TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, June 4, 2026
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, June 4, 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
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

ABSENT: Punkin Lee, Vice Chair

New Business

COA 26-14 (S 26-08): Wall Sign – 107 W. Federal Street, Unit 14 – Jeff Yeutter

Planner Rogers reminded the Committee that this applicant appeared before them last month for an application to add a window and advised that he had returned with a request for a five square foot wall sign at the entryway to the business. She reported that the sign would be red, black, and green.

Jeff Yeutter, the applicant, appeared before the Committee. In response to inquiries, he confirmed he would use the same mounting holes as were used for the previous sign. Mr. Yeutter advised that if the previous sign covered the corner of the stucco arch, this one would as well. He confirmed he could raise it; however, he would have to drill new holes into the brick. Mr. Yeutter advised that his business was a mental health practice and explained that he incorporated animal assisted therapy into it when requested by his clients. He confirmed he did use trained therapy dogs.

The Committee opined that it made sense to mount the sign on the existing mounting hardware.

Deputy Town Manager Moore displayed a photo depicting the previous sign. He confirmed it covered the corner of the archway just like the proposed one would do.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-14 (S 26-08) as presented.

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

COA 26-15 (S 26-09): Wall Sign – 4 E. Federal Street – Chan Nara

Planner Rogers reported that the request was for a six square foot wall sign that would be hung on the porch facing the east side of the building. She advised that it would only be seen by someone traveling west on Federal Street. Ms. Rogers reported that it was proposed to be a black metal sign with gold lettering. She noted that the applicant was not present to represent her application.

Chair Clites noted that the sign was already in place. He reminded the members that this should not affect their comments.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Planner Rogers confirmed there were other metal signs in town and cited one that was located directly across the street from this one. She acknowledged, however, that signs were typically carved wood or painted ones.

Chair Clites noted that the Committee was less agreeable when the edge of the sign was visible, such as on a projecting sign. He advised that it did not accept aluminum sheets.

In response to a comment from the Committee about the visibility of the sign, Planner Rogers reported that the applicant indicated she may return with a request for a hanging sign in the future.

Chair Clites noted that dark signs with gold lettering were difficult to see. He suggested that it be pointed out to an applicant that wanted a high visibility sign that these types were very low visibility.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-15 (S 26-09) as submitted.

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

Chair Clites suggested the discussion of Jane Covington's application be delayed in order to give her time to arrive at the meeting.

COA 26-17 (S 26-10): Window Signs – 10 N. Pendleton Street – MainStreet Bank

Planner Rogers reminded the Committee that MainStreet Bank appeared before them in September and October for a new door and sign. She reported that they also added window signage totaling 8.89 square feet in their front window. Ms. Rogers displayed photographs of the signage, which included their logo, hours of operation, and other language.

Josh Heath appeared before the Committee representing the application. He advised that the language at the bottom was a security message asking people to remove any face coverings when in the building. Mr. Heath explained that this was typical bank language that was posted at all their locations. He apologized for putting the signage up ahead of the approval. In response to inquiries from the Committee, he advised that it was hard to say whether people could read the small lettering.

The Committee opined that the signage was discreet and seemed to be appropriate to its location.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-17 (S 26-10) as submitted.

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

COA 26-16: Exterior Alterations – 18 S. Madison Street – Jane Covington

Planner Rogers reported that the applicant was proposing to cover the rear wall and chimney at 18 West Madison Street with a lime-based stucco. She advised that it was currently exposed fieldstone. Ms. Rogers noted that the other building faces contained a light green stucco coating. She advised that the applicant claimed this was a repair to the face of the building and would like to cover it to protect it.

Councilmember Pearson advised that this was beautiful stone and expressed hope that there was a way to work around it, so it would not be covered. She advised that while she preferred the entire area remain stone, she would be okay if the wall was finished and the beautiful stone chimney was left. Ms. Pearson reminded the Committee of the guidelines related to retaining the character of a building and retaining historic chimneys. She opined that this needed further consideration.

Committee Member Simons questioned whether the pointing on the exposed stone was Portland cement or a lime-based mortar. He advised that if it was Portland cement, there would be no benefit in adding a lime-based stucco over it. Mr. Simons noted that lime-based stucco was a traditional building material. He advised that the applicant was seeking to repair the cracks in the existing stucco where water may be entering; however, he agreed with Councilmember Pearson that there was a case to be made about leaving the stone exposed because it told part of the story of the house. He noted, however, the numerous stone buildings and numerous stucco buildings and advised that he would not be opposed to either. Mr. Simons suggested it may have been covered at one time and just fell off.

Jane Covington, the applicant, advised the Committee that when the rear west facing elevation was constructed, it had a lime-based parging over it, just like the rest of the building. She explained that she was asking that it be returned to its original appearance with a protective stucco coating. In response to inquiries from the Committee, she confirmed she would apply the finish so it would be like the other sides of the building.

Councilmember Pearson noted that she viewed some old photos of the building, which were approximately seventy years old, and advised that there was no covering on that side or the chimney. She reiterated that the stone was beautiful and that she hated to see it covered. Ms. Pearson advised Ms. Covington that the Historic District Guidelines recommended retaining historic chimneys and not covering them in order to keep their historic character.

Ms. Covington noted the raw edge of the stucco on the side of the building and opined that if it was intended that the rear be exposed stone, the raw edge would not be as it was. In response to a comment from the Committee, she noted that she was looking to apply stucco to the entire elevation, not just the chimney.

Councilmember Pearson noted that other houses had finishes on their elevation but left the chimney in the exposed stone. She expressed hope that there was a way to work something out so the chimney would not be covered.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Covington advised that she did not know of a technical method to date stucco; however, there appeared to be several layers based on an inspection of the raw edge. She advised that the first layer was lime-based stucco, which would have been original to the house. Ms. Covington noted that, unfortunately, a cement covering was applied and advised that water was getting behind it and popping the cement stucco off. She reminded the Committee that the elevation (being displayed in a photo on the viewing monitor) was not visible from the public right-of-way and advised that the stucco would be removed and the finish redone because of the moisture being held behind the cement parging.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to whether the mortar joints on the exposed stone were Portland cement or lime, Ms. Covington advised that it was everything. She noted that when she purchased the building five years ago, one of the first things she did was put stucco back on the south chimney (right-hand chimney on West Federal Street) because it had popped off on three different sides. Ms. Covington reiterated that she put it back on as a maintenance measure. She noted that she left it to cure for a couple of years and painted it green this past spring.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that she liked the stone; however, she was not opposed to covering it.

Committee Member Wright noted that she liked the stone and questioned whether there was some other way to address the raw edge to keep the water from getting behind the cement stucco.

Ms. Covington explained that it was not just the edge but the entire elevation that needed to be addressed. She suggested that if the Committee looked at other buildings around town, they could see how they were handled. Ms. Covington cited the Red Fox Inn as an example of a building with a lime finish. She also cited the example of an old building that appeared to originally be stucco that was removed, with heavy cement joints applied to keep the stone exposed. Ms. Covington advised that she chose not to take that path.

Committee Member Wright expressed a preference to keep the exposed stone; however, if there was no way around it, she advised that she would not be totally opposed to the stucco. She reiterated that it would be great to keep the exposed stone.

Committee Member Littleton questioned whether a whitewash that would serve as a preservative could be applied as a compromise.

Ms. Covington advised that this was a tax credit project and explained that everything she did to the building had to be approved by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR). She further explained that they went by the Secretary of Interior Standards, which talked about the proper ways of maintaining a building, not only from a historical integrity, but from a structural integrity perspective. Ms. Covington advised that aesthetics were not a primary driver of the VDHR's decisions.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with the need to stucco it to keep the water out.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington advised that the first thing she did was repoint the top of the chimney. She further advised that the water was not inside the building. Ms. Covington explained that the stone was structurally unstable at the top of this chimney and the south one.

Committee Member Anderson opined that what he heard was that the stucco was coming off the edge of the south elevation where there was a leak.

Ms. Covington clarified that there was not a water leak but rather water was getting between the stone and the stucco, which resulted in the stucco popping off. She confirmed there was no leak inside the building. In response to comments from the Committee, Ms. Covington advised that there were no federal requirements that she keep the stone by virtue of being on the National Register, either as an individual building or a contributing structure. She further advised that the Secretary of Interior Standards would allow for a lime-based stucco.

Committee Member Anderson inquired as to what methods would be appropriate. He opined that repointing would save the wall and chimney and allow for less water penetration. Mr. Anderson acknowledged the stucco was coming off the other walls; however, he opined that this was a separate condition. He suggested Ms. Covington did not have a water penetration problem on the stone wall but did have a stucco problem on the south wall. Mr. Anderson noted the need to understand the problem and questioned why the proposal was to apply stucco to the stone around the chimney if there was not a water penetration issue.

Ms. Covington advised that there was a water penetration issue; however, she repointed the top of the chimney to address it. She advised that she did not want to do that again. In response to inquiries from the Committee, she confirmed she had gone through her Phase I step related to the tax credit and was approved to Part III. She advised that it was under review. Ms. Covington agreed to send the Committee a copy of it.

Committee Member Simons advised that he would like to see what the State accepted as far as their methodology for this repair.

Ms. Covington advised that it was still under review. She further advised that this was Phase II.

Committee Member Simons advised that a lot of these stone houses were made to be exposed, whereas others were made to be covered with this part of the building (chimney) being exposed. He questioned, in her professional opinion, which this building fell under.

Ms. Covington opined that, judging from the stonework, it was not intended to be exposed.

Councilmember Pearson read excerpts from the Historic District Guidelines related to chimneys, which recommended that historic chimneys be retained and repaired and, if severely deteriorated, rebuilt in the same design. She opined that this did not support applying coats of stucco. Ms. Pearson advised that to her, the guidelines asked that the stone be kept, not covered.

Ms. Covington acknowledged that the guidelines called for it to be the same design as the original. She opined, based on the construction, that it was originally covered with lime-based stucco. Ms. Covington questioned whether there were any pictures of the building from 1785.

Chair Clites opined that Committee Member Anderson best expressed his concerns. He questioned the need for stucco on the stone versus on the south wall, which was clearly deteriorated and in need of repair or replacement. Mr. Clites advised that he did not know what the process would be if it was a combination of Portland and lime-based stucco.

Ms. Covington reiterated that the south wall had a lime-based stucco underneath the cement stucco. She advised that this was not the path she would have chosen. In response to inquiries from the Committee, Ms. Covington reiterated that there had not been water intrusion into the building. She advised that she wanted to remove the loose cement stucco and repair it with a lime-based stucco. Ms. Covington acknowledged this was not a part of her application and opined that it was not visible from a public right-of-way.

Chair Clites noted the photo of the south elevation and advised that it was visible from down the street.

Ms. Covington asked that it be formally included in her application.

Chair Clites explained that when he reviewed the application, he saw a conversation that said the stucco had issues; therefore, the applicant needed to stucco the stone wall, which did not make sense. He opined that the stucco could be repaired and the exposed stone left. Mr. Clites expressed appreciation that Ms. Covington had had to repair the stone at the top of this chimney, opined that the repair should last twenty-five to forty years, and suggested it would not be an ongoing maintenance issue. He noted that he remembered that the other chimney was stucco and that the two were not similar. Mr. Clites opined that given the view of the other chimney from the main street, the Committee felt it was appropriate to cover it with stucco. He suggested there were records that indicated the chimney in question had not been covered in stucco and advised that it was unique historically. Mr. Clites opined that it was an element worth keeping. He noted that he looked at it in person and advised that the rake barely covered the stone, much less a coat of stucco. Mr. Clites reiterated that he felt the stone was worth keeping. He agreed with Committee Member Simons that he would like to hear what the VDHR said and suggested the application be tabled until they heard their comments.

Committee Member Simons questioned whether there were any remnants of stucco on that side. He questioned whether there were any ghost marks or anything to indicate the elevation and chimney had a stucco coating at one time.

Ms. Covington advised that she was happy to wait until the VDHR responded to her application.

Chair Clites thanked Ms. Covington for agreeing to wait. He suggested the Committee members walk around town to look at some of the stone buildings. Mr. Clites noted the Red Fox Inn, which while renovated, had a lot of character that had weathered and been worn off over the years. He advised, however, that it still showed some evidence of its old porches and either lime or paint. Mr. Clites opined that it was different than the stone façade on Ms. Covington's building, which was clean and pristine in terms of the mortar joints. He advised that looking at it from the street level, the mortar joints all appeared to be tight. Mr. Clites opined that there was some slightly different tooling that showed it had been worked like any other stone building would have been. He reiterated his suggestion that the application be tabled pending input from the VDHR.

Committee Member Simons opined, based on the corner detail shown in a photo, that there was a strong argument to say that if the façade had not been stuccoed at one time, it would have a finished edge. He noted that the question was how long had the coating been missing and did that change the period of historical significance for it being uncovered.

Councilmember Pearson noted that the photographs only depicted the right side of the building and suggested the need to see photos of the left side.

Ms. Covington advised that she would provide a picture of that side as well.

Planner Roger noted the Committee's discussion of how long this had been an exposed stone elevation. She advised that the 1977 survey document contained a picture of the chimney, which was stone. Ms. Rogers advised that it was unclear whether the wall was also exposed stone. She confirmed the other chimney was stucco. Ms. Rogers advised that the chimneys were clearly different materials in 1977.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that since this was a tax credit project, it was a good idea to table the application. He opined that it was important to see VDHR's response to the Part II application. Mr. Moore advised that while it would not obligate the Committee to approve it, if the VDHR approved it, they should give that strong consideration. He noted that the VDHR took their job very seriously and reiterated that if Ms. Covington received their approval, the Committee should give that strong consideration.

Chair Clites agreed and opined that the last thing the Committee wanted to do was to discourage local investment in historic buildings because it did not give weight to the Virginia standards. He advised that if Ms. Covington was agreeable, the Committee would table the application until she could provide the VDHR's response to the staff.

Ms. Covington confirmed she was agreeable to the application being tabled.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee table (the application) *until the applicant resubmits, meaning Part II.*

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

Discussion Items

Outdoor & Rooftop Dining Guidelines

Planner Rogers reminded the Committee that last month, they discussed the draft guidelines amendments related to outdoor dining and reported that several proposed edits were made based on the discussion. She reviewed the edits, which included: (1) adding the term "on a first story uncovered porch or patio" to the language about umbrellas at street level; (2) the addition of a listing of permitted materials for planters; (3) the addition of language related to light bulbs' temperature range; and (4) the addition of language that rooftop dining items should not be visible from the public rights-of-way, should blend with the building, and should be modest and at the lowest level possible, with no pergolas or roof coverings being permitted.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the next step would be to put the amendments in a finished format to match the existing guidelines document, to vote on it, and to forward a recommendation to the Town Council for their approval of the amendments to the guidelines. He confirmed there were no public hearing requirements.

Chair Clites suggested that unless the Committee felt time was of the essence, they consider an amendment to address the issue of black building facades. He noted that he had some other things he wanted to add and asked for the other members' input.

Committee Member Littleton suggested the need to stress appropriateness more and noted that Middleburg was a small, historic town. She opined that it needed to be kept that way and advised that rooftop dining was a whole new invention that was not appropriate.

Committee Member Wright agreed there should be no pergolas on rooftops and advised that they belonged on the ground or in a garden and should be appropriate in that style. She opined that there may be a condition where it would be appropriate to have a covered pavilion on the second floor if it would blend in and be appropriate. Ms. Wright opined that this could be a possibility for some of the buildings as long as it looked like it was part of the whole building structure.

Committee Member Jenkins agreed with Committee Members Littleton and Wright. She suggested that language be added to the umbrellas section to repeat that umbrellas were not allowed on rooftops.

Committee Member Simons questioned what was meant by a first story uncovered porch or patio.

Deputy Town Manager Moore cited the example of CDMX, which had a patio that was not on the sidewalk level, but was raised a step or two. He noted that the Red Horse Tavern also had a patio at a raised elevation. He agreed this language could be tweaked to make it clearer.

Committee Member Simons noted the lighting section and advised that 3000 Kelvins would be pretty bright. He noted that lighting also came in 2500 Kelvin. Mr. Simons suggested lights bulbs be allowed in the 2500-2700 Kelvin range. He opined that anything over 2700 Kelvin was approaching an incandescent bulb and anything at 3000 Kelvin was getting into the bluer spectrum.

Committee Member Simons agreed a pergola was a ground structure. He opined, however, that there could be a rooftop covering as long as it was integrated into the structure to look like it was part of the roof system for the building. Mr. Simons suggested it could partially conceal what was happening on the roof, as long as it was appropriate from the street view. He further suggested that rather than not permitting them, they should be an option on a case-by-case basis.

Planner Rogers suggested the need to wordsmith this language and advised that there was not an intent that someone could add another roof in the form of one that was open on the sides. She explained that this was in reference to something like the addition of a sunshade that was not structural in nature.

Committee Member Simons noted that the Committee suggested Mr. Ash consider a retractable fabric awning. He suggested a broader definition be included in the amendments and advised that he had no problem excluding pergolas, as they were not appropriate in the air.

Councilmember Pearson questioned whether a sail type awning would be allowed.

Committee Member Jenkins suggested roof coverings also be not seen from the street. She noted that one of the things the Committee said during the last meeting was that items should be pushed back.

Chair Clites advised that he was not trying to be a naysayer; however, in this case, he was. He noted that, unfortunately, the Committee was only tasked with looking at rooftop dining and advised that someone could ask for a rooftop garden with a giant contemporary sail cloth over it. Mr. Clites opined that in that case, the Committee could say it was not sympathetic to the traditional architecture to avoid it. He suggested there could be a debate about pergolas or other elements associated with outdoor dining. Mr. Clites suggested the need to include a phrase along the lines of "if consistent with zoning regulations" and noted that the Council had tasked the Planning Commission with looking at the appropriateness of this use from a zoning perspective. He advised that this would allow the guideline amendments to be adopted without having to change them again. Mr. Clites suggested the amendments also clearly state that no pergolas, umbrellas, or tents would be allowed on a rooftop and noted that this would prevent temporary ones. He suggested the need to address permanent or temporary elements that project above the plane of

the table and noted the need to define that. Mr. Clites cited as examples sunshades and outdoor heaters. He noted the visual of having six to eight large outdoor heaters on a rooftop so people could dine outdoors. Mr. Clites opined that the Committee was trying to eliminate visibility of rooftop dining from the public ways. He suggested the Committee did not want to see any of the amenities that would allow that use to happen, including railings and furniture. Mr. Clites noted the conditions that were imposed on a recent applicant and noted the need to be sympathetic to the village. He suggested the need to include language that addressed sitting, standing or any pedestrian space being set back from the roof edge, parapet or building elements to eliminate views to the public street or space. Mr. Clites stressed the need that no outdoor element be visible from the public street or rights-of-way. He opined that this would be difficult to regulate and questioned whether it should include the people.

Committee Member Simons noted that people who were in one of the adjoining buildings would be able to see the rooftop dining area even though it may not be visible from the ground level. He opined that it could impact residents who lived in residential apartments on second floors.

Chair Clites agreed; however, he noted that there was only so much the HDRC could do since it would not be a public space. He suggested the need to be sympathetic to this. Mr. Clites noted the question related to a second-story roof and advised that the zoning ordinance did not talk about number of floors. Mr. Clites explained that in that case, the HDRC would be tasked with the appropriateness of the architecture around a completely covered outdoor space. He opined that the guidelines already covered that well enough and noted that it was not historically something that would be found in town.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with Committee Member Simons that the lighting was important. She questioned how the Committee could gauge it and limit it to soft warm light.

Chair Clites reviewed the scale of bulbs and noted that the guidelines limited them to 3000 Kelvins.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the technology had changed since the guidelines were written five years ago. He opined that 3000 Kelvins was included only because there was a struggle to find a bulb that was 2700 Kelvins at that time. In response to an inquiry, he confirmed there was nothing to prevent the Committee from amending the current guidelines to eliminate 3,000 Kelvin bulbs.

Chair Clites noted that applicants already struggled to get appropriate lights for the requirements and questioned whether reducing the limit to 2700 Kelvins would take some of the dark sky compliant lights out of consideration. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he advised that in this case, it would apply to all lighting in the Historic District, not just tabletop lighting.

Committee Member Simons opined that there should be an important distinction and noted that the Committee was only talking about the color and temperature of the lighting – not the lumens. He questioned whether there was anything in the guidelines to limit the lumens and noted that even a 2700 Kelvin bulb was the equivalent of a 200-watt bulb and produced more light. Mr. Simons opined that the intent of the dark sky ordinance was to keep the amount of lumens at a reasonable level.

Chair Clites confirmed it was both, as well as a cut-off, so the light did not spill onto the neighboring property or head up into the sky. He advised that he felt a sense of urgency to move the remainder of the amendments along, even if they revisited the guidelines again.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that rooftop dining would not fall under their purview, as their purview was only what could be seen from the public rights-of-way. He noted that in the past, he used solar panels on a roof in the Historic District as an example and advised that the Committee would not see an application for a solar panel unless it was for a little corner of it. Mr. Moore noted that there may be solar panels in the Historic District; however, the Committee would not see an application because they could not be seen from the public rights-of-way. He opined that this was the Committee's preference for rooftop dining based on their discussions.

The Committee agreed their preference was to not see rooftop dining.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that depending on the zoning regulations, this use may be permitted. He advised that the Planning Commission had taken it up as a topic of discussion and was in the process of determining how to craft regulations around this use. Mr. Moore noted that they were interested in getting input from other groups, including the HDRC. He advised that this was their opportunity to send a representative to the Planning Commission meeting, as they wanted their input. Mr. Moore suggested the input should be from the Committee's perspective; however, the members could also provide personal input from the public perspective. He noted that the Commission's next meeting was June 22nd.

Chair Clites suggested the staff forward the date to the Committee members. He further suggested all members should feel comfortable attending and voicing their individual opinions, not just those of the Committee. Mr. Clites opined that there was value in the Commission hearing from any member who wanted to take the time to attend the meeting.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed the proposed amendments would not affect any current applications when they were adopted. He noted the previously approved application, in which the pergola was removed, and advised that if an amendment to it was to return after the guideline updates had already been approved, then the requirement to not see any elements from the public rights-of-way would affect that application.

Chair Clites noted that without any of the amendments, the applicant would still have to file an application and get approval from the Committee; therefore, there would be a discussion either way. He thanked the Town staff and Committee for working through the amendments.

2026 Joint Architectural Review Board (JARB) Awards

After considerable discussion, the Committee agreed it wished to submit the following applications for a sign award: Town Duck and Middleburg Museum. They further agreed they would like to submit the following applications for a combination renovation/sign award: The Boyd Bed & Breakfast, Loudoun Market and Bedford Lee.

Quorum for July Meeting

It was noted that the following day was the Fourth of July holiday observed. Those members who were present advised that they would be present for the July 2nd meeting. Chair Clites asked that the members let the staff know if they found they could not attend so the meeting could be rescheduled if needed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

HDRC Meeting Transcript – June 4, 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 got their screen up. Anybody having computer issues, can we start? Call the meeting to order. First order of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

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

Bill Anderson: Present.

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 for something on our agenda, we'll get to you. If you're here for public comments, now's your chance to talk about anything to us. All right. Thank you. We'll close public comments. Action item new business. Our first action item is COA 26-14 (S 26-08). Request of Jeff Yeutter for a wall sign at 107 West Federal Street Paws2Heal. I apologize for I'm sure messing up that last name pronunciation. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Good evening, Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. You saw this business last month. They were here to add a window in the downstairs. And they're here tonight for their new sign. They're doing about a five-foot, five square foot wall sign at the entranceway going into the basement level of the building. It will be red, black, and green, as you can see on the screen. And the applicant is here to answer any questions for you all.

Tim Clites: Thank you. If you'd like to add anything name and address before you give us any comments.

Jeff Yeutter: Jeff Yeutter, 1890 Ridge Road Haymarket, Virginia don't have anything else to add. All the info, sir.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'm used to always starting to my left. So, let's go to Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I'm sorry. I was having problems with my computer. I'm going to pass right this second. Steve go ahead.

Tim Clites: All right. Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: No questions.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Neither do I.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: One question, in the picture does the sign actually cover that corner of the stucco arch over the [inaudible]? Sorry.

Jeff Yeutter: It's going to use the same mounting holes as what was there previously. So, if the previous sign covered it, then this sign would. If it did not, it would not.

Linda Wright: Okay. Yeah. You don't have much leeway to do anything else differently with that. It's just too narrow. But other than that, no, that was my only question.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I was going to ask the same question. Can you raise it? And.

Jeff Yeutter: We could raise it, but again.

Margaret Littleton: You don't want.

Jeff Yeutter: Correct. We would have to drill new holes into the into the brick.

Margaret Littleton: Well, you do what you want as long as you get good visibility.

Jeff Yeutter: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Is this like a service dog?

Jeff Yeutter: It's a mental health counseling practice, and we incorporate animal assisted therapy into it when clients request it. So, we do have trained therapy dogs at the practice.

Margaret Littleton: I love that. That's great.

Jeff Yeutter: Yeah, [inaudible] to use it.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah. Good luck. Thank you.

Jeff Yeutter: Thanks.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: No comment.

Tim Clites: Well, my comments were already addressed. Same kind of question, it overlaps that header in an odd way. But I guess if you're going to mount it on a mounting piece of hardware that exists, then that certainly makes sense for other reasons, so.

Will Moore: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I just pulled up some old imagery. I can't put it up on the screen, but the previous sign that was there for the I think it was an orthodontics practice. It did cover that corner of the archway just like this one is proposed to.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying that for us. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I have no questions. Thank you.

Tim Clites: All right. I move that we approve COA 26-14 (S 26-08) as presented.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor.

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed, any abstain? Thank you. Welcome to town.

Jeff Yeutter: All right. Thank you very much. Have a good evening.

Tim Clites: Next item COA 26-15 (S 26-09). Request of NextGen Restaurants for a wall sign at 4 East Federal Street, Chan Nara. Ms. Rogers.

Amy Rogers: This is a request for a six square foot wall sign for Chan Nara, which is at 4 East Federal Street. The wall sign will be hung on the side of the building on the porch it's facing on the east side of the building, so you can only see it when you are actually traveling west on Federal Street. It is a black metal sign with gold lettering. And the applicant is not here tonight. I did notify her. I'm just not sure if she was going to be here, so I don't know if that's a problem for you all.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Let's see if there are any comments. I did walk by this site today. I don't know if some of the rest of you had the opportunity to do that. And the sign is in place. That shouldn't change our comments, but perhaps some of the rest of you have seen it as well. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I did see it. I don't have any questions. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: I did see it as well. And I noticed that this sign is aluminum with vinyl letters. Is that out of normal character from most of the signs that we see here in town?

Tim Clites: For most of them, yes.

Steve Simons: Is that still an allowable material under the guidelines?

Amy Rogers: I will say across the street it is a metal sign with vinyl, as is Fox Automotive across the street. So, this particular area of town does have those types of signs, but we do typically see the carved wood or painted signs.

Tim Clites: And generally, we're going to be less agreeable when you can see the edge of the sign, like a projecting sign. We would not accept an aluminum sheet. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: No questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I wonder why that you can only see it going west. Why they, there was a hanging sign there. I mean, that's up to them, but it just seems to me, you know, it's fine.

Tim Clites: I think the hungry people come from the East. [off mic]

Margaret Littleton: Get the umbrellas up, you won't see it.

Amy Rogers: I will say that the applicant did say they may come back in to do a hanging sign at a later date.

Tim Clites: Okay. Yeah, that certainly would help their visibility, but it's not before us tonight. So yeah, we'll wait to see that. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I think it's an attractive sign. Other than that, no comment.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. I as well, the only thing I'll say that I noticed, not that we would have either noticed this or changed, asked the applicant to change it, but the dark sign with the gold in a shadow makes it very tough to see. So just kind of an interesting observation as we get other sign applications. To be able to perhaps point to this for someone that wants a high visibility sign, this is very low visibility. I move, we approve COA 26-15 (S 26-09) as submitted.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor.

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? [multiple speakers] Thank you. Any opposed, any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. COA 26-16 request of Jane Covington for exterior alterations at 18 South Madison Street. Can I change the order in case she were to arrive? Okay. You're not here for this application. Okay. If it's all right with the committee, then we'll skip over this in the event that the applicant can arrive. Before we get through our meeting, let's go to CoA 2617 S 2610. Request of Main Street Bank for window signs at ten North Pendleton Street. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee, Main Street Bank came in back in September and October to do a new door and a sign on the bank. They've done that. And they also added window signage to the windows. It is window signage totaling 8.89ft² that is in the front window. The pictures that you see, there is a piece of paper in there, and that they were taken for Memorial Day and they it was just a temporary sign that said, “We’re closed, but that is no longer there. So, it is their logo and the hours of operation at the top. And then their beware, I guess language at the bottom. I'd be happy to answer any other questions. And the applicant is here for you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Name and address and any comments for us before we deliberate.

Josh Heath: Josh Heath. I live in Fairfax, Virginia. The little sign at the bottom is a security message. Just asking people to remove any face coverings while they're in the building. That's a typical bank language standard at all of our locations, as is the logo and ours. And I would like to apologize. I will own putting it up ahead of schedule that was my fault. I should have known better. So, I'm sorry.

Tim Clites: But that's all right. It gives some of us a chance to see it as opposed to just see the pictures.

Josh Heath: So, I have a copy of it in here. If anybody wants to just swipe if anybody wants to see it.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: You know, isn't it terrible that we're at the age that you have to put that warning on your window? But I understand it totally. I don't have any questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: No, I don't really have any questions other than is that 12 inch by three-inch message at the bottom? Is it legible? Can you actually read it?

Josh Heath: It's hard to say.

Steve Simons: Seems small.

Josh Heath: They took the format. That's all at all our other locations. And they just shrink to fit the space that's how they do that. So that's my marketing team. That's not my choice. I think it's a little hard to read. I mean, it is legible if you look at it and read it, but it's not real obvious if you don't look at it.

Tim Clites: So presumably it gives someone in the bank something to point at if they feel uncomfortable. Right? Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: No questions. I think it looks fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think it looks fine. You need it. So do it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I also think it looks fine.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Well, I like I say, I walked past it today and it was up and I was actually walking past to see what the white. So, I'm glad you clarified that was not there, of course, but just a temporary. So, I didn't it's fairly discreet and it seemed appropriate to its location, so I move, we approve COA 26-17 (S 26-10) as submitted.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Yeah. Steve, the reason you have trouble sometimes is we're only allowed so many mics on at once. So, some of us have to remember to shut it off so you all get the chance. There you go.

Josh Heath: Thank you all.

Tim Clites: Thank you for coming tonight. Appreciate it. Should we go ahead and go to this application? Mr. Moore, what do you recommend?

Will Moore: I would recommend not taking action on the application.

Tim Clites: Without the applicant.

Will Moore: Without the applicant here. But if you want to have some discussion and then we could certainly relay those points that you make in your discussion to the applicant, as well as invite her to watch the video so that she could understand the comments that you might make.

Tim Clites: Feedback from the committee. Perfect. All right. Let's do that. So, we're looking at COA 26-16 request of Jane Covington for exterior alterations at 18 South Madison Street. Ms. Rogers, you want to just walk us through this, please?

Amy Rogers: Yes. The applicant is proposing to cover the rear wall and chimney at 18 West Madison Street with lime-based stucco. Currently, now it is exposed fieldstone. The other building faces are the light green stucco coating. The applicant did supply pictures and justification for the change in materials. She claims that it is a repair of the face of the building and would like to cover it to protect it. And that's all I have for you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I have gone down and looked at it, and it is beautiful stone, and I really hope there's a way we can work around this for the stone not to get covered. I am not I don't know how to work with this. I know that's in your guy's purview, but I don't know if there's some way I'd like to see the whole thing stay stone, but I don't know. I like my neighbor's house. They have a beautiful stone chimney, and they have other finish up to the chimney, and it does look fine. But I'm hoping. And there, there are lots of in our guidelines, there are lots of different places where it says you know, to keep the character of the building, to retain the historic chimneys. There's many different things. So, I think we should look at this a little bit more.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Cindy. Steve.

Steve Simons: I was questioning whether or not the pointing on the exposed stone, if that was Portland Cement or if that was a lime-based mortar. From a protection standpoint, if it's Portland, it's not going to add any benefit to put lime-based stucco over top of that. The lime-based stucco is a traditional building material. And I think where she's asking to repair the cracks in the stucco, where it's where it is, water would be potentially getting in behind that. I think that's probably a smart move, but I would agree with Cindy. I think there is some case to be made about the exposed gable and a chimney being left exposed, because I think it tells part of that story of that house. You know, there's numerous stucco buildings here in town and numerous stone buildings in town and, but I wouldn't be opposed either way if she decided to cover it. It probably was once covered at some point it's just falling off that was my only comment.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So we are, thank you. I'll pause. We are just getting started on your application. We were discussing it so that you would have some comments if you didn't make it tonight. So, and we're

literally two into seven. So, let's just back up. If you'd like to come and give us any comments and we'll start over.

Jane Covington: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Now that you're here, Jane.

Jane Covington: Good evening. I'm Jane Covington. And this is 18 South Madison. The rear west facing elevation when constructed had a lime-based parging over it just as the rest of the building does and as a maintenance and you know, kind of protect it from the weather. I'm asking to return it to its original appearance with the protective stucco coating. So, thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right, Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: So, to understand that I'm sorry because I don't do this kind of work. Are you meaning to put another finish on it?

Jane Covington: Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Yes.

Jane Covington: Just like the rest of the all-other sides of the building. Of the building, yes.

Cindy Pearson: We have looked actually into some of the old pictures that as many as 70 years and haven't seen where that was over it before.

Jane Covington: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: And I have looked at it a couple times that stone is beautiful. I hate to see that stone covered.

Jane Covington: I know.

Cindy Pearson: I mean, it is absolutely gorgeous. So, I'm hoping we can work with this. And in the Historic District guidelines, there's many areas that says to, you know, retain the historic chimneys here in town not to cover them and.

Jane Covington: Not to cover the chimneys.

Cindy Pearson: Pardon me. Right, right.

Jane Covington: For what reason?

Cindy Pearson: To keep it historic. Whatever the word. Does, yeah character design.

Jane Covington: Okay. I think that. Is there another photo where I sent the raw edge? Yeah. I think that if it had been intended to be exposed, that raw edge would not be that way.

Cindy Pearson: Well, there are other chimneys here in town that.

Jane Covington: This is the whole elevation. This is not just the chimney.

Cindy Pearson: Right, right? But what other people have done on that side of their house where the chimney is, is come up to the, left the chimney stone, and had the other with siding or some sort of finish

on it, that at least you have kept the chimney in the stone. But like I said, I was hoping we can work somehow to keep this stone and not cover it with that. So that's all.

Jane Covington: No, I totally understand.

Tim Clites: Steve.

Steve Simons: Do you have any idea when the stucco was applied to the building, have you done any research on the composite of the existing materials that are on there to try to date when that was potentially bought?

Jane Covington: I don't know of a technical method to date stucco, but you can look at it, and it appears that there are several. If you look at that raw edge, you can see that there were several different layers applied, and the first was a lime-based stucco that would have been original. And then what's there now is, there's an unfortunate cement covering, and you can see how the water is getting behind and popping it off. Yeah. So that elevation technically is not visible from the public right of way, but that will be something that would come off and we would redo it because moisture is being held behind that cement parging.

Steve Simons: And on the exposed stone section that you're proposing to reapply lime stucco to is the are the mortar joints in that section of the stone? Is that Portland or is that lime?

Jane Covington: It's kind of everything.

Steve Simons: A little bit of everything.

Jane Covington: Yeah. And then Cindy, back to you. When I first bought this building five years ago, one of the first things I did is a repair method and told Will what I was doing was put stucco back on the south chimney because it. [off mic] The south chimney so, that so in the bottom photo, it would be the right-hand chimney along West Federal, because the stucco had popped off of that chimney on three different sides. So, as a maintenance measure, we put the stucco back. And then just this spring, we painted it green. So, we left it to cure for a couple of years and then painted it green.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I can understand why you want to cover it with stucco for maintenance purposes. I like the stone, but I'm not opposed to covering it, frankly.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I really like the stone, too. And again, this is not what I work in. But is there any other way to handle that edge and keep the water out other than cover it all with stucco?

Jane Covington: It's not just the edge. It's the whole elevation.

Linda Wright: Okay.

Jane Covington: Which is why they designed the building that way? Like if you walk around town, you can see you can kind of study how other buildings have been handled. And the Red Fox is a great example where that has a lime finish on it. Right. And you can see the balcony. And then there's 111 East Washington Street. That's Dominic's old building across from Sheridan McMahon. And that my guess is that building was originally stuccoed. And then at some point it was taken off, and they put in some pretty heavy cement joints, which is a path that I would not choose to take. Yeah. But that's the way that they handled keeping the stone exposed.

Linda Wright: Well, if I had my preference, I'd love to see the stone stay. But if there's no other way around it, then I wouldn't be totally opposed to the stucco, but it would be great to see the stone stay.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I'm a stone girl, too. However, would a compromise be is there some sort of a wash? A whitewash with a chemical in it that would preserve. So, you'd have a little bit of both.

Jane Covington: The problem is this is a tax credit project. So, everything I do runs through the Department of Historic Resources.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Jane Covington: And they have they go by the Secretary of Interior Standards which talks about proper ways of maintaining the, not only the historic integrity, but the structural integrity of a building, so.

Margaret Littleton: Correct. No, I understand that. And I guess the aesthetics is what I like.

Jane Covington: Yeah. And the Department of Historic Resources. That's not a primary driver of their decision.

Margaret Littleton: Sure, I understand. So, you better stucco it. We got to keep the water out because we know that gets worse. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: Hi Jane.

Jane Covington: Hi, Bill. Come visit. [multiple speakers]

Bill Anderson: It's a couple of things. Questions? What is the water damage at that inside the house at that point, inside the building?

Jane Covington: Well, I mean, one of the first things I did was repoint the top of that chimney. And it wasn't inside the building, but the stone was structurally unstable at the top of that chimney and the south chimney. So that's the very first thing that I did.

Bill Anderson: But what I was hearing is the this that south elevation, which we have a picture of here. It's clear that the stucco is, you know, going to be coming off that edge condition where the leak is. Let me ask you.

Jane Covington: Wait the edge condition with the leak. It's not really a leak. It's where water is getting between the stone and the stucco and popping the stucco. [off mic] Yeah.

Bill Anderson: No leak on it.

Jane Covington: Yeah. So, it's not a leak inside the building.

Bill Anderson: That's good. Let me ask you if and with your experience, if let's say this was a registered building, historically registered building itself.

Jane Covington: So, what is it? So, it's it does contribute to the Historic District.

Bill Anderson: And part of the requirements was that that stone wall would have to stay.

Jane Covington: Requirement of what?

Bill Anderson: Keeping yeah, of the requirement for this federally registered building its elevation. It says.

Jane Covington: So even if it was individually registered on the National Register, is that what you're talking about?

Bill Anderson: Yes.

Jane Covington: There would not be the requirement that I did or did not do that.

Bill Anderson: Okay. Well.

Jane Covington: So, by virtue of being on the National Register, either an individual building or contributing structure, which this is, there are no mandates of what one must or must not do at the federal level.

Bill Anderson: Okay. Well, let me go back to what you said a little while ago. You said that, if you were to do something on that stone wall, of the stone facade, there would be the right way. And to do it, per the guidelines.

Jane Covington: Which guidelines, your guidelines?

Bill Anderson: You were discussing.

Jane Covington: The Secretary of Interior Standards. Okay.

Bill Anderson: What would they be to keep that wall and to repair that wall? So, it would not be penetrating or allowing water to penetrate.

Jane Covington: A lime-based stucco.

Bill Anderson: No. To keep the stone wall as is the stone facade as is. What would they be asking or allowing you to do?

Jane Covington: But they're not.

Bill Anderson: Repoint the entire wall.

Jane Covington: We do that, but they're not judging me on keeping it or not keeping it.

Bill Anderson: I'm not saying that. I'm just saying what methods would be appropriate and would [multiple speakers].

Jane Covington: Let me describe it this way. The way that 111 East Washington Street was handled where they kept the stone, that's not an appropriate method, per the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Bill Anderson: That may be the case. I'm just talking. Excuse me. Excuse me. Repointing the wall that would save the wall and chimney. I guess that was one way that would save or allow less penetration of moisture through that wall. So, we have the wall and the chimney. And then we have the other elevations, which I agree. Obviously, stucco is coming off similar to what you did on the chimney on the other south

elevation. But there are two separate conditions. And I'm just saying you don't have water penetration on the stone wall, but you do have a stucco problem on the south wall. And I just wanted to make sure I understood that. So why are we taking the stucco around to the stone and chimney if in fact, There's not a water issue penetration.

Jane Covington: There has been a water issue penetration, and I repointed the top of the chimney. And I just don't want to keep doing that over and over again.

Bill Anderson: Okay.

Steve Simons: Can I ask just a quick follow up question? Have you already turned in your phase one or phase two to the HR for your tax credit?

Jane Covington: This is yes; this has gone through phase one and has an approved to part three.

Steve Simons: That's an approved part three.

Jane Covington: Yes.

Steve Simons: And do you have a copy of that by chance?

Jane Covington: Yes. And this is under review. But I'll send you. I'll send you whatever you want.

Steve Simons: Okay. Just I'd like to see what the state has accepted as far as their methodology for the repair.

Jane Covington: This is under review. This is phase two.

Steve Simons: Phase two?

Jane Covington: Yes.

Steve Simons: And then as your considerable professional opinion. You know, a lot of these houses, stone wise, were made to be exposed, and then others were made to be covered with this part of the building being exposed. Would you say that this would fall into the first category or the second category.

Jane Covington: Not intended to be exposed, just judging from the stonework.

Steve Simons: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I just want to read from our guidelines just so we all can hear it. Since chimneys and flues were used to remove smoke and sparks from heating and cooking in earlier eras, most historic buildings contain these important elements. Their visual presence today helps define an important part of the historic character of many buildings in the district. I'm going to go on to in the guidelines, it says to clean your chimneys and flues, [inaudible]. This number two is retain historic chimneys and repair the masonry as recommended in the materials chapter. If the chimney. If severely deteriorated, chimneys must be replaced, rebuilt in the same design. Use the same type of masonry in the same pattern and the same masonry joints as the original. And then I'll go over because it just has about different things to number eight, and it says do not cover brick caps at the top of the chimney with coat of stucco, and the masonry needs repairing. So those to me are the guidelines that ask us to keep the stone and not cover it with other material.

Jane Covington: But Cindy, read that again. It says in the same design as original that's what I'm asking for.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic] The stone. Sorry. As we have looked back in the pictures, it's never been covered with anything else.

Jane Covington: Did you see a picture from 1785?

Cindy Pearson: No not 1785?

Cindy Pearson: Have you?

Jane Covington: No.

Cindy Pearson: Okay, then.

Jane Covington: I'm judging from the construction as I put in my bullet points.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. All right.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Yeah, I do. I think my comments Bill best expressed, which is it's seem to be a little bit of a cross conversation around the need for stucco on the stone versus the stucco that is on the south wall that's clearly deteriorated and does need repaired and or replaced. And I guess if it's a combination of Portland and lime-based stucco, that's, I don't know what that process is, but it could be that I'm looking at photo four. It could be that all of the stucco on that wall needs to be redone. I don't know that that's a question for, I guess, you or the contractor.

Jane Covington: So that wall was its lime based underneath that's been covered with cement.

Tim Clites: Right.

Jane Covington: Which is not a path that I would have chosen.

Tim Clites: So, but what does? But in terms of as I understand the application, there's been water intrusion behind that. So, is that the goal of one of the goals of this repair is to repair that situation? Are you going to leave that situation?

Jane Covington: No, I eventually want to that's loose and I eventually want to take that off and repair with a lime-based stucco.

Tim Clites: But that is not part of this application.

Jane Covington: I guess technically, maybe I made a mistake. It's not visible from the public right of way, but if you want to include it in this application, please do.

Tim Clites: I guess I'm confused about what I'm looking at then, because I thought photo four is actually the view of the South that looks over.

Jane Covington: And that's so that wall is not visible from the public right of way as I see it in photograph one. Did I make a mistake?

Tim Clites: Well, I think you could say it's behind the tree. And if you walk down the street in either direction, 6 or 8 steps in photo two, you see the wall it's directly under the red arrow.

Jane Covington: So, can I formally ask to include that in this evaluation?

Tim Clites: Perhaps. I mean, I'm just trying to for me, when I looked at the request, I, like I mentioned, I saw a cross. I don't know what the right term is, but a conversation that was saying that stucco has issues. And so therefore I need to stucco the stone wall, which didn't quite make sense to me because if the repair is that the stucco needs repaired, I think that could be done and the stone could be left. And so, I do appreciate the history on the fact that you have had to repair this stone at the top of the chimney. I would imagine that should be what, a 25 to 30- or 40-year repair that shouldn't be an ongoing maintenance issue like painting trim. And I do remember the other chimney where we looked at the fact that the whole facade was stucco and from the main street, those two chimneys weren't similar. And so given that kind of added view from the main street, I think the committee at the time felt it was appropriate to cover that stone element in stucco. I mean, so when I looked at this prior to everyone else's input, my thought was that given that as long as we have records that we can look at, it is not that the stone has not been covered in stucco. I found it to be maybe it's unique historically or not completely. Correct. But I found it to be an element that to me felt worth keeping. I did go look at it in person. And for instance, the rake, that is, if you go to photograph two, the red arrow points to a rake. We don't have a zoomed in picture, but that rake actually doesn't even sit, well you can see it in the picture that you just were at. It barely covers the stone, much less a coat of stucco. So again, I don't really know how old the rake is there, but that's kind of a minor detail, I guess, in the grand scheme of this. I felt like it was worth keeping the stone. I do think I'm with Steve. I'd be interested in what VDHR said. And I think if this doesn't have to have a motion on it now, perhaps we if you're in agreement, we could wait until we hear what they say. And that would certainly help the rest of us.

Steve Simons: Are there any remnants of stucco on that side that are still left? I mean, it's all, nothing's been gone so long. There's no ghost marks or anything.

Jane Covington: I'm happy to wait. Sure.

Tim Clites: Because I think, yeah, I think and the other thing, thank you for because I think it helps the committee maybe to walk around town and look at some of the stone buildings that were mentioned. Right like. And I'll just digress for a minute, I didn't realize until I did a little walking tour with VAA month and a half or two ago that the Red Fox was actually renovated by Billy Dew as one of the first project when he came back to Middleburg after being here and departing. And so, it does have a lot of character and part of that has been weathered and worn off over the years, but there's still some evidence of those old porches and maybe some. Was it all lime or was some of it paint? It's kind of hard to tell. And I think that's, to me, that's somewhat different than this stone facade, which looks fairly clean and pristine per whenever it was last worked on in terms of the mortar joints. I guess you just did the top of the chimney, not the whole facade. Right. And so at least without getting up and inspecting it, but standing back at the street level looking, you know, the mortar joints all seemed tight. There was some slightly different tooling, like clearly had been worked like any stone building would have been. But if it's all right with the applicant and the committee, I would pose that it's worth waiting for the input from VDHR.

Steve Simons: I'll just add to that, so we're all on the same page here. Looking at photograph three, which is that corner detail. I think you could make a strong argument to say that if that facade in question was not stuccoed at one time, that would have had a finished edge in it with that raw edge it looks like that coating would have would have covered that at some point. I think the question is how long has it been gone? And does that change the period of historical significance for it being uncovered?

Tim Clites: And to be clear what, so everyone that's looking at the photo, Steve, what you're referring to is the two places where the arrow is pointing to the edge of the open edge of the stucco.

Cindy Pearson: And as you look at the chimney, the other side that you can't see as much, of course, because it's farther down, does it have the same edging on it? Maybe a picture or two of that? Or, you know, we can just go look closer at that.

Jane Covington: Wait, ask me again. I didn't understand.

Cindy Pearson: So, when you're looking at the chimney from Federal Street, the right side of the chimney is what we see here in the pictures.

Jane Covington: Okay.

Cindy Pearson: The left side, the chimney you can't see it all.

Jane Covington: And this is not a picture of the chimney. Just to be clear, this is a picture of the elevation.

Cindy Pearson: Right.

Jane Covington: Okay. Okay, good.

Cindy Pearson: The wall. Exactly.

Jane Covington: Yes. But Cindy. Good question. Let me go.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Jane Covington: Get a picture of that. Thank you.

Cindy Pearson: Because that might tell us some more.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Staff, anything you would like to add to this conversation?

Amy Rogers: So, we've been talking about how long it's been stone. We do have a 1977 survey document that does show picture of the chimney as stone. We're not sure about the wall itself because it's a black and white photo that's been photocopied, but it's very clearly stone. And the other chimneys were stucco in that photo that you said you recovered. So, they were different materials at that time, 1977.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Will Moore: Oh, if I may, I think it's a great idea to propose tabling the application. In particular, knowing this is a tax credit project, I think it's important to see what the part two application to VDHR brings back to her. And if DHR approves what it is she's proposing to do that doesn't necessarily obligate your approval, but I think it's something you should take into strong consideration. There are similar boards to you in other jurisdictions that mandate approval by the local board or exempt approval by a local board if a part two application by VDHR has been approved, because there I mean, you take your job very seriously. VDHR takes their job very seriously. So, if she gets a part two approval and then comes back for your consideration, I would suggest you give that strong consideration.

Tim Clites: Well, thank you Will. And I agree. I mean, I think when we I'll speak for myself when I think about the work of this committee, the last thing we would want to do is discourage local investment in our historic buildings because we don't give a lot of weight to the Virginia standard. So, if you're agreeable to that.

Jane Covington: Yep, yep, yep. Thank you.

Tim Clites: We can table the discussion until such time as you can send the documents to staff and then the next meeting we will meet again.

Jane Covington: Good. Thank you.
Awesome.

Jane Covington: Thank you everybody.

Tim Clites: Thanks, Jane. Appreciate it. Do I need to make a formal motion?

Will Moore: Yes. I would just move to table until the applicant resubmits. And we'll know that that means the part two.

Tim Clites: So, moved.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of Committee: Aye.

Jane Covington: Great. Thank you so much.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Appreciate it. All right. Next is our discussion items. We're going to discuss outdoor and rooftop dining guidelines. Miss Rogers, this is now the exciting part.

Amy Rogers: So last month we had a discussion about the guidelines that were put in front of you. There are several edits that were made based on that discussion. I took a little liberty on a couple of them. The one being umbrellas, it was said street level, and I added on there or on a first story uncovered porch or patio, because we do have several locations that are actually first level, a little bit elevated. So, if everyone's okay with that that's been added. It was also discussed to add some materials for planters, but no one suggested materials that we should have it. So, we threw materials in here. Specifically, didn't put wood. Just because it tends to, and again, you may have a different opinion. I just know that my wood pots that I had had a band around them and they popped and made a mess. So, I left that off, but added a statement about other that they could be considered if they were appropriate to the aesthetic of the environment that it's going to be placed in. Added the language about the light bulbs that was discussed to have the range, just like it was in the lighting chapter. And then we added some rooftop dining items for you to consider. Not visible from the public [inaudible] right away, which was stated many times. Added they should blend with the building and the materials that, that are on the roof railings modest and the lowest level possible. And then no pergolas or roof covering should be permitted. And I'd be happy to answer any questions about what we proposed.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Just a refresher for me before I ask for comments. Once we're satisfied with this, our next step is what?

Will Moore: So, the next step is we would put it in a more finished format that would. I won't say it would match our existing guidelines document, but something that would be appropriate to append to that document. And then we would get you to vote on it at that time. And the vote would be a recommendation to Council to adopt an amendment to our guidelines. And then we would forward that to Council to formally adopt as an amendment to the guidelines.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And is there any public hearing requirement from the time we start that until it's adopted?

Will Moore: There is not.

Tim Clites: There's not. So, I think that's important for this committee to understand. Just based on whether you think time is somewhat of the essence or not. We know how quickly black building facades took off. So, I don't want to be the, the negative person in the group, but I think it would be nice if this is important to us that we, you know, get to a place where we have something and it feels like we've looked at it. Now, what are we at? We're at draft six. So, we've clearly been doing our homework. Thank you for that. I do have a few things that I want to add, but I want to hear other people's input first and I'll switch it up and start with Bill.

Bill Anderson: I'm going to ask to come back to me, please.

Tim Clites: Right. We'll come back to Bill. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I believe we should stress more of the appropriateness for Middleburg, a small historic town. And that is what we fight for, to keep it that way. And this is a whole new invention, kind of from what we are used to. And I just think it is not appropriate. So, the rooftop, I'm talking about.

Tim Clites: But be specific about what you're talking about. This is a guideline for dining, seating, and other outdoor areas. Are you talking about all of that or just?

Margaret Littleton: I'm doing the other outdoor area, this rooftop.

Tim Clites: Rooftop, specifically. Thank you for clarifying that. Linda.

Linda Wright: My only question would be I would definitely agree that no pergolas is a good idea because I just they belong on the ground and in the garden and more appropriate in that style, not on a roof. I don't know if there would ever be a scenario here. If you had the right roof lines and the right things where you actually could extend part of a roof and have like a covered pavilion on the second floor, if that could blend in and be appropriate enough, I don't know. I mean, until we see one, I don't know, but I would think that could be a possibility with some of these buildings, as long as it actually looked like it was part of the whole building roof structure that may.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with both Margaret and Linda, but also, even though it's repeating itself, I think stating no umbrellas on rooftops also should be put in there as not just in the umbrella section.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: So, under section two umbrellas, I wasn't quite sure what we're referring to as first story uncovered porches or patios. First story being ground level or first story being top of first story.

Will Moore: Yeah. So maybe we can tweak our language a bit, but let's think about CDMX. They have a patio, but it's not, it's sidewalk level. It's raised by a step or two.

Steve Simons: Red Horse, same thing.

Will Moore: Same thing. Red Horse has like an elevated patio. Thaiverse technically, like it's kind of ground level if you're looking at it from where you walk toward the building from Madison Street. But if you're looking at it from the.

Steve Simons: Yeah, I'd talk just to avoid any confusion there, maybe we could tweak that language a little bit. So, people are clear that it's ground level or elevated ground level.

Will Moore: Yeah. We can put our heads together to maybe clean up that wording a little bit.

Steve Simons: And then on under section six, under the lighting, you know, this is my personal opinion, but I think 3000 K is kind of getting into that wandering of lights getting pretty bright in town. There is a 2500 K and if we were down to 2500 to 27 K as our suggested outdoor lighting, that might be preferable. I think once we kind of skip past 2700, which is probably the most close to what an incandescent bulb is, 3000 starts to get sort of towards that bluer spectrum. So that was just a comment for consideration.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Steve Simons: And then last, I'll kind of just jump on what Linda said about roof coverings on rooftop dining areas. I agree with what Tim said a couple meetings back about pergolas. I think that's a ground structure, but I think there could be a case where you could have a rooftop covering, as long as it was well integrated into the structure that looked like part of the roof system of the building. I think that would also partially conceal what was happening on that rooftop deck area. If it was appropriate from the street view. So, I think we, instead of just totally leaving it out, is not permitted. Maybe we would consider leaving that as an option on a case-by-case basis.

Amy Rogers: I think this is another institution need to wordsmith it a little bit because it wasn't intended that if someone's going to, you know, add technically another roof on the building, a covered roof that may be open on the sides, it was more of if someone like wanted to string cloth across the roof or something for. Yeah. I've seen where, you know, they put posts up and have yeah, sunshade kind of things that it was something that wasn't structural in nature.

Steve Simons: Right. And I think we did even suggest to Mr. Ash last time around that you know maybe consider an awning, which would be a fabric. So maybe a little. [off mic] Yeah, retractable system. So maybe just a little broader definition of what that is, but I don't see a problem with excluding the pergola as I don't think it's appropriate up in the air.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: That was just going to be my question about the roof coverings. Does that mean everything, you know, with the sail type thing or the retractable roof or you know, what is allowed or more specifically, what's not?

Tim Clites: Thank you. There's a question.

Virginia Jenkins: Virginia vis a vis roof coverings. It too would be under the guideline of not being seen from the street. Right?

Tim Clites: I don't know, I think that's part of what, when you're all done, I'm going to raise as a point of clarification.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

Tim Clites: You haven't finished. I'm not.

Virginia Jenkins: That's it. I mean, because, I mean, I think that was one of the things we said in the last meeting is that it was discussed about pushing that stuff back.

Tim Clites: Right?

Virginia Jenkins: So, but if you have a roof covering, is it going to be visible from the street? Would that be under the same purview as just visibility in general?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: That's it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. So, here's where my mind went. And, and you all bear with me for a minute because I've, I try not to be a naysayer, but on this particular set of issues, I'm trying to be a naysayer. Like pretend like someone's really going to ask for that, right? Because that's unfortunately what we're tasked with. We're tasked with someone has an outdoor garden, roof top deck, and they come in and they want to put a giant contemporary sail cloth there. And I guess on that it would be fairly easy for us to say, well, it's not traditional. It's not sympathetic to the traditional architecture or the language. Right. You could, we could probably avoid that. But you get into pergolas and now we've got a big debate. You get into other elements that might be part of outdoor dining. So, my notes went as follows. And I'll just run through them and then you all can kick this back and forth or just ignore it. But the first thing I think we ought to say, because this may change with time, is that under item A, it should start with something along the lines of if consistent with zoning regulations, because I do know that the Town Council has tasked the Planning Commission with looking at the zoning appropriateness of this feature, and therefore, we don't want to have to go back and change this. So, I think that would allow this to get adopted in advance of that, which may or may not ever get adopted, but would at least not require, right, we wouldn't be inconsistent. And then my other comments really got into what you all have mentioned. So, no pergolas. And then I just walked around town today and I made a list, right. I added umbrellas because I think we've already agreed to that. I added tents because like, do you want a temporary tent up for Christmas in Middleburg? Right, like, and what would stop it even temporary. So, I had a note about permanent or temporary elements that basically project. And then how do we define that right above the plane of the dining table? I mean, like, again, I know I'm going to an extreme, but intentionally so sunshades, outdoor heaters, right? I walked by a building that on the front porch on Marshall Street, there's two of those heaters that you see at restaurants on the porch. Well, there's probably nothing we can do there, but imagine, you know, 6 or 8 of them on a roof for outdoor dining so people can stay there. And do we want to see that? So, my take on this was we ought to add enough language and then some generic language. And I think what we're trying to do, but I'm open to the committee's input, is I think we're trying to eliminate the visibility of rooftop dining from the public way. So anywhere that the public is that looks up and sees a roof. We don't want to see any of the amenities that allow that to happen. We don't want to see the rail. We don't really want to see the furniture. So, in the most recent application, we ask an applicant was agreeable to pushing the rail and the all of that considerably back from the front facade of the building so that we didn't see it along one of our prominent streets. To me, that that's a requirement that allows this to be sympathetic to the village that we live in. I don't know how we say all of that and whether I'm too far down in the weeds. Then the other things that I added were along the lines of seating, standing or any pedestrian space should be set back from the roof edge, parapet and or building elements to limit or eliminate views to the public street or space. However that gets worded, I think we want to be clear about. And maybe that's the first thing under, I guess we say that they're not visible from the public street or right of way in item A, but we're really talking about outdoor elements. The question is, do we even want to see the people, personally, I don't right. But I think there's that's going to be harder to regulate. How are we going to set up the geometry to understand? So, I think if we see the people and only when the people are there, we see the people and no other elements. To me, that's kind of a minimum requirement to even stomach the idea. [off mic] Anyway, does that spawn any further comments or thoughts from folks?

Steve Simons: Yeah, I think it may have been Margaret that brought up this point last time, but even with the rooftop dining area, if you're in one of the buildings that like perhaps on Madison Street where there are residential apartments on the second floor, you could potentially be looking into that rooftop space, even though it may not be from the ground level view. It could impact residents that live in those units.

Tim Clites: That's true. And to the extent that that's not public space anymore, there's only so much I think we can do about that. But it's something that we should be sympathetic to. As you know, new projects come into town. I think to the question that a few folks, well, maybe Linda brought it up, this idea that there's a second story roof and the zoning allows the building height to be tall enough for some kind of a roof structure. For me, and let's just pretend that, like, there's a floor, well, is that considered a floor? And we don't really, I guess in our zoning, we don't talk about the number of floors, do we? Mr. Moore, we talk about the total building height.

Will Moore: Correct.

Tim Clites: Right. So, then we would be tasked with the appropriateness of the architecture around this completely covered outdoor space as a hypothetical design that someone might bring us. Which seems like our guidelines cover that well enough, because historically that's not something we find in town, at least.

Margaret Littleton: I have one more question.

Tim Clites: Please, Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I agree with Steve so much with the lighting. I think the lighting is so important not to be too bright. I don't know anything about lumens, but how you gauge it, but soft warm light.

Tim Clites: So, remind us again, we came up to that 2,700 is what you think of when you have an incandescent light bulb. For those of you that aren't clear, 3,000 is just slightly less warm or yellow than that. If you looked at a scale, when you get to 3,500, it starts to look white by 4,000 it's starting to look blue. And by 5 or 6 it looks like you're in a hospital. Yeah. So, there are reasons to have that brighter light, but not in our town. What does the zoning ordinance say about the Kelvin temperature?

Amy Rogers: I'm not sure what the zoning ordinance says, but we added this to match what the historic guidelines say.

Tim Clites: So, our guidelines already allow up to 3,000 Kelvin. Okay.

Will Moore: Yeah, it is interesting. My eyes bulged out when Steve mentioned that there's a 2,500 Kelvin available now. I was not aware of that. I think when we wrote our guidelines while they're somewhat recent, they're a few years now. It's been five years since we still feel like these guidelines are very new to us because of the ones, we had before. But it's a technology, obviously that's been evolving for a while. 2,700 was very hard to come by. So, I think we included 3000 because it's there is a difference. It's somewhat negligible. But certainly, when you get above 3,000, you start getting into the much brighter, much whiter lights. So, I think we included 3,000 because it was sometimes a struggle to find 2,700. At that time.

Virginia Jenkins: Is there anything that stops us from changing?

Will Moore: No. We could propose at the same time amending what's in our current guidelines to take away that 3,000 option.

Virginia Jenkins: That might not be a bad idea.

Tim Clites: The only the only thing that I wonder is whether we are. Well, let's back up. We already have a fair number of applicants that struggle to get appropriate lights for our requirements. And I wonder if by limiting that to 2,700, if that takes out some of the dark sky compliant lights that might otherwise be available. I don't know. I'm just hypothesizing.

Virginia Jenkins: Isn't this specific to the tabletop?

Tim Clites: Well, in this case it is. But in the whole guideline, all of our lighting in the district is to be in that 2,700 to 3,000 Kelvin.

Steve Simons: I think there should be an important distinction. We're only talking about color, temperature of lighting. We're not talking about lumens. And is there anything in the guidelines that limit the amount of lumens that can be produced and that, you know, there's ways to deal with lumens and how bright the light is? Because even at 2,700 Kelvin temperature light that has, you know, it's an equivalent of a 200-watt bulb, it's going to be a lot more light at the end of the day. And I think what the intention of the dark sky ordinances is to keep the amount of lumens at a reasonable level overall.

Tim Clites: Yeah, it's both that and it's cut off, right? So that that light doesn't spill into the neighboring property or obviously head into the sky. Okay. Well, I don't know that it's, I mean, I'm happy to include that in the discussion. I do feel the sense, at least for myself, the sense of urgency to move the rest along, even if we want to come back and revisit that. I don't know how the rest of you feel. And so, have we confused staff just enough that we can wait till next month or Mr. Moore, what do you recommend we do from here?

Will Moore: Yeah, I think we definitely need to come back with another draft. I just want to ask a question here. Is the idea that you people aside, and you could maybe address that by pushing back where the outdoor dining area is relative to the roof line or the exterior walls of the building. But people aside, is the idea that you don't want to see anything, period. Because we're getting into a lot of nuances of, well, a pergola might not seem like a small nuance or a covering or heaters. If we just say we can't see any element. Now we can give examples including but not limited to we can't see anything from a public right of way. We could cover it pretty much that way. And because I get the feeling that the majority of the members are saying that like, we don't want to see it, so we don't need to talk about whether or not, well, it's okay to see the heater versus the table or we don't want to see a sunshade, but it's okay to see, it sounds like we don't want to see anything. And that's a perfectly reasonable, like, if that's what you want, then we could maybe simplify the guidelines regarding rooftop dining much more.

Virginia Jenkins: Personally, I would like to not see anything. And I think we have to be very stringent on what we decide or go as we go forward, because people are going to be pushing that envelope down the road, I think.

Tim Clites: Right. So, I, yeah, I don't know how the rest of the committee feels, but I think that if you were to redraft this, I agree. Let's not get down in the weeds on all the particular elements. Let's be really clear about the concept. And if that's enough clarity for you all to come back to us next month, that's how I feel. But I don't speak for the whole committee.

Margaret Littleton: You could put IE those heaters because if we approve something and they build their patio and then they, we don't know they want a heater. Right. I think we should be specific on a few things.

Will Moore: Well, at the end of the day, you wouldn't approve anything because seriously, you wouldn't because this is going to be because your purview is what can be seen from the public way. So, I, early on, I used the equivalent of solar panels on a roof in the Historic District. What your guidelines essentially say is we don't want to see them. So, you're not going to see an application for solar panels unless it is like on a secondary elevation and you can see just a little corner of it. Then I would make it come to you. But in general, you're not going to see solar panels. There might be solar panels in the Historic District, but you would never see the application because you can't see it from the public right of way. And I think it seems like that's the way we're going with rooftop dining from your perspective.

Tim Clites: Straw vote, is that what we're feeling? I say vote more or less. Not completely right. Good. Okay, we have a divided conference. I love this.

Will Moore: Okay. [off mic] So a curveball you mentioned that kind of, you know, depending on zoning regulations, you know, these may be permitted. So, the Planning Commission has taken up that topic. The Council referred that to the Planning Commission and they're starting their process of determining how to craft some regulations around the use. They are interested in inputs from other groups, one of them being this group. So, in understanding what this group's overall position on the topic is. I keep telling you that you don't have any purview over use. You only have purview over kind of the view. This is your opportunity to maybe send a representative to the Planning Commission meeting or to talk with them because they want your inputs. And at that point in time, I think it's important that you give them input from the committee perspective, but you also have your input from the public perspective about the use as well that you could talk to them about. So, they meet next on June 22nd. If anybody would.

Tim Clites: I think Punkin is free then. Right. [laughter]

Will Moore: No, but it would be great. They are very interested in having a representative or representatives or the entirety of the group come and have a discussion with them.

Tim Clites: I was just going to suggest that if you can forward the date to all of us, I think everyone here should feel comfortable going and voicing your own individual opinion, because we're not a committee of one and we don't always agree. And I think there's value in them hearing from any one of us that wants to take the time to go, that would be great.

Steve Simons: Just a quick question for staff. When these guidelines are updated, will this affect any current applications that are already in?

Will Moore: No. Yeah. Correct. No current application. Now if an amendment to that application were to come back. So, if the, as you recall from last month, in order to get the approval, the applicant agreed to just take the pergola off the table for now. So that's gone for now. If these guidelines were adopted and you can't. And then went to say, we can't see any elements period from the public right of way that would affect what a future amendment application that he might file would come into play then.

Tim Clites: And by the same token, without any of this, he would still have to file it and come to us, and we would still have to approve it. So, we would have the discussion either way. Right. Yeah. Just again. Right. Yeah. All right. Well thank you, staff and everyone in the committee for, you know, working through this, it's we don't often get something as meaty as this to chew on, do we? Cool. All right. Let's jump over to our last item, which is the Joint Architectural Review Board nominations. Hopefully, you've all had a little bit of time to look at this list. Normally I start around with other people on the committee, but since there's nothing on this list that has anything to do with me, I'd like to start by nominating the Claire Dickey Veritas Contracting, 204 East Washington Street Renovation. It's listed more than once because they came back in with some alternate changes and updates based on the construction. But I think as soon as I thought about these nominations, that was the first project that came to my mind. And just to wrap up my comments, I did walk around town, and I was glad to be reminded of Loudoun Market, which I felt came with an all-black scheme. And then when we saw them come back, I thought they came back with what really now is kind of a lovely building. It's an old gas station and it doesn't look like it at all. So, I thought they did a really good job of taking our input and making it just a really appropriate and very pretty structure. I didn't get into any signs, although if we had to pick one, I have 1 or 2 that I would comment on, but I'll stop and we'll go down to Cindy and see what comments you have on this list.

Cindy Pearson: Well, I like your first two choices. I think that's great. And I agree with Loudoun Market, how that building looks nothing like the BP station or whatever it was before that. Our signs this year, I think, aren't as great as they have been over the years. I think the Town Duck looks good because it's placed on that stone. It's the stone that makes it look really good and stand out. That could be one.

Let's see. I did the same thing. I looked around at different ones. The, and the same thing with, as you all know, you've heard me talk many times about that gold. So, the Middleburg Memorial and Emmanuel Cemeteries has that gold on it. But sitting back in that stone wall, it's like perfect. It tames it enough that it looks nice. And I think it's the stone wall. Well, it's a post or whatever it may be, is what makes the sign look good. I don't think it's a sign making them. So, either way. Let's see Loudoun Market. And I think that's about it. Oh, the other thing. Middleburg Museum. Whereas I think it's an interesting sign. I don't think it's a great sign, but the town this week had a social media post, and it was a picture from the north looking down. And that was great. The building, the picture, the street, the flag made everything look wonderful. So, if we were to use that or nominate them to use that type of picture would enhance the sign. That's it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Simons: There was two signs that I didn't see on here that I wasn't sure if they fell into the purview of this consideration. One was the balloon shop sign.

Tim Clites: It already won an award.

Steve Simons: Already won an award, and okay. And then the other one was the school, the elementary school. Was that also that previous year?

Tim Clites: The elementary school, I don't remember. Did we ever submit it for an award? It's been a couple of years.

Will Moore: I don't think so.

Tim Clites: Yeah, it is a great sign.

Steve Simons: I thought that was last year when that came up for review here though.

Tim Clites: The elementary school. It's been a couple years, hasn't it?

Linda Wright: Yeah, I think so.

Tim Clites: It feels like a couple years.

Steve Simons: Maybe it's time just flies by so I could be totally lost there.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Steve Simons: I did because I wasn't familiar when I volunteered for that this committee, I asked Ashley to send me what the award categories were for consideration. So, I thought I'd just read these real quickly just to refresh everybody's memory. But overall design, rehabilitation, restoration, additions, architectural detail, new construction, signage, public spaces, and Community Blue Ribbon. Wasn't sure what Community Blue Ribbon was, but maybe [inaudible].

Tim Clites: So, I can explain Community Blue Ribbon is, as I recall, something that has happened outside of one of our Historic Districts on a historic building that we as a community can nominate. And so, for instance one of the old historically African American Schools was restored by a lady who now lives in it and that got nominated and won an award as a kind of an outside.

Steve Simons: Contributing building to the area, but not necessarily to the Historic District.

Tim Clites: Right. It's not part of a Historic District, but part of the community. And just to thank you for bringing up the list of, Punkin could share this too. We've been on this go to JARB a couple of times now. They do list different types of work, you know, restoration, rehabilitation, and addition, etc. accessory structure, sign. They don't once they look at all of the awards, they kind of edit that down and modify that list each year for what it is that's been submitted. Because like our little district, sometimes we don't have a restoration or a building. We only have a couple of signs where some of the other communities will have no signs because they don't review signs, right? So that list is kind of flexible from year to year. Sorry. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I too like the Loudoun Market. I think they've done a phenomenal job there. And also, Jane Covington at 101 West Federal, I think with that window, which we had a lot of discussion about it, as I recall, but it turned out really well, I think. That's it.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I would definitely everything at The Boyd was my first. Loudoun Market and.

Virginia Jenkins: What was your first? I'm sorry. [off mic]

Linda Wright: The Boyd, all the signs and everything at that. Yes, absolutely. And then also the Bedford Lee one for the old building for that.

Cindy Pearson: [off mic].
Bedford Lee.

Virginia Jenkins: That's the building that. [off mic]

Tim Clites: So, I'm sorry, I connect these Bedford Lee and they're both the same building. Is that right? One is a projecting wall sign and painting the door, and the other is the building. And you're saying you'd like to nominate the projecting in windows signs.

Linda Wright: The sign yeah.

Tim Clites: The signs. All right and the building?

Linda Wright: Can we do both?

Tim Clites: Yeah, yeah. This is little old Middleburg. [multiple speakers] Yeah. Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think Loudoun Market is winning, and we did a really good job there. I like Bedford Lee. That building is adorable. And the sign means a lot. The other one was Town Duck and agreeing with Cindy. It's perfect. And it looks great with the stone. Here we are with stone again.

Virginia Jenkins: The signs that have been on that building have been really nice in the past, have also been really nice. I'm not talking about me. I'm talking about the one before. I mean, I don't think the town. I like it, but I don't think it's that extraordinary.

Tim Clites: The architecture makes a beautiful sign, doesn't it? Just the way it sits at the end of the street. Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: They had to use that because that's their second store. It's their logo.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Bill.

Bill Anderson: My trifecta Middleburg Museum, Loudoun Market, actually I think you're right, is the winner here. And the Town Duck also.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. So now I'm going to try to recap this. Tell me what I missed. We're going to go with signs first. And I heard that Loudoun Market is a combination of sign. And they did some work on that building. So that's what I mean by when we get to the actual award night, they'll, kind of blend that together, the committee will. But for us, it's just let me start at the bottom. Town Duck, I saw a couple of votes for that. A couple of votes for Bedford Lee and on other signage, a couple of votes for museum are those our three. Well, The Boyd is combination of. [multiple speakers] Yeah. I'm just focused on signs to start. So is that our three signs.

Will Moore: So, can you repeat those three?

Tim Clites: The three signs that I have listed that I heard positive comments about were the Middleburg Museum, Bedford Lee, and Town Duck.

Will Moore: Okay. So yeah, so with Bedford Lee though, are you treating that like you are allowed market where it's the building as well as the signs?

Tim Clites: The committee should tell me that they do both. I heard. Yeah.

Linda Wright: Okay. Okay.

Tim Clites: All right. So let me back up. We go to this award ceremony. There's us, there's Purcellville, there's Leesburg, and there's the county. And they used to have a whole process where you got up, and you went and you accepted your award. And then they realized like it was taking like 2.5 hours. So, it's much more condensed now. I think that if we have, we don't always have this many from Middleburg that we're excited about. So, I think we could combine to your point, I think we could combine the work that was done to 101 West Federal Street by Jane and the sign. We could combine those as a. And then we could do the same thing for The Boyd, which I think not only is a great building, but it's got great signage too, right? Yeah. And Loudoun Market. So, the kind of three projects and we're celebrating both the buildings, and the signs is that is that what we're saying?

Linda Wright: Yeah.

Tim Clites: And then do we want to add? So then all right, now I understand this better. Do we want or maybe I'm not going to do anything with this? The staff's going to have to sort out whatever I'm blabbering about here. Do we want to do we want to have just for signs the Middleburg Museum and Town Duck or is Town Duck really the building and every sign looks good on such an awesome building.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah. There you go. I agree.

Bill Anderson: It's true.

Tim Clites: What's the straw vote? It's the sign. It's the building. [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: Which are we voting on the building or the sign?

Tim Clites: Well, yeah. We're trying to figure out whether we should nominate the sign or whether it's really that we love the sign because of the building that it's on. All right.

Margaret Littleton: Let's skip it.

Tim Clites: Margaret says, skip it.

Will Moore: Interesting. I'll give you my perspective as somebody who's not deciding this. They put up a temporary sign before the permanent one went up. Exact same dimensions meaning length and width or height. It did not look good on that building, but when that went away and the actual sign, which it was essentially the same thing, same color, same lettering when that one went up and it's got the carved elements and things, it pops much better. So, I'm not saying it's not an attractive building. It is, but the question is to whether you could put anything up there, and it would look good because of the building. I would say no.

Tim Clites: That's not true.

Will Moore: Not true.

Tim Clites: All right. And so that's a very good point because I think.

Virginia Jenkins: [off mic] sign is really good.
You didn't win an award. You were sensitive about this.

Linda Wright: Committee wasn't around then. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Yeah. Wow. Committee wasn't around then. All right. So, I do think that the committee does look to our town as, I think, the only town that reviews signage of the three towns with Historic Districts. So, I think it you know, if we generally like that, we can say that we like it not only for the sign, but because of the way it contributes and is sympathetic and enhances the building. So, let's go ahead and do that. Is the committee okay with that? And then Middleburg Museum, same thing, right? It's a little bit of a quirky sign, but it does it actually is this graphic of the building itself, the Pink Box being significant to our town. And there are some angles. I think Cindy's right where that sign really pops. So those will be our two signs in addition to the ones that are part of our projects. All right. Do we miss anything? Anybody like to add anything or delete anything?

Steve Simons: Is the second part of the renovation that Loudoun Market finished or do those windows still have plastic in them?

Cindy Pearson: They [off mic] sell paper up or something?

Steve Simons: Yeah. So, the market size or the food side of that is not completed yet. Right. Okay.

Tim Clites: Which is the right side?

Steve Simons: The right side.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, we'll have to take a picture carefully.

Steve Simons: That might be a great there might be a great candidate for 2027.

Tim Clites: Yeah. All right. Do we need to formally vote on this? All right. Thank you. Thanks for reminding us or remembering to do this and for helping us pull it together. I think it's a nice thing that we've been doing for a couple of years, and I'm glad we can continue it. Meeting quorum for July 2nd.

Margaret Littleton: Would that be Thursday?

Tim Clites: That would be the Thursday before the fourth, obviously. And a lot of companies take the third off as the celebrated day. Does anybody know for sure they can't make that? Is that inconvenient to staff to have it then on the third. On the second, I mean I'm sorry. [off mic] You're tentative. [off mic]

Okay. [multiple speakers] Let the staff know as know as soon as anybody knows about their travel arrangements. So, we can reschedule if we have to. And with that, we are adjourned. Thank you all.

Amy Rogers: Thank you.