



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

**Monday, 03 December 2012
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Council Chamber**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Richard Koochagian, Vice Chairman Jim Sisley, Parliamentarian Edward Kiley, Dieter Meyer (arrived at 7:46pm), Teresa Minchew and Paul Reimers

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tracy Coffing, Town Council Representative Marty Martinez and Planning Commission Representative Mary Harper

STAFF: Director of Planning & Zoning Susan Berry Hill, Deputy Town Attorney Barbara Notar, Preservation Planner Kim K. Del Rance and Planning & Zoning Assistant Debi Parry

Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. Koochagian called the meeting to order at 7:00pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

Adoption of Meeting Agenda

The meeting agenda was adopted on a motion by Vice Chairman Sisley, seconded by Mr. Kiley, and approved by a 5-0-2 vote (Coffing and Meyer absent).

BAR Member Disclosure

There were no disclosures.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the November 5, 2012 BAR Work Session were approved on a motion by Ms. Minchew, seconded by Mr. Kiley and approved by a 4-0-2-1 vote (Coffing and Meyer absent. Sisley abstained).

New cases in the H-1 Overlay District

- a. **TLHP -2012-0127, 6 W Market St (B-1/H-1 Overlay District), Applicant: Michael O'Connor, Kingdom Enterprise, LLC. Project: Approve side door and pediment already installed and lighting on front façade already installed, add brick to lower side façade, brick sidewalk along side of building and paint building black with gold trim.**

Chairman Koochagian opened the public hearing at 7:03 pm.

Ms. Del Rance stated the majority of the application was discussed at the previous meeting. She stated she has not researched the lighting on the front façade; however, the center light fixture currently installed is street lamp sized and should be replaced with a more proportionately sized fixture. Further, she stated the applicant has brought paint samples for the building.

The applicant, Michael O'Connor, presented the "black forest green" and "gold finch" color samples proposed for the building and the trim. Further, he provided photos of buildings in the Historic District with similarly sized light fixtures to the center fixture currently installed on this building.

The Board asked Ms. Del Rance to provide an overall report for the application given the presentation at the last meeting was a preview and not the official public hearing.

Ms. Del Rance outlined the application to replace the asphalt along the side of the building with a brick sidewalk, the addition of brick to the lower west side façade to match up with the front, the door surround with large triangular pediment and decorative columns with decorative capitals already installed on the side of the building and painting the building.

Ms. Del Rance stated staff's recommendation is that the brick sidewalk is appropriate; a non-rotting material should be use on the lower west side façade rather than the brick; the previously installed door surround is too large and decorative for this building; the proposed colors for the building are not appropriate and; the larger light fixture installed on the front façade is not in keeping with the building's character and should be replaced with a smaller fixture.

Vice Chairman Sisley verified Mr. O'Connor's willingness to replace the larger light fixture with a smaller fixture to match the previously installed fixtures on either side.

There was further discussion regarding the size of the light fixtures and whether it is appropriate for the fixtures to be in their current location on the building.

Mr. O'Connor stated these proposed changes to the building are to attract visitors to his business and the downtown; however, he is willing to replace the center fixture. He sated the door surround was constructed in 1890 and is similar to surrounds found on other buildings in the historic district. He stated he would be willing to discuss alterations to the surround to make it less ornate.

Chairman Koochagian verified the door itself is not part of the door surround.

Ms. Minchew verified a zoning permit was not issued for installation of the door surround.

Vice Chairman Sisley stated there is little guidance in the guidelines regarding new doorways; rather, the guidelines address repairing and retaining existing doorways. He suggested instances such as this be noted and addressed by the BAR when the guidelines are reviewed in the future.

Ms. Del Rance stated it is appropriate to consider the Secretary of the Interior's Standards which indicate a replacement feature should compliment the existing character and architectural style.

There was further discussion regarding the simple style of this building in contrast to the ornate door surround and alterations that could be made to the surround such as removing the capitals and columns, painting the trim to match the siding and having a simple pediment roof.

The petitioner's section was opened at 7:43pm.

Darius Saeidi, 19 S. King St, expressed support for the changes Mr. O'Connor has made to his building. He discussed the need for buildings and downtowns to evolve and for business owners to find ways to bring more visitors to the downtown area. Further, he asked how the guidelines can be used for business owners to draw in more business.

Mr. Koochagian stated the purpose of the guidelines is to provide guidance for alterations, additions or other physical changes are made to the current built environment in the Historic District. He stated they are not written to enhance business; however, they also do not preclude business.

The petitioner's section closed at 7:45pm.

Ms. Minchew stated the surround depicted on the drawing submitted by Mr. O'Connor in support of the brick sidewalk is of appropriate scale and would meet the guidelines. She asked Mr. O'Connor if he would be willing to go back to a simpler door surround as was verbally agreed upon earlier.

Mr. O'Connor stated the drawing was submitted in support of the brick sidewalk and is not pertinent to the door surround proposal. He asked if the doorway could be considered a second entrance to the restaurant, similar to the Lightfoot's second entrance in the same alleyway.

There was further discussion regarding potential alterations to the surround and pediment to remove the decorative elements.

Ms. Del Rance stated Ms. Coffing could not be in attendance tonight; however, she had suggested removal of the capitals and installing a flat overhead.

Mr. Koochagian stated a new design should be submitted for consideration depicting a simplified surround and detailing the proposed brick courses on the lower façade.

Ms. Minchew asked Mr. O'Connor if he has found support for this surround in the guidelines.

Mr. O'Connor stated the guidelines do not adequately address this situation He stated the only guidance he received was that the door surround should come out 18 inches.

Ms. Del Rance stated she asked Mr. O'Connor to send her a picture of the door surround to review before it was installed.

Mr. Kiley verified that the applicant did not submit a photograph to staff prior to installation.

Ms. Minchew verified the brick courses would closely match the brick found on the front façade. She further clarified that staff would need to see a sample of the brick before it is installed.

Mr. O'Connor stated his desire to paint the roof trim "gold finch" and the west and front façades "black forest green" to where it meets the brick.

Ms. Minchew asked if staff feels the guidelines would support the proposed color.

Ms. Del Rance stated the proposed color would typically be found on shutters, not the main body.

Mr. Meyer discussed the possibility of unifying the paint colors on 2 W. Loudoun and 6 W. Loudoun to read as one building. Further, he stated the western façade of the building could be made to look like a second front façade in which case the current door surround may fit.

After further discussion, the Board expressed general support for the brick sidewalk and brick courses along the lower west side. The Board indicated the need to replace the center light fixture on the front façade with a properly sized fixture. Further, the Board asked that the applicant return with a cohesive design plan for the building detailing plans for the painting proposal door surround.

Vice Chairman Sisley proposed a motion to recess application TLHP-2013-0127 to the December 17, 2012 BAR Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reimers and approved on a 6-0-1 vote (Coffing absent).

Recessed cases in the H-2 Overlay District

- a. **TLHP -2012-0093, 1 Catocin Circle NE (B-2/H-2 Overlay District), Applicant: Sandy Spring Bank. Project: Remove free standing ATM structure and place new ATM on building side facing Market Street.**

Chairman Koochagian noted the public hearing has been closed.

Ms. Del Rance stated the applicant has requested an extension of the 75 day time period and recommended the case be recessed to the January 17, 2013 meeting.

Mr. Kiley proposed a motion to recess TLHP-2012-0093 to the January 17, 2013 meeting at the applicant's request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Minchew and approved on a 6-0-1 vote (Coffing absent).

- b. **TLHP-2012-0098 and TLHP-2012-0099, 448 S. King St Ride Aid (B2-H-2) and 720 S. King St Food Lion B-2/H-2) Gary Finiff, Virginia Regional Transit. Project: Construction of a prototype bus shelter in front of Rite Aid and Food Lion, no new notices required, public hearing closed.**

Chairman Koochagian noted the applicant was not present.

Ms. Minchew proposed a motion to recess TLHP-2012-0098 and TLHP-2012-0099 to the December 17, 2012 BAR Meeting due to the absence of the applicant. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer and approved on a 6-0-1 vote (Coffing absent).

Recessed cases in the H-1 Overlay District

- a. **TLHP-2012-0107, 107 W. Market Street (B-1/H-1), Dwight Stonerook, Trustees of the Leesburg United Methodist Church. Project: Replace existing pair of 28" doors with a single 42" wide door and 14" sidelight for safety and accessibility, no new notices required, public hearing closed.**

Chairman Koochagian noted the public hearing has been closed.

Ms. Del Rance stated she has worked with the applicant to determine that a glazed door similar to the one found on the Wirt Street side could be appropriate for this proposal. She stated the

addition where the door is proposed to be changed was constructed in 1987. Further, she stated based on the date of construction, the door proposed for replacement is not historic.

The applicant, Dwight Stonerook, stated after meeting with staff, he feels the design of the door on the Wirt Street side could be used for the proposed door replacement on W. Market Street and centered under the existing gable roof. Further, he stated the door would need to be custom made and provided several design options.

Ms. Del Rance verified the applicant plans to replace the existing six lite transom with a five lite transom for better symmetry with the gable roof.

Mr. Stonerook stated the church would eventually like to install a power door opener at this location, for this reason the transom will need to be replaced. The new transom will have a thicker board between the lites and the door to absorb the vibration.

There was further discussion regarding the design and size of the proposed door.

Ms. Minchew asked for staff's opinion on the options presented.

Ms. Del Rance stated a 7-foot door in the configuration listed as "option 2" or "option 3" would be most appropriate.

There was further discussion regarding the design options presented.

Ms. Minchew offered the following findings:

1. The door in question has not attained historic significance since its installation and the building's addition occurred only 25 years ago.
2. The proposed glazed door in "option 1" and "option 3", presented to the Board tonight is appropriate to the building and does not negatively impact the architectural character of the existing entry portico and overall façade of the building.

Ms. Minchew proposed a motion to approve TLHP-2012-0107 subject to the drawings and other materials submitted as part of this application dated November 22, 2012 and December 3, 2012.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kiley and approved on a 6-0-1 vote (Coffing absent).

TLHP-2012-0114, TLHP-2012-0115, TLHP-2012-0116 & TLHP-2012-0117, 19 S. King St (B-1/H-1) Fabian Saeidi, Kings Tavern & Wine Bar. Project: Review already constructed porch roof and gazebo on existing rear patio, installation of two signs and exterior painting already completed. Chairman Koochagian stated the public hearing has been closed.

Ms. Del Rance stated since the last meeting, it was determined that the porch roof is a metal siding material while the shed roof and gazebo roof are both singled. She stated after viewing satellite images she was able to determine the shed has been in its present location for at least 10 years; however, the gazebo was not visible as late as last year. Further, the applicant has provided a paint sample for the "barn red" on the rear of the building.

Representative for the applicant, Darius Saeidi, stated the shed has been repainted in the “barn red”. He stated the platform for the gazebo has been in existence for some time as an outdoor stage for musicians; however, the roof was added recently. He stated the guidelines indicate gazebos are appropriate in gardens and he is unclear as to the specifications for what a garden is. He stated the roofing material for the shed and gazebo match; however, the roof over the rear entrance is a metal roofing material, but it does not match the roof on the main structure. Further, he stated they are in the process of painting the front of the building with the “barn red”.

Ms. Minchew stated Ms. Coffing had submitted comments on this application based on her site visit. She read the following comments into the record:

East Elevation

- **Signage:** Remove “ABC-On” neon sign over front entrance; it may be installed indoors if it is at least 3’-0” from a window.
- **Storefront Windows:** The northerly storefront window consists of two large glass panels with a central vertical mullion; a grid of simulated muntins is applied to the interior surface of the window. The southerly storefront window has been replaced and reconfigured with three large glass panels with two vertical brushed aluminum mullions. The replacement window is inconsistent with the northerly window and is non-traditional in design and materials. The aluminum mullions in the southerly window should be replaced with properly-designed mullions in an appropriate, traditional (eg. wood) material. If three window bays remain in the southerly window, than three window bays should be established in the northerly window. Design and materials are to be consistent in both windows. Simulated divided lights may or may not be utilized, as long as the design and materials are appropriate, consistent and approved.

West Elevation

- The following questions should be presented: (1) Was the existing deck ever approved by the BAR? (2) Was the existing bar and seating area beneath the deck approved by the BAR? (3) Are these features code-compliant?
- **Gazebo:** Replace the existing asphalt shingles (variegated brown) with an appropriate roofing material that matches the existing standing seam metal roof on the main building (finished silver/gray) – or – relates, as a subordinate structure, in regard to color (eg. light gray asphalt shingles). Remove wrought iron posts adjacent to the wood posts. Paint the gazebo according to a cohesive, consistent color scheme (eg. white and/or red to match main building), as approved.
- **Existing Covered Rear Porch:** Remove metal siding material on roof. Replace with an appropriate roofing material (eg. standing seam metal to match roof on main building or light gray asphalt shingles) that is consistent with other subordinate structures, as approved.
- **Existing Lattice Fence:** Remove existing plastic lattice enclosure. Replace with a code-compliant enclosure that is appropriate in the OHD, built of traditional materials (eg. wood; or wood/metal bollard and chain) and consistent with other approved architectural features and details. A simplified enclosure would minimize visual clutter and enhance the outdoor space.
- **Existing Storage Shed:** Replace existing asphalt shingles (variegated brown) with an appropriate roofing material (eg. standing seam metal to match main building or light gray asphalt shingles). Paint shed according to cohesive color scheme (eg. red siding and white trim), as approved.

- Existing Lattice Dumpster/Trash Enclosure: Replace with an appropriate and code-compliant enclosure that is consistent in design and materials, as approved. Paint the enclosure according to cohesive color scheme, as approved.
- Signage: Remove any extraneous signage (eg. "Welcome to Historic Leesburg..."; "Colonial Garden", etc). Develop an appropriate sign plan according to the current guidelines. Install signage, as approved.

Ms. Minchew explained no further work should be done on the site until approved has been granted by the Board. She asked staff to detail what additions to the site have received approvals and what structures are code-compliant.

Ms. Del Rance stated was not able to find Board approvals for any improvements to this property since it has been in the applicant's ownership. She stated there are no permits on record with the county for the rear deck, so it is unknown whether it is code compliant. She stated for the applicant to come into compliance, the first step is approval from the Board.

Mr. Meyer stated the spacing of the columns on the rear porch is awkward and questioned the need for such a wide width rather than just a small roof to cover the door.

Mr. Saeidi stated the main purpose for the size was for the gutters on this roof and the shed to meet. He acknowledged the area is also used for outdoor seating.

Mr. Meyer verified it is staff's opinion that the gazebo is not appropriate for a paved lot.

Chairman Koochagian verified staff's opinion that the light fixtures at the rear entrance are utilitarian and not appropriate.

Mr. Saeidi indicated the light fixtures have been replaced and a photo was submitted to staff today.

There was further discussion regarding combining the applications and recessing the cases to allow time for the applicant to return with a cohesive plan for the building and the signs.

Mr. Saeidi asked if the sign applications could be discussed tonight as there are only two signs.

Ms. Minchew stated there are a number of signs currently on the property; however, the ordinance only allows a certain number of signs per business. She stated a plan should be submitted to detail where the signs will be placed.

Ms. Del Rance stated the guidelines allow for two signs; however, the Board does have the authority to allow more signs if it is architecturally appropriate. She stated the sign currently on the front and the sign above the rear entrance do not meet the guidelines with regard to placement and materials. She stated the hanging sign in the rear could meet the guidelines if it were properly located near an entryway.

There was further discussion regarding the zoning violation process as there are several items in violation that are not in the purview of the Board. It was the consensus of the Board to recess all of the applications with direction to staff to combine the applications that can be combined and

direction to the applicant to submit a comprehensive plan to detail how each of the items will be addressed with regard to placement, color and materials.

Vice Chairman Sisley proposed a motion to recess TLHP-2012-0114, TLHP-2012-0115, TLHP-2012-0116 and TLHP-2012-0117 to the January 7, 2013 BAR Work Session. The motion was seconded by Ms. Minchew and approved on a 6-0-1 vote (Coffing absent).

Mr. Saeidi confirmed he should meet with staff and submit information before the next meeting.

Vice Chairman Sisley advised the applicant to not perform any further work on the building until the Board has reached a decision.

c. TLHP-2012-0118, TLHP-2012-0119, TLHP-2012-0120, 15 S. King St (B-1/H-1), Fabian Saeidi, Old Town Grill. Project: Review two signs and exterior painting already completed.

Chairman Koochagian noted the public hearing has been closed.

Ms. Del Rance stated since the last meeting the front façade of the building has been painted red and the side of the building remains green. She stated her opinion that the shutters are not appropriately sized for the windows and that while wall sign and hanging signs may be appropriate; the window sign should be removed.

Chairman Koochagian asked how long the shutters have been on the building.

Representative for the applicant, Darius Saeidi, stated the shutters were in place when purchased.

Mr. Meyer verified the shutters are not operable.

Ms. Minchew stated while the building was most recently green and it is unknown at what point it was first painted green or what the original color of the building was.

Mr. Meyer suggested a unified design for the building could be achieved by painting the remaining window trim white, removing the shutters and painting the side to match the front façade. Further, he stated the business is only allowed two signs and the applicant can choose one to be removed.

Mr. Saeidi stated the business previously had four signs; however, when it was rebranded as the Old Town Grill, one of the window signs was removed and the other three were repainted.

Ms. Del Rance stated approval is needed anytime a sign is replaced or altered.

Mr. Koochagian pointed out that the windows on the front façade do not match, similar to the property at 19 S. King where one side has been replaced.

There was further discussion regarding the symmetry of the windows and whether they need to match on this building as the front façade reads as two separate buildings with two entrances.

Ms. Minchew stated Ms. Coffing had submitted comments on this application based on her site visit. She read the following comments into the record:

East Elevation

- **Signage**: Remove either the sign in the southerly storefront window or the projecting sign on the northeast corner of the building. Since the projecting sign and the main sign over the first story are highly visible, it would seem most practical to remove the sign in the southerly storefront window.
- **Paint Colors**: The paint colors on all elevations should be consistent. The existing paint scheme on the east elevation could be tempered by (1) painting all with window trim and sash white; (2) painting the presently white trim over the first floor storefront windows red to match the wall; and (3) painting the front doors white (to match adjacent trim) or black. See note regarding shutters.
- **Shutters**: The shutters should be removed. The shutters are not properly sized for the windows and are not installed to be, or appear to be, operable.

North and West Elevations

- The paint color scheme for the north and west elevations should be consistent or complimentary with the front (east) elevation. The existing bold green paint with a high-gloss finish is not appropriate for the building or OHD. In addition to color, the BAR needs to evaluate the level of glossiness of proposed finishes. The north and west elevations should be repainted either red (to match the east elevation) or an appropriate, complimentary neutral color, as approved.

Mr. Meyer stated if the applicant's intends to keep the window sign, the sign should be moved back three feet from the window so it is not considered a sign in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Minchew asked that staff investigate the material of the existing wall sign.

After further discussion regarding signs and window symmetry it was the consensus of the Board to request that the applicant provide a comprehensive plan for the building to detail the signs and paint scheme.

Vice Chairman Sisley proposed a motion to recess TLHP-2012-0018, TLHP-2012-0019 and TLHP-2012-0120 to the January 7, 2013 BAR Work Session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kiley and approved on a 6-0-1 vote (Coffing absent).

Chairman Koochagian asked the applicant to meet with staff to create a proposal for the January work session.

Old Business:

Ms. Berry-Hill provided an update regarding the Zoning Ordinance amendment recently passed by Council pertaining to signage for auto dealerships. She stated ordinance amendment was initiated by the Council to assist the auto dealers in meeting the signage requirements mandated by their brand's corporate headquarters. She outlined the approved amendments stating the quick turn around in the approval process was requested by Council to help the auto dealers in meeting the timelines mandated by the corporate headquarters. Further, she stated normally the Board would be included in the process for changes in the H-2 Corridor; however, this case was an anomaly.

Ms. Berry-Hill provided an update to the Board regarding the Crescent Design District and regarding the proposed language in the draft ordinance pertaining to design. She stated staff anticipates a Council vote on this ordinance at their December 11, 2012 meeting. Further, she stated the proposed boundaries of the district would remove the Barber & Ross property from the H-1 District and several properties along South King Street and East Market Street from the H-2 District and the parcels would be governed under the design elements in the Crescent Design District ordinance.

There was further discussion regarding the boundaries of the Crescent Design District.

Ms. Berry-Hill stated if the Crescent Design District is adopted as drafted, the question then becomes what should happen with the remainder of the H-2 Corridor. She stated staff plans to work with the BAR in the coming year to discuss possibilities related to this area and suggested the Board hold a retreat for this discussion as well as any other topics of interest.

It was the consensus of the Board to hold a retreat to discuss the H-2 Corridor, the proposed preservation plan and other priorities.

Ms. Berry-Hill provided an update regarding the proposed courts expansion stating the Council has asked for public input regarding the courts expansion at their December 11, 2012 meeting. She stated Council has encouraged the Board of Supervisors to keep the Courts downtown as opposed to moving all or part of the court offices to the Sycolin Road area. She stated Town staff is working with County staff regarding what the process would be for reviewing their plans. Further, she stated the County would need to come before the Board for an amendment to their existing approval on the former jail site as well as a demolition permit for four houses adjacent to the site.

Ms. Minchew asked that staff ensure the BAR is kept up to date regarding opportunities to provide input into this process.

New Business:

None

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:26 pm.

NEXT REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING:
Monday, December 17, 2012 at 7pm
Council Chamber
25 West Market Street
Leesburg, Virginia

Richard Koochagian, Chair

Kim K. Del Rance, Preservation Planner