TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, February 6, 2025
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, February 6, 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
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: Virginia Jenkins (excused)
Margaret Littleton (excused)

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the January 2, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

Old Business

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

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that Mr. Pappas watched the video of the discussion during the Committee's last meeting and submitted a revision to his application based on the comments. He reminded the Committee of their question regarding the need for a building permit and reported that because the building was under the minimum square footage of two hundred fifty-six square feet required for a building permit, one was not needed. Mr. Moore advised that as to the question regarding the support posts, they were set thirty-six inches into the ground, with the patio being constructed around them.

Michael Pappas, the applicant, apologized for building the structure prior to receiving approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. He opined that it would have been impossible for the Committee to understand what he was proposing to do based on the sketches he provided and opined that it was best to construct it and then collaborate to make it better. Mr. Pappas expressed an understanding that the members had major concerns with the structure. He reminded the Committee that the main structure on

the property was constructed in 1820 and explained that he envisioned there would have been a run-in shed or a kitchen that would have been more rustic on the property. Mr. Pappas acknowledged that he should have made the accessory structure more compatible with the Historic District. He further acknowledged the Historic District Guideline language that stated that any additional structures should be consistent with the main structure. Mr. Pappas agreed the structure, in its existing form, looked stark; however, he opined that it would look better with some significant plantings that would make it more compatible with the home. He advised that the product was unfinished and reiterated a desire to collaborate with the HDRC to make it better. Mr. Pappas noted that he was into historic preservation. He acknowledged the Committee's concerns regarding the corrugated roof and suggested he paint it the same color as the roof on the main structure. Mr. Pappas advised that if he had to, he would replace it with a standing-seam metal roof that would be totally compatible with the main structure.

Chair Clites advised Mr. Pappas that in cases in which an applicant performed work prior to the issuance of the certificate of appropriateness, the Committee's responsibility to the citizenry was to provide input as if the work had not happened.

Bernadette Kidder, 6 Piedmont Drive, noted that her backyard faced Mr. Pappas'. She advised that she was very disappointed with the inappropriate lean-to structure that was recently built and noted that it was very rustic and unattractive. Ms. Kidder opined that it would have been better suited near a remote cabin in the woods and advised that the corner posts appeared to be tree trunks that were limbed off. She suggested the woodsy lean-to did not fit in the Historic District and expressed concern about the property values for all the properties that overlooked the structure. Ms. Kidder advised that she had no concerns regarding the slate patio and fire pit and explained that her only real objection was to the very rustic and inappropriate lean-to. She shared pictures of what she looked into from her home and reiterated that this was a concern for her. Ms. Kidder advised that she would never have bought her home if the lean-to had been there.

Committee Member Anderson advised that he had the same reactions as Ms. Kidder regarding the rustic nature of and some of the materials used on the accessory structure. He opined that if the structure had been painted inside and out to match the existing house, it would have resulted in a less shocking appearance. Mr. Anderson opined that at a minimum, the structure needed to be repainted; the roof changed to a standing-seam metal roof; the columns needed to be clad to be some type of trimmed wood columns, so they were not just tree trunks; and, the shutters needed to be painted to match those on the house. He suggested these changes would change the appearance of this simple structure drastically.

Vice Chair Lee agreed the roof was an issue. She opined that regardless of whether painted or not, the structure would be out of place for the neighborhood. Ms. Lee further opined that the structure was not in the right spot. She acknowledged Mr. Pappas' desire to have something in his backyard; however, she reiterated that what was constructed did not fit with the neighborhood.

Committee Member Wright agreed with Committee Members Anderson and Lee. She suggested the roof be changed so it did not look like a shed. Ms. Wright agreed the structure was out of character for where it was located and noted that it was visible from all directions. She acknowledged that Mr. Pappas mentioned that he planned to do lush plantings and suggested his neighbors would be interested in seeing that plan. Ms. Wright agreed with Committee Member Anderson regarding the roof and columns. She noted that the roof in particular was a concern and advised that she was not sure how it could be changed.

Councilmember Pearson opined that the structure looked like something that would be found on a ranch or in a pasture for horses. She suggested it would be great in those locations, but not in the Historic District. Ms. Pearson expressed concern regarding the Z-braces at the windows and opined that they were not appropriate and did not fit in the Historic District, as they looked like a brand. She agreed with the need to change the roofline. Ms. Pearson suggested Mr. Pappas return with revised drawings for the Committee's consideration.

Chair Clites noted that he would not repeat the concerns that had already been expressed. He advised that he could not think of another place in town where there was a structure with only a rear wall and that was open on three sides, regardless of the style. Mr. Clites noted that the structures the Committee reviewed over the years had the ability to open up a bit; however, when they were closed, they resembled more of a building than a cabana. He acknowledged the comments from the Committee about the need for consistency with the fabric of the town and noted that that was why the HDRC existed. Mr. Clites acknowledged the applicant's proposal to paint the structure and the Committee's comments to change the roof to a standing-seam metal one and to change the columns. He suggested the need for rake molding; although, he acknowledged that may not be enough of a detail. Mr. Clites reminded the Committee that during their last discussion, they talked about the idea of a mono-pitched roof and suggested that while this was a potential solution, it would not be a complete one. He acknowledged the single pitched roof on the main structure; however, he noted that because it was attached to the historic structure, it had more verticality to it. Mr. Clites advised that this was a stand-alone structure, which was what made it feel inappropriate in this area. He questioned whether the paint color should match the house or whether it should be a softer, more muted color so it would not stand out as much. Mr. Clites acknowledged Councilmember Pearson's comments regarding the Z-braces and suggested that if they were painted the same color as the structure, they would probably disappear.

Mr. Pappas advised that this was the type of collaboration he was hoping for and opined that the Committee had offered some great comments. He suggested he could make the front-line roof structure more compatible through a run-in shed look. Mr. Pappas noted a run-in shed located on Route 50 and suggested it had a better roof line. He further noted that it was painted a muted color and suggested he propose another color that was not as stark. Mr. Pappas advised that he liked the idea of going back to the drawing board and opined that it was generous of the Committee to allow him to do that. He suggested he make the changes to be consistent with the Committee's suggestions and see where he was from there. Mr. Pappas acknowledged the expense of making the changes; however, he advised that he wanted to make this right for everyone. He advised that he was also opposed to the Z-braces and agreed they needed to go away. Mr. Pappas noted that the wood was old, reclaimed wood that he wanted to keep out of the landfill and acknowledged that it was not working. He advised that he could clean and paint it properly. Mr. Pappas opined that he would get a ridge line naturally when he changed the roof to a standing-seam metal one. He acknowledged the comments about blocking off more of the outside, to look more like a shed than a pavilion, so the neighbors did not have to look at the inside, and asked that he be allowed to retain the natural wood appearance on the inside. Mr. Pappas asked that he be allowed to see how that looked and if the Committee did not like it, he would paint everything. He advised that as to the posts, they came from trees he felled from land he owned in Spotsylvania and noted that they were meaningful to him. Mr. Pappas asked that he be allowed to retain them unless the Committee felt they were too rustic. He suggested he make the structure better through the other items that were discussed and then see how things went. Mr. Pappas advised that if the Committee did not like it, he would work with them on that too. He noted that he would like to avoid the construction of a privacy fence.

Chair Clites advised Mr. Pappas that the Committee did not have purview over the interior of a structure that was enclosed. He further advised that it only had purview over items that could be seem from the street or public right-of-way. Mr. Clites acknowledged that he was the only member of the Committee who commented on the openness of the structure; however, he noted that if Mr. Pappas returned with a solution to enclose the sides, it would allow him to do whatever he wanted on the interior and would allow him to keep the cedar columns visible on the interior.

Mr. Pappas expressed appreciation for the opportunity to collaborate with the Committee.

Committee Member Anderson opined that Mr. Pappas was saying he would change the roof to look like a run-in shed; however, this was not what the Committee wanted it to look like. He suggested that what would help the look of the structure would be to make it into a gabled roof. Mr. Anderson further suggested that Mr. Pappas return with a scaled drawing of what he was proposing so the Committee would understand it and so Mr. Pappas would understand what the Committee was talking about.

Vice Chair Lee agreed with Committee Member Anderson. She opined that it sounded like Mr. Pappas had planned to take some of the suggestions and physically implement them. Ms. Lee reminded Mr. Pappas that the Committee needed a scale drawing so they could see what was being proposed. She advised that she felt the structure would be out of place even with the suggested changes. Ms. Lee noted that the house and utility shed were both smooth and simple; however, even with the proposed changes, the accessory structure would be very heavy. She advised that if he kept the posts, they would still look like they currently did. Ms. Lee advised that the structure was not working for her given the location.

Committee Member Wright agreed with Committee Member Anderson. She suggested Mr. Pappas also return with a landscape plan. Ms. Wright acknowledged that landscaping was not something the HDRC had purview over; however, she noted that it would help the neighbors understand what was being proposed.

Councilmember Pearson advised that she understood the purpose of the structure; however, what was constructed was not quite right. She noted that this process would have been much easier if it had occurred in the right order. Ms. Pearson opined that going back to the drawing board was the answer.

Mr. Pappas opined that the Committee was saying a gable roof might be better. He suggested he needed an architect. Mr. Pappas noted that he was thinking about the run-in shed coming into Middleburg and opined that it must have received some kind of approval. He advised that he would like to install a fence so no one had to look at his accessory structure.

Chair Clites opined that a fence would not resolve the comments and the need for a solution to them. He suggested that it was important that Mr. Pappas heard Committee Member Anderson's most important request – that being that he return with a scale drawing of what he was proposing. In response to a comment from Mr. Pappas as to whether he could do a run-in shed, Mr. Clites advised that there was nothing that required the committee members to agree with him. He suggested Mr. Pappas be specific as to what roofline he was proposing, what the elevations would look like, and what the finishes would be. Mr. Clites opined that Mr. Pappas would be happier if the Committee took time to understand what he wanted to do before he did anything. He suggested the need to get the application right so the Committee and Mr. Pappas' neighbors could all understand what he was going to do, so the revision would be a one-step process as opposed to a multiple step one.

Mr. Pappas advised that he could not hire an architect and questioned whether the members of the Committee would provide a suggestion for how the shed could look from an architectural drawing standpoint.

Chair Clites explained that when a member of the Committee served as an architect for a project that was before them, he/she had a conflict of interest and had to recuse themselves.

Mr. Pappas opined that the committee members seemed kind and willing to work with him. He asked that they say, "make it look like this and we're good to go". Mr. Pappas advised that he would give the Town money.

Chair Clites advised Mr. Pappas that as the applicant, it was his responsibility to develop the plans. He noted that the Committee did offer suggestions. Mr. Clites advised Mr. Pappas that he was not there to be his architect and noted that he had to be careful not to appear to be. He opined that what was needed was not a particularly detailed set of drawings and noted that they were often simple. Mr. Clites suggested Mr. Pappas look at recent applications that were submitted to the Committee and noted that it was agreeable to fairly simple drawings. He explained that the Committee was more interested in the solution.

Committee Member Anderson suggested it was important for Mr. Pappas to understand that he should have no expectation that whatever he returned with would be accepted. He noted that it would go through the same review process it should have gone through had it been submitted in the beginning. Mr. Anderson reiterated that there should be no expectation that whatever Mr. Pappas returned with would or would not be accepted.

Mr. Pappas acknowledged this and thanked the Committee for their input.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that unless Mr. Pappas was willing to defer action on his application, the Committee was obligated to take action during this meeting. He noted that if he was agreeable to continuing the application, this would be fine.

Mr. Pappas advised the Committee that he was going to try to make it look better and would return with a drawing or something that would make it look better. He acknowledged that it would involve an expense; however, he advised that he was going to make the accessory structure look better. Mr. Pappas advised that if the Committee still did not like it, he would beg for more time to make it look better. He acknowledged that part of the issue was the original sketch he provided and opined that they would not have understood it until the structure was built. Mr. Pappas agreed the structure was very stark. He advised that he was going to try to make it better and would maybe come up with a drawing. Mr. Pappas reiterated that if the Committee did not like it, he would go back to the drawing board. He opined that the members had some great ideas and agreed the structure did not look so good in its present location. Mr. Pappas opined that painting it to match the house would make it look more compatible. He agreed it needed a contrasting color. Mr. Pappas advised that he planned to start with the house color and if the Committee did not like it, he would propose another color. He expressed appreciation for the opportunity to work with the Committee and acknowledged that it was for the greater purpose of keeping Middleburg looking like Middleburg. Mr. Pappas confirmed he was okay if the Committee deferred action until next month; however, he noted that he was not sure he would be able to get much done in a month.

Chair Clites advised Mr. Pappas that he did not have to return next month and suggested he work with the staff when he was ready to return.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee defer action until next month or when the applicant was available to come meet with the Committee again.

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

New Business

COA 25-03 (S 25-02): Porch Alterations, Lighting, Replacement Door, New Windows & Window Openings & Signs – 101 W. Federal Street – Jane Covington

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the applicant included a narrative, annotated photographs, and elevation drawings to help explain her proposal. He advised that earlier in the day, she forwarded two different options for a revised south elevation, which he would display once the Committee reached that part of the discussion. Mr. Moore noted that a number of the elements the applicant described fell under the category of routine maintenance and repairs, such as fixing the sag in the porch and repainting it the same color. He reminded the members that those items were not subject to their review; although, it was good that they were aware of them so they could make editorial comments. Mr. Moore noted that this

property was very historic in nature and was one of the older homes in town. He further noted that it was in need of good care. Mr. Moore reported that the applicant intended to replace the front door with a new one that would be painted in a contrasting color. He further reported that she planned to introduce some new windows and window openings on the rear elevation of the building, which was a later addition that was not part of the original 1798 structure.

Jane Covington, the applicant, advised the Committee that she just purchased the property. She reported that she was proposing no changes to the front, with the exception of the lighting. Ms. Covington advised that she planned to replace the two existing surface mounted lights with recessed lighting that would not be visible from the street and that would produce downlight. She reported that the window sashes would remain and the front door would be painted yellow. Ms. Covington displayed color samples of the proposed colors for the building. She explained that the trim would be a cream color, the existing stucco would be a light green color, the roof would be black, and the porch would be dark gray.

Ms. Covington advised that as to the side elevation, no changes were proposed to the 1790 portion of the structure. She further advised that the signpost and sign would be removed. Ms. Covington advised that a new window opening was proposed, which would match what was on the south side of the building. She reminded the Committee that the side elevation reflected the three generations of the building, including the original 1790s structure, a 1920s addition and a 1970s addition that was cinder block. Ms. Covington noted the fixed plexiglass openings, which were not even windows, and explained that she was proposing to replace them with three separate single light casement windows.

Ms. Covington advised that as to the south elevation, she had proposed two-over-two windows; however, she was able to repair one of the windows in the 1920s addition, so she was now proposing to use six-over-six windows to match the existing ones. She noted the two windows on the first floor and the two at the basement and advised that there was limited public access in these areas. Ms. Covington reminded the Committee that they were only visible from the Middleburg Millwork or the former Snyder's Plumbing buildings.

Ms. Covington noted that the elevation drawings were pencil sketches. She advised that the sashes for the existing windows would remain. Ms. Covington noted that she planned to replace the modern half-light front door with a solid wood one. She acknowledged the existing signs on the building and advised that they would be removed and replaced with signs that currently existed in Middleburg for her business. Ms. Covington noted that if she removed the house numbers, she was obligated to mount them somewhere else on the building. She continued her review with the side elevation drawings. Ms. Covington advised that no changes were proposed to the original portion of the building; that the 1920s addition would have a single new window opening and a new sash. She reviewed the rear elevation drawing and noted that no changes were proposed to the 1970s addition; the window that was repaired in the first floor story was a six-over-six window; no changes were proposed to the window identified as Window A; the original windows on the third floor would remain; the window identified as Window C would be a six-over-six window to match the existing ones; and the basement level windows would be six-over-six to match the existing ones and would include new sashes and new window openings. Ms. Covington reiterated that the existing fixed plexiglass opening would be replaced with three operable casement windows with single lights. She advised that no changes were being proposed to the 1790s portion of the building and noted that the real changes were to the 1970s portion.

Ms. Covington advised that she was showing the building to different tenants and noted that one tenant requested two French doors on the back of the building, with a Juliet porch, on the first floor. She advised that the basement level would contain six-over-six windows, which would be tightened to align with the French doors. Ms. Covington reiterated that this elevation did not have a lot of exposure to the public right-of-way.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Covington explained that she proposed single lights in Window B because they were low to the floor and could not be double hung windows. She advised that they could be six-over-six if desired. Ms. Covington explained that the single light was closer to what existed, which was why she chose it. In response to a comment that the windows on the cinder block addition seemed like they were up on the ceiling, Ms. Covington noted that she was working with what she had.

Vice Chair Lee opined that either the window additions or the French doors on the back of the building would be nice. She noted that the front porch on the west side was in bad shape and opined that it was great that Ms. Covington had undertaken this project in order to bring this building back to life. She reminded the Committee that it was an important feature in the town and thanked Ms. Covington.

Committee Member Wright agreed with Vice Chair Lee and noted that it was wonderful to see someone paying attention to the building, as it was important to the town. She advised that she would be fine with either the windows or the French door in the rear of the building, as either would be appropriate.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to why she was proposing to make the front door a solid one, Ms. Covington confirmed there were three lights on the existing door. She noted that she was quickly running out of money and advised that if she could afford to change the door, it would be with a single light door. Ms. Covington opined that she may end up staining the existing door due to budgetary constraints. She confirmed the existing door was not historic.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed the Historic District Guidelines suggested retaining historic doors or recreating them if they could not be repaired. He noted that in this case, the door was not historic and there was no evidence of what the original door looked like. Mr. Moore advised that this would be a question of the Committee's interpretation of what would be an appropriate door on the structure.

Ms. Covington reminded the Committee of the steps that came from the east side that cut into the porch. She noted that the pedestrian traffic came from the west; therefore, she was asking to add a set of steps exterior to the porch that would extend into the partition between this and the adjacent building in order to invite pedestrians onto the front porch. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed she was proposing wooden steps.

Chair Clites noted that the porch contained two types of railing – a wooden one and a black iron one.

Ms. Covington advised that while she loved the wooden rail, it was not up to building code, as it was too low. She further advised that the new rail would look like the existing iron rail.

Chair Clites opined that this made sense and noted that it would not be noticeable. He agreed that no one would see the recessed lights when they were on. Mr. Clites questioned whether Ms. Covington was proposing to either keep the existing door or replace it with a solid door and a single light glass storm door.

Ms. Covington confirmed she would like to replace the door with a solid door, which would be in keeping with the 1790's structure, and a full light storm door. She advised, however, that if she ran out of money, she would paint the existing door.

Chair Clites advised Ms. Covington that he returned to the Committee a couple of years after he moved into his building to ask for the addition of a storm door because people would not open the solid door. He opined that solid doors were unfriendly and noted that the light coming into his front entry was welcoming. Mr. Clites advised that while he did not have a strong feeling one way or the other, he questioned whether the Committee should request the addition of muntins in the windows in the 1970s addition.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington confirmed these windows were in the 1920s addition; however, they were likely a 1970s item. She reiterated that it was fixed Plexiglass. Ms. Covington advised that windows in the rear would contain the Marvin sill that would not have a lot of ornamentation. She further advised that the window would be recessed on the interior, not the exterior.

Chair Clites questioned whether the Committee had a preference with regard to the muntins in the center windows. After some discussion, the Committee agreed this was not a prominent façade; therefore, they were fine with the single lights that were proposed.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington advised that she anticipated the balcony would consist of a tongue and groove wooden porch, with an iron structure for cantilevering. She suggested the need for two beams. Ms. Covington advised that the railing could be iron. She noted that there would not be much room on the balcony for more than a couple of chairs.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee would need to see what was proposed. He suggested that an alternative was a Juliet balcony that would allow the door to open and for someone to lean out of it. Mr. Clites advised that it would be eighteen inches in width at a maximum.

Committee Member Anderson opined that a Juliet balcony would save money, as Ms. Covington would not need to tear into the wall to install a cantilever structure. He noted that it could be fabricated to hold onto the wall.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Covington requested approval for the doors and windows and suggested she return with a proposal for the balcony.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Covington confirmed the proposed steps to the front porch would be as wide as what existed.

The Committee agreed they liked the proposal for recessed lights and noted that they would not be blinding for the vehicular traffic at that intersection.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington advised that she proposed to relocate her existing business signs onto this building in order to make it look alive. She advised that the tenant would return with an application for their sign. Ms. Covington advised that she would remove her signs when the tenant installed theirs.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-03 (S 25-02), a request of Jane Covington for alterations as discussed with the following clarifications: (1) starting at the front porch to the west, the new steps going to the sidewalk would be constructed of materials to match the porch and they would be the width to match the eastern steps and that the rail that would be installed at the western new steps would match the eastern step rail; (2) the porch lights be replaced with recessed lights that should be 2,700 kelvin; (3) the signs are approved as submitted; (4) the colors are approved as submitted; (5) the front door may either be repainted as exists or replaced as proposed; (6) in the rear elevation, the Committee approve the four windows with the six-over-six light pattern or, as an alternative, the Committee approve a French Door with the requirement that the railing and/or Juliet balcony come back for further review and approval prior to proceeding; and (7) the widow on the east be approved as submitted.

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

Chair Clites thanked Ms. Covington for providing the detailed application and noted that it made the Committee's work much easier.

March Meeting Quorum

Chair Clites asked the members to let Town Clerk North know as soon as possible if they found they were unable to attend the March 6th meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – February 6, 2025

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

Tim Clites: Welcome, everybody. This is the call to order for the Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's regularly scheduled February 6, 2025 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.

Bill Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins is absent. 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, we have a public comment session. Anybody is welcome to give us comments from the general public. If you're on the agenda, we ask that you wait until your item on the agenda comes up and you have all the time you need to discuss an item on the agenda with us, so we'll pause for a second for any public comments.

Michael Pappas: I'm not sure. I assume we're on the agenda. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Your name is? [off mic]. Okay. Yep. Well, we'll get if you're. Yeah. We only have two things on the agenda, so you're probably not waiting long, but thank you. Next order of business is approval of the minutes from our January the 2nd 2025 meeting. Are there any clarifications to the minutes? Seeing none, I move that we approve them as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain. Motion passes. Thank you. The next action item is an old business action item request of Michael Pappas for an accessory structure at 5 to 7 North Jay Street. And we had a discussion about that last meeting. But I'll look to Mr. Moore to kind of walk us through and make sure everyone's caught up.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As you stated, you had a discussion at your last meeting Mr. Pappas was unable to be here. But he did watch the video. So, he heard all the deliberation and discussion that occurred there. And he has submitted its attachment number three under this agenda item, which is a narrative of recognizing again that he had seen the video, heard the discussion offering to discuss some possible changes to the structure with you. As he noted within, and I did in the memo for this month. And we'll just state it for the record. There were a couple of questions as to whether or not this building was subject to building permitting. And it is not. It does fall underneath the minimum square footage of 256ft² that is required for a building permit. But he also did clarify one of the questions, which was whether or not the support posts were simply sitting atop the flagstone patio. And they are not. They are each 36in deep into the ground. And the patio was then constructed around it. And the mortar was put very close to it. So, it has that clean appearance, which would make you think it was sitting loose but they are indeed not. With that said certainly let the applicant walk through his narrative with you and discuss the possible changes that he is offering to make.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you and welcome. You're welcome to come up to the podium. State your name and address for the record. It's nice to hear that you got the chance to listen to this video. You know, we.

Michael Pappas: Oh, yeah.

Tim Clites: We now get video recorded. We didn't used to, but it's been helpful.

Michael Pappas: It was so helpful. And I'll admit I actually was able to see you all live. I was in preparation for a procedure for the next day, and I wouldn't have been particularly helpful for anything. But in any event so I saw you live, and I've watched the video a couple of times. So, you guys are stars in our house. But I'm not just trying to flatter you. Okay?

Tim Clites: So, let's start with pull the mic down.

Michael Pappas: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Rhonda likes to make sure we can hear you.

Michael Pappas: Oh okay, good.

Tim Clites: And your name and address. And then.

Michael Pappas: Michael. Michael Pappas. Michael Pappas. This one is popping. Is that me? Michael Pappas. The home address is 3806 Hemlock Way, Fairfax, Virginia. 22030. Of course, this is pertaining to a home that I own here in Middleburg at 5 and 7 Jay Street North Middleburg 220117. [inaudible]. And so that's that. That's the answer to that.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We have what you submitted. We've all had a chance to read through it. Thank you. If there's anything you'd like to add or further thoughts that you've had since submitting that we're happy to hear them.

Michael Pappas: I'd be happy to do that. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Just a little dialog with the applicant. And then we, I try to we try to stay organized. We tend to be a chatty group. Sometimes we're not, but we try to, in an organized fashion, then go through and allow each person to give comments. And then we'll come back around to you for more comments.

Michael Pappas: That sounds great, Mr. Chair. This is when I have a harmonica in front of me. I want to pull out my harmonica. I mean, when I have a microphone, I want to pull out my harmonica and play.

Tim Clites: You should have brought it.

Michael Pappas: But it's a little. But so, the I meant what I said. I apologize for going forward and building the structure. There was a it was a confrontation if you want to, if you want to say of a situation where I have a guy that I've worked with for many years, he was willing to create the structure. He was out of work. And I said, well, you know, how bad could it be? Because he does great work. He's a kind of an of an artistic type. And so, we went forward. And the other thing was, as I noticed from your discussions, and you looked at the pictures of the preliminary things without what, Mr. Moore shared, which was the actual pictures, it was impossible for you all to and I can understand that for you all to envision what I had in mind. Okay. And now that it's built and I said, okay, best thing to do is go ahead and build it, and then we'll explain further and get some collaboration to make it better. I notice you all were relatively aghast with what was built from a perspective of, oh my God, not in my back yard. Well, of course it's in my backyard. But I understand, you know, some major concerns with it, with how it looked. Maybe it's okay. I've been involved in historic preservation for many, many years. I've done about 15 or 16 historic revitalizations of homes dating mainly from the 19th century in Virginia. One of my thought was that this home, the main structure, was actually built in 1820. The 1900 thing doesn't make any sense. It was built in 1820, and it was part of a it was a dormitory for the original Middleburg Academy. And I envisioned in 1820 that behind the property there would be Run-in sheds or a kitchen, an outhouse, or an outhouse or maybe a kitchen, something much more rustic. Now what I didn't realize, and I should have paid a little bit more attention with what your concerns are, and that is making it compatible, making any structure compatible with the town of Middleburg. And to that end there you have a specific a specific rule, if you will, that Miss Pearson had brought up that any additional structures should be consistent with the main structure. And so, I said, oh, now I get it. And then talking with a number of people, including my wife Victoria, they said she said they want it painted like the house. And so, I say, okay, so that's and, you know, I get it, and I understand. And when I look at it and when I look at how stark it is in the backyard, I can see that concern. Now, as I said in my statement, I'm at a bit of a disadvantage presenting this in the winter. Everything looks terrible in the winter, and I wanted to try to get you all to envision planting significant plantings around to make it more compatible with the home and the like. So anyway, it's an unfinished product, and I want to collaborate with you all to make this better for the Town of Middleburg, because I'm into historic preservation, too. And that's it. And then the other thing that I noticed from your meeting was y'all didn't like the roof structure, and I get it. Corrugated roof, as was pointed out. The corrugated roofs do have some historic usage, if you will, but not in the Town of Middleburg. I get that. I was thinking, well, maybe I could paint it the same color as the roof, the gray color is the roof of our main structure. And see what that looks like. But if I have to, I'll do the standing seam metal roof, which would be a totally compatible with the look of the main structure, particularly the kitchen. So that's where I'm at. And again, I want to work with you all to make it better for us all.

Tim Clites: Well. Thank you. Thank you for walking us through that. And just to clarify what I think Mr. Moore clarifies for us, always when an applicant is before us that has left the starting blocks a little soon.

Michael Pappas: I did.

Tim Clites: Our responsibility is to give input as if that didn't happen. And so, we do the best we can to do that. And I think it's worth repeating that again before we go down through the group, because that's our responsibility to our citizens. So, appreciate your added input. And why don't we start? I don't know, Bill want to start with you.

Bill Anderson: Sure.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Mr. Kidder: Excuse me, is the public comment period still open? We'd like to make a comment.

Tim Clites: Okay. Let me. I may have missed cued. Are you here on with the applicant on behalf of the project?

Mr. Kidder: The applicant? We're here to speak out against what he's proposing or what was originally built.

Tim Clites: Okay, I apologize. I didn't understand that when I presumed when you two were sitting together and you were here for the same thing that.

Michael Pappas: We're neighbors here. Yeah, yeah.

Tim Clites: So, let's Yeah, let's take a pause if we can. Thank you very much. I appreciate it, and I appreciate you coming as neighbors, so please come same kind of rules apply. It'd be nice if you'd come up and introduce yourselves. Name and address. And then share your comments with us.

Bernadette Kidder: Bernadette Kidder, 6 Piedmont Drive, Middleburg, Virginia.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Bernadette Kidder: I've. Go ahead. [multiple speakers] I wrote down some of my comments so that I wouldn't forget them. Okay. My backyard faces the backyard of 5 and 7 Jay Street. I am very disappointed with the inappropriate lean-to structure that was recently built in the back yard of five and seven Jay Street. It is very rustic and unattractive structure that would be better suited near a remote cabin in the woods. The corner posts appear to be tree trunks with the limbs trimmed off. Middleburg is a quaint, picturesque town with a colonial vibe, and this woodsy lean to just doesn't fit in the Historic District. I am further concerned for all of the property owners on Piedmont Drive that overlook the structure and their property values. Lastly, I have no major concerns regarding the slate patio and fire pit. My only real objection is the very rustic and inappropriate lean to. I have pictures that I can share with you that are from my home what I have to look out into. If you'd like to see them. Thank you for this opportunity, but it is truly a major concern for me, because if that had been there when I was looking to buy this house, I would never have bought the house. And would you like to see?

Tim Clites: Yeah. It doesn't hurt. Sure. If you want to start, hand them to Bill and he can pass them down. Thank you.

Bill Anderson: Thank you. Thank you.

Will Moore: Thank you. In addition to her photos, if you look on the screen that has just come up or may have, should be up now on your dais. So, the subject property Mr. Pappas' property is where you see the cursor kind of circling here. And the Kidder's property is right directly behind here. Faces on Piedmont Drive with their rear yard faces Mr. Pappas' rear yard, if that gives some context.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you. I think when did I get somehow volunteered to be the Chairman. It's been like two years, maybe. And I think that's when we decided to do public comments about that time. We didn't used to. And I think you're the first public comment in two years. So, we actually appreciate citizen input. Otherwise, it tends to be a fairly lonely spot sitting up here. So, thanks for your input. Let's wait for those pictures to make it through the group, have they? Yeah. Thank you. And I don't know, Rhonda is it possible for us to get a picture, or is that important at all that we have that to add to the file or maybe not? I don't know, it's not part of the application, right?

Rhonda North: Yes. But since she has introduced them to the group and you all, it's now a public record, so we should at least scan them.

Tim Clites: Yeah, go ahead.

Rhonda North: Yes.

Tim Clites: Perfect. I think that would be appropriate. Yeah, fine. Thank you. All right. Bill.

Bill Anderson: Thank you for your written comments, that gave this I think, almost a firsthand understanding of where you're coming from now. I had the same reaction initially as you did. And the rustic nature and some of the material elements of the material elements really give me second thoughts about this. I think that what was suggested by Mr. Pappas, by one, if painting the entire structure, I assume, inside and out to match the existing house, if that was done initially and that was brought in to us, I think it would have been a less shocking appearance. I believe that as a minimum, a repainting of the structure, a change of the roof to be a similar standing seam as on the primary residence and cladding the columns. So, they aren't just tree trunks, but some type of trim trimmed wood columns would make an enormous difference, including on the backside painting the shutters to match the house. I think this would change the appearance drastically of this pretty simple structure. Those are my initial comments. I'll probably come back again.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think obviously the roof is an issue, but I just feel the structure itself, painted or not, is kind of out of place for its neighbors. Paint would only make it match the other buildings, but it still looks like it would be happier if it was beside a creek or a lake or something. It just seems to me as presented a bit not in the right spot. I get your idea for having something in your backyard, but to me this just doesn't fit the whole neighborhood at all.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

Bernadette Kidder: Can I respond? Should I wait for everybody?

Tim Clites: Yeah, please. We'll go through. And that way some of the comments agree. Some of them sometimes disagree. Yeah. Thank you.

Linda Wright: Well, I would pretty much agree with everything everyone has already said. I don't know if there's any way, since you've already built this, if there's any way to change the roof line so it isn't looking like a shed that would certainly help. But I do sort of agree that this is sort of out of character for where it is and, in the town, and it's so visible from everywhere. I know too, there's no landscape plan submitted with this. You had mentioned in your writing that you were hoping to do lush plantings and things. I think your neighbors would be very interested to see that, and to see how you might be screening it from them and helping it blend in with the backyard. But I think, as Bill said, I would agree with the roof comment and the column comments. I just the roof line really bothers me, and I just can't quite figure out how I'm not the architect here, but how to figure that that would help that. So, you could have this in your backyard if it could be changed somehow.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda.

Cindy Pearson: And I too, think the structure to your neighbors in fact, I almost wrecked my car the first time I looked over there off of 50. Looking at it, I thought, oh, my. Because to me, it looked like something that would be in a ranch or out in a pasture with your horses ready to run in. I mean, it could be great there, but not in a backyard in our Historic District. The other thing, they've mentioned some other things, but the Z is, I will call it, that's on the windows in the front or. Yeah, it's a backward Z, but to me it's a Z. I don't think that's appropriate either that looks more like a like a brand. That it just doesn't quite fit in there too. So that should be if it can all be, you know, the roofline changed different things painted plantings, you know, like Linda said, you'd have to see what that would do. Then we would look at it

again and see. So, I would suggest that we just send this back to the drawing board and see what can be done with it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I don't want to repeat what we've heard, so maybe I'll have my comments try to be a little bit of an extension of what we heard. We heard about painting the structure, Well, first I heard the structure feels out of place and for me to put words to that. Just trying to think of another place in town where we had a rear yard structure that was a one wall and open on three sides, regardless of style, and I don't remember, I can't think of a place where that. Now, that doesn't mean that it's not possible to do well in a Historic District. But when I think about the different structures that we've seen at this committee over the years, they tended to perhaps have the ability to open up. But then when they were closed, if you will, or put back into a closed position, they tended to resemble more a building than a cabana. So, backing the whole way up, I think it's a cool structure. But everything has a place where it feels consistent. And so, I think you've heard that from the committee. It is about consistency with the fabric of our town. That's why we're here. And so, then this question comes up. The notes were that I made from the committee's comments and the feedback we got from the applicant was potentially paint potentially standing seam. Maybe there's a subtle detail about cladding the columns. I would add to that. Maybe it needs a rake molding coming down. So that it's not just the kind of two by furring sticking out. If you look at the one image during the snow and you squint a little, you can see a white line, almost like what's actually the snow built up on the one picture. And it looks like a kind of a crisp rake board. And I'm not saying that's enough of a detail, but this would be in the most recent follow-up that we got. There we go. And go to the pictures. So, I think there's some additional trend beyond just the columns that would help. That dark, snowy picture in the bottom right. If you kind of squint, you can see it looks like a rake. So, and then in the last discussion, we at least brainstormed the idea that the mono pitch roof, if it had a steep pitch, like a Run-in shed headings. [multiple speakers]

Michael Pappas: Run-in shed like that; we see.

Tim Clites: That's a potential solution. I don't know that that would be the complete solution, but that would. And you're right, the home does have on the rear of the home, it has a single pitched roof, a shed, but that's connected to the historic structure that has some more verticality. This is a standalone structure, which is, I think, part of what makes it feel inappropriate or inconsistent in this area. The one thing that I wondered about the paint color is whether it, and this is maybe open for discussion, whether it should match the house or whether it should be a softer, more muted color so that it didn't stand out as much. That's just a question, not something that I want to set a direction on. I think to that end, probably, Cindy, your comments about the Z brace, if I understand that that's on the back of the shutter that occasionally could be opened, but when it's in the position, the closed position that it's in, the neighbors might see that, but from the public way, I don't think we would see that. But again, if that got painted, that would probably disappear. It looks like it's maybe just a different type of wood to create that brace. And what other comments do I have? So, with that, I'll pause. By all means, you're welcome to, this is a dialog, so please.

Michael Pappas: This is a kind of collaboration that I'm hoping for. Great ideas. And it was. I think I can make that the front-line roof structure more compatible with what we see in Run-in sheds, including the newest shed that the newest Run-in shed as you proceed west on route 50 that house that had a lot of work done. And there's a shed. There's a gable roof had an outbuilding in the front, a stone gable roof outbuilding in the front, and I don't want Miss Pearson to get into an accident looking over at the one that's further in the back there. But there's that's a type of Run-in shed that would have a better roof line that Mr. Anderson had suggested earlier on, and that structure is painted a muted I don't want to say a barn red, but a kind of a muted brownish red kind of thing that could be compatible with the idea that you're saying to make it not so. So, the house, the main house is, I want to call it white, but it's actually a light gray, which I kind of like. But if that's going to be too stark, yeah, we can come up with another color. But what I like the idea of going back to the drawing board.

Michael Pappas: I think that's very generous of you to allow us to do that. And just change what it is consistent with our suggestions and then see where we are. I mean, seriously consistent. It's going to be an expense. But, you know, I want to make this right for everybody and have a backyard. One of the things that I, the Z I, when I saw the Z, I said, Julio, what are you doing? So, but the Z is a no go. I'm against the Z as well. I don't even know where that came from. But yeah, that's got to go. One of the things that I'd like for you all to consider is if I were to do all the paintings, you know, that need to be done to make it again. I'll be honest with you, this would is the product of reuse. All of this wood is old wood that has been reused. That would have been in the landfill. Okay. I thought that was the cool thing. Obviously, it's not working for us, but I think it could be cleaned and painted properly. But one of the things I'd like us to consider is if we did all this on the outside structure, including that ridge line that we saw in the snow, I think that would look a lot better too, but I think I would get that naturally with a standing seam metal roof that, that comes naturally to have that edge. But one of the things I'd like us to consider is we do all this stuff on the outside, but and maybe block off a little more outside that more compatible with the shed versus the pavilion on you know, facing our neighbors so they don't have to look at the inside. But I'd like us to consider allowing just for purposes. For purposes of, oh my gosh, what is it? Variation. Allow us to consider having an inside that is more of a natural wood, just like one would have in a cabin where, you know, the outside is painted, etc. but when you go inside, you got your natural wood. At least if we could see how that looks. And then if we don't like that, the Z's got to go. But if we don't like that, then okay, well, we'll paint everything. But also, those trees you know, the posts they come from some land that I own in Spotsylvania that dates from 1790. There was a it was the what was the name of the Anyway that that comes from there. And there's a historical structure on there that I've worked with.

Michael Pappas: And so that's where I got that wood. It's kind of kind of meaningful to me. Those are again, all there, Cedar Woods that came off. So if we can keep that until you all say, nah, you know, that's too rustic, but I'm just thinking if we could have some contrast with, you know, the painting, the standing seam metal roof, make it look better according to, you know, everything we're talking about today. And then see how that goes. And if you don't like that, then we can work with that, too. I want to work with you. I want to work with you all, so you know, and I won't even get into the whole fence idea. Because I'm telling you, if the neighbor to the south had not started working on his fence after many years to make it, I was going to come here and ask, well, come to the town and asked to build a six-foot privacy fence. But he's done that. That's you know, and so that's great. And so, you know, a privacy fence. I'd like to avoid that. But if the structure is too gross for everybody, I'd like to use my backyard. But I'll do whatever y'all want me to do.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you. Just to jump in.

Michael Pappas: I'm sorry for going on.

Tim Clites: That's all right.

Michael Pappas: I haven't been able to make a long story short and so. [laughter]

Tim Clites: That's all right. We appreciate the comments. Just to be clear any structure that is enclosed, we have no purview over the interior. Okay. We have not anywhere in town. That's not our purview. Is only things that can be seen from the public way or the street.

Michael Pappas: Okay.

Tim Clites: So, to the extent that the committee had some input on the openness of the structure, I was the only one that made that comment. But to the extent that you came with a solution that started to enclose the sides, that would do two things. It would allow you to do whatever you wanted on the interior, and that includes keeping the cedar columns at least visible from the interior.

Michael Pappas: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Again, it depends on the particular solution that you might come up with but.

Michael Pappas: Anyway, I want to work with you. I just appreciate you know, this collaboration it's different.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Michael Pappas: I mean, attempted lawyer by trade, but don't hold it against me. I'm not used to seeing cooperation. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Bill, any additional comments?

Bill Anderson: Yes. If I understood some of the comments, if there was some change to the roof in the front of this structure and it looked more like a Run-in shed. Well, we don't want it to look like a Run-in shed, that's the whole point. I mean if there was any roof adjustment, I would think that would help the looks of this structure. It would be to make it into a gabled roof. The house has a gable roof. The other shed has a gable roof. It would cut down the immediate, you know, shed roof look. That's the only other thing I'd say. And I think, of course, that requires construction to be done, but that might work. Maybe coming back with a drawing of what this thing actually is being proposed. Any changes proposed would also help the committee members understand, and the owner understand what we're all talking about. Anyway, I would recommend that.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Bill Anderson: I mean, a scaled drawing.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Bill because it kind of sounded like you were taking some of the suggestions and going ahead and physically do them, but that's only going to not work. We need to, you know we need like, the scale drawings and see. But for me, I still feel like it's totally out of place, even with the suggestions. Your utility shed is smooth and simple. The house is smooth and simple, and this just kind of just doesn't fit. It just, you know. Even with the suggested changes, it just seems very heavy. And you want to keep the posts. Well, then the posts are still going to look like they do now, and you try to change the roof. I don't know. It's not working for me for its location. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

Linda Wright: I would agree a lot with what Bill had to say, and I would just suggest to, because you do have so many neighbors that all look into this property to come back with some kind of landscape sketch, even though we don't have purview over that. I think it would help your neighbors and adjoining properties understand kind of what your intent is but help.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No. I think you all have said everything. You know, I do see the purpose of it. You wanted a place to go out and enjoy a fire pit and a place to be. But I just don't think this quite. It would have been so much easier had it gone in the right order. That we wouldn't be where we are right now. But to take it back to the drawing board, I think, is the answer.

Michael Pappas: So, trying to understand, a gable roof might be better. So, I need an architect. Okay, so. So, a gable roof might be better, but, you see, my gable is it's going in the wrong direction. But I was thinking about that again that Run-in shed that is right there. I mean, I can make it look exactly like that

Run-in shed that is on the right-hand side as you're driving into Middleburg. That has must have gotten some approval. The other thing is, I would like to put up a fence, so that nobody has to look at it.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I think the height of the fence won't solve the problem.

Michael Pappas: No, it would be a six-foot fence.

Tim Clites: Yeah, but it probably still won't resolve the comments and the need for a solution. So, I think Mr. Moore you could help, but I it doesn't feel like we're at a place where we should have a motion to deny. I think it's important that you hear that I think the most important request, perhaps, was Bill's that you come back with a scale drawing, and I would say take in the spirit of suggestion, the Run-in shed or the gabled roof versus the mono pitch, more contemporary. Right like take just.

Michael Pappas: I'm going to do the Run-in shed. I can do the Run-in shed.

Tim Clites: Well.

Michael Pappas: Okay.

Tim Clites: I'm just. I want to be clear that if I make this objection, there's nothing that requires anybody else sitting up here to agree with me. And so, I think getting a little advice so that you can be specific about what is the what's the roof line going to look like. What are the elevations going to look like? What are the finishes? I would rather and I think you're going to be happier in the long run if you and we take the time to understand what you're going to do before you do anything, it sounds like with the winter, we're not in a hurry anyway. So, let's get this right so that you and we and your neighbors all understand what it is that you're going to do, so that the revision is a one step process, not a multiple.

Michael Pappas: I got an idea. I can't hire architects, but since we're going collaboration would you gentlemen like to provide a suggestion as to how the shed could look from an architectural drawing standpoint? And then I might be able to do that.

Tim Clites: Yeah. The conflict of interest just to be clear there is when I present to this board, I have to leave, and I then present to them.

Michael Pappas: No, no this would just be, hey, Mike, why don't you make it look like this? And then I would say, great idea, Mr. Chair, Mr. Anderson, and let's go there.

Tim Clites: We appreciate that.

Michael Pappas: Rather than guessing. And I'll make that happen. I just want to don't want to hire an architect who's going to say, well, have him look at this, and then I have to hire the architect again. You all seem so kind and willing to work with me. I'm asking you to work with me and say make it look like this and we're good to go.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And that is You. Yeah.

Michael Pappas: I'll give money to the town.

Tim Clites: Yeah, that's the applicant's responsibility. We do offer suggestions. And like I mentioned, some of us are occasionally on the other side of this dais and could do that. But that's not why I'm here tonight. And so, I think we have to be very careful not to. [multiple speakers]

Michael Pappas: Fair enough.

Tim Clites: Right. Because. Yeah. Because. Yeah, I think that I don't think it's a particularly detailed set of drawings that we're looking for a shed. They're often very simple. And actually, I would encourage that perhaps you could look at some of the current or recent applications to see that we're actually quite agreeable to fairly simple drawings. It's more about the solution, I think, that we're interested in and then. Yeah.

Michael Pappas: All right. Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: So yes, Bill.

Bill Anderson: Having said all that, I think it's important at least I think it's important that there should be no expectation that what you bring back will also be accepted. That goes through the same process that it should have gone through in the beginning. But it shouldn't be that expectation that it will or will not, you know, be approved.

Michael Pappas: So yeah. Okay. Good to know.

Michael Pappas: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Will Moore: One other thing. Before you walk away, Mr. Pappas. If you are not going to take action to approve or deny tonight, I would just need Mr. Pappas to consent to that. So, if.

Tim Clites: To a deferment?

Will Moore: To a deferment. Because otherwise you would be obligated to take action tonight. But if he's agreeable to continuing the application rather than you taking a vote to for hypothetically deny tonight, that's fine, as long as he states that he's agreeable to that.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I think.

Michael Pappas: Thank you. Yeah. And you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to try to make it look better and come up with a drawing or something but try to make it look better. I know it's going to be an expense, but I'm going to try to make it look better. And I'm going to say, what do you all think of this? If you all don't like it like that, I'll beg for more time to make it look better. Okay, but it's silly for me to say, I think I'm going to be making it look like this, but it doesn't look like that. That was my whole problem in the first in the first place, with my crappy drawings that I gave to everybody and until it finally got built. And thankfully, Will ended up taking pictures of it. And it was very stark. But I'm just going to try to make it look better and maybe come up with a drawing if you don't like it there back to the drawing board. I think someone suggested that, but I am not saying that this hasn't been added value. You all have some great ideas. It does look not so good right now in its present location. I just thought maybe painting it consistent with the house might make it more compatible. If you think it needs a contrasting color that's fine too. I can start with consistent with the house. And then if you don't like that color, I'll come up with another color. I appreciate you all working with me. It's not like I'm not used to homeowners associations. I'm on the board of a homeowner's association, and this is that at large. But it's for a more. It's for a greater purpose to keep Middleburg looking like Middleburg. And I can understand that.

Tim Clites: So just to confirm, are you okay if we defer till next month?

Michael Pappas: Till next month, I might not be able to get too much done.

Tim Clites: That's okay.

Michael Pappas: But I'll see what I.

Tim Clites: If we defer, you don't have to come next month. When you're ready you work with the staff and we're.

Michael Pappas: I don't want you to get sick of me. But I don't mind coming to these meetings.

Tim Clites: I think as long as you're making progress, we appreciate that very much so.

Michael Pappas: Thank you all.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. So, then I move that we defer until next month or when the applicant is available to come meet with us again.

Linda Wright: Yes.

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

Punkin Lee: Aye.

Bill Anderson: Aye.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Linda Wright: Aye.

Tim Clites: Motion passes. Thank you. Thank you. And thank you for coming tonight as neighbors. Also, we appreciate all your attendance and engagement. All right. Next order of business is. Hold on. COA 25-03 S25-02. Request of Jane Covington for porch alterations, lighting and replacement door, new windows and window openings and signs at 101 West Federal Street. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My apologies again for the late distribution of the packet for this month's meeting. I hope you've had a chance to look through the applicants materials. She's done a few things, I think, which are very helpful here. One is just her narrative, but then she has these annotated photos, one of which is on the screen to help explain some of her proposals, as well as annotated elevation drawings. I will note that today she sent me a revised, actually, two different options for a revised south elevation. When you get to the point in your discussion when you were talking about the new windows and window openings, I will show you those revised elevations as well. But again, there are a number of different elements in this some of what she describes is just falls under routine maintenance and repairs. So, she's going to fix the sag in the porch repaint the porch decking the same color. Do some other repainting in the same color. All those things are not subject to review, but it's good to know if I can make an editorial comment. I'm very excited that she has acquired this property, because it's a property that's very historic in nature, one of the older homes in the town. And it's in need of good care. So again, editorial comment but I'm very excited about that. She intends to replace the front door with a new door painting it a contrasting color from what it is today. And again, introducing some new windows and window openings on the rear ell of the building, which was a later addition, wasn't part of the original circa 1798 structure, but I'm more than happy to let her run through all those specifics, and I can bring up on screen the corresponding photos or elevations as she walks you through those different elements.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Jane, welcome. If you want to add anything? Same idea, name and address and give us any additional comments. I understand there are updated elevations. And so, I think after your comments, we should look at those so that we don't comment on something that we're then going to get superseded.

Jane Covington: Great. My name is Jane Covington, and I live in Bloomfield, Virginia and just bought this property. And so, thank you for your time. Do you just want to go slide by slide, Tim. And then we'll wrap around to the back where the changes came in today.

Tim Clites: Yep.

Jane Covington: So, no changes to the front except for the lighting. And it's very hard to see the lighting in that photograph. But there are two surface mounted lights. I brought a picture on my computer. I can show it to you. It shows up more, but they look like they're circa 1980. Light fixtures, I talked with Will today. He had some concern over it. The recessed lighting will not be visible from the street, and it will have the same down lighting that these have now. So, there'll be no change, except you won't see the surface mounted fixture. And then that's it for the front. All sashes to remain. Front door will be a yellow. [off mic] So the colors coming around that Cindy has the yellow is the front door. And then I pulled other colors. No, that's the yes. The cream is the color of the existing trim. And then the kind of light greeny is the color of the existing stucco, and then the roof is black, and then the porch will be a dark gray. So that's the front. And then next slide Will. And here we have a side elevation changes. So, changes to the 1790 portion of the structure there are none. So, the existing window sash that we see in the 1790 portion will remain. The signpost and that sign come down. And Will, do you want me to do sign application with this, or how do you want me to handle that?

Will Moore: We can come back around to that.

Jane Covington: Okay. And then the. Excuse me? The red arrow is pointing to a new window opening that will match what's on the south side. And we'll see that in the next slide. So, three whoops. I'll go back. Yep. This is showing three generations of building additions. So, you have the 1790 structure likely in 1920 addition. And then behind that is a 1970 addition that's cinder block.

Tim Clites: They get prettier as they go, don't they? [laughter]

Jane Covington: Just wait. Just wait. Okay. So, this is my favorite. So, the right arrow is pointing to some fixed Plexiglas openings. They're not even windows. Those will be replaced with three separate single light casement windows. And then on the south elevation we will have in the application I submitted for two over two windows, but we've been able to repair one of the windows in the 1920 addition, so we'll have six over six to match existing for them. Two on the first floor two at the basement, and this elevation has limited public access. It's only visible when you leave Middleburg Millwork or when you are coming from the old Snyders building. And then what else? Well.

Will Moore: Maybe I'll bring up the elevation drawings.

Tim Clites: Sure.

Jane Covington: Yeah. So, these are hard to see. These are my pencil sketches. Thank you. Well, that's really helpful. So that's 101 West Federal Street. And then to the right are the commercial condos that Ned Quinn did. So, we can read the drawings together. All existing windows, sashes to remain. And then I say replace modern half-light front door with a solid wood door and a light that door that Will is pointing to will be yellow. Then you can see two signs in this elevation, one to the left of the front door, and that's replacing an existing sign and one bracket mounted sign off the east elevation. Those signs exist in Middleburg, now there's one hanging on South Madison Street and one that faces to West Federal Street. And Will remind me that if I remove the street numbers, I'm obligated to mount them somewhere else on the building. All right. Next slide. Okay. Changes here. Let's go. Original all the way back to the 1970s. So, no changes to the original portion. The 1920s addition will have a single new window opening and new sash, and then the rear elevation, the 1970 portion. There are no changes there. We were able to fix that first-floor story window. So that's now a six over six existing window. Window A is an existing window sash and we're not changing that. And then the rear elevation. So, let's go third floor all the way

down. So, third floor. Those are original window openings. They remain. And then you see the two over two windows at the first floor. Window C that will be a six over six to match existing. And same with the basement level six over six to match existing. Those are new sashes and new window openings. And then to the right on the 1970 addition, replacing the fixed Plexiglas openings are three operable windows. They're casement windows and single light. So really, this is where the changes are happening. No changes to the 1790 portion of the building. The real changes are happening to the 1970 portion of the building.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Very helpful.

Will Moore: Did you want to review the other option that would include the French doors?

Jane Covington: Yes. Let's just show this. So, the building's under renovation, and obviously I'm showing it to different tenants. And someone came up to me and said, hey, Jane actually, what I want are two French doors on the back with a little Juliet porch. And I said, hey, whatever. So, this was their idea. The change here is you have these French doors at the first floor, and at the basement level you have the six over six windows. They're tightened in a little bit to be in alignment with the six-foot-wide French doors, but no changes otherwise.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Jane Covington: And again, this elevation is difficult is does not have a lot of exposure from the public right of way.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We'll just pause for a second and let everybody digest that. Since some of these drawings they are just seeing now. And when you're ready, we'll start with Bill again if when he's ready.

Bill Anderson: Great to see you again.

Jane Covington: Hello, Bill.

Bill Anderson: Hi. I have a question. Why did you put the B windows with single lights?

Jane Covington: I can do whatever you want. They're low to the floor, so they can't be double hung. But so, they're casement for a reason. But if you want six over six, go for it. You can.

Bill Anderson: No, I'm just curious why.

Jane Covington: I mean, the single light is closer to what's there now, which is why I chose it that way.

Bill Anderson: And again, I realize this is just a sketch. The windows on the cinder block addition on the lower level seem like they would be right up on the ceiling.

Jane Covington: It's low. [laughter] I'm working with what I got, Bill.

Bill Anderson: All right.

Jane Covington: I didn't put the 1970 addition on. Did you?

Bill Anderson: No.

Jane Covington: Okay.

Bill Anderson: Okay. I have no other questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Good evening.

Jane Covington: Hello.

Punkin Lee: I think the window additions or the French doors on that back side either one just is so nice. Rather than that, you know, 20-foot-high slab of stucco on the 70s. And the addition of the window on the east side of the 20s is very nice. Having been in that building for a few years, those additions of the windows will be pretty spectacular and very nice. I have no trouble with the recessed lighting on the porch.

Jane Covington: Oh good, thank you.

Punkin Lee: I know the existing lights are they're just there. They don't do much. And it's nice that the porch will be leveled. When you really look at the front of that porch on the west side, it's like thinking pretty bad. So, I think it's great that you've undertaken this project and bring this old building back to life.

Jane Covington: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: It's an important feature in town for sure. So, we all thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

Linda Wright: Well, I would echo everything Punkin just said. It's wonderful to see somebody paying attention to this building because it is so important in town. So. And with the windows in the rear, I would be fine with either the four windows or the French doors. I think either one are very appropriate, so I'd be fine with both of those. So glad to see you doing something.

Jane Covington: Good. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Punkin, was this your family? [off mic] Yeah, right. I thought so. Just couldn't get my mind to that. It looks like a bunch of guys got together that night late and built that add on there. Oh yes. The only one other question I had is for the front door. Why did you make it solid and not have the top three or whatever the proper language is for the lights? I guess they're called up there. Doesn't that isn't the one there that's there now have windows at the top?

Jane Covington: I don't think so. I mean, I'm looking at now. Oh, I know. Let's look at this. Oh, yes. It says what I'm. So, Cindy, you're right. This is three lights on the existing front door. And if I can afford to change it, I'm quickly running out of money. I've barely started.

Cindy Pearson: I could imagine.

Jane Covington: It would be a single light. Would be a half-light, single light front door. Not the three windows, but my guess is that door might be stained. Looking at my budget.

Cindy Pearson: Because I'm not sure. Is it a historic door?

Jane Covington: No.

Cindy Pearson: Is it? No, I didn't get it. But I hear you with the plan. Okay. Because I think that is part of our, in our guidelines that it says don't remove doors if they're. You might want to clarify that for me Will. I don't quite understand it.

Will Moore: Yeah. There is language in about retaining historic doors or recreating if they can't be repaired. But in this case, we this is not a historic door, and we have no evidence of what the original door looked like. So, it's more now just a question of your interpretation of what an appropriate door on that structure would be.

Cindy Pearson: Can't wait to see.

Jane Covington: Great. [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: If and I just realized that we did skip over just one item, Jane. The introduction of the steps.

Jane Covington: Oh my gosh, those are so important. Yeah. Will, thank you. Oh my gosh. So, looking at this, the steps coming up from the east side and they cut into the porch. And that's how the building is accessed. But the pedestrian traffic comes from the west, like the connection to those shops along Federal Street. So, I'm asking for a set of steps exterior to the porch so they would not cut into the porch because then you arrive right at the front door. So, these steps would cross that little strange partition between the two structures and then invite Pedestrian shoppers up to the front porch. Right now, it's occupied by a trash can that's never emptied. Streetscapes Committee. But So. Yes. Will, that's important to me. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Is that a town trash can?

Jane Covington: Yes. Yes, yes yes yes.

Punkin Lee: I see Tim emptying it. I think the tenants put their own trash in it along the way, but Tim's there early in the morning when I come in.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Let's if I can start with the steps. So wooden steps?

Jane Covington: Yes.

Tim Clites: And we have two rail, wooden rail but the other handrail is just a simple looks like a black iron post and a black iron rail. Is that what you would do with the new steps, or would you? [multiple speakers]

Jane Covington: The problem is the love, the wooden. I love that, except it's not to code. It's a little too low. So, the new rail would look exactly like what's there? The iron rail.

Tim Clites: Iron rail? Yeah. Okay.

Jane Covington: Yes.

Tim Clites: And that makes sense to me. I mean, you don't even notice until you look for it, at least in the picture. All right, so that was my first question. I agree, I don't. The recessed lights, I don't I think our little bungalow, someone put a recessed light in it before we got there, and it just you don't really see it when it's on. You have the light, and when it's off, no one notices. I want to understand what you said about the front door. Is it you're either going to keep the door that's there, or replace it with a solid door and a single light glass storm door? Or if you were.

Jane Covington: Is that what I put in there? Yeah, that's what I put in there. Yes, yes. That said something incorrect that was my choice.

Tim Clites: It was a I thought, didn't I?

Jane Covington: Solid door which is in keeping with the 1790s structure.

Tim Clites: Right.

Jane Covington: And the full light storm. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Storm door. That would I assume the color would be on both.

Jane Covington: Yes.

Tim Clites: Or you're going to paint the door that's there, that color?

Jane Covington: If I run out of money, I'm keeping what I got. Yes.

Tim Clites: Understood. Okay. So, does everybody understand?

Jane Covington: Tim, thank you for the clarification.

Tim Clites: Oh, you're welcome. I only asked that because, you know, we moved in and after a couple of years, we came back and asked for permission to add glass to the front door because people would come up to a solid door and they wouldn't even try to come in. They would just set the package down and leave, and it's like, it's 10:30, like on a Tuesday. We're here, you know? But and so it was very unfriendly and, and the light was very welcoming in the little front entry of our building. So, with the storm door, you could open the solid door if you were expecting somebody, and they would maybe feel more apt to come in. Yeah. Here we go. Half-light replace with a six-panel solid wood and a storm door, which is a full light door. Got it. Okay. And then my only other comments, I had the same question that Bill had about why the 70s addition didn't have muntins in it. I thought, well, maybe it's because that's what's there and I didn't have a strong feeling about whether we should request adding muntins or not. Arguably, if that was built. When did you say that was built? The second addition. The 1920s.

Jane Covington: 1920s. But I'm replacing something that's likely 1970. It's fixed.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Jane Covington: The plexiglass that you see around the back is probably from the 70s. Yeah.

Tim Clites: And so, then my only additional two questions in this, in the rearmost addition, when you put those windows in it looks like you'd drawn in the sketch. It looks like you just kind of drew a cell. But do you have a is there an intention about what that sill material is, or is it just the Marvin Sill?

Jane Covington: It's just the [multiple speakers] cell.

Tim Clites: And you'll set the window out far enough that you don't need a sub sill. Is that what you're thinking?

Jane Covington: Not a lot of ornament.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, the window is sitting close to the exterior face of that. I'm assuming that wall is 8 or 10in thick, maybe more if it's blocked.

Jane Covington: Cinder block. So, it's probably.

Tim Clites: Probably right. [off mic] So then the window is not recessed. Doesn't have a deep shadow line if it's the Marvin Sill. Maybe the only person that makes sense to is Bill. [laughter]

Jane Covington: It makes sense to me.

Tim Clites: Yeah, and that's what you.

Jane Covington: The recess would occur on the inside, not the exterior.

Tim Clites: Perfect. All right. My only question for the committee would be whether they as a group, we have a preference. My only question would be a preference about muntin windows that center portion.

Cindy Pearson: And does the top one, two, three, four. Do they have them in it?

Tim Clites: Yeah. They're existing, and they're just going to be repaired and repainted.

Cindy Pearson: It would make it look more consistent for sure.

Tim Clites: I think so.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: And I think I don't know how we go about that without a drawing, but we could say that the pattern should yield a proportion of the individual glasses close to what the six over six is. As right like. Right the B window not having a size. I don't know if that would be a three wide, three high or two wide, three high or four right in terms of the muntin pattern. Well, if you go to that elevation you were just on. And zoom in if you can.

Jane Covington: How about this for a rebuttal? Don't make me spend more money than I have to. I know you're not supposed to count on that, but.

Tim Clites: We don't. [inaudible] Yeah, I think that's right with muntins, that would not be more money than you have to like you wouldn't have to spend any more after that. Deal.

Jane Covington: Tim, is that what you meant? How about this, Tim? Like, what I have there is similar to existing.

Tim Clites: It is. And that's why it didn't for me. I think I said this, but I'll say it out loud if I didn't, it didn't at first blush bother me that there wasn't muntins there. I'm collecting the comments from the committee.

Punkin Lee: I think if you've been in that building, those three, it's a very short passage there. It's not like you've got a longer expanse that you need all the extra on those windows, because it's pretty tight and it's low.

Tim Clites: It's also not a prominent facade.

Punkin Lee: Right. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: If it was the front facade. I think we would all have a much stronger opinion about the approach.

Jane Covington: Yeah. You can't you can't see this unless you're leaving Middleburg Millwork or leaving the old Snyders property.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Oh, and I do have one last question. The little balcony would be what? Iron to match the rail?

Jane Covington: No. I mean, I could I was thinking about a tongue and groove porch. So, the porch would be wood, and the structure needs to be iron for cantilevering. I need two iron beams, but the railing could be iron. Absolutely. And then you see less of it.

Bill Anderson: Wouldn't be that be one where someone could stand on it?

Jane Covington: Yeah. And not much more than that. Maybe a couple of chairs.

Tim Clites: That's much more than that in my mind.

Jane Covington: But not a lounge.

Tim Clites: That's something I'd want to see again if when someone says Romeo [multiple speakers].

Jane Covington: I agree with. I agree with that. I'll do that.

Tim Clites: A Juliet Balcony. I think it's like you open the door and you can kind of lean out.

Bill Anderson: A potted plant.

Tim Clites: Yeah, it's like 18in max. So, if you just. [multiple speakers].

Jane Covington: So greater than 18in come back.

Bill Anderson: Well, just to save you probably some money. If you didn't have to tear into the wall and put in some type of cantilever structure. You can get a Romeo and Juliet balcony out of metal as a fabricated to hold onto the wall. That saves a lot of money. I think.

Tim Clites: Let me back up. Are you asking for approval for the doors tonight or the windows?

Jane Covington: Let's do doors and windows. And if you're having heartburn over the porch, I can come back with that.

Tim Clites: Over the balcony.

Jane Covington: Balcony? Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I'm not having heartburn over it. I just feel like it's worthy of the committee seeing a little more detail. And it sounds like you would like to know if it's a possibility as you talk to people that potentially you're renting the building to, but you would have time to come back. So that's why I'm asking.

Jane Covington: Yeah. Windows have a two-month lead time so.

Tim Clites: Right. It's great, isn't it? Remember the good old days? Nine months or a year. All right, so then what I just heard is if we as someone gets ready for a motion. The motion, if we're okay with the four windows in the updated submission, the six light four windows, we could approve that. If this is an

alternate that the motion was willing to accept, I would recommend that we approve the concept of the doors but ask for the balcony details to be presented to us again for a final approval. It's just me suggesting, but. And have we gone over all the details of the application, Mr. Moore? Are we missing anything? The front steps we talked about that they would be as wide as the porch itself. As they would be as wide as the porch is deep. The new steps [multiple speakers].

Jane Covington: Yeah. The others are not. The others are a little bit narrower. Let me check my photographs and make sure I'm speaking properly.

Punkin Lee: The other side. Yeah. Cut into the porch [multiple speakers].

Jane Covington: The other. Yeah, the other sides are cut in. So, I was thinking the same width as what's existing.

Tim Clites: On the other side. Yeah. Okay.

Punkin Lee: I would go back. One more comment about the recessed lighting I think is a real plus, because you come down to the stop sign and that building is right on the corner, and there's a bright light by the front door. It's blinding. This will be nice if the lights stay on after dark and not run you off the road because you can't see.

Cindy Pearson: And just shine down. [multiple speakers].

Punkin Lee: Yeah, and it shines down. And then.

Tim Clites: Are there any other comments from the committee?

Punkin Lee: We looked for the two signs were going to hang, but the tenant would have to come back with their sign.

Jane Covington: Right, right. [multiple speakers].

Punkin Lee: Just so that's clear. Just.

Jane Covington: Yes. Yes, yes. No. I just wanted to look like it's alive. It's no longer Popcorn Monkey. Anyhow, that was the reason for the signs. I hope I get around.

Cindy Pearson: Does it smell like popcorn? The oil.

Tim Clites: I have one question. Muntins in the middle windows. What's the straw vote on are we okay as presented? Or do we would we like to see muntins? So, I can try to make a motion that's not then open to debating that. Let's discuss it now.

Cindy Pearson: I think being that it's hardly ever seen. I'm okay with incasements.

Tim Clites: With no muntins?

Linda Wright: With no muntins.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Punkin Lee: Same.

Tim Clites: Are there any other items that the committee would like to discuss amongst us before I try to make a motion? Rhonda, am I missing anything? You're looking at me a little sideways, like I'm missing something. All right. Thank you. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: So, with the signs well, there's you know, you can only have so much signage for space. Is that going to cause a problem with her renters to come back?

Jane Covington: Cindy, I'll take my signs down.

Cindy Pearson: If they needed.

Jane Covington: Yet per Punkin's reminder that they would come with their own application. I'm just hanging them, so it looks like.

Cindy Pearson: Somebody's there. Somebody's home.

Jane Covington: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Tim Clites: Look what I did. Who needs a job sign when you can just. I'm kidding. Oh. Where do we start here? I move that we approve COA 25-03 S25-02. Request of Jane Covington for alterations, as discussed with the following clarifications. Starting at the front porch to the west. The new steps going to the sidewalk would be constructed of material to match the porch, and they would be the width to match the eastern steps, and that the rail that would be installed at the Western new steps would match the eastern step rail, that the porch lights be replaced with recessed. And to clarify, they should be 2700 Kelvin, that's the color temperature of the light. And if you can put them on a dimmer, you might be happier. But I don't know that that's a requirement on our end. But it certainly wouldn't hurt because depending on the volume of light, you might like that. Not as dim as the particular fixture that you pick. And that the signs are approved as submitted. The colors, we didn't discuss that. Everyone saw the palette. I would say they're approved as submitted. The front door may either get repainted as exists or be replaced as proposed, and in the rear elevation that we approve the four windows with the six over six light pattern, and we or as an alternate, would approve a French door with the requirement that the railing and or Juliet balcony come back for further review and approval prior to proceeding.

Punkin Lee: We have got another window on the east side.

Tim Clites: Oh, I'm sorry, and the window on the east side is approved as submitted.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: Any discussion? All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Jane Covington: Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: Thanks for all the detailed work here. Makes our lives much easier.

Jane Covington: Thanks for working with my drawings.

Tim Clites: You let me know if you get slow. We'll keep you busy doing drawings. They're great. Yeah.

Jane Covington: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you very much. All right. Discussion items. Do we have any discussion items?

Cindy Pearson: I can see this going before the, what's the JARB awards one day.

Tim Clites: [laughter] Yeah, yeah.

Punkin Lee: That'd be nice.

Tim Clites: Meeting quorum March the 6th if you can't make it as soon as you realize that, please let Rhonda know and she will coordinate with the rest of us. And unless staff has anything, the meeting is adjourned.