TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, May 30, 2024
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee for the month of June was held on Thursday, May 30, 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
Virginia Jenkins
Linda Wright

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

ABSENT: William Anderson
Margaret Littleton
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the May 2, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes.

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

New Business

COA 24-13: Revisions to Approved COA 24-04 for Addition – 100 N. Madison Street – Rick & Susan Sierra

Planning & Project Associate Moore reported that this was a request for revisions to the COA that was approved on April 4, 2024. He explained that the applicants were seeking to change the approved roofing material from standing seam metal to composite shingles on the addition and approval of outdoor stairs on the southwest side of the house. Mr. Moore noted that the applicants were also asking to consult with the Committee regarding the chimney on the original stone structure.

Tom Gilbride, the architect, advised the Committee that after looking at it further, they believed that having a standing seam metal roof on both the original structure and the addition would create a monolithic appearance; therefore, they would like to switch to an architectural composite shingle on the addition, using a color that would blend with the existing roof color. He advised that they would also like

to add an exterior stair to the basement that would be tucked away in the southwest corner where it would be almost impossible to see. Mr. Gilbride noted that the existing chimney was in some disrepair and advised that they would like to discuss whether to replace it in-kind, leaving the stone where the stone was and the brick where the brick was, or whether they should explore replacing the brick, so the chimney was all stone.

The Committee members agreed they had no problems with the proposed railing for the stairs to the basement. They noted that they would be tucked away from sight.

Committee Member Wright advised that she was conflicted about the roof. She acknowledged that it was a massive amount and that it could look like too much metal; however, she felt it would look best and hold the house together if it was all the same material. Ms. Wright agreed an architectural shingle would be the best choice if shingles were the approved option, as they would provide a shadow. She acknowledged that in the past, the Committee wanted additions to read differently; however, she noted that this was a very significant house in town. Ms. Wright advised that she was torn between the two materials.

Vice Chair Lee noted the significance of the house and advised that her first choice was for a standing seam metal roof on the addition. She expressed a desire to see a sample of the proposed architectural shingle.

Mr. Gilbride advised that he would be happy to bring a sample if the Committee approved it. In response to an inquiry, he advised that the metal roof would be approximately 600-800 square feet and the shingled roof would be approximately 1,300 square feet if approved. Mr. Gilbride opined that this would be a massive amount of metal if the entire roof was a standing seam metal one.

Chair Clites agreed the rail and basement stairs made sense and looked fine. He opined that it would be worth it for the Committee to see a sample of the architectural shingle and collar, which could help answer some questions. Mr. Clites reminded the Committee that this would be a stone house with a clapboard addition and advised that he would be comfortable with the roof being the same or different materials since it would be a different structure. He noted that the existing addition contained a metal roof and did not look out of place. Mr. Clites reiterated that having a sample of the shingle could help the Committee feel more comfortable with this change.

Mr. Gilbride advised that his client preferred a darker bronze architectural shingle, which would provide more variation. He reminded the Committee that the existing chimney was a combination of stone and brick. Mr. Gilbride reported that different chimney companies provided conflicting information as to whether this was original to the structure or whether the stone was somehow repaired into the brick at some point. He noted that it would not be uncommon, given the age of the house, that the chimney would be brick or that it was stone that was finished with brick. Mr. Gilbride questioned whether they should keep it as it currently was. He advised that the stone was stopped before they had to try to flash the stone with the chimney and noted that it was easier to flash brick than stone. Mr. Gilbride questioned whether the Committee would approve an all-stone chimney or whether it should remain a combination of brick and stone.

Rick Sierra, the applicant, advised that he would have a preference if he knew for sure what was original.

Chair Clites noted that he found the stone to brick transition to be interesting and advised that it was something that could be seen a lot around Middleburg. He opined that it would be original; however, he noted that no one knew for sure. Mr. Clites acknowledged that one reason they may have done this was the flashing. He opined that the change in material would still make it feel authentic.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Gilbride advised that years ago, the flues extended further than they did today, which was what caused water problems. He suggested they would reproduce the chimney in stone and brick and would reproduce the cap. Mr. Gilbride advised that other than a bird screen, they would not install a cap on the top of the flue.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that she preferred stone only, as it would appear to be more cohesive.

Committee Member Wright suggested the applicant stay with the combination of stone and brick, as this could be seen many times in the county. She further suggested the applicant stay with basically the same details.

Vice Chair Lee advised that due to its age, she felt keeping the brick would make it feel like it was old and done on purpose. She opined that it would be difficult to find matching stone.

Mr. Sierra advised that this was fine with him. He noted that he had not thought about the difficulty in finding matching stone.

Mr. Gilbride noted that the other advantage of keeping the brick was they could waterproof the flue properly.

The Committee held further discussion of the chimney. Mr. Gilbride advised that the idea would be to try to replace it in-kind in terms of texture and color.

In response to an inquiry, Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested the Committee table action on the application. He opined that they had given the applicants confidence that they could move forward with the changes in the stair way, which could be formalized at a later meeting.

Chair Clites noted that they had also given them guidance with regard to the chimneys; although, he noted that additional committee members would be present at the next meeting.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that no action was needed by them if the repair was in-kind. He noted that approval was only needed if something was being changed.

Mr. Gilbride opined that he had the input he needed and noted the need to address the chimney before the roof was installed. He advised that he would bring in samples of the composite shingles at the next meeting. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Gilbride advised that the project would not be affected by the fact that the Committee would not meet again until July.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Committee generally felt the stairwell and railing were acceptable and that their recommendation was to keep the existing brick and stone chimney configuration. Chair Clites further moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Committee wanted to see a sample of both the metal roof color and the architectural shingles. Chair Clites further moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Committee table the application until its next meeting.

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

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Gilbride, Chair Clites confirmed the applicant could proceed with the installation of the stairway.

COA 24-14 (S 24-04): Illuminated Wall Signs & Repaint Main Entry Door, Trim & Window Shutters – 14 S. Madison Street – NOMAD

Planning & Project Associate Moore reminded the Committee that they held a pre-application discussion of this request. He reported that the first sign would be installed in the same location as the existing one that faced Madison Street and would have three downcast light fixtures. Mr. Moore advised that the second sign would be affixed to the side of 16 South Madison Street, facing north toward Washington Street, and would have one downward casting light fixture. He reported that the signs would be constructed of wood, vinyl, and high-density foam. Mr. Moore advised that the applicant was also proposing to repaint the main entryway door, the trim, and the shutters.

Brad Juneau, the applicant, displayed a sample of the Graphic Charcoal color for the shutters and door. In response to inquiries from the Committee, he confirmed the larger sign would line up with the windows. He noted that it would be lower than was shown on the drawing, with the upper edge being at sixteen feet. Mr. Juneau explained that there was a conduit that ran up the side of the building that would be removed and advised that they would run a power source through the wall in a grout line. He explained that they needed the sign to be lower in order to get the power behind the sign. Mr. Juneau noted that there was no way to get the conduit across the building that was pleasing, so they decided to remove it and come through the building at the grout line. He noted that they were reducing the size of the other sign in order to increase the size of this one. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that the sign would be centered and noted that they were sensitive to the patina on the brick that may have occurred due to the location of the previous sign.

The Committee agreed they liked the proposed paint color and signs.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Chair Clites, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-14 (S 24-04) for two illuminated wall signs and repainting the main entry door, trim, and window shutters at 14 South Madison Street.

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

Discussion Items

Pre-Application Discussion – American Legion Post 295 – 111 The Plains Road

Gary Nickelson, Commander of American Legion Post 295, advised the Committee that they had formed a partnership with the Royal British Legion, who was going to acquire some of their property that was located behind the American Legion building for the construction of the British Legion's east coast headquarters. Mr. Nickelson advised that in return, the American Legion would receive cash and upgrades to their building. He advised that the two organizations also planned to construct a memorial garden between the two posts. Mr. Nickelson opined that this could be a component of the plans for the revitalization of Federal Street, in that it could complete a walking loop between Washington and Federal Streets and The Plains Road.

Commander Nickelson reminded the Committee that their organization was seventy-seven years old and that their building was even older. He reviewed the improvements the American Legion had made to it recently. Mr. Nickelson advised that they wanted to use this opportunity to give the building a facelift and fix some problems to ensure it would stand for another seventy-five years.

Commander Nickelson reported that they were proposing to install three new flagpoles – one for the American flag, one for the Virginia flag and one for the POW-MIA flag – that would be centered on their front door. He advised that they would like to install flagstone around them in order to reduce the amount of maintenance that was required for this area and to improve the view from the road. Mr. Nickelson advised that they would also like to make improvements to the building's façade and proposed that they construct a pediment wall, followed by a gabled roof that would extend six feet back in order to provide protection against the rain. He advised that they would also like to install a flagstone path that would connect to the front patio. Mr. Nickelson noted the existing retaining wall around the flagpole and advised that they would like to install steps to allow someone to walk out of the building to the flagpoles. He noted the need to install lighting for the flags. Mr. Nickelson advised that their long-term vision was to replace the existing storage shed, which was falling down, with one that would be connected to their building, which would also allow for the creation of an observation deck/viewing area that would overlook the memorial garden and that would be accessed via French doors on the roof. Mr. Nickelson explained that their short-term goal was to improve the façade and front of the building and install the gabled roof.

Chair Clites noted that the addition of the pediment wall would increase the building's height and questioned whether that was allowed under the zoning regulations.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that he had not yet received any dimensional plans that would allow him to evaluate that.

Chair Clites suggested the need to ensure the proposed changes met the zoning regulations before the Committee provided comments.

The Committee members opined that the preliminary information looked nice.

In response to an inquiry, Commander Nickelson confirmed they would have an architect prepare the plans. It was noted that the architect would look at the zoning regulations.

Chair Clites noted that the existing structure was a mid-century one. He reminded the Committee that they had a discussion about proposed changes to a mid-century building on Washington Street and, although they voted to approve them, the owner later decided to leave the building as a simple flat façade with a flat roof after hearing the Committee's comments. Mr. Clites opined that the building was successful with just a few small changes, which included cleaning, painting and lighting. He advised that he was not saying this was the solution for the American Legion; however, he suggested they not pursue the pediment wall. Mr. Clites further suggested that wrapping this contemporary building in stone would feel inconsistent and not right. He suggested that if the zoning regulations did not allow for an increase in the building's height, a stone "belt" should not be added. Mr. Clites advised that he liked what was being proposed for the flagpoles and window details. He noted that the Committee had no purview over the hardscape.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Commander Nickelson confirmed that if a gable was added, it would increase the height of the building. He confirmed the bottom of the proposed pediment wall was the current top of the building.

Chair Clites noted that due to the grading of the land, the building was recessed a bit, which made it appear to be shorter from the street. He questioned whether the American Legion planned to stone the brick retaining wall so it would be consistent with the height of the proposed stone water table around the building.

Vice Chair Lee opined that if the height of the building could not be increased, the stone water table needed to be reduced.

Deputy Town Manager Moore opined that increasing the height would not be a problem; however, he would need to double check this before giving Mr. Nickelson further direction. He advised that this building was not included in the Historic District Survey and noted that it would located outside of the National Register district boundaries. Mr. Moore explained that as such, it was not designated as either a contributing or non-contributing building. He advised that when he first saw the proposed addition of a stone water table to the elevation, he advised Mr. Nickelson that the historic aspect of a structure was not always its perceived aesthetic value to someone. Mr. Moore opined that the structure was somewhat utilitarian and suggested that dressing it up might be welcome; however, if the building was viewed as a contributing structure, the Committee may want it to retain its original form and features as much as possible. He noted that it was not necessarily in the best interest of the Historic District to welcome changes that someone may say make it looked better if those changes took away from the historic character of the building.

Chair Clites advised Mr. Nickelson that his inclination was to preserve as much of the brick as possible and to use the funding that would have been used for the stone for other enhancements. He opined that the building would be very successful without the addition of a stone water table. Mr. Clites further opined that it would not add to the aesthetics of the building and would only add to the cost. Committee Member Wright agreed.

Chair Clites noted that during a recent visit to the facility, he noticed that there was no cover over the main or side entrances. He suggested that when considering architectural elements that could be added, there were aesthetic things and practical things that could be done. Mr. Clites noted that the stone veneer would simply be an aesthetic item and suggested a more practical one be considered, such as a cover for the entry. He thanked Mr. Nickelson for giving the Committee the long-term perspective of the building and opined that it would become a more integrated part of that section of town.

Commander Nickelson advised that he would like to keep as much of the existing building as possible, including the brick. He noted that there would be patches in it once the sign was removed. Mr. Nickelson advised that the brick retaining wall was damaged due to being struck multiple times by cars and explained that this was why he was proposing to replace it with flagstone. He noted that the gable and pitched roof would be one piece. Mr. Nickelson opined that this addition would tie the buildings in this area together. He advised that their membership liked this proposed change. Mr. Nickelson noted that he would keep the brick façade and would pursue the addition of the flagpoles and the hardscaping of the patio area.

Chair Clites suggested that as the American Legion was in the design phase, they consider a different solution that did not include a gable roof. He opined that a gable roof would create a three-dimensional movie set appearance and noted the cost of creating what would be an elevated sail on an existing structure. Mr. Clites suggested there could be a simpler solution that would enhance the building. He opined that there was another solution that was quieter and preserved the nature of the building. Mr. Clites advised Mr. Nickelson that their building did not need to match their neighbors' in order to be successful.

Vice Chair Lee opined that Chair Clites offered some good observations. She noted that while the gable roof would be seen from The Plains Road, there would be nothing behind it. Ms. Lee opined that the building already had its own personality the way it was and suggested there were ways to give it a facelift without it looking like a bad one.

Commander Nickelson questioned whether it would be possible to construct a stone retaining wall or fence that would separate the grass from the street in order to protect the members from traffic when they were in the front of the building.

Committee Member Wright suggested the installation of a retaining wall and noted that while it could start at eighteen inches, it would be about two feet tall when it connected to the wall at the other end. She noted that another option would be the planting of a low hedge.

Chair Clites advised that while the Committee could offer some comments, this was not an area where it had any purview. He noted that there may be zoning issues with regard to adding impervious surfaces through hardscape. Mr. Clites suggested Mr. Nickelson discuss this with Deputy Town Manager Moore.

New Business (continued)

COA 24-12: Accessory Structure – 109 The Plains Road - Paul Edmundson

Planning & Project Associate Moore reported that the applicant was in the process of constructing a wooden pergola, which he planned to stain. He advised that the structure would be shielded from view by the house and heavy landscaping to the north. Mr. Moore noted that only a small portion of the structure would be visible, which the applicant was proposing to screen with two or more evergreens.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the structure was intended to be an enclosure for a hot tub. He advised that the back of it, which was on The Plains Road, would be solid wood. Mr. Moore noted that the applicant provided photographs of the structure from the interior of the property; however, this was not subject to the Committee's scrutiny, as it was not visible from a public street.

The Committee agreed that if the solid wood wall was screened from view by evergreens, it would be acceptable. They noted that it would appear to be the back of a garden shed. The Committee opined that once the evergreens were planted, it would blend with the rest of the bushes.

Chair Clites asked that the staff confirm with the applicant that lighting would be an issue and noted that this was not a great place to install string lights, as they would be disruptive. He noted that the structure sat below the elevation of the road and was back off the street.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the application as submitted, with the stain color as submitted, including the landscaping buffer as proposed. Chair Clites further moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Committee clarify that there is to be no outdoor lighting approved with this particular application.

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

July Meeting Quorum

Vice Chair Lee advised that she would not be available to attend the July 2nd meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – May 30, 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 will bring this meeting to order Thursday, May the 30th, 2024 Middleburg Historic District Review Committee meeting. A few days early. Thank you for those that are here for allowing us to adjust our schedule a little. Just a reminder for those of us speaking into the mic, we speak into the mic one at a time and not to each other outside of the mic. Roll call.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Clites. Excuse me Chair Clites. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Is this a trick? [multiple speakers]

Rhonda North: It's been a long day. Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

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

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

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

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson is absent.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Pause for a moment for public comments. If you're here, want to address anything with us before we get into our agenda. And seeing none. We'll move to the approval of the meeting minutes from the May 2nd, 2024, regular meeting. Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes? Are there any adjustments? I move that we approve as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any abstain? Any opposed? Motion passes. Thank you. Next is our action items. We'll go into new business. We'll skip the first action item. I understand from Mr. Moore that they won't be here. And so, we'll do that at the end. We'll go to action item COA 24-13 request of Rick and Susan Sierra for revisions to the approved COA at 100 North Madison Street. And Mr. Eric Moore. Run us through this, please.

Erick Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Certificate of appropriateness, 24-13 is a request for revisions to the approved COA 24-04. The zoning district is R-1 single family residence. The Commission conditionally approved COA 24-04 at its April 4th, 2024, meeting. The applicants are here, and they are requesting changes to the approved roofing material from the April 4th meeting. Standing seam metal composition or excuse me, standing seam metal. And they wish to change that to a composition shingle on the addition onto the existing brick structure. They're also requesting the addition of an aerial way stairs at the southwestern side of the house, and this will be shown on the screen. It will be screened and

have a fence and railing system. Finally, they are requesting a consultation with the Commission for the chimney work that they were approved for concerning repairs and replacement. And just as a reminder, this is the stone house that is the subject of the application for revisions and has been used as a single-family home for many years and consists of the original 1780 stone portion and that's all.

Tim Clites: Thank you for that report. From the applicant any comments? If you same drill as the past. Come to the podium, state your name and happy to chat with you.

Tom Gilbride: I'm Tom Gilbride. I'm the architect for the project. When we were considering, we submitted before we were considering an architectural shingle on the addition and leaving metal on the original house. And then we submitted with metal on both. And as we looked at it, what we didn't like about the metal, even though we got it approved, was it made it all basically monolithic with the addition, with the addition to the original house. We'd like to leave the standing seam metal on the old house the way it was is a replacement of standing seam metal. They switched to an architectural composition shingle on the addition that will be in a color that will be blend, blend, but work with the color of the roof. And we also like to add this the exterior stair to allow access down to the basement. And after talking over with a couple of the people with the furniture guys like that stair at the bottom, you're not going to make that turn with some of the furniture they want to get down there. So right to have a stair that's tucked away on the southwest corner you can't see it from. It's really almost impossible to see. It would run down the backside what we call the west side of the house leading down to the basement, and then use an architectural rail as the guardrail on it. And then we also would like to talk to you about the chimneys that are on the house. There's they're in some disrepair. And we've had some conversations with some chimney companies about whether we stick with replacing the stone brick as keeping it where the stone is stone and where brick is brick. Or do we go all stone? And we would like to have some input from you all on that as well. The we do feel. I do feel when I did the original drawings, I had an architectural composition shingle. And because I felt that it would have been better to offset it from the original metal roof, that it would stand alone, the original structure, we didn't touch it. We're trying to leave it, and then we start looking at taking that metal roof and tying it with the addition that started looking kind of all monotone. So, we just like to try to we like to view, we consider us using the architectural composition shingle on the addition.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Let's discuss them as opposed to one at a time. Why don't we just start with Virginia if I can, and just give us comments on, let's just do the first two and then we'll talk about the chimneys. It seems like that's a little bit of a discussion I don't yeah, I don't want to. [off mic] conversation too closely. But yeah, let's talk about the shingles and the access way and then we'll come back to the chimneys. Oops. Can you turn your mic on Virginia? I'm sorry.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm going to hold off on commenting on the shingles. I need to read a little bit more about the specific product, and I'm assuming it's a wrought iron rail. Yeah, or has one been chosen?

Tom Gilbride: We submitted the top and the bottom rail and, in the end, the [off mic] tongue and the rail.

Virginia Jenkins: It's not marked on.

Linda Wright: [off mic] arrows too.

Tim Clites: If you go to page 20. There we go.

Linda Wright: [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. That's the railing is fine with me.

Erick Moore: I see it here.

Virginia Jenkins: And that's it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I have no problem at all with the areaway and the stairs at all. I think that's tucked away enough. And it's simple, and I have no problem with that at all. With the roof, I kind of went back and forth in my head, I certainly understand. Setting the two apart. There's a lot of roofs on this edition that it's all one level and it's a massive amount of roof. So, I sort of hear what you're saying, that it's just too much metal. Much as I, in my original thought was, I thought it would look best and hold it all together if it were all the same material, it would look more cohesive, I guess. But I start to understand both sides of that. So, I'm a little torn. Yeah. [laughter] I'd love to. I wish we had samples of the shingle and the color with the roof. That would help. But I do like the dimensional shingle. I think that's probably the best choice, because there's a lot more dimension to it than just a standard shingle.

Tom Gilbride: Yeah, it's an architectural shape. It has the depth to it.

Linda Wright: Yeah. So, and I think that's good. And you get the shadow and the difference in it and all of that I think is a good thing. I know we've done different things with a lot of times when you do an addition, you want the addition to read is different and leave the old is the old. And I know this is a very significant house in this town, so. I'm still a little torn over that. [laughter] I am.

Tim Clites: That's okay. Thank you. Yeah. That's helpful. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I'm right in Linda's camp for the age of the house, and its, you know, significance to the town. The standing seam would be nice. That would be my first choice, but it is a lot of roofs.

Tom Gilbride: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: On the addition. I don't know. I wish we had a sample of the thing to actually see.

Tom Gilbride: Yeah, we tried to get a sample, you know, quite properly with this, but we'd be happy to bring you sample whatever we, you know, if we can get it approved for shingle and then we bring the samples that you look at, we could do something like that.

Punkin Lee: But then if we don't like it and want to go back to, oh, then we're.

Tom Gilbride: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: Yeah, a little tough. The railing and all the steps I think that's fine, I think, but I think the roof is. It's a big decision to do something to that older structure, right?

Tom Gilbride: Because on previous boards [inaudible]. When I tried to go monolithic, they told me I couldn't, which is why he started off with shingle and metal.

Punkin Lee: Right? Because we usually like to generally stick to standing seam for the older structures in town, more in keeping. Decision to be made.

Linda Wright: Can I ask one quick question?

Tim Clites: Sure Linda.

Linda Wright: Do you know off the top of your head just square footage wise. Old house roof, square footage versus new addition square footage.

Tom Gilbride: It's probably. Let's say. 600 and 700ft² of metal and probably around 1300 square feet of shingle.

Linda Wright: Yeah, so that's a massive amount of roof, and it's.

Tom Gilbride: Also, a massive amount of metal that was like, it's just that texture just added a little depth to it. And I just like the fact that it offset this is the original house and we're not even though. Yeah. [multiple speakers] we're replacing it because of its condition. You get hail damage I guess years ago that nobody ever replaced.

Linda Wright: Oh, yeah.

Tim Clites: Well, I guess I would not feel like I could add enough comment one way or the other to change anything we heard. I agree that the rail to the basement, the basement stairs make good practical sense and I think they look perfectly fine. So, no comments there. I do think if we're going to switch to the shingle, it would be worth presuming we're not holding anything up. Because probably your engineering permitting, all of that would not care except for this board's approval. I think it's worth seeing a sample of the shingle and the collar. Just to help answer the question that the rest of the committee members have. I mean, I feel You know, the guidelines recommend that additions clearly be different. And so, the question is to what degree and based on what set of criteria. So, we have a stone house with a clapboard addition. Well, that's different. And so, the roof could be the same. And I would feel comfortable. And I can also see that the roof could be different because in fact it is clearly a different structure. The little addition that's there currently, although clearly in addition, has a metal roof and it doesn't look odd or out of place, so I think. If we're not. I'm going to try to read the minds of those sitting around me a little bit. I think the sample would help. And if we have the time to do that, I think maybe that's the right approach there. The renderings just as an observation, are like we often do renderings, which is we're at a vantage point that is actually above where any of us can be. Meaning the perspective. We're 16, 18, 20ft off the ground. So, by virtue of really the front right view, that view is the closest to standing on the ground that we have in terms of the scale of the roof. It's a lot of roofs no matter where you stand. But I think maybe the sample would help the committee feel more comfortable with that change.

Tom Gilbride: And if I remember right, we had a we worked on the fence between a black and or dark bronze. So, with the architectural composition shingle the clients preferred a darker bronze instead of a flat black roof. And if we went to a darker bronze, then we have more variation in that architectural shingle with some of those color variations can happen to help blend it and still offset it, instead of it all being black.

Tim Clites: Exactly. And I think for the members to see that it may help us all feel more comfortable about a decision. Yeah, because you're right, the brown colors are going to have a higher degree of what's the term variation or variation. Right. They're going to be. Okay. Any other comments on those two items? So, what do you think about the chimneys?

Tom Gilbride: Well, the, of course, a lot of the stuff with the chimney companies is the variation in the wasn't a huge cost issue. It was more of a right now it's a combination of stone and brick. And two of the two of the stone companies thought that was original brick with the stone. Other guys I think that was stone was somehow repaired into brick, so we didn't have a clear answer on it. The it wouldn't be uncommon, given the period, the age of the house, that it could be brick. It was already originally there. It wasn't uncommon where they went up with stone to stop and just finished with brick. I think we're really looking for was if we went back and kind. Do we have to keep it where you can see from the photograph

where it's breaking below the ridge? So, what they which makes me think it really was a stone than a brick, because they stopped the stone before they had to try to flash to the stone with the chimney, which wasn't uncommon. It was easier to flash the brick than it was to flash the stone. So, the question really was, is a matter of do we have latitude? You know, if we decide to go all stone, would that be approved? We decided to keep it as was as is and go the brick and the stone. Would that be acceptable with the repair? That's what we're looking for.

Tom Gilbride: Do you all have a preference? Okay.

Rick Sierra: I would have a preference if I knew for sure what was original.

Tim Clites: Yeah, so would I. Right. [laughter] Absolutely. Yeah. Because there's something I've always found that something kind of interesting about the stone transition to brick. And you see it around here a lot. And so, I agree it feels like it could be original but without knowing for sure. Yeah. I've often wondered that myself. Virginia was asking why they might have done that historically, and I guess the flashing would be one reason.

Tom Gilbride: That's the only reason I would figure was flashing, because at that point, it cost more to bring just a brick in to finish the chimney. And but so oftentimes that maybe one of the chimneys got hit by lightning, or maybe one of the chimneys had some sort of disrepair they had to replace. The two caps were bad. And the guy said, I'll tear it down. And some Mason had bricks on his truck, so they'll do it in the brick for X. We'll do it for stone for Y. And it ended up brick.

Tim Clites: So, I mean, I guess I would say on balance. It's a little touch that I like in brick. And so if you don't have a straw, I'm just going to vote for I'm not voting, I'm just going to comment for myself, absent from asking the committee that like if you didn't have a strong feeling that you wanted it to be stone, I think the change in material if you have to rework it, allows it to still feel authentic by blending in new stone, it's likely going to look more like a repair. Maybe I'm just. I'm not sure. But like you could imagine that, you know, with a if you had to rebuild it in an older brick, it would still look like it was maybe more original intentional than stone that might be tough to match.

Tom Gilbride: Yeah, [multiple speakers] I had that thought too was short of bringing Alan Cochrane out and having to find it somewhere in the county where he can match the stone. It's difficult to match some of that stone. Yeah.

Tim Clites: And then what do you do at the very top of it with the stone detailing?

Tom Gilbride: Right.

Tim Clites: What is that detail?

Tom Gilbride: Exactly. Yeah. So, it is of course, having the flues would extend further than they currently do because back in the old days they just over at the top and they stopped, which caused all the water problems on these chimneys.

Tim Clites: Right.

Tom Gilbride: We would probably still reproduce it in stone. The brick would reproduce at the same kind of a cap that we would do a that smooth the mortar wash, which you would never see, see the brick edge and the mortar wash would be a synthetic mortar wash that can move, you can expand and contract because that's where they fail is that mortar wash cracks and the water gets in.

Tim Clites: And so, would you, you'd propose putting some kind of a cap on top of the flue itself, then too? A metal cap.

Tom Gilbride: No other than a bird, a bird, you know, stopping the spark [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Yeah, that's what I'm not. Yeah. Not amazed. [multiple speakers]

Tom Gilbride: No, not putting the lid on it. No, I don't think I'd propose anything like that. Yeah. Because that would change not only the look of it, but its height.

Tim Clites: Right. Yeah. Right now. I'll pause and go. Sorry. I should have started with the Committee. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Well without that historic background on this, I personally would prefer stone only because it would be more cohesive to me, particularly if you're thinking on the other building having different roofing. So, there's. [off mic] if that makes any sense. One doesn't equate the other at all. But to have some commonality, I guess, in one building instead of bringing in more materials. Excuse me, my voice is a little rough. But that's just my aesthetic.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I think I'd stay with the brick, because I've seen it done so many times in this county. And if it is a flashing issue, and I would totally agree with you trying to find stone to match this, it's going to be incredibly difficult and get the mortar to match it. It's going to look so much more like a patch.

Tom Gilbride: Right.

Linda Wright: I just, I think I'd stay as long as you stay with the same details basically, and kind of put it back like it was. I think staying with the brick will make it look like it didn't have to change it.

Tom Gilbride: But yeah, if we did in the brick we would use like a hand-thrown wire cut brick. So, it had that old world look to it. Yeah.

Linda Wright: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think even though you can't find something that actually shows that the brick was there. We know it's around, and it's this is not the only structure that got treated this way. And due to the age and everything, I think the brick would be the way to keep it pretty much 100% sure that it was old and done with a purpose, though. And finding matching stone, I think would be really tough. So, I would say keep with the brick and just keep the house like it is.

Tim Clites: Rick, what do you think?

Rick Sierra: It's fine with me. I mean, I hadn't thought too much about being able to match the stone. But definitely when the masonry person was out there, I was telling him, you know, I said, I don't want it to look different. And, you know, they he's a very confident person. But at the same time, he said, you know, there's not a lot of stone left in the area, and it could be a challenge. But he didn't say no. But in listening to, you know, your experience here, it's telling me that maybe that could be a risk that we could take. And then it turns out that it doesn't look that great, and then we're kind of stuck with it.

Tom Gilbride: And the other advantage of brick would be that we built a block, flue up. We can then waterproof it properly and we'd use stone that's such a small chimney. By the time you put the stone in, there's stone. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: There's not much left. Right.

Tom Gilbride: Right, right. Well, okay, I mean, I guess we haven't actually voted on that. But yeah, it does do seem to have some input from us.

Virginia Jenkins: I can be easily persuaded on this one. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Easily. Thank you, I appreciate that. I like the flexibility, although I do understand your comment as well, which is we're starting to not only change the siding at the addition. If perchance we agree to change the roof, then we're added. Well, but then I think we're not really adding another material. It's already there. And so, you know, arguably maybe the brick's older than any of us in the room. So, we'll just say it's allowed to stay, right. And even if it's not original, it's probably at least the one side. I think your notes suggested it seemed fairly old. Yes. Yeah. So yeah, that seems like.

Tom Gilbride: It has a lot of Spaulding on it, which is evident of water getting back behind it. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Yeah. Maybe even a softer brick. Right.

Tom Gilbride: Yeah. Right.

Tim Clites: So that creates a problem.

Virginia Jenkins: I would like the softer brick if you're going to do the brick.

Tim Clites: The new brick will be visually soft, but it'll be probably a high fired brick. [multiple speakers].

Virginia Jenkins: I understand. No, I know, but I'm talking about. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Aesthetic? Sure. Yeah, absolutely. And I think.

Virginia Jenkins: That's the way I took it.

Tom Gilbride: The idea is to try to replace it in kind in terms of texture and color.

Tim Clites: Right. Mr. Moore, what is your recommendation? Should we make a motion? I believe that we're going to ask to come back, or should we table the whole item and make a motion after we get the sample and review the roof? Is there any reason to go one way or the other?

Will Moore: I would suggest just tabling at this time. You've given them the confidence that they can move forward with the changes in the area way. You can just formalize that at a later meeting.

Tim Clites: And the chimneys, I think, were generally in agreement. We may have a different group of committee members here when you come back, but I think we can recap the comments of this committee. They'll read the notes, and they'll know what we've talked about.

Will Moore: Honestly on the chimney requires no action of this committee, because if they're doing a repair or replacement in kind that they don't need. So only if they were changing something would they need action from you on that.

Tim Clites: So yeah, thanks for that clarification it's helpful. All right. Well, any other questions or comments for us?

Tom Gilbride: No. So, is the idea that we would get approval for the area way approved or not approved for the chimney? But we've got the input we need because we want to make sure that before we put the new metal roof on, that the chimneys were done before the guys crawling over the finished roof. Roof. And we can bring in the samples of the other roof for consideration.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, let's see, we're going to not be able to meet as a committee again until July. Does formal approval of any of that pose a problem with your schedule?

Tom Gilbride: No, because they all have the same underlayment, so we'd be fine getting [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Okay, so then I'll just recap. And what's the term again, Mr. Moore? We're going to I would just.

Will Moore: I would suggest tabling action on this application.

Tim Clites: So, to recap the discussion we the committee generally feels that the window, or that the stairwell and railing are acceptable, that keeping the existing brick chimneys and reworking them is the recommendation. And we would like to see a sample of both the metal roof color and the shingle architectural shingles. And we're going to table the application until our next meeting. All those in favor? Is that a motion formerly?

Will Moore: It sounded like a motion. You would need a second.

Punkin Lee: Second?

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Thank you. That's unanimous. Thank you.

Tom Gilbride: One quick question. So, are we okay with putting the stairway in? Okay. That part [inaudible].

Tim Clites: Okay. Yeah. If you proceed with that.

Tom Gilbride: I know we have to go through Will in the regular process with the site and things.

Tim Clites: We will not.

Tom Gilbride: Okay.

Tim Clites: Allow ourselves to change our mind now.

Tom Gilbride: And I really appreciate your time.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And I'll just mention this may be inappropriate, but don't take it that way. You're more than welcome to come back next month. You're also. You should feel comfortable if you all just want to bring the shingles depending on how, it's the summer, a lot of people have a lot going on, so don't stress out. I think we're down to a small discussion, so if that helps in any way. I appreciate you all being here, but I'm also sympathetic to how that works, right? When everyone's busy and has summer vacations or whatever. So, thank you for coming tonight, though. All right let's go to our next action item. Thank you all for working through that. COA 24-14 S 24-08 request of Brad Juneau. Did I say that right? Did I? For two illuminated wall signs and repainting the main entry door trim and window shutters at 14 South Madison Street for Nomad Mr. Moore.

Erick Moore: Thank you. Certificate of appropriateness 24-14. It has you had mentioned there was a pre-application discussion at last month's meeting, and we do have one sign. Actually, there's two signs, but the first one will be going where the existing sign is which is facing Madison and has three cast down light fixtures. The second one, which had some discussion, will be affixed to the side of 16 South Madison, facing north towards Washington Street, with one downward casting fixture in the center, identical to the three against the wall where the main entrance is. The signs are to be constructed of wood, vinyl, high density foam, and a sample and will be provided for your inspection. Proposed repainting the main entryway, door trim and also the window shutters. And a sample is that will be provided as well. And the applicant is here. He's present. And if you have any questions for him, he is here. So that's all.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Appreciate that. Any comments? Here we go. [off mic]

Brad Juneau: This is the sample of the proposed [off mic]. Graphic charcoal.

Tim Clites: Quick question before I pass this around. It does have the two-tone gray black texture.

Brad Juneau: I think that's a computer generated.

Tim Clites: That's a printed.

Brad Juneau: It's a printed.

Tim Clites: So, it's going to be all it's kind of cool. But your goal is just one color. It's not graphite.

Brad Juneau: That's correct.

Tim Clites: And this is the color?

Brad Juneau: That is going to be the color of the shutters and the door, but not the door trim around the main door, just simply the door. And there you go. So, the shutters, we tried to get the computer. The IT person to make those shutters that color, the gray.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Good luck.

Brad Juneau: Yeah. [laughter]

Tim Clites: So, we tried that too.

Brad Juneau: So, what I did instead was I painted two pieces of board to show you what the door would look like and what the shutters would look like.

Tim Clites: I'm. Oh, there it is. There was that. Oh, where did that come?

Brad Juneau: He just put it up.

Will Moore: The picture of the door was not included in your packet, but the applicant provided it afterwards, so they have it now. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: It's perfectly good. All right. Yeah. Thank you for these. This is helpful. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: What? I like it, I like it. That was. What more do you want?

Tim Clites: That's [inaudible] at the moment. Linda.

Linda Wright: A couple of quick questions with the larger sign does that actually, it's hard to tell. And I know just because of computers, does it actually line up with the front windows? Like if you took the top of the window.

Brad Juneau: The photo you had [multiple speakers]. In that photograph there?

Linda Wright: Yes.

Brad Juneau: It does. So, it's actually going to be lower. So, the height of that.

Linda Wright: Is it? Because this doesn't look like it. It is hard to tell.

Brad Juneau: It is going to be lower. And the reason it's going to be lower, it's going to be the upper edge is going to be at 16ft. So, it's going to be lower by in that photograph probably about two feet. And the reason we did that was because the discussion we had on the earlier meeting last month was, if you look at the far right of that photograph, there's a conduit that runs up the side of the building. We're going to remove that because there's a power source right on the other side of that wall. And we're just going to come straight through the wall through a grout line. And we're going to cancel the conduit. There'll be no conduit on that building. And then we're just going to come right out and have the fixture.

Tim Clites: You need to be lower in order to get behind the sign.

Brad Juneau: That's correct. And that's why it's going to be 16ft high. So, it's actually on that. It's actually going to be down about two feet.

Linda Wright: Lower I thought was good.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah. Yeah. As I recall when we discussed that last month. [multiple speakers]

Brad Juneau: We didn't like what.

Virginia Jenkins: That would visually be better lower.

Brad Juneau: There was just no way to, in a pleasing fashion, to get that conduit to move across that building. We didn't like it. So, we're going to cancel the existing conduit and come through a grout line on the building right above the sign.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Much nicer thank you.

Brad Juneau: I will tell you as well on the other photograph of the Nomad sign on the patio view and that's this one. So, you'll, notice that this sign is smaller than the previous Old Oxe. We did not deviate

from the total square footage on the sign. This sign is reduced by two feet on each side to give me more square footage on the south face, the north facing wall. So, we're at the same square footage. I just gave some real estate to the wall sign.

Linda Wright: Is it centered in there? It looks like it needs to go up like one brick or something. It looks a little low sitting on the jack arch of that window.

Brad Juneau: It does. And I think that's a computer regeneration problem. [multiple speakers] One of the things that we're sensitive to is because the Old Oxe sign sat there for however long it sat there we're sensitive to patina on that brick. And we're prepared to address that once that sign comes down. I actually don't think the Old Oxe sign was up long enough to really change the patina on that brick.

Linda Wright: Then I'm fine with it.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree, I like the paint selection. It almost, but not quite makes the air conditioners go away.

Brad Juneau: Almost, but not quite.

Punkin Lee: But not quite.

Punkin Lee: But a vast improvement. Yes, I think it'll be nice. And I agree with Linda if the sign was just up. It kind of looks like it's resting on the where it shouldn't, but I think everything is going to be.

Brad Juneau: I think that was a product of graphically removing and putting this on.

Punkin Lee: Right. Just want it noted that we all think that come up a little bit, but it looks good. Thank you.

Brad Juneau: Thank you.

Tim Clites: I have no additional comments. Do we have a motion?

Virginia Jenkins: I make a motion to approve COA 24-14 S 24-04 for the two illuminated wall signs and repainting of the main entry door trim and window shutters at 14 South Madison.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Motion passes. Thank you.

Brad Juneau: Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: Thanks for the samples.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Always helpful.

Tim Clites: All right. We are now. Should I do discussion item, or should we go to, is the applicant here? And then. Yeah. All right. So, we'll jump to the discussion item pre-application discussion with the American Legion post 295 at 111 the Plains Road. Good evening, gentlemen.

Gary Nickelson: Good evening.

Tim Clites: Say hello to the microphone with your name and address. I think they like.

Gary Nickelson: My name is Gary Nickelson. I'm the Commander of Middleburg American Legion, 111 the Plains Road. I'm accompanied by Mr. Kevin Daly just want to recognize that Mr. Daly today as a Member of the Legion post. That is his other volunteer role. And my partner that's on the side here Stephen Carney sends his regrets. He's feeling a little bit under the weather, and unfortunately, he's the one that's kind of involved in a lot of the materials that were selected. I'll try and speak of as best that I can to that. But he's he knows the ins and outs and did most of these drawings. But I'll speak most of it. This is really just a preliminary meeting. We're in a very unique situation where we formed a partnership with the Royal British Legion. And if you're wondering what the American Legion is, it's a veteran service organization dedicated to supporting veteran outreach, social services, Americanism programs such as promoting things that deal with the Constitution, education. You saw us out there this past weekend giving out poppies in honor of Memorial Day and what that signifies educating everyone, children, and youth. My daughter is a student at the Hill School here in town. I'm big on youth programs. We have a Boy Scout troop that we sponsor at the post. We just graduated our 20th Eagle Scout, I think, in the last 15 years yesterday. Well, we're home to multiple organizations here in town. The K-9 Foundation, train service dogs, Boy Scouts, Middleburg Lions, and multiple other nonprofit organizations use our building as kind of a gathering place. The town has used us for county elections while this place was under construction. The Little River Supervisor Debate was held there and just many other. I think right now I'm trying to organize a blood drive. You saw us for Loudoun County Parks & Recs and the Mickie Gordon Park hearings, hosting all that and working with the county and the town just providing support where we can. So going back to the British Legion, we formed a very unique partnership. It's come to our attention that there's a lot of British expats living and serving here, and not just Middleburg and Loudoun County areas, but America as a whole. And so, they and some other like-minded individuals have decided to form their own chapter of the British Legion. And they found if they're familiar with our lot, we have one lot, a one acre, just under one acre lot in front of where our building is. And then behind that, it's about a one acre, less than one acre lot of land that's been unused ever since that building, to my knowledge, been built when it was back at the old Ford tractor facility. And so, they would like to purchase a little bit of the back lot and build there what's going to be their East Coast headquarters for, as they'll be the only British Legion chapter in the Americas? By doing so, they'll give us some cash and a bunch of upgrades to our building. And in between our two organizations, it's going to be a memorial garden. That's going to have a walkway in between the two posts. It's going to connect with the town. It's going to have a cenotaph for remembrance ceremonies and then a memorial garden in the back. Now, that's a long-term plan. It's not really why we're here for today. Just want to give you that big picture of what we're trying to obtain too. And it's going to the multiple Town Council meetings. I've heard some of the cries of individuals from the town of what they're trying to do to the Federal street to revitalize that and bring more business down there. And I want to say that this partnership is the final piece of that revitalization project, because we're going to complete the loop and kind of make that final walking piece in between Washington Street, Federal Street, and then up around the Plains Road. So, you have a nice safe walking path all throughout town. So that's the vision. As you know, our building is about, well, our organization has been around for 77 years. That building is even older. Most of my time when it's not dedicated to social outreach. And the youth has been maintaining this building ever since I took over as commander. Let's see, we have a new HVAC system in there. We had to dig out the old heating 750-gallon oil tank. Worked with the Department of Environmental DEQ, I believe. Ripped that out, replaced that to make sure that the oil was no longer leaking in the ground. We replaced the old French drain system now we're hooked up to the town's sewer system. So, a number of improvements in our when that big storm came through that big hailstorm, we had to replace the roof. We actually had a wonderful

insurance policy. We only had $100 deductible to replace that entire roof, because we've been here for so long. But we have noticed there is a small leak going out because we have a nice flat roof where our I guess our facade is, it's flat on the back and it has produced a new leak where the water is standing. So, we're using this opportunity as a chance to kind of give us a new facelift to fix the existing problems that we have, and basically ensure that this building stands for another 50 to 75 years from the work that we have going out today. So, what we're proposing first is new flagpoles. So, we want to we have one existing flagpole right now. It's dedicated to the old [inaudible] former police chief of Middleburg, Cindy's father. So that will stay to the dedication, but we're going to replace it with new flagpole, the fly American flag, and then have two flagpoles adjoining each side of that. They'll have the Virginia state flag and POW MIA flag. We want to move that to kind of in the center of the door. Right now, it's encased by some grass and dirt, which, as you know, we're not a full-time organization, so that during the spring months the grass grows pretty rapidly, same with the grass. Our Boy Scouts are pretty good at pulling the weeds, but it's not always perfect, so we like to replace that with some flagstone. And then that way we'll remove that need to have maintained that the grass on a weekly basis to have a nice view as you're driving by that. Part of this conversation why I'm here tonight is kind of talk about the other existing improvements that we'll have to the facade. We'd like to propose, you know, one third brick facade going up the way of the brick. And that kind of will tie in with the rest of the town architecture around there. I want to keep the brick facade all together, but on top of where we have our flat pitched roof a gable there with some, I guess some white panels and then the gabled roof will extend back, I believe, about six feet, and that will provide an extra layer of protection against the rain and then slope down where the water is. Let's see. So, and then our flagstone path will also extend out to our front patio. So that will tie in the two not only with our flagpole, but then down with our patio. And what's not pictured there is we do have a retaining wall so that those where the flag poles are actually about three feet above the ground, there's a retaining wall that goes in front of that. And so, in the middle we'd have a nice a couple steps that would allow you to walk out from the front of the building and directly up into the flagpole. And then raise and lower the flags as needed. Talked with Will, learned about some of the flag regulations. We either have lighting that's coming from the side of the building, or we'll have down lighting from the flag poles to in accordance with that, no uplighting rule here in the village. And then the rest of it's kind of that long term vision. So, at the back of the building, we do have a storage shed. Now, I don't know when that was built in, but basically some guys got together and stacked a bunch of cinder blocks and threw a door on it. That thing's collapsing will need to be taken down. A lot of underpinning will have to be done underneath. We'd like to build that properly, get attached to the building and then open up some French doors at the back. Plus, some storage area that's going to open up to the inside of the building. Those French doors, that is, those French doors open in the back there, that's going to create an observation deck viewing area. So that's going to overlook where the potential cenotaph memorial garden is going to be. So, when we have ceremonies, our elderly veterans or those confined with accessibility issues will be able to just walk out there to the patio instead of that steep driveway, and they'll be able to view the ceremonies from there. But that would be the future plans. Our short-term target is the facade of the building and the front, plus that gabled roof. Possible brick facade and then the flagstone removal of the grass flagstone and then the three flagpoles. I believe that's all I have.

Tim Clites: Yeah, thank you for that. Kind of follow along with the pictures. And your description is very helpful. I'll start with Punkin. I'll give you a break. How's that? This is just a discussion item, as I understand. And I do have a few questions. Maybe, but I'll go last, so.

Punkin Lee: No. Go ahead.

Tim Clites: My questions actually have nothing to do with the design to start. And they have to do with building height. And even though this pediment that gets added has there even been a quick check? Like, I didn't get the chance to do this before the meeting, but that would seem to me to be something we would want to verify. What is the zoning and what is the building height because it would fall under that limit if there was one, right?

Will Moore: Yeah. I did have a chance to meet with Mr. Nickelson and Mr. Carney to have a discussion. We had some additional exhibits. I've not seen any we don't have any dimension plans yet to make that kind of evaluation yet.

Tim Clites: And the only reason I bring it up, that's not part of something this committee is tasked with, but in fact, if it and it may not but if it does change what you're allowed to do on the facade, then we could we could dive pretty deep into a bunch of comments, because we love to do that and find out that there's this thing called zoning that says it maybe can't quite be that tall. So that's just a little side note anyway. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think that was a very good point. I think the facelift definitely will be well received and very much appreciated. I think the ideas are pretty, the preliminaries look pretty nice for going forward, but I'll wait to hear other comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I'm happy to see some improvements to the building. I think where you're starting and going looks good. And being able to do the garden off the side and the balcony and sort of connect the inside and outside of the building somewhere will be really nice. And help with the steep hill and trying to get over there is not easy. [laughter] But no, I like where it's going. I think you're off to a good start.

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

Virginia Jenkins: I agree, I mean, I drive that road all the time and it'd be nice to have that depending upon height, of course, but are you going to get an architect to draw this up or just a builder?

Gary Nickelson: So, we will have an architect draw it up. As a nonprofit, I don't have a lot of money. So that's going to go straight to.

Virginia Jenkins: I was just going to say that I would assume that the architect would look into zoning and height elevation. So, you'd be ahead of the game right there.

Tim Clites: Yeah. That's it. I'm sorry. I'll let you finish.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, other than that, I like where you're going. You know, I think it's just going to enhance that property, frankly.

Tim Clites: And so then. My thought about tying all that together is if perchance the gable end does conflict with the zoning, and you're left to think about a design that keeps the facade, which I don't know what I would call that stylistically, it's kind of a mid-century, almost. Not industrial institutional building. It's kind of a mid-century, just a simple structure. We actually have one right out on Main Street. Brick and Mortar went in there and they came to us. And it's a long story. The short version is they wanted to paint the brick facade. I think that's a 1930s building, if I remember. And we had a big, long discussion here and we finally voted along, I think it was one of the few times we weren't even all in agreement they could paint the building, but when they heard us have that whole long discussion, they went left the meeting and owner and the tenant talked a little more and they said, you know, maybe we won't paint the brick. Maybe we'll just keep that simple flat facade, flat roof building the way it is, and we'll paint the sign on the brick which ultimately, I think [inaudible] to a really successful building with a really few little touches that they added. They cleaned up the entry door, they painted the sign, they added some lighting in the right places, and I think they cleaned up like the top of the parapet. Not suggesting that that's the solution for you, but I would say without the pediment. The architectural expression there to kind of take the stone and wrap it around a more contemporary building might feel inconsistent, start to

feel weird to me, right? In other words, if the zoning does not allow for if you look at the pictures and if it did not allow for the pitched roof at the top, but it had to stay more the facade it was. I'm not sure I would like the stone belt course as much, but that's just me. It's a personal kind of question. I do like what you're doing with the flag poles. I like what you're doing with the detailing around the windows. I think that all seems successful. And the hardscape, although we don't really have a lot of purview over that. I guess we do see it on occasion. What? I'll pause for a second. [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: I do have a question and it may be just scale, but in these drawings in the front drawing is. Before you have the gable is the elevation or the height of the building to the gable, or to the beginning of the gable or the bottom of the gable the same as the existing height now?

Gary Nickelson: No. So that would add what, whatever the height of the gable would be. So.

Virginia Jenkins: Forget the gable. Pretend it's just there's no gable there.

Gary Nickelson: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm just saying that from the top of, I don't know what.

Tim Clites: I think your question is answered. The bottom of the pediment or the bottom of the triangle is the current top.

Gary Nickelson: Right is the current top.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. So that is the same height.

Gary Nickelson: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Because in the drawing visually it looks higher. And so, I think that throws might be throwing people off a little bit.

Virginia Jenkins: Do you see what I'm saying? Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Well, the other thing that happens is this building because of the way the grading works, it sits down just a little bit into that recess. So, you don't from the street, you don't even perceive that little bit of, right, it appears to be a shorter building than it is now. Other I mean, there's a lot of little details. We can talk about this stone. Would you then bring it out and also stone the brick wall that's in closing the entry there. So that's all consistent. That's just you don't have to answer that question. But when I look at this little picture, if we can go to three. Erick. Mr. Moore. Mr. Erick Moore, if you're running the controls, if we can go to picture three existing conditions, photos. And zoom into the left photo. You can see the little brick wall beyond. And if that were the approximate height of the stone water table around the building, it might be nice to have that. Finish this kind of interior little entry court. Right. And there's a little details that maybe way, way ahead of ourselves at the moment, but. Other comments. Linda?

Linda Wright: No, I'm good.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I kind of go back to what Tim said, that if you have to lose some of the height, then the watermark probably needs to change accordingly, because if it comes up too high, then it's going to look like you're squashing it because you didn't get the height of the whole facade. So, I think that's something

to discuss with whomever you pick as your architect when you get the right height. It's going to change the presentation of the front.

Will Moore: Mr. Chairman, if I may, there is a scale. I don't think height would be a problem with the gable, if that helps your discussion. I'm pretty confident.

Tim Clites: Based on [multiple speakers].

Will Moore: 85% confident that. But we'll double check that before we I give Mr. Nickelson any more general direction, but I'm pretty sure it's not going to be an issue if that were a preferred design. If I can just add a couple of things for your consideration. I did check our Historic District survey. This property is actually not included in that survey. So, when that survey was updated in 2016, that's an update to the survey of the properties that are within the National Register District. So we do have some areas where our local district and National Register District do not match on the boundaries. So, this is just outside of the boundary of the National Register district. So, we don't have a survey sheet on this. So, we don't have it officially designated either as a contributing or non-contributing structure. And sometimes that designation will influence the weight to which you deliberate on certain possible changes. The one thing I pointed out to Mr. Nickelson and Mr. Carney when I first saw a proposed elevation that added the stone water table and added possible siding overlaying a brick. They had made some comments that they were kind of picking up on some of the design elements from the newer buildings that were built. Just to the south. So, the barn building, the professional center, and the building up closer to the Plains Road. And just a reminder for this Committee and as I mentioned to them that you know, and again, we don't have designation as contributing or non-contributing, but the historic aspect of a structure is not always its perceived aesthetic value to somebody. So, we can look at this structure and say it's somewhat utilitarian. And dressing up might be welcome. But if this were designated as a contributing structure, one of the principal elements of viewing changes is that you want it to retain its original form and original features as much as possible, so it's just something to consider that it's not necessarily in the best interest of the Historic District to welcome changes that the general passerby might say looks a little neater or better if it takes away from the historic character of the building. So.

Tim Clites: I certainly appreciate that. I think you said it better than I was expressing it when I was talking about the building out on Main Street, right, which is a building that we were struggling with it. It's simplicity, right? And so, the thought was, oh, well, we'll paint it. That'll cheer it up and make it something that we like more. But like is something we've been encouraged not to use. [laughter] And right. And so, and I apologize, I didn't completely follow. I did follow the elevations and the one sheet that has all four elevations. It says proposed front elevation. And I saw the vertical boards. And then the next one had more of a blow up, and it looked like it was a grid in both directions. And in my mind, I guess I was thinking that the person doing the quick rendering was assuming that the brick would stay, and the stone water table would just be at the bottom, and then it would be brick, and then the pediment above that. Is that what you were thinking?

Gary Nickelson: That's correct so I was the quick editor of adding that that's how it occurs.

Tim Clites: That's all right. Yeah.

Gary Nickelson: Speaking with Will because we had about a 24-hour turnaround. Yeah. Day job during the day.

Tim Clites: I guess I would not only because of what Will mentioned, but if you were asking just me to comment on the building, I would be inclined to try to preserve as much of the brick and find other places where the funds that went to the stone could be used sooner to enhance other things. I think said differently, I think you could still keep it a very successful building without a stone water table on this particular building. That's just my opinion, but I think that even if it's a simple stone veneer, a thin veneer

is still quite a bit of work. And I'm not. My aesthetic judgment would be I'm not sure it adds as much to the aesthetics as it might add to the cost. There may be a better place to put some of the funds.

Linda Wright: I would agree with you because I think the brick is really pretty. It's very nice brick and unless there's something structurally wrong with it, I think it ought to stack.

Gary Nickelson: And so, the [multiple speakers].

Linda Wright: Soft and it's pretty and, you know, changed the roof and some other things. It's going to change the facade a lot. You might save yourself a lot of money not switching the brick up at all.

Tim Clites: So, I won't. This is not a design recommendation, but I went in the building when one of the elections, and I remember it seemed like it either was or was getting ready to rain and it was a dash right. And so, the thing I wonder is, well, is that little there's that's the main entrance but there's really no way. The little side entrance isn't really under a cover either, is it?

Gary Nickelson: No.

Tim Clites: No. So both of them are That's a practical comment, right? But when you think about things that elements, architectural elements or things that could be added or adjusted, there are aesthetic things and then there are practical things, and then there are things that do both. And I think the stone veneer appears to be simply an aesthetic move, and I'm not sure it. Yeah, I guess I've already said what my instinct is that there's probably other things that would be maybe more successful. More practical and successful, right? Whether it's a cover to the entry or some more work somewhere else in the building or some more funds available for. I really appreciate you giving us the long-term perspective. I think that helps a lot. It sounds like over time, it will become a much more integrated part of that little section of town, which is great.

Gary Nickelson: Yeah, absolutely.

Tim Clites: For sure.

Gary Nickelson: So, I'm big on the stone as well. I know when they got building. Any improvements that the individual did for myself. It took a lot of work and every dollar that they earn to make it how it is today. I know they earned it, and everything was put in for good reason. So, I'd like to keep as much as I can. I think with the gable. So. So I'm good with really just keeping that brick. But we'll have some patches underneath the sign. There's multiple holes where I guess there are lights in the past. So, I'm just listening to the other conversation you had about that brick work. We're going to have to do some repairs on that one. That stone water, the brick water table in front. We've had multiple individuals kind of hit them with their hit it with their cars so that I don't know how much we can save that one. That's why we're just kind of might have to get removed as an integrated with the flagstone as much as possible, but we'll see what we can as far as trying to save that one. But I think with the gable and the pitch roof over that. If I'm using incorrect terms, that might just be the one piece. So I know you know talked with Mr. Moore and where the historical piece of that area. So, the ones across the street should be pivoting off of us and not us off of them. But I think that would tie in all the buildings together if we just use the gable and then a nice little white panel that kind of matches the areas around us. So, I think we'll still go with that. I know a lot of membership likes that one. But otherwise, I'll keep the brick and then just add the flagpoles and then a nice landscape hardscape patio that will prevent me from having to go over there and pull weeds every week.

Tim Clites: I had one more comment again. Remember, this is just me. I'm one of a committee and the committee is encouraged to disagree. While you're in the design phase, it might be worth considering. Is there a solution? Just a quick study that doesn't include the gable, and I'm going to mention that for a

couple of reasons that just come to mind. Kind of off the in the middle of the discussion. The one is that it will by being 4 or 5 or six feet deep or two feet deep, it will clearly be an addition and a little bit a little bit movie set like in its three-dimensional appearance. Right. As you're coming into town, you do see this building or as you're leaving town, you it's not like we're driving into town and there's the building. And so if it's a movie set, you don't know that there's no building behind it or there's no and not knowing what that might cost, because essentially, it's also kind of a elevated sail up in the air that you're putting on top of an existing structure that has whatever it has for a structure. There may be a there may be another solution that is simpler that's still enhances the building in a way that you're satisfied with it. And so as much as I would say I don't completely dislike it, I also, since you're in this planning discussion stage and thank you for coming in this early and having the discussion with us. I feel like there might be another solution there that is a little quieter and helps preserve the kind of nature of the building, which is, you know I said differently, I don't think you need to match any of your neighbors to be successful. Right. I've talked enough. Anybody else? Punkin. Any other comments?

Punkin Lee: No. I think those are very good observations. When you think about the entry from the Plains Road, as you see. I mean, are you just going to see and there's nothing behind it? It's not like you're putting a second story on so that front presentation becomes kind of very different from either approach. It just is kind of there. I mean, I think I think it's good we've had more discussion because we all looked at the image and was like, wow, great facelift. And then you start, and it is. But the building itself was pretty cool as it is. It's got its own personality the way it is. And yeah, there are probably other ways to give it a facelift without looking like a bad facelift. Not that this is bad, but I mean, you know, we'll still be our American Legion building.

Gary Nickelson: And it is. It is the town's American Legion building, because I have all the old commanders that come in, such as Franklin Payne and anyone else who ran that place before my time is coming and told me it's their building and not to mess it up. So. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Yeah, I can imagine.

Punkin Lee: They might be onto something.

Tim Clites: Yeah, which is awesome. Linda.

Linda Wright: No other comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia?

Virginia Jenkins: No, I'm good.

Tim Clites: Thank you very much. I just got.

Gary Nickelson: One more piece of guidance as I remembered it, I did get asked if we could talk about potentially. So. So if we do rip out the grass where the black holes are and do the hardscape there. I was asked if we could present maybe a stone retaining wall to kind of protect us from the traffic because it may blend in, and then the road kind of gets mixed in with our flagpole area, and there is a safety concern for that. So, they want some kind of a fence or possibility of fence whether stone wall or hedges or I want to just get your thoughts on that one real quick.

Linda Wright: If you did a low stone wall, like a little curb little, just seat wall, like no more than 18in out there. Something to just separate the two. Like here.

Virginia Jenkins: Are you talking about separating on the street?

Linda Wright: From the grass to the street. Am I right?

Gary Nickelson: Yeah. So, I think.

Linda Wright: Along that curve.

Gary Nickelson: Where Will's along the curve, it might have to go another foot out just to keep that area where the flagpoles will be but.

Linda Wright: If you started it up really low at the top left, as you come down around, it's going to be two feet tall probably by the time you get around to where the other wall ends. So, if it just stays level, [multiple speakers] It would be very nice.

Virginia Jenkins: To me. Okay, having seen people gather around there, that's just an accident waiting to happen. [multiple speakers] People. No, they're walking, and they trip. They don't pay any attention. I mean, you know, so I was thinking maybe bushes along, you know [multiple speakers]

Linda Wright: Like a hedge. Little low hedge.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah. Low hedge.

Linda Wright: Something there.

Virginia Jenkins: I mean if.

Linda Wright: [multiple speakers] That's maintenance for you guys.

Virginia Jenkins: Right. One of those Boy Scouts, you're not going to have any more lawn. So, you know they can be trimming hedges. That would be my suggestion.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I think what I'm hearing is we understand the issue and the solution. Absolutely. I mean, some of that. This committee would give you comments on, but we wouldn't have really direct purview over. I think the hard scape is one of those where there's maybe some zoning impervious issues with adding impervious. I'm not, I don't mean to talk out of term here Mr. Moore. But you could talk to Will and he'll confirm what may or may not be something you want to be aware of, but you know, the road in the grass do kind of blend together, don't they? Yeah. Right now, they're not really defined. So Awesome. Well, thanks for coming in, I appreciate it. Yeah.

Gary Nickelson: All right.

Tim Clites: Okay, I lost. I talked too much. This thing went blank.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, yeah. I've been doing this.

Tim Clites: I believe we have.

Linda Wright: They all went away. Yeah. Just hit. Okay. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Oh, here we go. Got it. All right, I'm back in business. [off mic] Okay. Then we're going to jump back to our new business. COA 24-12 request of Paul Edmondson for an accessory structure at 109 The Plains Road, Mr. Moore.

Erick Moore: And thank you, Mr. Chairman. COA 24-12 109 the Plains Road is zoned C3 General Commercial. The applicant was in the middle of constructing this pergola/gazebo and a sample of the stain that he plans to. Oh, sorry about that. That is what it's going to be constructed of wood, and that's going to be the stain. It is. The house to the. Let's see here. I'm sorry. It's mostly shielded by the house and a heavy landscape from the north. And then the applicant's house is fairly shielded from the south. There's a small section of visibility between the two houses which is being proposed to be shielded by the installation of two or more evergreens, as detailed on the included drawing. And that's the report.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin. Do you have any comments?

Punkin Lee: Not yet.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I guess my first question is this meant to be a patio area? This gazebo wasn't meant to be an outdoor patio for the owners.

Will Moore: It is an enclosure for a hot tub.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, right on the Plains Road.

Will Moore: Right on the Plains Road. [laughter] It's a solid back on the Plains Road. So, it's this is a question of the view that I have on screen right now is essentially the view that is subject to your purview. It's what's seen from the public right of way. The applicant did include a couple of photos from interior to the property. These are those photos, but these are not subject to your scrutiny at this point, because they're not visible from public street. No, no. Understood. I just want to be sure. So. So this is as strange as that may sound. A hot tub along the Plains Road. This is what you get from the Plains Road is a solid back to the structure.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Mr. Moore.

Linda Wright: I would think then if its screen with some evergreens, if that's the only thing we're looking at. Right. As long as it's screened from the street. They'd be all right.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with Linda.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I mean, from the Plains Road, it kind of looks like the back of a garden shed or something. I mean, I go by it every day and I haven't it hadn't jumped out at me yet, so and it hadn't even been stained. And I think, as Linda said, if you put some evergreens on the Plains roadside, it's just going to all blend in with the rest of the bushes.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I would agree with the comments. My only additional comment would be to make have via these meeting notes, or the staff confirm with the applicant that lighting would be an issue because the hot tub is a great place for string lights, and we. This would be right. [laughter] Like we talked about that quite a few meetings, but that wouldn't not be a great place to suddenly have string lights that are on whether people are in the hot tub or not. Right. It could be somewhat disruptive to that view with or without landscape. But the structure itself, I don't have any additional comments, or I don't have any issue with. I think it's fine. It does sit about a half a story below. If I remember, it kind of sits below the elevation of the road, right? It's like, yeah. So, and it's back off the street. So. I would make a motion

that we approve the application as submitted with the stain color as submitted, including the landscape buffer proposed, and that we clarify that there is no outdoor lighting approved with this particular application.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Motion passes. Thank you. Next meeting July 2nd. [off mic]

Will Moore: It's a Tuesday.

Tim Clites: I'm sorry. Tuesday. It says it right here. I just didn't read it. I'm sorry. It's a Tuesday. Tuesday, July 2nd. If anybody has an issue, please.

Punkin Lee: I do. MBPA Board. Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: Take a vacation. [off mic]

Linda Wright: Oh, no, no. She's got a board meeting.

Punkin Lee: MBPA Board meets the first Tuesday. If it's a conflict, I can get that meeting to change. Will, just let me know.

Will Moore: It's okay. I'm pretty sure everyone else had already indicated that they were available for that meeting, so unless something changes with their schedules between now and then, we should be fine.

Tim Clites: Wipe that grin off your face. Thank you all. Anything else from the staff? All right, we're adjourned. Thank you.