

**Town of Washington | Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes | May 19, 2025**

Present:

Ryan Crabbe (ARB Member, Secretary)
Nanette Edwards (ARB Member)
Deb Harris (ARB Member, Chair)
Wesley Kerr (ARB Member, Vice Chair)
Drew Mitchell (ARB Member)

Call to Order: D. Harris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., noting that the zoning administrator, S. Gyurisin, wasn't in attendance but he provided an update on pending zoning activities.

Proposal to Approve Agenda: D. Harris called for a vote to approve the meeting agenda. D. Mitchell motioned to approve the agenda as printed. N. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0-0.

Approval of April 2025 Minutes: With no amendments or edits from ARB members, D. Mitchell moved to approve the April 23, 2025, minutes. N. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0-0.

Process reminder: D. Harris reminded all present of the meeting's application review process noting the following sequence: (1) zoning administrator review and notes, (2) applicant presentation, (3) public comment directed to the board, (4) ARB member discussion with questions directed to the applicant and/or public. D. Harris reminded all present that the ARB does not have purview over use and zoning (e.g., parking spots).

Old Business:

Item #1: Request of Alicia Fatula on behalf of The Inn at Little Washington for a CoA at The Parsonage, 360 Main Street, for a "tower" addition to the main structure.

D. Harris referenced last month's discussion about the application and thanked the applicant for updating its submission with a new project description, 3D drawings, and landscaping details.

a) Zoning Administrator Review: S. Gyurisin provided comments to Deb. H before the meeting. He had no zoning or setback issues with the application.

b) Applicant Presentation: David Silek presented on behalf of the applicant and noted that the application had been resubmitted on May 9 with requested board updates.

c) Public Comments: Fred Caitlin, town Vice Mayor, shared that he has had 15-20 incidences of people expressing dislike for the proposed tower addition. He acknowledged and praised applicant's preservation efforts in the town but referenced the town's historic district guidelines that he views as in conflict with the proposed

application, specifically Chapter 5: standards 7, 8, 9, 10, and 16, plus Chapter 6: standard 9.

D. Harris noted that the ARB received a number of emails expressing public comment and asked for these to be included in the meeting's record (attached). Joan Platt asked if her emailed comments to the board would be included in the record. D. Harris confirmed they would.

d) ARB Review and Member Discussion: W. Kerr did not have comments or questions. D. Mitchell mentioned that he thought the previously submitted plan was discordant with the rest of the Parsonage and lacked sufficient detail; however, the applicant's resubmitted plan fully satisfied those concerns. He acknowledged that public comments rightfully referenced and interpreted the town's historical guidelines; however, he wants to entertain opportunities that add personality to the town with occasional follies. R. Crabbe thanked the applicant for the added clarity in the revised plan, especially the upper tower and updated window design. He asked whether the flag shown only in the initial plan had been removed and would not be installed; the applicant confirmed, and R. Crabbe suggested noting its removal in the potential COA. He also inquired about the use of the tower's three levels. The applicant stated the first floor is a bathroom, the second a guest room with access to the third floor by a single unit. R. Crabbe asked if the large tree next to the tower would be preserved; the applicant said it would, with some limbs removed. N. Edwards was glad to see the applicant's additional details, particularly the 3D schematic to clarify the setback depth. She referenced her interpretation of the town's historical guidelines at the last ARB meeting, highlighting seven sections that are in conflict with the tower application. In her view, the tower addition is incompatible with other residences in the heart of town and that it is not appropriate for an 1870s Victorian building. D. Harris did not have comments or questions and thanked the ARB Members for their review.

R. Crabbe motioned to approve the application as submitted with the condition that a flag isn't included at the top of the tower. D. Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1-0.

New Business:

Item #2: Request of Joan Platt for improvements for approved apartment / remodeling at 78 Piedmont Avenue.

a) Zoning Administrator Review: S. Gyurisin provided comments to Deb. H before the meeting. He had no zoning or setback issues with the application.

b) Applicant Presentation: Joan Platt and project architect reps presented the proposed improvements to the residence, inspiration images from other town structures that influenced the plan's design, and features and samples of the plan including an outdoor living space and an expanded first floor footprint.

c) Citizen Comments: Caroline Anstey asked if the proposed application is an addition or a remodel. Applicant rep confirmed that it is both. Brad Schneider, a neighbor, shared his perspective that the plan brings together the facade with the rest of

the home. He supports the application and believes the improvements will add street appeal, value, and critical first floor space.

d) ARB Review and Member Discussion: W. Kerr thanked the applicant for sharing her vision for the property and its rich history. D. Mitchell thanked the applicant for the level of detail noting that it is one of the finest applications he has seen in awhile. He asked about the skylight material and glazing to confirm that it blended seamlessly with the rest of the plan; applicant rep shared that it would be metal or aluminum with a baked-on finish in line with the roof's color scheme. R. Crabbe liked the bay window design and asked about the second floor gutters and downspouts; applicant rep clarified they are included in the plan. N. Edwards echoed other ARB member sentiment about the level of detail in the plan plus the box bay window.

D. Mitchell motioned to approve the application as submitted. N. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0-0.

Item #3: Request of Kees Dutilh, Historical Society of Rappahannock, for new door, new window, shutters and enlarging front wall entrance at 328 Gay Street.

a) Zoning Administrator Review: S. Gyuris provided comments to Deb. H before the meeting. He had no zoning or setback issues with the application.

b) Applicant Presentation: Kees Dutilh presented on behalf of the society, outlining proposed improvements to the society's 1830s building. Improvements include the addition of historically accurate working shutters, doors and windows, plus the widening of the front stone wall for ADA compliance.

c) Citizen Comments: Nancy Butin said that the wall dates from 1922 and that it is contemporary with the town's discovery monument. She also believes that it will be easier instead of harder to renovate since the proposed modification is a subtraction instead of addition to the wall. Joan Platt's representative shared that mortar repair of historical walls is possible and that there is precedent of repointing and repairing such walls in historical districts.

d) ARB Review and Member Discussion: W. Kerr clarified the location of shutter installation; applicant is requesting shutters for all windows and may do the work in phases. He also asked about the side door, which applicant said would be a window or a door in keeping with existing windows and doors. D. Mitchell shared that he helped the society photoshop the potential new wall and explained the proposed width of the new wall is to satisfy ADA requirements and that the right column did not need to be modified. The left column's location would need to shift farther to the left to make it ADA compliant and symmetrical with the building's front door. W. Kerr suggested to D. Harris that D. Mitchell recuse himself from the vote, which D. Mitchell had planned to do anyway. R. Crabbe asked which ADA requirements were not currently met by the wall's opening; applicant said 36" is the required clearance. Applicant stated the revised opening would be more welcoming and correct the door alignment offset due to multiple building moves. R. Crabbe asked if a general contractor had been selected; applicant said that a mason has been selected and will use similar grouting methods to match the existing wall detail. R. Crabbe expressed concerns about the proposed renovation interrupting a historically

significant wall structure that spans numerous properties and that the measurements may be off and/or hard to understand because the application lacked a site plan. He also asked if neighbors who share the wall had been consulted; applicant shared that some neighbors had and were in favor. R. Crabbe suggested the application deserves more study suggesting a site plan and consultation with neighbors. N. Edwards did not have questions or comments that had not been previously asked. D. Harris did not have comments or questions about the windows or doors but sought to clarify the applicant's proposal for the building's northern elevation, asking the applicant if it sought approval for a door, window, or bricked wall. It prefers a window with bricked wall. D. Harris noted the application did not include a site plan but believed one would be helpful in order for the board to view existing and proposed locations and measurements. She asked for an updated application to reflect questions about the wall's measurements. Kees Dutilh encouraged approval of the full plan as submitted but suggested approval in-part as an alternative so the society could proceed with physical updates ahead of an upcoming event.

D. Harris motioned to approve the application in-part, including the addition of the shutters, replacement of the front door with a wooden door, and replacement of the side door with a matching window and bricked out wall. R. Crabbe seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0-1 (D. Mitchell recused).

D. Harris motioned to table the stone wall portion of the application and ask applicant for additional information on the proposed changes, including its current location and where the proposed changes will place the wall amongst the broader site plan. She noted that an informal, handwritten drawing will suffice, as long as it indicates measurements. W. Kerr seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0-1.

D. Harris motioned to adjourn the meeting. D. Mitchell seconded the motion. D. Harris adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m. The next meeting is June 23, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.