TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, October 3, 2024
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, October 3, 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
Margaret Littleton
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: William Anderson (excused)
Virginia Jenkins (excused)

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the September 4, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

Old Business

Chair Clites noted that a revision had been submitted earlier in the day by the Middleburg Community Charter School for their application to revise COA 24-20. He further noted that Deputy Town Manager Moore had not had the opportunity to process the revision; therefore, consideration of this item would be delayed to the next meeting.

COA 24-21 Revision: Wall Sign – 2 W. Washington Street – Tom Beckbe

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that there was discussion when the COA was approved about the addition of a wall sign on the front elevation to help customers understand which door was the entry to the business. He reported that the applicant was proposing to install a 5.8 square foot wall sign that would be centered between the door and the window. Mr. Moore opined that it was unclear during the last discussion of whether this sign would be in lieu of the projecting sign or in addition to. He reported that there was a sufficient allocation of signage for this building overall to accommodate this request; although, its approval would take them close to the total maximum allotment for the building as a

whole. Mr. Moore questioned whether three signs would be too many for one business. He further questioned whether it would be acceptable for this to be an additional sign so they could retain the projecting sign on the front as well. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Moore advised that the size of the two projecting signs were not proposed to decrease. He reported that the one on the front elevation would continue to be ten square feet and the one on the side elevation would continue to be seven square feet.

Vicky Davidson, Manager of Tom Beckbe, appeared before the Committee representing the application. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the window to the left of the entry door was a part of the store. Ms. Davidson advised that the main entry door for the building was in the foyer and noted that this would be the temporary access to their store until their new historic door was installed on the front of the building. She explained that the reason for centering the sign above the window and new door was so people would know they were going into a retail space.

Councilmember Pearson opined that the sign would look better if it was located over the new door.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded them that their approval of the projecting sign last month was for it to be on the front façade at a ninety-degree angle.

Committee Member Wright and Vice Chair Lee advised that they were fine with the application as submitted.

Committee Member Littleton opined that it would be better to have the sign above the door, as it would designate it as the entrance.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed there was still a small wall sign for the attorney's office located in the building to the left of the main door.

Chair Clites opined that a small wall sign on the other side, but closer to the new door, would be more sympathetic to the building. He suggested that one way to manage a smaller sign would be to have it just say "Tom Beckbe" and to remove the wording "fine sporting apparel and gear."

Ms. Davidson opined that moving the sign would result in people having a hard time knowing where to enter their store. She advised that she did not want them entering into the foyer and disturbing the attorney's office. Ms. Davidson opined that having the sign centered above their door and window would clearly denote that this was their shop.

Vice Chair Lee opined that the attorney's wall sign was located in a space where there was more room between the shutter and the door. She further opined that bringing this sign down would make it look like it was crammed in between the shutters. Ms. Lee suggested that having it on top would make it work better in the space. She opined that it was nice that the black panel above the main door was being removed.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-21 Revision (S 24-08), a request of Radcliff Menge for a wall sign at 2 West Washington Street – Tom Beckbe.

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

Chair Clites noted that Mr. Menge had been working to source a door and would likely return next month with it. He suggested to Ms. Davidson that if he was having challenges finding someone to create a custom door, he should reach out to the members of the committee, as many of them were architects who could provide suggestions.

New Business

COA 24-23: Fence – 105 Garden Cottage Lane – Baron Buckner/All About Fences

Deputy Town Manager Moore reviewed the location of this property. He reported that the request was to erect a fence along the western property line, between the home and the adjacent commercial parking lot, and along the southern property line, between the home and the Shiloh Baptist Church. Mr. Moore further reported that the applicant was requesting approval of an eight-foot-tall privacy fence that would consist of seven feet of solid fencing topped by a one-foot-high section of lattice. He advised that this was allowable under the zoning ordinance, as the home was adjacent to a non-residential zone; however, it still required a review by the HDRC. Mr. Moore reminded the members that the Historic District Guidelines discouraged privacy fences except in certain cases and noted that it was usually a case in which the property owner was trying to screen their property from a higher intensity use on a commercial property, such as a dumpster. He advised that the staff raised some question as to the appropriateness of the fence, particularly at the proposed height along the southern property line and noted that there was currently a low fence in that location. Mr. Moore advised that the existing fence was not in the best of repair and noted that it stepped up a bit toward the western end where the grade stepped up a bit. He advised that he was unsure of what the applicant was trying to accomplish in this direction. Mr. Moore reported that on the western side, the commercial property owner removed a number of trees and other vegetation that previously served as a landscaping screen between the two properties. He advised that some of this screening, which should not have been removed, was on the applicant's property and explained that he was trying to recreate some screening with a fence rather than plantings. Mr. Moore advised that while the Historic District Guidelines did not anticipate this type of solutioning, the question was still the appropriateness of the proposed fence. He reiterated that the guidelines discouraged the use of privacy fences in general in the Historic District. Mr. Moore displayed a photograph of the property and noted that it would result in a stark white fence being seen from Jay Street. He asked that the Committee consider the visual impact of a fence of this height in the Historic District.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to the location of the property line and whether the proposed fence would be on the same elevation as the parking lot or whether the bottom of it would be at the lower location, beginning where the steps were, Baron Buckner, Manager of All About Fences, advised that he did not know the exact location of the property line, as he was only able to locate one of the corner pins. He opined that it was midway up the incline or approximately four feet from the parking lot level. Mr. Buckner advised that while the existing fence between this property and the Shiloh Baptist Church appeared short in the photographs, it was a six-foot-tall fence. He noted that only about forty-eight inches were visible because of the elevation. Mr. Buckner opined that if he installed an eight-foot-tall fence, only six feet would be visible from the street because of the difference in the planes. He explained that he was proposing an eight-foot fence so it would match all the way around.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Buckner confirmed there was a different fence in the corner that was not the same as the fence that was adjacent to the back of the church. He confirmed the applicant also had a white picket fence in his back yard. Mr. Buckner advised that what was being proposed was to replace the existing six-foot-tall privacy fence in the front.

Chair Clites opined that there was a misunderstanding between neighbors that resulted in the tree removal. He noted that it appeared there were some plantings that had been planted not long ago and questioned whether those were on the neighboring property or the applicant's.

Mr. Buckner advised that it was his understanding that this was an attempt by the commercial property owner to alleviate the situation created when an overzealous contractor removed trees from the residential property that previously provided a screen. He explained that the property owner he represented now had a view he was not thrilled with as a result.

Chair Clites noted that the staff report talked about eight-foot-tall fences having planting buffers. He acknowledged this was generally conceived for a different application in that it was usually the commercial property owner asking for the fence. Mr. Clites noted that this was the reverse. He suggested that one day, the new plantings would create a buffer between the parking lot and this property.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Buckner confirmed there was a short stone retaining wall at the base of the incline inside the residential property.

The Committee noted the difficulty in making a decision when they did not have information on the location of the property boundary. They expressed an understanding of why the property owner wanted the fence; however, they questioned whether a landscape screen would be a better solution.

In response to a comment and inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Buckner advised that the stone retaining wall did not serve any purpose from the standpoint of privacy and explained that it was at the base of the hill and very short. He advised that it only outlined the parking. Mr. Buckner opined that it would take some time for the plantings to provide an effective screen and advised that the homeowner was looking for something that would be as effective as what was removed. He noted that a fence was his first choice. Mr. Buckner advised that the property owner already had plans to replace a portion of the existing fence before the trees were removed.

The Committee opined that the proposed fence was not appropriate, particularly given its view from the parking lot. It was suggested that plantings could accomplish the same thing. The Committee noted that most jurisdictions did not even allow eight-foot-tall fences. They advised that being all white, it stood out from the street. They expressed concern that it looked like a fortress, as opposed to a cozy little area. The Committee noted that they would like to keep the atmosphere and intimacy of the area as it was.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the commercial property did not have any required plantings shown on the plan he was able to locate. He opined that it was a safe assumption that the residential property owner did not install plantings on the commercial property.

Chair Clites agreed with the remainder of the Committee that an eight-foot-tall fence was not an appropriate separation. He acknowledged the situation that had occurred and opined that it was not unreasonable for the property owner to think about fencing. Mr. Clites suggested the Committee discuss the height of fencing they thought would be appropriate. He opined that the existing fence that was adjacent to the church had a nice scale and noted that the porch and house were still visible over it, which created a welcoming feel. Mr. Clites opined that it was important to retain the sense that there was a house and a porch there.

Mr. Buckner explained that this was not a situation where the property owner was trying to block out his neighbors. He noted that he had an existing picket fence between him and his neighbor and was not looking to change that one. Mr. Buckner explained that in this case, his residence backed up to two commercial properties, which he was trying to screen. He advised that there was already an existing six-foot-tall privacy fence on one side of the property as well, which was in disrepair. Mr. Buckner noted that originally, all they were going to do was to replace it. He advised that he expected there to be push back on the height of the fence and questioned whether there was one that could be agreed upon. Mr. Buckner further questioned whether the fence could be a different height along the commercial property where the trees were removed. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that the original plan was not to replace the fence in-kind but was always to replace it with one that had a lattice top.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the homeowner would be open to a four-foot-tall fence with some strategic plantings or a different style fence, Mr. Buckner advised that he did not believe a four-foot-tall fence would screen much of the commercial property. He further advised that the homeowner wanted an eight-foot tall one in order to replicate what was previously there.

Chair Clites noted the change in grade. He opined that a six-foot-tall fence would result in three feet sticking above the plane of the commercial parking lot. Mr. Clites suggested, however, the Committee would want verification of this before it approved it. He acknowledged that this was a commercial building; however, he noted that there were residences across the street. Mr. Clites noted that the town tried very hard to be neighborly. He acknowledged that the headlights from cars entering/exiting the parking lot would beam into the porch and advised that he was sympathetic to the homeowner for the loss of his screening. Mr. Clites opined that in a couple of years, the vegetation would regrow and would be more appropriate. He acknowledged that this would take some time; however, this was what the Committee was more comfortable with in terms of appropriateness and scale. Mr. Clites opined that even if they approved a six foot tall fence, there would not be six feet exposed on the parking lot side.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Mr. Buckner suggested a five-foot-tall board fence, with a foot of lattice on top, would be the next best option.

Councilmember Pearson read an excerpt from the Historic District Guidelines that stated that privacy board fences were generally not appropriate for front and side lawns and other highly visible areas; although, they may be appropriate where necessary to screen delivery, storage or other such visible items. She noted that it also stated that where permitted, solid board fences over four feet tall should be landscaped to soften their appearance. Ms. Pearson recommended that if the Committee felt a fence was appropriate, it be screened with landscaping.

Chair Clites noted that the commercial property owner had already planted some trees and plants on his property and suggested they would grow in the future. He acknowledged that there was four-foot privacy fencing with lattice on top used elsewhere up the street. Mr. Clites opined that it was appropriate on a back street and advised that he would be comfortable recommending it here. He suggested a five-foot-tall board fence with a foot of lattice on top would balance the openness and screening in a way that was pretty. Mr. Clites noted that previous property owners used the rear steps so they could cross the parking lot and walk into town.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether all the fences would become the same at some point, Mr. Buckner advised that the property owner wanted to leave the white picket fence in the back, as he liked the openness of it. He opined he would never touch the stone wall. Mr. Buckner advised that the two proposed fences would be white and noted that they would match the fences at most of the houses in this area.

The Committee opined that having a fence with lattice on top would look out of place from Jay Street. They questioned whether the property owner would consider something other than the standard board-on-board fence. The Committee further questioned whether he was open to a fence that looked more colonial or a picket fence. They opined that reducing the height and changing the fence would help, as they were struggling with the commercial nature of the proposed fence in this neighborhood.

Mr. Buckner explained that the property owner asked for the proposed fence style because it already existed at the townhouses behind him. He clarified that they were not asking for a board-on-board fence, but were asking for a solid board fence.

The Committee opined that a shorter solid board fence would not feel inappropriate. They acknowledged that the plantings would also help break it up.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested the motion be contingent upon the confirmation of the location of the property lines. He further suggested he work with Mr. Buckner and noted that what he heard was the assumption that the fence would be set down a certain distance so it would appear to be two to three feet shorter from the outside view. Mr. Moore advised that the Committee could delay action until this was confirmed or they could approve the request subject to confirmation of the property lines. He noted that if after doing so, something was amiss, he would return the application to them. Mr. Moore advised that he was comfortable with either approach.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-23, a request of Baron Buckner/All About Fences for a fence at 105 Garden Cottage Lane with the following clarifications: the fence description shall match the picture of the plank fence with the lattice on top, which was image eight; that the top rail of the lattice be six (6) feet from the grade that the fence is on; that Mr. Moore have the opportunity to confirm the property line with the applicant before it's installed; that the fence color be white to match the adjacent fence; and, that there be a gate at the top of the stairs between the properties.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Buckner confirmed a gate was intended.

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

November Meeting Quorum

Committee Member Littleton advised that she was not available to attend the November 7th meeting.

Chair Clites reminded the members that it would be helpful to know when someone would be absent and advised that he planned to send a note to the members through Town Clerk North. He reminded them that they needed to let Town Clerk North know when they would be absent, as she was the one who tracked whether a quorum would be present, and advised that it was difficult to track when some members notified Deputy Town Manager Moore of their absence.

Joint Architectural Review Committee (JARB) Awards

Councilmember Pearson noted that she, Town Clerk North and Deputy Town Manager Moore attended the JARB Awards Ceremony and advised that it was really nice. She reminded the Committee that the Hersh's received a design award for their house. Ms. Pearson further reminded them that signage awards were received by some Middleburg businesses and that the Town received a design award for the Town Hall Project. She thanked Chair Clites and Vice Chair Lee for attending the JARB meetings and for making the awards possible.

Town Clerk North noted that the JARB Design Award for the Town Hall Project was in the display case in the main corridor if anyone was interested in seeing it.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – October 3, 2024

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

Rhonda North: We're live.

Tim Clites: We will turn on our mics and we'll bring to order Middleburg Historic District Review Committees' Thursday, October the 3, 2024 meeting. 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 is absent. 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. Seeing as we have a huge audience in the public, we open for public comments. That's only in case you're here for something that's not on our agenda. Assuming you are here for something on our agenda, we'll get to you in just a minute. We have a short agenda tonight. Approval of meeting minutes from the September 4, 2024 regular meeting. Any additions or corrections to the minutes. Seeing none, I move we approve as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstaining? Thank you. Next action item old business COA 24-20 Revisions Request of Middleburg Charter School. This application Will, Mr. Moore received updated information this morning without enough time to process it. So, we're going to skip over it this evening. I will say, just for the applicant, the rest of us haven't had the benefit of seeing what Mr. Moore received. But I for one, without opening this up to comments, thought that the simplification of the overall support was nice, but we'll wait until he's had a chance to review, and we'll review this next month. Okay. COA 24-21 Revisions to the request of Radcliff. I said this wrong the last time, Menge for a wall sign at 2 West Washington Street. Tom Beckbe. And we have a memo in front of us from Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you. You do have the memo. There was some discussion when the application was reviewed last month. A couple of members suggested maybe the applicant consider doing a wall sign on the front elevation to help potential customers understand which door on that elevation would be the entry door for the business. But because there's the central door at the top of the stairs but the door that would be created to the right, that is, toward the east end of the building would be the entry door for this particular business. So, in response to those comments, the applicant came back with this request for 5.8ft² wall sign. It wouldn't actually, as proposed, be directly above the door, but it would be centered between that door and the window just to the left of it. I did note in the in the memo that it was unclear during the discussion last month whether the suggestion for the wall sign was in lieu of the projecting sign that would be on the front elevation or in addition to. There is sufficient allocation of signage for the building overall to accommodate this request. It would get them very close. That is the building as a whole, up to its maximum allotment but it's just it's more of a question for the committee. Are three signs for one business too many or in this particular instance, with it being a corner property, is it? And being in response to suggestions that you received last month that this type of sign might be helpful, or are you okay with the addition of this sign while retaining the approved projecting sign on the front as well?

Tim Clites: And I have one question before we start. Did the two projecting signs get reduced in order to accommodate this additional sign?

Will Moore: No.

Tim Clites: No.

Will Moore: So, the one on the front elevation would remain at ten square feet. And then the one on the side elevation would be seven square feet, as was approved last month.

Tim Clites: Last month. Thank you for that clarification. Okay. Cindy, do you want to start?

Cindy Pearson: The only question I have is the window that's to the left of the door. Is that part of their shop? So.

Tim Clites: I'm sorry. Let me pause is someone here from the applicant?

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Vicky [inaudible]

Tim Clites: Come on up. Say hello. Your name and your address for the record. Welcome. I apologize. I should have done that.

Vicky Davidson: Vicky Davidson, representing Tom Beck be, the 2 West Washington Street. So, what was the question?

Cindy Pearson: The window that's to the left of where the door is going to be. Is that part of the store?

Vicky Davidson: Yes. It is. And so, when you walk in that door.

Cindy Pearson: It goes to the hall?

Vicky Davidson: Yep. You walk into, like, the foyer and then there's, like a little door that you walk into, and that's temporary until he hopefully gets plans for this new historic door that he wants to put on the far right.

Cindy Pearson: Right.

Vicky Davidson: And which is why the sign going above both of them, I think the issue was is. And I even think that you just want to make sure when people walk into that building, they know where they're going for that retail. And when you have the flat sign on the front, I think that that helps denote, hey, we're on this side of the building on the first floor. I think that projectile sign coming out helps people going both ways down, you know, rush hour, what have you to denote that, you know, because they might not see a flat sign on the building helps them to, you know, bring business and what have you. And then of course, the one on the side same business.

Cindy Pearson: Because when you look at it, at first you would think it would look better straight over where the door is going to be. I wish we had something we could just move it just for a second, just to see what it looked like. But you know, if you have if you're in both the door and the window is your property, then.

Vicky Davidson: Yeah. So, and it goes all the way back too just I don't know, personally, I think it looks it looks nice centered to me.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy. Linda.

Linda Wright: With the signs attached to the building for the photograph is kind of hard to tell, because last time we had talked about putting it on the front face of the building. Is this out at a 45, or is it? It's hard to tell how it's attached from the photograph.

Vicky Davidson: I believe so, and I think it's.

Linda Wright: So which one?

Vicky Davidson: Oh, sorry the 45.

Linda Wright: It's a 45. It is.

Will Moore: It is not. I'm sorry.

Linda Wright: Oh, it isn't?

Will Moore: It is not. No. Nothing. Nothing changed for the projecting signs from your approval last month. So, it will be on the front facade at 90 degrees to the building. [multiple speakers]

Linda Wright: Like it's going there.

Will Moore: He was reusing a graphic that was included last month rather than recreating.

Linda Wright: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: And that's already been approved. Correct?

Will Moore: Correct.

Linda Wright: Okay. Otherwise, I'm fine with the other sign.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think the sign looks nice, centered, and especially you've got all those stairs to get up to the, you know, the flat level. So, I think that is definitely going to help people. Which door do I take? Oh, there's a sign.

Vicky Davidson: You need to tell them where to go. You know. [laughter]

Punkin Lee: So, I think it's nice.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I would be happier having the Tom Beckbe sign over the door that you're going to have, because I think that designates that as the entrance. Of course, it's a big room. I mean, you know, that, but I would prefer to see it moved over.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. My only question that wasn't a right or a wrong, but the main door to the left of it has a little sign, I think, for the attorney, if I remember. Has it been removed?

Will Moore: No, no, it is there. If you look in the photograph, it is about halfway up the height of the door, just to the left of the door.

Tim Clites: Right. And so, I wondered, I guess if you look at the 140-inch dimension at about that location, a smaller Tom Beckbe would be more sympathetic to that other wall sign and still be close to in between the doors. And I don't know if that's better or not, but it was the only question or potential suggestion that I had. I guess that maybe the scale of the projecting sign does it say fine sporting apparel and gear as well? It does, doesn't it? Yeah. So, I don't mind seeing that more than once. One way to manage a smaller sign between I'll say between the shutters would be to have it just say Tom Beckbe. Not that I want to manage what it says, but I think 42in. Right. It would.

Vicky Davidson: I just wonder if that. May I speak?

Tim Clites: Please yeah.

Vicky Davidson: I just wonder if that. I think you have a hard time when you're standing on the street seeing that other sign to the left of the building. If you look and that's a retailer, I want people to know exactly where. You just want them to know where to go. I don't want them to enter the hall and if there's a small sign to the side of the door you know, to walk into Bruce's office or. Right. In my opinion, I think that the sign over the two windows is a clear it denotes clearly that we as a shop, because that's where shop signs go above, you know, above your windows, above where your where exactly. So, I think maybe if it was in my opinion, if it was down there, I just don't want people to get confused.

Tim Clites: Yes, Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think the difference, I think the Bruce small sign has much more room between either shutter, whereas bringing it down, when you look at the space, it's going to be kind of crammed between two shutters, whereas it has much more space above the shutters as it is as presented. And if you lined it across with the roof small to put it, you know. So, I think.

Tim Clites: That's true.

Punkin Lee: I think up top probably works better when you really look at the space.

Vicky Davidson: As a retailer. Yeah, I would want my shop sign that was denoting where my shop was to be above my shop.

Punkin Lee: I think it's really nice that that blank black thing above the main door as it shows now being taken off is really nice.

Vicky Davidson: I agree completely because I even I said to him if it was there that would confuse me too not having it because you don't know where you're going, but you need to tell people where to go.

Tim Clites: Don't read into that too much. [laughter] All right. I'm happy to have a motion.

Cindy Pearson: I would like to have. How do we start this? I'm sorry. You just.

Linda Wright: Make a motion.

Cindy Pearson: There we go. I was going. This isn't right. Where am I? What day is this? I've had too many meetings this week. I'm sorry, I get it. I'd like to make a motion to approve COA 24-21 S 24-08 revision request of Radcliff Menge.

Vicky Davidson: Yep.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. For a wall sign at two West Washington Street. Tom Beckbe.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Vicky Davidson: Thanks, guys.

Will Moore: So, Mr. Chairman, before you move on, I did want to point out that Mr. Minge has been working on sourcing a door or having a door created, and he likely will be back next month with that. He's had some challenges finding somebody to create the custom door, but it sounds like he's making progress on that. So.

Vicky Davidson: Absolutely.

Tim Clites: If you need a suggestion, reach out. Okay. That's I mean, we don't make doors, but as architects we're in the business of. So yeah, if you're having trouble, just reach out.

Vicky Davidson: Absolutely.

Tim Clites: I'm happy to give you a suggestion or two.

Vicky Davidson: Okay. All right. Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: You bet.

Vicky Davidson: Thank you. Thanks, guys.

Margaret Littleton: Bye.

Vicky Davidson: Bye. We'll see you soon.

Tim Clites: Yeah. That's not always an easy thing. Yeah. All right, so now I did it. I lost my I can go to the Deputy Town Manager's email, but I can't. [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: Can I ask a question?

Tim Clites: Oh, there it is. It's that little. Yeah, for us old people, it needs to be a big red button. Sorry about that, Rhonda.

Margaret Littleton: It's the end of the day.

Tim Clites: I'll start reading the next action item while we all get onto our screen at COA 24-23 request of Baron Buckner all about fences for a fence at 105 Garden Cottage Lane. And while we're getting it open, Mr. Moore, would you like to walk us through this?

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have my memo of the proposal here is to so the Garden Cottage Lane there are three homes that front along that that small private street. The subject 105 is kind of tucked in directly behind Shiloh Baptist Church. So, the proposal is to erect a fence along the western property line, which lies between the home and the commercial parking lot, just to the west, and then also along the southern property line, which is between the home and the rear of Shiloh Baptist Church. In this instance, the applicant is requesting an eight-foot-high privacy fence. So, it would be a seven-foot high, essentially board on board fence topped with a one-foot-high lattice section. By zoning standards and zoning standards alone, independent of being in the Historic District Committee. This would be allowable when you have a residential property that is adjoining nonresidential zone or use. However, in the Historic District it still does require appropriateness review by this Committee. The design guidelines typically discourage privacy fences except in certain cases, and usually it's a case where a commercial property is trying to screen their own property from some of their higher intensity uses dumpsters, loading areas and where it's desirable for them to screen those uses from surrounding properties. This is kind of being proposed a little bit in reverse. Staff does raise some question. Certainly, to the appropriateness of the fence, particularly at this height along the southern property line, where it would be essentially screening the small vacant lot behind Shiloh Baptist Church so that portion of the property currently has a low fence. It may not be in the best of repair but and it steps up a little bit toward the western end where the grade steps up a little bit, but unsure of what the applicant is trying to accomplish in terms of screening from this direction. On the western side it's an interesting study in that the commercial property owner removed a number of trees and other vegetation that previously grew and provided landscaping, screening, essentially between the properties. And it sounds like some of those trees may actually have been off site and shouldn't have been removed by that particular property owner, and the residential property owner is now trying to recreate some screening. But in this case with a fence rather than replanting. So, our guidelines don't really anticipate this type of solutioning for a problem. It still does raise question as to the appropriateness. Again, our guidelines discourage privacy fences in general in the district. And there is a even though it's some distance this gives you the view from Jay Street across the property and essentially kind of in the area of the cursor here, if you see it going back and forth, this is where we would be seeing an eight foot high kind of stark white fence in this area. So, I simply ask you to kind of consider the visual impacts of a fence, especially of this height in the district.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Can I ask point of clarification? I have been on both these properties before, and I drove by before the meeting, and I couldn't identify is the property line that the fence would be on at the elevation of the parking that's on your screen, or would the bottom of the fence be at the lower beginning of the steps, as seen on page nine?

Will Moore: I may have to defer to the applicant on that question. I have not seen a survey of the property, so I'm unclear, as was apparently the neighboring property owner of the commercial property owner, as to exactly where that property line is. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So, someone here from the applicant, you're welcome to come up. Say hello. Your name and address, business for the record. And anything you'd like to add or clarify. And I'm sure we'll have a couple of questions for you.

Baron Buckner: Awesome. Sounds good. Yeah, I'm Baron Buckner Manager over all about fences. And I'm kind of representing the homeowner who couldn't be here today, he's out of state doing some family stuff. And then for the last question about where the property line is, I don't have complete certitude. I did locate one of the property corner pins while I was there. It's not at parking lot level. But it's not down at the base of the stairs either. It's like midway up that incline is where the property line. I'm almost 100% sure is going, which we would obviously have to confirm before doing anything. But based off of his fence location that he has in his backyard that we'd be butting up to it would imply that the property line is kind of maybe four-ish feet from the parking lot level down the hill, crossing over those steps that you see. And then I did want to just add this picture that we're looking at now behind Shiloh Baptist Church. So that existing fence, while it looks really short in this picture, because it's the yard that you're looking at, the vacant lot behind Shiloh Baptist is way higher than the property at 105 Garden. So that's a six-foot-tall fence, but it's only about 42 to 48 inches in appearance from this picture because it's set so much lower. So, the eight-foot-tall fence, if we replaced that with it only six feet of it would actually it would look like a six-foot-tall fence from the street because two feet is way below the surface because of the two different planes. So I think you just want it to be eight feet so that it would match all the way around, as opposed to having if we did an eight foot on the other side next to the commercial property an the six foot here, it would look like a huge step down because of the variance in grade. I don't know if that makes sense. It's hard to explain, but just wanted to add that on there.

Tim Clites: And one other question before I go around the room, can we go to image ten? It looks to me like in the corner coming from the left where the fence turns. I'm trying to understand exactly where that is, but I guess it's on the steps that we see in the other picture on the other side of that, that little fence that's there is not the same fence that's at the back of the church. Is that right?

Baron Buckner: That is correct. That's a different.

Tim Clites: It is not that's a different fence that would be on this property owner's property.

Baron Buckner: Yes. He has a white picket fence in his back yard behind the house. And I believe that we're seeing a part of that in that picture. I'm trying to get my bearings on it as well.

Tim Clites: Yeah, okay.

Baron Buckner: But that is a different fence. The fence in the front that we would be replacing is a privacy fence six feet tall stepping level that goes along the front.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And then I have one other question just to understand it. And I don't know that it matters to us who took down the trees. It sounds like maybe that was a mistake between neighbors. I'm not sure. I did notice that there was additional planting that looks like it was planted not long ago. Do you know, is that on the neighboring property or on this property owner's property?

Baron Buckner: As I understand it, this was, was an attempt by the commercial property to help alleviate the situation, which, as I understand it was they hired a contractor who was a little overzealous in their tree removal and removed some trees from the residential property by mistake taking away the screening. And so now Bob, who I represent at 105, is now has a view he wasn't exactly thrilled with [laughter] that he didn't have before because there's no trees there.

Tim Clites: But certainly, can understand that. And the reason I asked the question before we go around the committee for discussion is in Mr. Moore's report, it talks about eight foot high fences having a planting buffer. Again, I think that generally was conceived for a slightly different application, meaning

that if this was the commercial entity asking for the fence, we would ask for the buffer outside of the fence to respect the residential property owner's view of an eight-foot-high fence. The reverse is happening, but given the grade change, it's important for us to kind of have the whole picture, because it does look like there's a replanting of what someday will be a buffer between the parking lot that's there now and the loss of the trees that occurred. Does that make sense to everyone in the committee? At least that's what I saw when I was there. All right. So, with that in mind, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: This was like, the most confusing. I think we all have to go down to walk the line honestly. Do I see a stone fence there? Is that what is in the planting or the wild growth? It's even on the one we were just looking at to the right of the picture. It looks like stone in there.

Baron Buckner: I think there is a really short stone retaining wall at the base. At the base of that incline.

Cindy Pearson: Does that go around the whole thing? So, I think we need more clarification on this whole thing. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: I think on this property that goes around their parking spaces, inside their property.

Baron Buckner: Yes.

Tim Clites: And then behind that wall, the grade slopes up and to the commercial lot that's about 5 or 6ft above the property line.

Cindy Pearson: So that quote retaining wall is commercial, or is it?

Tim Clites: It's residential.

Cindy Pearson: Residential.

Tim Clites: Yeah. It's inside the property. Well, inside the property boundaries.

Cindy Pearson: Well, anyway, I'm so confused by this whole thing. I even had a conversation, and I'm still not 100% clear on it because there looks to be so many things that we really can't tell from these drawings.

Baron Buckner: Tough without seeing it.

Cindy Pearson: And not having the true boundary or whatever you'd like to call it, area that you're working with. It's just really hard to understand and to look from Jay Street over. If you were looking at that, an eight-foot fence, even if some of it was down, it's going to make it look more like a compound than, you know, a home that you're trying to. And I get why they want the fence there. I can see what you're looking at. But, you know, it was always there. Would plantings be an easier way to block that? That you wouldn't have to have a fence? And then you would still be able to use your stone fence. I mean, that's actually great to have a stone fence on your property.

Baron Buckner: Yeah. So, the stone wall doesn't serve any purpose as far as privacy or screening.

Cindy Pearson: No.

Baron Buckner: It's at the base of the hill and it's very short. It's just to outline the parking lot. As far as doing plantings instead of a fence there, it's definitely an option, I think it would be it would take a while for that to come into fruition in terms of providing as effective a blocker as it originally was. So, I think maybe the homeowner is looking for something that's going to be as effective as what was there that was removed, unfortunately. And the fence was his number one choice. I think he also originally had plans of

[inaudible] since he already has the fence behind Shiloh of continuing it so that it was it cornered it off the property and kind of provided a clear boundary line between the commercial property and the residential. He already had plans before all this happened of doing that. And then this sort of expedited his decision making.

Cindy Pearson: And so, is that that I read that, and I could have this wrong that you want eight foot, and you want two foot on top of the eight?

Baron Buckner: No, eight-foot total height.

Cindy Pearson: Total.

Baron Buckner: Yes. So, seven feet of board fence and then one foot of lattice on top.

Cindy Pearson: Oh. Okay. I didn't get that at all.

Baron Buckner: Lattice screening on top.

Cindy Pearson: You know, I would just to break up it looking so fenced and blocked in. As we've had a lot of trouble with fences over the years, you know, looking not appropriate, I guess, is the word I should use to consider plantings a bit more.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I would agree with Cindy, particularly in this parking lot view. There are plenty of trees that could be planted in there that you could plant at eight feet tall, and it would block it out immediately, rather than having most jurisdictions won't even allow an eight-foot fence. Almost nowhere in Northern Virginia will even allow one. And particularly I didn't catch that it was going to be white. I think if you've got a big white fence down there, it's going to stand out like a big white elephant. And all those houses down there are so tied together that I think building something eight feet on two sides is going to look like you've built yourself a fortress, like you just never want to see anyone ever again all the way around. I would prefer to see plants rather than doing fence. And I know that's not what you want to hear, because that's not why you're here. But I think something softer and a little more neighborly, so to speak, I think would maybe make his neighbors happier.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree also with what Linda just said. I mean, that space, those little steps, and that whole thing is you have to like your neighbors and get along. And that huge fence is kind of like, you know, stay away. It's not for that kind of cozy little area there. I think, you know, plantings would be a lot softer and do the trick and just keep the atmosphere and the intimacy of that area as it is. I think that big fence, it's a beautiful fence. But in that location, to me it's like, stay out. [laughter]

Baron Buckner: Sure.

Punkin Lee: It's a little severe for the place. Sure.

Baron Buckner: Can I jump in real quick or I don't know if I.

Tim Clites: Okay. Let me just get through comments and then we'll make sure and come back to you by all means. We want to hear from you. Thank you. [multiple speakers]

Margaret Littleton: I agree with my committee, and I've always loved the idea of trees. I think we need more trees for sure.

Margaret Littleton: And it's a big fence like that it's not friendly at all. And we try to be a friendly town. So, thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I have a couple of observations, but I want to start with a question for Mr. Moore. Is the commercial property owner by chance? And maybe you didn't get the chance to research this. Does their site plan require any vegetative screening along that property line?

Will Moore: This development does not have any required plantings shown on the one plan that I've been able to locate.

Tim Clites: So, what they started to do is really to make amends for the error that was made by someone working on their behalf.

Will Moore: Presumably.

Tim Clites: I mean, I'm assuming that the residential property owner didn't go plant the plants on the commercial property.

Will Moore: I think that's a safe assumption.

Tim Clites: I'm just trying to. Okay. So then to the Committee, I would just pose a question because I think the question of appropriateness is our first discussion. And I would agree with the overall sentiment that an eight-foot fence doesn't feel like an appropriate separation, even between two uses that aren't the same. I mean, I think, but I then also think it seems like a reasonable discussion to have that a fence could be appropriate if you were the residents and there were commercial properties right adjacent to you, and you were used to a heavier screen of planting, and they've started to reintroduce that planting, it doesn't seem unreasonable to think about fencing in your property at some level, so I wonder if it would be useful for us to have a discussion about a height of fence that we think is appropriate, given that they're looking to do a solid fence to a certain height and then a lattice above. I guess the observation that I had when I pulled into the parking lot, understanding I'm going to a commercial space and I'm not driving around and coming in the residential side, but the lot behind the church that fence actually kind of had a nice scale, and looking over it and seeing the porch and the house was welcoming, even though it's a commercial space to everyone's comments, it's still the same town. So personally, I felt like the scale of an eight foot fence would do exactly what you all said, which is it would actually be tall enough that it would start to kind of block in any sense that there's a home and a porch and some invitation or some domestic scale there. And I think it's important to retain that. That being said, I'm going to pause and back to you for any comments or feedback based on what you've heard so far.

Baron Buckner: Sure. I think you kind of jumped. The two things I was going to say, you basically just said. But yeah, number one, I was going to say was that this isn't it's a situation where he's not trying to block out neighbors. It's commercial properties. So, it's not an I don't think it's that unfriendly necessarily. He has picket fencing between him and his neighbor already, and he's not looking to change that. This is a resident backing up to two commercial properties and that's all he's trying to screen. So, I don't think it's necessarily unfriendly, I would say, because it's not as nothing to do with blocking neighbors. It's just commercial properties. And then also, he already has a six-foot fence on one side of his property, just to be clear. So as far as like, oh, adding trees instead. Well, there is an existing six-foot fence on that property. So, at the very least that's in disrepair. And originally that's, all we were going to be doing at this property, which is replacing that fence as it stands. And then when the whole tree debacle happened, he decided to try to do fencing on that side as well. So, it is a property that already has a six-foot-tall fence, which in my experience, around the historic districts here, you don't see that many of. So, if it's already allowed there, we thought that you know, adding another fence might not be that big of a problem between the other commercial property. The height was always something that I was a little surprised at the height he was asking about. So, I'm not shocked to hear that there's some pushback on that. So that

was going to be part two of my comments was saying, you know, maybe there is a height that could be agreed on for that side where you're looking at from Jay Street, from that commercial property where the trees were removed, a different height that could potentially, you know, go in there as you were just suggesting.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Which is what I'm. Go ahead, Punkin.

Punkin Lee: You just said you started the project by replacing the six-foot fence.

Baron Buckner: Originally, that was what we were. We haven't done yet.

Punkin Lee: Right. Was that going to be replaced in kind? And then we got to a fancier fence with the seven foot with the lattice.

Baron Buckner: The idea was, and we didn't ever we didn't even get into permitting before all this happened. But originally, no, it was going to be replaced with the lattice top. His neighbors behind him have that style he likes.

Punkin Lee: So, the end product would be latticed all the way around if it went. Right? If you're the.

Baron Buckner: The lattice on the top, yes.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Baron Buckner: Yes.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: Do you think he would be open to looking at something that's more of a four-foot fence with some strategic planting done with it that would create the screen rather than this just feels so commercial. If there was a different style of fence or something that might be considered, that's more of a picket or something that's kind of a combination of give you some screening, but then still do something behind it to get you the height you might want to do. I don't know, just throwing that out there.

Baron Buckner: From standing on his property several times now, I personally don't really think a four-foot-tall fence would screen that much of the commercial property. Just with the grade difference. I think you're going to be staring right over top the fence at the commercial property. And I think that's. So, when I was there, we kind of did a I'm like exactly six feet tall. So, I was kind of standing where the fence would be going, and he was kind of like standing on his porch and looking and seeing. And that's why he went up higher to try to get the screen like he had before. And that's why he said, you know, we were asking for eight feet. Just because he was trying to replicate what was there, essentially.

Tim Clites: But help me understand, when you were standing at the approximate property line, how far up the embankment were you? There's about six feet of grade change there. It feels.

Baron Buckner: About six feet.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Six feet. Are you halfway up? Are you at the top of that? At the [multiple speakers].

Baron Buckner: I would say three feet from the parking lot level. Yep. So about midway up.

Tim Clites: So, six-foot fence from the commercial side would have three feet or so sticking above the plane of the commercial parking lot. I think we'd probably maybe want to see some verification of that if we were to approve it. I guess I would say a couple of things that the whole idea of neighborly isn't just in

my opinion limited to commercial or, I'm sorry, residential. Our little commercial building has people that live right across the street, and we try very hard to be neighborly, which is, I think maybe Margaret's point. Right? Yes, the uses are different. I do think that the coming and going of vehicles out of that lot, you park when you go to leave. Your headlights are straight at their porch. So, I'm very sympathetic to that. I'm sympathetic to the loss of trees. I'm also having been in a similar situation many years ago, very aware of how it feels to be the residential owner and just give me a wall right. And in a couple of years, I think with the vegetation regrowing a fence that we think is more appropriate. I think we'll unfortunately; it's going to take a little time for that planting to grow in, but it sounds like that's what the committee is more comfortable with from an appropriateness and a scale perspective. I guess I feel like it's appropriate for the owner to ask for a fence right and have us give them some guidance on what we think is an appropriate fence. It sounds like six feet is not at the top of the hill, but part of it, both along the commercial side of the parking lot and along the empty lot side, that a six-foot fence is still going to not have six feet exposed. Just want to make sure the Committee is aware of that.

Margaret Littleton: Do a five-foot fence with the one-foot lattice on top.

Baron Buckner: I think that would be the next best option. That's what I yes would be five feet tall with a board fence.

Margaret Littleton: It would look prettier. Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Will, could you switch to the view that's from Jay Street, please. Thank you. Okay. Just wanted to reread this part to in our guidelines, it says privacy board fences generally are not appropriate for front and side lawns or other highly visible areas. Once again, this will be a highly visible area. Doggone it. Sorry, just lost my. They may be appropriate where necessary to provide screening for delivery, storage and otherwise visible from a public right of way, which this is kind of saying it both ways. Where permitted solid board fences over four feet in height should be landscaped to soften their appearance. So, I would highly recommend, if we do think it's appropriate to have a fence there, that it would need to be screened with landscaping. So, it will almost have to be set back if they did that, correct?

Tim Clites: Well, I think that that's why I had the whole discussion before we started. I think the commercial property owner has already made that accommodation on their land and added some. You can't see it well in the picture, but if you drive by, you can see there's a number of trees and plants that have been planted and staked already. And I think in a couple of years that I don't know much about plants, but they look like they're going to grow. And should they grow, they will help to reinforce the screening more than just the fence. I think the other thing I did is drove down and looked at some of the fencing at the townhomes that butt up to the public way. And in fact, the four foot privacy fence with the lattice is used elsewhere, right up at the street. This is not right at the street. This is between two properties. And so I think if it's appropriate at the street, albeit maybe the back street or what would be considered an alley for some of those townhomes I feel comfortable looking at or recommending like a four foot fence with a lattice. Now let's just be clear. A five foot fence with lattice, because the overall height being six feet, for instance, to the vacant lot, the top of that fence would be approximately where it is now would be slightly more open, but then when you turn the corner, that fence would provide more screening than what was there. So, we're kind of balancing the openness and the screening in a way that would be pretty. And the other thing I remember when I first moved to town, the folks that owned this house at that time, we were there often because our children were the same age. And in fact, when no one's in the parking lot, you use the steps and walk across the parking lot to go to town. And it is a very neighborly place. It's just in the morning when all the trucks are coming and going it's probably not everyone's favorite way to wake up, right? So, any other comments from the Committee?

Linda Wright: One other quick one about the color of what he consider. Well, back up one more. Since we have three different types of fences going on around the property, or all of these going to become the same at some point.

Baron Buckner: I think he wants to leave the white picket fence in the back. I think he likes the openness of it. And I don't, I haven't I have no knowledge that he wants to change it. The stone walls he would never touch. And those are going to stay. It's only the proposed two fence lines would be would match would be the new style of board fence with lattice on top.

Linda Wright: And he's set on doing it in white. And I guess since the others are already white, that's probably why.

Baron Buckner: I think it was to match the most houses around there seem to have white fences and all the townhomes behind him are white and or most of them.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. I just as I'm still up here on Jay Street. Sorry to look down across there and see a fence with lattice on top of it. To me, looks out of place in that area. Now, you know, being down where the house is and up, it's a different story. So, and I see the plantings that they've attempted. They really don't look like the type of plantings that will grow quickly. And a buffer is the word I'm going to use. You know, some other things probably should be added.

Linda Wright: Well, and to your point too, and what I said earlier, would he look at something other than your standard board on board fence that looks like it's something that goes around a dumpster or to hide A/C? Can we look at a fence that looks more colonial, more picket, more different sort of style maybe would help?

Baron Buckner: Yeah. Like a space, some kind of spaced picket, essentially something like that.

Linda Wright: Yeah. If we're going to drop the height of it, I think that might help it because that's what we're sort of struggling with, is it looks so commercial. It looks like something that's built to hide, something really ugly. And it's a very nice little cozy little neighborhood back in there that maybe something of a little different style might sit with everybody a little better.

Baron Buckner: Sure, sure. Yeah. I think I think he's just been so from his back. And there's pictures in here of the kind of the proposed fence from the townhouses behind him. I think he just likes the way it looks, to be honest. And that's why he went asked for it. I think it's as simple as that. Because behind him, that's what they have. And he likes it. But yeah. Yeah, that one right there.

Linda Wright: The one we're looking at that is not board on board. That's board mixed [inaudible] board. That's not a board-on-board fence.

Baron Buckner: And we just to be clear we yes. We did not ask for a board on board. It says solid board.

Linda Wright: Solid fence.

Baron Buckner: Yeah. Solid board okay. Yeah. [inaudible]

Linda Wright: So that's what happened.

Tim Clites: So, what we're saying is like the picture.

Baron Buckner: Yes sir. Like that picture right there.

Linda Wright: That may be shorter.

Tim Clites: Than eight feet.

Linda Wright: Yes.

Tim Clites: And you know, I guess I would just add like that fence to me looks more.

Linda Wright: That's more residential.

Tim Clites: Residential and contemporary to the last 20 years or 30 years than some of the other fences. But the home that it's surrounding is also a what, 20- or 25-year-old home. Right. And so, it I'm not sure I'd like that fence in other parts of town.

Linda Wright: Right.

Tim Clites: But it doesn't feel inappropriate to me here if it's at the right scale.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I would agree. No.

Cindy Pearson: And as there it has a little planting in front of it to break it up. So, you're not looking at a sore thumb.

Tim Clites: Right. And I would imagine inside their property, which is their business, they'll probably do that. And I guess we'll have to have a little patience with the commercial side and remembering that we're not, it's not abutting a street. We're actually looking across that entire commercial property to see this. Right? Mr. Moore wants to say something before we try to make a motion.

Will Moore: If you're working toward an approval, I would simply maybe add in your motion that it's contingent on confirming where the property lines are. And then I can work with I could work with Baron to just confirm that, because I think if I'm hearing the discussion correctly, a lot of what you're discussing is assuming that it's going to be set down a certain amount so that even though it might be X amount of feet, it's going to look like 2ft or 3ft shorter from the outside view. And I think that's an appropriate discussion. But we would just want to confirm where that is.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I agree with that.

Cindy Pearson: Could we suggest that it comes back to us with the boundary of the?

Will Moore: So, I think there are two ways to do that. You could delay your action until that's confirmed or you could potentially approve, just subject to confirming where those property lines are. And if I see anything amiss in that confirmation, it would then have to come back. That's two ways to approach it, and I would be comfortable with either approach, whatever you're most comfortable with.

Tim Clites: All right. Any further comments from the Committee?

Margaret Littleton: This is a fancy one [off mic].

Tim Clites: Anybody want to make a motion? Would you like to make a motion? I'm just kidding. That's not laughing. All right, so we're looking at. Let me get back here without losing all the context. And thank you for your patience while we talked through this with you. So we're going to give you an approval and or we're going to vote. We may or may not approve it. Sorry. Let me not get ahead of myself. But if in fact, what we approve when you go back to your owner is something that is not agreeable, you're certainly welcome to come back. Right. So, this isn't kind of a, like, once and done thing.

Baron Buckner: I'm going to send him back I'm not.

Tim Clites: We do advocate or try to be as accommodating if we feel like we can make a suggestion or approval on something to keep things moving, we try to do that. So, I'm going to move that we approve COA 24-23 Request of Baron Buckner All About Fences for a fence at 105 Garden Cottage Lane, with the following clarifications. The first one being that the fence design will match the picture of the. And Linda, help me. What's it called? The board beside board or the plank? [off mic] The plank fencing with the lattice on top, which is image eight, and that the top rail of the lattice be six feet from the grade that the fence is on, and that Mr. Moore had the opportunity to confirm the property line with the applicant before it's installed, and that the fence color be white to match the adjacent fence and that they're. Sorry, this is just coming to me. I don't mean to throw you a curveball and that there be a gate at the top of the stairs between the properties. Was that intended?

Baron Buckner: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thanks. [off mic]

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Baron Buckner: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. Thank you all for working through that. Here I shut this whole thing down. I know Margaret's in a hurry, so I was just trying to speed it up, but this is not speeding it up. Here we go. All right any discussion items? No. Great. Meeting quorum for November the 7th. Everybody have their calendar. Does anybody know of a known conflict at the moment? [off mic] You have a known. Mr. Moore is the problem. Oh you. [laughter], Okay? And I'm going to send out a little note to the whole Committee through Rhonda. But just a quick reminder for those of us that are here, it's really helpful if we know in a meeting, it's also really helpful if something comes up that we let staff know, particularly not just any staff, but Rhonda because she keeps track of. And so, some of us email will some of us email Rhonda. They have two different sets of notes about who's going to show up. And it's more work for them. Send out. I'll send out a little note to Rhonda, which she'll forward to everyone. But the more we can do that, I think the more helpful it is for staff. And they clearly have their hands full. And Cindy, do you have anything to add to that?

Cindy Pearson: Not to that but back to the discussion.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: I did go to the JARB Awards and Rhonda and Will were there. It was really nice. Great facility that they have over there. And it was nice that the house here as we come into Middleburg that award was there. Our signs we had quite a few. And of course, the town hall. Needless to say. So, thank you and Punkin for attending those meetings and helping to make all that happen.

Tim Clites: You're welcome. I was sorry to miss it, but I got a good report from the folks that yeah, that we knew that were there. Yes. Rhonda.

Rhonda North: And our award is in the display cabinet just outside of the hallway. If you all want to take a glance at it as you leave this evening.

Tim Clites: That's awesome. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, Mr. Moore, anything? We're adjourned. Thank you all.