



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

September 22, 2016

7:00 P.M.

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on September 22, 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. James Tucker, Vice-Chair, Mr. Steve Wojcik, Mr. Carter Nevill and Councilman Alec Burnett. Ms. Kelly Machen, Community Development Planner was present and represented staff. Dr. Carole Hertz was absent.

Purpose Statement

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

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Wiedenfeld said the minutes from August 25, 2016 were for approval.

Mr. Carter Nevill moved to approve the minutes for the meeting of August 25, 2016.

Mr. Tucker seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote. (4-0-1, Hertz absent)

New Business

- **Certificate of Appropriateness 2016-40:** Wrought iron railing along front porch at 191 Culpeper Street; Michael Straight, Applicant/Owner.

Mr. Straight approached the podium and addressed the board. He said he recently acquired the property and his home insurer had recommended the installation of a rail on two sections. Utilizing the overhead TV monitors, Mr. Straight presented pictures to the board of what the porch and the stair railing look like. The applicant proposed to match the design of the existing railing located on the stairs.

Board members gave comments and asked questions of Mr. Straight regarding the proposed rail and Mr. Straight provided answers.

Mr. Tucker commented that the proposal would not meet the building code due to the spacing between the rails, but that the applicant can apply for a building code modification.

Ms. Kelly Machen explained that the Building Official could waive certain requirements for historic buildings.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve the application **Certificate of Appropriateness 2016-40** for the proposed wrought iron railing at 191 Culpeper Street with the following conditions:

1. A building permit is acquired.

Mr. Wojcik seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a majority vote. (3-0-2 Tucker abstain, Hertz absent)

Work Session

- **Preliminary Submission:** Saint James Episcopal Church proposed renovations and addition at 73 Culpeper Street; Sean Reilly, Architect.

Dr. Wiedenfeld said the Work Sessions are typically more informal than the regular meeting, with more back and forth and questions. The Board does not vote on anything in a Work Session. It is an exchange of ideas. She said that Board members should feel free to ask questions at any time because it is informal.

Mr. Nevill said that discussions in a Work Session are non-binding.

Mr. Sean Reilly, architect for the project, introduced the concept of the project to the Board to share ideas and answer any questions the Board. He started by showing historic photographs of the church because, he said, the story of St. James Church goes back quite a way. He added the church was founded 200 years ago this year. The slide show included a photograph of the original church which showed that it was built in the gothic revival style which is intentionally asymmetrical in its composition. It is composed of lancet windows, pointed arch windows and it is marked by a tall steeple with an octagonal piece at the very top and then a cross.

He showed additional historic photographs of the church to Culpeper Street. The images were utilized to explain the history of the property and past/present configurations. A major historical point for the property came in late October of 1910 when a tragic fire seriously damaged the original church and parish house.

He explained that the process for determining the proposed new building began with site visits to understand what exists and to get clues to inform the design of an addition. He said the addition is a wonderful opportunity to extend the vocabulary and the general spirit of the buildings without copying it literally. He added that the primary material of the original sanctuary is a coarse stucco finish with stone sills, slate roofs and wood-framed windows with metal muntins. The cross tower of the steeple was rebuilt in a different form after the fire. The octagonal steeple was replaced with a crenellated top. In a side view of the existing sanctuary, the gothic revival building, which is reminiscent of a church one may have seen in the English countryside in the late 1800's or early 1900's is very nicely articulated with a projecting base, projecting buttresses that step down, horizontal belt courses to demarcate and give scale to the steeple as well as to subdivide the base in between the buttresses.

The stucco finish carries through but there is the introduction of new roof forms are not on Culpeper Street. He said there is a sense of the variety of roof forms. There are gable ends with a clean gable, gables with robust chimney projections, and the introduction of a shed roof in the lower story below the chimney.

Mr. Reilly presented additional photographs and went on to describe various aspects of the church and campus, including materials, architectural details, and current uses. A few of the key issues to be addressed for the project were discussed, such as vehicular traffic/queue limitations due to existing parking situation and space requirements. He showed a diagram that illustrated on weekdays there is a vehicular queue that develops up Beckham Street waiting to turn into the church for pick up and drop off of students in the morning and afternoon. The cars turn to the right, pick up and drop off the children, and then the cars either exit out where they came in or use one other exit. He said that the existing parking situation isn't large enough to handle the entire queue.

There is another issue, he added, illustrated on the diagram. The footprint of the original church starting with the sanctuary that was rebuilt in 1912 on the left and was converted into the chapel in 1949. The parish hall was built in 1932. The Kirby building can be seen at the corner of Culpeper and Beckham. He said as the need for space grew, the church expanded down the hill. The site slopes about 24 feet from Culpeper down to S. Third Street. The church made use of the topography and stepped down the hill to build the Christian Education wing in the mid 1960's. He added the only other structures on the site are the rectory immediately south of the sanctuary and its garage.

Mr. Reilly also presented a diagram showing the arc of the sun as it traverses the site along with the axis of the original church that extends through the center of the sanctuary and through the beautiful Ascension stained-glass window.

When considering where to put the addition, it seemed that the green space, between the Christian Education wing and the basketball court, was the logical place. An important factor in considering

the design is the preservation of the view from Franklin Street of the sanctuary and the Ascension window. It is an important existing element that should be respected and preserved. He said another important factor is the size of the footprint, how it lays out and how it respects the existing structure. The church is also looking to address handicapped accessibility and is including an elevator in the proposed building to enhance the accessibility. Finally, the proposed layout would seek to improve the access and queuing issues of the cars.

Board members gave comments and queried Mr. Reilly on issues related to the addition and Mr. Reilly provided answers. Highlights of the discussion included proposed materials for windows and roofing, the architecture of the roof line, the treatment of entrances, and the future of the existing garage. There was a lengthy conversation over whether the existing garage is a contributing structure, demolition procedures, and whether it can or should be moved. The applicant was encouraged to bring samples of proposed building materials when the formal application comes forward for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Tucker noted the Architectural Review Board has first review of site plans.

Ms. Wiedenfield suggested the architects do a thorough review of the Historic Guidelines in reference to the addition and renovations.

Mr. Wojcik made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Nevill seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.