



**MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
TOWN OF WARRENTON
July 23, 2015
7:00 P.M.**

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on July 23, 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. Carter Nevill, Mr. Steve Wojcik, Mr. Jay Tucker, and Dr. Carole Hertz and Mr. Jerry Wood. Ms. Kate Gibson, Planner, 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.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Wojcik asked that the following wording *and would there be a retaining wall* be added on page 4, ninth paragraph at the end of the sentence. With this addition the entire sentence reads as follows.

Mr. Wojcik stated that on the east elevation and on the north elevation at the basement level the drawings show windows and he asked if some of them would be below ground and would there be a retaining wall.

Mr. Tucker made motion to approve the minutes with the revision; Dr. Hertz seconded the motion, the motion passed, and the minutes were approved.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Certificate of Appropriateness 15-13. Replace door at St. John the Evangelist Catholic Church, 271 Winchester Street. Thomas Camarca, agent

Mr. Thomas Camarca was asked to come forward for questions from the Board.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the Board if there was sufficient information to review and consider this application.

Mr. Tucker noted that the application procedure requires several items and there were a few not included with this application. The application did not have sufficient photographs to show where the door would be located on the building, there was no plan to identify the door on the building nor was a site plan included to show where the door was located and if it was visible or invisible and it appeared there were infilled materials not shown.

He indicated this could be worked out with this application, but it should be noted that applications need to include all of the materials that are required and identified on the application. Mr. Tucker stated this was not the first case this had occurred. He recommended the Board proceed with the application but wanted to note that future applications need to include all required materials.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the other Board members if they had any additional comments. There were none. Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Mr. Carmarca to explain the project.

Mr. Carmarca stated there was a door that needed to be replaced in order to meet safety/fire and security requirements. This is an old delapated wooden door located on the old elementary school building that faces King Street. The room is used for youths, and that is the reason it needs to be replaced. The existing door is 48 inches wide. It swings outward onto a landing that is 38 inches, and as result, the door does not open a full 90 degrees. The new door will be 36 inches in order to get at least 90 degree operation with the door. Mr. Camarca indicated the application before the Board included a description of the door, color, and hardware that will be used.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Board members for their comments/questions.

Mr. Wood indicated he had no issue with the door and asked if it matched the other door.

Mr. Camarca stated yes. He indicated the door on one side of the building was a beige/almond color and on the other end of the building there is a similar black door. The frame of the proposed door will match the color of the façade that currently exists. He stated that if color was an issue with the Board it could be easily changed.

Mr. Wood asked if all of the material information listed for the entry door reflected on the application was all that was needed.

Mr. Camarca stated yes but the existing door is 48 inches, the new door will be 36 inches and as result the opening will be reduced by 12 inches and the doorframe will go from masonry to masonry, and about five inches will be wood infilled that will be painted to match the side of the building.

Mr. Camarca indicated he met with Ms. Gibson and submitted the application after that meeting and he did not hear that any other materials were needed for his application and if he had, he

would have done so and apologized to the Board. As far as materials, there will be a door which is shown on the application, there will be a few 2x4 boards and some 2x6 boards and the only other material that will be seen from outside is a 1x6. He stated this was not a large project and in essence is removing one door and doing some framing for the new door because of the change in size but that was the extent of it. He indicated the door is located on the third floor on the side of the building where there is a fire escape and will only get used for emergency.

Mr. Nevill stated that it appears on the opposite end of the building there was a slight reduction of that door and it appears what is reflected on the opposite side is exactly what is being proposed.

Mr. Camarca stated that was correct.

Mr. Nevill asked if the door being replaced faced Winchester Street.

Mr. Camarca stated yes.

Mr. Wojcik indicated he had no questions for the applicant.

Dr. Hertz indicated she had no questions for the applicant.

Mr. Tucker asked if the Fire Marshal was requiring this replacement.

Mr. Camarca stated he did not believe it was the Fire Marshal. Over the course of a couple of years, the school had gone through a security assessment. Because of that assessment, windows have been replaced, cameras have been installed, and one of their auditors recommended the door be replaced and indicated a fire marshal would be in agreement with him. Based on that recommendation, the school made the decision to get it done.

Mr. Tucker asked if there would be panic hardware on the inside of the door.

Mr. Camarca stated yes.

Mr. Tucker asked if the hardware would be steel frame.

Mr. Camarca stated yes, 18 gauge steel frame.

Mr. Tucker asked Mr. Camarca if he proposed to infill with wood between the steel frames.

Mr. Camarca stated there would be a small amount of framing on each side and he will not be going with masonry.

Mr. Tucker asked why not masonry.

Mr. Camarca stated one reason was cost and the other is it would not be seen and the amount of framing to be done is minimal and infilling with masonry would be unnecessary. He stated if he infilled with masonry he would have to cut the block back a foot or two and that is not necessary.

Mr. Tucker commented that the handrails did not appear to meet safety and security standards but that was something the Board did not address.

Mr. Camarca stated he had been a Class A General Contractor in the states of Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia for over 25 years and his first comment to the school was to get the stairs checked. The stairs were inspected and found to be structurally sound and to meet Town Code.

Mr. Tucker stated he had a problem with the infill being wood but if no else on the Board did he would go with it.

Mr. Camarca stated masonry frames does not mean it cannot be wood because typically, not always, he has installed those frames many times with wood and in new construction a frame like that will be installed first but in a retrofit situation that is not the case. Even though it is called a masonry frame it does not mean it cannot be installed with wood and it will be as tight as masonry.

Mr. Tucker asked what material was used for infill on the other door.

Mr. Camarca stated wood.

Mr. Tucker stated the issue this evening was strictly the door installation that has been brought before the Board.

Mr. Tucker stated that a masonry steel frame with commercial structure brick or block could be used with a doorframe with masonry tabs on it. It would be a forever repair, but wood will be a forever maintenance issue.

Mr. Camarca stated that there would be no exposed wood. The opening has to be closed and when he installs the doorframe, he will have something to bolt it to. The only thing that will be exposed on the outside will be a 1 inch trim. He indicated the doorframe was powder coated metal and is as good as it gets in terms of maintenance.

Mr. Tucker stated he did not think the repair had been thought out very well and it lacked detail showing how the repair would be achieved which makes it difficult for the Board to review. He stressed to Mr. Camarca he was not picking on him but it is a shortcoming of submitted applications including materials and it is an ongoing issue.

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant proposes to replace an existing wood exit door with a new metal fire-rated door. The door is on a two-story cinderblock building that was constructed in 1964 and it is a non-contributing resource in the Historic District. Ms. Gibson stated the Zoning Ordinance did not address style of doors, and therefore that was not an issue. Historic Guidelines state non-contributing resources are not required to meet the same criteria as contributing resources. She stated that the proposed door replacement complies with the Zoning Ordinance but Board review is required because of material change. The Guidelines state that non-contributory structures should not have to meet the same criteria as other resources within the Historic District and there

is more flexibility in the design, texture, use of materials and architectural compatibility than with contributory structures. Ms. Gibson stated that it appeared the new door would not negatively affect the surrounding character of the Historic District and she recommended approval of the application with the following condition.

1. A building permit is acquired.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated most of her questions had been addressed but wanted to know why both doors on that side of the building were not being addressed.

Mr. Carmarca stated he did not know but he believed the room below was not used and that may be the reason the church did not consider doing the other door.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated normally the Board does not address color but if a black door is installed on the third story and the door below will be a different color she stated she thought it would look odd from the street side. She indicated that from the photographs it appeared other painting needed to be done as well.

Mr. Carmarca stated she was correct and the color could be changed. The stair railing and landing are black wrought iron and the door on the other end of the building was black.

Dr. Wiedenfeld pointed out something hanging over the stairwell at the opposite end of the building and she asked what the purpose was for having it.

Mr. Carmarca stated he thought it was an attempt to have a portico to protect people from the weather.

Mr. Tucker stated the door is on the south side of the building facing Winchester Street and the heat on that black door will cause it to bow and may bind the latch and a young person may not be able to operate the door.

Mr. Carmarca stated that would not happen because it will be a 20 gauge steel door with a powder coated baked on finish and the paint warranty is seven to ten years. Mr. Carmarca stated he had used a particular brand for over 20 years and at one time there were issues especially when storm doors were put in front of a very dark door and the intense heat would cause the retainer clips, used to hang glass in the door, to melt. This problem no longer occurs and this door will have panic hardware so there will be no latch on the jam side, it will be on the inside.

Mr. Nevill stated that much of what had been discussed exceeds what is in the Board's Charter, regarding color, etc. It is most important that the door meets fire and safety codes. It is a non-contributing structure and leeway is allowed. He believed this was something that was not highly visible from the street. It is non-contributing structure and it does have numerous issues that have been discussed this evening, but in his opinion, it sounded like the parish was working on it bit by bit and in time it will become more attractive and in keeping with the rest of the church's grounds. Everything the Board is tasked to look at meets ARB requirements and unless someone on the Board disagrees, he wanted to make a motion.

Mr. Carmarca stated he has been involved in the church repairs and the new pastor is working very hard to repair and clean it up.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve COA 15-13 for the proposed door replacement at St. John the Evangelist Catholic Church, 271 Winchester Street with the following condition.

1. A building permit is acquired.

Dr. Hertz seconded the motion.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if there was any further discussion

Dr. Hertz stated the major issue here is not just the door but also the safety of the children, and if this panic door opener works easily, that would be beneficial.

Mr. Tucker stated he was not in agreement with the installation and the technical aspects of it.

Mr. Carmarca stated he had already spoken to the Town Building Official.

Mr. Tucker stated his comments did not relate to Building Code.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for a vote on the motion. Four (4) voted in favor and one (1) opposed. Motion passed.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness 15-14. Replace porch roof at 178 Main Street. Keith Selbo, owner.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the Board if they had enough information to proceed with this application.

Mr. Wojcik stated a sample of the roof material was present.

Mr. Tucker questioned if there was enough information if gutters were involved with this project.

Mr. Selbo pointed to the sample material.

Mr. Tucker asked if gutters would be included.

Mr. Selbo stated the gutters would be built in.

Mr. Tucker asked if there would be any change in material.

Mr. Selbo pointed to the sample and stated that would be the material also used for the gutters. He stated the whole roof was being replaced and the gutters would be built into the roof.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Board would proceed with the application and asked Mr. Selbo to explain the project.

Mr. Selbo stated it was an in-kind roof replacement with the exception of the material, which is more appropriate for built-in gutters. He stated the roofing materials form the gutters.

Mr. Wood stated that the applicant has a number of material options and he is using what we recommend, the copper standing seam, and he could use galvanized. Mr. Wood stated he had no problem with the standing seam copper roofing material that the applicant plans to use.

Mr. Nevill stated he agreed with Mr. Wood's statement.

Mr. Wojcik stated he agreed that it would be an improvement.

Dr. Hertz stated she agreed with her colleagues.

Mr. Tucker stated he appreciated that the applicant wanted to replace and repair a roof with copper material and thinks that is the superior material, but his earlier comment about the gutters related to the fact the Board cannot see what was planned because the application was not clear. He stated he assumed with Mr. Selbo's comment that the gutter will be of the same material that is currently there.

Mr. Selbo stated it will be an in-kind replacement.

Mr. Tucker asked if down spouts would be replaced.

Mr. Selbo stated yes.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the application did not have detail information on the seam and the gauge

Mr. Tucker stated it was sixteen ounces and was sufficient.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the material met the Guidelines.

Mr. Tucker stated issues have been the height of the seam being either too tall or too short and he asked Mr. Selbo if he knew the height of the seams.

Mr. Selbo stated it was his understanding it would be the same as it is now.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the age of the existing roof.

Mr. Selbo stated it was 10 years old. He said the roof was fine but the built in gutter material was inappropriate because it could not be soldered.

Mr. Tucker asked Mr. Selbo if the existing roof was pre-painted.

Mr. Selbo stated yes.

Mr. Tucker asked what failed in the 10-year period.

Mr. Selbo stated the gutters because it could not be soldered and adequately sealed.

Mr. Tucker stated that was good information for the Board to know.

Mr. Selbo stated the contractor that put the roof on 10 years ago swore by that method; however, that contractor is no longer in business.

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant proposes to replace the existing standing-seam steel porch roof with a new standing-seam copper roof. The house was constructed in 1870 and is a contributing structure in the Historic District. The property is zoned R-6 and the Zoning Ordinance does not address style of roofing, except that exterior alterations on properties within the Historic District are subject to review. Copper is identified as an acceptable replacement for deteriorated, non-repairable standing-seam metal roofs. Staff recommends approval of this application with the following conditions

1. The roof is hand-formed or mechanically formed on site during installation.
2. The roof is not painted after installation but allowed to darken naturally.
3. A building permit is acquired.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for a motion

Mr. Tucker made motion to approve COA 15-14 for replacement of existing standing-seam steel porch roof with a new standing-seam copper roof at 178 Main Street with the following conditions.

1. The roof is hand-formed or mechanically formed on site during installation.
2. The roof is not painted after installation but allowed to darken naturally.
3. The details are similar or exceed the present and soldered wherever seaming is necessary for anything but the folded joints.
4. A building permit is acquired.

Mr. Nevill seconded the motion.

Mr. Selbo stated he thought color was not something the Architectural Review Board passed on and he could paint whatever he wanted.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated color is not the issue; it is painting the metal that is the issue.

Mr. Selbo asked if that meant the Board could pass on what he could paint on his house.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Guidelines state that copper roofs are not to be painted.

Mr. Selbo stated that was fine but that was not his understanding.

Ms. Gibson read the Guidelines, which state that copper roofs shall not be painted after installation, but allowed to darken naturally.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated other metal roofs could be painted.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Mr. Selbo if he wanted to paint the copper.

He stated no.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for a vote on the motion. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness 15-15. Add kitchen addition at Paradise, 158 Winchester Street. David R. Hall, P.E. Agent

Mr. Winston Watt, owner stated that Mr. Hall was not present and he did not know why, but he would answer questions as best he could.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the Board if there was sufficient information to review the application.

Mr. Tucker stated he had reviewed the application carefully and he had issues that there were no architectural plans, only a drawing of one side of the building. There were no samples of materials, no window sample or description of the window that will be used, no sample of the siding, and no sample of the grill. Mr. Tucker suggested, with the concurrence of the owner, to review the application for comments and discussion and table the application for action for next month or until the issues addressed are dealt with, or simply deny this application as insufficient. Mr. Tucker stated it would be up to the owner to choose what direction the Board should take.

Dr. Hertz asked the homeowner if he was expecting Mr. Hall to be present with the information.

Mr. Watt stated yes and he was very disappointed that Mr. Hall was absent.

Mr. Watt stated he was disappointed the Board did not have the information they needed, and that he could provide them some information based on the instructions he and his wife gave Mr. Hall.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that she could ask for a motion to table the application until next month and discuss it, which would allow Mr. Watt to get the information that the Board needs for next month.

Mr. Watt stated he was fine with that suggestion because he did not want to waste time.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated there was a motion to table the application until next month and to discuss the issues.

Dr. Hertz seconded the motion.

Mr. Wojcik asked if it would be better and more productive to have the discussion with Mr. Hall in attendance.

Mr. Tucker stated he thought the owners would gain a lot of information by the discussion.

Mr. Watt stated he wanted to know where he was short and find out how to fill in the blanks.

Dr. Wiedenfeld provided a checklist to Mr. Watt unofficially that outlined the types of information required as well as extra things the Board may look for.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated there was a motion and a second and she asked for a vote. She asked those in favor of tabling the application until next month and discussing it with the homeowner to vote by saying aye and asked for those opposed. No one opposed but Mr. Wojcik abstained from voting.

Mr. Watt stated he and his wife purchased Paradise in May from the former Mayor Fitch and his wife Patricia. He stated that the Fitches had done a lot of the renovation to the house. He indicated they had given serious thought to purchasing Paradise five years ago, and that at one time he and his wife owned Alwington Manor and this was not his first rodeo for doing this type of work on a historic structure. At the time they first looked at Paradise, the porch was falling off, there were leaks, plaster was coming down, and it was a disaster. He had his contractor go through it and his advice at the time was to run. Therefore, he and his wife brought a home in Haymarket, but they love Warrenton and wanted to come back and he heard about another opportunity to own Paradise. He stated the Fitches had done electrical, plumbing, roof repair, wall plastering, and painting and had refinished the original pine floors in the old section. The grand hallway was blocked some time ago by a kitchen that was put in and that blocked the entrance to the back of the house and the grand stairway. The Fitches removed that kitchen, and the house is back to its original configuration, but now the house does not have a kitchen. There is a summer kitchen that is in a separate building but they need a kitchen to make the house complete. The southeast corner of the house is part of the 1870 wing and it is not visible from the street. There is one room that is approximately 8x17 but it is not big enough for a kitchen so they plan to bump it out about eight feet for the kitchen. The back of the house has a beautiful louver look, there is one window in the center, and his plan is to take that and move it back eight feet. Mr. Watt stated his contractor took pictures of what it would look like when it is completed. Mr. Watt stated the exterior materials and brick foundation integrity has to be maintained for ARB and because it is on National Historic Register.

Mr. Watt stated that he had talked with Patricia Fitch about what she and Mayor Fitch were going to do, which was to bump out the whole length of the rear of the house eight feet and put in a kitchen. Mr. Watt stated this kitchen addition is not a new idea for the restoration of the property, and he was going through the required steps.

Mr. Watt stated that Mr. Hall was asked to come up with a set of plans that the ARB needed so the project can get started. He indicated he and his wife are currently not living there because there is only one functional bathroom with no shower, but it is slowly coming together so he and his wife can make it their home. He stated there was a lot of work being done to the grounds and he is not looking to change anything about the house other than the kitchen and planned to maintain the structural integrity and the historic nature of this property.

Mr. Watt indicated that he and his wife restored Alwington Manor 20 years ago and even though it was not in the Historic District, he wanted to preserve its history. It has become a valuable part

of the community; that is what he and his wife want to do for Paradise.

Mr. Watt stated he could not address the technical aspects of the project in terms of materials, etc., but that is their vision for the property.

Mr. Tucker asked Mr. Watt if he had selected a builder.

Mr. Watt indicated he had discussions with B&L Builders but had not made a selection, but his goal was to have a builder experienced in restoring historical properties.

Mr. Tucker stated that B&L Builders were excellent. However, his reason for asking is that he sees the “match existing” statement, but in terms of getting it built like that, it did not convince him that a builder, even B&L Builders, is going to do that. He stressed the need for Mr. Watt’s designer to detail these issues and put it on the permit, and show exactly what the items are going to be so when the Building Official and Zoning Department reviews it for compliance with ARB approval they can look at the drawings, look at what was built, and determine if it complies. Right now, it says this is not the original but it is kind of like it.

Dr. Hertz asked what materials would be added.

Mr. Watt stated it would be added on the side and will be matching wood.

Mr. Tucker stated that it would help if a notation stated very clearly that it will be removed and reinstalled as it is. The description needs to be clear as to what materials will be used.

Mr. Watt stated that the louvers were installed as panels and he is in great hopes that they are wood screwed on a panel that can be removed without having to reconstruct it.

Mr. Watt stated that the only window is the one that is in the existing room and shown in the photographs. No additional windows will be added.

Mr. Tucker asked Mr. Watt the date the enclosed porch was put on the house.

Mr. Watt stated 1870. When you face the house, the center section is 1758, the two wings were added in 1870, and the porch is in the rear of the left hand wing.

Mr. Wood commended Mr. Watt for taking on this older place, and stated that at one time, he owned a pharmacy on Main Street and he is familiar with what is required of maintaining these older structures. He asked what kind of foundation was in the house.

Mr. Watt stated it was brick and the original house is dry lock stone.

Mr. Wojcik stated when additions are being added onto old structures located in the historic district he focuses on (1) conserving and using the existing materials and (2) keeping the structure in tact as much as possible. Mr. Wojcik noted that the description used the wording *if possible* applicant proposes to re-use existing materials removed from the south elevation. He underscored *if possible* because he would prefer to have an assessment made so when it comes

before the Board we will know that it will be re-used or if not, the reasons for not doing so.

Mr. Tucker suggested Mr. Watt remove the wording *if possible* from his description.

Mr. Wojcik asked Mr. Watt if he planned to keep the foundation intact and add another foundation for the addition, or if it will be destroyed and made into a crawl space.

Mrs. Watt stated his intention was leave it as it is and add on.

Mr. Wojcik stated it would be reassuring for him if the application specifies all the materials that will be used for the addition and whether or not the grill will be re-used.

Mr. Watt stated it was a great feature of the house but it could not been seen from the street because it was in the rear.

Mr. Tucker asked if the neighbors could see it.

Mr. Watt stated no because directly behind it is the old smokehouse and between the smokehouse and the house is only about 20 feet. That structure blocks the view from the left side and no one is behind it because of the large trees and wooded area.

Mr. Wojcik suggested that Mr. Watt specify in the application the type of metal roof that he will be replacing and include all the details. The Guidelines are somewhat contradictory because it states the addition should not try to match but in this case it is good to try to match.

Mr. Nevill stated that it was obvious the owner had put a lot of thought and effort into this in maintaining the character and nature of the house. He stated he would be excited to see the materials and if copper roof is appropriate, as would have been used during that time. He did not feel there would be any issues for the Board to move forward with this application. It is a National Historic house and he hoped Mr. Watt had explored if there were grants that he may be able to receive.

Mrs. Watt indicated that was done when the Fitches owned the property.

Dr. Hertz stated that the small double window would not provide much light and asked what they would use for light.

Mrs. Watt stated interior lighting. No additional windows will be added.

Mr. Tucker listed the following that the designer should provide.

1. Floor Plan
2. Foundation Plan
3. Wall Section – show how the wall is actually going to be built
4. Grill Detail – brackets and scroll works so the Board will know how it will be replicated
5. Take out the wording *if possible* and state it will be.
6. Roof façade detail including gutter detail

7. Information on the metal roof

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she would like to see a better plan of how the roof will look. She asked about the back room with all the glass.

Mr. Watt stated that was a sunroom that was added on in the 90's.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that section was vinyl siding and asked if that was the only vinyl siding on the house.

Mr. Watt stated yes.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Mr. Watt if it would be possible for the Board to walk around his home and look.

Mr. Watt stated yes.

Mr. Tucker asked Mr. Watt if he had considered replacing the vinyl siding to something more appropriate and adding it to the application.

Mr. Watt stated the entire length of the section was windows and there is not a lot of vinyl on there.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the grillwork dated to 1870.

Mr. Watt stated yes.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that the application needed to address the blending of the two foundations in relation to how mortar issues will be dealt with. There will be a veneer blended with the brick, and there will be a seam between the old brick and new brick. Old mortar is soft but new mortar is not.

Mr. Tucker stated that is identified as type N mortar.

Dr. Wiedenfeld made Mr. Watt aware of a Fauquier County Masonry Seminar workshop held earlier this year that was excellent and there were artisans there that worked with old brick.

Mr. Tucker stated that the brick is not supposed to match the existing.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she did not say match but if you have an eight-inch long brick and you are blending this old foundation with the new somehow they are going to touch. She stressed that her main concern was the mortar. At some point, there will be new mortar touching old bricks and care needs to be taken.

Mr. Tucker stated the plan does not show that the bricks are being interlaced and that needed to be pointed out that they are abutting and not interlacing. If you interlace a brick, it is being laced with unknown mortar that is there but it should be an obvious addition.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the floor in the addition would be level with the existing floor in the house.

Mr. Watt stated yes.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the glass room was on the same level.

Mr. Watt stated yes.

Mr. Tucker stated that there would be a western wall and that needed to be included.

Mr. Tucker stated all three elevations needed to be included in the plan.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if there would be a door on this addition.

Mr. Watt stated no.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the roof pitch was enough.

Mr. Tucker stated the staff had researched the Building Code and the staff report states that the minimum slope is two percent for a standing seam metal roof. Mr. Tucker stated Mr. Hall needed to prove that the roof would fit beneath the windows of the second story and above the wall that is eight feet out from the house and still meet the minimum two percent.

Mr. Watt stated that he had Mr. Dave Loving and Mr. Hall come out and measure and both have assured him it will fit.

Mr. Nevill stated that the foundation has a pattern and indicated that pattern should be addressed in the application.

Mr. Watt stated the pattern would be the same.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Ms. Gibson if she wanted to add anything to the discussion.

Ms. Gibson stated that her issues had been addressed in the discussion.

Mr. Wojcik stated that mechanical information needed to be included in the checklist. Drawings need to provide information on the system and location.

Mr. Tucker asked Mr. Watt if the discussion had been helpful.

Mr. Watt stated it had been very helpful and he expressed appreciation to the Board for taking the time to discuss it with him.

Work Session

Mr. Tucker asked staff if there were any administrative approvals.

Ms. Gibson stated no.

Mr. Carter stated that having Ms. Gibson speak after the applicant and the Board's discussion was redundant. He suggested she speak first, explaining the application before the applicant, which would relieve the applicant. He felt this procedure would streamline the process.

Mr. Wojcik inquired about the status of the project on the yellow house located on Winchester Street. Ms. Gibson stated she would inquire with the Building Official. Mr. Wojcik stated that Mr. McDonald has recently purchased the building on Hotel and Culpeper Streets, and he spoke about all the renovation work he had done on old structures in Town. He suggested ARB consider a commendation about good restoration work that has been done.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she thought that was a great idea.

Mr. Tucker stated that would be good for any project.

Dr. Hertz made motion to adjourn. Mr. Wojcik seconded.

Meeting Adjourned 8:30 pm.

Minutes Submitted By
Dee Highnote