

**FAUQUIER COUNTY
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Meeting Minutes

July 3, 2019

4:00 p.m.

Warren Green Building, 2nd Floor Meeting Room

10 Hotel Street, Warrenton

Attendance:

Mary Root, Chair (Citizen-at-Large)

John Toler (Scott District Representative)

Jack LaMonica (Marshall District Representative)

Bob Lee (Planning Commission Representative)

Virginia Gerrish (Center District Representative)

Bryan Jacobs (Lee District Representative)

Members Absent:

Kristie Kendall (Cedar Run District Representative)

Staff:

Wendy Wheatcraft, Staff

Maureen Williamson, Staff

1. Chair Mary Root called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.
2. The June 6, 2019 meeting minutes were reviewed. Ms. Root made a motion to approve the minutes with the noted revision. Mr. Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion carried 5 – 0.

3. Ongoing Business

- Development of an Annual County Preservation Award Program

Ms. Root introduced the idea of naming the award categories after people important to Fauquier County history and historic preservation, similar to Fairfax County's award program. While doing research on notable figures in the area of historic writing in Fauquier County, Ms. Root found Fauquier native John Gott to be a possible namesake for an award. Other suggestions for award namesakes included W.H. Irwin Fleming, an architect noted for designing Grace Episcopal Church during the early 20th century, and Meade Palmer, a well-known mid-20th century landscape architect. Ms. Wheatcraft asked the ARB what they thought of naming an award after John Spillman, a prolific 19th century designer/builder of Fauquier County. Mr. Lee asked the ARB how they felt about a Fleming/Spillman Award.

Ms. Wheatcraft introduced another county preservation awards program, the James City County award, as an example. She said it may be easier to implement than the others due to its simplicity. She said it is an annual program that has been in existence since the 1980s. She explained that it had no award categories. There is noted criteria for nominations, and nominations are due each spring with an award's ceremony in August. If a project meets the nomination criteria, then it is awarded. She explained that during some years they have received as many as three nominations and in other years no nominations. However, if three nominations were received and each met the criteria, all three nominations would receive an award. Ms. Root said that it sounded like an

“everyone wins” approach. Mr. Lee stated that his concern was that if someone knew they were being nominated and did not receive an award, they may complain to their district Supervisor. Ms. Wheatcraft said that nominations could be reviewed with a systematic point system to make the decision of awardee objective. She recommended making the criteria for the award explicit with separate criteria for each award category, if the ARB decided to have separate categories.

Ms. Gerrish mentioned that when the ARB first discussed an awards program, the thought was to establish a single award so as not to overwhelm the process. Then, in subsequent years, she said that the program could grow, and further awards could be introduced. Mr. Jacobs thought that the ARB may want to have an award for a person and one for a project. Ms. Wheatcraft clarified project to mean just about any *product*—a written work, a National Register nomination, research, rehabilitation of a historic building, an educational program, etc. She stated that she felt it important to clearly state the objective of the program and the nomination qualifications upfront. Ms. Wheatcraft suggested that giving an award to all qualifying nominations makes the award less special. Ms. Gerrish said that perhaps in a multiple nomination situation, one award is given and the other contenders receive honorable mentions. Mr. Jacobs asked the ARB what to do if a project is up for nomination and does not win. He asked the group if the project would be automatically up for nomination the following year.

Ms. Wheatcraft suggested that the ARB could award certificates of recognition rather than awards so that perhaps one nomination receives the annual award and other contenders receive a certificate of recognition for their efforts. Mr. Jacobs wanted the ARB to think about this scenario—once a qualifying project is up for nomination and does not receive the annual award, would the project/person be automatically up for nomination the following years?

In preparation for the next meeting, the ARB agreed to flush out the proposed criteria for each of the award(s). Ms. Wheatcraft also mentioned a rating sheet that could be used to tally points during the review. She proposed a review process: 1) nominations are received; 2) nominations distributed to ARB with rating sheets attached; 3) ARB members would review each individually and rate/score submission(s); 4) the ARB would reconvene to review the nominations as a group and make decision(s) based on the previous scores. Ms. Wheatcraft said that this is the general process used for bids that come into the County. Ms. Gerrish again let it be known that she is in favor of starting the program with one award. She believes the ARB should offer one award per year called the Fauquier County Preservation Award. She added that there may be several categories an award can fit into and added that perhaps an applicant can apply for one award under multiple categories. Ms. Wheatcraft said it is important for the ARB to be able to justify the points and the rating system in order to have something to fall back on should anyone question the award decision. She mentioned creating a nomination form, but said the award criteria must be established first. The ARB agreed on a couple of nomination criteria, including that the project must be completed before the nomination is accepted and digital photographs must accompany the nomination, particularly if the project involves historic architecture or landscape features.

Ms. Wheatcraft suggested that a certificate or proclamation be created and a small trophy of some sort was discussed. Ms. Root suggested a trophy in the shape of something that is useable. She mentioned receiving a cut glass pitcher as an award and how useful it has been over the years. She suggested the award could be a cut glass crystal pitcher with the Francis Fauquier crest engraved on it, along with the name of the recipient and the year awarded. The ARB disagreed as to whether the name of the recipient should be engraved on the award. Ms. Gerrish said it may be useful to get estimates for several

types of awards. Mr. Lee commented that it seemed that a number of ARB members liked the idea of a pitcher as the actual award.

When the subject of a rating review sheet was introduced, Ms. Wheatcraft thought it important to mention that each nomination will be different (e.g., rehabilitation, written work, advocacy), and the rating sheet will have to take this into account. Ms. Gerrish said that criteria for grading could be generic and tailored for big and small projects so that neither one would have an advantage over the other. Ms. Root believes the scoring should fall back on the nomination criteria.

Mr. Jacobs suggested that one must be careful about using the word “category” on the nomination form. An applicant may interpret this to mean that there is an award for each category. Mr. Jacobs asked Ms. Wheatcraft if she had spoken to anyone at James City County about their scoring method. Ms. Wheatcraft said she had spoken to Planning staff at James City County who said they simply take the nomination criteria and use it to judge the nomination. Ms. Root said that the ARB needs more time to come up with better criteria. Ms. Wheatcraft, in preparation for the August meeting, asked the ARB to submit proposed criteria to her via email. She said she will compile a list of proposed criteria and will come prepared to present a document for review.

4. New Business

No new business was presented.

5. Announcements

- June 20, 2019 State Review Board Meeting – Approval of Vint Hill District PIF
Ms. Wheatcraft announced that the Vint Hill District PIF was approved by the State Review Board as potentially eligible and that she has received the official approval letter from DHR.

There was a discussion about a developer’s preliminary proposal to rehabilitate the men’s and women’s historic barracks at Vint Hill into apartments. Ms. Wheatcraft said that the developer intended to use historic tax credits to complete the rehab. If he intended to take the credits, the work would have to be done according to the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*. The property would have to be listed in the NR to take advantage of the tax credits.

- July 2019 – every Tuesday, 11:00 & 1:00 – showing of *Rosenwald* at AAHA, 4243 Loudoun Avenue, The Plains
- Upperville Historic District NR update...update
No update was given at the meeting.
- August – dedication of Rosenwald School Marker at Eva Walker Park, Warrenton
Ms. Wheatcraft told the ARB that the marker will be dedicated on August 3rd at 10:00 a.m. to commemorate the Rosenwald Schools in Fauquier County. All are invited to a reception at the Family Life Center immediately following the dedication ceremony.
- Ideas for FY2020 (July 2019-June 2020)
Ms. Wheatcraft said that it is not too early to start thinking about educational programs or project ideas for FY 2020. Ms. Root asked about the amount of funding available to support the programs. Ms. Wheatcraft said that funding is not specifically dedicated to the ARB in the budget, but some funds are on an “ask basis.” The sooner in the year staff asks for funds for specific projects, the better the likelihood that the funds would not be dedicated to another project. She told the ARB that she sent an e-mail to Matthew Reeves,

the head of the archaeology program at Montpelier, regarding his availability to give a presentation in October, and he has not yet responded. She mentioned that she would try a follow-up phone call if she has not heard anything in the next couple of weeks.

6. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 7, 2019.
7. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:19 p.m.