LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
WORK SESSION MINUTES

Monday, 06 August 2012
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Richard Koochagian, Chair; Jim Sisley, Vice-Chair; Dieter Meyer, Parliamentarian; Tracy Coffing; Paul Reimers; Teresa Minchew; Edward Kiley
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Mary Harper, Planning Commission Representative; Marty Martinez, Town Council Representative
STAFF:	Kim K. Del Rance, Preservation Planner; Barbara Notar, Deputy Town Attorney; Wade Burkholder, Deputy Zoning Administrator

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

Adoption of Agenda
Mr. Sisley moved to adopt the agenda as presented. seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0.

BAR Member Disclosure
Mr. Reimers recused himself from TLHP 2012-0061 and TLHP 2011-0080 since he is the applicant. Mr. Meyers recused himself from the same applications. Mr. Sisley recused himself from TLHP 2012-0057 since he has a business association with the applicant.

Petitioners
None

5. Recessed case from site visit

TLHP-2012-0057, B-2 (H-2 Overlay District), 521 through 545 E Market St, Applicant: Andrew Neuman, Project: Bellewood Commons cedar shake roof replaced with asphalt shingles
Ms. Minchew requested a recap of this case since she was not present at the prior meeting. Kim Del Rance provided a recap. Andrew Neuman, applicant, came forward and explained the reasons they want to move forward with the asphalt shingles. He asked that the BAR reconsider their thoughts on the asphalt shingles.

Mr. Myer cautioned the BAR that they had approved asphalt shingles on another structure in town and said there are several structures that use them in the H-2. Ms. Coffing said she did not have strong opposition to the asphalt shingles.

Ms. Minchew asked about the timeframe of the replacement. Mr. Neuman said their goal is within a five year period. Ms. Minchew said replacing one roof with very different material will dramatically change the look of the center and would like to get a more realistic timeframe. She did state that she would find it difficult to deny this based on the guidelines and asked that the color be carefully chosen.

Mr. Reimers agreed with the proposed material.

Mr. Kiley said they should be careful to stick with the guidelines. If they want to go against them, they should be changed.

Mr. Koochagian has concern about the look over time, e.g. black will cause too much contrast. The guidelines limit the allowable material to use. He felt that research on why some roofs were approved for asphalt shingles would help on the circumstances surrounding the decision.

Kim Del Rance asked why standing seam metal roofing was not considered since it has a much longer lifespan than the asphalt shingles and is a recommended and appropriate roofing material in Leesburg. Mr. Neuman replied there were issues with trucks knocking off corners of the building now and they had to cut back one corner to prevent continual damage, which would be more expensive to repair if it were metal roofing. Kim Del Rance stated that was a design issue that could be addressed separately with bollards or other methods instead of changing out the roof material on the entire shopping center.

Ms. Minchew asked if they had considered using metal on some roofs and asphalt on the rear building where it has less visibility. Mr. Neuman replied to buildings up front are those with the problems with trucks causing damage.

Mr. Meyer addressed a mimic slate stating that it is a very attractive solution to the material use. Mr. Neuman replied it was expensive.

Mr. Reimers asked if the roof was failing. Mr. Neuman said they were experiencing a leakage problem, along with the danger of having some of the cedar shake shingles be caught by the wind and fly off the roof, creating another type problem.

Based on the findings that asphalt is generally not appropriate in the H-2 corridor district as a roofing material when visible on non-residential forms due to the pedestrian scale of the buildings and massing of the subject roof forms which are more residential in nature, it is not necessarily inappropriate to use asphalt shingles, and based on the fact that the roofs will be changed one entire building at a time beginning with the Starbucks building and continue until complete, with completion no later than five years from approval, Ms. Minchew moved that TLHP 2012-0057 be approved according to the application submitted by Andrew Neuman on June 6, 2012 with the condition that the color of the shingles will be weathered wood, Ms. Coffing seconded, motion and it carried 5-1(Kiley)-1.

6. Recessed cases in H-1 Overlay

a. TLHP -2012-0062, B-1 (H-1 Overlay District), 107 N King St, Applicant: John Voigt, Sign-a-Rama, Project: Wall sign

At issue is the fact that the sign placed on the building is too large in area for what is allowed in the sign ordinance and the H-1 guidelines. The Zoning Administrator has provided information on

signs that were similar and why they were allowed.

John Voight of Sign a Rama came forward and said they have reduces the size of the sign to under six square feet and lowered it. He stated that hanging something underneath the porch is not acceptable to the client since they feel it will be too difficult to see. Kim Del Rance suggested that they place a projecting sign at the corner of the house.

Mr. Reimers asked how the sign would be attached. The response was that it would be screwed Into the wall and once removed would leave some holes in the stucco.

Ms. Minchew said much effort was put into the H-1 guidelines and does not feel that all options were explored in this case.

Ms. Coffing asked if the occupant wanted to place a hanging sign on the porch in addition to the wall sign? The response was no, they want just one sign.

Messrs. Meyer, Sisley and Kiley said they wanted an updated staff report before they come to a decision.

There was some further discussion on the limitations of signage on "residential" style buildings.

Mr. Sisley moved to recess this application to the next meeting, August 20, 2012 for further review. Ms. Minchew seconded, the motion carried 7-0.

b. TLHP -2012-0061, R-HD (H-1 Overlay District), 209 North St, Applicant: Paul Reimers, Project: New construction

The public hearing was opened by Chairman Koochagian. Kim Del Rance stated staff was not prepared, as the new information was not received in time. She stated the project was reviewed; however, the changes still need discussion. Ms. Del Rance updated the Board on the last meeting stating this application is for new construction next to existing construction and there are questions on the elevations given the grading lines were not delineated in the initial drawing. Elevations for the new construction were requested so there would be a record.

Ms. Coffing had questions on materials, window sizes and placement. Mr. Reimers responded that one of the questions was regarding the large window on the second floor. That is an egress window. He went on to explain that the left elevation is almost totally screened by trees and the right elevation lends itself to the movement of the upper windows to line up with the lower windows. Ms. Coffing went on to ask about the size of the basement windows. Mr. Reimers said one of them is another egress window in the basement bedroom. There was a question about the material makeup of the deck columns. It was stated that they were wood. Mr. Reimers summed up the window issues as follows: right elevation master window to be moved toward the front of the house. It was determined that the basement foyer window could remain as planned.

Mr. Koochagian asked about the deck and whether that had been addressed in the guidelines. It was stated that more of a porch look was preferred over a deck type structure. Following further discussion on this, the consensus was they had come to a resolution of the issues.

Since there were no speakers from the public, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Sisley moved to approve TLHP 2012-0061, new construction of 209 North Street, NE with notations regarding moving the master bedroom window toward the street as recommended by the Board and the new drawings with all building heights noted per the applicant's submission, Ms. Coffing seconded, motion carried 5-0-2 (Myer and Reimer recused)

c. TLHP -2011-0080, R-HD (H-1 Overlay District), 207 North St, Applicant: Paul Reimers, Project: corrected elevations
Staff recommends deferral because there is some question about proper notice; further, the applicant has not submitted all required information and has requested a deferral.
Mr. Sisley moved to defer TLHP 2011-0080 until the next meeting, 8/20/12, Ms. Coffing seconded, motion carried 5-0-2 (Myer and Reimers recused).

In H-2 overlay

d. TLHP -2012-0056, B-2 (H-2 Overlay District), 540 E market St, Applicant: Gary Fennell, Project: Roy Rogers exterior alterations, applicant requests to recess until 8/20/12 meeting
The applicant requests that the recess be continued until August 20, 2012 so that they can have their materials in for review.

e. TLHP -2012-0064, B-2 (H-2 Overlay District), 707 E Market St, Applicant: Carolyn Thaemert, AutoZone Project: Exterior alterations. This is a continuation of discussion. Kim Del Rance explained that AutoZone was scheduled to take over the space formerly used by Blockbuster Video, and they plan to make exterior changes that include a color change, glazing color and adding an orange band to compliment their logo on the front of the building. They have agreed to use frosted glass versus blackout glass on the windows. These changes include some variations from the H-2 guidelines.

Carolyn Thaemert, representative for the applicant, came forward and explained how much they had given up of Auto Zone's branding to accommodate the guidelines. She explained the white, red and gray banding that appears on the top of the windows, along with a red roof.

Mr. Myer said the proposal erodes the cohesiveness of the center.

Ms. Coffing agreed saying her comments were the same as last time. She feels that the orange stripe is part of signage and detracts from the look of the center.

Ms. Minchew agreed that this was in direct violation of the guidelines that encourages cohesive designs at shopping center. The only thing she feels that she can support is the frosted glass.

Mr. Reimer said the glass is fine, and asked if the entrance door area could be the red painted area and leave the rest the way it is. He does not support the orange band either.

Mr. Kiley agreed with the comments made by the others.

Mr. Sisley said if they resubmit the comprehensive sign plan and put the band around the entire building, it could provide the conformity. It would be a disconnect to have the orange band only

around the Auto Zone area. Ms. Thaemert said that would be very distracting and is not a part of the other stores' branding. Mr. Meyer agreed stating that the orange band throughout is not really a good solution.

Ms Thaemert then asked if they could draw the red around the entranceway and the windows near it. The question then arose on whether they could agree on restoring the window trim to it's original color. There was further discussion on various options to insert the Auto Zone brand without creating a disconnect from the rest of the shopping center.

John _____, property owner, asked for clarification on what was discussed. Mr. Sisley explained they were discussing the individual possibilities for the Auto Zone store versus the comprehensive sign agreement for the entire center.

In recap Ms. Thaemert called out that the store front arrangement was fine as long as it was bronze, and frosted glass instead of blackout glass. Still outstanding is the status of the orange band and the comprehensive sign plan.

Mr. Sisley moved to recess TLHP 2012-0064 until the August 20, 2012 meeting, Mr. Kiley seconded, motion carried 7-0.

f. TLHP -2012-0074, B-2 (H-2 Overlay District), 707 E Market St, Applicant: Carolyn Thaemert, AutoZone, Project: comprehensive sign plan amendment

Mr. Reimers moved to recess TLHP 2012-0074 to the August 20, 2012 meeting, Mr. Sisley seconded, motion carried 7-0.

Barbara Notar noted that when something is deferred, under the zoning ordinance it states that you need to re-notify the neighboring property owners. Therefore she is suggesting they recess which eliminates that step. Under public hearings, this is an opportunity for the public to see what is going on. There is no given right to speak. Leesburg has decided they do want the public to speak. Once these are opened, and then closed discussion on the topic may continue without public input. The only reason not to close a hearing on the same night is if a) there is a deferral; or b) it's a big project and you want public input at more than one session.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:35pm

NEXT REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING:
Monday, 8/20 2012 at 7pm

_____
Richard Koochagian, Chair

_____
Kim K. Del Rance, Preservation Planner