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

**Thursday, September 4, 2024**

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, September 4, 2024, in the Town Hall Council Chambers. Chair Clites called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Town Clerk North called the roll.

PRESENT: Tim Clites, Chair
Punkin Lee, Vice Chair
William Anderson
Margaret Littleton
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

STAFF: William M. Moore, Deputy Town Manager
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

ABSENT: Virginia Jenkins

**Approval of Minutes**

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

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

---

**Old Business**

COA 24-22: Exterior Alterations – 204 E. Washington Street – Veritas Contracting

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that there have been no changes proposed to the application since the Committee reviewed it last month. He reminded the members that the proposal was to re-open the western door on the front elevation that was currently being used as a display window, with the remainder of the changes being on the rear elevation, the most substantial of which was the addition of a shed dormer on the left wing to turn it into habitable space. Mr. Moore advised that there would be some repairs and upkeep done to the landscaping and hardscaping in the courtyard, as well as the installation of some exterior light fixtures. He reiterated that the majority of the changes would occur to the left elevation and would include the addition of the shed dormer, the replacement of the existing French doors, and the replacement of a solid door with one that would provide lights into the space. Mr. Moore noted that there would also be the addition of a small window on the east elevation.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that there was an interior floor plan included in the agenda materials; however, it was not subject to the HDRC's purview. He stressed that any approvals granted by the Committee would be solely for exterior changes and would

not involve any interior changes or a change of use. Mr. Moore noted that those would be reviewed separately. He opined that the Committee's approval of the exterior changes could encourage the owners to move ahead with additional investments in the building while they were awaiting some zoning changes that may or may not occur, but that had been initiated.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee offered comments and clarified a few things during its previous meetings related to the exterior elevations with regard to the doors and windows. He suggested that while minor, they should be reconfirmed. Mr. Clites noted that the final rendition showed a Marvin divided light door with side lights would be installed in the rear elevation. He further noted that the dormer windows would also contain divided lights, as would the additional double hung window on the bottom elevation. Mr. Clites advised that the door that was proposed for the upper elevation would match Ms. Dickey's drawing, not what was in the Marvin package, as it would be custom built. He noted that the Committee had the details and cut sheets on the exterior materials, which would be synthetic. Mr. Clites advised that the Committee previously reviewed the light fixtures and noted that the applicant confirmed they would contain a shielded light. He reminded the members that the landscaping and zoning were not in their purview.

*Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the application as submitted and as just clarified related to the door and window products and the lighting.*

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

---

**New Business**

COA 24-20 (S 24-07): Free-standing Sign and Wall Sign – 101 N. Madison Street – Middleburg Community Charter School

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that this was a request for a free-standing sign and noted that there were some options proposed for its location. He further reported that the request was also to replace the existing brushed aluminum lettering on the school using the school's full name and horsehead logo. Mr. Moore noted that two options were proposed for this sign – one in brushed aluminum and one with colors based on the school's branding.

Nicole Madden, of Quail Run Signs, appeared before the Committee representing the application.

Councilmember Pearson opined that the proposed colors stuck out and questioned the need for four colors. She suggested the free-standing sign was a little big for the area in which it would sit.

Committee Member Wright also expressed concern about the size of the sign. She opined that the green color disappeared in the grass.

Ms. Madden advised the Committee that the colors were based on the Charter School's actual logo; therefore, there were limitations on what changes could be made in terms of color.

Committee Member Wright noted the signpost and opined that it harkened to a stables. She expressed a preference for the first proposed location for the free-standing sign and opined that there was more room for it and that it looked more in place there.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted the Committee's concerns regarding scale. He displayed a photograph of a tape measure in the grass that depicted the width of the sign. Mr. Moore opined that the sign was not as large as shown in the photo simulation.

Vice Chair Lee acknowledged that the colors were based on the school's colors. She questioned the visibility for motorists who were pulling out of the school's entrance onto the road if the sign was placed at the entrance.

There was some discussion as to the traffic patterns for the school, as well as for weekend activities at the school.

Committee Member Littleton suggested the sign be installed on one post.

Ms. Madden explained that from a structural perspective, two posts were recommended given the size of the sign. She advised that the school preferred two posts so it would have more prominence.

In response to inquiries from the Committee as to the exact colors, Ms. Madden confirmed the green was as dark as shown.

Committee Member Anderson noted that the sign was proposed to be one-sided and suggested it be two-sided so there would not be a blank side facing motorists would were coming into town. He agreed with the preferred location for the sign, provided it was on the school's property and not in the Town's right-of-way. Mr. Anderson advised that he liked the idea of a single rigid signpost. He reiterated his concerns that the proposed location could be in the right-of-way.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted the location of utility lines in that immediate area. He further noted the need to meet with the installers prior to the sign's installation and to ensure that all utilities were properly marked. Mr. Moore opined that there was sufficient space to allow the sign to be installed on the school's property, without creating a site distance problem.

Chair Clites noted the increase in the grade at the proposed sign location. He advised that the sign reminded him of the Town Hall entrance sign and reminded the members that when taken into context with the location and plantings, it did not feel out of scale. Mr. Clites noted that the only scale question he had was related to the height and suggested the sign could come down a few inches, as long as the plantings would not cover the bottom of it. He advised that his inclination was to keep the two posts and suggested someone could think about swinging on it otherwise. Mr. Clites reiterated his concern about the sign's height, particularly given its elevation.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Madden advised that the majority of the lettering would be carved into the sign and painted black, as would be the horse and symbols to the left and right of the horse.

Committee Member Wright agreed the sign should be a two-sided one and opined that it would be unusual to have people come up Foxcroft Road and look at a blank sign.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Madden confirmed it would be possible to make the sign a two-sided one.

The Committee suggested the lettering on the building be brushed aluminum and opined that having a colored sign would conflict with the brick. It was suggested that the brushed aluminum would also look nicer for a longer period of time and was more in keeping with the historic look of the building. It was noted that the font was different for the word "community" on the free-standing sign; however, since the font on the building sign was quieter, that font could have more interest.

Chair Clites summarized that the Committee preferred the free-standing sign be a two-sided one; there was debate as to whether the post should be a single or two posts; and, that the width of the sign was okay, although, there was some question about the height.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested the Committee check with the applicant to determine if they were okay with a two-sided sign. He noted that otherwise, the Committee may need to make a judgement on whether the sign was appropriate as submitted.

Ms. Madden advised that there had been discussion of a two-sided sign; however, the owner preferred a one sided one. She advised that the back would simply be painted black; however, she suggested it could be painted white to match the edges of the sign. Ms. Madden suggested that another alternative was to paint a huge white horse on the back of the sign. In response to an inquiry, she confirmed the sign would be perfectly perpendicular to the road.

The Committee held some discussion about imposing a condition that the sign be a two-sided one. They noted that the applicant stated it would be on a one-way street; however, North Madison Street was a two-way street. The Committee acknowledged that the school's driveway was a one-way one; however, they reiterated that the sign would be on Madison Street, which was a two-way street. They agreed to offer a motion for a two-sided sign, with both sides being the same, and suggested that if the applicant found that to be problematic, they could return to the Committee.

*Committee Member Anderson moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-20, a request of Middleburg Community Charter School for a free-standing sign and a wall sign at 101 N. Madison Street as presented with the* (free-standing) *sign being a two-sided sign, with the location being the recommended installation location as shown on the submission; and, the lettering as shown in the brushed aluminum, in the same font as the Middleburg School font.*

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

---

COA 24-21 (S 24-08): Two Projecting Signs, New Doors, Repainting and Relocation of Free-standing Sign – 2 W. Washington Street – Tom Beckbe

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that there were multiple components to this application. He advised that Tom Beckbe was a new retailer that was moving into the Noble House, one of the most iconic buildings on Washington Street. Mr. Moore further advised that the first item involved moving the existing free-standing sign from the eastern corner to the western corner of the front porch. He noted that this would require some minor adjustments to the sign's height to ensure it met the minimum seven-foot clearance requirement. Mr. Moore advised that the second part of the application involved re-introducing a door into an opening that had been converted into a window on the eastern part of the front porch. He noted that a solid wood Hemlock door had been proposed that would contain three columns and five rows of lights and brass hardware. Mr. Moore further noted the existing shutters on the window and advised that they would be removed. He reported that the next proposal involved the portion of the building that

fronted on North Madison Street and advised that the proposal was to repaint the existing door, which contained a three-by-three light pattern. He reported that the two other doors, which had been inappropriately closed in at some point in time, would be reopened using the same door that was proposed on the front of the building. Mr. Moore noted that those doors would not match the light pattern on the existing door on this elevation. He advised the Committee that while the application contained specifications on the light's height, it did not contain them on the width of the panes for comparison purposes. Mr. Moore reported that the next proposal was to repaint the brick on the North Madison Street elevation only. He stressed that they would not touch the original Federal style building. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that this elevation was currently painted three different colors, likely to represent three separate spaces. He advised that the applicant would like to repaint the elevation all one color, that being Revere Pewter. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that the Historic District Guidelines called for a color scheme that was appropriate to the period during which the building was constructed and was to be generally compatible with the adjacent structures. He further reminded them that the language specific to Federal style buildings stated that generally, those brick buildings should not be painted or, if they were, they should be painted a tan, gray or white. Mr. Moore advised that it would be the HDRC's interpretation as to whether Revere Pewter complied with the guidelines. He noted that the application also contained a request for signs for the business. Mr. Moore reported that the first proposed sign was a projecting one that would be mounted at a 45-degree angle where the front and side planes of the building met. He noted that the applicant pointed out that a similar sign for the Red Fox Inn, located across the street, came off their building at an angle. Mr. Moore reported that there was a specific guideline that stated that projecting signs should be mounted at a 90-degree angle. He opined that comparing the Red Fox Inn sign to a newer, modern sign was not an equivalent and suggested it may be best to follow the existing guidelines. Mr. Moore advised that the proposed sign height was in accordance with the guidelines. He further advised that it was ten square feet, which was the maximum size allowed under the zoning ordinance for a projecting sign. Mr. Moore reported that an identical projecting sign was proposed on the North Madison Street elevation; however, it would be at a lower height. He noted that the original proposal was for a seven square foot sign, which was the typical size for a sign mounted at a lower height. Mr. Moore opined that the applicant was attempting to capture all the available sign area that was allowed under the zoning ordinance. He advised that while not out of the realm, the HDRC generally did not see projecting signs at ten square feet when they were installed at lower heights. At the request of the Committee, Mr. Moore reviewed the Historic District Guidelines again with regard to the painting of the building. He advised that in addition to the Revere Pewter color for the wall, the trim and doors were proposed to be Natural White, and the doors would be dark green, dark blue or black.

Chair Clites suggested the Committee break down their review by components. He further suggested they begin with the proposals related to the architecture of the building.

Committee Member Anderson opined that the proposed door had a different proportion of lights when compared to the existing ones. He advised that he would like to have information on how the size of the lights in the proposed door would be better proportioned to the window lights on the front of the building. Mr. Anderson opined that it made sense to install doors in the openings on the North Madison Street elevation and advised that it appeared the lights were more in proportion to the lights in the windows. He suggested the need for more information on the size of the lights and what was available to make the doors more appropriate. Mr. Anderson advised that while it would be nice to sandblast the paint off the North Madison Street elevation to get back to the original brick, this was unlikely. He suggested the building façade was made up of up to four separate structures that were built at different times and opined that painting them all one monolithic color did not seem appropriate in light of the historic nature of Middleburg. Mr. Anderson suggested it would not represent the different stages of the building and would change the scale of the building.

Committee Member Littleton advised that her husband owned the building in the 1980s-1990s, when it contained a restaurant. She questioned the need for another door on the front and noted that the front hallway went into the room where the new business would be located.

Radcliffe Menge, the applicant, explained that he was leasing the eastern side of the front portion of the building, as well as the portion that went down Madison Street, from Charles Carroll. He further explained that because the front hallway was a common hallway, the other tenants had access to it. Mr. Menge opined that having retail traffic coming through it all day long would be difficult for the other tenants. He advised that for clarity for his customers and the continuity of business, he would like to reopen the door on the far eastern side of the front porch. In response to inquiries from the Committee, he confirmed the door would be painted white to blend with the existing windows and that it would not have shutters. Mr. Menge acknowledged that the main front door to the building had arched shutters; however, he advised that he was unclear as to whether adding shutters to the proposed door would be a positive or a negative. He opined that visually, it would be more clear that this was a door if they were taken off.

Committee Member Littleton reminded the Committee that this was one of the most important buildings in Middleburg. She opined that it should be a door, the lights should match the others and that there should be shutters that went all the way to the ground. Ms. Littleton noted that the existing shutters were in poor condition and needed restoration. She advised that as to the North Madison Street elevation, the first building was the original kitchen. Ms. Littleton noted that her husband added the second and third buildings, each of which contained separate businesses. She questioned why three doors were needed on this side.

Mr. Menge advised that the natural light from the doors would be nice. He further advised that they sold clothing and that it would be nice for people to be able to see it. Mr. Menge opined that a door would look nicer than the existing plywood. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he confirmed while they would exist as doors, he would only use the existing door that's currently used on Madison Street, as well as the new front door.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with Committee Member Anderson that the North Madison Street elevation should continue to be treated as three separate spaces through paint. She opined that a solid color was not appropriate for the building.

Vice Chair Lee opined that without signage to direct people to the new front door, people would enter through the main door and be stuck in the hallway. She agreed the glass should match the existing lights better. Ms. Lee reiterated that there was nothing to tell her she needed to go to the right when reaching the top of the stairs. She suggested the need to break up the long line of color on the North Madison elevation and advised that she did not think three colors were needed again. Ms. Lee suggested the gray color be used to convey that this was the door and that the color, which would cover the two doors that would not be used, be a different color.

Committee Member Wright agreed with Committee Member Anderson with regard to the size of the lights, the doors and the windows. She also agreed with Vice Chair Lee about the difficulty someone would have in locating the front door on Washington Street. Ms. Wright opined that the windows in the front of the building were important and advised that she had a hard time converting the window to a door. She agreed with the suggestion to break up the North Madison Street elevation with another color. Ms. Wright questioned what would happen to the existing sign over the front door.

Mr. Menge confirmed it would be left in place.

Councilmember Pearson opined that the new door on the front would not appear to be stark if shutters were added. She expressed a desire to have the brick on the North Madison elevation sandblasted to remove the paint.

Mr. Menge advised that they explored that possibility; however, the cost was prohibitive.

Chair Clites opined that as to the proposed front door on the Washington Street elevation, it appeared that a standard door would not fill the opening. He noted that it was clear that the masonry had been interrupted in this location; therefore, the history was available for the Committee to see. Mr. Clites advised that he was open to the idea of returning that to being a door. He questioned whether the door should completely fill the opening and opined that the white panel above it was problematic. Mr. Clites reiterated his suggestion that the door go the full height of the opening, with the amount of glass to match the windows and a wood panel being under the glass. He opined that this would make it more sympathetic to the building. Mr. Clites suggested the door also be painted black so it would recede into the opening. He noted that the existing front door was dark, with a light trim and black shutters. Mr. Clites suggested that shutters be added to the proposed door that would be the full height of the door, so the front façade would have a consistent line of shutters around the square openings. He advised that as to the side elevation, he agreed with the comments that an all-gray color would be too monolithic. Mr. Clites advised that he was comfortable using a more standard door to fill the openings; however, his preference would be for all the doors to be painted black. He reminded the Committee that this was part of the Historic District Guidelines and would help differentiate the fact that these were doors and not windows. Mr. Clites opined that it would be ideal to add shutters where they were missing. He suggested that if the first section of the side elevation was painted a different color, it may be preferable to have no shutters. Mr. Clites advised that his preference was to have shutters on all the windows and opined that it looked strange to have an odd, lonely shutter on this elevation.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Menge confirmed he was not proposing a light at the proposed front door.

The Committee suggested Mr. Menge may want to return in the future with a light.

Committee Member Anderson stressed the importance of representing that the three buildings on the side elevation were distinctively different and were constructed at different times. He opined that it would be a mistake to paint them all the same color, as they would lose their distinction. Mr. Anderson opined that it would also change the scale of the building. He suggested that adding shutters on the Madison Street elevation and on the front door would improve them. Mr. Anderson agreed with Chair Clites that the proposed front door should be a full height door that matched the windows and details, excluding the paint color. He further agreed the door should be painted black. Mr. Anderson opined that it would be a mistake to not have some type of light by the door if people were expected to access it during the winter when it would be dark. He reminded the Committee that signs were not supposed to be lit; however, he suggested a light be incorporated into the projecting sign at the corner of the building. Mr. Anderson opined this would get the sign away from protruding out of the corner of the building and would give direction to the door.

Chair Clites suggested the Committee review the sign portion of the application.

Committee Member Anderson suggested the proposed sign on the corner of the building should instead be located on the face of the building. He advised that the sign seemed appropriate in terms of scale. Mr. Anderson noted that he had no problem with the projecting sign on the Madison Street side of the building and acknowledged that it met the Town's zoning regulations.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed it did meet the zoning regulations. He noted, however, that the photo that simulated the sign had not been adjusted to reflect the increase in its size. Mr. Moore advised that a ten square foot sign was very large, especially when mounted at the minimum seven-foot six inch clearance. He reminded the Committee that the signs they have approved in the past in such situations ranged from three to eight and a half square feet. Mr. Moore cited the example of the Federal & Black sign, which was eight and a half square feet, and noted that it was at a higher mounting height. He advised that just because a sign met the sign requirements, it did not mean the HDRC had to deem the size as appropriate. Mr. Moore reiterated that originally, this sign was proposed to be smaller; however, its size was increased but the photo simulation was not changed.

Committee Member Littleton questioned whether the other tenants were happy with the relocation of the free-standing sign on Washington Street. She further questioned whether the black board over the existing front door contained any signage. Ms. Littleton agreed with Vice Chair Lee that it would be difficult to know where the door for Tom Beckbe was located. She suggested a sign be installed over the new door that would match the existing black one over the front door. Ms. Littleton agreed the proposed front door should be painted black.

Vice Chair Lee opined that a ten square foot sign on Madison Street seemed a little large and suggested it should be smaller. She agreed with the need to have something at the new front door to lead people to the right location.

Committee Member Wright advised that she was fine moving the free-standing sign down. She agreed with the need to direct people to the new front door and suggested the use of a small wall sign. Ms. Wright further agreed the projecting sign on Madison Street should be seven square feet and opined that a ten square foot sign was out of proportion.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, advised the Committee that the proposed sign was smaller than the previous sign that was approved for a smaller section of the building. He noted that the goal of the sign was for people to see it from the stoplight at the intersection of Madison and Washington Streets. Mr. Ralph opined that putting a wall sign on the Madison Street façade did not make sense and putting one on Washington Street was not ideal. He explained that the whole point of relocating the existing free-standing sign was to make the projecting sign the star in the corner. Mr. Ralph suggested a sandwich board sign be placed on the patio to lead people to the front door.

Councilmember Pearson opined that the relocation of the existing free-standing sign would interfere with the people who were visiting Scruffy's next door.

Chair Clites summarized the Committee member's comments. He advised that they liked moving the existing free-standing sign further down and opined that this was respectful to the building. Mr. Clites agreed with Deputy Town Manager Moore that the projecting sign should be removed from the corner of the building and noted that it felt inconsistent to fasten it into the masonry with a metal bracket. He suggested the projecting sign come off the building perpendicular to the main street, which would allow it to be most visible to vehicles. Mr. Clites noted the guidelines recommendations that this not be done. He summarized that the Committee was suggesting the projecting sign be located off the front of the building between the corner and the shutter. Mr. Clites noted that as to lighting, there already appeared to be a junction box at this location and suggested the applicant may wish to return in the future with a proposed light. He agreed the Committee had probably approved vertical signs that were larger; however, the proposed sign felt substantial, particularly with people walking under it. Mr. Clites suggested the larger projecting sign be on the main street and that a smaller one be installed by the Madison Street door that would be more in a pedestrian scale.

Mr. Menge questioned whether the regulations would allow for a projecting sign and a small wall sign on the front of the building. He noted that there were businesses in town that had both.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed they could have both signs, as long as they met the square footage limitations.

Mr. Menge explained that he was trying to explore the options. He advised that he was fine reducing the size of the sign on Madison Street. Mr. Menge noted that when designing his signs, he wanted to be thoughtful of the building's other tenants and not take up all the allowable sign square footage for the building.

Committee Member Wright suggested that if the projecting sign was perpendicular to the building on Washington Street and dropped down a bit, it would almost be right over the door. She opined that this would tell people where the front door was located. Ms. Wright advised that she would not be opposed to a small wall-mounted sign on the other side of the door.

Mr. Menge advised that as to painting the side elevation, the intent of the paint scheme was to convey to the consumer that this was one business. He noted, however, that he was sensitive to preserving the integrity of the three separate spaces. Mr. Menge opined that the Committee's preference was for the space immediately adjacent to the original building to have its own paint scheme, with there being a separate one for the next two spaces. He questioned whether the Committee would be okay if the paint scheme was white and then Revere Pewter for the remainder. Mr. Menge noted that the neighbor's building was also white.

The Committee agreed this was acceptable.

Deputy Town Manager Moore displayed an example of a house in the Residences at Salamander that was painted Revere Pewter.

The Committee agreed it would be nice on the building.

Chair Clites opined that the Committee was recommending the new door on the front façade should be custom made to fill the entire height of the opening. He noted that they did not address the question of whether it should be a full glass door or one that contained glass down to the height of the windowsill, with a panel below it. Mr. Clites opined that if the door was painted a dark color, it would not matter as they would both appear to be dark unless there was more light inside the building that outside. He agreed this would change the proportions of the lights.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that he would be more comfortable if an updated drawing of the door was returned to the Committee for their review.

Committee Member Anderson suggested the glass in the door stop at the sill of the adjacent window, with the proportion of the lights working with those in the window.

Councilmember Pearson noted the downspout located on the Madison Street elevation, which split up the building.

*Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve this application (COA 24-21) for the Noble House as follows: approve the moving of the main building sign from the corner of the intersection to the left of the entry stairs; approve the window that's right most with the wood panel below it being removed and a new door, subject to the cut-sheet that the Committee would approve, but that the Committee conceptually now approve a new door in that opening, maximizing the height and width of the opening with the new door and that it would have to be painted black and that the shutters are the full height square top, like the shutters that are on the window now; that the* (projecting) *sign that is on the corner be moved to the main façade and be located in the spandrel, which is halfway between the first floor window head and the second floor window sill and centered in the available brick between the corner and the first shutter. Chair Clites further moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that on the Madison Street façade, the gutters and downspouts stay as they are; that the two plywood openings have doors replacing the opening as submitted; that all three doors be painted black; and, that the façade be painted, starting at the left – the first panel to be Sherwin Williams Natural White and the second two buildings to be the Benjamin Moore Revere Pewter. Chair Clites further moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the projecting wall sign on that facade be no more than seven square feet. Chair Clites further moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the windows without shutters receive a shutter on Madison Street.*

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Menge confirmed the current Noble House sign would be updated when it was moved. He questioned whether the property owner, Charles Carroll, was okay with the motion as proposed. Mr. Menge noted that the reason the gutter was in the middle on the Madison Street elevation was because the window was part of the "white building." He advised that Mr. Carroll was questioning whether the gutter was where the white should be, with the remainder of the building then being painted Revere Pewter. Mr. Menge noted that this would still allow the two doors to be on that side of the building.

Deputy Town Manager Moore opined that what was being suggested was that the Natural White go to the gutter, with the gutter being the dividing line.

Charles Carroll, the property owner, advised the Committee that the gutter was at the same location as the interior wall. He further advised that there were no walls in the basement and that it was completely open. Mr. Carroll opined that this was one building. He advised that the dining room was where the fireplace was at the end. Mr. Carroll explained that the basement was an exact copy of what was underneath the building below the street level. He advised that he did not see how it could be three separate buildings. Mr. Carroll reiterated that the footprint of the basement was from where the brick of the Noble House ended to where the chimney was located in the far right-hand corner. He further reiterated that it was all one, with no dividing walls. Mr. Carroll advised that from a structural point of view, he did not see how it was built as three buildings. He agreed it would be nice to have sections as if they were separate businesses and suggested there be two parts, with the gutter serving as the dividing point.

Chair Clites opined that the request was that the door that would be an active door, which would include the sign and the windows on both sides of the door, be one color and the remainder of the building be the other color. He noted that the other two doors would be in the other color, which the Committee had agreed to since they would not be operational doors.

*Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, to amend the motion that the color line be eight inches to a foot to the left of the downspout so the downspout appears like it's on the gray.*

In response to an inquiry from the applicant, the Committee confirmed the piece of iron on the outside of the building would be the mark for the dividing line for the paint scheme.

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

---

Chair Clites clarified that the applicant would need to return with the details for the front door, including how it would proportionally work with the window beside it; however, he was free to proceed with the remainder of the items.

Mr. Menge reviewed the history of his business. He noted that this would be his fourth location and advised that all were located in historic buildings on corner locations. Mr. Menge noted that he was delighted to work with the HDRC and advised that the location was important to him. He further advised that the location was special and suggested it would not make sense to change it. Mr. Menge advised that he was attracted to the location for the same reason the HDRC was interested in keeping its integrity, which he also wanted to do.

**Discussion Items**

Sidewalk Signs

Deputy Town Manager Moore explained that the Council had been interested in getting a better handle on the proliferation of sidewalk signs for some time now. He opined that the Town had turned a blind eye to them in the past. Mr. Moore advised that in the past, the signs were smaller and were almost exclusively chalkboards. He noted that as the empty storefronts filled, many more signs popped up on the sidewalks. Mr. Moore advised that they were increasing in size; numerous businesses were putting out more than one; they were being left out all the time; and they were creating issues with pedestrian circulation. He noted that some street corners were so crowded with sidewalk signs that the handicapped ramps were blocked. Mr. Moore advised that even in areas where there was a wide expanse of sidewalk, the signs were creating issues. He reported that the Council tasked the staff with getting a better handle on them and advised that he was proposing to set up a permitting process for the use of public space. Mr. Moore opined that the permitting process was not as much of an interest for the HDRC, as it was designed to provide certain protections for the Town, such as requiring it be listed on the business' certificate of liability insurance. He explained that the idea was to create a set of parameters under which the signs would be evaluated. Mr. Moore advised that the Council asked that he consult with the HDRC on the aesthetics of the signs.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that he was not seeking the HDRC's input on things such as the accessibility requirements. He reminded the members that the Historic District Guidelines anticipated that, at some point in time, there may be a review of sidewalk signs. Mr. Moore advised that those guidelines were incorporated into his draft sidewalk sign policy. He reviewed the proposed details which included that the sign be an A-frame or possibly a single vertical sign; and, that it have two flat faces. Mr. Moore noted that the detail on which the Council wanted the HDRC's input was whether the signs should be limited to chalkboards only or whether they were amenable to printed graphics and advised that a few of the businesses were already using printed graphic signs. He explained that the guidelines would also include details on what the sign frame should be constructed of and would contain a size limitation. Mr. Moore further explained that he was proposing the signs be no larger than four (4) square feet per face. He noted that there would also be some overall dimension limitations. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that the Town implemented some directional signs that were placed on street corners to highlight some businesses that were located off the main street and advised that those were just barely over three-square feet on their face and were slightly smaller than the dimensions identified in the draft policy. He advised that there would be a limitation of one sign per business on the sidewalk and noted that it would have to be located within the storefront's width of their business. Mr. Moore advised that the signs would have to be removed when the businesses were closed and that the placement of them would be in such a location as to maintain a minimum traversable sidewalk width. He noted that there would be a specific prohibition on dry erase boards, plastic frames and vinyl lettering and reminded the Committee that all of this came from the Historic District Guidelines. Mr. Moore reiterated that the Council was seeking the HDRC's input on the aesthetics of the sign, the size, and the composition. He opined that the biggest question was whether they should be limited to chalkboard signs only or whether they wanted to allow for graphics as well. Mr. Moore noted that the individual signs would not come to the HDRC for review and explained that once the guidelines were established, this would be an administrative permit. He noted that the Council was interested in getting the permitting process established soon so the Town could get a handle on the sidewalk signs before the holiday season. Mr. Moore further noted that it would take some time to get the Town Code amended to put the permit process in place so he could then get the businesses to comply by submitting their permit applications.

Chair Clites noted the temporary nature of the signs, as the businesses would be required to take them in at night. He advised that he preferred the chalkboard aspect. Mr. Clites noted one chalkboard sign that was currently being displayed which also had a graphic aspect to it, and opined that it was a nice branding identifier. He expressed concern that signs that consisted of entirely pre-made placards would deteriorate over time. Mr. Clites advised that his preference was for a chalkboard sign and noted that it would have

to be updated and maintained. He opined that it was also softer and was not a permanent sign that would deteriorate over time. Mr. Clites advised that it would require a certain amount of engagement by its user and would be a nice complement to the other signs in town.

Councilmember Pearson noted the difficulty pedestrians were having accessing the sidewalks, particularly those in wheelchairs, due to the signs. She advised that she did not care for the sign that contained printed graphics and noted that they usually were large and contained different frames, such as a metal one. Ms. Pearson agreed a chalkboard sign seemed more quaint and in keeping with the town.

Committee Member Wright opined that it may be easier for the businesses to include their names on the chalkboards in the form of a printed graphic, with the remainder of the sign being a chalkboard. She agreed the chalkboard signs were quaint and could change all the time, meaning there would be something new to read. Ms. Wright opined that the Town's directional signs have been very effective.

Vice Chair Lee advised that her biggest issue with the signs was that businesses did not take them in at night. She noted that the majority were left out on a consistent basis. Ms. Lee advised that she preferred the chalkboard signs, as the retailers paid more attention to them because they had the opportunity to change the message on them. She opined that this was better than having a stagnant sign. Ms. Lee advised that the Town's directional signs were nice; however, they were not being updated. She noted that it was difficult to tell the businesses what to do if the Town's signs were not being consistently maintained.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the staff was working on this.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with the need for a permit. She suggested all the signs should be required to be the same and expressed a preference for a chalkboard sign with a wooden frame. Ms. Littleton agreed the businesses were lax about bringing the signs in at night and noted that this was dangerous for the pedestrians. She suggested a smaller sign would be better.

Committee Member Anderson agreed the signs should be chalkboard ones. He further agreed with the Committee members' other comments.

Chair Clites noted Committee Member Wright's comment and suggested that no more than the top 25% of the sign be in the form of a printed graphic containing their business name, with the remainder of the sign being a chalkboard. He acknowledged Committee Member Littleton's suggestion that the signs all be the same and questioned whether this would introduce any problems.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed it would create a multitude of problems. He advised that the Town would not want to favor a specific vendor by saying "this is the sign" and "this is who you have to use." Mr. Moore opined that many of the existing signs would not be able to be re-used. He advised that the Town would want to allow the signs that complied with all the regulations to continue to be used. Mr. Moore suggested there was something to having a bit of variety.

Committee Member Wright questioned whether the Committee would want to allow metal frames, given that it allowed black metal outdoor furniture. She further questioned whether the frames should be black. Ms. Wright noted that if they were metal, they would be consistent.

Vice Chair Lee suggested they be black or dark green, which would create variety. She suggested the chalkboards should have the business name as presented within their logo, which would also create variety.

The Committee agreed with the administrative review and suggested these signs did not need to come before them.

Deputy Town Manager Moore clarified that he would not be able to mandate content; therefore, if a graphic was allowed, he could not say it must be the business' name and logo. He reminded them that there were legal decisions related to that. Mr. Moore noted that the regulations could state that 25% of the sign could be in the form of a printed graphic; however, he could not say what the graphic must entail.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, advised that over the years, he had worked with a number of jurisdictions on their sign ordinance re-writes to address this issue. He noted that of all the things the Committee discussed, the only one he disagreed with was the suggestion that the signs all be the same. Mr. Ralph noted that the big reason Middleburg won a ton of sign awards was because they were all different. He opined that they would not want sandwich board signs to be all the same. Mr. Ralph advised that in jurisdictions where the sidewalks were not deep, they allowed businesses to have "leaner" signs, which was a one-sided sign that leaned on the building. He acknowledged that municipalities could not regulate sign content; however, he advised that one of the regulations that worked well was that a large portion of the sign must be changeable. Mr. Ralph suggested this did not need to be called a "printed graphic" and suggested it could be called "painted" or something with permanence. He further suggested it could be something dimensional, like cut out letters, and noted that not everyone was a chalk artist. Mr. Ralph suggested the term "chalkboard" not be used, as they were not waterproof, and noted that there were other products available. He advised that he had a list of products and volunteered to share it with Deputy Town Manager Moore. Mr. Ralph agreed the biggest problem with sidewalk signs was that businesses did not bring them in. He noted that a lot of people used signs with pre-made frames and advised that he liked the idea of not allowing plastic ones and of specifying a size. Mr. Ralph suggested the need to look at the frame sizes so the businesses would not be forced to use a custom-made sign. He reiterated that he had information he was happy to share with the Town. Mr. Ralph reiterated that the only problem for which there was not a solution was that the businesses just left the signs out and noted that the only solution was for the Town to take them.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that if they were left out for twenty-four hours, the Town's Maintenance Supervisor would remove them and return them to the business with a reminder. He noted that the Town did not want to be punitive and wanted the businesses to be successful; however, the Town did have a problem. Mr. Moore advised that many people were complaining about the proliferation of the signs, including members of the Council, citizens, and visitors. He noted the need to find a solution that worked for everyone.

Chair Clites noted the Town's signs and the scale of them at the main intersections. He suggested the need to err on the side of smaller signs because they were intended for pedestrians, who would walk right up to the signs to read them. He reiterated his suggestion that the Town err on the side of a smaller sign.

Chair Clites thanked Mr. Ralph for his input.

**October Meeting Quorum**

Chair Clites asked that the members let Town Clerk North know if they were unable to attend the October 3rd meeting.

**Joint Architectural Review Committee (JARB) Awards**

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that he would send out an invitation for the JARB awards ceremony. He announced that Middleburg won all four JARB awards for which the HDRC submitted a nomination, including sign awards for Middleburg Books and Federal & Black, as well as awards for the Town Hall Project and the Hersh's project on the east end of town. He expressed hope that the members would be able to attend the award ceremony.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

**(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:** [off mic] All right. Welcome, everyone. We'll bring to order the Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's meeting for Wednesday, September the 4th, 2024. The first order of business is a roll call.

**Rhonda North:** Chair Clites.

**Tim Clites:** Present.

**Rhonda North:** Vice Chair Lee.

**Punkin Lee:** Here.

**Rhonda North:** Committee Member Anderson.

**Bill Anderson:** Here.

**Rhonda North:** Committee Member Jenkins is absent. Committee Member Littleton.

**Margaret Littleton:** Here.

**Rhonda North:** Committee Member Wright.

**Linda Wright:** Here.

**Rhonda North:** Council Member Pearson.

**Cindy Pearson:** Here.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Just remember, mic's off unless you're using them, and we will try not to talk over each other. I'll pause for any public comments. If you're here for something on the agenda, we'll get to you in the order that you're listed on the agenda. Any public comments? All right. We'll go to approval of the meeting minutes from our August the 1, 2024 minutes. I'll pause and see if there's any additions or corrections to the meeting minutes. Seeing none, I move that we approve them as submitted.

**Punkin Lee:** Second.

**Tim Clites:** All those in favor?

**All Committee Members:** Aye.

**Tim Clites:** Any opposed? Any abstain. Motion passes. Thank you. The next action item is old business. COA 24-22 request of Claire Dickey of Veritas Contracting for exterior alterations of 204 East Washington Street. Mr. Moore.

**Will Moore:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have discussed this at your last two meetings. No changes to the package from what you saw last month, but this is now an application before you for consideration for action for approval. Again, the exterior changes involved with this on the front elevation, it is limited to the reopening of the western door that was closed and kind of used as a display window when it was a

real estate office. The majority of the exterior changes are at the rear of the property. The most substantial I would suggest would be the addition of the shed dormer to the L wing to turn that into kind of a habitable space. There are some other more minor changes. Repair upkeep of some landscape and hardscape items within the courtyard, a couple of light fixtures that would be added that you reviewed last month. But again, the majority of the changes are on the L addition. They involve the again, the addition of the shed dormer, the replacement of existing French doors on the north end and the opening of well, there's a solid door that opens toward the courtyard currently, and then that would be replaced with a fixed door to give additional light to the space, and then a small window added on the east elevation as well. But if it pleases you again, the architect is here if you want to have discussion with her. But again, no changes to this package since what you had last month.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Welcome. You're certainly don't need to, I don't think, walk the committee through the whole package again. I think everyone was here. Everyone that is currently here was here last month. So hopefully we remember both the package and some of the discussion items that we had. Maybe I'll just start with Bill and see if you have any additional comments or questions.

**Bill Anderson:** I don't.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Margaret.

**Margaret Littleton:** I do not either.

**Tim Clites:** Punkin.

**Punkin Lee:** Nothing yet. Thank you.

**Linda Wright:** No questions for me either.

**Tim Clites:** Linda. Cindy.

**Cindy Pearson:** The only question I have is what we were discussing. I'm not sure if it was the Planning Commission or Council about who was going to be in the living area. Does that have anything to do with this at all?

**Will Moore:** It wouldn't have anything to do with your consideration for approval. There is an interior floor plan that's included with this. That's not subject to your purview. So, it's we just make clear that any approval that might be given tonight is solely for the exterior changes. It does not involve any interior changes. It does not involve any change of use. Those are separately reviewed. But again, this could you know, encourage the owner to move ahead with additional investments while awaiting some zoning changes that may or may not come to fruition, but they have been initiated and are working their way through the process right now.

**Cindy Pearson:** Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Cindy, for clarifying that. And no new updates from you all based on what we talked about last month. Yeah. So, as I recall, we as a committee gave comments or we clarified a few things related to, for instance, the exterior elevations and which openings were rendered in the elevation properly versus which windows and doors were rendered in the packet the submission associated with this property. It's a minor detail, but obviously and I think we all agreed and understood what you were intending. But if we have a motion tonight, I think we should reconfirm that. And specific to well, for instance, the front. We'll just go elevation by elevation if we can. Mr. Moore, if you can steer for us the door that faces the street. I think the final rendition of that is a divided light door shown in the Marvin submission, that's what you're intending. If we go to the elevation above that, which is the rear elevation, the door and side lights that are intended are the divided light also in the Marvin. And then if we jump up

to the other set of elevations where we can look at inside the courtyard, you're clearing your submission that the dormer windows are divided light per the package. The Marvin package and the little additional double hung window on the bottom elevation is also divided light to match the window to the left of it. However, the door that's rendered on the upper elevation that's your intended door design for that drawing not what's in the Marvin package. Because it's a custom unit, you have to get a custom shop drawing submitted from them. All right. So, does everyone on the committee understand that correctly? Okay, great. We have details and product cuts for the little bit of exterior material on the dormer, material sizes. It's going to be a synthetic, which we have certainly approved before. And given that it's an addition, it's going to be painted, we won't notice that. So, I didn't see any issues with that. The light fixtures we reviewed, and the applicant confirmed that they are a shielded fixture with the filament, if you will, or the LED diode up in the housing and not visible. And I think that was the extent of and again we appreciate seeing the landscape plan that's not really part of our purview here. And like Mr. Moore mentioned zoning is not something we can review. So, I'll pause and see if there's any other comments or questions from anyone on the committee. And if there's not, I would make a motion to approve the application as submitted. And as I just clarified related to door and window products being used in drawings versus the Marvin submission.

**Bill Anderson:** [off mic] And lighting.

**Tim Clites:** And lighting. Thank you, Bill.

**Linda Wright:** Second.

**Tim Clites:** Second. All those in favor?

**All Committee Members:** Aye.

**Tim Clites:** Any? Thank you. Any opposed? Any abstain? Thank you. It's easier when you've been here before. [laughter] Thank you. Yeah, we appreciate it. Yeah. Well but you got to get all the ducks in a row, right? So, thank you for coming back in tonight. And we look forward to seeing an activity there as I think we mentioned the first time you came in. We're excited to have that building be an active building in town. So hopefully the rest of your zoning issues work through in an agreeable way. Thanks. All right. Next is action item, new business COA24-2024-07. Request of the Middleburg Community Charter School for a freestanding sign and a wall sign at 101 North Madison Street. Mr. Moore.

**Will Moore:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have the application package before you. The request is for a freestanding sign. There are a couple of options which will bring up on screen here in a second for placement of that sign, but it would be along North Madison Street frontage, either parallel to the chain link fence or perpendicular to the street in a small grass area. Again, we'll bring those up on screen here in a second. And then the second part of the application is to replace the existing lettering that's on the school itself that still just reads Middleburg School in raised brushed aluminum letters. The idea there would be to replace it with the full name Middleburg Community Charter School, as well as the Horsehead logo. And you have with that, two options, one in all brushed aluminum or one with the colors picking up on the school's branding. And again, we'll bring up those graphics here in just a second.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Is anyone here from the applicant would like to add any comments for us?

**Nicole Madden:** No comments at this time. This is Nicole from Quail Run Signs.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. And I think Rhonda likes for you to state your name and address, just so we know who we're speaking to.

**Nicole Madden:** Yeah. Nicole Madden from Quail Run Signs. Thank you. Thank you. Nicole.

**Tim Clites:** All right. Cindy, why don't we start with the. Just not a particularly complicated application, but let's start with the free-standing sign first and go over our comments there, and then we'll come back to the wall sign.

**Cindy Pearson:** Sure. I will start. Well. There's a lot of questions going through my little. Hold on one moment, please. I think the material and things that they're using is. Part of you know, it's a part of our guidelines. So, I think that's fine. The different colors, the all the colors that are in it. It's just it's new. So, it just sits out like a sore thumb. So, it's just going to take a while to process it back in a little bit. You know that school has sat there before, all quiet and kind of tucked back in there, and now the signs up and going, woohoo! Here we are. Let's celebrate. Which they should. I mean, it's doing very well. So, I don't know about the four colors, how I'll listen to other comments on that and maybe come back around to it. I do think it's a little big for the area that the sign sits in, because the fence is right there and then the road is right there. But once again, I don't know if that's you know something we can work with or not? So that's all I have for right now on that.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Linda.

**Linda Wright:** Yeah, I'm a little concerned about the size as well. And I know with pictures and transforming it on and all of that, it's really kind of hard to tell. It's a little out of scale, maybe. Looking at it sitting in the grass, I think the green with the community tends to kind of disappear somewhat in the grass. And I don't know if you had talked or looked at other schemes.

**Nicole Madden:** If I may add, that is actually their logo.

**Linda Wright:** Sure.

**Nicole Madden:** So that's essentially what they're using through their branding. So, we do have some limitations there in terms of changing colors and things like that.

**Linda Wright:** Yeah.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you for clarifying.

**Linda Wright:** I don't know I mean that's sort of like the post that sort of harkens back to sort of stables and that sort of thing. But and again, it's hard with the scale. I don't know whether it needs to come in a little or and I do like the first location where you want to put it, not the second. I think it has more room there and looks more in place there. But those are my first comments.

**Will Moore:** Mr. Chairman, if it's helpful, I know there was some question from scale, and I had some communication with Council Member Pearson earlier about that. This photo that's up on screen right now. You have there's a tape measure laying in the grass so that is set at the widest proportion. So, I don't give you any scale with I don't give you any sense of height here. It's six feet overall, but that that is that's the widest portion of the sign, which is actually the top cross member. The legs are set in a couple inches from either side, but that might help frame a little better.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. That actually is helpful.

**Will Moore:** [multiple speakers] maybe not quite as large as it seems in the photo simulation.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Very helpful. Thank you, Linda. Punkin.

**Punkin Lee:** Thank you for a little clarification on the size. I think you have to go with the school colors to get it. I think placement at the entrance is looks a little more stable on the other cattywampus. But has

anyone, like, been in a car to see if they have the visibility as pulling out in the road with that because it's, you know.

**Nicole Madden:** Yeah, at the.

**Punkin Lee:** Right in the vision. Just I'm just asking because it looks like it could be a little questionable. But that is the better I think the better placement. Just like Linda said.

**Nicole Madden:** The recommend location. Yes, definitely have better visibility, while if it was more parallel to the fence is a little bit hard to see. However, on the other side of the school I did notice it is a no through, not a no through road. It is a one-way street, so majority of cars are actually coming away from the school. So really, you're just dealing with majority of school traffic, residential traffic going one way, which is why it's a one-sided sign. And that way essentially, they just can the location is in place. It shows exactly where the school is while, if it's more towards the fence, you know, with the oval right there, it's hard to tell exactly where the school is though.

**Punkin Lee:** That works Monday through Friday. But if you're here on the weekends, those cars pull in and out and don't care which way they go. So that's why I ask. I know the school goes in that way, but the other two days could be a little hazardous if it's blocking making a left-hand turn because people don't pay attention. Just bringing it up.

**Nicole Madden:** Right.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Punkin. Margaret.

**Margaret Littleton:** I like the sign. I don't mind the colors at all. What I would suggest is putting it perhaps on one post. I don't care for the two posts.

**Nicole Madden:** I think structurally.

**Margaret Littleton:** I like the first location.

**Nicole Madden:** Right. I think structurally it would be recommended for it to be on two posts just for the size that it is. However, we could look at doing one post if that's what the board would like to do. However, it is preferred by the school to have it on two posts just so it has more prominence, more dominance in that area, and that stands out better.

**Margaret Littleton:** Right, I understand. Other I have no comment.

**Nicole Madden:** Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Margaret. Bill.

**Bill Anderson:** Is the green the school color too?

**Nicole Madden:** Yes. That's correct.

**Bill Anderson:** Is it that dark? Because seeing the black letters against the green, even when you look at it at the recommended location, and granted, that's kind of a, you know, some artwork that was done might be hard to read. Also, this says that it's a one-sided sign.

**Nicole Madden:** That's correct.

**Bill Anderson:** I think it should be two sided myself. I think it should be able to not have a blank side on the other side just from appearance. And thirdly, I like the I agree with the recommended installation location if in fact it's on your property. To me, it looks like it could be very close to the right of way. Having said that, I like your idea of a one post sign rigid one post and it, you know, protrudes out off the post. But I would check the right of way because the right of way isn't at the curb at the gutter. That's my comments.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Mr. Moore, I don't want to put you on the spot, but you could probably now or later work with the applicant around right of way issues and whether that's related to. [multiple speakers]

**Will Moore:** Yeah, I've already looked at it. It's getting close. And there are some utility lines in that immediate area that we would need to be cognizant of. So, I would want to meet with the installers before installation. Ensure that they have a missed utility ticket properly marked and everything, but there is space within that general area to mount the sign and to do it on their property and without creating a sight distance issue. We've looked at all those kinds of different things.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. Thank you. I guess I'll add my minor comment to what we've already heard. I think the grade comes up a little bit there. And so as opposed to 1 or 2 posts, the two post doesn't. I would say I like it enough to be satisfied with it. It actually reminds me a little bit of the sign, scale wise, that we see as we come into this building, which when we first looked at it, felt kind of big. And then when we kind of put it in the context of where is it in the world? And like the planting, it was like, oh, that's kind of like it doesn't feel out of scale now, but. And so, for me, the only scale question I would have is the six feet. And could it come down a few inches. As long as they're not planting something in there that would grow up and cover the bottom of it. I'd be inclined to leave it at two posts only because I envision, you know, some toddler, at least when my boys were there. Somebody's thinking about swinging on that right. And it's like I say, I hate to say that, but I did have all boys. So, the two posts would be fine with me. I feel like maybe just the overall height of it, since it is in an elevated relative. Let me be clear relative to the street, it's elevated slightly. I think the scale of it could be a little shorter. The sidewalk is right there. It is an elementary school, so a six-foot sign. Most of those children are, you know, somewhere between K and sixth grade. They're not. I mean, I'm sure there's some sixth graders that are a lot taller than they were when we were in sixth grade. But it's an elementary school. So that scale. Let me ask what part of it is carved versus painted?

**Nicole Madden:** The majority of the lettering would be carved. And I imagine that the horse and the symbols left and right of the horse would be carved.

**Tim Clites:** Carved into the sign and then painted black.

**Nicole Madden:** Yes.

**Tim Clites:** Yes, and there is a white frame that's an intentional like white frame around the outside. Okay. All right. We're going to any other comments on this?

**Linda Wright:** I would agree with Bill that I think it should be two sided. It's going to look very unusual to have a blank side. There's a lot of people that come from Foxcroft coming up that road and just look at a blank back. I think it would look unusual. I think it should be two sided.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. That's why I was asking about what's carved, because in my mind, I'm like, wait a second. What? So, is that possible to make a two-sided sign carved both? Yeah.

**Nicole Madden:** It would be possible to make it two sided.

**Tim Clites:** It's twice as much work, but it's. Yeah.

**Nicole Madden:** It's using the same material.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. Okay. Then let's. If there's no other comments on this, let's hold that and go to the sign on the building. And Cindy, if I can start with you and we'll go through comments on that, and then we'll summarize this in one recommendation. How's that sound?

**Cindy Pearson:** And being the alum of the school, you know, this is going, like, really, we're [inaudible]. No. I'm kidding. [laughter] It looks so good, but I believe with the colors it looks better with. And I'm going to say is it the gray or the brushed aluminum. Aluminum. Yes, I can say that word. I don't think that when you have all the colors on it, it's just a bit much with the brick. So that is my thoughts on that.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you Linda.

**Linda Wright:** I like the aluminum one as well. I think it'll wear longer.

**Nicole Madden:** The material is all aluminum. It just depends whether it's brushed aluminum or painted.

**Linda Wright:** Yeah. I just think it would look nicer longer on the building, I think maybe. That's all.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Punkin.

**Punkin Lee:** I like the plain. Also, I think you got enough color with the brick and it's cleaner. Not so conflicting what to look at. So, I also agree with Cindy and Linda.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Margaret.

**Margaret Littleton:** I don't have any further comments.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Bill.

**Bill Anderson:** I would also choose the first one brushed aluminum. It's more in keeping from that kind of historic look of Middleburg School lettering that was there.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Mr. Moore, you're looking like you would like to speak.

**Will Moore:** I was just going to ask Miss North, are we re-experiencing the issue on the dais?

**Tim Clites:** Oh, there it is. [multiple speakers]

**Will Moore:** And now they're up.

**Tim Clites:** Okay. It's flashing. We don't always have that but thank you. We now can see what's up on your monitor.

**Will Moore:** We're still having a few technical issues and adjusting to the space here.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. Okay, well, I'm good. There was seemingly quick consensus on that, which is nice. And in the absence of that, I had this kind of. But maybe it's a moot point if the sign if the building signage is all aluminum and it grabbed me that the three-dimensional freestanding sign, the word community was in cursive. And then the rest of the fonts were like what was on the building. And I started thinking, if we're going to do the color on the building, then should the font like? But I think if we recommend that the building be the aluminum all in the same font, it is a little quieter. And in keeping with historically what the signage on the building looked like. And I think then the freestanding sign

could have a little bit of kind of what would you say flair or interest to it in terms of the font. And it's actually nice. And this is nice, right?

**Cindy Pearson:** And I would just say if they're going to have a school flag, it's going to have colors and it'll be above it. So, this will kind of keep it, as you said, the historic part.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. Awesome. So, if we're going to have a motion, I would recap what I believe I heard, which is we would like the freestanding sign to be two sided. There is some was some debate about whether it's a two post or a single post sign. Obviously, if it's a single post, you would have to look at it again. And that's certainly okay if that's the committee's preference. But that be a double-sided sign and the width, I think Mr. Moore's mockup helps us get a sense that the width is okay that I was the last one to comment on the height, so I don't want to rule that part of the meeting. I'd be happy to have someone make a motion and collect that for the committee as part of an overall motion. Or do you want me to do it?

**Cindy Pearson:** Yeah. Go for it.

**Tim Clites:** No. Go ahead.

**Bill Anderson:** Well, since four members, I think like the double-sided post. Am I correct with that? It looks like that's where we're going. And two-sided sign and the aluminum letters. No changes in the colors. All right.

**Tim Clites:** And the last question is the height. Does anybody have any preference? Is the height okay or?

**Bill Anderson:** It meets our requirements as I understand it.

**Will Moore:** If I may, before you apply a condition as to a two-sided sign, could we just check with the applicant to make sure they're okay with that?

**Bill Anderson:** Sure.

**Will Moore:** Because if not, then you might be asked to make a judgment on the appropriateness of it as submitted just.

**Tim Clites:** Okay. Thank you. That's worthwhile doing. And I don't know if you all can speak on behalf of the applicant.

**Nicole Madden:** There was discussion for a two-sided sign, but they felt that one side was more appropriate for their property. And I believe for the traffic that comes through there.

**Tim Clites:** Yep.

**Nicole Madden:** In presence with the road where it's just one way, which goes past the school.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. And you didn't ask this question, but if it's one sided, the back would be what? Black. The back would be black.

**Nicole Madden:** It could be black. It could be white, considering that the edges are white. However, there is the debate of, you know, road and whatnot coming onto the sign. It's hard to see on black. So black would probably be recommended here.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah.

**Nicole Madden:** Unless if I may add a suggestion, it could just be a huge horse symbol on the back of it that's painted on.

**Bill Anderson:** That's an interesting compromise.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah.

**Nicole Madden:** That way it's not entirely the whole sign again, but there is still some element on the back when you drive past it.

**Punkin Lee:** I think it's a good idea.

**Tim Clites:** Or would it? So, would it be the green banner, the yellow with the horse and no text?

**Nicole Madden:** It could be black with a white horse.

**Tim Clites:** Or just black with a white horse, which is the inverse of the horse on the front. Or maybe could be. We're trying too hard, or it could be.

**Will Moore:** Maybe. And it's not 100% clear from the artwork. I assumed in looking at this that the sign would be perfectly perpendicular to the roadway.

**Nicole Madden:** That's correct.

**Will Moore:** And if it is, I think that probably speaks more to your desire for two sided. Whereas if it were angled in maybe that's less important, but I don't want to insert myself too much, but I just want to make it clear it would be odd for us to insert a condition if the applicant weren't amenable to it.

**Tim Clites:** Bill and the committee, what do you think about making an approval with a recommendation for the back and leave it up to the applicant?

**Bill Anderson:** We could ask the applicant to reconsider putting a two-sided sign there.

**Tim Clites:** Right.

**Bill Anderson:** As opposed to leaving it up to and be not satisfied with what we get. Yeah.

**Tim Clites:** Yes. Cindy.

**Cindy Pearson:** And with your what I'm hearing with your comment that it's a one-way street there. The Foxcroft Road or North Madison Street, excuse me, is not one way. It's two ways. They come from Foxcroft in. Now, to turn into the school and go around is one way. So, to me, that's a little bit clearer than what I was hearing that you said, if that makes sense.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. And I understand because we had kids there too. I understand it's a one-way loop at the school.

**Cindy Pearson:** [off mic] By Foxcroft [off mic] Madison is two ways.

**Tim Clites:** Right?

**Nicole Madden:** I don't know the road name. If you don't mind, can I look it up real quick?

**Cindy Pearson:** It's North Madison. [off mic]

**Tim Clites:** When you pull into the school, it's one way.

**Nicole Madden:** Yes.

**Tim Clites:** And the loop in front of the front door and back out. But the street itself is a two-way traffic.

**Nicole Madden:** Agreed. I thought it was the road that was just past the school that's one way.

**Tim Clites:** No, that's both ways. So, people can come from the north, out of town, almost out of town, but from the north down and turn in, which means essentially, they're looking at and the sign at an angle where they wouldn't see the face of it if it's facing southwest. Hence maybe the logic around a two-sided sign. All right. So, Bill, go ahead with your original motion if you were getting ready to make that.

**Bill Anderson:** The two-sided sign?

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. And they certainly can come back if that's problematic for some reason.

**Bill Anderson:** I guess that would work.

**Tim Clites:** Right?

**Bill Anderson:** Does that become part of the motion that if?

**Tim Clites:** Yeah, what that the sign be two sided?

**Bill Anderson:** No. That if it's problematic for the ownership.

**Tim Clites:** No. That's always the case. Anybody can come back to us if there's something about what we've approved that doesn't meet their requirements.

**Bill Anderson:** All right, let me be clear. We're two-sided sign with both sides being the same.

**Tim Clites:** Correct. Okay. That's what I understand. Is that what the committee's preference is? Yeah.

**Bill Anderson:** COA 24-20 request of Middleburg Community Charter School for a freestanding sign and wall sign at 101 North Madison Street, to be approved. This the sign construction to be approved as presented with a sign being two sided. The location being the recommended install location as shown on the submission, and the lettering as shown in brushed aluminum. I believe in the same font as the existing Middleburg School font. That's it.

**Tim Clites:** Is there a second?

**Cindy Pearson:** Second.

**Tim Clites:** All those in favor?

**All Committee Members:** Aye.

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

**Nicole Madden:** Thank you.

**Bill Anderson:** Take a breath. Now take a breath. I'll get this set up for you.

**Margaret Littleton:** I'm getting the old agenda. July.

**Bill Anderson:** Oh, I didn't know you [off mic].

**Tim Clites:** The next action item COA24-08 Request of Radcliff. I'm going to say that wrong, so I won't say it for two projecting signs, new doors, repainting and relocation of a freestanding sign at two West Washington Street. Mr. Moore. Are we having technical difficulty?

**Margaret Littleton:** I'm getting July.

**Tim Clites:** We'll pause, just for a moment. [off mic]

**Tim Clites:** There we go. All right. Is everybody able to see what we're looking at for the application? Mr. Moore.

**Will Moore:** Okay.

**Tim Clites:** Please.

**Will Moore:** Thank you. So, this is a request with quite a number of different proposals within, appreciate the applicant packaging it this way with the graphics and the kind of numerical key proposals that go in order of the presentation to give a quick rundown. So, this would be a new retailer that would be moving into the Noble House, one of our iconic buildings right at the intersection of Washington and Madison streets. The proposal involves a number of items. The first one, as noted in the package, involves the existing freestanding sign that is at the eastern corner of the front porch currently. It would be to relocate that to a position midway on the western part of the porch. With that, they would have to do some minor adjustments to the height of the sign just to ensure that the minimum seven-foot six-inch clearance is achieved. It would only overhang the planting area by a couple of inches, but they would have to raise the sign a little bit in conjunction with the relocation. The second part of the application involves reopening of what was a door at one point in time on the eastern part of the porch. So that was closed in at some point and converted to a window. But you can kind of see the area underneath that window that's boxed in, where the door used to extend down to the porch. The idea here would be to again reintroduce a door. This would be a solid wood hemlock door. Three columns of lights, five rows of lights with some brass hardware added. The existing window height shutters, which do not extend all the way down, would be removed in that location. And again, this is the specifications on the lights for the door and the specified hardware. The next proposal goes along the L on the North Madison Street frontage. So, there's an existing door. It's a three-by-three light pattern, so it doesn't extend all the way down like the newly proposed door. This door would be repainted and then two existing doorways that were inappropriately closed in at some point in time in the past. I say inappropriate because our guidelines specifically say do not, do not close in door openings where they exist on historic buildings. So, these doorways would be reopened. It would utilize the same door that was specified on the front. So again, the three light three columns and five rows of lights. So, it wouldn't exactly match the light pattern on the existing door. We did ask the applicant to consider giving us additional information on the dimensions of the panes in the lights. We do have a height in these specifications, but we do not have the width of the pane, so that the committee could compare that with the dimensions of the lights in the existing door, or back to the front elevation. So, you could get an idea of how the dimensions of these lights might compare with the dimensions of the window lights to the side. So, we did ask for that information. The next part of the proposal would involve repainting of the brick on the L itself. It would not be touching the main portion of the structure. The original federal building. So, it currently is painted in three different lighter shades, likely harkening back to a point in time where all three doorways existed and there were three separate spaces of some sort in there, but this would repaint it all to one color. This is Benjamin Moore Revere Pewter. I believe the applicant has some hard copies of the color for this. If you're familiar with the

residences at Salamander, this is one of the colors that they're using. One of the four colors, it's the second lightest shade that they're using on those homes. This was revised from an earlier submission that had kind of a dark bronze green for the wall. So, it has lightened to some extent. We do note within the staff report, there is a specific guideline related to painting and in particular painting of brick which the color and placement generally says select a color scheme appropriate to the period in which the building was constructed, and it is generally compatible with adjacent structures. And then if you look at the guidelines specific to federal style buildings, it states, generally these brick buildings were not painted or were painted with light shades of tan, gray, or white. So that's what your guidelines provide. So, it would be up to your interpretation as to whether the Revere Pewter would comply with that guideline. And then moving forward we also have proposals for signs for the particular business. the first one we don't have the best graphic for this. It's shown in this one as appearing to be mounted at 90 degrees to the wall, which is what the guidelines suggest for projecting signs. But the proposal is actually to have this come off at a 45 at the angle where the front and side planes meet. The applicant does point out that in this photo here, you see on the opposite corner you have at the Red Fox Inn, you have a sign that comes off at an angle. It's not mounted perpendicular to either the front or the side plane. However, we do have specific guidelines that state that the projecting signs should be mounted at 90 degrees. My comment to the applicant in the first review of this was while the Red Fox sign may indeed exist, I'm not sure that applying that historic sign location and mounting on that particular building would be equivalent with a newer, modern sign on this building. And maybe it would be best to follow the guidelines as they are. Again, very specific as to mounting a projecting sign at 90 degrees. But again, it's not it's a guideline. It's not a hard and fast rule. So, this again is the first of two projecting signs. It is mounted at a height that is consistent with the guidelines. It says it should be mounted, no higher than the sill level at the second story. And this is a ten square foot sign, which is the maximum size that is permitted in zoning for a projecting sign. And a few different angles. I think this one was the one where they best tried to capture it being shown at a 45 degree in a photo simulation. And then finally along the North Madison Street elevation this is proposed the identical sign itself but mounted at a lower height. This one when the package originally came in, the sign at this location was proposed at seven square feet, which is a little more typical of a size that we see for signs that are mounted at lower heights with the minimum clearance provided. The corner sign originally was proposed at 15ft², which would not meet zoning limitations on projecting signs. So, I believe the applicant was just trying to capture all of the potentially available sign area. And when the corner sign decreased in sign in size, they proposed increasing the size of this one? Again, it's not completely out of realm, but we generally don't see larger projecting signs at ten square feet at the lower mounting heights. Usually if it's a larger sign, it's one of those that's mounted, like at a second story height. And again, that's the quick rundown on the application. There are some other graphics within. And I'm happy to answer any questions you might have. But of course, the applicant representative, the business owner, the property owner are all here this evening to speak with you.

**Tim Clites:** Awesome. Well welcome y'all. You're certainly welcome to come up and add anything to Mr. Moore's report if you'd like to or just wait till, we have questions. Whatever you're comfortable with.

**Bill Anderson:** Can I ask a question? Just a question.

**Tim Clites:** Sure.

**Bill Anderson:** Could you.

**Tim Clites:** Can you speak into your mic, please?

**Bill Anderson:** Would you again go over the issue on the guidelines regarding the painting?

**Will Moore:** Sure.

**Bill Anderson:** Please. Thank you.

**Will Moore:** So, this is listed in the staff report but I will read it. So, guidelines on color and placement include to select a color scheme appropriate to the period in which your building was constructed. And that is generally compatible with adjacent structures. For most buildings, limit the number of colors to three a wall or field color, a trim color, and an accent color for doors, shutters, and sash and then taking off on that. In particular, the part of that which talks about a color scheme appropriate to the period in which your building was constructed. There are further guidelines that are specific to a federal style building, which this is a federal building. And it states generally these brick buildings were not painted. Not really an option here as the L has already been painted or were painted with light shades of tan, gray or white. Trim would be white shutters and doors would be dark green, dark blue or black.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. So those samples that we're looking at, I understand you can look at the back. They're labeled I think the one is Revere Pewter, the gray and the other is the white. Is that correct?

**Will Moore:** Yes. The natural white is what is proposed for each of the doors, and it is also the white that would be the lettering and lines, etc. within the sign.

**Bill Anderson:** And the pewter is?

**Will Moore:** The Revere Pewter is what is proposed for the wall. That's the solid wall.

**Bill Anderson:** So, the images we see are really not very close. Okay. [laughter]

**Tim Clites:** It's better to look at the sample. Yes. Thank you. You can only do so much, Mr. Ralph, I understand. [laughter] Oh, sure. Don't take the blame. Let him take the blame. All right. Cindy, you want to start with Bill. All right, Bill, let's go ahead. Let's again, just so we don't try to cover too many things at once, let's do a run through skip the signage for a moment. Let's run through any comments on the architecture, and then we'll come back and do signage. Does that seem to be okay?

**Bill Anderson:** That's fine.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. So, Bill, architecture.

**Bill Anderson:** It appears the architecture comes down to the replacement of some solid panels with glazed doors. I guess my first pass, my reaction on the front of the building is that. And again, I'm taking this just from the photograph I see. I don't think what page it is. It's page I think it's 13 of 27. The proposed doors or door when you look at the proposed scheme appears to have a different proportion of the lights on the new as if as compared to the existing. And the front of this building is very different from the side, obviously. And I would really rather have some more information of how the size of the lights and the door would be better proportioned to the window lights, that's my comment on the front. On the side it appears, or I should say Madison Street putting doors in those openings makes sense, I guess, depending upon how the inside of the space is going to be used. Here it appears. It appears that the lights are in more appropriate proportion to the lights in the windows. And all I can say is that's a guess. So, I don't really know. But as close as they could get, I realize it's nice to be able to go and pick a door out of a, you know, a catalog versus something that's custom. And I just want to make that point. I realize that, but I think we should find a little more information about the size of lights and what's available to make the doors more appropriate. And lastly, I guess it's the issue of the color, colors of the building. What I take away, I haven't hadn't read the guidelines in a long time, with regards to that section, but what I take away from that is it would be really nice to sandblast the white and the tan off the buildings, and to get the brick back to what its original material would be. However, that seems unlikely, and I only say that in kind of a sarcastic way. I mean, that's not going to happen. However, as I think we'll be discussing with others will be discussing that these that this facade is made up of one, two, three, four separate structures that were built at different times. And the idea of painting it, painting them excuse me, one monolithic color doesn't seem appropriate to me in light of the historic nature of Middleburg. It doesn't represent the different stages of these buildings underneath the painted facade, and it changes the scale of the building

on the street. So, with that simple explanation, I'll put it to others that have a more interesting history with the building. An important history.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Bill. Margaret.

**Margaret Littleton:** Okay, I do have a bit of history since my husband owned it in the 80s and 90s as it was a restaurant then. And I guess I have a question. Why do you need another door? Because as I remember, the front hall goes right into that room. Are you blocking that off? Because it starts. [multiple speakers]

**Tim Clites:** Welcome to come to the podium. Say hello. Give us your name and address.

**Radcliff Menge:** Hi, I'm Radcliff Menge. It's Menge. Yeah.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you for helping me with that.

**Radcliff Menge:** Yeah. No problem. And I started and owned Tom Beckbe and delighted to be coming to Middleburg.

**Margaret Littleton:** Great.

**Radcliff Menge:** Just as an aside. We have leased from Charlie the eastern side of the first floor of the front of the building, and then we go down the Madison side. So that's why we're talking about all of it. And because the hallway is a common hallway with other tenants that have access to it. There's an attorney space on the left hand side, and then there's also tenants that go upstairs, you know, to open the main hallway for a retail store, for retail traffic coming in during the day, it seems, you know, like a lot for them and for clarity for customers and continuity of our business. The door reopening the door on the far eastern side. We think makes the most sense.

**Margaret Littleton:** I understand. And would it be a white door as the picture shows?

**Radcliff Menge:** Yes. We would paint it white to blend with the existing windows.

**Margaret Littleton:** And you would have no shutters?

**Radcliff Menge:** No shutters? Well, so if you look at the front of it the main door has the arched shutters and it wasn't clear to me visually, if it needed, if putting in shutters that had a different height, different shape to the front door would take away from it in a way that was, you know, positive or negative. We all are more seasoned in all this than I am. But that's just the way it seemed to us visually, as clear as a door by taking them off.

**Margaret Littleton:** It is one of the most important buildings in Middleburg, I think. And historically, I mean, that's what we're for, to keep the history here. I think it should stay as a door personally. When my husband had it, it was never a door. I don't know who did that. It was always a window. And I think the lights, as Bill was saying, should match all the other. No matter whether you have to make it, or I don't think, I don't know whether you can buy it or not. And I feel very strongly that you should have the shutters go all the way to the ground. Have some. And the shutters are in very poor shape, at any rate. Some of them need restoration. So that was the front and the side. the first attached building attached to the brick. The main building was the original kitchen. And where the front was the dining room.

**Radcliff Menge:** Oh, interesting.

**Margaret Littleton:** And my husband, he did add, I believe he added both of the two and three. And they were all separate businesses. And is that what you will have as well? Why do you need three doors?

**Radcliff Menge:** So, it's one continuous business going through the three spaces.

**Margaret Littleton:** Right.

**Radcliff Menge:** The two reasons for the door on the interior, the natural light is nice. It's a retail store. We sell clothing, and so it's nice to be able to see it. Yeah. And then I personally, and again, you all are the experts from the streetscape. I think a door looks a lot nicer than a piece of plywood.

**Margaret Littleton:** I agree with you. I totally agree with you. I just wondered; would it be three ways to get four ways to get into your space?

**Radcliff Menge:** No, we would they would exist as doors, but we would use the side door that's currently used to access on Madison. And then the new front door.

**Margaret Littleton:** Right, right. Do you just want the light, which I certainly understand.

**Radcliff Menge:** Yeah, the light would be great. The light is helpful.

**Margaret Littleton:** And I'm agreeing with Bill that I don't. I think it should be treated as three separate spaces still with paint. I don't think the solid color all the way is appropriate at all with the building. So that's my start.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Margaret. Punkin.

**Punkin Lee:** Welcome to town. Thank you.

**Radcliff Menge:** Thanks.

**Punkin Lee:** I'm also on the front entrance because I think as you go up the steps and that existing front door just says, come in that's and you have no signage specified by that door to tell me once I get to the top step that I don't just open the front door and be in the center hall. It however it ends up. Yes, the glass would look better to match the more and however you're going to really tell me when I get to the top step that I need to go right to go in your door. And on the side, I get the adding the taking out the covers that are under those doors, which look pretty heinous for sure that's a big block of gray that is just a line of windows and a line. I don't know if it would be to match your entrance, to go more with the brick and do something with the other, because you're not accessing the building there. Just to break the long line of color. I don't think we need three colors again, but maybe. Somehow you need to kind of tie the. If you're going to keep the gray to get in from Madison, it should somehow convey to your front door, too. And then maybe the other two doors which aren't really going to be doors, that whole section be another color. Just a thought to break it a bit. I think any improvement is going to be very nice. Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

**Linda Wright:** I would agree with Bill's comments about the size of the lights and the doors and the windows and all areas. I have a question. Does anyone who's been here longer, there's a white looks like a wood panel under the window that they're proposing to make a door, was it ever a door? It was a door. Not originally, though.

**Will Moore:** No, it was a door at one point.

**Linda Wright:** It was at some point.

**Will Moore:** At some point.

**Linda Wright:** I don't remember it being there. But anyway, I would agree with Punkin's comments about coming up and trying to find that door. If that's considered your main entrance, or is the side entrance considered your main entrance? Either way, I just think the windows in the front of that building are so important in this town. I would have a hard time making that a door. And then I would agree with the comments on the side of the building that trying to break it up with some other colors, because it is a very long building. Trying to soften it somehow with either something you do, whatever it may be, whether it's paint or something else you might do, I think it would be good to try to break it up some as well. And then what happens to the sign that's over the front door, now the big black? Are you all just going to leave that because it's there, or are you doing anything with that one that's right over the front door?

**Radcliff Menge:** No.

**Linda Wright:** Leave it there. Okay. That's all I have for now.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Linda. Cindy.

**Cindy Pearson:** Oh, thank you for, you know, this. The building is going to be so nice when you all are finished giving it some TLC. With the door on the front, I don't think it's going to look so stark if they do put the shutters down. Even if they were, it would help. It would not make it. Because just this picture with that stark white there, it's just jumping out at you. I think it's just the clip art that they're using. The side looks so nice with making those doors and bringing you some extra light and an extra entrance. I just go back to when brick and mortar was doing some work and they were going to paint something, and they decided not to. How wonderful that looks that they, you know, are using that brick instead of paint on it. I can't imagine what you'd have to go through to blast that paint off of there. There's probably a bazillion coats of paint under there. It's probably holding the building together.

**Radcliff Menge:** I would almost say we explored it, and I think that it's both. It's prohibitive in a number of ways.

**Cindy Pearson:** I can understand that.

**Radcliff Menge:** Mostly cost.

**Cindy Pearson:** Yeah. I'm sure, but I just don't have any other comments other than what you all have said. Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Cindy. Welcome to town. This is awesome. I'm really excited to be looking at a project where everybody's got a lot to chew on in this committee. We do a lot of just signs, and we're happy to do them. And we certainly think that's important.

**Radcliff Menge:** Wouldn't want y'all to be bored.

**Tim Clites:** And thank you. We appreciate in Loudoun we're kind of known for the town with the cool signs when we do our awards, which are, by the way, coming up this month. Just a little diversion here. September, the Thursday of the 19th. I think [multiple speakers] everyone, if you can make it, I'm sure they'd be glad to see you. So, then I'll just add, I try to add my comments in a way that builds on some things that we've already heard, and sometimes to try to bring some summary to what we've heard. So, a little bit of all of that first. Oh. We're not doing signs. Skip that. That's not first. That's second on the potential door at the front. If I understand the diagram that shows the door, it looks as if a standard door would not completely fill the opening. And that's correct. So, because it's the front facade and there was at one point a door opening there, which is clearly the masonry has been interrupted and that history is still available for us to see. I'm a little more open to the idea that a door go back in there. But I wonder if the

devil in the details is that it should be a door that completely fills the available opening? That's one question. And if you're all looking at the picture of that, if we could go, I'm sorry, Mr. Moore. If we could go to. Yeah, that would, 5. So the little white the little panel above the door, I think is maybe problematic because it's such a prominent location. If the door went full height and perhaps had a wood panel at the bottom, so the amount of glass matches the window, that might be a way to start to make it more sympathetic to what's there. I would add that I think in any case, if there's a door there, it should be black, not white, so that it recedes into the opening. And the detail that I like about the front door is that the dark door has the light trim, which is just a little kind of line or a hyphen, and then the black shutter. And I would agree with comments that the door, the facade looks more consistent. I think if we had shutters that were just the full height of the door, whether it's a black or white door. My eye kind of picks up, you know, this is behind a rail you see through the rail, but it kind of picks up on the front facade does have a consistent line of shutters around the square openings that are on it. So that's my comments on the front. On the side, I would agree with comments. I don't know what the solution is for the color scheme, but I agree all gray is perhaps too monolithic and because we know the history now. Thank you, Margaret, of the second and third edition. Using a more standard available door to fill those openings, I think I'd be comfortable with. My preference would be that all the doors are painted black. Again, it's part of the guidelines and I think it just helps differentiate at a distance that that's a door and not a window. And those are I mean, in the ideal world, it would be great while the building were being painted, to either add the shutters that are missing or take the windows with one shutter and make them two or I almost would prefer none over one. And I guess that would tie in perhaps to the color scheme, if that perhaps the first painted first to the left painted version. If that was a different color, maybe it would have no shutters just as a way of not having it. My preference would be shutters on all of the windows. But I don't know that we can specify that today. I don't know if that's part of our purview, but it looks a little strange to have the odd, lonely shutter there. So those are my comments on the facade. And I'll pause. Yes. Punkin.

**Punkin Lee:** On the front proposed door. Is there no light by it? Are you having an outside light? Because there's nothing that I could see that's got a light. We didn't.

**Radcliff Menge:** No, we've not proposed a light there. [off mic]

**Punkin Lee:** I mean, you got lights by the existing front door, but your hopeful new door on the front porch.

**Radcliff Menge:** We're not proposing a new light there.

**Punkin Lee:** Just the two lights that are on them. Madison for that entrance would have lights at night. So, no light at your front door at night?

**Radcliff Menge:** That's correct.

**Punkin Lee:** I see the doubt going by.

**Radcliff Menge:** What's that?

**Punkin Lee:** I see doubt going by.

**Radcliff Menge:** No, I just I we didn't propose any, I didn't.

**Tim Clites:** It's an interesting. Well, you may come back after you move and say, boy, I sure could use a light next to.

**Radcliff Menge:** This seems like enough for tonight. [laughter]

**Tim Clites:** Yeah, it is certainly. You know, we don't want you to leave us alone. You certainly are we welcome back. But thank you for noticing. I was going to bring that up when we got to signage. Any other comments about the architecture? If not, Bill, you can certainly. Yes.

**Bill Anderson:** I just wanted to reiterate the how important I think it is to represent the three buildings that are distinctly different. We look around town and that's what we do. We don't try to hide a building that happened to be painted over. It's distinct. I mean, we are recognizing little chimneys on the back of buildings that you can't even see. But yet here we have a situation where we have three distinct buildings of different times of construction that are represented with paint now, but not keeping that distinction to me, I think it would be a big mistake.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah.

**Bill Anderson:** Personally, and as I also think the scale does change when you look at it coming across the corner. I would also add, while I'm at it, I think the shutters on the Madison Street side would improve no matter what the scheme is adding the shutters when they're missing and on the front you're right, you make a good point about the transom that was shown on the proposed new door on Main Street, that it should be a full height door to match how the windows are and even the details, not the paint color. Which is right, I agree black, but the details even of the sash should be something that's submitted to us that has some authenticity too. What happens at the front door of the building? Lastly, somebody, you know, you mentioned lights. It might be a mistake not to have some type of light at that door if you're expecting any type of access in that, you know, in the wintertime.

**Cindy Pearson:** This town is dark. [multiple speakers]

**Bill Anderson:** It's dark and right now, the signs aren't supposed to be lit. But I was going to propose when we talk about signs that maybe the sign on the corner be actually on the face next to the door, maybe with an incorporated light in it. That would solve two things. It would get it away from just protruding out on the corner of the building and would give direction to this is a door to get into this space, and having a light on it might solve the best business from a business point of view. You know, after 4:30 on a winter night, there's it's dark and you're not going to see the sign or the light. Excuse me? The door. Unless you have that, except the light coming through.

**Tim Clites:** Use that to go ahead and just roll into your sign comments, and we'll run through the Committee on Sign comments, because.

**Bill Anderson:** That's my sign comment on the corner. I think on the face of the building, since there already, excuse me, exists a sign on the face of the main street facade? I don't have any. I don't think there's any issues from an approval point of view of the how the sign is actually what it says in the scale. I think that all seems to be appropriate. If it's on the building, we might have to reconsider the size and proportion. Similarly, on the Madison Street side don't have an issue with the signage. Meets all our requirements, I understand.

**Will Moore:** It does meet the zoning requirements. I do want to point out that the and I pointed it out in my staff report. And if I could just pause for a second. Please read my staff reports in advance of the meeting. A lot of the questions and information that have been asked here are actually contained in my reports. I spend a little bit of time formulating them, so please, please do read those. That I would caution you looking at the photo simulation that is on screen right now. This is the same photo simulation that was included in an earlier iteration that called this sign out as a seven square foot sign. So, they have actually increased the size of the sign. But the photo simulation has not been adjusted, whether the original photo simulation was to scale or not I'm not sure. But a ten square foot projecting sign is very large, especially if it's mounted at the minimum seven-foot six clearance. As I note in my report, the kind of typical size, there is no uniform size for them. Projecting signs that we've approved over the last couple of years have ranged in as small as, like, two and a half to three feet. So, like Middleburg Books has a

very small projecting sign. The largest one was a little over 8.5ft² that's Federal and Black. I mentioned those two because those are two award winning signs for this year. The one at Federal and Black is a higher mounting height, and it has two distinct proportions to it. So again, it the regulatory maximum size is ten square feet, which it meets. The regulatory minimum clearance is seven-foot, six inch, which it meets. But that doesn't necessarily mean that it's the regulatory part establishes absolute maximum, because that doesn't necessarily mean you have to deem the size as appropriate. So, I again this one started smaller. It got bigger, but the photo simulation didn't. So please don't rely on this as an accurate depiction of what it would look like on the wall.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Bill, any more comments on the signs? Margaret, comments on the signage?

**Margaret Littleton:** The other tenants in the building, are they happy with the signage being moved over to the west side.

**Tim Clites:** I don't know, I guess it's up to the building owner to make sure that they're happy.

**Margaret Littleton:** Right. I would think that'll be two signs then. Yeah, that would be. I wondered what the black board is over the front door, does that say something? I can't. No. It's just. Was it ever?

**Tim Clites:** It's an old sign.

**Margaret Littleton:** Did it say Noble House or something? Maybe. Right. Because I agree with Punkin. I think when you get up to the steps, you're just not going to know that your front door. I wondered maybe you could put the sign above the new door to match the black one that's already there and keep it. And the door should definitely be black, I think.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Punkin.

**Punkin Lee:** I think the sign on Madison definitely, that's a long shoot. And a ten-foot sign seems a little large. And that's the only thing you're going to see anyway. Good for you. [laughter] So I would think that should be smaller, but I definitely think you might think of something for the new front door just to get people to the right spot.

**Radcliff Menge:** Okay.

**Punkin Lee:** Even something small to the side, at least it catches your eye.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

**Linda Wright:** Yeah, I'm fine with moving the original Noble House sign down into the planter. I think that's fine. I think to somehow direct you to the new door if it goes in, whether it's just a small wall sign on the wall or something needs to get you to go that direction. So, I would agree with all those comments. And I do think the sign on Madison should be more like seven square feet. I think ten is looking out of proportion there.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Cindy.

**Cindy Pearson:** John has something to say. Can I hear what he has to say before I make a comment?

**Tim Clites:** Mr. Ralph.

**John Ralph:** Good evening, all. I'm just going to add a few things. The sign is actually smaller than the Middleburg Museum sign that you approved on a smaller section of that building a couple years ago, which was also sort of white and pink. So, I don't I know you said it feels massive on South Madison, but

it's actually not unprecedented. And again, you're looking the goal of that sign is for really for me to see it from the stoplight looking under the trees and up Madison. That's why we're kind of arguing for that size. Similarly, I heard your discussion about the wall sign earlier, but that site, as you stand there, that intersection, that corner location is just ideal. Putting it on Madison doesn't make sense. Putting it on Washington isn't ideal. The whole point of moving the existing Noble House sign is to really let it star in that corner. I'd actually love to do it bigger. I understand the code won't, but it kind of would bookend the intersection really well. And that was always our goal. When you talk about leading someone to the front door, I just want to add he's got his basically his own patio. And it's a perfect place to put a sandwich board to put a display out there, kind of a captive audience once you get them up onto that patio. So just a few thoughts, a few thoughts along the way.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Cindy.

**Cindy Pearson:** Yeah. I don't have a whole lot more to comment other than with moving the front sign on Washington Street down. It's just interfering with the people from Scruffy's who eat ice cream and sit there. Sorry, just being a little silly here, but when they sit there and get up. [laughter] Yeah. No, I don't think I have any other comments other than what's already been said.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. So, my recap or with comments. I actually like moving the main building sign down. There's something kind of really respectful about you pull up to the intersection and you look at that building, and instead of the sign, you're saying, I have a sign, but it's on the other side of the entry. And I think that to me, that felt like a really kind of the only word I could come up with was a respectful thing to do. So, I do like that. Equally so I agree with Mr. Moore the staff report this kind of thought that there's a sign coming out of the corner of a building that's been there a long time in a stone building. And as soon as I contemplated that, when a brick building where it hasn't been with a metal bracket that somehow has to get fastened into the masonry, it felt inconsistent. And also, I even though I live very close to town, you drive into town. So, I was envisioning that the main sign, if it were a projecting sign coming off of the building perpendicular to main street, would be most visible to vehicles perpendicular. If it comes off at an angle at the stoplight, you're actually kind of looking at the sign, but I think there's some guideline recommendations around not doing that as well. So, if I understood some of my colleagues, they were suggesting maybe this sign at the front door be wall mounted, maybe I misunderstood that. I would still think a projecting sign is okay because it very much captures the corner, which is where you are. You're on the corner. And so having it over projecting off of the right most panel of brick between the corner and the windows. Similar to the picture that's up on the screen now, but not on the actual corner, but in that panel of brick between the corner and the shutter is where I would recommend that sign. Speaking to the lighting, I couldn't actually tell. If you zoom into the picture, it appears the location with the proposed door. There is a junction box or something there, so it may be that you just need to come back. And once you decide if you do need lighting, hey, there's this box. I want to add a light that may be less of a project. You could add lighting to the sign, but that probably is more of a project in terms of how you get the power out through the brick wall. So, we'll leave that maybe for a future time when you determine whether you need it or not. And then the other sign headed back Madison Street. I think you're right. We probably have approved vertical signs that are square footage wise larger. The part of this sign that feels substantial to me is walking under a sign that's hanging off the wall that's four feet out, that it's more a proportion thing than the actual. And so, you know, I think more like in the 30 to 30 inch to three-foot range is what we're used to walking under. Right? Mow sometimes that's 30in by almost four feet because it's still a ten square foot sign. But so, my take would be the balance would be a larger sign on the main street. And then this sign at the other door, which well, may get as much traffic as the main street door because people have to walk up the steps. And it's a very busy pedestrian corner with folks going in both directions. It'll be interesting to see where people identify as your main door, but the signage helps direct them to either. So, I would be inclined, like others have mentioned, for to recommend the little sign at the small at the side entry is more scaled to that pedestrian scale, which is not at ten feet. Or maybe I would say not at almost four feet wide, is the part that I object to.

**Radcliff Menge:** Can I ask you a question?

**Tim Clites:** Sure.

**Radcliff Menge:** I don't know the answer to this, so I probably shouldn't ask this question, but.

**Tim Clites:** No, ask it.

**Radcliff Menge:** On the front of the building. You know if the sign is going to come out 90 degrees. And to address y'all's point about how do you know that the business is up and to the right? I don't know if the regs permit for us to have that projecting sign and then a small wall mounted sign. I know there are some businesses in town that would have both. And Bruce Smith, the lawyer, has a small you know, sign mounted to the left of the door. I wonder if one good solution here is, you put the projecting sign coming off 90 degrees where y'all had identified it. You know, essentially flush right on the building. And then a small Bruce like sign next to our door. So, when someone looks at the front door, they say, all right well, this is Bruce's door. And then this is the door that I walked up all those steps to go in through. Because there's a little sign right over here that says this is the Tom Beckbe door. I mean, I don't know if that if you can actually have two signs. So, my question is could we even do that?

**Will Moore:** Yeah. As long as the square footage works. You could have a wall sign as well as a projecting sign there.

**Tim Clites:** That's certainly something you could come back for when you get this. You know, in a couple of months, you see what the lighting is like. It may be, hey, I want to do that little placard sign, and I want to add a light and I want to lead you into that solution.

**Radcliff Menge:** Sure, sure, sure. I'm just trying to explore what our options are, because it sounds like the sign on the Madison Avenue, I'm fine with reducing it if you all think that it's, you know, not the right scale for the city and streetscape. And if we do that, what we're trying to do to answer your question about thinking about the other tenants of the building, when we design the signs, we're trying not to use up all the available square footage in the building, knowing that Charlie's going to lease it to other people in the future. And so we're just trying to be mindful of that if we take some square footage away from the Madison side, then it raises in my mind that we then have some square footage we could use on the Washington Street side, and then that would address, you know, y'all's concerns about how do people know that this is the correct door for me to go in.

**Tim Clites:** So, but I certainly think that's a solution. As you know, as long as it's meeting the technical side of sign limits, I think that would be a good solution.

**Radcliff Menge:** Great. Yeah.

**Linda Wright:** And just one other comment. If you take that sign and make it perpendicular to 50, drop it down a little bit. It's almost right over that door. I think it's going to tell people more this if you put it in here and then turn it this way, it's almost right over the door. And if you have a light or something that says, you know, here's the front door. I think that would help. And if you had a little small one to match what's on this side, I wouldn't be opposed to that either.

**Tim Clites:** Okay. We just covered a lot. Any further comments on the signage or the color scheme? Bill.

**Bill Anderson:** Just so I was. [off mic] saying. When I look at this package right now, [off mic] where did it go? [inaudible] At the sign in the front was also proposed to be ten square feet. And if what I understand you were suggesting, which I don't think is a bad idea, by the way, is if the sign is mounted perpendicular to Main Street, and I assume, did you mean it to be still a ten foot square sign that would have it projecting out four feet? Okay. It would have to probably be considering what Linda said at the spandrel height between the two windows, which is about 14ft, or where it is now. Okay. I was just

wanting to make sure that's what. And if it has to be smaller because of a placard sign next to the door, so be it.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. I think what the applicant mentioned is that sign would stay the large size and the sign around the corner, because we feel it should be smaller, would free up some available space if he needed the third placard style sign.

**Bill Anderson:** I understand.

**Tim Clites:** Did we understand that right?

**Radcliff Menge:** You nailed it.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. Right.

**Radcliff Menge:** And I did just want to address the painting on the Madison side. If you all feel from our approach, we're thinking of it as a continuous business, right? And so, the continuity of the paint scheme is to convey to the consumer that there's one business here. I mean, I'm sensitive to the, you know, preserving the integrity of the three separate spaces. It sounds like the preference, y'all's preference is that because the space immediately adjacent to the building on the Washington Street side was part of the original that it should have its own paint scheme, and then perhaps the next two spaces. It would be fine if they had a unified paint scheme, but it was separate from the front one. So, to put it another way, if we went white, Revere Pewter, Revere Pewter, and then our neighbor's white, then that would potentially work.

**Punkin Lee:** I would think so, because if they come in the door on the Madison Street side, yes, it's all one building, but as soon as you get inside, you're going to see where you are. And the other two old doors are not going to be accessible for access or egress. So, their windows, I mean, I think it's kind of self-explanatory for your entrance.

**Will Moore:** May I just ask, did everyone see the actual hard sample color of the Revere Pewter? Because it is quite different from what you see in the package. If it's helpful.

**Punkin Lee:** I think the sample is really nice because the rendering is like way too much institutional looking gray.

**Radcliff Menge:** That was just to get your attention.

**Punkin Lee:** It did. [laughter]

**Will Moore:** If it's helpful on screen is Revere Pewter? Again, it's a different setting, but it gives you this is Revere Pewter on.

**Tim Clites:** Just to be clear. Does anyone on the committee not. Is everyone comfortable that's a light gray. Like, I think we're okay with the Revere Pewter.

**Will Moore:** It's a grayish beige.

**Tim Clites:** There's a light. It's in the lighter tones. I think it fits with the [off mic].

**Radcliff Menge:** Well and the regs if I'm not wrong, say, a light tan or a light gray.

**Tim Clites:** That's right. Yeah, exactly. It's right in there. Right in two with one stone. Right. Yeah.

**Punkin Lee:** And that color is much softer, which I think for that expanse is going to be nice.

**Radcliff Menge:** We've used Revere Pewter on another store, and it looks very nice.

**Tim Clites:** Okay. Would someone like to summarize that? All right. Everyone chuckled. So, I'm going to summarize it. That's why they make me sit in this seat not because I like to do this, but because I'm willing. No, I'm just kidding.

**Radcliff Menge:** And the only thing before you summarize, I do have the measurements on the lights. I know that you had been asking about it, so if you're interested in it, I can give them to you now.

**Tim Clites:** So, let's just pause on that for a second. And let me ask specifically because I want to be clear about what I think we're recommending. And that is that the new door on the front facade likely will need to be a custom-made door to fill the entire height of the opening. And that, and I didn't hear from my colleagues, whether they agree or disagree with whether it's a full glass door or whether it's a glass down to the height of the windowsill with a panel below it. And maybe we don't. If it's painted dark, maybe we don't care, because essentially, they're both going to appear dark unless there's more light inside than outside.

**Bill Anderson:** But that will change the proportions of the lights.

**Tim Clites:** It does.

**Bill Anderson:** Right.

**Tim Clites:** And so, my. [multiple speakers] All right. My sense is that if we recommend that tonight, we would also ask for that updated drawing, either to come back to the entire committee or to someone on the committee that could approve it on behalf of the committee. We've done that before. If Mr. Moore thinks that's advisable or would you rather see that drawing?

**Will Moore:** I think I would be more comfortable with a feature like this that it comes back to the whole committee.

**Tim Clites:** Okay, so let's give us clear instruction as we can on that particular detail.

**Bill Anderson:** Given the retail door, my recommendation I would think, would be that it would have [inaudible] the panel, the glass would stop at the sill of the windows adjacent so that it gives strength to the door. Because if it's a door that's being opened 100 times a day, 200 times a day, you want something to be workable. But hopefully that works with the proportions of the lights.

**Tim Clites:** Okay. So.

**Cindy Pearson:** Tim.

**Tim Clites:** Yes.

**Cindy Pearson:** Before you start with the motion, I just wanted to say on the Madison Street side, if you look at it existing now, it has a couple of gutters down, the kind of splits the building up a little bit, but it's not shown. Only one on the I'm on page nine. Do you see what I'm saying? That helps define the building and there's no definition there. Would that help?

**Tim Clites:** Well, thank you for clarifying that. I'll clarify that in my comments. How's that? And then you can all agree or disagree and I'm happy with either. All right. So, let's start at the front facade. I move that we approve this application for the Noble House as follows. We approve the moving of the main

building sign from the corner of the intersection to the left of the entry stairs, and we approve the window that's right most with the wood panel below it being removed and a new door subject to a cut sheet submittal that we would approve, but that we conceptually now approve a new door in that opening. Maximizing the height and width of the opening with the new door and that it would have be painted black, and that the shutters are the full height square top, like the shutters that are on the window now, and that the sign that is on the corner be moved to the main facade and be located in the spandrel, which is halfway between the first floor window head and the second floor window sill, and centered, I think, in the available brick between the corner and the shutter, the first shutter. And I further move that on the Madison Street facade that the gutters and downspouts stay as they are, that the two plywood openings have doors replacing the opening as submitted, that all three of the doors be painted black, and that the facade be painted starting at the left. The first panel you would like in the white.

**Radcliff Menge:** Sounds good to me.

**Tim Clites:** You certainly can come back because you'll need to bring the door back. But for now, I would propose the first panel is the I'm using white generically. The sample that we looked at, Sherwin-Williams, Natural White, and the second two buildings be the Benjamin Moore Revere Pewter and further that the sign wall projecting sign on that facade be no more than seven square feet. What did I miss?

**Margaret Littleton:** Shutters on Madison Street.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. And that the windows without shutters receive shutters on Madison Street.

**Punkin Lee:** I have a question. Moving the current Noble House sign will that be updated? Because Noble House no longer has wealth management or the museum?

**Radcliff Menge:** Yes.

**Punkin Lee:** We're not just going to move it and keep it.

**Radcliff Menge:** We're updating it.

**Punkin Lee:** Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Any clarifications to the motion? Yes.

**Radcliff Menge:** Yeah, I was going to ask. I just want to make sure Charlie is okay with that. It's going to go white, Pewter. You can't do white over here because this is white. And then it will just be white, white, white. So, it's got to be Pewter on the far right. And so, what they're saying is that this is the part of the original. So, it kind of connects to there. And then these came later and then so those are separate. So, it's just a Natural White. And then the doors will be black. Okay. Would you be opposed to that. [off mic] That's actually a good point. So, Charlie made a good observation. Right. Because this is kind of hard to. I'm just going to draw this line. Actually, if you can pull the I'm on page seven close to the end here. But I think if you show the drawing that has the gutter back on it, Will.

**Linda Wright:** Page nine. [multiple speakers]

**Radcliff Menge:** Yeah. So, the reason that gutter is in the middle is because that's the actual the building that you said had the kitchen in it. It actually. So, it goes window, door, window. That window is a part of the I'll call it the white building for our purposes. And so, what Charlie was pointing out is that the white should be, I guess, essentially where the gutter is right on this. Yeah. And then it splits and then it's Pewter, Pewter, because that the white building ends on the right-hand side of these shutters on the right side.

**Bill Anderson:** Just a suggestion. Instead of three. Maybe just do it two.

**Radcliff Menge:** Well, it's still going to be two doors over there.

**Bill Anderson:** Oh, I know. Yeah, but two colors.

**Radcliff Menge:** Well, that's what it was going to be white, pewter all the way down. Yeah.

**Will Moore:** Am I hearing paint white back to the gutter. And basically, the gutter becomes the dividing line. Is that what we're hearing?

**Radcliff Menge:** I think if you look at the interior, the interior space itself, on the inside, that window that's immediately to the left of the gutter is where the wall is. That's where the wall is.

**Charles Carroll :** No one of them is. See where the gutter is? That's where your wall.

**Radcliff Menge:** That's where the actual wall is on the interior.

**Charles Carroll :** Both sections.

**Margaret Littleton:** Is it brick? It's not brick?

**Radcliff Menge:** I'm not sure what it is.

**Charles Carroll :** And underneath, in the basement. It's completely open. No walls at all.

**Bill Anderson:** So, are you saying this was probably the edge of the first?

**Charles Carroll :** I would say it was all one building. Just because the, you know, like in the Red Fox or. Yeah. The Red Fox. The dining room where the fireplace is at the end. That basement is the exact copy of what's underneath there? Below street level. So, I don't see how it was three buildings. That's what I'm saying.

**Bill Anderson:** So, you're suggesting white.

**Margaret Littleton:** One was original and two were in two buildings. They were shops.

**Charles Carroll :** Oh, I don't see how. Maybe upstairs.

**Margaret Littleton:** No, they came in off the street. Yes. [off mic] had had a gallery there. Yeah.

**Rhonda North:** Mr. Chair could the speaker please speak in the microphone.

**Radcliff Menge:** Hey, Charlie, come get on the microphone.

**Will Moore:** I think we should.

**Tim Clites:** Go over to this microphone. Believe it or not, we have people watching.

**Radcliff Menge:** Sorry. There we go.

**Tim Clites:** [multiple speakers] Throughout the world.

**Radcliff Menge:** All right.

**Tim Clites:** People are watching.

**Charles Carroll :** So, the footprint of the basement from the where the brick of the Noble House ends to where the chimney is on the far-right hand corner. The footprint in the basement is all one, no walls dividing it up, and it's the same footprint, roughly or to give you an idea of what the basement looks like, is the Red Fox dining room. Same fireplace in the basement. So just looking at it from a structural point of view, I don't see how it was built as three buildings. I think it looks nice having the sections if they were separate businesses. So, all I was saying is like instead of dividing three, maybe two large parts as your gutter is the dividing point.

**Radcliff Menge:** So, you're saying instead of going basically a third two thirds go halfsies?

**Charles Carroll :** Yeah. It's just an idea.

**Tim Clites:** That's the better way to clarify what we're talking about. Instead of one third two thirds. Let's go back to page five, please.

**Charles Carroll :** Right. Isn't that what I was trying to say? Yeah, like that's one color. That's for sure. I know, do you like that idea or do you want it white, gray, white.

**Radcliff Menge:** If the only thing. The only thing you can suggest is if they really want.

**Charles Carroll :**

**Tim Clites:** [multiple speakers] The request would be that the door that's going to be the active door with the sign, which is the left door and the window on both sides of it, be part of one-color panel, and the rest be part of the other color panel. So instead of it looking like three, it would look like two.

**Bill Anderson:** It's better.

**Margaret Littleton:** But it still has three doors.

**Tim Clites:** It still has three doors and the two doors in the other color, which we had agreed, is the Revere Pewter would not be operational doors. They're essentially fixed doors, windows. So, the fact that that's a different color is kind of a unique. It'll take somebody a minute to figure that all out. Once they're inside your store, it'll. Right. It's fine.

**Radcliff Menge:** Logical. Yeah. Once you're in.

**Tim Clites:** So, my only, I'll just say I made the motion. I'm happy to adjust the motion with the clarification. I'd like at least Bill or one of you' s help. I don't think that the color line is behind the downspout. It's not behind the downspout, is it? It's slightly off of the downspout, so the downspout appears like it's on the gray. Does that make sense? So if you look at the left downspout there's a little bit of paint that goes to the left of the left downspout, and I would like the dividing color to also be if that's eight inches or a foot, it should be that far beyond the center downspout so that the downspout.

**Radcliff Menge:** So, you get a long metal building.

**Tim Clites:** Yes. Does that I mean I know we're nitpicking right. We've come this far. [multiple speakers]

**Radcliff Menge:** So essentially where there's so many architects in here, you all can tell me what they are. But the piece of iron on the outside of the building. And is that your mark?

**Cindy Pearson:** Yeah.

**Tim Clites:** Perfect. That can be the arc. That can be the mark. Sure. Thank you. Okay. All right. Now, that was actually a motion with a clarification to the dividing line for the paint scheme. Is that all understood?

**Punkin Lee:** Second.

**Tim Clites:** All those in favor?

**Punkin Lee:** Aye.

**All Committee Members:** Aye.

**Cindy Pearson:** Aye. It's not working. I ordered.

**Tim Clites:** All ayes. No opposed. No abstain. All right. So, to be clear, that motion. Then you'll come back with the details on the door. But the rest of your. If I understand Mr. Moore the rest of it, you're approved to proceed with the signage, you can proceed with the other doors. It's just the door at the front that we want to see a detail of how that door proportionally works with the window that's beside it. Got it.

**Radcliff Menge:** Thank you all.

**Tim Clites:** Sure. Thank you.

**Punkin Lee:** Thank you.

**Radcliff Menge:** So, the business is based in Birmingham, Alabama. I'm actually from Winchester. I grew up in Winchester. Yeah. This is store number four. So, we I started the business back in 2015. I used to be a full-time practicing attorney, and this was supposed to be my creative outlet, so now I'm in retail. What a relief. [laughter] But we opened the store in Mountain Brook Village in Birmingham in 2021, and that's a corner location and a historic building. And then last September, we opened a store on the square in Oxford, Mississippi, Historic building. And we're also opening another store at the same time we're doing this one in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, corner location, historic building. So, we're hopefully communicating that we're very, very sensitive to one. We like to find locations like this and have been delighted to work with Charlie and delighted to work with you all too. The location is really important to us, but what makes the location special. It wouldn't make sense for us to come in and change it. Like we're attracted to the location for the same reason you all are interested in keeping the integrity of it. So that's what we're trying to do.

**Tim Clites:** Awesome. Well, welcome to town. We're excited to have you.

**Cindy Pearson:** And you should call yourself the Corner Store. No, I'm kidding.

**Margaret Littleton:** Four corners.

**Radcliff Menge:** Four corners. Well, thank you all very much.

**Punkin Lee:** Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Okay. That's all of our action items. We do have a discussion item. Sidewalk signs. Mr. Moore?

**Will Moore:** Yes. Give me just one second, please, to get this teed up. Okay, so you have my memo, but assuming that you might not have read it completely the Town Council has been interested in for some time in trying to get a little better handle on the proliferation of sidewalk signs in town. So historically, they have not been regulated. They've never gone through a permitting process. We just kind of turned a blind eye to them. I think it's fair to say that in decades past and leading up to even at the point when I began here ten years ago it was more often than not that the signs were smaller than many of the ones we see now. They were almost exclusively traditional chalkboards. Over time with the success that we're very happy for in getting retail spaces filled. We don't have the empty storefronts that we were necessarily as concerned about 8 or 9 years ago. But with that, we've seen many more of these signs popping up. We've seen them. Many of them not all, but many increasing in their size. A number of businesses putting out more than one, which was typically not happening. We've seen them being left out 24 hours, which was typically not happening as well. And just creating in a number of cases some issues with pedestrian circulation. We've had some street corners that have been crowded to the point where handicapped ramps are blocked. So even in spaces where we do have wide expanses of sidewalk, still having some issues. So, Council kind of tasked us with getting a little better handle on these. So, what they're proposing or what I'm proposing to Council in response to their concerns is setting up a permitting process. Which should be the case anyway that it is use of public space, it is not we're talking about signs in the public realm. So, the permitting process not as much interest of this committee, but it would provide certain protections for the town that we are being listed as a certificate on their certificate of insurance. So, if anything ever happens, somebody trips on a sign, becomes injured the town is covered as well as the owner of the business. They obviously have their own liability insurance, but we're covered under the blanket of their insurance as well, being listed as an additional insured; things like that. But the idea is to come up with a set of parameters under which the signs would be evaluated. So, Council specifically asked that I consult with you on some of the ideas about the esthetics. So, there are some things within the draft conditions here that apply to minimum traversable width of sidewalk, things like that. Not really asking for your input there. That's based on accessibility requirements. But what I've done, and I tried to color code this so it would maybe help you understand how I came up with the first draft of this. So, we do have in our historic district design guidelines. When those were updated, we did contemplate that at some point in time there may be a review of the signs. So, guidelines were incorporated even though we don't currently review those. And so, what I did was within the Historic District Design Guidelines section, I kind of highlighted things. And then I tried to incorporate those in this draft of conditions. So a quick rundown is that obviously it would be either an A frame or possibly just a single vertical sign, two flat faces, one particular area where Council wanted your input was the idea of whether they should be limited to only chalkboards, or whether you would be amenable to the printed graphics that a few businesses have used. My initial draft would have allowed for either, but again, Council wanted your input on this. Some guidelines about what the frame would be constructed of, so we have seen some signs we talked about the sizes, the materials. Well, not so much the materials, but the facing. But we've even seen what I call the Fisher Price Sign's kind of bulbous plastic signs popping up in only a couple of occasions, but so this would have some requirements of what the frame would be made of. It would have some size limitations on sizes on the signs. So, what I have here proposed is no larger than four square feet per side of the face, and then some overall dimensions. Within my report, I kind of compared that the town has separately implemented some directional signs that we've put at street corners to give to highlight some businesses that are off of main street. Those signs are just barely over three-square feet on their face. And they're a little bit smaller than the overall dimensions here. So, it gives you a little bit of a maybe a relative idea if you've seen those signs. Those signs. These signs could be slightly larger, but not much than those. It would have a limitation of only one sign. One sidewalk sign that could be permitted per business. It would have to be within the storefront width of the business. They couldn't take that sign and put it a couple storefronts down or at a street corner. It would have to be in front of the business. It would have to be removed when the business is not open. And then again, some things about placement maintaining the minimum traversable width a specific prohibition on dry erase boards, plastic frames, and vinyl lettering. That all comes from our historic district design guidelines. So that's kind of an overview. Again, Council is asking for your input on essentially the esthetics, the size and the esthetics, the composition of the signs. The biggest question that I raised to them was involving, do you want to limit it to the chalkboards, or do you want to allow for graphics as well? Understanding that these would not be coming to you for

individual review, these guidelines would be established, and it would be an administrative permit. So, I'm happy to answer any questions, but I'm open hoping for your input on the draft that we have come up with here. And sorry, that's a lot to throw at you obviously, but Council is really interested in getting this established sooner than later so we can start to get a handle, especially before we get into the holiday season. You know, it's going to take a little bit of time once we adopt a code amendment if Council goes that route to actually get the permit process in place and to get and then to get businesses to comply with submitting those permit applications.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you for all this work and thought. There's a lot that's going into this. I'll just go first this time only because I almost never do. I think it's great. My biggest reaction is that I have this sense that these are like, temporary. You're taking them in, you're taking them out signs. And so, I actually very much like the chalk board aspect. And at the same time, I think the little Zest sign that is on in the documents that you sent us, 9.4 is a chalkboard sign. It does have some graphic, but the graphic is around like this is who owns the sign. And that's kind of a nice branding identifier, but the whole sign is not a pre-made placard that's going to sit out there and deteriorate. So, my quick vote is chalkboards because it's required that then you've got to update it. You've got to maintain it. It's this kind of softer, not permanent sign that looks ratty over time. And it requires a certain amount of engagement from the user, which I think is a nice complement to the other signs that we work on in town. With that, I'll go to Cindy.

**Cindy Pearson:** Yes. We, as you all know, when you walk down South Madison or different parts of town, you really have to go like this. And having people in wheelchairs or restricted, you know. It's a tough way to get around. So, I do think this is very necessary. I made comment that the other what was it? The printed. For some reason, we're not on that same page. Can you? Let's see. It's here. The printed graphics. I don't care for those. There's a couple of them that have that, and they're large. And it also seems if I'm picturing this correct with the printed graphics, usually has the different frame around it, the metal or whatever you'd like to call it. They don't use the chalkboard type material with that printed graphic, so I would suggest not having the printed graphics or the unlike Tim, the chalkboard type signs are, you know, seem to be more quaint or the town the way the town is.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Linda.

**Linda Wright:** With the Zest sign. Is the Zest considered a printed graphic? And then obviously the chalkboard is chalkboard, but is that part considered printed graphic?

**Will Moore:** I think maybe the better way to answer that is if you're open to that kind of arrangement, we could find a way to word that so that that would be okay, if that makes sense.

**Linda Wright:** Because yeah. Because it might be easier for businesses to [inaudible] put their business name there. That's permanent. Then the rest would be chalkboard. I would be all for that. And I think the chalkboard thing is she said, is quaint. It's cute. It changes all the time. It's something new to read. I think that's a good way to go. And I think the ones you've done on the corners in town with all the signs to the businesses, have been really effective. Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Punkin.

**Punkin Lee:** I think the biggest issue about whatever choice is made is that people don't take them in at night. The majority of them are left out on a more consistent basis than taken in consistently. I think that the chalkboard is to me, the best part about a chalkboard is it makes retailers pay more attention to their sign on the street because you have the opportunity to change it up. If you're going to do something fun one day or another than just having the stagnant sign out because your name would be on it anyway. I think the town signs on the corners are nice, only they're not updated.

**Will Moore:** Yeah, we're going to work on that. We? Yeah.

**Punkin Lee:** You know, it's one thing to tell suggest to people what they do, but if the town signs aren't consistently maintained, then it's not good.

**Will Moore:** Agreed.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Punkin. Margaret.

**Margaret Littleton:** I agree with the permitting. I think that will be very helpful. I think my idea would be to have all of them the same. And I like there's several that are wooden with a chalkboard. I like the chalkboard. And I was going to agree with Punkin that they definitely are lax on bringing them in at night, and that's dangerous. And I guess the size is smaller is better than larger. So that's it.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you Bill.

**Bill Anderson:** I also agree with the chalkboard idea, not the And I think all the other comments in the permitting requirements are really appropriate and good.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. And just yeah, I think maybe Linda's clarified, but I think like I look at the Zest sign and I would say that the top no more than the top 25% could be a printed graphic from the business, so that that's a permanent they're not having to rewrite their business name, but the rest of it's a chalkboard. That would be a way to maybe contain the amount of printed graphic. I guess, to your question, all of them the same is an interesting question. Would we literally want to say this is the approved sandwich board sign? It's this dimension by this height and it's a wood frame. And you can't use a synthetic. You can't use a metal. Like what? help us, Will. What kind of problems do we introduce if we're that limiting?

**Will Moore:** Yeah, I think there's a multitude of problems there. A if we don't want to favor a specific vendor, so we don't want to say this is the sign. This is who you have to use. That vendor may not keep making that sign for the longest time, I think while I envision many signs that exist out there especially the ones that we've noted as problematic will not be able to be reused. We certainly want to allow ones that would comply with all the regulations to continue to be used. So, if Zest sign meets the I mean, that's we've referred to that a number of times. If it meets the size requirements, which I think it does, there would be no reason to make somebody with a successful sign change it to meet that. That would be my and not to insert myself too much into your realm. I think there's something about having a little bit of variety that's nice as well.

**Linda Wright:** So, with the metal ones, with all the outdoor furniture and everything else we've talked about recently, would you want all the outdoor metal ones to be black or? [multiple speakers]

**Will Moore:** I mean, that's a question for you.

**Linda Wright:** Yeah. Yeah.

**Tim Clites:** That's actually a great observation because we did talk about that with outdoor furniture, didn't we?

**Linda Wright:** We did. So at least if they're metal, they would at least be a consistent color. Oh, just a thought.

**Punkin Lee:** They could be black or dark green. You know, that would be a variety but still a darker background maybe. Yeah, But I think if chalkboards end up being the choice that they should have the business name as presented within their logo, not just a standard name like the Zest. You know, that's how they write their name. So, I think because that would create variety rather than cookie cutter one font all the way around.

**Tim Clites:** I think that's what we're saying right?

**Punkin Lee:** Yeah, I know.

**Tim Clites:** Is that they would use their name and logo. That's right. Yeah. And I also agree with the administrative review. Like I don't, certainly don't think we need to have these come before us because.

**Will Moore:** Yeah. Just one clarification. I can't mandate content. So, I can't say if you're going to have a graphic, it has to be your business name and logo I can't regulate content on a sign. It's there's legal decisions on that. So, it something along the line of you can have 25% of it being a printed graphic. That works great. But I can't say the graphic has to be this. I'm just not legally allowed to do that. We can't do that. So just understand that if we allow a printed graphic to exist, they would have the flexibility for that graphic to be whatever they want to within a limitation. If it's 20, no more than 25% of the face of the sign, that's fine. But I can't say if you have a graphic, it has to be your business name.

**Cindy Pearson:** And can it be worded something else other than printed graphic. Because in graphic I'm seeing picture also or does that get clarified in the definition of printed graphic and I don't know if we can or not, but it looks like John has a comment. He's dying to give us. I don't know if that's appropriate during this.

**Will Moore:** It's our job.

**Tim Clites:** It's up to you to be open. You do this a lot. What suggestions might you say.

**John Ralph:** You've actually worked yourself back to a lot of the things that I was hoping you would say. But I've been over the years, I've been lucky to do a sign rewrite for quite a few other jurisdictions or to sit on the committee. The only thing, the only one I honestly disagree with is making them all the same. And the big reason there is this town wins tons of awards, a lot of them for signs, and every one of them is different. And I don't think you want the sandwich boards to all be different. I mean, to be the same I think that kind of just ruins the whole thing. And in other jurisdictions and not all of those work in Middleburg, but and I'm happy to not belabor the meeting with this, but we came up with one where like where the sidewalks aren't very deep, they can only have leaners. So, it's a one-sided sign that leans on the building. That way you can't tell people they don't have it. I know you can't regulate content, but one of the ones that I've worked with in the past that worked really well is that a large portion of it needs to be changeable. In a lot of jurisdictions, and currently Middleburg is one of them. You basically can have a sign with a permit and have a sandwich board that is the exact same sign without a permit. I mean, you could literally duplicate your sign. And to prevent that you know, you make a requirement that a certain percentage is changeable and then allow a certain percentage of it to be fixed. You don't have to call it a printed graphic. You could call it painted or something with permanence. You know, it could be dimensional, it could be cut out letters. And then not everybody's a chalk artist. And just from like a semantics, we don't want to use the word chalkboard only because they're not waterproof. So, there are actually other products. But I have a whole list from doing this with a couple other jurisdictions. I mean, quite honestly, I think it is forwarded to Will, but it solved a lot of these other people's problems. The biggest one is that people don't bring them in. And then the last thing that just occurred to me is a lot of people do use pre-made frames. I love not allowing plastic, not allowing any of those horrible ones and picking, you know, a good square footage number, six is what a lot of them are, and that's pretty big, you know. So, dropping that as you did, I think is great, but we should probably look at what frame sizes they come in so that we're not forcing everyone to custom make them. I know there are four square foot ones in different versions of things that at least that way we don't just create a new four-square foot limit and discover nobody makes it. Nobody makes that product.

**Tim Clites:** Well, certainly if you have information [multiple speakers] if you're willing to share.

**John Ralph:** I'm happy to.

**Tim Clites:** I think we'd be happy to have it.

**John Ralph:** I'm happy to bullet list what we did. I've done it in several jurisdictions now that it's solving all the same problems. The only one you can't solve, and I don't know the solution is people just leave them out there. We have a solution for that, I mean the solution is you have to go take them.

**Tim Clites:** Yeah. It is.

**Will Moore:** And I don't mean and it's not like we're going to take a sign and we're going to toss it in the dumpster. But, you know, if my maintenance supervisor starts work a lot earlier than I do and a lot earlier than most businesses are open, and it's going to become, if this gets going.

**Tim Clites:** Pick it up and.

**Will Moore:** Become a thing where we if we have to remove a sign because it's left out 24 hours, we do and then we return it nicely. And a nice reminder. And you know, we don't want to come across at all as being punitive to our businesses. We want our businesses to be successful, but we do have a problem. And it's not just one voice on Council, it's many voices on Council. Many citizens complaining, many visitors complaining about the proliferation of signs. So, we need to find a solution that works for everyone.

**Tim Clites:** I guess the only thing I would add to everything that we've heard is the town signs and the scale of them at the main intersection. I always viewed positively, but I think given what standard signs are available, I certainly think we should error on the side of smaller signs than larger because they are a pedestrian scale. They're intended for the pedestrian. So that's a much slower pace. You can walk right up to it. And what does it say? And it's not about the vehicle. So, if you know if there's an option for oh, this bumps us up to the next size, I think I would err on the smaller side of whatever those standard availables are. Is this helpful?

**Will Moore:** Very much.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you. Thank you for running it by us. We appreciate it.

**John Ralph:** Thank you.

**Tim Clites:** Thank you, Mr. Ralph, the sign man of Loudoun County. We appreciate it. Yeah. Any other comments from anyone? All right then I move that we adjourn. Thank you. Attendance. Oh, we started back up. False stop attendance next month. Is there any conflict, beyond just who's available? We don't have any town conflicts or anything, do we? So, if y'all can let Rhonda know if you're not available. She'll make sure we have a quorum. Thank you. And meeting adjourned.

**Will Moore:** Just a reminder. I will send out the invitation to the JARB Awards for anybody who's available to attend. So, we did nominate four projects and all four projects I understand were selected for awards. Again, those are it's the signage for Middleburg Books for Federal and Black the town hall project, as well as the Hersch's project on the east end of town. So, I'll send out that invitation. But again, it's Thursday, September 19th. 6:30 reception. That's in Leesburg. We'll get you the address and everything.