



***LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES***

Monday, 16 May 2011
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dieter Meyer, Chair; Jim Sisley, Vice-Chair; Richard Koochagian, Parliamentarian; Teresa Minchew; Tracy Coffing; Paul Reimers; Edward Kiley

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mary Harper, Planning Commission Representative; Marty Martinez, Town Council Representative

STAFF: Christopher Murphy, Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner; Barbara Notar, Deputy Town Attorney

Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. Meyer called the meeting to order at 7:00pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes

Edward Kiley moved to approve the minutes of the 7 March 2011 and 18 April 2011 meetings. The motion was seconded by Teresa Minchew. The motion carried 7-0.

BAR Member Disclosure

Dieter Meyer recused himself from Agenda Item 5a, since he is the architect on that project. He will remain in the room to act as a backup spokesperson for the applicant and will leave the room during the BAR discussion period.

Consent Agenda

Jim Sisley moved to approve BAR case TLHP-2011-0023 (223 West Market Street), applicant Michael Bindas, property owner, for a new 10-foot by 18-foot wood deck in the rear yard of the property on the consent calendar. Edward Kiley seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously 7-0.

Public Hearing Agenda

- a. **THLP-2011-0020, 19 North King Street (H-1 Overlay District), Applicant: Dieter Meyer, W. A. Brown & Associates, Project:** Addition of three dormers to the east elevation and two dormers to the west elevation, construction of an entrance canopy on the north facing ell entrance, replacement of the roof, and construction of a two story frame addition on the southwest corner of the ell.

Chairman Meyer turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Jim Sisley since this is the case from which he is recusing himself. Mr. Sisley asked for the staff presentation. Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner, presented photos showing the site and its surroundings. She went on to point out which portions would require extensive construction and indicated asking the applicant for documentation of how the gutted interior would be stabilized. She added that the Historic District Guidelines specifically state that dormers cannot be added to the façade of the primary elevation of the building. The applicant was asked to provide documentation of the presence of dormers on the building. The addition is not at all visible from the front of the building. Ms. McDonald went into more

detail regarding the dormers that are proposed versus dormers that are more in line with what is used in downtown Leesburg.

The applicant, Lynne Guy, came forward and commented that she had one correction to the application. The metal roof that will be on the addition features a soldered flat seam instead of a standing seam due to the low slope. She explained that they agree to work with staff to get the correct dormer design. She added that they have indication from the same time period that buildings of the Federal style may have simpler dormers than were shown in the presentation. She said it depends on what the board deems appropriate, but that, in their professional opinion, the cut rafters present enough evidence to show that there were previously dormers there and that they are thus appropriate now.

Mr. Sisley called for questions from the board.

Mr. Reimers asked if they are planning on running the siding diagonally instead of horizontally, to which Ms. Guy replied in the affirmative. Mr. Reimers asked if there were any windows planned for the south elevation of the addition. Ms. Guy responded that there were now windows planned because of the character of the surrounding property and to respond to the tenant's needs.

Edward Kiley asked if the structural evidence in the attic indicated what size the dormers might have been, to which Ms. Guy responded in the negative.

Richard Koochagian asked if there was any indication that the roof sheathing had been replaced, to which Mr. Meyer replied that the sheathing varies. Some of it is consistently cut while other sections are not consistently cut. He said that different sections of the roof have been replaced at different times. He said that there are nails coming through the sheathing indicating that there were wood shingles on the roof at one time. In response to Mr. Kiley's question, he added that the spacing of the rafters is roughly 24 inches on center, which is consistent with the size of the dormers on the drawings and that they were sized to be proportional to what is below. He said that sometimes the dormers were built with knee walls down and that sometimes they were intended for a less-finished space. Mr. Koochagian asked if any of the cut ends have any nails coming out, explaining that it is difficult to tell from the photographs how much reengineering had been done, if any. Mr. Meyer responded that there are no cuts, but that it depends on how the dormers were built. If they were built on top of the sheathing, then there may well be no evidence. Mr. Koochagian clarified that he meant if there was any additional evidence of framing around the cut rafters. Mr. Meyer said that there is evidence of wood blocking that is left. He said that there didn't appear to be any other good explanation for the holes in the rafters in exactly the place you would expect to find dormers.

Mr. Sisley explained that, seeing no members of the public who wished to comment on the application, he would move straight to comments from the board.

Ms. Coffing agreed with staff's comments regarding the dormers and that it is preferable to have the siding running in a horizontal pattern rather than a diagonal. She said that it would be ideal to incorporate some of the proportions and details that are illustrated, particularly from the dormers at 11 Cornwall Street NE.

Mr. Koochagian asked to get a general read on how the Board is thinking about the dormers. He asked if the board will accept the very minimal evidence that there were dormers. He asked if that is a good enough reason to say that the board would decide contrary to the guidelines. He said that they need to determine what their justification will be.

Ms. Minchew said she was uncomfortable with the amount of evidence the board has to act on in such direct contraction to the recently adopted guidelines. She said that she accepts the idea that it is a logical explanation, but that it's being a logical explanation isn't quite enough evidence.

Mr. Reimers said he had been in the building quite a bit and had actually done some work on it in the past and is inclined to believe there were dormers at one time. He explained that, given the stairway that goes up to the attic and what it looks like, he is led to believe that something more than is there right now. He said that the whole attic is a hodgepodge. He said that he remembers looking at some of the old wood shingles. He asked Ms. McDonald if the dormers on the east elevation were a different issue than the dormers on the west elevation? He said that the guidelines say no new dormers on the façade, so are they severing them. Ms. McDonald explained that the dormers on the west elevation, or back of the building, are less of an issue. She said that the guidelines recommend that the details recommend that the details be consistent with the rest of the building.

Mr. Kiley said he believes that there is enough structural evidence to indicate that there were dormers on it at some point, but that he is concerned about the size of the dormers. He said that, as presented in the application, the size is excessive compared to the scale and the size of the windows on the façade. He said that they appear to be from the drawings as virtually the same size as the windows on the façade. He said that in Leesburg, the dormers on a 2-story building are not the same size as the windows on the façade. He said that he has no problem with the dormers, but that he does have a problem with the size as proposed.

Mr. Sisley said that he has spent a lot of time in the building and that he has every belief that there were dormers there. He said that there was another roof and that he and Mr. Reimers were in the space a lot during the past renovation. He said that there was some form of shingle roof on the building in the past and that he is in support of the dormers.

Mr. Koochagian explained that he would like, if at all possible, is to do a site visit. He said that he would prefer to see what others on the board have had the chance to see. He said that it is important to make a decision. He said that there could be a variety of reasons for the cut rafters. He said that he agrees with Mr. Kiley about the size and scale and that he has added concerns about the use of Hardiplank and that it's not dimensional enough and will be too thin. He added that he'd like to see a sample of the window with the solid glazing and interior bars.

Ms. Minchew agreed with Mr. Koochagian. She said that it's wonderful that some of the board members had the opportunity to see it but that it's important for the board to base their decision on the same evidence. She said that it would be good for an independent third party to explain the evidence of dormers. She said that the next step is to research exactly what the dormers would have looked like. She said that it is an important, significant building in downtown Leesburg, and it's a strong guideline that they are prepared to disregard without doing any real strong attempt to figure out what it would have been. She is encouraging deferral of the dormers on the east side, but that she doesn't have a problem, based on the guidelines, with the dormers on the west elevation. She said she thinks they should match in style and detail. She added that the drawings are not detailed to the extent that the board frequently demands of others. She said she is not comfortable with what is being proposed on the façade in the way it is being presented. She added that she doesn't have a problem with the north elevation canopy in concept, but that more detail needs to be added and she is comfortable with the applicant working it out with staff. She asked Ms. McDonald if she correctly read the staff report in her interpretation that it was not recommended that final approval of the dormers be handled administratively. Ms. McDonald replied in the affirmative. Ms. Minchew stated that the board would be abdicating responsibility if they just punted to staff to figure out the final dormer design. Ms. Minchew asked if the 6-inch exposure is appropriate, to which Ms. McDonald replied that the guidelines recommend between a 4-inch and 6-inch reveal. Ms. Minchew agreed with the horizontal direction of the siding on the dormers and the use of wood for the siding on the dormers.

Mr. Sisley asked Ms. McDonald what type of expert the BAR consult to determine if there were dormers on the façade. Ms. Minchew asked if the applicant could provide someone to give

independent input during a site visit. Ms. McDonald stated that there are professionals whose areas of focus include historic building construction, particularly buildings of the antebellum period. Ms. Minchew added that she didn't mean for it to be at the BAR's expense, but rather that it is up to the applicant to provide the information. Ms. McDonald indicated that if there is a lack of photographic documentation or clear structural support, it might be recommended.

Mr. Sisley asked Ms. McDonald, based on her observation of the conditions in the attic, what convinced her that there were dormers there. Ms. McDonald replied that she is not convinced that there were previously dormers on the building. She said that there has been evidence proposed and that her staff recommendation is based on a presumption by the BAR that sufficient evidence has been provided. She added that the BAR may find that additional evidence is necessary, such as photographic documentation. She said that if there were dormers there that came down in the 1960s, the Thomas Balch Library may have photographs that show the structure with dormers

There was some further discussion regarding the motion to either defer or send along with further conditions.

Mr. Koochagian would like to get a better sense of the addition and the materials proposed. Ms. Minchew said because of the location of this it is not as critical.

Barbara Notar, Town Attorney, commented that in the motion they make no reference to different evidence for the various Board members. They can certainly take the word of the person who might have had more intensive opportunity inside the building. If you want to have a site visit, fine, but don't set precedent that everyone has to also have the same opportunity inside the building.

Motion

Based on the BAR's discussion at the meeting; based on the facts that the early 19th century building is a contributing resource in the Old and Historic District; and the project involves replacing the standing seam metal roof with a new standing seam metal roof with any necessary replacement of trim being done in-kind to match the materials, profiles and dimensions of the existing features; and the Design Guidelines support the construction of a roof over the side entrance of the north elevation of the ell, but clear details of the roof need to be provided; and the design of the two story addition which features a standing-seam metal roof, cement fiberboard siding, wood corner boards and trim and a brick foundation, is compliant with the Design Guidelines and consistent with previous BAR approvals in similar cases; Teresa Minchew made a motion to approve TLHP 2011-0020 with the following modifications and conditions: Details on the side entry porch will be provided to staff for final review and approval; and further evidence will be provided to support the argument that dormers have existed previously on this building to include a site visit and other necessary information; and design of the dormers and all action on the dormers is deferred at this time. Mr. Koochagian seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-1 (Meyer recused).

Administrative Agenda

- a. **JARB update.** Annie McDonald announced that the JARB program was scheduled for Thursday, May 19th. She requested RSVP's be sent in ASAP
- b. **Ordinance Amendments pertaining to the H Overlay Districts.** There are two pending amendments. They will be initiated at the next Town Council meetings. The first is the level of review, if necessary, for decks. There is a desire for either no review or a different level of review, but it is unclear if this is limited to the H-1 district or if it is town wide. The second has to do with the H-2 Corridor District. This would initiate an ordinance amendment to remove the review authority from the BAR and give it to the Planning Commission. Ms. McDonald will send a copy of the staff report and the initiating document to the BAR members.

The question arose on the deck review. Ms. McDonald said that the feeling was that the amount of review for the type of structure was excessive. The initiating ordinance will start the process of drafting new language.

c. Staff Approvals (For Information Only)

- TLHP-2006-0098** (202 Church Street SE) Amendment to previous approval to substitute wood composite Miratec trim for previously approved finger-jointed pine trim.
- TLHP-2011-0008** (219 Royal Street SE) Repaint exterior, with new color scheme to be sage siding with white trim
- TLHP-2011-0009** (9 East Market Street) Replace non-historic metal-and-glass front door with new metal-and-glass door
- TLHP-2011-0010** (1-3 North King Street) New wall and projecting signs for Le Tache
- TLHP-2011-0011** (101 Old English Court) Installation of new wood privacy and picket fences
- TLHP-2011-0012** (411 South King Street) Installation of new wood privacy and picket fences
- TLHP-2011-0014** (404 East Market Street) Installation of five (5) awnings at Douglass Community Center
- TLHP-2011-0016** (3 West Market Street) New projecting sign for Capsalis & Fitzgerald, PLC
- TLHP-2011-0017** (225 West Market Street) Extension of existing fence along east property boundary
- TLHP-2011-0019** (222 South King Street) New wall signs for Transition Triathlon
- TLHP-2011-0021** (429 South King Street) Replace failing raw aluminum triple-track storm windows with new triple-track storm windows with a factory-applied white finish
- TLHP-2011-0022** (211 Loudoun Street SE) Repaint exterior, with new color scheme to be beige siding, burgundy door, and dark green shutters
- TLHP-2011-0024** (6 Wilson Avenue) Installation of new metal fence along East Market Street property frontage
- TLHP-2011-0025** (101 East Market Street) New freestanding projecting sign for Herring & Turner, PC

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 8:00pm

NEXT REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING:

Monday, 20 June 2011 at 7pm
25 West Market Street
Leesburg, Virginia

Dieter Meyer, Chair

Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner