety of

reasons, including that it would not shield the view of the equipment. He explained that fencing was still needed for security reasons. Mr. Davis reminded the members that this area was shielded from view by Dr. Helvey's building. He noted the location of the windows for the police bullpen area, which contained the patrol officers' offices, and advised that there was a need for security there as well. Mr. Davis reported that the staff was proposing the construction of two fence sections – one that would run a couple of inches off the corner of the stone retaining wall and would connect to the corner of the Town Hall building (in the Marshall Park area) and one at the far western end of the retaining wall that would connect to the Town Hall building. He displayed a photograph that depicted the locations of the proposed fence. Mr. Davis reiterated that it was not intended to create a visual buffer, but rather was to provide security. He reported that it would contain a single gate on the western end and a double gate on the eastern end. Mr. Davis further reported that the fence would match the existing handrail on the stone retaining wall, only it would be aluminum, as opposed to wrought iron.

The Committee held some discussion as to whether the post would go through the rail. It was noted that because the panels would be affixed to the posts where the gates would be located, this would not be an issue. They suggested the fence with the double gate be pulled back slightly from the corner of the retaining wall so the wall would be the prominent elevation.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether any additional stone would be involved, Town Manager Davis advised that the fence would be placed on the ground.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee, approve COA 24-06, a request of the Town of Middleburg for a new fence at the Town Hall – 10 West Marshall Street – as presented with the clarification that the fence will be adjusted to be closer from the view of the park and set back six- to twelve-inches from the corner of the wall.

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

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

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

Information Items

Letter of Thanks

Vice Chair Lee read a note of appreciation from former Planning & Project Associate Estee LaClare thanking the Committee for her parting gift and for their friendship during her tenure.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:09 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – March 7, 2024

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

Tim Clites: We are live now. You've been warned. This is the Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's regularly scheduled meeting for Thursday, March the 7th, 2024. The first order of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Present.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Present.

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: Thank you. And just a reminder to try to turn on and off our mic so we don't have too many on at once. It helps the recording. Pause for a moment for public comments. If you're here for something on our agenda, we will get to you in the order that you're on the agenda. We'll just pause for a moment and see if anyone has anything to address with us before we start. All right. I'm seeing none. We have approval of the meeting minutes for the February 1, 2024 regular meeting. Are there any comments, corrections, or adjustments to the meeting minutes? Seeing none I move, we approve as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Rhonda North: My system's locked up. I'm just going to try to reboot it, but you keep going.

Tim Clites: Are you sure?

Rhonda North: Yes.

Tim Clites: Okay. We're happy to pause if needed. All right.[off mic] [laughter]. All right. We have no old business. So our next action item will actually be new business COA 24-03 request of the National Sporting Library and Museum for approval of artwork for the quote Honoring the Point exhibit banner.

Danny Davis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Committee Members, you have Mr. Moore's brief report here. This is a fairly standard process that comes before you for the 8 by 12 banner on the building at the National Sporting Library. And we wanted to bring this forward to you and happy to turn it over to the representatives from the Sporting Library for any discussion.

Tim Clites: Thank you and welcome.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Hello. Good to see you all again. First time in the new digs. Very, very impressive. Yeah. We're very excited about this exhibition that's coming up. This is an amazing collection of 84 paintings, prints, sculptures all featuring most all of them featuring sporting dogs of one of some iteration. It's in a bequest by Gwynne McDevitt. It's amazing. Sporting enthusiast herself, during her lifetime who lived in Pennsylvania, and she chose to bequeath this incredible collection to the museum. So, we are doing a museum and library exhibition to feature all of those 84 works to celebrate them. And there's an amazing variety of artists that were not represented yet in the collection, and also the opportunity to start to share this material in the museum as well, because we do have a lot, of course, artwork. So, this will be all dogs, lots and lots of friendly dogs. So.

Rhonda North: Mr. Chair, could we get the speaker's name, please?

Tim Clites: Yes. For the record. Your name?

Claudia Pfeiffer: Sorry, I'm Claudia Pfeiffer. I am the George L Ohrstrom Junior Deputy Director and Head Curator at the National Sporting Library and Museum.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. Where do you want to start? Bill.

Bill Anderson: I think it's terrific. I love it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I love it too. Wonderful.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think it's wonderful also.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: It's beautiful as always.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Yay. We try. Actually, Mason Heard our new Graphic Design Associate is here to see how the process works. And he's the designer for our presentation today.

Tim Clites: Welcome. The process does not always work like this. However, having been here frequently in the past, I think our comments you've always remembered. And so, the few times we've had comments about the clarity of maybe the amount of text or the ability to read that text is always the next iteration has always been improved. But I'll continue. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I think this banner is my favorite so far that we've seen.

Tim Clites: [inaudible] dog. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: And my only comment is with the I like it, it's fine, and it's better than some that have so much words and letters on it that you can't read it, but this one seems a little less so. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you all. I have nothing to add so I'm happy to go ahead in the spirit of keeping things moving. Thank you for coming in tonight. I'm happy to move that we approve COA 24-03 as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Claudia Pfeiffer: Excellent. Thank you. And I also wanted to introduce Julie Banner who's our Marketing and Education Manager. So one of us will usually be coming moving forward. Thank you so much. Have a good night.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. Next. Take care. Next order of business COA 24-04. Request of Rick and Susan Sierra for alterations and additions at 100 North Madison Street. Danny.

Danny Davis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And in the spirit of introductions, if it would be appropriate, I'd also like to introduce Committee Members to our newest town employee, Mr. Eric Moore. He is our new Planning and Project Associate. And so, today is literally his first day. And we finally got him logged in as computer about an hour ago. So, thank you, IT firm, for getting us through that. So, we are really excited to have Mr. Moore with us. We joke about now having the law firm of Moore and Moore at the town office. But we are grateful for his experience coming from a number of jurisdictions prior, Franklin County Warren County, City of Winchester and Mount Jackson. So, he has city, county and town experience and has demonstrated a lot of excitement about being part of the Middleburg team. So, we're glad to have him here. And you will definitely see more of him month by month.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And I apologize. We should have done that when we started the meeting.

Danny Davis: I should have I should have done.

Tim Clites: Nice to have you on board.

Eric Moore: Thank you. I appreciate being here. Thank you.

Danny Davis: So, Mr. Chairman we did ask our Interim Zoning Administrator, Ms. Semmes, to provide the review and write up of this COA that's before you. And I appreciate her hard work on this. She is not

able to be here this evening, but I think you have a very comprehensive memo reviewing the project. And just very briefly, to reiterate a few of the important points. As you know, this property is perhaps one of the most important properties here in Middleburg in terms of it being a likely and from all the research having been conducted a, a quarters for enslaved persons on the original estate of Mr. Powell. And so, it is a very important property and very important to preserve the primary structure here. The request before you is to make alterations and additions to around the stone structure. And that's before you in the memo. On the second page of the memo for you, you will see a few of the particular items that are called out just in our review specific to the windows some questions that you may wish to consider in the review and discussion with the applicant. And then maybe the further discussion would be just the overall size and massing of this vis-a-vis the original structure. Oh, yeah. So of course, this is the historic survey from our historic 2016 update of the historic district and information that you have also in your packet here regarding the history of the original structure on site at 100 North Madison. And then as you wish or as you wish to further discuss particular items, we can scroll through to those particular pages of the request or bring that before you as you wish. Not being a historian or planner, that's all I have to give you at this point, but I'm happy to walk through any other questions you might have or help you through the discussion with the applicants.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Is everybody able to look at the application on their little pad in front of them or share the shared screen and you can at least see where Danny is looking? Before we go any further, perhaps the applicant and whoever they brought with them, presumably their architect, would like to take a few minutes to address the committee.

Sue Sierra: Good evening. Sue Sierra, 100 North Madison Street.

Rick Sierra: Rick Sierra also 100 Madison Street.

Tom Gilbert: Tom Gilbert. I'm the architect for the project. I'm not on Madison.

Tim Clites: Well welcome. You're certainly welcome to walk us through the project if you'd like. It's not a requirement. We can work through the committee, but I always like to start when applicants take the time to come to at least you know, hear anything that you'd like to introduce us to specific to the project.

Tom Gilbert: All right, so I worked with Will at the very beginning because the building was there, and then they redid the boundary lines, and then the question became what was the front side and rear? So the site plans you have in front of you is what Will said were the back lines, the side lines, and the front lines. And given that one of the things that he had said was where the front line is, is where the current driveway comes up. The driveway comes up and sort of faces the side gable of the house. But that's considered the front of the property, front property line, not the front of the house from the property line. And there was a rule that he didn't want any accessory dwellings in that front yard. So that limited our choices of where we could possibly place the garage that we're trying to do. So we try to place the garage further back behind the stone structure towards the west. And the rest of the additions that we're placing in there is just reworking the living room that's there and creating a master suite in one room, type of mud room laundry. The clients plan on making this a forever home. We try to be very sympathetic to the old structure by way of not putting anything in front of it on the sides of it. There already was an addition on the side we have the addition. So, we started from there and went that direction with the addition. We kept the whole structure subordinate to the original structure because it's unique in the sense of the stone house has a second floor, but it's the typical up, like five feet, 6'12 pitch. Right. So, the ridge is fairly low. So, what we're proposing with our work, the ridge that we're showing on the addition that's there is the ridge that's already there. We're not going any higher than the original stone house. And we're about 20 inches lower than at which is what it was. And everything coming off of that and going lower. Then we try to break the massing up so that we could, with certain bump outs, change the roof planes, and the intent was to make it look like it had been added to over time. In other words, this was built, and this was built, and this was built. Of course, the biggest thing of all, the thing is, like, you still have to put a garage in 24.5 by

24.5. So that's the big rectangle. But that garages ridge is only 14ft, eight inches off this slab. So, it's still a low, low pitch on there. The original house has stucco. It was built, we think the original addition, given the windows that are in it, was around 1980. We're not positive somewhere in that area. And stucco work that was on there. It wasn't the current type of stucco work you see today with the historical stucco. It's like the, what do you call it? EIFS. So, any taking it down to the ground on the north side was all had gone to algae and was pretty bad. It was in pretty bad shape. What was also unique to us about the original Stone House was back in, like we think 1980. Because I believe there are, and I don't know if you're familiar with the old Barber and Ross Rockwell windows they used to sell in Leesburg. I think that's what was put in there. So, they're not in very good shape. And it has the fairly clunky aluminum storm that's on it. So one of the things we wanted to talk to you about tonight was whether we go back in with the all wood window product, or we want to show you a composite product that they're making now that has a paint on it where they're trying to develop the whole window industry is moving this direction. So, in 20 years, you'd be hard pressed to find aluminum clad or any of these things in fiberglass. They're going to end up being these clad products. And I want to show you to see if it was something you guys would consider on the Stone House. We have a fallback window and door. If that won't work, we'd like you to at least take a look at the sample. And then the original, the rest of the additions that we have, we're proposing to do it in a lap siding, and we're calling for the what do you call the Hardie plank concrete siding, the six-inch exposed or smooth face. So, we're trying to do with the addition is keep that part very low key. All the trim is simple. It's a little 4x4 corners, very simple cornices. Nothing elaborate because the original Stone House has very little elaborateness to it. It's very, very straightforward. So, we try to keep everything on the addition that we have as low key as we could. So that's a synopsis of how we got where we are.

Tim Clites: Thank you for that introduction, appreciate it. I'll pause for just a moment to make sure everybody has their bearings. Does anybody have any screen trouble? And Bill, would it be all right if we started at your end of the room again?

Bill Anderson: Sure, but probably come around back to me again because. You know, I want to hear what everybody else has to say also. This is I think this is a wonderful site, very important site. And it's just terrific how it's going to fit into that corner. And I can understand I'm trying to see the site plan again. Could you bring it up there? For some reason I can't get it on this for some reason. [off mic] Yeah. The view out the back is just got to be just terrific. I think how the plan works makes a lot of sense to me, given where you come in the property and all. The common side probably have is at first glance, without really going into detail about the notes, which I've only really just skimmed is the two things that jump out at me. And again, without even talking about colors or anything like that. I know it's Hardie board, but the first thing that jumps out at me is the size of the roof. The expanse when you look at what's called the side elevation as you drive in. And again, the one over the garage kind of elevates the importance of these of the garage section, as opposed to the front door which is right next to it. And somehow the roof over all of it kind of seems large in terms of scale of the older house. It could be some way that that roof could be modified above the entrance to give it more importance, the garage less importance other than color and all that sort of thing. The other thing that jumped out at me on all the elevations was the difference between the proportions of the windows in the old house to the old house façade and the windows in the new additions to that section. They seem to me. I understand why, especially towards the rear. You want to get as much windows as you can. And when I'm looking at, I'm looking at the back section. It just seems that to me the windows don't really reflect the scale of the importance of the old house in terms of the window scale there. It doesn't repeat itself in the in the new house. The windows just seem to be a little bit heavier, whatever. I always was curious about the piano room that with this fabulous rear you have there, why the windows don't really go down to the ground to the lower part and that whole rear because that's almost the that's in my opinion, that's got to be one of the most protected views you have of the property. But those are my general first comments. And one after everybody else looks at it, I wanted to go through the notes again and see. Did that make sense?

Tom Gilbert: Yes.

Bill Anderson: Okay.

Tom Gilbert: In fact, what you're talking about we had versions with some of that on like in this one.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I too find the rooflines disturbing. And the pie shaped ones from the bird's eye view that looks really tricky. But would you consider having one bay of garage rather than two?

Tom Gilbert: A one car garage?

Margaret Littleton: One car garage, right? Because I think you are taking away totally from the charming old house. And I've been in it, and it is, it's a, it's tiny. Yes. But and I think the windows again the new windows they are totally incongruous with the old house, which I understand why you're doing it, of course. But if you. It is an old house. And that, I assume, is why you loved it.

Sue Sierra: Absolutely.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah. It is charming. So, to keep that feeling I think is important and I just don't think the roofline is interesting. Maybe it or it's very interesting maybe.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. One of the things I was trying not to do with the addition or having one gable at the living room where the piano room is.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Tom Gilbert: But I was trying not to put other gables in there to make it more and more and more busy. I was trying to keep it just simple.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Tom Gilbert: So that's how we got where we were.

Margaret Littleton: Right, I understand.

Tom Gilbert: We had other versions up and down. Yeah, but.

Margaret Littleton: So that's all I have for right now.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. And just in the spirit of what Bill said, this came up a couple of meetings ago. So, let's just walk through everyone's comments and I think they'll then we'll kind of collect those comments, at least to start. I think it's more around the overall massing and scale things we've already been hearing. We can come back into another round of comments around specific details around windows and things. But if we collect them all together and then have a dialog either with the applicant or among us, and then kind of go, that may just help everyone hear what's on everyone else's mind before we try and consolidate our comments. Does that make sense? All right, Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think with the old house, it's hard to, the windows that are, can't get away from the windows. It looks just like a long line of windows that don't really help the old house. I know it's a different space. And you're coming in angles, and you want to keep the view, but it just seems a bit disjointed to me at the moment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Well, I think everyone's pretty much hit some of the highlights. I had too just sort of the massing of it all kind of bothers me because it's so much bigger than the original house, and if there was some way to kind of like you were saying, put dormers or do something, but then it gets too busy and it calls too much attention to the roof, and there's just a lot of back and forth trying to figure out how to make it not overwhelm the old house. And it's a tough thing to figure out. It is. But as far as specific things, I don't have anything quite yet, but everyone's kind of highlighted the same things that I was thinking.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm with Linda. Everybody is basically saying the same thing. I love the idea and I love that house. I think it's one of the greatest houses. I just wish there was, like everybody said, a way to make it fit better, I guess, for lack of better terms. That's all for now.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: As you know, this is not my thing is to read plans as well as you all do. But I do see something that on the front elevation south. Could you put that [inaudible]. Over where the original building is in this case that comes down to that window. Am I not? I don't know. No. Over on where it comes to. Yeah. Right there. What is that?

Tom Gilbert: We were just trying to create enough of a cover over the door without putting a cable on.

Cindy Pearson: So that will be the main door?

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. Down further. And then I didn't want to do. I wanted the gutter to be able to get away from the house. So, if I was interrupting everything, I couldn't get the gutter out. So. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: You don't want a pond right there, though?

Tom Gilbert: Okay. Right.

Cindy Pearson: No, I just I didn't it just kind of was sticking out like this to me.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. No. I'll just continue to listen and maybe make some more comments later.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Danny, is it possible for you to bring up our guidelines? And I think it's worth all of us perhaps most of us did this before we review this, by the way, we don't get a whole lot of projects like this with a nice big addition. So, in the spirit of and we did just redo our guidelines, maybe I'd say two years ago, but I think everything happened two years ago and it probably happened five years ago. But in that effort, there's a nice page around additions. It doesn't say much, but I think it's worth us reviewing as a committee because what it does say is important. And we considered it at the time that we adopted the guidelines. I want to say it's close to the end of the seven the chapter seven. It's near the end of that chapter. That's all right. And while we're finding that, I'll just share why I'm asking for them to do this, because I think that as a committee, we sometimes struggle with using the terms that we're comfortable with conversationally, and what we sometimes need to be doing is looking at our guidelines and saying, but additions. For instance, if we read down through some of these things, the guidelines attempt to locate the addition of the rear elevation, so it minimizes the visibility from the street. In this case, I think that you don't have many options and you're not right on the street. So, it seems like it fits

that attach a new addition or alteration to an existing building in such a manner that the addition or alteration were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic building would be unimpaired. I think here, for the most part, doing that actually, that ties into the one. I only had a few little comments, all of which were mentioned by other committee members, and one was that little roof that sticks out and the little entry and like it makes perfect sense to me that that's the spot for the entry. And I look at it and I just think if the whole thing was pushed back, it could stay the way it was. But if it somehow was back a little and that still met the setbacks, you'd have the same intent. But we wouldn't have this new roof kind of coming out on this old building. And it's a really minor thing, but it's also a fairly significant building in our little town. So, a short, narrow connector or a small hyphen can provide a link between the old and the new. I think to me that resonates, except there's an addition already there. It's not like you decided to come up against this building, right?

Tom Gilbert: Right.

Tim Clites: And so, we'll come back to that in a second, because I do have a question for you clarifying the model. I'll limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building. It should be subordinate. And I think to the extent that the volume in a horizontal fashion is, the square footage is just bigger than the existing building. So, when we look at it flat on, I think, you know, it looks big, it looks out of scale. I think the model helps to understand that. And I think looking at it from the only place in town that I could see it, which is out in this parking lot, you realize that it's really going to come out into the side yard and kind of fill that side yard. And that's not a negative comment on my part, it's just an observation. Maintain the original orientation of the structure. Well, you're not really changing. You are changing the front door, but the front door as it appears to be, which is actually facing the west.

Tom Gilbert: Right.

Tim Clites: Probably isn't ever going to be the front door. Right? That's where you're going to go out to enjoy the view in the evening. Right. So, but you're maintaining it. You're not covering it; you're not hiding it. And the fact that you would have another entrance that you all might use every day, I don't think is not in support of that comment. The new design should not use the same wall, plane, roofline, cornice height, or identical material. I think you're doing that conceptually. And then the last thing is the new work should differentiate the old from the new. And you're doing that in material. So, with that little reminder about like that's how we're supposed to think about additions, then I think a lot of the comments that we heard and there's another I'm sorry, there's one other little spot in here that it says there is no specific formula for the design of an addition. It can be in any architectural style, traditional, contemporary or a simplified version of the historic building. So I think that's useful when we start to think about how to give the applicant and now I'm talking to the Committee good input on things like glazing or how much glass. Right. Because in fact, an addition, at least per our guidelines, an addition to a historic building can be much more contemporary than that building. And often that manifests itself in things like how much glass is there. And so, I agree with the comments we heard, but I want to be able to give the applicant something maybe a little more substantial to work with if we're going to ask them to restudy the glazing. I'm almost ready to pause, but I'm going to ask Danny if he can go to the little 3D models, because for me, they were more helpful than with the application, more helpful than the drawings, because they really allowed me to and I looked at drawings all day long, but they allowed me to really understand the massing not just as a flat on drawing, but as it relates to. Yeah, let's zoom into those. There we go. And let's just pause at each of them kind of one at a time. Thank you. You want to go to the next one? I'm going to. Sorry to keep being the speaker here. I'll be quiet in a minute. I want to make sure that your intent was the addition that exists right now the roof line is like eight inches below the existing roof line. And the intention is to keep that that way. Yes. There's still a break.

Tom Gilbert: There is yeah.

Tim Clites: Okay. Yeah. The model [multiple speakers]

Tom Gilbert: Actually control, the one on the stern we could even change that if we needed to.

Tim Clites: I'm okay to keep the same. I just I couldn't tell if there was some desire to lift the new roof to align with it. And I thought that that feels. That doesn't feel like it would it would respect the old structure. But if you're keeping that roof plane and extending it again, I can understand you'd be working with something that's there.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. And then what we're also doing is the line that comes back down. You see that little piece that comes down right there?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Tom Gilbert: Right there. So that was the back wall of the original. We call it the family room, living room, bedroom, whatever it was. Right. So, we're using that height. And what we're doing inside is maintaining that height and then going with our trusses and then inside pitching back up to give us back some height because they're pretty they're like seven foot eight or something.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you for clarifying that. And I'll just add my last comment, which is on this. [inaudible] And it really was a question about whether, in the design process there were any options that took this gable and slid it to the right enough to. And I'm not trying to design your project. I'm just kind of asking the question, were there any options that slid that element coming towards us to the right at all? Because from this angle, I feel like it would give a little more space to the historic building. And with that, I'll be quiet for a minute. And when Bill is ready, he can add another layer of comments. I was just going to say and if Bill's sitting quietly. Yes, Margaret, please.

Margaret Littleton: Have you decided on any kind of color for the outside? It's not going to be [multiple speakers].

Tom Gilbert: Towards, actually, just a simple white. She's got some samples.

Margaret Littleton: A simple white.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: Because maybe something a little softer to go with the.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah, the computer does an awful job of doing that.

Margaret Littleton: Stone as opposed to white.

Tom Gilbert: One thing we were worried about was if we try to bring stone in, it's just not going to match. And it's not going.

Margaret Littleton: No, I don't mean bring in stone, that stone color.

Tom Gilbert: Oh, working with a hue in that fashion?

Margaret Littleton: You know, a lighter, right? Right.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah, I don't know. Would you be open to something like that?

Sue Sierra: Sure.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah.

Sue Sierra: The addition that stucco right now is a sort of a cream color, and it really clashes with the mortar of the stone house. So, we've been fooling with color and just sort of came up with white as being something that would allow the stone house to shine and the white would just be white. Yeah. Kind of keep it vanilla like the property is. We don't want to outshine the stone house.

Margaret Littleton: Would you have any shutters?

Sue Sierra: No shutters. No shutters.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret.

Bill Anderson: I have been admonished in the past. I'm trying to be reluctant with trying to be the designer. So, you must forgive me if I'm not going to go there. I mean it's really not my place anyway, to try to come up with a design solution to some of the things we've talked about. I do think the entrances everyone has talked about is probably one of the most difficult parts. And I see how you got there on the site plan. No question about it. Bringing an entrance to the other side doesn't make sense. Because that's such a kind of pristine space to keep as is. But I think that to me, that needs more work. And as suggested before, before we get into discussion of the type of windows the scale of the windows to the proportion of the addition I think really should be considered. Just it's just awkward. It seems awkward for the house. And I think I want to leave it there until we get into the discussion of the windows. I mean, of the materials. I would mirror it. One other thing I would mirror what you said about the color. I agree that the stucco color that's there or EIFS whatever it is, is kind of a yellowish. But there are many nice warm colors of Oh, gosh. Yeah. [laughter] of what a warm stucco could be color. That Hardie board has these great colors. Really? Yeah. Color is very important given the scale of this addition to the existing house.

Tim Clites: And just to clarify, the color discussion is about trying to help manage the scale.

Bill Anderson: It does help. Even as you drive into the front of this proposed house, the garage doors. It's the biggest thing, you know, in this scheme you're going to see garage doors. Now, color can do an enormous amount to that, but it only goes so far. It can reduce the scale on the other portions of the house. And there's other tricks. You mentioned shutters or somebody mentioned shutters.

Margaret Littleton: I did.

Bill Anderson: Shutters have a great deal to do with creating scale. Not that it has to be put into it. I'm just saying using that as an example. Yeah.

Sue Sierra: Did you mean shutters on the stone house?

Bill Anderson: No. No, no. The windows on the addition, as I said, just seem out of proportion even to the addition of windows there with some shutters would, I think have a lot of effect on the scale of the addition.

Tim Clites: We'll come back. We'll come back to that.

Bill Anderson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: As a group. Yeah. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I mean, I think the 3D version definitely shows it better than the flat, where you can kind of see where you're going, but to me, the mass and the trying to put the old and the new together we've kind of lost the old one. It just seems the addition has swallowed it up.

Tom Gilbert: One thing. We're one thing we're struggling with. You go back to the two up from there. The one in the back we were just looking at. Yeah. And that's that one. You see that far right window. That's only two-foot 4x4 foot high. It's that the wall is only seven or something feet tall. So, what's happening here is like we're trying to have a window and then there's not enough wall height. So, the windows are starting to overpower the elevations because there's not a lot of wall. So that's part of the battle with it. And the windows of the triple this next to it wouldn't necessarily have to be triples. But those are egress windows. And if the double hung it's going to be five-foot six high there is nothing, we can do about it. So, for [inaudible] can make it very small, but there's no [inaudible] on the house. So, I wasn't trying to introduce a different type of window.

Bill Anderson: Actually, I think you the way you mentioned the windows, particularly the triples and whatever. The way you said, the windows can overpower the elevations. That's actually a good comment to what I'm thinking is the window has to overpower the elevations. Although I understand why you that's the great view.

Tom Gilbert: Right.

Bill Anderson: But there's you know, this is a balance, I guess.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin. Or am I still on you? No. All right. Well, who's over here? Linda.

Linda Wright: I'm curious about your comment, because when I'm looking at this, too, I feel like the addition that comes out in the back is so tight to the stone building. I'm just curious if that could be moved over more in the center of that mass without totally messing up your floor plan design, which it might, if that would just help the massing, if that, like you said, moved to the right a little bit and gave a little breathing room in that corner where it hits the old building.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. That room is just an extension off the original addition that's there. So, they shift it over. Everything. Dominoes. Dominoes [multiple speakers].

Linda Wright: Yeah. Because I think some of the scale with it just being butted so tight right there, some of that is what kind of bothers me. And I don't know. I know the site's tight and everything else if there's even any way. You don't want to put a little space to, you know, separate the two or not, because it just doesn't work with your floor plan.

Tom Gilbert: Right.

Linda Wright: But some of that again with the massing and the windows. I just think the windows are too big.

Tom Gilbert: And Bill, can I clarify your comment, Bill? To Bill your comment. Remember you talked about the windows in the back. If they were doors like French doors or something, bringing them down. If we were to do something like that, we would then bring the windows in, we wouldn't need to go as far as we are. So, if you went down, you could get that effect. The other thing we could do would be to go and bring them in and keep them windows, and then panel the bottom look like the door, like do something like that where it's not a door. Because what I don't want to do is I don't want we don't want people going through there. And they wouldn't have any armor on it because of the way the house is flowing they don't want people going through where the piano is to get to the backyard. They want them to go out the side

door to that patio that's over there is going to be the main area. So that was kind of what was driving that decision. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay, I think the comments so far have been pretty good, but I'm going to go back to what Margaret said about the color, because I honestly think if it were a warm beige, it would not draw your eye as much as this white does, which makes it just really pop out at you. And I think it would just sort of fit into the landscaping a little bit. Well, not the landscaping, but the whole shape and size of the house wouldn't see appear as massive.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Tom Gilbert: Are you thinking of I'm sorry like a white. Like a beige color with the trim being white is that what you're thinking?

Virginia Jenkins: Go back to the Hardie plank. I mean, if you're going to use a Hardie plank, find something that is close to the stone where the stucco, you know.

Tom Gilbert: We just didn't want that yellow there.

Virginia Jenkins: That would sort of fit in a little bit better.

Sue Sierra: The white that we chose is actually from Sherwin-Williams, and it's one of their historic lines.

Virginia Jenkins: But I still think it's too stark is what I'm trying to get across. And I think if it was just sort of blended into more of the original house.

Tom Gilbert: Okay.

Virginia Jenkins: That's just my opinion. That's all I can give you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Danny, can you go back to the picture of the original house? The original picture? I don't. I was looking for it. Sorry, I can't get to it. The real one. Yeah. The photo. There we go. Okay. Now the windows are sort of white, correct?

Tom Gilbert: Yes. They're white.

Cindy Pearson: They're just old. And do I see with the house that you're using the black windows?

Tom Gilbert: No, no, no, it would be white.

Cindy Pearson: No. Oh, okay.

Tom Gilbert: The problem again has to draw a line and the lines that small. So, my white now looks black.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. [inaudible] Thank you. [laughter] Yeah.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you. That was one of my concerns, that it was going to have black windows. But because I didn't read that. All right. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Let's stay on that picture. I don't know how to interpret what I'm seeing about that little addition. But there's something welcoming about the little porch there that doesn't overlap the historic structure that I'd be fine if it was completely gone, but there's a certain kind of appeal to that feels welcoming and at a scale that like, as you explained to us, the dimensions of and I didn't really focus on the dimensions, your elevations. But with these eave lines being low, that's making the addition feel much more linear than perhaps it actually is in dimension because you're right, you've squished the ratio, if you will, of what we're used to seeing in an eight or a nine-foot wall. We've got a 7'6 wall. So, there's something about that scale of that little entrance that to me feels appealing. And I would say that's what I feel like the entry now is missing in some way, and I don't want to say exactly what that means, whether it's columns or brackets or a little more recess or a little space, but I would agree with what I think Bill mentioned, which is that sense of entry by the garage door, which now will be the primary entrance, perhaps could be improved.

Tom Gilbert: The pushed back you think, and he creates more of a void between the garage and the stone that you're looking at it from really the garage doors. If that entry was pushed back where got the gutter line was like it is there where that gable end is right at the stone. Is that what you're thinking creates a [multiple speakers]?

Tim Clites: I don't know exactly. It just grabs my eye. When the gutter came out over the stone corner, it grabbed my eye as being something that was starting to encroach on the historic fabric in a way that I just didn't. It just didn't feel as nice as I wanted it to. It didn't feel as, I hate to say, respectful because it doesn't feel disrespectful, but it's like it's starting to wrap around this little stone structure. Maybe there's a different way to address that entrance and make the entrance feel a little more like the entrance, which would pull your eye away from the garage. And I think that's some of the other comments that we heard that that elevation including the roof line and the kind of simplicity of it is nice on one level and on another level, it doesn't give our eye anything to say, oh, here's the prominent, here's the reason I'm headed that direction. Right. I guess I'm going to try to interpret some of the comments that I think I heard. And again, I'm not trying to play designer at all, but if we go to the elevation that faces West, I don't know what that's called. The one with all the glass, let's call it that one. Every architect and designer has an opinion about what the right proportion of glass is, right? And we're probably not any different. I wonder. Is it just the glass or is it perhaps a level of architectural ornamentation that would help, and I don't know what I mean by that. Like is it the scale of the trim? Is it the fact that the rakes and the soffits and everything is? and this is a question for the people in the committee that have commented about the glass and the scale of the addition. Right, does more detail help this or not? Because I understand your intent, which is to keep it very simple and quiet.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah, because that head height, you see, for those windows there, that's six foot eight, that's a regular door. So, it wasn't like it went to eight feet or something like that. And you got a taller window. Yeah.

Tim Clites: So, it's like a long thin cottage?

Tom Gilbert: Yes.

Tim Clites: Right.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. I mean literally you put that fascia across there and you gotta get the [inaudible], you slip it in, and it sits in like a jigsaw puzzle piece. There's not a lot of give there in terms of how it needs to fit.

Tim Clites: And I am not comparing this to other projects in town under construction that this committee has reviewed. But the doors there were eight feet tall on a very tall elevation. And so, scale is important, right? Our eyes tend to think these things are all the same scale, but they're not. So, does everyone understand what we're hearing? These windows are your standard window height, and the roof line is right there. So, it's a very compact, low ceiling compact addition, even though on paper it's looking much longer and larger than it actually is. I heard I have an idea.

Margaret Littleton: Would you consider over on the stone house again having a roof, a little porch?

Tom Gilbert: Over the stone?

Margaret Littleton: Over the door.

Tom Gilbert: It would have to be flat because there's others above the original stone door. The original house, middle door.

Margaret Littleton: I just think something on that façade would look. And the on the other side, that cat slide roof, I call it where the addition is so old and complementary. If you could bring that somehow in the front or the back whatever it's called.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. Because you see that door that's there. That door is six foot six inches tall.

Margaret Littleton: But even with rain, you would want a porch of some variety, wouldn't you?

Tom Gilbert: And then the next window up is only like 15in to the bottom of that window. So, it's really snug.

Margaret Littleton: It was just a thought.

Tom Gilbert: No [inaudible] Great idea we had. I had all these things in your mind. You start sketching and come back and go, nope. [multiple speakers]

Margaret Littleton: Right. Right. Thank you.

Rick Sierra: Conceptually, we were just trying to not do anything to the stone house other than to repair and bring it up to, you know, a more attractive look by replacing the windows and replacing the roof.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Tim Clites: I mean, I could see with some use that patio area. You may be back here saying we want to do, and it may be something more related to a garden structure because that's got it's going to be an amazing space, right? The view, it's just incredible in that direction. So, I like the idea that you're starting with nothing on the Stone House. I had the same thought. Right. Like just yeah, something to kind of tie the addition across. But then, you know, I think we have to respect the fact you're trying to respect that old stone building. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I don't have anything additional.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'll just pause, and we'll try not to talk over each other.

Cindy Pearson: I was just going to say, I would love to get my paintbrush out and just put a few bushes here and a few trees here and a little something, and I think it would yeah, break it up. Tone it, make it not

look so stark. And I think that's the whole thing. Of course, I'm very visual. I need to see it sitting there. So, yeah, that's my thing. I want to paint it a little bit.

Bill Anderson: One point if you look at the back elevation of the stone house. I would point out to me, the proportion of the windows, and particularly the door is a beautiful scale on the house. And that's really kind of what we're talking about, that scale. And even though it's got limited height we're talking about, it's still a lovely proportion. Anyway.

Tom Gilbert: The actual living room space is there. The addition that we're working with that's up it steps up from the Stone House. So that's part of what we're fighting too, is that window head height versus the window head at the addition. And then the elevations, like you were saying, we look at elevations, you draw all the trim and everything on there and say, okay, if you were able to say, okay, this part is what's glass? It's not as busy as it looks like with all the line work. That's what we're trying to say. Do you all allow, like a casement window versus a double hung in an old house? We usually try not to do that, but.

Tim Clites: I think in the historic house we would want you to keep double hungs. But in the addition. Well, that's why I ask us to read together what we say about additions. Right. Because it's suggested in our guidelines that the style of an addition wants to be different and distinct. And it's open to you, the architect and the owners, to really think about what that is. And so, I don't know that we would rule out casements, although we would probably want to see a certain consistency to them. And there might still be the conversation from some of us about the proportion of it. And does it, you know.

Tom Gilbert: Right. For example, the double hungs, the triple double hung that's at the bedroom. If those were casements, they can proportions can change and meet the egress. But as it is right now that's if he took those two of those windows away, I still need that one.

Tim Clites: Right.

Tom Gilbert: If I could to get out of that bedroom. So. It's the double sash that gets you.

Virginia Jenkins: Do you mean like the French casements that open completely?

Tom Gilbert: Well, they're called egress casements. No, it's not a French case where there's no muntin.

Virginia Jenkins: Right.

Tom Gilbert: Nothing like that. But the one when you do the casement what the code says is you have to have 5.7ft² of area for a fully packed firemen get into rescue. So, when you open up a double hung window, it's the bottom sash he has to be able to fit through where the casement that opens up the whole casement swings open. There's more room, and so you can get to that 5.7ft² in a smaller unit size. So that's why I was asking about the casement versus the double hungs.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I think it would help if we're going to ask the applicant to study the glazing that we specific about in which areas. And for what purpose? And not just generally say that we think the proportions of the glass need work. Like, I'm not exactly sure what I'm suggesting, but. So, I think we also should run through the rest of the packet so when we're ready to transition to that I think that's useful. Maybe let's do that just to keep some momentum. Let's run through the rest of the packet and then we'll come back and ask. I'll give you some time to digest and maybe ask us questions if we can be more specific. I would like any applicant if in fact we ask you to come back with some other considerations that we'd be clear about what we're asking. Not about the solution, but about what it is that we're asking you to do. So maybe the easiest way to go through the packet. Is Danny. Yeah, let's just start with that and let's go page by page. And I guess the easiest thing to do would be for me to read each item and pause for a

moment, and anybody that has any comments or questions could go ahead and step in. And if there are no comments or questions, we'll keep moving.

Tim Clites: So, we'll start with the foundation stucco coating over smooth concrete foundation. And the color would match the siding and a chip would be provided. Is there any hesitation comment on that? The siding would be, as we heard a primed. We have a sample of it in the packet, a primed and painted smooth concrete lap siding by James Hardie. And that's a material we've seen and approved before. Six-inch exposure and the color as it relates to how that might help. The massing is the one thing that we've commented on. Any other comments there? Corner boards. Smooth painted. 3.5in five quarter corner boards. Assuming the corner boards would be if there were siding color one color and window trim corner boards soffits a different color, they would be the same.

Tom Gilbert: That's right.

Tim Clites: Window trim five quarter by four window trim. Just a simple trim with the historic sill. Any comments there? Its exterior door trim the same five quarter by four. Gutters and fascia trim primed and painted. And the gutter would be a pre-finished white. So, comments there. Soffits primed and painted there's cut sheets in our packet. Smooth finish. Benton. Any comments there? Windows Anderson A series Fibrex double hung. Let's pause for a moment. Unwrap the present, please. Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Question about it when we talked about the gutters and fascia trim. Not the gutters themselves, just the trim.

Tim Clites: Well, I went over both in the packet. There is a profile for the gutters. As a pre-finished white [multiple speakers] Yeah. It may come up again in the further down. But when we look at the cut sheets, there's a profile for that. And while we're opening this up, I will say that the only thing that I observed that was not within our guidelines was the lack of a spacer bar. But I'm looking at this window and it does have a spacer bar. [off mic] Oh, great.

Tom Gilbert: [off mic] Describes this thing like it was [off mic] spacer bar. There's a similar [off mic]. And then they have this other description of something, whatever they call it in some vernacular language. Yeah. So, when I called up the manufacturer. [off mic] spacer bar.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Great.

Tom Gilbert: I actually brought another piece [off mic] I said.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Tom Gilbert: It's on the same page. It was the opposite.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And that's one of those little subtle things that we actually care about. Yeah, I'm sure you do too. Right? Yeah.

Tom Gilbert: I just wanted to show this to you. So, what's happening with the industry is kind of moving towards these composite products. And what this manufacturer does is puts 40% of the wood fibers in your system. So, [off mic]. What we liked about it was they were working hard with trying to keep in that [off mic] restored [off mic] yeah. Typical. [off mic] Why do you not have [off mic]. And they also make all the moldings that go around here in the same way. So this is a what the industry will call a composite window. So, we were talking. I said, that's [off mic] we'll ask we'll bring a sample of it and show you what it was. Just I wanted to get your feedback on it because if you had. If we did this window in the historic stone structure everything, we've been talking about would be white, but it would be the brick walls and the sills, and the historic sills. So, when you add that one foot, you know, step back one foot, it

looks like the traditional window. The historic [off mic] is recommending everything be wood on the historic structure. So, we have an alternate like the [inaudible] all wood. [off mic] of a window. I just wanted to get your feedback, if for no other reason, just to satisfy my curiosity, because I've just kind of curious as to where historic districts are going to be going with these products as they start to come out and start doing better and better and better with them. I was just kind of curious, is this just. We wanted when we were talking. Rick and Sue said, doesn't [off mic]. So that's what we're doing.

Tim Clites: Let's start with any comments just on the window. And then we'll break it down into historic structure versus new. [off mic]

Bill Anderson: Really, the only comment I have is I think as you said, this would not be the appropriate window for the existing building, or I should say the stone structure.

Tom Gilbert: Right. The reason we got to this was we're looking at the Rockwell that is already in there. Well, this is going up. This is going.

zSpeaker4: Sure, sure.

Tom Gilbert: So that was the reason [off mic] decided to ask because usually these old houses, it's an old. You know, old wood still has [off mic] a place in it and stuff.

Tim Clites: And so, I'll I'm talking to the committee now, and we have looked at historic structures that still have the historic, original or very old windows in them. And we've asked particularly when that's a key contributing feature to that building that they stay. This home doesn't have windows that we want to keep. And so, to me, it seems reasonable to think about whether this window is an improvement, and is it really required that we use a wood material? If it's a replacement window contemporary to today. Right. Is that really a requirement or is this window that we're looking at acceptable for both the addition, which I would suggest it is and for consistency, since you're offering to replace it sounds like they need replaced anyway. For consistency, is it an acceptable window in the stone structure? One thing I'll just bring everyone in the committee's attention to this window has a brick mold, which is about this big, and that's the trim that goes around the window, which is part of what you would expect in a stone structure versus in the siding. It's going to be a wider flat board. And so, the trim is different. All we're really talking about is the window itself. And I'll just speak for myself. I would be comfortable replacing in the stone structure with the same window that we would approve for the addition, because we're not. And let's be clear, so that this is on the record, because we're not taking out wonderful old wavy glass historic windows that really contribute to that old structure. Does that make sense? Yeah, I agree with you.

Tim Clites: Bill how do you feel about that?

Bill Anderson: The only comment I would say on that it'd be. I'm not sure that how the thickness of these windows really would compare to what's there, even in general appearance. And it would be a shame that even though the windows that are there are not necessarily the original, as you said, you know, thin, that we wouldn't want to put something in there that's even heavier. So. And I know that we need a I'm looking at the picture of it now and it's really hard to tell. But that's a pretty heavy-duty window. [off mic] You think it does. Yeah. It's I don't know, it just I would just be careful in that way. I don't want to make it look heavier than it already is. And I can't tell by this, but you'll be able to tell that. Yeah.

Tom Gilbert: Well, that window has a 78-inch [inaudible] and 78 inch [off mic]. The thickness that they have [off mic] this distance to that [inaudible] in there. [off mic]. What's deceiving about these is they have the [off mic] on them. Those everything on that aluminum frame.

Bill Anderson: But we are not going to put the aluminum frame back? Gee, the good old [multiple speakers] liners.

Tim Clites: But to be clear, the entire existing window comes out and the window that goes in is maximized to the masonry opening. Right. It's not a replacement. It's not. We're not packing anything in. We're maximizing the window in the masonry opening. And the brick mold helps us do that, both from a molding perspective and dimensionally. Right, it. Yeah.

Tom Gilbert: This is actually very similar to that [off mic] historic. Thanks.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you for bringing that. We really appreciate it. Danny, do you want to keep working our way through the list? And yeah, the pictures are helpful also.

Tom Gilbert: I got to find it again. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Entry foyer door. So, we're going to do one.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. That's going to be a wood. We're going to have that made.

Tim Clites: Wood?

Tom Gilbert: Wood door.

Tim Clites: Painted.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah.

Tim Clites: And then the door on the other in the side by the piano room would be a [multiple speakers] yeah finish to match the windows. Garage doors. Any comments on the style of the door for the garage door? I mean separate is this conversation about color. But we could leave that alone for a moment.

Cindy Pearson: On the drawing. These they look up and down like this isn't the one that you show across.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah, yeah. The limitation [inaudible] does not have that door in it. So, I had to pick the one that was closest to say at least it had the windows right. [laughter]

Tim Clites: The pencil never had that problem.

Tom Gilbert: No, it didn't. That's right. Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: So, it is the one that has the.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah, that one there we were talking about that I would call it like a crossbar. Yep.

Margaret Littleton: I like the plain one better.

Tom Gilbert: The one with the [inaudible] open to the garage. We give it. There's probably 3 or 4 that we liked. We just settled on this one because he could take the panel across the diagonal. If that diagonal came out and you had the main panel that was in there, whether or not it has a bead or I'm not sure, it depends on the manufacturer, but do we have them like that at one point?

Bill Anderson: Yeah, yeah.

Tim Clites: I think some detail in there to break up the scale is nice. Right?

Tom Gilbert: Right.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any other comments on the garage door? Danny.

Tim Clites: The roof.

Margaret Littleton: Black.

Tim Clites: Black or dark bronze?

Tom Gilbert: Yeah.

Tim Clites: The argument for dark bronze might depend a little bit on the color scheme. And the other question that we would pose as a question, because we won't direct it one way or the other, is a dark bronze, white gutters and downspouts or dark bronze. I think the prefinished are the same price. So, it becomes a design question that we leave up to you.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah, I think the preference was the dark bronze because we thought it blended. It looked better with the stone was the stark against the stone. So that was the preference was dark. Well, we just brought both because we weren't sure what way we were going here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And then here we are, gutters and downspouts again. Bill, more specifically.

Bill Anderson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Prefinished case style with a three by four corrugated downspout. In this case color to be white. Gable wall attic vents primed and painted composite vent with a screen. We saw those in elevation. Any comments? Roof mounted attic vents. Those are things that when they're done, you probably won't even notice them, but they help ventilate the roof. And the egress. Well, we probably won't ever see it, but it is part of the exterior. Any comments there? Oh, and yeah. So, let's scroll down and look at that light fixture. Have you been listening to our meetings around light fixtures? Yeah. You have. That's right. I forgot you were here. Yeah. [laughter]

Sue Sierra: It doesn't have the [off mic] but.

Tim Clites: That's all right. We don't we're not going to make everybody do the [inaudible].

Tom Gilbert: Guess my first thought was where's the light? [laughter]

Tim Clites: I'll speak first. I actually liked the light fixture. I thought it was quite nice. Can you see it? Can everyone see that? Okay. And have we made it through the package?

Danny Davis: I think so. Okay. All right.

Tim Clites: So, let me ask, have we been clear enough about I would I'm going to summarize. I'm not always very good at this. So, I'll ask the committee to listen and help. I'm going to summarize and say that I think the outstanding question seems to be around the glazing, the proportion and amount and the proportion and scale of the glazing. There seems to be some consensus around maybe an option to have what will be the front door more apparently a front door. A few little comments around the garage door, which I think probably could be one or the other, I don't that didn't feel a strong sentiment from the group, and I think then a question around color and how that may help the scale of the building. Did I miss anything? Does anybody on the committee? Yes, Danny.

Danny Davis: Mr. Chairman, I apologize if this was captured in what you said earlier. I do know one of the comments early on was related to the kind of length of the roofline and kind of the not broken up, and I don't know if that's still something you want necessarily under consideration, further consideration or not, but I do recall that from the earlier discussion.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'll pause and let the folks that commented about that comment again.

Bill Anderson: Yeah. I made that comment, particularly looking at the front entrance and the garage in the entrance, all under one roof. Without designing it out, if somebody mentioned at the entrance were to be recessed slightly, the roofline or the eave line could come up almost to the height of the existing stone building eave line. And that section of the roof can either be heightened or change from the garage. It would identify the entrance and also provide some shelter, maybe for the entrance. I think this to me, I've always liked you know, the entrance experience to a house is really one of the most, you know, important things. Not the most important thing, but it's an experience that is really you only get it once when you first come in. And passing by this, the stone portion of the house as you walk in to me, it's just a would be one wonderful thing. So, anything that directs you to that existing stone house while walking along it to get to the entrance different from the garage is an advantage to me, and maybe recessing, as somebody mentioned, maybe would work raising the roof of that section up higher. I don't know if there's room inside the house. I see there's a foyer and a project room, so I know losing pushing the entrance back would affect the floor plan. So. A difficult problem, I guess.

Tom Gilbert: What's your opinion on if you look at the elevation and it has the garage doors, if. Like I've done a lot of work in Leesburg and these other places that it's always funny because I say, should this be a double gable or a single gable? I'll go single. Don't look too busy and I go give me a double gable. I'm like, sure. So, when I want to find out here on these doors is I was purposely not placing a different gable on that garage because I thought it was going to make it look more important. Because we did experiment with that idea of like, what if you like the special the end garage if the gable the last one that gable then would run along the left side in that ridge would drop, it would just hit that gable and drop down. So, it wouldn't look as long across the top if he had done if we did that.

Tim Clites: I guess if I had to not solve the problem, but try to define it, I think I would be happier if something in the architectural detailing made me more aware that's the front door, and that that solution didn't come out on the stone. For me, that's almost more it is recessed right now. If you look at the plan, it's already recessed a little. But for me it's the additional overhang that laps out on the stone that starts to feel a little awkward. And I know you can't push the garage back because you're kind of tight on the back corner, right? So, you're tight. So, it's just like, I think a little study there might be worth it. Yes.

Sue Sierra: I just wanted to say that through the history of that house, as we've read, the front door is really the door that's facing the Salamander. So, I'm hoping for the holidays, people will come through that door, go into the parlor and then see the kitchen, and that's really the front door. Now, the door that we will be using my husband and I most of the time will be where we're parking the cars probably. But I just picture, you know, like embellish the stone sidewalk and that's where people will walk in. [off mic]

Tim Clites: That may be a trick, by the way, to get them right. Just because of the way the driveway comes up and where the parking is. Right. And it kind of it starts to feel more naturally.

Sue Sierra: So pretty.

Tim Clites: I know. Right. And but then you give away the view before you came in the house. Right. That's the other problem, right?

Tom Gilbert: That's true. Yeah. Yeah. That's true. Because on that front elevation, where that meets that gutter line meets the stone house right there. The other roof is pitching down. So, I have to make sure I get that water off of there.

Tim Clites: Right. So, going up will be a problem, right?

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. If I put a gable on, I'm going to trap the water. So. Yeah. And on the fenestration stuff in the back, we're talking about the North because I think that's predominant. The other ones are smaller windows in the bedrooms in the back of the garage. I think those are fine size wise, but the ones specifically on that elevation if would you all be open to not necessarily on the main piano room area, because that would probably just be adjusted and maybe we go with doors or something to change the proportion, but the ones to the right, if the doubles that are there, the pair and the triple and that what I would do would be all those windows along that side I would go if one went to casement, I would make them casement so that the one at the sunroom would have whatever those windows or doors are. And then to the right would, I don't want to go double hung, double hung, casement casement, double hung rather than be the same type of window anyway. But if I were able to go to a casement, I know I can reduce the proportion of those, but specifically the ones in the master bedroom. Other than the quantity of them the height and size is the one I need for a code.

Tim Clites: I'm going to go out on a limb on your behalf. [laughter] I actually like the triple windows in the master bedroom, and I wonder if that proportion of double hung made itself to the main room. And you study that so that the glass at the main room was less linear as a group of triples, and found some way to feel more vertical, like in my mind, it's like you might be done, okay. Like I'm just saying out loud without even thinking this through much. But like, if I block the gable, the double hung, there's three different sizes there that like that I actually that doesn't bother me. I'll speak for myself, but as soon as I look at the gable and I look at, it's like two double hungs in the picture and they're all similarly scaled. And so, they become this long element. And it's, it's to my eye, it's almost like I want something that is either less linear or something that helps it feel vertical and kind of more defined. Does that make sense at all?

Tom Gilbert: That makes sense yeah. Structures are going to be happier too because they'll be more wall area.

Tim Clites: You need a little corner there, right? Yeah, exactly. I didn't want to get into that. [laughter] And honestly for the group, when I first looked at the elevations, the other elevations that we have not talked about, I thought, man, that's a lot of roof. And then I looked at the site plan and I'm like, well, yeah, but I understand it. And really, we're not really going to see that from anywhere. Right. So the elevations we're talking about are the one that we will see from the west and the one that you'll see every day you pull up. Right. And the other two have are kind of a byproduct of your site plan and your limits and your program and kind of just how and I think with a dark roof, that's all just going to kind of disappear and be fine. Right? Right.

Yeah, yeah.

Tim Clites: Have we given you adequate input?

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. Yes. Okay. Very much so.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Do you have any questions for any of us or?

Tom Gilbert: How would we go about if we were rather than coming here and saying, here are our colors? Is there a way we can submit things to get feedback ahead of the meeting, or do we have to just submit and do it again? Is there? How does that work?

Tim Clites: Danny [laughter].

Danny Davis: Well, you have a number of options, and it's at the discretion of the committee. One could be that if you wish to designate 1 or 2 members of the committee to review some potential colors that they submit forward and then that could come back to the next committee meeting. I will say in this building that we're sitting in, if you recall, we had that same, very same conversation and we invited Miss Littleton over to our old town office with a 150 different colors. [laughter] And she said that one. And here we are. And it was perfect. So, whether it's something like that or whether they wish to send a few via email, we, we cannot, you know, vote by email, of course but.

Tom Gilbert: No, we expect that just so we get some feedback.

Danny Davis: Some inputs from the committee if you wish. And that's kind of up to your discretion. If you want to deem someone a point of contact and could meet in person or could do that via email.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Of course, I'm comfortable doing that because I'm not the person that I would volunteer. But if Virginia or Margaret were available, I think, again, they're going to give you comments from their perspective. It still comes back to the committee. But I think they often comment the most on colors as a way of trying to help. Sure. Whatever it is that we're focused on. So, if either of them are comfortable to be available. Sure.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah.

Tim Clites: There's two of them. They could do it together. Three of them. They can. They were officially a meeting. So. Yeah. Thank you. Yeah.

Tom Gilbert: Quorum.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay. Any other questions for us?

Tom Gilbert: You guys have any questions? No? Do you have any questions?

Rick Sierra: Well, yeah. Just aside from the color, is there any other things that we need to take back and study?

Tim Clites: I believe it's the color. It's the glass. Particularly at the piano room, west elevation. And it's the entry I'm going to say level of detail. And kind of just making it in some way distinct on that elevation, separate from the garage doors.

Tom Gilbert: Okay. And then you're feeling on this is that this would probably be [inaudible] the condition was starting from. Is that right?

Tim Clites: Why don't we pause for a moment and an unofficial straw vote on the window that's been presented so that if they need to do more legwork for the stone structure, we give them that direction now.

Bill Anderson: Say again.

Tim Clites: Straw vote on the window, this window so that if they need to do some more work before the next meeting, that we give them that direction.

Cindy Pearson: Now this window will have that wooden part that surrounds it that's there already. This just goes into it, right?

Tim Clites: Correct.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, I'm fine.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no problem with that window.

Linda Wright: I'm good too.

Punkin Lee: I'm good.

Margaret Littleton: I'm good.

Bill Anderson: I'm good based upon what you had earlier said that the entire window comes out in the existing house. And so, your stone-to-stone jams, but. Okay.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah, yeah. So clearly stone will be like.

Tim Clites: Right there, correct? Yeah. Thank you. Yep. Perfect. Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Is it recess by the way.

Tom Gilbert: It is. Well yeah. The walls are 16 inches thick. Yeah. We're keeping the stone. We have to sit in on the original stone seal that's there. But it is set back about 5 or 6 inches.

Bill Anderson: It is set back that far.

Tom Gilbert: Yeah. Right.

Tim Clites: Yeah. That'll be nice. Thank you. Any other questions? Clarifications for us?

Sue Sierra: So, I just wanted to ask you some colors that I could start exploring before we met. Do you have a color that you like? Do you know one off the top of your head that you've used? [off mic] Yes. No, but a color that you would like for the house.

Tim Clites: Can I give you a challenge?

Sue Sierra: Sure.

Tim Clites: Go pick one you like. It's not up to us.

Sue Sierra: I like the whites.

Tim Clites: I know, we know, no, but, like, I would think you all. I would look at the stone in the mortar. You mentioned the mortar. And it's such a great way to enliven the stone house by finding a color that helps bring out the mortar, the well, the richness of something, whether it's the mortar or, you know, the stones probably have 20 different colors in them. And if you put like some of these stones have green in them and you don't see it until you start to put the right color against it and your eye suddenly says, oh, look, there's that. So, I think it's a bigger opportunity than yeah.

Sue Sierra: Okay, I think too, we're, we're trying to move things along so that we can actually move in. So that's the other part.

Tim Clites: And just to be clear for this committee I would think with the fenestration, okay, we'll often approve. And if we have to look at a detail like a paint color, you can get the approval to move forward with a little thing like that.

Sue Sierra: Okay perfect. Okay great.

Tim Clites: We would not hold you up just for paint.

All right, thank you.

Tom Gilbert: Some of these lead times are running pretty long. So, if that was approved, we could get that part started.

Tim Clites: Right. Okay. Awesome. Do I? Yes. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Could Virginia and I come to your house with a fan of colors, and we'll call you first. Thank you.

Sue Sierra: I'll meet you over there. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Well, thank you for putting up with my volunteering too if you would. [laughter] Danny, do we need to do anything officially? No, sir. So, we will look forward to seeing you next month. And thanks so much for your patience tonight for [multiple speakers].

Tom Gilbert: Thanks, appreciate it. Appreciate the input.

Rick Sierra: Thank you for your time and feedback.

Tim Clites: We're excited to see this house come alive. Are you kidding? Like this is awesome.

Tom Gilbert: You should see me trying to find it the first time.

Danny Davis: Oh, yeah. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Thanks again for bringing the window sample. Not everyone does that, but it's a big help. All right, let's move along then. COA 24-06 request of the Town of Middleburg for a new fence at the town hall. Danny.

Danny Davis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I guess I'm kind of presenter and applicant all at the same time. You have previously reviewed and approved various aspects of our current building that we're in now. And we had originally had a board-on-board fence, and I'm trying to move my cursor here, if you see it here to block the equipment back here realize that board on board fence was kind of worthless for a number of reasons. One, it sits low vis-a-vis the property next to it. But also, the fence was not taller than the equipment back there, so it really had no value. So, as we looked further, we wanted to create a sense of security for the back. I call it back. I mean, this portion of the building is the front really on Marshall Street, but for this portion kind of blocked by Doctor Helvey's building. Back here, we have our generator, we have our HVAC equipment, we have valving, we have electrical boxes. And also, then where I'm moving my cursor currently our 4 or 5, I think five windows for the patrol police officer bullpen. And so, our idea was to create a little bit of security in this back equipment pad and courtyard by putting up two fences, one along the retaining wall here just at the extension, kind of that retaining wall along the village green. And then one at the end of the retaining wall on the western side again, to kind of connect with the end of the retaining wall. So as noted here in this first photo, you'll see this location is where that fence would run across from corner of the retaining wall to corner of the building. Just might

be an inch or two off the exact corner to corner, but it would be very close. And then I did a zoomed in picture, of course, for you here, I almost tried to photoshop a fence in there and realize I have bad Photoshop skills. So, you did not want to see that at all. And then this is the view from the back. And of course, you can see some of the equipment from this view. It's not really meant to create any visual buffer, more security. We would have a single gate at this one so people could walk back here and mow if necessary. We'd have a double gate at the front in case we had any equipment delivery or other larger things to bring back. The proposed fence is intended to match our existing handrail. This is an iron handrail on the retaining wall. We would prefer to go with an aluminum fence. But that has a very simple design basically just a single bar at the top to match the style of the current handrail on our retaining walls. So this is a long fence aluminum, four foot tall and four to 4.5in spacing between the railings. So that's our request of you. We are happy to answer any questions or discussion that you might have.

Tim Clites: I have one simple question. Are we going to match the no post coming up through the rail? Like in other words, is it going to exactly match the one picture of what exists? The post will stay under the rail. And the other picture the post comes above the rail.

Danny Davis: Rhonda, do you have? And I'm going to confess I do not recall if that's an option I. [off mic] Hold that up real quickly.

Bill Anderson: I would guess that the post, since these are not tying into the existing fence, that it's going to have posts to allow it to start and stop to hold it up.

Tim Clites: But do they have to go through the [inaudible]?

Bill Anderson: Well, the vertical that goes above the railing. You're going to probably need that on whether where it goes in so.

Punkin Lee: So, it's going to match.

Danny Davis: Yeah. I do know your question, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if they offer that where the vertical piece stops at the horizontal handrail.

Tim Clites: I probably can understand. Did you say what's installed now is iron?

Danny Davis: It is.

Tim Clites: What you're proposing is aluminum.

Danny Davis: That is correct.

Tim Clites: And so, the aluminum I believe comes in these panels that are then affixed to the post.

Danny Davis: Correct. Sure.

Tim Clites: So, I probably answered my own question just by talking myself through it. And you're right though, each place there's a post, there's going to be a gate. So, it's probably fine.

Bill Anderson: I would also say may just to this looks terrific, but I would the one that has the double gate in it, I would just pull it back slightly from the corner of the building, let it be in front of the wall instead of at that corner. This way it's also a little back from the face of the stone wall and the other one it's not going to be the same height as the side railing, so I guess it doesn't matter where it's going as long as it doesn't come into the window.

Danny Davis: Sure.

Bill Anderson: So, it's going to sit back further than it shows on the plan probably?

Danny Davis: It will, yes. And I don't believe it'll hit the [multiple speakers] there.

Bill Anderson: Correct?

Danny Davis: Correct. Yeah. So, the suggestion is pull this back. Just a few inches from the actual corner of the retaining wall. That's fine.

Bill Anderson: It'll look better at the stone wall than the stone wall in that job.

Danny Davis: Okay. [off mic]

Punkin Lee: Is there any stone involved? Because this one, the view of the smaller fence location is going to be a lot lower without the stone. You're just putting the railing right on the ground?

Danny Davis: We were just going to put it right on the ground. So, there will be just a step down from the handrail to it.

Tim Clites: I like Bill's suggestion. Expose the stone corner at the other side, and that's a prominent elevation. You're going to see that. So, I think that's a nice suggestion.

Danny Davis: Yeah, definitely can do that.

Tim Clites: Any comments from this side of the room?

Punkin Lee: So, you need a.

Tim Clites: I move that we approve COA 24-06 request of the Town of Middleburg for new fence at Town Hall, as presented with the clarification that the fence adjacent to choose that closer the view from the park be set back 6 to 12 inches from the corner of the existing stone wall.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Danny Davis: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Do we have discussion items? Meeting quorum for April the 4th.

Punkin Lee: I got one thing.

Tim Clites: I won't.

Tim Clites: We have one thing for Punkin.

Punkin Lee: We just have a nice note from Estee that said, please read at the next HDRC meeting. Punkin, Tim, Virginia, Cindy, Linda, Bill, and Margaret, I wanted to thank all of you for the beautiful designer scarf and your kind words that you shared with me at the HDRC meeting. I will think fondly of all of you whenever I wear it and shall cherish it always. It truly was my great pleasure and honor to work with you over the past four and a half years. You all are devoted preservationists of Middleburg history, and your dedication has allowed Middleburg to maintain its small-town charm. Thank you again for your kindness and generosity and friendship. Estee.

Tim Clites: Thank you. It's nice. And on that positive note, we're adjourned.