

***STAFFORD COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES***  
***May 2, 2016***

The meeting of the Stafford County Architectural Review Board of Monday, May 2, 2016, was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Chairman Paul Eakin, in the ABC Conference Room of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Eakin, Range, Dodgen (6:08), Gossett, McAdams, and Osborn

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bailey

STAFF PRESENT: Baker and Knighting

GUESTS PRESENT: Greg Motta and Ben Motta

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Eakin called the meeting to order and asked Mr. Range if he would call the roll in Mr. Dodgen's absence.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Mr. Range called the roll and stated 5 of the 7 members were present, and there was a quorum.

Mr. Eakin asked Ms. Baker if there was anything to discuss before the first COA.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Baker apologized to the ARB for not sending the staff report out for King Street. She suggested since the applicant was well versed, she would let him present it to the ARB.

Mr. Eakin agreed. He stated the first they would start with Mr. Ben Motta.

Mr. Motta stated he was a 14 year old Life rank scout at Hartwood Presbyterian Church, Troop 1717 in Hartwood, Virginia and attends Gayle Middle school. He explained in detail the requirements to become an Eagle Scout, which includes a public service project. He stated he has grown up in Stafford and read about the many drownings at the Historic Port of Falmouth, noting the sign states 85 drownings since 1972. He stated with the statistics of two drownings every year at the Port of Falmouth and because his uncle drowned some years ago, he thought he could do his part to help avoid more drownings by building and installing proactive items. He stated he met Cathy Vollbrecht, interim Director, and Derrick Carr of Stafford Parks and Recreation, at the Historic Port of Falmouth to discuss plans for his project proposal. He stated the first part of his project proposal was a personal flotation device (PFD) lifejacket rack. Currently, Parks and Rec has a PFD loan program where an attendant lays them out on a tarp every day throughout the summer. He stated his plan is to build a double tier PFD rack, explaining it would include two tiers with two planks and PVC pipes, which would allow 2-3 PFDs on each PVC pipe. He stated he

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

thought that may increase usage, because many people do not want to use a wet or dirty PFD, and it would increase the visibility of the loaner program. He stated it would be located near the park attendant and within sight of the patrons. He stated the structure could be permanent, removable or temporary and would be paid for by Scout fundraising. He explained the three types of bases, stating the permanent one would be in the ground and surrounded by gravel, and the removable one would have a metal sleeve encased in concrete and gravel. He stated the posts would slide into a metal sleeve and could be placed in other locations or removed for the winter to prevent decay. He stated the second part of his plan was the life ring buoy stand and explained that many fishermen and waders use the Historic Port long before and after the summer season, at which times there are no PFDs available and no attendant on site. He stated the life ring buoy stand could be installed before the summer beach season and remain after the season. He stated it would be located at the location selected by Parks and Recreation, which may be on a bluff near an existing beach sign, approximately 120 feet from the water level and 90 feet from mid-beach. He stated that by placing the stand on the bluff, it would be more stable because of the soil and sand, and it would help minimize damage by minor flooding. He stated Parks and Recreation also wanted input from Fire and Rescue since they would be responding to an event. This structure could also be permanent, removable or temporary, like the PFD rack. Parks and Recreation is recommending the removable one with a metal sleeve set in concrete. He stated the life ring would also have a buoy alarm to help prevent theft and to alert patrons of a drowning in progress. Again, the cost would be covered by Scout fundraising and his objective is to have these projects installed by summer, but he needs Stafford approval first, as Stafford is the beneficiary of the project. Once he receives approval from Stafford he can seek Troop approval, then National Capital Area Council approval, before fundraising can begin. He stated he has approached Fredericksburg officials for another life ring buoy stand on their side of the river at Old Mill Park, and Mayor Greenlaw was very supportive of the idea and will be meeting with Mr. Ward of Fredericksburg Parks and Recreation very soon. He asked the ARB if there were any questions.

Mr. Dodgen stated there is definitely a need.

Mr. Range stated he lives across the street from the park and has witnessed, almost every weekend, Fire and Rescue trying to rescue people who get into trouble in the water. He stated he applauds the idea of doing this project and the presentation was very professional. He stated since he has personally witnessed the flooding several times a year, he applauds the idea of removable stands, so the hard work does not get destroyed or removed. He also suggested enlisting another Scout, living nearby, to assist in inspecting the devices and removal of the equipment when flooding might occur. He stated he knows of a Scout that lives across the street that may be available.

Mr. Motta thanked Mr. Range for his suggestion and stated as soon as he finished the project it would be turned over to Stafford for maintenance and removal. He asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Eakin stated he thought making it removable was very smart. He asked Mr. Motta for his opinion of when it should be available to the public.

Mr. Motta stated it would be most effective during the swimming season, but Stafford could keep it there whenever they decided.

Mr. Eakin asked if Mr. Motta had a recommendation.

Mr. Motta suggested the first two weeks of April through late September.

Mr. Range stated he often sees people using the park when there is no County presence, and this would help alleviate some of his worries.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes  
May 2, 2016*

Ms. McAdams stated she feels more comfortable, since her granddaughter works there.

Mr. Eakin stated he thought the County's position with Fire and Rescue was they do not want the employees or volunteers involved in water rescues, so this would provide something they could toss to someone, or encourage them to use a PFD and, in his opinion, was a great idea.

Ms. Gossett stated it was a great presentation and thanked Mr. Motta. She asked the Chairman what the goal was because this was not an official COA.

Ms. Baker stated Mr. Motta submitted the COA today. Based on the need to proceed in a timely manner, and because this was not a permanent feature that would impact the historic district, the Chairman permitted the item to be discussed and most of the ARB members had agreed.

Ms. Gossett stated she now had several questions. She stated the racks would be constructed out of wood and PVC, and asked what color the wood would be painted.

Mr. Motta stated driftwood gray.

A brief discussion ensued concerning the color of the wood, it was suggested white would be more visible and blend in with the PVC color, but the ARB did not prefer one color over another, just preserving the wood structure.

Mr. Eakin asked if the roof would have any shingles on it.

Mr. Motta stated he could do that. The plan was for the wood to be pressure treated, but he would build it to County specifications.

Ms. Gossett stated there should not be any archeological issues with these structures.

Mr. Osborn asked if the ARB had any jurisdiction if the signs were temporary.

Ms. Baker stated if they are removable, technically the ARB would not because you deal with permanent structures. She asked Mr. Motta if Parks and Recreation had a preference.

Mr. Motta stated they preferred removable with a metal casing for the wood post to go into so it could be removed in the winter.

Mr. Dodgen stated that would be a sleeved foundation.

Mr. Eakin stated the foundation would be permanent but the structure itself would not be.

Mr. Osborn suggested when the sleeve is placed in the ground, a cap should be added to prevent the sleeve from filling.

Mr. Eakin asked what material would be used for the cap and what type of metal would be used for the sleeve.

Mr. Motta stated perhaps like the post, just a cover with a ring on top to allow it to be pulled out, and the sleeve would be steel.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes  
May 2, 2016*

Mr. Dodgen suggested a five inch steel pipe threaded on the end and using a threaded metal or PVC cap on the end.

Mr. Eakin asked Ms. Baker if this was a temporary structure and if it was in the purview of the ARB, or would it be approving the foundation to hold the structure.

Ms. Baker stated she would leave that up to the ARB to make that determination. She stated in her opinion it was something that would be removable, so it does not technically have a permanent effect on the district.

Mr. Range stated in his opinion the spirit of the project was that it is permanent and the only reason it is removable is in special conditions.

Ms. Baker stated Parks and Recreation will still have the final decision.

Mr. Dodgen made a motion to approve the project as presented.

Mr. Osborn seconded.

The motion passed 6-0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent).

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Application COA1615123, 303 King Street

Mr. Eakin asked Mr. Range if he would like to give an overview of his proposal.

Mr. Range stated there was a lot of information and he would start with the primary item he was submitting, which were the skylight additions. He stated he would be making modifications in the attic and he would like to install skylights. He stated one of the pictures shows the roof with the approximate size of the skylights and the approximate location. He stated he also included an article from the Department of Interior concerning installation of skylights on historic buildings. He stated the skylights should be as small as possible, few in number and located in a single row in areas not visible, and does not change the historic character of the house. He stated he wanted to install three small, low profile skylights located between the rafters. He stated the skylights would have a hinged opening to provide the capability to escape through the attic in case of a fire or emergency.

Mr. Dodgen asked if the interior space was finished.

Mr. Range stated no. It does have a floor and he uses it for storage, and this would allow daylighting. He stated the area was visible from Gordon Street but that was not the primary front of the house. He would be doing all the construction work. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Dodgen asked if the skylights would line up with the second story windows.

Mr. Range stated yes, he would try to line them up, but the rafter positions would determine the actual placement.

Mr. Dodgen stated Mr. Range would have to re-shingle around the skylights and asked if he was going to match the existing shingles.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

Mr. Range stated yes, and he would try to reduce the disturbance of the existing shingles by doing the cutting from the inside. He stated the existing shingles are dark and the skylights were dark grey, and they should match. He stated the roof was installed in the 1920s.

Mr. Dodgen stated it looks like this falls within the guidelines and he saw the request as being appropriate.

Ms. Gossett stated the only concern she has was since the house was located on the corner, it is very visible from the public right-of-way. She stated everything else falls within the suggested guidelines.

Mr. Range stated he considered that and he felt the smaller, low profile skylights would be barely visible.

Ms. McAdams stated she has seen it in other homes and felt it would be fine.

Mr. Range stated Gordon Street was not a primary traveled street like River Road and he felt the skylights would not negatively impact the buildings behind him, or the view from Gordon Street.

Ms. Gossett stated she would like to make the ARB aware that the guidelines state when it comes to roofs, we are to insure the changes in the roof form or the addition of new roof features, which accommodate interior expansion and remodeling, such as skylights, etcetera, etcetera, are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and completed in such a manner that it does not damage or obscure the defining features. She stated she wanted to make sure everyone understood that this is one of the guidelines. She stated in her opinion, this is probably appropriate, but she is worried that there will be an explosion of skylights in the district that may not be as attentive to those details and that is why she wanted it in the record, so the ARB could be clear that they feel Mr. Range has met those requirements and has mitigated the issues that would often be of concern to the ARB.

Mr. Eakin asked if it would be more efficient to vote on each item since there were seven items to discuss.

Ms. Baker stated it would be easier to do it item by item.

Mr. Osborn made a motion to approve the skylights.

Ms. McAdams seconded.

The motion passed 5 – 0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent, Mr. Range abstained).

Mr. Range stated he would like to move to the second item, which is fencing along the side. He stated he submitted a drawing of what it may look like. He stated he wants to improve the privacy in his back yard, especially in the summer, due to the increased traffic and people illegally parking on the small parcel of land that adjoins his property on the Gordon Road side. He stated he has people changing clothes in that area and would prefer his children not see that. He has not been able to purchase the land in order to install a more historically appropriate type of privacy fence. He stated he would like to install a simple wood fence that would be on the top of the deck and then replace the old existing fencing. He explained in detail where the fence would be located. He said he spoke with the neighbor and he did not seem to have any issues with the fencing.

Mr. Dodgen asked about the existing gate.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes  
May 2, 2016*

Mr. Range stated he would still have a gate to allow ingress/egress but it would not be as pronounced as the current gate.

Mr. Eakin stated this was the portion of the project he had the most concern with. He said he understood wanting more privacy and reducing noise, but in reviewing the pictures submitted, the existing fence looks to be 4 feet tall and that it allows you see through, showing green space, trees, the porch features and the first floor windows. The proposed picture looks like a fortress and it does not feel like it fits. The deck is almost completely obscured, as well and the windows, and you see less green space.

Mr. Range stated because of the negative things happening to him and his family, he wants to provide his family privacy from the lunacy that occurs on the adjoining property.

Mr. Eakin asked if a lower fence with bushes planted on the inside of the fence, giving a more natural screening, could be done.

Mr. Range stated that would take away a good portion of the backyard and explained the backyard was long and narrow.

Mr. Dodgen stated the fence example submitted showed an alternating surface on both sides.

Mr. Range agreed.

Mr. Dodgen stated it was very similar to the existing fence, but the drawing does not give an accurate depiction of what would be in place. He stated there would be some visibility just like the existing fence has, because it is not solid wood on one side.

Mr. Range said as he was working on the fence, his intention would be to artistically build the fence without going out of the realm of what was approved.

Mr. Dodgen asked about the location of the existing fence, and if there were any encroachments, and if the new fence would be placed in the same location.

Mr. Range stated the fence is right on the property line and the new fence would be placed in the same location.

Mr. Dodgen asked Mr. Range if he had discussed the plan with the neighbors.

Mr. Range stated he had spoken with Mr. Schools, who did not have an issue with the design.

Ms. Gossett stated she agreed with Mr. Eakin. She is concerned that this is a solid wall and she is concerned it is masking the historic house, and it is masking the Conway house from public view as well, and that was is not in keeping with the guidelines. She asked if fences that were more open had been considered.

Mr. Range stated he did not want that because he did not feel safe having his children play in the backyard because of traffic, people parking next to his property, abandoned vehicles, and he has even had people picnic in his yard in the summer. He stated their privacy has been invaded because of the adjoining property and he has no control over the property. He stated he did not feel the people using the property were people who enjoyed looking at the historic view and would not be disrupted by the fence.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

He stated he was open to suggestions for something that was more artistically pleasing which gave him the privacy needed.

Ms. Baker stated she did not get a chance to speak with the Zoning Administrator concerning the height of the fence. She stated eight feet was the maximum height for a side yard, and she was not sure where they would take the measurement since it was an actual fence on the deck. She stated it could exceed the maximum height and she would have to check into that.

Mr. Dodgen asked if the panels were 6-foot by 8-foot.

Mr. Range stated yes.

Mr. Eakin stated it would be 10 feet off the ground on the deck.

Mr. Dodgen said it was sitting on top of the deck.

Ms. Baker stated she was not sure if it would be measured from the ground in that location or from the base of the fence.

Ms. McAdams stated she could sympathize about the things his children were seeing there and it was not appropriate.

Mr. Osborn asked Mr. Dodgen if he knew of any type of retractable screen.

Mr. Dodgen stated he did not think something like that would have been available at the time this house was built, and you would have to use modern material. He stated, in his opinion, the reverse batten fence provides air movement and a certain amount of visibility at certain angles. It is not like what is depicted in the drawing as a solid structure, there are 3 or 4 inches between each bat and it is reversed on the other side. He stated he had a concern with Mr. Range designing the fence as he was building it. He suggested he make a revision to the design and bring it before the ARB to review as a supplement to the application.

Mr. Eakin stated he had more of an issue with the deck area fencing and he was not sure that fence material was the right material for that area. He suggested a bamboo type shade feature that would give privacy when needed.

Mr. Range stated he would entertain lattice work all the way up. He asked about the fence going all the way to the house and placing lattice on the top.

A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the design of the fence and lattice work in the deck area, the size and location of the deck, and privacy concerns.

Mr. Range asked the ARB if they would be more comfortable with the fencing going all the way to the edge of the house with lattice work above the fence. He sketched out a design and presented it, stating the fence would extend to the edge of the house, and above the fence he would place lattice work that would gently bend up to the brick edge of the house. He stated he would also put arched lattice over the two gates that would complement the curve on the deck.

Mr. Eakin stated he would like to see the exact dimensions.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes  
May 2, 2016*

Mr. Range stated the fence is 6 feet and the lattice from the start of the curve to the top of the curve would be 3 feet by 3 feet, and from the top of the curve to the house would be approximately 10 feet.

Mr. Eakin confirmed it would still be approximately 9 feet off the ground.

Mr. Range stated yes.

Ms. Gossett stated she was concerned about the fence being 6 feet in height. She stated there are very few fences in the Falmouth district and the ones that are there did not come before this Board for approval. She stated all the fencing that has been approved was a much more open type of fencing. She stated she is concerned because this blocks your view. She stated she enjoys the view of Mr. Range's backyard and the Conway House when she is in the area. She stated she did like the idea of lattice at the top but still had concerns from a landscape standpoint about everyone walling themselves off in a district that historically has not been like that. She asked if the fence could be shorter and lattice added on the top.

Mr. Eakin asked Mr. Range if a 4-foot fence would provide the safety and security he was looking for his family.

Mr. Range stated he was looking for privacy in addition to security. He stated because his house has a corner location it is a little different that most of the properties in Historic Falmouth. The amount of traffic, especially when I-95 is backed up, increases and is sometimes overwhelming. He stated he is requesting the fence because he feels there is no other option to escape the traffic short of selling his home. This is an attempt to try to make his family more comfortable to live in their home. He stated he knew some of the view of Conway House would be blocked from certain angles and he was trying to adjust that by using lattice and the batten fence, but he needs the fence to make his property livable. Obtaining the property next to his is not an option. He does not feel it is being used appropriately and he has tried to get help. He has asked for help with the traffic conditions and has presented petitions with every landowner's signature for traffic easement, but it has been refused by the county and VDOT. He stated this is the only way he feels he can get any salvation from the traffic and things that happen on the property next to his.

Mr. Osborn asked if the ARB had the ability to give temporary approval that would dissolve if the property was ever sold.

Ms. Baker stated she was not sure.

Mr. Range stated he understood and asked if he could install the fence as he sketched out and it would be revisited in a year. If at that time the ARB felt it was not inhibitive of the spirit of Falmouth, it could be left, or if the ARB felt modification was required, it could be modified.

Mr. Eakin stated he thought that was a good concept but he would hate to see Mr. Range put the time and money in the project, if it may require modifications later.

Mr. Range stated he was willing to take that gamble. He stated he felt he could build it in a way that was acceptable.

Mr. Eakin stated he would rather figure it out now and get the fence that is needed and then it is done.

Mr. Dodgen asked if a fence could be installed on the vacant property that may discourage people parking in the area.



*Architectural Review Board Minutes  
May 2, 2016*

Mr. Range stated the landowner had special arrangements with businesses and organizations he allows to park there.

Mr. Range suggested having a 5-foot tall fence with a foot of lattice all the way down the side that faces Gordon Street and still have the lattice rise up to the deck and use the same drawing he presented.

A brief discussion ensued concerning the design of the fence. It was decided this item would be tabled to allow discussion of the other items.

Mr. Range moved on to the shed. He stated it was a wood shed kit from Lowes and he was not sure if it would have the window or not. It would be painted Montpelier Red like his front door, with white trim. The roof would have regular shingles and it would sit on blocks.

Ms. Gossett asked if the vegetation would be cut back.

Mr. Range stated as long as the disheveled garages were there, he would leave the bushes.

Mr. Osborn made a motion to approve the shed.

Ms. Gossett seconded.

The motion passed 5 – 0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent, Mr. Range abstained).

Mr. Range stated there was existing lattice work on the porch that is vinyl, which is cracked and broken. He stated he just wanted to remove and replace with a tighter meshed wood lattice. He stated he would either paint it green, like the existing, or paint it red to match the front door.

Ms. Gossett asked if the proposal for the design in the back would match the lattice in the front.

Mr. Range stated yes.

Ms. Gossett made a motion to approve the front lattice as presented.

Ms. McAdams seconded.

The motion passed 5 – 0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent. Mr. Range abstained).

Mr. Range stated the last item was a flag pole. He stated he has a historic flag pole that was at the Iwo Jima memorial at one time. He wants to place it on the front corner of the porch.

Mr. Dodgen asked about the size of the actual flag.

Mr. Range stated either 3 ½ or 4-feet by 6, or 4 by 8.

Mr. Eakin asked if there was enough room to allow him to fly the flag at half-staff without touching the ground.

Ms. Gossett asked if the columns were original to the house.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

Mr. Range stated the columns that touch the brick are original, but the columns on the edge of the porch were replaced approximately 15 years ago.

Ms. Gossett said if it was not historic material, she did not have a problem.

Mr. Osborn made a motion to approve the flagpole.

Mr. Dodgen seconded.

The motion passed 5 – 0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent, Mr. Range abstained).

Mr. Range stated he would resubmit he entire fence.

Mr. Eakin asked about the storm windows.

Mr. Range stated they were just standard white aluminum storm windows that would be screwed in. He stated traffic is very loud and this may be some sound proofing.

Mr. Dodgen asked if the existing windows were single pane divided light.

Mr. Range stated they were double pane, but because the front windows are about 20 feet from the road, he is hoping this will reduce the decibels a slight amount.

Ms. Gossett stated these were appropriate.

Mr. Range said the existing windows were not historic; they had been replace about 15 years ago during a renovation by a previous owner.

Ms. Gossett asked if the storm windows were tinted.

Mr. Range stated no.

Mr. Dodgen asked if they were seasonal or if they would be installed and left.

Mr. Range stated they would be installed and left.

Ms. Gossett asked if he used the windows.

Mr. Range said no, it was too loud.

Ms. Gossett asked if it was for all windows.

Mr. Range said yes, he was trying to add soundproofing.

A brief discussion ensued concerning the operation of the storm windows and the screen colors.

Mr. Range stated it was a standard storm window but he would probably not open them often.

Mr. Osborn made a motion to approve the storm windows.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

Mr. Dodgen stated he would like to make sure the glazing was clear, Low-E glass glazing with no tint.

Mr. Range agreed.

Mr. Osborn accepted the amendment.

Ms. Gossett stated she would second the original motion with the amendment.

The motion passed 5 – 0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent, Mr. Range abstained).

Mr. Eakin asked Mr. Range if he would resubmit the fence.

Mr. Range stated yes.

Mr. Eakin moved on to unfinished business.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. ARB By-Laws

Ms. Baker stated the ARB reviewed the by-laws previously and had to wait 30 days to vote on them, so it was just a matter of voting on the amendment which discussed the limitations on the two-year cap on serving as Chairman.

Ms. Gossett asked for a summary since she missed the previous meeting.

Mr. Eakin said the Board of Supervisors wanted all the Committees to align with their terms that the officer be limited to serve no more than two years consecutively and incorporating it into the by-laws of each Committee, Commission or Board.

Mr. Osborn made a motion to approve the by-laws.

Ms. McAdams seconded.

The motion passed 6 – 0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent).

3. Joint Meeting with Historical Commission

Mr. Eakin stated they had discussed the joint meeting with the Historical Commission and stated Mr. Dodgen had some comments.

Mr. Dodgen stated he was trying to understand what the concept was, or if there was some direction or end product to what was being proposed. He asked if it was just attending their meeting to observe or was there something more. He stated it was his understanding from the meeting in which the Historical Commission Chairman came to speak with the ARB that it was a consolidation of the two Boards and he wanted to make sure that was not the intent.

Mr. Range stated in his opinion the idea was to have a yearly get together to compare what was being done on each side and educate each other on items being approved or worked on, or direction each was going, and a sharing of goodwill.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

Ms. Gossett stated that what the Historical Commission and the ARB do complement each other and it is not being communicated well at this time.

Mr. Dodgen asked if it was a social hour or a joint meeting with an agenda to talk about various things.

Ms. Baker stated the idea is to follow standard procedures for convening, the Historical Commission would open their meeting and the ARB would open their meeting and take roll and go through all those formal procedures because it is an official meeting. Joint agenda items would be scheduled for discussion. There may still be individual items to discuss - perhaps the ARB would have a Certificate of Appropriateness on the agenda. The discussion piece was what would actually be good joint topics. She stated the Historical Commission had a couple of items, such as an ordinance dealing with archaeology and the requirement to have studies done on certain properties. That was one topic they were hoping to have input from the ARB to see if it was something worthy of entertaining.

Mr. Dodgen asked if it was a one-time meeting or every month they would join together.

Ms. Baker stated the ARB and Historical Commission would determine the number of meetings. It was first discussed as quarterly but she suggested starting with once a year.

Ms. Gossett suggested one of the items on the agenda should be the issue of having an informal public meeting concerning the Falmouth area and some of the issues going on there, and working together to get things done more effectively.

Mr. Eakin referred back to Mr. Dodgen's question whether this was just a meet and greet where they can get to know each other and conduct official business.

Ms. Baker stated yes, but it would still have to be advertised meeting.

Mr. Eakin asked what they would have to do to move forward.

Ms. Baker suggested the Chairman of both bodies set it up and decide a meeting date and time. She stated it could be scheduled any day or time, or in addition to your regularly scheduled meeting.

Mr. Eakin stated he would reach out and compare schedules. He asked the ARB if they were open to a joint meeting.

The members agreed.

REPORTS BY ARB MEMBERS

Mr. Dodgen stated there were some messages on several members' voice mail advising that he would be arriving late.

Ms. McAdams stated she went to an architectural-type meeting in Loudoun and was quite interesting.

Ms. Gossett stated the members needed to think about training.

Mr. Osborn stated he would like to announce that he no longer owns any property in Falmouth. He stated Mike Degen bought the Lightner Building and Billy Cox bought the seafood restaurant.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes  
May 2, 2016*

Ms. Gossett thanked Mr. Osborn for taking such good care of the buildings.

Mr. Eakin advised the ARB that he also sold his property to Mike Degen. He stated Mr. Degen has taken an interest in developing the area. He explained because of the price of the flood insurance he could not take the risk any longer, but loves living in the area and made an agreement that he would live there for two years.

Mr. Range stated he actually went without flood insurance for about six months and the mortgage company was contemplating foreclosing unless they produced flood insurance.

Ms. Gossett stated the COA received today was the old application and not the new one. She asked if it was ever voted on.

Ms. Baker stated yes, it has been on line.

Ms. Gossett stated she went on line today and it was not.

A discussion ensued concerning the form online.

Ms. Gossett stated she has also asked for the guidelines to be on the website. She stated it was unfair to have someone fill out the application and not know what the ARB is looking at. She also stated the COA on line stated the applications need to be submitted 30 day ahead of time, which is outdated.

Mr. Range stated the application did note the 30 day requirement.

Ms. Baker stated the change was made after the application was updated and she would get it corrected.

Ms. Gossett stated she was sure the ARB members saw her rant concerning Aquia Church. She said it she had not been up there since everything was completely finished. She inquired about the black coating that appeared on the roof. She also stated she is still concerned about the modern LED streetlight next to the church on the other side of the parking lot, which she was sure the ARB did not approve. She stated the double globe lamps by the new building are fine, but the modern on a square pole that a very bright in front of the historic chapel are not. She stated they were absolutely not appropriate and wanted to know if the ARB could do anything about that.

Ms. Baker stated she had responded via email regarding the lighting requirements, but would have to look back to see what was found out.

Ms. Gossett agreed that Ms. Baker's response dealt with a county requirement. She asked, because of the National Historic Landmark status, if something could be worked out with the county.

Ms. Baker stated Mr. Harvey forwarded the message on to staff because they are considering a new a lighting ordinance now, which would add changes regarding lighting in historic districts.

Mr. Osborn stated the County did not require the lighting on the site plan, the County Code included a Lighting Ordinance which requires a minimum foot candle measurements of lighting to meet certain safety requirement. He stated it also addresses maximum illumination of lighting. He stated it also required the lighting be cut by 50 percent within 30 minutes of normal business hours. He stated he personally attends Aquia Church and they have a lot of night-time activities in the church. Lighting is a

***Architectural Review Board Minutes  
May 2, 2016***

serious issue for the seniors that attend the church. He stated no one has complained about too much lighting, but he understood her concern.

Ms. Gossett stated she saw an amazing amount of activity in the church the evening she was there but she was concerned about the character of the most historic building in the county. Now when you sit in front of it you see the glaring LED lighting.

Mr. Dodgen stated it was more of a security light than a wayfinding light.

Ms. Gossett agreed and stated it was not decorative in the least. She stated they do not keep within any guidance for any setting.

Mr. Dodgen asked how tall the poles were.

Mr. Osborn stated 18 to 20 feet.

Mr. Dodgen said when he was working in the Scottsdale area they used a shoebox type of fixture which directed light straight down.

Ms. Gossett stated it does do that. She state the issue is they are very tall, they are right in front of the church, and she felt they could be brought down and still provide the light at the pedestrian level and be out of the way of the view of the historic structure. She stated there are lots of options there and this Board did not see it when those plans were put in place.

Mr. Dodgen stated one size does not fit all when it comes to aerial lighting, so when you have pedestrian walkways the lighting can be very low to the ground to light the path and not have the sky shine.

Ms. Gossett stated she did not feel this was a crime issue.

Ms. Baker stated it was a requirement of the ordinance based on the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) which is actually reviewed by the Sheriff's office, and it is incorporated into the lighting ordinance, which has minimums and maximums depending on how close or far you are to the building.

Mr. Dodgen stated that could be done with different types of lighting, alcove lighting, outside walkway lighting, parking lighting. You don't solve all of it through the parking lighting.

Ms. Baker stated that is what the engineers do, and that was why she recommended the ARB have the engineer come in because he can tell what would work and what would not. She stated they actually prepare a plan that shows the foot candles at 20 foot intervals or something like that.

Ms. Gossett asked if the light was a result of the County's requirements so, therefore, the County is who the ARB would want to talk with verses the church.

Ms. Baker stated no, you would want to talk to the engineer that prepared the plans for approval. The County relies on the engineering information in order to review the plans.

Mr. Osborn stated he could call Wack Construction and ask if they would come to a meeting to discuss the lighting. He stated the church would be coming back before the ARB to discuss re-roofing.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

Mr. Dodgen asked if the County keeps good records for permitting. He asked if they could see the permit, what was submitted.

Ms. Baker stated yes, it was actually shown on the site development plan.

Mr. Eakin asked if it was brought before the ARB to approve.

Ms. Baker stated it was not part of the original application. She stated the COA did not include lighting, but she does not know why it was not flagged. She stated the environmental planner reviewed it in accordance with the Certificate of Appropriateness. We don't have a Historic Preservation Planner.

Mr. Range asked the ARB members if they have seen the Historic Stafford signs that point in the direction of the different things. He asked if those signs were brought before the ARB.

Ms. Baker stated no, because they are within public right-of-way and they were initiated by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Range stated the reason he asked was because when you take a right on to Washington Street to go to Belmont, you see the backside of one of the signs on the left. He stated it was a giant silver monster. He stated they were going to install a sign at the intersection of Gordon and King Street and something happened. He did not know if anybody knew the story.

Mr. Eakin stated they actually installed the sign and it was showing the wrong directions. He stated it would be corrected and reinstalled.

Ms. Gossett stated the back of the signs are galvanized steel.

Mr. Range stated it was very unattractive and asked why they did not have to come before the ARB.

Ms. Baker stated because they are within VDOT right-of-way.

Ms. Gossett asked if the back could have the burgundy and blue also.

Ms. Baker stated VDOT has specific requirements, but she would check.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 1, 2016

Mr. Range made a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Ms. McAdams seconded.

Ms. Gossett stated since she was not present she would abstain.

The motion passed 5-0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent, Ms. Gossett abstained).

Mr. Eakin asked Ms. Baker if there was anything else.

*Architectural Review Board Minutes*  
*May 2, 2016*

Ms. Baker reminded the ARB about the Historic Preservation Awards on May 17<sup>th</sup> and everyone was invited. She stated there would be four award winners this year, and a special proclamation would be given to Al Conner, for lifetime achievement, and mentioned his new book that just came out.

Ms. McAdams stated she did not recall the name of the book, but it was about the Civil War and the profits would be going towards the Civil War Park.

Ms. Baker stated she would send the link to the ARB.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Gossett made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Dodgen seconded.

The motion passed 6-0 (Mrs. Bailey was absent).

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.