

## Town of Washington | Architectural Review Board

### Meeting Minutes | July 15, 2024

---

#### ***Present:***

Nanette Edwards (ARB Member, Secretary)  
Deb Harris (ARB Member, Chair)  
Wesley Kerr (ARB Member, Vice Chair)  
Steve Gyurisin (Zoning Administrator)

#### ***Absent:***

Ryan Crabbe (ARB Member); Drew Mitchell (ARB Member)

***Call to Order:*** D. Harris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

***Approval of Agenda:*** D. Harris added an agenda item to discuss rescheduling the date of the August meeting due to a schedule conflict. W. Kerr made a motion to approve the agenda with the addition. N. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

***Approval of Minutes:*** No minutes from the May 2024 meeting were submitted, so the approval was tabled to the August meeting.

#### ***Zoning Administrator's Report:***

- Zoning Administrator Steve Gyurisin provided a written summary of existing project activities.

***Old Business:*** None

***New Business:***

#### **Item #1: Request by Tom and Constance Bruce to Add Stairs to Their Home, 577 Main Street.**

- a) **Zoning Administrator Review:** S. Gyurisin reported no zoning issues with the project.
- b) **Applicant Presentation:** On behalf of the applicants, S. Gyurisin explained their request to add wood stairs, painted white, around the perimeter of the front porch.
- c) **Citizen Comments:** None
- d) **ARB Review and Member Discussion:** There were no ARB comments or questions. W. Kerr made a motion to accept the proposal as submitted; D. Harris seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **Item #2: Request by Steve Critzer, 417 Warren Avenue, to Replace Existing Roofs.**

- a) **Zoning Administrator Review:** S. Gyurisin said there were no zoning issues.
- b) **Applicant Presentation:** On behalf of the homeowner, S. Gyurisin explained the request is to replace the existing roof with a standing seam metal roof on the residence, porch and garage. He noted this is a replacement project and not a new installation.
- c) **Citizen Comments:** None
- d) **ARB Review and Member Discussion:** There were no ARB comments or questions. N. Edwards made a motion to accept the proposal as submitted; D. Harris seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **Item #3: Request by The Inn at Little Washington to Demolish a Barn, 218 Piedmont Avenue.**

- a) **Zoning Administrator Review:** S. Gyurisin noted the barn is listed as a Contributing Building/Accessory Structure in the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) Reconnaissance Level Survey dated June 24, 2005.\*

- b) Applicant Presentation: On behalf of The Inn at Little Washington, Project and Design Coordinator Alicia Fatula described the state of the barn as dilapidated with the presence of areas of structural collapse, rot, and vermin, resulting in an unsafe structure beyond repair. She said there are no firm plans for future use of the barn site but did share an “inspiration photo” of a smaller agriculture-related building that could replace the barn.
- c) Citizen Comments: The ARB received two letters\* from Piedmont Avenue neighbors:
- Fawn Evenson, 118 Piedmont Avenue, in a letter dated July 12, 2024, stated she is in support of the Inn’s petition to demolish the barn citing it is an eyesore and speculating that it is likely not worth the cost of rebuilding it.
- Joan Platt, 78 Piedmont Avenue, in a letter dated July 12, 2024, asked the ARB to deny the demolition due to: The house and its barn are listed in the DHR survey and described as “...the Depression period house and earlier barn contribute to the Historic District.”; Article 13 of the Zoning Ordinance\*, citing 13.6.2 Minimum Maintenance Requirement (Demolition by Neglect), which states, “No contributing building or structure within the Historic District shall be allowed to deteriorate due to neglect...”; and her belief that the Inn was aware of the historical status of the barn yet had allowed the barn to deteriorate.
- d) ARB Review and Member Discussion: W. Kerr asked if the barn is still a part of the 2.8-acre parcel that includes the house and was told it is. Citing the July 2018 ARB meeting -- when the ARB voted unanimously to deny the Inn’s application to demolish the barn -- N. Edwards asked why repairs had not been made to the barn since that first application, no reason was provided. D. Harris suggested that the Inn provide a more complete application to include a more defined vision for the barn’s replacement. In response to the ARB discussion, Inn Proprietor Patrick O’Connell said an engineer had conducted an evaluation of the barn and based on his findings his recommendation is to remove the structure. Mr. O’Connell said he felt the town and community would be better served by not having a dangerous and unsafe building in town and urged the ARB to approve the demolition. He added that should the Inn decide in the future to rebuild on the site another application to ARB would be submitted, and he gave assurances that any new building would be built to be historically accurate, referencing the newer, but historically accurate, buildings found in Colonial Williamsburg. Motions: W. Kerr made a motion to approve the barn, which was not seconded. N. Edwards made a motion to table the discussion to the August 2024 meeting to allow for further time to examine the structure and documents. D. Harris seconded the motion; W. Kerr voted not to table the discussion. The demolition application was tabled until the August 2024 meeting.

**Item #4: Request by ARB Chair Deb Harris to Reschedule August 19 Meeting to August 26.** Passed.

***Closing Comments and Adjournment:***

- S. Gyurisin has obtained copies of the lighting standards approved by International Dark Sky.

D. Harris adjourned the meeting at 7:32 p.m. The next meeting is August 26, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nanette Edwards, ARB Secretary

\*Attachments: Letter, Fawn Evenson; Letter, Joan Platt; Article 13 of the Zoning Ordinance; DHR Reconnaissance Level Survey.

**From:** Fawn Evenson  
**Sent:** Friday, July 12, 2024 5:42 PM  
**To:** Steve Gyurisin, Barbara Batson  
**Subject:** The Barn on Piedmont Avenue

Steve: can you please share this with the members of the ARB? Thanks.

To Whom it may concern:

I am writing in support of the petition of the Inn to demolish the old barn on Piedmont Avenue.

I am its closest neighbor and it is entirely in my viewshed from my screened-in porch. It has been derelict since I moved into my home here 30 years ago this month. The roof has been peeling off, it has been listing badly for years and I am sure it is infested with all kinds of wild creatures. While I recognize it is probably the last barn in town, it is an eyesore and certainly not worth the tens of thousands of dollars it would take to rebuild it, and then it would have no architectural significance whatsoever. I look forward to a nice clean field to view instead.

Thank you for your consideration.

Fawn Evenson  
118 Piedmont Avenue  
[571 215 9672](tel:5712159672)

Attendee panel closed

To: Deborah Harris, Chairperson, [deborah.harris@washingtonva.gov](mailto:deborah.harris@washingtonva.gov)  
Wes Kerr, Vice-Chairperson, [wes.kerr@washingtonva.gov](mailto:wes.kerr@washingtonva.gov)  
Nanette Edwards, Secretary, [nanette.edwards@washingtonva.gov](mailto:nanette.edwards@washingtonva.gov)  
Ryan Crabbe, [ryan.crabbe@washingtonva.gov](mailto:ryan.crabbe@washingtonva.gov)  
Drew Mitchell, [drew.mitchell@washingtonva.gov](mailto:drew.mitchell@washingtonva.gov)

Cc: Steve Gyurisin, Zoning Administrator, [zoning@washingtonva.gov](mailto:zoning@washingtonva.gov)  
Barbara Batson, Town Clerk, [townofwashington@washingtonva.gov](mailto:townofwashington@washingtonva.gov)

I received notice the Architectural Review Board would be meeting on July 15 at 7:00 p.m. at Town Hall to review three requests. Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend, therefore, I would like to, in writing, respectfully ask the Request to demolish the barn located at 218 Piedmont Avenue be denied for the reasons stated below.

I would like to address specifically the Application on the Agenda - the ARB Application Request for a COA, from Alicia Fatula, as the legal representative for The Inn at Little Washington. The Inn's application requests removal of "The structure that sits before 218 Piedmont Avenue which is essentially a dilapidated shed." In my opinion, the description Ms. Fatula provided is not accurate. The 'shed' structure on the property at 218 Piedmont Avenue is actually an historic, circa 1900 barn (with an addition added in 1930), and is listed by the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) as a **'Contributing Building' in the Town of Washington**.

I have attached the *DHR Reconnaissance Level Survey* (DHR survey) dated June 24, 2005, for 218 Piedmont Ave describing the 'shed' as "a circa 1900 one-and-one-half-story, vertical-board-frame **barn** with a standing-seam-metal gable roof which stands on a stone foundation east of the house on the lower hill." The DHR Survey states there was an addition to the 1900 barn, circa 1930, which is one-and-one-half-story, two-bay, vertical-board, shed-roof to the east with two open livestock bays and a door on the second floor. A one-story, aluminum, shed-roofed addition is on the north gable. The DHR survey lists the building as a barn; the **barn is identified as a 'Contributing Building' at 218 Piedmont Ave in the Town of Washington**.

The Significance Statement portion of the DHR Survey states, "The last property within the western Piedmont Avenue boundary, the Depression period house and **earlier barn contribute to the historic district**."

The Secondary Resource Description for the 2004-05 Resurvey portion describes, "A circa 1900 one-and-one-half-story, vertical-board-frame barn with a standing-seam-metal gable roof stands on a stone foundation east of the house on the lower hill." The 1930 shed addition is not included in the description. **Set out in DHR Survey the WUZIT Count and NR Resource Count both list the barn (and house) as 'Contributing'**.

I am providing some history which I hope will be helpful: In 2007, I bought my small Town lot because I was drawn to the quirky home and the large historic barn. The back portion of my home in the early 1900s was a granary, and believe in the 1960s it was a funeral home. The circa 1900 barn on the property not only stored grain and caskets, but according to a neighbor her grandfather worked in the wheelwright shop in the barn sometime in the early 1910-30s. Unfortunately, one of the previous owner added two poorly built additions; the first renovation was to provide two office spaces; the second renovation to provide two apartments. A few months after I moved into the 'quirky' home I went to the Town Office to ask about the history of the property and was given a DHR Survey listing the circa 1900 barn as a **'Contributing Building'**. If I recall correctly, I was told that my barn, and the barn further down Piedmont Avenue, were likely the only barns left in Historic District in the Town of Washington, and both barns were given **'Contributing Building'** status by DHR. I was advised that when a building is listed as a **'Contributing Building'** by DHR the owner(s) needed to maintain the building, and could not be torn down. The exceptions are listed below in Article 13, I have added for you reference below.

A bit more history. The reason I feel the need to respond to this particular application for demolition due to "dilapidation" of the "shed" is, I believe the barns deterioration could have been prevented. A few years after I moved into my quirky home in 2008, I saw a notice/article that a group (whose name I cannot remember) were looking for barns to place barn owl nesting boxes. I called their number right away and within days two individuals came out to look at my barn. Unfortunately, my barn was not a suitable for barn owls nesting boxes is because a previous owner covered up the upper loft with left over siding from one of his renovations. The upper loft is where barn owls would naturally nest. One of the owl enthusiasts asked if I had information on the barn further down Piedmont; because of my previous research I knew The Inn owned the barn (and

house) and I was asked if I would call The Inn on their behalf; I called The Inn's Office and spoke with a representative. I asked if The Inn would allow a barn owl nesting box to be placed in their barn at 218 Piedmont Ave. I received a call back a few days later informing me The Inn would not give permission to place any barn owls' nest boxes in their barn because the barn was slated for demolition. I was surprised and told the representative that I did not believe The Inn could demolish the barn since it was a '**Contributing Building**'; the representative said she would pass along the information. I believe The Inn was aware of the historical status of the barn yet has allowed the barn to deteriorate by neglect. It is my opinion the circa 1900 barn should not be demolished due to owner neglect.

I have attached the DHR Reconnaissance Level Survey for your information and consideration, and hope the information is helpful to the ARB members as the ARB makes its decision to approve or deny The Inn's Application to demolish this historic circa 1900s barn.

I respectfully the Request for demolition of this circa 1900 barn, a '**Contributing Building**', be denied.

I appreciate your time and attention in this matter.

Respectfully,

Joan Platt  
78 Piedmont Avenue

## Article 13 of the Zoning Ordinance. Some Sections may be applicable:

### 13.6.2 Minimum Maintenance Requirement (Demolition by Neglect)

1. **No contributing building or structure within the Historic District shall be allowed to deteriorate due to neglect to the extent that decay**, deterioration or defects may, in the opinion of the ARB, result in the irreparable deterioration of any exterior component or architectural feature, loss of integrity or produce a detrimental effect upon the character of the district as a whole or upon the life and character of the structure itself. Upon such determination, the ARB shall request a report of the Zoning Administrator who shall, within thirty (30) days report to the ARB on the following matters:

- A. Deterioration of exterior walls or other vertical supports;
- B. Deterioration of roofs or other horizontal members;
- C. Deterioration of chimneys;
- D. Deterioration or crumbling of exterior stucco or mortar;
- E. Ineffective, long-neglected peeling paint representing a lack of a protective waterproof coating on exterior wooden wall surfaces and wooden elements causing prolonged water penetration, rotting and other forms of decay.
- F. The perpetual lack of maintenance of the surrounding environment causing prominent decay and destruction of the building or structure through long-neglected plant overgrowth, including overhanging trees, limbs and roots that beat against or grow into the resource, or invasive vines, like climbing ivy with tendrils, that attach to and disintegrate the mortar and structural soundness of masonry walls or cause loss of corner boards, weatherboards, board-and-batten siding and other wooden elements.
- G. Deterioration of any feature so as to create or permit the creation of any hazardous or unsafe condition;
- H. A determination by the Zoning Administrator or other state authorized safety expert that a structure is unsafe or not in compliance with any safety provisions of the Statewide Building Code.

2. The ARB shall hold a public hearing on the report prior to making a determination about any violation of this Section. The Zoning Administrator shall notify the owner of the subject property of the hearing and provide the owner with a copy of the report. The owner shall have thirty (30) days from the decision to appeal to the Town Council a determination by the ARB of a violation of this Section. (See 15.2-2283 and the Virginia Statewide Building Code.)

3. The owner shall have sixty (60) days from the date of the ARB's determination to present to the ARB a plan to remedy the neglect and six (6) months from the ARB's approval of the Plan and issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to complete the necessary remedial work. If appropriate action is not taken by the owner, the Zoning Administrator shall initiate appropriate legal action for a violation of the Zoning Ordinance.

### 13.7 DEMOLITION APPLICATIONS

#### 13.7.1 Razing or Demolition

No historic landmark or contributing building or contributing structure, which is established under this Ordinance shall be partly or fully demolished until a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued by the ARB, with right of direct appeal from an adverse decision to the Town Council, as hereinafter provided. An ARB approval of the razing or demolition of a registered historic landmark will automatically be referred by the ARB to the Town Council for consideration. The Zoning Administrator may approve the demolition of a building or structure within the Historic District, which has not been designated either as a landmark, contributing building or contributing structure on the Inventory Map.

### **13.7.2 Matters to be Considered in Determining Whether or Not to Grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Razing or Demolition.**

The ARB shall consider the following criteria in determining whether or not to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for razing or demolition:

1. Whether or not the historic landmark, contributing building or contributing structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its removal would be to the detriment of the public interest, to education, cultural heritage and the architectural history of the Town.
2. Whether or not the contributing building or contributing structure is of such interest or historic significance that it would qualify as a national, state, or local historic landmark through individual listing in the Virginia Landmarks Register or National Register of Historic Places.
3. Whether or not the historic landmark, contributing building or contributing structure embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, style, method of construction, represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic values or represents a significant or distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
4. Whether the resource is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of history or is associated with significant persons.
5. Whether or not retention of the historic landmark, contributing building or contributing structure would help to preserve and protect a historic or architecturally significant place.
6. Whether the quality of life and pride of place or area of historic interest in the Town and would promote the purposes and intent of historic district zoning, including tourism.
7. Whether or not the historic landmark, contributing building or contributing structure has retained integrity or authenticity of its historic identity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, location, association and feeling and whether its unusual design, quality and workmanship of traditional materials and details of character-defining features could be easily reproduced.
8. Whether the proposed razing or demolition will affect the archaeological potential to yield information important to prehistory or history at this site.

**Department of Historic Resources  
Reconnaissance Level Survey**

Rappahannock

DHR Id#: 322-0011-0128

**Individual Resource Information**

WUZIT: ..... Barn

---

<i>Est. Date of Construction:</i> ....	1900 ca {Site Visit}	<i>Accessed?</i> .....	No Not accessible
<i>Primary Resource?</i> .....	No	<i>Number of Stories:</i> .....	1.5
<i>Architectural Style:</i> .....	No Style Listed	<i>Condition:</i> .....	Good-Fair
<i>Interior Plan Type:</i> .....		<i>Threats to Resource:</i> .....	None Known

*Description:* 2004-05 Resurvey - A circa 1900, one-and-one-half-story, vertical-board-frame barn with a standing-seam-metal gable roof stands on a stone foundation east of the house on the lower hill. A circa 1930, one-and-one-half-story, two-bay, vertical-board, shed-roofed addition on the east has two open livestock bays and a door on the second floor. A one-story, aluminum, shed-roofed addition is on the north gable.

WUZIT: ..... Single Dwelling

---

<i>Est. Date of Construction:</i> ....	1930 ca {Site Visit}	<i>Accessed?</i> .....	No Not accessible
<i>Primary Resource?</i> .....	Yes	<i>Number of Stories:</i> .....	2.5
<i>Architectural Style:</i> .....	No Style Listed	<i>Condition:</i> .....	Good
<i>Interior Plan Type:</i> .....		<i>Threats to Resource:</i> .....	None Known

*Description:* 2004-05 Resurvey – This two-and-one-half-story, three-bay-wide, two-bay-deep, asbestos-shingled-frame, Vernacular house has a cinder-block foundation, an asphalt-shingled gable roof and an exterior-end, cinder-block flue chimney. The second story overhangs a few inches on the façade. The raised-panel, wood door at center is flanked by a six-over-six, double-hung-sash, wood window on the west and paired eight-over-eight, double-hung-sash, wood windows on the east. The similarly-designed second story windows are directly above those the first-story. The one-story, five-bay-wide, front porch is not full width. It has a plain balustrade and square posts supporting the standing-seam-metal shed roof. Two six-over-six, double-hung-sash, wood windows are on the west side. A bay window is in the northeast rear corner of the east elevation, while a small four-over-four window is on the second story and above in the gable. A one-story, one-bay-wide, board-and-batten-frame addition with an asphalt-shingled gable roof is attached to the west side of the house by a narrow breezeway. This circa 1950 wing appropriately sets back from the main block and is secondary in size, scale and design.

**Cemetery Information**

**Bridge Information**

*Historic Context(s):* ..... Domestic  
Subsistence/Agriculture  
Architecture/Community Planning

*Historic Time Period(s):*..... P- Reconstruction and Growth (1865 to 1914)  
Q- World War I to World War II (1914-1945)

*Significance Statement:* 2004-05 Resurvey – This is one of two asbestos-shingled houses on Piedmont Avenue. Popular in the 1930s, the asbestos is non-hazardous unless some trauma has caused major disintegration. Well protected with paint, the rippled shingle provides an important design characteristic to this otherwise modest Vernacular house, although the second-story overhang is a neat detail of New England influence. The last property within the western Piedmont Avenue boundary, the Depression period house and earlier barn contribute to the historic district.

**Bibliographic Documentation**

**Ownership Information**



**Department of Historic Resources  
Reconnaissance Level Survey**

**Rappahannock**

*DHR Id#: 322-0011-0128*

**Resource Identification**

Property Name(s): ..... House, 218 Piedmont Avenue {Current}  
 Property Date: ..... ca 1930  
 Address(s): ..... 218 Piedmont Avenue {}  
 County Independent City: Rappahannock  
 City: ..... Washington  
 State, Zip: ..... Virginia 22747  
 Tax Parcel: ..... 20A-1-33  
 Magisterial District: ..... Hampton  
 USGS Quad Name: ..... WASHINGTON  
 UTM Coordinates: ..... 17/4288590/746600  
 Surrounding area: ..... Town  
 Restricted location data?: No

**National Register Eligibility Status**

Property is Historic (50 years or older)

This Property is associated with the Washington  
Historic District [district]

**Resource Description**

Ownership Status: ..... Private  
 Acreage: ..... 2.8

**Primary Resource Exterior Component Description:**

<u>Component</u>	<u>Comp Type/Form</u>	<u>Material</u>	<u>Material Treatment</u>
Chimneys	Chimneys - Exterior end	Concrete	Chimneys - Block
Foundation	Foundation - Solid	Concrete	Foundation - Block
Porch	Porch - 1-story, 3-bay	Wood	Porch - Post, Square
Structural System	Structural System - Frame	Asbestos	Structural System - Asbestos Shingl
Windows	Windows - Sash, double-hung	Wood	Windows - 6/6
Windows	Windows - Sash, double-hung	Wood	Windows - 8/8

Site Description: ..... 2004-05 Resurvey – This house and barn stand on the last western hill on the north side of Piedmont Avenue within the town corporate limits and the historic district boundary. The nearly three-acre lot provides a deep rear yard for the house and gives the barn standing near the road ample open field space.

Secondary Resource Desc: ..... 2004-05 Resurvey - A circa 1900, one-and-one-half-story, vertical-board-frame barn with a standing-seam-metal gable roof stands on a stone foundation east of the house on the lower hill.

**WUZIT Count:**

<u>No.</u>	<u>Wuzit Types</u>	<u>Historic?</u>
1	Single Dwelling	Contributing
1	Barn	Contributing

**NR Resource Count:**

<u>#</u>	<u>NR Resource Type</u>	<u>Contributing Status</u>
2	Building	Contributing

Contributing: 2 Total: 2