TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 2, 2024
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Tuesday, July 2, 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
William Anderson
Virginia Jenkins
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: Punkin Lee, Vice Chair
Margaret Littleton

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the May 30, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

Old Business

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

Planning & Project Associate Moore reminded the Committee that the applicants were seeking a change in the approved roofing materials from a metal roof to an asphalt shingle one. He noted that Mrs. Sierra brought in a sample of the shingles, as well as a couple of color options for the Committee's consideration.

Chair Clites reminded the Committee that during their last meeting, they reached a consensus regarding the applicants' request for changes to the approved COA related to the areaway/stairs and repairs to the chimneys. He noted that this needed to be a part of the formal motion.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed that no action was taken on those items; although, the Committee reached a consensus on them. He advised that the only remaining item was the change in roofing materials. Mr. Moore noted that the metal roof would remain on the original portion of the house.

Susan Sierra, the applicant, displayed samples of the shingles and advised that their color preference was Heather Blend for the addition. She opined that this color would allow the stone house to shine.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they approved a dark bronze color for the metal roof on the addition. He noted that the shingle samples included the applicants' color preference of Heather Blend, as well as an alternative color of Driftwood.

Chair Clites noted that the Heather Blend included more of the browns that could be seen in the stone, whereas the Driftwood included more of the grays. He reminded the Committee that there were two questions before them – (1) is it okay for the addition to have an asphalt shingle roof; and (2) if so, which color should the shingles be. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he confirmed the Historic District Guidelines allowed for the use of shingles in this case.

Committee Member Jenkins noted that she was not a huge fan of shingles; however, she liked the idea of breaking up the roof.

Committee Member Wright opined that Heather Blend was a better color choice. She advised that she was fine with the use of shingles, as it would help break up the massive roof. Ms. Wright opined that everyone would love to see a metal roof; however, she acknowledged it would be cost prohibitive.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the existing metal roof would be replaced with a new metal roof in the dark bronze color. He explained that the proposal was for shingles on the addition only.

Committee Member Anderson suggested that because the addition was far removed from the style of the existing stone house, the metal roof would be an element that would make the addition more in keeping with the overall feel of the older house. He opined that the roof for the addition should be metal.

Chair Clites noted that he drove around the three main streets in the Historic District and advised that there were some buildings that contained shingle roofs; although, most were predominantly standing seam metal roofs. He acknowledged that there were also a few slate or synthetic slate roofs. Mr. Clites advised that he only found one building with a combination of a standing seam metal roof and asphalt shingles, which was the church building on Washington Street, which contained a fairly substantial addition. He acknowledged Committee Member Anderson's comments and noted that when there were additions to buildings, the other elements changed but the roof line tended to be consistent with the original building. Mr. Clites advised that this was not a directive but merely an observation. He noted that if he had to vote, he believed a metal roof would tie the addition, which was already distinctive, together with the stone house. Mr. Clites suggested it be more consistent, despite the fact that it would result in a big expanse. In response to a comment from the Committee, he opined that the structure would already be broken up, as the original house was clearly defined from the addition, which contained different materials. He suggested a different roofline was not needed.

Councilmember Pearson read excerpts from the Historic District Guidelines, which stated that the form and materials of a roof were important visual elements that could help create continuity and rhythm. She noted that this was an historic building. Ms. Pearson acknowledged that the guidelines allowed for different roofing materials on an addition; however, she also acknowledged the Chair's thoughts about maintaining consistency.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that she would prefer the roofing materials be the same; however, she was not opposed to shingles on the addition.

Committee Member Wright acknowledged that this was the oldest building in town. She agreed it should be a metal roof because of the historical significance of the original building. Ms. Wright suggested it would be more consistent if the roof materials were all the same.

Committee Member Anderson suggested the need for a metal roof in order to bring the styles together.

Mrs. Sierra advised the Committee that the house that was just added onto on the west side of town had a standing seam metal roof on the original home and asphalt shingles on the addition. She explained that she tried to copy the color of those shingles.

The Committee noted that the house referenced by Mrs. Sierra was not located in the Historic District.

Chair Clites opined that Mrs. Sierra's point was what it looked like and suggested this was a valid one.

Mrs. Sierra opined that it did not stand out and that the addition melded well with the original house.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that the question was not what the Committee preferred but was whether what was being requested was appropriate. He further reminded them that the original application was for a metal roof, which the Committee deemed to be appropriate for the entire structure. Mr. Moore questioned whether the Committee deemed shingles on the addition appropriate.

Committee Member Anderson opined that it was more appropriate to have a metal roof on the whole building, as it would make the addition more complementary of the existing house.

Chair Clites questioned whether the Committee had any questions related to the stairwell access or chimney repairs that were discussed during the last meeting. (None were raised.)

Mrs. Sierra advised that she and her husband were doing what they could to preserve their beautiful home. She reminded the Committee that their lot was very private and could only be seen from the Salamander property. Mrs. Sierra noted that they revised their plans to separate the addition from the stone house so it would shine. She opined that shingles on the addition would be fine.

Councilmember Pearson noted that this was a historic structure. She questioned whether the addition would be described as that – an addition to a historic structure.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that the guidelines stated that additions should not try to replicate or appear as though they were a part of the original structure. He further reminded them that the guidelines stated that additions should be clearly distinct and apart from the original structure. Mr. Moore opined that the addition would still be distinct if it had a metal roof and suggested the guideline language would apply if the applicants were trying to replicate the stone on the addition, as well as install a metal roof, in order to give a faux appearance that the addition was original to the structure. He explained that the Committee could look at the addition separately; however, it still needed to compliment the original structure. In response to a comment from the Committee, he confirmed the Town had a survey document on every building in the National Register District, as well as a couple of outlier buildings that were located in the local Historic District but not the National Register District. Mr. Moore advised that this particular building had been surveyed and was listed as a contributing structure in the district.

Chair Clites opined that it was more appropriate to have a metal roof; however, he did not feel it was inappropriate to have a shingled one. He noted the location of the structure and advised that if it was on the main street, he would feel strongly that the roof material needed to be consistent.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-13, a request of Rick and Susan Sierra for revisions to previously approved COA 24-04, with the revisions to include: the areaway and stairs and railing that the Committee reviewed last month; the repair of the chimneys that the Committee reviewed last month; and the asphalt shingles in Heather Brown.

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

New Business

COA-RS 24-02: Garage – 603 Martingale Ridge Drive – Castlerock Enterprises

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that the home was previously granted a certificate of appropriateness and had been constructed. He further reminded them that at the time of their last review, a garage was not included in the plans; although, it was shown as a possible future location on the plat. Mr. Moore reported that the applicant was now requesting approval of a one-car garage that would be consistent with the other garages in The Vineyard section of the development. He advised that it would include a mixture of cladding and stone on the forward portion and stucco on the rear, in the same color as the rear portion of the house.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, noted that the Committee reviewed this garage plan in the past. She advised that it included a pool bath option in the rear.

The members of the Committee advised that they had no comments to offer.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 24-02, a request of Castlerock Enterprises for a garage at 603 Martingale Ridge Drive, Middleburg Residences Lot 17.

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

COA-RS 24-03: New Single-Family Dwelling – 801 Old Saddle Drive – Castlerock Enterprises

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that this was the second home to be constructed in The Stables section of the development. He noted that it would be located on a larger lot, west of Chestnut Street, directly across the street from the existing home. Mr. Moore reported that they were proposing to use the Hunt Box design, which the Committee reviewed for a previous application; however, it would include a two-car garage, which was allowed on the larger lots. He advised that the one distinguishing factor in this application than in the one that was previously reviewed was that the proposal was for lap siding for both the primary structure and the garage, in a Bruton White color.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, advised that this residence would closely depict the one that was recently constructed, which had a side walk out. She reported that the two houses would face each other and give a complementary view shed to the other. Ms. Yahn advised that the differentiation was that this house

would have a complete stone water table, whereas the other one had a stucco water table in the rear sections. She noted that this house would be slightly wider and deeper and advised that there was a slight difference in terms of window fenestration. Ms. Yahn noted the additional window, which would be slightly bigger. She advised that the garage would have the same siding as the house, which would be in the same color, and would be a radius style. Ms. Yahn noted that the garage would contain a living wall, with lattice, to create more privacy for the pool area. She opined that this would serve as a quasi-cabana for the pool or an entertaining space in the rear. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the garage door would be on the right going toward the house and the living wall would be on the parking side of the pool side. Ms. Yahn clarified that the door would go toward the house and the window would face the Town's water treatment plant, with the living wall being on the back side so it would not look onto the parking. She confirmed the living wall would not be in the same plane as the garage doors, but rather would step in. Ms. Yahn explained that the pool was a bit further down and would be center lined on the space so it could serve as a covered space. She advised that it would be a dual function space between the garages. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the windows would not have mullions in the middle. Ms. Yahn advised that they were finding the doors were better if they were six-eight doors, as opposed to eight-zero doors. She further advised that they were using a transom above the doors and windows.

The Committee agreed they liked the plans. They held some discussion regarding the window. The Committee opined that the scale of the garage complimented the house.

Ms. Yahn advised that there would be no doors on the area that would be used as a cabana.

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

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

Discussion Items

Pre-Application Discussion – Exterior Alternations – 204 E. Washington Street

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the narrative commented on the bed and breakfast use being a by-right one; however, he had not spoken with the owners about their plans. He noted the need to clarify a couple of things regarding the manner of operation. Mr. Moore advised that this had nothing to do with the Committee's review. He noted that even if the Committee approved the exterior changes, this would not constitute an approval of the use, as that was a separate process.

Planning & Project Associate Moore reported that the application was for some exterior work to the property, which included the re-opening of a door on the left side of the building that was previously blocked off and, the installation of some dormers and outdoor light fixtures. He noted that the applicant provided a few drawings; however, they had not provided the details for the changes. Mr. Moore suggested it would be good to do a pre-application review of the proposed changes.

Clare Dickey, 128 North Jay Street, appeared before the Committee representing the application. She advised that the majority of the renovations would be internal, with a few minor external ones. Ms. Dickey advised that they would like to restore the former door on the front and, in doing so, would respect the existing architecture. She explained that the intent was to keep the building looking as much the way it did as possible in order to pay homage to its history.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee would not take official action on the application during this meeting and advised that it would be good to give the applicant some feedback for when she returned. He inquired as to the thought regarding the old plank door.

Ms. Dickey advised that the existing wooden door was not original to the house and was not in a good state of repair. She noted that the floor plan called for future development of that wing as an owner's suite/apartment for the full-time, live-in caretaker for the property. Ms. Dickey advised that they wanted to replace the door with a window to bring light into the space. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the window did not need to serve as an egress. Ms. Dickey advised that while she wanted there to be a substantial amount of glass, she did not think it was appropriate to fill the entire opening with a window; therefore, she was entertaining the idea of installing a door with glass in it. She noted that she entertained the idea of making it a functional door; however, it was not tall enough to support use as a means of ingress/egress.

Chair Clites noted that the door was not visible from the public way; however, it provided an interesting opportunity. He opined that long ago, there were steps down because the floor was lower than the door's threshold.

Ms. Dickey confirmed the floor was recessed in that area. She advised that when entering the building, the floor was raised; however, you had to step down three steps to go into the former spring house space. Ms. Dickey advised that you had to then go up two steps in the back to get into the back wing of the building. She explained that they wanted to put the owner's private kitchen in this space and were looking to raise the floor. Ms. Dickey advised that this was the reason they were looking to put a window in that space. She reiterated that they were looking for a door that was less than six feet tall, with glass, which was architecturally appropriate.

Committee Member Anderson opined that it would be wonderful to see the building completely renovated, as it was a beautiful property. He questioned when the Committee could expect to see the application with the floor plans.

Ms. Dickey advised that she had hoped to have a decision during this meeting and noted that the new owners, Paul and Jennifer Moore, were anxious to start the renovations and get the bed and breakfast opened as quickly as possible. She advised that she would return next month with the complete application.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised Ms. Dickey that floor plans were not a necessity for the HDRC; however, they may help inform some decisions related to the exterior of the building. He explained that what made the application ineligible for a decision by the HDRC at this time was the lack of specifications, including cut sheets for the doors, windows, and light fixtures, and the lack of information related to dimensions, materials, and colors. Mr. Moore noted that he provided Ms. Dickey with information regarding the Town's lighting standards. He advised the Committee that some of the things included in the application were normal maintenance items and did not require their action.

Ms. Dickey explained that her intention was to match the existing architecture. She advised that she did not have any intention of repainting or refinishing anything on the exterior. Ms. Dickey further advised that as to the new doors, they would simply match the existing ones in order to be consistent. She noted that the doors and windows would all be white and would be in keeping with the existing architecture. In response to comments from the Committee, Ms. Dickey advised that they were also excited about the restoration of the garden. In response to a comment from the Committee regarding the proposed light fixtures, she advised that she pulled some cut sheets. Ms. Dickey noted the challenge in finding a historic looking light fixture that had a concealed lumen. She advised that as to the proposed light fixture above the sliding French doors, there was already an existing junction box at that location. Ms. Dickey noted that she selected a gooseneck barn light fixture that would shine down for that location. She advised that

they did not intend to replace the light fixtures on the Washington Street elevation. Ms. Dickey noted that the new fixtures would be located in the rear of the building for guests who were entering through the rear elevation, which was intended to be the guest entrance for arrivals. She advised that she would also like to replace the small lamps that were next to some of the supporting doorways; however, she had not found anything appropriate, so she may just leave those.

Chair Clites acknowledged that historic fixtures that met the dark sky initiative could be difficult to find. He described an instance in which one applicant found a fixture he loved and retrofitted it, so it was dark sky compliant. Mr. Clites summarized the Committee's comments for Ms. Dickey. He advised that they included the need to provide cut sheets for the light fixtures, as well as cut sheets or drawings for anything she was replacing, such as doors. Mr. Clites explained that the Committee reviewed them, as it was their responsibility to confirm the details. He advised that the Committee liked to keep the muntin size to what existed. He noted that simulated divided lights were fine; however, the Committee preferred that they contain an internal spacer bar so the window would have an authentic look. Mr. Clites noted the drawings for the west elevation and advised that it would be helpful to have more information related to the shed dormer. He questioned whether the applicant intended to keep the muntins in those windows and noted that the application did not contain details related to the casings.

Ms. Dickey acknowledged that she did not appreciate the level of detail that was required by the HDRC. She explained that she thought she would get conditional approval and then return with final details later. Ms. Dickey advised that she was looking at Marvin windows, specifically an awning window with some kind of muntin that would be sympathetic to the rest of the house.

Chair Clites explained that the Committee needed to see the pattern that was being proposed. He further explained that it would look at the muntin patterns, open glass, and other things. Mr. Clites noted the need for a cut sheet for the door that was being replaced. He advised that the more details Ms. Dickey could provide, the easier it would be for the Committee to approve her application. Mr. Clites noted that the window that was in the stone appeared to be a double hung one; however, he believed that Ms. Dickey was more intentional. He advised that he would like to see what was being proposed. Mr. Clites noted that the Committee would look at the details and offer comments.

Ms. Dickey noted that since receiving an email from Deputy Town Manager Moore, she had pulled together the information that was needed; however, she set it aside. She acknowledged that she needed to package and submit it. Ms. Dickey advised that this submission was a learning curve for her.

Chair Clites explained that this was a typical pre-application discussion, which a lot of people did.

Ms. Dickey advised that she would submit the information. She questioned whether the property owners should meet with Deputy Town Manager Moore before the next HDRC meeting to discuss the bed and breakfast use.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested that the sooner they met with him the better, as that conversation may drastically inform decisions that were made.

Ms. Dickey advised that she would let them know this. She noted that they were anxious to begin the renovations and open the bed and breakfast.

<u>Pre-Application Discussion – New Building on Vacant Lot – 6 & 12 S. Pendleton Street</u>

Planning & Project Associate Moore advised the Committee that this was an application for a new two-story building. He further advised that it would contain commercial space on the first floor and a one-bedroom apartment on the second floor. Mr. Moore noted that it would be located on what was currently a vacant lot that was an overflow area for the adjacent business. He advised that like the previous

application, things were missing such as details and colors. Mr. Moore noted that this would be highly visible infill development that was close to the main street, as well as to contributing structures.

Clare Dickey appeared before the Committee representing the application. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she advised that the intention was to build close to the lot line in order to fit the building and drive aisle on the property. Ms. Dickey noted that the zoning ordinance did not require a side yard in this case. She further noted that they were space constrained. Ms. Dickie advised that the adjacent building was set back off the property line a bit; therefore, there would be a little bit of space between the two. She noted that it was not intended to be pedestrian space.

Councilmember Pearson encouraged Ms. Dickey to make sure there would be enough room to get to the back of the property. She advised that she liked that they were proposing an apartment above the commercial space and noted that it was needed in Middleburg.

Chair Clites referenced the Chinn's Crossing Project, which was located across the street from the Post Office. He advised that what helped the new buildings blend so quickly was that the architect planned how they came up against the existing building and noted that he provided enough information that the Committee could understand the scale of things. Mr. Clites suggested a photo montage or something similar would help the Committee understand what was being proposed here and opined that it would be charming. He advised Ms. Dickey that the Committee wanted to work through the design development of the details and noted the need to bring the details to them. Mr. Clites explained that when he appeared before the Committee representing an applicant, he provided details that fell between a schematic and a detailed set of drawings. He noted that some were freehand sketches, but they provided enough detail for the Committee to understand what was being proposed and to ask questions. Mr. Clites opined that in this case, most of the focus would be on the front elevation, as well as the side elevation that would face the corner, as it would be a fairly prominent elevation. He noted that depending on the sequence of events, Ms. Dickey may be able to get some things approved, but could return for approval of the softer details, such as the final colors or brick palette.

Ms. Dickey confirmed she would have the details and advised that there was a strong vision for the building. She noted that she was in the process of procuring the samples.

Chair Clites advised Ms. Dickey that the Committee would want to see the brick and stucco samples. He reiterated that if she was short on an item or two, the Committee could conceptually approve the architecture, with the applicant returning for some of the final details, so the project could keep moving. Mr. Clites suggested Ms. Dickey reach out to the staff if she had any questions before the next meeting.

<u>2024 Joint Architectural Review Board (JARB) Nominations</u>

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the Town was behind schedule and advised that the Committee needed to decide which projects it would like to nominate at this meeting. He reminded the members that they could pass on a project this year and nominate it for an award next year. Mr. Moore advised that once the nominations were identified, Planning & Project Associate Moore would work with Chair Clites, who was the HDRC's representative on the Joint Architectural Review Board. He noted that one or two members could serve on JARB.

The Committee suggested that Vice Chair Lee also serve on JARB.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that this would be helpful in case Mr. Clites was an applicant for one of the nominations. He noted, however, that it was the JARB who would ultimately decide who received an award. Mr. Moore advised that the Committee had an extensive list of projects for their consideration.

Chair Clites reminded the Committee that these same projects could be considered for the HDRC's awards. He further reminded the members that they set a three-year window when considering projects for an award.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed to nominate the below projects for a JARB Project Award. It was noted that any projects that were approved by the HDRC this year would be eligible for consideration of an award next year.

-COA 22-25: Hersch Project – 408 E. Washington Street
-COA 21-20: Middleburg Town Hall Project – 10 W. Marshall Street

The Committee also agreed to nominate the following businesses for a JARB Sign Award:

-Middleburg Books
-Federal & Black

August Meeting Quorum

Chair Clites asked the members to let the Town Clerk know if they were unable to attend the August 1st meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – July 2, 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: Are you ready, Will? All right. We'll call this meeting to order. It's the July 2, 2024 Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's meeting for the month of July. The first order of business is roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee is absent. Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

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

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Got kind of a full agenda, so we'll try to move along. Remember to turn your mic and the mics really working well today. Remember to turn your mic on when you speak off when you aren't. And we'll try not to interrupt each other. Pause for any public comments. I know some of you look familiar to what's on our agenda tonight. Now, right. We'll get to you in the order that you're on the agenda. The next item is the approval of our minutes from the May 30th, 2024 regular meeting. Any comments on the minutes? Move that we approve as submitted.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain.

Bill Anderson: Abstain.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Motion passes. Next item is action item. Old business COA 24-13. Request of Rick and Susan Sierra for revisions to the approved COA 24-04 for an addition at 100 North Madison Street and Mr. Moore.

Erick Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So last month I guess it was April 4th or. No. I'm sorry. Yeah. The last. Yeah. April 4th. May 3rd. I'm sorry. Off to a great start. The applicant wanted to consider changing the roofing material that was originally approved, which was all going to be the same style as

metal roofing as the original structure. Today they wished. Or to show you samples that they brought in tonight and have the asphalt style shingles. A couple different colors here, and that would be what they're asking for tonight.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And Susan, you're certainly welcome to come up and share. Just a reminder, I guess everyone has the notes. We did review also in the last meeting, the Areaway stairs and the chimneys and I believe came to some consensus, but I think that'll still be part of our formal motion tonight, is that right?

Will Moore: Correct. No action was taken on those, but the committee reached consensus. And really, the only remaining item to discuss was the proposal to change the roofing material on the additions from originally proposed metal to shingles. The metal on the original portion of the house would remain as metal.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. Okay. And it looks like the applicant is here, so I'll pause for a moment.

Sue Sierra: Susan Sierra, 100 North Madison Street.

Tim Clites: Welcome.

Sue Sierra: Thank you. So, we have some samples, and our favorite was the Heather [inaudible]. It's just a really pretty coppery kind of color that would allow the stone house to shine with its metal roof. And then we would have this on the additions for [off mic]. This is not the color, but this is the type of shingle that we're proposing. And I don't know if there's [off mic]. This is the other option.

Will Moore: So, Mr. Anderson is passing down the sample of the metal that was already approved, the dark bronze bottom left corner of the asphalt shingle sample is the what I think Mrs. Sierra just said was the preferred color. Right. And then a second option, driftwood, is on the second panel that Mr. Anderson is holding right now. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Bill can explain it to each of you, but let's not discuss it between us. Because I know that as people look and listen.

Virginia Jenkins: I was just questioning the color tones. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Thank you for the show and tell Bill. Why don't we set it out where it's facing us? If that's easy. [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: Do you want me to repeat that? I said, perhaps from a distance it would be better. [off mic] Would you mind putting the metal between the two? Thanks.

Sue Sierra: So, what we did was we left it out on the back patio for 24 hours, and we kept looking outside the window to see how it looked in the different times of day.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: With the light shining on it the way it is, the metal looks more silver than the black tone to me.

Tim Clites: Depending on the angle of the roof [off mic].

Virginia Jenkins: But from here, that's just. I'm just commenting on color.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, Cindy, we want to start with you. Maybe.

Cindy Pearson: Can I ask which one that you all prefer? Oh, sorry. I didn't turn my mic on. Which one you preferred?

Tim Clites: The heather, which is on the right.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, that's one of the options also. That one.

Sue Sierra: Yes, it is. It's a Heather blend on the right and Driftwood on the left.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, I'm sorry, we thought it was the bottom left on that one.

Bill Anderson: Where the white tab is?

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Where the white tab on both of them?

Sue Sierra: [off mic]

Cindy Pearson: Oh, it is okay. See, from here you're getting it's different shades.

Sue Sierra: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: No other questions right now.

Tim Clites: [multiple speakers] So the Heather blend has more of the browns in it than you'd see in the stone. And the other one is more grays, and I don't know about that complementary color. It's a little tough to see from here. Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, at first glance, I was for more of the blackish tones, if you will, as opposed to the brownies. Brownies. The brown tones. But, you know, as you said, with different times of day, it's. And we've only got one type of lighting here. Either or.

Tim Clites: Remember this? I believe at the moment this is still a two-part question. One is, is it okay to be shingles? And the other is if yes, then color. Just to be clear about it. I'm sorry. At the moment the question is kind of a two-part question. The first question is if the addition is shingles, that's still an open question. And the second part of that question is which color would be appropriate if shingles and the.

Virginia Jenkins: Finish. If you want me to comment on the shingles? The idea of breaking up the roof, I think, is great. I'm not a huge fan of shingles, but that's just personal preference. And that's not what's it? But shingles are appropriate, right? According to the.

Tim Clites: According to our guidelines, you're allowed to use shingles. Yes.

Linda Wright: Okay. Well. And remind me to the siding color is an off-white kind of a creamy white? Then I think the heather blend is the better choice with all things considered together. And I'm fine with the shingles. It is a massive amount of roof that may be breaking it up helps with some of that. I think in the long run everyone would love to have seen metal all the way around, but I know that's very cost prohibitive, so I'm fine with that and the heather would be my choice.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I'm sorry I wasn't here for the meeting on the 30th of May, but I read the meeting minutes. So, the metal roof color that. Let me ask a couple of questions first. The metal roof color is only

for the addition. So, if this color was put on the addition, it would be a different color. And that's on the existing house metal roof?

Will Moore: No. So I believe and please correct me if I'm wrong, but all of the metal roofing that exists now will be replaced and that will be replaced with the dark bronze. The proposal is just to use shingles on the addition.

Bill Anderson: Got it. Well, my thinking is that when you look at the samples, it's not really a true comparison, because the standing seam on the metal roof really plays to a different field of the roof than just a flat piece of metal laying on the ground. Also, since the addition, in my opinion, is far away from the style of the existing stone house, I would think a metal roof would be an element that would make the addition more in keeping with the overall feel of the older house. So, to answer the question of should it be shingles on a metal roof? I think it should be a metal roof. Did I?

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. Bill. And I would just add my only comment, and this is not directive, but I did drive through the three main streets in our Historic District. So Main Street and the street to the north and the street to the south. And we have buildings with all shingle roofs, a few, not many, but a few. Predominantly, there's maybe you all know this, but mostly standing seam. There are a few slate roofs, and there are some synthetic slate roofs. And the only roof. And then there's some townhouses that have shingles on the predominant roof line and little bay windows, or the little entry porch would have metal. Right. And again, that was done at the different time period. There's nothing wrong with it. I'm just I'm just observing, telling you what I observed. And then the only roof that I could find on a building that had a combination of standing seam and another, which happened to be asphalt shingle, is the church across from the Safeway that is a brick building, and clearly, I don't know when it maybe was 70s. I'm not. I don't quite have the date on that. It's fairly substantial addition, but it was maybe a little before. Yeah, somewhere in that area. Anyway, it has asphalt shingles. So just as a way of thinking about what we have in the town predominantly when there's been additions done to buildings, the other, like Bill just mentioned, the other elements change, but the roof line tends to stay pretty consistent. That's not a directive for this particular application. It's just an observation that I made since the last meeting that I had not made before the last meeting. And I guess on balance, if I were voting and, I don't know, maybe I guess I don't unless I need to, but I would think that it would make the addition, which is distinct already from the stone house. It would tie it together to have at least the roof as a common element. So that's the way we originally approved it. I think that still if I had to vote solely by myself, that's what I would suggest is more consistent.

Virginia Jenkins: Even though the expanse is so big?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: And something another medium wouldn't break it up? Wouldn't help break up the.

Tim Clites: Well, I think the to my eye, it's already broken up by, I mean it's not a stone addition, right. It's the original house is clearly defined, the addition well, the addition, it's theirs, I guess, being modified and extended. And so, I think it's clear enough with the different materials. I don't think it needs a different roofline roof material myself, but I don't. Yeah. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: This one sentence on the part that comes out of our guidelines is the form and materials of a roof are important visual element and can help create continuity and rhythm and for the Historic District you know, goes on to say more, but right there, you know, with that being that old of a building and the historic, you know, value of that is hard to find around here. That's really. So, in keeping it with the metal roof would be more I mean, it does say that you can have standing seam metal, asbestos shingles, asphalt or occasionally slate, but like you're saying, to keep it consistent. Yeah.

Tim Clites: I'll go down through for any other comments. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I really don't have anything more to add. You know, I personally would prefer the one roof, one roof type, but I'm not opposed to having added shingles.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Well, and I guess I should have thought a little harder about it. It is the oldest building in town. Right. So. Yeah. So that might sway me a bit more the direction of doing a metal roof just because it is one of the historic gems in town, it might be more consistent to have it all the same.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill, anything else to add?

Bill Anderson: Only to again in a different way say that with the metal roof on the addition it'll add, even though it's, in a way, a big scale of roof on existing houses. Two stories, 90 degrees when you, as you come in the driveway to versus straight on for the addition. The scale will, I think, help it bring it down and it'll bring the styles, you know, together, I think. So, metal roof for me.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Tim is there a or Will, is there a picture or a drawing of this is it? Yeah. [off mic]

Tim Clites: So please.

Sue Sierra: So, all due respect, I did a lot of driving around the last week or two. And the house that was just added on to the west side of town, it's on the right side if you're going towards Marshall. They have a standing seam roof on the original home. And then the addition is asphalt shingles. And I was trying to copy the color of those shingles. So, I must have driven by about 20 times trying to copy those.

Tim Clites: Oh, the white, the two-story white house that sits back a little bit.

Sue Sierra: Yes.

Tim Clites: In the street.

Sue Sierra: Yeah, yeah.

Tim Clites: And that's right at the entrance. You all know that house, it's right at the kind of that not the entrance, but at the beginning of Ridgeview, as you head towards the fire station on route 50, just across the hill. [off mic] Walnut?

Cindy Pearson: They're not in our HDRC.

Tim Clites: They're not correct.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: But to the point of understanding what that looks like, which I think is a valid. [off mic]. Turn your mic on.

Virginia Jenkins: Whoops. I have to say, it looks so much better than it did. So again, if you're having, you're saying something about the combination of.

Sue Sierra: I do think that it doesn't stand out. I think it melds really well with the other house. And you know, what's the originally old house and then you can appreciate the new house. But that was just a I've just been driven by trying to, you know, capture the color of the asphalt shingles. So, thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: Park in front of everybody else.

Sue Sierra: Okay.

Will Moore: Mr. Chairman, if I can just add and I'm making no judgment on what your decision should be, but just a reminder that the threshold question is not what the committee prefers, it's whether what the ask is deemed as appropriate. It's a certificate of appropriateness, not a certificate of what Will prefers. So now the original application was for metal, and you deemed that appropriate for the entire thing. The question is whether you deem shingles on the additions appropriate for your guidelines, not necessarily your preferred option, but appropriate. So, and again, I'm not going to interpret those documents that you make that interpretation yourself, but that's the way it should be framed as opposed to your preference.

Tim Clites: Understood. Thank you.

Bill Anderson: Can I. Now let me amend mine. And I think Will's right. I think it's more appropriate that it would be a metal roof keeping the whole building as more if the addition, more complementary to the existing house.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. I'm going to pause just for a half a second. Rhonda, is there a number for me to get in this screen? Got it. Thank you.

Rhonda North: Ten. Ten. Ten.

Tim Clites: Now the whole world knows it's no secret. Thank you. Okay. The next step is for someone to make a motion, and it should. Let me get to the right page here. It should include let me just pause. I think Bill was the only person not here. [off mic] You were not here last either. Okay, so let's just pause for a second and make sure there are no questions on the discussion we had last time related to the two chimney tops. And what's the other thing? And that the access way to the basement, which is a code requirement that switched, I recall, from a window well to a stair with just a simple iron rail. We those of us that were here had no comments but let me just make sure that the two that are here now. Okay. And so, as part of the motion, it would be to include approval of those two elements.

Sue Sierra: So, I just want to say that we're doing everything we can to preserve the beautiful home. We're not doing anything to that. And I also wanted to add that the lot is very, very private. Only if you walk onto the Salamander and take a peek can you see the addition. So, and I think with the revision of the plans that we did a couple of meetings ago, you know, we separated the addition from the stone house so that it would shine. And we didn't have like shadows and overlap on it. So, I just wanted to add that. I do think that the shingles would be fine. And I just wanted to remind everyone how private the property is. It's not like it's on the main street. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Can I ask a question?

Tim Clites: Sure.

Cindy Pearson: So, Will, with this being a historic structure. So, the old part is. So, when the new part is described, that's just described as an addition to within our historic. I don't want to use the word guidelines, whatever that's called. Does that make sense what I'm asking kind of? No. So. [laughter]

Will Moore: I think so.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Will Moore: And to back up a little bit and again, I'm not making any judgment. There is a premise, and it's echoed in our guidelines regarding additions that additions should not try to replicate or appear as though they were part of the original structure. They should be clearly distinct and apart. But that's not to say that this wouldn't be distinct in a part that had all metal roof, but you should you should never like if they were trying to replicate the stone on the addition as well as the roof to try to give a faux appearance as though it were original, that would be inappropriate. So, you can kind of look at the additions separately, but it still must somehow complement the original structure.

Cindy Pearson: But somewhere all of our historic buildings are listed as historic buildings.

Will Moore: Yes. We have a survey document that that surveys every building that's in the National Register district. There are a couple outliers like the American Legion that was discussed at the last meeting. It's in our local district, but not in the National Register district. So, we don't have a survey sheet on this. But this particular property is surveyed, and it is listed as a contributing structure in the district.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Tim Clites: I think that the question of shingle or metal, I think it's more appropriate to have metal. I don't think that it's inappropriate to have shingle, and I would respect the location of this particular structure in the town. If it were on Main Street, I would feel much more strongly that there's a real consistency to Main Street, although the one building that I mentioned with two different materials was on Main Street I also had to go hunt for it. So, these are the kinds of things that when we're really focused closely under a magnifying glass, we look at and I think I could say that it's not inappropriate to have the shingle. And so, with that, I would make a motion to approve COA 24-13 request of Rick and Susan for revisions to their previously approved COA 24-04, and those revisions include the areaway and stairs and railing that we reviewed last month. It includes the repair of the chimneys that we reviewed last month, and it includes the asphalt shingle in the heather brown.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: Any further discussion? All those in favor?

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Linda Wright: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed?

Bill Anderson: Opposed.

Tim Clites: Any abstain.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I second it. Do I have to vote again? I approve.

Tim Clites: Yeah, you voted, I got it. Okay. Thank you. Three I's, one abstain. The motion passes. Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for your input.

Will Moore: Correction. It was one opposed.

Tim Clites: One opposed.

Will Moore: Three in favor, one opposing.

Tim Clites: What did I say? I said it the wrong way.

Will Moore: You said, one abstained.

Tim Clites: One abstain. One opposed or opposed. Yes. What Mr. Moore said. Thank you. Thank you all. Thank you, Susan. All right. Now, I really messed this thing up because now I don't have my calendar. I found it. All right, next order of business is an action item. New business COA-RS 24-02 Request of Castlerock enterprises for a garage at 603 Martingale Ridge Drive. That's Middleburg residences lot 17, Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, lot 17. The home was previously reviewed, approved, permitted, constructed. Occupancy has been issued. You see it on screen. At the time of application, a garage was not included. A possible future location was shown on the plat, but they did not include the garage at the time. They were returning now with the proposal to construct a one car garage consistent with the other garages within the vineyard section. The home as you see, it's a mixture of cladding with stone on the forward portion of the home and then stucco on the rear portion. They're proposing the cladding on the rear garage to be in stucco as the same color as the rear portion. And that's all I have on this.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Applicant. Hello.

Gretchen Yahn: Hi, Gretchen Yahn Castlerock Enterprises. The plan is one that you've seen before. This one is completely done in stucco. It does have the pool bath option, which is to the rear. And we had in the original zoning package place card hold a place card hold for the garage location, which made it real easy. The people behind it have decided they want a garage, so hence we are here.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Thank you. Cindy, when you're ready. Any comments?

Cindy Pearson: I'm ready. No comment.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comment.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: No. We've seen this before. No comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: No comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I would be embarrassed if I had a comment right now after my comments.

Gretchen Yahn: That's okay.

Tim Clites: No. Thank you. We have seen this before and. Yeah, the house looks familiar. The site plan looks familiar. Thank you for going to the extra effort to come in and provide this for us. Any other comments? Seeing as we had none previous. Someone like to give me a motion.

Cindy Pearson: I'll make a motion to approve COA-RS 24-02 request of Castle Rock Enterprises, a garage at 603 Martingale Ridge Drive, Middleburg Residences, lot 17.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. [multiple speakers] Thank you.

Tim Clites: Next item COA-RS 24-03 request of Castlerock Enterprises for a new single-family dwelling at 801 Old Saddle Drive, which is Middleburg Residences, lot 29. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Trying to bring up a couple exhibits right now. So, this is just the second home that will be constructed in the stables section of the development. This is the larger lot section toward the west. West of Chestnut Street. So, this, as you see on the map, would be constructed essentially directly across the street from the one existing home. In this case, you have seen the home design before. So, they're using the hunt box design for this lot, which is the same design that you just saw on the previous application that's having the garage addition. I don't want to gloss over the design of the home, but I do want to point out that new to you this time is a two-car garage. So, the adopted guidelines for the residences limit garages to one car garages in the vineyard section but allow for two car garages on the larger lot. So, you are having your first look at the actual drawings, elevation drawings for the two-car garage. There is a front elevation of this very similar in design that's included in the design guidelines so that one elevation is reflected in the design guidelines. But that is the I would say the one distinguishing factor of this application, different than ones you've seen before. In this case, they're using the lap siding for both the primary structure for the cladding as well as the garage. And it is a differing color. This is using the Bruton White. And again, the home across the street, the one that has been constructed so far is the one that has a mixture of cladding, and it's in the Revere Pewter. So, it is a color variation from the closest neighbor.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Thank you. Gretchen.

Gretchen Yahn: So, this residence is, if I had to depict it very closely to lot number 14, which has a sidewalk out to it. So lot 14 we just completed, that's the one that has the kind of simulated cedar shake cladding to it with the stucco foundation. So, what we decided is to give a complimentary scenario. We would do that walk out on 14 that side. This will have a facing. So, they're kind of facing each other to give a kind of complementary view shed to one another.

Will Moore: And sorry Gretchen, just for your orientation, lot 14 is on the north side of Martingale Ridge Drive, and there's one farthest to the west, so closest to Chestnut Street.

Gretchen Yahn: The one we just completed. So just to give a visualization okay, so we have this complementary kind of scenario. What I would say is a differentiation is this will have a complete stone water table whereby that one had a stucco water table on the back sections. So, so this will be stone all the way around as depicted. This house is slightly wider and deeper. We increased the square footage slightly. So, in terms of just window fenestration there's a little bit of a slight difference. Like we had to add a window. So, it's just slightly bigger than because we wanted a bigger model on the bigger size lot. So, I just wanted to pick those two things. The two-car garage will have the same siding. It would be in the same color. It would have a radius style garage scenario to it versus what we had in the vineyards as a squared off type of garage door. So just trying to give a little bit of differentiation between the two kind of scenarios. We will have and it’s not shown elevation only. Excuse me, but there is if you will notice on Sheet A1, which is the second sheet of the garage, I just want to point out two things to it. We will in the plan have a living wall scenario. So, there will be lattice, so it won't be a complete breezeway through. So, if you see that scenario kind of circled on that second sheet, that will be that lattice depiction to have it so that it's got living wall scenario through there. So, it will have like evergreen euonymus, probably some climbing hydrangea that will be between it to give a little bit more privacy to what would be the

pool area as you see it. We just didn't want to have it just like a breezeway through. So, you will see. And if you that'll make a little bit more sense when you're looking at it in terms of, excuse me, the site plan, because it's going to serve as kind of a quasi-cabana to what would be a pool or entertaining space in the back. So hence it makes it a little bit more private. It's not like you're just staring out onto your parking area.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I want to make sure. Can I ask one just question around what you just mentioned?

Gretchen Yahn: Yes.

Tim Clites: It looked like it was also saying the window and the door at the sides were flipping. But the site plan, if I understand it right, the door would be to the as you pull up to the garage, the door would be to the right to go towards the house, [inaudible] to the left to go towards the house.

Gretchen Yahn: Correct.

Tim Clites: So, the living wall would be on the pool side of that opening?

Gretchen Yahn: No, it will be to the parking side of that side.

Tim Clites: Parking side. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: That's correct. What had happened is, is when we were putting it together, it was very difficult to kind of move.

Tim Clites: I just want yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: And that's why we put this second sheet in because we wanted to depict it in the plane of what you would see on the site plan. So, to be clear, the door will be going towards the house, hence with the sidewalk. The window will be facing towards the water treatment and then the living wall scenario will be to the back side so that you're not looking out onto parking. When you're at, you know, kind of using the cabana space for the pool.

Tim Clites: So, the living wall and the garage doors are in almost the same plane.

Gretchen Yahn: The living wall is will step. Well, the living wall itself will be a little bit set back in, but then the planter area will be there so that we'll have the euonymus. So, we just didn't want to have it. Just didn't. We needed something to close it up. [multiple speakers] And I was like, I don't want to just stick siding here. It just wasn't going to look right.

Tim Clites: Yep. Does everyone understand that?

Virginia Jenkins: Is it a covered breezeway?

Gretchen Yahn: It is. So, the pool will actually be a little bit further down and be center lined on the garage there, that the engineer isn't the most creative, but so that the pool would be center lined ultimately on this space so that that would serve as kind of like a covered space. It's a dual function space between the garages, because we found that that's what most people are wanting, is kind of a dual space for use to get out of the sun, so to speak. So that was the only thing I wanted to clarify on that.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Perfect. Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: On the drawing of the house on the left elevation on the windows that are here in the middle, they don't have the mullions, is that what it's called? Will they?

Gretchen Yahn: No. So, what we had done is if you, it kind of makes a little bit more sense on the right elevation in terms of if you can go to the next one Will. So, what we're finding also is that the doors are living better, especially when they don't have a big covering over them by making them six eight doors instead of eight zero doors, we can get away from using multi points. So, we have done this on lot 14 as well, where we used a transom scenario to allow us to get to a 6, 8 door and then carry that transom scenario to the windows, because the windows are not tall enough to allow us to have a bunch of muntins. So, this is similar, not similar. It's exactly the same window fenestration that we did on lot 14 as well. So, we're trying to marry that form and function because the eight zero doors are not in operation with the multi-point. Sometimes people don't like that in an outdoor.

Cindy Pearson: Visually it's just a little off to me.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Virginia. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I like the revisions. I don't think I don't have a problem with the windows. And I really think the Living wall is a wonderful idea. That will be soft and nice, and that'll be a nice addition to that. Otherwise, I think everything's fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I'd like the garage plan. It's a really nice plan. Appropriate, I think, for the site. I always had a I realized that it was a lot of reasons that it was a single garage and a lot of the properties, and it always looked out of touch. And now kind of. But the double car garage really does seem to fit. Also fits with the pool. Although if they haven't decided to use the garage as a pool house, I would assume there'll be doors put in the pool side of the garage. Oh, which I also, I don't think it's drawn, is a very small thing. I hardly would mention it that the windows on the pool side of the garage, I think, was supposed to be two foot six windows, if I'm not mistaken. I'm not sure what [inaudible] to read.

Gretchen Yahn: But if you look at the schedule.

Bill Anderson: Six wide by five zero and they look like they're drawn just much bigger.

Gretchen Yahn: No, no no, it's Schedule A. Schedule A window is a.

Bill Anderson: Schedule A says two foot six by five foot six.

Gretchen Yahn: It says two foot six by 3 0. No, it says 5 0. I don't have my glasses either.

Tim Clites: So yeah.

Bill Anderson: This says, 5 0. Now maybe.

Gretchen Yahn: I think it's three, zero.

Bill Anderson: Oh, I my screen just keeps.

Tim Clites: Yeah. If you look at the copy with the blue on it gets a little fuzzy. Look at the drawing above it.

Bill Anderson: Yeah, yeah.

Will Moore: The previous sheet. This markup sheet is a scan, so it doesn't work as well for reading the details. If you look to the sheet previous to that, it doesn't have the markup of the living wall or the window and door revisions, but it does have all of the information you're referring to in a much clearer manner on the first sheet.

Bill Anderson: The scale of the garage seems to be really compliment that the house. So, I think the whole thing looks nice.

Tim Clites: Yeah. When you need a two-car garage and you have a 15-foot height limit, when you need a two-car garage, you have a 15-foot height limit and you're not allowed a flat roof. You're a sitting duck. You don't got many options. [laughter] So.

Bill Anderson: You always look, you know.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I know, no, I know it's not just here. It's not just. It's everywhere in town. Yeah. Anyway, good. I don't have any additional comments beyond the questions and discussion that we've already gone over.

Gretchen Yahn: Can I make one comment? Just Bill, you were saying that, you know, using the area as a cabana so it won't have doors on it in the breezeway side to the pool? I mean, it's just like a cabana that you would use in the summer, and you'd take stuff away and leave it, you know, so I just, I just wanted to just so that there weren't any expectation there would be. Okay. And then Will calls me and goes, where's my doors? [laughter]

Tim Clites: Any further comments from anyone? Well, I move that we approve COA-RS 24-03 as submitted.

Bill Anderson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain?

Virginia Jenkins: Aye. Sorry, that was late.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Will Moore: Was that an aye to approve? Just for clarification.

Virginia Jenkins: An aye to approve. But unfortunately, my microphone wouldn't come on when it was.

Will Moore: We just wanted to make sure we record your vote correctly. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Four ayes. Thank you, Gretchen.

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you. We're looking forward to doing the two car.

Tim Clites: Yeah, we're looking forward to seeing it. All right. The next item we have is discussion item, a pre-application discussion for exterior alterations to the main building and repair, replacement of illumination fixtures, existing wall fencing, and gates at 204 East Washington Street. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Before I turn it over to the other Mr. Moore, I just want to make one comment and I've already passed this on to Clare. In the narrative there is some commentary on the use being by right as a bed and breakfast. You don't need to get muddled down with that. I just want to make it clear for the record that I have not talked with the owners about their plans, and there are a couple of potential red flags pertaining to the manner of operation. So has nothing to do with your esthetic review of the proposals, but I just want to make it on record that even if you were to grant an approval for the exterior changes, that does not constitute approval of the use. That's a separate process that I'll have to go through with the owners.

Tim Clites: So, understood. And just to be clear, it's a pre-application. So, we're not looking for decisions.

Will Moore: Oh yes. That's correct. Yeah.

Tim Clites: So, but yes zoning is not part of what we. What was that, was it Monty Python or someone that said you want an argument that's the next door? Yeah. We're not that's the next door. All right. The other Mr. Moore.

Erick Moore: Yes. So got the application for some work to be done on this property at 204 East Washington. And the majority of it is exterior. And it's divided between East Washington and East Marshall. As outlined, there is a closed end door that's on the far-left hand side of the building, which is over here on the far left. And when it was a real estate office, it was kind of like a display window that had all the different houses for sale. So that's completely blocked, and they want to be able to open that back up. It's all surrounded by about a six-foot-tall wooden solid fence in the rear. So, I went and did my inspection. Some elements are visible. It all depends upon what happens down the road. But as you read the report there's going to be some dormers and some other outdoor lighting and fixtures like that. And we had a few drawings but no detail and so thought it would be a good idea for you all to ask questions or have her ask you or whoever asks you questions and get down to the different details that they may want to add instead of what they were thinking of.

Tim Clites: Thank you. It's helpful. And applicant, come up to the podium and state your name and your address.

Clare Dickey: Hi. Good evening. My name is Clare Dickey. I live here in Middleburg at 128 North Jay Street. And I am here to speak on behalf of the applicants for this project this evening.

Tim Clites: Welcome. Anything you'd like to add to the introduction from staff?

Clare Dickey: I mean, I think the majority of the renovations to this project will be internal. There are a few minor exterior updates that we are proposing to make, which you had discussed, which we would like to consider more of which just kind of we are restoring. For example, with the door that's on the front, it was a door. If you look inside the glass casement there, you can see all of the molding around the interior of the opening. They just kind of put a glass over it. And so, we would consider that we are restoring that opening and then just trying to be very respectful of the existing architecture. The intent is to keep the building looking as much the way that it does now as possible to just pay homage to the history of the building that's here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So, this is a discussion item. I mean, they're all discussion items at the end of the day, but we're not officially taking action tonight. But I think, like we have in the past, it's good to give any comments or observations or requests for additional detail so that when the applicants come back,

they can bring that with them. And I suppose I could start with Bill this time, so I don't have to pick on Cindy the whole night to go first. While Bill's getting his bearings, maybe I'll ask a question or two. Are you ready? I'll ask a question or two because I'm kind of interested. So, there's this picture in the picture nine picture portfolio center bottom is the little stone bump out kind of along the wing with the planked door. It looks like an old plank door. And go over the details. What is the thought there for? The kind of the ultimate what's the ultimate solution?

Clare Dickey: So, the wooden door that's currently in that opening is not original to the house, and it is not in a good state of repair. And for the floor plan of the future development that wing that extends off of that east side is intended to be the owner's suite apartment for the full-time, live-in caretaker that will be at the property. And so, we wanted to replace that door with a window to be able to bring some light into that space. And so that was really the comment that was there.

Tim Clites: Does the window need to meet egress? Based on the use, it does not.

Clare Dickey: It does not.

Tim Clites: And so, what are your thoughts about the window.

Clare Dickey: So, I think that the opening would like to have a substantial amount of glass, but I don't think that it's appropriate to fill the entire opening with a window. What we were really kind of entertaining was the idea of doing something that might appear more like an appropriate door there, but with glass in it. We had originally entertained the idea of restoring that door as well, so that it could actually be a functional door, but it's not actually tall enough to support somebody using that as a means of egress in and out. It's less than six feet tall, so we weren't able to go ahead and say that we would be making it an actual door, but we wanted to be able to take the opportunity to utilize the opening that's there, to be able to bring some light into that space.

Tim Clites: I ask because the architect in me, like, that's a kind of interesting opportunity, right? I don't think it's visible from the public way, and that makes it perhaps even more of an opportunity. And I'm not looking to steer you in any direction, but I just it's kind of intriguing. As I remember in that building a long while ago, as I remember, there were steps down like that floor is lower than the threshold, right?

Clare Dickey: And I apologize because I've not come before the committee before I didn't submit floor plans. And I guess.

Tim Clites: That's all right. [multiple speakers]

Clare Dickey: But the, you know that floor is recessed. And so, as you come in from the main building, there is a raised floor area. And then you go down three steps into that, which we believe is the spring house. It is a perfect almost ten by ten square on the inside. And then you go up two steps to go back into the back wing. And so, as the owner's suite apartment, what we want to do is put the kitchen in that space. And so, we will be looking at raising the floor maybe not to be level with one side or the other, but to raise the floor there and then have a really cute little kitchen in that space. And so, for that reason, we really were hoping to be able to provide a window into that space. But the way that it looks right now, as we were kind of talking about, I think it's a little bit over scaled for the opening. And so, we would be looking for something that maybe would be more in the style of a door that's less than six feet tall, but with glass in it to be able to make that a more architecturally appropriate solution.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. So now maybe I've given everyone a chance to get a little more up to speed. Bill, do you have any comments or questions?

Bill Anderson: I really don't have any questions right now, but other than, like, it's a real interesting project, and it would be really wonderful to see it renovated completed. It's a beautiful property. I think

we've probably all been in that building quite a few times over the years, so. No, I don't have any questions. When do we expect to see a submission with floor plans? That is a question, I guess.

Clare Dickey: So. And I guess that was clearly my error, we would have liked to have been able to see a decision coming out of this meeting. The couple, Paul and Jennifer Moore, who bought this property, are anxious to get the project renovated and open as quickly as possible. And so if we are not able to get any sort of decision tonight, which it seems like we won't, I will be back next month. [laughter]

Will Moore: And so just to be clear floor plans are not always a necessity for applications to this body. They're helpful if they inform some of the decisions that you're making on the exterior. So, they can translate for them. What really made the application incomplete, ineligible for a decision at this time, are the lack of specifications on you know cut sheets for the doors. You know what actual door, what actual window are you using? What dimensions, what materials, what colors? All of those sorts of things. Similar thing. There are a few light fixtures proposed, and I've provided her information about our lighting standards and the necessity to hide the lumen. For example, a number of the things within this application repairs to the walkway, repairs to the arched wall. Those would all fall under normal maintenance and wouldn't require action from you. But it was really the lack of the specific details, cut sheets for the windows, doors, and light fixtures.

Clare Dickey: And I guess if I could speak to that, you know, really, because our intent is to match the existing that I didn't have cut sheets for those because our intent is to match the existing of what's there. We don't have any plans to repaint or refinish anything on the exterior. So any new materials, any new doors would simply match the existing of what's there. In order to be consistent. So, you know, the black door the windows would all be white. So that we are just really trying to be in, in kind and in keeping with the architecture that exists and make that as kind of harmonious a renovation as possible.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Linda Wright: I don't really have any other comments other than I'm really happy to see you're going to renovate that beautiful garden. I know that's not in our purview, but I'm happy to see somebody's going to pay attention to it because it's a wonderful space.

Tim Clites: This is the gardener on the committee. More than one of the gardeners, I should say. [laughter] Landscape architect.

Clare Dickey: I can't even tell you how excited we are about that as well. And just being able to restore the garden and really bring it back to glory.

Linda Wright: Well, we'll be looking forward to that.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: It's one of my favorite places in town. I mean, I've known it since I was a kid. But I can't remember what was this. The original color? The white. Do you know? No, I don't know. Because I'm going back even further than you, I'm afraid, John Talbot. But anyway, I'm thrilled that you're going to have [inaudible]. I can't wait to see what you're going to do.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, I was just when I was reading through, it was the light fixtures and where you have add a new light fixture on the existing junction box above the sliding French doors. I guess two you just have because lights do go way out. So. Yeah.

Clare Dickey: So just to speak to that because I did pull some cut sheets of light fixtures, which by the way if you want to challenge somebody in finding historic looking fixtures with concealed lumens. [multiple speakers] gantlet thrown down. So, I do have cut sheets for those light fixtures. That the one that you were referencing specifically, if you go back to the sheet with the photographs and look in the bottom left-hand photo there are those pair of double doors. Yes, that one. There is a junction box that's over the door right now that's just open and exposed. And so, what I had selected for that was really just a barn light fixture that is on a gooseneck that would just shine down and very sensitive to the issue of the dark sky compliant issue and we want to make sure that we're being sensitive to that concern for sure. We did not intend to replace the sconces that are on the Washington Street elevation. It really was just that at the rear entries of the, if you're looking at the site plan what the kind of the functional kind of idea is, is that for any of the guests who are going out into the town to shop or dine will be using the front Washington Street entrance. But for guests who are arriving at the property, they will be parking in the parking lot in the back and then coming up to the door that is centered on the rear elevation of the building. So that is really kind of the guest entrance or intended to be the guest entrance. And so, we wanted to have a lantern light fixture that would illuminate that door in the evenings and kind of provide a little bit of hierarchy to that doorway. And so Capital Lighting does make a historic looking lantern with concealed, light. And so, we were looking at using that fixture and then otherwise I would love to be able to replace the small lamps that are next to some of the supporting doorways. There's one next to the kitchen door, but I've not been able to find anything that I felt was appropriate. And so, at this point, I feel like we're just going to leave them.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Anything you leave, you can leave, right? But what? Yeah. What happens is charming lantern with a couple little candelabra bulbs, and someone wants to replace it, and it doesn't meet the dark sky initiative. And, yeah, you probably heard there was a couple of months ago the house right out on Main Street near you, that owner went and actually made his own because he found a fixture he loved, and it wasn't dark sky compliant. And he pulled it all apart and put the light up in the little house. You know, I wouldn't recommend it. There's a lot of work. [laughter] However, let's just do a little, if we can, as a committee to help the applicant. Let's do a little recap. So, bring cut fixtures of lights, that's important. I do think that where you have an elevation like the gable end door that you're replacing, if you're going to replace it you say with a slide, I'm going to pretend with a sliding door or something else, and I don't know if the little side lights are replaced. Also, it's worth either drawing that or bringing the cut sheet of what it is that you're going to replace it with. Because we do review those, right? So, in terms of this, you know, kinds of things that are important, you would know this, but it's our kind of responsibility to confirm it because some applicants don't. But like keeping the muntin size appropriate to what's there. And, you know, simulated divided light is obviously fine. But we like it with the internal spacer bar so that it has that kind of authentic look. Those are could be deemed straightforward things. But we go over the same list regardless of whether the applicant is an architect, an owner, a builder, a, you know, so I think it's useful to have that. And then I don't know how everyone feels. Perhaps the drawing is done, or maybe it's just kind of a preliminary, but the elevation, it's the west elevation. It's page 202, looking at the shed dormer along its length. And I think it would be useful to me to see to see that maybe with a little more detail. Okay. I'm not just because I don't know what you're intending. Are you intending muntins in those windows? You know, you don't have to do details through the casing, and but to be able to say, oh, we're using a casing and take a picture of the other casing on the house. The more you can kind of fill out that picture for us, I think the better.

Clare Dickey: And yeah, again, that was my misunderstanding. I didn't I guess I did not fully appreciate the level of detail that would be required at this stage. And so, you know.

Tim Clites: Yeah, because once we approve it, we don't see it again when you go for a permit, we don't see those. So, details [multiple speakers].

Clare Dickey: So, yeah, I guess I just like, I figured maybe that was like a conditional. And then there was a kind of final at some point. But no, I mean, the intention for all of these windows we're looking at

you know, Marvin's ultimate. And so those particular windows, just to answer the question, I was thinking they would be awning windows with mullions.

Tim Clites: With some kind of a muntin [multiple speakers].

Clare Dickey: Yes, absolutely. And in order just to keep it sympathetic to the rest of the house.

Tim Clites: Sure. And we'd want to see what that pattern is typically like you heard in the application before you, even though we had seen a very, very similar house to the one that was being submitted it's part of the planned development. But we were still looking at, you know, muntin patterns and open glass and things like that. And then I'll just the door that you're replacing, it's, you know, like if you have the door selected by next month, just bring the cut sheet. You don't necessarily have to go detail all of that. If you can say, here's the cut sheet and the profile of what you're using, or if it's a reclaimed door something. The more you can show us there, the easier it is for us to give you the okay. And then the last thing I would say, like the reason I ask about the window, and I'll just stammer for another minute here. The window in the stone is when I first looked at it, I thought, it's a double hung. And then I'm like, no, I know you're more intentional. There's something you're intending something. So I'd love to see it like and I don't know what the use is inside and how much that could drive what that solution is, but I think it's in a place where if we don't actually see it from the public way, you could put a sheet of glass in there, right? Like you should be an architect when it comes, just because that's that little. Do I remember did Margaret used to live here? Did Margaret Littleton used to. Who used to live here?

Will Moore: I think her.

Linda Wright: Mother in-law.

Tim Clites: Her mother-in-law used to live here. So, a lot of people have been in that little stone portion. And I think, like, literally.

Clare Dickey: That is literally my favorite part of that entire house. And in my imagination, that kitchen is going to be so amazing. Yeah. So.

Tim Clites: So, we don't see that from the public way. So do something nice.

Clare Dickey: Yeah.

Tim Clites: And we're still going to look at it and give you comments but it's up to you.

Clare Dickey: I'm happy for the feedback and ideas. Absolutely.

Tim Clites: Anything I'm missing, Mr. Will Moore, in terms of what we would like to? You know, like siding if you have the cut sheets, that's fine.

Clare Dickey: I do.

Tim Clites: You can actually go online. Just as an example, if it helps, like the Sierra's came in for their addition and they had a combination of they would bring samples for certain things and then they would just do cut sheets for other things and that's fine.

Clare Dickey: Yeah, and since I think since I had gotten Will's original email, I have gone back and pulled all of that information and, you know, and have it set aside to be able to just package and submit. And so, yeah, I, you know, there's a learning curve for me, I apologize.

Tim Clites: No, don't apologize. I mean, this is actually a typical pre-application meeting, right? Like, a lot of people come in and do this, so we're happy to do it. Do we want to? Is that enough? Do we want to jump to the next. Clare has another project. I think we've seen it before, but she has another project to talk to us about the pre-application. Any other questions for us on this application or pre-application at 204?

Clare Dickey: Well, I don't think so. I mean, I think just being able to come back and to submit that information, I guess there is a question about speaking with Paul and Jennifer about the way that they are planning to operate. Would it make sense for them to make sure that they have that meeting with you before we meet again next month?

Will Moore: I think the sooner they have that discussion independent of the HDRC's timeline, the sooner they have that discussion with me, the better, because that may drastically inform decisions they make.

Clare Dickey: Okay, I will let them know. I know they're very, very eager to get the renovation underway and to open and to bring, you know, a really adorable bed and breakfast to town since we need it so much. So.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Thank you. All right, so I guess we don't have to do anything formal. There. We'll go to the pre-application discussion for a new two-story mixed-use building on an existing vacant lot between 6 and 12 South Pendleton Street. And Mr. Moore.

Erick Moore: The application included some good elevations of the project and of the new two-story building with a about, like a general commercial space below. Suggested maybe a they were suggested like a sandwich shop or something similar to that. And then a one-bedroom apartment upstairs would be the space above the ground floor. It is the vacant lot right now, which is like an overflow area for the nursery that's next door there on the corner. And just like with the Washington Street, we were just without colors, textures you know, those type of details, especially being an infill development area so close to Main Street as well as some others that are contributing. And so, this was going to be a highly visible new infill structure.

Tim Clites: I try not to jump out in front of everybody, so I'm trying. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: The one question I have is it seems to be right up against the building next to it. It doesn't. [off mic] Yeah. The [inaudible] building. How much room is between?

Clare Dickey: So, our intention is to build pretty close up to the lot line in order to be able to fit both the building and the drive aisle on the property. Zoning does not require a side yard setback for this particular commercial zone. And so, we are space constrained. But on the neighbors side of the building, their building is set back from the property line a bit, and there are a line of air conditioning units that are out there. So they won't be, you know, Chic by Jowl. On the two sites there, there will be a little bit of a space that's in there, but it's you know, not intended to be, you know, pedestrian space or anything like that.

Cindy Pearson: I'm sure it is within the guidelines, but just have to remember get enough room that you can get back in there. No, I like that you're doing the apartment above. That's, as we know, needed here. I think that's the only question I have at the moment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I don't have any questions right now.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: No questions right now either. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, I like the little elevation that faces the street. I think it would be a charming little. I used to work two doors up from that and walk kind of by that every day for, I don't know, ten years or something. So familiar with the vacant lot and with the building kind of adjacent to it. I don't know that I would say that's a requirement, but it is an interesting when you think about putting together the final presentation for this committee, I remember when the applications came in for the buildings across the street from the post office. So, the coffee shop existed, but the buildings on either side of it didn't. And it was without a doubt, it was a bit of a controversial process and a lot of work and but ultimately, what I think helped make that those new buildings blend quickly after they were done, and feel like maybe they had been there longer than they had, was that when the architect planned how they came up against their existing fabric, he showed enough of that to kind of help understand the scale of things. So yeah, to the extent that you don't need to go draw that whole building to the one side or the other, but maybe it's a photo montage or something to help us understand. I mean, by itself, I think it's really, really kind of charming. We will want and so I would just describe from one architect to another what I've found when I was in your shoes presenting at the same committee and off of elevations like that, we worked through kind of the design development of the details and brought those details to this committee. So, like, what's the brick sill? What how does the window fit in the brick? What is it?

Clare Dickey: Sure.

Tim Clites: And so, we didn't have it all figured out. I mean, we knew we had to detail it for construction, but we were kind of halfway between a schematic and a detailed set of drawings, and we just brought those. Some of them were just freehand sketches, but I think they were enough for the people in the Committee to understand and ask questions about moldings and overhangs. And, you know, how does the glass fit in and how does the, you know, handrail work and that kind of thing. And we got our approval. And then of course, when we submitted for permit, all those similar details were already part of that package, if that helps at all. So, I think the focus here likely will be mostly on the front elevation, but in fact, this side elevation that faces the corner part I always call the corner [inaudible]. Wrong. That was a long time ago. The nursery nature component. Right. It will be a fairly prominent elevation right at the end of the day.

Clare Dickey: Yes.

Tim Clites: So yeah, we'll be, and I like what you're doing there compositionally. You're kind of you know, you're telling a story that isn't completely true, but it's kind of still a nice story. And I would I would think about considering the same kind of thought process. So yeah, we'll be interested in now. I guess the other thing, depending on what the sequence of events is for you and the client, it might also be something where you get things approved, but you don't have the final color or brick palette, but you could still get our approval and come back for some of those softer details if there was a schedule that you needed to meet. Does that make sense?

Clare Dickey: Sure. I will have them. There's a pretty strong vision for this building, and so I'm in the process of procuring the samples. I've got things narrowed, so we should be good, but that's good to know.

Tim Clites: Yeah. We love to see like the brick samples and things are stucco. Yeah, we'd love to see them. But if you're 1 or 2 short, I think we could we could conceptually approve the architecture to allow you to keep moving and then come back for some of those final details.

Clare Dickey: Okay.

Tim Clites: All right. Anything else from the committee? Thank you.

Clare Dickey: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you for yeah coming in. If you have any questions, talk to obviously staff is happy to help. And if there's specific questions between now and next month, you can, you know, reach out. If not from design questions, but I mean from just like what's helpful for the committee? Just start with staff or reach out to me.

Clare Dickey: Okay.

Tim Clites: All right. Okay. Great. Thanks, Clare.

Clare Dickey: Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right. Take a big swig of water there, boy. All right. Last discussion item, 2024, Joint Architectural Review Board nominations discussion.

Cindy Pearson: Where's Estee? [laughter]

Tim Clites: Well.

Will Moore: Erick has been asking that same question when I just said, hey, take this. [laughter] And so, so we are a little bit behind time schedule for this, which makes it important that this committee decide which projects you would like to consider nominating. We need that decision today. And then today for the ones that you would like to consider nominating for those awards. Yeah. A project could be passed on this year and still nominated next year. So, once this committee simply decides which projects you would want to nominate, then Erick would work with, I believe Mr. Clites said he would be willing to serve as a representative of this committee on JARB. Whether or not you wanted you. They asked for either 1 or 2 members to serve. Now maybe.

Cindy Pearson: I suggest Punkin do it again. She's not here. She can't say no.

Will Moore: But that that may be important. For example, if Mr. Clites was the designer on a certain project, then it might be helpful to have a second member representing that nomination. When JARB convenes to discuss the nominations and ultimately decide who receives those awards. So, I did attach a list of quite a number of projects for your consideration. I unfortunately have to run at this moment, but Erick will be here to take notes, and then he and I can follow up with the chairman in the following days or early next week to talk about the process of actually writing up the nominations that would be taken into that joint meeting.

Virginia Jenkins: I have a question. Are these all things that were discussed in 2023 or they go back further?

Tim Clites: The goal is to go back no more than three years.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay, because there are a couple of things here. I'm going, we didn't talk about that.

Tim Clites: Yeah, 2023 some well, things like Clare just presented or that we looked at tonight. If it's under construction, it will take often more than a year to get it built. So both for our local awards.

Cindy Pearson: Really?

Tim Clites: Really. So, for both our local awards and JARB I think when we restarted, we set a three-year window so that that would give us opportunity to look at and consider. And yeah, something may get passed one year and added the next year, just depending on how many applications we've had come in and the kinds of applications and what we like, or feel are exceptional about them.

Virginia Jenkins: I make a nomination. I'm ready.

Tim Clites: Virginia is ready. All right, Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: And you're going to have to excuse yourself, too. I would like to nominate COA22-25 the Chris and Carolyn Hersh Project at 408 East Washington Street for the addition and relocation of the accessory structure. I think they have been right on the money with everything they've done. So, you're welcome.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Linda Wright: That was my first choice, too. I'd like to nominate Middleburg Books.

Tim Clites: I'd second Middleburg Books.

Will Moore: And for Middleburg Books are you thinking for the signage? Is that. That's okay. Yeah. Yep. And we're not necessarily the numbers are on there just for reference, but for example, the Hersh's project, there were a few different COA's, like they had a separate one for chimney revision. So, all the everything can get packaged in one nomination.

Virginia Jenkins: Just covering all the bases.

Will Moore: Understood.

Virginia Jenkins: Don't want to be reprimanded.

Will Moore: Understood. That's I think that was a very wise first nomination to offer up there.

Virginia Jenkins: Nomination.

Will Moore: Yeah. So, we've nominated as few as two in the past. As many as maybe half a dozen. So, we. Yeah.

Tim Clites: I think what the JARB awards in particular are like is a sense of what's happened in the Historic Districts. Right. And so, it doesn't have to be all the things because, you know, we do have some years that are slower than others. And so. Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Rhonda.

Virginia Jenkins: Can it be something that was done this year? Will?

Will Moore: No. If the application came in this calendar year, that would be pushed to next year's.

Virginia Jenkins: Next year. Okay, so the new shop with the they do invitations.

Will Moore: Oh yes. Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: That's next year?

Will Moore: Correct. Yes, ma'am.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay, darn, I think that's [off mic]

Tim Clites: What about the Lucky Knott signage? You don't have to say yes, I know, but. Just the. Any other comments from anyone?

Bill Anderson: From this list? Is there a problem with the new town hall being nominated? I'm surprised we want to include that, too? It's the first item on the list [inaudible]. It's pretty significant.

Tim Clites: It's the first all new anything in the Historic District in a long time. Like about 15 years, maybe. No. Not quite. I guess the building that y'all did on Jay Street would have been the last all up from the ground up new building. And before that would have been across from the, I think probably across from the sorry before that would have been across from the post office. But there's not. Yeah. [off mic] The building we're in. [multiple speakers].

Bill Anderson: It's the biggest thing that's been done in the district.

Tim Clites: Yeah, Yeah, I support that. I mean, if you're I don't know what we do at the end of all this, we make a list and vote on it? I guess we should think a little bit. [off mic]

Tim Clites: I think for the. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: Decisions. Right.

Will Moore: Thank you. We can do this by consensus. You don't you don't have to take an official vote. But if there's consensus among the group of how many projects you would want to nominate, we would want to know that. And then we can start working on writing the actual nominations that get sent to the Joint Architectural Review Board.

Virginia Jenkins: But we don't have to vote?

Will Moore: Correct.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Okay. Then I will nominate Federal and Black for their sign and awning. COA 23-27.

Bill Anderson: And again, I guess then officially would nominate COA 21-20 for the new Town Hall Town of Middleburg.

Will Moore: Okay. So as of right now, we have the Hersh's project. Middleburg Books, Town Hall and Federal and Black. Those are the four that we've written down so far.

Tim Clites: Did you have somebody else? Any other comments from anyone in the committee? Great. Thank you. Awesome. Thanks for fitting that in, everyone. We have another meeting coming up August the 1st. If you're not going to be here, please let Rhonda know as soon as possible. And any other comments? Meeting adjourned. Thank you all.