



**MINUTES  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
TOWN OF WARRENTON  
February 25, 2016  
7:00 P.M.**

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on February 25, 2016 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. J. Tucker, Vice-Chair, and Mr. Jerry Wood Town Council Ex-Officio member. Ms. Sarah Sitterle, Director of Planning and Community Development and Kelly Machen Community Development Planner were present and represented staff. Dr. Carole Hertz and Mr. Steve Wojcik were absent.

**Purpose Statement**

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Purpose of the Architectural Review Board; Statement of Qualifications of Architectural Review Board to be: The Board makes a decision on applications in order to preserve the character of the Historic District of the Town of Warrenton on behalf of the Town of Warrenton. Decisions of the Board are based upon the Historic Guidelines and a decision for each application is made based upon its own merits. Those decisions do not constitute precedence for any future decisions. The guidelines provide the framework for consistent decision making by elaborating upon the Zoning Ordinances goal to identify, protect and preserve the buildings within the Historic District boundaries.

**Approval of Minutes**

Dr. Wiedenfeld said there are two sets of minutes to vote on and asked if there were any changes or edits required for the **November 19, 2015 meeting minutes**.

Mr. Tucker requested the following revisions to the minutes:

Page 6:

- Second paragraph, *they* change to *the*
- Last paragraph, line 2, *it and out* change to *instead of*

Page 7:

- First paragraph, line 1, should include *Mr. Tucker*

- Last paragraph, line 1, in front of the word *processed* should be the word *the*

Page 9:

- Fifth paragraph that begins Mr. Tucker, it should state, *stated the issue here is what he calls the termite factor*

Page 10:

- At the top there needs to be clarification whether Mr. Wood made a motion or not

Page 12:

- The middle of the fourth paragraph down, handrail work *form* change to *from*, should say *from* the surface of the walkway

Page 14:

- The second full paragraph, next to the last line, the word *but* should be removed from that sentence

Mr. Wood stated that he did not make a motion on page 10.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said Mr. Wood should be stricken from that sentence.

Mr. Tucker made a motion to approve the minutes with amendments for the November meeting. Mr. Nevill seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked, are there any changes needed to the **January 28, 2016 meeting minutes**.

Mr. Tucker requested the following revisions:

Page 3:

- The large paragraph at the bottom of the page, the word *handrail* should read *guardrail*. In the same paragraph, the word *rail* should read *guardrail*.

Mr. Tucker made a motion to approve the minutes for the January meeting. Mr. Nevill seconded the motion and the motion passed.

### **New Business**

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the next part of the meeting is devoted to the applications for appropriateness. She would introduce each project, allow representatives to describe the project, and then call on each member of the Board for comments and questions. Members of the community would be given an opportunity to speak about a project.

**Certificate of Appropriateness 16-1:** Construction of a garage at 23 N. Chestnut Street, Roger Cordani, Agent.

Dr. Wiedenfeld explained that the existing structure at 23 N. Chestnut Street was constructed in 1965. It is a non-contributing resource within the Warrenton Historic District.

Mr. Cordani, the agent for Mr. Wright, then addressed the Board. He said the project is to build a two-car garage on the side of the property. It will have a one-bedroom apartment above and hardi-plank siding. The house has vinyl siding, which will be replaced with hardi-plank siding.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said the proposed structure respects the primary street, the town grid pattern, and the relationship of other nearby contributing structures. The proportions are moderate and do not dominate adjacent buildings. While the hardi-plank siding is not appropriate for use on historic structures, it is acceptable on this modern dependency and the new structure has appropriate fenestration. She asked if Mr. Cordani could talk about the proposed windows for the garage.

Mr. Cordani explained that they would be the same windows as shown on the proposal, vinyl windows with 2/6 grids.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that the windows are not true divided lights.

Mr. Cordani said yes they are true divided lights, double hung as shown in the proposal.

Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked if the windows had fake grids.

Mr. Cordani said yes they have a grid.

Mr. Tucker stated that is called simulated divided light.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the hardi-plank siding would be painted.

Mr. Cordani said yes.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the structure would have a cupola or an ornamental vent on the roof.

Mr. Cordani said the picture shows one, but he was not sure if it was going to be used.

Mr. Nevill said the plans submitted do not show a cupola and that the Board should go by the plans that have been submitted and not the photograph.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the structure's setbacks meet the zoning requirements.

Mr. Cordani stated Mr. Wright would have a surveyor check setbacks before submission.

Mr. Nevill suggested that, since some of the building is visible from Waterloo Street, some landscaping to beautify the project be considered. He believed this would benefit the project. This was a request.

Mr. Tucker said the only issue he has is with the use of simulated divided lights in the double hung windows. The Board frequently sees them, but the guidelines suggest not replicating historic materials with modern materials. Modern windows are generally double pane insulating glass that is a large sheet of glass per sash and the simulated dividing is an adaptation to make it

look like it is from a different era. He then asked if the applicant would accept omitting the simulated divided light from the windows.

Mr. Cordani said yes.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said not on the garage doors or the entrance door but on the windows. She then asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve **Certificate of Appropriateness 16-1** construction of a garage at 23 N. Chestnut Street with the following conditions:

- 1) A building permit is required.
- 2) A special use permit is required.
- 3) The window treatments properly reflect a contemporary design, not to conflict with buildings surrounding the structure, in other words, no simulated divided lights.

Mr. Tucker seconded the motion and the motion passed with no opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness 16-3** Removal of a two-story addition to guest cottage and replacement with smaller one story addition, roof replacement and siding repairs at 319 Falmouth Street, William and Sally Semple, owners.

Utilizing the overhead flat screen monitor to show the Board drawings of their project, Mrs. Semple gave a presentation to the Board. She said showed the original house on their property. The house is a Victorian house fronting Falmouth Street, dating to before the civil war. Research found that was the site of a tan yard.

She went on to say that sometime before her purchase of the house in 1994, there was a non-conforming addition. It is a two-story addition and it obliterates the historic roofline. It has been a lifelong goal to get rid of this addition, but it serves valuable storage space, which is at a premium in historic homes. She would like to take off this addition and build a one-story structure with a more sensitive roofline. In the picture here, there is an enclosure, which covers the original back door to the cottage. The doors on this house are a bit of a mystery, as the door the side does not continue to the inside, but they will keep it as a false entrance. There is a back entrance, which is covered by an enclosure. The applicant will take the walls off that enclosure and put on a proper porch entrance.

She said in terms of the repairs, when they remove the new addition, they do not know what will be behind it. They are hoping the original Board and batten siding from 1840 is there. If not, they will have to make repairs that are consistent with the Board and batten. Additionally, the other part of this application is to put on a new roof for the whole structure. The current asphalt roof is in poor condition. They will put a new roof on and new gutters and down spouts.

Dr. Wiedenfeld has a few comments on the project. This project is a model submission. She thanked the applicant for their thoroughness and clarity. The historic cottage dates to before the Civil War. It is a contributing structure to the Historic District. The 1980s addition is non-contributing and its demolition is an improvement for the structure and the district. The project

appropriately proposes the preservation of newly exposed historic materials. The proposed addition respects the historic materials, respects the form of the original material and the mass and proportion of the addition does not overwhelm the historic structure.

Mr. Nevill said he wants to commend the applicants on the ideal and model submission. All the information included in the application eliminates the need for questions from the Board. This is an appropriate and very model example of historic preservation and stewardship. It adds to the structure and appropriately restores it, still updating it to contemporary use, and respects the historic value of the property. With that said, he wished them the best with the construction.

Mr. Tucker said he likes this project and that they have done a nice job. He likes the fact that they are respecting the original building, removing what is an inappropriate addition. As with the last submission and application, he does not agree with using simulated divided light windows.

Mr. Nevill asked if they are simulated or true divided light windows.

Mrs. Semple said they are proposing simulated divided light windows.

Mr. Semple said it is consistent with the windows they put in their house in Old Town Alexandria. They prefer it because of the cost and it is a good performing window. It looks almost identical to a true divided light window. That is what they want to do and this addition is not visible from the street.

Mr. Tucker said this addition should reflect 2016. He suggests that the simulated divided lights not be used and instead use a one over one window to differentiate it from the original building. He stands by that and will stand by that for any project brought before the Board. It is inappropriate to replicate material with material that is not true. Otherwise, it is a great project.

Mrs. Semple said he has a comment about the aesthetics. It is a good-sized window because they do want light. A one over one is just two big plates of glass. It is not a modern looking addition, it does use modern materials, but it is in the spirit of an older style.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if Mrs. Semple has a spec sheet of what window they are proposing to use.

Mrs. Semple said it should be in the application.

Mr. Tucker said it does not matter who the manufacturer is. They all produce the wrong result.

Mr. Semple said we provided this type of window to the ARB in Alexandria, deferring to this Board's decision of course. To put in a window that is 1/1, without any treatment that reflects the quality and central architectural aspects of the windows that already exist, in my opinion, would be inconsistent with the overall appearance of the entire project. He has never liked one over one clear glass windows. If he thought that was appropriate, he would have put them in the application.

Mr. Tucker said he fully understands. It is counter to the guidelines and its counter to trying to differentiate the addition from the original building. You are trying to replicate it with modern materials. It does not work.

Mr. Semple asked if the Board would accept a true divided light window.

Mr. Tucker said he would rather see that, yes.

Mr. Semple said this is a difficult requirement when windows cannot be seen from the street.

Mr. Tucker said if you cannot see them from the street, then what is the matter with using true divided.

Mrs. Semple said because it is their preference. They do not want to put in something they dislike.

Mr. Nevill said he believes the applicants have gone above and beyond to respect the intent of the guidelines. Mr. Tucker's points are well noted and there are times when it is very important that we follow them, not to say that this is an exception. In the nature of the addition, the fact that the applicant is using modern materials, should meet the standard of the time. Given the nature of a small cottage, and unduly forcing the use of single pane-divided lights, is not beneficial in this instance. Mr. Nevill was comfortable with the application as presented.

Mr. Wood said he believes the plans that have been brought for this project are good. The applicant has gone above and beyond and they will have a nice place when it is complete.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve **Certificate of Appropriateness 16-3** for the removal and replacement of addition, roof replacement, and siding and trim repairs at 319 Falmouth Street with the following conditions:

1) A building permit is required.

Dr. Wiedenfeld seconded the motion, taking into consideration the windows are in the back.

Mr. Tucker denied. The motion passed with a majority vote.

**Certificate of Appropriateness 15-22** resubmission of the application to construct ten (10) townhouses at 67 Waterloo Street. Horatio Magalhaes, Applicant - Mr. Norden and John Foote, representatives.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said the property is significant and prominent within Warrenton's Historic District. It is incumbent upon the Board to apply the Warrenton Historic District Design Guidelines in review of this application to determine whether the design, as submitted, meets the requirements of the Design Guidelines. It is imperative that the Board considers the long view, encouraging construction that is an asset to the Historic District, stands the test of time, and makes succeeding generations proud. The site of the project is a large, now empty lot. It is immediately adjacent to two modest two story historic houses, both contributing to the Historic District, one at 23 Smith Street and one at 14 Diagonal Street.

She said the resubmission includes some requested information and the following changes:

- The addition of brick walls with interpretive signage explaining the site's history or the promise of interpretive signage.

- New porches on Waterloo elevations.
- Brick instead of hardi-plank in the gables.
- Stamped concrete pavement.
- Additional green space along Smith Street.
- Fence enclosures for the heating and air conditioning.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for Mr. Norden and/or Mr. Foote to explain the application. She requested that the applicants please be sure to state their names clearly for the record and that Board members delay comments and questions for a few moments. The applicants were to speak first, followed by members of the community, and then the Board.

Mr. Foote introduced himself and his assistant Jessica Pfeiffer, a professional planner. He said they represent HC Investors. They were retained by Mr. Magalhaes to look at what happened at the first ARB meeting regarding this application. Mr. Foote listened to the entire tape of the first ARB meeting and understood the dissatisfaction with elements of the application as previously presented. They took everything from the tape, made notes, and asked what the ARB found to be missing for its purpose of a decision in this case.

Mr. Foote explained that Mr. Norden thought he would have the opportunity to provide the additional information, and he understood why the ARB voted as it did. The applicant filed an appeal to the Town Council as permissible under the law, as Mr. Foote has done on numerous occasions. It was known that there was additional information needed. Mr. Norden was asked to take the notes that Mr. Foote took and modify the plans to meet the specific comments about design issues and provide additional details. Mr. Foote also asked Mr. Shepherd to make the 3D depiction of the townhouses presented at the meeting, which is something that was not available previously.

Mr. Foote went on to say, that they know this parcel will be developed; a decision that will be made by the private sector, not by the public sector. They also know that issues of site planning and zoning are not issues for the ARB. They have come before the Board to show how the project has changed and to ask the ARB to reconsider its previous decision. The applicant asked to go back before the ARB because they wanted the ARB to have a look at the project again before the council acted on it.

Mr. Norden then came forward and gave a presentation to the Board. He said one of the biggest complaints was the facades that face Waterloo Street. These were ends without any detail so they put a new face on the facades that face the street. While they did not face the units and the front doors toward Waterloo Street, they did create new brick entryways and three story porches on those end facades to make those buildings have a good face toward Waterloo Street. The new brick entryway walls are six feet high, the posts are ten, and the middle piece, where they provided a place to talk about the history or the centerpiece, is thirteen feet high.

One of the concerns was the ability to look into the project and the porches. By adding the three story porches on the end elevations, they have not only improved what was a bland elevation, but also removed the decks on the first two units, making those end units have porches on the street side instead of internally. The new entryway helps screen what is seen first when passing by on Waterloo Street. They were hoping, with a 3D rendering, it would give a better understanding of the overall image. They kept the staggered buildings on Diagonal and on Smith Street to help

break the scale and bring it back to human scale in keeping with the surrounding structures.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said she knows there are several members of the community who would like to speak. She asked community members to please step forward to speak to the Board.

Michelle Ferri spoke to the Board and said she lives on Smith Street, across the street from the development. She spoke in opposition. She believes this site offers a unique opportunity to provide a nice transition from the residential district to the business district. This application falls far short of achieving this. It remains intent on filling the site to maximum density, instead of taking into consideration that none of its immediate neighbors have built to the property line. This property does not exist on Main Street, but sits among historic homes. This development seems designed to punish its neighbors. It fails to consider the uniqueness of the site and poorly imitates the character of its neighbors instead of providing well thought out design that will add value to the charms and traditions of Old Town.

She went on to say, as the Board has already sited its review of the application, the proposal does not meet the simple, basic requirements of Warrenton's historic guidelines in overall design, building proportions, height, scale, spacing, or mass. It fails to follow the rhythm of the contributing structures in the block with its zigzag presentation on Smith and Diagonal Streets, inadequate yards, and street presence. The design creates its own inner street instead of a truly inviting street character. The Board's previous decision to deny this application is the correct one. She sees nothing but lipstick added to this revised submission and requests that the Board seek significant alterations to this development before considering it worthy of appropriateness.

Nancy Blough spoke to the Board and said she lives adjacent to the proposed project. She would like the Board to reconsider the proposed townhouse project. Her concern is that regardless of the structure approved it must conform to the historical and architectural guidelines. In addition, the safety of all of the residents in the immediate area of 67 Waterloo Street must be protected. The drawings lack the historic presentation consistent with neighboring properties and the rest of the Town of Warrenton's older residences. The renderings of the proposed project at 67 Waterloo Street are not in keeping with the character, harmonious values, and historic ambience of Old Town Warrenton. Looking out her kitchen window, Ms. Blough will see a three story brick wall and limited light through six three story townhouses, representing an overly dense use of a half acre piece of property. This can be compared to a property on Falmouth Street, which has fifteen townhouses on two and one half acres, a lot of green space, and sidewalks. Additionally, that space provides much more room for their residents to enter and park in the rear of each residence. There is a wall around that townhouse subdivision helping to curb the density. When this property was a restaurant, it had much more green space than is proposed with this project.

She went on to say, an extremely important consideration is the safety of the residents. Having witnessed one fire at the property in question, she saw firsthand the potential for catastrophe. At the time of that event, in the parking lot at 67 Waterloo Street, which would no longer exist according to the proposed plan, fire fighters had to go over the top of a burning historic structure to keep water on her home and Michelle Ferri's and Bill Weaver's home. The heat was so threatening, they were asked to remove their vehicles from parking spaces and driveways on Smith Street. She is very concerned with emergency vehicles being able to control a fire or help someone in need of an ambulance because when vehicles are parked on Smith Street, there is no

room for emergency vehicles. The same consideration would be true of Diagonal Street since parking is allowed on both sides of the street. She requests that a Fire Marshall approve the plan's areas of egress to insure emergency vehicles access to project and neighboring properties.

She continued that it was her understanding that a new application was submitted to the ARB, allowing for another public hearing, because the owners altered their original plans. A number of residents had similar concerns after attending the Town Council meeting on February 9 and they should be allowed the opportunity to express them. The townhouse fortresses should be less dense, to allow green space and attention to the concerns mentioned here.

Mr. Bill Weaver then addressed the Board. He elaborated on Nancy's comments. His major concern is in regards to emergencies. They were there when the fire took place and the only way, not criticizing Warrenton's first responders, to get a fire truck in range to protect homes was through the parking lot of the restaurant. With this project, that is going to be gone. The street is 16 ½-foot wide and zoning calls for 20-foot wide streets. With a car parked on a street, it is 10 feet wide. Twenty feet of road is needed for fire apparatus. Diagonal Street is narrow with lots of traffic, Smith Street is narrow and one way, and Chestnut Street is very narrow. His concern is that, for those dwellings, it would take a boom to get to the top. The renderings have cherry picked the views to make it look like there is plenty of room. The rendering also removed trees and in one of the drawings removed Mr. Weaver's house. Mr. Weaver is not against it, but against the density. He knew this was a zoning issue, not an ARB issue, but this was also a safety issue. He asked why their homes should have increased risk. He wants to fix the problem.

Ms. Cheryl Shepherd introduced herself as having been on the ARB for many years. She heard the guidelines mentioned and how they were referred to in a past hearing. She did a revision to the Historic District guidelines sometime after 2003. She is an architectural historian and studies, analyzes and photographically documents historical buildings to get them on the historic register. The guidelines are a document to have at hand. They are not part of the ordinance. Having heard the comment about the windows tonight, she knows there is a clause or a sentence in the guidelines that says, "A new building under construction should be recognized as a product of the period of its construction for design, materials and craftsmanship and consistent with the architecture of the Historic District." She believes that "product" has become a misunderstood word. She would like to offer to the Town and to Sarah through a letter that the word that would be better a "labor" of its period of its construction. It makes those who have to look at projects across the district begin to think more modernly, that everything has to be considered a "product" of its time, and it is not meant that way. It is meant as a "labor."

She then went on to say that concerning the windows earlier, on new construction on a property with non-contributing buildings, the new construction is non-contributing. Under new construction for buildings within the Historic District, "windows may have simulated divided light sashes, but true divided lights are encouraged." It does not say that they have to be true divided light or simulated divided light. True divided lights are encouraged, required because it is 2016. "Product" in that respect is clouding the issue.

She lives on Winchester Street. Looking at the plans for the new construction on Waterloo Street the parcel is difficult for new buildings. Part of the concern is the density allowed on the lot. That is a zoning issue and does not come in front of the Board. Waterloo Street is considered a major street, but Smith Street and Diagonal Street are in close proximity. If you look at the setting and

at the guidelines for the setbacks and orientation of buildings, it is not as the guidelines suggest. It is somewhat different from the grid form in this location. The Fauquier Bank is facing Main Street but on the Diagonal Street side, one is not looking at the front of the buildings, which is unique. The house that is now the Natural Market Place is facing Diagonal Street. The guidelines are suggesting that buildings front a major street. This is a very difficult and unique site and it is going to take a considerable amount of planning and forethought to get it right, keeping in mind that the guidelines suggest that the history of the location be respected.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if Ms. Shepherd was speaking as a citizen and not as a consultant.

Ms. Shepherd said yes, as a citizen.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said the Board would begin their comments. She provided her comments and the other Board members gave their comments in turn. The Warrenton Historic District Design Guidelines have a section on new construction that begins on page 72. The application design as presented does not meet these Historic District Design Guidelines for new construction in the central business district. It lacks architectural compatibility and aesthetic continuity that is called for in the guidelines. This is a quote from the guidelines, *“in order to maintain the character of the central business and Historic Districts, the new Design Guidelines take into consideration the historic variation of building types, their architectural design, arrangement and spacing.”*

She had four main areas of concern. One is the siting of the buildings and the guidelines state, *“recognize and insure consistency with the relationship and situation of existing buildings to the street when siting a new building. Recognize the historic grid street plan throughout the district and the immediate surroundings where historic buildings face toward the major street. Orient primary buildings to face the front major street in keeping with neighboring buildings in the immediate surroundings. New primary buildings on corner lots should face the major street.”* The buildings with the saw tooth siding does not recognize the historic grid street plan. District buildings are parallel to the street not at an angle. The adjacent buildings are disrespected by this angled siding; like turning ones side away from a neighbor. By placing the primary facades on Smith and Diagonal Streets, the project does not meet the requirement to front the major street, which is Waterloo. To have an alley/driveway dump into a major street is inappropriate within the Historic District and is in direct opposition to the guidelines. It is obvious that Waterloo is the primary street but this design has made Waterloo secondary. She noted there is a parking lot behind the church on the same block that empties onto Smith and onto Diagonal Street.

Her second concern is mass and scale. The guidelines state, *“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. Massing is the enclosed volume or block of a building or its features. Rhythm means the pattern of buildings or features to one another. The guidelines for new construction state that new construction should comply with the predominate width and proportion of contributing buildings. Characteristic of their style, houses are of varied forms: vertical, square, compound or horizontal in their overall proportions. Therefore, the proportional character of any new construction in a given neighborhood should reflect that of contributing houses, and comply with the predominate massing of the form and elements of contributing buildings in their block or neighborhood. Contributing residences have varied massing according to their styles.”* Her comment was that these are enormous buildings that do

not respect the predominate massing of neighboring structures. It is possible to design townhouses that respect the massing of buildings nearby. In terms of proportions, according to the guidelines, *“the new construction of houses should reflect that of contributing houses in the neighborhood. New construction should comply with the predominate massing of the form and elements of contributing buildings in their block or neighborhood.”* She noted that none of the illustrations provided presented of the neighboring structures are in relation to the proposed construction. She has not seen what the neighboring houses look like adjacent to this. She attempted to design a figure to illustrate this, but does not have the skills.

Her third concern is height or rather stories. The guidelines state, *“comply with the predominate height of the contributing buildings on a block. No new building, commercial or office in the block of two or three story buildings 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 predominate height of contributing buildings and not to exceed three stories. Lower roof pitches are encouraged on tall buildings.”* This block has several two-story buildings. Are there any three-story buildings on this block? Four story townhouses would tower over the smaller nearby houses and create a canyon out of Smith Street. Yes, there are houses in the Historic District that are more than two stories but they are set back from the street and their neighbors. They do not create a canyon such as this would create. The guidelines or the zoning ordinance state that the church cannot be used for comparison.

The fourth item is other issues. The guidelines state, *“A new building should be recognized as a product of its period of construction and craftsmanship.”* That wording by the way is from the National Register of Historic Places and is used appropriately. The guidelines further state, *“respect the size, proportion, spacing and rhythm of door and window openings on all stories of contributing buildings in the subject block or neighborhood when designing and constructing new commercial or residential buildings. Respect the relationship between wall surface area and window opening area of contributing commercial and residential buildings of the block or neighborhood and true divided lights are encouraged.”* This will be much more visible than an addition on the backside of a lot. The design does seem more derivative than a product of its period, but the materials, including a brick façade, stamped concrete, and false divided light windows lend a 21<sup>st</sup> century element. The size, proportion, spacing, and rhythm of fenestrations on the Waterloo Street side do not respect that of contributing buildings in the subject block or neighborhood. The relationship between wall surface area and window opening area similarly do not respect the contributing buildings in the subject block or neighborhood. The placement of porches on the Waterloo side of both buildings tries to address the requirement to avoid blank undifferentiated walls, but the porches neither copy porches in the Historic District, nor do they present themselves as a product of the current period. The lack of fenestration behind those porches only serves to highlight the blank, undifferentiated wall behind the porch. The lack of fenestration on each bay is something Dr. Wiedenfeld has never seen before on a design.

She went on to say, on a positive note thank you for the effort to have interpretive signage recognizing Eppa Hunton and the history of the site as required on page 97 of the guidelines. The ARB looks forward to the formal application for a COA on that signage. In short, her comments are that the design presented in the application for **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-22 to construct ten (10) townhouses at 67 Waterloo Street** does not conform to the Town of

Warrenton Historic District Design Guidelines for new construction.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for Mr. Nevill's comments.

Mr. Nevill said that he has looked at this from many different aspects, from that of the applicant and from our view. In all applications, he believes it is important to look at the applicant's view and try to understand what they are trying to do. He understands they are approaching this from a by-right point of view, which he respects. The ARB, the overlay, must also be taken into consideration. There is precedence where ARB decisions have upheld and superseded by-right applications. With that in mind, he looked at this through view of the Town Comprehensive Plan, suggestions of creating corridor and overlay districts, and expanding the Historic District. This has not happened and it is not something that he can take into consideration. The ARB looks in terms of Historic District preservation, town culture and future, and what new construction means.

He went on to say, this is within the 1810 route plan, and at that point they have to take a much more strict and very deliberate approach towards what is considered new and appropriate. That is the Town of Warrenton's historic foundation. This site is a transition property as moving from a neighborhood into the business district. It is zoned CBD, but it is on the shoulder. It is important to reflect and respect that transition nature of the neighborhood immediately adjacent and the flow of the location. It sits in the shadow of the courthouse, the most iconic building in the county. All of these factors need to be taken into consideration with this application. He respects what the applicant says about the private sector developing this property. The ARB wants to see that happen. This is too important a property to go undeveloped. However, the public should benefit from the development of this property, not just the private sector. With that in mind, as well as Dr. Wiedenfeld's comments, this application still has not addressed its orientation toward Waterloo Street in a manner that is real, but through decoration. It has not fulfilled the request. In reference to the orientation of the buildings in respect to the grid pattern, these buildings sit on various angles and do not reflect that. This staggered effect breaks up the grid pattern. It does not respect the orientation toward the street. He understands the difficulties to overcome with the development of this property. Unfortunately, he has not seen this project as meeting the standards they are trying to promote. It is those two elements, and the fact that this sits at a primary entrance, that lead him to the decision of not being able to support this project.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if Mr. Tucker had any comments.

Mr. Tucker said he believes the Board has spoken very well. Not to argue with the individuals who have spoken in favor of this application, he would like to say that the guidelines either are or are not meaningful with respect to this and any other project within the Town of Warrenton. They use the guidelines for just that purpose, to help us guide the applicants to what is appropriate or is not appropriate. Ultimately, guidelines aside, whether this building or any building is appropriate comes to the ARB for its decision. With respect to what was presented to Town Council as an attempt to appeal and was then withdrawn, it was essentially the same project. It did include many details, which are required for any construction. However, that addressed only a portion of the first half of a two-point motion to deny this project several months ago. Contrary to what has been heard, the resubmission does not satisfy all the points brought up when it was first denied. It does not address the second point, which was its relationship to its surroundings and the overall appropriateness.

Mr. Tucker went on to say there are other features here that do not comply with zoning or the ARB guidelines. There is a fourth floor and four floors are prohibited. Three stories are the maximum. There are other features here in question such as the site plan. People would argue the ARB does not review site plans. *Paragraph 3-5 3.5.4 of the zoning ordinance – final action by the Architectural Review Board shall be taken prior to consideration of proposals requiring site plan approval.* Numerous areas within the zoning ordinance refer to the ARB and its role in reviewing issues in the Town of Warrenton with respect to the zoning ordinance and the ARB guidelines. This application has not addressed those. There are three members present at the meeting. Mr. Wood does not vote. This is the most important presentation since he has been on the Board, and probably the most important one to be presented for a long time to come. Many issues need to be covered. He suggested that a motion be made to table this application and work with the applicant, through numerous work sessions if required, to resolve any differences between the applicant and this Board prior to the next meeting at which point this project will need to be approved or denied with whatever can be hashed out in a one hour meeting. It is time for a discussion on what is needed in this case.

Mr. Nevill asked if the applicant considered other designs for this project.

Mr. Foote said Mr. Norden would have to address that question.

Mr. Norden asked in what respect.

Mr. Nevill asked if when looking at this site, were there any other possibilities or designs that were being considered before coming to this design.

Mr. Norden said this is the design that was in everyone's thought in the initial concept. They explored different orientations since the Board rejected it. They honestly feel it is a worse solution. They can put six townhouses along Waterloo Street and then more units in the back. When looking at the mass on Waterloo Street, which is the most important street, not that the others aren't important, which again is why they did a saw tooth affect to breaks the mass of those buildings down for the neighbors on Smith and Diagonal. When looking at six townhouses across the front of Waterloo, it is not very inviting. Having the end of the run was much more reflective of the scale of chip shot across the street, for example. These buildings are shorter than chip shot. They came back with the idea to try to create a much more inviting entrance on Waterloo Street and to try to address the facades that were blank. There is a lot of fenestration on those facades. They are going to see two individual buildings with these porches. It is a better thing to have facing Waterloo Street. It is a vast improvement on what they had before. If they put six units on Waterloo Street, all the traffic is going back and forth from Diagonal to Smith. This is why they pursued this model the first time, and came back with the same orientation.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the restaurant had an entrance onto Diagonal Street.

Mr. Tucker said it did not. He went on to say, Mr. Norden what you are presenting here on the screens are 3D architectural models of the project as you have designed it. He wants everyone to know these are what architects call bird's eye views. Architects use these to sell designs to their clients. He asked Mr. Shepherd to lower the point of view so that it is at eye level, five foot six from the ground. At eye level, one can see the underside of the porches. He asked to rotate the model clockwise so to see the house adjacent on Diagonal Street from eye level. From here, one

can see the fourth story that towers above the house next door. This is something not seen before. This view was a required part of the submission materials that they have not had the opportunity to review. He asked to rotate the model 180 degrees and see the Smith Street view from the same 5-foot elevation. The townhouses are a full story higher than the contributing property next door. He asked to see the intersection of Smith and Waterloo Street to show the house across Smith Street from the property and its relationship to the proposal. He said the house model is far larger in scale than it actually is.

Mr. Norden said all the surrounding buildings were done through photography and computer programs that establish the scale of the structures.

Mr. Tucker did not believe the height of the house was shown appropriately. The site plan seems to indicate there is only three feet of elevation difference between the intersection of Diagonal and Waterloo Street and the intersection of Smith and Waterloo Street and yet the drawing appears to be more than 3 feet of rise. He asked the engineers to double check those elevations because; walking the site, there appears to be more than a 3-foot difference in elevation.

Mr. Norden said there is a “topo” site plan in the application packet.

Mr. Tucker said that is where they are getting their information.

Mr. Norden said it goes from 606 down to entrance level and climbs more rapidly as you get to the corner of Smith, then once on Smith it's almost dead level for the length of the project.

Mr. Tucker said he wants everybody to see this from a realistic point of view not birds eye.

Mr. Norden said that is why they brought the live model

Mr. Tucker requested the model be checked. The wall is an interesting attempt to hide what is behind it. It is in violation of the guidelines, if the guidelines mean anything. If they do not then it is in the violation of the zoning ordinance. It is too tall.

Mr. Norden asked if the zoning ordinance dictates wall height. The ARB discusses wall height and review.

Mr. Tucker said Zoning Ordinance 2 - 19, fences and walls might be erected to a height of 6 feet.

Mr. Norden said the wall is 6 feet.

Mr. Tucker disagreed. He took the 1/8 scale drawing and drew a 6 foot high line across and saw that the wall was higher than 6 feet.

Mr. Norden said there is no question we are at the posts.

Mr. Tucker felt all of these things need to be worked out in the time it is going to take for a few work sessions. He proposed work sessions before a motion is made. The applicant requested work sessions in the past after they were denied. He asked if they would like work sessions now before a motion is made. There is a lot here, two Board members are missing, and they deserve the opportunity to go over this with you.

Mr. Foote said they have no explicit authority from their client, but taking the members of the Board in good faith, this would be an effort to work through the details. They would agree to the work sessions.

Mr. Tucker said he would see a work session's purpose to have the Board massage the project to bring it into compliance.

Mr. Foote understood and took it as suggested. The client makes the decisions. Mr. Foote was saying on behalf of his client, without explicit authority, they we will work with the Board.

Mr. Tucker said if Mr. Foote cannot speak for the applicant, then they do not have an applicant before them.

Mr. Foote said that would not be correct. His authority is limited to presentation, his client and he had not discussed deferral or work sessions. As his representative and his lawyer, he will speak for him tonight and agree to a work session with the Board.

Mr. Robinson, the Town Attorney, said everyone is on the same page. He clarified that Mr. Foote is saying they we will do a work session, and the ARB is suggesting a work session, so if someone made a motion for a work session, that would be agreed on. Mr. Foote will work with The ARB during a work session.

Mr. Tucker asked for the requirements in advertising work sessions.

Mr. Robinson said there are no requirements and the ARB can table this whether the client agrees or not.

Mr. Tucker asked what if they make a motion to table and suggest one work session a week, as many as three, whatever it takes to work out the details? This major project needs major work.

Mr. Robinson felt everyone agrees to do that. If ARB wants to set up work sessions, Ms. Sitterle would help. Work sessions could be arranged with enough public notice.

Mr. Wood asked it would it be better to postpone.

Mr. Robinson said that is what you would be doing by tabling and setting up work sessions.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said there are three choices regarding applications according to the guidelines. ARB can approve an application with conditions, deny an application, or table an application. Staff can help arrange a work session. ARB can table it and arrange work sessions. She suggested having one and seeing how that one goes before the next one is arranged. The next meeting is in 28 days. ARB has 60 days to vote if it is tabled. 60 days puts ARB beyond the April meeting. Essentially, ARB has 28 days to work this out.

Mr. Neville asked if the applicant withdrew the application, would it reset the time.

Mr. Robinson said it might reset the time. If ARB does a work session, and the media is notified well enough in advance, ARB has the work session and things are progressing well, the applicant would be able to agree to an extension.

Mr. Tucker said work sessions only work if they effect changes. If there is no change, there is no point in having a work session.

Mr. Robinson believed that is what the applicant is saying that they will work with you on. Have a work session; see how it is progressing, and go from there.

Mr. Foote said that gives them the opportunity to brief our client.

Mr. Nevill said in preparation for that, they have been looking at this within the twelve-unit presentation. Part of the problem is that no matter how it is done, it seems to be running against fitting into the Historic District and the transition from the neighborhood to the central business district in respect to the placement and the scale of the buildings surrounding it. He asked the applicant be open to perhaps less units or a different configuration. That was a personal request.

Mr. Foote understood. He explained to the ARB that they receive instruction from their client. They will go back to the client, give him the information, and then get in touch with Ms. Sitterle.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said if a motion is, made ARB has 60 days to act.

Mr. Foote suggested a longer deferral. He suggested ARB gives both of them enough time.

Mr. Robinson said what can be done, with Mr. Foote's consent, is agree to two meetings from this month. ARB can table until the May meeting. If it goes beyond the 60 days, Mr. Foote would agree to an extension.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said what is appropriate for the Board is to entertain a motion to table this and set up a work session to discuss the project. That puts ARB at 60 days. Before the next meeting, ARB will look at this, see where it is, and if it looks like ARB will go beyond 60 days. Then ARB will have to vote on it at the next meeting or the applicant can ask for a delay. She asked for a motion to table it with the planning of a work session before the next ARB meeting. If ARB believes they need more time beyond the 60 days, the applicant will have to ask for it.

Mr. Robinson said there has to be a tabled time because it cannot be tabled indefinitely.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to table the application **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-22**, a resubmission until the next meeting on March 24, 2016 and that ARB establishes a work session with the applicant prior to that meeting.

Mr. Tucker seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said the next item on the agenda is a work session and the regular session is over. She asked Ms. Sitterle, is there anything for the work session.

Ms. Sitterle said no.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Nevill seconded the motion.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.