



***LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
WORK SESSION MINUTES***

Monday, 06 June 2011  
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street  
Council Chamber

---

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: Michael Watkins, Senior Planner; Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

Mr. Sisley called the meeting to order at 7:03pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

**BAR Member Disclosure**

Dieter Meyer recused himself from TLHP 2011-0020 since his architectural firm is involved in the proposed project.

**Deferred Cases/Referrals**

- a. **TLHP-2011-0020, 19 North King Street (H-1 Overlay District), Applicant: Dieter Meyer, W.A. Brown & Associates, Architect, Project:** Installation of three (3) dormers on the façade (east elevation) and two (2) dormers on the west elevation of the main block of the building (deferred from 16 May 2011 Business Meeting following approval of other aspects of the application)

Preservation Planner Annie McDonald gave a presentation recapping the previous report given at the May 16 Meeting. She pointed out that there might be some dormer adjustment necessary to meet code. The original submission had two six over six windows, the modification had two four over four windows. She asked for an image to indicate these window patterns. She made reference to the historic building at 15 N. King Street and pointed out some of the similarities, along with those features of other properties in the proximity. Basically, everything has been approved with the exception of the dormers. Ms. McDonald then suggested that the Board review either their notes from the site visit, the presentation material and/or ask the applicant any questions necessary to assist them in their review.

Lynne Guy concluded that there were dormers in the house at one time. They can certainly do some research to determine the size of those. They would like to make that space usable by the tenant.

Ms. Minchew asked if there was any other evidence the applicant could provide to help the Board embrace the fact that there were dormers and what their dimensions might have been?

Ms. Guy said they had nothing and felt they were there prior to photography being readily available.

Mr. Kiley said he did not see any indication of measurement for the dormer structure. Ms. McDonald said dormers in the historic district would be of varying sizes and shapes. Mr. Kiley said he was interested in information on the outside dormer dimensions.

Ms. Minchew felt they should agree on whether there should be dormers and then deal with the size. Mr. Kiley said the dormer size seems to be the same size as the window. In most structures they are mostly smaller. Ms. Guy said their width is standard and the height is actually somewhat smaller. Mr. Kiley still wanted the dimensions including the pediment. Ms. Guy said the dimension is five feet. Mr. Sisley asked which side these dimensions are on.

Ms. Coffing said she is not convinced that there were ever dormers, however the rafter cuts at the intervals visible suggests otherwise. Therefore she would not be opposed to dormers.

Mr. Koochagian agreed that he was not entirely convinced, while there are cuts in the rafters, he saw no other evidence. If they can come to terms with a reasonably designed dormer, he would go to the next step.

Ms. Minchew also agreed that she has not seen sufficient evidence for dormers. She would have liked more information from the roofer. She feels that they are moving forward with some type of dormer.

Mr. Reimers is convinced that there were dormers.

Mr. Sisley also felt there were dormers of some sort.

Mr. Kiley said he is convinced that there was some sort of "through the roof" treatment, whether it was dormers or not is not clear. He is concerned about the size as proposed. He feels it is too large compared to what he has seen in Leesburg's historic district. Lynn Guy asked how much smaller they should be? At this point they asked Ms. McDonald to go through the slides again for some comparables.

Ms. Guy said she had references of windows in Alexandria that show dormer size and design. This is considered a reliable local source for historic structures.

Ms. Minchew asked if the cuts in the rafters wouldn't be a good guide to the maximum size that could be used? Mr. Koochagian said that should be a good start for the sizing. The bottom cell would be 22" to 24" from the floor with the top being at 5'4" to 5'7". The window is at 4'1" and the framing would take up the balance. The size proposed is larger than these measurements.

Mr. Koochagian said there need to be better measurements so that the Board has a good basis for their decision.

Mr. Reimers asked if they are settling the differences between the front and back dormers? Ms. McDonald said since the rear is not visible to the right of way, she is less concerned about the decision on the rear of the building. There are three possible alternatives that were presented. Any of the options would be acceptable in the rear. The front has the potential to alter the historic character of the structure and how it is perceived. If the board allows any of the three choices, the staff could then research the sizing of the front dormers.

Mr. Koochagian said he would like to see the cut section where the existing openings were and that should be the size limitation.

Ms. Minchew has no issue with the back side and said that any of the choices would be acceptable.

Mr. Koochagian agreed that the back side is not visible and therefore any of the choices could work.

Ms. Coffing said she would like to see the height of the dormers be consistent. She has no issue with the rear choices, but feels that the front needs to be carefully considered.

Mr. Kiley agreed that they should follow the pattern of the cube that exists for the front dormers. He has no objections to the rear dormers.

Mr. Sisley said he also did not have any objections to the rear dormers. He commented that in the Design Guidelines there are examples of these and the applicant should take cues from some of these examples. He also said they need to look at the existing size.

Ms. Minchew said she would like to see a more detailed proposal and that it takes the current cut size into consideration.

Mr. Koochagian said he is also concerned about materials. He did not see a change in the hardy plank siding and feels that it should be wood.

Mr. Sisley said the front elevation of this building is important since this is a unique building. He said his comments about the dormer size still stand and he wants a detailed design prior to making any decision.

Mr, Koochagian asked about more detailed documentation. It has been requested.

Ms. Coffing noted that the size of the dormers on the rear side of the building would still have to be determined based on the size of the front dormers, and that has not been done yet.

Mr. Koochagian asked if there was an advantage to approving one side and not the other? He doesn't feel he can approve the rear without the design on the front.

The Board agreed that this was necessary.

**Motion:** Ms. Coffing moved to approve the addition of dormers on east and west elevations with the conditions that the sizes of the dormers on the east elevations and the smallest dormer on the west elevation should be consistent with the size of the apparent original dormers and that the section of the attic is to be provided to show that the new dormers would be designed and constructed so they are consistent with what was previously there and that additional information will be provided to show enhanced details on the dormers specifically the east dormers that reflect dormers in Leesburg for this period and that wood will be used on the dormers on the east elevation.

Mr. Koochagian added that since this building is a contributing resource in the Old and Historic District and based in the physical and structural evidence found in the attic, the applicant proposes adding three dormers to the east façade if the building and two dormers on the west side of the block as an additional condition, the applicant will provide a through the roof section indicating the height of the sill and headcuts in each of the three rafter, the widths of those openings between rafters and photographs that show those existing conditions.

The motion was seconded by Ned Kiley. The motion passed 6-0-1 (Meyer recused)

## **Administrative Agenda**

### **a. Review of the 20 June 2011 Business Meeting agenda**

Annie McDonald reviewed the June 20 meeting agenda which has also added continuation of 19 North King Street. Tracy Coffing applied for a two story addition, relocation of a shed and construction of a free standing garage at 211 Cornwall. At 218 Cornwall BAR recently approved modifications to the existing addition and construction of a mudroom, the applicant or property owner now wishes to add a master suite and construction of a free standing three car garage on that property. 326 East Market Street. Back in 2003 or 2004, Star Pontiac, GMC came forward with a complete branding change, altering the building to a two story structure to be consistent with the

manufacturer's brand. That has since changed due to changes in the industry. They are coming forward with a standard GMC brand. She had not received the plans but it is consistent with other Northern Virginia car dealerships. Then, 19 N. King St., details on the dormer windows.

**b. Zoning Ordinance Enforcement Procedures**

With regard to zoning ordinance enforcement procedures, she had hoped that Wade Burkholder could be in attendance this evening, but he may issue a memo. Due to issues of a recent case and how it came to the attention of the applicant, the town is instituting a policy whereby any Board member who wishes to notice staff of any violation must fill out the zoning ordinance complaint form available on the website. She has placed in on sharepoint and can also email to Board members. Additionally, staff that are not enforcement staff must also file this form to assure consistency in the process and sensitivity and confidentiality of the complainant. As a complainant there is a degree of confidentiality unless it goes to court. If it goes to court, the complainant may have to testify, which does not happen often.

Dieter Meyer, Chair, returned to the meeting and chaired it henceforth.

Mr. Reimers commented that he and Tracy Coffing would have to recuse themselves on June 20 during the hearing for her application. Mr. Reimers went on to comment that Hardy plank has a new, thicker product on the market now which fits in better with older, historic homes.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 8:14pm

**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