

**FAUQUIER COUNTY  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**Meeting Minutes**

March 7, 2018 p.m.  
Warren Green Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Meeting Room  
10 Hotel Street, Warrenton

---

**Attendance:**

Mary Root, Chair (Citizen-at-Large)  
Bob Lee (Planning Commission Representative)  
John Toler (Scott District Representative)  
Bryan Jacobs (Lee District Representative)  
Reta Rodgers (Cedar Run District Representative)  
Virginia Gerrish (Center District Representative)

**Absent:**

Jack LaMonica (Marshall District Representative)

**Staff:**

Wendy Wheatcraft, Staff  
Maureen Williamson, Staff

**Guests:**

Barbara Pivec, Calvert Crossland, LLC

---

1. Ms. Root called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.
2. The February 7, 2017 meeting minutes were reviewed.

Ms. Root made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion carried 5 – 0.

3. New Business

**ARB Review - Goldvein Tower Application**

Ms. Root introduced guest Barbara Pivec of Calvert Crossland, LLC. Ms. Pivec was a representative of the applicant for the proposed 195 foot cell tower project known as the Goldvein Tower. Ms. Root reminded the ARB that any facility proposed in excess of 145 feet requires a review by the ARB. She said that in review of the proposed Goldvein Tower, the ARB's focus, according to the Zoning Ordinance, should be the assessment of possible impacts to historic resources identified within a one mile radius of the proposed location.

The ARB reviewed the staff report produced by Ms. Wheatcraft (attached to these meeting minutes).

After considering the ground elevation in the area, topography, and the enclosed historic resources map, Ms. Root noted her concern for Monroe Park, a resource that appeared to be within the viewshed of the project.

The ARB reviewed photo simulations of the project provided by the applicant. The photo sims were generated from a balloon test. Ms. Pivec was asked at what time of year the balloon test was conducted. She replied that it was conducted during the early fall of 2017. The photo simulations indicated that the tower could not be seen from the park during the early fall. Ms. Root suggested that the monopole could be painted a gradient pale blue to blend in with the color of the sky, as this may help to camouflage the structure during the months the tower may be seen from significant resources.

Ms. Wheatcraft summarized the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) recommended procedures for the review of impacts made by telecommunications tower projects. She said that first, DHR determines the area of potential effect (APE). For towers that are proposed at 200 feet and below, a half mile radius is considered the APE. Secondly, DHR identifies the resources that are within the APE and determines their significance [their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or listing status]. Third, DHR determines the direct or indirect effect(s) the project will have on resources listed or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. She explained that a direct effect would include demolition of a structure or destruction of an archaeological site, and an indirect effect would include visual effects. She continued by stating visibility from a resource does not necessarily mean the project would have an adverse effect on that resource. She added that it depended on its severity. If the visibility is to such an extent that it would lessen or diminish the integrity of the resource, especially its setting, then it would be considered an adverse effect.

Ms. Wheatcraft also noted that a ca. 1900 frame I-house has been identified on the subject property and it appeared that the project would be clearly visible from this resource. However, she said the I-house does not seem to possess sufficient historical or architectural significance to be individually eligible for listing in the NRHP, but eligibility had not been officially determined by DHR. She also mentioned other resources within the 1-mile radius, which included buildings associated with Goldvein—the church, general store and historic houses. She said that if the tower is visible during certain times of the year from these resources, it was her opinion that the visibility would not diminish the integrity of the resources.

Mr. Root made a motion that recommended no adverse effect to the historic resources within a 1 mile radius of the proposed Goldvein Tower site. She added that the ARB would suggest the applicant consider painting the upper portion of the tower a shade of pale blue so as to blend in with the sky and make the tower less visible during months of low or less vegetation.

Barbara Pivec noted that, in her experience, painting a tower is an extremely costly procedure and would require annual maintenance. She said that the standard color for a tower is a silver gray. She added that painting the tower would complicate the situation, as carriers would have to be “off the air” and the antennae arrays would have to be removed during the period that the tower would be repainted.

Ms. Root revised the motion, which remained the same except to remove the suggestion of painting the tower. The motion passed unanimously with a 6-0 vote.

Ms. Pivec left the room.

#### 4. Ongoing Business

May Historic Preservation Month Public Workshop – Saturday, May 12, 2018. Topics: historic tax credits and stucco and plaster repair

Ms. Gerrish shared a personal collection of text books on historic preservation and historic architecture with relative articles of interest, including those regarding stucco and plaster.

Ms. Gerrish asked Ms. Wheatcraft how many stuccoed houses she envisioned being on the walking tour, which has not yet been determined. Ms. Gerrish and Ms. Wheatcraft agreed to work together to compile a list of houses to be considered for inclusion on the tour. Ms. Wheatcraft agreed to go through the NHRP district nomination to identify the stuccoed buildings listed.

Ms. Wheatcraft presented an article she found in the Leesburg *Genius of Liberty* newspaper from 1842, which talks about "The President's House in Washington" being whitewashed and included a recipe to make and tint whitewash from that time period. Ms. Root thought that a stucco or whitewash recipe might be a fitting piece for the back panel of the walking tour brochure. Ms. Wheatcraft asked Mr. Root to send her the brochure template in Microsoft Publisher format.

Ms. Wheatcraft reminded the ARB that the Warrenton Visitor's Center has been reserved for Saturday, May 12 from 9:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. with the event starting at 10:00 a.m. and continuing until 1:00 p.m. DHR has agreed to send a representative to give the historic tax credit presentation. She believes the historic tax credit presentation will last an hour with a question/answer period. A break would follow and then a short presentation regarding stucco and plaster, leaving the remaining time for the walking tour.

Ms. Wheatcraft shared a photograph of a display Tim Winther of Dominion Traditional Building Group used during the Masonry Workshop in May 2015. She said she contacted Mr. Winther to ask if they would be willing to display it again, as it depicts the technique of plaster application. She said that to the rear of the Visitor's Center outside the large meeting room there is a small patio and green space where displays of this sort could be showcased. She told the ARB of Two World's Renovations, a plater repair group out of Fredericksburg, who may be available for a demonstration.

Ms. Wheatcraft said that there is interest from the Town of Warrenton's ARB in forming some sort of partnership for the public workshop. Ms. Gerrish said that she and Carter Nevill, who is a member of the Town's ARB, had a recent discussion on historic tax credits and both believe that this would be a topic of mutual interest to county and town residents.

Ms. Wheatcraft noted knowing of a company called Limeworks U.S., a company based in Pennsylvania that specializes in lime-based mortars and finishes. She said she would contact Limeworks to ask for samples, business cards and brochures. She said she would also attempt to order National Park's Service Preservation Briefs on topics related to the workshop, including *Preservation Brief 22: the Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco*.

#### Fauquier County Preservation Ordinance –

Mr. Lee noted that the County's ordinance, which allows the adoption of local historic area districts (Section 4-300 of the Zoning Ordinance) was adopted in 1976, and it appears that it is outdated. He said that if a community group were to come forward to petition the Board of Supervisors to create such a district, there would be no legal mechanism to use because he believed that it currently did not meet some of the parameters established within the State Code. Mr. Lee believed that writing a draft revision of the ordinance would be a good project for the ARB to take on, as it is within the ARB's scope of responsibilities. Ms. Wheatcraft reminded the ARB that in order for staff to work on a Zoning Ordinance revision, it must be officially initiated. The ARB members agreed to consider this project after the May public workshop.

5. Announcements

- **Marshall Tract at Remington – Civil War Trust Comp Plan Assessment Request**  
Ms. Wheatcraft stated that the Civil War Trust has recently requested a Comprehensive Plan assessment for placement of a conservation easement on the "Marshall Tract," which is located in the Remington Service District, along Business Route 29. The CWT has expressed interest in acquiring the parcels using funds from the American Battlefield Protective Program.
- **March 21 - Public Forum, "Addressing the Legacy of Slavery in Public Policies and Spaces International Perspectives," Charlottesville - Jefferson School African American Heritage Center, free.**
- **April 24-May 5 – Archaeology Field School at the Eastern Shore (Northhampton Co. – Eyreville Site)**
- **May 2-5 – Vernacular Architecture Forum 2018 Conference in Alexandria**  
<http://vernaculararchitectureforum.org/conference>  
Ms. Wheatcraft stressed that it is rare that this conference is being held in Virginia this year. She said that a registrant need not sign up for the entire conference, as there is an a la cart menu of session choices available. (One could potentially register for a bus tour or day of paper sessions only.)
- **Mr. Lee told the ARB that on February 28, 2018, the Planning Commission held a joint session with the Prince William County Planning Commission. During the meeting, Prince William County staff discussed the Prince William County's Historical Marker Program. Mr. Lee said that when development is proposed, Prince William County has had remarkable success in getting developers to do a Phase I archaeological study and if something significant is found, they ask the developer to erect a historical marker. Ms. Wheatcraft added that archaeological study is a requirement for certain applications, like a rezoning, in Prince William County. Mr. Lee said that Justin Patton, the Prince William County Archaeologist, at Ms. Wheatcraft's invitation, would be pleased to speak to the ARB about the Historical Marker Program.**
- **Mr. Jacobs informed the ARB that the old barn at Millburn started losing its roof during the recent wind storm. He referenced the barn at Chestnut Lawn.**

6. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 4, 2018.

7. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

**Staff Report**  
**Fauquier County Architecture Review Board**  
**Telecommunications Application Review**  
**March 7, 2018**

---

Applicant: Calvert Crossland, LLC  
Proposed Location: PIN 7824-06-9456-000, 3590 Rivenoak Lane, Goldvein ~310 AMSL  
Owner(s): John Bristoe Woodburn III, Siobhan Woodburn  
Parcel Zoning: Agriculture (RA)  
Parcel Acreage: 61.62 acres

---

Proposed Project Description: A 195 foot monopole tower with a 60' x 60' fenced equipment compound constructed within a wooded area. Four wireless providers are anticipated to install antenna at:  
RAD center 191' AGL (Omnipoint Technology Inc.)  
RAD center 181' AGL (Verizon)  
RAD center 171' AGL TBD  
RAD center 161' AGL TBD

Tower Concealment Design: None proposed

Ordinance Requirements: A Special Exception (SE) is required for this application due to the proposed height of the tower and the site's proximity to a county park. According to Article 11 of the Zoning Ordinance, new telecommunications towers proposed in excess of 80 feet and less than 5,000 feet from a county, state, or national park or wildlife area require an SE. Any facility proposed in excess of 145 feet requires a review by the Architectural Review Board to determine possible effects on historic resources. The ARB's recommendations are to be transmitted to the Community Development Director no later than 30 days after the ARB's scheduled meeting; otherwise, it will be deemed as a recommendation for approval.

ARB Review: According to the Zoning Ordinance, the ARB's review is to focus on Sections 11-102.3.a (location and siting) and 11-102.3.b(14) (assessment of impacts to historic resources and Virginia scenic byways), as well as Comprehensive Plan directives.

**11-102.3.a. Zoning Application Category.** *New personal wireless facilities which cannot achieve the standards in Section 11-102.2 shall require special exception approval, subject to findings of fact based on the following criteria:*

- *Location: Due to topography, forested areas, and floodplain barriers, environmental factors provide, to an equal degree, adequate buffer and camouflaging to reduce the 1,000 foot setback from a residential unit;*
- *Siting: A new personal wireless service facility may be a pole that is sited outside of existing trees, or in an area surrounded by less than 100 feet of trees in all directions, if the design is mitigated or camouflaged in such a way to be less visible than if it were in the trees.*

**11-102.b. General Performance Criteria.** *All personal wireless or telecommunication facilities, whether permitted by right or permissible with the approval of a special exception or special permit application, shall be subject to the following submittal standards and criteria:*

*(14) Applicants proposing a new telecommunication tower or monopole within one (1) mile of a County designated historic district, historic resources designated within the Comprehensive Plan, or a Virginia Byway if a telecommunication facility is proposed on a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places, shall submit a minimum of three (3) visual simulations and written justification as to why the facility could not be sited elsewhere.*

**Comprehensive Plan Direction:**

Chapter 9 Addendum of the Comprehensive Plan provides goals, objectives, and policies regarding telecommunications facilities. They are intended to address infrastructure needs of the telecommunications industry, while minimizing impacts on adjacent and surrounding land uses. The principal goals and objectives relating to historic resources are included below.

- To ensure that wireless communications towers and related wireless communications facilities are compatible and as visually unobtrusive as possible with surrounding land uses.
- To minimize the adverse visual impacts of wireless communications towers and related facilities through careful design, siting, landscape screening and tower camouflaging techniques.
- To encourage the use of alternative support structures, collocation of new antennas on existing wireless communications towers, and camouflaged towers.

According to this chapter, the most preferred sitings for wireless telecommunications facilities are on or within existing structures where the antennas would not be highly visible and within wooded areas with only the antenna arrays above the tree tops. The least preferred sitings are in open areas. Stealth or camouflaged tower designs are strongly encouraged. Siting Policy 2.J states that no tower should be sited within 1,000 feet of a Virginia Scenic Byway, unless an acceptable stealth tower design is utilized.

The Department of Historic Resources (DHR) provides additional direction for review of these types of projects. (See attached sheet.)

1. First, DHR determines the Area of Potential Effects (the area to be reviewed), which is a ½ mile radius around the site for towers proposed at or less than 200 feet in height.
2. Second, historic properties that are listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places are identified within the APE.
3. Third, direct (destruction due to project construction) and indirect (visual) effects are considered on those properties identified. (Archaeological resources are only considered when located directly in the path of project construction. Only when visibility compromises the integrity of a resource to such a degree that it is no longer eligible for National Register designation is there a determination of adverse effect due to visibility.)
4. Lastly, if it is determined that there are adverse effects to historic resources listed in or eligible to be listed in the National Register, mitigation efforts are recommended.

The table below shows a listing of architectural resources recorded within a 1 mile radius of the proposed tower site. The attached maps identify their location.

Resource & Location	DHR #	Listing or Eligibility for Listing in the National Register	Project Identified as Visible from Site?
Ca. 1900 frame I-house and two ca. 1930 sheds. Located on subject property approximately 600 feet west of the proposed site. House is a typical example of a popular residential form of that period. Notable for two interesting details—the pressed tin shingles and star cut-out in the central-front gable and the diamond attic windows in the gable ends. Property was surveyed in 2001.	030-5184	Not listed in the NRHP. The property does not appear to possess sufficient historical or architectural significance to be eligible for listing.	Equipment compound probably not visible from the site but tower likely visible. Cannot determine completely from reviewing balloon test and site photos.

Monroe Park/Gold Mining Camp Museum Located approximately .5 miles east of the proposed project. Includes reconstructed buildings and other structures/objects associated with local historic gold camps.	Not yet surveyed	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Balloon test photos indicate that the project would not be visible from the park, but visibility may be possible during specific times of the year due to lack of tree canopy.
Bridge 6172 Sumerduck Road	030-1036	Not listed in the NRHP Determined ineligible	Tower not visible
Bridge 6171 Sumerduck Road	030-1035	Not listed in the NRHP Determined ineligible	Tower not visible
Historic house 14100 Goldvein Road	030-5709	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic house 14155 Goldvein Road	030-5707	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic house 14146 Goldvein Road	030-5708	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic farmstead 14191 Goldvein Road	030-5706	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic house 14222 Goldvein Road	030-5705	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic house 14281 Warrenton Road	030-5704	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Grove Baptist Church 14260 Goldvein Road	030-0090	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Grove Presbyterian Cemetery	030-0089	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Goldvein General Store (Goldvein School)	030-5177	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic house 14312 Goldvein Road	030-5657	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic house 14327 Goldvein Road	030-5655	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible
Historic house 14322 Goldvein Road	030-5656	Not listed in the NRHP Not evaluated	Tower not visible

**Staff Recommendation:**

Although the tower is proposed at a height of 195 feet and the ground elevation is quite low in this area, the wooded area surrounding the proposed site and undulating landscape appear to provide sufficient camouflage of the project. The project may be visible from Monroe Park during the months of minimal tree cover; however, visibility of the project should not diminish the integrity of the resource. It is staff's opinion that the undertaking would not have an adverse effect on historic resources identified to date within a one-mile radius of the project.

# Goldvein Tower Site - Historic Resources Identified within One Mile Radius

