TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, September 4, 2025
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, September 4, 2025, in the Town Hall Council Chambers. Chair Clites called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Town Clerk North called the roll.

PRESENT: Tim Clites, Chair
Punkin Lee, Vice Chair
William Anderson
Virginia Jenkins
Margaret Littleton
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the August 7, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

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

Old Business

COA 25-16 (S 25-09): Wall Sign and Façade Revisions – 7 W. Washington Street – Grandeur Antiques

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded Council that this was the third time they have reviewed different elements of the application. He further reminded them that last month, they approved the projecting sign, door signs, and paint color. Mr. Moore reported that this month, the applicant proposed to add some columns over the existing trim to the left and right sides of the eastern space, some molding above the space, and one additional sign. He advised that the sign would be centered between the two retail spaces. Mr. Moore noted that the box would remain as a community box and would not be used for signage for the building. He reported that the three-square foot sign would fit within the remaining signage allotment for the building. Mr. Moore noted that the design would match the approved design for the projecting sign and would include arrows.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they provided the applicant with some feedback on the columns last month, with the comments being that what was proposed was too ornate. He noted that they suggested a Tuscan column or something with a simpler design; however, the applicant continued to submit a design for a fluted column. Mr. Moore advised that the proposed material for the column would be substitute materials. He noted that he included excerpts from the Historic District Guidelines in his memo, which indicated that substitute materials on a contributing structure in the district may not be supported. Mr. Moore suggested the Committee discuss the proposed use of fiberglass reinforced polymer columns and PVC for the pedestals and pediments. He expressed concern that the trim around the building was deteriorating and rotting in places. Mr. Moore advised that the application was unclear as to whether that would be removed or whether the proposal was to wrap the columns around it. He suggested that if the plan was the latter, the existing trim needed to be repaired so the columns would not simply cover the rotting condition.

Nicole Madden, of Quail Run Signs, advised that the proposed sign was to promote that there were two stores. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the ivy had already been removed from the building.

The Committee noted that they had no comments regarding the proposed sign.

Ms. Madden advised that she had a spec sheet on the proposed columns, which she distributed to the members of the Committee.

Rachel Harshman, the applicant, opined that she toned down what she was proposing for the columns, even though it was still a fluted design.

Councilmember Pearson read an excerpt from the Historic District Guidelines that stated that detailing that was not historically used on a building or that represented another architectural era should not be added to a building. She noted that what was proposed was from a different era, was not an architectural detail used on the building originally and did not represent Middleburg. Ms. Pearson advised that what was proposed was not proper, nor did it fit with the Historic District. She agreed with Deputy Town Manager Moore that the rotting trim should be repaired or replaced even if the plan was to cover it up, otherwise, it would only continue to decay and rot. Ms. Pearson noted that the Guidelines also stated that trim should not be covered with decorative elements.

Committee Member Jenkins agreed with Councilmember Pearson. She opined that the fluted columns were too much for the style of the building.

Committee Member Wright agreed with Councilmember Pearson and Committee Member Jenkins. She agreed the proposed columns did not fit with the character of the old building. Ms. Wright opined that they would be better if they were square.

Vice Chair Lee noted that the exterior of the building was simple and opined that the personality of the façade was lost in the proposed changes. She agreed that before anything was done, the rotted trim needed to be addressed.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with the Committee that the fluted column was too fancy for this building. She suggested the applicant consider adding a gold pinstripe on the glass window and doors. Ms. Littleton recommended the columns be plain and simpler. She noted that the applicant would have beautiful things in her storefront window. Ms. Littleton opined that the proposed columns would not add anything to the visual.

Committee Member Anderson agreed with the Committee. He noted that while there was an engaged column on another building in the Historic District, the fact that what was proposed was a rounded column gave him concern. Mr. Anderson advised that the illustrative drawing did not represent how a

rounded column would look on the building and noted the need for a detailed drawing to show how this column would work. He advised that he did not see how it could. Mr. Anderson noted that a rounded column applied over a square one would need to have depth on the outside and reiterated that he did not see how it could work. He advised that he also had an issue with the ornateness of the capital at the top of the column. In response to an inquiry from Ms. Madden, he advised that the Committee did suggest the use of a Tuscan column during their last meeting and noted that he anticipated the applicant would return with detailed drawings to show how what they were proposing would work. Mr. Anderson noted that the drawing also did not include any Dentil molding and questioned where that would be located. He reiterated that he was expecting a detailed architectural drawing; however, the Committee only received an illustrative one.

Ms. Harshman advised that she had a drawing of a plain column and explained that it would be cut in half to fit over the existing column. She noted that it would be weight bearing. Ms. Harshman advised that it would wrap over the sides and opined that this would be considered a repair. She questioned whether the Committee would consider a plain column and advised that, if they would, she would return with more details.

Committee Member Anderson explained that they required more of an architectural detailed drawing to show how things would work and opined that this would help Ms. Harshman to see how it would work and how it would relate to the front door and façade. He noted that the Committee suggested a Tuscan column; however, he preferred the engaged columns as they existed. Mr. Anderson suggested they simply be repaired.

Chair Clites explained that the Committee was tasked with reviewing the details, including the proportion of the column, its diameter, and its height. He further explained that it was important to make sure that how the entablature sat on it was right. Mr. Clites noted the need to understand those details. He advised that as to the question of the Dentil molding, the Historic District Guidelines recommended those things not be added. Mr. Clites opined that the existing molding was not as old as the building; however, any improvement to it would need to be to scale. He advised that an architect did not need to draw up the details; however, everything needed to be drawn so the Committee could understand how it would be built, how it would relate to the door, and what it would look like. Mr. Clites noted that in looking at the drawings that were submitted, it appeared the box above the entablature would be larger than the entablature and the capital on the column. He reiterated the need for construction details in order to understand how what was proposed would be built.

Ms. Harshman suggested the Committee give her guidance of what she needed to do. She advised that she wanted to repair the columns; however, she opined that their appearance was “sad”. Ms. Harshman advised that she wanted to do something “nice” and questioned whether there was a compromise.

Vice Chair Lee suggested the Committee decide on whether it would behoove the façade of the building to improve what was there when the Guidelines stated that there should be no columns to begin with. She agreed the existing columns needed to be repaired, even if they were covered, as they were a supporting structure that was attached to the stone. Ms. Lee noted that if they failed, everything would fail.

In response to an inquiry from Ms. Harshman, Chair Clites explained that what existed was not constructed in the way an independent column would be for a building of this era. He noted that the Committee had consistently stated that round columns were problematic both from an expression standpoint and from the standpoint of how they would be integrated into the building. Mr. Clites noted that a rounded column needed a certain amount of space and advised that there was not enough room for them so they would not look like they were mashed into the building. He advised that the Committee was talking about a square column that should not be heavily ornated or detailed. Mr. Clites noted that the existing trim was not particularly historic or authentic and suggested that when it was replaced, it be replaced with molding that was consistent with a stand-alone column. He further suggested it could be replaced with like materials to what was there. Mr. Clites advised that the Dentil molding raised

questions as to how it would be installed and keep the roof the same size. He noted that this would require a bunch of layering offsets, which would project out beyond the roof. Mr. Clites explained that what was being proposed was difficult to understand without precise drawings.

Committee Member Anderson opined that if built as proposed, the entire structure would grow and there would be a big change. He suggested that if the applicant restored the existing structure, it may be possible to add a bit of detail to the base.

The Committee agreed with the idea of restoring the existing structure and that it be left plain. They noted that the awning would make a difference in the building's appearance.

The Committee held some discussion as to what needed to be included in the motion.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested that if the applicant was agreeable to not making any structural changes to the front of the building, she could verbally remove that from her application. He further suggested that if she wanted to think about it some more, the Committee's motion could be that the changes to the façade would need to return to them. Mr. Moore advised that it would be up to the Committee as to whether they wanted to give the applicant the option to do the gold pinstriping around the glass area in their motion.

Committee Member Anderson moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that for COA 25-16, a request of Rachel Harshman for a wall sign and facade revision at 7 West Washington Street, be as follows: the sign as proposed is approved; the Committee made a recommendation as to pinstriping on the glass storefront and glass door, and if that goes ahead, an illustrative drawing should submitted for approval; and that this approval does not include any structural changes to the façade and, if any are proposed, the applicant will have to come back for that approval.

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

New Business

COA-RS 25-08: New Single-Family Dwelling – 2 Stagecoach Ridge Lane (Middleburg Residences Lot 45)

Deputy Town Manager Moore reviewed the location of the proposed home in The Stables neighborhood on one of the westernmost lots. He reported that it would contain lap siding in Kendall Charcoal, as would the detached garage.

Gretchen Yahn, of Castlerock Enterprises, advised that the front elevation was based on the Hunt Box Premier design, with a wing added for an expanded master bedroom. She noted that a stone water table would be incorporated around the entire structure. Ms. Yahn reported that they were proposing a fenestration change to allow for more muntins on the windows. She advised that the reverse gable on the rear elevation included a different slope, in part because the porch was deeper and in part because they made a change in the great room. Ms. Yahn noted that there were more windows and a wider chimney; however, they would be in the same details. She advised that to avoid a long scenario on the roof, they incorporated a faux louvered effect. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the dormers would include a louver on the outside, but would not include a window on the inside.

The Committee agreed they liked the proposed design.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Yahn explained that the chimney was the same height as the other chimneys; however, it did not look as high because it was wider. She noted that the owner wanted the chimney to be wider because it would be stone on the inside and they wanted to have more breadth in the look. Ms. Yahn confirmed there were no changes to any of the details on the detail sheet.

Chair Clites noted that muntins were added in the left elevation. He further noted that there would be two over three windows that would be as large as the doors. Mr. Clites advised that in the lower level, the windows were one wide over three high per sash. He questioned whether these were in the same room.

Ms. Yahn confirmed they were not; although, they aligned horizontally. She ackowledged that their choices were strange with regard to the windows and advised that they went with a design that was more traditional with more muntins.

Chair Clites advised that he was fine leaving the design as it was in that the pairs of doors would only have one light; however, he suggested that muntins could be added there.

Ms. Yahn noted that they looked at a lot of different shop drawings; however, in the end, the owner did not want to look through a lot of muntins.

Chair Clites opined that it would be pretty if the stone base wrapped around the lower area.

Ms. Yahn agreed and explained that it was changed to siding for value engineering reasons. In response to a comment from the Committee, she advised that they have seen the dovecote detail in the gable ends in almost all the houses. She noted that it worked effectively, as this was where she exhausted all of the kitchen vents.

Chair Clites noted the second story light above the window on the rear elevation. He advised that when it faced the street, it projected a lot of light onto the street. Mr. Clites acknowledged that it was a shielded fixture; however, due to the height of its installation, it did not meet the intent of the outdoor lighting ordinance, as there was light spillage.

Ms. Yahn advised that she had looked at fixtures that contained bulbs that were bottom coated. She noted that in that case, the fixture would be there for ambiance, not for security purposes. Ms. Yahn advised that she would be happy to do a mock-up of one. She agreed with Chair Clites and reiterated that she would do a mock-up for the Committee's review. Ms. Yahn opined that it would improve things.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 25-08 as submitted.

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

COA 25-25: Artwork for "American Women Artists – Vision of Nature" Exhibit Banner – National Sporting Library & Museum

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that the National Sporting Library & Museum appeared before them every six months for approval of their newest artwork for their upcoming exhibit. He noted that they had the latest artwork in their agenda packet.

Claudia Pfeiffer, Head Curator for the National Sporting Library & Museum, appeared before the Committee representing the application. She noted that the coloring of the artwork appeared to be off and advised that there appeared to be a banding that was not actually there.

The Committee advised that they had no comments on the artwork.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Ms. Pfeiffer advised that the painting depicted on the artwork would be a part of the exhibition. She further advised that while the National Sporting Library was not selling the artwork, it would be for sale through the American Women Artists, which was a contemporary women's artist organization.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-25 as submitted.

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

COA 25-26 (S 25-14): Two Projecting Signs & Freestanding Directional Sign – 104 S. Pendleton Street – Windy Hill Foundation

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that this was one of two buildings that formerly housed the J.R. Snider Plumbing business. He further reported that the Windy Hill Foundation was going to occupy the front portion of the northernmost building and their leasing management agency, Quantum Real Estate, would occupy the rear portion. Mr. Moore explained that the proposal was for a projecting sign on an existing bracket above Windy Hill's main office, a directional sign that would distinguish the two office spaces, and a projecting sign in the rear for the leasing office. He noted that the arrow configuration on the directional sign would be different than shown on the drawing. Mr. Moore advised that the drawing showed three proposed locations for the projecting sign for the leasing office; however, Option 3 was the only location that would meet the sign ordinance requirements. He reported that the sign material would be Extira and the logo would be a three-color one that was the Windy Hill Foundation's logo. Mr. Moore advised that the directional sign would be black and white and would contain the logo, and the projecting sign for the main office would be the logo in full color with a blue band around the area of the sign.

Nicole Madden, of Quail Run Signs, advised that she had updated the arrow configuration. She opined that the new configuration would make more sense for the general public.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether it was possible to match the white on the signs to the white trim on the building, Ms. Madden confirmed she could.

Chair Clites agreed it would be nice to tie the signs to the building, to which the remainder of the Committee agreed.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-26, a request of Windy Hill Foundation for two projecting signs and a freestanding directional sign as presented, with the clarification that the arrows on the directional sign will be as per Mr. Moore and the applicant's discussion and agreement; that the sign at the rear door for the leasing office would be at location #3; and, that the white of the sign will be to match the white trim on the building.

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

COA 25-27 (S 25-15): Projecting Sign, Wall Sign, Replacement Front Door – 10 N. Pendleton Street – Main Street Bank

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the application was for a new business and a new owner of the buildings which comprised the entirety of the Courtyard at Middleburg. He further reported that the new owner, Main Street Bank, would occupy the building at the corner of North Pendleton and West Marshall Streets. Mr. Moore advised that the signs were identical in design, with one being a two-sided projecting sign on a new bracket and one being a wall sign that would replace the existing sign. He reported that the applicant was also proposing to replace the existing solid front door with a wood door that would be mostly glass. Mr. Moore noted that there would be no divisions within the glass pane.

Councilmember Pearson acknowledged that the Committee could not change a business' logo; however, she noted that the Historic District Guidelines recommended that colors complement the materials and color scheme of the building. She opined that the sign was as far away from an accent color as possible. Ms. Pearson questioned whether there was a way to tone it down.

Nicole Madden, of Quail Run Signs, advised that the photo was a bit dark and opined the sign would not be too bright. She further opined that it would complement the columns.

Chair Clites noted that the application indicated the wood stain for the door was to be determined. He suggested the Committee comment on that when they commented on the signs.

Committee Member Wright advised that she was fine with the signage; however, she agreed it would be nice if the white in the lettering could match the building trim. She suggested the door stain be on the darker side and pick up on one of the colors in the stone.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Madden explained that the reason the applicant wanted to replace the door was that it contained no glass. She noted that they wanted to make the space more inviting. Ms. Madden advised that someone was supposed to be present with stain samples; however, they were not.

Vice Mayor Lee suggested a darker stain color for the door. She opined that the proposed door looked more residential than commercial.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with Vice Chair Lee. Committee Member Anderson agreed with all of the comments.

Chair Clites noted the lack of muntins in the proposed door for the one historic building on the site. He questioned whether this was the right decision. Mr. Clites noted that it contained sidelights that were a

single sheet of glass. He questioned whether the door would be more sympathetic to the building if it contained muntins to give it a more traditional look. Mr. Clites agreed with the comments about a medium to dark stain, as opposed to a lighter one. He noted that he made a similar door change in his building and advised that it made an enormous difference in the space. Mr. Clites advised that he supported the change; however, he opined that the proposed door was too contemporary for this original building. He agreed the signage was fine. Mr. Clites further agreed that if it was possible to tone down the white so it would be like the trim, it would be nice.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Madden confirmed this would be the only door.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised the Committee that there were some interior doors within the space. He advised that despite the name, this would not be a retail bank. Mr. Moore noted that while they would have the ability to accept deposits on a limited basis, it would not operate like a typical retail bank. He explained that their focus would be more on the wealth management aspect of their business. Mr. Moore advised that the primary use of the building was not allowed to be for retail banking.

Chair Clites suggested the door have a small panel at the bottom and some muntins above. He opined that a three-quarter door would provide plenty of light and would be more sympathetic to the building than what was proposed.

Councilmember Pearson agreed. Committee Member Jenkins agreed the door would look better if it had a panel at the bottom below the glass.

Committee Member Anderson suggested that another option would be to add muntins to the proposed door. He noted, however, that the Committee did not have an idea of the muntin size in the adjacent windows. Mr. Anderson opined that a glass door for a building like this one would have more muntins.

Chair Clites advised that he did not have a strong feeling about a three-quarters light versus a full light door.

Vice Chair Lee opined that the addition of either muntins or the use of a three-quarter door would make it look more substantial. She suggested the proposed door looked “lightweight” for the building.

Chair Clites opined that the Committee wanted the applicant to return with a different door option.

The Committee held some discussion of the white in the sign.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that in looking at their website, it appeared the blue field was part of their brand, and the three stacked squares were a part of their logo. He opined that he would not say the signs’ design represented their brand or their logo, as he did not have their style sheet.

Ms. Madden noted that she had their style sheet. She advised that the design was based on the information they provided to her.

Chair Clites noted that he liked the darker sign that was on the Main Street Bank’s website. He advised that he would be comfortable with that as an option.

Committee Member Anderson noted that the building had some beautiful brown stones and asked whether the Committee could recommend the stain match some of the stone color.

Chair Clites opined that the applicant would bring in a stain sample when they returned with a door pattern.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 25-27, a request of Main Street Bank for a projecting sign, wall sign and replacement front door, with the projecting sign and wall sign being approved as submitted and, if possible for the white in "Main Street" to match the trim of the building, that would be preferred but not required; and that the front door be resubmitted with a muntin door design, either full or three-quarter light muntin door design and stain samples reflecting the species and color of the wood, and hardware for the front door.

The Committee held some discussion of the "for lease" sign, which had turned into a permanent sign that was not approved. They opined that it may be removed given that the building was under new ownership.

Chair Clites advised that his motion would include the condition that the approval is with the understanding that the white sign would be removed.

Councilmember Pearson offered a friendly amendment that the darker blue be used on the sign instead of the brighter blue. She noted that in looking at the logos, they used a darker blue that was more of a navy.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested this did not need to be in the motion and advised that he would discuss it with Ms. Madden.

Councilmember Pearson withdrew her friendly amendment.

Ms. Madden reported that what was proposed was Pantone 7694C, which was a darker blue.

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

Discussion Items

Pre-Application Discussion: Fence – Middleburg Museum – 12 N. Madison Street

Charlotte DeButts, a Board member with the Middleburg Museum, advised the Committee that they had a serious fence problem, which they hoped to remedy. She noted that she had conducted a lot of research on fence options and what may be appropriate. Ms. DeButts reviewed her findings with the Committee and asked for their feedback. She advised that they wanted to build a fence that reflected the mission of the Middleburg Museum & Visitors Center, which included collecting, preserving, and sharing the history of the museum, building and grounds and providing a place that established "community". Ms. DeButts noted that their goals were to screen their property from the Safeway parking lot, as they planned to host events in their garden; and, to have a clean and tidy appearance so their grounds were inviting and encouraged people to visit. She noted that the museum had budget constraints and would like to keep the fence as simple as possible for maintenance purposes, in addition to being cost effective. Ms. DeButts proposed the use of seasoned plain clear white oak to which a whitewash would be applied to create a patina that went with the Pink Box. She advised that in order to make the garden as accessible as possible, they were proposing to widen the entrances and create gently sloped paths. Ms. DeButts noted that while the paths would not be ADA accessible, they would be accessible for a wheelchair. She advised that the fence would not have gates in order to create a welcoming experience. Ms. DeButts explained that in order to offer a reference to the history of the area, they were proposing a board paddock fence. She expressed hope that the style would exhibit the agriculture of the area. Ms. DeButts opined that her application included a picture of a painting by Madeline Hughes of the Pink Box.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the picture was not included in the application.

Ms. DeButts advised that the painting depicted the Pink Box surrounded by a four-board fence that dropped to a two-board one. She opined that it was painted in the 1950s and possibly represented what existed back to the 1930s. Ms. DeButts suggested the painting represented strong support for their fence design. She noted that her applicaion also included information on Colonial Williamsburg fencing, which supported the proposed post and rail fence design. Ms. DeButts advised that they were also proposing that their fence drop from a four board one to a two board one in line with the cherry tree. She explained that it would terminate at the front where it wrapped into the north entrance by the building. Ms. DeButts advised that there would be no fencing beyond that point – only a hitching rail, like the ones that could be seen in old photographs of Middleburg. She reported that the Museum had plans to renovate the pavilion, which they took into consideration when planning the fence.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reviewed a map showing the proposed location of the fence. He explained that the Middleburg Museum was proposing a four rail fence adjacent to the Safeway property, that would drop down to a two rail one, which would be thirty-inches tall, that would wrap around along the Marshall Street frontage and continue to Madison Street where it would wrap around to the northern entrance on the north side of the building. Mr. Moore advised that there would be no gates, just an inward turn of the fence. He noted that to the left of the building would be a four-foot-high hitching rail.

Ms. DeButts advised that the fence contractor suggested the fence be angled at the northwest corner due to the maple tree in that location. She noted that they would have to extricate the existing fence from the tree. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, she confirmed the fence would contain a cap.

Vice Chair Lee suggested it not contain a cap and noted that it would be labor intensive and would rot quickly. She further suggested they just use a flat board.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. DeButts advised that they were proposing to re-use the existing fence posts, if possible, and noted that they would have to be stripped. She advised that they could not use the ones adjacent to the Safeway because they were too short; however, they would trim the others down, strip them and treat them with a whitewash or paint, depending on what the Committee approved.

Chair Clites opined that the Museum was proposing oak for its durability, not its character. He advised that a painted surface would peel, whereas a stained one was easier to touch up. Mr. Clites opined that the Museum would like for the posts to all look the same and suggested the existing ones were either pressure treated or cedar. He advised that cedar and oak were going to look very different with a light stain. Mr. Clites noted that he could not provide an answer if the goal was a white fence that appeared to have some age to it.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the existing posts would be durable enough to hold oak boards, Ms. DeButts advised that if they were not, they would be replaced.

Vice Chair Lee noted the weight of oak boards.

Chair Clites advised that he liked the fence design. He thanked Ms. DeButts for her research. Mr. Clites noted that a year ago when this was last discussed, the Committee felt the Museum should keep the current design; however, he opined that what was being proposed could be successful.

Most of the Committee opined that the proposed design was beautiful.

Councilmember Pearson noted that this had been a picket fence for a long time and fit on the corner. She advised that she was not saying the proposed design would not look good; however, she would miss the picket fence.

Ms. DeButts advised that she had photos from 1990, which showed no fence.

Committee Member Anderson noted that he looked forward to reviewing the submission. He advised that he had also gotten used to the picket fence, which was why he suggested it be repaired the last time it was discussed. Mr. Anderson opined that Ms. DeButts had opened up some nice possibilities, which he looked forward to discussing. He expressed concern, however, that the property would not be ADA compliant.

Ms. DeButts opined that it would be too onerous for them to do. She further explained that they planned to open the pavilion so the entrance was level with the sidewalk. Ms. DeButts noted that there would be a slope down into the garden. She opined that someone in a wheelchair could access it; however, she reiterated that it would not be ADA compliant.

Committee Member Anderson opined that it would be nice if this was addressed during their presentation. He advised that in speaking for people in a wheelchair, he would hope they would not be excluded from getting into the museum's facilities.

Ms. DeButts advised that they would do their best to make sure someone in a wheelchair could get in. She opined that being ADA compliant was burdensome.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee of the application that was heard some time ago for revisions to the pavilion. He noted that the approval had expired; therefore, any changes to the pavilion would need to be the subject of a new application.

Chair Clites thanked Ms. DeButts for giving the Committee the chance to look at their pre-application.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that he would send the application to the Committee. He asked that Ms. DeButts send him the picture of the painting she referenced.

Ms. DeButts confirmed she would. She advised that she would love to hear any suggestions the Committee may have for making the area ADA compliant.

<u>Electronic Participation in Meetings</u>

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised the Committee that if they wished to allow a member to participate in a meeting electronically, because they were traveling or incapacitated, they would need to adopt a policy. He advised that if they had an interest in doing so, Town Clerk North would propose the policy next month for their consideration. Mr. Moore noted that the Committee did not have the option of changing the details of the policy, as it was based on the State Code requirements. He questioned whether the Committee wanted to allow for this. Mr. Moore noted that when it was raised in the past, there was no desire for it, as there was concern the Committee would lose the collaborative manner in which they worked.

Chair Clites agreed the Committee worked best sitting together. He noted that there were attendance requirements and advised that sometimes real life did not allow people to attend in person. Mr. Clites opined that it would be a shame if someone was removed from the Committee because they did not meet the attendance policy if that could be addressed by virtue of having the option to meet electronically. He questioned whether this was correct.

Town Clerk North confirmed that if the person participated in the meeting electronically, they would still be considered as attending from the standpoint of the Council's Attendance Policy. She noted that as to the policy related to electronic participation, there were nuances as to whether a quorum could be achieved through remote participation or not and explained that it would depend on the circumstances.

Chair Clites noted that the policy was intended to apply to emergencies and real-life events. He questioned whether it would need to be enacted on an annual basis.

Town Clerk North confirmed it would. She noted that when the General Assembly first allowed electronic participation, the policy only had to be adopted once; however, the Assembly had since changed it to require that it be adopted annually. Ms. North opined that the purpose was to incorporate any changes to the policy that were needed due to changes in the enabling legislation. She advised that if the Committee adopted the policy, she would track it and bring the policy, with any changes needed, to the Committee annually for readoption.

Chair Clites opined that the Committee could readopt the policy or it could opt out of it.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether it would be possible to get pre-approval to participate electronically if an individual could not attend in person for three to four months, Town Clerk North explained that under the policy, pre-approval to participate electronically was required from the Chair of the Committee. She noted that this approval must occur prior to the meeting. In response to a comment from the Committee, she explained that the policy was based on the State Code provisions and could not be changed. Ms. North advised that as to the question about pre-approval for an extended period, the policy regulated how many times a member could participate remotely. She noted that if the participation was for a personal reason, such as a vacation, this could only occur twice per year or up to 25% of the meetings on a one year period; however, if it was due to a disability or medical condition or to care for a family member who was disabled, the member could participate remotely for an unlimited number of times per year. Ms. North explained that if a person participated remotely due to personal reasons, their remote participation could not count toward the quorum; however, if it was for medical reasons, their remote participation did count toward the quorum. She noted that there were a lot of intricate details associated with remote participation.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reiterated that the Committee would need to adopt the policy. He advised that they would not vote on whether to allow a member to participate remotely. Mr. Moore reiterated that the Committee could not revise the policy, they could only approve or disapprove it as written.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Town Clerk North explained that if an individual wished to participate remotely, assuming the policy was adopted, the Chair would have to either approve or deny the request. She noted that this would have to be recorded in the meeting minutes. Ms. North confirmed the Committee would only vote on whether to adopt the policy and explained that an individual's use of the policy would be at the Chair's discretion.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted the need to consider the individual's technological capabilities when participating remotely and advised that he printed hard copies of the agendas for some members. He noted that if the Committee adopted the policy, the members would have to navigate Microsoft Teams on their computers to participate remotely. In response to an inquiry, he confirmed no one would be required to use the policy. Mr. Moore confirmed the policy would only help them maintain their eligibility to remain on the Committee. He noted that the Committee only had two registered architects and agreed it would be helpful if they could participate remotely if they were going to be absent for an extended period of time. Mr. Moore acknowledged that every member brought a different skillset and contributed in different ways.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed they would like to consider adoption of a policy to allow for electronic participation in meetings and directed this be placed on their next meeting agenda.

Joint Architectural Review Board Awards Ceremony

Chair Clites noted that the Committee received invitations to the JARB Awards ceremony, which would be held at the Birkby House in Leesburg. He thanked the Committee for their work to identify sign nominations. Mr. Clites noted that there were some interesting projects that would receive awards.

Vice Chair Lee noted that the balloon store owner was excited to receive the notice that her sign was being recognized by the Joint Architectural Review Board.

October Meeting Quorum

Chair Clites asked the members to notify Town Clerk North if they were not able to attend the October 2nd meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – September 4, 2025

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

Tim Clites: Good evening. We'll call the Middleburg Historic District Review Committee meeting for Thursday, September the 4th to order. The first item is roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson.

Bill Anderson: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton.

Margaret Littleton: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: We'll pause for any public comments. If you're here for something on our agenda, we'll get to you or item in the order that it's listed on the docket. If you're here for just general public comments, we're happy to receive them now. All right. Seeing none, we'll move to first item is approval of the minutes from our August the 7th, 2025 regular meeting. Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes. And are there any comments or corrections? Seeing none, I move, we approve the August the 7, 2025 minutes as submitted.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain. Thank you. Motion passes. Next is action item old business COA 25-1625-09. Request of Rochelle Rachel. Rochelle. I said that wrong. Rachel. I think I said it wrong the last time too. I'm sorry. Harshman Rachel. For a wall sign of façade revisions at 7 West Washington Street. (Grandeur Antiques. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is the, I think, third consecutive month reviewing different elements of Miss Harshman's application. Last month, you approved a number of elements, including a projecting sign window and or door signs for the two separate spaces the one to the east, which was the former, another blue moon space, and then the one to the west, which is recessed under the stone archway. You also approved the paint color for the trim surrounding the eastern space. And this month so last month, kind of new to the application that wasn't included. The first month was the idea of adding some columns over top of the trim on both the left and right sides of the eastern space, as well as some molding above the space. So, that was kind of just introduced in a quick drawing last month. You didn't really have details on that. You provided some feedback to the applicant on that. So, she is returning this month for one additional sign and then for consideration of the details for the columns and the molding above. For the sign itself it would be centered between the two spaces. So, you see to the left side of this photograph just the edge including the entry door to the eastern space. The western space is kind of off screen of the photograph. A little further to the right of the photograph. This sign would be placed kind of central not exactly centered, but between the two spaces on the stone wall kind of giving a directional arrow, either way, clarifying that there's two separate spaces for this one business. This particular box that you see here would. Was this one removed, Nicole? No, this is the one that would remain for a community box, not for signage for the building, but for fliers, for community events, things like that. So, that one would remain. But this would be a new sign that would be introduced with the revisions to the signage that were approved last month. This three-square foot sign will fit in the remaining allotment. So, it would comply with the regulations. The design, other than the addition of the directional portion at the very bottom, both arrows and text, the design of the sign matches the design of the approved projecting sign that is just above it, replacing the blue sign here that you see in the photograph. So, that's the portion with the sign. The portion with the columns may be a little more detailed for the Committee's consideration this month. You did provide some feedback last month. Specifically, most members made comments that the drawing you saw last month was a little too ornate. Was a term that was used I think by a number of the members and with particular a reference to the fluting of the columns. A couple of members suggested possibly considering a Tuscan column, something that would be of a simpler design. Nonetheless, the submittal for this month still includes a fluted column. It is not specific to providing all the details that we would need in terms of what the proposed materials are for the column. So, that would be something you would need clarification on as well. Sorry, there are proposals for the materials that were not discussed last month, but they would be substitute material. So, I've included in the staff memo some possibly relevant excerpts from the guidelines that, depending on your read of them, may not support the use of substitute materials on a contributing structure in the district. So, that's something that the Committee should discuss the use of the FRP the fiberglass reinforced polymer for the columns and then PVC for the pedestal as well as the top pediment. So, those are some of the things that we would suggest the Committee spend some time discussing those particular details. The one last thing that is of concern to staff is that some of that trim work around that particular building is not in the best condition. It's deteriorating, rotting in places. The way this reads it is unclear whether that material would be removed, and then the columns put in place, or whether these columns would actually wrap around, and that existing trim would remain in place. If it is to remain in place it would really need to be repaired prior to wrapping something around it so that we don't have an already deteriorating or rotting condition going on underneath, and it's just being covered up. So, again, that's another subject. You might want to discuss when it comes to the trim work.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Let's run through the sign because I'd like to venture that maybe that's pretty straightforward. Any additional comments on the sign from the applicant? It looks pretty straightforward.

Nicole Madden: It's straightforward just to promote that there are two stores, so that way you're not walking across one and going, oh, there's the one store, and then you go to the next store and be like, did I just see? Or did I just pass it just to kind of draw attention that there is two stores right next door to each other?

Tim Clites: Great. So, let's start with Cindy and we'll work. What is that? Right to left and we'll just run through the sign.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. I have no comments for the sign.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no comments either.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Linda Wright: I'm fine with the sign. Thank you. Okay.

Punkin Lee: I'm fine with the sign. But is the ivy going to get cut down and removed?

Nicole Madden: I think it's already been cut down. That's an old quarter. It's not there.

Punkin Lee: I didn't think so. But that stuff grows so fast. I just thought I'd ask. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think it's fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I like the sign, so I think it's fine.

Tim Clites: Awesome.

Rachel Harshman: She made it or are going to.

Tim Clites: The easy part. So, let's then go back through and have a little bit before we jump into our comments, I should then say on the additional architectural detailing, any comments on that that you'll want to share with us before we kind of go down through the Committee and get their input?

Nicole Madden: Any comments? I don't have any comments, but we do have a spec sheet now which we only received recently. So, happy to pass that around.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Nicole Madden: For consideration.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you.

Rachel Harshman: Also, I'd like to say that I felt I toned it down, so it's not so over the top. So, if you look at the detail, even though it's fluted instead of Tuscan, it still has a nice, I think, traditional look to it, and then the top part isn't so ornate. It's more has like a little bit of design, but it's definitely a lot plainer than the other one that you thought were over the top.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. Okay. Yeah. Just set that up here, and that way we can pass it around. Or is there a whole bunch of them? There's a couple. Yeah, just. That's fine. Just kind of sprinkle them down through here and folks can take a look at them. All right, so then talking about the surround the columns, the entablature that everyone's probably seen the color go up, that started, I guess, earlier this week. But Cindy, architectural detail. Comments.

Cindy Pearson: Yes, I do have some. And so, I'm just going to read what's in our guidelines and comment as I read that a little bit. So, it says detailing which was not historically used on the building, or which represents another architectural era, should not be added to the building. Plainly this fits right into that it is in a different era and it's not the architectural. It doesn't represent Middleburg in the way that our columns are on any place else in town. This includes brackets, columns, dormers, dentals, shutters, cupolas, etc. that are sometimes added in an attempt to dress up a building or make it appear older than it actually is. So, even though it is a very attractive drawing and it just, I don't think it's proper or fits into our Historic District at all. And the guidelines state that. So, is that the only part we're doing right now? Pretty much. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Sorry. Yes. I think in the last meeting, we clarified paint colors and what was happening on the interior. So, as I understand it, the only thing left before us is if there is any changes to this.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. And I would agree with what Will said on the what is behind it should be repaired replaced repaired. However, you phrase that because if you cover it, regardless of what you cover it with, that's still going to decay and rot away. I know it's an expense, but it's an expense that is going to save the building in the long run. It's just and, you know, as that is in our guidelines, too, that you shouldn't just cover it with decorative elements, so.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm in agreement with Cindy. I wasn't here last month, so I don't know exactly what went on other than reading the minutes. I think the fluted columns are a little much for the style of the building, and I don't think it really fits into the scheme there.

Linda Wright: Thank you. I'm in agreement with both of them, and I too was not here last month, but I just it doesn't go with the character of that old building. And like we were saying and part of the Historic District. It just seems way out of character for that building to me. If they were square or, you know, something else decorative and squarer, it would, I think, look better.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think the exterior of the whole building is a rather simple building. I mean, it was a car dealership back in the day, and I know you're selling fine antiques, but the personality of the facade is kind of lost with these. I think these are. Yeah, definitely toned-down columns, but they're still columns added to a building that really doesn't take columns. But and also, I would think before you do anything that the repairs would need to be made or else you'll be having worse repairs down the road when all of it disintegrates. But I just think they're too much for that nice little space. It's kind of trying to be something it isn't when it's a great space.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I'm in agreement with the panel in that the fluted it's just fancy, too fancy for a simple building. And I had maybe a suggestion. I know you want to use a little bit of gold; would you consider putting a pinstripe kind of around the glass and the door?

Rachel Harshman: We talked about that actually doing that.

Margaret Littleton: Which I think would look very nice. And for the next person it could be removed, or you know, whatever. And then just keep it off the columns or the I like the plain not fluted and simpler. And will you have flower boxes or anything in front, you think? And I think it's such a big glass and you're going to have your beautiful things and it's sort of an it's got a stage. So, people walking by are

going to love it and see the sign. And I don't think the columns are going to add a thing. I think you walk in the door and say, oh, I like that. So, that's my.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I generally agree with all those comments so far but let me also add. As I was reminded, we do have some columns or engaged columns on a building here in town that has slight flutes in it. So, as I recall that by someone, I think it's the fact that this is a round column fluted is the what gives me more of a problem. Plus, I'm going to be very specific when I look at the drawing that's on page four, that isn't the way I think this thing's going to look. For instance, you in our first, your first go round there was some talk about wrapping the existing columns and covering over the existing columns. Well, the way this is drawn and I and again I'm being this is more an illustrative, drawing, not a detailed drawing. I thought we were going to get some type of detail of how this was going to work. But that column that's shown in this illustrative drawing, I don't see how that could work. I'll be more specific if you try to look at the existing building and where the existing engaged column hits the door edge, the jamb, versus where this column is proposed to sit. It just wouldn't work. As an architect, I can't see how I could make that work. Second is, I don't see the round column wrapping this square column that's got depth on the outside, Side, so I just don't see how it would work. But aside from that, I think it's the round column that and the ornateness of the top of the column, the capital that I have an issue with.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Nicole Madden: Just to be clear, I guess so would we prefer if it were like a Tuscan square column?

Bill Anderson: We did suggest that last time, but I think, again, what I misunderstood, I guess that you're going to come back with details of how this was going to work. There's no details how that column is going to work with the existing. Also, I might add, I forgot to add that illustrative drawing doesn't show any Dentil work. So, where's that? Where does that go? How does that work? So, I guess I was expecting more of an architectural drawing. And what we got is illustrative drawing that I know, particularly at the column, isn't going to work. I don't know how I would make that work, anyway.

Rachel Harshman: Well, they do have, actually do we? Don't we have another picture of the plain column? So, it's not a fluted but it's plain and how it's actually made. It's like there's a column and they cut them in half and then they are actually fitted custom fit to go over the weight bearing. Because what's there is considered a weight bearing wall, I mean, a column. And so, this is going to go over it for.

Nicole Madden: [off mic] Yeah, I think it wraps over the sides. [off mic]

Rachel Harshman: Yeah, it wraps over it, which would be considered a repair since what's there is kind of in poor shape. So, if we didn't do a fluted and we did more of a plane, would you consider that? And we can get more details to it.

Bill Anderson: So, we'll see. [off mic] We've required in the past more of an architectural detail of how certain things are going to work. And I think that probably is something that would really help you all in seeing how it's actually going to be done taking the existing column or wherever the column is and drawing this fluted column as it relates to the front door as it relates to the facade. Plus, and I think I mentioned it's the capital also is I think it's much too ornate. And we had suggested the Tuscan. But, you know, I prefer myself the engaged columns that are there and having a repair and going with, you know, and up the paint suggestions that were made. I thought there could be a lot done there. Anyway.

Rachel Harshman: Okay.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you, Bill. I think I don't have anything to add. I guess I would say what you said just by means of clarification that for us architects, we maybe spend a little too much time, but it's part of

what we're tasked with, which is the proportion of a column, its diameter to its height. And how the entablature sits on it is really important to get right. and so, what I think I heard Bill saying is that those details, that figuring out how whatever the column is, whether it's a square, Tuscan or simpler Doric version or it's the pilaster that's there with slightly better, more traditional capital and base moldings, which could also be a way to improve what's there without completely redoing it. And then this question of Dentil does get into the historic guidelines and its recommendation that those things are not added. I think I feel comfortable critiquing what's there and saying it's not as old as the building itself. And if we're looking at a historic building, it could use some improvement in that detail. But I think we would want to see that to scale. So, the term architectural doesn't mean an architect has to do it so much as the Dentil and the entablature and the column and the diameter and how it relates to the door all needs to be drawn to scale enough that you all understand how to build it, and we understand what it's going to look like. Right. Because otherwise you'll end up with a kit of parts on site and it'll be like, well, now we have to figure it out. And that's not a great way to end up with details that look correct. And that are constructed correctly. For instance, just a minor and I say this because there's another applicant coming tonight that in one of the first processes as we looked at the houses in Salamander. And I'm not using that as an example of anything except to illustrate we spent a fair amount of time talking about how the columns on their porches and the little capital would actually have a projection in the entablature would not hang over the top of the column, because that really is it gets to the kind of authentic way things were constructed. And we went back and forth quite a bit on that initial guideline application so that those that detail was correct. And when I look at this illustration on page, I don't know which page I'm on but shop one columns only. It suggests that that box that's above it would be bigger than, or the same size as the entablature or the capital of the column. So, just a few little nits in there beyond just I think is it fluted or not? Does it have a lot of detail in the capital or not? There's some other kind of alignment and construction details that we're going to find important to understand. I think before we say yes, let's go have you build this.

Rachel Harshman: Well, you're explaining it well, so I understand. How about this? We'll do next time too. So, give me maybe better guidelines of what I understand architecturally, what I have to do. But just so I don't come, and you guys go, oh, nope, not that one either. So, what would be the best way? Because what I want to do is definitely repair and fix the columns. The appearance of it outside is really sad looking to me, you know? And I do want something nice. How, I guess I should say, is, what is your suggestion that we can compromise? How about that? And I'll work on the details of, you know, we can see how it would be fitted and what would we do to repair it, and, you know, such like that, so.

Tim Clites: I'll pause and not do all the talking. Go ahead, Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think it's important that we decide whether, it would behoove the facade of the building to improve what is there, because the guidelines say no columns to begin with. So, it's a that is a I would think the first step, because if, you know, if you come back with columns and it's like, well really columns aren't appropriate. So, I think that should be decided before you spend more effort and time.

Rachel Harshman: I agree, but what would you consider what's there? Would you call them columns? Would you call them like what's already in existing? [multiple speakers] Like to me I call that a column. But I'm maybe incorrect with actually what we would call that.

Punkin Lee: I mean they definitely need repair, and I think you'd have to repair them even if you're going to cover them because they are supporting and attached to the stone. So, if they crash, everything is going to crash.

Tim Clites: Yeah, I think. I would call them square box column or a pilaster.

Rachel Harshman: But they're a column, right?

Tim Clites: Yeah. They're not. Yes. They're not constructed the way an independent column on a, you know, building of this era might have had it built. Yeah. They're engaged. So, to give you some input, I

think it's a great question. I'm going to go out on a limb a little bit, and I hope the Committee will pull me back if I say something that misrepresents how they feel. But I think I've heard consistently that round columns are going to be problematic, both from the expression of a round column and from the technical, how do you integrate that into the building? Right. There's it's not a porch. There's not enough room to really see a round column there. That's just and that's the architect in me saying that also because a round column needs a certain amount of space around it to look right? So, it doesn't look kind of mashed up into the building. So, I think we're talking about something that's square, like what's there is square. And I think it doesn't want to be heavily ornamented or detailed. So, I walked by while it was the painter was there working. And the base of those columns is nothing but a piece of one by width. It's like a baseboard in a house. It's like the baseboard behind us. Right. It's not it's not particularly historic or authentic. So, I'm of the opinion that when that needs replaced, it could be replaced with moldings that perhaps are more consistent with what you might expect in a standalone column, but it wouldn't have to be. They could be replaced just as is. The Dentil gets into a whole list of other questions around, right, the crown molding. What do you do with that? If we're going to keep the roof the same size, which is, I think, the discussion in the last meeting. You suddenly have a whole bunch of layering offsets that when you start to add layers to it, it projects out beyond the roof. And so that seems also like a tough thing to understand without seeing a really precise drawing explaining it.

Bill Anderson: If this was built, I believe the way this with the round columns as proposed, the entire structure would wind up growing. I think, as you said, because of the scale and proportion has drawn an illustrative drawing. So, everything would change if those columns were put in. So, I mean, that's a big change. So, the original idea just wrapping the columns because it's simple. That's not what would happen if we went down that road. I would be interested to hear what the Committee has to say. If we took the, if the applicant took the existing structure actually restored, that would portion maybe added to the base with a little bit more detail. Other than that, simple little pieces of trim and really brought it back to an almost like not new. Obviously, it's not going to be new. What would members of the Committee think about that?

Margaret Littleton: I think that's a very good idea. I would your awning is going to be spectacular.

Bill Anderson: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: And I think I leave it plain and enjoy the window with your things. Put some planters in front of the face of these plain columns and it's eye popping. It's a wonderful place. I think you're wasting money. [laughter]

Rachel Harshman: Okay.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Margaret. I think that's. That awning is [off mic] once that awning is on there.

Rachel Harshman: Make a big difference.

Punkin Lee: It. Yeah, is make a big difference. And then you've got too many parts that don't kind of because you've got that lovely window and the glass door, so.

Rachel Harshman: Okay.

Punkin Lee: Keep it simple.

Tim Clites: Any comments from Linda?

Linda Wright: No, I would agree with all of that. I think that's a better route to take for what the facade of this building looks like in the history we've all known here for so long. I think that's a better route to go. And you still have a spectacular front.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I totally agree with that. Because the columns, the ornate columns take your eye away from the store and you want the focus to be on your shop. So, I think Margaret's suggestions are really good. And to keep those columns very simple.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Rachel Harshman: So, no Paris meets Middleburg, basically.

Cindy Pearson: And I agree because in your picture, if you just take your hands and put it to the side and cover up the columns, it's beautiful. You know, it's kind of like that old thing they say when you get dressed and you have all jewelry, take a piece off, it'll be better. Yeah. Yeah, it would look. It draws you to the window, which will be what the purpose is.

Rachel Harshman: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: And I'm sure we'll see a lot of gold in your window. Right?

Rachel Harshman: I hope so. Okay.

Tim Clites: Okay. Is that helpful? I would like to have a motion to approve the sign. I'm sorry. Let me speak into the microphone, approve the sign, and well, I guess we technically don't need to approve any repair to what's there that can just happen. So, if there's something that's to be changed, we would want to talk about that next month. So, the motion wouldn't have to address that. Well, could address that any changes would need to be in a scale or accurately proportioned drawing for next month.

Punkin Lee: What about the gold if you decide to add gold on the windows?

Tim Clites: Or are we suggesting no changes? You are looking at me confused.

Punkin Lee: That would be a change.

Margaret Littleton: That's what I was going to ask. Does she have to come back if she wants to put the gold around the pinstripe on the glass? Yes.

Tim Clites: You can decide to make that part of a motion or not, unless you need to see the drawing, then.

Margaret Littleton: Well, she may not want to do it. I was just suggesting that would be [off mic].

Rachel Harshman: Oh no, we actually talked about. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Mr. Moore would like to do something for.

Rachel Harshman: I think it's a great idea.

Will Moore: Okay, so.

Rachel Harshman: Gold stripe over columns that's a good compromise.

Will Moore: Yeah. I mean there are a number of things that could happen here if and I don't want to force your hand, but if you are agreeable to not making structural changes to the front, you could just remove that from your application verbally right now. But if you want some time to ponder it, you could the Committee could just include in their motion if there are going to be changes to the structure of the facade that would need to come back to the Committee. So, that leaves it open for you. As far as the pinstriping, it's completely up to the Committee. You know if you have a drawing, you can tell how far is that offset from the, you know, the trim around the glass. If you're not really concerned with that and you just want to give them carte blanche to do gold pinstriping or a rectangular gold pinstriping around any of the glass area, you can just make that up in the motion as an option for her. She would not be obligated to do it, but she would have the option. She wouldn't have to come back.

Tim Clites: Understood. Thank you. Did I miss anything, Bill? Okay. Thank you. Okay.

Bill Anderson: But like everything else, I think the pinstriping is a good idea, but I think without getting specific about it and requiring like that illustrative drawing to be sent back for our review, we don't know what would be approved. So, I think it's a great idea, but we should either suggest that they just make a change to the illustrative drawing. A sign company can make that and resubmit that for the pinstriping issue part.

Tim Clites: That's fine. Okay. Also, you can make a motion. Sounds great right. [off mic]

Bill Anderson: I'll make a motion for COA 25-16 request of Rachel Harshman for a wall sign and facade revision at 7 West Washington Street, to be approved as follows. The sign as proposed is approved. The Committee made a recommendation as to pinstriping on the glass storefront and glass door. If that goes ahead, an illustrative drawing should be submitted for approval, and this approval does not include any structural changes to the facade. If any are proposed, they will have to come back for that approval. Second. Okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Do I have a second?

Punkin Lee: Second?

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Rachel Harshman: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Sorry. I just shot my agenda by accident. Let's try this again. All right, now we're on to action items. New business. COA-RS 25-08 request of Castlerock Enterprises for a new single-family dwelling at two Stagecoach Ridge Lane Middleburg Residences, lot 45 Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have the report in the packet, along with all the drawings and details. This actually is the same lot that was included originally in your materials last month, but it was pulled last minute. But the owners are going ahead at this time now. So, you have on screen the location kind of highlighted here within The Stables neighborhood. This would be the sixth approval of a home in the stables neighborhood. This is one of the westernmost lots, so, like, set back the furthest from the public street. There's a private street that would go back off of Old Saddle Drive. Not Old Saddle Drive. Stallion Barn Place. There's a stagecoach. Ridge Lane goes back and would serve three lots along that private drive. So, this one is set back a good bit, even from the public street. Nonetheless, you have

the elevation details within the packet. This is using lap siding as well as Kendall Charcoal for the primary color on both the home and the detached garage.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any additional comments or feedback for us?

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah, a couple things here. The reason we pulled last month was because we wanted to do another resighting. It's one of the little challenging of a lot. So, with respect to it, we feel like we got to a really great place with this, so we're pretty happy with it. One thing of note on this plan is it basically takes the front elevation of the Hunt Box Premier, which is the larger Hunt Box at the Stables. It then also add the wing because they wanted an expanded master bedroom bathroom wing. So, hence, you see that left hand wing? We are incorporating a stone water table around the entire structure. And we did do a fenestration kind of change with regards to the muntin configuration on the windows. So, we went to a little bit more muntins, I'll put it that way. If you go to the rear elevation of the house, you will see there is a change that we did slightly make here. It's still takes on the rear reverse gable. It's got a little bit of a different slope than what we have on the other ones. Part of that is because this is a deeper scenario with a deeper porch on it, and then we have a small difference on this left side elevation as you're looking at the house because we made a change in the great room. So, it's got a little bit more window, it's got a little bit wider chimney. So, there's a differentiation on chimney, but still the same details. This does not have the clerestory lights. So, what we did is we still wanted to incorporate that same kind of look and not have such a long scenario on that roof. So, you have kind of a faux kind of louvered effect, kind of barnlike effect on that. And that's pretty much about it.

Tim Clites: So, a quick question before we go to the Committee on what you just mentioned, the dormers with the louvers that's not a window with the louver inside it, it's a louver on the outside.

Gretchen Yahn: It's a louver. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: Because we thought it would look too long and not.

Tim Clites: Plain.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. This is a deeper back. You know, t so to speak on this house.

Tim Clites: Understood. Thank you.

Gretchen Yahn: So, I can see.

Tim Clites: All right. Everyone had a chance to review this. Cindy, would you like to start with any comments?

Cindy Pearson: I have no comments right now. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comments.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I like what you've done. I like the rear elevation in particular. I think the changes you've made are very in keeping with the house.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree, I think the changes are nice. I went to look at that lot. That's going to be some creative excavating on that.

Gretchen Yahn: Oh, it's a lot of cuts. Woah! Anybody get any dirt.

Punkin Lee: And this house looks very large. [laughter] Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I just have a question because I don't know anything about anything. Why isn't the chimney higher? Like on the left elevation?

Gretchen Yahn: It doesn't. It's actually. [multiple speakers]

Margaret Littleton: Is that a chimney?

Gretchen Yahn: It is a chimney. In relation to what you see on the other chimneys, it's the same type of height. It doesn't like code have to be any higher. It may look a little bit less high because it's a little wider than. But it's the same height as what the other chimneys on the development are.

Margaret Littleton: Okay.

Gretchen Yahn: I think it's a width kind of thing.

Margaret Littleton: Right, right. No, it's just that it didn't know what it was. It wasn't a chimney to me.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. They wanted it. Yeah. They wanted it wider on this one because it's stone inside. And they wanted to have more breath in the kind of look.

Margaret Littleton: In the rear it's low as well. So.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. Just a question. Thank you. It looks good.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: Are there any details on the detail sheet that have not been approved before?

Gretchen Yahn: No. The detail sheet has stayed the same. We've stayed consistent with regards to that.

Bill Anderson: There are no new details.

Gretchen Yahn: No new details.

Bill Anderson: No other comments.

Tim Clites: So, I don't have any comments until you mentioned. So, I have a question. Not really a comment you mentioned was it the left elevation adding more muntins? And I did notice when I was reviewing it that there's it seems like there's this you've got like two over three, I guess they're windows, but they're almost as big as the doors. And then in that, you know, below in the lower level, it's one wide, three high, each sash, which is consistent with the rear elevation. I guess I got to go back to the plan. I guess they're not in the same room, are they?

Gretchen Yahn: No. So, they do line horizontally through. In terms of our shop drawings are done to that.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: We just felt that if we did, like a big, our choices would be kind of a little strange with regards to the windows, if we. It's kind of like we had to go to more traditional, more muntins.

Tim Clites: Yeah, that's why I was asking, because I heard you say that was part of what you were looking at. And really, I'll just say my question, which to leave it the way it is, is fine is in the pairs of doors that are only one light wide.

Gretchen Yahn: Yes.

Tim Clites: You could add muntins there, and I think it would still be successful if the owner liked more muntins I think it would be successful. But I can see why you needed to add them in the left elevation, because that would get a little squat.

Gretchen Yahn: It was getting kind of weird looking. So, we did a lot of looksee's at a lot of different shop drawings and then but it kind of was hit in the diodes from inside to out because then they were like, well we don't want to, especially on the back. They didn't want to look through a lot of muntins.

Tim Clites: Right.

Gretchen Yahn: So, we kind of were going that route too. So, it was kind of getting the best of both worlds.

Tim Clites: Yeah. The only other thing, but then when I looked at the site plan and realized no one will ever see it. The stone base would really be pretty to wrap around that lower area.

Gretchen Yahn: We had originally had that. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Right, because it's like you can just see it and you're like, where is it? You know? And so, it's facing, I guess the [inaudible].

Gretchen Yahn: That's what we did is we went the compromise on the value engineering was to take a stone wall that you would see from the front and then wrap and then take the siding that because we did originally have it as stone.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Yeah. Well, I don't have any other comments myself either. So, and the little louver, the little, I'll call it a dovecote in the gable ends. We've seen that somewhere before, right?

Gretchen Yahn: Yes. We have a dovecote on almost every single one of them.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: And it's actually it works effectively because if you will notice, if you go through this all the houses, the vent pipes and stuff, I exhaust all of my kitchen through the dovecote. That's why you don't see a lot of vent pipes when you go through the neighborhood.

Tim Clites: Yeah, there is one thing I noticed. I'm just going to say this. I don't know that you need to find a solution for it. But if you go to the rear elevation and the light that is above the second story window, when that happens facing the street, you get a lot of light out into the street. Like this whole idea

that it's a shielded fixture, that's true. It checks the box. But this is just an observation around like what happens in town when we keep getting rid of these lanterns and we get these darker lights, and then it's like it's a compliant fixture, but because of its height, it suddenly it meets it checks the box, but it doesn't really meet the intent. Right. There's a lot of light spillage out of a fixture like that, that's 16ft or so in the air. It's just an observation. I'm not asking you to change anything.

Gretchen Yahn: Yeah. One thing that could happen on those also is they do. I have looked they do have a bulb that is on the bottom coated.

Tim Clites: [multiple speakers] Yeah.

Gretchen Yahn: So, that literally it's going up, which is something we could look at too, because it's, you know, they're there for ambiance. They're not there for security. So, I hear what you're saying because I see it sometimes because, again, because the height, the throw in, you see. So, we could do a mockup on one of those. I would gladly look at that.

Tim Clites: Around the back, it's I'm not, you know, but when you think about it, facing the street, particularly a street that's not like a little pipe stem like this.

Gretchen Yahn: Yep.

Tim Clites: That's more a community comment than this particular.

Gretchen Yahn: No, I totally I agree with you. I agree with you on that. And we can do a mockup on that, and I'll let you guys see it because I think it would affect it. Very nice it would improve things also as well.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Awesome. All right. Any other comments from the Committee. Well seeing none I move that we approve COA-RS 25-08 as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Gretchen Yahn: Thank you guys.

Tim Clites: Next is COA 25-25 request of the National Sporting Library and Museum for approval of artwork for the American Woman Artist Vision of Nature exhibit banner. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have the. The Committee is familiar with this process now. So, they come every six months or so with the newest artwork for the upcoming exhibit, and you have the artwork in your packet. I'll bring it up on screen here in a second.

Tim Clites: They come show us a beautiful banner and make us smile. Right? Yeah.

Claudia Pfeiffer: So, there's something that looks like it's happening with the rendering of the PDF graphic on your Adobe.

Will Moore: Yeah. So, the color is actually consistent here. The blue remains. There's not.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Yeah. So, for some reason that there's some banding that's happening in the software online that's not actually there [off mic].

Will Moore: Yeah.

Claudia Pfeiffer: So, it has a it has a slight shadow against the white.

Rhonda North: Mr. Chair, could we get the speakers to state their names, please?

Tim Clites: I'm sorry. My apologies. Yes, we will do that. Thank you for the reminder.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Oh, okay. So.

Tim Clites: I'm sorry. Could I have you state your name and address, please?

Claudia Pfeiffer: Sorry. I am Claudia Pfeiffer. I am the George L Ohrstrom Junior Deputy Director and Head Curator at the National Sporting Library and Museum. Hello, everyone. Glad to be back and talking about our next banner.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. Okay. Any questions from the Committee or comments?

Cindy Pearson: I have no comments. I think it'll look very nice up there. I have had a wild turkey walking right next to my house. And if you'd like to come, get him and add it to the. [laughter]

Claudia Pfeiffer: Lovely lawn ornament.

Cindy Pearson: And I'm in town. I mean, so, you know. Yeah. Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no comments; I like it very much.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I think it's beautiful. It'd be great.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: It'd be another nice banner on the wall. Yes.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Beautiful.

Tim Clites: Bill.

Bill Anderson: As a collector of turkey images and a past owner of Turkey Roost Farm, I think this is superb. Where can I buy a poster of this?

Claudia Pfeiffer: Well, this painting is part of the exhibition, and the American Women Artist is a contemporary women's artist organization. We are not selling the artwork, but the artworks will be for sale through the organization. So, I'm just going to, you know, say that out loud for them on their behalf. [laughter]

Bill Anderson: The sign company that's here originally designed the sign for Turkey Roost Farm, which has endured over several owners and has been noted in several books Middleburg Books. And maybe I

should get you a picture of that. It's really a magnificent picture of a turkey. So, much for that. I think it's wonderful.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. I move that we approve COA 25-25 as submitted.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thanks for coming in tonight.

Claudia Pfeiffer: Thank you. See you in six months.

Tim Clites: And next action item COA 25-26 S 2514. Request of Windy Hill Foundation for two projecting signs and a freestanding directional sign at 104 South Pendleton Street. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, 104 South Pendleton Street. This is south of Federal Street. This is one of the two buildings that used to house the J.R. Snyder Plumbing business. It's the northernmost of the two. So, Windy Hill Foundation is going to occupy the front portion nearest South Pendleton Street. And then their management agency for leasing Quantum Real Estate is going to be in the rear portion of back nearer to the garage bays at the rear portion of the property. So, the proposal is for a projecting sign that would go up on an existing bracket here above what would be the Windy Hill main office. There would be a directional sign. It will actually face a different direction than you see here to provide arrow directions to visitors so they can distinguish between the main office of Windy Hill and the leasing office. The actual arrows are revised from what you see here after some discussion with Nicole. The revised ones are not included in here, but the Windy Hill main office area will now be a diagonal arrow for people who are approaching the ramp.

Nicole Madden: So, I was actually just thinking about that. So, thank you for picking up on that.

Will Moore: Yeah. So, but regardless it's the sign design remains the same. The arrow configuration is just changed a little bit. And then finally there would be a projecting sign at the rear for the leasing office. And that would be back here. She had originally included three potential locations for that projecting sign, the one that's shown on this this particular drawing. Although the sign would be oriented differently than shown here would be the only one that would comply with our regulations for clearance of it when it's above a pedestrian path. So, the two options that were presented that would have the sign on the right side in the photo here they would not comply because the sign would be too low, and that's along the pedestrian path to the door. So, it would be this option where it's on the left side of the door, as you are looking at, that would comply with the regulations. And this shows those three options. It would be option three, which would of these three options it would be the only one that would meet these requirements. But otherwise, this is the typical sign material Extira that Quail Run uses on pretty much all their signs. The three-color logo is indeed Windy Hills logo that they have adopted. Otherwise, the leasing office sign would just be black and white. The directional sign would be in black and white with the logo, as well as the projecting sign for the main office would be in just the logo in full color and would have the blue band around the area of the sign.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Mr. Moore. Name and address please. And then any comments?

Nicole Madden: Nicole from Quail Run Signs. I don't have any additional comments. Do we have the updated arrows with us today just so that everyone.

Will Moore: That's okay, I have those I think that's.

Nicole Madden: Okay. Yeah, we discussed it in person.

Tim Clites: [multiple speakers] Because.

Nicole Madden: Like when I put it together, I was like, I think this would make sense. And the client didn't make any comments on it. And then Will was like, well, actually, let's. And I was like, let's change it. So, yeah, we came up with a revised option for the arrows. So, it makes more sense to the general public. But apart from that, from my understanding they're already there. But people keep going to the Windy Hill main office when they really need to go around the building to Quantum. So, it's just like we're trying to like show, you know, show people to go to the right place in terms of where they're parking, considering they're parked at one side of the building, but they really need to walk around to the other side to make sure people don't get lost so.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Seems pretty straightforward to me.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I'm fine with them. They're fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think they look fine. And you changed the arrows, so ought to help.

Nicole Madden: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: All good for me.

Nicole Madden: Thank you.

Bill Anderson: I only have one comment. I know [inaudible] the I like the sign. I like the lettering and all the trim on the building is white. And these illustrative drawings, the sign just is white in your right. Are you proposing that the white color would be the same as the white trim on the building?

Nicole Madden: We can we could match to that. I think originally, we were thinking of just the standard white that we use, but we can match to the existing white that's there.

Bill Anderson: It was just my comment. I don't know what the other Committee members think about that.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Bill. I like that comment. I often look at these digital mockups and just assume that the starkness of the mockup is a, you know, electronic limit. But if it's possible to match the white, I think that would be a nice tie into the building. How does the Committee feel about that? Via nodding their heads. I'm seeing mostly, yes. So. Okay. And we're in. Well, there wasn't really any discussion at the

side door. There is only one option, as Mr. Moore mentioned, which is option three. So, I guess we can clarify that when we're making the motion. Correct. Yeah. And we'll leave it up to the applicant and Mr. Moore to make sure the arrows get the people to the right door. Okay. All right. Margaret. Oh, I'm sorry. You were leaning forward like you were going to make a motion. [off mic] You just. I tried, I tried, I tried. [laughter] All right, I move that we approve COA 25-26 Request of Windy Hill Foundation for two projecting signs. Is this two projecting signs and a yard sign, did I?

Will Moore: And freestanding. [multiple speakers]

Nicole Madden: Freestanding.

Will Moore: Freestanding.

Tim Clites: And a freestanding sign. Oh, there it is. I didn't read the rest of the sentence. And a freestanding directional sign as presented with the clarification that the arrows on the directional sign will be as per Mr. Moore and the applicant's discussion and agreement, and that the sign at the rear door for the leasing office would be at location three. [off mic] I thank you, Punkin and the white of the sign will be to match the white of the trim of the building.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: Second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Nicole Madden: Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right. Moving right along. We have COA 25-27 S 25-15 request of Main Street Bank for projecting sign a wall sign and replacement of the front door at 10 North Pendleton Street, Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have the materials in your packet. This is a new both a new business and owner of the property at 10 North Pendleton Street, which comprises this particular building, but also the entirety of the courtyard at Middleburg. So, Main Street Bank is now the owner of that entire property. But they are just going to occupy this building at the corner of North Pendleton and West Marshall. The two signs are identical in design. One is a projecting sign, obviously two sided. It will be a new bracket but will be in the same location as the existing projecting sign for the VIP Nails. There will also be a wall sign which matches it in dimension which will be placed there's an existing wall sign that would be removed and then the smaller Main Street Bank wall sign would go in place there. And then as noted the proposal is to replace the existing solid front door on the business with this mostly glass door. It would be a wood door. No divisions within the glass pane. And that is the proposal for you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any additional comments from the applicant?

Nicole Madden: From staff perspective, I don't have any further comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy let's go. Come on. I know.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. With the sign, I know we don't can't mess with the logo. That logos logo. But the one part in the guidelines that says use colors that complement the materials and color scheme of the building, including accent and trim colors. That sign is as far away from accenting that building as anything you can get. Only, and I don't know if it's the way you put it in to show it. If it's that bright of a

white on Main Street, or if there's some way they could tone that down. If it is, it looks like a fluorescent light in the night almost.

Nicole Madden: That photo is a bit dark, so I wouldn't think it would be too bright. I would like to think that it would complement with the columns that are there or is a similar sheen.

Cindy Pearson: Because it does. It's just like a bit bright. It's just that it's so different with that house.

Nicole Madden: That's it's quite a shock.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. Right. Yeah. Right. But that's all I have to say at this moment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I have no comment.

Tim Clites: While we're going down through, I just paused so we don't have to come down through twice. The wood stain on the door is to be determined TBD, to be determined if you have any comments on that while you're looking at the signage, maybe you could throw that into the discussion. Linda.

Linda Wright: I'm fine with the signage, but I would agree if the. Oh, sorry. Thank you. I'm fine with the signage as it is. I just think if the white in the lettering could match, the trim it would tone it down a bit. As far as the door goes, I would think something kind of on the darker side of a wood stain of some kind pick up one of the colors in the stone somehow and make it a little darker, so it blends in.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: On the door is it in bad disrepair that they want to replace it with glass? I mean, you kind of think of a bank not having glass doors, but yeah.

Nicole Madden: I think the original door doesn't have any glass, so I think they're trying to make it more inviting, from my understanding.

Punkin Lee: But I think a little darker also looks. [multiple speakers]

Nicole Madden: For the wood.

Punkin Lee: Yeah.

Nicole Madden: I was informed that there would be someone here today that would have some wood stain samples, but I don't think they're in here today. So, I apologize for that.

Punkin Lee: To me, with that glass like that, it looks more residential than it does commercial. Just my.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I agree with Punkin. I think it looks Yeah, residential, and very definitely a darker tone.

Nicole Madden: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I agree with all the comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. One question for the Committee around the door and the lack of muntins in the one historic building that's on this site. And I just wonder if that's the right decision. Or I see there's sidelights there, and it looks like the sidelights are single sheets of glass. Yeah, I didn't stop by and walk up to it to check, but I wonder if the door wouldn't be more sympathetic if it had some amount of muntin into it to give it a more traditional look. Just a question. I agree with the comments about a dark or medium to dark stain, as opposed to a lighter stain.

Nicole Madden: Which it is now.

Tim Clites: It appears that there now appears to be. Yeah, yeah. So, I understand we did this in the building that I'm in. We went from a solid door to glass door, and it makes an enormous difference in the space. So, I fully support that. I just wonder if it's a little too contemporary a door detail for if it was on another building on this same property, I might even care less. But this is the one original building, right?

Nicole Madden: Yeah.

Tim Clites: That's the only reason I had that comment. The signage I think is fine. I agree, if it's possible to tone down the white to a slight off white like the trim that would be nice. But certainly if. Yeah, if Main Street has a white and that's their white, I think we'd probably have to defer to their color scheme as well.

Cindy Pearson: So, this is the only door that'll be there. There won't be another door that they shut at the end of the night. This is it?

Nicole Madden: I think that's the door where customers will walk through.

Cindy Pearson: Right. But there's no main door behind it. It's just going to be a solid glass door all the time that it will be open.

Tim Clites: So, I think that's right. This is not a storm door.

Will Moore: Yeah. So, just to clarify if it's helpful that there are some interior doors within the space, we're not exactly sure how they're going to allocate the space within the building at this point. But it is not despite the name Main Street Bank, this particular location is not geared toward retail banking. So, while they may have the ability to accept deposits on a limited basis, it's not operating like your typical retail bank, like our Atlantic Union on Main Street. For example, it's more going to be focused on their financial advice financial planning, those kind of services that they offer. So, it's more their wealth management aspect. There may be some limited aspects to retail banking, but they're not allowed to do a primary use of a retail bank at this location. So, that I know questions like, oh, it's a bank, you want a glass door? Well, that's kind of, I think where that's headed.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I remember the application last month where we looked at a number of single light doors and or other configurations and there, I think we all felt it was an improvement to have doors that had some detail in muntin in them. And I could see this being just based on the sidelines. I could see it having a small panel at the bottom and then some muntins above. So, like a three-quarter light door still going to provide plenty of light. I know that that's totally traditional to the building, but more so maybe than or more sympathetic to the building than I think this one light no muntin door. But again, this is just me, so I'm open to the Committee. [off mic]

Cindy Pearson: It was a good idea. Yeah, yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I'm sorry. One at a time. Turn your mic on. There we go. Push it there.

Cindy Pearson: Sorry, I have a word. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Go ahead, Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I was looking. I'm sorry. I was looking at the door with the sidelights. And I think proportionately, it would look better what you're suggesting with the panel at the bottom of the glass. And I'm trying to figure out which picture.

Bill Anderson: As opposed to the glass. The glass all the way down with muntins. [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah. Which is similar, at least.

Tim Clites: Yeah. One, one person at a time. So, Rhonda can keep track of all this. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I was just saying the other. The option could be basically glass the size it is, but with muntins, which would even though the windows, the adjacent, not the sidelights, but the adjacent windows don't have any real clues as to what the muntins proportions would be. One would think the glass door like this would be for a building like this would be tend to be more muntins.

Margaret Littleton: In Keeping.

Bill Anderson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: I think so.

Bill Anderson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: I don't mean to say that I have a strong opinion about whether it should be a three-quarter light or a full light door. I just I'm responding to the panel below the sidelights, which are kind of not. Yeah, they don't appear to have muntins at all.

Punkin Lee: I think either muntins or the panel at the three quarter would make the door look a bit more substantial. It looks a little lightweight for the rest of the building. Just the open glass. It needs a little weight.

Tim Clites: Okay. And so, then I guess if we were to make a recommendation, we would want to have that come back to us. I think so. Yeah. If we want to see the pin striping on glass, we probably want to see this door too. Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: I think we should do both. I think we should have a bigger panel on the bottom and mullions too. Okay.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Well, we can certainly make that suggestion. The applicant can bring that back if there's a strong reason why they want muntins of a different configuration. I think we can be open to seeing it, but does anybody want to make a motion?

Bill Anderson: Go ahead. I'm not quite sure what we decided with the color of the signs.

Tim Clites: Well, you can make a motion with what you decided. [multiple speakers] My only comment was I liked the white to match the trim, if that was possible. But if this Main Street Bank, if that is their white, I don't think we can ask them to go against their corporate colors or logo. If it's not their white, then the idea that it's a white simply closer to the trim in the building.

Bill Anderson: But I thought the first comment was the blue. [off mic]

Cindy Pearson: It's their logo. Yeah. Yeah.

Will Moore: I think that is correct. That just from looking, perusing their website that that blue field in the back is part of their brand, but I'm not 100% on that. I do know that the three stacked squares, whatever they're supposed to represent, that color scheme is part of their brand. But you see on this particular logo, they're using those colors as well in the actual text. So, I.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And thank you for bringing that up.

Will Moore: Yeah, I would just I would hesitate for us to declare that what is presented there is their brand or is their logo? I'm not sure that because we don't have their like style sheet for all their applications of their brand, we.

Nicole Madden: If I can interrupt. They did supply that to me.

Will Moore: Okay. And did that include white specifically for.

Nicole Madden: The design as is what they provided to me?

Will Moore: Yeah. Okay.

Tim Clites: And I would thank you for bringing up that website as opposed to a white sign with Blue Main Street and Green Bank. I think I like the darker sign, so I'm comfortable with that if that's our options potentially. Right.

Bill Anderson: I have another question.

Tim Clites: All right, Bill. One more question.

Bill Anderson: The front door, the stain on the door the building has got some beautiful brown stones on it. Can we make the recommendation that the stain would take into account matching some of the stone color?

Tim Clites: Yeah, and I think they'll bring some stain samples with. They just aren't here tonight. So.

Bill Anderson: So, they will be coming back with that.

Tim Clites: I think when they come back with the door pattern we should ask for samples.

Bill Anderson: I'm with you.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Yeah. Perfect. All right. Are we ready? I move that we approve COA 25-27 request of Main Street Bank for projecting sign, wall sign and replacement front door with the projecting sign and the wall sign being approved as submitted. If it's possible for the White in Main Street to match the trim of the building, that would be preferred but not required, and that the front door be resubmitted with muntin door design; either full or three-quarter light muntin door design and stain samples reflecting the species and color of the wood. And hardware for the front door. And then I'm going to pause. And I'm sorry, I just saw one picture and I have one question before I even ask for a second. Does anybody know if the For Lease sign is still there? Page five.

Virginia Jenkins: Anybody know what?

Tim Clites: We'll wait till we get to page five. So, I'm sorry. I meant to bring this up earlier.

Punkin Lee: And what are you asking?

Tim Clites: Is the white Courtyard Middleburg For Lease sign still there?

Will Moore: I don't have any reason to believe that it would have been removed. It's not noted for removal in the application. It is something that we may have to talk with the new owner about. You know, there are provisions that allow for real estate signs, but this has become more of a permanent fixture for this property, which is not permissible. So, but I do believe it's still in place currently.

Tim Clites: Is the applicant the new owner or the tenant?

Will Moore: Both the applicant is both the new owner and the occupant of this particular building.

Tim Clites: So, before I ask for a second on my motion, can we pause around that? Because yeah, I'll just go out on a limb. That sign for 10 or 12 years has set there as a non-approved sign that is not pretty and doesn't contribute to anything. And we spend a lot of time in this town on signs. So, if there's a new owner, I'm not looking to make life difficult for them, but I think it's an opportunity to either request or require that that be removed. Oh, I'm sorry.

Will Moore: Yeah, it actually may have been removed because it probably has the former.

Tim Clites: Punkin just corrected me right below. I didn't read the second line of text says removal of all Courtyard Middleburg signage. So, I would assume that includes that white sign. So, my motion is going to say that my understanding of the, thank you Punkin, that line is that it includes the removal of the white sign in this on this sheet and that. Now, does everyone understand my motion?

Cindy Pearson: I'd like to make a friendly amendment.

Tim Clites: Amendment.

Cindy Pearson: Can we add to it that if it's the darker blue, be used on the sign instead of the brighter blue. Is that appropriate? [off mic] If it is part of their logo, is that appropriate Will?

Nicole Madden: sign the same background color?

Cindy Pearson: If you do check the Main Street Bank logos, they have a darker color they do use.

Nicole Madden: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: It's more like navy instead of a brighter blue.

Will Moore: That may be just the way it's reflecting.

Cindy Pearson: It could be.

Will Moore: Be on the thing but.

Cindy Pearson: So, I'm not quite sure how to say that. Is that okay? How I? If possible.

Will Moore: I don't think it necessarily needs to be in the motion, but I can talk to Nicole about just confirming that the color is.

Cindy Pearson: Then I withdraw that. Thank you.

Nicole Madden: If you're referring to the background color Pantone 7694C, I believe that would be the darker blue unless I'm mistaken.

Cindy Pearson: It's just show it in [off mic]. Sorry.

Nicole Madden: No. You're fine. Okay.

Tim Clites: Any other comments or amendments or clarifications?

Margaret Littleton: I second it.

Tim Clites: Margaret seconds it. All those in favor?

Margaret Littleton: Second.

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

Nicole Madden: Thank you, I appreciate it.

Tim Clites: Realize you're going to have that much fun on that one I appreciate it. Discussion items. Pre-application discussion for the Middleburg Museum Fence at 12 North Madison Street. Welcome.

Charlotte DeButts: Hi.

Tim Clites: Hi. And I'm having to remember my manners. So, name and address, please.

Charlotte DeButts: Okay. My name is Charlotte DeButts, and I'm with the Middleburg Museum. I'm a Board Member and also on the Committee of Buildings and Grounds. And in case you all haven't noticed, we have a serious fence problem. And I'm here tonight to start to remedy that. We have done quite a bit of research on what might be appropriate for the fence, and I'm hoping that you all will give me some feedback so we can move forward on this. We have researched not only the building itself and what might have been there before, but also the area to understand what the vernacular is. And we really see this as an opportunity to build a fence that reflects the mission of the museum and visitor center. To that end, we want to, or at least our mission, includes collecting and preserving and sharing the history of the museum, the building, the grounds, and also to provide a place that establishes community. In order to do that, we have set several goals and in our design process. And the first goal we have is screening the Safeway parking lot and cars that are there. So, yes, Will, and may I thank you, Will, for helping me with this process. This is all new to me as far as coming to you all. So, as you can see in that illustration there, we have a four-board fence that screens the parking lot and the cars that are parked there. Our intention is to plant that area in front of the fence so that we get as much screening as possible. One of the reasons is not just because it will make the garden look nicer, but we plan to include or we plan to host events, both community and museum events in our garden there. We just recently leveled that space and have very nice turf down there. And we would like to be able to put up a tent up there. the lawn area was designed so that it fits a standard tent, but in order to feel any kind of enclosure or privacy or not so much privacy, but just a sense of place, we feel pretty strongly that that needs to be screened, and therefore we would like a higher fence and then plantings in front of that. The next goal was to have a very clean and tidy appearance. We are the visitor center as well as the museum, and we want to be able to have people come and think, wow, this place is sharp. You know, this is a really together kind of organization. And they and this is a beautiful little town, and we want people to come back and enjoy the space. I think having it very clean and neat, tailored and tidy is inviting and will encourage people to visit and use the museum grounds. We also have budgetary constraints, as all most or most non-profits do as we do. I'll just keep it

to us, and we want to keep it so that the maintenance for the fences is as simple as possible. And as cost, you know, as cost effective as possible. We would like to use the materials that will enable us to maintain the fence more easily. So, what we're thinking of is a plain, clear. Let me get the actual wording on that seasoned plain clear white oak for the fencing. And then we would like to apply a whitewash very neat, clean-looking whitewash on that. We feel like that provides the proper patina that goes with our beautiful little pink box. And also, will be easier to maintain going forward. So, that's just an idea, and I would welcome your feedback on that. One of the design goals on this fence is really to make this garden as accessible as it possibly can be to everyone in the community. And we have widened the entrances of the garden, and our intention then is to create paths that are gently sloped. It will not be absolutely ADA compliant, but it will be very accessible even for a wheelchair. So, we'll slightly widen all of these entrances. And if you all are interested, I can go through, you know, foot by foot what we're planning to do. But for the sake of discussing just the fencing itself we will not have gates, we will remove gates and we will just have openings and then any kind of welcome sign, then will be able to be seen from the street, because right now the gates are open and the welcome is on the inside as you walk through, you don't even see it. So, we feel like that's a much more welcoming experience for visitors, as well as the community who use the garden actually pretty frequently. And then lastly, we want it to be a historic reference or historical reference to the history of the area as well as the town. This kind of board fence, which of course, you all know appears in your guidelines, would have been used in the back of house areas behind the taverns that existed at the time. And this little pink box probably was never fenced before. I don't know, maybe in the 50s or something, but the fence that exists right now was built in the 90s, so it's not something that goes way back, that has been repaired and replaced as it is. The fence, the areas behind these back of houses would have had paddock fences and most likely. And so, we would like to borrow that concept and use that in our garden. We also as a museum, we are representing not just the town itself, but the villages that surround it and the rural area that surrounds it. And as we all know, that's very much part of the rural vernacular of the area. So, that's why we've chosen this type of fence, that one of the reasons we've chosen it. We ultimately will have, we hope, exhibits on the agriculture of the area. And of course, this will be, you know, a perfect selection for that kind of interpretive garden. So, we'd like to use that design if possible. For historical support, I've included in the packet a description of. And actually if there's a picture, I think Will, of the painting by Madeline Hughes. Are you all familiar with her? She painted the paintings that are now in the foyer of the community center, and they're paintings of Middleburg and the surrounding area and the pink boxes in there, and it shows up a couple of times. But in one particular painting, The Pink Box.

Will Moore: I don't think it was actually in the materials. I have the PDF that references it, but it's not at the end.

Charlotte DeButts: Okay. Well, I can describe it to you. It's a wonderful painting. And it's in a sort of primitive style. The pink box is there and surrounding it is a four-board fence that drops to a two-board fence. And so, it's and that painting was painted in the 50s. And we think that it probably represented what was there possibly in the 30s, 40s, 50s certainly at the time that the artist was painting the painting. So, we consider that strong support for our fence design. And then also I did include in the packet the reference to the Colonial Williamsburg fencing research and that to very, very briefly excerpt that these are historic district. I'm sorry. These are the it's called partitioning the landscape, the fence in 18th century Virginia. And it was commissioned by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. And in that it says by the 1810s there was an increased application of the post and rail, and this the pink box was built, we think, around 1827, something around there in the 1820s. So, this would make sense to have that. And then by the Civil War, post and rail was the most common fence type in Virginia by rail they mean board. So, and they had illustrations for that. So, again, that's something that would make perfect sense for us to use in our situation there. You haven't had time to look at the pictures. If you look at your pictures right now, just something that I want to add, because I don't want to keep you much later, but you can see where in the bottom picture the four rail, the four board drops to a two board. It's a natural transition spot right there. In this picture, it doesn't look quite the way it does when you're in the garden. Where it drops is pretty much in line with where the cherry tree bulb is. And so, you it's not quite as abrupt as you're looking right now. And then we come around the rest of the perimeter with wide open entrances. And

then as we come to the front, it terminates right there as it wraps into the north entrance along the building. So, it wraps and terminates right there. There's no fencing beyond that other than a hitching rail. And what we thought was is that that's really common. If you look at the buildings like the Oyster Bar or is it Oyster House or Oyster Bar? I always get confused, Oyster Bar, I guess. If you look at pictures of that old bank building, there is a hitching post there and a number of if you look at the old pictures that are available of Middleburg, you see a number of hitching posts just like this one. And we thought also we could use that when during Christmas in Middleburg when the carriage pulls up in front of the pink box and loads people that would be a possible place for someone to hitch those horses. Or at least it would add to the ambiance of the ride. So, that's what we thought we would do. We have plans to renovate the pavilion and this in selecting this fencing and in deciding where it would terminate and begin again and all we took into consideration what we're planning to do with the pavilion as far as pathways and things like that. That's all I had to say.

Will Moore: Yeah. So, just to give a quick rundown because you've not had the benefit of seeing this ahead of time, as she was describing at the rear. So, Safeway it would be to the top of the screen along the majority of the rear. Here the black line would be the four rail fence. This is where she referenced it transitioning down to the two-rail fence with a cap which is just proposed to be 30 inches tall that would then wrap around onto the Marshall Street frontage where the gates are now, they would have the inward turn of that two-rail fence. It would then continue all the way down Madison. Sorry. Marshall to Madison Street frontage and then wrap around at that northern entrance on the north side of the building. And then here to the left of the building, as you're looking at, it would be where the, I believe four-foot-high hitching rail would be.

Charlotte DeButts: May I add something? I mean, good idea. I think, to nip this in the bud from the very beginning, that that northwest corner is showing at a 45-degree angle now. The fence person I just spoke to about what was possible and what we could do, has suggested that we angle that off similarly to the northeast corner because of the tree. The maple tree is in the way right now, and it's actually starting to surround the fence that's there right now. So, we're going to have to somehow extricate the existing fence from the tree. And we will blunt that corner. [off mic] Thank you. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: I have a question. Is on the two-board part are you putting a flat board on the top?

Charlotte DeButts: Yes, it's a rail and cap.

Punkin Lee: Right, which is labor intensive because it takes all the rain and rots really quickly, so.

Charlotte DeButts: So, are you suggesting that we maybe just keep the same design.

Punkin Lee: Just a flat board.

Charlotte DeButts: As the four board? Just do the flat.

Punkin Lee: It just will rot quicker than you need to repair it.

Charlotte DeButts: Okay.

Tim Clites: And I have a question too. You say the existing posts on, are they painted now?

Charlotte DeButts: They are painted now. So, they would have to be stripped. And if we decide we're going, well, they have to be stripped anyway because they're crumbling. We're going to try to reuse any post. We can't reuse any post for the Safeway Edge because they're too low. But for everywhere that we can, we'll trim them down and then strip them and then treat them with whatever final treatment we have whitewash or paint, depending on what you all allow.

Tim Clites: And the reason I ask is that the oak, presumably you picked for its durability.

Charlotte DeButts: Yes.

Tim Clites: Not necessarily its character. And so whitewashing or a stain that's, you know, they make semi-transparent, semi-solid and solid stains. There's whole levels of the benefit of stain, I guess, is it's a little easier to go back and touch up. You're not it's not a painted surface that's going to peel or chip. And that's why I was asking about the post, because when you're done, I'm sure you want them to look the same.

Charlotte DeButts: Exactly.

Tim Clites: Even though one is probably what the posts are probably either pressure treated or cedar, I would guess.

Charlotte DeButts: Right. So, you're thinking that maybe we stain with something that's more opaque.

Tim Clites: Perhaps.

Charlotte DeButts: Even if we don't go to the paint route?

Tim Clites: Yeah. Because like, a cedar and oak are going to look very different if they have a light stain too.

Charlotte DeButts: Right.

Tim Clites: And if your goal is to have it look like a white fence that's got some age to it.

Charlotte DeButts: Right?

Tim Clites: Yeah. I don't know the exact answer, but I'm, you know.

Charlotte DeButts: I think probably. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: The comments.

Charlotte DeButts: Yeah. Okay.

Punkin Lee: And also recycling those posts, are they going to be durable enough to hold oak boards that are not light, you know.

Charlotte DeButts: If they're not we won't. We'll replace them if we have to replace them, we will replace them.

Punkin Lee: Something to think about.

Charlotte DeButts: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: The weight of those is pretty good.

Charlotte DeButts: Right. Right.

Tim Clites: Until someone else starts giving comments, I'll give comments. I like the fence design. And thank you very much for all the research and thought given too. We did talk about these fences, what was

it, a year ago or so, a little while ago? And in the absence of something more historic and like you described, simple and tidy. I think we were feeling like keep what's there. But I could see this being very successful. I'll just speak for myself. I like the design. How does the rest of the Committee feel?

Virginia Jenkins: I just want to say, as a former member of the museum board, this is really great. I love the presentation. I love the way drawn it up and made it very clear for all of us. And I just I think the whole thing is really going to up from the picket fence.

Linda Wright: Yes, I would agree. I think it's beautiful. I think it will be a total upgrade of that whole space.

Charlotte DeButts: Thank you.

Linda Wright: Yeah.

Charlotte DeButts: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: I think it's going to be pretty pretty nice. Very nice. And your presentation was right on. Thank you.

Charlotte DeButts: Thank you so much. Thank you.

Margaret Littleton: Well, they are all saying think. I know it will be wonderful. [laughter] [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: And I'm going to be I'll be the black sheep in the family.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, for crying out loud Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I can't help it. It's been a picket fence for a real. I do like the part at the Safeway, but it has been a picket fence there for a really long time, and it just fits on that corner with a picket fence. I'm not saying what you have presented won't look good, but I would miss the picket fence, totally.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy. We always want to hear how people really feel. So, that. And I mean that, right? Like.

Charlotte DeButts: Well, it has been, what, 35 years? In 1990 I have photographs, and it was there was nothing there. There was nothing in the yard, in the garden. There was nothing, no fence, no nothing. So, in 35 years so.

Bill Anderson: I thought it was a very nice presentation. I look forward to getting the submission actually, looking at it even further. My time in Middleburg is not as long as some others, and I've gotten so used to the fence that's why the last time it was presented, I wanted to see that fence repaired and brought back. But you've opened up some nice possibilities which I'd be interested in reading more about.

Charlotte DeButts: Okay.

Bill Anderson: We have a very good presentation. One other thing that was you had a kind of a throwaway line, which I didn't understand. And that is, you said the property will not be Ada compliant and for wheelchair compliant, why would that be?

Charlotte DeButts: Because for us to be able to do that, I think would be so onerous. I just don't think we'd be able to do it. I think it may be possible. What we're planning to do with that pavilion is to open it up so that you will enter straight from the sidewalk to the level of the pavilion in the center. Exactly.

Thank you, Will. Exactly. Right there with that line is right there. So, we would open it up there and then on the far side into the garden it would slope down into the garden so that someone could wheelchair in there. But I just can't guarantee that it's going to be absolutely Ada compliant. But it will, our intention is for someone to be able to get a wheelchair in there and then into the garden.

Bill Anderson: Well, just a suggestion. It would be nice if during the your submission that can be addressed again, although I know it's not the issue. I kind of remember when it came the last time there were some preliminary information that said, oh, the grades wouldn't work in the front of near the pavilion. Oh, we couldn't do it, but we would look into it, that's the way I remember it. I hope, you know, speaking for people that are in the wheelchair, I hope they wouldn't be excluded from being able to get in by themselves into this facility. But anyway, that's just an aside. Great presentation.

Charlotte DeButts: Yes. Thank you. And that is very important to us. So, we will do our best more than our best. We will make sure that someone in a wheelchair can get in. It's just that I know when you get into Ada compliance, it can be so, you know, burdensome.

Bill Anderson: Believe me, I know.

Charlotte DeButts: Yeah, well, I'm sure all of you all know. So, anyway, we will do our best to be Ada compliant, and if not, you will be able to wheel a wheelchair into that area.

Will Moore: And just to note, there was an application quite some time ago for revisions to the pavilion. That application has since expired, so any changes they would make to the pavilion itself would need to be subject of a new application. So, you would get to see all those details again.

Charlotte DeButts: Okay. One grant at a time. [laughter]

Tim Clites: And thank you for bringing this for discussion, for discussion item also because it gives us the chance to, over the next month, all of us to go walk through it and look at what you've presented and consider it so that when you come back, we're ready with any additional comments. But sure, this is a great pre-application.

Will Moore: I will send out all of the materials she submitted to you tomorrow so that you have them. If you could maybe resend if something happened or send me that. [multiple speakers]

Charlotte DeButts: The photograph of the pink box of the painting.

Will Moore: On the painting. I think that would be really helpful for context as well.

Charlotte DeButts: Okay yeah.

Will Moore: And then I will make sure they get that as well.

Charlotte DeButts: Yes. And any suggestions, if you all do go to look at the pavilion and the yard and all, if you have a suggestion about Ada compliance, you know, be happy to hear what you have to say. Would love for you to draw up some drawings. But anyway, that I would appreciate it if you'd go take a look. So, next time when we're here we can respond to that. Thank you. Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: You're welcome. Thanks for coming in.

Charlotte DeButts: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: All right. Next action or discussion item is electronic participation in meetings. Mr. Moore, I don't know if that's you or.

Will Moore: Well, let's start with a discussion of, you know, if we get into the details of what it looks like, that's where I will definitely turn it over to Rhonda because she has all the specifics of when you can, when you can't, how many times you can do it, etc.. But the point is, if you wish to allow members the option to participate electronically in meetings. So, if someone is traveling or if someone is incapacitated for some reason and they still want to participate, if you want to allow for that, you have to adopt the policy. And then Rhonda would bring that policy back next month. You don't really have any option of tinkering with it. It's basically from state code. But the question is whether or not this Committee would want to allow for that. In the past, it's been brought up, I think it's been quite some time and there didn't really seem to be a desire to allow for it. I think some this Committee in particular works in such a collaborative way around this table. I think the feeling in the past was that you would lose that if somebody were trying to participate electronically, but I'm open to it if you want to. But before we get into the details about it, if it's still a hard no, then we won't bore you with all the details.

Tim Clites: Can I jump in with a question?

Will Moore: Sure.

Tim Clites: I agree with you. This Committee seems to work best sitting here together, and I think it's worth understanding why that would be valuable as a Committee to have as an option. So, I'm going to use a for instance we have requirements for our attendance, and sometimes real life doesn't allow for attendance the way we would like it to. And I think it would be a shame to have an attendance requirement that there's no option. Rhonda has to say this person has not met the attendance requirement and for the year. And so, they're no longer on the Committee. I think that would be a shame, that's the only reason I can think that it would be worth having a virtual option. Because it would allow in the rare instance where someone, right had real life that they had to take care of, they could be in attendance at a meeting which would allow that other part of the code to not kick them out of being part of our Committee. Did I say that all right, correctly?

Will Moore: I think so.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Rhonda, is there anything about that, that?

Rhonda North: So, what you're referencing is the Council's attendance policy with regard to Committees.

Tim Clites: Correct.

Rhonda North: So, you are correct. If they participated remotely, that would still be considered.

Tim Clites: Participation. Right.

Rhonda North: Participation in the meeting. Now getting a little bit into the policy, there are nuances to whether a quorum would be met through remote participation or not. That depends on the circumstances of the remote participation without getting into it too deeply.

Tim Clites: Right? Right. Are there any other reasons why we would want to have that? I mean, I don't think as a group we're suddenly like, oh, great, I need this is now my opportunity to sit at home and not come to the meeting. Right. And I think that the guidelines maybe. Did you share them with just me or did you share them with the Committee?

Rhonda North: Just you.

Tim Clites: Just me? I think the guidelines make it pretty clear. That's not really what this is intended to do. It's intended to take care of emergency, real life things that you need, you cannot physically be here either for your own personal reasons or some very limited circumstances around life, family commitments that are so. And now I have another question. This policy, if we enacted it, is it something we would need to enact on a yearly basis?

Rhonda North: Correct.

Tim Clites: To be renewed or whatever the term is every year.

Rhonda North: Correct. When the state first started allowing remote participation, you could adopt the policy, and it just stayed in place. But last year they made some changes to the state code. And the policy now has to be adopted annually. And the purpose of that is to allow any changes that may be made to that section of the state code to be incorporated into the Committee's policy annually. So, if you adopt it, what I do is I track the date of adoption, and then I will bring back a policy again and again and again each year. You know, at the same time that incorporates any state code changes that have occurred.

Tim Clites: And so.

Rhonda North: Since [inaudible] last adoption.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So, then two things can happen on that annual date. We can get an update on the state code. And we can also opt out of that.

Tim Clites: Correct.

Rhonda North: Also, we could say we no longer want to do this. That's created a problem that we weren't aware of or an inconvenience and so once a year we check in on that approval.

Rhonda North: Correct.

Virginia Jenkins: I have a question.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: If it were adopted, is there any way it could be done on basis of pre-approval by the board for a particular person? You know, let's say I couldn't come for the next 3 or 4 months. Could I do it and get pre-approval from the board? [multiple speakers]

Rhonda North: Now we're getting a little bit into the policy. So, approval of the Chair is actually required as a part of the policy. And the approval has to occur prior to the meeting.

Virginia Jenkins: And that's what [off mic].

Tim Clites: Yeah. and what Rhonda is there's this code is already written. We're not going to write the code. We're not going to write what happens. But you would, what would we do from here if we you would share that with us and we would vote on it in our next meeting?

Rhonda North: So, I mean, you're right, it is a state code. It's just written for the HDRC. And yes, we would bring the policy to the Committee, and you would, if you so choose, you would adopt it at the next meeting. You know, in reference to going back to Ms. Jenkins' comment about, you know, if I'm going to miss three months. Now, there are rules with how as regulations as to how many times you can participate remotely. So, if it's a personal reason, say you're on vacation for three months, you know, you can do it twice a year, up to 25% of the meetings in a one-year period for personal reasons, like vacation. If you are

out sick if you're disabled, if you are caring for a family member who is disabled, then it's an unlimited number of times per year that you can participate remotely. Personal reasons don't count towards the quorum. Medical reasons do count toward the quorum. So, there are lots of intricate details associated with this.

Tim Clites: And but what does that really mean? That means that it's a little more work for you when someone if we had this enacted, it's a little more work for the staff to understand exactly why and track that. It's not something we negotiate as part of agreeing on the.

Will Moore: Correct. So, you had asked the question, do we vote on it? I think Rhonda was responding. You would have to vote on adoption of the policy. But this.

Tim Clites: It's the policy.

Will Moore: This Committee would not vote on whether to allow a member to participate.

Tim Clites: No, I understand that.

Will Moore: Yeah. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: No, but we also don't amend this is a state policy. So, we would just look at it and it's either an it's an up or down vote.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: And whatever it says we then abide by and in the event that it is used by a member or two, then it's up to staff to track the reasons and whether it still fits within the intent of the policy.

Rhonda North: Well, you know, if we got a request, then we would take that to the Chair because the Chair would have to either approve or deny.

Tim Clites: Understood.

Rhonda North: You know, these things have to be recorded in minutes. There's lots of details associated with it. But it no the Committee's vote is just whether to adopt the policy or not to adopt the policy. It's not the details of the policy. It's not whether someone gets to use the policy, that's the Chair's discretion. So, yes, it's a question of do you want to allow folks to participate remotely or do you not?

Will Moore: Yeah. So, that's really back to that initial question. Does the Committee see value in having that? And do you think it would work well with this Committee and the work you do? And I guess the last thing I would say sorry to jump in is you also need to consider your technological capabilities. So, you know what we like not to call out anybody, but I print a hard copy packets for certain members and that's I'm happy to do that. If you're participating remotely, you're going to have to be navigating the Microsoft Teams environment on your computer. You're going to have to be muting and unmuting yourself, and you're going to have to. Yeah. So, it brings in all those aspects of it as well.

Tim Clites: Understood. [multiple speakers] But it doesn't go ahead.

Cindy Pearson: And I was going to say it did. It was helpful when I had surgery and then had another surgery on top of it. It was very helpful. So, it's yeah, you know, six of one, half a dozen the other.

Tim Clites: It's not a policy that anyone's required to use. Right?

Will Moore: Correct. Correct.

Tim Clites: It's a policy that gives us or gives an individual an option that they wouldn't otherwise have that could help them maintain their eligibility to be on the Committee.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: To me, that's the big thing, right? Because. Yeah.

Will Moore: Yeah. And with two registered architects on the Committee, if one of you or both of you were going to have an absence for an extended period of time for one reason or the other, I think it would be extremely helpful if those circumstances allowed for you to participate remotely for this Committee to have that input. Everybody's input here is extremely helpful. Each member has different skill sets and contributes in different ways. But you know, it, like you said, it would have an option. It's a simple vote. We put it in place next month, and if you would like to. And then it's an option. And to your point, you could do it a test run for a year, see if anybody uses it, revisit how well did that work and decide whether next year whether to keep it in place or not.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I mean, I think generally we don't have quorum issues here. And you know, so it probably is not going to be used because we need to maintain a quorum. But and yeah, I guess I don't think that suddenly everybody is going to, you know, the three months of the summer, there's three people out on vacation. Like, I think we're all kind of aware of the Committee. My recommendation would be that you circulate the documents so everyone has a chance to read it, and I'd certainly I don't want to push one way or the other for the Committee, but I think by reading it and having some time for all of us to digest it by the next meeting we then can, you know, have another discussion and vote about whether we think it has value or not. Is that all right?

Will Moore: Yeah, we'll definitely have it in your packet next month and can discuss it again. You either decide to vote to adopt it, or you just take no action, and you won't have it. So, yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Will Moore: Okay. Okay, great.

Tim Clites: Let's do that. Thank you. Thank you. Thanks, everybody. What do we have left? Oh, we have JARB Awards coming up. Everyone will get that. Well, you got it in your packet, the little link. It's at the Birkby house. I think this is the second year in a row.

Will Moore: Yeah, I have hard copy invitations for you. I will bring those down as soon as you adjourn. So, you have a hard copy?

Tim Clites: Yep. And thank you for your work. Was it just a meeting or two ago where we scrambled to get some signage and there's a few interesting projects in the county and the other Historic Districts that have won awards. So, if you get the chance to go, it's kind of a nice hour and a half or two hours in an evening. And is that it? Yes. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I just want to say that the Beth who has the balloon store was over the moon to get a notice that her sign was being recognized by JARB. She was just excited.

Tim Clites: That's awesome.

Punkin Lee: Yes, she was thrilled. She had no idea that something like that could happen.

Tim Clites: So, very nice.

Punkin Lee: Yeah. Made her day.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Well, the sign made our day. I think when it came in, it made mine anyway, it was kind of a very fun sign, so. All right, if we're done with our quorum for next month, let the staff know if you can't make it, we're going to be voting or at least discussing whether we vote on a very important. I'm just kidding. Yeah. Meeting adjourned.