



*DRAFT*

**MINUTES OF THE MAYWOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES COMMITTEE**

**MEETING #3**

**Wednesday, April 4, 2018**  
**(Make-up date for 3/21/18 snow cancellation)**  
**2100 Clarendon Boulevard**  
**Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood**

**MAYWOOD MEMBERS:** Heidi Fitzharris  
Sean Handerhan  
Kris McMenamin  
Tova Solo  
Bruce Wiljanen

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Dean Arkema  
Alex Berger  
Bart Collart  
Amanda Davis, MCA President  
Lorne Epstein  
Chris Friedli  
Ken Friedli  
Maria Greene  
Eleanor Harvey  
Heather Hanson  
Frieda Kulish  
Kris McLaughlin  
Andy McLeod  
Rae Mueller  
Carol Rickard-Brideau

**HALRB MEMBERS:** Sarah Garner  
Joan Lawrence, Chairman  
Richard Woodruff, Vice Chairman

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Andrew Wenchel

**STAFF:** Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
John Liebertz, Historic Preservation Planner  
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Specialist  
Kyle Fisher, Historic Preservation Management Intern

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Lawrence, Chairman of the Maywood Design Guidelines Committee (MGC), called the meeting to order.

**REVIEW OF DRAFT CHANGES TO MAYWOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES**

Mr. Liebertz explained that the first half of the meeting would focus on proposed amendments to the *Maywood Design Guidelines* in the site elements category. The second half of the meeting would focus on potential ACoAs for exterior renovations.

Mr. Liebertz summarized the changes made since the previous MGC meeting discussion on January 17, 2018. Most significantly, these included changes to permissible fence cap styles on

page 5-28 and updating the requirement on page 5-41 that A/C condensers be at least eight feet from any side lot line and at least ten feet from any rear lot line.

Mr. Liebertz then reviewed the new proposed content. He began with the section “Outdoor Fireplaces and Fire Pits” (page 5-42). Mr. Liebertz also explained the definitions of the terms “structure,” “building,” and “accessory building,” that he received from Zoning staff. A “structure” is “anything constructed or erected that requires location on the ground or attached to something having a location on the ground.” A “building” is “an enclosed structure anchored to its foundations and having exterior or party walls and a roof, designed for the shelter of persons, animals, or property. When divided by walls without openings, each portion or section of such building shall be regarded as a separate building.” An “accessory building” is “a detached subordinate building, the use of which is clearly incidental to the main building or to the use of the land.” Mr. Liebertz said that fireplaces and fire pits are structures according to zoning.

[6:12 PM: Kris McMenamin arrived].

Mr. Wiljanen asked if “portable outdoor fireplaces” (described on page 5-42) are structures. Mr. Liebertz replied that they are not structures. As the *Maywood Design Guidelines* state, “portable units do not require a CoA or ACoA.”

Mr. Liebertz said that the only fireplaces that would be reviewed under the ACoA process are those that are less than seven feet in height. He noted the zoning requirements for structures on pages 5-42 and 5-43. Interior lots require a rear zoning setback of 25 feet.

Mr. Liebertz next reviewed the requirements for fire pit construction. Only non-combustible materials may be used, and fire pits may be faced only with stone, brick, or parged concrete. They must be three feet tall or less; anything taller also requires a building permit.

Mr. Liebertz called for comments on the “Outdoor Fireplaces and Fire Pits” section.

Mr. Woodruff asked why fireplaces could be up to seven feet tall but fire pits could be only up to three feet tall. Ms. Lawrence explained that fireplaces normally have a chimney, and are therefore allowed a greater height.

Mr. Liebertz then introduced the proposed “Sheds” section (pages 5-44 through 5-48). Mr. Liebertz began by explaining that per the Zoning Ordinance, anything that changes the nature of the property – satellite dishes for instance – must be reviewed. He stated that sheds also change the nature of the property, and therefore must be reviewed. However, HPP staff wants to make it easier for Maywood residents to purchase a shed that meets the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. One way to do this is for staff to allow a variety of typical wood wall coverings for sheds, such as all-wood plywood siding, oriented strandboard siding, hardboard-faced siding, or cementitious fiberboard siding. Mr. Liebertz stated that plastic sheds still would not be permissible as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*; however, sheds may include such elements as PVC trim or vinyl windows.

Mr. Liebertz explained that according to Zoning, all sheds are structures. Sheds that are anchored to a foundation are accessory buildings. Both structures and accessory buildings have different zoning and setback requirements. Accessory buildings may be closer to the property line than structures, while structures may be closer to the main building than accessory buildings. Lean-to sheds (page 5-45) must meet building setbacks as they are considered part of the main building.

Mr. Wiljanen asked for a definition of a lean-to shed. Mr. Liebertz pointed to the example on page 5-45.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the proposed maximum size allowed for sheds under the ACoA process would be 80 square feet. Any shed larger would need to go through the CoA process.

Mr. Wiljanen asked if plastic sheds approximately six feet in height used for storage are considered structures. Mr. Liebertz responded that Zoning considers such sheds to be structures.

Mr. Wiljanen asked if children's playhouses are considered structures. Mr. Liebertz replied that whether Zoning considers children's playhouses structures depends on each individual playhouse in question.

Mr. Wiljanen said the zoning regulations seem to encourage individuals to ignore the ACoA or CoA process.

Mr. Liebertz stated that there is a difference between the zoning process and the historic preservation design review process. Children's playhouses were excluded from the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, but not necessarily from all other Arlington County requirements. If Zoning receives a complaint, they may inspect something under question and conclude it is non-compliant under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the reason for Zoning to have control over structures, buildings, and accessory buildings is to ensure setbacks. Mr. Liebertz replied yes.

Mr. Woodruff asked why the *Maywood Design Guidelines* must follow the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Liebertz responded that neither the HALRB nor staff can approve something that violates the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Woodruff replied that the Zoning Ordinance does not specifically discuss requirements for small sheds. Mr. Liebertz replied that regardless of the size or design of any particular shed, it is staff's responsibility to refer shed applications to Zoning, which makes a decision on whether the shed meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Lawrence stated that there are some very limited situations in which the HALRB can recommend an exception to the Zoning setback requirements. Mr. Liebertz stated that, for instance, the HALRB could consider an application to reconstruct a porch on a house in a local historic district even if such an action would require an exception to the setback requirements. However, the HALRB would immediately refer to Zoning any application to construct a porch on an historic house where no historic precedent existed.

Ms. Fitzharris said she believed the HALRB had previously approved special use exceptions. Mr. Liebertz responded that the HALRB can direct the Zoning Administrator to change the setback modifications only if the case relates to the historic character of the property.

Ms. Liccese-Torres called for any questions on the "Sheds" section of the draft guidelines. There were none.

Mr. Liebertz asked if there were any questions regarding proposed shed materials.

Mr. Wiljanen expressed concern that the proposed OSB building material would be inappropriate for sheds.

Mr. Liebertz said that there is a material called OSB Smart Panel that may be more durable.

Mr. Wiljanen said that the "Sheds" section deserves further discussion at the next MGC meeting since there are fewer committee members in attendance tonight. Staff concurred.

Mr. Liebertz asked for any additional questions or comments.

Ms. Fitzharris agreed with Mr. Wiljanen that there should be greater discussion about the "Sheds" section with the rest of the group. She added that the proposed amendments to the guidelines seem to be in keeping with the MGC's goal of making standards that were more

lenient. Ms. Fitzharris said she was supportive of the use of PVC and OSB materials as long as they do not have a reflective sheen.

Mr. Wiljanen said he had the impression that any plastic building material is acceptable as long as it is out of sight. Mr. Liebertz replied that is not the case.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that through the proposed changes, staff is attempting to provide more options for building materials to make it simpler for Maywood residents to follow the design guidelines.

Ms. Lawrence stated that some of the proposed building materials for sheds are readily available through big box stores and major retailers, and not only through specialty building supply companies.

Mr. Liebertz added that wood-like materials such as OSB proposed in the “Sheds” section would not be allowed for larger structures like garages.

Ms. Fitzharris stated that the idea behind the proposed revisions was to make it easier for residents to buy an economical pre-fabricated shed.

Ms. Lawrence added that the guidelines do not prohibit the use of real wood materials for sheds as long as they conform to other requirements.

Ms. McMenamin suggested that staff add wording to the draft document stating that sheds larger than 80 square feet must be approved through the CoA process. Mr. Liebertz agreed and took note.

Mr. Liebertz next introduced the proposed “Garages” section on page 5-49. Staff, however, does not recommend putting most garages through the ACoA process. Given their size and detailing, staff believes garages should go through the CoA process to allow for public comment. In the current proposal, he explained that:

- Single car garages may go through the ACoA process.
- Proposed building materials are similar to what is currently allowed.
- Designs using dormers, ribbon windows, vinyl garage doors, and decorative elements (i.e., veneer foundations, cupolas, shutters) would not be permitted.
- The term “flower boxes” should be struck from page 5-49.

Ms. McMenamin asked for clarity about what could be considered through the ACoA process.

Mr. Liebertz responded that this new section calls for larger discussion with the HALRB. He said that staff is not opposed to using the ACoA process for some aspects of garage design and construction, but is especially concerned with maintaining the public review required by the CoA process.

Ms. McMenamin pointed to wording on page 5-49: “For examples of single-car detached garages that could and could not be processed for an ACoA see Figures X-X.” She stated she saw no examples of garages that could not be processed for an ACoA. Mr. Liebertz noted the discrepancy and said he would correct it.

Mr. Liebertz directed the committee to page 5-50. He discussed the possibility of property owners requesting garages closer to the dwelling rather than the corner of the house.

Ms. Fitzharris said placing a garage nearer the house is not necessarily more advisable. She said that only wider lots could accommodate the turning radius required for a car to maneuver in and out of a garage located closer to the house.

Mr. Wiljanen noted that requirements for driveways on page 5-34 prohibit circular or curved driveway routes, which would be inconsistent with driveways located near the center of the setback area.

Mr. Wiljanen said that there are several corner lots in Maywood where the garage is located very close to the street, outside of the setback area. He inquired if such garages would have to go through the CoA process since only the HALRB could ask the Zoning Administrator to grant setback modifications. Mr. Liebertz responded that the application would need to be heard by the HALRB.

Ms. Fitzharris pointed to the 10-foot setback depicted on pages 5-43 and 5-50. She asked Mr. Liebertz to confirm that 10 feet is correct, rather than one foot. Mr. Liebertz took note and said he would confirm this for the next meeting.

Mr. Liebertz called for additional questions or comments. There were none.

Mr. Liebertz then introduced discussion on proposed new ACoA categories for exterior renovations. Regarding roofing materials, he explained that the HALRB usually approves typical architectural shingles on its consent agenda, so this material would be appropriate for the ACoA process.

Mr. Wiljanen asked if only rectangular architectural shingles would be considered under the ACoA process. Mr. Liebertz said yes, and agreed to make this clearer in the next draft.

Mr. Handerhan asked if roof replacement currently requires a CoA. Mr. Liebertz replied it does if one changes roofing materials or designs, such as three-tab shingle to architectural shingle.

Mr. Liebertz next introduced the topic of solar panels. The proposed revisions would update both the CoA and ACoA sections of the guidelines. Given the rapidly emerging solar panel technology, this section likely will be revised multiple times in the next decade. Mr. Liebertz said that staff proposes allowing the placement of solar panels proposed for additions on interior lots or roof slopes not visible from the street under the ACoA process, provided the roofing material is asphalt. He asked if the committee agreed.

Ms. McMnamin said she agreed.

Mr. Wiljanen said restricting solar panels to roof slopes not visible from the street would limit the places where one could put them.

Mr. Liebertz replied that one still could use the CoA process to request the installation of solar panels on street-facing roofs. The CoA process would be primarily applicable to cases where solar panels would be placed on historic sections of the house.

Mr. Woodruff asked if solar panels proposed for roof slopes on additions that faced the street would be considered under the ACoA process. Mr. Liebertz said that such proposals likely would be considered under the CoA process. He asked the committee for feedback.

Mr. Woodruff said solar panels on roofs of interior and corner lot additions should both be considered under ACoA.

Mr. Wiljanen said the same requirements should apply to interior and corner lots regarding solar panels.

Mr. Liebertz said it would be beneficial for the HALRB to review proposals for solar panels on corner lots given the inappropriate solar panel placement staff has seen in recent years.

Ms. Fitzharris said the guidelines should specify that solar panels proposed for front elevation roofs must go through the CoA process. The guidelines also should include language about requiring solar panels to be placed in an aesthetically appropriate arrangement.

Ms. Solo suggested the committee discuss what portions of a roof actually would be visible from the street.

Mr. Liebertz replied he would create some graphics and bring them to the next MGC meeting for review and comment. He said the committee could continue to explore ways to put more solar panel requests through the ACoA process.

Ms. Solo asked staff to suggest ways to make solar panels more accessible through the ACoA process.

Ms. Lawrence said that design guidelines for other local historic districts have specified freestanding solar panel arrays with success. Mr. Liebertz commented that freestanding solar panels are always the preferred type, but the large number of trees in Maywood has made these difficult.

Mr. Wiljanen asked for more information about the use of freestanding solar panels. Mr. Liebertz replied that in some cases, freestanding solar panels are the best green technology available to particular Maywood residents.

Mr. Liebertz introduced a discussion about roof vents, flues, and other such openings and pipes. He said that placing these items under ACoA review would expedite the approval process.

Mr. Woodruff asked if sun tubes could be added to the list. Mr. Liebertz agreed and noted the request.

Ms. Lawrence asked if staff could stipulate that shiny natural metal be painted a dark color.

Ms. Fitzharris commented that painting them could make them appear worse.

Ms. McMenamain said it could be problematic to begin requiring certain colors for vents/flues. Ms. Lawrence agreed it could be.

Mr. Liebertz then began a discussion about the removal of non-historic building materials, particularly siding. He said that asbestos siding is often an issue in Maywood. He suggested staff could meet applicants on site to see if the safe removal of non-historic materials is feasible. In cases where it is, replacement with anything less than a five-inch exposure wood siding could be approved by staff if there are no historic materials underneath.

The committee was supportive of this proposal.

In closing, Mr. Liebertz asked the committee to consider any other suggestions for improving the draft document. Those suggestions could be sent via email to staff or shared at the next meeting.

Mr. Liebertz asked if there were any other topics the committee would like to discuss for potential ACoA review.

Ms. Fitzharris asked if the MGC would only discuss changes to the ACoA process.

Mr. Liebertz replied that this first phase of MGC meetings only addresses changes to ACoAs. A second phase of meetings, currently unscheduled, could discuss broader changes to the CoA section of the guidelines.



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT

Neighborhood Services Division

Courthouse Plaza One 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201  
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

Ms. Liccese-Torres announced the next MGC meeting will be June 20. If there are no additional changes requested after June 20, the feedback of the MGC will be submitted to the HALRB for review at a public hearing before being submitted to the County Board.

Ms. McMenamain asked if staff could provide a summary of all of the proposed changes to the ACoA section of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Both Ms. Liccese-Torres and Mr. Liebertz agreed.

Mr. Handerhan asked if the MGC would meet again in April. Ms. Liccese-Torres responded that the next meeting is June 20.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if there were any additional questions or comments. There were none.

The meeting adjourned at 7:09 PM.