TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, June 5, 2025
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, June 5, 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
Virginia Jenkins
Margaret Littleton
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: Punkin Lee, Vice Chair (excused)
William Anderson (excused)

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the May 1, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

New Business

COA-RS 25-04: New Single-Family Dwelling – 4 Foxtrot Knoll Lane (Middleburg Residences Lot 42)

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that this was the fourth home proposed to be constructed in The Stables section of the subdivision, which was the larger lot section to the west. He advised that this home would sit back farther than the previous one they reviewed. Mr. Moore reported that it was of the Hunt Box design and would contain shingle siding. He displayed the color distribution map for the subdivision and noted that this one was proposed to be Revere Pewter, with the next closest home being Rockport Gray. Mr. Moore noted that this was a combination the Committee had reviewed in the past.

Gretchen Yahn appeared before the Committee representing the application. She advised that this was the larger version of the Hunt Box design and would contain cedar shake siding. Ms. Yahn reported that the garage would be smaller than on the previous homes and would not contain any type of cabana or breezeway option. She advised that it would have a shaker, saltbox feel in the back area. Ms. Yahn noted that the side door would contain a four-light glass. She reiterated that the entire house would contain

cedar shakes in Revere Pewter, a black roof and black windows and doors. Ms. Yahn noted that the garage doors would be overhead doors, not swinging doors; however, they would have the same glass scenario as the Committee previously reviewed. In response to an inquiry, she confirmed the garage doors would not be black and would be painted Revere Pewter. She noted that the same was true of the side door on the garage. Ms. Yahn advised that this would be standard for this type of overhead garage door. In response to a comment from the Committee, she confirmed the house would not have any shutters.

Chair Clites noted that on the right elevation, it appeared the idea was this was to look like a porch that was enclosed. He further noted the baseboard, which looked like an extension of the column, and questioned whether this was intentional. Mr. Clites questioned whether the shingles should go further down.

Ms. Yahn confirmed the baseboard was not needed and noted the slate that would carry the water table all the way through. She advised that there was not a baseboard present on the rear and agreed it should be removed from the right elevation. Ms. Yahn opined that it was also shown on the left elevation and proposed that it be removed there as well. She advised that she would provide Mr. Moore with a revised drawing for the record.

Chair Clites noted that the reviews would become easier as the Committee looked at homes that had already been reviewed. He advised that he found the small garage to be interesting.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 25-04 as submitted, with the clarification that there are no shutters; the garage doors will be painted the wall color; and, the little baseboard on the rear elevation be removed and the shingles to go to the flagstone.

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

Ms. Yahn asked Deputy Town Manager Moore to let her know when the deadline was set for the next meeting.

COA 25-13: Rear Window & Rear Porch Rail Revisions to Approved COA 25-03 – 101 W. Federal Street – Jane Covington

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that Ms. Covington received approval for a number of different aspects of her renovation project. He noted that specific to the rear elevation, she received approval for three new casement windows. Mr. Moore advised that there was also an option related to a porch with French doors that did not include a porch but rather had two window openings as well. He reported that all four windows were to be six-over-six windows, for which the Committee granted approval. Mr. Moore advised that they also gave conceptual approval for the two lower windows to be six-over-six windows, with French doors above, conditioned upon Ms. Covington returning with the details for the porch and porch rail for subsequent approval. He advised that she was seeking tax credits through the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) and reported that it was their desire that the windows be revised to be two-over-two double hung windows. Mr. Moore noted that the size of the window openings would remain the same and reiterated that the windows would just be a different configuration. He reported that the applicant sought a revision to the railing to do a board railing that was inspired by the railing on the front porch; however, it would contain four boards, as opposed to two, in order to meet the Building Code.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that he subsequently found out that the applicant had already proceeded with the construction of the porch and advised that she thought she had already received approval for the porch and only needed to return with the rail design. He noted that the applicant was now seeking approval of the porch, which had been constructed. Mr. Moore displayed photographs of the completed porch. He opined that Ms. Covington would provide the Committee with the dimensions of the porch. Mr. Moore asked that the Committee consider this request, despite not having advanced warning of it, and advised that whether they took action was at their discretion. He noted that Ms. Covington would also need to receive a building permit for this work, as it did not go through the County building permit process, which was problematic because of the type of construction. Mr. Moore advised that the permit could be issued retroactively; however, she or her contractor would have to go through that process once the Committee considered her request.

Jane Covington, the applicant, advised that she never received a letter from Deputy Town Manager Moore identifying the previous approval and thought she was allowed to construct the porch. She further advised that she only thought she needed approval for the railing.

Chair Clites noted that this happened on occasion and advised that, in the past, Mr. Moore had directed the Committee to review the application on its merits and not on the fact that it had already been built.

Ms. Covington opined that a phone call from the Town staff, rather than the posting of a stop work order, would have made her team feel better. She reiterated that she never received a letter regarding her previous approval.

Deputy Town Manager Moore accepted responsibility for any confusion related to whether HDRC approval had been obtained; however, he noted that it was not acceptable to proceed with construction that required a building permit. He asked that the applicant not pretend that miscommunication resulted in work being performed that clearly required a building permit. Mr. Moore opined that a reputable contractor would never have proceeded with construction without a permit.

Chair Clites noted that building permits were not in the HDRC's purview. He further noted that when a building permit was needed, the first thing needed was a zoning permit. Mr. Clites advised that the first question in the zoning permit process was whether the work had HDRC approval. He noted that regardless of the misunderstanding as to what had or had not been approved, that would have been caught if the building permit process had been followed. Mr. Clites advised that there was no value in having the Committee focus on this, as it had to consider the request before it on its merits. He noted that the Committee was allowed to vote on the item during this meeting if it was comfortable doing so or it could delay taking action if it needed more time; however, he noted that this was not like other things that normally came before the Committee. Mr. Clites suggested the Committee raise any concerns they had regarding the design and then determine where they were in terms of process. He asked that Mr. Moore display the photographs of the rear porch.

Ms. Covington opined that the railing on the front porch was lovely; however, it did not meet the building code, as it had varying widths. She reported that the railing that was constructed on the rear porch would be ten-inches for the top rail, eight-inches for the middle rail and six-inches for the bottom rail to meet the building code. Ms. Covington advised that the spacing between the rails would be equal. She reported that it would be painted green to match the rest of the trim. In response to inquiries from the Committee, she advised that the porch surface and underside would be painted dark gray. Ms. Covington advised that the edge of the deck would also be gray. She advised that her preference would be not to enclose the bottom and noted that it was not visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Covington opined that the wood was not pressure treated wood.

Chair Clites advised that regardless, it could still be painted. He opined that the brackets, railing, posts, cap, and skirt board would all be the cream color of the trim on the building. Mr. Clites questioned whether there was any intention of having lights or electricity, to which Ms. Covington confirmed there was not.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington confirmed the windows would be two-over-two; therefore, they would have four lights in total. She advised that this was not her first choice.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington reported that the porch was eighteen inches deep. She confirmed there was not a porch at this location previously.

Committee Member Littleton advised that she liked the original windows better. She noted that this 1790 building was a treasure and opined that it was a shame the windows could not remain the same.

Ms. Covington explained that because the windows were in the 1970 addition, the Department of Historic Resources wanted the windows to be plain. She advised that they said she could use one-over-one or two-over-two windows. Ms. Covington noted that she had not decided whether she intended to remove the existing windows and explained that she wanted to have a discussion with the HDRC first to determine whether there was a middle ground.

Committee Member Littleton acknowledged the windows were in the rear and would not be seen by many people; however, she expressed a preference for the six-over-six windows.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington confirmed the windows in the adjacent building were six-over-six. She advised that she had not yet determined whether she would leave the existing windows in place and noted that she needed to determine the possible benefit of the tax credits.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested that if the Committee was open to it, the motion give Ms. Covington the option of either the six-over-six or two-over-two configuration.

Chair Clites agreed. He questioned whether the French doors would still contain three-by-five lights. Mr. Clites noted that this was a small custom door that was only four feet wide.

Ms. Covington advised that it was a pair of doors that would contain true divided lights in proportion to the door. She noted that this may be two-by-five or three-by-five. Ms. Covington advised the Committee that the door was on back order.

Chair Clites advised that he was not surprised the VDHR wanted single panes of glass, if the windows were going to be replaced, so they would be sympathetic but not match the muntin pattern. He noted that this would take away some of the contemporariness of the windows and advised that he was okay with that. Mr. Clites advised that he agreed with Committee Member Littleton regarding the lower windows and noted that his preference would be if the doors had little lights for the windows below to match. He advised that if VDHR felt strongly that they needed to be two-over-two, given the location of the building, he would not feel strongly about not allowing it. Mr. Clites noted that this part of the building was not its charm, nor was it part of the original historic structure. He advised that he was okay with the applicant's description of the rail.

The Committee held some discussion regarding the details of the motion.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-13 as presented with the clarification that the two-over-two windows in both locations are acceptable, but if the VDHR (Virginia Department of Historic Resources) *and the owner approved type C windows to remain as six-over-six that is also acceptable to the Committee; and, that the balcony and railing are acceptable as an all painted structure, with the horizontal rails starting at the top being*

ten-inches, eight-inches, and six-inches from the top to bottom, with equal spacing; that the entire assembly, except the walking surface be gray and the underside of the structure should also be gray if exposed; and, it is to be painted to match the trim color.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Chair Clites confirmed that Ms. Covington would not need to return if she used either of the two windows options; however, she would need to return for any other changes.

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

COA 25-14: Painting of Porch Railing & Signpost – 4 E. Federal St. – Best Thai Kitchen/Red Bar Sushi

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the applicant was going to repaint the deck and trim on the building, all in the same color; therefore, that was not subject to the Committee's review. He further reported that the application was to paint the railing, including the handrails, posts, and pickets, as well as the signpost, white. Mr. Moore noted that the attachment was created using AI, which made other changes to the building.

Neil Metzger, the applicant, opined that the staff's synopsis of the application was perfect.

The Committee agreed they had no issues with the white paint.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Chair Clites, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-14, a request of Neil Metzger for painting the porch railing and signpost at 4 East Federal Street – Best Thai Kitchen/Red Bar Sushi.

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

Discussion Items

Joint Architectural Review Board

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the organizers of the Joint Architectural Review Board (JARB) have reached out to question whether the HDRC wished to be a part of their effort again this year by appointing two members to the Committee. He noted that their request came in May, after the HDRC meeting; therefore, the representatives may have to get together in the next couple of weeks.

The Committee held some discussion as to who could serve on the JARB.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that in the past, they selected nominations from their approvals during the previous calendar year. He opined that they would not consider anything from the current year.

Chair Clites opined that the nominations could not be more than two or three years old.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that he would get clarification on that and send out a list of approved projects to the Committee. He asked that each member send him three to five projects that they believed were worthy of nomination for an award. Mr. Moore advised that Mr. Clites would then have a narrow list from which to work. He noted that he would figure out whether the Committee would have time to vote on the recommendations at their next meeting.

Chair Clites suggested the Committee discuss whether they were comfortable having a sub-committee of two to decide who should be nominated in case that had to be done outside of a normal meeting. He volunteered to serve. Mr. Clites suggested that Vice Chair Lee also be appointed to serve if she was available.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, to appoint Tim Clites and Punkin Lee as their representatives on the Joint Architectural Review Board.

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

July Meeting Quorum

It was noted that the July meeting would fall in line with the Fourth of July holiday weekend. Chair Clites asked that the Town staff poll the members of the Committee to determine whether a quorum was available and, if not, identify a new meeting date.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

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

Tim Clites: 10:10, right? [off mic] All right. Welcome, everyone. This is Thursday, June the 5th Middleburg Historic District Review Committee meeting for the month of June 2025. The first order of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

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

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton,

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We'll pause for public comments. It looks like everyone in the public is here for something on our docket. So, assuming you don't have anything outside of that, we'll move to approval of the May 2025 meeting minutes for our meeting. Any clarifications or comments on the meeting minutes? I move, we approve as submitted.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Thank you. Motion passes. Next item is action item. New business COA RS 25-04 Request of Castle Rock Enterprises for a new single-family dwelling at 4 Foxtrot Knoll Lane Middleburg Residences, lot 42. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, this is the now fourth proposed home to be permitted in the stables section. That is the larger lot section of the Middleburg Residences to the west. This one sits back a little further from the main road than the one that you just previously approved last month at number one Foxtrot Knoll Lane. It is a design that you have essentially seen before, the hunt box design, which there's one additional one here in the stable section, and then a few examples of it in the vineyards as well. This is, I think, just the second home within the entire residences to use the shingle siding. But it is

one of the cladding options that was reviewed in the, the early discussions. And then you see kind of the color distribution map here for the larger lot section. Again, just the four homes now. But it is yeah, set back a little bit. This is in the Revere Pewter. The closest home permitted was the stucco home that's in the Rockport Gray. A little bit east of it. So again, it's a combination that you have seen before. You have the all the elevations and details within your package. And I would just turn it back to the applicant if she has anything additional.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. Good evening.

Gretchen Yahn: Good evening. So, yes, this is the larger hunt box version, which is for the stables. It'll have the cedar shake siding. Oh, say that fast. And there is one notable item on this in that we have been charged with doing a little bit smaller garage than the one that we have done previously. So, the one we had before had the two kind of gable scenarios with the kind of breezeway area between it. We tasked to do a smaller one that was simply going to be more garage and not have any kind of cabana options do not have any kind of you know, breezeway options. And so, what we did on this is we brought the size down, did a little bit of a kind of traditional kind of millwork fenestration, and then kind of almost like a shaker-ish kind of saltboxy kind of feel to the back area as well. One thing that I would note is I think she may have put this with it; Will is that that side door will have a four-light glass in it. Yeah, it we'll be that. So, I just wanted to make sure that that was noted because it was not shown. And I wanted to make sure that that was shown that way. This will also be in Cedar Shake the entire thing with the same Revere Pewter, the same scenario of the black roofs and the exterior black buttons on all the rest of the windows and doors. And those doors, just so you know, it will be overhead doors. They will not be swinging outdoors, so they will have three sections to them, but they will have the same glass kind of scenario that you see there now.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And they will be black like the other?

Gretchen Yahn: You know, I probably will not do these black. In fact, I would like to say that I don't want to do them black [inaudible] because I just don't want it to look like a hole. So, we will paint those I go on record that we're paying them the same color as the as the Revere Pewter.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. So if you could make that note, if it's put that way I just feel it'll look a little overbearing.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I agree. Thank you.

Gretchen Yahn: And that would go for the side door as well. [multiple speakers] Door on the garage. On the garage? Yeah. So, we do everything in the same color on the garage, and we'll make that as a standard for when we do that type of garage. Thanks for noting that. Okay, so everybody follow that. The little door at the end of the package is the little side door for the garage. The garage doors and the overhead garage doors will be the wall color. All right, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Hi Tim.

Tim Clites: Hi.

Cindy Pearson: The only thing that I noted. It says the shutters will be painted with exterior finish. It's in the schedule. I don't see any shutters on this drawing.

Gretchen Yahn: That was a just typical note that she has in her things. But you are correct. There are no shutters on this.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. And there will not be any?

Gretchen Yahn: There will not be any shutters.

Cindy Pearson: That'll be interesting. But I like the shingles.

Linda Wright: I do too.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Nope. No questions for me either. Looks good.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I was going to ask about the shutters as well, and I think you've explained it very well, so. Okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you. My only question was just one clarification to make sure it was intentional. Will, can you bring up the, let's say, the right elevation?

Gretchen Yahn: Right?

Tim Clites: The right elevation. So, they're under the series of windows. And the idea as it looks like a porch that got enclosed and it looks like there's a baseboard, which looks like it's the extension of the column. Is that intentional or would you have the shingles go down and not have that? We're just trying to envision. [multiple speakers].

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, we don't really have to have that. What I think he was trying to do there, which we don't have to do, because at the end of the day, we do have that datum of the slate that that carries that water table all the way through. So, I don't think we need that.

Tim Clites: I don't care one way or the other. I just didn't know if it was intentional.

Gretchen Yahn: No.

Tim Clites: Because I on the rear page, it doesn't.

Gretchen Yahn: It doesn't have it. Yeah. No, I agree with you. I would take that off. I agree with you on that.

Tim Clites: That was my only comment.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. Which would mean also that we would take he's showing it on the other scenario underneath that one window as well. So, I agree with you.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: So, we'll delete those, Will. And I can make a revised drawing for that. Just so you've got it as well with these notes so that you can put it to record. I'll get him to make these changes.

Tim Clites: Okay. And great. So again, this the goal was these should get easier as we look at homes that we've seen before. I do like the little garage is interesting. Kind of take the shape, turn it. Do the salt box. Give us a kind of a simple front, but with a little detail to make it interesting. I thought that was nice.

Gretchen Yahn: I've just been trying to find something that's less expensive because that other one is not cheap to get.

Tim Clites: No, I know it's not, but that's part of the well, not to digress. It's part of the problem, in my opinion, with the 15-foot height limit, which is there for practical zoning reasons, but it doesn't help the esthetics, right? We get stuck quick if there's anything but a single bay garage. So, and that's true for anywhere in town, not just in Salamander. Awesome. Well, then I move that we approve. Let me go back to COA RS 25-04 as submitted with a clarification that there are no shutters, that the garage doors will be painted, the wall color, and that the little baseboard on that, what was that?

Gretchen Yahn: Rear right left elevation.

Tim Clites: Yeah, the rear elevation be removed. And the shingles just go to the flagstone.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Gretchen Yahn: Any opposed? Any abstain. Thank you. Thank you. And Will, when we know when the date is for deadline and meeting for next month, will you just let us know?

Will Moore: Yes.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: Thank you.

Gretchen Yahn: Appreciate it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Next item COA 25-13 request of Jane Covington for rear window and rear porch rail. Revisions to the approved COA 25-03 at 101 West Federal Street. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Committee. So, Jane was last here in February received approval for a number of different aspects of her renovation project here at 101 West Federal Street. Specific to the rear elevation the proposal and approval included some new windows on the rear elevation the three casement windows that you see here. And then there was an option where on this drawing, you see a porch with French doors. There was an option that did not include that porch but had two window openings there as well. In that option, all four of the windows on this side were going to be these six over six windows. You gave approval for that option. You also gave conceptual approval to do the two lower windows with the six over six and the French doors above. And if that option was to be pursued, she would then return with the details for the porch and the porch rail for your subsequent approval. So, Jane has been working through the tax credit process with the Department of Historic Resources. Based on their comments, the desire with this revision application is to change the approved casement windows, as well as the two lower windows on the west side to two over two double hung windows. So, again, this is based on the feedback from DHR. The size of those window openings would

remain the same. But it would just use that different window configuration. The application she originally submitted was requesting a revision to the railing. I was a little bit confused by that. You didn't actually give an approval for the railing previously. But regardless, she was explaining that she wanted to do a board railing somewhat inspired by the porch railing on the front. However, this would have four boards instead of two. Would be 42in high of those aspects required to meet code requirements. I found out with a subsequent email from Jane this morning that she had actually already proceeded with the construction of the porch. So that was something that was unknown. There was some confusion. She thought the condition from the February meeting was that she would just have to return with the design for the rail, but not for the porch. I thought she had already had the approval for the porch. Regardless, you had not seen those details. So, she is now it was not included in your packet, but based on what we've learned today, she's also going to request your consideration this evening of approval of the porch, which has now been constructed. And I'll just show you a couple views of it here. This is kind of the side elevation view. This is the rear elevation, which includes that board rail that she was describing in the materials that you have in the packet. When we turn it over to her, I think she's going to have some dimensions for you as well. So, I would ask that you give this some consideration tonight without having any advanced warning on this, whether you take action on the approval of the porch and rail this evening would be at your discretion. She will also have to subsequently receive a building permit for this. So, this did not go through the building permit process with Loudoun, which is problematic because it is an aspect of this type of construction. Absolutely does require building permitting. But that's something that can potentially be achieved retroactively as well. But either she or her contractor will have to work through that process once you have given this your consideration. So again, consideration of the porch and the rail, as well as consideration of the replacement of the previously approved windows with these two over two windows, which were the suggestion or requirement of, DHR to continue on in the tax credit process there.

Tim Clites: Thank you for that thorough update. That's very helpful. Jane.

Jane Covington: Hello.

Tim Clites: Hello.

Jane Covington: I'm Jane Covington. Do I need an address? Middleburg Upperville. So, I do want to be clear that I never received a letter from Will. So, putting the porch on, I thought I was allowed to do. And I thought I needed permission for the railing, which is why I'm here. So, it was a completely innocent mistake, and I apologize. And Will and I spoke, and I know what I need to do, so.

Tim Clites: Well, let's pause just for a second. This happens on occasion. And I think what our committee has been directed by Will at every case is to review the and thank you for bringing the pictures up. I was going to ask you to do that. Well, that helps to review it on its merits, not on the fact that it was already built. So, I think.

Jane Covington: Perfect. You know, the very sorry this was not I didn't do it out of spite or anything. And, you know, a phone call from Will saying that I had done something wrong rather than posted stop work orders would have made my team feel better.

Jane Covington: Well, it's all right. It doesn't matter. I didn't receive a letter.

Will Moore: There's an important clarification that's needed here. If there was confusion on whether or not historic district approval had been obtained. Fair enough. And I can perfectly accept that. What is not acceptable is proceeding with construction that requires a building permit when clearly, the building permit was never.

Jane Covington: Then Will speak to my contractor. And you did. And thank you. And he called me today and said y'all had a great conversation. So, thank you for your time.

Will Moore: So, but let's not let's not pretend as though.

Jane Covington: It's not. [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: Miscommunication resulted in work being constructed that requires a permit clearly requires a permit, and a reputable contractor would never have proceeded with this kind of construction without a permit. So, let's be clear on that.

Jane Covington: I have forwarded your letter to my contractor.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, building permits are actually not part of our overview. They are part of Will's responsibility.

Jane Covington: Sure perfect.

Tim Clites: Because when the permit gets applied for, the first thing it gets is a zoning permit. And the first part of a zoning permit in a historic district is, Does it have historic approval? So, to rephrase everything, I just heard, the misunderstanding about what was approved or not approved would have been caught if that process had gone forward. Just so you understand clearly, and I know you do, because this is not your first time working here in Middleburg or in other historic districts. So, the process of applying for a permit would have caught the miscommunication. But really, there's not a whole lot of value for this committee and focusing on that because there's honestly nothing, we can do except review what's in front of us on its merits. And if we're comfortable tonight seeing it for the first time tonight to make a motion, we're certainly allowed to do that. If we felt like we needed more time it's certainly reasonable to say we need more time, but this is not like other things. In my quick assessment that we've seen that were built without a permit. So, understanding my colleagues, I think what I'd like to do is hear is there anything around the design that you would like to add for us to be aware of? And then we'll go ahead, and I'll get the input from the committee, and we'll recap that and kind of see where we are in terms of the process. The approval of this when pending approval, when that happens, then allows you to go through the other paperwork.

Jane Covington: Great thank you.

Tim Clites: Right. Because they can't do any the building permit will stop as soon as there's no historic approval.

Jane Covington: Great.

Tim Clites: So, I think it behooves us to so the first question is, is there anything beyond. Will, actually, if you could show the other view, I find for me at least, that's a thank you, a little more helpful. Is there anything you'd like to add, clarification wise, to what Will explained about and what your drawings explain about the design? Will, can you go to the front elevation? [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: So, I'm sure you understand the front. Yeah. We have a picture of the front of the building on your application.

Jane Covington: And so that's a very delicate railing that doesn't meet code but lovely proportions.

Tim Clites: Right.

Jane Covington: And it has varied railing widths. So, I think one is ten, one is six. Maybe So these railings, I would have to buy something custom. These would be ten, eight and six to meet code rather

than these four standard dimensions. What do you mean? What does ten, eight and six mean? I'm sorry, I don't follow that. [off mic].

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, from the bottom it's ten and eighth and sixth wide?

Jane Covington: From the top it would be ten inches.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Jane Covington: And then the third, the second, the middle railing would be eight inches.

Will Moore: I think I understand her saying that what you see there would be replaced with different widths. Is that correct?

Jane Covington: Thank you Will.

Tim Clites: I'm sorry I was looking at what's here.

Jane Covington: It's all right.

Tim Clites: [inaudible] you're talking about taking the horizontal boards. Now say that again so we can all follow.

Jane Covington: Yes, thank you. Ten would be the top.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Jane Covington: And then the middle would be eight.

Tim Clites: Eight.

Jane Covington: And then the bottom would be six.

Tim Clites: And the spaces between would be equal.

Jane Covington: Yes.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Jane Covington: Yes, to meet code.

Tim Clites: All right, now I understand. Thank you. So, three boards.

Jane Covington: Instead of four.

Tim Clites: Of space instead of four. Thank you for that clarification too. All right. Does everybody understand that? Thank you. Any other clarifications around the design?

Jane Covington: And it would be painted green to match the rest of the trim.

Tim Clites: And what about the. I'll just ask a few questions so that it's easier when we go through the group. What about the surface that that you would walk on? Is that painted also?

Jane Covington: Yes. That's a dark gray.

Tim Clites: It's all okay?

Jane Covington: Yes. Not visible from the public right of way, but a dark gray. The underneath could be a dark gray. You see how you see the underneath of the floor?

Tim Clites: Yeah. I mean, we see the edge of the deck also. So that that will be a gray line.

Jane Covington: Yes. Same as the front porch.

Tim Clites: Got it. That'll be nice. Okay. Anything else design wise you want to add? Are you intending to enclose the bottom? [multiple speakers]

Jane Covington: Good point. It could definitely benefit from that.

Tim Clites: I don't. I'm just asking so I understand the design. I don't have a preference. The water gets through from above, so enclosing it may give you some water issues. What is your intention or preference around?

Jane Covington: Not to enclose it and not drop the water, but.

Tim Clites: Not close it.

Jane Covington: Visible from the public right of way?

Tim Clites: Yeah. The deck gray could be, I don't want to suggest what you should do. It could be painted onto that structure too, right? The is that I'm assuming that's pressure treated structure that you see up underneath.

Jane Covington: I don't think it is [off mic] I haven't examined it.

Tim Clites: But it could either way.

Jane Covington: Either way.

Tim Clites: It could be. It could be painted. Yeah. And then the brackets and the railings, the posts, the cap, and the skirt board would all be the cream color of the trim of the building. Okay. So sorry everyone, for me going first and asking questions, but.

Jane Covington: Tim, thank you.

Tim Clites: And one last question. I presume there's no intention to have any lights or electrical in the bottom of that. No. Perfect. All right. So, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] Yeah, I do actually. The windows. I see that you on the whatever page. This is where you circle are the windows. Is this a new window?

Jane Covington: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: In there. [off mic] And so that's the color all the windows are going to be on the back is black.

Jane Covington: No no no. The windows are going to, that's cream. [off mic] No no they're not black.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Go back to that picture.

Tim Clites: That's a door that hasn't been taken out above. It hasn't been taken out yet. On above, behind the balcony, there's a door.

Jane Covington: That's a temporary door just to get some light into that room. But no, the French doors are on back order.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] Because on this page where you have it circled. I think. Is that just the style? And I didn't pay attention to it properly. [off mic]

Jane Covington: Cindy, thank you. [off mic].

Will Moore: And just a quick reminder the previous approval was for an aluminum-clad wood window. I believe she intends to still use the aluminum-clad wood window.

Jane Covington: Yes.

Will Moore: But it'll just be the different design, same manufacturer, same size. [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Is fine with that because it's a replace. Yeah. Great.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] And also, on the picture of the windows in the drawing room on the left. So, on the previous version, of course, you had, I guess you call them six lights. Is that on those windows? And then up in the French doors, which are no longer going to be French doors, correct? [off mic]

Tim Clites: No, we still are doing French doors.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] Four lights now. Is that what I read?

Jane Covington: So, two over two.

Cindy Pearson: Two over two. [off mic]

Jane Covington: Is four lights total. Correct. You're correct.

Cindy Pearson: All right. Thank you. [off mic] It just looks right that it just made the design so much better with the more lights than the lessons.

Jane Covington: That was not my first choice.

Will Moore: Yeah, it is an interesting process when you're going through the tax credit process. [multiple speakers] [off mic] And I know I noted in the memo that it's when you go through this process, it's not odd to have already gone through local review and then to have to come back with this based on the feedback from historic resources.

Tim Clites: Right now, the only tax stuff, that's for sure. Yeah. Is there anything that. You want to focus on the last one. That's all I have.

Jane Covington: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Sorry, [off mic] that wasn't supposed to happen. Thank you, Cindy. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I do not have a design question, but I out of curiosity, what color is babouche?

Jane Covington: It's yellow and it's on the front door. It's on the front door right now.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, well, I was just curious. Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: I'm fine with the changes. I know you have to do the windows and they're not your first choice, but you got to do what you got to do. And I'm fine with the design for the wood railing on the little balcony. And I would paint the underside the same gray,

Jane Covington: Great. Thank you.

Linda Wright: It's fine.

Jane Covington: Thank you, I appreciate it.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: How deep is the porch?

Jane Covington: 18in.

Margaret Littleton: So, I mean, was there a porch there before?

Jane Covington: No, ma'am.

Margaret Littleton: I just wonder why it's even there. Just to break it up.

Jane Covington: It's a cement box.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. And I just, I like the original windows much better, too. And this building is such a treasure from 1790 that it's a shame that the. It can't. I assume this is new part. So that's why [multiple speakers].

Jane Covington: It's 1970.

Margaret Littleton: Is that why the DHR wants the plain windows? The two over two.

Jane Covington: Yeah, they said I could use one over 1 or 2 over two.

Margaret Littleton: But they won't accept what you wanted?

Jane Covington: I haven't decided if I'm going to rip my windows out, but I want to start the conversation with this board.

Margaret Littleton: With what?

Jane Covington: I want to start the conversation with you to see if I can find a middle ground between HDRC and VDHR.

Margaret Littleton: Well, I realize it's in the back, and not too many people are even going to see it. But again, it's the building I love and of course, its neighbors are very modern, and I don't know. It's just me. I prefer the six over six. I guess it was. So, I don't know.

Tim Clites: The six over six is something that exists right?

Tim Clites: Next door.

Jane Covington: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Does it, but it exists in that opening right now, doesn't it?

Jane Covington: Excuse me. You're correct the six over six in the building right now, in the original windows.

Tim Clites: In the original windows. Right. So, what you're if I understand what you just mentioned, you haven't decided whether you might leave those. Right?

Jane Covington: Yes. I just need to do the math and see what kind of bang I'll get for this tax credit. Do I want to rip my windows out? Which will obviously make me furious?

Tim Clites: Right.

Jane Covington: But I mean, I understand it's always. And they're backed up right now. You know, they're they were very late on their responses.

Tim Clites: Sure.

Will Moore: Mr. chairman, with that knowledge that she may or may not make this change. If you're open to the two over two that are proposed by DHR, I would maybe suggest that in your motion, you give her the option of continuing with either the six over six or the two over two. That way it's not, Oh, we changed it. If she decides to stick with the six over six, she has to come back. So, you could give her the option of doing it either, right? I think that makes sense.

Tim Clites: My mind was kind of headed there. That's why I wanted to understand. Make sure I understood what you were saying, because. Yeah, certainly, if we can agree on an approval, that gives you some flexibility. So, when you talk to VDHR and get your final approval, you don't necessarily need to come back to us. I think that would be helpful. Okay. Do I have any additional clarifications? I don't think I do. Well, I did have one question. The French doors, they still want as a three by five light French door? VDHR? We didn't get into details on that. It? It might not be. I should go back to my notes. It might not be three by five. It's small. It's a custom four-foot-wide door. Standard is your six-foot wide. And I didn't want anything that big.

Tim Clites: So, is it a single door or?

Jane Covington: No no no.

Tim Clites: It's a custom four-foot-wide pair of doors with little.

Jane Covington: [multiple speakers] Pair of doors. True divided light. So, whatever is proportionally appropriate for four-foot door versus a six-foot door. So maybe it's only two by five rather than three by five.

Tim Clites: Right.

Jane Covington: And I should go back and look at my notes. So, I know that what I ordered and what I've been waiting three months for.

Tim Clites: From then you're waiting.

Jane Covington: No, no, no, the door is on back order.

Tim Clites: Oh, okay. Well, in terms of what we're talking about tonight, I would say based on what I've heard from the committee, I don't I'm kind of not surprised at VDHR wants the single panes of glass if they're going to be replaced, to have a sympathetic but not matching muntin pattern. There's something about that that I think, okay, the little I've worked with them, I could see that being a preference. Right? In other words, take away some of the contemporariness of the single, the three windows, the B windows and instead give them a two over two pattern. So, I'm okay with that. And the lower windows I kind of feel like Margaret, my preference if the doors above have little lights would be for the windows below to match. But if VDHR felt strongly that they needed to be two over two, I don't know, given the location of this building that I would feel strongly about not allowing that. I know that's what I'm saying. And that part of the building is not really the charm of the building, it's the front and the original mass. So, I'm okay with this. I'm also. [off mic] What's that? Still part of it. It is part of it. Right. But it's not part of the like the original old historic. Right? It's not what? How would you say it politely? It's not the endearing part of it. Right? At least from my perspective. And I'm also okay with the description you gave for the rail, which is not represented in the pictures, but does seem to be represented in the drawing now that I look more closely. A wider top board and then ten, eight and six to give some interest to that. And the drawing shows three sections, but in fact the flat on elevation shows two, which seems to make sense with the door that's going to go in. Any further comments from the committee or questions? All right.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] Do you want me to make a motion?

Tim Clites: You can. Sure. [off mic] That's fine. Go ahead, Virginia, please.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm not even sure how to phrase it. I make a motion to approve COA 25-13 request of Jane Covington for rear window and rear porch revisions. Based on approval of what? Who are these people?

Tim Clites: Why don't you start by saying the [multiple speakers] the window.

Virginia Jenkins: Why don't you do it, then?

Tim Clites: You want to withdraw that motion?

Virginia Jenkins: I'll withdraw my motion and pass it on to you.

Tim Clites: It's a tough bunch here. And I don't have Bill here to help me out. There's no defense. Okay. I don't have it in front of me. [off mic] Move to approve COA 25-13 as presented, clarifying that the two over two windows in both locations are acceptable. By if VDHR and the owner approved type C windows to remain as six over six that is also acceptable by the committee and that the balcony and railing are acceptable as an all painted structure with the horizontal rails starting at the top being ten inches, eight inches and six inches from top to bottom with equal spacing that the entire assembly except the walking surface be gray, and the underside of the structure, I guess, also should be gray if it's exposed. And yeah, that it be painted to match the trim color. How did I do? That's the motion.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: Is it clear? Is everybody clear? Yeah, sure.

Cindy Pearson: Can I ask a question, please? So, Jane mentioned that, you know, she's going to see I'm taking it how the money goes, what they're requesting. And then you might take the windows out. Does she have to come back to us if there are other changes? Is that what is, I mean?

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, what we are approving then?

Cindy Pearson: Is just this.

Tim Clites: We are approving two over two windows.

Jane Covington: Yep, I got that.

Tim Clites: And the option to leave the two six over six below the balcony.

Cindy Pearson: Okay.

Tim Clites: And she doesn't have to come back if either of those two things are true. If anything, else got to come back.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. That's the motion, and it's been seconded. Any other clarifications? All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Jane Covington: Thank you. Will, thank you for your time today. I appreciate it.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you all. Let's go back to our next item, COA 25-14. Request of Neil Metzger for painting the porch railing and signpost at 4 East Federal Street Best Thai Kitchen, Red Sushi Bar, Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It will be news to Mr. Metzger that I challenge the committee to play a little game with his application. As he pointed out in his email, and I read it in the memo that this is the first application where we've seen the use of artificial intelligence to produce a proposed viewpoint. But as he noted in his email it changed a lot of other things on the building. But just to be clear this is the existing view. What is being requested he's going to do some repainting of the decking, repainting of the trim on the building, but that will all be in the same colors. So that's not actually subject to review or approval. But it's worth noting that he's doing an entire refresh there. But as far as changes requiring your approval, it is to paint the railing, including the handrails the posts the pickets, as well as the signpost over here that holds the Best Thai Kitchen sign to paint all of those which are currently unpainted white. So that's the extent of the request. Again, this is the AI image which changed many, many other aspects of the building. But I still think it's at least somewhat effective in just showing you what going from an unpainted rail to a white painted rail might do to the brightness of the elevation. So. And I think Cindy was at 15 differences between the photo. I think she counted 15. There's probably more. [off mic].

Tim Clites: It's nice to clean up the utilities in the sidewalk, though. Like, the sidewalk looks much I think we got to do this with all our town photos.

Will Moore: We're going to expect you to reset all those bricks now just like this picture, Neil, please. [laughter] That's all I have to add. Unless the applicant has anything else.

Tim Clites: Thank you. For the record name and address and any additional comments.

Neil Metzger: Neil Metzger, 4 East Federal Street. No. That was a perfect synopsis. Sorry. ChatGPT, you tell it not to change anything except the rails, and it doesn't change everything a lot, but it changed everything.

Tim Clites: It's still a kid. It's not. You know, it's like a kid.

Neil Metzger: Yeah, exactly.

Tim Clites: Well, very good. That's interesting. It was interesting for me to see that we're seeing more of that every day, I think. So sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. But here we are. Okay, it's pretty clear, but, Cindy, any comments?

Cindy Pearson: I think the white really does brighten that up down there. It looks nice. My only that thing that would probably irritate me to no end is the white with the dirt on from people's hands that's going to be on that rail that they're going to hold on to. So, I hope you're painting with a really tough paint that somehow your people I mean, this is just coming from me. This is nothing you have to do. But boy, that white paint is going to get dirty. Things do.

Neil Metzger: It can be hosed off.

Cindy Pearson: They can be hosed off. Yes. But no, it looks great. Thank you.

Neil Metzger: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I think the white paint is fine. Other than that, I have no problems with it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda. No, I'm fine with white. I think it brightens it up. Like everyone has said, it really helps the space look bigger and brighter.

Neil Metzger: Awesome.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Big improvement. I like it a lot. I like the window. I mean the flower boxes too.

Neil Metzger: Oh, thank you.

Tim Clites: ChatGPT.

Neil Metzger: Every year, nine years, we spruce it up whether you know whether it needs it or not.

Tim Clites: You're right. Awesome. Okay, well, I have no comments. Virginia, would you like to make a motion for us?

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic]

Tim Clites: I didn't want you to feel miss out, you know, because.

Virginia Jenkins: Thank you [off mic] I need to go back. I make a motion to approve COA 25-14 request of Neil Metzger for painting the porch railing and signpost at 4 East Federal Street, Best Thai Kitchen Red Sushi Bar.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor.

Margaret Littleton: [off mic] Okay. Sorry. Oh.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] Excuse me.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Neil Metzger: Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: Appreciate you for coming in. Discussion items. Do we have any? We have a discussion item or two.

Will Moore: We do.

Tim Clites: Great.

Will Moore: So, we received outreach from the organizers of the Joint Architectural Review Board. So, they're about to start up that process, I think, this month requesting if we want to be part of that effort this year and if so, if we would like to appoint a representative, as we did in the past. So, we're a little late coming to you, I think. Generally, they reach out in May, but. Well, technically she did reach out in May, but after your meeting. So, if that is something you would want to participate in, we would endeavor to probably get together. I'm guessing timeline wise, we might have to do it outside of the committee setting, but whoever might be the representative staff could get together with them to get input on potential nominees for those awards in the next couple of weeks, if possible.

Will Moore: Okay. How does the committee feel?

Cindy Pearson: I think we should nominate Punkin, since she's not here to head that up.

Tim Clites: What a good idea.

Cindy Pearson: And have I got a second on that one?

Tim Clites: All's in favor. [laughter] Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with Cindy otherwise it should be Bill. [laughter]

Tim Clites: So, well, who attends we probably don't have to decide tonight, but I think I think being involved in it is great. Right. I mean, it's just a couple of historic districts and the county wide and the folks that work on that at the county put a lot of effort into it. And I think we should always personally, I think we should always try to be involved. So that's my input. And if that means I need to be involved like I am in the past, I'm happy to do that. But I'd be happy for Punkin or someone else to also it's a fairly easy after we do our work and submit it, someone goes up and they meet as a group in Leesburg and have a kind of a review and vote session on which things get approved and or don't get approved. And then, of course, usually in the fall, September, October, they have an event where they celebrate the award

winners. And so, it's not that much work for the person that goes. But in the absence of anybody else, as long as I'm available, I'm happy to go. I know Punkin's got a lot on her plate, so as much as I'd love to pick on her when she's not here, I would not if she was here.

Cindy Pearson: I don't. [laughter].

Tim Clites: Yeah. And there's. Yeah, there's other people that certainly could.

Will Moore: I think in the past, what we've done is selected nominations from approvals during the previous calendar year. So, these would be from calendar year 24 applications. I think that's correct that we would not include maybe things from January to current, but I'm not positive.

Tim Clites: So yeah. And I'm not sure it seemed like we had a bigger window because the approval sometimes in the work getting done are often.

Will Moore: Right.

Tim Clites: Are over. So, it's like I think it was not it couldn't have been reviewed or approved more than either 2 or 3 years old as a way of.

Will Moore: Right.

Tim Clites: Right.

Will Moore: Understood. So, I'll try to get clarification on what that time frame is. And then what I'll do is I'll send out a list of the approved projects to every member. And then if every member wants to write back to me individually and say, hey, I think these two or 3 or 5 would be worthy of consideration. Then when staff gets together with whether it's Mr. Clites or whoever the representative is, we can have a slightly narrowed list to kind of work from at that point.

Tim Clites: And then would we vote on that in our next meeting to submit, or we don't have enough time to do that?

Will Moore: That's I'm still going to have to figure that out with the staff person. It's actually a staff person at the town of Leesburg who's taken the lead this year rather than the county, but I will get with her and see what the time frame is on needing to know.

Tim Clites: So then maybe tonight, could we just quickly get comfortable if there needs to be a smaller group of the committee, like, let's should we just decide, try to decide tentatively who that might be. I mean, so that not to put anybody on the spot, but just so that the rest of the committee is at least proxied at some level. Right if there's some urgency to what we're going to submit.

Will Moore: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Sorry. [off mic] I was just saying maybe tonight we should have occasionally we've done a kind of a focused like a subcommittee or these 2 or 3 people on behalf of the committee if there's this urgency. I mean, I'd like the whole committee to look at the list next meeting, if we can. But in the absence of that. Does that make sense?

Will Moore: And yeah, in the absence of that, we would probably have to just do a two person so that it's not technically a meeting of if you actually did a subcommittee of three or more people, we would just. [multiple speakers You could do that, but we would just have to announce it ahead of time, make sure we give notice and make sure it's open to the public. If they. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Understood. Thank you for clarifying that. I knew there was some. Yeah. All right. So, I think Bill and Punkin aren't here, and we need a subcommittee of two. [laughter] They'll never miss again. No, let's not do that. I'm happy to be one of the two. Just because it seems like you all gang up and make me go anyway, so I feel outnumbered so I'm just going to say uncle from the start. But if there's someone else that would like to join me in doing that, or I can just call and select a member.

Cindy Pearson: Can we just wait until Will gets the information from the girl or guy, whoever's running this program on what the dates are going to be.

Tim Clites: Sure.

Cindy Pearson: We might not need a subcommittee.

Tim Clites: That's right.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. So, and he could all if we do, then he can announce that in his email and we can say, sure, I'll do that or crickets. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Is there any issue in the event we need to make the decision before the next meeting? And, and myself and someone else come in, and do it? Do we have to do anything tonight to make that? I mean, this isn't official business, but kind of. Right?

Will Moore: Yeah. It might be easier if you go ahead and select somebody tonight. Just so it's known at that point, right? Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Will Moore: I would suggest that.

Tim Clites: In the rare outside.

Will Moore: Yes.

Tim Clites: Case that that's important. All right. So, I'm going to suggest that I hate volunteering myself but myself and Punkin will review if we can't have it come to our next meeting.

Virginia Jenkins: You need a second?

Tim Clites: I know you all second that. I mean, I left you all off the hook, but, I mean, that's the easiest way, right? Chair and Vice chair, will and I know Punkin is around. She and I surely could get together for whatever time that would be required.

Will Moore: That's great.

Tim Clites: With the goal being that we bring it to the committee if we can. Does that?

Will Moore: That's great.

Tim Clites: I need a second.

Cindy Pearson: I'll second that.

Tim Clites: Yeah sure. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. And July 3rd is a Thursday. The fourth is the next day. I'm going to go out on a limb and say that might be a tough day for a meeting. Probably not going out on a limb very far. What do we? Do you have any sense, Rhonda, or whether we should try to go sooner or later? [off mic]

Will Moore: Are we certain it doesn't work? Is that what we're saying?

Tim Clites: I'm not. Okay, let me back up. I know for myself it doesn't work. [off mic]

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Let's see.

Virginia Jenkins: Because people will take a longer weekend.

Will Moore: Okay. We will send out dates by if not tomorrow, early next week with the typical. We'll try to give you maybe four dates to select from. And if you can tell us yes or no for each of those dates, don't just say I prefer this date, but say yes, no, yes, yes. And then we can consolidate the list and whatever we have the most availability for, we'll select. So, we'll send out some potential alternate dates. I guess you could include the third just to see if there's, right keep the third as the. Yeah. All right. Thank you. Does that work?

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. Okay. Thank you all. With no further business, we're adjourned.