

STAFFORD COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

December 4, 2023

The meeting of the Stafford County Architectural Review Board of Monday, December 4, 2023, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Linda Burdette, in the ABC Conference Room of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Al Bain, Linda Burdette, Doris McAdams and Mark Ethridge

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kim Taylor-Wilson

STAFF PRESENT: Nancy Kotting, Crissy Kendall

GUESTS PRESENT: None

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Burdette called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Ms. Burdette called roll and stated there was a quorum.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

None

NEW BUSINESS

1. Certified Local Government Annual Report

Commissioners and staff are required to attend at least one training program relevant to your Commission each year. Training sessions must be documented by the end of January. If any members have attended a training session between October 1, 2022 and September 30, 2024 please let Ms. Kotting know the training title, description, duration of training, who provided it and the dates.

2. 2024 Calendar

Members reviewed the draft of the 2024 meeting dates. January and September meetings will be moved to the 2nd Monday of the month due to holidays. Al Bain made a motion to accept the 2024 meeting dates. Doris McAdams seconded. Motion passed, 4-0. Members were reminded if they wish to change a meeting date there must be a minimum of 30-days notice.

3. COA Application: 985 White Oak Road

Ms. Burdette reminded members that when doing an evaluation, personal opinions don't factor in. The application is evaluated according to the criteria in the Stafford County Ordinance on Overlay Districts and the Historic District Overlay Guidelines adopted by the County and also the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Concerns and issues should relate back to the guidelines and specific evaluation criteria. When a COA application is made, the Board has 60 days from the

***Architectural Review Board Minutes
December 4, 2023***

date of submission, to come to a final decision unless the applicant and the Board agree to an extension. This COA was submitted on November 8, so a final decision will need to be made by January 8. If the applicant is unhappy with the decision they have 30 days to appeal to the Board of Supervisors. The BOS will review the applicant's appeal and come to the ARB for input and then make a decision. If the applicant is unhappy with the BOS's determination the applicant then has 30 day to appeal to the Circuit Court. The ARB's options are approval of the application outright, approval with conditions, send the application back to the applicant for them to make changes and resubmit in January (which is short of actually denying it) or denial outright. Ms. Kotting added that accepting it with modifications is normally done in conversations through the course of the meeting with the applicant. Since the applicant chose not to attend that limits that option.

Board members then discussed possible scenarios that could occur depending on what decision they made tonight. If they vote to defer they must provide a list of all the items that need to be addressed and the guidelines that those things don't meet. On January 8 the applicant could not show up at all or he could show up say "No, vote on what I originally submitted" and then the Board will vote. Or he could show up and say "I'm willing to make the changes". The Board would then require the applicant grant an extension. If the Board denies the application, the applicant also has the option to submit another application but he would have to pay a new application fee.

After the review of the COA process Ms. Kotting presented the COA application. The application was received by the ARB electronically on November 17th. The property located at 985 White Oak Road, TM 55-216, is owned by Majid Kashanikhah. It is zoned A1, Agricultural and is 2.0843 acres. The property lies within the White Oak Museum Historic Resource Overlay District. The application, as written, is to "convert the partial flat roof to follow the existing roof line". The structure is on a corner lot and is a modified cruciform shape creating a number of façades that have a public view. The primary façade is the one that is most sacred when evaluating changes to historic structures. Ms. Kotting provided a picture of what is considered the primary set of façades (the perpendicular sides visible from both White Oak Road and Newton Road). According to the guidelines on Physical Integrity (Section 1.A.3) the roofing material must retain and preserve the architectural metal features, including finishes and colors that are important in defining the character of the property and the metal features must be based either on documented precedent or on compatibility with the size, scale, style and color of the property. The original roofing material is standing seam metal with the exception of the polygonal apse. Standing seam metal roofing material is a traditional architectural feature which contributes to defining the character of the property. The application, as submitted, includes the use of asphalt shingles on the proposed new roof structure, as well as the entirety of the existing roof structure remaining exposed at the completion of the new roof plan. The color, size, profile, and granular composition of the asphalt shingles is not indicated.

The second guideline applied is Visual Character. Guidelines (Section 1.B.5) call for the original roof pitch/form to be retained as a defining architectural feature. The architectural drawings provided clearly indicate the existing roof pitch with rafters terminating at the exterior wall of the main structure. A portion of the existing façade is exposed, above the existing flat roof. This alteration eliminates the differentiation between the two roof types, altering the original defining roof pitch. The extension of the new rafters out over the current flat roof portion of the structure obscures the

***Architectural Review Board Minutes
December 4, 2023***

architectural features created with changes over time to the structure. This structure has an apse which is normally found in religious buildings, which makes this a very curious structure architecturally. The apse was originally used in the elementary school as a theater space. Overhead views of building in 2020 show the entire roof was standing seam. The overhead view today shows the roof is now predominantly asphalt with only three roof surfaces remaining standing seam. The work has been completed without a COA and without a building permit by the applicant. The applicant has received a notice of violation for the construction that's been done without a permit. The building department is holding off referring the outstanding notice of violation to the County Attorney for prosecution pending tonight's review.

Mr. Bain noted the new surface of the wall above the brick is not consistent. If the Board allows the roof pitch to change it needs to be noted that that area must be brick. The area is currently OSB with no brick ledge which probably means they plan to cover that area with siding, though that is not indicated.

Ms. Kotting informed the Board that the staff recommendation is that the applicant re-submit a modified application to reflect compliance with Historic Design Review Guidelines.

Ms. Kotting's presentation concluded and the Board began discussion. Ms. Burdette asked if standing seam metal is something available to purchase by applicant. Ms. Kotting said it is available and the Board should be prepared to provide guidance as to width and height at the seam.

Ms. Kotting stated that this particular structure has not been evaluated for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The structure in the Overlay District across the street, White Oak Primitive Baptist Church, is listed on the National Register but this property has not been evaluated.

Ms. Burdette stated her issue with the application is that this is not a roofing issue, this is a reconstruction issue. The application states it's just putting on a new roof when it's literally rebuilding one entire wing of the house. She noted after reexamining the pictures, it's actually two wings being reconstructed.

Mr. Bain stated that understands why they would want add a slope to the flat roof portion. He would have liked to have had the applicant present to explain why they want to make all the other roof pitch adjustments.

Mr. Bain questioned if this building has a chance of being a candidate for review for the National Register. Ms. Kotting said with the changes that have now been made to the structure it has lost significant architectural integrity which would threaten its ability to have a fair evaluation.

Mr. Bain wanted to confirm the owner/applicant was notified of the meeting. Ms. Kotting confirmed that she emailed him twice and left a phone message. The meeting is also published publicly.

All members were in general agreement that the application as submitted was unacceptable.

Doris McAdams made a motion to deny the application. Al Bain seconded. Motion passes, 3-1.

***Architectural Review Board Minutes
December 4, 2023***

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Quorum Requirements per Assistant County Attorney

A response was received from County Attorney. According to the ordinance there must be four people present to have a quorum. Mr. Bain suggested the ARB send a request to the BOS to change the guidelines. Ms. Burnette agreed but would prefer to wait until they have the information on the architectural historian so only one amendment is sent to the BOS.

2. Professional Qualifications for Architectural Historian as potential ARB member

Ms. Kotting shared the professional qualifications the National Park Service requires for an architectural historian. The following requirements are published in the Code of Federal Regulations and define minimum educational experience required to perform identification, evaluation, registration and treatment activities for an architectural historian. The minimum professional qualifications in architectural history are graduate degree in architectural history, art history, historic preservation or a closely related field with coursework in American architectural history or a bachelor's degree in architectural history, art history, historic preservation, or a closely related field plus one of the following: at least two years of full time experience in research writing, or teaching an American architectural history or restoration architecture, with an academic institution, historical organization, or agency museum or other professional institution, or substantial contribution through research and publication to the body of scholarly knowledge in the field of American architectural history. This information was provided so if the ARB couldn't find an interested licensed architect they could possibly look at an architectural historian to fill the empty seat.

3. ARB 2023 Work Plan Updates:

a. Design Guidelines Progress Report/Staff

Discussion deferred.

REPORTS BY ARB MEMBERS

Nothing further.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Al Bain motioned to approve the minutes from July 10, 2023.

Doris McAdams seconded the motion.

Al Bain motioned to approve the minutes from October 2, 2023.

Doris McAdams seconded the motion.

Doris McAdams motioned to approve the minutes from November 6, 2023.

Mark Etheridge seconded the motion.

All minutes approved (4-0).

***Architectural Review Board Minutes
December 4, 2023***

176 ADJOURNMENT

177
178 With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 7:01 pm.