



LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
SITE VISIT MINUTES

Monday, 06 June 2011
19 North King Street

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

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

STAFF: Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner

Preservation Planner Annie McDonald made brief introductions in the front entrance hall among the Applicant's representatives, including Lynne Guy of W.A. Brown & Associates, and the BAR members in attendance. She explained that the BAR is only on site to look at the evidence relating to the dormers and that anything relating to the addition or the entrance canopy on the north elevation has already been approved. The only remaining issue is the dormers in the third story. With attendance by the voting members, the group moved to the third story to look at the attic.

Once in the attic, Ms. McDonald explained that the site visit is an opportunity to ask questions for clarification, get any details or any information that the board feels it needs to discuss the project further and render a decision. She said that there will not be discussion on site, but that there will be discussion at the work session once everyone returns to Town Hall. She explained that the BAR should direct specific questions to the Applicant's roofer, Karl.

Ms. McDonald pointed out the three locations of the rafter cuts in the east side of the roof framing. She said that these are the areas for which the Applicant provided photographs at the BAR meeting on May 16th, but that the photographs were dark and it was difficult to see exactly what was being presented in the images. She asked the roofer if there was anything besides the cut in the rafters that he had seen that would indicate the presence of dormers. He replied that, in addition to the cuts, there was remaining blocking at the bottom of the cuts that could have supported a sill. He added that just because there aren't cross-ties doesn't mean that the framing wasn't sitting on top of the sheathing. He said that all of the sheathing was probably replaced when the dormers were removed.

Ms. McDonald asked if there is anything in particular that the board members had noticed besides the blocking that they would like to establish for the record while on site. Mr. Koochagian asked that if all of the sheathing had been replaced, why weren't the rafters replaced at the same time. He clarified that the sheathing doesn't tell any story that there are holes where the dormers would be. The roofer explained that the sheathing definitely appears to have been replaced, but that it's difficult to know what, exactly, occurred. He added that the replacement is consistent all the way across the top part of the roof. Ms. McDonald asked if there is a difference in the vintage of the nails. He responded that there are enough hand-forged nails to suggest that the roof was finished with wood shingles at some point in time.

Mr. Sisley asked Ms. McDonald the age of the house, to which she replied that she would not say for certain without looking at the architectural survey files. She explained that the house was built in stages and that she does not know the date of the earliest date of the original phase. Mr. Sisley asked the approximate age of the building, to which she replied it most likely dates to the early nineteenth century and that she's more comfortable giving an era rather than a date that is better based on construction technique, materials, and form—not just the stylistic elements. Mr. Sisley said that the main block of the house is approximately 200 years old and asked, given the frequency with which people do roof repairs,

how many roofs could the building have had on it. Ms. McDonald responded that he is leading more to discussion that is better left for the work session. She added that she's understanding where he was going with the question and that she is prepared to answer.

Ms. Coffing asked if the Applicant's intent in adding the dormers was to turn the attic into useable space, to which the response was yes.

Mr. Koochagian stated that, based on his recollection of the drawings, the proposed new dormers were higher up than the cuts in the rafters. He added that another thing he noticed was the whitewashing in part of the attic and that the whitewashing doesn't show up on the edge of the cuts.

Mr. Sisley observed the difference in saw marks on the sheathing and said that there is a history of salvaging materials in other buildings in Leesburg.

Mr. Reimers said that he worked in the building roughly ten years ago and, upon noticing the cuts in the rafters, said to himself that the building must have had dormers.

Ms. McDonald if there are any other questions, comments, or observations.

Ms. Minchew said that she would like measurements of the height of the cuts in the rafters, following which Ms. Guy measured some of the openings. She asked of the roofer if there was anything else that he'd like to point out, to which he responded no. He added that the historic roofing techniques were so different from current practices that it's difficult to know how they were framed and built. Ms. Minchew asked if this was not something he was experienced in. He replied that they'd have a better idea of what they would have looked like if there was framing left, but that everything could have been on top of the sheathing.

Approximately 5 to 10 minutes of measuring the dimensions of the cuts in the rafters and their height from the floor level followed the discussion. The BAR members and Applicant's representatives adjourned the site visit at 6:55 pm to reconvene in Council Chamber at Town Hall for the work session.

NEXT REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING:

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

Dieter Meyer, Chair

Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner