



TOWN OF WARRENTON

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

MINUTES ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD TOWN OF WARRENTON August 27, 2015 7:00 P.M.

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on August 27, 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, Dr. Carole Hertz and Mr. Jerry Wood, Town Council representative. Ms. Sarah Sitterle, Director of Planning & Community Development and Ms. Kate Gibson, Planner were in attendance and 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

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if there were any changes or revisions to the July 23, 2015 meeting minutes and there were none. Mr. Nevill made motion to approve the minutes. Dr. Hertz seconded the motion and all voted in favor. Minutes were approved.

OLD BUSINESS

- A. **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-15. Add kitchen addition at Paradise, 158 Winchester Street.** Applicants have asked for a continuance in order to address all concerns of the Board. Application will be heard at the September 24, 2015 meeting.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she had visited the property and encouraged the other members of the Board to do so.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. **Discussion of Parking Lot Wayfinding Signage.** Sean Polster, Council Member

Mr. Polster presented three different parking signs that are in Old Town and indicated that about three months ago he looked at the wayfinding signs for the Town of Warrenton to see what Town Council could do to help businesses. Council has been proactive in hiring the Economic Development Director and providing scholarships to Lord Fairfax Community College and some other programs.

One of the things they are trying to do is get people to Warrenton and direct them to Old Town once they come in through the by-pass. One question that came up during the Wayfinding Study was the parking signs. These signs became a known problem when the Interim Town Manager, Mr. Hendrix, got lost trying to get out of the Visitor Center parking lot. Mr. Polster handed out pictures of the three different parking lot signs found throughout Town. Mr. Polster stated this summer he traveled with his family to 13 states from South Carolina to Maine and the towns that had signage were easy to get around and the towns that did not were difficult to navigate. He indicated the Maine signs were the best because they were very distinct and stood out.

During the Wayfinding Study, the signs approved had contrasting colors. What he presented to the ARB was instead a standard "P" Sign, and he requested permission from the Board to do a contrast with the blue and green.

There are currently three different parking signs in Town. One is a teal color. Another is a brown color, and some of those are on bricks and there is no contrast. The other sign is a hunter green color with a white circle and burgundy inlay. Mr. Polster stated these signs would match the wayfinding signs and would be located on the bypass, Shirley Highway and Broadview Avenue and direct people to Old Town.

Mr. Polster asked for the Board's opinion on his proposal.

Mr. Nevill stated he has had privilege of seeing the wayfinding signs around Town and agrees with the project's concept. He stated he did like the continuity. As a business owner and as a resident he stated he was excited about this. The color continuity between the whole of what Warrenton is becoming identified as and uniquely radiating from the Old Town and drawing the two together is important and he was pleased with it.

Mr. Wojcik stated it was a great idea and he liked it.

Dr. Hertz stated she found it to be eye catching and liked it.

Mr. Tucker stated it was better than any of the other three.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked where the new signs would be located.

Mr. Polster stated the plan is to have universal signs across the Town. Mr. Polster stated the problem is that you find one parking sign and then you are looking for that sign as you go through Town and it is missed because signage changed. The plan is to have continuity with signs across the Town.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if more signs would be added.

Mr. Polster stated he plans to discuss this with Town staff and Mr. Bo Tucker. Council has allocated funds for signs and he will work with the Economic Development Director.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked how many signs would be replaced.

Mr. Polster stated approximately 60.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if this project was part of a greater program. The signage to the entrances into the Historic District is equally mismatched if not worse.

Mr. Polster stated the Council is looking at the Comprehensive Plan, and the thought process was that it would premature to do all of these at the present and to wait until the Comprehensive Plan was done, and then do a branding study for the Town and a Wayfinding Study that encompasses the entire Town. Over the past twenty years there have been several studies, and Council found those studies only focused on Old Town Warrenton. One of the things they want to do is to include the businesses located on the by-pass and do a whole Town study. When that is complete, it would be a total project. One finding is that when doing the Wayfinding Signs out on the bypass, the Town could take away three or four signs, depending on location. They would like to take down some of the brown signs that say Old Town and some that say Visitor Center, decrease the sign clutter, and improve the visibility.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if Mr. Polster would be working with VDOT.

Mr. Polster stated Town controls all signs located in the town limits. The only signs VDOT would have control over would be the 17/29 by-pass and any signs on the Outback restaurant side or coming into Town from Marshall. VDOT only has control on signs outside of the town limits.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if he would be working on signs for those areas.

Mr. Polster stated no. He stated VDOT has a company they work with called Virginia Logos and Council plans to work with them to develop the outer ring signs that say Historic Warrenton or Commercial District as a way to pull people from those directions into Town.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the Board would have opportunity to review and comment on the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Sitterle stated yes.

Mr. Polster stated he was asking ARB permission to have staff move forward and use these signs.

Mr. Nevill stated he questioned whether ARB had purview over this given that this is a Town and municipal project instead of a private property project. He stated he thinks it is important that the Town and ARB are working together, but he questions if this is something over which the ARB has voting authority.

Mr. Tucker expressed appreciation for this being brought to the ARB's attention for advice and approval.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that perhaps a motion stating the Board supports this effort could be made.

Mr. Nevill made the following motion. *The ARB is in agreement with the need to move forward on appropriate signage that helps promote and draw tourism to the Old Town Historic District and that methods to do so include the ARB's consent and advice. This is about Warrenton as a whole of which Old Town and the Historic District are very important.*

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for a second

Dr. Hertz second the motion.

All voted in favor.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness 15-22. Construct ten townhouses at 67 Waterloo Street. David A. Norden, Architect.

Dr. Wiedenfeld commented that the original structure at 67 Waterloo Street, the Eppa Hunton house and its slave quarters, tragically burned last year and was subsequently demolished. This was a significant property within Warrenton's Historic District, both in terms of its history and its architecture. The loss of such a prominent resource to the Historic District is immeasurable. It is incumbent on this Board, through the application of the Warrenton Historic District Design Guidelines and the Certificate of Appropriateness process, to encourage the architect and property owner to again make 67 Waterloo Street a resource that Warrenton can be proud to have within the Historic District.

Dr. Wiedenfeld noted that the title page of the Warrenton Historic District Design Guidelines includes a quote from Architect John Ruskin, which reads as follows:

“When we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for....”

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that staff analysis would be foregone because detailed analysis was provided and published in Fauquier Now.

Mr. David Norden, Architect with Hinckley, Shepherd & Norden. He introduced Mr. Don Turman who was present and representing the owner. Mr. Norden stated that he and his firm were involved with the restaurant project, which was approved by the ARB prior to the fire. When the building burned the owner's interest in doing a new restaurant without the historic fabric on the property was negated. Other opportunities that the zoning would allow were explored with the owner, and he came up with this project of 10 townhouse units. Mr. Norden stated they were trying to shoot for higher-end units for retirees moving into Old Town rather than a first time homebuyer. Two different designs have been made. Six units will be located on

Smith Street and four units will be located on Diagonal Street. Mr. Norden stated that access to this property was not possible from either Smith or Diagonal Streets. Smith Street is a one-way street. Diagonal was also not practical. He met with Ms. Sitterle on various issues and entering from Waterloo Street was determined to be the best option.

The idea for staggering the units was to try to break them up as they faced Diagonal and Smith Streets. The owner intends to put in a sidewalk in front of the units on Smith Street where there is no sidewalk now. Mr. Norden indicated the project had been pulled back in order for the sidewalk to be built on the owner's property. He stated the plan would include a green median with street trees planted between the units to help block the view of the inner workings of the units. All units will have two car garages plus an extra parking space. Mr. Norden provided to the Board an overlay to get the idea and feel for the scale of buildings located in the area. Mr. Norden stated the packet includes photographs of the buildings around the site. He indicated that some are very large scale and some were closer to the street than the project would be. He identified a place along Waterloo Street for proposed green space for trees.

Mr. Norden stated he could not recall what was in the staff report, but that the property is zoned as CBD and just about everything in Town is allowed under that zoning, such as townhouses, single family houses, an apartment buildings. The allowable density for an apartment building was calculated at 17 units. Mr. Norden stated originally more than 10 units could be placed on the property but the owner settled at 10. They have made the units larger than the average townhouse at 24 feet wide and 42 feet long. Mr. Norden stressed again the goal was to reach a higher-income market with a higher sale price targeted for older people who want to move into Town from substantial houses outside of Town that they no longer can or want to maintain.

Mr. Norden stated the units on Diagonal Street have elevators, but the units on Smith Street do not. Mr. Norden stated they could be interchangeable. The packet includes an alternative for the four units on Diagonal Street with the elevators to utilize the roof with another half story for a master suite with a roof deck. Whether they build that will depend on what their market study shows but they would like to know the Board's opinion.

Mr. Norden indicated all the units are brick up to the eave with brick all along Waterloo Street with HardiePlank siding and trim. Mr. Norden had samples of various features of the units that included windows, crown molding, and siding, which is proposed to be smooth, not fake wood grain. The owner wants to use shingles and he noted his firm is not fond of architectural shingles because it looks like a shag rug on a roof and they are proposing to use generic non-descript three tab shingles for the roof, which are intended to disappear.

Mr. Norden brought a sample window but indicated it was smaller than what would be placed in the units. He stated the windows in the units would be 3 feet by 5 ½ feet or 6 feet on the main level with nine-foot ceilings. On the second level, 3-foot by 5-foot windows. He indicated the windows are aluminum with R500 Finish with 7/8 inch beaded muntins.

Mr. Norden asked for questions.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Mr. Norden to be seated, as she wanted to delay questions until after public comment and then have him come back up later for questions.

Public Comments

Michelle Ferri, former Vice Chair of the ARB who lives on Smith Street. Ms. Ferri stated she would prefer to make her comments after the discussion of the ARB and applicant.

Mr. Tucker stated that the reason Dr. Wiedenfeld was running the meeting in this manner was because there had been hundreds of comments made about this project on social media and there are a few people here. It is true the Board may have read the comments on Facebook, but it is good to hear from those who have taken the time to attend and hear what their concern or support may be.

Ms. Nancy Blough – 79 Waterloo Street. She expressed safety concern for the residents that live along Smith Street currently and of course the new residents because it is such a small street, and having six townhouses facing Smith Street with an entrance is going to be very busy and it will crowd the five or six parking spaces currently on Smith Street. She indicated she could barely back out of her driveway now because there is a telephone pole there, and that to have more confusion there will bother the current residents.

Mr. Bill Weaver lives at 12 Smith Street and is Michelle Ferri's husband. He stated that he currently spends a lot of time out and around his house and is aware of traffic that is on Smith Street and asks that the Town lower the speed limit to 15 MPH. He noted one of the homes owned by Malcolm Alls on Smith Street, and that its front door steps right onto the street and the residents living there have a small child. He said traffic comes down that street all the time. He said he has talked to his neighbors, and along with Nancy's Blough, is concerned about six more houses close to the street. He appreciated that a sidewalk was going to be put in, but when the restaurant burned, it caused him to lose trees because they were so close. His concern now is there will be six buildings closer to the street and if something happens he questions that. Why introduce a new situation that could possibly do the same thing? The second concern he expressed was traffic flow and parking spaces on the street and the narrowness of the road. He stated he could not pull into his driveway if someone was parked before his driveway. He indicated he reviewed the townhomes located near the Division of Motor Vehicles and the townhome development that is being put in further down Falmouth Street and the additional parking spaces they put because they were mandated to. People are going to have visitors and guests and they are going to want to park in front of their house periodically but Smith Street is a narrow street, and there is no parking on Waterloo Street. Diagonal is a narrow street and if there are cars parked you have to go around it but if there is more traffic and more parking on the streets both Diagonal and Smith Streets will become impossible. Mr. Weaver stated he thought the density was too much for the street.

Mr. Tucker asked if it would help if Smith Street were widened in the area of this development to accommodate parking on both sides of the street.

Mr. Weaver asked how that would happen with Malcolm's house up against the street.

Mr. Tucker stated from there down.

Mr. Weaver stated he did not know if that would work or not because he had not considered that

as a possibility.

Mr. Wood stated his concerns with both of those streets and asked Mr. Norden the size of the whole lot.

Mr. Norden stated it was more than one-half acre but less than three-quarters of an acre.

Mr. Wood stated he had concerns about widening the street and asked what the set back was for Smith Street.

Mr. Norden stated it was zero because it is zoned CBD. The sidewalk would be on the owner's property.

Mr. Wood asked Mr. Norden if the plan also included an area between the two streets.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Mr. Wood to hold his questions until Mr. Norden returned to the podium and she wanted to allow opportunity for any further public comments.

Ms. Michelle Ferri stated that safety concerns have been expressed, and she asked that whatever solution is made this evening be made very thoughtfully and harmoniously with the District. She felt this particular solution was not compatible with the District and did not have enough detail or variety to blend in with the District. She stated she did not disagree with the use, as a more intense use to transition between the CBD and the residential. Personally, as a neighbor, she found the residential use of the townhouses preferable to the restaurant, but it is very intensive and the streets need to be honored for what they are. There is no landscaping along Smith or Diagonal. She stated she would be hard-pressed to find any residential properties in the district that have no yardage in their front yards. The commercial properties do not have yardage but this is not a commercial property. To compare this property to its immediate neighbor is not a good comparison. She stressed that the Board needed to keep in mind that there are no yards on either street when they are considering this project. To develop a private street down the center and ignore the other two streets in her opinion is not right because the other two streets currently exist and should be honored.

Dr. Hertz asked Ms. Ferri if she would be against widening the street.

Ms. Ferri stated no, not necessarily. She stated she had never considered that and could not comment on it.

Mr. Yakir Lubowsky, President of Fauquier Historical Society, active conservationist and member of Town Council. He stated that a few years ago he sat on the ARB as Town Council representative. Mr. Lubowsky showed a large photograph of Napoleon's Restaurant and indicated that he had spoken to most of the Board members and they knew what his feelings are about this project. Mr. Lubowsky stated the parcel is a critical parcel and no matter what has stood there in the past, it needs to be viewed exactly as the linchpin that it is, for so many reasons including the integrity of the Historic District. Whatever goes there needs to be a contributing structure. Of course, it cannot be a historically contributing structure because that is gone. However, it can be a contributing structure in sense of place and something of which the Town

can be proud.

Mr. Lubowsky stated that Mr. Polster mentioned the Matt Thornhill and Ed McMahon presentation, which had the purpose of education of the community in the importance of things like Napoleon's Restaurant and what we do in the space that is the core of the Historic District. From that perspective, there is process and result. Mr. Lubowsky stated he had discussions with Mr. Norden regarding this and wanted to note that he considered Mr. Norden a friend and former Town Council colleague, who he misses being there. Process like this is one of a kind, hopefully never to be repeated in our lifetime. When something like Napoleon's Restaurant is lost, an opportunity is presented. With that opportunity is a mighty challenge to elevate the community. A healthy process is open to the community, without waiting for the ARB meeting, which is the only opportunity for the public to have input into this. As far as anyone else knows, it is by-right and, but for some administrative processes, this thing kind of slides right through unless ARB stops it.

A better process would have been for the applicant to come to the community early and tell them they did not burn the house and are sorry it happened, but that given the extraordinary circumstances, they would like to hear what people feel about this space. How do people feel about this? He indicated he had not read the entire Facebook posting but clearly, people have strong feelings about this project. He stated that it would have been healthier to engage the people in a dialogue about the project, including the use. Mr. Lubowsky indicated that he has sat on ARB and Planning Commission as Town Council Representative, and each time there was a hearing for proposals from this applicant, the groups did everything possible to facilitate the applicant's use of the space in two critical fashions. One was to clearly preserve the historic asset that was there and secondly to have a restaurant, which was their intention. A restaurant is cash positive, generates meal taxes, and is the way the Town keeps the lights on. What we end up with from a residential development is more people, who will not generate revenue.

With respect to the virtue of what is being proposed, perhaps the Town did not get the process, but maybe the ARB can require it. Everyone can have their own opinion as to what is here and he knows that David, Rick & Albert are very talented architects and all are very civic-minded people. The project is in the hand of the right people but even good guys make mistakes. This project is a mistake. It is the wrong thing, wrong use, wrong appearance, and it does not elevate that space or the community. This is something that can be sold and we want everyone to be successful, but the profitability of the applicant is not our principal concern. The Town's focus must be on the thing they will leave potentially for a long, long time. It is the ARB's responsibility to consider this impact.

Dr. Wiedenfeld thanked all that made remarks to the Board. She stated the Board would begin their discussion and questions for Mr. Norden, and asked him to return to the podium.

Prior to Mr. Norden speaking, Mr. Don Thurman stated to the Board that he was there on behalf of the owner and wanted to address traffic flow. He stated that traffic was a concern, which he thought they did address appropriately by having three parking spaces behind each unit. He indicated they did not think people would park in front, but in the rear, and if they had guests, they assumed it would be after businesses had closed and guests could utilize those parking areas. The applicant felt that they were meeting tenant parking needs inside the development, and

this would be less disruptive. This project is being marketed to local people who know the area and the residents. They may take those spaces occasionally but they will have a driveway and parking spaces. Mr. Thurman stated that it was their opinion a residential use would bring less traffic than commercial because people come and go less often for residential. There are positives and negatives to everything.

Dr. Wiedenfeld thanked Mr. Thurman for his comments.

At the conclusion of Mr. Thurman's comments, the Board made their comments as follows:

Dr. Wiedenfeld's Comments

Dr. Wiedenfeld read the following prepared comments:

I am going to exercise my prerogative as Chair and provide my comments first. There are two primary areas of concern: the incompleteness of the information package and the unsympathetic design. The Architectural Review Board deserves the respect of a complete package. The Town of Warrenton deserves a design that is compatible with the Historic District.

The package provided by Mr. Norden lacks the necessary information to clearly and precisely understand what is being planned. The set of plans provided is minimal and lacks sufficient detail. The site plan, for example, does not include dimensions, topography, or information on proposed grading. There is no sense of how these proposed townhouses compare in footprint to nearby structures, something that could be accomplished easily by superimposing a plan of the footprint on aerial photography.

Dr. Wiedenfeld noted that some of the information was provided this evening, but there was not sufficient time for the Board to review it.

I cannot tell where the property line is in relation to the structures. There is no information on lighting or landscaping. There are no details on the proposed pavement and materials. No walkways are indicated. No terrace or entry pavement materials are described. Any samples you are providing tonight at the last minute will require time for review for their sufficiency.

The Board needs to know specific details about the design and fabric being used. We need to see deck edges, railing details, porch and deck flooring, column details. There is no information about the roof. Will the project have guttering? Will the roof have vents? Chimneys? Antennas? Exhaust fans? Will these townhouses have HVAC? Where will the mechanical equipment be located? What kind of screen will be used around that HVAC? Will there be exterior lighting? Will there be dumpsters?

Will the salvaged materials from the Eppa Hunton house be used in this project?

The application design fails to meet the *Warrenton Historic District Design Guidelines* for new construction in the Central Business District. It lacks architectural compatibility and aesthetic continuity as called for in the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for compatibility sympathetic to the Historic District.

According to the *Guidelines*, in the section for New Construction (p. 70), “the building should be recognized as a product of its period...consistent with the architecture in the Historic District.”

Under New Construction, #2, the Placement/Relationship to the Street, any new construction should “Recognize the historic grid street plan throughout the district and the immediate surroundings where historic buildings face toward the major street.” Furthermore, “Orient primary buildings to face the front major streets in keeping with neighboring buildings in the immediate surrounding. New primary buildings on corner lots should face the major street.” It is obvious that Waterloo is the primary street, but this design has made Waterloo secondary. The view from Waterloo is essentially two large brick side-walls devoid of architectural detail and minimal fenestration and an alley lined with decks and parking. In terms of orientation, the saw-tooth siting appears to violate this part of the *Guidelines* as well. I will point out that the primary entrance to one of the townhouses adjacent to Waterloo appears to be an afterthought, perhaps to acknowledge Waterloo. I believe it is clear that the *Guidelines* require siting to reference Waterloo as the primary street.

The *Guidelines* also note that new construction should “comply with the predominant front and side setback patterns of contributing buildings.” The design appears to violate this requirement as well. While one neighboring house on Smith Street is close to the street, there is a small setback on Diagonal Street.

The *Guidelines* note that infill should “Avoid blank undifferentiated walls and lack of openings.” Note the undifferentiated walls and lack of fenestration on the Waterloo walls.

The *Guidelines* are very clear about **Proportion, Scale, Spacing, Massing, and Form** in section 3. Specifically, new construction should “Comply with the predominant height of contributing buildings on a block.... No new infill building...should ever exceed three stories unless the structure can be lowered into the ground. Avoid heights that exceed the adjacent building.... New townhouses or multi-family residences in permitted zones should also comply with the predominant height of contributing buildings and not exceed three stories. Lower roof pitches and belt courses are encouraged on tall buildings” (p. 71).

The proposed design clearly violates the height recommended in the *Guidelines*.

In terms of proportions, new construction of houses “should reflect that of contributing houses” in the neighborhood.”

The *Guidelines* also recognize spacing in historic lot sizes in residential neighborhoods. “Typical to their nineteenth-century development..., the grander mansions in the Historic District stand on large lots with grassy front and side yards. Subdivision of large lots... for infill construction may negatively impact the integrity of the historic setting.” This proposal clearly violates the *Guidelines*.

New construction should “Comply with the predominant massing of the form and elements of contributing buildings in their block or neighborhood.” This should be addressed with better visual materials in the package, so a fair comparison is made with neighboring contributing structures. What will these townhouses look like next to the building across Diagonal Street?

Next door on Diagonal? Next door on Smith Street?

The *Guidelines* require that new construction “Respect the relationship between wall surface area and window opening area of contributing commercial and residential buildings in the block or neighborhood” (p. 73). I again refer to the design of the townhouse walls on Waterloo Street.

And “True divided lights are encouraged.”

The *Guidelines* also recommend that new construction “Incorporate an appropriate amount of detail and decoration in new construction to avoid blandness and establish a compatible relationship with contributing buildings.” This has been egregiously ignored. I again refer to the Waterloo elevations. I also note that there is no recognition of neighboring structures.

I would also note that on page 97 of the *Guidelines*, on the demolition of contributing buildings, that “Under all circumstances of demolition for contributing buildings or historic landmarks, [the applicant should] design, and present to the ARB for approval an interpretative ground sign that will explain its history. The sign should be placed on the property where the building formerly stood.” It is clearly incumbent on the applicant to provide the ARB with the plans for that sign with any application involving the property at 67 Waterloo Street. The owner who demolished the building is the applicant, and this sign is clearly required within the Guidelines.

In short, the application package is inadequate and the design of these ten townhomes at 67 Waterloo Street does not conform to the *Guidelines* for new construction.

Mr. Norden stated he would have liked to have had a copy of her comments prior to the meeting and asked for clarification on her comment relating to topography. He stated he could address all of her questions. He noted that they do not show topography but they do show property lines, and sidewalks, and if she did not see them on the drawings, he would be glad to show them to her.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated there were no dimensions, no property lines, and there was something that indicated sidewalk but there is a lot left to interpretation. This is a very important application and parcel, and the Board cannot leave anything to guess work. She needs to see where the property line is and she stated she did not know he was proposing a sidewalk and she did not know where the right-of-way is, and she did not know where anything is or the dimensions. She indicated she did not see topography or anything that shows the relationship to that. She stated that what Mr. Norden provided this evening is helpful and stated she would have liked to have seen it before the meeting. There are townhouses that have been put up in this Town that dwarf their neighbors and it is very important for the Board to get a sense of what this is going to be like. This is how people will see Warrenton driving on Waterloo Street and this will be an introduction into the Central Business District. It is very important that the Town get this right because they only have one shot at this.

Mr. Norden stated he could not agree more, and asked Dr. Wiedenfeld to confirm her comments for his notes. He stated that Dr. Wiedenfeld had a list of things and he wanted to make sure he wrote them down and did not miss any of them.

Dr. Wiedenfeld indicated he could have her list.

Mr. Norden stated that the gutters are explained on the project drawing.

Dr. Wiedenfeld indicated information on chimneys, antennas, exhaust fans, HVAC, mechanical equipment and screening around HVAC are not included. Will there be exterior lighting? Will there be dumpsters? Will any of the salvaged materials from the Eppa Hunton house be used in this project?

Mr. Norden stated that the gutters are addressed on the drawings, and he could address other concerns now or wait for the other comments.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that she would prefer to have the other Board members present their comments first.

Mr. Wood's Comments

Mr. Wood state this is a historical house, and Mr. Lubowsky is right that it is important what we do and put there. Congressman Hutton was the owner of this house many years ago. He stated he was disturbed with the poor attendance of residents to the meeting. He stated people will not attend public hearings and then when it comes time for a decision to be made they become excited. He indicated that Dr. Wiedenfeld had addressed a lot of his issues. His primary concern was traffic flow on the two streets and what could be done to satisfy the size of Smith Street. He asked Mr. Norden if the setback on Diagonal Street was 15 feet.

Mr. Norden indicated it would depend because the buildings were angled. Mr. Norden identified Diagonal Street, the entrances, and green space large enough for the trees that are currently there. Mr. Norden stated this would address Michelle's concern on Diagonal Street. He stated there was not that much green space for those units on Smith Street because of the porches. He indicated those units could be pulled back, but they were trying to keep the green space in the center large enough for trees.

Mr. Wood stated he would rather have the street and traffic problems addressed and then include the green space. It would seem feasible to do this and give the people living on Smith Street enough room. Mr. Wood stated either the street should be widened or the units set back further.

Mr. Norden stated anything was possible. He stated he did not think the street could be widened because of Malcolm Alls' rental property sitting directly on the street. He stated the property owner could be asked to use his property to widen the street for parking and they could possibly make that work.

Mr. Norden stated that the plan was to stagger the units and make them harmoniously out of the same type of brick but have them set back from one another to break up the façade and the scale of the buildings along Smith and Diagonal Streets. Mr. Norden stated he was trying to be very conscious as to what was on those two streets. He noted that on Smith Street there were two houses directly across from the units, Michelle Ferri's home and Nancy Blough's home on the corner. He stated he understood Dr. Wiedenfeld's point relating to Waterloo Street and how the façade would look, but he stated there is fenestration and was not sure how it is entirely blank as

she stated. Mr. Norden stated they considered doing larger porches to make it look like the side of a house with front porch on it. He stated they could go back and try again, but he could not find a comfortable way of doing it, so they did it as end porches similar to what is around the corner on Diagonal. Mr. Norden stated that there are a lot of things that can be done but that the concept was set up because they had to keep the traffic for this coming from Waterloo Street. He stated they did everything they could to keep traffic off of Smith and Diagonal Streets. Single-family home designs were considered and traffic with that would have been coming and going from both streets and he abandoned that in order to keep the traffic off of the side streets.

Mr. Norden stated many options were considered because the slate is wide open for this property due to the CBD zoning. Technically, there are no setback requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated they tried to be sympathetic in the layout and how the units are staggered and not just a massive wall. He stated this project is not like every other townhome project in Warrenton, with massive wall fronts. They cocked all the units to break up that façade and create green space, and to be sympathetic to the area. The picture of the buildings on the landscape that he provided shows the buildings are not tremendously out of scale. If another restaurant went there or commercial with apartments over top of it, it would be a mass, and they are trying to break that mass up as much as possible. Mr. Norden stated the buildings were only three stories and, as shown on the elevations, the Smith units are a half-story in the ground because Smith Street is higher than Diagonal Street and is very level from back to front.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the drawings show that it is 3 ½ stories not three.

Mr. Norden stated that it is three stories with everything else in the roof.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said the level in the roof was a half-story.

Mr. Tucker stated it was not a half-story, and that the definition of a half-story is a story within the roof structure with dormer windows. It is not a story with sliding glass or terrace facing a street. That is essentially another story that is half the size of the floors below. It is not a half-story, but a full story.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that the building was four stories.

Mr. Tucker stated yes.

Mr. Norden stated technically it was not four stories and it was a half-story. Mr. Norden stated that nothing would go in the roof unless the ARB approves the half-story.

Mr. Tucker asked to see the elevations that show the terraces.

Mr. Norden showed elevation drawings and identified the unit with the half-story in the roof and the unit without the half-story.

Mr. Tucker stated that was not a half-story as historically known. Webster does not define as such and the Historic District does not see it that way.

Mr. Norden stated he did not disagree with that analysis but it is a half-story in the Building Code.

Mr. Nevill's Comments

Mr. Nevill indicated he had nothing to add, and Dr. Wiedenfeld had stated very clearly his concerns with the project in terms of appropriateness according to the Guidelines. Mr. Lubowsky had addressed some of the concerns that he had regarding compatibility with the Historic District. The Historic District is designed around the core of the Courthouse, which is the icon and the heart of Warrenton. The Central Business District is the core of the Historic District, and this property is within the CBD and close to the Courthouse, and is something that demands the ARB's utmost scrutiny regarding compatibility with the historic nature of Town. He stated he felt the orientation of the units take away from Waterloo Street, which is the very first and obvious issue in terms of compatibility and Historic District. He looks to Waterloo as being a main artery into Town, and this project skews the orientation towards the backside of a residential complex. The rhythm of the sawtooth pattern and staggering is incompatible with the historic nature of Town and its grid pattern. Since the orientation of the project is so unique, it requires great scrutiny on the part of the Board.

This package is skirting or completely missing the Guidelines on the issues addressed by Dr. Wiedenfeld. The Board needs to very seriously consider the appropriateness of this project. He stated he was not ready to move forward and approve the project based upon his concerns, which have been addressed by the Chair and Mr. Lubowsky. He also referenced those who did come forward on behalf of the community, and stated that history is not just what happened in the past, and that living history is also very important. The Board needs to look at this and judge it on the relevance to the Guidelines.

Mr. Wojcik's Comments

Mr. Wojcik stated he just returned from a trip to Warsaw, Poland where they made a conscious effort to rebuild about 300 buildings that were important to the identity of the city that were destroyed during World War II. It is not Williamsburg or Disneyland and it looked very close to what it was before. They had blueprints, photographs, and some old materials that they salvaged and recreated. He also visited a city in eastern Poland, visited the cathedral, and saw pictures of the damages to the cathedral, but it was not until he came back home that he realized the cathedral had been reconstructed. He stated the Eppa Hunton House had significance for the Town of Warrenton similar to the castle, cathedral, and significant civic buildings in Warsaw, and he would have liked to see an effort to reconstruct the building.

He stated that the density is too high, which is causing the difficulties with the streets. Another issue is that the units are not facing Waterloo Street. The townhome development on Madison and Falmouth Streets is 15 townhomes on 2 ½ acres, and this proposal is for 10 townhouses on ½ an acre. If this project had a similar density, it would only be five townhomes. If there were only five townhomes, many of the problems would go away in terms of street parking. The townhomes could face Waterloo Street, and there could be extra parking in the back with a drive from Diagonal or Smith Street and connecting all the way through, allowing people to get in and out. He questioned whether the Fire Department would have enough room to get into the development and if it would be possible for them to turn around.

He stated he thought something could be created similar to the house that was there, and perhaps divide it into two or three and have out buildings and/or carriage houses in the back to resemble what use to be there. The townhouses need to have significant variation in the façade so it does not look like a development but make it look like each one is constructed individually. In addition to Dr. Wiedenfeld’s comment about lacking detail, he stated he did not see any mechanical details or exterior lighting and he would like to see more landscaping. He stated he would like the sidewalk to be brick and if this project does happen, he thought the driveways should be brick and not concrete. The roof should be a standing-seam, hand-crimped metal roof with no ridge caps to match the surrounding area.

Dr. Hertz’s Comments

Dr. Hertz stated she had similar problems with this proposal because the scale dominates the area and is not compatible with the residential area. It is not sympathetic to the neighborhood and it does not interpret the area’s historic value. She stated she had studied the plans extensively, and she felt the project as currently presented would be an eyesore. Driving up Waterloo Street and suddenly seeing this would be a visual shock and people would question how it got there. It does not comply with the footprint that is already there and the adjoining neighborhood. She stated she did not think this type of development could be crowded into this very beautiful area. This proposal, next to Smith Street, Diagonal Street, and the Chip Shot building across the street, is like wearing denim with a mink stole. It would be such a difference, and it would be a shock for anyone, whether a Warrenton resident or someone new to the area. She stated she could not see moving forward with this proposal because there are just too many things that are incompatible with Old Town Warrenton.

Mr. Tucker’s Comments

Mr. Tucker stated there had been many comments made by the Board, and he complimented Dr. Wiedenfeld for her thorough comments. He stated he had looked at this proposal for several days, and that before he presented his prepared statement, which quotes the Zoning Ordinance and Historic Guidelines, he wanted to make all aware of Town of Warrenton Zoning Ordinance Article 3-5.3.5.3 “Material to be Submitted for Review”.

“By general rule, or by specific request in a particular case, the Architectural Review Board may require submission of any or all of the following in connection with the application: architectural plans, site plans, landscaping plans, construction methods, proposed signs with appropriate detail as to character, proposed exterior lighting arrangements, elevations of all portions of structure with important relationships to public view (with indications as to visual construction materials, design of doors and windows, colors, and relationships to adjoining structures), and such other exhibits and reports as are necessary for its determinations. Requests for approval of activities proposed in historic districts shall be accepted only from the record owner of the land involved in such proposal or his agent.”

Mr. Tucker read the following prepared motion:

This is a motion to deny application 15-22 in its entirety for two important reasons.

First, the application submission requirements have not been met. Omissions include, but are not

necessarily limited to:

A Site Plan – What has been submitted as a site plan is minimal, lacking sufficient detail for review. Specific site plan shortcomings include the following:

- North direction is not shown.
- No dimensions are presented.
- No topography has been shown.
- No grading or finished grading is shown.
- No lighting has been shown.
- No landscape materials, trees and other items are shown.
- No vehicle pavement details and materials are shown.
- No walkway materials or surface details are shown.
- No street names, and no curb and gutters are shown.
- No terrace or entry pavement materials and details are shown.
- As drawn, it is clear that insufficient vehicle maneuvering space has been provided which in turn negates parts of the indicated non-paved or otherwise landscaped areas. You cannot get a Toyota Corolla into the first garages off of Waterloo Street. You cannot get a Chevrolet Suburban into most of any of them from the driveways as shown.

I note that there are some material samples that have been prepared and are ready for presentation, but they require review just as everything else.

A set of Architectural or Building Plans – The architectural drawing items submitted are, at best, minimal and are lacking a great number of important details. The following information and details are not shown on the Architectural drawings:

- Deck and porch details are missing:
 - Deck edges, beams, ribbons and fascia details.
 - Railing details beyond very small-scale drawing and simple written description.
 - Porch flooring materials and details.
 - Deck flooring materials and details.
 - Porch ceiling materials and details, Smith Street configuration, Diagonal Street configuration and the two configurations indicated for Waterloo Street.
 - Column details.
- Door details are missing:
 - Detail scale door elevations of specific doors.
 - Head, sill and jamb details with casing/molding and trim materials and details.
- Garage Door details are missing:
 - Detail scale door elevations of specific doors.
 - Head, sill and jamb details with casing/molding and trim materials and details.
- Textures of all materials not otherwise indicated by samples are not indicated.

- Roof features not included or otherwise not indicated include:
 - Skylight details (remove if serving the fourth floor).
 - Vents and chimneys, if any.
 - Flashing details.
- Gutters and rain leaders are not shown on drawing elevations at all possible locations.
- Antennas (if proposed to be included or not) are not shown.
- Exhaust fans, style, materials and locations are not shown.
- Stairways lack materials indication, details of tread, riser and carriages.
- Mechanical equipment including air conditioning condensers & disconnects are not shown.
- Exterior lighting fixtures type, style, location and details are not shown.
- Electrical service and meter locations are not shown.
- Gas meters if proposed are not shown.
- HVAC equipment is not shown.

Further, the indication of what is essentially a fourth floor on the Diagonal Street façade should be removed from the architectural drawings.

Second Part of Motion to Deny – What can be discerned from the presented materials is that the scale, siting, relationship to the surroundings and the overall appropriateness of the design’s proportions are not in compliance with the Warrenton Historic District Guidelines.

I have prepared a set of drawings utilizing the presented material and scaled photographs of the adjacent photographs to support that position.

This part of the motion to deny is not dependent upon the lack of specific design, detail and materials information as stated in the first part. The application overall design fails to meet the Warrenton Historic District Guidelines for its specific character as it would appear in the historic central business district.

It is noted that the established treatment and principle repeatedly used on historic or contributing buildings throughout the guidelines apply also to new construction.

From the Guidelines, pages 69 through 74, for **New Construction:**

1. **“The building should be recognized as a product of its period of construction, design, materials and craftsmanship consistent with the architecture of the**

Historic District.”

The design presented does not appear for the most part as a style of this current period of construction, 2015 specifically. It has too many apparent references to early 1800’s Federal period architecture that makes it appear more as an attempt to copy the Federal style. It is neither a product of the style of present period architecture or construction, nor an accurate reproduction of the Federal period of the past. Anything more than a contemporary expression with respect to historic precedence, context, significance and architectural heritage is one of the things the Department of the Interior Historic Guidelines and Warrenton’s Historic Guidelines strive to prevent. That is, the present day misrepresentation of historic architecture by overly mimicking previous era design. This practice detracts from the character, atmosphere and educational value of the existing true historic buildings within our town.

- 2. PLACEMENT/RELATIONSHIP TO THE STREET (note that the guidelines emphasize this by placing it in all capital letters underlined) – Recognize and ensure consistency with the relationship and situation of existing buildings to the street when siting the new building.”**

The submitted design does not achieve this. I have a drawing made using Google Earth to show the surroundings and a replica of the submitted design to study consistency and relationship aspects of the proposed design. It is marked with an ‘A’. It is noted that the submitted site drawings alone is insufficient to make this determination.

“Orient primary buildings to face the front major street in keeping with neighboring buildings in the immediate surrounds. New primary buildings on corner lots should face the major street. Accessory or outbuildings may face the primary building on their interior yard.”

The proposed building lot or lots do not recognize the historic grid street plan throughout the central business district and the immediate surroundings where historic buildings face toward the major street (Waterloo Street in this case). The major façade or ‘front’ of the buildings do not face Waterloo Street. Rather large uninspired brick end walls face Waterloo Street with the back side decks and parking areas of the units in prominent view from Waterloo Street.

The building and their sub parts are set off at a sharp ‘sawtooth’ style arrangement with an approximate 33 degree, oblique angle to Smith and Diagonal Streets. It is not fronting on Waterloo Street.

“Comply with the predominant front and side setback patterns of contributing buildings. Avoid siting a building significantly farther away or closer to the street than adjacent and other buildings on the block.”

The zigzag setbacks along both Smith and Diagonal Streets clearly do not comply with the predominant front and side setback patterns of the surrounding contributing buildings.

I have a couple of drawings marked 'A' & 'B' which I prepared to show the situation with these items.

3. **HEIGHT, WIDTH, PROPORTION, SCALE, SPACING & MASSING**

“Understand the basics. Proportion is defined as the relationship between the width, height and depth of a building or its features. Scale is defined as the relative portion of a building to neighboring buildings or to a pedestrian or of a building to its surroundings in general. Scale is also defined in a relationship of architectural features to other architectural features. Spacing is the distance between buildings or elements. Massing is the enclosed volume or block of a building or its features. Form is the shape of the building, i.e., rectangular or square. Rhythm means the pattern of buildings or features to one another.”

The proposed building designs do not comply with the predominant height, proportion, scale, spacing, massing and form of contributing buildings in the proximity of the project.

The height of the three and three and a half story buildings will be significantly taller than the houses in the immediate and adjacent vicinity. The height of new buildings should not exceed three stories in height. Therefore, the indicated option for three and half stories should be removed.

The proposed project is not similar in proportion to any buildings in close proximity. Drawings and photographs have been prepared as a study of this project's facades, that show the proportion of both the project facades and the facades of each adjacent or nearby historic and other structures to be quite different. The designed proportions simply do not fit the neighborhood.

Those photographs of buildings adjacent to designs are labeled 'C', 'D', 'E', & 'F'.

The existing large lot is indicated to be effectively subdivided by nature of the design into what appear more as “infill” construction that negatively impacts the historic scale and spacing of buildings on both Smith and Diagonal Streets.

Again see photographs of buildings adjacent to design labeled 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', & 'F'

The orientation of buildings along Smith and Diagonal Streets presents a

significant portion of its backside massing of garages and decks to the major street, Waterloo Street. The sub-massing of the buildings does not comply with the predominant massing of contributing buildings on any of the three streets which the designs face.

Mr. Tucker noted there had been discussion earlier about the traffic, and he stated the Town has one-way streets, such as Culpeper Street, Second Street, Third Street and Fourth Street and they are very narrow streets and have no traffic problems. He indicated there will still be traffic on Smith Street regardless, and that entering the development from Waterloo Street will not relieve the extra traffic that will occur. He projected there would be more traffic on Waterloo Street, Diagonal Street and Smith Street because of this project.

Mr. Tucker continued his prepared motion.

Therefore, this motion is to deny the application immediately, with no need for further discussion of all the missing information, and recognize that the application does not meet the basic requirements of Warrenton's Historic Guidelines in both overall plan and elevation, its proportions, height, scale, spacing and massing. Any future submission of a design for the 67 Waterloo, Smith and Diagonal Streets parcel should be rethought, redesigned and presented in the future as an entirely separate project that follows all of the Warrenton Historic District Guideline principles, especially addressing it as a building, or buildings facing Waterloo Street at both the corner of Smith and Waterloo and the corner of Diagonal and Waterloo Streets.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for a second.

Dr. Hertz seconded the motion.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for any further discussion.

Mr. Norden asked if he could have opportunity for discussion.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated yes.

Mr. Norden stated all of the comments will be reviewed and he asked for copies of the Board's comments. He stated he would like to point to a few things, and stated he understood Mr. Wojcik's comments about Madison Square but it was not zoned CBD. This property, zoned as CBD, has many uses, and the owner is entitled to build something on this land. The Board needs to recognize that there are three road frontages, and that no matter what they do...

Dr. Wiedenfeld interrupted saying I beg your pardon.

Mr. Norden asked if he could continue with his comments.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Board was following the Historic Guidelines.

Mr. Norden stated he understood that and asked for an opportunity to finish his comments.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she wanted to make sure Mr. Norden understood he was addressing the Board.

Mr. Norden stated that if they front everything appropriately on Waterloo Street, then their concern is the effect on the side streets. He stated that no matter what they did with the three streets that surround the lot, they would face concerns of the Board.

Mr. Tucker stated there were an infinite number of architectural designs and site plan design solutions for this parcel. What is proposed is putting 10 townhouses in a 5-townhouse bag, and it just does not suit the site or the neighborhood. The Guidelines hammer this project, and it is not his personal opinion, but is directly out of the Guidelines. It does not suit the area, it needs to go away, and a new design needs to come back. The motion is ready for a vote.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated there was a motion made.

Mr. Tucker said I call the question.

The motion was seconded and Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for a vote. All voted in favor of the motion. The motion to deny was passed.

Mr. Norden asked members of the Board to please send him copies of their comments.

Copies of comments were provided to Mr. Norden.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she had a note from Anna Maas, a former member of the Board, who provided comments on this project. Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she forgot to read her comments, but indicated her comments echoed similar concerns that had already been made.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated this ended the New Business.

WORKSESSION

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Ms. Gibson if she had any administrative approvals she would like to share with the Board.

Ms. Gibson indicated the packet of material included a listing of those items that had been administratively approved since the last ARB meeting and asked if anyone had questions.

Mr. Tucker asked why the Board needed to hear about staff's review and administrative approvals. The Board does not see them or review them so why is it important to have it reported to the Board.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she found it useful, and gave the example of the stained glass protective cover for the church. She said it is great seeing the work being done and knowing they went through the appropriate process. Often Board members will see someone working in the Historic District and this listing gives a brief overview of what is going on. In the past, staff used to read descriptions of the administrative approvals and have recently reduced it to a listing.

Mr. Tucker stated that the listing shows a sign has been approved but a picture of the sign is not included and he would like to see what the sign looks like so the Board knows what is going on.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked staff to note that and to include photographs in the future.

Dr. Hertz stated that the emails she gets from staff are very helpful. She stated the last one regarding Paradise was very informative and helpful.

Mr. Nevill asked what the status was of the BMW building that staff has been working on.

Ms. Sitterle stated that was an interesting situation and that there has been a proposal for new use of that site. It is not set yet, therefore further discussion is not possible. It is an exciting proposal and a tremendous amount of investment would go into the site.

Mr. Tucker stated the project, just reviewed, failed to have details and two other applications have come before the Board that were also incomplete. He stated the Board was not getting all of the material that is necessary, and when staff sees applications are incomplete they should turn them down and tell the applicants that the ARB is not going to accept it.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that if the applications are passed on to the Board, they should tell the applicants that they are lacking information. The Board can either turn an incomplete application down for lack of information or table it and assume the information will be provided at the next scheduled meeting. Any time the Board gets new building construction the Board should contemplate a longer term of discussion. That is discuss it, table it, and bring it back to the next meeting so people have time to digest any new construction in the Historic District.

Mr. Tucker stated that the problem with not turning an application down right away is that the 60-day clock starts. The applicant comes back to the next meeting and it is either go or no go. The Board does not want people to be delayed for their projects, but planning that was missing for the Waterloo Street townhouses needs to be done anyway. Mr. Tucker stated the applicant this evening had nothing that could be submitted to the Building Official, and that the applicants were months away from that.

Mr. Tucker stated this evening's presentation was similar to the Greek Revival House on Culpeper Street that came before the Board in that it lacked so much information that the Board was struggling. Mr. Tucker stated it was due to that application that he developed a checklist, which he has shared with the Board, because that project was a mistake, but the Board was without sufficient information and was not willing to push for it to get that project to be more appropriate for Culpeper Street.

Mr. Nevill stated that the more the Board could avoid having a situation where applicants come before the Board unprepared prevents the applicant from wasting their time and the Board's time. When these applications come before staff, staff should convey Mr. Tucker's checklist and the importance of presenting a complete package with information and materials needed. Any way staff can encourage them to have the information in order will expedite the process, which will also save them a loss of time. The more things are streamlined for everyone the better.

Mr. Tucker stated the only way the Board would turn a project down would be if it did not comply with the Ordinance.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Board has been bending over backwards trying to help people and that was an error. The Board can help people, but they need to bring enough information for the Board so that they do not have to coax the information out of the applicant at the meeting.

Mr. Tucker stated the Board is not the bad guy, but can help people see what the ordinances and Guidelines are and help them come up with a more appropriate building.

Mr. Tucker stated there was no reason for the applicant to try to cram so much on that site.

Mr. Nevill made motion to adjourn.

Mr. Tucker seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Minutes submitted by
Dee Highnote