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
October 22, 2015
7:00 P.M.

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on October 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, Mr. Steve Wojcik, Mr. Carter Nevill, and Mr. Jerry Wood, Town Council Representative. Ms. Sarah Sitterle, Director of Planning & Community Development represented staff. Dr. Carole Hertz was absent.

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.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Wojcik made a motion to approve the minutes with no revisions, Mr. Tucker seconded the motion, and the motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Certificate of Appropriateness 15-15 for kitchen addition at Paradise, 158 Winchester Street. Dr. Wiedenfeld stated this application was originally reviewed two months ago and was tabled. Currently, the applicant proposes to extend the screen porch behind the east wing of the house to accommodate a kitchen. There are changes from the original application. Dr. Wiedenfield asked Ms. Sitterle if she had any comments on the matter. Ms. Sitterle stated she did not. Mr. Norton and Mr. Shepherd, the architects for the project, spoke to the board and stated that it is proposed to extend the existing back porch to double the depth in order to add a kitchen. We propose to reuse the details and make new brackets for matching column details. In this application, we propose to use lap siding between the columns. There is vertical bead board there now of different sizes, which will be removed in three days, leave only one bay, and then we will add five bays. It seemed appropriate to us to do the addition in wood siding to match the house as opposed to recreating the bead

boarding siding and all the louvers, etc. There is scrollwork on top of three of the louvers on the back and we believe they were on the porch originally. It is proposed to reuse them between the columns on the backside of the addition. The existing porch had a hip roof over it, but no continuous shed roof across it, so we are coming out with a new hip. This will help keep consistency with the details around the perimeter; the heights will match and so forth.

Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked the architects why bead board was not going to be used for the project. One of the architects on the project stated that when they looked at it they did not have any reference on why the bead board was there, and someone had applied louvered panels over it. We looked at using bead board but we thought that applying siding would fit better. It is not all the same bead board as some has already been replaced. It is not all original material. Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked if the porch was added in 1870. The architects stated they did not have a date for it. Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked if there was a period of significance for the house. It was mentioned that the structure was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2013.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked why on the original application an attempt was to be made to preserve the louvered panels, but currently it is not on the plan. The architects stated when they look at a project, preserving the integrity of the structure is a consideration as well as the continuity of the appearance for the whole structure. Mr. Tucker stated that the project was presented to the ARB previously and was tabled because there were so many unanswered questions about details and it came back as an entirely different project, which is okay, but in so many ways now it does not follow guidelines. The project plan is to delete a portion of the house, which was placed on the Register of Historic Places in 2013. Removing historical materials and replacing with materials to match the house is contrary to the guidelines that we are to use in reviewing a project. I noticed that you indicate the grade does not slope away from the house, but it does, so there will be more brick on the south elevation than you show. You show no foundation ventilation.

Mr. Tucker asked the architects if they intend to ventilate the foundation area. They answered that they would use mechanical ventilation, so it will be a conditioned crawl space. Mr. Tucker noted that a window would be replaced by a double hung window with simulated divided lights. On a historic property, simulated divided lights are specifically denied. They are not to be used. This set of windows is not a major feature, but it does not follow the guidelines regarding historic property additions or alterations.

Mr. Tucker stated if there is kitchen counter work immediately behind the windows, and asked what the height of the counters is. One of the architects stated 36 inches, and the windows come down to the top of the counters with no casing. Mr. Tucker stated that it matters about the casing because if you want to replace casing above the countertop, your window is going to have to be smaller than what you show on the elevation, which is going to change the proportion of the window. One of the architects stated that it would fit; they sized it and even did it in sections, they just did not provide sections at the meeting. Mr. Tucker then asked if the architects had the sections to present, and they stated they did not. Mr. Tucker stated it was okay if they did not do casing, but if casing was to be done, and therefore order a different window than was shown, that was a problem. The architects said they knew it was tight, but it would fit. Mr. Tucker then asked if they were ready to modify the application to use true divided lights. Yes, if that is the will of the ARB, the architects said.

Mr. Tucker stated that the ARB has been through many applications, some take a short time and some do not go so quickly. He went on to say he would like to work with the architects tonight and answer the questions the ARB has and have that delineated on the drawings that Sarah will submit to the Building Official to permit. Mr. Tucker then asked if it had been submitted for a permit yet. Sarah Sitterle stated it had not. Mr. Tucker said he asked so that we can insure that whatever we agreed upon tonight, we can achieve an approval, and whatever we've agreed upon is placed on a set of drawings and makes it all the way through the process and is utilized for permitting, and makes it all the way through the process so that when the Building Official or his inspector in reviewing the work know what we have agreed to tonight and can review it on the job rather than having to leaf through 8 1/2 X 11 text. I would like to make sure this gets all through the process, because this is an important house as the oldest house in the Town of Warrenton. We have items that do not comply with the guidelines that I would like to resolve with the architect tonight, have them loaded onto the drawings, and make sure that set of drawings gets through to the Building Official and through to the contractor and actually built that way. I want to make sure on this historic house that is what actually happens, if that is the board's pleasure.

Ms. Sitterle stated she understood, that each time an application is made and goes before the ARB, we make sure the letter of approval to the applicant follows the application all the way through. Mr. Tucker stated that his concern is that the inspector will not look at the letter. He added that the inspector normally looks for issues to pass building code, not for design. Ms. Sitterle stated that members of the building department always look at the plans. Mr. Tucker noted there were no details on the plan before him except elevations. He added that the board would like to get issues addressed for the architects so an approval can be reached. One of the architects present agreed that is how the process should work, but did have a comment about the window. He said they have done thirty or forty projects in historic districts with simulated divided lights. We have done projects where we have replaced windows in historic structures, not additions as we are with this. We have actually had windows that were replaced and we had them built to exact specifications of the historic house. In this case, as in many cases of additions that we have done, we have used simulated divided lights all over town. What you are asking us to do, unless you are proposing we put in single glazed windows, is to create a window with a mutton that is 1 3/8" thick, because I know of no window company any longer that will make an insulated glass window true divided with any narrower mutton than 1 3/8" thick. Weather Shield tried, they failed and they have had callbacks so they stopped. The existing muttons on this house are extremely thin, so what you are asking us to do is put a window in that will match worse than the window above it on the second floor.

Mr. Tucker said he would like to see them make this work with true divided lights and not the simulated divided used all over town. He would like to see additional effort to make this work on a historically important home so that the window manufacturers are not going to stick us with this big fat mutton. You have the ability to do that and we would like to see you make this work with true divided lights so the window is appropriate in its appearance from the exterior on this oldest house in the Town of Warrenton. We would like to put an end to what is not appropriate on an historic house, ignoring what has been done in the past or the fact this work is on the back of the house. A new house would be a different story and a product of its time, but this is something entirely different.

Dr. Wiedenfeld read the guidelines for additions "double-hung sash encasement windows on additions should have true divided lights and be composed of wood. Additions to historic buildings require a higher standard than modern buildings outside the district or new building construction" so it is different and there is a window there, which is a true divided light historic to what period we do not know, but an historic era. Mr. Tucker suggested just reusing the existing window to get rid of the casing problem and resolve this issue. Dr. Wiedenfeld brought up the question to the architects in terms of insulation with having one double-glaze window when there are many single-glaze windows around the house. Does one window make that difference when all the other windows are historic? Realizing there are modern double-pane windows on the porch, does having one single-glaze window make a difference in terms of insulation. Mr. Tucker thinks the effect on the heating and cooling load would be miniscule compared to the rest of the house, but when they get to plan review the building officials are going to have to deal with the energy efficiency code. This is when they will have to look at a storm panel to bring this window in some sense of compliance. One of the architects present stated single-glaze windows do not meet the new laws, which are universal (national and international). Single-glazed windows are not acceptable any longer to the energy code.

The homeowner stated she does not have light in the kitchen and one of the architects present reiterated they want larger windows that will provide more light in the kitchen. Mr. Tucker stated that what she wants and what she has are two different things and she is about to violate the guidelines of the historic district in several ways. Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if she was to understand they could not ask for true divided lights on anything. One of the architects stated that if it is to be made, be double-glazed and meet energy code then it will have a wide mutton. Mr. Tucker commented that the guidelines say that it shall be true divided light and the building code is going to say that it has to be energy efficient and that is going to result in this window, if used by the architect as suggested, is going to have a wide mutton. The guidelines and the building code do not speak to the mutton width, so Mr. Tucker feels the architect is using that to convince the ARB to agree to what he wants to do indifferent to the guidelines. Dr. Wiedenfeld asked about Theresa's flowers, what about that window, didn't the ARB approve. The architect stated it was a simulated divided light, exactly what they were asking for. It was also mentioned that there was a building on the corner of third and Main and it was restored, every window and door was replaced with aluminum clad simulated divided light. Dr. Wiedenfeld mentioned she would have to go look at it.

Mr. Wojcik stated he appreciated what the architects are doing with the house, that they are attempting to preserve as much of the existing additions, so that if someone wanted to reverse course, they could. I believe your firm does that, and I think one of the things we talked about last time was whether you could clarify and be more certain about whether it was possible to reuse the brackets, the detail work, the scroll work and the columns. He then asked if they have assessed whether they can reuse them. One of the architects then stated that their plan was to reuse everything that is possible that is currently on the home. But, whatever needs to be fabricated, that is not able to be used, will be made to look exactly like what is there. It will be fabricated to replicate what is there. Mr. Wojcik asked that if something was taken off the house and not reused, that it would be kept with the house. Mr. Wojcik then spoke about the existing foundation, and said it looked like the plan was to make a hole in the brick wall and keep the existing foundation, but it says to verify with the architects. The architects mentioned that the plan was to leave the foundation that was there, behind the new addition, but that it was necessary to put a hole to

gain access. Mr. Wojcik reiterated that any materials removed from the structure should be kept with the house. He added that he was happy that the plan was to keep the original material as much as possible, that fabrication is not within the guidelines, but in this case it is good to use replication. I agree with the true divided light window. The only other thing I see on the proposed drawing is there are no gutters planned. One of the architects confirmed no gutters were in the plans. These were all the questions Mr. Wojcik had at this time.

Mr. Nevill stated he was neutral on the issue of single-glazed versus double-glazed windows. Although he is not sure how the use of single-glazed windows complies with Energy Efficiency Standards in regards to houses with historical designation, or if there are exemptions for use of single-glazed windows, which would add to the value of the historic house. However, I am not opposed to the use of double-glazed given this is a newer part of the house and would distinguish it from the older part of the house. He would rather see windows matching closer to scale of the original windows, he added. He said that there seemed to be flexibility as he read the guidelines. We're talking about an addition, part of this house that was indeterminate of origin, which was historically significant at the time of it being designated a historic residence, but, again, this addition was indeterminate of origin as to when this addition was added, so it's sort of hodge podge. I think what is to be done improves upon and brings the house to living standards recognizing the need for a house to be livable and something that can be insured for future generations enjoyment of use. That said, the guidelines should be followed as close as possible and reuse of materials and decorative elements as appropriate. He added he believed the windows should be larger to let in more light, certainly reuse of the old ones is an unnecessary burden on the applicants, so I am opposed to enforcing that, to insure livable space. The only item I noticed on the application that should be enforced is that the addition should be distinguishable from the remainder of the house. Will there be some indication that this is the newer part, he asked. One of the architects said they indicated on the drawings the new brick, adding that all the brick has just been redone, but if the board would rather see a hard line that could be accomplished, but that there are some odd things going on with some of the brick. It's not like a wall with an identifiable pattern. The plan is to match the brick and point it exactly like the little small piece that would be left then once we trim the corner then you have got the run under the sunroom part that is going to remain. I really do not have any problems with the plans as submitted, while I acknowledge the boards concerns and respect them.

Mr. Wood stated that this board can make amendments. Whatever your concerns, they can be a part of the amendment of the motion when you get ready to do that. Mr. Wood asked the architects what they propose to do concerning the existing roof. One of the architects replied that the existing roof is not a continuous shed roof, it actually hits at this outside corner so we are proposing to pull that forward and now do a double hip that would go back. Mr. Wood asked if they would be able to reuse materials. The answer was no because the materials would possibly not be in reusable condition along with the need to add new materials for the bump-out and proposing to use the only paintable material on the market, which is galvanized metal. Therefore, we are proposing to have all the seams and things at the same height and to match then paint it onsite. Another question Mr. Wood had was concerning "the addition should be reversible" and any removed materials should be saved and stored. Where should these materials be stored? Comments were made the materials would disappear after a period. A recommendation was to store the materials, such as old windows, in the attic of the house because someone gave an example of purchasing an older home where the original cast-iron stove was stored in the basement.

One of the architects said he was sure the owners would be willing to store the old materials not reused during the remodel.

Dr. Wiedenfeld had a few more comments. I think it is good that the roof is going to match the original in terms of basic shape as well as reusing the brackets and additional wood columns to match the existing. It seems there was a real interest in the louvering, because it's unusual, but because you can't identify there is no interest in maintaining it. Someone stated that they put some sort of bead board behind it when they enclosed the porch and now it's all mold and mildew back there. Dr. Wiedenfeld queried that since there was mold, does that mean you wouldn't be able to save the materials. Mr. Wojcik asked if it was known if this was ever a porch. Too much interference to hear the whole answer, but one of the architects said it was a porch at one time. The one thing about the loss of the louver, Dr Wiedenfeld added, is that the louver did add detail. It is almost as if there was a fenestration there, but there was not. So now, when you put the siding on, there is no fenestration there or the hint of a fenestration. The louvers would look inappropriate because it would be horizontal lines upon horizontal lines if you didn't use the bead board. Here we have these horizontal lines and the louvers, but if you put them on top of clap board siding it wouldn't stand out. Did the national register nomination say anything about them, she asked. One of the architects said he didn't think so. Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked the architects how they saw the addition being both compatible with the historic portion of the building, that she saw that, but do you see anything that identifies it as being a part of its' time. One of the architects quipped, the new simulated divided lights. Dr. Wiedenfeld then mentioned that a sense of humor was good.

Mr. Tucker then added, regarding Carter's discussion of the brick, I would propose that you simply make a butt joint, and use a different brick. Let it show that this is an addition to the addition to the original house and don't try to tooth it in. Don't try to hide the fact that you're adding on to something that has been there a number of years. One of the architects suggested block and pargeting. Mr. Tucker stated the application would then have to be amended. It was mentioned, that is already what is being done, suggestion was just being made to do block and pargeting. Mr. Tucker then reiterated that his suggestion was that you simply attach the new brick adjacent to the new brick, it will differentiate the old brick from the new brick. He added that several of the architects here are countering what the board is stating here, and requested that all work together to get this project approved tonight. The applicant then said it was mismatched in the back already and for her as the applicant and whose home and back yard I'm going to look at, I don't want different brick around there and I don't believe that's unreasonable. Mr. Tucker said the windows and siding and brickwork all are contrary to the architectural guidelines for the historic district. You can't come to us with a project, that before was closer to complying but the detail wasn't there, and then come back with something that's totally different and butts head with the guidelines of the district that we're supposed to follow and apply. That is what we are trying to get beyond. I simply say just butt the brick and the architect says let us do pargeting and stucco, and that is an argument against toothing, and no work to compromise and no work to get this approved tonight.

One of the architects said that he believed that the will of the applicant should be given serious consideration, that he did not believe they are trying to override the guidelines or get us to approve something unusual or unreasonable. He believes the applicants have done a very good job with a project that has been languishing for some time. They are taking action on something that has long been needed. I do not see enough reasons to be looking,

as much in minutia as we are when there is enough that meets our guidelines and finding nonexistent problems goes against our role. I think we have brought up some good concerns that as long as we are open to discussion on these, that is good, but this needs to go both ways. I believe it is their home and for them to be put into a position of not being able to be the place they want to live, is abusing our stewardship. The guidelines on one hand tend to say that any addition should be built compatible with the historic district, compatible to the structure that is being added to, and to the structures that are adjacent. It also says that any new additions should be built as a sign of the times of when they are built. If you think about that, it is kind of an oxymoron. I have tried to reconcile that for myself in the past objectively, with other applicants. You could take from that there has to be give and take, I believe. The guidelines should be subjective. Dr. Wiedenfeld said that is true and seemingly contradictory, but I do sense that the board is willing to not bring up the louver issue. The louver and the bead board were there and we were willing to let clapboard go in instead of the bead board and the louver, so we are already bending quite a bit more in terms of what I am comfortable.

Dr. Wiedenfeld went on to say the guidelines may seem to have contradictory parts, but it is very clear that we are supposed to preserve historic fabric. What is being proposed here is removal of historic fabric on that entire addition with the exception of brackets and columns. All other historic features are gone and those are big changes in terms of the board bending. I am sensing that the board is willing to have give and take but, realistically removing the louvers, taking off the board and batten, and replacing a true divided-light historic window with a simulated divided-light historic window seems to me it is all counter to the guidelines. At this point, I am going to ask for a five-minute recess. Dr. Wiedenfeld told the homeowner she wants her to get this addition. She was fortunate enough to get the tour and it was wonderful. I am sensing a very different approach to this addition then when we first talked and so I am having trouble reconciling the guidelines, the initial application, and the revised application. The homeowner remarked if they only knew what was going on outside of the kitchen in the dark of night, according to previous owners, then their hair would be on end. Dr. Wiedenfeld replied that she was not here or on the board then, so she cannot say about the past.

Dr. Wiedenfeld then said she thought they could suffer a few more questions unless someone is prepared to make a motion. One of the architects stated he was happy doing the butt joint on the brick and wanted to make sure Mr. Tucker knew. Dr. Wiedenfeld thinks it is not necessary to do a different brick. In fact, it would be wrong to do a different brick and be counter to the guidelines. Mr. Tucker stated he felt the architects were distorting and going over and above what he suggested, to the point of argument for a simple feature. Mr. Wojcik said his subjective interpretation of reconciling those guidelines was if you were making an addition like a new wing onto the house, maybe would make sense to differentiate the original, but this is just doubling the size of the existing porch. Therefore, I weigh it in my mind as not necessarily needing to differentiate and trying to replicate and reuse the old materials as much as possible. The only old materials they are not using are the louvers, but agree with the recommendation to keep them with the house along with the window. He views this remodel as minor compared with ones such as years ago on Shirley Street where they added a completely new wing so differentiated it by having a closed separation from the rest of the house. His view is it is better to replicate and match the old materials. He also thinks a true-divided light window should be used. Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the board was ready for a motion.

One of the architects brought up that the board can put what they want in the motion, and if the motion passes, and it is in the motion, it passes. If it does not, it does not. Mr. Tucker then asked if anyone has thought about the question of why the louvers exist in the first place. The applicant stated because when you have an old porch that lets a breeze through, they put that board behind it to enclose it many times. Mr. Tucker then asked, so you are saying that the porch existed with the louvers before the bead board was installed behind the louvers. The applicant then stated she thought so, with one of the architects stating he did not believe so. Mr. Tucker then asked the architects if there was any technical, physical or architectural reason why the louvers could not be reused in the porch. Alternatively, is there a secure garage or storage room on the property where they could be otherwise saved? The applicant then stated there was the dirt cellar, but did not think they will fit down there. Mr. Tucker said he agreed they would not fit through the doorway. They will never go in the attic, he added. Dr. Wiedenfeld then mentioned there was the conditioned crawlspace, but Mr. Tucker said they would disintegrate in a few years.

Mr. Tucker then added that the imaginative solution to this could reuse the louvers. You have reused the scrollwork by flipping it upside down and putting it on the south elevation. I am certain you can find a way to reuse four panels of louvers on the side. You could move the louvers to the far portion, the addition portion of the porch, use your clapboard siding if you want, put the louvers over it and run clapboard siding or leave the bead board that is on the existing east and west sides as is and achieve what the guidelines say to do. In this way, you are reusing the materials, and you are setting it off as distinct. I think this old idea that you use this one story, horizontal clapboard siding on a two-story house is architecturally against the guidelines. It is not a shape or form that exists on the property. I hear what Mr. Wood had to say so we can make a motion and we can say anything we want in the motion. The way I see things going tonight, I believe I am going to vote against what the board is going to propose.

Mr. Tucker then said that regarding the louvers, the first seven to ten feet of wall can remain just as it is. It does not need to be changed, on the east and west side, on the east side anyway, the west side is interior. You have four panels of louvers that are going to be thrown out. One of the architects stated it is listed as south side for what you are referring. Mr. Tucker then said the east side could remain exactly as it is and it does not change anything else in your plan. He said he was speaking of the side yard. One of the architects stated the side yard is listed as south. Mr. Tucker said the house does not sit true east and west. As you identify south, the first seven or eight feet needs no change whatsoever, and then your addition would do like the guidelines say, differentiate. The architects asked if they should leave the louver and then go on with lap siding as we are proposing for the addition. Mr. Tucker then said I am not designing the project, but what I am saying is what you are proposing goes against the ARB. The purpose of this board is to guide you for what is appropriate for the town. If we do not, there is no reason to have a board if we let homeowners do whatever they want to do. One of the architects said the board wants a butt joint and that is fine, we will work the window out the way you want it, Mr. Tucker interjecting that certain window companies will make a single glazed window with a storm panel on the inside. An architect then stated that was fine, but asking us to keep these louvers is over the top in his opinion. Mr. Tucker said the louvers are the only distinguishing feature on the house besides the brackets and its age. Otherwise, it is just a clapboard house. One of the architects asked Mr. Tucker if he saw on the rear elevation, the three panels that were there are not full height and look very much like they were added later. He also said if you look at them, they look very different, like they were added later

and go around the small casement window, which we have already agreed to replace with a pair of larger windows. Mr. Tucker said he did not agree to the larger windows as the architect understood, because the louver panels will not fit around the other windows. The architect feels like Mr. Tucker is trying to reapply a piece of unknown history. Discussion then was about not knowing when the louvers were added, and Mr. Tucker confirmed to the architect he had been out to look at the property and fully understood what they were discussing.

Dr. Wiedenfeld then pointed out that when this application was initially submitted, the louvers were seen as unique historic fabric that were important, but I actually thought they looked like they had been added later, who knows when, it was unclear to me. I was of the understanding at first that the louvers were historically significant and it was an important part of the design. I do see that as being contradictory, but we are going in circles. I believe it is time for a motion and I would like someone to make a motion. I want the motion to be thoughtful and clear so that we can come to a decision one way or another, she said. She then asked if anyone could make a motion. Mr. Tucker stated his motion was to deny and asked if anyone else would like to make a motion. Mr. Wood stated he would try and then the board can amend if desired. Mr. Wojcik made a motion to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness 15-15 for the proposed kitchen addition at 158 Winchester Street with the following conditions: 1) Existing brackets, columns and scrollwork will be used to the extent possible. If the materials are unable to be reused, replication of details will be utilized. 2) Existing brick foundation of existing porch will remain except for that cut in the drawing. The best match will be used for additional brick and they will be feathered in. 3) The existing casement window and louvers will be stored in a place that prevents them from deteriorating and preserves them, preferably on the property, in case someone in the future wishes to use them. 4) A building permit is required for this project. Ms. Hertz seconded the motion. Dr. Wiedenfeld stated there was a motion and a second and asked if there was any amendment. Mr. Tucker said he would offer the amendment that the south facing louver be reused, either in the first bay as it exists now, or in the second bay similar to the way it exists presently with or without bead board below. Mr. Tucker stated his amendment could be rejected or accepted. One of the architects made a suggestion that, if that is the way the ARB wants to go and apparently the man who made the motion is willing to do that amendment, if we are going to try to save the louver on the south side, that's fine. I would save it where it is, not put it in the new bay. The clarification I would like is, if we save that, can we begin lap siding under the rail and then carry lap siding around the rest of the way. (Mr. Tucker interjected that his amendment covered that). I thought Mr. Tucker said something about the first bay or the second bay and Mr. Tucker said it gives you the option. The architect added that he would not want to do that because he would not want to put the historic part on the new. Mr. Tucker says it gives you the option. Dr. Wiedenfeld then said it seems clear. Dr. Wiedenfeld then went on to say the board has an amendment and a second, all in favor. Mr. Norton asked that, if in requiring this, are we detracting from a finished product by forcing the historical materials to be used, and perhaps making the finished product look more clunky or inappropriate. Wonders if the requirement for this louver to remain flow with the addition or cause the addition to look inappropriate? I would not want us to force an approval with the requirement that, in the end, is something that does not look good. Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked Mr. Norton to show her something on the plans. He said they were saving the piece of old rail and reusing it, it would be redone and the existing louver will fit on top of it, if it stays as it is. Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if they called it a rail. Mr. Norton said that yes, it is an existing rail, and we are saving it because like the brackets, they are part of

the original open porch. Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that we now have a motion and a second, all in favor. Mr. Tucker abstained. The motion passed by a majority vote. Dr. Wiedenfeld then went on to say this is an historic moment for the Architectural Review Board; this kitchen has come before us four times. Congratulations, you have your kitchen, she told the applicant.

Dr. Wiedenfeld then stated the next item on the agenda was application **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-28 to install wall sign at 39 S. Fourth Street –** Meridian Financial Partners. Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the applicant if they would like to step up to the podium to state your name for the note taker and tell us about your sign. Agent said yes and she was from Meridian Financial Partner, they had recently moved to 39 S. Fourth Street and we wish to put a wall sign on the wall that faces the (too much interference to hear applicant). Dr. Wiedenfeld mentioned that the building was constructed in 2005 so it is a new building, and asked Sarah Sitterle if she had any comments about the sign. Ms. Sitterle stated it is consistent with the ordinance regulations. There is some flexibility of ordinance where it can be placed. The sign has to be within ten percent of the wall area on which it is placed. Based on the frontage, it would be an appropriate sized sign, 21 square feet. The Board is reviewing this because the number of characters exceeds administrative criteria. Staff would recommend approval of the request with the conditions that it would be mounted eight feet from the ground, the lettering would meet requirements of the ordinance, and sign and building permits would be obtained prior to installation.

Mr. Wood said he understands the sign is going to be 21 square feet, no lights, made of wood, faces East Lee St, with 55 letters. He said the concern he has is the application states hanging sign from wall. He asked the applicant if the sign would be hanging from the wall. The applicant stated the sign would be attached. Mr. Wojcik said the sign was to be two dimensional, there are two sizes listed for the sign and asked if applicant knew which size applies. Ms. Sitterle stated she understood the sign was to be 21 square feet. Mr. Tucker then stated there was only going to be one sign, on the back of the building, but asked if it was the front of your office space, essentially access from the parking. The applicant responded that it was. Mr. Tucker then asked the applicant if they would be amenable to having some form of a border included with the graphics of the sign. I see the sign as a white sign on a white wall with nothing distinguishing it as a sign. The applicant responded that yes that would be fine. Dr. Wiedenfeld then stated that, in the future, when a sign comes before the ARB the size should be on the application. Mr. Tucker said it should also be to scale on any photograph or drawing. Dr. Wiedenfeld asked what space you have between the windows and said it is probably more than three feet. I believe the sign is dull in that it is on a white wall and the sign is in white. Of course, she said, it is a modern building, it is a modern sign with modern font, you are not pretending to be historic with Ye Olde on the sign, and that is good. I believe it does need something around the edges to differentiate it from the siding. That is not in the guidelines but I see that, in terms of aesthetics and the historic district, it might fit in better. Possibly the other board members disagree. Because it is not historic fabric, I do not think there is a need for us to specify how it is put on the building. Mr. Wojcik added that, this is just preference, but do you want it in the center of the building because I thought it may look better over the door. The applicant said they were trying to make a decision about that. She added she does not have a strong opinion about it. Centered is where the sign person and my assistant thought it looked best. If the Board believes it will look best for aesthetics above the door, I do not have any objections. Dr. Wiedenfeld said because of the ballast of the shutters, because you have shutters punctuating it, but the door does not have anything on the side or above

it, it might look better. She added that the Board would not specify that, but it may look better.

Mr. Tucker said he had mentioned a border to differentiate the sign from the wall, actually a frame that is more than one-dimensional would really enhance your sign, but I am not asking for that. At least, please come up with a design of a border of a contrasting color around the perimeter of your sign. It could even have scalloped corners that would enhance it. I took one copy of your sign and put this on the photograph of it. Please come over and look at the picture, he told the applicant. He then showed the applicant what he had drawn around the picture of the sign. He said he believed it would be more interesting and fit quite nicely. He suggested that the size of the sign be adjusted as it need be so the sign is at least 3 inches or 4 inches above the door and 3 or 4 inches below the window. This shows it up tight to the door, I would like to suggest that the motion to include that the sign be offset 3 or 4 inches from the windowsill and the door head. Dr. Wiedenfeld said that, in terms of aesthetics, that location and the border really enhance the sign. Dr. Wiedenfeld then said she needed a motion. Mr. Tucker made a motion that the application for the sign for Meridian Financial Partners be approved provided that it's centered above the door, its' size be adjusted appropriately to clear the top of the door and the underside of the window by 3 or 4 inches, and that a border be included on the perimeter of the sign panel with some distinctive character to the corners of the border. The sign lettering must meet the ordinance requirements in Article 6-2.1.4 with sign and building permits obtained prior to installation. Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that we now have a motion and a second, all in favor. The motion passed with a unanimous vote. Ms Sitterle clarified under Article 6-2.1.4 no wall sign may be erected less than eight feet above the sidewalk or ground.

One of the architects noted about the requirement for scalloped edges on the sign was not given sufficient time to discuss and wonders if scalloping would be appropriate given the type of font being used might not be appropriate and keeping square borders might be more appropriate. Mr. Tucker asked Dr. Wiedenfeld to read the motion concerning the sign. The motion was to approve the wall sign with following conditions: it has a border that is 3 to 4 inches clearance above the door and below the window, lettering must meet the ordinance requirement, and obtain permits prior to installation. The condition of scalloped edging did not make it into the motion.

Dr. Wiedenfeld made motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned 8:45 p.m.