TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, September 3, 2026
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, September 3, 2026, in the Town Hall Council Chambers. Chair Clites called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Town Clerk North called the roll.

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

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

ABSENT: Steve Simons

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Chair Clites noted that the minutes indicated he asked the Committee to determine their feelings on an issue related to an application that was coming back before them during this meeting. He advised that he really should be using the word "recommendation" and noted that the Committee should not deal with feelings, but rather with recommendations.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the August 5, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes as presented.

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

Old Business

COA 26-20: Demolition of Accessory Structure, Renovations & Addition–114 W. Federal St.–Kevin Ash

Planner Rogers reminded the Committee that the applicant was proposing to add a second story and a two-story garage to a one-story contributing structure located on Federal Street. She explained that the upper story of the building would be incorporated over the top of the garage. Ms. Rogers reminded the Committee that last month, they conditionally approved the application; however, they asked that certain items come back before them. She noted that those items were identified in the staff report. Ms. Rogers advised that the applicant had provided additional information in his plans.

Kevin Ash, the applicant, and Matthew Stevenson, the architect, appeared before the Committee. Mr. Ash opined that Mr. Stevenson did a good job of successfully addressing the Committee's previous comments. He noted that they had paint chip samples available.

Committee Member Wright advised that she liked the changes the applicant made. She further advised that she liked the proposed building.

Councilmember Pearson expressed concern that there could be a glare from the light fixtures that would hit motorists in the eyes. She asked that the applicant be thoughtful of this when they were installed.

Chair Clites noted the need to make sure the locations of the lights and the cut-off were appropriate.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash advised that the lights would be located on either side of the front door. He further advised that there would only be recessed lights on the side porch and in the garage overhang.

Chair Clites noted that he had some questions and clarifications he would like the Committee to consider. He reminded the members that the last rendition of the drawings showed the window casings as being stucco and noted that the Committee asked the applicant to make them painted trim, which he did. Mr. Clites opined that a building in a historic district should be more traditional and noted that one would typically see an actual windowsill and not a picture framed casing. He suggested this may have been the applicant's intention and that the software rendered it as a picture frame, which was a casing on all sides. Mr. Clites reiterated that in a typical building, there would be a small projection or a sill below the casing.

Mr. Ash advised that this was part of the window assembly itself. He further advised that the sill at the lower sash would protrude and have a lip in the casing that would come underneath it.

Chair Clites noted that a handful of companies, including Hardie, made a historic sill that was an actual windowsill that the casing sat on. He confirmed it was more like a projecting sill or a stool on the window. Mr. Clites opined that this would lend to being more traditional. He noted the casing around the garage door and advised that typically, the garage casing trim would be similar to the windows and doors. Mr. Clites further advised that it would not have a slightly wider casing with a wider flare. He noted that it was painted and seemed a little inconsistent. Mr. Clites advised that his last comment on this elevation was the porch columns and noted that he did not have a good sense of the detail. He questioned whether the intention was to have a beam that wrapped around them or whether the beam came toward the front, with the column being a simple shaft with no base, capital or necking. Mr. Clites further questioned whether the one-by-six was intended to be the capital, with there being no beam.

Mr. Ash confirmed there was a beam. He advised that what was proposed was a simple column with a one-by-four capital. Mr. Ash noted that the framing would be above the soffit and opined that given the size, there was no intention of having a beam below it. He advised that the header would be behind the fascia and the framing would return back, with the rafters sitting on top of it.

Chair Clites expressed an understanding; however, he advised that this was not typically a traditional look. He advised that traditionally, the column would come up with a bit of a beam and then the soffit, rake and all the detail above it would create an additional layer. In response to an inquiry from Mr. Ash, he advised that typically, there would be a little beam if the column was six-by-six inches, with the beam being six-by-six or six-by-eight inches. Mr. Clites further advised that everything in the pediment would sit on top of that, meaning the pediment would lift up by about six inches, and then there would be a beam. He noted that in addition to being more traditional, it would help with the comment about cutting off the glare from the light because it would be inside of a little bit of a box.

Chair Clites advised that he did not know how the remainder of the Committee felt about the pediment, which was the triangle above the front door. He noted that the applicant was showing it as a standing seam roof and advised that he could see that simply being a piece of flashing to simplify it and noted that often, a little pediment might not have the detail at the gable end. Mr. Clites advised that he did not feel strongly one way or the other about that. In response to a comment from Mr. Ash, he suggested he could flatten it down, make it flashing and paint it.

Chair Clites noted the elevation shown on Page 4. He advised that if he understood the details correctly, the rake was ten inches, and the fascia was eight inches. Mr. Clites opined that this felt a little heavy and suggested it should be in the six- or eight-inch range. He expressed appreciation that the applicant included a full gable return detail, which the Committee requested. Mr. Clites noted that it showed a one-inch overhang, with the lower section being eight inches. He further noted the rake. Mr. Clites opined that everything should be either eight- or six-inches – not ten.

Mr. Ash explained that there would not be a double framing where the overhang was. He agreed it should either be six- or eight-inches. Mr. Ash reiterated that because of the double framing detail, it should be just a single rake pad out. He advised that they would make note of that.

Chair Clites noted that in the same detail, the slope was 8:12. He opined that the main roof was 6. Mr. Clites advised that he would either do a 6:12 slope or something that was shallower for the same reason that it was only a foot.

Mr. Stevenson explained that the idea was that the steeper the pitch, the more it would read. He opined that it would be lost with a flatter pitch.

Chair Clites acknowledged that there was some validity to that. He explained that his comments were to match the roof to make everything consistent, with all of the angles and cuts being similar. Mr. Clites noted the proposal to put siding in the gable. He advised that in one drawing, the siding was the color of the stucco but in another it was white. Mr. Clites questioned whether this should be siding or stucco. He noted the need for the Committee to understand what color it would be.

Mr. Ash advised that it should be the stucco color.

Chair Clites noted the garage doors and advised that the window option that was circled showed an arch top; however, there was a note about it being the double light six over design.

Mr. Ash confirmed it was not the arch, but rather was the square glass.

Chair Clites noted the window details. He advised that the Committee would typically approve windows that were consistent with historic windows, with there being a 7/8 spacer to simulate divided lights.

Mr. Ash acknowledged that this was left blank and suggested the Committee circle that one. He noted that the windows on the last project were the 7/8 simulated glass ones. Mr. Ash confirmed he was proposing simulated divided light windows. He further confirmed that he was proposing they be without cladding and be wood painted on the exterior.

Committee Member Anderson agreed with Chair Clites' comments.

Committee Member Littleton agreed with Chair Clites' comments. She opined that the gable should be stucco.

Mr. Ash clarified that he was saying the gable would be the same color as the stucco, with only the trim being in the accent color.

Vice Chair Lee opined that the detail on the columns needed to be clarified as Chair Clites suggested, so it had a more finished look.

Mr. Ash questioned whether the Committee would like a beam detail on top of the column, with the pediment being on top of the beam.

There was some discussion as to which elevation represented the front and which represented the side. Chair Clites advised the Committee that the long elevation that contained what looked like a front door actually faced the side yard.

Vice Chair Lee and Committee Member Wright agreed the gable color should match the stucco.

In response to a comment from the Committee about the need for more detail on how the bracket worked at the front door, Mr. Ash advised that it was a simple 4x4 cant at a forty-five-degree angle. He noted that it held up the roof pediment that accentuated it. Mr. Ash reported that due to a technical issue, the structure could not come down like a side. He explained that he could not increase the footprint of the building from a zoning perspective.

Chair Clites noted that the cant piece would come down and hit the stucco. He questioned whether there would be a little vertical piece that tied into it.

Mr. Ash advised that it would tie into the stucco. He questioned whether the Committee wanted to see a vertical piece. Mr. Ash confirmed it would be connected to the stucco using a countersunk screw. He advised that the cant trim piece would be applied after the stucco.

Committee Member Jenkins opined that the porch that faced Federal Street did not look as finished as it should because it faced the street. She suggested the need for a better detail so she could get a better understanding of what was being proposed.

Chair Clites opined that in response to what the Committee was saying, the question was whether it needed more detail or a different style to be consistent with the home. He reminded the Committee of the Tom Becke building, which looked like three buildings because of the paint scheme and noted that it contained three little roofs, all of which had similar details. Mr. Clites advised that he wanted to understand the details of what was being proposed.

Mr. Ash advised that the goal was to keep it simple like the rest of the building. He opined that it would get problematic if he tried to put a base on it. Mr. Ash reiterated that this was a simple building and that he wanted to keep the details simple.

Deputy Town Manager Moore displayed a photo of the building referenced by Chair Clites.

Chair Clites questioned whether the roofs cantilevered without a bracket or whether there was a small bracket under them.

Mr. Ash advised that they contained a backer.

Chair Clites noted that a post could not be used because it would add to the building's square footage.

Planner Rogers explained that the porch did not currently exist. She advised the Committee that this was an existing non-conforming use. Ms. Rogers further advised that having a residential use in this district required a special exception; therefore, if the applicant sought to expand the use, he would have to obtain a special exception from the Town Council. She explained that adding a covered porch on the front would increase the footprint.

Deputy Town Manager Moore displayed a photo showing an example of an alternative.

Mr. Ash opined that it looked like a triangle.

Chair Clites opined that it looked more like a completed bracket. He noted that the bracket contained a little horizontal. He advised that the examples were much smaller; however, they completed themselves as a bracket.

Committee Member Jenkins noted that the bracket did not drop down as far in the example. She opined that this produced a better finished look.

Mr. Ash explained that his would protrude further in order to hold the extent of the overhang. He noted that the example only extended out fourteen inches; whereas, his extended out thirty inches.

Chair Clites noted that appropriateness needed to be considered. He advised that what was proposed was a fairly simple farmhouse style. Mr. Clites questioned whether what was proposed was appropriate at a side entrance. He suggested it would have a fairly simple bracket, as opposed to something that was more scrolled.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that she did not want more scrolling. She further advised that the concern was the angle. Ms. Jenkins opined that what was proposed looked unfinished.

Chair Clites questioned whether the Committee would feel better if there was a 4x4 horizontal above it that the roof would set on and then a 4x4 angle. He questioned whether this would make the bracket feel more finished.

Mr. Ash suggested he use a five quarter by six return along the wall, with a 4x4 in between. He opined that this would provide a bracket that would hold up the roof and noted that layers could be added to it. Mr. Ash suggested this would give it more depth and a little more detail. In response to inquiries from the Committee, he confirmed he could make the overhang a little shallower since it would be used structurally. He advised that the overhang was currently three feet, with the bracket starting a foot back. Mr. Ash noted that the bracket sat down the wall thirty inches. He explained that this would be a landing and noted that he was allowed to have a walkway but not a porch.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that if this were not facing Federal Street, it would not bother her as much.

Vice Chair Lee agreed with Committee Member Jenkins. She noted that this faced Federal Street, which was the introduction to the house. Ms. Lee suggested the Committee request a better detail and opined that they did not have a good presentation of what was being discussed.

Chair Clites noted the need for the Committee to be clear about what it was looking for. He questioned whether they were looking for a bracket that felt more complete as an architectural element, as opposed to a simple beam. Mr. Clites further questioned whether they were okay with the beam being made out of a simple square material. In response to Committee Member Jenkins' comment that it did not seem like a finished product, he agreed that was a reasonable thing to ask. He noted that there were companies that made those brackets.

Mr. Ash reiterated that he was trying to approach this simply because it was a very simple building. He advised that he could make it more ornate if he had some examples.

Committee Member Jenkins advised that it was not the ornateness that concerned her. She reiterated that it did not feel like a finished product.

Mr. Ash advised that he would bracket it with a five quarter by six, which would give it more detail. He opined that it would still be very simple, while providing another layer to look at. Mr. Ash noted that someone who passed by would see the bracket against the house, along with the little detail underneath it that would feel like it was holding it up. He opined that it would be simple like a farmhouse.

Chair Clites opined that the upside-down L would make it feel like a more finished element.

Mr. Ash opined that what he heard about the side porch was to add a 2x6 beam on top of the columns and about the front door was to create an upside-down L to finish the bracket. He questioned whether this was consistent with what he heard. Chair Clites opined that it was.

Mr. Ash opined that there would be fascia instead of the 1x10. Mr. Stevenson opined that the sills would then wrap around. Chair Clites agreed.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash displayed the color and shingle samples. He confirmed the shingle was an architectural grade one. Mr. Ash noted that the sample depicted the color but not the exact pattern. He advised that the front, side and garage doors would all be stained a warmer brown color. Mr. Ash further advised that there would be some faint differences in the asphalt shingle color.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Ash advised that he would not mind putting shutters on the front; however, he would have trouble doing so on the side due to the triple window. Mr. Ash reiterated that he would put shutters on the front, not the sides. He noted that they would be black paneled shutters.

The Committee suggested the shutters be dark green.

Mr. Ash agreed and opined this would look nice with the copper and tan color. He noted that the apartment building would have black shutters and opined that dark green ones on the house would offset it nicely. Mr. Ash confirmed there would be a lot of landscaping.

Chair Clites noted the elevation that was being displayed on the monitor. He advised that there would be a pair of dark green paneled shutters on each of the three windows. Mr. Clites suggested the applicant could return with the exact color, or the Committee could designate someone to approve it.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-20 as presented, with the following clarifications: the Committee would like to see the little bracket detail for the three foot overhang that faces Federal Street, with the goal that it stay as simple as it's rendered, but with an extension up the wall and out the overhang to show that it is actually a complete bracket; that the side porch, which has columns, can stay simple with no base necking or capital detail, but that above it should be a continuous soffit or beam, the same width as the columns and about the same depth as the columns and, if it's six-by-six, to keep that proportion, and to help it feel traditional to lift the roof a couple of inches; the windows will have three side casings and the bottom will have a traditional sill as an applied sill below the thin sill that the window comes with; the casing of the garage door would be the same width as the casing around the windows, with no chamfer or flare; the addition of shutters on the elevation that faces Federal Street – the three windows will each get a pair of shutters that are paneled in a dark green, with the color to come back before the Committee; the siding in the gable ends will be painted the same color as the stucco; the rakes and fascia for the entire structure will be the same dimension – either 8- or 6-inches – and they will be consistent in both locations; the garage door will be as presented in the large picture with the large circle, which is square glass at the top; and, the windows to be simulated divided light with a spacer bar 7/8 of an inch.

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

New Business

COA 26-22: Fence - 115 W. Washington Street – Kevin Ash

Planner Rogers reported that the request was for a five-foot-tall cedar screen fence on the back side of 115 West Washington Street. She explained that the applicant was proposing the fence as a part of the new restaurant and apartment complex. Ms. Rogers reported that there was previously a post and rail fence in the location along the property line where the new fence was proposed to be located. She reminded the Committee that the Historic District Guidelines stated that privacy fences were generally appropriate for front or side lawns but not for other highly visible areas, and may be appropriate to screen delivery, storage or utility areas.

Kevin Ash, the applicant, advised the Committee that he was requesting a waiver to have parking closer than five feet to the property line and explained that one of the conditions of the waiver was to have a fence. He advised that he could lower the height of the fence if the Committee felt it would be better; however, he could not go below three feet.

Planner Rogers clarified that the fence must be thirty inches in height.

Mr. Ash opined that the fence would help screen the parking, as well as screen deliveries. He advised that it would help prevent lights from shining from the upper parking area to the lower one. Mr. Ash noted that it would screen the parking lots for the bank and post office.

Councilmember Pearson read an excerpt from the guidelines and opined that it left things open both ways. She noted that a tall fence would block visibility for those driving down Federal Street and would make it appear like a "cattle run". Ms. Pearson suggested the fence should either be lower or not be installed at all. She opined that there were fence types that allowed people to see through them.

Mr. Ash advised that he must have a solid fence. He suggested he could install a three-foot one. In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash advised that the fence would be installed to within ten feet of the actual street. He confirmed he needed the privacy for the parking. In response to the suggestion that the fence be different heights down its length, Mr. Ash opined that if it was a three-foot fence, there would be breaks due to the slope of the grade. He advised that there would be a step-down effect even if the fence was only one height.

Planner Rogers clarified that the zoning ordinance did not require the fence to be a solid one. She reported that it only had to be semi-opaque. Ms. Rogers advised that it could be an open fence with bushes or a hedge underneath it. She reiterated that it did not have to be a solid fence.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that within the landscape strip, the applicant could get a reduction to three feet, with the fence being located anywhere within the landscape strip. He noted that this was a separate process. Mr. Moore advised that there was no requirement to have a fence.

Planner Rogers advised that the applicant had several options from which to choose. She reported that it could be a fence, a wall or a hedge.

Chair Clites opined that this was a zoning requirement and that it needed to create a screen. He confirmed it could be a planting fence.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that it could not be less than thirty inches in height. He noted that there was no requirement for a five-foot-tall fence.

Mr. Ash advised that he would reduce it to thirty inches and stop it at the end of the parking, with the remainder being addressed with a hedge. He noted that this was a commercial area that included mail trucks and parking. Mr. Ash suggested that from the point where there was no parking, the fence transition to a hedge. He noted that this would allow anyone in the house to look at a landscape hedge, as opposed to a fence.

Committee Member Wright agreed with this idea. She advised that she would prefer the fence be board-on-board, as opposed to a stockade fence.

Vice Chair Lee expressed concern that a five-foot fence would look huge from the post office property. She opined that it would be great to lower it and add something softer at the entrance. Ms. Lee noted that this would also help the trucks that have to make the ninety-degree turn.

Mr. Ash advised that he liked the idea of a softer hedge from that point back. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he confirmed the smooth side of the fence would be on the parking lot side.

Committee Member Littleton agreed the fence height needed to be reduced. She suggested the need for a quality fence because of the quality of Mr. Ash's project and advised that what was proposed was not it.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash explained that he had to have screening because he was proposing that the parking be closer than five feet off the property line. He confirmed there would be plantings on the inside of the fence.

The Committee held considerable discussion about fencing options.

Committee Member Anderson agreed with Committee Member Littleton's comments. He suggested Mr. Ash also consider a stained cedar fence. Mr. Anderson further suggested a simple elevation be drawn that showed more creativity. He noted that the purpose of the fence was to protect the neighbors from headlights shining onto their property and advised that a three-foot fence would work very well.

Chair Clites noted that in addition to being courteous to the neighbor, the fence would define Mr. Ash's property.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Ash advised that the bigger trees were on Mr. Morency's property. He noted that the large tree on the end was being trimmed by the power company.

The Committee agreed they liked the idea of a stained fence, as well as the idea of some combination of a fence and plantings. They suggested the fence be interesting. The Committee asked Mr. Ash to return with a revised proposal, as opposed to verbalizing what he was proposing.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee table this with the permission of the applicant.

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

COA 26-23: Projecting & Wall Signs – 115 W. Washington Street – La Caccia/L 'Enoteca/The Chase Club

Planner Rogers reported that the applicant was requesting three projecting signs on a single hangar that would be located on the western corner of 115 West Washington Street. She advised that each sign would be 4.08 square feet and would contain varying colors. Ms. Rogers further reported that he was also requesting two wall signs – one above the door for the restaurant and one on the header above the door for 117 West Washington Street. She noted that the applicant provided two options for the size of the bracket – a 53-inch one and a 43-inch one – for the hanging signs.

The Committee agreed the signs were very attractive.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Kevin Ash, the applicant, advised that the wall signs would be lit by the lighting in the soffits. He further advised that the hanging signs would be lit by two down lights on each side. Mr. Ash noted that they were the lights normally used by Quail Run Signs. He confirmed the bulbs would be a warm light that would not be bright. Mr. Ash advised that he preferred the larger sign bracket so the signs would be subservient to the bracket. He noted that the signs were the same width as the smaller bracket.

The Committee agreed the larger bracket was the better option.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-23, as presented, using the larger bracket.

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

COA 26-24 (S 26-15): Replacement of Projecting Sign – 112 W. Washington Street – Afield

Planner Rogers reminded the Committee that the applicant previously appeared before them to amend the wall sign to reflect their name change and was now seeking to replace the projecting sign with the same size sign on the same bracket. She noted that the sign would be green with bronze colored lettering.

Philip Miller, the applicant, advised that, as predicted by the Committee, there was confusion about the signage; therefore, they wanted to clean it up. He further advised that they wanted to have consistent signage so when people looked for them online, it would be easier. Mr. Miller opined that the proposed sign was a big improvement aesthetically.

The Committee agreed they liked the sign.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Miller confirmed the sign would be the same size as the existing one and noted that he used AI to create the image for his application, which produced a slightly inaccurate size. He advised that the background color of the sign would be Roycroft Bottle Green, which was the color of the building. Mr. Miller advised that he would also be amenable to the green color used for their shopping bags.

Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-24 (S 26-15), a request of Philip Miller for a replacement sign at 112 West Washington Street – Afield.

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

COA 26-21: Exterior Renovations, Accessibility & Lighting – 105 N. Jay Street – Asbury Church

Planner Rogers reminded the Committee of their pre-application review of this project in April with the Town's consultant, Glave & Holmes. She further reminded them that the project consisted of exterior renovations, including repairs to the stucco, siding, windows, trim, doors and paint, as well as addressing ADA accessibility issues. Ms. Rogers opined that the proposal was well received by the Committee in April. She noted that they offered comments regarding the front door lock and reported that those details were updated. Ms. Rogers noted that Glave & Holmes' representative was appearing remotely to present the application.

Nickolas Coile, Senior Associate with Glave & Holmes, appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. He noted that he came before the Committee in April and reported that the majority of the proposal remained the same; therefore, he would only focus on the items that had changed. Mr. Coile advised that two exterior lights were added due to the foot candles needed as determined by further calculations. He reported that the exterior repairs remained the same. Mr. Coile noted that as a result of the previous discussion about the door hardware, a different keypad that would be located on the side panel was now being proposed. He advised that the pad would be attached with very minimal screws and would be installed on the cross bar, so it did not impact the panel. Mr. Coile further advised that there would be a traditional deadbolt on the door and noted that its inner workings would work with the keypad. He reported that the doorknob and deadbolt would look no differently than the one on the basement door. Mr. Coile advised that the only other item that would be seen would be the doorknob and noted that the box for it would be on the interior. He reiterated that the only two elements that would be seen were the brass doorknob and the deadbolt. Mr. Coile noted that the keypad would be white to match the white trim. He reiterated that the remainder of the project items remained the same and opined that they were well received by the Committee during the pre-application review. Mr. Coile noted that the Town staff had the color samples.

Chair Clites noted that the finish for the doorknob and deadbolt was listed as polished brass. He advised that in a historic building, they would not have been lacquered. Mr. Clites suggested that, if it was available, an unlacquered finish would look better and would patina. He questioned whether there would be any accessibility issues given that a doorknob would be used.

Mr. Coile confirmed they took the ADA accessibility issues into consideration, while still maintaining historic accuracy. He advised that once the code was inputted into the keypad, the door would disengage so a person could roll into the door, and it would open.

The Committee advised that they had no comments and opined that the building would look much nicer when the project was done. They concurred with the recommendation that the door hardware be unlacquered.

Councilmember Pearson noted that the Town was the applicant and that she was a member of the Town Council; however, because she would not benefit financially from the project, she was eligible to vote on this item.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 26-21 as presented, with the clarification that the hardware be unlacquered brass if that is available.

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

Discussion Items

Electronic Meeting Participation Policy

Town Clerk North reminded the members that they had a policy that allowed them to participate in meetings electronically if they were on vacation, sick, or caring for someone who was ill. She further reminded them that the State Code required this policy be adopted annually and explained that the reason was so any changes in the State Code could be incorporated, so the policy would always be up to date. Ms. North advised that there were no changes in the State Code this year; therefore, the Committee would simply readopt the policy that had been in place for the past year if they wished to continue to allow members to participate electronically.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Committee Member Jenkins, that the Historic District Review Committee re-adopt the policy as previously approved and continue it for another year.

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

Appointed Officials Training

Given the lateness of the hour and the absence of Committee Member Simons, Town Clerk North suggested the appointed officials training be delayed until the October meeting.

Joint Architectural Review Board Awards

Chair Clites announced that the 2026 Joint Architectural Review Board Awards Ceremony would be held on Thursday, September 24th at the Coach House Complex in Morven Park. He noted that the members should have received an invitation.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that he was picking up the printed invitations and would deliver them to the members.

Quorum for October Meeting

Chair Clites asked the members to let the Town Clerk know if they were unable to attend the October 1st meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

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

Tim Clites: Excuse me. We'll bring this meeting to order. This is the Middleburg Historic District Review Committee meeting for Thursday, September the 3rd, 2026. The first item is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Here.

Rhonda North: 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 is absent. Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Next order of business is public comments. If you're here for something on our agenda, we'll get to you when your item comes up. Anybody just from the general public? Seeing none. We'll move on to approval of the minutes. Are there any comments or clarifications on the meeting minutes? I'm going to correct myself. I did not go listen to the tape, but I probably full well did say the following, which is, I asked the committee to determine their feelings on the issue. We were actually looking at the application that's back before us this evening. And really what I should be using is the word recommendation. So, if I use the word feelings, my bad, I own it. We shouldn't deal with feelings here, but instead recommendations. And the one other item on the meeting notes is fine, but I want to remember it when we get to an action item tonight. Any other comments? I move; we approve them as presented.

Linda Wright: Second.

Margaret Littleton: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

Linda Wright: Aye.

Virginia Jenkins: Aye.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Margaret Littleton: Aye.

Bill Anderson: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Great.

Punkin Lee: Abstain.

Tim Clites: Abstain. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Was not here.

Tim Clites: Punkin was not here. Thank you. The motion passes. All right. The next item is our action item. It's old business. COA 26-20 request of Kevin Ash for the demolition of an accessory structure and renovations and an addition to 114 West Federal Street. And Ms. Rogers, would you like to give us a little update and remind us of this project, please?

Amy Rogers: Yep. Chairman Clites Members of the Committee. This was in front of you last month. This is a one-story contributing structure on Federal Street. The applicant is proposing to add a second story to the building and a two-story garage. The upper story of the building will be incorporated over top of the garage. Last month you all conditionally approved this application and requested certain items come back before you. Those items are listed in the staff report. The applicant has provided the additional information in their plans for your review, and I'd be more than happy to clarify anything you may need.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I don't remember which side we started on last week. So, there are a few folks here from the applicant. Please come up. State your name for the record.

Kevin Ash: Good evening, everybody. Kevin Ash.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Matthew Stevenson: [off mic] Matthew Stevenson.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Anything to add before we go through comments from the Committee?

Kevin Ash: No, I think Matt did a good job successfully, you know, addressing the comments. We have paint chips and samples here. He's incorporated them in the plans. Sometimes the colors aren't exact. So, we brought them here so everybody could see exact colors.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Is there, would the committee like to look at this? Let's go through a first round of comments and then we'll look at the samples, unless someone would like to do that in a different sequence. Bill, let's start with you, please.

Bill Anderson: No comments at this time.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: No, nor I.

Tim Clites: Hold on, I got to check and make sure everybody's awake. [laughter] Is this the Historic Committee? I'm just kidding. Punkin? Punkin was not here last time, so if you want us, happy for your comments, or we can skip over and come back.

Punkin Lee: I'm going to listen.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Punkin Lee: I do have a comment for later.

Tim Clites: All right. I didn't want to put you on the spot.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Linda.

Linda Wright: I mean, I like what you've done with the changes we asked for and all of that. I still like the building, and I have no further comments. I like the fixtures and the things that you picked out.

Kevin Ash: Thank you.

Linda Wright: I think we're good.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any comments at this time.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I really don't have a lot of comment. I do on the light, which I like the fixture. My only concern is because that starts that grade up the hill and the front porch light could put enough light down to be in somebody's eyes when they're driving at different levels there, as that is common when some I don't know how close it is to the road. I can't picture that.

Kevin Ash: Probably.

Cindy Pearson: But it's just a thought to be thoughtful of when they're installing it maybe.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, location of the lights and yeah whether they are cut off appropriately.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Well. All right Punkin. Everybody, shut off your mic if you're not using it, please. Try again.

Punkin Lee: Yeah, since Cindy brought up the lights, where are the lights going?

Kevin Ash: On the front elevation? Yeah.

Punkin Lee: I couldn't quite tell.

Kevin Ash: On either side of the front door.

Punkin Lee: Because there's no indication on the drawing, so I was like.

Kevin Ash: So, it's up on the screen now, Punkin. It's right there. We just have a architectural note. And then the cut sheet of the fixtures in the back. So, there's two light fixtures on either side of the front door.

Punkin Lee: Oh, because it had decorative wall sconce on the thing. So, I'm like, so what is that? And what is the light?

Kevin Ash: Yeah. So later in the thing, we actually have the fixture itself. So Matt wasn't able to take that existing fixture and apply it on the rendering. So, we noted where those two light fixtures are. And then there's only recessed lights under the side porch and the garage overhang. So, it's noted right there. And right there is a down light, so.

Punkin Lee: Okay. Thank you.

Kevin Ash: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: All right. Well, I have a hand. No surprise. I have a handful of questions and clarifications. And so, let's just start with sheet one and I'll try to go through them clearly without repeating myself. And I'm going to not make these as definitive statements, but as something for the committee to consider. And then if that spawns any additional comments, I would welcome them. So, in the last rendition, the casing was stucco and we, this is to get Punkin up to speed if she hadn't had the chance to read the meeting minutes. And we asked for that to be painted trim, which it now is. I think on historic building or a building in a Historic District to try to be more traditional, I would typically expect to see an actual windowsill and not a picture framed casing. And now it maybe you were intending to do that in the way the software renders it. It renders it as a picture frame, which is a casing on all sides. But I typically would think of like I say in a traditional building, seeing the casing, which is a small projection below the or a sill below the casings.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, that is part of the window assembly itself. And I don't know, from an elevation standpoint, you could actually articulate that at this scale because that what you're talking about is the lower sash, like the sill at that lower sash is going to protrude and have a lip in your casing comes underneath of it.

Tim Clites: Well, no, I'm actually they make they being like, there's a handful of companies like even Hardie. I think if you're using, say if you were using a Hardie siding, they make a historic sill. It's an inch and a half or inch and three quarters or two inch or something that is actually a windowsill that the casing sits on. I don't remember if we looked at that in the other building that we looked at with you or not.

Kevin Ash: Like more like an interior, like you would trim or you'd have a like a sill apron.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Right. Like a projecting sill or a stool like on that window. So that was one comment. I think that lends itself to be a little more traditional. If you look at the casing around the garage door. Again, I would ask everyone to remember that and my comments are around. What I think fits in with some of the historic language that we see in other buildings. So typically, a garage casing trim would be similar to say the windows and doors in the house, not have that slightly wider casing with a wider flare, but then it's all painted that seemed a little inconsistent. And the last thing on this elevation was the porch columns. I don't feel like I have a good sense of the detail. If there's intended to be a beam that wraps around them, or if what we're looking at is the end of a beam coming towards us, and then the column is just a simple shaft with no base or capital or necking. Or is that a piece of like one by six that's intended to be the capital, in which case there's still no beam below it?

Kevin Ash: A beam. Yeah. So, I think it's just a simple column with like a one by four capital, right? Isn't that what you.

Matthew Stevenson: Yeah, because it's only projecting it you know [off mic].

Kevin Ash: The framing would be up in above the soffit. So, I don't think with this size we're intending to have a beam below it. So, it kind of like the header would be in behind where the fascia is.

Tim Clites: Yep.

Kevin Ash: And the framing then returns back. And then you have the rafters on top of it.

Tim Clites: Yeah. I understand how you can frame it that way. It's just not it's not typically a traditional look, right? Traditional construction, carpentry. You'd have a column that comes up with a bit of a beam, and then the soffit and rake and all the detail above it would be kind of an additional layer. So, it's just an observation on that elevation.

Kevin Ash: So, would you say that you would have like the structure on top of the column and then the roof would be up like six inches higher above that structure?

Tim Clites: Yeah. There'd be a little beam that's, you know, if the column is six by six, the beam might be six by six or 6 by 8. And then everything that you have in the pediment sits on top of

that. It just means that pediment lifts up about six inches, right? But then you get a beam. And if nothing else beyond that being more traditional, it would help the comment that Cindy gave about the recessed light and cutting off the glare of that light, because it would be inside a little bit of a box. And I don't have a picture to show that, although I'm guessing if we looked out the window, we'd probably see it on the front of this building. And then the second page. No additional comments actually, although I. Which page are we at? Yeah. I wonder, I don't know how some of the rest of you feel about the pediment, which is the triangle above the front door. We do they show standing seam there. I guess that's fine. I could also see that just being a piece of flashing, if you wanted to simplify it, because often a little pediment might not have had that where when you get to the gable end, I think you have that longer line, that's a detail you can decide. I don't feel strongly one way or the other, but when I think about like that probably sticks out about this far. And you do little pieces standing yeah. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: I'm not sure you are going to get the actual standing. It might.

Tim Clites: Yeah, you could just flatten it down and make it flashing and paint it and it would be fine, I think. The next elevation let's go to page four where we're looking at the gable end. And there's just a couple little, I actually noticed this more on page five, but we'll stay at page four for the moment. The details show if I understood them correctly, that the rake is ten inches and the fascia is eight inches. And I'm just wondering that feels a little heavy to me. I think it ought to all be in the 6- or 8-inch range, and I don't know if that was intentional. So, if you jump to.

Matthew Stevenson: Those are the section in there.

Tim Clites: What's that?

Kevin Ash: The rake molding is the.

Tim Clites: So, if you go to.

Kevin Ash: The fascia on the rake is.

Tim Clites: The detail it's set at O, 7. There's a full gable return detail which thank you. We did ask for that. I appreciate the effort to put that together. So, it's a one-inch overhang and at the lower its eight inches. But then the rake.

Kevin Ash: It should all be the same.

Tim Clites: It should all be either 8 or 6 I think, but not ten. It gets a little heavy.

Kevin Ash: No that's it. Yeah.

Tim Clites: That's okay. All right. Well good. We and then.

Kevin Ash: Because you're not going to have a double framing where your overhang is, you're not going to double frame that. That's just going to be.

Tim Clites: To be you could almost make that six and it might even look better on in my opinion. But it's up to you, right? It just doesn't want to be bigger than what you have at the [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: Yeah, it should either be 6 or 8. But I mean eight. Yeah. Because you have a double framing detail. It should be just a single rake pad out. Yeah. We can make a note of that.

Tim Clites: In that same detail, the slope is 8 12. And I think the slope on the main roof is six. And I know I'm sorry, I'm just I love this stuff. So, I'm not right. I'm not don't take this the wrong way, but I would either do 6 12 there or something shallower for the same reason it's only a foot, so I.

Matthew Stevenson: I think our idea behind that was the steeper the pitch, the more of that would read. So, kind of the flatter it gets you kind of lose that when you're looking at it.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Well, and I guess there's yeah, there's some validity to that.

Kevin Ash: Because it does sit up high from the pedestrian area. So, I think if it gets much flatter, you won't even see it.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay. Again, my comments to myself before we discussed it were, you know, 6 12 to match the roof would at least make it all consistent. All the angles and cuts would be similar. If we go back to the gable elevations, I noticed that we have siding in the gable, which for everyone listening, the gable is the little triangle part, obviously at the top of the roof. And in one elevation, it's shown the color of the stucco. The other, it looks like it's shown white. And for me, the question was, should it be siding or stucco? I don't have a strong opinion. But it's worth us discussing as a Committee to make sure that we like that result and that we understand which color it would be, whether it's the trim color or the stucco color.

Kevin Ash: Should be the stucco color.

Tim Clites: All right.

Matthew Stevenson: Yeah.

Tim Clites: And just to give you all the rest of my comments, when you get to the garage doors [inaudible]. One more, please. One more. There we go. The circled main elevation, I think, is what we're approving. The window option is circled, and it shows an arch top. But I think what you were really saying is that's the double light six over.

Matthew Stevenson: Yeah, that was my note that I added on there. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, it's not the arch. It's the square glass.

Kevin Ash: No. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Okay. Perfect. And if we flip two more pages, we get to the details of the windows. And I'm sorry if I missed this in a write up that you provided to us, but I think we typically to be consistent with historic windows go two more that one. I think the muntin that we, when we have

simulated glass or insulated glass we use the simulated divided light with the 7/8 spacer, which is the one to the left furthest most to the left.

Kevin Ash: We left it blank so you could circle it.

Tim Clites: Well, isn't that what we did on the last project? Yeah, I mean.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, yeah 7/8 is simulated glass.

Tim Clites: I just want to be clear. I mean, I think you know that, but just to make sure we're all on the same page there.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: And yeah, all this stuff about integrated blinds and shades, presumably we're not doing that if we're doing integrated muntins.

Kevin Ash: Simulated [multiple speakers] light.

Tim Clites: And then just for the committee to be aware, there is the option provided in this that it could be without cladding and wood painted on the exterior if we wanted it to be that way.

Kevin Ash: That's what we're.

Tim Clites: That's your preference.

Kevin Ash: That's our preference to have it blended. Yeah.

Tim Clites: All right. I got my turn to talk. Any comments? We'll start with Bill.

Bill Anderson: Thank you. I agree with your comments about the design. I don't have any further ones.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Me? I do appreciate your comments because I'm not an architect and they all make sense. We have a choice of stucco or siding to.

Tim Clites: No, the proposal is for stucco. The only siding comment was up in the gable in the roof line.

Margaret Littleton: Right, I agree and that should be.

Tim Clites: Well, it was a question. I just wanted to make sure people didn't miss it. I didn't hopefully I didn't present that as I have a preference. I wasn't presenting a preference.

Margaret Littleton: Right. Well on paper, it looks a little odd.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Margaret Littleton: I don't know. It doesn't matter to me. This. Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: So, other than that, as I said, I appreciate your comments.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Margaret, just to be clear, like we are saying that that would be the same color as the stucco and only the trim would be the accent.

Margaret Littleton: Would be what?

Tim Clites: Only the trim.

Kevin Ash: Only the trim would be the accent.

Margaret Littleton: Okay.

Kevin Ash: If it's not clear on the imagery, that's the intent.

Tim Clites: Thank you for clarifying that. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think the detail on the columns needs to be clarified as Tim brought up. So, it has a little more finished look with that.

Kevin Ash: So, you like a beam detail on top of the column and then put the pediment on top of the beam.

Punkin Lee: Just I mean Tim's comments. You have a better presentation of what it's going to look like because that is the front first thing you see.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. I this is actually the side Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I meant the.

Kevin Ash: This is the side entrance so.

Punkin Lee: Yeah, the side.

Kevin Ash: We changed the orientation to be forward facing to Federal Street.

Tim Clites: Just to be clear to everyone, the long elevation where it looks like the front door actually faces the side yard.

Punkin Lee: Yeah, right.

Tim Clites: So, we all have the orientation of the house.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. We tried to accentuate that by having the sconces on either side of the front door rather than just a.

Punkin Lee: Right. But we have no detail on that.

Tim Clites: Right. The brackets there.

Punkin Lee: Right. So, the real front, the overhang there is there detail on that to see how that's going to look. It faces the street.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. That faces Federal.

Punkin Lee: So, because there's no I don't think unless I missed it a rendering of the what that's going to look like.

Kevin Ash: It's up on your screen now.

Punkin Lee: Right? It's on here. But I mean a better.

Margaret Littleton: It's just a side.

Kevin Ash: You have a side and a front view.

Punkin Lee: Right? Here's the front. [off mic] Yeah. And for the other I think the color should match the stucco.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I would agree the colors should match. I would agree with that. And then your other comments are certainly well taken. And if we just need one more detail of how the bracket works on the front door would be helpful.

Kevin Ash: The actual cant that.

Linda Wright: Just sort of what it looks like.

Kevin Ash: So yeah, that 4x4.

Linda Wright: Out yeah from the building.

Kevin Ash: Can we go to the side view just so I can understand the question?

Linda Wright: Did I miss that? You know?

Kevin Ash: Oh, right. There's the side.

Linda Wright: Right.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. So, there's just a simple 4x4 cant a 45-degree angle.

Virginia Jenkins: Got you. I missed that I'm sorry.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Holding up that roof pediment that accentuates it. Because there's a technical issue that Amy and Will and I have talked about. We've talked about that, you know, that structure can't come down like the side because we can't increase the footprint of what's there from a zoning standpoint.

Linda Wright: Okay. You answered my question.

Tim Clites: So, I'm going to interrupt the sequence. I'm sorry. Just since we're on that to clarify. So, when the cant, canted piece comes down and hits the stucco, is there a little vertical piece that it ties into.

Kevin Ash: Behind it?

Tim Clites: Or is it tying into the stucco?

Kevin Ash: It was tying into the stucco.

Tim Clites: Okay.

Kevin Ash: Do you want to see a vertical piece?

Tim Clites: I don't know. I just want everyone. I mean, without a detail of that, that would be just a question I'd have, right?

Kevin Ash: Like, yeah, it would just be a countersunk screw coming back in, you know the stucco.

Tim Clites: And the canted trim piece would basically, yeah, either tie into the stucco or add some.

Kevin Ash: But it's applied after the stucco.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. Yes. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm on the same thing because it's the one that's facing Federal Street. And I just. It doesn't look quite as finished, I don't think, as it should facing the street like that. So maybe with a better detail, I can get a better understanding. Am I making sense?

Tim Clites: You are making to me. But I think we'll have to bring some clarity too. Let's get everyone's comments. Cindy. Thank you, Virginia.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any comments. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, what to interpret what I think I heard about the bracket, the question is, does it need more detail or a different style to be consistent with the home? And I guess I would bring everyone's mind to and I'm sorry I don't I'm not good with addresses, but at the red light, when you head north, there used to be a bank box and there's three. There's that building is actually looks like three buildings because of the paint scheme. And there's three little roofs and I think they have this similar detail, don't they? Isn't that just like a little flat board that?

Punkin Lee: I'd have to go look at it again. [off mic]

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: That's the only place in town. I mean, I'm sure there's other places. We just haven't seen them, but. So, I'm not particularly focused on whether there's a detail on the stucco or not. I just wanted to understand it.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. I mean, our goal is to try to keep it simple like the rest of the building. That's why there's no real ornateness like really no base trim on the column, because a lot of times you get conflict when you have that lower horizontal rail that's part of the railing. And like, it's like, do you make the base too tall, so it hits flush? Or if it's smaller, it's only four inches. And so that gets problematic when you're trying to put a base on it. So, it's a really simple building. We just want to keep it simple details.

Tim Clites: Yeah. And while we talk, I see Mr. Moore trying to get us an image. Maybe it helps, maybe it doesn't. But is it though? Or do those little roofs have?

Will Moore: Sorry, were you talking about North Madison Street?

Tim Clites: Yeah. North Madison.

Will Moore: On the side of the [multiple speakers] house.

Tim Clites: Do they just cantilever without a little bracket or is there a little bracket under them? He shut us off.

Margaret Littleton: He wouldn't put a post down.

Kevin Ash: There's a backer to it.

Tim Clites: So that's a good question. They can't put a post down because they're in the setback. And that would be well not the setback that would be.

Margaret Littleton: Could the railing go into the post?

Tim Clites: But that would be considered. It would add to the square footage of the building, which where are you pointing on this?

Margaret Littleton: On this on page 5?

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: It looks like it's a gutter. It looks like a post is there.

Tim Clites: No.

Margaret Littleton: Or is it, I'm looking at the wrong end. Sorry.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: You're looking at the wrong end.

Kevin Ash: The wrong side again.

Tim Clites: Yeah. That's all right. You're looking at the little side roof.

Margaret Littleton: I think it should be a post down here.

Tim Clites: They can't do that from a zoning perspective because it will make the footprint. Is that right, Will, it would increase the footprint?

Margaret Littleton: On the same porch? I'm sorry.

Tim Clites: We're not the zoning folks.

Amy Rogers: So, the porch doesn't exist right now.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Amy Rogers: Because it's an existing non-conforming use and I don't believe did we just explained it the last time. It is a special exception to have a residential use in the district today. So, if they expand that use, it's a special exception to the Town Council to make an expansion. So, they can have a little stoop, but they can't increase the footprint of the building. So having a covered porch on the front would increase the footprint.

Margaret Littleton: I'm not saying that I just said that to hold the roof up, to have a post come down to the landing.

Tim Clites: Yeah, that's what that technically means. It means a porch.

Margaret Littleton: Oh, okay. Oh. Thank you. See, I'm not an architect.

Tim Clites: Sorry, for better or worse. And architects didn't even invent that necessarily; it is part of the zoning.

Margaret Littleton: Overlooks it looks funny.

Tim Clites: Thank you Will, let's everyone look at the screen in front of you or up. I'm not saying this is a great example. Do this. I just want people to see what you are talking about.

Kevin Ash: That's the other alternative, right? Rather than having it just cleanly attached to the stucco or have a back bracket that it connects to.

Tim Clites: Right. Looks more like a, it looks more like a completed bracket. Right.

Kevin Ash: A triangle.

Tim Clites: And likewise, there the bracket then has a little horizontal. These are much smaller. They're probably what, 12 or 14in deep.

Kevin Ash: Right.

Tim Clites: Maybe 18. But it completes itself as a bracket. Do you feel Virginia like that helps enough based on your comments?

Virginia Jenkins: Yes, because that doesn't have a bracket that drops down as far.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: And to me, that's a better finished look than this.

Kevin Ash: Well, Virginia, the further protrusion you have, the brackets are going to come down further to hold the extent of that overhang out. Like Tim was saying, that's only sitting out about 14in. So, there's not a lot of structure, but when you start extending it out to like 30in, that bracket needs to hold a little more weight.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. Because this is a flat. Is it, do we have a picture of it on the side view of it?

Kevin Ash: Yeah. We have a side view of it. Whoever had the screen share.

Virginia Jenkins: What page?

Kevin Ash: What page is that? Yeah, yeah. Like page 6 or 7. Amy.

Matthew Stevenson: Yeah. Right there. Virginia it's on this.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, I just, I don't like those brackets like that. But. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: Yeah, like an appropriate yeah. And appropriateness too like, as we look at what seems to be an interpretation for a fairly simple farmhouse, does it seem appropriate that on a side entrance they would have a fairly simple bracket as opposed to something that's more scrolled?

Virginia Jenkins: I don't want more scrolled.

Tim Clites: Right. Is it the angle of it that?

Virginia Jenkins: I think it's the angle. It just the whole thing looks unfinished. If it were as, it were. But and that's just a. I don't know, maybe. Is it possible to bring the post down to the railing?

Kevin Ash: No, no, we can't do that.

Virginia Jenkins: That's.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, that's the zoning issue.

Tim Clites: Yes. Let me.

Virginia Jenkins: I know you went.

Tim Clites: Let me ask another question for you. Virginia to see if this helps. If the what is the post? The angled post 4x4.

Kevin Ash: 4x4.

Tim Clites: If there were a 4x4 horizontal above it that the roof set on and then the 4x4 angle, does that help it feel more bracket like to you more finished. Because if you look at.

Virginia Jenkins: My mind's eye.

Tim Clites: If you look at the front.

Kevin Ash: It's almost like I do like a five quarter by six with a five quarter by six return along the wall and put the 4x4 in between it. And then you have your bracket per se that's holding up the roof. You could add those layers to it. That gives more. I guess it would give some more depth and some a little bit more detail.

Tim Clites: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: Then my question is.

Tim Clites: And I think Virginia's question is, could we change it from 45 to something a little shallower? If you're using it structurally.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, if you're using it structural. Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: What is the depth of the gape that's there?

Kevin Ash: The depth. I think it's three feet. Right. The overhang is three feet.

Virginia Jenkins: That's what I'm talking about.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. The overhang is three feet. So, the bracket starts about a foot back. And so, in 45 it's going to come down the wall probably 30in.

Virginia Jenkins: Esthetically I'm not just not sure about this. I mean that angle.

Tim Clites: Any other comments from other members about that particular detail?

Virginia Jenkins: Excuse me, may I.

Margaret Littleton: About four feet deep.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Okay, so you call it. [off mic]

Kevin Ash: It's a landing. Yeah, because I'm allowed to have a walkway. I just can't have a porch.

Tim Clites: Catching on quick. That girl, she's a quick study. [laughter]

Virginia Jenkins: I think my issue is probably because it's facing Federal Street. So, it's if it were not on Federal Street where you'd have a straight on view. Probably wouldn't bother me, particularly if it was on the west side, but or the north side. But it's just because it's right on the street there.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Cindy. Linda. [off mic] Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I just think since it faces. I agree with Virginia. It faces federal. And that's your introduction that I don't know. Can't we request a better detail that'll show us? I mean, I get the discussion and talking sizes and all that, but it just has raised a lot of discussion. And we don't have a really good presentation of it.

Tim Clites: And so, I think to do that, we need to be clear not with the solution, but with what it is that we're looking for. Our job is to design it per se. Right? Are we looking for a bracket that feels more complete as an architectural element, as opposed to just the simple beam? And are we okay with it being made out of simple square material? I am asking you to start because.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, I know.

Tim Clites: Just give some feedback.

Virginia Jenkins: I understand the [off mic]. It just doesn't seem like a finished product, that's all.

Tim Clites: Okay, so I think that's a reasonable thing to ask. And actually, there are I'm sure these folks can go look, there are companies that make those brackets, right? Like wood products or whoever is that. [multiple speakers]

Kevin Ash: Around town that are different. And so, we were just trying to keep a simpler approach because it's a very simple building. That was our approach. We can make it a little more ornate with other examples.

Virginia Jenkins: Maybe you're misunderstanding. It's not the ornateness I'm concerned with or the plainness. It just it doesn't feel like a finished product to me.

Kevin Ash: So, by bracketing it with a five quarter by six, it's going to give some more detail. Not very ornate, still very simple, but it's going to give you another layer to where if you looked at it because there is no sidewalk here. So as somebody passes by, you would see that bracket up against the house, along with another little detail underneath of it, where that bracket will then feel like it's actually holding it up versus it's just a structural support. And it's pretty simple, like a farmhouse.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm just visualizing it from the street, from the eastern end, looking up towards it or in front of it. And that's just the way my mind's working here tonight, right now.

Tim Clites: I do think my own opinion is the extra L upside down L will make it feel like a more finished element. You don't have to, but. All right. Thank you. Punkin did I ask? Did I check in with you for the last time? Yeah. Margaret. Anything additional? Bill? So, I rambled about a few things, and you all said what you said afterwards. But we have to pull this together into a motion. And so, I just want to clarify which pieces, if any, we need to see again. And I'll pause so that one or more of you can suggest if there's anything you'd like to see again versus a verbal description.

Kevin Ash: And Tim, if I may, just to reiterate, what I think I'm hearing is on the side porch at that two by six beam on top of the columns that will support the side porch and on the front door creating an upside-down L to kind of finish the bracket was what I think I heard. So, I just want to make sure what I'm hearing is consistent with.

Tim Clites: Yeah, well I agree. I think that's what.

Kevin Ash: And also. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: We've been saying.

Kevin Ash: Fascia instead of the one by ten.

Matthew Stevenson: And then the sills [off mic] wrap around [off mic].

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Right. And the same flat. So, we'll go through the list just before I maybe I should just consolidate the list of comments. And then if someone wants to add a friendly amendment to that to say, I'd like to see that in detail, you can do so. Is that the easiest way to do this? Yes. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: You have the materials and color samples tonight you're going to show us?

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Oh, great. Thank you for that reminder.

Kevin Ash: Here Vana. [laughter]

Tim Clites: And just to confirm, [off mic] just to confirm, while we're looking at this, [off mic] while we're looking at the shingles, is this an architectural grade shingle? Yeah. So that's the color but not the exact pattern of it.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Yes. Yeah. The front side and garage doors are all stained. Yeah. It's more brown, so it's a warmer brown. This gets a little darker.

Amy Rogers: Mr. Ash, if I may, I believe you said it was Ficus was what you put on there, which isn't the bottom one. I think that's what you put on your application. Yep, Ficus. Yep.

Kevin Ash: It's a little lighter.

Margaret Littleton: Is the roof? Is the asphalt all one color, or is it gray and then dark gray and light gray?

Kevin Ash: I mean, there is some very faint differences to.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Kevin Ash: Of get the impression that it's [off mic] Different [off mic].

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Maybe we should give this to Virginia. Yeah. It's going to. Yeah. You'll have more of an over. Oh, that's the front. Yeah. And then you have this piece here that's on the side porch. Yeah. Yeah. More of an overhang. You need more time to do that one. That one's easier.

Matthew Stevenson: I understand.

Kevin Ash: This is the side [off mic].

Tim Clites: So. [off mic] You can ask one more question.

Margaret Littleton: Would you ever consider putting shutters? It looks so plain from Federal Street.

Kevin Ash: I think we'd run.

Margaret Littleton: It's more traditional.

Kevin Ash: I don't mind on the front. I think we would get into some trouble with the triple window on the side.

Margaret Littleton: That's fine.

Kevin Ash: So.

Margaret Littleton: Side or the.

Kevin Ash: The front is the Federal side.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. Yeah. The Federal side.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah. But that's not the front door.

Kevin Ash: It is the front door.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm so confused because the finish this looks.

Tim Clites: That's it. Yeah. That's what we've been saying. That it appears like it's the front but it's actually facing the side yard.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

Tim Clites: Because where the parking is or they will get out.

Margaret Littleton: A lot more traditional.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, I love shutters. But again, just on the front, not on the sides. Yeah. Black.

Tim Clites: Shutters. Did you say black and [off mic] he said black. Shutters.

Kevin Ash: He said yes.

Tim Clites: And louvered or paneled.

Kevin Ash: Paneled.

Tim Clites: Paneled?

Kevin Ash: I think so.

Tim Clites: I don't know. I'm asking, I don't.

Margaret Littleton: Oh, they're both traditional. I don't care.

Kevin Ash: I think panel is more.

Margaret Littleton: Fine. And you wouldn't think a real dark green.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Against that tan. I think that like a. Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Dark green rather than black. We kind of.

Kevin Ash: With the copper and the tan. I think it would look nice.

Margaret Littleton: Thank you.

Kevin Ash: Because the apartment building on the other side already has black shutters. So, this could offset it nicely.

Tim Clites: Right. Yeah. As opposed to black and black. It'd be nice to make it different.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, I agree.

Margaret Littleton: I think it'll make that whole side look a lot better. And a bush [inaudible] at a bush.

Kevin Ash: There'll be a lot of landscaping. Don't worry.

Tim Clites: If everybody looks at the elevation that's on our screen now, this will help anybody that's listening remotely or in the audience. We're talking about the elevation that's on the screen. There are three windows, and they would have pairs of shutters on each of them that would be paneled, and they would be a dark green. Any questions to that?

Virginia Jenkins: All right. We've gone through dark green and dark green. What color dark green?

Tim Clites: Well, let's just again, I'm going to then I guess I will get the privilege to pull together a motion. And we can always ask for that color to come back. I don't think that's or you can designate someone on the committee to approve it, whichever you prefer. We've done that in the past as well. If it's a small item.

Kevin Ash: I designate Margaret to approve it. [off mic]

Tim Clites: Yeah. Usually, the one adds. Yeah, exactly. Let's not go there. We'll keep it business. All right. Any other comments from anyone? All right. Well, I move that we approve COA 26-20 as presented with the following clarifications. I would like to see the little bracket detail for the overhang. The three-foot overhang that faces Federal. And with the goal that it stay as simple as it's rendered. But with an extension up the wall and out the overhang to show that it is actually a completed bracket and that the side porch which has columns can stay, the columns can stay simple with no base necking or capital detail, but that above it should be a continuous soffit or beam as it were, the same width as the columns. And I would say about the same depth as the columns. [multiple speakers] So whatever, if it's six by six, let's just keep that proportion. That'll be really simple. And I think it will help that feel traditional to lift the roof a couple of inches. But and then the windows will have three sides casing, and the bottom will have a, what I'm going to call a traditional sill as an applied sill below the, the thin sill that the window comes with. The casing of the garage door would be the same width as the casing around the windows with no chamfer or flare. That we add the shutters on the elevation that faces Federal Street. The three windows that are there each get a pair of shutters that are paneled in a dark green, and that color will come back before the committee. The siding in the gable ends will be painted the same color as the stucco. The rakes and fascia's for the entire structure will be the same dimension, either 8in or 6in, and they'll be consistent in both locations. And the garage door will be as

presented in the large picture with the large circle, which is square glass at the top, and the windows are simulated divided light with a spacer bar 7/8 of an inch. End of motion. Any friendly amendments or additional comments from the Committee? Did I cover it all?

Kevin Ash: You did? Yes.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: Thank you for the second. All those in favor?

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Virginia Jenkins: Aye.

Linda Wright: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Aye.

Margaret Littleton: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain?

Bill Anderson: Opposed.

Tim Clites: Thank you. All right. The Thank you, thank you. The next item.

Margaret Littleton: Yeah. We have a fence.

Tim Clites: Give me a second. The next item on our action item is COA 26-22 Request of Kevin Ash for a fence at 115 West Washington Street. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Commissioner Clites, Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. This is a request for a five-foot-tall cedar screen fence at the back side of 115 West Federal. Sorry, West Washington. This is actually the same face as the house we were just looking at. I know that's kind of confusing. The applicant is proposing this fence as part of the application for the new restaurant and apartment complex that is going in there. This is a picture of what it looks like. Sorry, I had to do an aerial or Google because it's under construction, but currently there was a post and rail fence along the property line. This five-foot screened fence is proposed to be going in about that same location. And the guidelines do have some guidelines about the privacy fences that they're generally appropriate for front or side lawns and or other, but not for other highly visible areas may be appropriate to screen delivery, storage or utility areas. I'd be happy to answer any questions. The applicant is here.

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

Kevin Ash: No. We are requesting a waiver to have parking closer than five feet to the property line. And part of one of those conditions is to have a fence. So, I think this I didn't want to go six feet. I could go lower if the board feels lower is better. But it can't be below three feet. I think.

Amy Rogers: I believe it's 30in.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. But by zoning. And so, I do think that this will help screen parking in the back. It will screen deliveries. It will help prevent lights from shining from this parking area down to the lower parking area, albeit it's been used as a parking space for many years. But it is along that same split rail fence.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Kevin Ash: So, this screens the parking lot of part of the bank parking lot in the back of the post office parking.

Tim Clites: Great. Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. I'm going to be the one that reads the part out of the guidelines. Privacy board fences generally are not appropriate for front or side lawns or other highly visible areas. They may be appropriate where necessary to provide screening for delivery, storage or utility areas otherwise visible from a public right of way. Where permitted solid board fences over four feet in height should be landscaped to soften their appearance. That kind of leaves it open a little bit both ways. But as you're driving Federal Street and to have this tall of a fence there is going to block it's, all right. In my opinion. It makes it look like a cattle run, you know, in townhouses, how their fences are one up to the next, up to the next, up to the next. This is going to even though it's a different board, they don't use this type usually in townhouses. It has that effect to it. They're [inaudible]. I believe it should either be lower or not at all to use some. I don't know what the exception. I'm don't quite.

Kevin Ash: I have to have a solid.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. You have to have something solid. So, it's a shame because whoever lives in that house is going to have to look at that fence that's going to be their view.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. And I have no.

Cindy Pearson: But I get your issue.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, I [multiple speakers] issue of doing a three-foot fence to keep it lower. Yeah, it's anywhere between 3 and 5ft. So, three feet would be fine.

Cindy Pearson: And we have had, we did have months ago, maybe it might have been almost a year ago now, down on Marshall Street, where you could look through to that fence down there. And there are some other types of fences you could use that you could basically not have such a cattle run chute kind of issue.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay. The fence is going all the way to Federal.

Kevin Ash: Pretty close, I think, to the easement line, which is about ten feet from actual Federal Street.

Virginia Jenkins: And which part do you need the privacy all the way down for parking?

Kevin Ash: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: Would it help if it was different heights for you? You know, like, let's say, four feet closer to the Fun Shop building. Just to clarify. And then as it gets down towards that house, maybe three feet. Would that make it?

Kevin Ash: I think if you pick three feet.

Virginia Jenkins: It wouldn't look like a run.

Margaret Littleton: Right.

Virginia Jenkins: Like I'm just throwing that out there.

Kevin Ash: I think it this is just a sample, but I think that the grade there does slope. So, if we kept it at three feet, you're going to have breaks as it goes down towards Federal because there's about. Yeah, because of the sloping. So, you're going to get you're going to get the stepping effect if you picked one height.

Virginia Jenkins: I got you.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Amy Rogers: If I could make a clarification. The ordinance doesn't say it has to be a solid fence in the zoning ordinance. It just says it has to be semi opaque. So, it could be an open fence with bushes underneath it, a hedge something.

Kevin Ash: We do have plantings on the inside. But this has to be on the property line. So, it could be a picket fence from a zoning standpoint.

Amy Rogers: Again, it doesn't say that it's got to be a solid fence. It doesn't say you have to have a fence at all. It could be just a hedge.

Kevin Ash: So oh, I thought we.

Will Moore: And that's within the landscape strip that you may get a reduction to go to three feet on. It's a separate process, but it can be anywhere within that strip. It doesn't have to be right on the property line. So, there's no requirement to have a fence.

Kevin Ash: I thought it had to be a fence in order to be within five feet of the property line.

Amy Rogers: There are several options of what you can have. Again, it could be a fence, it could be a wall, it could be a hedge. It could be several different things to be in there.

Tim Clites: This is a zoning requirement, and it needs to be a screen of some sort of one of or a combination of those options. So, it could also be fence planting fence, it could be some variety of.

Will Moore: And not less than 30in in height. So, five feet is not a requirement either. Under 30in.

Tim Clites: Thank you both for clarifying that, that helps.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, that does help. Thank you. So, I mean if we could keep it down to 30 and then stop at the end of the parking. And so that would then be a hedge. So, I guess in my mind, what I'm thinking is like that real commercial area where mail trucks and everything are coming in and out, and then the parking of the bank right back there, and then we transition to a hedge from that point, because then that's the entrance. We don't have any real parking. Could you pull up the plan? So, where the merger starts, there's a triangle closest to Federal. Amy, is there a way that you can help? Yeah. So, from that point there moving forward if there's no more parking and transition to a hedge, which to your point is going to be right outside of the house. So, you're looking at a landscape hedge right outside of the house, but any lights that those parking spaces might shine upon other people in the parking lot would be concealed short of a big, tall truck or something. But yeah, I think that would be really appropriate.

Tim Clites: Thank you. We got a few other people for comments, so let's get through the rest of them and then we'll see where we are. Linda.

Linda Wright: I think that's all a great idea and I would love to see with the fence, rather than doing more of a stockade kind of thing more, it could be a Board-on-Board kind of picket with just a little detail or something to it that kind of goes from residential to commercial, rather than just being a stockade and then go to a hedge of some kind, I think would be a nice solution for everybody.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think when you're standing behind the post office, that five feet will look like it's ten feet.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: It will look huge.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: So, I think if it could be lowered would be great. And I think going to something soft at the entrance would be good because that's a 90-degree turn for a truck.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: If you have something solid, that fence is going to last about a week.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. No, I definitely like the softer hedge from that point back. Yeah.

Punkin Lee: And is the smooth side facing the post office parking lot?

Kevin Ash: The framing side is on the parking side.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Kevin Ash: Yep.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: Yes. I'm glad it will come down. That was definitely going to be my observation that it would be so high because I've stood there and it will be way up. I think you need a quality fence because of your quality project. And this is not at all to me. And I think I don't understand your three feet, five feet parking thing. Does it come to this fence? It's somewhere else?

Kevin Ash: No, it's three feet. It's three feet away from the fence. But there has to be some screening because I'm closer to the property line.

Margaret Littleton: Right. Well, will you have any room to put plants?

Kevin Ash: On the inside, yes.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. Well, you don't own the other side?

Kevin Ash: Correct.

Margaret Littleton: Right. Okay. And a board and batten kind of fence might be, I think, a straight rather than a whoop de whoop kind of.

Kevin Ash: So, board and batten meaning alternating.

Margaret Littleton: Board and batten is, as boards and then you have a strip.

Kevin Ash: Oh, like a board and batten, like on a farm building.

Margaret Littleton: I'm trying to be traditional. Or just some kind of interesting fence. And what a member on this panel has a very interesting fence that I could take you to and show you, being Virginia. It's beautiful and it has a little copper top on the post.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Which it just really yours. I love yours.

Virginia Jenkins: Mine's like this [off mic]

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Margaret Littleton: Okay. Well, whatever it is, it's very good looking.

Kevin Ash: And a flat top with a trim like a cap rail and then post.

Tim Clites: At the top of the boards, does it have a cap to the top of the boards or they're just open?

Virginia Jenkins: It's just open between it's in panels and each panel that's where they have the little, [off mic]

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Virginia Jenkins: The little couple.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. Bill. Margaret, are you not done? [multiple speakers]

Bill Anderson: Where are the bushes we talked to you about would be if they started on Federal Street in lieu? Is it in lieu of the fence?

Kevin Ash: Yes. Correct.

Bill Anderson: How far were they? Were you talking about it going?

Kevin Ash: Going past the side entrance of 114 Federal Street. So, where the triangle.

Bill Anderson: So only halfway in front of the house?

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: Okay. And from that point on, we're talking about a fence.

Kevin Ash: About a three-foot fence.

Bill Anderson: Okay. I think Margaret had some very good ideas and comments about what this particular fence looks like. I think a creative a design that shows more creativity in the fence design, a solid fence height, depending upon what we decide here, should really be looked at. For instance, even if. Well, you also should consider that it's not just a cedar fence, but maybe a stained cedar fence, maybe a darker gray or some. Not a gray, but some type of stain. There needs to be some, I think, more creativity with regards to this fence to be able to present that, I would suggest that a simple elevation along that, that property line be drawn, showing the fence design or a fence design, or multiple options to a fence design that shows a little more creativity. It seems like the and I'm just, this is more of a question now. It seems like that the fence, the purpose of this fence is going to be to protect the property from headlights coming in. Is that what you were talking about?

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Bill Anderson: So, it's protecting. Okay.

Tim Clites: It's the other way around. I think this property sits higher than the parking. So, as they pull out, it's your headlights shining over the neighbors.

Kevin Ash: Correct.

Tim Clites: Is why you're thinking.

Bill Anderson: You mean over the parking lot next door?

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay. Now there's some. Whether it's a fence or planting, there's a required screen.

Bill Anderson: Fair enough. So, three feet could work very well. Fine, fine.

Tim Clites: And also, there's parking like right adjacent to it. So, in thinking about courteous to your neighbor as opposed to looking at the car. Yes, it's a parking lot beside, but this defines your property, right? And in a big way for the back street. Because as you're coming from the east towards the west, it's the first thing you see. Yeah, yeah.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Because the neighbors asked about keeping our stuff on our property and that split rail fence is falling down. And so, kind of being neighborly as well.

Tim Clites: And then otherwise you'll have people taking the short cut right across. [multiple speakers] Yeah. Yes please.

All of the Committee: There are several trees along there. Are they yours or Morency's?

Kevin Ash: The bigger ones are on their property. So, our property, [multiple speakers] the trees. Yeah, we.

Margaret Littleton: The one on the end is great for shade.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. And that one's far enough away the power company is trimming those from the power line. So yeah, they're kind of carving them up a little bit.

Margaret Littleton: That will be tricky. [laughter] Yeah. And I definitely think it should be stained whatever you're doing.

Kevin Ash: Yeah. Okay. Well thank you for the feedback.

Tim Clites: I have nothing to add. I like the idea of a stained fence. I like the idea that it might be some combination of fence and planting. And I like obviously, who doesn't like an interesting fence? And that may include a variety of height as you get further back based on the use. I do think it's worth. If you agree, I think it's worth taking a pass and bringing us something back as opposed to us just verbalizing it.

Kevin Ash: Sure.

Tim Clites: Is that all right?

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, we'll defer this until next month, if that's okay. All those. I don't even think we have to vote. Do we have to vote, Mr. Moore?

Will Moore: Yes, please make a motion to table.

Tim Clites: All right. I'll make a motion to table with the permission of the applicant.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of the Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Thank you. All right. Stay standing please. Next action item COA 26-23 request of Kevin Ash for three projecting signs and two wall signs at 115 West Washington Street. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites Members of the Committee, you have the report in front of you. The applicant is requesting three projecting signs on a single hanger that will be on the west corner of 115. Each sign is 4.08ft², and they all have varying colors of Black and White, a Turkish coffee and Alabaster and a Brown and Gold Leaf. There will also be two wall signs. One will be above the doorway of the restaurant building at 115, and the second one will be on the sill beam. I'm not sure the right term.

Kevin Ash: The header.

Amy Rogers: The header. Thank you. Above the door on the 117 West Washington Street. The applicant is here to answer any questions about your signs. They did provide you with a 53-inch bracket and a 43-inch bracket for the hanging sign. Kind of giving you a choice of which one you preferred.

Tim Clites: Thank you for the clarification on the bracket. I will admit I missed that there were two different lengths there. So, thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any comments. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I think the signs are very attractive.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: The wall signs have no lighting on them.

Kevin Ash: There's lighting in the soffit. So, there's like an eyeball light in the soffit. So, there's no light fixture other than what's in the soffit.

Punkin Lee: I was just asking. And then the light fixture for the three that are going to hang, what is that going to look like? I mean we have a.

Kevin Ash: Yeah, that's with Quail Run. It's two down lights one on each side.

Punkin Lee: They're normal.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Punkin Lee: Okay. Thank you.

Kevin Ash: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Punkin. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I love them.

Kevin Ash: Wait, wait, wait. Can you speak into that? [laughter].

Margaret Littleton: I do. I'm an artist. But I want you to pronounce them for me.

Cindy Pearson: Yes please.

Kevin Ash: It's.

Margaret Littleton: Will the lighting, the bulbs be soft?

Kevin Ash: Yes. It's a warm light.

Margaret Littleton: No bright.

Kevin Ash: No.

Margaret Littleton: No bright.

Kevin Ash: No. My wife won't allow it.

Margaret Littleton: Like the hanger. So please tell me the name.

Kevin Ash: La Caccia, that is the hunt in Italian.

Margaret Littleton: Okay.

Kevin Ash: La Enoteca.

Margaret Littleton: Enoteca.

Kevin Ash: La Enoteca. So, an enoteca in Spain is like a wine bar or cafe kind of grab and go pre-made foods. So, it's an Italian wine bar.

Margaret Littleton: Tapas.

Kevin Ash: That's Spanish.

Margaret Littleton: That's right.

Kevin Ash: Italian. So yeah.

Margaret Littleton: It's great. Okay.

Bill Anderson: Italian, Spanish.

Margaret Littleton: And I also love your windows. They look very, very pretty.

Kevin Ash: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you Bill.

Margaret Littleton: Something positive.

Bill Anderson: I also find the signs very attractive.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And so just to confirm if we can go to page seven. I think that's where we're looking at the sign with a what size is that bracket? Let's just clarify the bracket question, because I think that seems to be the one pending question.

Kevin Ash: If I may, I personally like the larger one. So, where it's larger than the sign. So, the sign is, you know, subservient to the bracket. When you reduce it, it actually becomes the same size as the sign.

Tim Clites: But is there a rendering showing it each way or the rendering we're looking at is the larger bracket.

Kevin Ash: It's the larger.

Tim Clites: It's the 53-inch bracket on a 42-inch sign.

Kevin Ash: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Understood. Yeah, I would agree with that. Any further comments. Seeing no further comments, I move we approve COA 26-23 as presented. Second, all those in favor.

Virginia Jenkins: [multiple speakers] Aye.

Punkin Lee: With the larger bracket.

Tim Clites: Using the larger bracket. Sorry. All those in favor?

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Aye.

Virginia Jenkins: Aye.

Bill Anderson: Aye.

Linda Wright: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed any abstain?

Margaret Littleton: Aye.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Thank you.

Kevin Ash: Great. Thanks very much. Appreciate it.

Tim Clites: All right. On to our next item. COA 26-24 request of Philip Miller for a replacement projecting sign at 112 West Washington Street. Thank you, sir, for your patience, Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee, you have the report before you. This is for the Afield building. They have already come in previously to amend from Tri County to Afield previously. And now that they are going to take this tri county sign and replace it with an Afield sign of the same size on the same bracket on the building. It is a green with a bronze-colored lettering. And the applicant of course is here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Anything to add? Name for the record, please.

Philip Miller: Philip Miller. Eight Orange Drive. As predicted by this committee, there's a bit of confusion about the signage, so we wanted to go ahead and clean that up. And so that's why we're here. We wanted to have consistent signage across both so that when people look up the store online or try to find us, it's just easier, simpler. And I think that this sign would be a big improvement aesthetically too.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think it looks really nice. Makes sense.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I like it very much.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I also like it very much and I assume it's not assume you did say it's the same size. Excuse me, Same size as the existing sign.

Philip Miller: That's correct.

Bill Anderson: Because the images show it as a.

Tim Clites: Much bigger sign. [laughter]

Bill Anderson: Yeah.

Philip Miller: I will admit to using some AI help to make this happen very quickly. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: It's not as smart as I thought it was.

Philip Miller: Therefore, it's slightly inaccurate, but it's the same bracket, same size.

Bill Anderson: Okay. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: No comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: Who me?

Tim Clites: Yes, you.

Virginia Jenkins: I don't have any. Well, just wondering what is the color green. Is it on here? The shade green.

Philip Miller: So, the shade as it's shown in the three images, is actually matching to the building, which is. Hold, please. Roycroft Bottle Green is the color of the building.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

Philip Miller: But just since I know Virginia, you've seen our bags. But that's just our color scheme.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Philip Miller: We would be open to matching this color of our bag as well, if that's amenable or agreeable to the committee. But as I put it up here, I felt like the greater contrast was easier to read. Matching the green of the building, the dark green.

Virginia Jenkins: I like the green of your bags.

Tim Clites: There's already disagreement. I'm going to move on to Linda.

Linda Wright: I think it's great and I'm glad it matches the rest of the trim on the building.

Virginia Jenkins: Thank you. Yes. [laughter]

Tim Clites: Thank you. Any further comments from anyone?

Margaret Littleton: I like the bag green.

Tim Clites: So, it sounds to me like after the meeting, there'll be some shoppers coming your way. They like the bag green.

Philip Miller: I have plenty of bags.

Tim Clites: Just to try to keep the peace. Thank you. Anybody want to make a motion?

Punkin Lee: Okay, I make a motion we approve COA 26-24, S26-15. Request of Philip Miller for a replacement projecting sign at 112 West Washington Street, Afield.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of the Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain. Thank you. Thanks again for your patience tonight.

Philip Miller: Thank you very much.

Tim Clites: All right. Next COA 26-21 exterior renovations, accessibility and lighting at 105 North J Street, the Asbury Church Project. Miss Rogers.

Amy Rogers: Chairman Clites, Members of the Committee. The committee had a pre-application meeting on this project in April with the town's consultant, Glavé & Holmes. The project consists of exterior renovations and repairs to the stucco, siding, windows, trim, doors, and paint. And they'll also be doing some accessibility ADA compliance issues. The committee was well received the project in April and has had many comments about the doors and the door locks on the front. They did update those details for you all. And Glavé & Holmes is remote to present the project for you tonight.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Well, thank them for their patience as well if they've been sitting here listening.

Nickolas Coile: Yes. Hello. Nickolas Coile, Senior Associate with Glavé & Holmes Architecture and Project Manager. So, I'm going to share my screen. So as mentioned we came before the committee to present back in April. The majority of all these items have remained the same. So, I will be flipping through these and just settling on the drawings that have changed. A

minor item, I think a couple of exterior lights have been added, two, due to the foot candles needed based on further calculations. Exterior repairs have remained the same. And as mentioned the door hardware had been discussed during the past meeting and so we have updated that reconsidered a different keypad that will no longer go on the door will actually go on the side panel that will be attached with very minimally with screws and will be attached in a sensitive manner in the middle of the panel on the cross bar, not actually in the panel portion. The in lieu of the keypad being on the door as was presented before, there will be a traditional deadbolt that will have the inner workings to work with the keypad, but it will look no different than what will be on the basement door, which was presented last time and has not changed, but there will be continuity between those two deadbolts and then just going back. Apologies. Then the only other item that will be seen will be the knob because the actual rim lock mechanism, the box of it will be on the interior. So, all that will be seen will be these two brass elements, one being the knob right here, the other being the deadbolt right here. And then this will be on the side white to match the general white of the trim. Any questions about that item? Those updates. And I will flip through the remainder. But for the most part there were no other changes. Everything else has remained the same and seemed to have been well received by the Committee before. So, when window repairs have not changed, the reinstating of more historically appropriate siding on the upper gable portion has not changed. And of course, the extensive window repair has not changed. The colors have not changed. And those I believe Rhonda has those for you all to view in person now. Those swatches to them. And that concludes the changes, updates or additional information provided tonight. Any questions?

Tim Clites: Thank you Nicholas. Appreciate that.

Nickolas Coile: You're welcome.

Tim Clites: I'll jump in with just two quick questions and then I'll ask the committee if they have any. The first is the and I apologize if we spoke about this the last time. The finish is listed as polished brass and then in the cut sheet it appears to be highlighted as lifetime polished brass. Is that polished unlacquered or polished lacquered?

Nickolas Coile: I think that's polished lacquered. I believe. Let's go back there. We can also look further into that and let you know about that nuance.

Tim Clites: It's not a big detail except, you know, on a historic building, it does seem like it would have historically not been lacquered. If that's available, I think it would patina and look better. So that was my first question and my second question as much as I love what you're doing with the door and think it's completely appropriate I wonder about any issues of accessibility with a knob.

Nickolas Coile: So yes, that was actually considered, I think the idea is that we believe that the ADA accessibility was being taken as far as we thought it could be taken while still maintaining the historic accuracy of and also, it should be noted that once the keypad is inputted, that it basically allows this person allows the door to disengage and you can actually roll into the door and it will open at that point. So, I'm sorry, I was trying to gather my words. I knew we talked about this internally, but it's been like a little bit of time. So, trying to gather that.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that. All right. We'll start with Linda. Any comments or questions?

Linda Wright: No other comments on this. This has been a wonderful [off mic].

Tim Clites: Say that again.

Linda Wright: I'm sorry. Yeah. No other comments. I think what you're doing is terrific and the whole thing is going to look so much nicer when it's done.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm in total agreement with Linda.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any comments on that, but I do need to say that the town is the applicant and I'm a member of the Town Council. However, I will not benefit financially from the project and thus I'm eligible to vote on this item.

Tim Clites: And so, you are eligible to vote. That's what you're smiling about. I'm not eligible to vote unless the three of you decide to disagree. And I got to break a tie here. I'd never get to vote. Bill.

Bill Anderson: I think it was a great presentation. Again, as we mentioned before, and I like everything they did here, it seems very appropriate.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Margaret.

Margaret Littleton: I think it's all good. And I agree with you. Non lacquer knob.

Nickolas Coile: Yes.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia or. I'm sorry. We did. Yeah. Forget it. I'm tired. It's okay.

Punkin Lee: I think the whole project is everybody says it's going to be quite amazing. And thank you for getting the keyboard off the door. And I also go with the unlacquered look. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Nickolas Coile: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you all for all the efforts. Miss Rogers, Mr. Moore, do we need to have a motion? Yeah, that's part of. All right. So, I'll go ahead and move that we approve COA 26-21 as presented with the clarification that the hardware be unlacquered brass if that is available.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor.

Linda Wright: [multiple speakers] Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? I want to make sure the two at the end here voted. All those in favor.

All of the Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Aye. Thank you. Motion passes. All right. Thank you, Glavé & Holmes, for signing in tonight with us. Appreciate it.

Nickolas Coile: Thank you so much.

Rhonda North: Thank you. Thank you, Nick. Thank you, Kevin.

Tim Clites: All right, folks, we're almost done. We're down to just the fun stuff. I know appointed official training is a discussion item. Rhonda. [laughter]

Rhonda North: I mean, if it's getting too late, we can we can delay this to the next meeting if you are getting too tired.

Tim Clites: Well, let's since everything that is left is not dependent on anybody in the gallery should we go ahead and jump to our policy for electronic participation and adopt that? Do we need to do that this month either adopt or not adopt?

Rhonda North: Yeah. It would be helpful to go ahead and take care of that this month.

Tim Clites: It would be helpful for continuity. Right.

Rhonda North: So, as you know, you all have had in the past a policy that allows members to participate in meetings electronically if you're on vacation, sick, you know, caring for someone who is ill. The town, the state code requires that that policy be adopted annually. And the purpose of that is so that we can check and see if there are any state code changes and make sure that it's always up to date. There were actually no state code changes to this this year. So, you would simply be re adopting the policy that you've had in place for the past year. If you want to continue to participate electronically in meetings.

Tim Clites: Thank you. I'll just leave the floor open for a minute for any questions. Okay. I'll move that we approve the policy as previously approved and continue it for another year.

Virginia Jenkins: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All of the Committee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Thank you. Appreciate it. That will be very important should any of us need it. So, thank you all. Rhonda, I don't want to make a comment on behalf of FOIA. How long might we anticipate this taking? Would you rather go to another evening?

Rhonda North: So yeah. It's going to be at least 30 plus minutes. Because there have been some changes that I need to go over. So, if you all would like to, you know, recognizing you had a huge agenda tonight and of course Steve is absent. And it would be helpful to have him present since he's not had this training. If you all would like to delay it to October.

Tim Clites: I think that's the right thing to do. Does the committee agree? Yes. [multiple speakers] Yeah. All right. Thank you, thank you, Rhonda. Sure. All right. Last item here I think it's just a general awareness. Is that right? The 2026 Joint Architectural Review Board Awards are Thursday evening, September the 24th, starting at 4:30 the door is open. I think the event starts at five. It's at the Coach House complex at Morven Park, and I believe everyone on the committee should have or will be receiving an official invitation. I think that comes via email, but I'm not sure. Mr. Moore, what did I miss there?

Will Moore: I will be picking up hard copies of the invitations sometime, maybe tomorrow, maybe Monday. No, no. Not Monday. Definitely not Monday.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Will Moore: But I'll be picking up hard copy for those of you who are hyper local here, I'll get those to you, but I may scan and email them as well.

Tim Clites: But thank you. All right. If you have an issue with the meeting quorum on October 1st, please let the staff know. Thank you all. We're adjourned.