TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, May 7, 2026
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, May 7, 2026, 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
Steve Simons
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

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

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the April 2, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Anderson, Jenkins, Littleton, Simons, and 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 25-37 & COA 26-09: Exterior Alterations, Rear Additions & Revisions – 115 & 117 West Washington Street – Kevin Ash

Planner Rogers reminded the Committee that they approved the COA during their last meeting with some conditions which were outlined in her staff report. She reported that the applicant submitted revised plans based on the conditions and noted that they also included other items due to changes to the interior layout. Ms. Rogers advised that changes were made to the windows on the apartment building, shutters were added, an entrance door was changed, the storefront was revised, and patio furniture was added in front of 117 West Washington Street.

Kevin Ash, the applicant, explained that as they were finalizing the interior layout, some alterations arose due to code requirements or modifications. He opined that his architect addressed the eight items identified by the Committee.

Committee Member Simons noted that the building was a non-contributing one. He questioned whether there was any difference in what the Committee could or could not approve as a result.

Chair Clites explained that the Committee was still tasked with approving things that were sympathetic to the Historic District and consistent with the village feel. He advised that they tried to honor historic buildings by taking a more careful approach to what was historic and what was not.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee asked for updates to the front entry at 115 West Washington Street related to the paneling below the windows. He further noted that one of the interior changes resulted in the addition of a mullion in the main panel of glass, so it divided it into two sashes as opposed to being one large one.

Mr. Ash advised that the architect provided a detailed cross section for the paneling below the window. He reported that due to the intersection wall, a muntin became a mullion. Mr. Ash opined that the architect did a good job of showing how this would be executed and noted that it would be an actual panel, not applied OG. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that the storefront windows were already divided. He reiterated that they contained a muntin that was proposed to be a mullion.

Committee Member Simons noted that the building was raised to two stories at some point, which was why he questioned whether it retained any of its historic character. He opined that if it did, what was proposed was a departure from what a traditional storefront was like in the 1950s. Mr. Simons advised that he was not opposed to it.

Chair Clites noted that his comments aligned with Committee Member Simons. He expressed concern that the wall could increase to six inches.

Mr. Ash advised that it was a two-by-three-inch wall. He explained that its purpose was to separate the dining area from the lobby.

Chair Clites noted the interior glazing and asked whether it was possible to have the intersection of the glazing in a T if the vertical was needed.

Mr. Ash advised that he was trying to keep it as narrow as possible by using a thin wall; however, there would be glazing inside. He noted that this was a picture frame window, which would allow guests to see into the restaurant even though it would be secure.

The Committee agreed they were fine with this proposed change.

Chair Clites noted the parapet wall and suggested the base cap molding be turned upside down.

Mr. Ash agreed and noted that it would look better to have the paneling down below to keep the profile turned around.

Chair Clites noted that the pergola on the roof had been rotated ninety degrees and reduced in size to minimize any view from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Ash opined that only the first couple of pieces of the pergola would be visible.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ash advised that the railing behind the parapet would be thirty-six inches tall and the parapet would be eighteen inches.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed no umbrellas would be visible from the roof. He confirmed he would not add lighting to the building; however, there would be LED tabletop lighting for ambiance.

Vice Chair Lee expressed concern that there was a lot being placed on the roof. She noted that the Committee could not decide whether this was a good thing or not. Ms. Lee opined that moving it back was helpful.

Committee Member Wright opined that it was a better solution. She expressed hope that it would be hidden from the street. Ms. Wright expressed hope that there would not be light spillage.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed the railing on the rooftop would match the one in the courtyard on the ground level. He noted that the plans did not show the green roof; however, he advised that such roofs tended to take on a meadow feel.

Chair Clites expressed hesitation about the idea of having a pergola on a roof and opined that it felt inconsistent with the vocabulary in town, particularly in the Historic District. He opined that a little of it would be seen. Mr. Clites expressed appreciation that the applicant made it smaller and turned it; however, he advised that this was a decision as to what was appropriate. He reiterated that it would be visible further down the street.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee asked that the applicant consider wrapping the mansard into the roof to integrate it into the penthouse on the rear of 115.

Mr. Ash opined that the revisions provided more continuity to the termination.

Chair Clites asked whether the wall should be a darker color on the back side.

Mr. Ash agreed it would feel more like a roof; however, he advised that from a patron's standpoint, they would be looking at a wall. He opined that the continuity of the wall color was more appropriate.

The Committee advised that they were fine with what was proposed.

Chair Clites noted the request for more detailed drawings for the entry door at the residential unit.

Mr. Ash advised that this would no longer be the main entry for the apartments and explained that it was relocated to be off of Washington Street. He noted that from a first responder's perspective, the address was Washington Street, so the front door needed to be on Washington Street. Mr. Ash advised that the referenced door would now be the rear door. He opined that residents would use it to enter and exit the building, as the parking was in the rear; however, pedestrians would probably use the door on Washington Street.

The Committee advised that they were fine with what was proposed.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash explained that the green roof would be a vegetated one that would contain a mixture of sedums and grasses. He futher explained that there would be trays that would hold rainwater, with the sedums and grasses using the trays. Mr. Ash advised that the water would evaporate. He confirmed the grasses would grow two feet tall.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed the lighting was a traditional gooseneck fixture.

The Committee agreed they liked these improvements.

Chair Clites noted that the last time the Committee reviewed the plans, the door had muntins in the side lights.

Mr. Ash advised that it would be a six light door that would match the side light.

Chair Clites noted the lighting was updated at the residential entry to two gooseneck fixtures. He further noted that lighting was added to the roof deck to the right of the side door.

The Committee advised that it had no comments on this change.

Chair Clites noted the window detail. The Committee advised that they had no comment on it.

Chair Clites noted the shingle sample that was presented by Mr. Ash. He further noted that it would provide a sense of a shadow line. The Committee advised that they had no comment.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee requested an option to screen the walk-in cooler. He further noted that it was proposed to be framed with a real wall and an extension of the lap siding, with an extension of the parapet to conceal the HVAC system. Mr. Clites advised that a metal louver would be installed and painted the same color as the siding.

Mr. Ash explained that they would build the wall, and insulate it with foam insulation, in order to apply siding.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed the door would be insulated so employees would just walk into the cooler. He noted that it was a specialty door that would prevent anyone from being locked in. Mr. Ash explained that the gray box depicted the compressor for the apartments and noted that there would be landscaping at the end.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Chair Clites opined that there would be a ramp leading to the side door.

Chair Clites noted the proposed rooftop accessories, which included lighting and furniture. He advised that no umbrellas or planters were proposed at this time. Mr. Clites noted the floor plan for the location of the proposed items.

Mr. Ash noted that there were furniture samples for the lower patio as well.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed there would be no light fixtures on the roof, other than the wall sconces. He confirmed there would be a sofa, table and two chairs under the pergola, as well as four chairs and two two-top tables around it. Mr. Ash advised that there would also be two sofas and four chairs around a coffee table. He noted that there would be tabletop lighting so patrons could read the menus; however, it would be LED low ambient mushroom lights that would sit on the tables.

Chair Clites noted that other applicants had requested and received approval for such lighting at street level, which included hours of operation.

Chair Clites noted the design changes based on the final interior floor plan. He further noted that the window arrangements on the apartment building were updated, with some windows being removed and some being shifted.

Mr. Ash advised that the biggest movement was to the windows in the rear elevation and noted that they were separated, which allowed for two shutters per window as opposed to a mullion window with a bifold shutter. He advised that the window was removed from a bathroom, as it was not needed.

The Committee agreed this was an improvement.

Chair Clites noted that the main front door in the storefront did not appear to have divided glass and questioned whether this was intentional.

Mr. Ash advised that it should be a divided light door and opined that this was reflected in the cut sheet. He further opined that it was a six-light door. Mr. Ash noted the comment on the plan that stated that the final delivery of the rear exit door and the front door would be for six-light doors.

The Committee agreed they were okay with this.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ash advised that the bottom panel for the Washington Street apartment door was taller and that the door would contain six lights. He noted that it was a new door that would replace the existing nine light door.

Chair Clites noted the window that was added in the mansard roof due to building code requirements. The Committee offered no comments on this change.

Chair Clites noted that furniture was added in the courtyard; however, there would be no umbrellas. He reminded the Committee that they have discussed including an outdoor furniture section in the guidelines; however, nothing had been formally adopted. Mr. Clites noted that during those discussions, the Committee expressed a desire that all furniture be black or near black and that it be consistent throughout any establishment.

Planner Rogers noted that the furniture layout depicted round tables; however, the detail was for square ones.

Mr. Ash noted they came in either style. He advised that there would be two four-top tables that would be square and four two-top tables that would be round.

Councilmember Pearson expressed concern about the use of cane chairs from the standpoint of maintaining their appearance.

Chair Clites opined that the seating in town was less formal, whereas what was proposed was more bistro-like.

Mr. Ash noted that he wanted patrons to sit for a long time and spend money.

Committee Member Simons opined that the chairs would get hot if they sat in the sun all day. He suggested the contrast and coloring helped with his comfort of them.

Committee Member Jenkins opined that the mesh would not retain heat.

Committee Member Anderson reminded the Committee of the terrible storm that came through Middleburg a few years ago that blew furniture off decks. He cautioned that the wind would catch anything placed on the roof.

Mr. Ash opined that the wind would blow through the wicker. He advised that he had these same chairs on the rooftop of Hotel Burg in Leesburg. Mr. Ash noted that lots of thunderstorms had come through and they have not flown off the roof.

Committee Members Littleton and Jenkins opined that the cane was attractive against the color of the chair.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed the tables' tops would be an imitation white Carrara marble.

Chair Clites reminded the Committee that they were tasked with determining what was appropriate. He advised that having umbrellas on the patio would not bother him, as this already occurred in town; however, having them on a roof felt inconsistent with the way things engaged with the street façade. Mr. Clites acknowledged that Mr. Ash was not asking for umbrellas and expressed appreciation for that. He noted the detail sheet, in particular the shutter dogs, shutter hinges, copper collector boxes, and downspouts. Mr. Clites further noted that there were no gutters, as there was internal drainage for the roof.

Mr. Ash confirmed that everything on the apartment was internal and that there were no actual gutters, only downspouts and collectors. He noted that because it was a mansard roof, it would sheet flow. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed the copper roof above the main entry would not contain a gutter, as it was only eighteen inches deep.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ash confirmed the iron railing was changed from the first review.

Vice Chair Lee opined that it was more contemporary than the original one. She further opined that the original one presented as being more substantial, whereas, what was now proposed looked lightweight.

Mr. Ash explained that he was trying to get consistency between all the railings on the project. He noted that the new railing had pickets.

Chair Clites noted that it stopped at a sub rail and then had a horizontal space before the handrail.

Vice Chair Lee opined that the original rail was much nicer, had more detail and looked more substantial. She suggested the new proposed rail was inappropriate for the building.

Mr. Ash advised that he had no preference. He suggested that if the Committee preferred the other one, he would include that in the final packet.

Chair Clites noted the need to clarify when the drawings and detail sheets did not match so the Committee would know what it was approving.

Committee Member Simons opined that the proposed railing was consistent with the guidelines. He noted that he did not have an opinion one way or the other.

Mr. Ash agreed both were consistent with the guidelines; however, if the Vice Chair preferred the original one, he would go with it.

Chair Clites opined that the original rail had a hierarchy to the pickets. Committee Member Jenkins agreed it appeared to be more substantial.

Vice Chair Lee noted Chair Clites' concerns about the pergola and opined that it was not appropriate for where it was going. Committee Member Littleton agreed.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the application as submitted with the following clarifications: (1) the entry door to

115 and the rear entry door to 117 both have two over three or six light divisions in the glass panel; (2) the iron railing match the previous submission, which has both a hierarchy and scale to the picket and baluster so that it has a more substantial look and it also has a sub-rail with a horizontal space below the handrail; (3) turn the OG upside down on the parapet so that the detail is facing down, not up; (4) approve the shingle sample as submitted; and, (5) removal of the pergola.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore explained that the applicant had the right to have his submission acted upon, which was to approve or deny it, if he liked. He further explained that if he was amenable to the removal of the pergola, he could so state and then it would be a condition of the approval. Mr. Moore reiterated that if he wanted the pergola included, he had the right to ask that the application be acted upon as submitted.

Chair Clites inquired as to what would happen if the applicant was not amenable to the removal of the pergola.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reiterated that he had the right to ask that the application be acted upon as submitted. He explained that if he was not agreeable with the removal of an element, the Committee must act upon the application as is and could either approve or deny it.

Chair Clites clarified that if Mr. Ash said "no" to the removal of the pergola and the majority of the Committee did not like it, they would have to deny the application as submitted.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested that a third option was for the applicant to remove the pergola from the application in order to get approval of the remaining elements and then reapply just for the pergola. He suggested a straw vote of the Committee to determine where the members stood on the question.

The majority of the Committee expressed a desire for the removal of the pergola.

Chair Clites suggested the Committee needed to be clear about what they would need to see, if anything, in order to be comfortable with approving a pergola. He further suggested that if they were not, they needed to be clear that they did not feel it was consistent with the vocabulary and language of the village and what they expected to see because it was something that would be seen.

Committee Member Simons suggested the need to articulate to the applicant what the major objection was. He further suggested that if it was just that it be reduced overall so it would be completely out of the public view, the Committee should give him that direction.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that if the applicant modified the pergola so it was completely out of public view, he would not need to return to the HDRC, as it would no longer be under their purview.

Chair Clites opined that the Committee would like to approve as much as they could.

Mr. Ash noted that having no shade made it difficult. He further noted that he was looking for progress and opined that agreeing to 95% was important to continuing to move the project along. Mr. Ash noted that he had done a lot of work to mitigate the pergola's impact. He advised that he would have to return with another suggestion.

Chair Clites opined that Mr. Ash was saying the Committee could vote on the motion as presented. He noted that he could return with a proposal on the pergola. Mr. Clites questioned whether Mr. Ash wanted the Committee to vote on the application tonight so he could keep moving forward. He further questioned whether Mr. Ash needed any further clarification on the motion.

Mr. Ash questioned whether the resistance to the pergola was its aesthetics and opined that it was consistent with other pergolas in town. He suggested the issue was location. Mr. Ash opined that precedents had been set for pergolas like this one, as they existed throughout the town.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Chair Clites confirmed they would vote on the motion as presented and that the applicant could return to discuss the pergola.

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

Chair Clites thanked Mr. Ash for getting the application this far along. He acknowledged that there were pergolas in town; however, he explained that the Committee viewed them with the scale and vernacular as being a garden structure that existed at the street level or the level of the grade. Mr. Clites opined that if Middleburg were a denser urban area where rooftops were a part of the streetscape and the vernacular of the town, it would be fine to put one on a roof; however, that was not the case.

Mr. Ash opined that Middleburg was no different than New York City in that it had zero lot lines and was an urban setting.

Chair Clites advised that Middleburg was a historic small scale vernacular federal town. He advised that in that context, saying it was urban was an overstatement of the scale of what was seen in town.

Mr. Ash inquired as to the Committee's thoughts on an awning.

Committee Member Simons noted that he was going to suggest a retractable awning and noted that there was a precedence for second story awnings in town on commercial buildings. He opined that a retractable one would not be present during off-hours and would still be available to provide shade when needed.

Mr. Ash noted that he had three retractable awnings, which contained wind sensors, on the fourth floor of the Hotel Burg. He explained that they automatically retracted when the wind was above 20 MPH.

Committee Member Wright questioned the amount of shade that would occur with a pergola. She noted that the sun would come across the roof a good part of the day.

Chair Clites expressed an understanding of the applicant's desire for a pergola and noted that it created a sense of scale when compared to being completely open to the sky.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ash advised that the columns of the pergola were six feet from the building and the rafters were eight plus feet out from the penthouse. He noted that the parapet wall was a lower profile. Mr. Ash suggested the Committee may need to revisit its height with an awning. He confirmed the Committee had provided enough feedback.

New Business

COA 26-04: Exterior Renovations – 107 W. Federal Street, Unit 14 – Jeff Yeutter

Planner Rogers reported that this was a request for renovations at the Federal Courts building, which is a condominium complex. She advised that a previous revision enclosed a doorway to a window and explained that this request was to add a window to the left of it in order to provide for a window in the interior office space.

Jeff Yeutter, the applicant, noted that his architect was present in the audience.

Committee Member Anderson advised that he had no issue with the proposal. He asked that the brick work match the existing brick work. The remaining Committee members agreed.

Committee Member Simons noted that the arch above the window was stucco.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-04 as submitted.

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

Committee Member Simons recused himself, as he had a conflict of interest on the following agenda item. He left the dais.

COA 26-05: Revisions to Approved COA 24-22 & COA 25-09 and Additional Lighting – 204 E. Washington Street – The Boyd Bed & Breakfast

Planner Rogers reported that during the occupancy inspection, it was noted that there were some changes from the approved elevations to what was actually constructed. She further reported that the western door was modified; the hardware was modified; the shed dormer was modified and the materials changed; the shutters were removed from the bathroom additions; and the exterior lighting was modified. Ms. Rogers advised that there was a new exterior light sconce that could not be approved under the zoning ordinance and noted that the applicant was proposing modifications to those.

Committee Member Anderson advised that he had no issues with the changes that were made. He opined that the lighting solution was very innovative.

Steve Simons, of Veritas Contracting, presented a mock-up of the lighting solution and noted that the prototype would look cleaner. He explained that the light bar was currently mounted to the bottom portion of the light, pointing up and advised that they were going to reverse it so it would point down and then apply a copper shield over the lamp/bulb in order to direct the light in a downward fashion. Mr. Simons noted that there was not a commercially available solution and advised that they would modify the fixtures themselves.

The Committee asked that the light be directed downward.

Chair Clites advised that this was a variation on a modification that was done on another project. He noted that the Hersh's took their bulbs and made them a LED light. Mr. Clites expressed an understanding that the Virginia Department of Historic Resources provided input on the rear addition. He advised that he liked the dormer being an extension of the wall and opined that it was an improvement over the original proposal. Mr. Clites noted that the original submission showed a divided light door and opined that it appeared to be a non-divided light one. He questioned whether this just occurred in the rear of the one-story addition.

Mr. Simons confirmed that both doors were the same. He noted that he provided a picture of the back door so the Committee could see it more clearly. Mr. Simons confirmed it had its original storm door on it; therefore, it was not obvious that it was a divided light door.

Committee Member Anderson moved, seconded by Committee Member Littleton, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-05, a request of Veritas contracting for revisions to approved COA 24-22 and COA 25-09 and additional lighting at 204 East Washington Street as submitted.

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

Mr. Simons noted that the owner – Mrs. Moore – was present in the audience.

Committee Member Littleton commended Mrs. Moore and noted that they had done a wonderful job on the project.

Chair Clites noted that the AIA Northern Virginia Chapter were recently in Middleburg for a board meeting and advised that he gave them a walking tour of the town, including a walk through of the Boyd building. He noted that it was a nice treat to see the inside of this recently renovated building.

Committee Member Simons returned to the dais.

COA 26-06: Fencing – 100 N. Madison Street – Rick & Sue Sierra

Planner Rogers reported that this was a request for a fence along the pipestem driveway that went out to Madison Street. She further reported that the proposal was to replace the existing chain link fence with a board-on-board one that was six feet tall and three feet tall. Ms. Rogers advised that it would be painted green to match the existing fence.

Chair Clites thanked Mr. Sierra for proposing that the fence be shorter as it came toward the street.

Scott Sierra, 100 North Madison Street, appeared before the Committee representing the application. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he confirmed the driveway only served the one property.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee, approve COA 26-06 as submitted, with the paint color as submitted, which was Benjamin Moore 448.

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

COA 26-07: Removal & Replacement of Outdoor Grill – 300 W. Washington Street – Middleburg Community Center

Planner Rogers reported that the Middleburg Community Center was proposing to remove their existing outdoor grill and replace it with a new masonry stone grill in the same location. She advised that it would contain a continuous four-foot cooking surface and would have a natural stone veneer. Ms. Rogers noted that the Town gave the Community Center a grant to construct the grill.

Sue Foote, of the Middleburg Community Center, appeared before the Committee. In response to an inquiry, she advised that they would use as much of the existing stone as possible and would then match it with local stone. Ms. Foote expressed hope to have the grill ready for use during the Fourth of July.

The Committee agreed they liked the proposed grill, which would be larger to serve the community.

Chair Clites opined that the Community Center would not be able to find fieldstone that large. He suggested they would need to use flagstone or blue stone on the horizontal surface.

Mrs. Foote advised that the stonemason believed he could obtain the material that would go with the Community Center. She noted that she tried to get as close as possible when she drew the rendering.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-07, a request of the Middleburg Community Center for the removal and replacement of an outdoor grill at 300 West Washington Street.

Chair Clites offered a friendly amendment that there would be flagstone as discussed for the horizontal surfaces.

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

COA 26-08 (S 26-03): Vinyl Window Signs – 10 E. Federal Street – Castle Gallery

Planner Rogers reported that the application was for four vinyl lettering signs in the bottom of the windows that read "Castle Gallery."

Catherine Dolaher, the applicant, expressed hope that the artwork spoke for itself.

The Committee opined that what was proposed was an elegant approach to signage.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Anderson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-07 as submitted.

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

COA 26-10 (S 26-04): Projecting Sign & Wall Sign – 200 E. Washington Street – Revive Clinic & IV Therapy

Planner Rogers reported that this was an application for a six-foot projecting sign on a new bracket on the eastern corner of the building and a 6.04 square foot wall sign on the side door. She reminded the Committee of the existing sign on the building for an architectural firm that was on the other corner and noted that it would remain.

Dave Singh, the applicant, appeared before the Committee. He opined that Ms. Madden did a wonderful job of designing the signs.

Nicole Madden, of Quail Run Signs, displayed a color sample.

Committee Member Anderson advised that he liked the signs and opined that there was no problem with their size or location.

Vice Chair Lee opined that the colors were fine.

Councilmember Pearson noted that the signs contained a phone number and reminded the Committee that they did not usually allow that. She noted that when people drove past them, it was difficult to read telephone numbers and opined that motorists would stop in the street to write them down.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Madden advised that the carving would be in the lettering. She further advised that the phone number would be on a slightly raised piece so it could be removed or replaced if needed. Ms. Madden noted that the phone number would be carved as well.

Chair Clites agreed with Councilmember Pearson's concerns about including the phone number and noted that the Committee generally asked applicants not to include them or website addresses. He noted that Middleburg was a historical town and liked the ambiance of pretending it did not have modern technology, even though it did. Mr. Clites opined that it was a pretty sign.

Committee Member Simons noted that he did not include phone numbers on his business signs because he wanted people to look him up on the Internet, which drove website traffic. He opined that it was a useful marketing tool to not include the phone number on signs.

Mr. Singh advised that he was fine with that, particularly for the hanging sign.

Ms. Madden suggested the phone number be included on the wall sign.

Chair Clites noted that the wall sign would not be visible. He suggested that given the way it was presented, it would be blocked by the hedge. Mr. Clites advised that he liked this compromise.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Simons, that the Historic District Review Committee, approve COA 26-10 (S 26-04) as submitted, with the clarification that the main projecting sign not have a phone number and that the sign by the entry door is allowed to have a phone number.

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

Dr. Preet Bajwa, owner of the business, announced that they would hold a soft opening on May 10th.

COA 26-11 (S 26-05): Relocate an Existing Projecting Sign & New Vinyl Window Signs – 13 E. Washington Street – Federal & Black

Planner Rogers reported that Federal & Black was moving to 13 East Federal Street and would like to move their existing projecting sign there, which would be installed on a new bracket. She further reported that they would like to install vinyl window signs containing their logo in the center of the windows, as well as a sign with another logo at the bottom of each window.

Chair Clites noted that the existing projecting sign won a JARB award last year.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Nicole Madden, of Quail Run Signs, confirmed the business would take over the whole building.

Chair Clites noted that the previous business also had a large logo on the glass; however, it was not on every panel. He advised that when he first looked at the proposal, he felt it was a lot of the same thing. Mr. Clites noted that there was some relief in one of the windows of the previous business. He questioned whether the Committee felt it would be overdone to have signs in each of the windows.

Committee Member Anderson opined that it was not going to appear as it did in the rendering, as this appeared to be opaque glass. He opined that this would not be an issue.

Councilmember Pearson agreed with Chair Clites and noted that the previous signage only included two letters. She opined that what was proposed looked like it would be more for a mall setting than a historic district.

Chair Clites opined that it was a lot of the same graphic. Committee Member Jenkins agreed it was a lot of letters.

Ms. Madden advised that they looked at only doing two windows; however, the applicant felt the other window looked lost without having anything on it. In response to inquiries from the Committee, she confirmed the applicant did not have a symbol that would go along with the graphic. She confirmed the applicant did not advertise her business as F&B.

Councilmember Pearson opined that the bottom lettering appeared to be more like an ad on each window, not signage telling people who they were. She reiterated that this was not appropriate for a downtown historic district.

Committee Member Jenkins opined that the lettering reading "Shopkeeper's Best Shop Around the World Winner" was overkill. She suggested that was not required.

Ms. Madden suggested the shopkeepers slogan be removed from the far-right window, leaving it only on the far left one. She noted that this award was a big thing in the retail community.

Vice Chair Lee suggested the shopkeepers award sign only be placed in the middle window. She further suggested that the lettering advertising the home accessories be on the two outside windows so the signage would not have as much weight. The remainder of the Committee agreed with this suggestion.

Vice Chair Lee noted that the Federal & Black signage would still be on all three windows. She explained that her proposal was to put the heaviest signage on the right window, by the door.

Chair Clites agreed this would provide an agreeable scale.

Ms. Madden agreed with this proposal.

Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-11 (S 26-05), a request of Rebecca Kidder to relocate an existing approved projecting sign and apply vinyl window signs in three windows at 13 East Washington Street, with the change of putting the Shopkeepers tagline on the middle window and the one-line tagline on the two outside windows.

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

COA 26-12 (S 26-06): Projecting Sign & Wall Sign – 15 E. Federal Street – The Clothing Closet

Planner Rogers reported that The Clothing Closet was moving into 15 East Federal Street in the left-hand bay. She further reported that the applicant was requesting a 12.5 square foot wall sign above the storefront windows and a circular projecting sign on the side door under the building overhang. Ms. Rogers advised that the signs would be mauve with black lettering.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Jennifer Del Grande, the applicant, advised that she had a photograph of their existing sign for their shop in Purcellville. She noted that the building it was hung on was the same color as her building in Middleburg.

Committee Member Wright noted that the color was more of a Blush Pink.

The Committee agreed the sign looked fine.

In response to inquiries from the Committee as to whether the round sign would have a black border like the square sign, Ms. Del Grande advised that the vendor who painted their signs suggested a border on the sign in front in order to make it stand out more from the yellow background. She noted that she was fine if the Committee preferred it not have a border. Ms. Del Grande confirmed she had no plans to light the signs, as they would only be open during the day.

Committee Member Littleton moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-12 (S 26-06), a request of Jennifer Del Grande for a projecting and wall sign at 15 East Federal Street – The Clothing Closet.

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

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Del Grande advised that she planned to open in early June. She explained that they were part of a non-profit called Tree of Life Ministries that served all of Loudoun County. Ms. Del Grande advised that they provided a variety of services, including free dinners and financial assistance. She explained that The Clothing Closet was a gospel enterprise that provided

free clothing. Ms. Del Grande noted that they also had high quality, gently used clothing that was available for sale at low prices. She advised that people could receive a voucher for free clothing and shop, by private appointment, from the same racks that customers shopped from.

Discussion Items

Outdoor & Rooftop Dining Guidelines

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they spent some time developing guidelines for outdoor furnishings for cafes a couple of years ago; however, they were never finalized. He suggested that given the discussions surrounding rooftop dining, it would be a good time to reintroduce those and possibly extend upon them to address the topic of rooftop dining. Mr. Moore noted his memo that also addressed other forms of dining, such as ground level dining. He advised that the only change that had been proposed to the outdoor furnishings language was related to lighting and explained that the Town Council had expressed a desire that no string lights be allowed except during the holiday season when decorative holiday lights would be allowed for a set duration. Mr. Moore suggested the Committee discuss the proposed language and then move to the topic of rooftop dining.

Chair Clites noted that earlier during the meeting, the Committee approved outdoor lighting that was not all black or iron. He reminded the members that the sooner these became guidelines, the sooner they would help regulate some of their discussions.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the language was written intentionally to say that wrought iron or painted metal was preferred, which left the door open for conversations on other options. He opined that the application that was just approved may still have been approved; however, if someone proposed the frame of a chair or the bottom of a table be painted a color other than black, the Committee may have a different response. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that guidelines were guidelines and noted that unless they said "this is the only thing acceptable," they put people on notice that this was what was preferred.

Chair Clites noted that a couple of years ago, the Committee considered murals and were emphatic that they would not be allowed to be a part of the town. He suggested it was important to state what was preferred, what was not allowed and what was inconsistent with the town. Mr. Clites opined that umbrellas should only be allowed at the ground/sidewalk level, as this was where they were most appropriate. He reminded the Committee that they have allowed umbrellas in a variety of colors so different businesses could express themselves. Mr. Clites noted that this was an area where the Committee took a less conservative approach. He reminded the Committee of the language related to planters and questioned whether they wanted to include a recommendation for materials. Mr. Clites noted that planters could be wood, metal, plastic, terracotta, or glazed ceramic. He further noted that they could be an old washtub or bathtub. Mr. Clites suggested that if the Committee wanted to be clear about what was allowed, they should talk through it.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Chair Clites noted that enforcement of what people put out was a different issue. He opined that it would be good to have a conversation about materials for the guidelines. Mr. Clites opined that, like sandwich board signs, they could get out of control before they were regulated. He noted that what was before the Committee was an attempt to regulate them. Mr. Clites advised that if they were placed in such a way as to impede pedestrian traffic, the Town would be within its rights to manage that regardless of the guidelines.

Committee Member Simons questioned whether the Committee wanted to define the Kelvin temperature that would be permitted for lighting. He noted that earlier in the evening, an applicant proposed battery operated LED lights on tabletops and questioned whether those should be under the Committee's purview. Mr. Simons noted that they were portable.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that typically, the Committee would not address tabletop lighting unless it was creating complaints due to excessive brightness. He suggested that government should not regulate something that was of a temporary nature that was only being used during evening hours when dining was occurring.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee had received a request for lights in umbrellas in the past and advised that it asked the applicant to bring the lights down to the level of the diner instead. He noted that this occurred as more of a commentary than as a guideline.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Chair Clites confirmed that an applicant would not appear before the Committee for a portable fixture.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed that string lights would not be allowed. It was noted that several businesses in town used them.

Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed the Town staff would deal with them.

Chair Clites agreed the guidelines should state that lighting sources should be between 2700 and 3000 Kevlin to be consistent with other parts of the guidelines.

Vice Chair Lee expressed concern that some tabletop lighting was too bright, particularly for motorists who were driving through town.

Councilmember Pearson suggested the need to let the business know the lights were too bright. She opined that the Town could not control that.

Deputy Town Manager Moore suggested the Committee discuss rooftop dining. He advised the members that the Town Council was very interested in this and had made looking at it and proposing regulations around it as one of their top nine strategic initiatives. Mr. Moore explained that there would be efforts on the zoning side to establish regulations pertaining to rooftop dining. He advised that the Council was very interested in hearing the input from this Committee on the aesthetics of rooftop dining. Mr. Moore suggested that one way to treat rooftop dining was to treat it like solar panels in the Historic District, in that if they could not be seen, they would not fall under the HDRC's purview, and if they could be seen, they would not be allowed. He noted that Mr. Ash contended that his railing would not be seen from the street level and advised that this may or may not be the case. Mr. Moore noted that the furniture on the roof also may or may not be seen. He reminded the Committee that the pergola would be an issue and opined that this was one way for the Committee to consider addressing this issue. Mr. Moore suggested another way was to adopt guidelines that were explicit about not allowing rooftop structures. He noted the need for the members' input on the aesthetics and advised that the Council would determine whether or not to allow this use.

Chair Clites suggested the discussion be expanded to rooftop uses and noted that there was nothing to regulate pickleball courts on a roof. He noted that this was the reason he was comfortable suggesting the removal of the pergola. Mr. Clites acknowledged that pergolas were used as an architectural element all the time; however, in this case, it seemed inconsistent being on the roof of a building in a very small-scale town. He noted that he could not think of a use that seemed consistent with going on a roof. Mr. Clites advised that if rooftop dining was the only thing that was singled out, nothing would prohibit someone from putting something else on a single-story flat roof. He suggested that in the Historic District, the Committee should not be open to allowing uses on rooftops and noted that there could be some uses that were even less attractive than dining.

Committee Member Jenkins suggested that people may want to use flat top roofs for things such as parade viewing and opined that this was something that could get out of hand. She suggested the need to be careful and very strict about what was allowed on rooftops, such as pergolas, tables, etc.

Committee Member Simons suggested the need to compartmentalize this into two conversations – one that revolved around commercial uses and one that revolved around residential ones. He opined that the two were very different and may have different restrictions. Mr. Simons opined that a commercial application would most likely be a restaurant or bar one. He suggested there were not a lot of buildings in town that would lend themselves to that use; however, there may be buildings in a residential application that could be used as a deck or a place to congregate outdoors.

Vice Chair Lee agreed with the need to look at all possible uses and noted that once the door was opened, someone would think of something else.

Deputy Town Manager Moore cautioned the Committee against mission creep and advised that he had been tasked by the Council with focusing on the use of rooftops for dining. He further advised that he would not say that he would not think about other things; however, he would not do so now, as he needed to focus on what the Council had tasked him to do. Mr. Moore asked that the Committee assume for the moment that rooftop dining would be allowed and questioned what they would like to include in the guidelines related to it. He questioned whether they wanted to be as restrictive as to say that it was not appropriate for them to be seen from the public view.

Chair Clites advised that personally, he did not want to see it, as there was nothing that could happen on a roof that would feel consistent with the town, especially on the main street. He reminded the Committee that there was no precedent for this. Mr. Clites opined that if the Committee had known the dining application was coming, it would have worked on this previously. He expressed understanding of why the applicant requested it and opined that the Committee did a good job of containing its impact. Mr. Clites reiterated that the Committee did not know what the next ask would be. He suggested that as to dining, it should not be visible from the street. Mr. Clites noted that, from reading the Planning Commission meeting minutes, its members were concerned about noise and the level of activity and agreed those were important things to address. He expressed hope that if rooftop dining was allowed as a special permit use, the Commission would condition any approval recommendation on a review by the HDRC for aesthetic purposes. Mr. Clites asked that the Commission follow up with other possible uses and cited as examples that someone could want to put a swimming pool or pickleball court on a roof. He opined that the scope creep of development should not change the feeling of being on Middleburg's sidewalks. In response to a comment from the Committee, Mr. Clites noted that things could be regulated through zoning, such as hours of operation, number of people, and kinds of activity; however, it was difficult for the HDRC to do so.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that if this item went through a regulatory review process to amend the zoning ordinance to allow such uses, there could be regulations related to noise, light, and hours of operation. He noted that this discussion provided him with the information he needed to draft guidelines for the Committee's discussion during their next meeting. Mr. Moore advised that the Committee could then forward their guidelines to the Council with a recommendation to amend them.

Planner Rogers noted that this was the first application the Committee had received that contained a rooftop addition. She questioned whether they wanted to have guidelines related to them.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee had looked at a rooftop addition in the past. He advised that for the sake of scale and vocabulary, the HDRC asked the applicant to push the addition back so only a little sliver of the roof was visible. Mr. Clites opined that the Committee could manage such requests better as they were related to architecture, which was within their purview. He noted that he felt comfortable talking about the pergola associated with the recent application because it was a combination of use and architecture.

Planner Rogers noted that other municipalities' historic district guidelines contained a section on rooftop additions.

Councilmember Pearson opined that there needed to be guidelines to protect against someone asking to do something like installing a higher wall on top of a building. In response to a comment from the Committee, she acknowledged that the building height regulations would play into that.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee had the authority to say it was not sympathetic to the building or the street. He reiterated that he as comfortable managing that more than potential uses that might go on a roof.

Vice Chair Lee suggested the need to make it clear that rooftop dining should not be seen from any side/street. She noted that in the case of the recent application, the property had frontage on two streets and opined that the Committee only addressed Washington Street, not Federal Street. Ms. Lee opined that any rooftop issue should not be seen from anywhere. Chair Clites agreed.

Committee Member Anderson opined that the entire Committee said it did not want to see the rooftop dining from the street. He noted, however, that people on the upper floors of buildings would still see what was occurring. Mr. Anderson opined that to be strict about property in a historic district, there should not be anything on the roof that could be seen from another historic building site. He noted that in the case of the recent application, the applicant said the pergola, restaurant and railing could not be seen from the street; however, he opined that the computer model was not correct. Mr. Anderson further opined that if someone was at the traffic light looking in the direction of the restaurant during the winter, they would be able to see it. He questioned how sound levels were regulated in the Historic District. Mr. Anderson questioned what would happen if the oyster bar wanted to install speakers for their outdoor seating area.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that this would be addressed through the Town's noise ordinance. In response to an inquiry, he confirmed it would apply to a restaurant on a roof as well.

2026 Joint Architectural Review Board (JARB) Awards

Deputy Town Manager Moore explained that the only thing the Committee was being asked to do at this time was to identify the HDRC's representatives on the Joint Architectural Review Board.

After some discussion, Committee Member Simons and Vice Chair Lee volunteered to serve. The Committee asked that Chair Clites also serve.

In response to an inquiry from Committee Member Simons about the potential for a conflict of interest, Chair Clites explained that the subcommittee attended the JARB meeting to present the projects that Middleburg would recommend for an award. He further explained that the meeting would involve members from other jurisdictions' historic review boards. Mr. Clites advised that the awards ceremony was held in September to recognize the people who did the work.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the staff would attempt to develop a list of completed projects in the next month so the Committee could consider what they would like to nominate for an award.

Chair Clites noted that Middleburg was known for its awesome signs.

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Regulations

Committee Member Simons noted that the Planning Commission was talking about ADU regulations and questioned whether the HDRC would have an opportunity to weigh in on and develop guidelines for them.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the Virginia General Assembly adopted legislation this year that compelled the approval of accessory dwelling units in any district, including single-family residential districts, in the Commonwealth. He advised that there were a lot of regulations that were included in the legislation. Mr. Moore reported that its implementation was delayed until July 1, 2027, which gave the Town some time to figure out what constraints were built into the legislation. He noted that it was a very sweeping regulation. Mr. Moore advised that he looked at his own neighborhood and thought about what it would do to it if everyone put a small house in their backyard. He noted that he was not sure what this meant for Middleburg's Historic District and advised that the staff had a lot of analysis to do to determine where it may apply. Mr. Moore noted the need for discussion with the Town Attorney as to how to interpret the legislation. He advised that the staff would not jump on amendments to the guidelines just yet; however, it would look at them at the right time.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – May 7, 2026

(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: Everybody have access to their technology. All right. I'll bring this meeting to order. Middleburg Historic District Review Committees meeting for the month of May, May 7, 2026. Our first item of business 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 Simons.

Steve Simons: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Next item is public comments. If you're here on something that's on our agenda tonight, we'll get to you when we get to that agenda item. If you're here as a member of the public and would like to comment before we start our meeting, you're welcome to do so now. Seeing no public comments, we'll move to the approval of the meeting minutes from our April the 2nd meeting. Are there any clarifications to the meeting minutes? I move we approve as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Thank you. As you all know, we have a full agenda tonight, so we'll try to keep it moving, remind me if I don't. By the same token we'll want to take the time to consider everything before us. So, our first action item is old business, COA 25-37 and COA 26-09. Request of Kevin Ash for exterior alterations, rear additions, and revisions to 115 and 117 West Washington Street, the former Fun Shop space. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Thank you, Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. You have the staff report in front of you. This application was last here in February of 2026. You approved the COA with conditions. And those conditions are listed out in the staff report. The applicant resubmit the plans based on your conditions and also addressed other items due to changes to the interior layout. They made some changes to windows on the apartment building, added shutters, changed an entrance door, revised the storefront in some ways, and also added some patio furniture in front of 117 West Washington. The revisions are in your revised plan documents. The applicant is here to go over with you in more detail. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Someone here from the applicant? Name. Good evening. Name and address for the record.

Kevin Ash: Good evening. Kevin Ash, 41800 Reservoir Road, Leesburg, Virginia.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Kevin Ash: Thank you. Good to see everyone.

Tim Clites: Good to see you. Would you like us to walk through? Would you like to walk us through any of the specifics? I'm sure we've all read the package. Thank you for preparing it and taking into account all our earlier comments, but I'll start with giving you a chance to present anything to us you'd like.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. No, I think Amy categorized it right as we were finalizing the interior final layout, there were some really four alterations that, you know, popped up due to code and or modifications that I'd like to address with everybody today as well. But I think Michael Wood and the team addressed the eight open items pretty thoroughly. I'm not sure. I mean, if you want to go through each one of those one by one and then talk about the four other items that are modified based on some code analysis and some modifications.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. I don't know. I thought about how to work through this as a Committee. I don't know if anyone has any suggestions. I guess we could run through them one at a time. And I'll just go from left to right and left to right. And we obviously can come back to any that anybody would like to spend more time on, but I'm going to look at the document that is from the applicant called Follow Up. It's page five of six in the document I have open, which is the written starts with the staff report and then it's from Woodworks Architects and it starts there we go with design changes based on final interior floor plans. Actually, let's go to that second. Let's go through the updates.

Kevin Ash: Second it's really the eight that were originally.

Tim Clites: Originally. Yeah. Let's start with things we've looked at. Is that all right with you?

Kevin Ash: Yeah, I believe so. Yeah, I think okay. Sure.

Steve Simons: Chair Clites, can I ask a quick question?

Tim Clites: Absolutely.

Steve Simons: Just a point of clarification. So, for a building that is determined to be noncontributing, but in the Historic District, is there any difference in leeway on what we approve or not approve based on that determination?

Tim Clites: Yeah, I think there is. I mean, I think we're still tasked with approving things that are sympathetic to the district, consistent with the village feel, etc... But I think we try to honor the historic buildings by taking a more careful approach to what is historic and what isn't historic. Does that answer your question?

Steve Simons: It does. Thank you.

Steve Simons: Sure.

Tim Clites: Is that a fair way to assess it, Mr. Moore? Thank you. Updates requested. Number one, the front entry at 115 West Washington Street, we asked for some details of the paneling below the windows. The detail is provided on page 17. And as part of those window details we will also notice there is one of the interior changes requested from the floor plan is the addition of what I would term a mullion in the main panel of glass, dividing that into two sashes instead of one large sash.

Kevin Ash: So, the original comment was a detail for the cross section of how we're doing the paneling below the window. So, Michael Wood did a cross section to see that there's MDO, you know, trim and then OG that creates the panel detail. And then above that we realize there's an intersecting wall. So, a Muntin became more of a vertical. What do you call that?

Tim Clites: Mullion.

Kevin Ash: Like a Muntin turned into a Mullion.

Tim Clites: When two window frames come together, they create a mullion which is a more substantial element than a muntin, which is the little element that you see dividing the panes of glass in an individual sash, just for anybody that's listening in the public.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. So, item one kind of references number two and the four changes. So, this is where like you can see the paneling detailing below. I think Michael did a good job of you know, showing how we plan to execute that. It's not an applied OG it’s; it's actually a panel. And then just above that North is the mullion that got created due to intersecting wall inside.

Tim Clites: Yep. So, let's take those two together and I'll start with Bill if that's all right. And we'll have comments on both those two items first. Turn your mic on please.

Bill Anderson: Thank you for responding to our comments. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: I don't have any problem with these. Your response is good.

Kevin Ash: Great.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think it's a good change.

Kevin Ash: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree. I think the change is good. Thank you.

Kevin Ash: Thanks.

Linda Wright: I'm good with it too. It's much more detailed so.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm at the same opinion.

Steve Simons: Yeah. So, this is kind of germane to my previous question, where we're changing the undivided storefront windows to a divided storefront window.

Kevin Ash: They were divided already. It was just, it was just a Muntin that was there that is now a Mullion.

Steve Simons: Previously, yes. I understand that the I mean, if there's because this building was raised to two stories at some point that's why I was questioning if the building, you know, retains any of its historical character. And if it does, then this is a departure from what a traditional storefront window from the 1950s would have looked like. I'm not opposed to it. I'm just stating how I read the guidelines. But that's my only comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I have no comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Well, I guess my comments more closely align with Steve's around the question of whether the larger panes of glass are important, and maybe the devil's in the details. I don't know how much of a mullion this creates, but if we have a two-by-four wall behind it, plus some trim.

Kevin Ash: Two by three.

Tim Clites: Could easily get to be six or so inches.

Kevin Ash: It's only a two by three partition. It's a three-inch metal stud wall that comes into it with drywall on either side.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Kevin Ash: So just dining area, you know, image right, is dining area that we're separating out from the kind of the lobby area.

Tim Clites: Right.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: I saw that in the plan. I saw some what looked like interior glazing as well. And although I don't, it's not our job to design things. I wondered if it was possible to have that the intersection of that glazing kind of a T in plan be such that if we really needed this vertical, which I do think is a little bit of a departure from what's there, that we make it as narrow as possible.

Kevin Ash: I think Michael and I were trying to keep it as narrow as possible by changing it to a really thin wall, but we do have glazing inside. It's a picture frame window. So, when you come into the lobby, if you will, the reception area, you can see the restaurant, you know, visually, but it's secured. So, we kept that wall as thin as we possibly could. Yep.

Tim Clites: Does everyone on the Committee understand that? Any further comments? All right. Let's go to item two, which I believe is on the same page. The detail through the parapet. I'll just pause for a moment. If anyone has any comments, they can share them.

Bill Anderson: Right here on this one.

Tim Clites: My only comment on the parapet is, I think I would take the little base cap molding and turn it upside down from the way it is. If you zoom in on that molding, to me it always looks like part of the classic entablature. And normally that would project out further on the top and then the profile would come back along the bottom. Otherwise, I thought the detail was fine. It's just a minor.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: I'm sure you wouldn't care one way or the other.

Kevin Ash: No, I don't care either way. It would actually work better with the paneling down below to keep the profile turned around. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Right. So, any other comments on item two? Let's go to item three. Remove pergola or rotate pergola 90 degrees to determine the impact from the street. The solution is the pergola has been rotated 90 degrees and reduced in size to minimize any view from the public right of way, see A 2, A 3, A 7, A 10, and A 11. And if you look on your second screen, that's probably

the bird's eye view is not necessarily the view from the public, but it's the best way to understand the reductions in pergola size. And the clarification about what else is going on in the rooftop area.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, I think that was a good comment because literally from a pedestrian standpoint, we could only see a couple, the first pieces of pergola on the upper level, you really couldn't see anything else. So, this is the best imagery to see the pergola turned 90.

Tim Clites: So, any comments on this part of the application?

Bill Anderson: Again, I think you responded to our comments. Well, I was trying to recall. Oh, that's what that button is for. [laughter] Thank you.

Kevin Ash: Come on, Margaret, keep him on track.

Bill Anderson: I was looking at the elevation from the street, which is drawing number. Now I can't find it.

Kevin Ash: Amy, do you have that right there? Right there.

Bill Anderson: As you look at the front elevation, then the parapet in the front of the building. I'd have to go back and figure this. The parapet in the front of the building is how high off the roof? And then the railing is how high above the parapet?

Kevin Ash: Well, the railing is 30ft behind the parapet from the front of the building.

Bill Anderson: I understand.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Oh, but it would be 36 inches. And the parapet, 18 inches, I believe.

Bill Anderson: Okay. I don't have any other questions about that.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: What are the little dots? Is that a shadow mark on like A 3?

Tim Clites: I think that probably just denotes the ceiling elevation inside that space.
Margaret Littleton: This.

Tim Clites: It's not something we would see on the outside. I think that's part of the CAD software they use.

Bill Anderson: That's a good question.

Tim Clites: You'll notice below there's some coming off of the copper roof.

Bill Anderson: Usually floor elevation, ceiling elevation, floor elevation. I assume the dots then on the top of the roof, the elevation of the roof. Is that correct?

Kevin Ash: I'm not sure of what.

Bill Anderson: The question is the dots on the top of just like the dots by the canopy that's the [multiple speakers] line.

Kevin Ash: Oh Yeah, I think that doesn't represent anything on that elevation. I think it's part of like Tim was saying it's part of the CAD profile. It's a layer. [multiple speakers]

Margaret Littleton: Thinking it's a shadow.

Kevin Ash: It's a layer of their drawings.

Bill Anderson: In architectural technology.

Kevin Ash: We're not putting polka dots on the front elevation.

Tim Clites: No dashes across the front elevation.

Margaret Littleton: I'm very happy that there'll be no umbrellas.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: You have a little star there. Does that mean a question? On your notes, the star, it says no umbrellas. Is that just?

Kevin Ash: Item number ten, Rooftop Furniture.

Margaret Littleton: You will not have umbrellas.

Kevin Ash: Not visible from the roofs. No umbrellas. Yeah, asterisk, no umbrellas will be visible. Correct.

Margaret Littleton: Big heads. Yeah.

Kevin Ash: Maybe if you're tall.

Margaret Littleton: Thank you. I think it's fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Margaret. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I'm glad the umbrellas left too, but my concern about the whole thing is as it evolves and you add more lighting and more people and I don't know.

Kevin Ash: I'm not allowed to add any more lighting on the building. There may be like LED tabletop lighting just for ambience.

Punkin Lee: But then you'll be able to get from the street. I don't know, it just seems like a lot on the roof and maybe something. At least I mean, it's moved back, that's good.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: And I know we can't decide whether it's a good thing or not, but I think moving it back is helpful. Whether it'll be a good addition or not, I don't know.

Kevin Ash: We'll see.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I think it's a much better solution from the original one pushing it back. And it really does hide it from the street. I hope you know if you can't do more lighting, then we won't have light spillage and that sort of thing going on. So, I think it's a better solution.

Kevin Ash: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Linda. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with everyone so far. I mean, I don't have anything more to add.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: Just one quick question, Kevin. The fence that's around the perimeter of the upper deck, is that going to match in material and design as the one in the courtyard on the ground level?

Kevin Ash: The railing?

Steve Simons: Yeah.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Steve Simons: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Kevin Ash: Didn't show the green roof, but, you know, those green roofs really do take on a real meadow feel. So, I think that will be a nice addition.

Cindy Pearson: I have no questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you all. On this item, I'll still add my hesitation to the idea of a pergola on a roof. I think that it still feels to me inconsistent with the vocabulary that we have everywhere in the town, particularly the Historic District. I know we can't see much of it, but we can see a little of it. And I think if we go to page one, two, three, page four. I think that I'll wait till that comes up on the screen. One before that. That one I think is an image from about the middle of the street. And so, till we get to the other side of the street, and if we were to back down the street towards the old Middleburg Bank, Mid-Atlantic Bank, I think we would see more of that

pergola. So just want the Committee to be aware of that as you make your final decision. I very much appreciate the applicant making it smaller and turning it so that it's less obvious. But I think, I think that's a big decision for us to consider around what's appropriate, which has nothing to do with the use but the appropriateness on the roof at all.

Kevin Ash: Just [inaudible] I do think Mike did that is a sidewalk view. So, he moved back as far as he possibly could to get a pedestrian view from the other side. I don't think it is middle of the street.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay. Well and again, it's, I do these renderings too. It's hard to know exactly. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: Yeah, it's tough.

Tim Clites: When I stand on the street and the further, if my back is towards the red light, the further I go towards the red light, the more I feel like we're going to see more of this pergola than you see in the view right now. So, I just want everybody to be aware of that. I'm not making a hard and fast comment on there. I think it's also important to just consider, while we're doing this, the idea that anywhere in town there would be pergolas on roofs that we can see, I think things that we can't see, obviously we can't see. So next item is the rear of 115. Same building where the stair comes up to the roof deck. And then we ask that they consider wrapping the mansard into the roof to integrate the penthouse. And if you remember the previous version of that had kind of a tall dividing wall between [multiple speakers] spaces that was very, it looked very much like a book ended addition.

Kevin Ash: This is more continuity. There's a lot more continuity to the termination of this.

Tim Clites: Yeah, yeah, I think so. I'll just look up and yeah, go ahead Bill. Let's just run through any comments.

Bill Anderson: No comment. It's well done how it's been wrapped.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Yes.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: No comment.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think that really is a nice improvement on the backside.

Kevin Ash: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: I would agree with Punkin. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comment.

Steve Simons: Steve.

Steve Simons: No comment.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comment.

Tim Clites: Well, y'all can't have no comments. I have to have one. And this is just a matter of question. Can we see that we can't really see the wall between at all, can we? Except in this bird's eye view.

Kevin Ash: But which wall?

Tim Clites: The wall that you walk out of when you walk onto the roof? If we can go to the bird's eye view.

Kevin Ash: Bird's eye view.

Tim Clites: Maybe this is irrelevant to our conversation today, but it just the bird's eye view. So maybe seven. Thank you for the roof. I think it looks much better. The question I had more for myself and I thought I'd pose it to you. Take it for what it's worth is whether that wall shouldn't also be a darker color, just around how it feels to be out on the roof.
The back side.

Tim Clites: You wouldn't want the shingles to come along there because. And then I thought, well, you know what? We can't see that one way or the other. So, maybe it's not really worth commenting on.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, I mean, I see your point because it would feel more like a roof than. But I think from a patron standpoint, like you're looking at it's a wall. And so, I think the continuity of the wall color, [multiple speakers] you know, while you're there would be more appropriate.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I don't disagree. All right. Next item, provide a more detailed drawing for the entry door at the residential. And that's on page 18. So that's close to the end of your packets.

Kevin Ash: And just to clarify, this is no longer the entry door. This is the exit door of the apartments. The entry door is off of Washington Street.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Kevin Ash: So internally, from a fire marshal standpoint and from, you know, a first responder standpoint, the address is Washington Street because the county has this as 115 Washington. You know, all of these structures have one address. And so, the front door is Washington Street. This is really the rear door.

Tim Clites: Understood. Thank you. And I think when we look at this elevation, we're seeing a couple of things just to go over them. We're seeing the door. We're seeing the proposed brackets and the overhang and we're seeing the lights. Bill.

Bill Anderson: Could you say that again? Could you repeat what you said about the exit?

Kevin Ash: This is the rear door. It's no longer.

Bill Anderson: Just from an address point of view.

Kevin Ash: It's a rear door from an address standpoint.

Bill Anderson: From an address point of view. But this is where people will be coming and going.

Kevin Ash: I think they'll be coming and going from both because if they're out, if they're in the town and they're walking around, they'll probably enter off of 115. Parking is in the rear. So, if they're a pedestrian, they'll come in and out of the front door which will be on Washington Street. And so, this is the rear door. If they were leaving to get into their car.

Bill Anderson: I'm looking at the ground floor plan and I'm trying to see the front entrance.

Tim Clites: It's tucked in behind the.

Kevin Ash: Front elevation to see the front door.

Margaret Littleton: You said off Washington Street.

Bill Anderson: Okay.

Amy Rogers: The floor plan that you have does not match the architecturals that were submitted because it has not been updated.

Bill Anderson: Yes, I see that there's no.

Cindy Pearson: Couldn't hear you on that, Amy.

Bill Anderson: So that's a lobby of some type you come into?

Kevin Ash: This one? Yeah.

Bill Anderson: The plan on the ground floor plan.

Margaret Littleton: This isn't the current.

Bill Anderson: Ground floor plan is a it's not. Well, that's that answers it then it's not the ground floor plan. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: During our final iteration of code review and everything, we put a corridor from the door of 115 back and around.

Bill Anderson: Okay, that now makes sense because I couldn't get there from here.

Kevin Ash: How do I get to that door? Yeah. [laughter]

Tim Clites: All right. So, Bill, any comments on this elevation?

Bill Anderson: Big improvement. And we'll talk about the other doors on the other facade next door. But I wish not next door, but adjacent. It would be nice if they looked like this. We'll get to that.

Tim Clites: Okay. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I really appreciate all of your adjustments. I think it looks great. I'm with our Chair here about the pergola. But you think it will work? It will work. And my only stupid question. But what does the remaining roof. What is that material? Is someone apt to leap over the fence and be safe?

Kevin Ash: That's the green roof.

Margaret Littleton: A green roof.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. So, it's vegetated roof.

Margaret Littleton: Oh. Grass?

Kevin Ash: It's a mixture of sedums and grasses.

Margaret Littleton: Oh, then that's pretty.

Kevin Ash: And it's an environmental type of roof.

Margaret Littleton: It'll hold the water when it rains.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. So, there's actually trays that hold rainwater and the sedums and grasses use those trays and then there's evaporation. So, it's less impactful to the environment because less goes into stormwater management.

Margaret Littleton: And grasses grow tall, don't they?

Kevin Ash: Oh yeah. They grow. Yeah. Two feet.

Margaret Littleton: Wonderful.

Kevin Ash: Like the green roof on Hotel Burg, we have 30-inch grasses and cedars.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: On the lights by the door was the light fixture up there. So, it doesn't.

Tim Clites: There's a light bulb way up there.

Punkin Lee: Okay. Because it was just kind of hard to tell looking at the picture.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. It's a traditional gooseneck light fixture.

Punkin Lee: Perfect. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: I like the improvements.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I also like all the improvements you've made. It's made quite a bit of difference, I think. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Steve.

Steve Simons: Are the gooseneck lights the same specification the visual comfort?

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Yeah.

Steve Simons: I have that spec if anybody would like to see it. It does say it was dark sky compliant.

Tim Clites: You say, it does.

Steve Simons: It does.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No questions or comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Just to remind the Committee, in last meeting, our staff asked us to use the words appropriate instead of like, so. I'll try to do that. My question for you is this door. I think the last time we looked at it, it had Muntins and Muntins on the side lights. And I just wonder if that is more appropriate or if it was that intentional or was that just one of those we're working on the computer and adjusting things up. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: I'm looking at it like it should be a 6-lite door to match the side.

Tim Clites: I think that's what it was the last time, right?

Kevin Ash: It should be a 6-lite door.

Tim Clites: Okay. Trust me, that happens to us, too. So, I'm not.

Kevin Ash: You could look at it ten times and not. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Not see it. Right. And I only noticed it when I looked at the previous submission. So, that's my only comment there. The light or the glass division inside the door would be two wide and three high. All right. With that, we're going to get to all the lighting. The lighting has been updated at the residential entry, two Goosenecks, added to the roof deck, and one gooseneck added to the right of the side door. Any comments from the Committee on the lights? All right. We will jump to the window detail, which has a little added picture to the left of the original drawing, showing the flashing at the head of the casing. Any comments on that?

Bill Anderson: No comment.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. We have a shingle sample. An actual real shingle sample. You just start at that end. Yep. You're on your own. [off mic]

Tim Clites: And it's designed to give us that sense of a shadow line. Right.

Bill Anderson: And that's for color as well as type?

Kevin Ash: [off mic] And texture.

Tim Clites: This is the actual shingle they're proposing to use on the roof. [off mic] Does anybody want to what? [off mic] Exactly? Easy. You never know. What we will ask? [laughter] Well, thank you for bringing that. That's always useful to see in person.

Kevin Ash: Will, do you want me to use this?

Tim Clites: Then we ask for an option to clad the walk-in cooler screening. And the walk in has been framed as a real wall, with an extension of the lap siding with an extended parapet to conceal the HVAC and a metal louver will be installed and painted the same color as the siding and we can see that on page seven, I think six or seven. I printed mine without the. Right there. No, that one. So, we're looking at item nine, which is between the two buildings.

Kevin Ash: So, we found a way to build the wall and then insulate it with closed cell foam insulation so that we could actually put, apply the siding to make it continuous.

Tim Clites: Awesome.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. That looks much more discreet. Any additional comments from the Committee on that?

Bill Anderson: Oh, on A 12 the door that to that area is I'm not sure you open that door. And then inside of that there's a cooler door.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. No, there's just a cooler. That is an exterior insulated door that has. There's actually, it's a specialty door because you can't lock anybody in the cooler. So, there's a push button on that on the inside. So, it's an exterior insulated door that's painted the same color as the siding.

Bill Anderson: What is this little gray box to the left and the elevation to the left on the ground?

Kevin Ash: That's the compressor location. There's landscaping at the end there and the compressor for the apartments is there.

Bill Anderson: So, there's a mechanical little mechanical unit sitting at that point.

Kevin Ash: Yes.

Bill Anderson: In the corner. Okay.

Tim Clites: Bill, I think are you talking about under the entry overhang.

Bill Anderson: On A 12?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Then to the left and [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: And I think that's a ramp.

Bill Anderson: That's what I read it as.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Getting up to the side door there.

Kevin Ash: Oh, that. I thought you were talking far left. So just to the left of the door. Yeah, it's a ramp.

Tim Clites: That's a ramp.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Where's that ramp? Oh, I know where it is. It's between there and the corner.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, it's foreground.

Bill Anderson: I got it, I got it. Chosen plant.

Tim Clites: Any other comments from the Committee on that? Then we have rooftop accessories, lighting umbrellas, planters, etc. the rooftop furniture layout and patio furniture layout are provided. The lighting is provided. There are no proposed umbrellas or planters at this time. And a separate application will be submitted for them if they are desired in the future. And

that is best seen. We do have a floor plan of this, and this is the little bird's eye 3D on your screen right now. Are there any questions from the Committee on that?

Kevin Ash: There are furniture samples of what we're proposing for the lower patio as well.

Tim Clites: Can we go to the furniture plan the actual plan? I don't know what. I'm sorry when I. Page 15, please. [off mic] There we go. That one. My questions relate to just understanding the graphics of this drawing. When I look at the little chairs, the two chairs facing each other, is that what that is? Or it looks like there's a light between them. If you're looking at the. [inaudible] Page 15.

Cindy Pearson: Upper part or the?

Tim Clites: I'm on the outdoor.

Cindy Pearson: Outdoor.

Tim Clites: The outdoor.

Kevin Ash: Lower patio or upper?

Cindy Pearson: Lower or upper. There you go.

Tim Clites: Upper patio. Sorry. Upper patio. I know there's two lights at the door.

Kevin Ash: At the door only.

Tim Clites: Yeah, yeah. And then like when you get to the main furniture arrangement outside of the pergola to the upside of the sheet. The furniture looks all dashed. And then there are kind of dark boxes behind it. I'm assuming that's a graphic and not representing some kind of a light fixture. It's just furniture.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. There's no light fixtures other than the wall sconces.

Tim Clites: Than the wall sconces.

Margaret Littleton: Okay, I on another thing, I saw it had sofas and chairs and a table in the middle. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: That's there's a sofa and a table and two chairs under the pergola. And then there's four chairs and two, two top tables per all the way around. And then there's two sofas and four chairs around a coffee table.

Tim Clites: But like the little two tops, it's not necessarily representing a permanent light. It's representing something that would be removable.

Kevin Ash: And I don't think that it's I don't think it's representing any type of light. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Okay. All right.

Kevin Ash: But I could see the restaurant wanting tabletop lights up there to be able to read menus or what have you, but the low ambient mushroom lights that they're led that would sit on the table.

Tim Clites: Right. And I think we yeah, we've been other applicants at the street level have been in to get approval for that including hours of operation, right when it's in use and that kind of thing. But I just wanted to understand lighting. Any other questions from the Committee on that part of this application? Okay. So, then we skipped over a couple of things. Let's go back to them at the beginning. Item number.

Kevin Ash: While we're on furniture.

Tim Clites: Sure.

Kevin Ash: Do you have to do you have to approve the furniture? Because there we've provided samples of the furniture.

Cindy Pearson: Can I ask a question on that?

Tim Clites: We are going to get I think that's item four so.

Kevin Ash: Oh.

Tim Clites: Yep. If I'm reading this right, the design changes based on the final interior floor plan and elevations. First one is the window arrangements on apartment building portion 117 of the project have been updated. The windows removed have been clouded and some windows have been shifted. I assume everyone's taken time to look at the elevations and. Are there any comments on the window adjustments?

Margaret Littleton: I think they were an improvement.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Kevin Ash: To that point, Margaret, I mean, we the rear elevation was probably the biggest movement in separating the two rear windows. But then it gives us an opportunity to have two shutters per window instead of having like a mullion window where we had the bifold shutter condition before. Yeah. And some of these areas, it was just like there was a bathroom that didn't need a window. And so, we deleted it.

Tim Clites: Any other comments from the Committee on that? Thank you. And thank you for the little bubbles and the clarifications. It makes our job easier when I have to flip back and forth. So much. So, appreciate that. Storefront window at the main entry were divided into two windows. We talked about that. What we did not talk about was the same question that I had on the rear exit door of the adjacent property. And that is if we go to the front, I'm going to call it the front elevation of the whole. Maybe we only have our perspective view, but the street view, maybe page three, the door there also doesn't have divided glass and I'm wondering if that's intentional or if your intention was to have that divided.

Kevin Ash: The apartment entry door to the far right.

Tim Clites: The main door that we see right here coming into the hotel.

Kevin Ash: I think it was supposed to be divided. I think the cut sheet in the back shows the divided.

Tim Clites: Well, that yeah, that's why I was asking because we've had the [multiple speakers] discrepancy between cut sheet and elevation. And we just like to make sure I mean I would recommend it be divided.

Kevin Ash: It should be divided.

Tim Clites: How does it actually, if we go to page materials, there's a better view of that where we looked at the windows earlier in the discussion. And so, we're talking about the [multiple speakers].

Kevin Ash: It actually shows undivided, but it should be divided. I think it's going to be more accurate if we have.

Tim Clites: And to the scale they're probably two by three is going to give you a similar proportion.

Kevin Ash: You, I think it's a six lite as well. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Kevin Ash: I think that's a consistent comment that we can do on our final delivery of those two doors should be six lite the rear exit door and the front door.

Tim Clites: Is the Committee okay with that comment? All right. Any other comments on. Let's see what item are we on or two. Now we're on to three. There's a window added in the mansard roof. You can see that first page.

Steve Simons: Can I interrupt you for a second?

Tim Clites: I'm sorry, Steve.

Steve Simons: Just to interject something real quick, top of those doors. The door from Washington Street into the apartments is a nine lite. Is that door significantly wider?

Kevin Ash: It's the panel down below is taller, so it I think it's six lite is a little more traditional.

Tim Clites: That's an existing.

Kevin Ash: I think what's there is a nine lite.

Tim Clites: Yeah. That door is existing, isn't it?

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: The door.

Kevin Ash: We would replace it to a new door, but it is an existing nine lite.

Steve Simons: Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right. No other comments on that. Any comments on the window at the third floor required for building code. And we added patio in the furniture. The courtyard specs included with no umbrellas. That is going to be on the last page of your document. We have had a number of discussions at this Committee, but with no formal final recommendation in our guidelines for outdoor furniture. But the previous applications and submissions we've looked at have requested all black or near black furniture, and that it be consistent throughout any given establishment so that there not be a kind of mixing and matching of furniture. Beyond that, I don't have a whole lot of additional comment unless Mr. Moore, or Miss Rogers has some.

Amy Rogers: Just one point of clarification for the applicant. Your layout of the furniture shows round tables, but you actually have a square detail here, so.

Kevin Ash: The manufacturer makes them round or square. So, it's more from a material. Yeah. The base is what's consistent. But I think we have a square. There's two four tops and then there's four two tops that are round. So, it has both round and square.

Tim Clites: Thanks for that clarification. Any comments? Come on guys, don't get tired on me now. We got a long ways to go.

Cindy Pearson: I will make a comment. I mean with the cane chairs this is just a use you know, the other chairs throughout town are more black or a dark silver. And with the cane, there's going to be a lot of food when people eat or greasy hands that get in that cane.

Kevin Ash: It's not real. It's synthetic cane.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, exactly. Yeah. No, I understand that because it couldn't be outside if it wasn't. But with the chairs, another place as being more, I don't know the word to use. Whatever they are. Use the hose. Yeah. No, I'm not just worried about the cleanliness that's for you guys. They can stand up there and scrub all day. I'm good with that. It's the look that is you know, if you look at the other things through town, it just doesn't go quite as well.

Tim Clites: I guess the term I would use is that I feel like the other all black or close to all black seating in town is less formal. It's a little more bistro like.

Cindy Pearson: That's it, maybe that is it. And I could see, for instance, these chairs on the rooftop where we can't see them, where it's more comfortable. Maybe that would be an option. They did feel a little.

Kevin Ash: I want people to sit for a long time and spend a lot of money. [laughter]

Tim Clites: You want them to sit for a long time?

Cindy Pearson: Got good cushions there. [laughter]
Wait till Christmas in Middleburg. You're going to be wanting them to. Hey, you sit here all day. Exactly.

Steve Simons: Yeah. I think that, you know, I think those chairs, if they're sitting out in the sunshine, if they were all black, they'd be super-hot.

Cindy Pearson: That would be horrible. True.

Steve Simons: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Yes.

Steve Simons: Yeah. I think I think the contrast and coloring does help with the comfort of.

Virginia Jenkins: Also, the ones you're talking about were [off mic]. Yeah.

Tim Clites: When you're making comments, keep your mic on so we can hear.

Virginia Jenkins: I've got my mic on.

Tim Clites: But I know I can't hear what you're saying though.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, the mesh. So, the ones that are meshed don't retain the heat.

Cindy Pearson: Correct. Good thinking.

Tim Clites: Yes. Any other comments, Bill?

Bill Anderson: The only comment I have is just as an aside, I remember probably 2 or 3 years ago we had this terrible storm come through. Right after HDRC that just devastated the entire Foxcroft Road. Trees through the town you couldn't even believe what the town was like. These are. What are these made out of? Because I've had furniture come off of decks. So, I would caution that anything up on the roof has got to be careful that it can't, especially with something that could be like a wing or could grab the air like this type of chair. Some.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. These are aluminum and wicker, but I think.

Bill Anderson: But they're light.

Kevin Ash: Steve's but to Steve's point, having a wicker in the air blows through it. These are the same chairs that we have four stories up in the rooftop at Hotel Burg. And we've had lots of thunderstorms come through.

Bill Anderson: Just a cautionary comment.

Kevin Ash: So, we've had no chairs fly off the roof. An umbrella, almost.

Margaret Littleton: No umbrellas.

Kevin Ash: No umbrellas. Mary Poppins.

Margaret Littleton: I think cane is very attractive against the color you've chosen. And I think.

Kevin Ash: Thank you. It really it reads really well because we have the same stone patio and like, it's just a really nice warm contrast against the warm blue stone.

Margaret Littleton: Warm and cozy. Yeah, I like that.

Virginia Jenkins: I have to agree with Margaret on the chairs. I think they're very good looking.

Kevin Ash: They're summer classics, by the way.

Tim Clites: And have you selected, are all the bistro tabletops going to be the same top color?

Kevin Ash: Carrara Marble.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Carrara, which is the what they call the porcelain top.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. So basically, it's an imitation white Carrara marble.

Tim Clites: Okay. All clear on that.

Margaret Littleton: Anyway, right.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: And again, we're tasked with, is that appropriate? So, I think we've gotten through. Wait, I think we've gotten through everything. Thank you for no umbrellas. I also will add just my own comment that would be a really difficult thing for me to get comfortable with. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: It's really shaded. This little, you know, patio is quite shaded throughout most of the day, and I don't think it's necessary.

Tim Clites: On the patio it wouldn't bother me so much because we already have that in town. But to think about umbrellas up on a roof, it just feels inconsistent with the way we engage our street facade. But you're not asking for that, and I appreciate that you're not. So, we also should just take a look at the details material sheet where I believe we have some additional information. We have the shutter dogs and the shutter hinges now shown. Want to bring the Committee that to their attention to be sure they've seen it. We also have the, I believe we saw this the last time the copper collector box and gutters or downspouts, there actually are no copper gutters. Is that right? These are internal draining the roof because I look at the elevations.

Kevin Ash: The roof pictures, I'm trying to think are there. Yeah. I don't think so because. Yeah. Everything else on the apartment's flat internal. Yeah. I don't think there are any actual gutters, it's downspouts and collectors.

Tim Clites: No actual gutters. Yeah. And that's if everyone remembers where that is. It's on the same facade as the entry door. And so, it breaks up that facade. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: Because it's all mansard around everything else that it'll sheet flow across that.

Tim Clites: And one last little question around gutters at the main entry to the hotel, that little copper roof, that's not going to have a gutter on it either.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay.

Kevin Ash: It's only about 18 inches deep. It's aesthetic.

Tim Clites: Right? All right. Thank you. That all helps me confirm that we're talking about the same thing.

Punkin Lee: I got a question.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Punkin Lee: The iron railing has changed from the first time, right?

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: That's fine.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. And we did add.

Punkin Lee: This looks more contemporary than the original one to me. Why did you decide to change?

Kevin Ash: Make them all consistent.

Punkin Lee: What?

Kevin Ash: I was just trying to get consistent between all the railings on the project. Do you not like the interim medium rail?

Tim Clites: Well, here's the earlier one.

Punkin Lee: The old one. The original one just looks more presents itself as more substantial. Where this one looks very lightweight.

Kevin Ash: Tim, can you show me your. Oh, I think that this is. Oh, it doesn't have the inner the pickets going all the way through.

Tim Clites: Right.

Kevin Ash: This one has the pickets going.

Tim Clites: Stops at a sub rail and then has this horizontal space before the handrail. Yeah. It's also got this shows a hierarchy of panel to post.

Punkin Lee: I think the first is much nicer, has more detail and looks more substantial.

Tim Clites: Just sorry for those of you that are. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: Inappropriate to the building.

Tim Clites: This is what Punkin is talking about.

Kevin Ash: I don't really have a preference either way. So, the Committee wants that one, I'll put that in the final packet. [off mic] I'm sorry.

Margaret Littleton: I agree with Punkin.

Linda Wright: That's different than that one.

Tim Clites: I know. Well, the way I think when we just to be clear, when we look at a drawing and then we look at a detail sheet, that's why we want to clarify when they don't match which it is that we're approving. I'm going to go ahead and pass this down and make sure everyone in the Committee sees it, and compare the previous to the earlier, just so that if we're making a motion that we can be clear about that. And while I'm doing that, I'm going to flip through my set, and I'll allow any further comments from the Committee. Just speak up if you have any that we've missed.

Steve Simons: Tim, I would put forward that the change in the railing is consistent with 4C of the guidelines, and it's with the examples that are shown it's not a departure from what I think would be allowable.

Tim Clites: From what we show in the guidelines.

Steve Simons: Correct. Based on what's shown in the guidelines. I'm not I don't have an opinion one way or the other between either railings, but I think this is consistent with what the guidelines say.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Kevin Ash: Steve. Are both of them consistent? Yeah. But if Punkin likes the other one. I think we should go with the other one.

Tim Clites: She needs a pretty rail if she is going to sit out there?

Kevin Ash: I just want Punkin to walk the street and say, those are the right railings.

Tim Clites: All right. So that is. Oh. I'm sorry. Absolutely.

Virginia Jenkins: Tim.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: I think the fact that Punkin was saying the fence or the railing, it's a heavier gauge on the older one. And that's why she likes prefers it.

Tim Clites: Likes, right? It has a hierarchy to the pickets.

Virginia Jenkins: It looks more substantial.

Tim Clites: Right. Understood. Okay. All right. So, we covered a lot. Deep pause. This was our big agenda item. Don't worry, the rest of you, we're not going to go this long with you, I promise. Middleburg doesn't often get a project this big, so thank you for your patience while we work through this. Any final comments? Or are we going to try to wrap this up into a motion? This is so unfair.

Punkin Lee: I would like to say that Tim's comments on the pergola were exactly what I was trying to say. I don't know that it is appropriate for where we're going. And he said it much better.

Margaret Littleton: And I agreed with the two of them.

Tim Clites: So, I guess you're all going to ask me to make this motion. And at the end of it, I will ask for without speaking over each other for any of you to offer clarifications or amendments, I believe is the term until we're sure we understand it and then we can vote. Is that okay? Wish me luck. No, actually. Thank you. This is a great presentation, and it makes it a whole lot easier. So, I'll just not forget to state that I very much appreciate it. So, I move that we approve the application as submitted with the following clarifications. The first being that the entry door to 115 and the rear entry door to 117, both have 2 over 3 or 6 light divisions in the glass panel. The second being that the iron railing matched the previous submission, which has both a hierarchy and scale to the picket and baluster so that it has a more substantial look. And it also has a sub rail with a horizontal space below the handrail.

Kevin Ash: Turn the OG upside down on the parapet detail.

Tim Clites: The third. Yep. With yes. Turn the ogee upside down on the parapet so that the detail is facing down, not up. Approve the shingle sample as submitted. And I would request removal of the pergola. Any clarifications?

Cindy Pearson: May I ask? Okay. May I ask Will on this? Is that in our purview to ask that?

Will Moore: The applicant has the right to have his submission acted upon. That is approved or denied if he would like. If he is amenable to the removal of the pergola, he could state so. And then that could be a condition. But so, it depends on his reaction to that request. If he wants the pergola to be included, he has the right to ask that the application be acted upon as submitted.

Tim Clites: So to clarify what I think I heard you say, if I'm making a motion requesting no pergola and we act on it and approve it before we do so, he has the opportunity to say he agrees with that or disagrees with it, and if he disagrees with it, we then can either defer a month or what happens if the applicant says he would, he's not agreeable to that?

Will Moore: Again, if that becomes a sticking point, he has the right to ask that the application be acted upon as submitted, meaning if he's not agreeable to removing an element of his application, then he would say, I'm not agreeable to removing that element that would then require you to act on the application as it is to either approve or deny.

Tim Clites: Completely as it is.

Will Moore: Or with any of the elements.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Will Moore: So, he could ask that.

Tim Clites: I understand. So, what that means for the Committee. And Mr. Ash, so you, we all understand this if I just understand what you said, if Mr. Ash says no, I would like the pergola, and the Committee votes that the majority of them would not like the pergola. What that means is that we deny the application as submitted.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: Is that confusing enough? Yeah. That's why I'm asking again. I want to make sure.

Kevin Ash: Basically, the entire application gets denied if I don't remove the pergola if you take a vote and the majority doesn't want the pergola.

Tim Clites: And the majority, if the majority says that's fine, we're okay with the pergola. And we could. Are we allowed to take a straw vote?

Will Moore: Absolutely.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Will Moore: So now just a third option is he could agree to it. The straw poll, he could agree to removing that from his application at this time to get approval of the rest of the elements. He could then reapply and ask that you.

Tim Clites: Reconsider it.

Will Moore: Reconsider that option so as to not deny everything. Which, I don't think anybody wants.

Tim Clites: Yeah. No, I agree.

Will Moore: But I think a straw poll would be very helpful among the Committee to see where you are.

Tim Clites: Okay. Well, I don't vote in case of a tie. So, on a straw poll, if you'd like to raise your hand, if you would like to see the pergola removed. Please do so. All right, so that's where the Committee is. I think thank you, Will, for clarifying that that can be something you can come back and apply for an amendment for. And then I guess we would have to be clear about, or we should be clear about what we would need to see to get comfortable with approving it, if anything, or just be clear that we don't, right think that that's consistent with the vocabulary and language of the village and the town and what we would expect to see. Because it is something we'll see, and I think that's where we're hearing or seeing a resistance from at least some of the Committee Members.

Steve Simons: If I might add, I think if we're going to put that straw poll. If we're going to send the applicant away without that determination, we should also be able to articulate to him what the major objection to it is. If it's just that couple of feet that you're able to see from the street, and if that can be reduced overall so that it's completely out of the public view, we ought to give them some direction.

Tim Clites: I agree.

Will Moore: And just to be clear if he can modify the pergola so it is completely out of public view, he would not need to come back to you. He can put within reason within code. He can put whatever he wants on that roof that isn't visible from a public way, because at that point in time, it's no longer in the purview of the Committee.

Tim Clites: Right. Understood.

Kevin Ash: Okay.

Tim Clites: We'd like to approve as much as we can tonight. If you would like the sentiment, I'm sure, of the Committee.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Trying to work in between some items here. Trying to provide shade taking out umbrellas now, taking out pergola, having no shade up there makes it difficult. I was looking for progress, so agreeing to 95% of it is important to continue moving the project along. I thought we did a lot of work to mitigate any impact and rotate it. I guess I'll have to come back with another suggestion.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, I understood you to say we could go ahead and vote. And if there's something in our motion that you would like to come back on the pergola, you understand you have the ability to do that, but you would rather us vote tonight so that you can keep moving. So, are there any further clarifications on my motion?

Kevin Ash: But I didn't hear what Steve made a great recommendation of. You know what the resistance is to the pergola. Is it aesthetics? Because I think it's pretty consistent with other pergolas throughout the town. So, I think the design can't be in question, just the location of it because I think if I drive through town, I can see plenty of pergolas that look very similar to this.

Tim Clites: Right.

Kevin Ash: That this board has approved. So, I think precedents for pergola like this has already been set throughout town. So, I would like to hear.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And I can provide that now from my own standpoint, but the rest of the Committee could let's vote first and then we can give the applicant some. Yes, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I have a question with the vote. If the way you're stating it, you want the pergola taken off. So, we either yay or nay, this whole thing and that is included.

Tim Clites: That's right and the applicant can come back and rediscuss the pergola. But after we vote, if that's the vote that we take we should give as much clarification about.

Cindy Pearson: Right. But saying no, if I vote no, that's saying I don't agree with everything else also. No?

Tim Clites: No. My Motion listed every clarification that we are approving, including the deletion of the pergola.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Sure. Is anything unclear to anybody? So that's the motion. We need a second and we need a vote.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

Steve Simons: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Aye.

Bill Anderson: Aye.

Margaret Littleton: Aye.

Virginia Jenkins: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed?

Cindy Pearson: I oppose.

Tim Clites: Any abstain. Thank you. Motion passes. Thank you for coming in tonight and getting us this far. Getting yourself this far. We really appreciate it. Let's talk just for a minute about the pergola. We do have pergolas in town. I view them in a town with the scale and the vernacular that we have as being a garden structure that exists at the street level or at the level of

the grade. And if we were in a more dense urban area where more of our rooftops were part of the streetscape and the vernacular of the town, I'd be fine with it. In fact, we're not. Right. Like we struggle to keep buildings [multiple speakers]. What's that?

Kevin Ash: We are an urban design vernacular because we do have zero lot lines.

Tim Clites: Sure.

Kevin Ash: So, no different than New York City. So, it is an urban setting.

Tim Clites: But it's a historic small scale vernacular federal town, right? And so, in that context saying that it's urban is an overstatement of what I think of when I think of the scale of what we see elsewhere in the town. So that's why the pergola to me just felt like the fact that I could see it.

Kevin Ash: Do you think awning?

Tim Clites: What's that?

Kevin Ash: Do you think awning?

Tim Clites: I don't know about awnings.

Steve Simons: I was actually going to suggest a retractable awning.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, that was my extra alternative is to think about a retractable awning.

Steve Simons: There's a precedence for second story awnings in town on many commercial buildings. And something that is retractable that's not always there during your off hours. But still be able to provide shade.

Tim Clites: And in windy [multiple speakers] wind issues.

Kevin Ash: We have at Hotel Burg on the fourth floor; we have three retractable awnings that have wind sensors. So, anything above 20 mile an hour winds, they automatically retract, so.

Steve Simons: Yeah. From an aesthetic standpoint, that might be something else to, for the Committee to consider.

Linda Wright: Because just one thing too, with pergolas, with the timbers as far apart as they are, if you're up there in the afternoon, the sun's going to come in underneath it. I don't know how much shade you're actually going to get from that pergola.

Kevin Ash: Well, Western is the other direction.

Linda Wright: The other direction that way. But you still going to have some come across here for a good part of the day. [inaudible]

Tim Clites: I understand from a seating area perspective why you want a pergola or something. It creates a sense of scale that being completely open to the sky doesn't.

Virginia Jenkins: Well, I have a question. What? And because none of it's really to scale, what is the depth of the pergola as you've got it drawn now?

Kevin Ash: I think the columns are like six feet out from the building. I think the rafters are probably eight plus feet out from the penthouse.

Virginia Jenkins: So, six feet from.

Kevin Ash: The columns are.

Linda Wright: Probably eight with the overhead.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

Kevin Ash: It just the parapet there is pretty low to keep the lower. Excuse me. Lower profile. So, from an awning standpoint, you might have to come back and look at the parapet height to be able to get some articulation [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: To get it above the. Yeah. Is that enough feedback?

Kevin Ash: Sure.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Any other comments for the applicant? Thank you. Appreciate it.

Kevin Ash: Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right. Our next item. I'm sure everyone in the gallery is going to come back next month just for the fun of a big project. But again, thank you for your patience. We don't get many big projects. I'm sure it feels like we overdo it. We try not to. New business COA 26-04 Request of Jeff Yeutter. I'm sorry I said that wrong. For exterior renovations to 107 West Federal Street, unit 14. Ms. Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. This is a request for renovations at unit 14, building C Federal Court, which is a condominium complex. There was previously a COA done for this in 2001 to enclose a doorway to a window. This request is add another window to the left of that location. Yes, left of that location. For to put a window for an interior office space. And the applicant is here to answer any questions you may have about it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any further? Hello. Name and address. Any further comments?

Jeff Yeutter: Jeff Yeutter 1890 Ridge Road, Haymarket, Virginia. No further comments. I do have our architect here from B&G Construction in case we have any technical questions.

Tim Clites: Great. Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: Welcome.

Jeff Yeutter: Thank you.

Bill Anderson: Generally, I have no issues with the concept. Makes a lot of sense. I would just like to see the brick work, as you said, match the existing brick work. And that means the sill and that the stone clearly you say the stone will be cut like the arches that are there. Probably will not match an exact color because one is an old stone and is new stone, but I think the sill could be made to look like the same as the existing. So yeah. Other than that, no comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: In agreement.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think as long as it matches. Good to go. Makes sense. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Nope. I'm all good with that. I think it fits in just fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm fine with it too. And I agree with Bill.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: Just a clarification. Bill, were you referring to the arch above the window as stone? I believe that's stucco.

Bill Anderson: That's good. There's more chance that it'll match.

Steve Simons: And that is correct. That is stucco correct? Okay.

Bill Anderson: Good. Thanks.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: It looks appropriate. Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right, I move that we approve COA 26-04 as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Jeff Yeutter: Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: Thank you for your patience tonight. All right. Next item is a COA 26-05. Request of Veritas Contracting for revisions to approved COA 24-22 and COA 25-09 and additional lighting at 204 East Washington Street. The Boyd Bed & Breakfast. Ms. Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. The Committee last saw this application in 2025. The applicant came in to they had to demolish a portion of the building and rebuild it. So that's the last time you saw that. During the occupation. Excuse me. Occupancy inspection earlier this year, it was noted there were some changes from the approved elevations to what was actually constructed. There was a modified Western. I'm sorry, the western door was modified and the hardware was modified. The shed dormer was modified and the materials were changed. The shutters were removed on the bathroom additions. And then the exterior lighting was also modified. There was a new exterior sconce that was added that was not part of the application. And it had a light fixture that could not be approved under the zoning ordinance. The applicant has proposed a modification to those lights that's under consideration for you all tonight. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Applicant.

Steve Simons: Good evening. I'm Steve Simons, Veritas Contracting, one South Hamilton Street.

Tim Clites: You want to add anything to the comments?

Steve Simons: No, I think we just should go by these individually and I'll explain in any further detail other than what's already in the summations, if anybody has any questions.

Tim Clites: Okay. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I really don't have any issue with the changes that were made and presented. And I think the solution to the lighting is, is very innovative. There's copper reflective, what would you call it?

Steve Simons: I do have a mockup.

Bill Anderson: Yeah. I saw you bring that. I think it's great.

Steve Simons: The prototype will look a little cleaner.

Bill Anderson: But still it's. Yeah.

Steve Simons: So just to explain the light fixtures are, the light bar itself is currently mounted to the bottom portion of light and pointing up. We have the option of reversing it and pointing it down and then applying this copper shield over the lamp or the bulb to keep that light directly to that downward fashion. There wasn't anything commercially available to do that. So, we're going to modify that ourselves.

Bill Anderson: Where will this kit is it? It's called Kichler.

Steve Simons: Yeah. The Kichler one is on the back main entrance of the house, and that one's already been installed. And we provided a picture of what that looks like.

Bill Anderson: Okay.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: No further comment.

Steve Simons: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: It seems like if you can go down with the light or up with the light, we pretty much ask people to have it down.

Steve Simons: Down.

Punkin Lee: So, I would suggest to go down. And then.

Steve Simons: Yes.

Punkin Lee: Going along with what we normally ask. But everything else. Great.

Steve Simons: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: No other comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comments.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comments. Other are you going to be selling those to other people when they need them? [laughter]

Steve Simons: It's hard to find a sconce fixture that is dark sky compliant.

Tim Clites: Yeah, that is a different version of a modification that was done at the far end of town. The Hersch's basically took the bulb and made it an LED. He did it himself, modified it, and put it up in the hat if you will. [multiple speakers] Yeah. I don't have any other comments. I did want to understand because I couldn't see from the pictures. I understand the shutters. Understand VDHR's input on the little addition on the back and kind of their comments. What I didn't quite follow, I actually have to say that the dormer being an extension of the wall, I like better than the idea of the little roof that was shown, because there's not enough overhang to make that look anything but pasted on.

Steve Simons: Right.

Tim Clites: So, I think that actually is an improvement. And the fact that it's an integral taller wall, getting rid of the parallels, we had the siding that was running with the pitch of the roof. I think in the earlier version, I think that is an improvement. What I didn't quite understand is where. Page four says the original submission it shows a divided light door and then it looks like the updated is in non-divided light door, and I can't tell if that is just at the back of the little one-story addition, or if that's also at the.

Steve Simons: The west or the south elevation on the west wing of the building, so.

Tim Clites: So, the south elevation on the west wing of the building. So, it's facing into the rear yard.

Steve Simons: No, that door. Both doors are the same, but the door in question is facing on the Washington Street. It was the door that had been removed and it was being used as a display case previously. And so, I provided a picture of the back door, so you can more clearly see what that door looks like. But that door does have its original, the original storm door on it. And so, from the street view, it's not obvious that that's not a divided light door. And that's why we're trying to demonstrate how it's partially obstructed. What happened with the original submission was on the architectural plans, it shows this door, but the submittal sheet was for a divided light door. So, there was a discrepancy between the two.

Tim Clites: Right.

Tim Clites: Okay. Now I, because I kept looking at these pictures and looking at the submission, and somehow, I wasn't piecing together. Does everyone else understand that? Am I just slow to catch up? All right. Any further comments? Someone else want to make a motion?

Bill Anderson: I'll make a motion COA 26-05 and COA 25-09. Let me restate that. Motion is for COA 26-05 Request of Veritas Contracting for revisions to approve COA 24-22 and COA 25-09, and additional lighting at 204 East Washington Street to be approved as submitted.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: Have a second. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Steve Simons: Thank you. I just wanted to recognize Mrs. Moore is also here tonight. The new purveyor of Boyd.

Tim Clites: Welcome. It's looking great.

Margaret Littleton: I just want to say. Can I say you all have done a wonderful job? Because we've seen it.

Steve Simons: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Actually, they were generous hosts. Just a departure for a half a second. The AIA's Northern Virginia Chapter came to town for their board meeting, and I somehow got self-volunteered into giving them a walking tour. And the one building that was available for us to walk through was the Boyd. So, it was wonderful. People got to not only see the outside of one of our buildings, but the recently completed inside, so it was a nice treat for us. Thank you for that. COA 26-06 request of Rick and Susan Sierra for fencing at 100 North Madison Street. Ms. Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. You saw this application in 2024 when they added an addition to this building. This request is for a fence along the Pipestem driveway that goes out to Madison Street. They want to replace the existing chain link fence and post and chain fence with a Board-on-Board stockade type fence six feet tall and three feet tall. It will be painted green to match the existing fence. I believe the applicant has brought a paint sample if you'd like to see one. If you have any questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And name address for the record.

Scott Sierra: Scott Sierra 100 North Madison Street.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'd love to see the paint sample, please. And while we're doing that, I'll just pause for anybody to give any comments without going down the line. The bottom two. I'll comment. Thank you for the notion that the fence would get shorter as it came towards the street. I think that's a nice respectful nod to that neighbor.

Scott Sierra: Right.

Tim Clites: It's my only comment and I'm by the way, I'm also glad to see a chain link fence disappear and a wood fence be put in its place. Much better. Any further comments?

Steve Simons: What is color we are looking at? Sorry. [off mic] The bottom.

Tim Clites: The bottom color.

Bill Anderson: Is this pipestem a the drive for just one property?

Scott Sierra: It's one property. Yes.

Bill Anderson: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: This is the house that we approved the addition to the old stone house. Probably a year ago now.

Scott Sierra: Right.

Tim Clites: Yeah. All right. Any comments on the paint color? I move that we approve COA 26-06 as submitted with the paint color as submitted, which is a Benjamin Moore 448.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: Have a second. All those in favor?

Punkin Lee: Second.

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstained? Thank you. Motion passes. Thank you.
Scott Sierra: Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right. Next item request of the Middleburg Community Center for removal and placement of an outdoor grill at 300 West Washington Street. Hold your breath, Miss Rogers. [laughter]

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. The Middleburg Community Center is proposing to remove the existing outdoor grill and replace it with a new masonry stone grill in the same location. It is an open space adjacent to Stonewall Avenue on the community center property. It will be a new grill with a continuous four-foot cooking surface and will have a natural stone veneer. This project has also been given a grant by the town to construct this grill. Any questions about it? The applicant is here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Name and address for the record.

Sue Foote: Sue Foote, 300 West Washington Street.

Tim Clites: Nice to see you.

Sue Foote: Nice to see you all. Thank you for having us, having me.

Tim Clites: So, let's start at the other end. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Thanks. You know, we did talk about this in Council for another, not the building itself, but when you say you're going to have veneer on it, were they going to try to use some of the stone that was there also?

Sue Foote: Yes. We're going to try to use as much of that stone as possible and then match it with local stone that our Mason thinks he can obtain.

Steve Simons: When's the first cookout?

Sue Foote: I'm so sorry.

Steve Simons: When's the first cookout?

Sue Foote: We are hoping for the 4th of July. We're going to give out hot dogs.

Steve Simons: Nice.

Sue Foote: Yes. Yes.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I think it's fantastic.

Sue Foote: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: I like it very much. And I think the fact that it's going to be larger to serve the community is great. Thank you.

Sue Foote: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: Ditto what she said. It's a great improvement.

Sue Foote: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: It's a great improvement in using original stone from the original grill, which makes it pretty special because that was done by a local stonemason back when, so. Very nice.

Sue Foote: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Wow. I think it's terrific. Terrific. And I don't know how you managed with this prior one. [laughter] Good job.

Sue Foote: Thank you so much.

Bill Anderson: I also think it's terrific. Who designed this? They are so simple and straightforward for such a big, big, big grill.

Margaret Littleton: A lot of burgers on it.

Sue Foote: I worked on that, so. Thank you.

Bill Anderson: Terrific. Simple. Straightforward. Great.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Great. I only have one question.

Sue Foote: Yes.

Tim Clites: I'd like us to look at the rendering. That's going to make your mouth water this late at night with the hamburgers on it. And my question to the Committee is the horizontal surface.

We're not going to get fieldstone that large. So, when I think of the community center, I think of its front steps and its rear terrace patio off the terrace room, and I think flagstone or blue stone. But I don't know what the Committee thinks or what the applicant thinks about what that horizontal surface was going to be.

Sue Foote: I think we are looking at flagstone, and I think my stonemason has he thinks he can obtain the material that would kind of go with the center as well. He's very invested in this too. I think he's excited about doing it. So.

Tim Clites: Great. Well, I guess I asked that because the rendering suggests that it could be some kind of a sandstone or something else. And I don't think that's as consistent as a flagstone or a bluestone. So.

Sue Foote: Yes, yes, that's as close as I could [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: I understand I'm not picking on you. This is great. This yeah. Big, big help to visualizing. Any other comments from the Committee? Go ahead.

Virginia Jenkins: I make a motion that we approve COA 26-07 request of the Middleburg Community Center for removal and replacement of an outdoor grill at 300 West Washington Street.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: I'd like to clarify that it's flagstone as discussed on the horizontal surfaces. All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Sue Foote: Thank you so much. I want to thank the town for helping us do this. Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: You're welcome. Can't wait to be up there and get something to eat.

Punkin Lee: 4th of July.

Tim Clites: 4th of July. Now you've got 10 more people showing up you didn't know about. All right. Next. COA 26-08 (S 26-03) Request of Catherine Dolaher. Did I say that right?

Catherine Dolaher: Yep.

Tim Clites: Oh, that was I'm good. It was a stab in the dark for four vinyl window signs at 10 East Federal Street Castle Gallery. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. This is a very simple application to put four vinyl letterings in the bottom that say Castle Gallery. There's pictures that show the location of those, and the applicant is here to further any questions you have. Yeah.

Catherine Dolaher: Hi, Catherine Dolaher 10 East Federal Street.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Catherine Dolaher: Thank you.

Tim Clites: I'm just going to pause. Are there any comments from anyone? I have one comment. Thank you for the restraint. It's awesome.

Catherine Dolaher: Hopefully, the art inside speaks for itself.

Tim Clites: That's what we want, right? Yeah.

Catherine Dolaher: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: So, I think it's a real elegant approach to signage. Very elegant.

Tim Clites: We appreciate. [beeping] Oops, sorry. That was to wake Punkin up. I just, you know I move that we approve COA 26-08 as submitted.

Bill Anderson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

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

Catherine Dolaher: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Welcome to town.

Catherine Dolaher: Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: COA 26-10 (S 26-04) Request of Gurdev (Dave) Singh for a projecting and a wall sign at 200 East Washington Street Revive Clinic and IV Therapy. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. This is another sign application at 200 East Washington Street. It's for a six-foot projecting sign on a new bracket on the eastern corner of the building, and a 6.04ft² wall sign on the side door. There is an existing sign on the building for an architectural firm that's on the other corner, and it will remain. The applicant is here to answer any questions you may have.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any further comments? Name and address.

Dave Singh: Well, I'm grateful for the opportunity and especially meeting honorable Committee Chairs and first time meeting also Nicole. She's the one. I spoke to her about this sign the last couple of months, and I think she did a wonderful job. And other than that, I thought that would

be great opportunity to meet Council Members, only person I think I've met, Mr. Moore and me and my wife Doctor Preet Bajwa. We come here and even though Nicole was going to take care. So, I thought, I'd just say hi to everyone.

Tim Clites: Well, welcome to town. And you are Dave Singh.

Dave Singh: I'm Dave Singh. I just retired from FEMA. I'm not a clinician or doctor. I was project specialist with the FEMA, retired in January. So, I'll be working for her now. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Good luck.

Dave Singh: Yeah. So, you want to take it?

Nicole Madden: I can take it. Nicole from Quail Run Signs.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. Any comments on the sign from the Committee? Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Do you have a color sample?

Nicole Madden: Yes, I do have my Pantone book today.

Margaret Littleton: You do what?

Nicole Madden: I do have my Pantone book today, so I do have color samples that I can show.

Tim Clites: Bill, any comment?

Bill Anderson: Pending looking at the color. I like the signs. I believe there's no problem with the size or the location. So, I think they seem appropriate.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin. Did you have more besides color samples? Sorry, I didn't mean to skip over you.

Punkin Lee: I think we just checked the color sample and should be fine.

Nicole Madden: Oh, okay. I can do that.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Punkin Lee: If you want to show us.

Nicole Madden: I'm more than happy to show you if need be.

Punkin Lee: Perfect. Yeah.

Tim Clites: While you're getting that, I'll just run down through the rest.

Linda Wright: Otherwise, I think the sign is lovely, and it's great. She did a beautiful job.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I like it very much.

Tim Clites: Steve.

Steve Simons: No.

Tim Clites: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I do have a comment with the phone number that's on it. That is, we don't usually have on other signs in town that there's a phone number on the signs. And when you're driving past, it's hard to catch a phone number on a sign. You're going to either stop traffic to write it down and there's parking is limited, as you know, here. So, I would just like to make a comment on that's not something we usually see.

Nicole Madden: I think it was more to help attract pedestrians that were likely walking across there.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, my two comments. One was a question about which parts are. Is there any of this that's three dimensional? Which parts are carved versus?

Nicole Madden: Yeah. So, carve some of the carved elements would be in the gul and in the lettering of Revive Clinic and IV Therapy. The phone number will be on a slight raised piece. So that way if for whatever reason it needs to be changed, it can be removed and replaced. The phone number will be carved as well, as well as the entrance.

Tim Clites: I would agree with Cindy's comment. I think, although we try not to at all dictate the wording on signs, we have generally asked applicants not to have phone numbers and websites on the sign because we're a historic town and we like the I'm kind of historic ambiance of us pretending like we don't have modern technology, even though we all do. So that was my only comment. Otherwise, I think it's a really pretty sign.

Nicole Madden: Thank you.

Steve Simons: Just for what it's worth to the applicants. As a fellow business owner here in town, we don't put phone numbers on our sign because we want them to look us up on the internet. And then that way you get website traffic, they can learn more about your business leaves, a little bit of mystery as well, and it can be a really useful marketing tool not to have the phone number.

Dave Singh: I think that is fine, especially on the sign going to be hanging. If there's no number on it, that's fine. Can we put the phone number on the?

Nicole Madden: You want it on the rider.

Dave Singh: Yeah.

Tim Clites: The sign by the door.

Dave Singh: Yeah.

Tim Clites: The sign by the door that you don't see. Let's clarify. He's asking about the sign back by the door that we won't mostly see from the street. Given the way that door presents itself, there's a hedge at the street. So that if someone were to walk up to the door and you weren't there, they would have a number.

Dave Singh: Yeah, they'd have the sign, the number. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Personally, I like that compromise.

Virginia Jenkins: Makes sense to me.

Punkin Lee: Makes sense.

Linda Wright: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I think that's a nice compromise that keeps the main sign out front consistent with what we have elsewhere in town. Everybody happy with the color? Any further comments? All right. I move that we approve COA 26-10 (S 26-04) as submitted, with the clarification that the main projecting sign not have a phone number, and that the sign by the entry door is allowed to have a phone number.

Steve Simons: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstained? Thank you. Motion passes. Welcome to town.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Dave Singh: Thank you very much again.

Preet Bajwa: We are having a soft opening this Saturday for free Mother's Day. So, 10 to 12. Really looking forward to see everyone there.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Thank you.

Nicole Madden: I'm not going to run away.

Tim Clites: All right. Where are we? We're up to G on our items COA 26-11 (S 26-05) Request of Rebecca Kidder to relocate an existing previously approved projecting sign and apply vinyl window signs to three windows at 13 East Washington Street, Federal and Black. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. Federal and Black is moving to 13 East Washington Street, would like to move their projecting sign from the existing building to 13

East Washington Street. They are also planning to put a new bracket up for that sign. And we'll be putting up vinyl window signs the logo in the center of the window and then another logo at the bottom of each window. The applicant's representative is here for any questions you may have about the application.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any further comments?

Nicole Madden: No other comments at this time. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'll remind everyone in case we forget, I believe this was one of our historic JARB award winners a few years ago. The projecting sign.

Nicole Madden: It was.

Tim Clites: So, it's always nice to remember things like that. Cindy, any comments?

Cindy Pearson: Not right this moment. No.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: No, it's a beautiful sign.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comment.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I think they're fine as presented.

Tim Clites: Punkin.

Punkin Lee: No comment.

Tim Clites: Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: No comment. Except is it the whole building?

Nicole Madden: Yes, it is.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Bill.

Bill Anderson: No comment.

Tim Clites: I only have one question. And it's for the Committee. The previous storefront also had a large logo in the glass, but it wasn't in every panel of the glass. And when I first looked at the application, I thought, well, that just feels like a lot of the same thing. And so, then I looked

at the previous tenant, and I thought, well, they had almost a lot of the same thing too, but there was this little relief in one of the windows, and I don't remember. I know at one point they only had part of the store or part of this shop, and then at some point they expanded to the other part. But my question for the Committee is, although it's allowable from a square footage, does it feel overdone to have Federal and Black in each of the windows? Or does that not bother anybody but me?

Bill Anderson: I think the photo and the graphic doesn't really come across the way it really will look.

Tim Clites: You think it'll be softer in the?

Bill Anderson: This looks like it's an opaque glass, and thus the sun comes popping out. But it's not going to look like that at all.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. That's a good observation.

Bill Anderson: It looks more like the.

Tim Clites: The photos.

Bill Anderson: Existing condition. What is the drawing number on that? It's the one that shows where the brackets going to be on the front of it. It shows the old storefront.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: And you can see there's more of a transparency there.

Tim Clites: To the glass.

Bill Anderson: So, I don't think it's going to be an issue.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay. Fair. Thank you for clarifying that. That helps me be more comfortable with the amount [multiple speakers].

Cindy Pearson: But I kind of agree with you on that, Tim, because with the previous ones, it was just an A and an M, it's not all the wording. That is a lot of wording. It looks more like you're in a mall than you're in the Downtown Historic District. [inaudible]

Tim Clites: So, it just yeah, it felt a little I mean, I understand why you have it, right? You have the projecting sign; you have the window signs. You want there to be some interest. You want people to know it's the whole series of storefronts. It just seemed like a lot of the same graphic.

Virginia Jenkins: It's a lot of letters.

Steve Simons: Does the applicant?

Nicole Madden: If I jump in.

Tim Clites: Someone needs to shut off.

Nicole Madden: We did look at just doing the two windows as the previous tenant, but she felt that the window looked a little bit lost without anything on it, like it was by itself. And, you know, if you put other products there, it might feel a bit separated from the rest of the store.

Steve Simons: I was going to ask, does the applicant have any kind of symbol that goes along with her graphic?

Nicole Madden: Not at this time, no.

Steve Simons: Would she consider something similar to having one of the windows with the Federal Street or Federal and Black on it? And then to Cindy's point, maybe F and B on the other two windows. So, it's a little less obtrusive.

Nicole Madden: The thing is she doesn't advertise as F&B, though.

Steve Simons: Yeah, understood.

Nicole Madden: So, I kind of understand the direction that we're trying to go through here. But she doesn't approach it in that way. No. Okay.

Steve Simons: I understand.

Cindy Pearson: But maybe with not having quite as much all over the Federal and Black is not bad with the Home and Fine Gifts. But the bottom part is more like you're running an ad on each window. Not just telling people who you are.

Steve Simons: Or is it possible that one logo could be the larger size and the other two could be slightly smaller? So, there's some differentiation between.

Nicole Madden: I guess you kind of lose the symmetry a little bit.

Cindy Pearson: Doesn't quite look appropriate for the downtown.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. I've looked at this again, looking at it even further. I think the shopkeeper's best shop around the world winner is like, it's overkill. I don't mind the home accessories, antiques, and gifts, but I don't think the shopkeepers thing is required.

Nicole Madden: Would it make sense if the shopkeeper slogan was dropped on the far-right window, and you just have it on the far left? There's like a big reputation. If you've been on the Shopkeepers Instagram, a lot of business owners, they leverage on that because it's such a big thing in that community.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, but Instagram is Instagram. I mean, I get what you're saying.

Nicole Madden: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: I would just have one shop keepers like the middle one. And then put your home accessories lighter on the two outsides and then you wouldn't have so much weight.

Nicole Madden: Swap it around.

Punkin Lee: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: Yes.

Punkin Lee: And that puts it by the door. It's hard with two doors and two windows on one side. I mean.

Nicole Madden: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: It's everybody wants to balance but you can't balance.

Nicole Madden: Yeah, it's not quite.

Punkin Lee: But maybe if you put the shopkeepers line.

Nicole Madden: If we just flip it.

Punkin Lee: Just once and put the tag. The [multiple speakers] tag line on the two outside windows that would put the weight in the middle.

Tim Clites: What were you going to suggest, Bill? I like that suggestion, Punkin.

Bill Anderson: I do, actually, I do too. I was just going to say A and M had their logo on two windows, not just one. I thought it was just on one, but I see it's on that. I think that's a good idea doing that Punkin.

Tim Clites: And then three Federal and Black or have the shopkeeper on the center with no Federal on Black?

Punkin Lee: No, I think, I think yeah, I think you'd have to keep the Federal and Black on all three and just stack the heavies right on the one, the window by the door. Yeah. And the other two.

Tim Clites: And you're right, because the big panel to the left, although the graphic for the hours is not computed as being significant, it's visually significant, right? So, to kind of scale that, does that seem agreeable? Shopkeepers in the middle and then the smaller home accessory graphics to either side.

Nicole Madden: Beside the doors. Yeah, I believe so.

Tim Clites: Any further comments from the Committee? Punkin would you like to make a motion?

Punkin Lee: Of course. Where did it go? Sorry. I make a motion that we approve COA 26-11 (S 26-05). Request of Rebecca Kidder to relocate an existing previously approved projecting sign and apply vinyl window signs in three windows at 13 East Washington Street with the change of putting the shopkeeper's tagline on the middle window and the one-line tagline on the two outside windows.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstained? [inaudible]

Tim Clites: Motion passes. Thank you.

Nicole Madden: Appreciate you.

Tim Clites: Good to see you again. Alright. And just what I know, at least one person was waiting for all night. Co 26-12 (S 26-06) request of Jennifer Del Grande for a projecting and wall sign at 15 East Federal Street. The Clothing Closet. You get the patience award for the evening. Hello, name and address.

Jennifer Del Grande: Very interesting. My first time at something like this. Jennifer Del Grande 15 East Federal Street.

Tim Clites: Nice to have you, and thanks again for your patience. It's not always this long. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. The Clothing Closet will be moving into 15 East Federal Street. They're requesting a projecting sign and a wall sign. This is the same building as Middleburg Cleaners and Fox Automotive. It will be taking the left-handed bay when you're facing the building. The wall sign will be above the storefront windows on that side and will be about 12.5ft². And then there will be a circular projecting sign on the side door that is underneath the overhang on the building. There'll be, it'll be a mauve color with black lettering. And the applicant is here to answer any additional questions you may have.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Start in the middle. Linda.

Linda Wright: Do you actually have a paint sample with that too?

Jennifer Del Grande: I don't, but I have a picture of an existing sign that we have at our Purcellville Shop that is actually conveniently hung on a building that's almost the same color. So, if you. I can show you all that it's a little less intense than the digital.

Linda Wright: Okay. Yeah, it's more Blush Pink. Yeah. Okay. A little, yeah. Right.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Linda Wright: That's my only comment. Otherwise, I think it's fine. [off mic]

Tim Clites: The color. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I think it looks fine.

Tim Clites: Steve.

Steve Simons: No comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comment. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: Looks good. Thank you.

Jennifer Del Grande: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Looks good. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I agree.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I just have a question. I always have to have a question. [laughter] I can't let all these people get off this easy. Is it intentional; I assume it is, the square sign has a black border, the round sign does not?

Jennifer Del Grande: Yes. So, our vendor who does the hand paints it suggested that we have the black border on the front, just to make it stand out a bit more from the yellow background. And previously, for our other two locations in Leesburg and Purcellville we just had the hanging sign. So that hasn't been an issue. But we are, obviously it's not a big deal if you all would prefer it not have that.

Tim Clites: I don't want it one way or the other. I just noticed it.

Jennifer Del Grande: Okay. Yes, that was just her. I mean she we just took her professional recommendation for that.

Tim Clites: Yep. Understood. Thank you. And at the moment, no need for any lights on the sign?

Jennifer Del Grande: No, no plans for that. At the moment our hours are 10 to 5, so it's not really an issue for us.

Tim Clites: Great. Any further comments from the Committee? A motion. Come on. I'm not doing the last one of the night. Come on Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I move that we accept COA 26-12 (S 26-06) Request to Jennifer Del Grande for projecting and wall sign at 15 East Federal Street. The Clothing Closet.

Tim Clites: A second?

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstained? Welcome to town.

Jennifer Del Grande: Thank you. Thank you all very much. Appreciate it.

Punkin Lee: When do you plan to open?

Jennifer Del Grande: Early June.

Punkin Lee: Oh, good.

Jennifer Del Grande: So, we already have some. It's really just a cleanup for the space and some painting and things like that, so. Should be great.

Bill Anderson: Could you explain what the store is?

Jennifer Del Grande: Sure. So, we're part of a nonprofit called Tree of Life Ministries that serves all of Loudoun County. So, we do a variety of services, including a food pantry. We do free dinners; we provide financial assistance. And the Clothing Closet is what we call a gospel enterprise. So, one of our ministry areas is providing free clothing. So, we opened the Clothing Closet so that we would be able to provide that year-round as opposed to just at yearly events. So, in addition to having really high quality, gently used clothing that are available at very low prices, we also have the opportunity for people to call in and meet and receive free clothing. So, we have them call in for it's our voucher program. They can shop a private appointment, the same racks that everyone else shops from, but they get it all for free for their family.

Tim Clites: Very nice.

Jennifer Del Grande: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Jennifer Del Grande: Thank you all very much.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Jennifer Del Grande: Very educational evening. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Glad I don't have to come back, she says. [laughter] Thank you. Alright. Thank you all for working through this tonight with us. Last item is a discussion item on outdoor and rooftop dining guidelines. And is that, it is Mr. Moore finally gets the floor.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As noted in the memo the Committee spent some time on developing guidelines for outdoor furnishings for Cafés. A couple of years ago it was we spent several meetings. We moved on to other things and never finalized the guidelines. I thought with the discussions surrounding rooftop dining now, it would be a good time to reintroduce this and then possibly expand upon it to address the topic of rooftop dining as well. So maybe the first thing is to talk about what we have here in this draft as it pertains to call it ground level dining or even on porches and such. See if you have any thoughts. Again, it's been some time since you've seen these. In Steve's case, it's the first time he's probably seen these. So open to any input on these. The only change I made from the last version you saw a couple years ago had to do in the lighting section. I had talked with Council about the fact that you were working on developing some of these and they wanted at one point in time a draft had an allowance for string lights in these areas if they were white. And Council's reaction was just say no string lights. So, we've revised it to say no string lights except during the holiday season when all bets are off with regard to decorative holiday lighting. But that is for a set duration in the ordinance. So that's where we are with these, maybe that's a good place to start and we can move on to rooftop after we talk about these.

Tim Clites: Yeah. All right well, I'll just pause so everyone has a chance to look at it. I will, while we're paused and looking at it. It's interesting that earlier tonight we approved outdoor lighting that was not all black or iron. So that's not insignificant except in understanding when we put forth guidelines or when we're talking about future guidelines, the sooner they become guidelines, the sooner they can help us regulate some of the discussions that we have. It doesn't mean that where this draft guideline is, is correct. But had the draft guideline been approved, we would have had either the ability or responsibility to have a different conversation with our earlier applicant.

Will Moore: Oh, maybe I will say that this is written intentionally where it says wrought iron or painted metal is preferred. So, it does leave open the option for conversations. And, you know, maybe that would have the application that came before you still would have been approved. But maybe if the frame of the chair or the bottom of the table were a color other than black, maybe it would have been different, but this, it again guidelines are guidelines, they don't absolutely say this is the only thing that's acceptable, but it puts it out there that this is what is preferred.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And the other thing that I would add, I mentioned, reminded, although I'm sure he did not need reminded, Mr. Moore that a couple of years ago we looked at murals and as an example of something that we emphatically or clearly said is not to be part of our town. I think that it's just important, just as important in a guideline to state what is preferred, and also to be really clear about what we think is just not simply not allowed or not consistent with our town. So, I'm going to jump ahead of everybody with my first comment, which was that umbrellas, in my opinion, should only be allowed at the ground level, sidewalk level, because

that's just where they feel the most appropriate to me. But that's I'm just sharing my own bias. We did as you remember, when there were other umbrellas that came in, we allow for quite a variety of color as a way for different businesses to express themselves. It's one of the places where I think we took a less conservative approach to color, and I found that to be enjoyable myself as I walked through town. My other comments had to do with planters, and it says that they're we don't get into the material of planters. It says they're encouraged to add decoration, and they shall be maintained in good condition or replaced as needed. And my question just was, do we want to get into a recommendation for what they're made out of, or do we just wait until we see them from an applicant? Because you can think about planters being wood, you can think about them being metal. You can think about them being plastic. They can be terracotta; they can be glazed ceramic. Like there's a lot of planter options out there. So, if [off mic] washtub. Yeah, so old bathtub, that's, a different town. But my, you understand my point. If we want to be clear about either what's preferred or what's not allowed, we should talk through that.

Virginia Jenkins: With regard to planters. And you're talking about pots and urns and all of that?

Tim Clites: We haven't yet.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, I know, but people will just put stuff out without coming to the town. How do we?

Tim Clites: Well, I think that's a different issue, which is one of enforcement. And if they don't get permission and someone finds it offensive or staff has reason to visit the business, they can have a conversation about that. I still think it's good to have a guideline. Right?

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, I totally agree that there should be a guideline.

Tim Clites: But it's a little bit like the sandwich boards, right? They just kind of get out of control before they became regulated. So, I think this is the start of trying to regulate that. And obviously if it impeded the flow of traffic, pedestrian traffic or otherwise, I think you're well within your rights to manage that regardless of what our guideline says.

Steve Simons: A couple of questions on the lighting section. I know in other places in the guidelines as I'm trying to learn those, it gives a range of Kelvin temperature between 2700 and 3000 Kelvin. This is saying that like 2700. But do we want to define that, so somebody doesn't come here expecting to be able to do 4000 or 5000 or we, you know, as you read the guidelines, there's the kind of we would like you to do this, and we definitely don't want you to do this. And so, is there a way to incorporate some of that language so that it's known to the applicant? Like don't come to the table with the 5000K light. Secondarily, and this is pertinent to conversation with Mr. Ash this evening. He had mentioned potentially putting probably battery-operated LED lights on their tabletops. Would those be considered under our purview because they're not a permanent fixture, they're a portable fixture. Or would we have any say whether those are allowable or not allowable?

Tim Clites: I think Mr. Moore can maybe answer that best.

Will Moore: We typically would not be at that granular level with tabletop lighting unless it was creating complaints due to being excessively bright or something like that. But, you know, there

are certain things that we're always under the gun as government not to be overregulating every little thing. And for something like that, that is temporary in nature only being used you know, in the evening hours when dining is going on, they're generally not going to be illuminated all night. Something like that. We wouldn't be regulating it.

Tim Clites: However, as a part of the history of being on this Committee, I believe we had an applicant ask about putting lights up in the umbrellas over the tables, and we asked for them not to do that, but to bring them down to the scale of the diner. Is that where we ended up with that? Wasn't that part of King Street Oyster or somebody? Somebody asked for that, right?

Cindy Pearson: It was. I think it was part, yeah.

Tim Clites: But that was more commentary than having a guideline. And I think they were agreeable to whatever wherever we ended up in that discussion.

Cindy Pearson: I think what started with oyster bar was they wanted to put the light up on the building, right, and have it shine down, and we didn't want to go there at all [multiple speakers] because I, you know, it's bothering your eyes. And we had suggested a different table types to them.

Margaret Littleton: They didn't do anything.

Tim Clites: They didn't do anything. Yeah. No ambient light.

Steve Simons: If I'm understanding what Will is saying, though, that an applicant wouldn't have to come in front of our Committee to ask for permission for a tabletop temporary fixture.

Tim Clites: A portable fixture? No, I think that's right. You mean you don't want to regulate the color of the glassware and the dish? Well, let's not go there. All right. Any other comments from the Committee on any portion of this?

Cindy Pearson: Back before we go there. The trash containers. Am I wrong that our town trash containers are green? They're not black now?

Will Moore: No. They're black. Yeah. [off mic] There may have been a green one in front of the coffee shop. It may or may not still be there. The one that's specifically for recycling. I'm not positive on that, though.

Punkin Lee: I just have a question on the no string lights. String lights. Is that like the kind of lights that are at Nature Composed over her plants? Are those string lights?

Will Moore: Correct.

Punkin Lee: And then the new people that have that bought the Best Thai Kitchen, they've now got lights all around, but they're stuck to the building, but they're the same kind of lights. So, what is the difference?

Cindy Pearson: Are they the two?

Punkin Lee: No, they're just like bulbs on a string, but they are affixed to the building. They're not like at Nature Composed where they're kind of lighting the area. So, what do you do in that situation?

Will Moore: I had not seen that they had put up those lights, so.

Punkin Lee: I just noticed them last night.

Will Moore: Let us deal with that.

Punkin Lee: Yeah. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Back to Steve's comment. I think item 6BA just having it say utilize incandescent or incandescent like 2700 Kelvin LED sources. I would just state that I wouldn't give a range. Although your point is if the other parts of the guidelines say 2700 to 3000 Kelvin, maybe this should be consistent with that. Yeah. And then so yeah, you're right. If to be consistent with other parts of the guideline, it could say that.

Punkin Lee: I think if you don't put something there, remember thinking that tabletops, if you get stuck at the stoplight or even through town and you're in a car. Table lights, if they're really bright, just knock you right out as you drive through it. So, if you leave it to them to light up their tables, you may have a car in it.

Cindy Pearson: That's when we should. The person should call and let them know they're too bright. You know, we can't control that.

Tim Clites: Mr. Moore, what do you recommend we do from here?

Will Moore: I think we need to talk specifically about rooftop dining. And just so the Committee is aware that the Council is very interested in rooftop dining inasmuch as they made it one of their strategic initiatives, meaning it's of the highest priority. They adopted nine strategic initiatives for the next two years. And this is one of those nine is to look at rooftop dining and propose regulations around it. So, there will be efforts on the zoning side to establish regulations pertaining to rooftop dining, but I think they're very interested in hearing the input from this Committee on the aesthetics of Rooftop dining. So questions exist and one that I posed to the Chairman when we were talking before the meeting is a one way for this Committee to approach it regardless of what Council does with it is to propose guidelines, treating it similar to the way you treat solar panels in the Historic District, which means if we can't see it, we can't see it. It's not under our regulatory purview. If we can see it, it can't be there. So, we don't want to see it. So that's one way to approach it. So, you know, thinking about Mr. Ash's application he contends that you won't be able to see the railing at all from the street level. I tend to agree that might be the case, might not. It's set back pretty far. It's 32 to 36 inches. I'm not sure exactly which. Yeah. So, you may or may not be able to see that, which would be fine. The furniture you may or may not be able to see it peeking above. He's not going to have umbrellas, so that wouldn't be an issue. Obviously, the pergola would be an issue. So that's one way for this Committee to consider addressing it. Another way is to adopt guidelines similar to these maybe without the provision for umbrellas. Maybe being explicit about no rooftop structures like a pergola or something, but that's where we need input from you as to your thoughts on it. The

aesthetics of it that is Council will figure out whether or not the use is something they want to allow for.

Tim Clites: Can I respond with an immediate reaction, which is, I think we should, if the Council and the Zoning Commission are working on this, I think we should expand it to rooftop uses because we don't have anything to regulate a pickleball court on a roof. And hey, I'm sorry. Like, I'm sorry we don't. And to say that we can't see it doesn't mean you couldn't put one up there. And so, if you're asking me, it's one of the reasons I felt comfortable suggesting the removal of a pergola. Not because I don't love pergolas. We use them all the time. I love them as an architectural element, but it seemed inconsistent with going on the roof of a building in our very small-scale town, as does honestly, I can't think of a use that seems consistent with going on a roof. And so, if we just single out dining, there's nothing prohibiting or I'm going to pick a building that already exists. The antique shop, the Reuters Antique Shop where the Reuter Real Estate is that it has a single-story element and a two-story element with a, but there are single story like on either side of that little walkouts that there's nothing prohibiting them from coming and saying, we'd like to put something out on this single-story flat roof. All you need is a flat roof to start to make use of it. So, I think that in the Historic District in particular, we ought to be very open to not just the possibility of dining, but other things that we would find maybe even less attractive than dining. I don't know what that does for your work. Mr. Moore, I know dining has been the only thing to come before us, but that, to my mind, is not the only potential thing that could come before us.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. I have visions of people using these flat top. [off mic] I've got my mic on. I'm sorry, but.

Tim Clites: If you're talking.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm talking. Yeah. Okay. I'm thinking of people using the flat-top roofs for parade viewing and things like that. I think it's going to get out of hand. I think we have to be very careful and very strict about whatever we just, you know, they decide or we decide for rooftop uses and not uses per se, but the pergolas, the tables, the, you know, we have to be very careful and have it very strict, I think. Did you hear me? Yeah.

Steve Simons: I would suggest, as we're looking at this rooftop question, that we compartmentalize that into two separate conversations, one that revolves around the commercial application and one that revolves around the residential application, because I think they're very different and they may have different restrictions. I think for the most part, commercial application is going to be more of the restaurant, or bar application is most likely. There's not a lot of buildings in town, I don't think that are going to lend themselves to that, but there may be buildings in a residential application that just might just be an outdoor space that is used as a deck or someplace to congregate outdoors. So, you may want to just kind of separate those two elements and look at them with a different lens.

Tim Clites: Yeah, that is a good point.

Punkin Lee: I'm glad you brought up the possibility of down the road, because once you start, the door gets opened and there's got to be somebody thinking of something. Yeah. You know, I can have a hamburger here on the roof, but boy, I could do this on this roof. And it may be so totally out of out of whack, but you opened the door. So, I think it's.

Tim Clites: Like when I came in with the black paint the next meeting, we had pretty much people wanting black paint. [laughter] I'm to blame, but no, that's a good point. Right. [off mic] And I'm glad you did by the way, I think that yeah, where we ended up there and where other people have ended up, I think is so much better for the town and the ambiance of the town. So, thanks for sticking to your guns on that. Does this help at all? You can be honest.

Will Moore: I need to caution you against mission creep. I hear what you're saying that, and I take Steve's point to heart, you know, we don't want to, we are focusing on the use of rooftops or dining right now. That's what I've been tasked with focusing on by the Council. I'm not going to tell you I won't think about other things. I'm not going to think about them right now because I need to address what they've tasked me with addressing. So, my interest in hearing from you is. If rooftop dining is ultimately allowable and just for the sake of argument right now, assume that it will be. Potentially, it might require a special use permit might require something. Maybe it won't be. And this would become moot at that point. But assuming that it could be allowable, what are your guidelines similar to what we have been working on here for the traditional outdoor dining? What would you want those to state? What would you want those to address? Would you want it to be as restrictive as saying it's not appropriate for any rooftop use in the commercial district to be seen from the public view? It could be that simple and that takes out we don't have to sweat over the details. Is it okay to have a, you know, black table versus a cane chair or whatever? You don't have to worry about that because what you're saying is if we can't see it, we can't see it so. [off mic]

Tim Clites: So, if you're asking me, I would say start with it that simple. We don't want to see it because there's nothing that happens on a roof that feels consistent in this town right now, especially on our main street. It's not we don't have any precedent for it. It's like the mural, right? If we had known this, if I'll speak for myself, if I had known that the dining application was coming, I would have probably asked for us to work on that previously. Not because I think it's horrible. I kind of understand completely why the applicant would ask for it, but I think we did a good job of trying to contain its impact. And it, like Punkin says, we don't know what the next ask is going to be. So related to dining, I would think we want it to be not visible from the street have you know, I read the Planning Commission's notes. They were concerned about things we can't regulate, like the amount of light, the amount of noise or music that might be up there, the activity level of activity. I think all of those are important for planning to address. If it is a special exception type process, I would hope that they caveat that with obviously review by us for the aesthetics, which I think is maybe a default position. Yeah. And then I would just ask them while you're doing that, I know it's more work but follow up behind that with any other uses while they're thinking about that. And just take your mind to the extreme swimming pools and pickleball courts, right? Like if you go to a more urban area, they're allowed. In Georgetown it's been years since I worked there, but as I recall, you couldn't see anything from any street or alley. It was not allowed. And it makes a big difference, right? Over time, that scope creep of development doesn't change the feeling of being on our sidewalks. So that's my input.

Margaret Littleton: We regulate [off mic]

Tim Clites: Well, I think when you get to zoning, you could regulate a lot of things. Yeah, sure, hours, numbers of people, kinds of activities. Absolutely. It's a little harder for us to do.

Will Moore: Yeah. Yeah, absolutely. And those are the things if the Council ultimately, you know, and this will go through a regulatory review process for an amendment with the Planning Commission as well as the Council. But if the route goes that the door is left open for the possibility all those kinds of things noise, light, hours of operations, things like that would be all part of the regulatory process. Yeah. Okay. That gives me what I need. I will package something up for you for your meeting next month. And then you would have to forward guidelines to the Council with a recommendation that they be adopted as an amendment to your existing guidelines. And then we could plug them in there. But I'll bring that back next month.

Tim Clites: Next month for us to review and potentially vote on.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Great. Yeah. In 2026 I'm sorry.

Amy Rogers: Back to that topic for a second, because Will and I discussed this a little bit. We haven't discussed it yet. This is the first application I think that you've had with rooftop addition. And you don't have specific regulations or guidelines for rooftop additions. Is that something we should also package up for next month?

Tim Clites: Well, I think if a rooftop we did. That's a good point. I was, Will and I were and he thinks this was before his tenure here. We did look at a rooftop addition. Punkin is going to have to help me. It was Middleburg Real Estate formerly, now it's Corcoran. And they had the brick building. And they put this addition on the back that started to come up over from the street. And we for argument of the scale of the street, the pedestrian scale, the vocabulary, we asked them to push that back so that we only saw a little sliver of the roof. So, I feel like we can manage that a little better when it's architecture, because that's within our purview. I think this is a combination of a use and its impact, and that's why I felt comfortable talking about the pergola, but not as much about the seating, because that's architecture. We can see that.

Amy Rogers: I only mention it because I did a study of some other Historic District guidelines, and some do have specific rooftop addition guidelines. So, if it's something that you'd want to add, we have some background to be able to add something to that.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Because that could be a question that someone who wants to do it. And if you say they can see the pergola, they want to build their wall higher on the side or whatever would block the rooftop. If you're getting kind of what I know, I'm not real clear on this, but they could build a higher wall. So that's why you would need guidelines to protect that from happening. And just having these walls on top of a building.

Steve Simons: Well, the height restriction of the building we already have.

Cindy Pearson: Well right.

Tim Clites: Height restriction, or we have the authority to say that's not sympathetic or consistent with the vocabulary, either of the building or the street. So, I think we I feel

comfortable managing that idea more so than like these potential uses that might go that might go on the roofs. All right. Well, we've given you. Yes.

Punkin Lee: I think the thing about not seeing it from any side should be in there because we always the guidelines are Historic District. Can you see it from the street? Well, in his instance of that, it's got two street sides and we only really kind of addressed Main Street versus Federal Street. So, we think any rooftop issue should be covered that you can't see it anywhere.

Tim Clites: Right.

Cindy Pearson: You know [off mic] guidelines [off mic] Sorry. See things from the back street.

Tim Clites: No.

Cindy Pearson: No.

Tim Clites: We have the right to regulate things.

Cindy Pearson: We have the right. Okay. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: That's, part of our Historic District. Yeah.

Bill Anderson: I think just to add on to what you were saying, first of all, we were all kind of saying that we don't want to see it from. And what we mean is we don't want to see it from the street. Of course, any second floor is going to see whatever's going on, and that's part of the Historic District to the people in the upper levels are going to see it. So strict accordance with if this is a Historic District, it shouldn't be there because you can see it from another historic building site. So also, having been in this situation myself, the fact that an applicant will say, well, here's a rendering of the roof and you see you can't see the pergola, or the restaurant, or the railing. Well, again, you've been there. If these computer models. I doubt very much that they're correct on that from, for instance, coming from the red light, as you mentioned today, in the wintertime, I feel confident that you're going to be able to see it. Well, that's so far away. But the views that the applicants take when they come in, we all have to have, you know, be thinking about, is it really true? And in this case, I think from the red light, you're going to see it there. And then one other point, and this is a question, how do we regulate in the Historic District sound levels? For instance, if your example of the Oyster Bar restaurant did want to put lights up there and we approved the seating on the side of the road. What if they decided to put speakers out there, for instance, and have a party and blast sound out? How do we control that? That's a question I'm not sure.

Will Moore: We have a noise ordinance that has.

Tim Clites: It's not part of HDRC, but the zoning has a noise ordinance.

Bill Anderson: So, the restaurant up on a roof top would also have that same requirement. I would assume, even though it's on the roof.

Amy Rogers: Yes.

Will Moore: Correct.

Bill Anderson: Good, good. All right. Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you, Mr. Moore. Miss Rogers, do you have what you need? Have we worn you out for tonight?

Margaret Littleton: [off mic] Pickleball Court.

Tim Clites: Pickleball? I shouldn't have said that out loud.

Will Moore: I'm in favor of banning pickleball, wherever it may be. Ground level. Everywhere.

Tim Clites: Come on, come on. All right. 2026 JARB Awards. What do we need to do for homework to get ready for that?

Will Moore: The only thing that I need right now is that the coordinator is asking for our representatives to be chosen. So.

Tim Clites: Anybody like to join me because I know what y'all are going to do.

Steve Simons: What are the awards for?

Tim Clites: So, the JARB Awards are we look at the work that we've approved over the last year or two that's been built or completed, and we submit it to Loudoun County who organizes the three historic towns, us, Purcellville, and Leesburg. And then Loudoun County has an overarching historic review process for any building in the county. And each jurisdiction submits. We get together, the representative or representatives get together, review all the submissions, and select some for awards. And it's really about just recognizing the amount of effort and work that it takes for many of these applicants to follow the guidelines and really do it well. So, the Boyd would be a great example of something that came to my mind when I thought about these awards, like, like we would, whether you're sitting here or not, this Committee would be saying, that's a project that we want to recognize as having really, you know, worked within the spirit of our guidelines.

Steve Simons: So, I'd be honored to volunteer for that if you need a second.

Tim Clites: Do we have any other volunteers? Punkin will do it again. Y'all going to give me a break? Wow. You are.

Margaret Littleton: You are on it, though.

Cindy Pearson: No, you're on it.

Tim Clites: Oh. [laughter]

Steve Simons: So, but just a quick question. If a project that I worked on was up for nomination, does that preclude me from being nominated?

Tim Clites: No because this Committee is going to do the nominating. Yeah.

Steve Simons: So, we are just a subcommittee to make a recommendation.

Tim Clites: Yeah. We are the representatives that go and explain the projects to the other Committee Members.

Steve Simons: Yeah.

Tim Clites: So, it's like we do the work here? There's one usually it's, I don't know, lunchtime or something early in the morning. We run up to Leesburg for an hour and a half, meeting with the other Committee Members from the other jurisdictions. And then they have an event in the evening in the middle of the September, I think, and bring in the people that have done the work and, you know.

Steve Simons: Just let me know if [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: Yeah. Great.

Will Moore: Okay. We will we will attempt for next month to have a list of projects that have completed since the last ones that you considered for nominating. So, we'll try to have that kind of short list for you to kind of consider.

Tim Clites: And in our town, Steve, just to get you up to speed, it's anything we've reviewed, and we're known as the town with the awesome signs. Like every year I go that I've been there, they're like, all right, what do you got for us for signs this year? Because other jurisdictions don't necessarily regulate the signs. It's done at the staff level. And so, it's kind of a for me, it's an interesting byproduct of the fact that we do even sweat our signage like other Historic Districts are like, you know, it's kind of a cool nod. Anyway. All right. I move; we adjourn. Thank you all.

Steve Simons: Can I ask one quick question before we adjourn?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Steve Simons: So, on a and I think it's just really short. On a similar note, to these guidelines, we talked about tonight for the rooftop thing. I was reading through the Planning Commission's notes about the new ADU regulations. Are we going to have an opportunity to weigh in on similar guidelines for the ADUs? Because a lot of that may fall into the Historic District.

Will Moore: It may. So, for those of you who don't know exactly what Steve's referencing the Virginia General Assembly and our Governor, in their collective wisdom, passed legislation this year that will compel the approval of accessory dwelling units in any district, in any single-family residential district in the Commonwealth. So that means that regardless of what you want your zoning to be if you have a single-family residential district, anyone within that district can buy right, build an Accessory Dwelling Unit in their backyard. And there's a lot of other stuff that goes along with that. The legislation has a delayed implementation of July 1st of 2027. So, we have a little bit of time to figure out what constraints are built into that legislation they passed, but it was a very, very sweeping regulation. So, I don't know, I just look around the

neighborhood I live in and just think, if everybody put a small house in their backyard, what would that do to the neighborhood? But this is the time that we live in now. So yeah, I'm not sure what that will mean for our Historic District. We have to do a lot of analysis as to which districts this may apply. There's some discussions that need to be had with the Town Attorney as to how to interpret the legislation, because there's always a little gray area in legislation. So not going to jump on any amendments to our guidelines yet, but we will certainly look at that at the right time.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We're adjourned. Thank you.