



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



Thursday, May 7, 2020

PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held as a remote meeting on Thursday, May 7, 2020. Chairman Turnure called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Town Clerk North called the roll call.

PRESENT: William Turnure, Chair
Punkin Lee, Vice Chair
William Anderson
Tim Clites
Virginia Jenkins
Margaret Littleton
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: Linda Wright (unexcused)

Chairman Turnure explained that it was the HDRC’s responsibility to conduct essential public business despite the COVID-19 pandemic. He advised that the Committee recognized the need to do so safely for its members, the staff and the public. Mr. Turnure advised that to that end, the Committee would hold its meetings remotely in accordance with the Resolution Confirming the Declaration of an Emergency and the Ordinance to Implement Emergency Procedures & Effectuate Temporary Changes to Address the Continuity of Government Operations During COVID-19 as adopted by the Middleburg Town Council, until such time as the Governor rescinded his emergency orders prohibiting the gathering of more than ten individuals and mandating social distancing. He noted that the meetings would continue to be live streamed on the Town’s website and copies of the agendas would be available on it as well. Mr. Turnure reviewed the procedures for the Committee members, applicants and public to participate in the remote meetings.

Approval of Minutes

Committee Member Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the March 5, 2020 regular meeting minutes and the April 27, 2020 test meeting minutes as submitted.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Clites, Jenkins and Littleton

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Member Wright

(Chairman Turnure only votes in the case of a tie. Councilmember Pearson is a non-voting member of the Committee.) (by roll call vote)

Old Business

COA 20-05 (S 20-02): Projecting & Mounted Signs – Premier Promotional Products – 15 S. Madison St.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, appeared on behalf of the applicant.

The Committee agreed the signs looked fine.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 20-05 (S 20-02), a request of Kaitlyn Ahalt for projecting and mounted signs at 15 South Madison Street, Premier Promotional Products.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Clites, Jenkins and Littleton

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Member Wright

(Chairman Turnure only votes in the case of a tie. Councilmember Pearson is a non-voting member of the Committee.) (by roll call vote)

New Business

COA 20-06 (S 20-03): Projecting & Wall Mounted Signs – Fields of Athenry/Side Saddle Bistro –
7 W. Washington Street

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, reported that other than that they were smaller, the signs were the same as the existing ones and would be placed in the same locations. He explained that this was just a logo update.

The Committee agreed the signs were better than the previous ones in terms of containing brighter colors that were more visible, so the signs did not blend in as much with the building.

Committee Member Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Anderson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 20-06 (S 20-03), a request of Elaine Boland for projecting and wall signs at 7 West Washington Street as presented.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Clites, Jenkins and Littleton

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – Committee Member Wright

(Chairman Turnure only votes in the case of a tie. Councilmember Pearson is a non-voting member of the Committee.) (by roll call vote)

COA 20-07: Request of Tanner Dudley for alterations to the original structure, an addition and removal of a portion of a stone wall – 308 E. Marshall Street

Tanner and Kyle Dudley appeared before the Committee representing the application.

Tanner Dudley reminded the Committee that he and his brother were in the process of renovating the existing structure; adding a larger front porch; constructing a one-story, one thousand square foot addition; and, constructing a small driveway on the right side of the property. He noted that the latter would require the removal of a portion of the stone wall that was already deteriorating.

Chairman Turnure announced that he was recusing himself from this item as he provided some design assistance to the Dudleys. He noted that the owners selected the materials, with no input from him. Mr. Turnure advised that given that the Committee was meeting remotely, he would continue to lead the meeting; however, he would not participate in the discussion as a member of the HDRC.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Tanner Dudley confirmed the addition was only a one-story one. He advised that they were putting forth Scheme 2 for the Committee's consideration.

The Committee held considerable discussion of the application. They advised that this was a historic structure and noted that the applicant was proposing materials that were not in keeping with an older building. The Committee suggested the need for materials that were sympathetic to it. The members expressed concern about the proposed front door and suggested the need for something more traditional in terms of the glass in the door; the proposed use of dental molding on the front porch and suggested it be scaled to the structure; the overhangs and soffits, which appeared to be too contemporary; the proposed colors, which seemed too bright; the proposed use of vinyl windows, which they have never approved on an historic structure, including that they would be black, which was not a window color that was traditionally used; and, the proposed use of fiberglass columns on the front porch.

The Committee inquired as to the amount of the stone wall that would remain, including how much would remain on the Stein side of the driveway. They suggested the pressure-treated decking either be stained or painted. The Committee inquired as to whether the driveway would be asphalt and noted the amount of water run-off that the road already experienced during a heavy rain. They noted that as to the roof, they did not like commercial grade applied ridge caps and suggested it be a traditional folded seam at the top, which could be hand or mechanically bent. The Committee questioned whether the fiberglass column and trim would be painted so the material would not be visible. They further questioned whether the roof on the small side porch would be a hipped or a gable roof. The Committee questioned the details of the soffit on the porch and whether it would be consistent with the other rakes. They questioned whether there would be anything between the deck of the porch and the ground.

In response to the inquiries from the Committee, Tanner Dudley advised that the proposal was to paint the original structure Major Blue to match its existing color and to paint the addition Blue Plate so it would be clearly defined as an addition. He confirmed the driveway would be asphalt and advised that VDOT had approved it. Mr. Dudley noted that the run-off would be directed to an existing drainage swale. He opined that the Committee was saying there was not enough glass in the front door and advised that he would pursue an alternate door that was similar to the original one. Mr. Dudley advised that he was fine with the removal of the dental molding from the porch. He noted that he was flexible when it came to the colors of the building. Mr. Dudley expressed a preference to use vinyl windows for the addition; however, he advised that he was fine using wood windows in the existing structure. He noted that the vinyl windows would have a traditional appearance. Mr. Dudley advised that he would be happy to stain the pressure-treated decking on the front porch. He advised that they preferred to use fiberglass columns on the porch and PVC trim on the entire house for longevity purposes. Mr. Dudley explained that twelve feet of the stone wall would be removed to create the driveway entrance. He advised that this would leave no stone on the right side of the property; however, it would allow fifteen feet between the driveway opening and the walkway to the house, plus an additional ten feet on the other side of the walkway.

Mr. Turnure advised that the roof on the side porch would be a shed roof. He advised that the soffit on the porch should match that on the remainder the structure.

Kyle Dudley reported that the space between the porch deck and the ground was thirty-two inches high and advised that it would contain vertical lattice that would be installed in a batten fashion. Mr. Tanner advised that he was proposing a synthetic lattice that would be painted.

Tanner Dudley confirmed that all the trim would be painted. He advised that while they were proposing the windows be black and the trim white, they were open to suggestions.

Deputy Town Administrator Moore advised that the staff report did not focus on the colors as that was a lower priority in terms of preservation; however, he acknowledged that the Committee did traditionally focus on them. He reminded the Committee that they had not traditionally approved the use of vinyl on any structure in the Historic District, including new ones. Mr. Moore noted that they have been open to hybrid materials that contained a wood fiber; however, they had not been open to vinyl. He reminded the Committee that they had also not approved the use of cement fiber siding on a historic structure.

Tanner Dudley expressed interest in the Committee's recommendations regarding the windows. He explained that their intent was to build something long lasting, which was the goal for using a vinyl material. Mr. Dudley opined that the cement siding would look exactly like wood siding once it was painted.

Chairman Turnure reminded the Committee that in the past, they had approved the use of pre-finished windows, such as ones with painted enamel finishes on wood, which carried ten-year warranties. He identified several manufacturers who offered such products.

The Committee opined that white windows would look fresher and nicer on this structure.

Mr. Dudley advised that he would be happy to change the window color to white. He noted that his goal was to continue moving and asked whether the Committee would grant them approval on the structural components of the project if they returned on the aesthetic items.

The Committee agreed they did not have any concerns related to the addition's footprint, massing or design for Scheme 2 – only to the finishes, which could be addressed later. They agreed to approve the footprint and massing, with the applicant returning next month for consideration of the remaining items. The Committee further agreed to approve the removal of a portion of the stone wall and the construction of the driveway.

Chairman Turnure summarized that the items to be addressed next month included the front door; windows; colors (requested the applicant provide a larger color sample); details of the rakes, soffits and facias; details of the front porch, including the columns; and lighting (to include specification sheet).

Deputy Town Administrator Moore advised that he would provide Mr. Dudley with a list of the items that needed to be addressed. He suggested that if the members thought of any other items, they send him an email so he could share them with the Dudleys.

Committee Member Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 20-07, a request of Tanner Dudley for alterations to the original structure, an addition and removal of a portion of the stone wall at 308 East Marshall Street, with the approval being limited to the footprint and massing of the renovation and addition and the approval of the proposed stone wall removal and driveway construction, with all other details and materials – windows, siding, trim, etc. – to be tabled for review next month.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Clites, Jenkins and Littleton
No – N/A
Abstain – Chairman Turnure (conflict of interest)
Absent – Committee Member Wright
(Councilmember Pearson is a non-voting member of the Committee.) (by roll call vote)

June Meeting

Deputy Town Administrator Moore explained that because the Town elections were rescheduled to June 4th, the HDRC meeting could not be held that day. He advised the members that he would email them some potential dates to reschedule the meeting and asked that they let him know which would work and which would not.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – May 7, 2020

(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)

Bill Turnure: I would like to bring this meeting to order. Rhonda, if you would give us the roll call.

Rhonda North: Chairman Turnure.

Bill Turnure: Here.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Bill Turnure: Hopefully, Linda will buzz in during the meeting. Next order business is the remote meaning announcement. So, Tim, this is where you can sort of take your nap if you'd like. It is the Historic District Review Committee's responsibility to conduct essential public business despite the Covid 19 pandemic. However, it recognizes the need to do so safely, not only for its membership, but for the town staff and members of the public. To that end, in accordance with the resolution confirming the declaration of a local emergency and the ordinance to implement emergency procedures and effectuate temporary changes to address continuity of governmental operations during Covid 19, as adopted by the Middleburg Town Council, the HDRC will hold its meetings via remote access until such time as the governor rescinds his emergency order prohibiting the gathering of more than 10 individuals and mandating social distancing. Copies of the previously referenced documents are available on the town's website for those who wish to view them. The town will continue to live stream and record its public meetings, which are available for viewing along with the meeting agenda packet on our Web site at www.MiddleburgVA.gov. Members of the public who wish to participate in the HDRC meeting during the public comment period and or applicants who are speaking on behalf of their application may do so by dialing 540 339 6355. You will be placed mute until such time as the public comments is opened on your application or your application is heard, respectively, to ensure trust in the process. The town clerk will do a roll call of the HDRC members at the beginning of the meeting and at least once an hour. In addition, I will ask each member by name if they have any comments or questions related to each item as we

proceed. When anyone speaks, he or she is asked to first state his or her name for the benefit of the viewing audience, and also once an individual is finished speaking, he or she should confirm that by saying something like, that's all I have to say or I'm done speaking as there is, is slight delay between the back and forth. All votes of the HDRC will be taken by roll call. Town clerk will announce the member's name with individual then stating how they are voting. OK. Any questions there are? If not, I will move on to the approval of the minutes. First item is action item 4a approval of the minutes from the March 5th, 2002, regular meeting and the April 27th, 2020 test meeting. Has everyone had a chance to read the minutes? And if they have, are there any additions or minute or omissions to those minutes? OK. Is there a motion?

Tim Clites: Committee Member Clites. I move that we approve the meeting minutes as submitted. End of my comment.

Bill Turnure: Is there a second?

Margaret Littleton: Second. Committee Member Littleton.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton. Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Yes.

Rhonda North: And John Ralph has now joined us. Mr. Ralph. Can you hear? Can you hear us?

John Ralph: Yes, I hear you fine. OK.

Rhonda North: I won't mute him since we're get ready to go to his.

Bill Turnure: All right. All right. The motion passes. OK. The next item of business is action item. Old business action item 5a. COA 20-05 S 20-02 request of Kaitlyn Ahalt for a projecting sign. Mounted signs at 15 S Madison Street, the premier promotional products. Is there anyone here? Is Johnny representing the PPP?

John Ralph: I am. I can gladly represent them and answer any questions. OK.

Bill Turnure: I will open this up for discussion. Vice Chairman Lee. Do you have anything to say?

Punkin Lee: I think the signs look fine, they are hanging already, so hopefully people got to see them in their proper place. But they look fine. No issue with them. Finished.

Bill Turnure: Committee Member Anderson. Any comment from Committee Member Anderson?

William Anderson: Yes, I agree. This is Committee Member Anderson. I agree with Punkin. The signs look very good in place. That's my comment.

Bill Turnure: Is there any comment from Committee Member Jenkins?

Virginia Jenkins: No comment.

Bill Turnure: Is there any comment from Committee Member Littleton?

Margaret Littleton: I like them. I think they're very nice. Finished.

Bill Turnure: And Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: I like them as well. No further comment.

Bill Turnure: Cindy is there, Council Member. Town Council Member Pearson, is there any comment from you?

Cindy Pearson: No comment. Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Is there a motion?

Virginia Jenkins: Hold on. This is Virginia. I make a motion that we approve COA 20 - 05 S 20 02, the request of Kaitlyn Ahalt for projecting and mounted signs at 15 S Madison Street (Premier Promotional Products). I'm done.

Punkin Lee: This is Punkin. I second.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Yes.

Bill Turnure: Motion passes and John, I think the sign. Very nicely done sign. Really nice. I liked it. Ok. Are you are you John, do you represent Elaine Boland?

John Ralph: That is correct.

Bill Turnure: Why don't we hold off on the 308 East Marshall Street? We'll go ahead and get the sign reviewed for you and let you go. We'll move on to action item 6b COA 20 - 06 20 S 20 - 03. Requests of Elaine Boland for projecting and wall mounted signs at 7 West Washington Street Fields of Athenry and the Side Saddle Bistro. Any comments, John, for the members to know?

John Ralph: My my only comment would be the same three locations of their existing and previously approved signs. Just really a logo update. So going on existing brackets, existing locations, existing lighting, and actually all three signs are smaller than the current one. So we don't want to get into any square footage issues. It's just a complete logo change, which you'll also be seeing on their menus and their delivering van and everything else.

Bill Turnure: Ok, thank you. Is there any comment from Vice Chair Lee?

Punkin Lee: I think the signs look very nice. Brighter color. The other was beautiful, but it kind of if you're walking along the sidewalk, it's blended in too much, I think, with the stone. So I think the shape is nice and they're smaller. So that's my comment. Finished. Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Is there any comment from Committee Member Anderson?

William Anderson: Yes, I agree again that the signs are very attractive. I think they are better than the signs that were there before. The end of my comment.

Bill Turnure: Any comment from Committee Member Clites?

Tim Clites: Committee Member Clites. I agree with previous comments. I think this looks nice. End of my comment.

Bill Turnure: Is there any comment from Committee Member Jenkins?

Virginia Jenkins: No, I like it very much.

Bill Turnure: Any comment from Committee Member Littleton?

Virginia Jenkins: I like them very much. They're much more visible and you can read it better. So and I like the shape and the size. All OK. Finished.

Bill Turnure: And Committee Member Wright is absent. Town Council Member Pearson, is there any comment from you?

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

Bill Turnure: Is there a motion?

Tim Clites: Committee Member Clites. I move that we approve COA 20 - 06 S 20 - 03 request of Elaine Boland for projecting a wall mounted signs at seven West Washington Street as presented.

Bill Turnure: Is there a second?

William Anderson: Committee Member Anderson. I second the motion.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Yes.

Bill Turnure: The motion passes. Thank you, John, you had a very good evening tonight.

John Ralph: Thank you all. Take care.

Bill Turnure: You do the same.

Rhonda North: I'm going to unmute Mister's Dudley.

Bill Turnure: Tanner and Kyle, are you there?

Tanner Dudley: Yes, we are. Can you hear us?

Bill Turnure: I think I heard Tanner; I didn't know about Kyle. You in there, too? Ok. All right. Let's move back up the agenda to action item 6a. COA 20 - 7 request of Tanner Dudley for alterations to the original structure. In addition, and removal of a portion of the stone wall at 308 East Marshall Street. Tanner, Kyle, if you would like to make any comments to or discussion, start the discussion with the committee members, please use this time to your advantage.

Tanner Dudley: Great. Thank you, Bill. This is Tanner speaking. Good to speak with you all again. Hope you're doing well. We've submitted an application which included a set of materials which try to lay out what we have planned for 308 East Marshall Street. We've chatted with you folks in the past and we're excited to come back to submit our application to the committee now for your consideration. I think at a high level, we are in the process of renovating the existing structure at 308 East Marshall. The plan is to add a larger front porch to the building, but maintain the existing structure as a largely as it currently is with an addition on the back, a single story addition of about a thousand square feet that is taking the place of footprint of the original house and some noncontributing additions that had previously stood on the site. Separate from that, we're planning to insert a small driveway in the front right side of the property, which requires that we remove a section of the stone wall on the front of the property, which honestly has deteriorated over time. So we're hopeful that that's a positive addition to the property in addition to providing some off-street parking for the site. We worked with Mr. Turnure to think through concepts of what the addition looks like. And I've had some communication with Mr. Moore about

materials that we have planned for the for the for the building. And I'm happy to talk through those with you now. Are there any specific questions or would you like me to elaborate on any other particular parts of the application before we go into questions?

Bill Turnure: Ok. Thank you all. Before we get into this discussion, I will need to recuse myself from the discussion regarding this application. I did assist the the the applicants with some schematic design for the for the addition. You basically saw the the front elevation as they had it sort of sketched out previously. the materials and so forth that they have selected was was all that selected by the owner and without any input from from me when it comes to discussion. For for the sake of this meeting, being that we're doing it remotely, instead of having the vice chairman lead that the comments and calling on the members for their comments. I think for for that reason, I will go ahead and continue to to complete that that task and then move through the discussion as we go over this application. I would like to start the discussion with the Committee Member Anderson. Bill, are there any comments from you?

William Anderson: Committee Member Anderson. I was looking for the second-floor plan, which I don't seem to be able to find there. Is there a reason it's not part of the pdf?

Tanner Dudley: Just to clarify, I'm not sure I could hear the question, but was that an ask if a floor plan is available?

William Anderson: This is Anderson again. No, I was asking the second-floor plan available?

Tanner Dudley: The second floor of the existing structure is just an open, open space. It's intended as a bedroom with a single bathroom. The addition will not have a second story. It will only be a single-story addition.

William Anderson: Are you saying that the new structure will not have a second floor?

Tanner Dudley: Correct. There will be no second floor on the addition.

William Anderson: I am. I'm a little confused. I see a stairway in the foyer, the living room. Where does that go?

Tanner Dudley: The existing contributing structure is two stories. So when you walk into the existing structure, there's was one staircase on the right side which we will be replacing to get access to the second floor of the existing structure, which will be a single bedroom with a bathroom.

William Anderson: So this application does not show a second second floor plan. That's the question.

Tanner Dudley: No, it does not. And for the existing structure, my understanding was since this is not going through, I guess, the historic tax credit preservation process, the inside of the existing structure and a floor plan for that was not required.

William Anderson: Ok. Thank you. That's my comment.

Bill Turnure: Thank you. Any comments from Committee Member Clites? Thank you. Thank you, Bill. Are there any comments from Committee Member Clites?

Tim Clites: Yes. This is Committee Member Clites. Apologize if I don't quite have it, I'm looking at elevation 1 dated 3/16 as an alternate concept. The elevation two dated 3/16. And I'm wondering if there is if one of these is older and included for reference. Which one should we be focusing our comments on? My first question.

Tanner Dudley: The if you look at what would be PDF change for the application you received which is scheme 2. That is the proposal that we are putting forth.

Tim Clites: Thank you. That helps. And I might add, which was my scheme, but I wasn't I was little unclear as to why we were looking at two so on this up on this scheme. I guess a couple of the questions I would have. The front door. I'm not sure if you're looking for. Bill. Are you looking for all of our comments now or are we going to go through a review and come back through for a second round of comments? Are we looking for an approval tonight? A little clarification there.

Bill Turnure: I would suspect that we will go around for discussion maybe two or three times until everyone has their questions out and thoroughly understand the application.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So my initial reaction to the application is I like the design of scheme better than the other scheme. So I'm glad to hear the applicant is interested in that design. I like the simplicity of the West elevation, which is an elevation that I feel like more people see because the neighbors drive, drive down there, a little private drive there and it seems sympathetic to the simplicity of the original structure. So those aspects I like, I was a little less. Well, so there are things that I was had a little concern about the front door. I like the style of the front door. I can't quite tell. It looks like the muntins and the glazing may be kind of an applied molding, which for the if that's the case for the front, more historic part of the structure. I think I'd like to see something there that's a little more traditional in terms of how the glass is held in the door. But I might I might just not be kind of seeing that that drawing that picture labeled front door, did we? Yes. And I can't I'm sorry. I can't tell you which sheet I'm on, but it's labeled front door and it's a white elevation, two panels with six light glass at the top. And the other comment that I had to two other comments that I would have as initial points of discussion; the idea of the dental molding is something that I wouldn't be averse to. But I think the scale of it would need to be carefully considered. I think the image that's represented has some issues with the scale of the dental in proportion to the other details. And so that's something we'd want to kind of dig into a little more. It's a little bit of an embellishment that doesn't feel totally sympathetic to the history of the House. And then my last comment actually relates to things like weights and overhangs and soffits. And I guess I would want to have a little more discussion around exactly how they're constructed and how they they appear to, at least in the preliminary scale, drawings feel slightly more contemporary soffit configuration. So that's the end of my comments at this time.

Bill Turnure: Thank you, Tim. Is there any comment from Vice Chairman Lee?

Punkin Lee: I agree. This is Punkin. I agree with Tim a lot. I love the simplicity of the West Side, I thought very nice for the people getting to their houses in the back. I think what struck me overall and is the materials we have a very old structure that wants to use materials that are really not in keeping, I don't think, with restoring an older building and then carrying some of that to the addition of the vinyl and the fiberglass. And it just to me, I think deserves more discussion. And also back to the stone wall in the driveway. Exactly how much of a stone will be left? And is the total opening 12 feet from where the wall start to the adjacent neighbor on the east that comes up and you go twelve feet. And then how much is left? Those were my questions right off the top. I'm finished.

Bill Turnure: Thank you. Comments from Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any comments at the moment. I don't. Well, other than I really don't have a problem, I don't think with the materials for the railing because they can look good. I've seen them used properly. So I don't really have an issue with that. That's it.

Bill Turnure: Thank you. Comments from Committee Member Littleton.

I like the design very much on scheme 2 the front elevation. The first picture, I like that front door and I do not know the front door on the I don't know what you call it that he showed is particularly old looking or appropriate. And I think I like that design very much. But, you know, I think we should see the materials, maybe feel them. Other than that, I think it looks great.

Bill Turnure: Comments from committee or town council member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Yes, this is Cindy. I was just going to speak about the front door too seeing the front elevation and then the sample on that sheet. They're totally different. Let's see. So the color is. That's the color of the siding that's down the blue. Is that what that is? Sorry, I can't find a page again it's way down on the major blue and the blue plate. It's just two different blues for the sidings. I'm not quite sure what that is. Sorry, I just need an explanation on that one. But other than that, that's that's all right now. Thank you.

Tanner Dudley: Mr. Turnure. Should I dress the color question now?

Bill Turnure: That would be great. Thank you so much.

Tanner Dudley: The intent was for the front contributing structure, for that to be the major blue, which was intended to be close to the existing color of the shingles. The addition we understand, should be a different color as its new addition. So we're planning to make that the blue plate.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Ok. So I would like to.

Virginia Jenkins: This is Virginia, excuse me for interrupting, but there's a lot of static on the phone.

Rhonda North: Punkin it appears to be in looking at the screen, it appears to be something coming on your end because it's got the it's showing is a noise constantly coming on your side.

Bill Turnure: Let's just we're going to try to talk to Punkin. Hold off on your comments right now.

Punkin Lee: Dial back in?

Rhonda North: Yeah. Why don't you try that? Just stay on the line. We're trying to fix this noise issue. [Multiple speakers]. We need Punkin to return. Punkin, are you back? Ok, we're going to do a roll call again. Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Clites

Tim Clites: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Bill Turnure: All right, thank you all. At this point, what I would like to try and do is go back through the members once more and then I'll open the discussion up a little further. So I'd like to circle back and ask Committee Member Anderson if he has any additional questions or any additional comments concerning the application.

Tim Clites: I'm sorry I missed that. Who were you asking?

Bill Turnure: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Ok. I'm sorry, I didn't hear that either. Oh, I would like to agree with your Committee Member who mentioned that the door the front door is shown in scheme 2 is much preferable to what's shown in the spec sheet where it only has ample light. It had six lights but the one that's shown in the elevation is preferable. It's also similar to the front door that's shown in the photograph that was used to identify the rail. If you look there, you'll see a front door that's similar to what's shown in the elevation. That's the end of my comment.

Bill Turnure: Thank you. I'd like to get some more comments or questions from Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: This is Committee Member Clites. My additional comments would focus on the what I would call the specification page starts 308 East Marshall Street alteration and additions proposed overall materials. The windows on the addition. Maybe not on this sheet but on another sheet the windows on the additional are vinyl, and I would be interested in making sure that the muntins in those windows actually look authentic. I think that's what we as a committee are always concerned with. Even if the material is not painted white, I will note that the existing historic structure. It's noted that there would be wood windows [inaudible] painted, which I think is appropriate and I appreciate. And the other thing that I wonder is just a holistic question around the porch. I know the porch is not historic. And there was a porch there that we have taken off. Just pose a question for other members to perhaps comment on as we go through the list how we feel about pressure treated porch decking. The rest of the specification talks about five or less columns were keeping to trim. I guess if that's painted, we wouldn't know what the material is. The porch decking, depending on how it's stained or finished seems like a question for me. I'm not sure. I am not sure it feels sympathetic to the history of the structure to use some of those materials, even though it's a new porch on the front side. That would be the end of my questions or comment.

Bill Turnure: Thank you. Additional comments or questions from Vice Chairman Lee.

Punkin Lee: This is Chairman Lee. I agree with Tim, and that was one of my concerns, was the porch, because it did have a porch. Yeah, they say we're putting a new one, but the materials just don't seemed to enhance the updating of the original structure. And we have the wood windows are nice, but then we go to vinyl in the back. But then fiberglass columns in the front and it just doesn't seem to match. It's like we've got new, old and new. And the materials are kind of hodgepodge. And I don't think complement each other for this particular structure. Finished.

Bill Turnure: Ok. Thank you. Comments from Committee Member Jenkins, any additional comments or questions?

Virginia Jenkins: No, I have no additional comments. No. I'm done.

Bill Turnure: Any additional questions or comments from Committee Member Littleton?

Margaret Littleton: Yes. How accurate are the colors, the blue, the major blue and the blue plate? From what we're seeing on the screen? And they seem bright. And if it's an old structure, I know you said. I think it is a major blue is going to be the old structure. And yes. And the blue plate was the back, but it's just they've just seem bright. And I totally agree with the porch. Is the pressure treated wood? It would have to be stained or painted properly. They just wouldn't feel that it was pressure treated lumber. Other than that, I think, you know, it's good. Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Thank you, Margaret. OK. So at this point, I think we might just.

Cindy Pearson: Can I make a comment, Bill?

Bill Turnure: Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry, Cindy. Yes, please.

Cindy Pearson: This time I have one. My one question is about the driveway. What material is going to the driveway going to be asphalt or some other material? I don't see that because this road, the runoff from different driveways that have been made, it's like a river or sometimes on Marshall Street when it rains hard. I'm sure you had already discussed that, but I. I didn't see, if it's on here somewhere, please tell me where. That's all. Thank you.

Tanner Dudley: And if you'd like, I can answer that quickly, our intent is for it to be an asphalt driveway.

Cindy Pearson: Ok. So I'm sure you've worked with whomever on the way it should be. Well, with no more how to state that's been me on which way the water would flow from it. That's all.

Tanner Dudley: I can just I can just comment that we've received approval from VDOT to punch in the driveway directly and for it to meet the existing swale that's right there on the side of the street. So the intent would be for the water to shoot off the driveway into the swale. OK. Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Thank you, Cindy.

Tim Clites: This is Committee Member Clites. Can I interrupt for a moment? I apologize. Just noticing that the applicant ask for comments from the committee regarding the roof material.

Tanner Dudley: I could just comment to say we are open to guidance from the committee on what you think is appropriate. Mr. Moore had provided guidance generally on no venting, no caps. If there is any specific information you think would be important for us to know, we're happy to hear.

Will Moore: And this is Will. Just to clarify, I did not direct that there should be no venting, but rather that they should specify if they are intending to provide venting. You know what type of venting that would be? We I did give him the comment that we generally give to applicants in that it's a preference not to have the ridge caps and instead to roll the the the standing seam over the the tip of the roof.

Tanner Dudley: I'll just say that we do not plan to vent.

Tim Clites: So are you going to do a foamed underside to the roof deck when you say no venting is that the construction system that you're planning for all the roofs or are you going to vent at the eaves and use a gable vent of some sort?

Tanner Dudley: Closed cell foam, not vented is our plan.

Tim Clites: Perfect. Understood. So I think without talking manufacturer's specifications, Will is and was correct in that we don't we don't like commercial grade applied ridge caps, and we like the pans to go up and be seamed at the top in a more traditional manner. But understanding the pre hinged roofs, Angler is one manufacturer that comes to mind using a standard 17-inch pan. And I want to say the height of the seam is about an inch or an inch and a bit, you know, I think that's a pretty traditional roof issue in the town a lot. And what we what we don't like to see is anything that would be a seam that has a smocked or applied cap to it. But we actually like a folded seam that can be mechanically folded it doesn't have to be hand folded. But that's hopefully enough direction for the roofing. That's the end of my comments.

Tanner Dudley: If we could say that that that guidance is consistent with the initial conversations we've had with our roofer. So it sounds like we're on the same page.

Bill Turnure: Ok. The rest of the committee, are there any is there any other further questions or any further discussion?

Margaret Littleton: Yes, Margaret. He hasn't addressed the front door.

Tanner Dudley: Sure. It sounded like there were a few things on the list that were mentioned. Mr. Turnure, how would you how would you prefer I go through the list? I could start from the top. I've been keeping a list of items that I can talk to.

Bill Turnure: Very good. Very good. Why don't you go down your list and if there are any other questions or any items, we'll just throw those in as well.

Tanner Dudley: I will start with the door and I hear we hear the reaction from folks with the proposed doors is does not have enough glass so we can explore something that is more similar to the drive. We have the existing door from the house, which, you're correct, is closer to having a little more glass. It's not a condition that we could repurpose it. So we will use the guidance from the drawing as it exists. And the existing door that we have for the property is something that's closer to that. Thank you. Does that give comfort to the committee? Great. Mr. Clites, you mentioned dental molding. We are we're fine. Not including dental molding on the porch and looking at some of the surrounding property that seemed like that that would be something the committee was interested in. We're happy to leave that out. If you'd like us included. We appreciate guidance on what size. And it's correct that it was not on the existing structure before.

Tim Clites: Thank you. This is Committee Member Clites. Just to be clear on crime. My comments are open to other input from the committee members around that question. Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Ok. Some other items, Tanner?

Tanner Dudley: Say that again, Bill?

Bill Turnure: Are there any other items that you had on your list?

Tanner Dudley: There were some. I see comments from folks related to the soffit sounded like there was a desire for something, and Kyle I chatted about having returned on the property on the corner on the eaves, I'm sorry, the gables. If that is something the committee is interested in, we're happy to look that. So I'll leave those two comments on dentals. On soffits. Color. Yes. Our understanding is that the major blue, which was the top color on PDF page 24 of the application, was fairly close to the to the existing color on the house. And what was on the House previously. We are ultimately flexible on this. Our priority is to move forward on the ultimate, you know, the addition of the property in the driveway. And if this is something that we talk about more, we're happy to. But we believe this color is very close to what was on the existing property before. I think that dress addresses colors on windows. Our preference is for vinyl

windows at the property. If we hear that their desire for wood on those existing historic structure, we understand that. And I think that's reasonable. Our preference would be for vinyl on the addition. And we understood that, given that a new addition and a desire to keep new different from old, that that would be something that group would be amenable to. I heard a comment, I think, from Mr. Clites saying mountings for the rear windows, if they are vinyl, would need to look authentic and interested to hear additional comments on that that we should be thinking about. So I think that it addresses our comments on the windows. Looking through the rest of the list on the porch, we are happy to sustain the pressure treated porch materials. That's consistent with what actually has been there previously. I think in terms of longevity of the porch, our desire is to use fiberglass on the posts, if at all possible, as well as big PVC trim on that, on the porch and on the rest of the house. Just the longevity of the home. So I believe those are the five points that I have on my list. Feedback to the group. Is there anything I missed?

Margaret Littleton: The pressure treated wood.

Tanner Dudley: On the porch. Yes. The plan is to use pressure treated typical to what was on the porch previously. Pressure treated decking on the porch. Was that the question?

Margaret Littleton: Yes.

Tanner Dudley: That was our intent [inaudible] granted it was a smaller porch, but we hoped wouldn't wouldn't be an issue.

Margaret Littleton: Ok.

Tanner Dudley: And I just I'm sorry, there's one more. The on the wall, the opening that we have planned for the wall is 12 feet. Which room? Which leaves the remaining 15 feet from the edge of the wall to the opening to the existing house starts with the walkway to the house. And that is separate from the rest of the wall on the other side of the entryway. So from Mimi's property, we will be taking out twelve feet. From there, it will be fifteen feet to the walkway to enter the house. And then there'll be an additional, I would estimate, at least ten feet. So we are taking out only a portion of the existing of existing walls.

Punkin Lee: So this is Vice Chair Lee. Is there stone left on Mimi's side? When you drive your car in, will there be stone left on the right side or not?

Tanner Dudley: There would not be.

Punkin Lee: Ok. Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Any questions or comments on those responses?

Tim Clites: This is Tim, my question on fiberglass column trim top and bottom would that entire assembly still be painted so that we didn't see the over time, the difference in material. One question on the column and then another kind of more minor question that perhaps Bill Turnure could help answer a little porch that is between the additions and the original house. When you face the front door, it's to the right side in front elevation number one, it appears to have a hipped roof and the side east elevation number four, it appears to have more of a gable or a rake facing the street. That's a minor detail that would be worth clarifying, which you're thinking there.

Bill Turnure: Okay. What what what you're looking at from the front elevation is whether it looks like there's a hip that is actually the new porch roof to the back where there is the rear door. That's what you're actually seeing there. And yes, that should be a return there. And in a shed, as opposed. It looks like a hip,

but you're right, that should be hip on that roof. I mean, not a hip, should be shed. Correct. As noted on East Elevation four.

Tim Clites: I guess that ties in to in a small way with my other question related to soffit. So if we look at elevation two West Side elevation and we look at the porch and the soffit, that is on original structure as the front wall, that soffit basically is an extension of the rafter and the underside of the soffit follows. I'd say the rake. And then when we get to the porch, it looks like it would have a square box soffit. Is that an intent? Or should that should the porch be consistent with all of the other rake's that are more of a rake at the pitch of the roof?

Bill Turnure: You're right that they'd be. All should be. They all should be consistent there. So it should be as all the rest the front porch should match the rest.

Tim Clites: I think so. I mean, if you are all right with that, I think it's the one thing that stands out as being different.

Bill Turnure: I agree there there's a just a, you know, in completion drawn.

Tim Clites: Then last question on the porch that I'm just noticing is we have a wood frame. What happens between the deck and the ground? Is there a lattice there or some other material to make up that difference? Or would the framing for the porch sit right on the ground?

Bill Turnure: I'm gonna have to leave that up to the owners because I had not discussed what their intentions were there.

Tanner Dudley: We've talked about vertical trim lattice.

Tim Clites: Well, I would join in and say I think that's appropriate if it works. I just don't know how much space you have, whether there's enough room to fit that in. It may not be a prominent feature at all. I'm not sure I'm asking about something insignificant.

Kyle Dudley: Yeah. Hey, it's Kyle here. Yeah, we've got about 32 inches. After we grade it, when we're done with the porch, it's gonna be about thirty to thirty four inches, which we're planning on just standing up vertical trim and installing in almost a batten fashion to hide the underside of the porch.

Tim Clites: This is Tim still. Thank you for the conversation. Would that trim be some kind of synthetic that would get painted then the true color, that what you think there?

Kyle Dudley: Yes, that's exactly what we were thinking.

Tanner Dudley: I think to add onto the other questions, maybe that maybe that was clear in Kyle's comment that all of the trim will be painted. All the pieces of trim.

Tim Clites: Right. Thank you for all the clarifications. This is Tim, I have no further questions.

Bill Turnure: Any further comments or questions?

Cindy Pearson: This is Cindy. I do have one just question. I just thought, sorry. Couldn't see this. It says that the trim is all going to be white, the windows are going to be black. Is that what I see? Is that correct? That's on the whole house.

Tanner Dudley: That was the intent. But again, open to feedback.

Bill Turnure: Any comments?

Cindy Pearson: So just. And I'm sorry, I don't know for sure. I might have to let this go to Will on that. That is the black color is acceptable since the other was white on the old House or? I just, I'm asking.

Will Moore: This is Will. From a preservation standpoint, the color is probably a a lower priority. So the concern with any of the windows that were proposed, any staff concern, did not focus around the color. But our main concern was with the proposal for use of vinyl on the addition. I would remind the committee that you have traditionally not approved vinyl windows on any sort of application, whether it be an addition to a historic structure or certainly not on an historic structure itself, but not on not on new construction either. The committee has been open on new construction and on additions to certain types of maybe hybrid materials that that have a wood fiber in them than maybe other materials you have been open to to that type of material on additions and new construction. But you have not in the past approved a vinyl window for any application in the historic district. OK. I've sort of got all of that. That was a little choppy for me hearing it, but I think I got a sense of that. So I will leave that comment from other members. I'm finished.

Tanner Dudley: This is Tanner. I did not hear the comment. If someone could just repeat.

Will Moore: Sure. This is Will again, I'm getting a little closer to the phone speaker. Hopefully, this will help.

Cindy Pearson: Much better. Yes. Thank you.

Will Moore: Certainly. So the original question was surrounding color for the windows, whether the black was appropriate. And we don't really address window color from a a high priority standpoint. Now, the committee certainly looks at colors in general. It is a little bit rare to have something other than a white painted window. But it's not uncommon staff's primary concern with windows in this application centered around the materials, in particular the proposal for vinyl on the edition. The committee has not approved, in any case in its history the application of vinyl windows for any structure in the historic district. Certainly not historic structures, but not on additions, nor on new construction have you ever approved vinyl windows. You have been open in the past to certain hybrid materials that contain wood fiber mixed with other types of materials, such as maybe fiberglass and wood fibers. You have been open to that type of material on additions and new construction before, but never to vinyl. So I just wanted to to highlight that. If you refer to my memo, I have a number of other concerns with materials. One of those being the cement fiber siding on the original structure. That is something that is traditionally not approved as a substitute for wood lopsided on a historic structure. Certainly, you have approved that for new construction and additions. And that's the end of my comments.

Bill Turnure: Any comments from the committee?

Punkin Lee: This is Vice Chair Lee. I had concern about the siding also that on the original structure that that was not very appropriate. Just my remarks. Finished.

Bill Turnure: Any comment on the windows by anyone?

Tanner Dudley: This is Tanner. If there's clarification related to other composite windows that would be interested to hear that. I think our intent is to build something long lasting. And that was the goal for why we wanted a vinyl material, and particularly on the addition as relates to the last siding, we have modified that we feel on the historic structure versus the addition to create a distinction between the two. But from a materials perspective, we've felt that [inaudible] siding when painted will look exactly the same. Which is why that was our goal. So those are just some additional comments. Happy to take questions.

Bill Turnure: This is Chairman Turnure. I'm just going to make a comment, more of a general comment than than any personal comment. But in the past, we had people who would not want to have more of a low maintenance or no maintenance window.

Cindy Pearson: You're going in and out, Bill. I can't understand you.

Bill Turnure: I'll talk into the phone, maybe this. Is that better, Cindy? Is that better, Cindy? Hello? Anyone there? I don't hear anybody.

Rhonda North: Looks like we lost it. [Multiple speakers]. OK. Sorry. The phone system reset itself again.

Will Moore: OK. Give us one second. We'll do a roll call by name.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright. Committee Member Littleton. Here

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Bill Turnure: Ok. And the Dudley's, Kyle, and Tanner, are you there?

Rhonda North: They're both here.

Tanner Dudley: Yes, we're still here.

Bill Turnure: OK. What we have approved in the past is a is a prefinished enamel. Painted enamel finish to wood. There's a number of manufacturers who who produce those. And it's a 10-year warranty on the window. And the color. So that's you know, you don't have to paint it. You know, every five or six years or something like that. So we have approved, you know, a number. And I think [Inaudible] make some. I know Colby and Colby make some, I think. I think Marvin probably makes them, too, but anyway, that's that's been the substitute for a true, true wood window. If you want a low maintenance.

Tanner Dudley: Ok, so we will look into that material.

Cindy Pearson: Could I make a comment? This is Cindy.

Bill Turnure: Yes, you may.

Cindy Pearson: I'll say it. And if it's not appropriate, somebody will have to tell me it's not appropriate. But I'm looking at the black color for the window if you will note. There's not many other places in town with black that I'm aware of, but it kind of jumps out at you if you'll go down. What is that? Reed Street where the library is the one house that has the black. It's kind of very bold and not as inviting as the other white. So I don't know. It's like Will said. We don't usually discuss color. But I wanted to throw that out there. That's all. Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: This is Vice Chair Lee. I totally agree with Cindy, even though the color is not something we normally discuss. You've got that nice blue and white trim and I think the windows. You know, white would look fresher and nicer in that old front and the back. That's all.

William Anderson: This is Bill Anderson and my comment I would agree [inaudible].

Tanner Dudley: This is Tanner. I can just make a note that we're happy to adjust the window color to white.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Any further discussion? Ok. So what's your feel? Do we would you like to propose a motion? Do you want to table it for further discussion next month? Or let me know what your what your thoughts are at this point.

Tim Clites: This is Committee Member Clites. I would propose that it's appropriate to with the comments that the committee has given the applicant table the application for a month so that we can see some of the updates on the windows and the doors and a few of the other items that were discussed. I guess the question I would have is, do we have a clear enough list for the applicant at the end of this discussion?

Tanner Dudley: This is Tanner. Do I have an opportunity to comment or should I wait? Mr. Turnure.

Bill Turnure: No, please. Please. If you have a comment.

Tanner Dudley: Our goal is to to continue moving as quickly as we can, given delays related to Covid. We would ask the committee to consider giving us approval to move forward on the structural components of this building so that we can continue moving if there are aesthetic pieces related to color, soffit, articulation. We're happy to come back to the committee, but for moving forward on the addition. The driveway. Anything structurally related. We've received approval from the county and from VDOT. We'd really rather not wait another month and potentially be delayed again. I just ask for some clarification on what we would need to come back for versus what we have approval to move ahead with.

Will Moore: This is Will. I will offer this to the committee for your consideration. During the discussion, I did not hear to this point any concerns related necessarily to footprint or in general the overall design of the addition of it. The concerns seem to be more related to finish his exterior cladding. soffit, trim, etc. things that would be they could be addressed at a later time. But if you are comfortable with the overall design of the addition in terms of its footprint, in terms of the overall design, you could state so and that you would be comfortable giving the applicant the ability to move forward with the structural components that would give me the ability to issue a zoning permit to clear them to begin structural work while the application as a whole remain tabled for you to get all of the updates that you have asked for today. So I only offer that is an option if again, if you are comfortable with the footprint and the the overall general design of the additions.

Punkin Lee: This is Vice Chair Lee; I have one question. Is the footprint final as presented? That we are looking at tonight.

Bill Turnure: That's a question for you, Tanner.

Tanner Dudley: Yes, it is. Yes. For Scheme two, it is final.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Bill Turnure: Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I would say to Will, that if there is a way for us to approve the footprint and the massing so that they can move forward. I think there's enough that we need to look at that we would be need it contingent for some process to be able to look at some of these details again and then in another month. But I don't I don't have and I haven't heard any comments around the footprint or the massing com or any of the details that we would consider structural. So I would be comfortable giving some kind of approval based on our list of things that we would like to see at the next meeting.

William Anderson: Committee Member Anderson. I tend to agree. I would just want to make sure that the window is clear, that the windows proposed are not in the items that are approved.

Tim Clites: Committee Member Clites. I think it would be appropriate for us to make a list of things that we would like to see in the next meeting so that we can then draft an approval. Mr. Moore, can you help us with that?

Will Moore: Yes, I would actually approach it from a slightly different point and simply make a motion. If you're so inclined that you would approve the proposed footprint and massing as presented and that you would table all remaining aspects of the application for one month.

Tanner Dudley: Thank you, Will. And just. This is Tanner. Just a clarification. The mass, we be most interested in the structure, the massing, and the driveway. Because in order to get access for development of that addition, the driveway is crucial.

Will Moore: Thank you. And if the if the committee is is comfortable with that. That would be fine. So I would again, if you were comfortable, you could make a motion to approve footprint, massing, the removal of the stone wall and installation of the driveway with all other remaining aspects, tabled for one month.

Bill Turnure: I might just mention with some emphasis on the points of the as we mentioned, the front door, the windows, the colors and I know we have these colors here, but I would really love to see a not just a little one by one paint chip, but, you know, a little larger sample size of what the actual color is. If you wouldn't mind bringing a sample those colors here to the town office so that the committee members could come by and actually see the colors as opposed to trying to see them on an A from an email, you know, from from Sherwin Williams excuse me. And B and the some of the details for the for the rakes and the soffits and fascias, which we can make the changes to that and the front porch, we can address those those details on the front porch as well, and then columns on the front porch. Oh, and the lighting, too. And we've got a you've got a lighting light fixture here, noted. Well, we really don't know the size of it, the material of it, you know, and how that how it's, you know, lit. So I think just maybe a cut sheet or something for the light fiction that you have submitted.

Tanner Dudley: I think this is Tanner, just a response specifically to the color question. We're happy to bring by a color samples for folks to review in person. The list of other points that you've raised, Bill,

sounds straightforward, consistent with the conversation. I trust that it sounds like that is the list we should work from. If I should work from a different list, Will. Is that something you will provide?

Will Moore: Yes, I can have some follow up with you. Tanner, as well as the individual committee members, may wish to send any clarifications of things they're looking for.

Tanner Dudley: I'm sorry. Will, I can't hear you.

Will Moore: Yes, Tanner. so, the list that Bill just gave you, I think is pretty good. I can do a little follow up with you. And I would also suggest that if any of the committee members have any other aspects of the application that you didn't necessarily hear in Bill's summation, you can send me an individual email and then I can pass those comments on to the applicant.

Tanner Dudley: Thanks for the clarification.

Bill Turnure: Any further discussion? Is there a motion?

Tim Clites: This is Committee Member Clites, I guess I'll try, I believe. I would like to propose a motion to approve COA 20-07 request of Tanner Dudley for alterations to the original structure, in addition, and removal of a portion of a stone wall at 308 Marshall Street. The approval is limited to the footprint and massing of the renovation in addition and the approval of the proposed stone removal and driveway construction and all other details and materials. Windows, siding trim, etc. will be reviewed or tabled for a later review next month.

Punkin Lee: Vice Chair Lee. Second.

Bill Turnure: Clerk?

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

William Anderson: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Clites.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Yes.

Bill Turnure: Motion passes. Thank you all for your patience. And we will be in touch with you, Tanner and Kyle, regarding what would be required for next month.

Tanner Dudley: All right. Thank you all very much. We appreciate it. I know the meeting date has changed for that month, so we'll keep an eye out for that. And we'll stand by for additional details.

Kyle Dudley: Thank you very much, guys.

Bill Turnure: Ok. Thank you. Any discussion items?

Cindy Pearson: When will the next meeting be? This is Cindy.

Will Moore: Yes. That is a good question. So the the town elections have been rescheduled to your normal meeting date. So we will be unable to meet on June 4 as usual, I will send tomorrow via e-mail a list of a few potential alternate dates to the committee. And I will ask you to advise as to your availability for each of those dates and times. As in the past, I will ask you not to just pick your favorite of those but let us know. You know, if I send five and you're available for three, even though two of those might not be quite as convenient. Please tell us of all three that you were available for. It's it's a little difficult to arrange with so many different persons, but. But I think we can get that done. So I will send you a list of potential alternate dates and times via e-mail tomorrow. And as soon as you're available to reply to that, please do so.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you Will.

Bill Turnure: Is there anybody that you know that is going on vacation any that week or so after that meeting?

Cindy Pearson: Are the beaches open yet? Yes, I might be there. [Laughter].

Will Moore: The beaches are closed all summer, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No, no. I'm going south. They're open.

Bill Turnure: Anything else? Is there a motion? So moved.