



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

Monday, 21 November 2011
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dieter Meyer, Chair; Jim Sisley, Vice-Chair; Ned Kiley, Teresa Minchew; Tracy Coffing; Paul Reimers;

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

STAFF: Annie McDonald, Preservation Planner; Michael Watkins, Senior Planner; Barbara Notar, Deputy Town Attorney

Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. Meyer called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

Adoption of Meeting Agenda

The applicant for TLHP 2011-0080 has requested that this item be deferred. Mr. Sisley moved to adopt the agenda as amended; Ms. Coffing seconded the motion and it passed unanimously 6-0-1 (Koochagian absent)

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Coffing moved to approve the minutes of the 17 October 2011 and the 7 November 2011 meetings. Mr. Sisley seconded the motion and it passed unanimously 6-0-1 (Koochagian absent)

BAR Member Disclosure

Mr. Sisley stated that he had an ongoing relationship with the applicants for TLHP 2011-0046, but it should not impair his ability to act fairly in that matter.

Mr. Reimers said he would be recusing himself from TLHP 2011-0063 since he is the applicant.

Ms. Minchew stated she will be recusing herself from TLHP 2011-0051 and TLHP 2011-0079 because of her husband's firm's relationship with the applicant.

Ms. Coffing is working with PR Construction on her house project, but that does not affect her ability to consider the application for TLHP-2011-0063 fairly and impartially.

Mr. Meyer said he will recuse himself from case TLHP 2011-0063 because he has an open contract with Mr. Remiers on an unrelated project.

Mr. Sisley said he needs to recuse himself on TLHP 2011-0048, 209 Church Street SE, because of his association with the applicants on this project.

Petitioners

None

Consent Agenda

- a. **TLHP 2011-0046, 201 Harrison Street, SE continued from September 19, 2011 public hearing, Gene Weissman, Architecture, Inc, applicant.** This requests construction of an addition on the south elevation of the freight depot, expansion of the deck on the north elevation, and construction of a freestanding shelter. Annie McDonald said staff recommended approval as amended on the condition of product illustration and cut sheets for the bay windows.
- c. **TLHP 2011-0060, continued from October 17, 2011 public hearing, 216 Wirt Street, NW, Matthew Penney, property owner/applicant.** Staff recommended approval on the conditions that the windows would be replaced by May 30, 2013.
- e. **TLHP 2011-0073, 101 Old English Court, Brian Jonkers, The Jonkers Company, applicant.** Staff recommended approval as submitted.

Chairman Meyer asked if there were any members of the public that would like to see any of these cases removed from the consent agenda.

Mr. Sisley moved to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Minchew and passed unanimously 6-0-1 (Koochagian absent)

Discussion Agenda

- b. **TLHP 2011-0048, continued from October 17, 2011, 209 Church Street, SE, demolition of the circa 1940 two story dwelling at 209 Church Street, SE. Chip Gruver, Gruver-Cooley Corporation, applicant.** Annie McDonald presented the material previously reviewed and noted that this was the 75th day so this must be voted on this evening. If there is not an agreement to a further deferral, or a vote is not taken, then the project is deemed approved. The Board conducted a site visit in September, 2011 because of the prior request of the rehabilitation of the building. The last time this was discussed, it was mentioned that demolition of the building might be appropriate because of the condition of the foundation and the overall structural condition and that rehabilitation might be unreasonable. The new construction project is a larger structure, with a porch, side gabled roof, two stories tall with a third story tucked inside a gable peak. The applicant will screen the parking area with a picket fence. Fences in the front yard of commercial properties cannot exceed 42 inches in height. This height will not screen the parking. Ms. McDonald's concern is that the screening is not sufficient to respond to the guidelines that call for full screening of parking. This is awaiting a modification or waiver of the screening requirement by the Land Development Official, Susan Berry Hill. The Board cannot take action on a project that is subject to an LDO waiver or modification. Therefore, her recommendation in the staff report is to allow demolition on the condition that the Land Development Official first approves a modification or waiver of the zoning ordinance requirements for buffers and screens of the parking lot. The LDO has to approve any plans before the board can take action on it.

The owners of the property stated that Mr. Gruver was not present this evening, but they would like to call the question. If the Board wants to put conditions on the application that is fine, but they do want to call the question.

Mr. Meyer asked if they had any questions about the staff report. They responded they do not want to incur additional costs until they know the Board's position on the matter. Benjamin Leigh, attorney representing the applicant and owner, said they suggested some clarification in the language submitted this afternoon. For the record the language they suggested as appropriate.

This Board has jurisdiction over certain things, and then the Land Development Official and the site plan review people have review. Do we have an overlap? The way the question is framed for tonight is we will approve the demolition if the LDO approves a modification or a waiver. The language then says that they are not deciding anything tonight. He suggested that "may" be changed to "shall" and add the expanded parking area "shall" be considered appropriate for purposes of BAR approval. This body cannot invade the approval power of the LDO or the site plan process. You are not approving a site plan tonight. You are agreeing to make a decision in the future. This is a burden on the applicant.

Chairman Meyer asked the Deputy Town Attorney if she had formed an opinion on this change? Barbara Notar said Mr. Leigh had a point. You can approve the demolition if you like tonight because you have seen the post demolition plans, but the way the motion is written should be rewritten so that the applicant does not have to come back before the BAR for screening. According to Zoning Ordinance Section 12.8.5, the "BAR must approve the non-vegetative architectural screen if any such modification shall be issued by the LDO before an application may be considered by the BAR on the subject property. The modification shall be in writing and shall set forth the reasons for granting the modification." If you are comfortable that you know this is going to be a parking lot and that those other things can be worked out in the future, you can approve the demolition tonight. But, according to the Zoning Ordinance, they will have to come back one more time to talk about the screening.

Chairman Meyer said it was his understanding that there was consensus amongst the Board to approve as written. So is this getting the wording correct? Mr. Leigh said the issue was if anyone wanted to propose a new building six months from now in the area of the parking spaces, there is no question that they would have to come in and receive approval from this Board. There is no question that if they want to make changes to the buffer yard, they have to receive approval from the Board. The question is whether it is appropriate to link the demolition with this approval.

Mr. Leigh said the question is how many approvals do you have to have. Right now they have two, the waiver, then the landscape buffer. Ms. Notar said they will also need the demolition approval.

Teresa Minchew said she was unclear whether the applicant was in agreement with the suggestion that the parking may be appropriate if it is located where the four rear parking spaces are. The response was that they were in agreement. Why are we not getting the LDO ruling on this first? Annie McDonald said the applicant did not want to incur the expense of the engineering drawings necessary and application fees to get the LDO waiver without knowing if the BAR was amenable to the demolition.

Ned Kiley said it was clear the BAR has no issue with the demolition, but the alternative language is asking us to approve something the Board hasn't seen yet. He has a problem with that. If we vote on the motion to change the wording, we are voting on something that we haven't seen. Mr. Leigh asked if it would clarify for everyone if the applicant removed from consideration anything regarding the buffering and agree that that would be the subject of your full approval and full review of the subsequent consideration? Mr. Kiley said he had no problem with that. Mr. Leigh said then the question should be a yes or no on the demolition. Mr. Kiley said they still needed language regarding the post demolition plans, even if they are general, that the demolition is approved subject to the approval of post demolition plans. You can say "subject to the post demolition plans that are approved by the BAR. In the landowners side of the BAR there is a great deal of angst over the circular nature of post demolition points. Everything you improve is already subject to approval.

Paul Reimers said he would be satisfied if the building were taken down and the land seeded for grass until they submit another plan. The post demolition plan is to have a field there.

Mr. Meyer said there was some objection to that being the only thing.

Teresa Minchew had concerns about removing any reference to post demolition plans in here because they have worked long and hard to stay on steady ground. She has no problem rewording it so long as it is clear. She does not want someone to come in the future and treat this as a vacant lot. When you remove a house and replace it with nothing, it creates a gap. It should approve in concept what Annie has proposed. She suggested they change "may be considered" to "will be considered" appropriate with staff's language there, and add "subject to final approval by staff". Annie McDonald said she could agree to that. Ms. Minchew said it should further state that it is clear that it's just not any four parking spaces, but four as demonstrated on the plans tonight.

Mr. Meyer asked if there were any further comments from the applicant. The applicant suggested that they would be willing to let the BAR proceed with the other cases and keep this one open for consideration later in the evening.

- d. **TLHP 2011-0063, 124 Harrison Street, NE, PR Construction, applicant, demolition of the one story, two bay wide garage.** Mr. Meyer recused himself from this case and handed the meeting over to Jim Sisley.

Annie McDonald gave a brief presentation of the site. Upon demolition of the garage, the concrete pad will be removed. This will facilitate two lots that face North Street in between 124 Harrison NE and 211 North St. NE. The lots were recently subdivided. The architectural survey dates the building to 1955 and the tax record reflected the same. Staff recommends approval of the demolition as submitted.

Paul Reimers said the area where the existing basketball court is, will be paved with pavers, not just concrete or pavement.

Marsha Thompson, owner of 122 Harrison Street, said she was opposed to this application for the following reasons. Destruction of the garage will destroy some of the architectural fabric of Leesburg. The resulting creation of the alley serving three homes will negatively impact the neighborhood, and finally, Board member Reimers has no good reason for restoring this building. She currently lives in the historic district because she feels it offers protection to property owners of inappropriate change and provides beautiful and interesting architecture. They are dismayed that this application proposes to destroy the structure on the neighboring property. This was a good example of post WWII architecture that preceded the cookie cutter homes and mini mansions. This is part of the architectural fabric of Leesburg. In her opinion Board Member Reimers wants to denigrate the environment of Harrison Street for the improvement of his own North Street property. The alley will foster a collection of trash cans, barbeque grills and other rear yard and parking area paraphernalia. This Board has a responsibility to prevent developers from altering the architecture on historic land. There is no compelling reason to approve this application since Mr. Reimers has 100 feet of access to his property on North Street. This should be denied because of the negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood and there is no good reason to destroy the building for an alley.

Elizabeth Waldrop, 210 Andover Court, questioned the integrity of the remaining house once the garage is demolished. Also whoever lives in the old Muse property will have only a parking pad which will be 9' x 18'. There is no parking on North or Harrison and he doesn't have room to park his cars. That would bring him to Andover Court which is already over-parked. She also pointed out that there was a storage shed on the property behind the garage that is not shown on the plat and she wonders how it got there.

Robert Thompson, 122 Harrison, has two concerns. Harrison Street is very heavily trafficked. While the speed limit is 25, it is very dangerous. Assuming two vehicles per house, that puts six vehicles that will be pulling onto Harrison Street. Secondly, this garage was built in 1955. Is the BAR really concerned with maintaining historic properties that date back to early families in Leesburg and were built in the WWI and WWII days? Wouldn't these buildings also contribute to the stories about Leesburg's earlier days? We need to preserve now what will tell the history of Leesburg in the future.

Paul Reimers said the shed on the property is not his. It belongs to the resident of 124 Harrison Street. When we went to the subdivision process with the Town, the issues were vetted and the alley was created because of sight distance problems on North Street. We plan to landscape the alley and use pavers to avoid the look of a vast piece of concrete. This will be a very attractive alley.

Ned Kiley said there are some things the BAR can take into account under the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance, and there are things they cannot. With respect to this application and the comments presented, some of these comments cannot be taken into account under our jurisdictions. If the property owner presents an application that fits within the Guidelines and Zoning Ordinance, we have an obligation to approve it, even though there might be elements that we don't like.

Teresa Minchew asked about the storage shed. Do the owners need to come to the Board for permission to place that shed? Annie McDonald said provided it is a permanent structure, yes. Ms. Minchew asked if there was some mechanism to find out what the overall plan is for that property. It seems they are altering the property and we should be looking at the overall plan. Ms. McDonald said if there is a structure that requires BAR approval, it needs to be followed up on by our zoning staff. Ms. Minchew asked staff to address the subject of alleys in Leesburg. Ms. McDonald said alleys are not uncommon in Leesburg. There are several alleys and shared driveways. She pointed out new streets that contain alleys. Ms. Minchew asked if there was any support in the current guidelines to address the issue of mid century buildings? Ms. McDonald said no, she did not see that anywhere in the existing guidelines.

Mr. Sisley referred to the introduction of the Historic District Guidelines. The Preservation Ordinance protects the architectural and historic integrity of the designated historic properties and it does not prevent new construction within historic areas. He thanked the people who spoke to this.

Tracy Coffing asked staff if a new parking space at 124 Harrison was indicated on her paperwork. Is this something that was reviewed and approved as part of the subdivision process. Will the BAR see plans on how the property was altered? Ms. McDonald said she failed to include this. She added that 9' x 18' is the DCSM standard for parking spaces in Leesburg.

Motion

Based on the findings that the garage is documented in the 1998 architectural survey as a non-historic resource dating to 1965, and the BAR has interpreted non-historic to mean that it is not considered to contribute to the historic architectural character or integrity of the Old and Historic District, and the applicant proposes demolition of the garage and its replacement with an elongated asphalt driveway that reaches from Harrison Street to the east property boundary with a parking area that is roughly 18' square located to the southeast of the dwelling, and the demolition of the garage is appropriate because it does not have a negative impact on historic resources, and the extension of the driveway is not considered to have an impact on surrounding resources because it will be done in the same materials as currently in place and is of limited area that is of a distance from the public right of way, and the guidelines for driveways, walkways and parking areas state that new parking areas should be located beside or behind the main

building, Ms. Minchew moved to approve TLHP 2011-0063 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ned Kiley. The motion passed 4-0-1-2 (Reimers and Meyer recused, Koochagian absent).

Chairman Meyer went back to TLHP-2011-0048 and asked the applicant if they had any additional information. The applicant said they discussed this and asked if they could submit a post demolition plan, which would be leveling the area, reseeding it and keeping it clutter free.

Ben Leigh, counsel for the applicant, addressed the Board and said the applicant wants to work with the language so that the Board can act on this tonight. One, which they referred to as the Reimers plan, be conditioned on the post development plan language that the area surrounding the demolished site is seeded and grassed and kept in a clean condition. That is not optimal in terms of some concerns of the members. This is the easiest to draft the language for. The other plan dubbed the Minchew plan, would not be as favorable to the applicant but would say that they move to approve the demolition of the dwelling on the condition that 1) the Preservation Planner approves the post demolition plans for the areas of demolition and 2) such consideration shall exclude any requirements related to site plan approval or modifications thereof. The reason this language is being inserted is if you muddy the water, where having this board dictate to the land development official approvals it puts Annie in a position where she doesn't have the authority to assert this.

Mr. Reimers stated that he considered the house to be a hazard and it is just getting worse and stands by his original opinion to demolish the house.

Mr. Kiley asked Ms. McDonald to comment on the alternatives. She commented that the Board does have precedent for approving demolition of a free standing structure as well as an addition. She presented recent applications. After reviewing the applicant's two proposals, she made a determination on each of them. She asked the opinion of the Deputy Town Attorney who said the Minchew plan was not advisable. Ms. Notar added provided the preservation planner approve the full set of plans (this is very open ended). The applicant added "such consideration shall exclude requirements related to site plan or modifications thereto". Again, Ms. Notar said the Reimers plan would be the way to go.

Ms. Minchew said she would go with the first option where they approve the demolition based on established reasons on why it is appropriate and approve a post demolition plan that is basically a well kept, vacant grassed in area. She asked if creating the language here tonight was sufficient? Ms. McDonald said the language was appropriate and fair if the Board decides that is the best course of action.

Chairman Meyer asked if there were any members of the public that wished to address the Board. Seeing none, he continued with the input from the Board.

Ms. Coffing suggested a change in the language for the Reimers option that included the following: "seeded grass, and kept and clean, maintained condition." Keeping it maintained is as important as keeping it clean.

Mr. Meyer concurred and agreed with the Reimers Plan. One of the factors is the condition of the existing property. This does need to be taken care of sooner than later because of the condition of the building.

Mr. Leigh read the proposed motion into the record as follows:

"I move to approve the demolition of the dwelling in case TLHP 2011-0048 on the condition that the area surrounding the demolished site is seeded and grassed and kept in a clean and maintained condition"

Ms. Coffing said the statement "the area surrounding" should say "the area of or including and surrounding the demolition site".

Motion

Mr. Kiley moved with respect to case TLHP 2011-0048 that, based on the finding that the circa 1941 dwelling is documented as a historic and contributing resource in the Old and Historic District and has maintained some architectural integrity, and the building has been documented in a structural engineering report dated 19 September 2011 to be in an advanced state of deterioration, that has affected the structural stability of the foundation and framing members, and the BAR has determined that the deteriorated physical condition of the building overrides its historic contributing status in the Old and Historic District and the applicant desires to remove the dwelling and expand a previously approved parking lot for an adjacent new construction project with a parking screen of 42" in height and the BAR is not in a position to take action on the expanded parking area or buffer/screen without prior approval by the Land Development Official of a waiver or modification of zoning ordinance required buffers and screens. I therefore move to approve the demolition of the dwelling in the cited case on the condition that the area of or including and surrounding the demolished site is seeded, grassed and kept in a clean and maintained condition. The motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Sisley recuse, Koochagian absent).

- f. **TLHP 2011-0076, 209B Wirt Street, SW, replacement of the metal porch railings, Fabian Saeidi, property owner/applicant.** Ms. McDonald said that she has not heard from the applicant and stated that she feels it is appropriate to not hear the case, to not hold a public hearing, but to defer it due to lack of applicant representation. The Board agreed.

Ms. Minchew moved to defer TLHP 2011-0076 due to the absence of the applicant to our next regularly scheduled business meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Coffing. The motion carried 6-0-1 (Koochagian absent)

- g. **TLHP-2011-0077, 15 Liberty Street SW, installation of a vinyl lattice porch railing, Fabian Saeidi, property owner/applicant.** Mr. Sisley moved to defer TLHP 2011-0077 due to the absence of the applicant to the next regularly scheduled business meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Coffing. The motion carried 6-0-1 (Koochagian absent)

- h. **TLHP 2011-0051, 1-3 Cardinal Park Drive, Leesburg Toyota, amendments to previously approved auto showroom, Miguel Yelos San Martin, YSM Design, applicant.** Ms. Minchew recused herself from these cases and left the meeting for the evening. Annie McDonald explained the changes that follow the lines of the corporate standard. The prior design did not include the corporate standard features. They have executed the same elements in alternate materials. The new design features more metal panels and includes a glass panel that can be illuminated. This new design should be evaluated on its own merit rather than compare it with the previous plan. The BAR has already approved the demolition of the one existing building. She recommends denial of the amendments since the materials do not comply, but cautioned that the Council had approved more non traditional materials for the Star Pontiac conversion. The applicant does have the right to appeal the BAR's decision to Council.

Christine Gleckner of Walsh Collucci, representing Leesburg Toyota came forward and introduced the architect for the projects, Miguel Yelos San Martin. Mr. San Martin said they are required to build by corporate standard, which differs from what the Town guidelines say. He pointed out the changes proposed. Ms. McDonald said the Board did not have the opportunity on September 19th to respond to the applicant's original desire.

Mr. Kiley asked about the day and night illumination. Mr. San Martin said this will be lit most of the night.

Mr. Reimers asked if anything like this had been approved in town? Ms. McDonald said that the approval of Commerce Bank in 2006 included translucent panels over the entrance. This decision was conditioned on not lighting the panels.

Mr. Sisley asked what the corporate standard for new dealership design was? Mr. San Martin said the corporate standard is different for each brand, for example the entry portal, to modulate the face of the building for distinction. Mr. Sisley asked if the translucent panel was considered part of the corporate standard? The response was yes.

There were no members of the public to speak on this case.

Discussion

Mr. Reimers said with the exception of the lighted portal, he had no problems, but he felt that did not conform with the guidelines.

Ms. Coffing agreed with staff's assessment stating the illumination is a character defining feature that does not comply with the guidelines, and the reflective quality of the metal panels do not comply. If the illumination can be eliminated and a different material (perhaps a matte finish) for the metal used, it would help.

Mr. Sisley asked if there was a lighting plan that was submitted with the application. Ms. McDonald replied no, but the building sits far enough back from the property line so there would not be an issue with the candle power.

Mr. Meyer said in looking at the elevation, there is a lot of illumination coming out of the building. He asked what part of the design guideline was being cited. Ms. McDonald read as follows: "*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*". Mr. Meyer said he understands that this is being used as a wall material and therefore should be avoided.

The Board members noted that they agreed with the staff report and will recommend denial.

Motion:

Based on the findings that the building is a non-historic structure with no foundation in the building traditions of Leesburg, and is thus a candidate for demolition, and the applicant proposes to amend the design approved by the BAR on 19 September 2011 by incorporating an illuminated translucent glass entrance portal and composite metal panels on all four elevations of the building, and the H-2 corridor design guidelines state on page 21 "*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*" Mr. Kiley moved to deny the amendments in TLHP 2011-0051 because they do not meet the standards set forth in the H-2 Corridor Design Guidelines. Seconded by Ms. Coffing. Carried 4-1-2 (Koochagian and Minchew absent, Meyer nay).

Mr. Sisley said there was work done about two years ago with recommendations made to make amendments to the H-2 Guidelines and the H-2 program in general. To date he is not aware of any action taken on that. We have two cases that have come before us where apparently we are running in conflict with certain applicants. He would like to have the BAR issue a request that the recommendations made by that panel be reviewed and action taken.

- I. **TLHP 2011-0079, 1-3 Cardinal Park Drive, Leesburg Toyota, conversion of current Toyota showroom and service building to service only building with construction of an addition on the north elevation, Miguel Yelos San Martin, YSM Design, applicant.** Ms. McDonald gave a visual presentation and explained since this will be a service only area now, it requires an addition. It is her opinion that this addition will have such little impact on the H-2 corridor that staff recommends approval on this. Conditions include any signage will be considered separately for final review and approval by the Preservation Planner and issuance of sign permits by zoning staff and its recommendation is for additional window openings be installed on the east and north elevations to further break up the solid metal panels. The paint color is in compliance with the H-2 guidelines.

Christine Gleckner handed out some elevation drawings. Mr. San Martin described the use and design of the building.

Mr. Kiley said it appears that this latest iteration satisfies the recommendation. Ms. McDonald said if the Board finds that additional window openings are necessary, the plans need to be amended. If they find the proposed design sufficient, then you would have to eliminate that from the staff recommendation.

Mr. Reimers is in agreement with the application.

Mr. Sisley asked if all of the building was in the H-2. The answer was yes.

Mr. Meyer said there were no members of the public to comment and there was no further discussion.

Based on the facts that the building is a non-historic structure with no foundation of the building traditions of Leesburg and the building addition has been found to meet the H-2 corridor design guidelines, and the building addition materials and paint color will match with what is currently used on the existing building, and the overall design of the site is not inappropriate, or results in no change to the property's impact on the H-2 corridor, Mr. Sisley recommends approval of TLHP 2011-0079 as submitted on the conditions that any signage will be submitted separately for final review and approval by the Preservation Planner with issuance of the sign permits by zoning staff. The horizontal 3.5 foot knee wall and the vertical window surrounds shall be painted a color similar to brick to provide contrast and visual appeal and the applicant shall submit final drawings to the Preservation Planner depicting said changes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kiley. The motion carried 5-0-2 (Koochagian and Minchew absent)

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

Ms. McDonald explained that much of this pertained to paint color, some signs, replacement of gutter and downspouts, and a fence and patio.

Again, Mr. Sisley asked what sort of request could be made of Council, but he feels they will continue to run up against H-2 corridor issues where they are following design guidelines, and where, because of the de novo review standard, they are being appealed to Council to have Council modify the decision. He feels there were clear recommendations made that would help solve some of the issues with the H-2 corridor with problems they are addressing. If this continues, it is incumbent upon Council to take action to resolve these problems. He is requesting a memo be sent requesting a review of the recommendations made by the H-2 Corridor Committee in an attempt to have Council address those.

Chairman Meyer said he thought this was part of the 2012 work plan and funding for the rewrite is necessary. Ms. McDonald recommended that rather than sending a memo to Council, that Mr. Sisley and Mr. Meyer arrange a meeting with the Planning Director. A reason that work was postponed in the past,

was because we were waiting for the outcome of the Form Based Code. Mr. Sisley said that staff, as short handed as it might be, will need to take time to review these which brings an even larger staff constraint.

Mr. Sisley said the H-2 Corridor and the Guidelines associated with it are outdated and need to be addressed. Updating would not only stop appeals, but would give the staff the tools they need, and tell the public that these are the appropriate design guidelines and should be followed.

Mr. Meyer said the Committee had a good starting point, but now needs to be looked at holistically. Mr. Reimers said that it is not a bad thing to ask for corporate design modification.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:22pm
NEXT REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING
Wednesday, 18 January 2012, at 7:00pm
25 West Market Street
Leesburg, VA 20176

Dieter Meyer, Chair

Linda DeFranco, Acting BAR Clerk