



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

21 Main Street

Tuesday, July 23, 2026, at 6:30 PM

MINUTES

AN OPEN MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF WARRENTON, VIRGINIA, WAS HELD ON JULY 23, 2026

Regular Meeting

PRESENT

Mr. Michael Beidler, Chair; Vice-Chair; Mr. William Hemmingson;
Mr. Tim Burch; Mr. John Scoggin; Ms. Whitney Burgess, Preservation
Planner

PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS

N/A

ABSENT

Mr. Steve Wojcik

REGULAR MEETING – 6:30 PM

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from July 7, 2026:

Ms. Burgess noted an edit to the start time of the July 7, 2026, meeting due to technical delay.

Mr. Burch made a motion to approve

Mr. Scoggin seconded the motion

Ayes: Chair Beidler, Mr. Burch, Mr. Scoggin

No: N/A

Abstention: Hemmingson

NEW BUSINESS.

1. COA 2026-22: 10 Hotel Street

Request to construct rear addition on building, make façade alterations, and hardscape/landscape improvements

Ms. Burgess introduced the project and gave a short history of the property's architectural evolution through time.

The applicant approached the podium to offer details and introduce their proposal. Select demolition and a small two-story addition on the rear for a galley kitchen, among other exterior alterations. A utility screen will be installed on the roof to shield view of mechanical equipment.

Mr. Scoggin asked for clarification on the purpose of the addition.

The applicant confirmed the addition will hold a service kitchen and the exterior chimney and fireplace will serve the patio.

Mr. Scoggin asked for details on the fireplace type and function.

The applicant confirmed the fireplace is gas powered.

Mr. Scoggin asked for clarification on how the mechanical equipment on the roof would be drained/ utility access and how many mechanical units would be installed.

The applicant confirmed there would be no physical gutters, but a roof drain with overflow spout/scupper that would lead toward Ashby Street, and that the MVP plans have not been finalized. Some existing mechanical units will be reused; others will be removed.

Chair Beidler asked for clarification on the roof structure and the mechanical screening and the parapet dimensions. A taller parapet may be more appropriate.

The applicant agreed a taller parapet would work and the height could increase to three feet.

Mr. Hemmingson asked if raising the parapet wall would require a taller chimney proportionally.

The applicant confirmed that a taller chimney would be proportional and the Board agreed.

The applicant discussed ways to hide the utility equipment for kitchen (grease duct and fan) behind the chimney.

Chair Beidler asked for clarification on the utility plan inside and around the chimney.

The applicant explained the utility plan and agreed to update the designs to show the correct ductwork behind and within the chimney.

Mr. Scoggin asked the board for clarification on what the recommendation for the parapet and chimney heights should be for the record.

A height of 3 foot was suggested.

The applicant agreed that three feet in height is appropriate.

Mr. Beidler suggested a condition of approval with specific language for the concealment of mechanical equipment from the centerline of the southeast sidewalk on Culpeper Street.

The applicant agreed with the language.

Mr. Scoggin expressed appreciation for the effort to conceal equipment.

Ms. Burgess recorded the requested condition.

Mr. Burch asked for clarification on the light configuration of the windows.

The applicant confirmed that for historic tax credit approval, a different configuration was preferred and a one-over-one light was chosen. The new windows will be wood sashes.

Mr. Burch asked for similar clarification on the proposed new door to the addition.

Chair Beidler asked if the door opening would have a header.

The applicant confirmed a brick soldier course would head the door and jack arches above the windows.

Mr. Hemmingson noted that the historic portions of the building have arched openings and asked for the applicant to clarify how their design choices occurred.

The applicant explained that the different headers were chosen in an effort to compliment but distinguish between original and new.

Mr. Hemmingson asked about the joint profile with the brick for the new addition.

The applicant explained that the brick was chosen with traditional widths and joints but modern profile.

Mr. Hemmingson asked that applicant to be mindful when removing the covered walkway as the original brickwork will be exposed beneath.

The applicant noted that the entire building will be painted to fit with the HD recommended palette and paint chip analysis may be utilized.

Mr. Hemmingson asked for details on the proposed patio and landscaping.

The applicant confirmed that the patio design is up to date and the existing sidewalk beneath the covered walkway will be removed.

Mr. Hemmingson asked if the lower-grade doorway was for staff or guests.

The applicant confirmed the egress is for staff and the lower elevation is to fit the topography.

Mr. Hemmingson asked for clarification on the new stair profile.

The applicant expressed their wish to replicate the existing details.

Chair Beidler asked for further details on the stair construction.

The applicant discussed details of their design choices and asked the board's preference on the porch cutout for the stairs

Chair Beidler asked the applicant to update the plans to provide further details on the porch alterations and repairs and recommended a condition of approval excluding any potential porch repairs and stair construction from this review.

The applicant agreed to modify the plans to explain the porch details and have a structural engineer verify the feature is structurally sound.

Mr. Hemmingson agreed with Chair Beidler and commented that code and safety requirements would be crucial as a high activity area. Mr. Hemmingson also asked for clarification regarding the rear window demolitions.

The applicant explained that the tax credit consultant would prefer the lower window to remain in situ and a separate opening made for the door. The applicant asked for the board's feedback.

Chair Beidler requested that alteration be noted on the plans.

Mr. Burch asked if the existing headers would remain.

The applicant confirmed.

Chair Beidler expressed approval for the concept and asked Ms. Burgess for Staff opinion.

Ms. Burgess noted that the prospect of leaving the window in place and creating a new door opening aligns with SOI Standards and would be a less impactful alteration.

Chair Beidler noted the concept is like the new second-floor door on the Culpeper elevation is designed and asked for clarification on the doorway design and railings detail.

The applicant explained that the door would be operable and open to the gallery. A partition wall or planter bed may be constructed to offer privacy for the attached suite.

Chair Beidler asked the applicant to provide more details once the final plan is developed.

Mr. Burch asked for clarification on the existing vs. proposed balustrade and railing profiles and if the historic balustrade has been assessed for needed repair or replacements.

The applicant offered details and agreed that a condition assessment of the existing railings and balustrade is needed.

Mr. Burch asked about the proposed railing near the first-floor door to the entry.

The applicant noted it would be a simple wrought iron design.

Mr. Hemmingson discussed options for the rear door location to the addition.

Chair Beidler asked for clarification on the relationship between the addition and the original elevation.

The applicant offered details.

Chair Beidler discussed the mechanical equipment parapet and the potential window removals in relation to the tax credit requirements.

The applicant offered details.

Chair Beidler asked further information on interior to patio circulation.

The applicant expressed the circulation details are being worked out but provided a general overview.

Mr. Hemmingson asked for clarification on patio access.

Chair Beidler asked for details on the proposed rear fireplace feature and cap assembly.

Mr. Scoggin asked if a flue would run through the fireplace.

The applicant explained that the preferred materials are brick and masonry and agreed to create a detailed plan of the feature. The chimney flue would also serve an interior gas fireplace for the adjacent second floor room.

Mr. Hemmingson agreed more details are needed.

Mr. Scoggin asked for verification on metal vs. wood stair, and if new signage would be needed.

The applicant confirmed the stair will be wood and signage will be a later submission once details are finalized.

Mr. Beidler recommended the Board defer a decision until next month to allow time for the applicant to update plans with sufficient details for a full review.

Mr. Scoggin seconded the motion.

Mr. Hemmingson relayed to the applicant that their design package is close to complete but the outstanding details were important to understanding the full project.

The vote was as follows:

Ayes: 4 (Beidler, Hemmingson, Burch, Scoggin)

Nays: 0

Abstention: 0

Absent: 1 (Wojcik)

The applicant asked Ms. Burgess for a timeline for the new plans.

Ms. Burgess requested the new plans be submitted at least a week in advance of the August meeting.

UPDATES.

Ms. Burgess informed the Board that the violation enforcement at 33 Culpeper Street for improper signage installation was ongoing awaiting a response from the owner and would relay any further details from Enforcement staff.

**BOARD MEMBERS TIME.
ADJOURNMENT.**

Chair. Beidler moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Scoggin.

All ayes.

With no further business, this meeting was adjourned at 7:45 PM on Thursday, July 23, 2026.

DRAFT