TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, January 2, 2025
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, January 2, 2025, 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
Virginia Jenkins
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: Margaret Littleton (unexcused)

NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Punkin Lee nominated Tim Clites as the Chair of the Historic District Review Committee. Linda Wright seconded the nomination.

Councilmember Pearson nominated Punkin Lee as Vice Chair of the Historic District Review Committee. Linda Wright seconded the nomination.

No further nominations were offered.

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

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the December 5, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

New Business

COA 25-01 (S 25-01): Wall & Projecting Signs – 204 East Washington Street – The Boyd Bed & Breakfast

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they previously approved exterior changes to the property and advised that now that the applicant was getting closer to finishing their project, they were applying for signage for the building. He explained that the signage would consist of a projecting sign on the second floor on the east end of the building, a smaller wall mounted sign to the left of the main entrance door, and a small projecting sign at the rear of the property to indicate the opening to the parking area. Mr. Moore displayed the sign application materials for the Committee members and audience.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, presented color samples for the Committee's review. In response to inquiries, he advised that the wall sign would be centered between the window and the door. Mr. Ralph confirmed the projecting sign would contain a separate hanging piece that would be hung using hooks. He advised that the edges of the sign would be painted black.

The Committee Members advised that they liked the proposed signs. They opined that the design was a refreshing change and that the colors were nice.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ralph advised that more than likely, the parts of the signs that would be carved would be the lettering and the pinstripes. He confirmed the sign for the parking would be metal and explained that this material was proposed because of the size and location of the sign. Mr. Ralph noted that this type of sign tended to be hit a lot. He confirmed the metal sign would be painted so it would not look like a digital print. Mr. Ralph suggested the wall sign be installed just higher than the railing.

Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-01 (S 25-01), a request of Jennifer and Paul Moore for a wall and projecting signs at 204 East Washington Street.

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

COA 25-02: Accessory Structure – 5-7 North Jay Street – Michael A. Pappas

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised the Committee that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict. He suggested they discuss the application and determine whether they had any comments they wanted him to relay to the applicant. Mr. Moore reported that Mr. Pappas had already constructed the shed. He noted that Mr. Pappas had mentioned to him last month that he might do so and reported that he cautioned him that he would be taking a risk that what he constructed could potentially not be approved. Mr. Moore displayed the site plan, photographs of the existing buildings on the property, and photographs of the accessory structure that were taken earlier in the day. He reminded the members that the Historic District Guidelines spoke of taking inspiration for accessory structures from the primary structure and noted that the existing one-story shed took some inspiration from the home. Mr. Moore reported that the new accessary structure was closed on one side and either fully or partially open on the remaining three. He reiterated that he reminded Mr. Pappas that he would be taking a chance if he proceeded with the construction prior to gaining approval.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the size of the structure required a building permit, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that he would have to follow up with the building official on that question, as he was not sure. He confirmed there was no building permit issued, as he did not issue a zoning permit and advised that Loudoun County would not issue a building permit without first having a Town approved zoning permit.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the front three columns were just resting on top of the flagstone, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that he was not sure. The Committee noted that they looked like they were just sitting there.

Chair Clites questioned the long-term viability of the structure, regardless of how it looked. He noted that it was not enclosed and questioned whether the wind could take it given its umbrella shape.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the structure was finished, Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested that, based on the application materials, it essentially appeared to be finished; however, he was not positive. He advised that he would get clarification on that.

The Committee requested clarification on the location of the accessory structure. It was noted that it was located behind the building on Jay Street; however, it could be seen from Washington Street. It was further noted that the six-foot-tall privacy fence shown on the drawing bordered the property to the north.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore opined that it would have been difficult for the HDRC to evaluate the application based on the information provided in it. He noted that the photographs he displayed depicted the actual as-built condition. Mr. Moore reiterated that he was not positive it was finished; however, it closely resembled what Mr. Pappas intended to be as his finished product.

Committee Member Wright expressed concern that the structure, in terms of material and character, was incredibly out of place in the Historic District. She noted that it was rustic, which was not in keeping with the other buildings on the site. Ms. Wright opined that the structure did not enhance its own property, much less add to the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Lee noted that the pavilion also included a fire pit.

Committee Member Anderson noted the galvanized metal roof on the accessory structure, which did not tie to the house or the shed, nor was it something that would be seen on a property in the Historic District. He opined that it was totally inappropriate for this area. Mr. Anderson noted that the Committee previously considered an application in which they were concerned about whether the structure would be tied down in any way.

Chair Clites noted that the corrugated metal was not a non-historic material; however, he could not think of any place where it had been used in the Historic District. He opined that the mono-single pitched roof added a contemporary nature to its use and did not look like it was being used in a historic way. Mr. Clites opined that the attempt was to create a run-in shed look and advised that he was not sure that worked. He noted that even in this region, most of the running sheds had an asymmetrical pitched roof, with a longer pitch over the stall and a shorter, steeper pitch with an overhang at the opening. Mr. Clites opined that those things were inconsistent with what could be seen in the town, as well as regionally. He noted the natural siding and advised that he could not think of a place where that existed. Mr. Clites suggested the rough nature did not both him as much as the unfinished nature of it and noted that he could not think of a place in town where there was an unfinished shed. He acknowledged that there were some old buildings that had old planking that was stained.

In response to an inquiry, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that there were no electric plans for the building as far as he knew.

Councilmember Pearson read an excerpt from the Historic District Guidelines, which called for the design of new outbuildings to be compatible with the style and character of the primary building on the site, especially in scale, materials, roof form and colors. She noted that the accessory structure did not meet those requirements.

Chair Clites opined that the application felt like a mess of all those things. He noted that the meeting was recorded; however, he questioned whether Mr. Moore had enough information related to the Committee's concerns to share with Mr. Pappas.

In response to an inquiry from Chair Clites, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that while he did not measure it, the sketch showed the accessory structure as being nine feet off the property line, which exceeded the five-foot minimum.

In response to an inquiry from Chair Clites, Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested the Committee could make a motion to table action or it could take action on the application. He further suggested that if they would like to delay action until next month so the applicant could be present, they could do so.

Chair Clites suggested it was not necessary to deny the application without first giving the applicant an opportunity to appear before the Committee. He further suggested the Committee table consideration until next month.

Chair Clites moved that the Historic District Review Committee table the application (COA 25-02*).*

Committee Member Wright asked whether it was possible to request Mr. Pappas return with drawings for a path forward, since the Committee could not see a path forward for the structure in its current form. She opined that it would require a good bit of revision.

Committee Member Wright seconded the motion to table.

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

February Meeting Quorum

Those members who were present indicated they would be present for the February 6th meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 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)

Rhonda North: Okay, Mr. chair, you are live.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We will call to order our Middleburg Historic District Review Committee meeting for Thursday, January the 2nd, 2025. 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.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

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

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. The next order of business is nomination and election of officers.

Punkin Lee: I'd like to nominate Tim for chairman.

Linda Wright: Second.

Cindy Pearson: And I'd like to nominate Punkin for vice chair.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: I forget how this works, Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: So, seconds aren't technically necessary, but we'll just ask, are there any further nominations for either position?

Tim Clites: Any further nominations? Anyone like to nominate Mr. Ralph for a position?

Will Moore: If not, you could close nominations and you could vote on them individually. Or you could vote on them as a slate. Either way is fine.

Tim Clites: All right. Any further nominations? Thank you. Would you all like to vote on those as a slate? All in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

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

Rhonda North: Thank you.

Tim Clites: You're welcome. Public comments. Notice I [inaudible] I'm glad there's a video running. Public comments. When we get to your item in the agenda, seeing as there are two people in the public that were expecting to go over agenda items, we'll move to approval of the minutes from our December the 5th, 2024 regular meeting. Are there any corrections or comments on the minutes? Seeing as none I move, we approve as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor.

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any Abstain.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Motion passes. Next is action item new business COA 25-01 (S 25-01) Request of Jennifer and Paul Moore for wall projecting signs at 204 East Washington Street. The Boyd Bed and Breakfast. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have my memo and the accompanying materials. You'll remember this property from some meetings last calendar year, where some exterior changes were proposed to the property, primarily to the rear, although on the front elevation there would be reopening one door that was closed previously. As they're getting closer on their project, they're submitting their application for signage for the building, which will consist of a projecting sign on the second floor level of the far right that is east end of the building, a smaller wall mounted sign just to the left of the main entry door, in the approximate location of where you see the contractor's sign in the image that's currently on screen, and then a small projecting sign at the rear of the property along the rear kind of ivy covered fence that would just indicate the opening to the parking area. So, on screen you see the specification sheet for the main projecting sign on the front elevation. Here is the specifications for the small wall mounted sign. We note in here that they relied on an existing photo that still has the old sign location for the Washington Fine Properties, and but this I take it to mean this is the approximate location of where the sign will be, but directly on the facade of the building, obviously. And then again, this is where the small parking directional sign will be located along East Marshall Street. I did ask, I'm not sure if Mr. Ralph got the if he could bring hard samples of the two colors, the two different pantones'. So that is all I have.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Mr. Moore. Any comments or clarifications from the applicant or applicant's representative.

John Ralph: I do have samples, but other than that, I'm happy to entertain any questions? Thank you.

Tim Clites: I'm going to start with Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Sorry. The sign next to the door to the left of the door will it be centered between the window and the door? Do you have any? Just kind of threw it on that.

John Ralph: I think it would make sense that it would it would be that. That obviously the wooden structure won't be there anymore. Okay.

Cindy Pearson: And down at the end, the bed and breakfast is a separate part. It's not like that sign. It's got the separate.

John Ralph: The projecting sign on the front. Yeah. It's a separate piece hanging from it.

Cindy Pearson: Doesn't show what it hangs. What is it like the top does it have is it going to have chain. What's it going?

John Ralph: It's just going to be hooks.

Cindy Pearson: Just hooks. Yeah.

John Ralph: And you'll never find a chain on one of our signs.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Good.

Cindy Pearson: So, and it makes note that black paint on the edge. Correct. So will it only be seen on the edges. It's not seen.

John Ralph: It's literally just the sides. Just the edge okay.

Cindy Pearson: No other questions. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no questions. Fairly straightforward.

Tim Clites: Thank you Linda.

Linda Wright: No questions. I think it's very attractive. I think it'll look great.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Linda on that text. It's kind of a refreshing change but still very easily read. And the colors are nice, so they look good. Thank you, thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Bill Anderson: You know, I agree with all that has been said. I think it's a good-looking sign.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Parts that are carved are the name and all the lighter color or just the name.

John Ralph: More than likely, it would make sense. It would be, those would be carved pinstripes, and the lettering would all be carved.

Tim Clites: So, all the lighter colors. Yes. And then I'm sorry if I missed this in the report. I should have paid better attention. The third sign is just aluminum. Correct. And just so I know, why is it you're proposing that?

John Ralph: I think really just because it's a little minuscule parking sign, they tend to get hit. They tend to disappear. Anything that's sort of down, kid, kid level things happen to them, and being just a parking sign. I don't think it's worth.

Tim Clites: Spending the effort to three dimensional.

John Ralph: Still painted. So, it still doesn't, you know, doesn't look like a digital print or any of that, but.

Tim Clites: And it's not located. I mean, it looks like it's not really a walking area. I guess people probably pull off and park there on occasion whether they should or shouldn't. Right? Yeah. Hence the whole it might get hit. Okay. Great. I have no other questions or comments either. I will agree with the yeah, the comment about the location on adjacent to the door. I think it either wants to be centered or more under the little stucco and the little molding that comes along above it, so that it even though it wants to be close to the door if it's centered, I think that would look fine. What about the height? Does anybody have any opinion about how high it should be?

Will Moore: Our thoughts were just higher than the railing.

Tim Clites: Higher than the railing? Yeah. All right. Any other comments? Anybody like to make a motion.

Punkin Lee: I make a motion that we approve COA 25-01 (S 25-01) request of Jennifer and Paul Moore for wall and projecting signs at 204 East Washington Street. But that doesn't look like it includes the parking sign.

Linda Wright: Second.

Punkin Lee: What? It doesn't.

Linda Wright: It does. It includes all.

Punkin Lee: Will that include it? Yes. Okay.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All in favor?

Everyone: Aye, aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any. Abstain. Motion passes. Thank you. Thank you all. Next item is COA 25-02. Request of Michael Pappas for an accessory structure at 5-7 North Jay Street. As I understand it, the applicant nor the representative is available to be here this evening, but I think it's worth our time. Mr. Moore can walk us through the application. And I believe he has some updated photographs. This might help us see a little better this situation that exists now.

Will Moore: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The applicant did send his apologies. He has a medical procedure he has to undergo, so he is unable to be here today. But I did indicate that we would at least attempt to get some comments from the committee that we could relay to him. As I noted in my email correspondence, after preparing the agenda item, I learned that Mr. Pappas had actually proceeded with the project, which was something he mentioned to me that he might do last month, and I simply cautioned him that he would be taking the risk that whatever he might construct could potentially not be approved. So, he was aware of that when moving forward. I just bring up the site sketch to give you a little bit of context first. So Jay Street is to the top of this drawing, as well as the existing small one bedroom home.

Has a small parking area right behind the home, an existing shed, and then he shows you the location of where the pavilion has now been constructed. I'll just go directly to the photos that I took today. Well, actually photos of the existing building. But then the photos I took today, I think they're a little more helpful, obviously, than some of the concept photos, because you see exactly what is there now. So this this is just to give a little context. This is the main home on the property sitting right up on North Jay Street. This is kind of a side view of it, which is at least somewhat helpful. You know, the guidelines do speak a little bit to taking inspiration, at least from the primary structure. And this does show that the primary structure does have the shed roof type window dormers as well as the one, the small one story shed roof addition. This is an existing accessory structure on the property. It is not the same materials as the main home, but clearly it was taking some inspiration from the home. This is the new structure as of earlier today. So, this just gives a little context of where it is on site relative to the existing shed. This is kind of the front view of it functionally if you will. Again, it was proposed and is materials to be closed just on the one side. So, you see it's opened at least fully or partially on the remaining three sides. This just gives another view of it. And this is the view from kind of the south, the rear of the property that fronts along East Washington Street. So happy to scroll back through any of those that were zoom in, as you might request me to. But this is what, again, has been constructed to this point. And again, I did kind of alert Mr. Pappas that he would be taking a chance proceeding prior to approval, that there maybe it could be denied, or it could be required that revisions would be necessary.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And again, I believe because the applicant is not here, we don't have to feel obligated to act tonight. But we, I think, could certainly discuss it. We could act tonight, but we could also just discuss it and pass on our comments through staff. I'll start with a question, Mr. Moore, does the structure of this size require a building permit?

Will Moore: I'm going to have to follow up with the building official on that question. I am not sure as to that square footage threshold has changed over the years. When I first started in this business, it was anything over 150ft², which is clearly exceeds. But I know that threshold has moved up, but I'm not sure if this meets it either by the square footage or there may be a implication of height as well that invokes a permit requirement. So, I will need to follow up on that. There was no building permit issued for this because there was no zoning permit issued for it and Loudoun County will not issue a building permit without first having a town approved zoning permit.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: I have a question. Since you were there, are those front three columns just resting on top of the flagstone or are they sunk in the ground?

Will Moore: I am not sure the answer to that question.

Punkin Lee: They kind of look like they're just sitting there.

Will Moore: They. Yeah, but I but I'm not sure.

Tim Clites: So. Well, yeah. You hit the nail on the head. That was kind of my question too, around just the long-term viability of the structure, regardless of how it looks in terms of its ability to stay on the site. You know, you know, it's not an enclosed structure like the other little shed that would take the wind differently than this more umbrella shaped structure.

Punkin Lee: And did you get any idea how he was going to finish this? Or is this finished?

Will Moore: The best I could tell from the application materials is this essentially appears finished, but essentially appears finished. But I'm not positive on that. We can get clarification.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: So, let's start, Cindy, maybe we'll start with you and just any comments or questions. Again, everyone try to remember that our task is to review this as if it was not yet built. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic]

Tim Clites: Mic on. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you. At the bottom of his first sketch, he says there's a six-foot privacy fence down or back behind what looks to be, I don't know which way. Jay Street's there. Do you see down here?

Linda Wright: Yeah, I do see. Can I interrupt?

Cindy Pearson: Please go for it.

Linda Wright: I'm a little confused at the of the location. I know it's Jay Street, but. Is there any other street involved here?

Tim Clites: No, it's behind the building that the lot goes off of. Jay Street.

Linda Wright: [off mic] So, this is behind it.

Linda Wright: We'll get you. It's not the house that fronts on. [off mic]

Cindy Pearson: But you can see it from Main Street. Yeah.

Linda Wright: Okay. And now I know where it is. I was just getting a little confused. Yeah. Because with the drawing, I'm trying to get an understanding. I'm sorry. That's fine.

Tim Clites: So, the six-foot privacy fence that you see is actually, I believe, Chad's fence headed towards route 50.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Okay.

Tim Clites: Does that make sense?

Cindy Pearson: Okay. No.

Linda Wright: It's the other way around.

Tim Clites: The one on the bottom corner. Bottom corner at the bottom left, to the left of the word 60. [off mic] Chad is to the left of this site plan [inaudible] 50 is to the left of this site plan.

Cindy Pearson: So, you turn it.

Will Moore: Okay. If you look at the visual that's on screen right now.

Cindy Pearson: I'm sorry.

Will Moore: If you look at the visual that's on screen right now. Yeah. I'm not sure if you can see my cursor here. Yep. This picket fence borders Mr. Healy's property. The picket fence in the far view right here. That is closest to route 50. Just beyond that is route 50. Okay.

Cindy Pearson: I get it. I get it. Well, then. So where is this six-foot privacy fence? That's on the drawing. It says on the drawing on the left-hand bottom.

Will Moore: Okay. So that's on the opposite side. So, if you're looking at the sketch Mr. Healy's property is to the left. And that's where it says the four foot wooden fence. The six-foot privacy fence is bordering the property to the north. So, looking now at the visual, this on screen where the cursor is running here, that is where the six-foot privacy fence is indicated on the drawing. Where the hand is sitting right now is approximately where the pavilion is built. Okay, if that helps. Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. I need to take this. I need to just look at it some more Tim. So, someone else would like to comment.

Tim Clites: Virginia. Any other comments?

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, I do, I'm getting lots of questions. I'm a little confused. This pavilion, they keep showing different pictures, the general design of the picture, and then the roof and timber post rustic materials example. I mean. What is being built? Those are examples. [off mic] I know, but what is he building?

Will Moore: So, I mean, what he is building is.

Virginia Jenkins: And then you have the general design. Yeah.

Will Moore: So as far as the what's in the application materials, it's it was going to be very difficult for you to evaluate that.

Virginia Jenkins: I'll say.

Will Moore: Yeah. The benefit if you want to look at it this way of him actually having gone forward with construction is you can actually see it now. So, what you're seeing here is actually built. Yeah. What has been built. So, the [off mic] Well Vice Chair Lee asked that question a little bit ago, and I'm not positive.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, I'm sorry I missed it.

Will Moore: No. That's okay. So, I'm not positive, but I think it's in my read of the materials that he provided. If this is not finished, it's very close to what he intended it to be as a finished product.

Tim Clites: We'll come back. Linda, any comments?

Linda Wright: Architecturally, I think it's incredibly out of place in historic district. It's so rustic. It doesn't, like you were saying, doesn't pick up on any of the other two buildings that are already on site. It is completely, totally sort of a detached, very different rustic look. I don't think it kind of goes with what is already on the property.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree. I mean, rustic is one thing, but that doesn't. Doesn't do much to enhance its own property, much less add to the to the neighbors, I don't think. And that's a fire pit in front of it.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Punkin Lee: Yes, that circular looks like a.

Tim Clites: Thank you Punkin. We can come back. Bill. Thank you.

Bill Anderson: I agree generally with what everyone so far has said. I think it this idea that it has a shed roof is a big stretch to tie it to the house. Even the little shed doesn't have a shed roof. I mean, the rustic materials. I mean, we see some missions that use rustic materials all the time, stone. You know, that's a rustic material we see. You know, I could see something being built with this type of siding. Not this particular structure, though. The idea that it has, it looks like a galvanized metal roof, which is far from anything we would ever want to see on a property in the historic district. I think it's to reiterate what others have said totally inappropriate for this area. I sure, I'm sure glad I don't live next door to it and that you know have a historic house or a one that really fits and then have to look at this. Anyway, lastly and I know Will doesn't know yet about if it requires a building permit, but I think some time ago we had another project that was similar. We didn't know if it was tied down, you know, properly. And I would just say that this, this if it were to stay and I hope it wouldn't. This could fly away like a wing if it isn't tied down. But I think Punkin you're right, it looks like it's just sitting on top of a of a structure. My comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Yeah, I guess I, I would just add that I think that corrugated metal isn't an inappropriate material. I've tried to think about whether we have it anywhere. It's certainly not a non-historic material. There were periods of time where it was used, but I can't think of any place where in our historic district, it still exists. And maybe more importantly, that I think the shed, or the mono single pitched roof just adds to that kind of contemporary nature of its use, right? Which is that it doesn't really look like it's being used in a historic way, but it's to enhance I don't want to say contemporary I guess the attempt. Did I read somewhere the attempt is at a run-in shed look, but I'm not sure that works. Even in in this region, most of the running sheds actually have a asymmetrically pitched roof, at least many of them that are local to our or within the within spitting distance of our town. Right. They tend to have a, a longer pitch over the stall and then kind of a I don't even know what you'd call it, but a shorter, steeper pitch with a bit of an overhang at the opening. So those things to me seem inconsistent not only with what we see in town, but what we see even regionally. I don't know what to do about the recommendations to make about the natural siding. Again, I can't think of a place where that exists. I don't think the rough nature of it bothers me so much as the unfinished nature of it. Again, because I don’t, I can't think of a place where we have an unfinished shed, whether it's painted or stained in town. You do have some old buildings that have old planking, but it's all been stained, as far as I can recollect, having not walked around. So, Will, there's no as far as you know, there's no electrical plan for this.

Will Moore: Not as far as I know.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Tim, when I don't understand something, I always go back to our guidelines and read that section.

Tim Clites: Sure.

Cindy Pearson: And it just makes comment again, or in the guidelines it says design new outbuildings to be compatible with the style and character of the primary building on the site, especially in scale, materials, roof form and colors. So, you know the kind of.

Tim Clites: It feels like a mess on all of those. Yeah. I don't think we need to belabor our comments tonight. If there's more to add, but thank you, Cindy. By all means, let's add that so that Mr. Moore has something to share with the applicant. Obviously, this is all recorded. It certainly can take the time to listen to it in the recording. Well, do you think this is sufficient? I mean, it sounds like there's a little bit of legwork that needs to be done on staff's part in terms of whether it would need a building permit if it did. Is the setback? The sketch says nine feet. I don't even know if that.

Will Moore: Yeah, I didn't measure it. It definitely exceeds the five-foot minimum. So, setback is not an issue.

Tim Clites: Not an issue. Not an issue in any case. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. And so then do we need a motion to continue or table or.

Will Moore: A motion of some sort. Either a table or take action. Either one is fine. It's up to the committee whether you would want to take action prior to having the applicant present. You can do that. But if you would prefer him to be present and delay until next month, you could do that as well by tabling.

Tim Clites: I think that I'd like to go out on a limb them a little bit and say that I don't think it's necessary to have a motion to deny it without the applicant at least having the opportunity to be here. I think that I would rather, I mean, if we deny it, they certainly could come back and make the same request again. So, I would suggest that we have a motion to continue or to table it until next month, and the applicant has the chance to listen to our comments and perhaps come more prepared to the next meeting. It's my motion to table.

Linda Wright: Will, would it be possible to suggest to him to come back with drawings, not actually doing anything to correct what doesn't seem like it's compatible with the property to correct what is not compatible? Or to come up with a different solution.

Will Moore: I mean, we could we could pass that on as a comment. I think it's I think it's fairly clear not to speak for the committee, but we're not seeing much of a path forward for the structure in its current form. So, it would require a good bit of revision. So, we could certainly pass it on.

Tim Clites: I believe I made a motion. [off mic] Did I. To table. Is that a motion? How do I do that?

Rhonda North: You did make a motion. We're just waiting for a second.

Tim Clites: All right.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

Everyone: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain. Thank you, Rhonda, for keeping us on our toes. All right. Thank you all. Let's go back to our agenda and see what else we have. Discussion items. Any discussion items from anyone this evening? Meeting quorum quorum. I can't even say that word right, for February the 6th. Does anybody have a conflict they're aware of at the moment?

Cindy Pearson: I'm just glad this was a short meeting, because it's kind of like, welcome back to the real world. And the brain isn't ready to do it yet.

Tim Clites: Here we are. I'm sorry.

Punkin Lee: Is there something about public comment?

Tim Clites: There's something about public comment. No, I was, waiting to see. Yeah, but we don't. We didn't have anyone from the second applicant. All right. Meeting adjourned.