ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

21 Main Street

Thursday, May 28, 2026, at 6:30 PM

MINUTES

AN OPEN MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF WARRENTON, VIRGINIA, WAS HELD ON MAY 28, 2026

Regular Meeting

PRESENT	Mr. Michael Beidler, Chair; Mr. Steve Wojcik, Vice-Chair; Mr. William Hemmingson; Mr. Tim Burch; Mr. John Scoggin; Ms. Casey DeHaven, Planning Manager; Ms. Whitney Burgess
PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS	N/A
ABSENT	N/A

REGULAR MEETING – 6:30 PM

Mr. Michael Beidler, board Chair, reads the statement of purpose and calls the meeting to order at 06:30PM, a quorum is present, and business can be conducted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No draft meeting minutes for review.

NEW BUSINESS.

1. **COA 2026-11: 82 Main Street**

Request to install hanging sign and bracket and an A-Frame sign to be placed on the sidewalk.

Ms. Burgess provided an overview of the COA and all proposed alterations.

Mr. Beidler requested clarification as to where the bracket was being installed.

Ms. DeHaven offered clarification on the applicant’s submitted photos and the location of the proposed wall mounted sign.

Mr. Hemmingson asked if attaching the bracket to the block rather than the brick would require a condition to require mounting within joints.

Mr. Wojcik stated the sign compliments the building style and asked about the mounting method for the bracket.

Ms. Burgess provided an overview of attachment methods for contemporary signage.

Mr. Beidler asked for clarification on whether or not the sign would be back-lit.

Ms. Burgess confirmed it is not.

Mr. Beidler asked the board members for any proposed changes to the draft motion.

Mr. Wojcik stated we should change “brick joint” to “masonry joint” for consistency.

Mr. Hemmingson motioned to approve the project conditions as written.

Mr. Burch seconded.

The vote was as follows:

Ayes: Mr. Michael Beidler, Chair, Mr. Steve Wojcik, Vice Chair; Mr. William Hemmingson; Mr. John Scoggin
Nays:
Abstention: Mr. Tim Burch;
Absent:

WORK SESSION

Red Truck Bakery – requested rear/side addition with exterior alterations including garage door fenestration updates.

Chair Beidler invited the Applicant to introduce the project.

Mr. Neal Wavra, Applicant/Owner, provided an overview of the difficulties the current floor plan presents, the proposed plans for this project, and their intention to maintain the historic fabric of the building.

Mr. Beidler requested a search as to the historic timeline of the garage doors and any approvals made in recent permitting history for the doors.

Ms. Burgess explained that the town’s OpenGov digitized record for the property only goes back to 2020.

Mr. Wojcik recalls the ARB did approve the inset door that was installed within the larger garage doors.

Mr. Burch asked if the change in the garage doors that is proposed would keep the historic style and design of the original doors.

Mr. Wavra confirmed.

Mr. Beidler stated the doors will actually be completely reconstructed and the ARB will need to take that into consideration.

Ms. Burgess stated that the proposed design is in keeping with the overall style of the building and would be supported by Staff.

Mr. Burch asked if it would be possible to replicate the doors and windows as to what it looks like right now, not slightly different as the AI rendering shows. The doors would not still need to be non-fixed.

Mr. Wavra agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Scoggin asked if this will be the new main entrance.

Mr. Wavra confirmed and explained the new proposed means of egress into and out of the building with the proposed changes.

Mr. Scoggin stated that the current proposal seems to detract from the historic value of the building and to maintain the current scale of the doors.

Mr. Hemmingson stated that the proposed layout seems agreeable but agreed that the current scale of the garage doors should be maintained, as seemingly shown in the draft drawings.

Mr. Wojcik stated the addition could possibly look more similar to the building.

Ms. DeHaven provided an overview of staff's guidelines for additions and maintaining visual separation between original and alter construction.

Mr. Beidler stated the siding could still be stucco, but a different variant to differentiate from the rest of the building.

Mr. Wojcik stated some ideas for replicating the garage doors and discussed examples around town.

The contractor spoke on the possibility of replicating the doors.

Mr. Wavra asked if the Board would prefer a stucco surface on the addition versus siding.

The Board all agreed.

Mr. Scoggin asked for confirmation on whether or not the addition should be enclosed or open.

Mr. Wavra stated he preferred fully enclosed.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Burch commented that the space intended for the proposed addition is right on the property line.

Ms. DeHaven confirmed that no setback is required because the property is zoned CBD.

Mr. Beidler asked for clarification on the misaligned property boundary on the drawing.

The contractor confirmed that is just the property boundary as shown via GIS.

Mr. Scoggin asked about any service/access issues with the neighboring property.

Mr. Wavra confirmed there will still be ample space to access the neighboring property.

Mr. Hemmingson asked about the windows and whether the addition would impact on the existing window fenestration.

Mr. Wavra asked for a preference from the Board.

Mr. Scoggin asked about waste management and where it would be located.

The contractor asked about bringing up the addition corner with an overhang to maintain the current proposed setback.

Mr. Beidler stated he prefers the current proposed layout.

Mr. Wavra stated that if the addition is enclosed, there will be ample space for waste management.

The Board discussed prospective waste enclosures.

Mr. Wojcik asked about where deliveries will be unloaded.

Mr. Wavra confirmed they will park on the side street to off-load and roll into the building through the door on the new addition.

Ms. DeHaven confirmed that delivery zones and hours will be required on the site plan by Zoning.

Mr. Beidler asked about any HVAC equipment and proposed a parapet wall on the rear/side elevations to conceal all utilities – would not support tile, but maybe a simple stucco parapet wall.

Ms. Burgess agreed that a more utilitarian approach to building a parapet would be more appropriate and to avoid mimicking the historic tile roof.

The contractor asked if an inset parapet would be appropriate, as long as it's set back 4-5' and maintains the current roofline design.

Mr. Wavra confirmed.

Mr. Hemmingson asked about kitchen ventilation.

Mr. Wavra confirmed there is an extant HVAC on the roof, it will be replaced when the new system is installed.

Mr. Hemmingson asked for a cellar plan.

Mr. Wavra confirmed where the parapet should be located on the roof.

Mr. Burch agreed that a small parapet wall would suffice.

Ms. Burgess addressed the additional proposed alterations, such as new signage, new light fixtures, etc.

Mr. Beidler asked if the truck was considered signage.

Staff confirmed it is not.

Mr. Beidler asked if seating was within ARB purview – Staff confirmed it is not.

Mr. Hemmingson asked about which direction the doors swing in or out.

Ms. DeHaven confirmed that is under the purview of Building/Fire Code requirements.

The Board discussed the inset of the doors and what the preference would be – Chair Beidler would prefer them to stay where they are.

Mr. Burch and Mr. Scoggin confirmed that the proposed garage doors are moved forward.

Mr. Beidler stated they should remain where they are currently, since they are historically garage doors.

Ms. Burgess provided a few Preservation Briefs to the Applicant for future reference and a brief overview of the Zoning requirements.

The contractor asked members for their thoughts about material for the replica doors.

Chair Beidler stated he had no real preference, but metal would be a great option.

Mr. Burch stated aluminum clad would also work.

The contractor stated the interest in wood.

Mr. Wavra stated the other existing fabric is wood and it will be maintained.

Ms. Burgess explained maintenance on historic wooden sashes versus metal.

Mr. Beidler asked about the best design to showcase the main entryway to guests.

The Board discussed the possibility of an awning or vestibule.

Mr. Wojcik asked about the windows that would be blocked by the addition.

Mr. Beilder agreed the addition would block the adjacent building’s window.

Ms. Burgess explained that the potentially blocked window would be examined by the Building Officer and Zoning.

Mr. Wavra thanked the Board for their commentary.

Ms. DeHaven summarized for the Applicant the next steps in the COA application process as they finalize design plans.

The Applicant excused himself to be seated.

UPDATES.

Ms. Burgess provided an overview of the on-going structural issues of the steeple at the First Baptist Church (39 Alexandria Pike) and the congregation's recent grant submission. Ms. Burgess assured that the church's contractor intends to execute an in-kind replacement of the steeple should the funding be secured.

Mr. Burch suggested an engineering report to support their case for the grant committee.

Mr. Beidler suggested that if the steeple conditions worsen, the Board might approve a request to temporarily remove and relocate the steeple for repairs, with the roof patched for that process.

The Board agreed that an engineer's report would be the best step moving forward.

BOARD MEMBERS TIME.

Mr. Hemmingson stated he will be absent for the June meeting.

Mr. Scoggin stated the work session was productive.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. Beidler moves to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Wojcik. There was no discussion.

With no further business, this meeting was adjourned at 8:04 PM on Thursday, May 28, 2026.