



The following minutes are a summary of items on the agenda. This meeting may be viewed in its entirety by accessing the video of the same date online via the Town's website at www.frontroyalva.com for a limited time.

A regular meeting of the Board of Architectural Review of the Town of Front Royal, Virginia was held on September 10, 2024, in the Town Hall East Conference Room.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Waters called the Board of Architectural Review meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Collin Waters, Chairman
Gary Vaughan, Vice Chairman
Katherine Snyder
Holly Rhodenhizer

Absent: Ellen Aders

Staff Present: John M. Ware, Deputy Zoning Administrator
Connie Potter, Executive Assistant/Clerk for the Board of Architectural Review

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- July 9, 2024 – Regular Meeting
- April 9, 2024 – Work Session
- May 14, 2024 – Work Session

Vice Chairman Vaughan moved, seconded by Ms. Rhodenhizer to approve the meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: Yes – Snyder, Waters, Rhodenhizer, Vaughan
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Aders

VOICE VOTE

NEW BUSINESS

- **COA Application #2400479** – A Certificate of Appropriateness Application submitted by Julie Wise to construct a 25' x 35' garage and connect it to the house by a covered walkway at 241 Church Street, identified by Tax Map 20A7-4-119A. The property is zoned R-3, Residential District and is located in the Historic Overlay District.



Mr. Ware reviewed the requirements of Town Code Sections 175-89-C and D and Section 175-91.

This application is for an accessory structure at the rear of the lot at 241 Church Street. The existing house has vinyl siding and a standing seam metal roof and is listed as a contributing structure in the Historic District. The proposed garage will be very similar to the existing house with vinyl siding and a standing seam metal roof. Mr. Ware explained that the Board of Architectural Review is either approving or disapproving the materials and not the location of the structure on the lot. A Zoning Permit and Warren County Building Permit would be required before construction begins.

Chairman Waters asked how tall the pitch of the roof will be.

Mr. Ware noted that the accessory structure pitch is required to be less than the height of the main building. The existing house is a 2-story structure.

After some additional discussion the BAR agreed they would like to see plans/detailed drawings for the accessory structure before making a final decision.

Ms. Rhodenhizer moved, seconded by Vice Chairman Vaughan to table the application to allow the applicant to provide plans for the garage.

VOTE: Yes – Snyder, Waters, Rhodenhizer, Vaughan
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Aders

VOICE VOTE

- **COA Application #2400480** – A Certificate of Appropriateness Application submitted by Teddy Stout Construction, Inc. to construct a duplex at 240 Blue Ridge Avenue, identified by Tax Map 20A7-4-178. The property is zoned R-3, Residential District and is located in the Historic Overlay District.

Mr. Ware explained that COA Application 2400480 is a request to construct a new duplex on property located at 240 Blue Ridge Avenue. He noted this was the property that the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) previously approved demolition of the existing structure from fire damage. The BAR will need to take into consideration the new construction and focus on whether the plans are compatible with and enhance the historic or architectural value of the surrounding structures or surrounding area. Should the BAR desire to disapprove the application the BAR can make recommendations to the applicant which reflects the design, material, texture, etc.

Mr. Ware reviewed Town Chapter 175-91 – Guidelines and Criteria for Review in the Historic District listed below:



A. All reviewing bodies shall be guided by the following guidelines and criteria:

- a) The historic archaeological or architectural value and significance of a structure and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area.
- b) The age and character of the historic structure, its condition, and its probable life expectancy and the appropriateness of the proposed changes to the period or periods during which the structure was built.
- c) The general compatibility of the site plan and the exterior design arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.
- d) The view of the structure or area from a public street or road, present or future.
- e) The present character of the setting of the structure or area and its surroundings.
- f) The probable effect of proposed construction on trees, wooded areas or historic sites.
- g) Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the reviewing bodies deem to be pertinent.
- h) The appropriateness of the exterior architectural features of such building or structure to the compatibility with the exterior architectural features of landmarks, buildings or structures in the district, taking into consideration the following:
 - a. General design.
 - b. Character and appropriateness of design.
 - c. Form.
 - d. Proportion and scale.
 - e. Mass.
 - f. Configuration.
 - g. Arrangement.
 - h. Texture.
 - i. Material.
 - j. The permanent color of exterior materials (excluding paint).
 - k. The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings.
 - l. Congruity with the character of the Historic District.

A scope of work was provided with the application and shown in a virtual presentation. Mr. Ware showed renderings provided by the applicant. The applicant is proposing one (1) driveway entrance on Prospect Street and the other driveway entrance off of Blue Ridge Avenue. Mr. Ware noted the BAR was not approving the location of the structure on the property.

The applicant is proposing to do architectural shingles, vinyl siding, a limestone water table in the front on both units and a standing seam black metal roof on the porches and bay windows only. There will be decorative trim pieces on the porch at the front door and some at the peak. The front elevation will be in a gable scallop or shake vinyl siding. Renderings were provided with the application. In addition, the applicant is proposing a 12' x 16' rear treated lumber deck with handrails, and a wooden 6' privacy fence. The front doors will be metal. The foundation, sidewalks and front steps will be concrete. Gutters and downspouts will be white aluminum, with white soffits and trim and double hung white vinyl windows with no grills. Each lot will be



landscaped with sod and installation of driveways. The applicants Teddy and Daryl Stout of Teddy Stout Construction, Inc. were present to answer questions.

Chairman Waters questioned that the BAR does not consider the location of where on the lot the structure will be placed.

Mr. Ware explained that Planning and Zoning staff will review the placement of the structure to meet Town Code required setbacks. He noted that the duplex will front Blue Ridge Avenue.

Chairman Waters stated the new duplex would be required to be out of line with the other houses on the street due to the required setbacks.

Mr. Ware explained that the BAR could make a recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeals to grant a variance which is within Town Code. However, the BAR has no authority to approve or deny the application based on the setbacks.

Ms. Snyder asked if all the trees were still standing on the property prior to the demolition.

Mr. Stout stated that everything is still on the property. The demolition will not start until construction can start at the same time. He noted that some of the trees are “junk” trees in the rear of the property and will be removed and new decorative trees will be planted. Regarding comments related to the setback of the property...if the new structure was constructed at a setback of 22’ to 24’ there would not be room for off-street parking.

Mr. Ware noted that Town Code requires off-street parking to be 9’ x 18’ and off-street parking is required by Town Code for new construction.

A conversation ensued between staff, BAR members and the applicants regarding the location of parking, porches, placement of windows, possible changes to the entrance locations and materials to be used.

Chairman Waters asked if this was the only design the applicants had considered for this lot. Mr. Stout answered, “yes it works”. Mrs. Stout stated she had looked and that it was hard to find something that is for townhouses. Mr. Stout stated it was a “bought” design and they had used it for years, noting they had probably built this design thirty (30) times. BAR members questioned why not build a single-family dwelling vs. a duplex and Mr. Stout said it would not make money to build a single-family dwelling. Mrs. Stout asked BAR members what their suggestions would be to better fit into the neighborhood.

The following suggestions were expressed from BAR members:

- Setback of the house. The proposed setback disrupts the continuity looking down the street.
- Would like to see wood vs. vinyl siding (traditional materials).
- Add a front porch across the front of the duplex with a bay.



- Come up with a different design other than what was submitted that makes the duplex look like other houses on the street.
- Create a structure that looks like an old Victorian.

BAR members agreed they liked the standing seam metal roofs on the bays and the scalloped siding.

Chairman Waters stated he could not tell them what style house to build.

Mr. Stout said he could offer the following changes:

- Add two (2) windows upstairs on the gable end that would face Prospect Street and a street side bay window.
- Install Trex front porches with vinyl railings.
- Install 4' wide front porch that will wrap around the corner of each unit.
- Stone around the front of the structure and around the Prospect Street side in resemblance to the previous house on the lot.
- LP Smart siding that looks like wood. (Sample provided at the meeting.)
- Scallop siding.
- Black standing seam metal roof on the entire structure.
- Offset the duplexes from each other.

Ms. Snyder does not think a shingle roof is appropriate and does not like the design of the duplex.

Ms. Rhodenhizer expressed she was not happy with the materials and would like to see similar materials to what was on the previous structure.

Mr. Vaughan said the burnt structure needs to come down for the sake of safety and likes what the applicant is proposing with the concessions.

Mr. Stout expressed that he had offered everything the BAR had asked for as discussed. He noted that the BAR could not deny him to construct a duplex as this is a by-right use per Town Code.

Chairman Waters asked if the applicants had looked at any other plans where the duplex would look like a single-family dwelling.

Mrs. Stout stated she had researched that possibility for countless hours and was not able to find another design.

Board members agreed they wanted a different design.



Mr. Ware recommended to the Board that if they were denying the application they needed to be specific as to why they were denying the application.

Ms. Rhodenhizer mentioned that the applicant has offered some concessions, but they were not written in the application as submitted.

Mr. Stout offered to write them in, and Mrs. Stout stated the Board could approve the application with those conditions (concessions).

Mr. Ware stated that the BAR could make a motion for approval and list the conditions specifically.

Ms. Potter wrote down and read the concessions the applicant agreed to providing.

1. Black standing seam metal roof on the porches, bay windows and the main structure.
2. LP Smart Siding sage in color.
3. Duplex offset by two feet (2').
4. Front porches on the left front wrap around and right front wrap around with composite decking and vinyl railings.
5. Composite decking in the rear.
6. Bay windows and add two (2) windows to the Prospect Street side of the structure.

Ms. Snyder moved, seconded by Ms. Rhodenhizer to deny the application because it is not compatible in the design with the character of the Historic District or respectful of the surrounding historic buildings and because there has been no alternative design proposed other than just the one that they have given us.

VOTE: Yes – Snyder, Waters, Rhodenhizer, Vaughan
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Aders

VOICE VOTE

OTHER

There were no additional comments.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Rhodenhizer moved, seconded by Vice Chairman Vaughan to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: Yes – Waters, Vaughan, Snyder, Rhodenhizer
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Aders

VOICE VOTE



The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Approved by Board of Architectural Review

Date: 12/10/2024