TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, July 3, 2025
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, July 3, 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
Virginia Jenkins
Margaret Littleton
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

ABSENT: William Anderson (excused)
Linda Wright (excused)

Public Comments

Megan Gallagher, 204 East Marshall Street, noted that the Committee was stemming a tidal wave of requests for black paint down the historic retail corridor and thanked the members for the work they did with a previous applicant. She opined that the solution was appropriate for the neighboring buildings. Ms. Gallagher noted that the HDRC had one of the hardest jobs in Middleburg and expressed her appreciation for the level of detail they considered. She advised that black was an accent color and opined that it had the potential to become garish when combined with gold. Ms. Gallagher questioned the appropriateness of the use of these colors as main colors. She questioned how one-third of a Romanesque building could be so dramatically different from the rest of the building as proposed, including in terms of appropriateness when compared to the adjacent buildings. Ms. Gallagher noted another application for the use of these colors and questioned the appropriateness of black and gold on one of the finest examples of federal architecture in the town. She expressed concern about the applications and appreciation for the Committee's attention to detail.

Nancy Gardner, 11 North Hamilton Street, thanked the Committee for doing what was a hard job. She noted that their work was necessary and important.

Donna Strama, 10 Orange Drive, thanked the HDRC for their hard work. She also thanked them for the rules that allowed Middleburg to continue to look like the older town it was. Ms. Strama opined that using colors that were not appropriate would take away from the town. She asked that the Committee not let anyone do something "really weird" to the buildings.

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the June 5, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

New Business

COA 25-12 (S 25-07): Projecting Sign – 12 South Pendleton Street – Wear/Ware Studio

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the applicant would occupy the second floor of the building. He advised that there was an existing sign bracket, from which the applicant would like to hang a four-square foot projecting sign. Mr. Moore noted that the Committee had a graphic of the sign; however, the exact boundaries of the sign were not included. He questioned whether the white was within a rectangle or whether it was carved around the perimeter of the graphic to depict only the black and white as shown. Mr. Moore reported that the sign would be black and white graphics digitally printed onto the material, which would consist of a metal face with a plastic core.

Mike McMillon, the applicant, advised that his business was located on the second floor of the Nature Composed building.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that while he was not sure of the plastic core material, there was at least one sign in Middleburg that was a flat metal sign with digital screening on it. He advised that it was not a material that had been seen on the main street; however, it would not be the first application for a one-dimensional sign without carving on a metal face.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. McMillon reported that the sign would be a rectangle. He advised that the only black that would be seen was what was on the graphic, with the remainder of the sign being white. Mr. McMillon further advised that he did not plan on having an outside border; however, he would install one if required.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that it was at the Committee's discretion as to whether they wanted the applicant to return with a plan or more information. He advised that it would not be problematic for him if they approved the sign knowing it was a two foot by two-foot rectangle surrounding the logo.

Mr. McMillon advised that he like Nature Composed's sign due to its durability and colors and explained that he wanted to his sign to use the exact same materials.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that traditional materials were an acceptable material under the Historic District Guidelines. He opined that there could be an argument for whether aluminum was a traditional material. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that the guidelines specifically stated wood, glass, gold leaf, raised individual metal or painted wood letters on wood, metal or glass. He suggested it would not be inappropriate for the sign to be metal.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. McMillon opined that the paint would not be super glossy or super matted. He further opined that it would be very clear with sharpish colors. Mr. McMillon confirmed the sign had not yet been made, as he wanted to get approval first.

Vice Chair Lee suggested a border around the sign would help to keep it from floating, especially given that it would be located on the second floor. She noted that she was not recommending a fat border. Ms. Lee opined that this would make the sign appear to be a little more traditional.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with Vice Chair Lee regarding the border. She noted that the sign was not a rectangular one, as the application stated it would be a square that was twenty-four by twenty-four inches.

Mr. McMillon advised that he needed to look at his email correspondence and advised that he put the approximate dimensions in the application. He confirmed it was more rectangular. Mr. McMillon further confirmed that the sign would not be carved around the cloud design.

Chair Clites agreed a little frame would be nice and would be more traditional. He opined that in terms of size, it would be okay if it was a square sign. Mr. Clites suggested the sign be centered on the bracket regardless of the dimensions. He further suggested the placement of the sign not fight with the corbel on the building. Mr. Clites noted that the Committee would prefer the paint finish not be glossy and suggested either a flat or matte finish.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-12 (S 25-07), with the following clarifications: (1) the size of the sign be 24-inches square or less so that it doesn't overwhelm the bracket; (2) that it have a black border around framing the white field that is somewhere around three-quarters of an inch or minus a quarter of an inch, so between half inch and an inch; and (3) that the finish of the white and black be a non-gloss finish.

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

In response to an inquiry from Mr. McMillon, Chair Clites noted that his graphics person would have to update the graphics and provide them to him. He asked that he provide Deputy Town Manager Moore with a copy. Mr. Clites noted that if Mr. Moore had any questions about them, he would contact Mr. McMillon.

<u>COA 25-15 (S 25-08):</u> Projecting Sign – 15 E. Washington Street – Shop Wall

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the proposed sign, which would be slightly less than six square feet, would be hung from an existing bracket. He further reported that the color, Pantone 2935C, would be a medium to medium dark blue and would be used for the border and carved lettering. Mr. Moore advised that there would some secondary lettering that would not be carved but would be thin lettering in black that would be below the white field.

Vice Chair Lee opined that there should not be a comma after the word "shop."

Shatabdi Sharma, the applicant, agreed and noted that this was a mistake. She advised that she would ask the vendor to make that change. Ms. Sharma reported that this was her trademark sign.

The Committee agreed the sign was nice.

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-15 (S 25-08), a request of Shatabdi Sharma for a projecting sign at 15 East Washington Street (Shop Wall).

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

COA 25-16 (S 25-09): Projecting Sign, Wall Sign, Window Signs, Re-painting, and Awnings – 7 W. Washington St. – Grandeur Antiques

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that this application was complex. He advised that the subject property was the Middleburg Plaza building. Mr. Moore reported that the applicant would occupy the eastern space, as well as a separate space located within the plaza itself, and advised that the desire was to have some synergy between the two and to make them match. He reported that the application included the installation of a wall sign on the face of the building that would point customers in both directions, a projecting sign and window signage on the eastern space and additional window signage in the space within the plaza. Mr. Moore reported that there were zoning concerns related to the total amount of square footage being proposed. He explained that the property from east to west was forty-eight feet, which meant it was only allowed to have twenty-four feet of signage for the entire property. Mr. Moore reported that, depending on how the existing signage was calculated, it was over the limit. He noted that there was a sign for a business that was no longer located there that was proposed to be removed and advised that there were boxes on the wall that may or may not be counted toward the signage area, depending on how they were being used. Mr. Moore reported that even if those were all removed from the calculations, this would only leave a little more than six square feet of sign allotment remaining for the total property. He noted that the application was for over eighteen square feet of signage, which was not permitted under the zoning ordinance. Mr. Moore further noted that he did not have the benefit of the signage inventory prior to the application submission. He advised that as it stood, there was no path forward during this meeting for the Committee to approve signage for the property, as the request was for three times the remaining allotment, depending on how the signage was calculated.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the application also involved the repainting of portions of the building, the addition of an awning to the eastern space, and the replacement of an awning in the western recessed space. He reviewed the existing color schemes for the eastern portion of the building and the recessed space and reported that they were proposed to be painted black. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that they recently discussed the desire of newer businesses to want a more modern look within the confines of the Historic District and noted that they expressed concerns regarding that. He advised that he provided citations from the Historic District Guidelines to help the Committee in its deliberations when considering the request to add more black paint along the storefront spaces on Washington Street.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reiterated that the applicant was also seeking to add an awning to the eastern space and replace one in the recessed space. He reported that the applicant was proposing to leave the existing awning frame in place and replace the red awning with a black one with gold stripes. Mr. Moore displayed mock-ups of the proposed color schemes, the awnings, and the signage. He reminded the Committee that the Historic District Guidelines addressed awnings. Mr. Moore noted the need for clarification of the awning materials, as that was not specified in the application. He advised the Committee that they could consider the portions of the application related to the repainting and awnings; however, they could not take action on the signage, as the property must be brought into compliance with the zoning standards before that could occur.

Rachel Harshman, the applicant, opined that what was proposed was a "historic black color" that was traditionally used in multiple historic buildings. She advised that the awning would be a cloth one, with a gold stripe and gold lettering, and opined that it was a very traditional look for historic buildings. Ms. Harshman noted that she sold antiques; therefore, she wanted the building to look old. She displayed a sample of the awning material.

Chair Clites questioned whether there was a sense of urgency to get the wall sign up. He questioned whether it would fall within the allowed allotment so the Committee could consider it.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reiterated that the signage calculation would depend on whether the two directory boxes were being used. He advised that assuming they were not, the building would have a little more than six square feet of remaining signage allotment, meaning the projecting sign and the wall sign, which were three square feet each, could potentially be approved. Mr. Moore reiterated that this assumed the use of the two directory boxes did not count toward the allotment. He noted that this was something he would have to determine and suggested the Committee could approve the signage subject to his determination.

Nicole Madden, of Quail Run Signs, reminded the Committee of the request for window signage as well.

Committee Member Littleton opined that the building had too many signs. She suggested the window signs and projecting sign would be more visible than the wall sign. Ms. Littleton noted that Middleburg was established in the 1700s and advised that the Town wanted to keep that feel. She further advised that black was a very cold color and, while handsome in some spaces, it was not appropriate for an entire building. Ms. Littleton reminded the Committee that they received an application previously for an all-black building, which was ultimately approved for repainting in a dark green color. She suggested the applicant consider a color that was warm and complimented the stone, such as a brown. Ms. Littleton opined that since the window in the eastern side of the building faced north, an awning was not needed. She suggested the awning material was right; however, the color needed to be warmer.

Ms. Madden expressed an understanding of the Committee's comments. She advised that a previous tenant had an approved black awning. Ms. Madden questioned whether the awning could be considered a minor detail.

Committee Member Littleton reiterated that the awning should go with whatever color the building was repainted and should be complementary.

Vice Chair Lee agreed the proposed awning fabric was the right material. She reviewed the color schemes of the buildings in the block and opined that a rich color in a brown tone that worked with the stone would set off the building more. Ms. Lee suggested the applicant select a color to complement the stone. She acknowledged the need to address the zoning issues with regard to the signage and suggested there was no use in discussing it.

Committee Member Jenkins agreed black was a historic color; however, she noted that what was proposed was overkill. She opined that painting the entire space black would make it too dark and would not be welcoming. Ms. Jenkins expressed concern about repainting the recessed space and opined that the warm wood was much more appealing than black. She suggested black should only be used as an accent color and not for the full space. Ms. Jenkins agreed with Committee Members Lee and Littleton that a color that complimented the warmness of the stone would be better.

Councilmember Pearson read excerpts from the Historic District Guidelines that stated that black was not an appropriate color as a primary color on a building in the Historic District and that the color scheme should be appropriate to the period in which the building was constructed and generally compatible with the adjacent structures. She advised that black was a primary color, not a color scheme that was appropriate to the period of any building in the Historic District. Ms. Pearson noted that it was a very modern treatment that, while it may have a place in other environments, did not have a place in the Middleburg Historic District. She suggested the applicant consider a lighter, brighter, more inviting color scheme that did not look "cave-ish". Ms. Pearson opined that the sign was a nice looking one and questioned whether any of the existing signage could be removed in order to make room for the proposed one. She suggested the awning color should complement the color scheme that was approved.

Chair Clites opined that the signage on the building had come a long way and noted that there were fewer signs that were better controlled in terms of physical sign plaques. He advised that he had no issues with the design of the proposed signs if they met the zoning ordinance. Mr. Clites acknowledged that there were buildings that contained signage on the glass; however, he noted that in the case of this building, the limit on the amount of signage would hamstring the applicant. He advised that because this was a zoning requirement, the Committee had no authority to overstep the limit. Mr. Clites explained to the applicant that the Committee could vote on signage that would stay within the limit, subject to Mr. Moore confirming how the directory boxes were used, if there was a sense of urgency to get some signage up for the business. He expressed an understanding of the desire to connect the two spaces using awnings and opined that there could be a nice way to do that. Mr. Clites suggested the applicant should propose a different color scheme that either built on the richness of the wood or was more compatible with the significance of the building, which was its stone. He advised that the language of the building helped the Committee understand what was an appropriate amount of black as an accent color. Mr. Clites reiterated that the Committee would like to see another color scheme proposed that was more compatible with the stone in the building. He asked the applicant whether there was a sense of urgency related to any of the components of her application. Mr. Clites inquired as to whether there was any urgency to the signage.

Ms. Harshman advised the Committee that she needed to do some things to the interior of the building and reported that her goal was to open by September. She expressed an understanding that the Committee did not like the black color scheme and advised that she would go back and look at the stone so she could pick a color scheme that brought out its colors. Ms. Harshman advised that she really wanted to install matching awnings and opined that they would be inviting. She opined that the gold lettering on the windows was important in order to bring people into her shop. Ms. Harshman explained that one side of the shop was going to contain antique furniture, as well as small items and art, while the other side would contain designer vintage and jewelry.

The Committee agreed they had no issues with the awnings, provided they were consistent with the approved color scheme.

Ms. Harshman advised that she would return with a couple of color schemes for the Committee's consideration.

Chair Clites opined that there was no issue with the lettering on the glass; however, he explained that it was a decision based on the quantity of signage that was allowed for the building. He advised Ms. Harshman that if the window lettering was her preference, she would need to work with her sign consultant.

Charles Carroll, the building owner, opined that the big question was the signage. He noted that he did not understand how the signage calculation worked.

Deputy Town Manager Moore explained that the calculation was based on the frontage of the building only. He confirmed there was no consideration for multiple business buildings. Mr. Moore noted that the signage allotments were identified in the zoning ordinance.

Chair Clites advised Mr. Carroll that other building owners have installed directory signs, with their collection of tenants having a sign on it. He opined that Mr. Carroll's building would be a candidate for that type of signage, so everyone had an opportunity for some signage. Mr. Clites acknowledged that this may require Mr. Carroll to renegotiate the number of signs that his existing tenants had. He reiterated that other multiple tenant buildings used a holistic sign package and had more control over how much signage each tenant could have.

In response to a comment from Mr. Carroll, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the HDRC could not approve additional signage due to the limitations in the zoning ordinance. He confirmed this was the case even if the signage was replacing existing signs. Mr. Moore advised Mr. Carroll that the existing signage was over the current allotment, depending on how the box signs were being used. He noted that while the Town would not force the removal of the signs, Mr. Carroll was limited in his ability to install new ones. Mr. Moore advised that this was not under the purview of the HDRC, as it was a zoning issue. He noted that it was tricky for owners of multi-tenant buildings, as when satisfying a potential tenant, they had to consider how that decision would affect future tenants. Mr. Moore advised Mr. Carroll that he had one tenant who had three signs that were using up more than half of the sign allotment for the entire building. He acknowledged that those signs have been up and could remain; however, they hampered the ability for additional signs to be installed. In response to a comment from Mr. Carroll, he confirmed the zoning ordinance had not changed and opined that at some point, additional signage was added to the building without a careful analysis of whether they should have been allowed. Mr. Moore reiterated that he was not going to require the signage come down; however, it limited the ability to add new ones.

Ms. Madden noted that she had the approximate dates for when the existing signs were approved.

Chair Clites suggested Ms. Madden review this with Mr. Moore and opined that he would appreciate having that information for the record.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore opined that the applicant was amendable to revisiting the colors and other things. He recommended they table action on the application.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee table this application until next month.

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

COA 25-17 (S 25-10): Free-standing Sign, Window Sign, Awnings, Awning Signs, Light Fixtures, and Re-painting – 207 W. Washington Street – Loudoun Market

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that this application involved signage, repainting, awnings, light fixtures, and hardware for the property that was the former distillery. He further reported that the proposal was to repaint portions of the building black, including the three wooden garage bays, the stucco and the door and window framing. Mr. Moore noted that the middle garage bay contained an overhead door, which was proposed to be removed. He advised that the raised planting bed adjacent to The Plains Road was also proposed to be painted black, as was the freestanding sign pole. Mr. Moore noted that his memo mistakenly stated that the wooden fence would be painted black; however, it was proposed to be stained a dark expresso color. He reported that each garage bay was proposed to have an awning sign, with the Loudoun Market nomenclature and logo on them. Mr. Moore advised that a sign was also proposed for one of the windows. He opined that the graphic depicted it as being larger than it would actually be. He reported that the free-standing sign would be made from Extera, a commonly used sign material. Mr. Moore advised that there was some synergy planned for the building and the sign that would depend on the color scheme. He reported that the light fixtures that were proposed were brass; however, the wall fixture did not comply with the Town's outdoor lighting standards requirements, as the bulbs were exposed. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that the bulbs had to be completely hooded and shielded for any new light fixtures in town so the bulb could not be seen at a horizontal level. He opined

that the gooseneck fixture may also have an exposed bulb; however, if it was recessed completely, it would meet the standards. Mr. Moore advised that if the bulb extended beyond the horizontal plane, it would not meet the outdoor lighting standards. He opined that the biggest discussion point may be the color scheme and recommended the Committee start there before moving to the other elements.

Sara Tyndell, the applicant, advised that the awning fabric that was displayed by the previous applicant was hers; however, she was not stuck on anything in particular. She advised that she was happy to hear the Committee's feedback. Ms. Tyndell explained that her goals were to stay consistent to her brand and to stay consistent with the vision the HDRC had for Middleburg. She noted that she wanted to be here for a long time and wanted to be something the Town would be proud of; therefore, she was grateful for any feedback. Ms. Tyndell advised that she was anxious to move forward so she could open as soon as possible. She corrected that the wooden retaining wall, the free-standing signpost, and the fence would all be stained a dark stain that would be consistent with what was already there. Ms. Tyndell noted the need to understand the outdoor lighting standards as they applied to the light fixtures. She reported that she had an alternative color. Ms. Tyndell opined that nothing tied what were perceived to be two separate spaces in the building together and advised that an olive-green color would be on brand with her business. She noted that she liked the green; however, she was open to ideas.

Committee Member Littleton opined that the proposed façade looked great, with the exception of the black color. She suggested the color should be lighter and more friendly. She noted the Middleburg Community Center that was located across the street.

Vice Chair Lee thanked Ms. Tyndell for being open to changing the color. She suggested a warmer one that was more welcoming would help tie the two spaces together.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that she liked the basic concept. She opined that the alternative color was still a little dark and suggested the applicant look at the color above it, which was a sage gray green color.

Ms. Tyndell clarified for the record that that color was "Bungalow House Gray."

Councilmember Pearson opined that the proposal looked really good; however, she agreed the black was too modern. She expressed a desire to keep it more in keeping with the historic part of Middleburg. Ms. Pearson suggested Ms. Tyndell look at the light fixtures on the Hersh house and noted that they custom made them to meet the outdoor lighting standards.

Chair Clites opined that based on the Committee members' comments, the application was headed in a direction that felt more consistent with what they felt was compatible with the Historic District. He opined that the aluminum storefront was awful and expressed gratitude that the applicant was willing to do something with it. Mr. Clites advised that he was okay with that part of the building being simple. He opined that the consistency of the color, whatever that may be, was a positive thing, as the building had a lot of busy things going on. Mr. Clites suggested the applicant should feel at liberty to pick a color scheme and explained that when the members suggested a color, they were only talking about its value in terms of how dark or light it should be. He opined that depending on the color selected, it could still be dark relative to other colors. Mr. Clites suggested the color around the doors and windows could be a darker color and still be successful. He noted that the light fixtures appeared to be brushed or burnished brass, which would not change over time.

Ms. Tyndell advised that the finish would be unlacquered.

Chair Clites opined that the Committee would prefer that. He advised Ms. Tyndell that Deputy Town Manager Moore could work with her regarding the fixtures. Mr. Clites noted that the rendering appeared to include a gold frame painted on the glass and questioned whether that was intentional.

Ms. Tyndell confirmed it was and explained that she was proposing to use vinyl to frame out the windows. She advised that she was flexible on this as well. Ms. Tyndell reported that it would be on the windows on the café side and on the two entrance doors on the retail side.

Nicole Madden, of Quail Runs Signs, advised that it would be similar to the Middleburg Books windows.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee would not vote on the application, as they wanted to see the new color scheme.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee table this until next month.

Ms. Madden questioned whether the Committee was tabling action on the signage as well.

The Committee suggested the applicant may wish to change the sign colors based on the color scheme for the building.

Ms. Tyndell advised that she would love to hear the Committee's feedback on the color options. She acknowledged that they were suggesting going lighter; however, she advised that she also wanted to make sure she honored her brand at the same time. Ms. Tyndell confirmed that white, black, and gold were her brand colors. She suggested a light accent of green that was more of an olive color would work.

Councilmember Pearson advised Ms. Tyndell that Middleburg was very dark in the winter and advised that a black sign would not be seen. She suggested she drive around town at night to see that a black sign would not be visible.

Ms. Tyndell advised that she could flip the sign colors as an option. She questioned the Committee's thoughts on Agreeable Gray or a beige/tan color. Ms. Tyndell noted that the brick would remain unpainted and advised that she was trying to think of color options that would complement the brick, not make the café side the star of the building and keep on her brand.

Ms. Madden advised that there was a streetlight and a tree at this location.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Tyndell advised that she would return with the entire package. She noted that she wanted to leave with enough feedback in order to gain an approval when she returned during the next meeting.

Chair Clites opined that if Ms. Tyndell's branding colors supported the black sign, the Committee would approve it as presented. He noted that they were not opposed to black signs; however, there was a hesitation to add a big expanse of black to a building façade. In response to an inquiry from the applicant, he confirmed she could bring color options to the next meeting.

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

Chair Clites left the dais, as he had a conflict of interest regarding the next two agenda items. Vice Chair Lee assumed the Chair.

COA 25-18: Revisions to Approved COA 25-08 for Exterior Changes – 200 W. Washington Street – Diamondback Hospitality

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the application was for some minor revisions to the approved COA that was issued a few months ago. He explained that when the zoning permit was submitted, there were inconsistencies with the approved COA, the first of which was that the light pattern for the bay windows were a different configuration. Mr. Moore noted that Mr. Clites made it clear in his presentation that the intention was to retain the windows as they existed and noted that the way they were drawn in the previous application was not the way they were configured. He reported that the drawing was now how they were configured, which was four lights across, as opposed to three. Mr. Moore advised that the other change was to the new entryway vestibule on the Pickering Street side of the building. He explained that the original plans showed a side light next to the door, which had been replaced with pilasters. Mr. Moore reported that another change was on the east elevation, which originally showed three lights in the new construction. He advised that this was now drawn to match the existing front elevation configuration of four lights. Mr. Moore explained that the panels on the first level façade were not available in the size that was originally proposed; therefore, the configuration was revised to include an arrangement of panels and columns. He reported that the zoning permit application also included some gas lanterns and noted that the Committee had not reviewed the proposed lighting. Mr. Moore advised that the proposed light fixtures complied with the outdoor lighting standards, as the light source would be concealed under the hood.

Tim Clites, the architect, noted that he used a set of drawings from before the previous occupant when he created his drawings. He further noted that he did not look at the light patterns to notice the window configurations were different than what existed. Mr. Clites confirmed the intent was to keep the configuration as they currently existed and to replicate the larger center windows in the new vestibule. He explained that after looking at the vestibule further, they thought it was better to have a slightly narrower door and eliminate the side light to make it easier for people to enter and exit. Mr. Clites advised that it was a decision around function; however, the new design also made it less busy. He reported that they proposed three light fixtures on the front of the building and two flanking the vestibule on the Pickering Street side. Mr. Clites advised that there would also be recessed lighting in the ceiling of the open porch that would not be visible. He further advised that there would be two more light sconces that would flank the rear porch door. Mr. Clites noted that everything else from the original approval would remain the same, including the color scheme.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Clites confirmed the half-moon windows at the top and the chimneys that already existed would all remain. He explained that he simply did not draw them in the permit drawings. Mr. Clites confirmed they were not eliminating the window on the east elevation. He advised that everything in the roofline would remain as it is. Mr. Clites confirmed they were proposing to close the window on the first floor, which was currently in a door into the kitchen, and to make it part of the panel system. He advised that all the elevations had small changes to reflect the current conditions.

The Committee noted that they had no further comments.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-18, a request of Clites Architects for revisions to approved COA 25-08 for exterior changes at 200 West Washington Street (Diamondback Hospitality).

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins, Littleton, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – Chair Clites
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

COA 25-19: Detached Garage – 102 West Washington Street – Clites Architects

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the request was to add a detached garage in the back corner of the Dimos property so it would be in line with the existing driveway. He further reported that it met all the zoning standards. Mr. Moore advised that it included a small, covered area before the entry door, as well as carriage-style garage doors along the front elevation. He reported that the proposed lighting would be recessed; therefore, it would not be visible. Mr. Moore displayed some photos of the property. He advised that the proposed garage would be stucco to match the main home and would have a standing seam metal roof. Mr. Moore noted that the trim would be a smooth Hardie plank. He advised that the details would match those on the existing home, including the ornamentation on the base of the column, the arrangement of the gutters and downspouts, and the windows and doors. Mr. Moore reiterated that the design elements were taken from the existing structure. He noted that they would match the colors as best they could, given that the materials on the main structure had weathered.

Tim Clites, the architect, explained that the goal was to have a simple little garage. He advised that it would have a little louver detail in the gable end. Mr. Clites noted that the stucco appeared to have been painted at one time. He advised that the remainder of the materials would be matched. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Clites confirmed the window would be the same as the one in the house. He opined that the difference the Committee saw was the screen that was in the window.

Councilmember Pearson noted that the garage doors would face the street and advised that this was something the Town was trying to get away from. She questioned whether it would be easier to back up if the door was oriented differently.

Mr. Clites reminded the Committee that this was a commercial site and advised that it contained parking, which provided adequate space to back up and pull out. He explained that the reason he did not propose a different location for the garage door was because of the large number of trees in the rear yard. Mr. Clites advised that he pushed the garage as far back on the property as the zoning regulations allowed.

The Committee advised that the proposed garage looked great with the existing building. They opined that the addition made it more interesting. They expressed appreciation that the Historic District Guidelines were followed.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-19, a request of Clites Architects for a detached garage at 102 West Washington Street.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins, Littleton, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – Chair Clites
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Wright

Chair Clites resumed the Chair.

COA-RS 25-05: Garage – 605 Martingale Ridge Drive (Middleburg Residences Lot 16)

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that the home was completed and noted that the plans showed a future location for a potential garage, which the applicant was now revisiting. He reported that it was for a typical one car garage in The Vineyard section; however, the one difference that was being proposed, and that may not comply with the guidelines, was that the primary cladding was different from the existing home. Mr. Moore explained that the primary cladding on the home was horizontal lap siding, whereas the garage was proposed to be stucco. He noted that the Historic District Guidelines required the materials for detached garages to be the same as those on the main house;

however, the Residences at Salamander Guidelines would apply in this case. Mr. Moore advised that those did not say it shall be the same as the primary cladding necessarily; however, it did say that all garage details, materials, etc. shall match the house on which site it resided. He noted that the house contained a stucco water table on the other side. Mr. Moore reiterated that the proposed primary cladding material for the garage would not match that of the home and advised that it was a matter of interpretation as to whether this complied with the guidelines. He reported that the color would be the same as the existing home.

Gretchen Yahn appeared before the Committee representing the application. She reported that there was an example of a garage that had a similar scenario in that the house was primarily clad in cedar shake, with a stucco water table. Ms. Yahn confirmed that what was proposed was the same scenario.

Councilmember Pearson noted that the guidelines required the materials to match the house. She opined that people would repeatedly ask for different materials and suggested the Committee needed to think about this more.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that the reason for proposing stucco was the cost difference.

Committee Member Jenkins agreed with Councilmember Pearson and opined that different primary cladding materials were not within the framework of the guidelines.

Vice Chair Lee suggested the need to follow the guidelines with regard to the requirement for the exterior finish to match the house. She noted that this would be more appropriate. Committee Member Littleton agreed.

Ms. Yahn advised that she would share this with the property owner; however, she felt he would point out the other garage as an example. She advised that if the Committee wanted siding, they would install siding.

Chair Clites opined that the intent of the guidelines was for there to be a change of color and materials from lot to lot, but that the things on the lot would be consistent. He further opined that there was not to be a change in material between the garage and the house. Mr. Clites opined that approving different materials would result in inconsistency from one lot to the next. He agreed the materials should be the same as on the house.

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Chair Clites, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 25-05, a request of Castlerock Enterprises for a garage at 605 Martingale Ridge Drive, with the exterior of the garage to be clapboard to match the house.

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

Ms. Yahn advised that she did not plan to resubmit the drawings. She further advised that she would do the garage with the siding.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed this was fine.

COA-RS 25-06: Revisions to Approved COA-RS 25-05 – 600 Martingale Ridge Drive

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that while doing the final inspection for occupancy of this home, he noted some changes that needed to be revisited. He advised that on the front elevation, the Committee approved a shutter on the second floor; however, it was changed to a window. Mr. Moore further advised that this was the same window that had been approved in other homes in that location. He reported that the other change was the addition of a screened rear porch. Mr. Moore advised that the floor plan submitted with the original COA called for there to be a screened porch; however, the elevations did not show those elements. He reviewed the details of the screened porch.

Gretchen Yahn appeared before the Committee representing the application. She advised that as to the window, this was an administrative error on her team's part that she did not catch at the time of the COA submission. She further advised that as to the screened porch, she tried to historically recreate where doors and columns would have been on an older screened porch. Ms. Yahn reported that they were using a new product that allowed them to do the screens one section at a time and that contained a very small reveal that was painted the same color as the column. She advised that in the past, she had clients who wanted phantom screens, which she did not mention to the Committee; however, in this case, the client wanted a permanent screen. Ms. Yahn reiterated that she tried to respect the architecture on the porch.

The Committee agreed they liked the window better than the shutter. They advised that they had no issue with the screened porch.

Councilmember Pearson noted that it was a shame the downspouts were located where there were, as they looked strange.

Ms. Yahn explained that it was difficult to relocate them due to the condition of how the roof came in at that location. She further explained that they had to go with middle ones for symmetry.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 25-06, as submitted.

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

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised the Committee that Ms. Yahn's assistant questioned whether it would be acceptable in the future for the Committee to approve that the window and shutter could be interchangeable on the front elevation. He noted that this would allow for the change during construction without the need to return for approval. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he confirmed this would not require a change to the guidelines and explained that it would simply be a note on the submission that they could either do a window or a shutter.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Yahn confirmed the size and details of both would always remain the same. She reported that there were probably another thirty COA reviews that would come before the Committee.

The Committee agreed this was a reasonable approach given that they had reviewed both options. They noted that this would provide the applicant with a little flexibility.

COA-RS 25-07: New Single-Family Dwelling – 5 Foxtrot Knoll Lane (Middleburg Residences Lot 41)

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that this would be the fifth house in The Stables section and advised that it would be located in the western portion on one of the flag lots that backed up to the wooded area. He further reported that it would be in Bruton White. Mr. Moore displayed a map showing the colors of the existing homes. He reported that this house would be a combination of stone and stucco and would be based on The Stables version of the Hunt Box design. Mr. Moore explained that the stone cladding would be on the front box and the left and right elevations, with the remainder being in stucco. He advised that the water table would be in stucco, with the exception of the water table surrounding the front porch. Mr. Moore reported that this was another application where an alternative cladding was proposed for the garage. He advised that the garage cladding would not match either the stone or the stucco and opined, based on the Committee's earlier discussion, that they would prefer it be stucco. Mr. Moore noted that it was also the Committee's first time reviewing a three-car garage. He reported that there was nothing in the guidelines that would prohibit them and noted that they only stipulated that the garages in The Vineyards be one car garages. Mr. Moore opined that the only potential concern was the proposal that the garage be board and batten clad.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, advised that there was nothing that had been re-invented on the main house; however, the one thing that was different on the left side elevation was that there was a different window configuration due to a modified condition in the bathroom. She further advised that they were also proposing a change to the window fenestration in terms of the muttons so they would be more traditional. Ms. Yahn noted that as to the garage, it backed up to the woods and advised that in order to be more sympathetic to the neighborhood, they were proposing a longer driveway, so the garage doors appeared to come to the side to face the woods. She reiterated that it would be angled toward the woods, with the front having a barn style appearance. Ms. Yahn noted the two car garages on Lots 29 and 38 and advised that they were using what would have been a third bay as a breezeway area or future cabana. She reported that from a square footage standpoint, the proposed garage was 450 square feet. Ms. Yahn noted that they worked with the truss manufacturer to get the fifteen-foot height so the garage would continue to look like a shed. She explained that this was the reason for the board and batten cladding. Ms. Yahn advised that if they had to go with stucco, they would; however, they were trying to get a barn/carriage house look.

The Committee noted the need to follow the guidelines, which would be for the garage to be stucco.

Councilmember Pearson opined that the windows on the left elevation did not appear to be centered.

Ms. Yahn advised that she would have to look at the floor plan. She suggested a modification may be necessary to something on the inside.

Councilmember Pearson opined that a stucco garage would make the garage doors look nicer, as there would not be boards going in different directions.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Yahn confirmed the baseboard would be removed at the water table in the left elevation. She further confirmed there would still be slate in this location and explained that it was supposed to look like a water table. Ms. Yahn confirmed that on the right elevation, the panels were AZEK and would have a small reveal. She noted that on the right elevation, there would be a grill in the same area as the door on the left elevation.

Chair Clites noted that he liked that the house had a different modern configuration. He opined that there would be a little detail that people would notice and appreciate. Mr. Clites noted that the garage included an additional twelve feet of depth, which did not help with its massing. He advised that his initial thought was it looked like two double wides that had been stuck together.

Ms. Yahn explained that this was the reason they turned the building, so you were not getting the view of the front elevation. She noted the choice to have a fake barn effect on the front of the massing and to give it a three-dimensional appearance through the bump out at the front.

Chair Clites noted that the rear elevation was looking toward the woods, which was the reason for the lack of windows.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that their purview was for what could be seen from the street and advised that this house was on a private street. He opined that the visibility from a public street would be limited for a lot of these homes.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Yahn advised that they took the house over to the side more and brought it back so it would stay on the flatter portion of the lot. She noted that its massing would not affect Lot 42, which was important to Salamander. Ms. Yahn advised that she could get more creative on the back lots with earthwork and other things.

Chair Clites summarized that the Committee was okay with the house, but that the garage cladding needed to match the house. He suggested it be stucco, as it would not make sense for the garage to be stone.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 25-07 as presented, with the following clarification: that the garage be clad in the stucco to match the back portion of the house.

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

Discussion Items

JARB Awards

Chair Clites reported that there would be a Zoom call next week between the members of the Joint Architectural Review Board (JARB) that would serve as an introductory call. He advised Vice Chair Lee that he would send her the meeting invite and noted that he was available to attend.

August Meeting Quorum

Chair Clites asked the members to notify Town Clerk North if they were not able to attend the August 7th meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 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: We'll call the meeting to order for Thursday, July the 3rd, 2025. The Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's regularly scheduled meeting. The first item of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson is absent. Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright is absent. Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Okay, well, this is exciting. I think this is the biggest group we've ever had here. We have a lot on our agenda, so we're going to try to keep it moving along while still doing a proper job as they ask us to. So, the next item is public comments. If you're here and you're on the agenda as a representative for the application, you can speak at that time. If you're here, just to give general public comments we'll welcome you to the podium one at a time. I think Rhonda has a sophisticated way of tracking a three-minute timer, which is a standard for public comments. And so, anyone with public comments is welcome to come to the podium, state your name and address and then give us your comments.

Megan Gallagher: Excellent. Thank you. My name is Megan Gallagher. I live at 204 East Marshall Street, and it's nice to be in front of this committee and not just Town Council. I came to express my thanks to all of you, because I think you're stemming a tidal wave of black paint down the historic retail corridor in our town, and I deeply appreciate the work you've done with Diamondback Entertainment and their builder, who's here to change it up a bit and from the original proposal and what's in your packet today. It looks like it's complimentary or appropriate for its neighbors. I'm not an expert at that. I read back over your minutes all the way to January, and I think you have the very hardest job in Middleburg. And probably a thankless one, because no one hardly ever comes until tonight. And so, I wanted to express my appreciation for that level of detail, to give a shout out to Cindy Pearson and Margaret Littleton for particularly considering this issue. And my point is on the change and black that goes from an accent. My front door, the shutters on the brick across the way from me, on the house, across from me to large structures or major sections of trim are that it screams modern. It's one Loudoun, it's the cool sections of Brooklyn. It's in Aldi in a way that shocked many of us. And it becomes a little it becomes what you all have noted, which is the potential for garish combined with gold. And all of a sudden, I questioned this appropriateness and complementary because gold has been used so well. Middleburg Antique Center to pick out a sign. The new loft, Tri-County feeds loft. That's kind of really gold, but it's just an accent. And this is different. I wanted to thank you for looking forward. I have questions on two of

your applications today about adjacency and appropriateness, which is part of your decision making. And I don't understand how one third of the Romanesque building that in my day growing up was during Chevrolet can be so dramatically different from the rest. And we all know that's not likely to change in terms of adjacency and at the former, cidery. I knew it as the gas station. The fact that that massing of black and the gold fixtures literally across from the community center, with its unique stature in the town for architecturally, but at the gable line of Vine Hill, perhaps the finest example of federal architecture in our town, so deeply concerned. And I greatly appreciate your attention to detail. I'm going to go home because the air conditioning is better at my house. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you for your comments. Anybody else for public comments tonight?

Nancy Gardner: Hello. I'm Nancy Gardner. I reside at 11 North Hamilton Street. I just want to say thanks. This can be a really hard job. I got my neighborhood in Nashville on the historic register. It's thankless, but it's so necessary. So important. So, keep up the good work.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Donna Strama: Hi, I'm Donna Strama, 10 Orange Drive, P.O. Box. No, you don't need that. Thank you for your hard work. And thank you for the rules that we have in Middleburg to keep our town looking like an older town that it is. You start adding the colors that aren't appropriate it just takes away from the town. Thank you for all your hard work. I appreciate it, and please don't let anybody do anything really weird to our buildings. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you for your comments. Anyone else? Public comments. All right. Well, we've got a lot of applications, so I'm not surprised that there's a big group to go through our applications tonight. So, we'll close public comments. I appreciate the input. As I'm sure my colleagues do. We'll go to the approval of the meeting minutes from the June 5th, 2025 regular meeting. Has the committee had a chance to have any corrections, additions, or clarifications to the meeting minutes? If not, I move that we approve as submitted.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. Next item is new business COA 25-12 (S 25-07) Request of Michael McMillon for a projecting sign at 12 South Pendleton Wear/Ware Studio. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Tim Clites: You can come up and say, all right, so the process, in case anybody has not been here, the process is we introduced the project. Mr. Moore walks us through it. And at the end of that, we allow some additional input from the applicant. And then once we've got your input, we go down the row as a committee and discuss it. And then we sometimes come back to the applicant or Mr. Moore depending on what the questions are. So, Mr. Moore, you're up.

Will Moore: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, Mr. McMillon is a new tenant here in town. Welcome, sir. So, he's occupying the second floor at the former corner garden building on South Pendleton Street. Now nature composed. So, he has a small studio in the second floor. You see on screen here, there's an existing bracket on that second floor from a previous tenant that was probably some time ago, but the

bracket remains. So, he would like to hang a four-square foot projecting sign from that existing bracket. We do have a graphic. I'm not sure the actual boundary of the graphic of the sign in Mr. McMillon can help with that. Whether the white is within a rectangle or whether that's carved around the kind of perimeter of the graphic that you see the black and white is shown as shown is correct for him. So, it is not going to be in color. It would be black and white. The material proposed is a dye bond, which is an aluminum facing. So, it is a metal sign on its faces. It has a plastic core to it, but it is metal on the outside, and the graphics would be digitally printed onto the material.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Mr. Moore. And name and address for the record and any If you want to add any comments, you're welcome to do that. You don't need to, but you're welcome to.

Mike McMillon: Sure. My name is Mike McMillon. You said where I'm going to be located. I live in Aldie, the South regions. But yeah, I'm the second-floor studio space in what is nature composed.

Tim Clites: Yeah. All right. Thank you. I have a question before we start just so everyone doesn't ask it. Do we know, Will whether we have any signs made of this material in town?

Will Moore: I'm not positive on the core of the material. We do have at least one sign that is a kind of a flat metal sign with digital screening on it. That would be the Willow Salon on Federal Street on East Federal Street. So, it's certainly not a material that we've seen on the main street. But we do have this would not be the first application where you had a kind of a one-dimensional sign without carving on a metal face. But whether we've seen something that has this core to it, I'm not positive on that.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. Let's see. Cindy, can we start with you?

Cindy Pearson: Sure. So, can you answer the question that Will asked about the sign? Is it a rectangle?

Mike McMillon: Is it? It comes out to be a rectangle. I guess I realized now that the rendering only really shows exactly what the logo is, but it would be on a rectangle the wrap up shape.

Cindy Pearson: And is that rectangle white? Is it what coloring?

Mike McMillon: It's black, so the only black that you would see would be what you see there. The rest of it would be white. I hadn't planned for a border outside of that. But that's not if that's something that would be required, that's not outside of what sort of my comfort zone or branding would be. Just my first time doing this.

Cindy Pearson: That's fine. Yes. So, I'm going to ask Will. Should we have him come back then with the plan of it, or do we need more information?

Will Moore: I mean, it's to your discretion knowing that it would be a just two foot by two-foot rectangle surrounding this logo. It's not problematic for me.

Cindy Pearson: But we could leave it with you with making the final decision on it also?

Will Moore: No.

Cindy Pearson: No, we have to. Okay. [laughter]

Will Moore: You are the decision makers.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Mike McMillon: Can I add something else? And this may not, I think, Will you and I talked about it just quickly in an email because I had never had a sign made before. What I did, being in the nature composed buildings, I really liked their sign, the way it looked. It seemed very durable, and the colors were really nice. So, I had approached so my approach to it was, hey, what would it look like to have my sign put on this exact material? And so, kind of the reason I went the dive on route was actually because that's what was suggested to me by the maker at that time. That maybe could get B incorrect or could be maybe I confuse something. But that's kind of how we how I came down to just proposing with the dye bond, because my understanding was that's what was already on the existing building or just outside the existing building that I was in.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. Thank you, Cindy. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I didn't look it up in the Guidelines, but have it's been addressed in the guidelines for metal signs or not?

Will Moore: So metal, yes. So, the guideline is, I'll scroll to it in your memo here.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Metal is an acceptable material.

Will Moore: Well, it says you use traditional sign materials, so it could be arguable whether aluminum is traditional, but it says such as wood, glass, gold leaf, raised individual metal or painted wood letters on wood, metal or glass. So, it's not inappropriate in itself for it to be metal. So.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Then my next question. Is it matte flat paint or is it glossy?

Mike McMillon: I believe it. I'm trying to think of what it looks like. It has. It's not. It's not super glossy. No. I wish I could explain it better again it's the first time I've done it, so I'm probably coming in, maybe a little underprepared. I don't see the sign on that picture. No, it's not super matted. It's not an incredibly glossy, bright sign. It just seems very clear with sharpish colors. I don't I know that's probably not very helpful, but.

Virginia Jenkins: Probably a satin finish. Satin finish.

Tim Clites: I know I interrupted the question is, the sign made?

Mike McMillon: It's not. I wanted to get it approved before I spent the money on it.

Tim Clites: You should, no, I appreciate it. I was just the way you phrased that, I thought, if it's already made, just bring it in and we'll look at it. But if it's not, let's try to. All right. So, Sheen is a question that you have. Is there any other questions? Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Welcome to Town.

Mike McMillon: It's good to be here.

Punkin Lee: I don't know if it might a little border might keep it from just kind of floating especially since it's on the second floor.

Mike McMillon: Sure.

Punkin Lee: That it might give it a little. I don't know, hold it together, baby. I mean, not a big fat border because you got enough dark going on.

Mike McMillon: Sure.

Punkin Lee: But that would be my only comment that it might look a little tidier with that. A little more traditional.

Mike McMillon: Okay.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Mike McMillon: Sure.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I agree with Punkin. I think a little border would be kind of just set it off. And it's not a rectangle. It's a square 24 by 24, right?

Mike McMillon: Yeah. I might have put that in. [laughter] I could maybe look up the email correspondence that I had. But this time I want to say it's a little off that I think in my notes, when I had sent it, I had put approximately, and I think it's actually a little bit more of a rectangle. And I'm happy to pull up what the email says if I'm able to do that, the exact same amount. But yeah, I don't it wouldn't be a curved sign around the lettering. It would be required. Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. No. And I think, you know, it looks sort of like a cloud now. It doesn't express photography and graphic design to me.

Mike McMillon: I'm sorry.

Margaret Littleton: I said it. I, like you, said you're going to just have the writing. You're not going to do the cloud or the bubble or whatever.

Mike McMillon: Oh, yeah. It wasn't going to be carved around the.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Mike McMillon: Yeah. Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. All right. Well. Looks fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I guess I would summarize, say I agree, a little frame would be nice. I'm looking at the picture. And ironically, I think if you zoomed in to West Federal Street, the little street sign, it has a tiny little black frame around it. Not that you look to match that. I certainly wouldn't expect you to, but when I think about just a white sign with no border on the black bracket, I think it would be more traditional to have a little just a little frame. Yeah. And in terms of its size, if it's a square sign, I think that would be okay. I would just want it to be the bracket. It's kind of hard to tell. It looks like it has two places where it would hang out. So, it obviously wants to hang centered under that. So, whether it's 24 or some dimension less than that, so that it hangs neatly under the bracket, I think if I was worried about how well it how nice it looked. That would be my recommendation to you that it there's a you see the little corbel if you will.

Mike McMillon: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Right. It doesn't want to kind of fight with that. I don't think it just wants to be a square that hangs below the two eyelets. And because I assume you're going to reuse this bracket. Yeah.

Mike McMillon: Yeah, yeah that was the idea the tenant that was using that bracket just before they left, I think about 2 or 3 months ago and just moved to a different spot in town. So, they come down and I'm right in those windows to the right there. So.

Tim Clites: Awesome.

Mike McMillon: That's my. Yeah. We're just going to be using the existing bracket. Make it nice and easy if I could.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, I'd like to come back to any other comments from the committee. I do have a question for Virginia in terms of finish. Is there any sheen that you dislike, like, for instance, glossy white and matte black or vice versa?

Virginia Jenkins: I wouldn't like glossy. I don't think.

Tim Clites: You wouldn't like glossy in either. Okay. So. So if that's acceptable to you as well, the black and the white would need to be some non, doesn't have to be flat or matte but not gloss, high gloss.

Mike McMillon: Something not gloss.

Virginia Jenkins: Not a high gloss, no.

Mike McMillon: Okay. Yeah, I prefer not glossy.

Tim Clites: Okay. So great.

Mike McMillon: And then an added border.

Tim Clites: And added border. Yeah. And it's kind of hard to guess with that, but I guess we could say someone could make a motion and say a border no more than some dimension. All right or I can make a motion. [off mic] I'm sorry.

Margaret Littleton: One dimension that would fit on the right.

Tim Clites: For the border? [off mic] Yeah, for the side. I'm sorry.

Margaret Littleton: I said I think it will.

Tim Clites: It'll look all right. All right. Thank you. Any other comments? Then I move that we approve COA 25-12 with the following clarifications that the size of the sign be 24 inches square or less so that it doesn't overwhelm the bracket that it have a black border around framing the white field that is somewhere three quarters of an inch, plus or minus a quarter of an inch. So, between a half inch and an inch. And that the finish of the white and the black be a non-gloss finish.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Cindy Pearson: I can't get it to work aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Thank you. Motion passes. Thanks. Welcome to Town.

Mike McMillon: Can I ask a clarifying question?

Tim Clites: Absolutely.

Mike McMillon: Once those little things have been updated, Will do I should I send those to you, or we just assume that I'm going to do it in [inaudible]?

Tim Clites: Your graphic person probably has to provide that to you anyway. Have them shoot it to Will; it certainly doesn't hurt to have him take a three-minute glance at it.

Mike McMillon: Okay.

Tim Clites: If he has questions, he'll get back to you.

Mike McMillon: Okay.

Tim Clites: And I appreciate that extra step. Thank you.

Mike McMillon: Thank you for y'all's time. I really appreciate it.

Tim Clites: Welcome to Town.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Next item COA 25-15 (S 25-08) request of Shatabdi Sharma. Apologize if I said that wrong for projecting sign at 15 East Washington Street. The Shop Wall. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another new business. Welcome, Miss Sharma. Good to see you again. So, this is the existing space at 15 East Washington. Existing bracket on the building. The proposal is for this slightly less than six-square-foot sign to be hung from the existing bracket. You see the graphics here? The Pantone 2935 C is kind of a medium to medium dark blue. The same so that color is used for the border as well as the carved lettering. You have some secondary lettering that I believe is not carved but is thinner lettering in just black below on the white field. That's all I have.

Tim Clites: Thank you. You're welcome to come up and add anything you'd like before we discuss as a committee. Okay. We'll call on you if you have any questions. Thank you. Cindy?

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] down there.

Tim Clites: We'll get to her. Don't worry.

Cindy Pearson: Sorry. Welcome to Town. No, I think it. I don't see anything that our guidelines don't allow, so. I'm good.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Looks pretty straightforward to me. It's fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I just have a question, and maybe I'm overlooking this, but why is there a comma after shop?

Shatabdi Sharma: Oh, so.

Punkin Lee: Because it really shouldn't be.

Shatabdi Sharma: I don't think it should be a mistake. Thank you for pointing out eye contact with the vendor who is [inaudible] and I'll ask him to make the changes, but they should not be any harm. That's my trademark sign, actually.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Other than that, I think it's nice. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: I think it's very nice. And I agree with the little comma. And I went in your shop last week and it's darling, everyone should go. And I had no idea what the name was, so it was great now we know. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. I have no further comments if the committee has any additional comments. Otherwise, I'll entertain a motion.

Margaret Littleton: On this one. I would move to approve COA 25-15 S 20 no, it's five. No, it is S 25-08. Request of Shatabdi Sharma for projecting sign at 15 East Washington Street Shop Wall.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Welcome.

Tim Clites: All right. We're down to COA 25-16 (S 25-09). Request of Rachel Harshman for a projecting sign, wall sign, window signs, repainting awning at Seven West Washington Street, Grandeur Antiques. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a slightly more complex application. So, this subject property is the Middleburg Plaza Building. Which is inclusive of the space and. Sorry. Here we go. So, Middleburg Plaza building. But it includes this, the eastern space that was most recently occupied by the Another Blue Moon Shop. So, the proposal for the new business is to occupy that space, but also to occupy a separate space that is located within the plaza itself. So just set back under the stone archway and as I gather from the materials, the desire is to have some synergy between the two spaces, making them match. So, the desire is to put a sign, a wall sign on the face of the building that would basically point you in in both directions. And then at the Another Blue Moon space to the east to have a projecting sign and some window signage. And then with the space that would be back recessed under the stone archway to have some additional window signage in that space as well. I note in my report to you that there are some zoning concerns with the total amount of signage that is proposed. This building, as noted in the report, has been the subject of discussions of this committee in the past with the accumulation of signage on it. That accumulation has seemed to have lessened a little bit over the years. But with this application we did insist on having a complete inventory of the signage on the site. The subject property from East end to West End is 48 linear feet, which allows for a total combined sign allotment for the

entire property of 24ft². And depending on how you calculate the existing signage they are over that limit. And when I say depending on it, we do know that there is a mortgage sign for a business that is no longer located there that is proposed to be removed. There are also a couple of boxes on the wall that are used for differing purposes depending on how those are being used right now. They may or may not count as sign area. But even if we were to exclude those what are referred to as directory boxes in this inventory. So, if we were to exclude those, if we were to exclude the mortgage sign, they would still they would be under the allotment currently if those were excluded. And again, I'm going to have to go out and take a look at how these boxes are being used. But it would still be they would still only have a little more than six square feet of allotment for the total property remaining. This application before you proposes over 18 square foot and signage to be added to the property that could not be permitted under zoning regulations. So, we did not have the benefit of this inventory until this incoming submission. So, I've not had the chance to circle back until immediately before the meeting. With the sign contractor. But as it stands, there's no path forward this evening for you to approve signage for the property. Because the requested amount again, it's about three times what the actual remaining allotment would be. So that's one area to discuss is the proposed signage. Also involved with this application is repainting and the addition of an awning to the eastern space and the replacement of an awning under the western recess space. So, as you see here today the existing eastern storefront has the framing here set in to the stone facade of the building. There is an amount of black paint incorporated into this space, which includes the framing around the glass door, the framing around all of the other glass spaces, including the transom window above as well as the main storefront window and some black trim above. But everything else here that you see in kind of the off-white color is now proposed to be painted in black as well with this application. As far as the recessed space here you see that it is currently framed. The glass areas are framed in this kind of medium-to-medium dark stain. All of that would be proposed to be painted black as well. You heard a public comment about the application of black. It is something that has been discussed in this committee recently. The desire for some newer businesses to want to have a more modern look but within the confines of our historic district. And the committee has expressed some concerns related to that. We've given you the citation of a couple guidelines within the staff memo that may be helpful in your deliberation when it comes to considering the request to add more of that weight of black paint along the storefront spaces on Washington Street. And then finally the application proposes to again add awnings for the space that is recessed here. There's Existing red awning around. My understanding is that the frame would remain and just the covering would be replaced in black with gold stripes. I had to go to the other. Sorry. So here is kind of just a mockup showing the black. Now, this doesn't have the this gives a little better view from the one direction of how it might look with the black paint on the framing, as well as the black awning with gold stripes. Again, this is the recess space where there's an existing red awning. On the eastern space back to shop one. This is kind of the mockup of what this would look like. Of course, when they prepare these graphics what is darkened in the glass here is not actually supposed to be darkened. They're just doing that for effect to show, to help the window lettering standoff. But again, this is showing where the awning would be proposed to be placed. There are some guidelines regarding awnings in there as well. We don't delve in the report much into the proposed color, because that kind of it's more relative to the color of the building, which I think you'll have some discussion of. We do ask for some clarification on the material for the awning. It is not specified in the application. Of course, we're looking for a cloth awning as opposed to kind of the shiny, plasticky kind that we get. I think that is assumed that that is what they're proposing. But we would want the applicant to clarify the material for the proposed awning. That's kind of the framework of it again it's signage. It is repainting and it's the awnings that are for your consideration. But as we discussed we would ask that you take no action on signage this evening because that is going to have to be brought into compliance with zoning standards before you can consider that.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Is there anyone here from the applicant that would like to add additional comments?

Nicole Madden: This is Nicole from Quail Run Signs and I sent you again this evening. I currently don't have any outstanding comments so far. Do you want to?

Rachel Harshman: Well, I just I'm Rachel. I'm the owner of Grandeur Antiques. It is a historic black color. It's been traditionally used in multiple historic buildings. And with the awning, it is. This is it? So, it's like a cloth with a nice gold. And then there's also the gold lettering, which is also a very traditional look for a lot of, you know, historic buildings. And we're antique, so we want to look old. So, I don't feel that it looks modern. And we're not trying to look modern at all. You know, definitely more traditional. Kind of like an old-fashioned look. Like the seal over here. You know, like, in the back, the black. You know, I think it kind of makes certain colors pop. And I think it would actually be a really nice I should say it would look really good. Stand out and be a positive thing, you know, for especially for the main street so. Have any questions?

Tim Clites: Thank you. And a sample of the awning. We appreciate that. And certainly, if you can pass that around while we're discussing that would be great. Thank you. All right. We'll give Cindy a break.

Nicole Madden: No. I guess whatever questions that the committee has, we'll just answer it as we go.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Maybe that'll work. Yeah. Because it sounds like.

Nicole Madden: I understand the complexity of this project. So, I think that's probably the best way to address everything.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Maybe while you're present, standing around signage. I do have one kind of conceptual question. The quantity is over because of the combination of signage on the glass and signage on the wall. Is that right? Let me ask the question differently. If there was some sense of urgency to getting the wall signs up. Does that fall within the maximum allowable? So that if we discussed that, they would at least I don't know what the timing is for the applicant, but they would at least have that option? And you don't I don't want to put you on the spot Will, you don't have to answer that before we start deliberating but.

Will Moore: Yeah. So, we have roughly a look. So again, this is dependent on how those two large community or directory boxes are being used. I will have to evaluate that if they are not being used in a way that counts toward the signage allotment. Let's assume that that's the case. I'll have to check if they're not being used in that manner then they have a little more than six square feet of allotment remaining currently. So that could mean that this projecting sign, which is three square feet, could go up. The wall sign that is proposed in between the two that would point one in each direction is also three-square feet. Those two signs could potentially be approved, assuming the use of those two box signs is not counted toward the allotment. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Understood. And that's something that we would not we would not be determining that you will determine that.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: So, we could subject our approval to your determination.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: If that.

Will Moore: Yes.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Will Moore: But yes.

Tim Clites: And I don't want to steer the committee because the committee may want to see all these pieces together before they approve signage. But I'm also aware when a business is trying to get started, signage is sometimes very helpful.

Will Moore: Understood. Yes, sir.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you for that clarification.

Nicole Madden: I would like to highlight that both Storefronts do have window graphics as well. So that way when people are driving by, they can see the storefront. If they do happen to miss both the projecting and the wall signs as well.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Okay. It's your turn.

Margaret Littleton: My turn. Okay. Well, I'll start with the signage. I think the whole building has too many signs on it personally. And it looks like they're just little fliers in those boxes so. And I, for me, I think on the glass shows up better when you're driving by. And I also like the hanging ones rather than on the wall, but that's just me. So, we'll decide about that later. I want to thank the public comment for coming forward because I totally agree with them. And I think, you know, this is a Historic Review Committee and Middleburg is ancient, 1700s. And we want to keep that sort of feeling. I feel that black is a very cold color. It's, you know, certainly handsome in some spaces, but not an entire building at all. And I think it's we had a previous application for it, and we toned it down to a dark green, which I think will be very pretty. And I would suggest going with the stone something warm, perhaps a coffee color, browns or that could be very elegant as well. Excuse me. And the other. What was the other question? The awnings. Right. You're facing north, which doesn't even require an awning, is just for looks, right?

Nicole Madden: I believe so it's both shop one and two look more similar to each other than pronounces that it is the same store, but in two locations. So, to help with that similarity.

Margaret Littleton: Right. Again, it's black and I think it feels good. At least it's, you know, the right it's cloth and canvas. But I just think for our town, we need something that is warmer feeling. And I like a contrast. I mean, to have total, total black and not have any beige or, you know, contrasting colors to kind of offsets that.

Nicole Madden: I understand the comments. There was actually a previous I don't want to say tenant, but business that has actually had an approved black awning before. So, I kind of just wonder, should this be considered separate and consideration of is this just a minor like detail or trim compared to painting a building in a solid color?

Margaret Littleton: Well, I think it should go with whatever color you paint you plan to have. It should be complementary. The awning color should be the complementary with the color of the new paint.

Nicole Madden: Okay, I understand that. Just in a previous again in a previous application, that was not the case.

Margaret Littleton: I don't remember that.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, let's make sure we as a committee, we're supposed to not have a dialog. We're you're supposed to give us your feedback, and we're supposed to get all of the feedback, and then that's all right. No problem. I'm not I don't want to be offensive to anybody but.

Megan Gallagher: Someone else's turn.

Tim Clites: So, we'd like your comments, and then we'll get everyone's comments, and then we can collect them. And then we'll probably have other questions. Right.

Margaret Littleton: Because I might come back.

Tim Clites: It's kind of a complicated. Yeah, it's complicated. We've got three distinctly different things to discuss. So, thank you, Margaret, for your initial comments. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think the awning fabric, no matter what color it comes to, that's definitely the right material. So, thank you for that. When you stand across the street and look down from the corner down, I mean the Thomas & Talbot building is dark green, but then the next has black, the next has black. This one's black. There's more black on around the Byrne part on there. To me, it's not as appealing as if you broke the black with something that worked. A rich color in the browns with the stone would set it off than more just black, black, black as you look down that whole side of the block. I think the stone is so pretty. So why not take advantage even though the black is a historic color. I mean, I get that. I just think in this background of the stone that you could pick something that would complement the stone. Pop your building out as looking totally different rather than more black as you march down that side of the street. And as we know, the signage needs to be worked on, so no use discussing that. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Even though black is a historic color, which is true, I think this is overkill. I think it's too much black, and it makes it way too dark. Frankly, I don't think it's welcoming to bring people in. And then my other concern is for the inside building or inside space. Let me go back to the pictures. The wood trim, I think, is very warm in there. And I think that to me it is much more appealing than painting it black. I think it's overkill. Frankly, I think blacks should be used as accent only and not as full space like that. And I agree with Margaret and Punkin with the warmness of the stone to do something complementary to that. I'm not going to address the signage because I think that that'll come later.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I'm going to read a little bit from our guidelines, and the one section is that the Historic District. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Can you turn on your mic, Cindy?

Cindy Pearson: Sorry. That would be nice. I'm going to read this from our guidelines. Protect and promote the historical character of the town's traditional commercial core and historic neighborhoods while ensuring future growth conforms to local design themes. And as per our guidelines, black is not an appropriate color as a primary color on a building in the Historic District. We have guidelines that states select a color scheme appropriate to the period in which your building was constructed and then is generally compatible and with adjacent structures. Black is a primary color; it is not a color scheme. I think I just read that before. Yes. No. Here we go. Black is a primary color, not a color scheme appropriate to the period in which any building in our Historic District was built. It's a very modern treatment. They may have its place in other environments, but not here in the Middleburg Historic District. And in saying that also, I know we all have our different visions when you look at something, but if you're across the street and you look like you're looking into your building, it looks more like a cave. It doesn't look somewhere that's inviting and wants people to come into with it being as dark as it's going to be. So, I would just consider coming, as maybe Margaret has suggested, maybe, maybe even going lighter and brighter and inviting. You know, I am not a color expert, but I can tell you it does kind of look cave-ish. As for the signs. The sign itself is a nice-looking sign, but we have to, you know, know about the other signs on the building and what can come down to make room for it. And what else was it?

Sorry. Pardon? [off mic] Awnings? Yes. And the awning should then complement what other color that is approved. That's all I have right now.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'll just go back to what this building used to look like signage wise, I think it has come a long way. And so, I think that's a testament to people that have been on this committee that are no longer here and people that are still on this committee that were here when that effort started. So, thank you to those people. I think that was before my time. But I do remember at one point it looking like yeah, yard sale collection of signs. So, it does seem to be fewer signs and better controlled in terms of the actual physical sign plaques that were presented, I would just say that if they met the ordinance, I don't have any I don't have any issue with them. I think they're I say I'm sorry in terms of the actual signs that single sided and double-sided signs, I don't have an issue with the design of them. The balance of the soft background with the dark colors and the gold accent. I think it's a pretty sign. So, if it meets the ordinance for quantity of signage, I don't think we would have an issue with that sign, or more than one of those signs, as the case may be, and the building may support. We do have some buildings that have signage in the glass, and I think that's a decision that, you know, the applicant you'll have to make, because unfortunately, the building will hamstring you with a certain limit to the total amount of signage. And because that's a zoning requirement, there's really no leeway. Even if we love it, we can't say we love it. So, you can do it because zoning is very much count the beans, count the square footage, and doesn't give us the authority to overstep that limit. So that's why, just to be clear, that's why we can't vote on this tonight unless there's some sense of urgency to getting a sign up if your business is up and running or needs to be up and running, we could consider the signage that would stay within the limits, subject to Mr. Moore confirming how the directory boxes are used. My comments on the awning are actually because there's an awning. The red awning, I don't think is particularly appealing, but I understand the desire to connect the two storefronts if it's the same business. And I think that actually could be a nice way to do that. So I personally like the idea of I would have to agree without suggesting color scheme that when you step back and look at the whole street facade from the red light down to this building, there is an awful lot of black already on that facade. So I think some other color scheme, whether that includes wood or not, means leaving the wood the way it is, I think should could be up to the applicant to really suggest a scheme that either builds on the richness of the wood or decides to get rid of it with a color scheme more compatible. I think the significance of the building is its stone. Obviously, it's the whole building. And so, in that regard, there's really very little place in this building for color. And so, it is a sensitive thing unlike even some of the buildings adjacent to it where you can see on the street facade maybe it was an accent color. But with a, you know, the Knead Wine has a lot of light contrast to it, the next building. And we could critique all of them. But essentially there's the language of the building really helps understand what the appropriate amount of black as an accent or dark color is, so I don't know if I'm adding much to the conversation for the committee, it feels like if I'm piecing together everything I heard, the committee would like to see another color scheme that's more compatible with the stone in the building. And so, if that's going to be our request we ought to be clear about not the color. It's not our job to pick the color, but the kinds of things that we would be looking at. And I think you've mentioned some of them, the streetscape adjacency to other buildings and the stone seem to be the couple of things that I heard consistently from the committee. So, is there anything to add to that from the committee? Okay. I'll just ask the applicant is there any urgency on any of this vis-a-vis your business? We like to be sensitive to the fact that businesses have needs. And this may obviously take another meeting. But is there any urgency to having some signage up now?

Rachel Harshman: Well, so I do need to do, like you know, some interior things. And there's some things that I'm going to probably have to go into the office and discuss with you guys about. So, I'd like to be open by September is my goal. I understand, even though I love the black you guys don't love the black. So, we'll come to some sort of happy medium right? You know, I'll go back and look at the stone. Maybe, you know, pick something that's going to bring out the stone. But I really do want an awning. I feel like the awning and the matching awnings really, I think there would make it, you know, be very inviting for people to come in. And of course, the gold lettering I think is very important as well on the windows because, you know, people want to see what's in there. And they again, I feel like that, you know, helps bring people into. So those are kind of like the big things I really wanted, you know, for the

shops because we're doing. Yeah, two different things. Like one side is going to be, you know furniture, you know, antique furniture and smalls and art. And the other side is going to be like designer vintage and some jewelry, you know? So, we're just going to kind of, you know, balance it, you know, just like that. And mainly because I really needed a bigger square footage to put everything in that I wanted to do. But of course, with all this, you know, smaller historic buildings.

Tim Clites: Right, there's no such thing.

Rachel Harshman: There's no such thing. So, I'm trying to create this. So, I'm trying to create something, you know, really nice. And especially it's on the main street. So, I want it to be beautiful, you know, so people drive by and go, wow, you know.

Tim Clites: Well, and we do too. And we appreciate your efforts in that. And we also so let me just take a little straw poll. Is there any objection to awnings? No.

Punkin Lee: I think the two awnings are very nice. I mean, it's kind of like a subconscious connection you know, without more signage.

Rachel Harshman: Right.

Margaret Littleton: When the color changes. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Well, and but when it's consistent with your color scheme. Right. Like, you'll have to figure that out. So, is it that exact awning or not? I mean, come up with a color scheme and I. Yeah and then.

Rachel Harshman: Let me go. Yeah. I'll go back and look at colors and then maybe we, I can bring a couple. We can all decide on one.

Tim Clites: Yeah. You certainly are welcome to do that. Show a couple of schemes for sure. Yes Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic]

Tim Clites: Turn your mic on.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. I'm having a bad time with that tonight. Sorry. Oh, that's all right.

Rachel Harshman: Yeah, that's already been there.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Thank you.

Rachel Harshman: Yeah. And it works.

Tim Clites: Okay awnings.

Rachel Harshman: And it's pretty.

Tim Clites: And it works. It was pretty. Awning was your one question, and then I'm just going to ask the committee. We do have other glass that is painted lettering in the glass. There's no resistance. Is there or is there any issue with that? No. So that's just a decision about the quantity of signage you're allowed.

Rachel Harshman: Okay.

Tim Clites: So, if that's your preference, because it's kind of more enticing and pedestrian to bring people in and look through the glass. Work with your sign consultant and we're certainly open to that as well. Yeah. All right.

Rachel Harshman: She's wonderful. Yeah. Very organized. Nicole puts everything together.

Tim Clites: They help us with a lot of signs as well. So, we appreciate good, good sign people are very important to us.

Rachel Harshman: Charlie wanted to say something.

Tim Clites: Okay. For sure.

Charles Carroll: So, I suppose the big question is really the signage. It's not as black and white as the paint color. So, the if Rachel wasn't putting in her business in the middle section, there'd be another business there replacing the sign that McInerney had. I understand that how your calculation I don't understand how you do the calculations based on just the street frontage or the side street as well, or the square footage of a building or a number of businesses in a building?

Will Moore: It's based on the frontage only. So, the 48ft frontage that you have on Washington Street gives you your allotment.

Charles Carroll: Yeah. So, there's no consideration for multiple business buildings.

Will Moore: There is not.

Charles Carroll: There's no like, oh, if you have a business in Middleburg, you can have a sign with a bare minimum frontage, even if you don't.

Will Moore: Yeah. The allotments are laid out in the zoning ordinance and it's.

Charles Carroll: Right. So, should there be?

Will Moore: I'm sorry.

Charles Carroll: This is a question, you know, because, like, there's.

Tim Clites: To interrupt. I think the answer to that question is some other building owners have. Am I on? Have tried to address the buildings across from the post office have a collection of tenants in them, and they do kind of a building sign, if you will that then allows those tenants to come and go and add kind of an it's kind of an almost a wayfinding sign. And I think there's I don't remember it seems like there's another building or two in town that is big enough with multiple tenants that that takes place. And I think this building is a perfect candidate for that as a way to make sure everyone has the opportunity for some signage, it would require working with a consultant. And unfortunately, depending on where you're at in your total, it may require renegotiating the number of signs that some existing tenants have, which is probably no landlord's favorite thing to do. Right. But essentially, am I saying that right, Will? That's what we've seen on other buildings is more of a building holistic sign package and a little more control over than how much signage each tenant can have.

Charles Carroll: So basically, you're saying you won't approve any signage unless what? Are they?

Will Moore: They cannot. It's not that they won't. They cannot.

Charles Carroll: Because of the confines of the zoning.

Will Moore: Zoning. Correct yes, sir.

Charles Carroll: Yes, sir.

Tim Clites: It's not a historic. Unfortunately for us, we can love all this signage if it's over the allotment. We don't have the authority to approve.

Charles Carroll: Even though you're just replacing the signs that were there before.

Tim Clites: But if there Will can speak to that. If it's over the allotment.

Charles Carroll: I'm just curious.

Will Moore: Yeah, over. The allotment is. Yeah. So Yeah. [off mic]

Charles Carroll: So even if there was a sign there before, you can't replace it.

Will Moore: Correct.

Margaret Littleton: So, nothing's grandfathered in, is what? Right. Since the building's been there a long time. The signs have been there a long time.

Will Moore: Right? So, if you're over the allotment currently. And that again, depends on how the existing box signs are being used. We would not force you to take down any signs, but that limits your ability to put new ones up. So. Correct? Correct. It is not under the purview of the committee here, though.

Charles Carroll: It's not what?

Virginia Jenkins: I was asking. To make sure it's not under our purview. Okay. We can't make that decision that's under the zoning, right?

Charles Carroll: So, it's going to be something that we have to work with you, Will, over the total amount of signage.

Will Moore: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

Charles Carroll: Exactly. Okay. So, it's not something that's getting stamped on here now that you have to take all the signs back and everyone has to remake their signs or anything like that.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: We're not asking you to change anything tonight. But yes, you certainly could sit down with Will, and he can walk through the potential process or to option or to about how to address that.

Will Moore: Yeah. It's tricky. It's tricky for owners of multi-tenant buildings because you have, you're trying not only to satisfy your potential tenants, but you have to keep in mind that the amount of sign that you allow one particular tenant to do could then affect a future tenant. So not to call out anybody in particular, but you have one tenant in particular now who has three signs that are using more than 50% of the allotment for the entire building. So that gets a little tricky.

Charles Carroll: But those actual signs have been there.

Will Moore: And they have, and they can remain. But it hampers the ability for additional signs.

Charles Carroll: Right. Because the zoning has changed.

Will Moore: No, actually, zoning is I think somewhere along the line signs were added to this building without careful analysis of whether they should have been or not. And again, we're not going to come and tell you, you have to take those down, but it does limit the ability to add.

Charles Carroll: So, as people have been going out of business. It's just [inaudible] here.

Will Moore: Yes, sir. All right. Yes, sir.

Charles Carroll: All right. Oh, okay. Let's do that.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Thank you. Thanks for the questions. We appreciate them. Yes.

Nicole Madden: I'm not sure if they'll answer anything, but I do have approximate dates as to when the existing signs were approved from the committee. And if that is before or after the new zoning got put in place. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: You can review that with Will, again, we won't be able to change that, but he certainly can, and he would appreciate that I'm sure, for the record. So, thank you. All right. So, Will do we need to do anything? Can we just defer this?

Will Moore: You can. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Because I don't see any reason to take action and deny it. That certainly is the intent is that you all will they'll work on it and come back.

Will Moore: Yeah. It sounds like they're amenable to relooking at the colors and things. So, I would recommend a motion to table. Yep.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, I'm going to move that we table this application until next month. Yeah. [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: That should give you enough time to get everything approved [off mic]

Tim Clites: Yep. Great. Awesome. So that's the motion.

Cindy Pearson: I'll second that motion.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any oppose? Any abstain? Thank you. We'll look to see you next month. Okay. All right. I guess we're up to COA 25-17 (S 25-10). Request of Loudon Market for a freestanding sign, window sign, awnings, awning sign, light fixture and repainting at 207 West Washington Street. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a proposal for the new owners and new business of the former distillery building at 207 West Washington Street. A few elements here. In many respects, similar to your last application involves proposal for signage proposal for repainting proposal for awnings. It also includes some light fixtures and hardware as well, for your consideration. You have my memo. I won't belabor the black discussion other than to say you know, we have the three former garage bays with elements of wood surrounding them, all of which would be painted black. I did not highlight it in my

memo. It's a little bit, maybe inconsequential, but the previous overhead door in the center that is behind the framing of the door and windows that were put in that is proposed to be removed in conjunction with this application. But again, all three of those former garage or garage bay openings would be painted black. The entirety of the western stucco portion of the building, as well as the window framing door framing is proposed to be painted as black as well. There are some elements on site. We don't necessarily have the best pictures of them, but just beyond the patio area here to the western side of the building, there is a raised bed. It sits almost street level along the Plains Road but drops down here. It has a, like, a wooden retaining wall that frames in that bed. It would be proposed to be painted black as well. The freestanding sign out front. I don't have an existing picture, but it's just a weathered wood. It would be proposed to be painted black. And then a fence that separates the subject property from brick and mortar to the east, I think I mistakenly wrote that it would be painted black in the memo, but it would be stained a dark espresso stain of not painted black. So those are the elements of the color. Each garage bay opening would have a fabric awning installed above it. The center one would have an awning sign with the Loudon Market nomenclature as well as the logo in the middle. There would also be signage on one window. I don't believe this graphic is accurate. I think this shows it a little larger than it actually would be, I believe from the materials that this graphic is a little more accurate in the proportions of that window sign. Again, this one showed a much larger there's an additional graphic of it here which shows it, I think better in proportion to the window. So don't be thrown by that one graphic where it takes up the entirety of that windowpane. So, and then again, the freestanding sign this would be made from Extira, which is the common material that you see from this sign contractor. It's been widely accepted here carved and painted. Won't comment on the color. I think you'll, you know, obviously, there's some synergy planned there with the building so that depending on how the discussion of the building color goes that may decide on whether the proposal for the sign in the same color scheme would remain. And then finally, with regard to the light fixtures and hardware, I'll point out that they're all proposed in brass. The wall fixture. Bring up that graphic. Sorry to keep jumping around. This fixture would not comply with our outdoor lighting standards requirements because the bulbs here would be exposed. Reminder that any new fixtures in town, the bulb, the light source has to be completely hooded and shielded. So, in a, in a fixture of this arrangement, the light source would actually have to be within the upper portion of here so that it could not be seen at a horizontal level. It's a little unclear, although as I look more at some of the other graphics, it looks like the gooseneck fixture might also have an exposed bulb. If you look in the bottom right of this graphic, it shows what appears to be a bulb. Underneath the canopy of the fixture. And then in these drawings as well, it shows something similar. So, if the bulb were to be recessed completely within this hood, it would meet the standards. But if the bulb would extend below this horizontal plane this fixture could not be approved either, because it would not meet those outdoor lighting standards. So those are the different elements. Again, the biggest potential discussion point to start with might be the color and then take it from there with the other elements would be my suggestion.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And we have someone here for the applicant.

Sara Tyndell: Hi, I'm Sara Tyndell. I'm the owner of Loudoun Market. And so, I'm one of the black sheep I think that came in today. [laughter] I promise we didn't even coordinate on this. It was like happenstance.

Nicole Madden: And we also shared fabric.

Sara Tyndell: Yeah. So, the fabric that I brought was one that we had considered that she used anyway. So, the point being that first of all, we are not stuck on anything. We're just happy to be a part of the town. We're happy to hear your feedback. We're happy to hear from the ladies who came in the town that they have a heart for, you know, Middleburg and more than anything, we want to come in and we want to meet a few goals. And one is to stay consistent with our brand. But in addition to that is to stay consistent with the vision that you all have for Middleburg. Because we want to be here for a long time, and we want it to be something that you guys can be proud of. So that being said, we welcome all the feedback. We're grateful for the feedback. And we're anxious to kind of make a decision on something at the same time moving forward so that we can actually get our doors open in Middleburg and start making some money

to pay for it all. So, you know it's the balance of all of that. So, a few, I guess, a few things that that Will mentioned, Mr. Moore mentioned that I did want to clarify. One was on the all of the wood that was for the retaining wall, as well as holding the support for the sign and the wood that is already the divider between all of that is meant to be stained in a dark stain, which would be consistent. The espresso was what I had pulled previously because we'd used that before, but it should look consistent to what is already there. It would just be freshening it up and making them all look the same versus looking weathered so for that one. For the feedback on the fixtures, I appreciate that I may have some questions later about understanding exactly what the exposed bulb issue is and how that works and looks. And so, let's see if there was something else. We did have an alternative color that we. Yeah. I'll be honest with you. So, a few things too. When we started looking at how to do this, we the way the building originally is or the way it looks now, driving up to it, I see a little bit that it's easy to perceive that it's two separate spaces. There's nothing that joins the two of them, whether it's the molding around the windows. It's silver on this side. It's yellow on this side. This is stucco. This is brick. We debated really going back to that original picture from when the building was built around 1950, it was solidly white. And so, one of the revisions that we did, we went white with it. I showed it to actually to my daughter, who used to work at the bookstore in Middleburg. She's actually a college student, and she said that it didn't have enough Middleburg in it. So, we came back, decided to keep the brick, and we went through a few revisions. I think with the dark color, black is obviously a black and white are our main colors for our brand, with some accents of kind of a goldy color or an olive-green color. So those would be on brand for us. I think that going dark on the stucco side, I've played with it going with a lighter color it because their main entrance, we're a retail shop first a cafe would be second would be a supplemental to our brand. It brought a lot of attention to that side. I have another [off mic]. So, this was the photo. So that is a historic color from Sherwin-Williams. Okay.

Nicole Madden: [off mic]. Is another option that is very similar.

Punkin Lee: That's the one for the concrete for the stucco. [off mic]

Sara Tyndell: I kind of liked the green. But I'm open to options. I'm open to ideas. I'm open to questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Lots of work. Yeah. I appreciate all the feedback and input. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. Okay. First of all, I compliment you on the facade. I think it looks great, except for the black. And It's funny, I picked gray, but I think I don't know what color that is that you've chosen. It's more of a green, but I think it should be lighter. And I agree with you. It should, you know, sort of all match. Meaning the corner. The stucco part should be one color and the it looks like the doors are the same color. Sorry. This and this are the same color? So that and that.

Sara Tyndell: No, they're not actually pulled in some color. So, you could do a color match. It looks different on the computers.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah, Totally.

Sara Tyndell: So, this is the tricorn black on the. [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: Oh, you still want black here, right?

Sara Tyndell: And then this was the.

Margaret Littleton: Well, it's there. It's very dark. Very dark. Right. My comment was it should still be lighter and more friendly. And across the street we have that beautiful community center. But I like how you have, you know, it looks. I love your flower boxes. If you do them still. And a great entrance. I had a

pop-up shop in this building, and I loved it. It's a wonderful building and it will do well. And I think, you know, people come to Middleburg on the weekends and all week as well, but mostly the weekends do eat and there will be no problem getting them in your door at all. I just feel they should be a lighter color and, but I think your design is lovely.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I thank you for being open to changing the color from so much black. A lot warmer and a lot more welcoming. It would seem so it would not look so much like two separate things that that color should maybe go a little in with the brick side just to. So, it doesn't look like two different businesses, even though you I mean, you got your logo on the stucco part, but still the color is not picked up on the larger part. So that would be my comment, but I think you all are heading in the right direction for sure. And welcome.

Sara Tyndell: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I like the basic concept, you know, with the flower boxes and it makes it much more cohesive. And I really think that's terrific. Again, the black awnings and the black facade, and I think that bronze colored that as an alternative, I think that still is a little dark. If you look at the Sherwin Williams painting above. Margaret, you take a look at it too, above the bronze color that they picked out. There's a lighter, almost sager gray green.

Sara Tyndell: Just for reference. That's bungalow house gray.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, that might be light enough. But any, you know, any kind of sage green or something like that, I think would be gorgeous. And if you wanted to have the awnings a slightly darker color, I don't know. You know, that's. But the whole cohesiveness of this building. I think you've done a great job. But the colors are still too dark, and I don't understand the whole signage thing. What you're saying about the signage was there.

Tim Clites: There's no signage issue on this application. Okay. Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Well, after I pulled the knife out of my heart because the gas station in my I had an uncle that ran it for years. It was Burns Robertson who ran the BP station for years. Yeah. And then my brother Charlie Craun ran it for years. So, after I'd do that, I'll throw it aside and say, this looks really good. It's amazing how you can turn a building around with just some paint and change the windows, or however you're going to do that. I do totally have to agree, though the black is you heard it all before. I won't go there again. And this having the black like that with the brick reminds me more of the buildings when you're in Leesburg. And you take a left on that off of Catoctin, where the Atlantic Union is, and go that street where they build all those new buildings. Kind of reminds you of that, that you're trying to make Middlebrook look like that, adding the black and making it look more, and I don't know, a word to use modern, I guess, is what I'm trying to use. You know, we'd like to keep it in the historic part and make it look more historic there. And it is a great place. And we are, I'm excited that you're going to be there, as you've heard everybody else say the same thing and just as you're leaving, do you go east or west or north or south when you leave? [off mic] Oh, okay. So, when you're going out of town tonight, right as you go around the turn, the brick house that's on the left. So, it's the gas station, then there's townhouses and there's a house. Chris Hersh. Yeah. Look at their house. They had the same problem with the lights, and they had to put some sort of.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, by the front door.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, right by the front doors. Just take a look over there. And yeah, they actually, I made those somehow had someone make them. Yeah. Yeah. So, they could use the lantern type thing. But anyway, thank you. And I'm glad, you know. Can't wait to see what happens here. Thank you.

Tim Clites: My, I have a couple of comments, and then I do have a question for the committee. Just kind of dive into this rendering that you just presented to us tonight, because I think it's it sounds like from the committee, it's headed in a direction that feels more consistent with what we would, I don't want to say they expect but what we would feel compatible with the district in the building. I think that aluminum storefront is awful. So, I'm glad that you're willing to try to do something with that because it's always been for me. And that part of the building is just simple, and I'm okay with simple. But there's something about the milled aluminum that's just so. Thank you for addressing that as part of this scheme. I think the consistency of whatever that color is with the doors is, a really positive thing. Because you're right, it's got a lot it's got a lot of busy things going on. I'm glad you didn't come wanting to paint the building white. Just a little background. Brick & Mortar came and to get their building painted white, and there was a long, I wouldn't say contentious discussion, but the committee was very much divided, like down the middle. And after a long, long discussion, I believe they got approval to paint the front white. And they left, and the owner and the tenant said, you know, maybe we shouldn't paint it white. Maybe we'll just paint the sign on the building white. And I have to say, it's one of my favorite. Like, we didn't even think of that as a committee. But they came back and said, we understand that there was such a division in the committee that we just thought maybe we should reconsider our guidelines, actually recommend not painting historic brick, even if it's not beautiful that we not paint it. So, you didn't miss anything there. I think it's something you can work with, and you know, mortar is not really, like anybody's favorite color, but it does the red in the mortar give you a texture, I think, to play off of for the stucco color. I don't you shouldn't take from the committee that any of us has actually picked a color. You should feel at liberty to pick a scheme. I think what maybe when we pointed a deck. Just to be clear, I think we're talking about the value of that color. How light or dark is it? Not the color. So, I would think when I look at the printout, I know you intended for it to be the what's the black of the night? Tricon black. [off mic] Sherwin Williams I know that's what you intended it to be, but I see something that's kind of a softer gray, and I think those elements could still be dark relative to the other colors. But maybe not black but come up with the scheme. [off mic]

Sara Tyndell: Specifically, too.

Tim Clites: Around the doors and the windows. Yeah. I think that that could still, I think depending on what the color is, that could still be a darker color and be successful. And I'll let the committee nod whether they agree with that or not, just in concept. You can watch them while I talk if they're all nodding. [multiple speakers]

Sara Tyndell: All the faces.

Tim Clites: It's kind of its.

Sara Tyndell: Read them all.

Tim Clites: It's kind of 4 to 1 here. So, I, you know, try not to ever have one. The other question that I have for the committee, the light fixtures appear to be a brushed or burnished brass. And my sense is that that finish would not change over time. And so, if the committee's expecting a living finish, that's going to tarnish, we should. [off mic] You did unlacquered. That's your preference. Okay. So just the pictures are showing okay. Great. That would be great. We would likely prefer that. Will can work with you on the permissibility of the actual bulbs and the fixture. And there was one other thing I wanted to ask. Oh, and then the rendering appears to have a gold frame painted on the glass. Is that intentional?

Sara Tyndell: Yes. So that was potentially adding vinyl just to frame those out. Or I can't remember the French term for the gold [off mic] on the right.

Nicole Madden: Sort of similar to Middleburg Books. Similar to Middleburg Books.

Tim Clites: Right? Similar to Middleburg Books. I just want to make sure the committee has seen that.

Sara Tyndell: It's up on the screen now.

Tim Clites: Yeah, you can see it on. Margaret doesn't have a monitor. There you go. So before.

Sara Tyndell: And just to clarify, it was added and I'm flexible with that as well. But it was added to the cafe side and then only on the two entrance stores the retail side.

Tim Clites: Right. Got it.

Sara Tyndell: Try to tie that together so.

Tim Clites: So, I just I was really making sure the committee is aware of that. We're not going to vote tonight. So, I think you probably would just still want to see that with the new color scheme. Unless there's any specific comment tonight about that. Yeah. Okay. Are we in a group? Yes. Any other?

Margaret Littleton: The Inn at Little Washington was a gas station to begin with.

Sara Tyndell: Oh. That's something. [inaudible]

Tim Clites: That's awesome. Look how far they've come. Look how far they've come. Any other comments from the committee? If not, I move that we. Now, I forget the term defer table, that we table this until next month. Yes.

Nicole Madden: Would that include the signage as well?

Tim Clites: Do we have?

Margaret Littleton: We can't do the sign if we don't know what color you can make it.

Nicole Madden: So, you have signage on the awning, but you've also got the projecting sign on the freestanding cross arm post.

Tim Clites: Oh. I'm sorry. Thank you for bringing that to our attention.

Virginia Jenkins: So, do you want anything? I'm sorry. Would they want it back if they changed the other colors?

Sara Tyndell: So, I guess I would love to hear just some more feedback about the color options that you guys would feel comfortable with. I know you're saying to go lighter, but I just want to make sure that I'm both honoring my brands and kind of meeting y'all's goals at the same time.

Nicole Madden: I'm not trying to, I guess, overlap what you're saying, but white, black, and gold are your brand colors, right?

Sara Tyndell: Right. So, I guess accent a light accent of green that would be more of like an olive the kind of darker green.

Nicole Madden: Right. So, I guess just considering that as well.

Tim Clites: Right? Yes. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Before we get started on the comments, I just wanted to remind you, too, that this town is very dark in the winter, and it starts as soon as the time, you know, to see a black sign in the wintertime, you're not going to see it.

Sara Tyndell: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: So, you might want to drive in town one night and just look around when it's dark, dark and go, oh, that would really be not visible.

Sara Tyndell: [multiple speakers] in Aldie. I don't know if you've been by. It's where the new roundabout is. And I don't own that building, so I was limited with what we were able to spend on doing it. I did encourage him to paint the outside of it, and it is Sherwin-Williams Alabaster. So, a creamy color white. And then that sign we did end up doing with a white background so we could flip that as an option. And, you know, I probably like I'm curious, like, if we went with like, I had an agreeable is it Agreeable Grey or something beige? Something like that. That is a Sherwin-Williams color that is, you know, a creamier, almost a tan using something like that on the side. I didn't love it because then it makes the cafe side look like the star. And I didn't mean for that to be the star. But if we're leaving the brick, then, you know, just thinking about what the options are to stay on brand. And how to achieve, you know, something that would be a little more inviting for you guys.

Cindy Pearson: What roundabout, which one?

Sara Tyndell: Oh, it's the brand new one that's at Trailhead Drive.

Cindy Pearson: At Lena? Yeah. Where Hammer Down is.

Sara Tyndell: Yes, we are right beside Hammer Down.

Cindy Pearson: I haven't noticed. I go by there all the time.

Nicole Madden: I guess just adding a small side note. I haven't been across there at, at nighttime, but I haven't cropped in that further. But there is a street post right there with a lamp. There is a tree right there also. But I understand the feedback I appreciate.

Tim Clites: Let me ask you a question. Does it help for you to get your signage approved tonight, or would you rather come back with the whole package? Is there anything about your business?

Sara Tyndell: Yeah I think we come back when we come back, I just want to make sure that I leave here with enough kind of feedback from you guys that when I come back next time, that we really could wrap it up, you know, and have something to start working towards.

Tim Clites: I would think I'm not overstepping the committee by saying that if your scheme supported black signage the way it's presented, I would think we would approve that. We're not against black signs, per se, but we're we there does seem to be a growing hesitation to add more black on a big expanse of a facade. Okay. Does that help? I think so. Okay, cool.

Sara Tyndell: So next time, can I bring a few options?

Tim Clites: Absolutely. Yeah. Yeah, we love it. Just check so you don't bring this in. No. Just kidding. Yeah. [laughter]

Nicole Madden: No, they both picked that color. I had no influence, no influence whatsoever.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Well, that's how it goes. These things get popular, right? So, thank you very much. We're going to motion to defer till next month. Table.

Cindy Pearson: Do we need to do anything?

Tim Clites: Do we need to do anything else?

Virginia Jenkins: You want me to do that?

Tim Clites: I need a second.

Cindy Pearson: I'll second that motion. Sorry.

Tim Clites: All in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed, any abstain? All right. We'll see you next month. Thank you.

Nicole Madden: Thank you very much. Appreciate you.

Unknown Speaker: Could you break into a rendition [off mic]?

Tim Clites: Well, so to continue the fun, you're in charge.

Punkin Lee: So, are you ready to present? But we'll go to Will first for the comments, please.

Will Moore: Can you read the item title? You need the title.

Punkin Lee: All right. This is for COA 25-8. Request of Clites Architects for revisions to approve COA 25-08 for exterior changes at 200 West Washington Street. Diamondback Hospitality.

Margaret Littleton: 18 not 8.

Punkin Lee: Excuse me. COA 25-18.

Will Moore: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. So, this is for some minor revisions to the approved COA that was just a few months ago. We found when the zoning permit application package was submitted, that there were some inconsistencies with the approved COA. I think the one that jumped out at me first was, if you look at the what was called out as the existing front elevation here, it has a light pattern and the box windows or bay windows that has three lights across and each that was supposed to represent the existing configuration. Mr. Clites was clear in his presentation that the intention was to retain those windows as they exist. It just so happens that the way they were drawn is not actually the way they are configured. So, they are configured instead this is the now proposed elevation, but the configuration with four lights across is actually the existing configuration. So, there was a little bit of confusion, but because the approved elevations had the three lights across in those windows, we had to come back for that element. But there were some other kind of changes. So, the approved elevation for the new entryway vestibule that would be created on the Pickering Street side as you approach it from Washington Street, it showed a side light next to that door that has been now replaced with a pilasters instead. So that's a revision. There are some likewise changes on the east elevation. This was approved. This entry vestibule, which also shows three lights across, will be new construction, but it was drawn to match the quote unquote, existing front elevation. But now we know that the front elevation has four lights. So that configuration is now being revised here on the package before you. You'll also see there is kind of an

arrangement of different panels in what is being applied to the first level facade here. It's my understanding that some of those panels are not actually available in the dimensions that they are looking for. So there have been some revisions. So instead of having kind of this configuration north of the entry vestibule where you have the one narrow panel, this configuration that's a little more ornate between these columns and the two large ones. We now are proposed with this different arrangement of panels along there. Similar on the rear elevation. There's kind of an arrangement of the panels and columns. That is proposed to be revised. I think based on availability of materials. But Mr. Clites can clarify on that. So again, those are the primary changes that that staff noted in review of the zoning permit, which initiated this. There was also some gas lanterns that were called out on the zoning permit application. You had not seen any proposed lighting. We did not have that at the time of distribution of the packet, but Mr. Clites has dropped off. Both a visual of the proposed now proposed fixture, as well as the cut sheet, which would show that in reading this, it would comply with our outdoor lighting standards and that the lighting source would be completely concealed under the hood. So that's all I have Madam Chair.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Tim.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Tim Clites, 109 West. Tim Clites, 109 West Marshall Street. I apologize; I hate this thing. I apologize. We ironically took the documents from when this building was renovated before Market Salamander moved in, and I didn't even look at the light patterns. I just traced over them. I was so interested in this little configuration that we were working that it didn't register until we went out to create the construction documents that the panel on the window configuration was different. So that adjustment, the intent was always to keep, as Mr. Moore said, to keep the windows, the windows as they are, and then, in fact, to replicate that large center three tall, four-wide window in the vestibule. When we showed that in the vestibule, a couple things about the door and the side light, we thought it was better that we do a slightly wider door and get rid of the side light, just so it was easier for people to come and go. It's kind of a narrow sidewalk there. And so, it was really a decision around function. It seems a little less busy. So that seemed like a nice compromise or balance, if you will, of practical and the esthetics. And the little panels show the location of the light fixtures. So, there'd be three on the front. And then as you turn to go up Pickering's turn to go up Pickering Street, there would be two flanking the vestibule. And then there are lights up under the open porch that you won't see that recessed up into the ceiling. So, no decorative fixture hanging. And then as you get to the rear facade, under the porch flanking those doors, we have two more sconces. Color scheme, everything else is as it was reviewed in the last meeting. So, this is simply the configuration changes. And it does have to do with the maximum width of the ship that we're using to create the raised [inaudible]. You good? I'm done.

Punkin Lee: Good. Thank you.

Tim Clites: You're welcome.

Punkin Lee: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. When I'm looking at the south elevation approved before. And then go to for permit. What happens to the little half-moon window up top and the chimneys? Are they no longer there?

Tim Clites: No. They're that all is staying. We didn't draw that in the permit drawings. It all exist as it is. We're not going to touch it.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, okay. It just isn't here. I'm going by. Okay. And the east elevation. So, you are getting rid of a window or the double windows?

Tim Clites: We're not getting rid of those window that the window. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: Because it doesn't show on the east elevation for permit. You just have the panels.

Tim Clites: Right? We didn't add all. It's just everything in the roofline is to stay as it is.

Cindy Pearson: No, I mean, down on the first floor on that one.

Tim Clites: Oh. That. Yes. We're looking to close that window. It's a door now into the kitchen. That has kind of a false panel below it. We're looking to close that off completely and make it just part of the panel system.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. And this north elevation approved. Well, there's something there, but I can't pick it up right this second. Maybe not. Okay. One moment, please. Okay. And I guess the other question is, you wouldn't consider just going a little bit lighter on that green? [laughter]

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, stop.

Cindy Pearson: It is dark. It is the darkest green you can get before you say black. [off mic] Yeah, it is in my eyes. Sorry, I have to say it. That's all. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no issue with the changes you've made to the east elevation. It's the only one we're concerned with the east elevation. Right?

Tim Clites: They all have small changes that really reflect the current conditions.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no issues with any of them. And I also think this lantern is fine.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, that was it. [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: That's what you forgot.

Cindy Pearson: That's what I forgot.

Virginia Jenkins: That's it.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: On the lanterns, I think they're great. Is this just part of a drawing that isn't going to be there?

Tim Clites: Yes, that's part of. If you get a gas fixture, they have the little gas.

Cindy Pearson: That's what I thought.

Tim Clites: Well, that won't be there.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] You're burning incense all the time? No. I'm kidding. Okay.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I have no further comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: I thank you for coming back with the adjustments. And I have no comments. I think everything's going to look good. And I'm back to the color. I'm glad we got we're not discussing black that we've moved along for that. Thank you. Thank you all. And the light fixture I think looks very nice.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'll make a motion to approve COA 25-18 request of Clites Architects for revisions to approve COA 25-08 for exterior changes at 200 West Washington Street, Diamondback Hospitality.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Is there a second?

Margaret Littleton: Second?

Punkin Lee: All those approved.

All of Committee: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you all very much. [off mic]

Punkin Lee: Thank you. And we have Tim up again for COA 25-19 request of Clites Architects for a detached garage at 102 West Marshall Street. Will.

Will Moore: Thank you, Madam Chair. So, this is Mr. Dimos' property many of you are familiar with along West Marshall Street. The desire is to add this detached garage kind of in the back corner, directly in line with the existing driveway. So, this shows the proposed location. We just note from a zoning standpoint that its location and its size and height do meet all zoning standards. In terms of the design itself. You have you have the design here. It does have kind of this small, covered area before you get to the entry door as well as the carriage style garage doors along the front or south elevation. And then you see the side elevation here Proposed. There is lighting proposed, but similar to what we just discussed with the Diamondback. It would be recessed lighting so it would not be exposed for view. These are just some photos of the existing configuration of the property. The one in the top right will give you the best idea. Again, this is straight shot from the driveway, and the garage will be set in the back there. He's highlighted a number of things on the existing building that are essentially going to be matched on the new building. So, like the main home, the garage would be in stucco. It would have a standing seam metal roof. The trim would be smooth trim. It is proposed on the garage to be in Hardie Plank or another brand of cementitious material with the smooth finish, not with the one that mimics wood grain, which is always the committee's preference. Again, some details that they would be matching from the existing home on the garage, including the kind of the ornamentation of the base of the column the arrangement of the gutters and downspouts with the OG or the somewhat some people call it Kay style guttering, but the round downspouts windows indoors would match as well. And then there's a more detailed narrative that goes along with it. But essentially, it's picking up on everything. All of its design elements, color materials from the existing structure. It would be they would be attempting to match the paint and particularly the roof the best that they can. But the roof is slightly weathered at this point, so we'd anticipate the roof on the garage to be probably a little brighter, but they would match the colors the best they could as well. Other than that, I have nothing to add unless there are any questions.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Tim.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Tim Clites again, 109 West Marshall. I think the goal is really to have a simple little garage so that when the Dimos' are here, they have a place to pop out of the weather and really match the house that's there. And so, for that reason, we did just that and down to the, you know, little louver detail in the gable end and the stucco finish. The stucco does look like it was painted at one point. Meaning it's not a, you know, natural cement stucco with a color in it. Which helps bridge gaps and cracks in it. And the rest of the materials right down to the, you know, roof and the snowbirds, we would just match. The house it's actually fairly close to where this garage would go.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think you've done you know, it looks great with the existing building, and you've done everything properly. I have no comments except go ahead.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Sorry. As I'm looking at the windows that you put on the page that existing materials to match the one that's on the porch, the walk porch that's on the back side of the house, correct? Because you have an existing walk/porch. And then it's the window trim there. Is that different than the window? That's different than the window trim that's on the front of the house, correct?

Tim Clites: I think what you're seeing is no, I don't think it's different. I think what you're seeing is that it has a screen in it. And if you look at the center second story windows, they appear more bright just because the screen is not in front of them. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: There might be an explanation. Okay, okay. And the garage doors are facing out, which I get that you're doing. But, you know, that's one thing we have been trying to get not to happen.

Tim Clites: Right?

Cindy Pearson: It is. It's facing the street, right?

Tim Clites: It is facing the street. Yes.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. And so, I mean, he's got a lot of backyard. Wouldn't it be easier? This is just me wanting to drive into a garage that you'd have room to back up and then go out safely, whereas he's not going to have that much room to turn around. He's going to be backing up the driveway.

Tim Clites: That's a good point. Can we go to the site? And it's actually a commercial property. It doesn't show clip from the garage. If you were to back up and swing the tail of your car towards the building, all of that is parking. There's actually a handicapped space or an ADA accessible space right next to the sidewalk there. And then there's three more spaces below that. So, they're not it's not a building full of tenants or people going to work right now. And so, I think there's adequate space to back up and pull out.

Cindy Pearson: Okay, okay.

Tim Clites: And one of the reasons we didn't want to turn it and more into the backyard is that very reason. Then you pull up and back in and you'd either have to back in a, you know, 180-degree circle or somehow push the garage far enough behind the house to back up it. And there's a number of large trees in the rear yard. So, we did push the garage as far back as the zoning would allow us to for the property. So, it's right against the zoning setback both on the north and the west side.

Cindy Pearson: I mean, I get it that it's far enough back that you're really not going to.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] Yeah, it's really not a problem.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. You know, we're not right on the street like we've had a problem with some houses, but if there was a way, it would be great. But it seems like you guys have thought it through.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any issues with it. I think it's fine. I looked at it first and I thought, where's the light? And then I saw it was a recessed light, so that's all. Thanks.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you. I think because you go in the driveway and straight up to the garage, that little addition makes it much more interesting. It doesn't look like you're just driving up to a box with a door on it. And I appreciate that the guidelines were followed for matching material for the garage, to the house, and all the nice detail has a lot going on for a little garage and it looks great. So, thank you. Are there any other comments? Do I have a motion?

Virginia Jenkins: I'll make a motion to approve COA 25-18 request of Clites Architecture for revisions. Is that the right one?

Cindy Pearson: Nope. 19.

Punkin Lee: We're on the garage.

Virginia Jenkins: I've lost it. Hold on. Sorry. Make a motion to approve COA 25-19 request of Clites Architects for a detached garage at 102 West Marshall Street.

Punkin Lee: Is there a second?

Margaret Littleton: Second?

Punkin Lee: Thank you. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Opposed? Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. Tim. Which one's first? [off mic] Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right, we're up to COA RS 25-05, request of Castlerock Enterprises for a garage at 605 Martingale Ridge Drive Middleburg residences, lot 16. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: It's contagious, not pushing the button. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, lot 16 is a completed home is one that was constructed without a garage but showed a future location for a potential garage. So, we're now returning to revisit that. Just the one thing in this is the typical design that you've seen for or atypical design that you have seen for the one car garage in The Vineyards section. The one thing that's a little different from this application and there may be some interpretation from you for how this does or does not comply with the guidelines. So, this is the existing home, and it is the primary cladding all around is in the horizontal lap siding. The proposal is to have the garage in stucco. The guidelines for the Residences at Salamander, which is it is different. Just a reminder than your Historic District Guideline says materials for the detached garages shall be the same as the materials used on the main house. Now, it does not say it shall be the same as the primary cladding, necessarily. But again, that's an interpretation

what was that supposed to mean? But then further it says all garage details, materials, overhangs, finishes, colors, etc. shall match the house on which site it resides. So I point that out because with this particular application I didn't take, I should have taken a photo from the other side, but there is a stucco water table on this home, so the material proposed for the primary cladding for the garage is not the primary cladding on the home, but it is a material that's used on the home. So again, there's an interpretation factor of does that comply with the guideline, or is the intent that the primary cladding on the two should match? I say I should have taken it from a different angle, because it's a very short water table that you see on this side. But on the west side it's not one of the ones with the walkout, but it does have a great drop off where there's more stucco exposed on that side. In either case, the color would be painted the same to match that of the existing home. So again, this comes down to your interpretation on that guideline whether the intent was that the primary cladding on the garage should always match the primary cladding on the home.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Gretchen.

Gretchen Yahn: Gretchen Yahn Castlerock Enterprises. On this lot 16 this client, you know, has come in and asked for a garage. With respect to the comment that was made about the cladding. We do have an example of a similar scenario of this on and after the fact garage on lot number 14 as well. That house has primary cladding is cedar shake, with it is a walkout as opposed to a view out which this is, but it also does have stucco as the water table effect on the predominant side and that wall area. Just in that lot number 14 has cedar shake on the entire box. There's no cedar shake and stucco. It's cedar shake with the water table effect in stucco. So just as a point we do have one already out there like that. So just not that it's right or wrong. I'm just saying it's already out there.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: So, I'm looking at the photo of the house as it sits now that Will took or whoever took. Is the garage on this side? It's not on the other side where the water table shows more.

Gretchen Yahn: That is correct. And that's the same on 14. It's the same scenario.

Cindy Pearson: You know, I just have to go back to the what Will read, which I had noted to you know, matching the house in which the site resides. So, you know, it's one of those. You know, you approve it for one, you have 49 houses going in or however many is there going to be each and every. Well, no, because some already come with a garage. But you know, you're going to have these repeatedly come back with different materials. So, it's kind of like, you know, here we go, kind of. Yes. Anyway, we'll just need to think about that a little more. So.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Probably not my business, but is there a reason that it was stucco as opposed to?

Gretchen Yahn: It's a cost difference?

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Understandable. [inaudible]. The whole garage is stucco, right?

Gretchen Yahn: That is correct.

Virginia Jenkins: You know, I'm sort of siding with Cindy on this. You know, it sort of opens up. It could possibly can of worms because, you know, once you start down that process, somebody else is going to want to do the same thing. And it's not really within the framework of what the guidelines were originally. So, I'm a little concerned in that regard. Not quality or for any other reason.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Following the guidelines in with this particular exterior finish, I would think matching the house in this instance would be better and be more appropriate.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: My exact opinion is that it should be siding and not stucco.

Tim Clites: It's turned on.

Margaret Littleton: I think it should follow the rules and be the same as the house.

Tim Clites: Okay. And you think that's going to be a significant problem for the owner?

Gretchen Yahn: No, I mean, I can tell him it could be that. I mean, I just think that they're going to point over to 14, which is what she was just saying I just need this garage. And, you know at the base cost. And I said, okay. We'll go from there. So, I'm just going to have to go back to her to. So, if you want siding, we'll put siding.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay. Yeah. I'm just trying to think back to working through that. I didn't read the whole guideline for this neighborhood, but as I remember, there was this wanting to have from lot to lot the color and or the material changed. But there were things that wanted to be consistent. And I think the material between the garage and the house was one of those. And then there were things that wanted to specifically change from lot to lot. So, I think the risk that we run into them is you get. On this case, a clapboard house with a stucco garage next to a stucco garage and a stucco house and next to it. Right. And suddenly every you know, we instead of having a consistency per lot, we start to get more of inconsistent. So, I would agree with that. Is someone would like to make a motion if there's no further comments.

Margaret Littleton: I'll make a motion for COA-RS 25-05 request of Castlerock Enterprises, a garage at 605 Martingale Ridge Drive, Middleburg. And that we suggest that they keep the exterior of the garage the same fabric as the main house.

Tim Clites: To be clear you're not suggesting that we're.

Margaret Littleton: Where we want it.

Tim Clites: We are approving.

Margaret Littleton: Approving it. Thank you. I'm so tired.

Tim Clites: The clapboard to match the house. Is that your motion?

Margaret Littleton: [multiple speakers] Yes. Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: Okay, I'll second that. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Gretchen Yahn: So, Will, just so I'm clear. We will, I'm not going to submit again the same garage with the siding. I'm just going to do this garage with the siding.

Will Moore: That's fine.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. I just want to make sure it's conditioned upon that.

Will Moore: You don't need to redraw.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. I just want to make sure.

Will Moore: Yes. Correct.

Tim Clites: Yeah. The garage. Yes. Thank you for clarifying, Gretchen. But. Yeah, that's fine. COA RS 25-06 request of Gretchen Yahn for revisions to an already approved COA 24-05 at 600 Martingale Ridge Drive Middleburg Residences, lot nine. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So doing the final inspection before occupancy on this home, we noted just a couple of changes that had been made needed to be revisited. One of them on the front elevation. This was the approved elevation for that second story elevation under the light that you see typical on many of the homes. Some of those have windows. Some of those have shutters. The approved elevation had a shutter, but somewhere along the way the owner made the change to the window. So, we're just bringing that back to you for your consideration. This is the same window that they've used on all the other homes that have the window in that location. So, the same configuration materials and details. The other one was the addition of the screened rear porch. Now Gretchen did correctly note that if we looked really carefully at the floor plan that was submitted with the COA, it did call out for this to be a screened porch. However, the elevations did not show those elements. So, in particular, as you're looking at the left elevation here kind of bubbled here, is that the extent of the porch. So, there is a door that you see, this is the window that's in the background. There has been a door framed in here. And then on the rear elevation again bubbled in here. Central to this, where you see this area of siding, there's been a door framed in here with columns flanking it, and then also there to support the screen surrounding each of the columns. There's some additional framing that was added. So, in terms of the actual visuals, this is what the side elevation now is. So you, you see that these kind of columns with the framing around them as well as the door was added, whereas previously this just was all open with the one column on the left and then here on the rear again, you had these four columns previously. But again, the framing here, center to the porch was added for the door. And if you look a little more closely at each of the columns, there's some framing that extends out a little bit beyond the extent of the column to support the screen door. So, it's the screen porch framing and doors, along with the replacement of the shutter with a window on the front elevation. Those are the extents of the revisions requested.

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you, Will. On the window issue, that was an admin issue on my team's part. Laurie had submitted the wrong AA, so that is on me. It was not an owner change. It was she had put in the wrong one when we were doing it at the time, and I did not catch that. So just FYI. So that is that. On the screen porch just in terms of my assumptiveness I didn't go out there to maliciously do something that was like, not correct, but I was just the screen porch wasn't something that was really, you know, something that I thought was not going to be at issue. All right. We didn't try to go in there and put, like, Plexiglas on the bottom for dogs. Or, you know, we tried to historically recreate where the doors would be, which you'd have on an older screened porch and in columns. And we have utilized a product that it is a brand-new product, by the way, that would allow us to do one sections and have a very, very, very small reveal painted the same color as the column. So just in terms of that, he, you know, so just giving you that background, a lot of times the clients have done phantom screens, which I don't even mention, which are the ones that roll down from the bulkhead. We've had three phantom screens that roll down from the bulkhead. This client in the discussion said, I don't want to have phantom screens." I just want to have a permanent scenario, because I want to be able to open my doors and just be able to have the dog go in and out. So again, it just didn't enter into my psyche. Sorry. Like I said not that you're going to look at a stupid little note on the thing, but, you know, it wasn't something that was just out there as a non-historical kind of issue. So, I tried to respect the architecture on it as well so.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I guess I don't always have to start at the end. So why don't we start with Virginia?

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. [off mic] Well honestly, I like the window better than the shutters. Like number one.

Tim Clites: Mic. Can you turn your mic on?

Gretchen Yahn: Everybody's getting tired.

Cindy Pearson: Tonight.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. It's catching. It is catching. Well. Maybe it's just that we've been here a while. As I said, I do like the windows or the window better than the shutters. So, I'm fine with that. And actually, I don't really have an issue with this screened porch at all. I mean, it's sort of fits in there. It's fine with me.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I like the window also. I think it's nice. And it always seems to when you add it, I mean, change it out from the thing. I think it's very nice. And the porch is nice. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think everyone needs a porch. I love that, and the wind is great. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: And it really has nothing to do with it, I guess, but where the gutters are going down. Wow. It's a shame they can't disappear somewhere else, but that's part of it. And to have gutters there and not at the end, I guess I just don't understand building, but they just look strange.

Gretchen Yahn: On this scenario, it is very difficult to get the one on the left side because you have this kind of crazy condition coming in. So, on all of them, we've had to go to the middle ones for that symmetry it's really a tough, tough detail in that corner.

Cindy Pearson: Oh, I get that. It's just. But I don't have any real comments. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I don't have any comments. That wouldn't be me just trying to architect someone else's work, so I won't do that tonight. I promise I'm tired enough. No, I'm not really tired. I think I agree with the comments. Certainly, the window brightens up that facade. We've seen that before. And yeah, I also missed the screen porch on the plan, but I think it's executed similarly to, honestly, the screen porch that was at the other end of town that you all reviewed with us for the historic house as we leave going towards the east. So, a big open screen panel and the frame is very similarly done. It's kind of a nice look. So, any additional comments, Mr. Moore? You'd like to say something.

Will Moore: After a motion. After you take action, I would like to ask a question of the committee.

Tim Clites: I move that we approve. And which one are we on COA RS 25-06 as submitted?

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Yes, sir.

Will Moore: So, just a quick question. The question was raised by Laurie, who is Gretchen's assistant permit runner. She whips me when I'm not turning things around fast enough. But she did ask the question, would it be acceptable to the committee? You've seen many of this similar front elevation where the shutter or the window were interchanged. Would it be acceptable to the committee to approve each of those going forward with the option of either one? And then if something changes during construction, even though that wasn't the case this time, would that be acceptable to you?

Cindy Pearson: Do we have to change that in the guidelines if we do that?

Will Moore: No, not new guidelines. They would just note it in their submission that window/optional shutter. And then they could do either one if you were amenable to that. Now, if you wanted to look at each one individually, that's fine as well.

Punkin Lee: Will the window always stay the same size? I mean it [multiple speakers].

Gretchen Yahn: It would stay the same. Both of the details would stay the same.

Punkin Lee: I think that kind of simplifies things.

Gretchen Yahn: Again, this was totally on me.

Tim Clites: That's all right, you know. No worries. I think that's and I mean we're going to have how far are we 49? How far are we?

Gretchen Yahn: Probably have another 30.

Tim Clites: So, I think that's a good. I mean, especially if we've seen both those options. I think that's a reasonable way to approach it. Give you a little flexibility. And first things that we've seen before for sure. So, thanks for bringing that up. All right. Let's try to round out the evening here. RS 25-07 request of Castlerock enterprises for a new single-family dwelling at Five Foxtrot Knoll Lane. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Give me one second while I pull up the kind of location map for you. So, this is yet another home in The Stable sections. That section is moving along now with a little greater pace. I think this is house number one, two, three, seven in The Stables section. So, the two kind of when you first come into it. But then this will be the fifth one for consideration here. Kind of when you get to the more western portion. So, this is one of the lots that backs up to kind of the wooded area. It's on one of the kind of stem roads, flag lots, if you will that goes toward the back. You see kind of the color distribution that the Chairman was talking about earlier. So, this one would be in the Bruton White. The closest to here would be in alternate colors to that one. So, it's sticking with that desire for a little variation in the placement of the color relative to the adjacent homes. This one proposes a combination of stone and stucco on the home. This is using The Stables version of The Hunt Box design. So, have you seen this one before? In this case, it would propose the stone cladding on the front box, if you will. So, both on the entirety of the front elevation here, and then on that portion of the front box on both the left and right elevations. The remainder going back would be in stucco, as would the water table, except for the water table surrounding the front porch. This is another one where we had an alternate cladding proposed for the garage. So, two notes on the garage here. It's another one where you may have that concern about the cladding on the garage not matching either the stone or the stucco. I don't think we'll probably see stone garages, but in this where you have a combination of cladding, you would probably based on your discussion earlier, expect a stucco garage rather than board and batten. This is also your

first time seeing a three-car garage. So, I simply noted, because it's your first time seeing it, there's nothing in the guidelines that would prohibit that. The guidelines do stipulate one car garages only for The Vineyards section but is silent on the number of bays that might be allowable in The Stables section. So, again, the only thing that staff would note of potential concern with the guidelines would be the proposed board and batten cladding on the garage.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay. Will can you do me one favor? Could you put up also the site plan for just a moment? A couple things on the main house. There's nothing re-invented on the main house. One thing that I will point out that is different is on the left side elevation. We are going with a different window configuration so that we can be in a situation to because we have a modified scenario at their bathroom. So just FYI. So typically, you'll see our gang of windows and, you know, paneling underneath. Here what we're doing is we due to the floor plan change and proposing a modified window. There also is modified window fenestration in terms of the muttons based upon the client in terms of wanting to have a little bit more traditional type of window fenestration. So that's the only thing that really changes on the house there. Okay. On the garage I bring up so what we did on this. So, this is backing up to the woods and to be extremely you know, sympathetic to the neighborhood and to the rest of the people. The owner, Mr. Stutzman has and ourselves did a little bit more site work and a little bit longer driveway in order to have this so that it looks the garages are coming to the doors are to the side, which would be towards pretty much the woods. So, we're trying to really, you know, angle everything to the woods and then have the front have a very kind of barn kind of style garage look to it. So that's why I had you bring up the site plan, because we did spend a lot of time and effort and money to modify kind of some things in order to get this so it's looking towards the wood side. I would put down in terms of the three-car garage, you know, the two-car garage that we have for lot 29 and lot 38 in the case of lot 29, they're not using that third kind of what I call the breezeway area. They're using it as a maybe a future cabana. But at 38, where we put the lattice. I mean, they do have the ability to drive in and be covered, so to speak, with regards to a garage. Square footage wise, this one is a little bit larger, approximately 450ft². We do we worked really hard with the trust manufacturers to get to this 15-foot height and still allow this thing to look a little bit more kind of shed like. So hence that's where we came up with the board in batten effect. If we go to stucco you know, we go to stucco. It's whatever. We were just trying to give a little bit of a kind of a little more kind of, you know, barn, detached garage, kind of carriage house look.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We didn't go first yet. Punkin. We'll pause for a second and then you start with that.

Punkin Lee: That's a large structure. That's a three-car garage really throws a whole different presentation for a garage. However, I still think we should follow the guidelines and be stucco.

Gretchen Yahn: Okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Stucco. I can't talk anymore.

Tim Clites: And before I keep moving, any other comments from either of you on the house or the massing or elevations of the garage? Nope. Okay. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I do have a question on the left elevation with those windows that you were changing from the. It doesn't look centered on this. Will it be? I mean, meaning from the down below? Well, yeah. Even there, they're not centered.

Gretchen Yahn: I'd have to look at the floor plan. We may have to modify something inside with floor plan.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Let's just make a note of that. And we need to get these garages swapped because the other one needed. And then this one needs the stucco. So, but I'm really in me looking at this I think if when it is done in stucco that these doors are going to look nicer because you don't have the different directions of the boards.

Gretchen Yahn: Stucco is fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'd go with the stucco also.

Tim Clites: Okay. Any other comments? I have a couple questions on. Yes, we're right where we need to be for my questions. Same question, I think is the last house we looked at last week. So below the cursor. Do we need that baseboard there?

Gretchen Yahn: No, he had that on there. We'll take that off. I don't know why he keeps putting it on there. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Wouldn't you just want to do the stucco now, is there still like a stone line?

Gretchen Yahn: Yes. There's still the slate. It looks like a water table. Right. Okay. I don't know why he keeps putting. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: That's all right, I just.

Gretchen Yahn: Sorry.

Tim Clites: And then let's go to the. If that's the left, it would be the right elevation, and we haven't. I don't think we've seen this in a while. Remind me again these flat panels. Is that just a smooth sheet with a like a five-quarter frame or something?

Gretchen Yahn: Yes. So that's an AZEK. We build that all out of AZEK there. So, it'll have it won't be just Shaker. It will have a small reveal to it [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Molded into it.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. Inside that is what we typically do.

Tim Clites: All right.

Gretchen Yahn: And I will point out as well the massing on the right side where we did out the door on the left side, the massing will be that's where the grill will go. Just to give a little, you know.

Tim Clites: Yeah, yeah. I like the fact that this house has a different modern configuration. I mean, I think it's one of those things that there's been a lot of consistency in the other houses. And there will be a little detail that I think some people will notice and appreciate. So, it's kind of nice. Garage. Welcome to the curse of a 15-foot ridge. Right. Yeah. This is I mean because it's a 36-foot-deep garage, you know, the minimum standard would be what, 24 or something. Right. So, we've added another 12ft to its depth and that doesn't help the massing. When I first looked at it, I hated to say the thought that came to my mind is it looked like a series of, like, double wide's added together. Right. Because I know what you're stuck with because we've been stuck with that.[multiple speakers]

Gretchen Yahn: Well, that's why we turned the building to have this smaller side. And if you go up a little bit more, Will I think we're kind of not getting that front or the front elevation. Oh sorry. Yes. Sorry.

There. Whoops. That's why we chose to kind of have that, you know, fake barn effect on the front on the massing. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: To give it some three dimensional.

Gretchen Yahn: Exactly. And then bumped out the front. So it wasn't, you know, wasn't in this just one plane across it. So, there is that's what that bump out indication at the front is.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Yeah. That certainly does everybody see that? That certainly helps. And because the rear elevation is looking to the woods more comfortable not having. I mean, if anyone could see it, you'd want a window or something there. But given that it's I mean, I want to say these things out loud, right? So that if we're ever looking at another project in town and people say, oh, well you approve that facade with no windows is actually we've consciously decided to do that, right?

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. This is totally to the woods.

Will Moore: Yeah. So again, your purview is what can be seen from the street. So, a lot of this is I mean it technically is a private street, that stem that goes out to Old Saddle. But there's the visibility of a lot of these not just the rear, but some of the side elevations is going to be very limited.

Tim Clites: Right? Understood, understood. But then also to just take a minute to acknowledge some effort in the massing and the architecture to try to make it more becoming. I think it's a good thing too. Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: So that's why I brought up the site plan because the site plan is as critical on this site as even just the architecture ones.

Tim Clites: And so then, like this. Remind me of the grading, though, isn't this house, you know, you're like going down to get to this right?

Gretchen Yahn: Down to this. But there is a very wide, kind of like [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Flat area.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. So that's why we took the house over to the side more and then brought it to the back so we could stay onto that more flat or plateau plus on top of it, just past this and then goes down.

Tim Clites: Dives off.

Gretchen Yahn: I mean it dives down. So.

Tim Clites: Right.

Gretchen Yahn: You know, and that was what was good about having lot 42 done because then we could see where this massing was going to. And so, it wasn't affecting 42, which is important to us as well. It wasn't affecting anything on 42 as well. Yeah. I can get a little bit more creative on these back lots just because, you know, with some earthwork and [inaudible] and things, I can do some sort of things and dirt. [laughter].

Tim Clites: Yeah, awesome. Okay. So, it sounds like the consensus from the committee is just a quick recap that the house is okay and the garage we would like to match when we say the house. Yeah. I think I heard you all say stucco because we wouldn't stone this building. That doesn't make sense at all. Right. Gretchen, I don't want to give you a heart attack here.

Cindy Pearson: That would really look good with the rock.

Tim Clites: Yeah. No, actually, it may not. It may be the stucco may look better, given how flat it is. Okay. Is there a motion? I move that we approve COA RS 25-07. As presented with the following clarification that the garage be clad in the stucco to match the back portion of the house.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you.

Tim Clites: And actually, congratulations. We made it.

Gretchen Yahn: Wow. This was a long one.

Tim Clites: You can take the rest of the month off.

Gretchen Yahn: How thoughtful of you.

Tim Clites: Yeah. You too. Thank you. Thank you. Do we have any discussion items? We've got the JRB just so you all are aware, there's a call with the county, a zoom call, I think, next week. Did you get the invite to that? Would you like it? It's just, you know, they do that first introductory call to kind of remind everybody what they do for the awards every year. Oh, there's a little zoom call. I'll send you the invite. I think you and I got elected to do that again this year. And if you're not available, I elected myself. So, I am available.

Punkin Lee: To go by yourself. So therefore, I guess we're going.

Tim Clites: Yeah. That's my only discussion item. Any known issues with the quorum for August 7th? If so, please let Rhonda or Will know. Thank you all for working through this, this evening, it read as a marathon. Oh. I'm sorry. Yes.

Cindy Pearson: I forgot to tell Punkin that because she wasn't here for that one meeting, that's why she can go into this JARB meeting?

Tim Clites: Oh, yeah. Never miss a night.

Punkin Lee: I never miss.

Tim Clites: Never miss.

Punkin Lee: You know one time a year. I miss one of these. Thank you for taking care of me.

Margaret Littleton: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: Didn't have enough to do. I'm sure. Yeah. Awesome. Well, thank you all for working through this with us tonight. It was a big agenda with a lot of sometimes somewhat difficult discussions to have

with our neighbors and our community. But you all do a great job at it, so I appreciate it. And thank you, staff, for setting us up to be successful. We appreciate that too. Meeting's adjourned.