

STAFFORD COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
December 7, 2020

The meeting of the Stafford County Architectural Review Board of Monday, December 7, 2020, was called to order at 3:44pm by Doris McAdams, Chairman, in the Activities Room of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Corey Miles, Kim Taylor-Wilson, Doris McAdams, Kim Taylor-Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Albert Bain, Mark Osborn

STAFF PRESENT: Lindsey Marr, Eva Campbell, Kathy Baker (virtual)

GUESTS PRESENT: Landon Davis, John Van Zandt

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. McAdams called the meeting to order and asked Ms. Marr to call roll.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Ms. Marr called roll and Ms. McAdams stated there was a quorum present.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

NEW BUSINESS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

[Ingleside, Certificate of Appropriateness, COA20153556](#)

Ms. McAdams: Is there anything you want to tell us before we start asking questions?

Ms. Baker: Do you all want an overview do you want them to give you an overview?

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: We can I mean I have some questions but yeah an overview would be good.

Mr. Davis: I don't mind giving a brief overview if you want. My name's Landon Davis, this is John Van Zandt, we purchased the property in March of this year and are excited about renovating it, the main home, and we also think there's also an additional lot on the river side that we're, up here kind of this was what made us come here before you today is that lot. We have a legal right it's called a de facto subdivision because the property is split by the road but in order to get the County to kind of recognize it we have to go through a minor subdivision application which we've done and so the problem with that is in order to get the minor subdivision we have to dedicate 50 feet of right of way off the road to the County or to VDOT and in order to dedicate that right of way there can't be any improvements within the 50 feet even though it's very unlikely that there will ever be an extension of that road ever done up there but just for the purposes of on paper we can't have any improvements within the 50 feet so we have to remove the structures that are within the 50 feet and we're in a historic district, most of this property is in its own historic district and so that's why we're here before you today. A lot of the things we would probably want to remove anyway to be honest with you because the property's just very

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

crowded right now with kind of these ancillary structures that don't add a lot of value historical or aesthetically or functionally. So we're here today to ask to remove the cinder block building which is just a cinder block shed with a back pvc board you know roof and asphalt shingled roof and we're asking to move the stone retaining wall so you know there might be some historic significance to this stone retaining wall, it looks pretty anyways so we're not asking to demolish that we're gonna actually take the time and spend the money to move that back behind the 50 foot right of way so it's out of the way versus just knocking it down. There's a gazebo on the main property that we believe is covering an old well that needs to be properly filled in so we'd like to remove that. There is this ice house cap here and the actual ice house is really cool and does have historical significance, it's this opening in the ground about 20 feet deep and I guess was built there in the 1700s and they'd store ice there where it was cool and you can see the walls are made up of these stones that were panned and laid in there, I took some pictures of it for you all to look at. So that part's historic, the cap on it is not historic it is again made of pvc board and asphalt shingles and it's completely rotting now to the point where we can't lock it, so we need to either, and just a tiny corner of this is in the 50 foot right of way so we'd like to figure out some way to you know kind of repair, replace, and kind of shrink what's there or to do something, you know totally start over and do kind of what we were talking about, doing some type of deck thing almost... boarding surface. See the edge of the wall, get a visual of that, you'll see some of the nice scope work that you can't even see now but it'll be not visible but secure for the same type issues. Yeah, because right now you can't even really see the actual supporting part of the structure there. And then the last request we had was there's a portico door on the side of the house on the gosh what is that the west side of the house and again that whole west wing was added we think in the 70s to the property so it's not part of the original structure and right now there's two back doors and this side door so there's three kind of back or secondary entrances to the property which is at least one too many and with what we're planning to do, and Doris and Al saw this when they went to the property on Friday but the way we're redoing the interior of the property it just makes a lot more sense not to have the door there with the way the furniture fit in there and the way that a family would live in that space, it really kind of messes up our, that's like the family room and the kids room, kind of the area where we envisioned people just kind of hanging out, relaxing and stuff and it would just make it difficult to have any relaxing going on there with the door there, a couch right up against it or something like that. So I guess that's really pretty much it and we've spent, John has a lot of experience with this historic renovations and stuff so I'm thinking a lot is you know my actions are based on his guidance, and there's some really cool stuff, it's a really cool property, that you know and I could tell if you go down to the basement there's the historic foundation from the 1700s and a couple of beams that just look like tree trunks that they took and put up under there, under the support floors, so there's really neat stuff and we're gonna be spending a lot of money on renovating the main house and so you know that's why it's important for us to be able to sell and you know get the value out of this lot across the street, it's gonna really offset the cost of renovating the main house properly like it should be renovated and not kind of cutting too many corners and stuff like that. So that's the plan and that's the request so I'm more than happy and John's more than happy to answer any questions y'all have.

Ms. McAdams: It may be in here but I don't remember, what is the square footage or the lot size for this lot where the ice house is?

Mr. Davis: The square like the buildable...

Ms. McAdams: Right.

Mr. Davis: So the actual lot's about a half acre because it goes all the way down to the river.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Ms. McAdams: Right but that's not the buildable lot.

Mr. Davis: The buildable area, hold on I'm just, sorry to go on my phone but I was just looking at it actually... it is 91 by 45, the buildable footprint.

Ms. McAdams: As we were talking Friday, probably if you get approval to building, probably would have to be less than 2,000 square feet, is that right?

Mr. Van Zandt: I don't know if that's a code, that's not driven by a code as my understanding but that's our intention to be smaller and blend in very well with the neighborhood and other structures around.

Mr. Davis: And another thing I do want to make clear is we're not, we would have to come back and pass y'all again before we did any type of structure on that. Right now we're just trying to get legally separated so we can sell the house. Our plan is really to, once we get the legal separation going, to renovate the house, sell the house, and then kind of simultaneously be moving in a parallel path with the lot and if somebody came along and wanted to buy it or build something then we'd probably move that forward but yeah we wouldn't be, we're not asking for some blanket approval to build whatever kind of house we want...

Ms. McAdams: Oh no no no, that's not where I was going I'm just wanting to get on the table that you will probably be coming back to us for something else, this is your plan that you want to build a house where the icehouse is you want a construction there, you want and also subdivide where the main house is and build another house on the side of that. I just wanted that to get on the record that's all. We're not gonna be voting on it.

Ms. Baker: Say that again about the main house?

Ms. McAdams: Where the main house is, and if you're facing the main house this way, off to the side, there is a sliver of land that they want to put another house on and in the back of that is a structure that is probably historic, and that's not in here but that came up in the conversation Friday and I just want it all in the minutes.

Mr. Davis: So Ms. Baker if you see, if you look at page 14 of the staff's presentation, it has a GIS kind of overview and so you have actually three parcels with this property, you've got the, I call it the river parcel which is the you know the parcel over here, then you have the main parcel which is the parcel with the house, then you have this little strip parcel right here, so I guess what I kind of realized after buying it was that you've got this river parcel that's a separate parcel because the road splits it and then you could do a boundary line adjustment on that strip parcel and you move it over till it's about .67 acres or something like that and maybe you could get another lot or a strip and again that's a little that's a tertiary kind of request at this point for just exploring that option.

Mr. Van Zandt: We'd really like to focus our energy and efforts on the river lot and the redevelopment of the house, the restoration of the house.

Mr. Davis: Yeah we would, we're exploring the possibility of doing that with the engineer right now to figure out you know make sure everything is completely conforming or not any less conforming than it is currently but yeah, that's not part of the ask today, today is just focused on the river lot over here.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Mr. Miles: The content of the application was that our *inaudible* and I'm reading the report now, to what level has your team reviewed the historical documents or to what depth of research have you guys done, what I'm thinking of you said there may be a while for example, to what degree of certainty are you that you know one of us, that seems silly to ask if you're not aware that there absolutely is a well then you certainly don't know when it was constructed so back to the broad question is have you consulted property records or spoken to a local historian about potential significant cultural or historical significance of the structures? Or are you kind of just intuitively from your other experience sort of implying that they do have historical significance? Is that, does the question make sense?

Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Miles: Okay.

Mr. Davis: Yeah, so I've reached out to Dovetail Cultural Resources I think and I spoke to them just very kind of generally about it and I know you know John does a tremendous amount of historical renovations mostly in the city but you know has done numerous recently so John I consider to be kind of an expert on this but... and I think when I was speaking to Eva she indicated that she was doing a lot of research and that it would be kind of included in the presentation to the extent that the records were available. I contacted the you know the Historic Fredericksburg Foundation and tried to talk to them and came up kind of empty. I've looked at any online data base that I could basically find to try to you know get a little background to tell a story with this application or just with anything and you know just found a couple brief snippets, it's not listed on the, I don't think it's listed on the Virginia register of historic places or in the National Historic database so-

Mr. Miles: So therefore it's easy for me to say that resources are limited or not available...

Mr. Davis: Certainly not easily at least and you know I'm an attorney and John has a lot of experience with it and you know not that either one of us are the smartest guys in the whole world but probably no more than the normal person knows about it and haven't been able to find it. I mean I checked, done the title search and read the deeds and stuff but there's nothing that would be you know with respect to the individual structures on the property.

Mr. Miles: Right the foundation for me asking that question is that in the past this body, this Board has asked for certain historical reports of structures where let's just say there's some incomplete knowledge about what historical or cultural significance there is and before I you know before we have deliberations about what whether that's needed in this case I was just curious to what level you already had that information.

Mr. Davis: Yeah I mean again we, I can't sit here and tell you we did an extremely deep dive on that but I mean certainly more than just, more than service levels trying to figure out what's going on.

Ms. McAdams: Do you have a contact in Stafford to start with?

Ms. Baker: We reached out to the Historical Commission, they said they didn't know anything.

Mr. Van Zandt: Right we were relying on the staff to kind of address-

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Mr. Davis: I asked Eva specifically whether I should hire you know I think I've done a lot of miquotes on it, but I remember generally saying you know hey do I need to hire a historian or something like that and she said no let me see what I can get from my sources first. So..

Mr. Miles: Cool, great.

Mr. Davis: A lot of the structures we're asking about, again I mean I understand what you're saying I think it's a good question but stuff like that, the shed, it's a cinderblock shed with asphalt shingles on it so I think that's one that you could be relatively safe in assuming I mean depends on what I guess your definition of historical is but not deep deep long 1700s significance.

Mr. Van Zandt: Certainly not original to the property, probably late 60s early 70s is where I would place the timeframe.

Mr. Miles: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Davis: Same with the cap to the ice house I mean you can look at that and tell, it actually looks kind of historical when you're looking at it from the outside but as soon as you open it and see oh this looks like it was just pulled off Lowe's.

Mr. Van Zandt: OSB and modern you know stamped lumber and so, nothing historical about that top.

Ms. Baker: That's kind of one the reasons why staff added that comment about the archaeologist because these instances, the two underground features are potentially significant, we know the ice house, that's why we've asked for I guess any additional disturbance that's gonna happen on the ground that there actually be an archeologist present in case something is found when the construction's going on and that's been an ARB recommendation in the past when there isn't historic recent information on it or there haven't been any previous studies so that would assist with that at least if they find anything. The stone wall, that could potentially...

Mr. Van Zandt: And the stone wall is in pretty bad condition as it stands right now, it's been kind of mismatched and repaired throughout the years, it's not in very good condition, its obviously more of a ruin than it is a wall at this point. Not saying it doesn't have significance but I think it would be much better long term for the health and recognition of that historically. Actually resourced to have it moved to a new place where it's more visible and outside the kind of road way area. A lot of the times you can see the walls been hit numerous times on that sharp corner of someone taking it too sharp and hitting that wall, right up against the roadway.

Ms. McAdams: Yeah there's been repairs and stuff and it's like reclaimed gravel.

Mr. Davis: It almost looks like asphalt.

Ms. McAdams: That's why I said reclaimed, it looked like what they're reclaiming because I've got some of it in one of my yards.

Mr. Miles: I don't have any further questions.

Ms. McAdams: Do you have any?

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: I asked some earlier.

Ms. McAdams: Okay so...

Mr. Van Zandt: We really just, we'd really like to do these renovations and restorations properly, it's typically we're working with a client who has lots of money to put into these properties and because you know we are the ultimate client here, generating this revenue from this river lot it will create the resources really needed to restore this house properly to get ready for the next 200 years rather than just you know glue and cupcake type solutions that some builders will put on a house and get it marketable, sell it, and then it falls apart in the next 20-30 years down the line.

Ms. McAdams: Your proposal is you're gonna get the money to repair this house by building or selling the part where the ice house is?

Mr. Davis: Yes ma'am. And it doesn't necessarily have to be you know, that's generally we're gonna repay ourselves from the lot or...

Mr. Miles: But your project is not exclusively dependent on the sale of that piece of...

Mr. Van Zandt: The level to which we restore the house is dependent on that.

Mr. Miles: Okay.

Mr. Van Zandt: If we got turned down we'd just have to they were saying you know there's, it's like a there's always a hard no and there is no way around it I don't know, we would probably revisit the levels to which we plan on... just because the income isn't there.

Ms. McAdams: And I know we're not building, we're not voting on this as part of it but at some point and I'm just curious have you applied to start trying to do something with that or do you have to wait til...

Mr. Van Zandt: We've kind of done some exploration but we can't put our time and resources into it til we know it's really gonna move forward so we've done some general research but nothing specific about or ready for a presentation on it.

Mr. Davis: A lot of interest in it from people we've talked to because the view of it's really going to be awesome.

Ms. McAdams: Yeah it is. It will be a nice view. I can attest to that.

Mr. Van Zandt: You can really get a unique view because you can see all the way across the river and all the way down the river, all the way to the bridge, so you've got this great kind of 90 degree unique view and down the river, I've never seen anything like it.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: By taking the cinder block structure out?

Mr. Van Zandt: No by being able to build cross, over there.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Okay.

Mr. Van Zandt: It will also help the original house view.

Ms. McAdams: What we need to vote on today is removing the ice house shed, removing the gazebo, and that portico, am I right?

Mr. Davis: So there's the remove the cinder block building and gazebo, move the stone wall, and then remove the wooden cap piece.

Ms. McAdams: That's right.

Ms. Baker: You could vote on them separately if you want or you could that way if you want set specific conditions on any aspect of it, that's just what was in the recommendations.

Ms. McAdams: Okay. Do you guys have any more questions?

Mr. Miles: No I have no further questions.

Ms. McAdams: Are you ready to go forward with a vote? If so could I get a motion and you can do individual, maybe we out to do individual.

Mr. Miles: I move for an itemized vote yeah.

Mr. Davis: Can I just ask a question on the staff recommendation was that the, it says the cap on the ice house does not appear to have historical significance to Stafford, drawings and plans were provided prior to obtaining a permit for removal so maybe would that be a permit to the building department?

Ms. Baker: Right it just depends on what you end up actually doing there. Just removal of something they're gonna want to see what's replacing it.

Mr. Davis: But that would be we would submit that to staff?

Ms. Baker: Yeah.

Mr. Van Zandt: Our one request before we get to move this would be that we be allowed to remove a small section of that cap that's in the right of way so that we can move forward with VDOT aspect of that project, getting the approval by VDOT then we'll bring back-

Mr. Davis: Well see I think that was the, we won't have to bring it back, we'll just have to *inaudible* to staff, which I think is fine.

Mr. Van Zandt: I was just confused I didn't know if it was requiring us to come back here or-

Ms. Baker: No, unless it was gonna change.

Mr. Miles: So there's four elements that we'd be voting on individual.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Ms. McAdams: Your motion is to do it all as one or as individual.

Mr. Miles: Individual.

Ms. Baker: So why don't you start with the cinder block.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: On application COA20153556 Ingleside, I make a motion to approve the removal of a cinder block building and gazebo.

Ms. McAdams: Can I get a second?

Mr. Miles: Second.

Ms. McAdams: All those in favor? (motion passes)

Ms. Baker: Then how about the icehouse cap.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Okay, referencing Certificate of Appropriateness COA20153556 I make a motion to approve to the removal of the wooden cap of the ice house on the southern parcel south of Ingleside Drive.

Mr. Miles: Second.

Ms. McAdams: So a motion has been made that we remove, approve removing the cap and in replacement, is that right?

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Yes it's removal of that cap and putting a ground level cap on.

Ms. McAdams: Alright. All those in favor? (motion passes) And the next portion, why don't we do the fence above the, the lot fence, stone wall.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: In reference to Certificate of Appropriateness COA20153556 I make a motion to approve the moving of the stone retaining wall on the north side of Ingleside Drive.

Ms. McAdams: Can I get a second?

Mr. Miles: Second.

Ms. McAdams: Alright we have another motion to remove and I think it's to remove and relocate it right? Is that your motion? Okay. So all those in favor? (motion passes) And I think the last piece I think is the portico. Oh the gazebo, yeah we still got that to go.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: In reference to Certificate of Appropriateness COA20153556 Ingleside removal of the gazebo, or portico.

Ms. McAdams: Did you all put both of those together or just one?

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Yeah the first one I had them both together, I said the cinderblock building and the gazebo.

Ms. McAdams: We didn't hear that yeah.

Mr. Davis: I heard it.

Ms. Baker: I guess go back to that then, when we talked about the gazebo, didn't make any reference to the well itself so we should do that, amend that motion then if that's the desire of the ARB.

Ms. McAdams: You want to amend your motion?

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Yes. I'd like to amend the motion to I guess fill in the well or properly abandon.

Ms. Baker: We ask that it be documented prior to that and then if they wish to abandon it then they'll get the appropriate permits to fill it in.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Okay.

Ms. Baker: it's just whether there's any, we're recommending if there's anything significant about the well itself, in the documents.

Ms. McAdams: Are you agreeable to that?

Mr. Miles: I second that.

Ms. McAdams: So, all in favor? (motion passes) Alright then we have, what else one more thing left then.

Mr. Miles: Restore the portico.

Ms. McAdams: He can make the motion, I'm gonna not make the motion. I'll let one of you guys do it.

Mr. Miles: On the portico that needs staff recommendation that *inaudible* prior to removal.

Ms. McAdams: Do I get a second?

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Second.

Ms. McAdams: All in favor? (motion passes) That's it. Alright I think that covered all of the pieces on it. Is there anything else that we needed to cover on that?

Ms. Baker: I was just wanted to say if you wanted to make the recommendation for the archaeologist to be present?

Ms. McAdams: Yes, definitely.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes
November 2, 2020*

Mr. Van Zandt: One clarification on that if I may, typically we would request that we would notify an archeologist if we come across any deposits, archeological deposits rather than have someone standing there the whole time.

Ms. Baker: Yes that's correct, that's fine.

Mr. Van Zandt: So if that's agreeable we are agreeable.

Mr. Miles: Does that agreement stand or does that need to be voted on? Okay. Then I'll make a motion that we vote on the applicant's notification of an archeologist if such material requires that.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Second.

Ms. McAdams: All in favor? (motion passes) Okay is there anything else that we need to cover on this one? I think that's it.

Mr. Davis: Alright, thanks very much for having us, we appreciate it. We'll be seeing you on this one at least one more time.

REPORTS BY ARB MEMBERS

Ms. McAdams: Do any of you guys have any reports?

Mr. Miles: No reports.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 2, 2020

Ms. McAdams: Next is the approval of the minutes, did everybody get a chance to read the minutes? And do I have a motion?

Mr. Miles: I move.

Ms. Taylor-Wilson: Second.

Ms. McAdams: Then the minutes stand approved as written.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss Ms. McAdams adjourned the meeting at 4:21pm.