



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

Monday, 20 June 2011
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dieter Meyer, Chair (arrived 7:24); Jim Sisley, Vice-Chair; Richard Koochagian, Parliamentarian; Tracy Coffing; Paul Reimers; Edward Kiley; Mary Harper, Planning Commission Representative

MEMBERS ABSENT: Teresa Minchew, Marty Martinez, Town Council Representative

STAFF: Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner; Barbara Notar, Deputy Town Attorney; Linda DeFranco, Recording Secretary

Call to Order and Roll Call

Jim Sisley, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

BAR Member Disclosure

Tracy Coffing recused herself from TLHP 2011-0030 since she and her husband are the applicants. However she will be staying for the staff presentation and the questions. Paul Reimers also recused himself from TLHP-2011-0030, since he is the contractor of record for the project.

There was some discussion on a quorum for the hearing on TLHP 2011-0030 since two members had recused themselves and Chairman Dieter Meyer was running late. It was suggested that the agenda be revised to reverse the order of the public hearings.

Motion

Edward Kiley moved to adjust the agenda as suggested. Richard Koochagian seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0-2 (Minchew and Meyer absent)

Public Hearing Agenda

TLHP 2011-0034, 326 East Market Street (H-1 Overlay District), Applicant: Roberto Rivera, Penny Design Group, architect, Project: Addition and alterations to the existing Star Buick GMC auto dealership.

Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner, gave the presentation on this application pointing out that an expansion of this dealership had been before the Board on two prior occasions, the first was a two story expansion and the second was a modification of the original design that was limited to a one story addition and rehabilitation of the facade. When the market downturn in 2008, the project were put on hold. Ms. McDonald provided a slide presentation and showed the location of the addition and described the overall redesign of the façade. All of the materials below the aluminum panels will be brick or concrete masonry units that will be painted. All of the masonry is consistent with the existing building materials and then painted so that the new and old masonry blend, since the existing colors are a variety of browns. The ACM panels on the fascia and around the portal entrance. She explained that most of the design is consistent with the H-2 Corridor Design Guidelines, which can be interpreted in a variety of ways, which is why there is such a wide variety of building forms, styles, expressions in the H-2 Corridor.

This is expressed by the Suzuki dealership and the Chevy Chase Bank. By a strict interpretation of the guidelines, for siting and relationship to roadway, massing and roof form, and some aspects of façade elements, seemed to be consistent with the design guidelines. The areas of the project that don't appear to comply with the design guidelines are design expression, which recommends against the use of trademark designs. She said that easily identifiable franchise design might not be compliant with the design guidelines, but that the BAR has previously approved trademark designs, examples of which include Commerce (now TD) Bank and McDonalds. In both of those cases, the BAR found that the corporate-standard design as proposed met the standards of the design guidelines. The guidelines specifically state that, where corporate-standard design does not comply with the guidelines or does not reflect traditional design in Leesburg, those aspects of the project should be modified to bring it into compliance with the design guidelines. She explained that this was the foundation of her recommendation against the use of the ACM panels. In the materials section of the design guidelines, it specifically states that anonymous materials such as artificial veneer materials like metal panels are not consistent with traditional design in Leesburg. Because the ACM panels do not comply with this design guideline, they also then do not comply with the guidelines for design expression. She said it was for that reason that her recommendation was to approve the project on the condition that the applicant replace the metal panels with a material more consistent with traditional design in Leesburg and that the revised material will be submitted to the BAR for final review and approval at the July 18th business meeting. She clarified that any final signage will need to be submitted to staff for final review and approval. She stated that the architect is present to respond to questions and comments from the BAR.

Jon Penney of Penny Design Group came forward and explained that the addition and design was submitted to comply with the company's requirement for the number of bays, etc., and that this is exactly what GM wants them to submit. He said that there may be some flexibility in the metal panels, but that they would have to present it to GM. He said that there is greater flexibility in the fascia than in the entry portal. The entry portal is a requirement from a branding standpoint. He said that the distance of the building from the street is one of the reasons they'd like to keep the entrance portal. He also stated that they've raised the parapet height.

Mr. Sisley called for questions from the board.

Mr. Reimers asked if there were to be an alternative to the metal panels, what would be suggested or proposed? Mr. Rivera responded that it would be synthetic stucco of the same color.

Ned Kiley asked Ms. McDonald to show the metal panels that were of concern. She said that the existing condition is a metal panel in the fascia that is consistent with any auto-oriented building in the H-2 Corridor from the 1980s. She said that buildings like the Midas on the northwest corner of Catoctin and East Market Street, the Toyota and Ford dealerships on East Market Street outside the bypass, even the Hyundai dealership across the street from the subject property all use metal panels. She said that this design is consistent with auto-oriented dealerships of the late twentieth century. She said that the existing conditions include a metal panel on the fascia and what is being proposed is a metal panel on the fascia. She clarified, however, that the guidelines were established after most of these auto dealerships were constructed. She said that there haven't been many dealerships constructed in the corridor since 1990. The Suzuki dealership and Dulles Motorcars on Catoctin Circle, the latter of which is outside the H-2 Corridor, are among the few post-1990 examples.

Mr. Koochagian asked if the HVAC equipment will be covered by the extended parapet? Mr. Penney replied that it will be extended approximately five feet above the fascia and it will cover the satellite dish. He said that it will not cover the rooftop units on the back of the building. He said that the existing units on top of the existing service bays will still be exposed.

Mr. Sisley called for comments from the board.

Ms. Coffing mentioned that the site's proximity to the eastern entrance to the historic district, she is inclined to agree with staff's recommendations.

Mr. Koochagian expressed agreement and added that his one concern is with the expansive area of glass that could be broken up a little more. Mr. Penney said they are already working on revising this condition and that the revised design will show a pattern of vertical elements of brick to break up the amount of windows. Mr. Koochagian inquired of Ms. McDonald and Barbara Notar if the BAR could require screening around the existing HVAC units. Ms. McDonald explained that the BAR's role is to comment on the project as proposed. If those units are not being altered then they are an existing condition.

Mr. Penney explained that there may be some give-and-take with regard to the front branding element and the possible addition of rooftop screening.

Mr. Koochagian expressed interest in the other board member's thoughts on the appropriateness of the contemporary entry portal, particularly because of its proximity to the Old and Historic District. He explained that he is concerned about it and is curious about what others think.

Mr. Kiley said he had no concerns about the arch, and echoed Ms. Coffing's comments on the materials for the panels.

Mr. Reimers said he had no problem with the arch, mainly because the building sits back so far from the road. He said that he doesn't understand how they can have much of a discussion about the branding if we have McDonald's and Chevy Chase Bank, both of which display branding. He said it's hard to understand how Buick GMC as a branding element is more or less objectionable than McDonald's or Chevy Chase Bank or any of the other branded designs the board has seen and approved. He said that he agrees with Ms. Coffing on the metal panels and believes that stucco would be fine.

Mr. Sisley said that his comments are the same as those of Mr. Reimers.

(Mr. Meyer arrived at 7:24) Mr. Meyer agrees with Mr. Reimers. He said he has no concern with the arch. He said that his only concern with switching the metal panel out is that it's been done on a project previously—at the Suzuki dealership—where the metal panel was replaced with brick. He stated that, in his opinion, one has to be really careful when doing that design-wise because it's designed to be a certain material and to simply switch the material may result in something less than what one is looking for—even if the change brings it into technical compliance with the design guidelines. The outcome may be less than desirable, and he thinks that's the case with the Suzuki dealership. He asked for clarification from the board if the idea is to change from the metal panels to stucco, to which Ms. Coffing replied presumably.

Mr. Penney said that he understands that the metal panels are not an approved material, but explained that he doesn't believe that, when viewed from the street, there will be any visual difference between the metal panels and stucco. He argued that a metal panel would look nicer.

Mr. Meyer expressed agreement with Mr. Penney's statement and asked if the design guidelines specifically prohibit metal panels.

Ms. McDonald said that the language in the H-2 Corridor Design Guidelines is never so specific as to prohibit any one thing or another. She cautioned the board that debates about good design or "nicer" versus "not as nice" ventures farther into the realm of subjectivity and it can put the BAR on a precarious course when making defensible decisions. She said that the design guidelines state "Extensive use of reflective or tinted glass, enameled or decorative metal wall panels, or other similar anonymous or non-traditional wall materials should be avoided. Artificial veneer materials such as Styrofoam-based simulated stucco, cast or fiberglass stone or brick, and plastic appear insubstantial and unauthentic, and should be avoided." She said that the history of the board is to permit the use of simulated stucco to a

limited extent, usually on a fascia, cornice, or trim. She said that the greatest use of it in the H-2 Corridor was at Wegmans and at Leesburg Plaza. She said there is also EIFS at Chevy Chase Bank and at several other structures. She said that it is typically approved for use in areas that are not readily apparent to the viewer, particularly from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Penney stated that black EIFS fades very quickly and that metal panels are designed to last much longer. He said that relying on the owner to maintain something is not a good idea.

Mr. Meyer clarified that the intent of his comment was not to say that one was prettier than the other, but that one needs to be cautious not to just substitute one material for the other because the results are not necessarily appropriate. He said that the amount of metal, on the front, appears to be at the entrance portal and on the fascia.

Mr. Penney stated that there is an 8-foot 8-inch band going across the entire front.

Mr. Meyer said that in his view there are enough other examples—he sees it very much as the EIFS is used, such as on McDonald's, such as on a variety of others that it's really an accent material. He said that there is a far greater percentage of brick and glass, and it's set back a long way from East Market Street. He said that he doesn't really have an issue with it.

Mr. Penney stated that one of the earlier discussion points that Mr. Meyer had missed was that they will be incorporating more vertical brick elements on the right side of the building at the auto showroom. He explained that it will provide a sturdier base for the fascia.

Ms. Coffing asked for Mr. Meyer to clarify if he doesn't have a problem with the EIFS or with the metal panels, to which Mr. Meyer replied that he meant the metal panels in the amount that they are being used on this particular project. Ms. Coffing asked how the metal panels are finished—if they will be reflective or matte. Mr. Penney replied that it is a matte finish.

Mr. Meyer clarified that he saw the metal panels as being analogous to the EIFS used as a trim material.

Mr. Penney provided the BAR with a sample of the metal panel.

Mr. Sisley asked if the applicant has a sample of the metal panel in matte, to which Mr. Penney replied that he does not have one with him. He added that the panel submitted this evening is what GM wants, but that he is sure that they can compromise on a matte black panel.

Mr. Koochagian expressed concern about the metal material, considering how close it is to the H-1 District. He stated that the design, in and of itself, is fine.

Ms. Coffing said that she doesn't have a problem with the arch at the entrance, but according to the drawings, the entrance surround is also finished with the metal panels.

Mr. Reimers said that he still prefers the stucco.

Mr. Sisley stated that one of the things he's hearing from the applicant is that the façade is changing and that the aluminum material is highly reflective. He asked if the applicant was willing to return with a more accurate expression of how the façade will look and better samples.

Mr. Penney replied that this is an accurate reflection with the exception of the brick vertical elements to break up the windows. This is the GM corporate standard. He said that a reflective black panel absorbs light and so does not reflect light. He said that if the black metal panel sample unacceptable, then they can try to get GM to approve a matte panel.

Mr. Sisley replied that he has a hard time believing that the sample shown at the meeting will not be reflective, especially given the people who are driving east and west on Market Street. Mr. Penney responded that light does not reflect off of black, to which Mr. Sisley replied that it's reflecting light as being shown to him from the podium.

Mr. Meyer said that he thinks the matte is probably more appropriate. He said that the bulk of the board seems to be leaning toward not wanting to accept metal at all. He asked if the rest of the board would like to see matte as a sample or would they prefer an alternative material like EIFS.

Mr. Sisley said that he would be ok with the nontraditional material if, in fact, they could demonstrate that it didn't have the reflective properties that were demonstrated this evening. He agreed with Mr. Koochagian that additional screening would be good.

Mr. Koochagian asked if they have a sample of the color, to which Mr. Penney responded that it is snow white.

Mr. Kiley asked what GM's response would be to replacing metal with an alternative? Mr. Penney said he would get an answer to that first, and then prepare the revised plans and bring alternate materials samples to the meeting.

Annie McDonald asked the board to clarify exactly what it is they expected. She stated that Mr. Sisley indicated the metal might be appropriate if it were matte, and that Mr. Meyer feels the same way. She asked for the rest of the board members to opine on whether or not the metal panel in a matte finish might be considered appropriate.

Mr. Reimers said he still prefers the stucco, but might be swayed if he sees samples. He added that he'd rather see black stucco that had weathered to battleship grey and the subtleness of that than a super-vibrant line across the front of the building. He said that if he was voting right now, he'd vote for stucco. Mr. Kiley echoed that sentiment. Mr. Meyer stated he was ok with the metal. Mr. Koochagian and Ms. Coffing agreed with Mr. Reimers. Mr. Sisley summarized that they would be looking for two samples—the matte-finish metal and EIFS.

Mr. Kiley moved to defer TLHP 2011-0034 with instructions or advice to the applicant that they come back with a presentation of alternate materials for the metal as opposed to the EIFS and that those materials include a matte finish for the metal as well as materials for the EIFS; that they also come back with descriptive modification for the vertical treatment; and also with whatever might be proposed to shield the HVAC and other rooftop equipment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer and passed 6-0-1 (Minchew absent)

Mr. Meyer took over as Chair of the meeting and reiterated that they had reversed the order of the public hearing items. He asked if the administrative agenda had been completed. Mr. Sisley replied that they had yet to approve meeting minutes but went directly to the public hearing items.

TLHP 2011-0031, 218 Cornwall Street NW (H-1 Overlay District), Applicant: Wanda Salser, property owner, Project: Construction of a one story master suite addition, constructions of a freestanding three car garage.

Annie McDonald presented birds'-eye aerial views of the property and showed exactly where the detached garage and cruciform-plan addition would be. She pointed out the location of the addition with regard to the architecture of the house and explained how the roof form and window location are placed with consideration of the existing building lines. She explained that there is a full hedgerow in front of the addition that will be retained. She explained that the addition is attached to the main building behind the bay window on the west side of the building. She stated that she provided design comments to the architect on roof form, window location and size, and proportions. She summarized the materials, which

would be cement fiberboard siding, a brick foundation, and standing-seam metal roof. She said that the garage accommodates three cars, but only two of the garage bays face Cornwall Street. She added that the third garage bay is tucked behind the two on the front and stepped back. She said that the materials are consistent with those used on the proposed addition. With regard to the massing of the garage, the third bay is configured so that the roofline changes, which means that the structure will not have a massive appearance when viewed from Cornwall Street. She stated that the recommendation is approval as submitted. Even though the footprint of the addition is large, it has complex massing so that it fits with the Queen Anne style and more complex massing of the house.

Mr. Meyer asked if the applicant would like to add anything to the presentation, to which the response was no. He then called for questions from the board.

Mr. Reimers asked if the Hardiplank siding was the Artisan series, to which the applicant replied yes. Tom Gilbride, the architect for the project, explained that the Artisan series is a newly developed material and has a deeper reveal than the standard Hardiplank. Mr. Reimers explained that if it was the flat Hardiplank he'd have a problem with it on the addition.

There being no other questions, Mr. Meyer asked if the board had any comments.

Mr. Reimers said he has no problem with the massing of the addition because it is lower and set back. He said that if it was a two-story addition he'd be a little more concerned about it.

Mr. Sisley opined that it is approvable as submitted.

Mr. Koochagian expressed that the difference in height of the addition's roof ridgeline on either side of the front gable looked awkward and odd. He added that the hipped roofline on the west side doesn't fit well with the house, in part because it doesn't exist anywhere else on the house except for the porch roof. He also stated that the height of the brick foundation wall looks massive and asked if there was screening, to which Mr. Gilbride said that there is an evergreen hedgerow that will screen it.

Ms. Coffing expressed her thought that the addition and garage are well designed and in accordance with the guidelines. She said that the project is appropriate for the existing building and the site.

Mr. Meyer stated that he has no concerns and doesn't see anything that is not in compliance with the guidelines. He stated that he understands Mr. Koochagian's position on the hipped roof and asked the applicant why that form was used. Mr. Gilbride responded that it was playing on the design of the porch roof and that, when designed with a gable, looked more massive. He added that the hipped roof doesn't appear as large. Mr. Meyer asked about the pitch of the 12/12 pitch of the roof, to which Mr. Gilbride explained that it was based on the pitch of the roof on the original building.

Mr. Meyer stated that he had some suggestions about the design. He said that the rake returns are steeper than one would traditionally see. Mr. Gilbride said that they are drawn at a 6/12 or 8/12 pitch and that they can be made more shallow. Mr. Meyer stated that the dormer design for the garage should be modified to be more narrow and that the cornice treatment should incorporate a simple crown. He reiterated they these are just suggestions, but that it wouldn't keep him from approving it.

Mr. Koochagian opined that Mr. Meyer's comments were well founded.

Ms. Coffing asked Mr. Meyer to clarify his comment on the pitch of the soffit return. Mr. Meyer stated that they are typically constructed at a 1/12 pitch—just enough to shed water, but so that they do not show.

Ms. McDonald asked if there are any modifications to the design, is the Board generally OK with the architect working out those details with staff administratively, or do you feel the need to come back. The board agreed that staff approval would be appropriate.

Ms. Coffing moved to approve BAR case TLHP-2011-0031, 218 Cornwall Street NW with the following conditions: that the pitch on the soffit returns at the gable ends will be flattened to minimize their visibility; and that the siding above and on the sides of the dormer windows will be eliminated.

Mr. Meyer added two things, first that a crown rake and return be substituted for the flat rake board that is on there now, and the same thing with the soffit and that when the siding is eliminated beside the window that the width of the dormer be reduced accordingly. Seconded by Mr. Sisley. The motion carried 6-0-1 (Minchew absent)

There was a brief break while Mr. Meyer consulted with the Deputy Town Attorney.

TLHP 2011-0030, 211 Cornwall Street NW (H-1 Overlay District) Applicant: Ronald Rogos and Tracy Coffing, property owners, Project Description: Demolition of an existing mid-20th century addition followed by construction of a new two story addition in the same location; relocation of an existing shed within the property boundaries; construction of a freestanding garage.

Mr. Meyer pointed out that Ms. Coffing and Mr. Reimers had recused themselves from this case.

Ms. McDonald again gave the presentation setting out the house style and bird's-eye views to illustrate the areas where the project will take place. She stated that the building is almost a twin to 215 Cornwall Street, which has a 1960s addition to the side of the house. She added that there was a prior approval from the 1990s for an addition at 211 Cornwall Street that was similar in footprint to the addition at 215 Cornwall Street. She showed the existing one-story, mid-twentieth-century addition at the subject property. She stated that an existing window on the brick ell had previously been a door and is proposed to be converted back into a double-leaf door that is similar to the double-leaf door to the north that opens onto the porch. She explained that the existing garden shed is proposed to be retained, with only in-kind replacements as necessary for repairs. The shed, which faces interior to the yard instead of Cornwall Street, will be relocated to a position at the back of the property behind the hedgerow but will retain its association with the yard. Once the existing one-story addition is demolished, the applicant will build a two-story addition that is similar in proportions to the main block of the building. The addition will be sided with the Artisan series cement fiberboard. The addition is shorter than the main block, but with the same roof pitch and a lower eave line. The west elevation of the addition has been set back from the west elevation of the ell. She said that there is a small one-story enclosure and inset porch on the south elevation of the addition. The garage is a one-story, one-car garage clad in board-and-batten siding. It has a slightly more complex mass because there is a workshop room on the east side of the garage. She opined that the addition complies with all of the guidelines for new construction and additions, down to the materials used. She said that the cement fiberboard breaks up the visual mass of the addition and that if it were sided in brick there would be issues with brick color and how it ties in to the existing building. She added that the construction of a frame addition on a masonry building is consistent with traditional building practices in Leesburg. She said that the use of board-and-batten siding on the garage unifies it with the other outbuilding, which features board-and-batten siding. She stated the staff recommendation of approval as submitted.

The applicant had nothing to add to the staff presentation.

Mr. Meyer asked for questions from the board. There being no questions, Mr. Meyer then moved to board discussion.

Mr. Kiley opined that it is a wonderful project.

Mr. Sisley agreed and stated it was approvable as submitted.

Mr. Meyer had a suggestion on the eave return that was similar to the other application. He expressed that there could be more detail on this part of the project.

Mr. Sisley moved that based on the facts that the dwelling and shed are historic contributing resources in the Old and Historic District and the shed is proposed to be relocated to another position on the property thus retaining its historic association; and the design the garage complies with the applicable design guidelines for out buildings; and the existing mid-twentieth century addition is not a character defining feature of the house; and the addition complies with the guidelines for location/orientation attachment to the existing building, size and subordination roof line and roof pitch and design including materials, Mr. Sisley recommends approval of TLHP 2011-0030 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Koochagian and carried 4-0-2-1 (Coffing and Reimers recused, Minchew absent).

TLHP 2011-0020, 19 North King Street (H-1 Overlay District), Applicant: Dieter Meyer, W.A. Brown & Associates, architect, for property owner, Project Description: Following approval on 16 May 2011 of the rear addition, replacement of the roof, and construction of an entrance canopy at the side (north elevation) entrance, the BAR deferred action on the addition of three (3) dormers to the east (front) elevation and two (2) dormers to the west (rear) elevation pending a site visit.

Mr. Meyer recused himself from this case handing the chairman duties over to Vice Chairman Sisley at this time.

Annie McDonald gave the presentation, stating that the bird's-eye views had been removed from the presentation but the ground-level photos were retained in case the BAR needed to refer to them. She said that three dormers were proposed to face North King Street, with two on the west side of the main roof, facing interior to the lot. She provided the illustration that was originally proposed as well as the new design that was based more on the size of the openings in the rafters. She said that the size of the opening in the rafters resulted in a window size that is more consistent with the windows at 11 Cornwall Street NW. This size lent itself to a 3/3 window. The design is based on the dormers at the Wahl House, with slight modifications as necessary. She said that the details of the motion at the June 6th work session were not exactly what was expressed during discussion, adding that the back slope of the roof is not visible at all from the public right-of-way. She explained that the applicant would prefer the original dormer design on the back slope. She said that the applicant would prefer the 6/6 window with original design and details on the back slope. She showed the original (preferred) design for the west elevation as well as a design that is the same as the dormers on the front. She opined that both are appropriate, but that, because it doesn't have bearing on the way the building reads from the public right-of-way, the preferred design is appropriate and approvable. She added that, based on the revised size, style, and treatment of the dormers on the east elevation, they are approvable. She explained that, because the way the roof pitches back, a dormer with a 6/6 window on the east elevation will appear too tall. The shorter dormer will appear more in proportion overall with the roof. Staff recommends approval of the balance of this application with the clarifications that dormers on the east elevation will be constructed in accordance with sheet A5.2 and A8.2 which are the elevations and the details, and the dormers on the west elevation be constructed in accordance with sheet A6.4.

Mr. Sisley called for questions from the board. There being no questions, he asked for further presentation from the applicant.

Ms. Lynne Guy, representing the applicant, added that the simpler design of the rear dormers are better suited for the more simple rear elevation of the building.

Mr. Sisley asked if the board had any comments.

Mr. Reimers said that he preferred option 1 over option 2 for the back of the building. He explained that the smaller dormer beside the larger dormer wasn't appropriate. Regarding the east elevation, he suggested that the windows could be casement units instead of double-hung windows. Ms. McDonald expressed concern that, if they were made casement windows, the proportions may not be quite right. Mr. Reimers responded that the design as proposed was approvable, but that if the board wanted to give the applicant flexibility, a casement window might be used.

Mr. Kiley applauded the applicant on the redesign of the east elevation dormers because right now they are perfect. He disagreed with Mr. Reimers on the subject of casement windows, because he thinks they should remain as double-hung units.

Mr. Koochagian agreed that they should stay double hung. He asked if the siding material on the dormers is wood, to which the applicant responded in the affirmative. He stated that the new dormers fit much better.

Ms. Coffing agreed that the new dormers on the east elevation are fine and supported option 1 on the west elevation.

Mr. Sisley also agreed with these comments.

Based on the facts that the early nineteenth century building is a contributing resources in the Old and Historic District; and based on the physical and structural evidence found in the attic, the applicant proposes adding three dormers to the façade of the building and two dormers to the west facing slope of the main block; and the dormers on the west elevation are not clearly visible and will thus have no impact on the character of the building as perceived from the public right of way; and the size and proportions of the dormers on the east elevation are directly related to the size of the openings in the rafters and the design of the dormers is based on historic precedent that the BAR considers to be appropriate for the time and period of the subject property; Mr. Koochagian moved to approve the balance of TLHP-2011-0020 as amended with the following clarifications: 1. The dormers on the east elevation will be constructed in accordance with sheets A5.2 and A8.2. 2. The dormers on the west elevation will be constructed in accordance with Sheet A6.4. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kiley and passed on a 5-0-1-1 vote (Meyer recused, Minchew absent)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Meyer abstained from voting on the minutes of May 16, 2011 and June 6, 2011. Mr. Sisley asked if there was a motion to approve.

Motion

Mr. Kiley moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Coffing seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Meyer abstain, Minchew absent)

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

Explaining that she was responding to a prior request by Mr. Kiley, Ms. McDonald gave the board members a copy of the H-1 District overlay map.

Ms. McDonald provided the board members a copy of the Alleged Zoning Violation Complaint Form to use should they wish to report a violation.

Administrative approvals of Certificates of Appropriateness:

- TLHP-2011-0027** (14 Cornwall Street NE); change in the exterior paint color scheme
- TLHP-2011-0028** (Potomac Station Shopping Center); installation of a new sign
- TLHP-2011-0029** (9 Ayr Street NW); installation of a new gate on the Market St. property line
- TLHP-2011-0032** (3 Wirt Street NW); replacement of the picket fence with a new picket fence.
- TLHP-2011-0033** (165 Fort Evans Road NE); replacement of one wall sign.
- TLHP-2011-0035** (26 South King Street); installation of a new projecting sign.
- TLHP-2011-0036** (301 North King Street); in-kind replacement of the standing-seam metal roof.

There were no other comments.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35pm.

NEXT REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, July 18, 2011

Town Council Chambers

25 West Market Street

Leesburg, VA

Dieter Meyer, Chair

Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner