



TOWN OF WARRENTON

POST OFFICE DRAWER 341
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20188-0341
<http://ci.warrenton.va.us>
TELEPHONE (540) 347-1101
FAX (540) 349-2414
TDD 1-800-828-1120

**MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
TOWN OF WARRENTON
January 22, 2015
7:00 P.M.**

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on January 22, 2015 at 7:00 PM in the Municipal Building.

Dr. Melissa Wiedenfeld, Chair, called the meeting to order and a quorum was determined. The following members were present: Mr. Jay Tucker, Dr. Carole Hertz, Mr. Steve Wojcik, Mr. Carter Nevill, and Mr. Jerry Wood, Town Council Representative. Ms. Sarah Sitterle, Director of Planning & Community Development represented staff.

Purpose Statement

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Purpose of the Architectural Review Board; Statement of Qualifications of Architectural Review Board to be: The Board makes a decision on applications in order to preserve the character of the Historic District of the Town of Warrenton on behalf of the Town of Warrenton. Decisions of the Board are based upon the Historic Guidelines and a decision for each application is made based upon its own merits. Those decisions do not constitute precedence for any future decisions.

Election of Officers

Mr. Nevill made a motion that current leadership for Chair (Dr. Wiedenfeld) be maintained. Dr. Hertz seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Nevill made a motion that current leadership for Vice-Chair (Mr. Tucker) be maintained. Dr. Hertz seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked members for any changes or additions to the minutes of the December 18, 2014, meeting. Mr. Wood asked that Page 1 be revised to read a long time resident instead of native of Warrenton. Mr. Tucker made a motion to approve the minutes with the noted revision, Mr. Nevill seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business

A. Certificate of Appropriateness 15-1. 92 Main Street, Suite 103. Application to replace window sign. Susan Royston, applicant.

Ms. Sitterle informed the Board that the applicant was not present and that it has been custom for the application to be tabled for 30 days until the applicant is present.

Mr. Nevill made motion to table Certificate of Appropriateness 15-1 until the applicant was present. Mr. Tucker seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Work Session

A. Presentation by the Fauquier County Architectural Review Board. Proposal to partner with the Town ARB for a hands-on masonry workshop in May 2015.

Wendy Wheatcraft, Fauquier County Preservation Planner for the past two and half years made a presentation to the Board regarding a planned upcoming event on Saturday, May 16. Ms. Wheatcraft stated that the Fauquier County Architectural Review Board was formed in 1976 and at this time, there are no historic overlay districts in the County. The County ARB primarily gives counsel to the Board of Supervisors on particular issues and they have annual educational programs. This year during preservation month, the County is proposing to have a public masonry workshop with a lecture and presentation and historic walking tour of brick buildings in Warrenton. She stated the County ARB suggested she request help from the Town for this event and for her to find out if this was something the Town would be interested in doing with the County.

The County will provide the funding for this event. Ms. Wheatcraft stated assistance with the promotion and walking tour was being requested from the Town. She provided to the Board members a handout and stated that the location for this event had not been determined but they planned to invite area masons to conduct a hands-on demonstration.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she thought it was a great idea especially with issues that Town ARB brings up routinely such as attaching signs to brick buildings. She thought the event would be very beneficial for people in the historic district and indicated she would be willing to help.

As a business owner who has witnessed events similar to this over the past couple years, Mr. Nevill expressed concern about the degree of attendance and how successful it would be. He indicated that there were very good reasons for both the County and Town ARB to collaborate to promote such an event but his concern was the attendance projections because in the past there have been less than stellar attendance. If this was going to happen, it needed to be something that is beneficial and will attract people to serve the interest of what the Town, as partners, is aspiring to be. People attending will see the historic preservation and architectural evolution of both the County and the Town.

Ms. Wheatcraft stated people from outside of the County have attended events in the past and she understood Mr. Nevill's concern.

She stated at first she wanted the County ARB to address craftsmen of various trades and have a

more well rounded workshop. She indicated that masonry was identified because there was a member of the County ARB who worked for the brick industry and she had contacts. She stated that she has gotten this far with masonry and as time is getting short, the County will only be having masonry as the focus of the workshop.

Mr. Nevill asked if there was an ongoing construction or re-construction in the County or Town where an actual application of a masonry project could be seen, as opposed to just having a tent set up.

Ms. Wheatcraft indicated there was one project in the County but it was not a masonry project.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that if a couple members of the Town ARB volunteered to assist in the walking tour, it would allow the opportunity to show things such as spalling and identify signs that are installed inappropriately. She stated the tour should also include the history of the Town.

Ms. Wheatcraft indicated that the County wanted to focus on history of the buildings.

Mr. Tucker stated that May was Preservation Month. He asked if the County was just trying to find something to do because he was not sure if it was projected to be a participatory or entertaining or education workshop. Mr. Tucker stated if people did not have a brick building it was thought that they would not have much interest in the activity and consider a preservation tour that was not centered on brick masonry. Those that own brick buildings and want to know about brick buildings, the National Park Service has a fabulous website that tells people everything they need or want to know about brick masonry and mortar and they can be directed to that site. Mr. Tucker stated he had concerns the same as Mr. Nevill about the attendance and how many people will want to spend their afternoon talking about bricks.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Ms. Sitterle if the Town ARB could participate.

Ms. Sitterle stated yes and indicated that since the Town is identified as a Certified Local Government (CLG) through the State, the workshop could be advertised and it was possibility it would allow more attendees. She recalled a similar event held four years ago and the attendance was good even though there were many folks from out of the area that attended.

Mr. Wojcik asked why not expand the event to include stone masonry and include a history of stone quarries.

Ms. Wheatcraft indicated the stone masonry was good idea because there are many stone in the county and town. She indicated she could go back to ARB in February and make suggestion to broaden the trades.

Mr. Wood asked if there would be any funds involved.

Ms. Wheatcraft indicated there would be no funding from the Town only asking for volunteer of time. County may request use of materials such as tents, chairs, tables, etc.

Dr. Hertz stated if the event was under umbrella of some other activities going on in the county or town it would draw more interest and county consider partnering with someone else, like Historic Preservation Society.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated if stone masonry was included, the tour could include walking down Main Street and Culpeper Street.

Mr. Nevill recommended the event be included with the Spring Festival. He recognized there are details that needed to be worked out and recommended discussion be tabled until next month's meeting.

Dr. Wiedenfeld recommended consensus on how the Town can help be done by email and a formal vote take place at the March meeting because this was not a Certificate of Appropriateness request.

Ms. Wheatcraft stated the County ARB will meet the first Wednesday in March and she will get back to Ms. Sitterle.

B. Historic Guidelines

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the Board if they had come up with anything for discussion.

Mr. Tucker suggested that a simplified form of Robert's Rule of Order should be established and followed as a way to make the meetings run more efficiently. He stated the presenter from the County was so gentle in her speech it was difficult to hear her and the Board needed to make sure all presenters were at the microphone so they can be heard and recorded appropriately.

Mr. Tucker indicated that not all members get an opportunity to speak and he suggested following a simplified version of Robert's Rule of Order would help tremendously. When a topic for discussion comes up the Chair will call on each member individually and everyone has an opportunity to speak. Before discussion takes place, a motion be made and seconded.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she liked Mr. Tucker's suggestion because she wanted to make sure all members have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Tucker stated that often the Board gets into a confusing conversation with the applicant but if each one of the Board members directs a question or multiple questions to the applicant and gets answers then the Board member is finished. He stated not following some type of procedure causes the meetings to drag on and be longer than they need to be. Mr. Tucker informed the Board members he had copies of the simplified Robert's Rules of Order if anyone wanted a copy.

Mr. Wojcik stated he agreed with Mr. Tucker's recommendation.

Mr. Nevill asked if a motion had to be made first before a discussion. For example, a motion would be made to approve Certificate of Appropriateness 15-1, discussion would follow and then a vote would take place.

Mr. Tucker stated the Board would first inquire of the applicant, and the procedure would follow and at that time someone on the Board may decide to make a motion or the Chair would call for a motion, and then a vote will take place.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the applicant would make a presentation, the Board hears from staff, after those presentations, questions will be asked one by one, during that time or right after all discussions, a motion should be made and a discussion of the motion will be held, if necessary, then a vote will taken. Doing this process will alleviate so much back and forth discussion and shorten length of meetings.

Mr. Tucker stated before a motion is made the Chair must call on each member and ask if they have any input so everyone has an opportunity to speak before a motion is made.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Chair should restate the motion to make sure everyone understands the motion.

Dr. Wiedenfeld suggested all members read the Robert's Rule of Order information provided by Mr. Tucker and adhere to the Robert's Rule of Order procedures.

C. Review of Warrenton Historic Guidelines

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she wanted to find out what changes were needed in the guidelines.

Steve Wojcik –identified the following

1. Objectives/Policies – Page 3 states, “discourage the removal or replacement of historic materials and/or design features.” Mr. Wojcik recalled an application where a window was going to be removed. He asked what was going to happen to the window and made a suggestion they keep it. When the applicant returned the following month, they indicated they took that under advisement and revised the plans and used the window in another location of the home. Mr. Wojcik stated he was not sure the Board consistently follows this approach.
2. Page 63 – Roof – Item No. 7 states, “never replace a clay tile or rock slate roof with another material or use synthetics, imitations or substitutes.” He recalled a case on Falmouth Street where a slate roof would not hold any longer and the Board allowed a different material. Mr. Wojcik asked about changing this wording in order to accommodate when a roof can no longer hold slate.

Mr. Tucker stated there have been issues when the applicant or the tradesman comes in and tries to convince the Board to allow changes. Issues arise when the conditions may not necessarily be the way they are portrayed. He emphasized the need for the Board to check out change requests thoroughly.

3. Page 68 – Item No. 9 – Additions to Existing Buildings – “New additions, exterior alterations or any related new construction shall not destroy historical materials that characterize the property.” Mr. Wojcik stated assurance that historic materials are protected during construction is needed and not be destroyed because of weather elements and other factors.
4. Page 69– Item No. 11 – This refers to unpainted or pressure treated wood or vinyl decks and inappropriate porch additions. Mr. Wojcik asked if the guidelines were referring to unpainted pressure treated wood.

Mr. Tucker stated new materials are available and being used for decks.

5. Page 76 – Item #2 – Heating, Ventilating and Air-Conditioning – Item #2 – Guideline states, “do not place heating or a/c unit on front elevation and avoid visible side elevations.” Mr. Wojcik stated there had been cases with units on front and side and the Board has not asked for it to be located in the back. He asked if the Board was going to follow this guideline.
6. Page 77 – Item #4 – High walls or solid privacy fences shall not be used except to screen in compatible adjacent land uses – STATIC – UNABLE TO HEAR

Mr. Tucker said in his opinion the guidelines read as if it is a personal preference and very opinionated.

7. Page 97 – Item 10 – Demolition by Neglect – Mr. Wojcik indicated that the Board needed to be made aware when demolitions were occurring because many of the old materials cannot be replaced and suggested that the Board consider looking into this. He asked if there was a timetable so when the deadline is up the Board knows what is being done to protect the property.

Mr. Tucker asked if he was referring to storage of historic materials.

Mr. Wojcik stated not necessarily. He stated that after the fire of the Napoleon’s Restaurant on Waterloo Street it sat exposed to the elements. The guidelines state there is a one-year deadline and he asked if there is a way for it to come back to the Board’s attention.

STATIC UNABLE TO HEAR

Mr. Wojcik asked what authority the Board has in implementing a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition by neglect.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated staff would need to research how the ARB can be notified.

Mr. Tucker indicated that the Building Code addresses this.

STATIC UNABLE TO HEAR

Sign Guidelines - Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the window sign guidelines require they be painted from the inside and people are putting up vinyl decal signs on the outside. She is not opposed to business owners doing that, but wants the Board to consider this.

Mr. Tucker stated the cost is the same inside or out, the vinyl signs are computer generated, and they adhere to the glass. He stated his experience on Fifth Street where the Great Harvest Bread Store’s signs are on the outside, there are letters missing, and it is deteriorating. Signs inside are protected from the weather; there are no cost differences and it looks more historically appropriate because that is the way it was done in the past.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she would look at other districts to determine what they are doing.

Mr. Nevill stated it was appropriate for the Board to suggest and encourage inside painting of signs but adding restrictions that are more prohibitive is not good because progress that the Town needs to make would be impeded. As a business owner, and hearing someone is trying to open up a businesses, they find it discouraging dealing with the Board and the Town. Adding restrictions that are more prohibitive would set a negative example. While the Board may be historically preserving the Town, the Board is losing sight of a bigger picture and allowing for flexibility is in the interest of this Town's success.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she thought the Board had been flexible but what she wanted to know is whether the current wording should be changed to reflect allowances for painting on the outside of the glass.

Mr. Tucker stated he understood Mr. Carter's position but the signs on Main Street and Culpeper Street are within arm reach, in your face and are very close to the public in terms of any other portion of the building. The guidelines currently state they should be either on the inside or outside and he was not recommending changing the guidelines. Having signs inside or outside is no more cost to the owner but it does require the applicant to submit their request to the Board and he did not see it as being more restrictive.

Dr. Hertz stated having signs inside preserves the appearance of the historic district and the cost is the same.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that the guidelines on page 82 state window signs are painted directly on the inside of the store window at eye level and are especially suited for businesses such as restaurants where window display are not prominent. She stated that the wording was odd.

Mr. Nevill stated clarification was needed.

Mr. Tucker stated the guidelines text appears to be the opinion of the writer. It is the way it was historically, but it is not dictating to the Board as to what it should be.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she had been interpreting the guidelines, as dictated by how things are done. She thought Mr. Tucker's explanation was correct. She was going to do additional research to see what other districts were doing, and provide information to members by email.

Mr. Tucker stated that receiving information by email was good idea but discussions could not take place until the next meeting.

Dr. Hertz brought to the Board's attention a resident approaching her about a red utility barn in front of her window that another resident had put in. The resident asked Dr. Hertz if the ARB could fix it and she did not know what to tell the resident.

Dr. Wiedenfeld recommended she bring it to the attention of Ms. Sitterle because it may

be a code issue and the zoning department could take care of it.

Mr. Tucker stated that if it is in violation of setback then the Zoning Administrator should address it.

Ms. Sitterle stated that occasionally sheds are installed without permits and anytime there is a concern town staff is happy to look into it.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness 14-54. 347 Falmouth Street. Application for in-kind replacement of asphalt shingles. Administrative approval was granted on December 29, 2014.

Mr. Steve Wojcik made motion to adjourn. Mr. Nevill seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Minutes Submitted By
Dee Highnote