

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE MAYWOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES COMMITTEE

MEETING #5

Wednesday, October 17, 2018
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood

MAYWOOD MEMBERS: Amanda Davis, MCA President
Heidi Fitzharris
Frieda Kulish
Rae Mueller
Bruce Wiljanen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dean Arkema
Alex Berger
Bart Collart
Lorne Epstein
Chris Friedli
Ken Friedli
Maria Greene
Sean Handerhan
Heather Hanson
Eleanor Harvey
Kris McLaughlin
Andy McLeod
Kris McMenamin
Carol Rickard-Brideau
Tova Solo

HALRB MEMBERS: Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Richard Woodruff, Vice Chairman

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Coordinator
John Liebertz, Historic Preservation Planner
Angelina Jones, Historic Preservation Planner
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Specialist

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lawrence, Chairman of the Maywood Design Guidelines Committee (MGC), called the meeting to order at 6:10 PM. Ms. Liccese-Torres introduced Angelina Jones as a new staff member with the Historic Preservation Program.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Edits/comments addressed since June meeting

Mr. Liebertz went through the list of changes made to the draft revisions of the design guidelines since the June meeting:

- Section 8, p. 57: added language to require that materials used to build new sheds appear finished and match the materials used in the primary building on the property;
- p. 36: freestanding solar panels will require a CoA;

- p. 38: allow for the replacement of roofing material from rolled asphalt sheeting to architectural asphalt with an ACoA; and
- p. 52: stairs still need a CoA for the front elevation or street facing elevations.

Staff did not include a provision for administrative review of proposed restorations based on historical documentation because it is impossible to develop a definitive process for the evaluation of these proposals. The ACoAs can only be applied to actions that have a finite and predictable number of options, the review of which can be delegated to staff by the HALRB.

Overview of revised *Design Guidelines* draft

Mr. Liebertz explained that the staff reformatted the existing *Maywood Design Guidelines* to integrate the new ACoA process and eliminate inconsistencies between the current guidelines and the new process. He explained that changes made to the draft document are primarily organizational, except for new language that reflects how the HALRB and County Board have reviewed applications for CoAs in Maywood over the last ten years. Section 1, p. 4 of the draft document states that architectural compatibility will be considered by the HALRB before any other factors such as economic feasibility, durability, design integrity, and harmony of proposed improvements. This language was added to reflect the current procedures of the HALRB.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Fitzharris asked what would happen if the majority of Maywood residents does not agree that architectural compatibility should be considered above economic feasibility. Mr. Liebertz responded that staff could modify the language of this section of the draft guidelines to reflect the existing guidelines, but that it would not change necessarily how the HALRB reviews applications for CoAs. Mr. Woodruff expressed his opinion that language pertaining to the priority of application assessment factors should not be added at this point in the process, since the main purpose of this phase of the guidelines review is to determine if there are applications that currently require HALRB review that can be approved administratively instead. He further explained that he was unclear as to whether the additional language in Section 1, p.4 accurately reflects the HALRB's current approach. The Chairman stated that the HALRB's enabling statute gives the Review Board the charge of looking at architectural compatibility, which makes it the Board's first consideration. Mr. Wiljanen stated that the new language was not consistent with the stated goal of the committee, which was to evaluate which CoA applications can be reviewed administratively. It was not to rewrite the guidelines even if the purpose for doing so is to increase clarity. Ms. Liccese-Torres responded that incorporating the proposed changes in the ACoA process without modifying the existing guidelines to reflect these changes may lead to confusion. Mr. Wiljanen countered that it would be appropriate to consider revising the language of the current guidelines during Phase 2 of guideline revisions.

Mr. Liebertz explained that Sections 3 and 4, which constitute most of the draft document, were reorganized and illustrated with new photos, but were not rewritten. Ms. Fitzharris stated that the committee only worked on creating a new ACoA process and that the reformatted guidelines suggest that the committee was involved in rewriting or substantially changing the current guidelines.

Ms. Fitzharris asked if neighborhood residents would be given the opportunity to review the final draft document before it is reviewed by the HALRB. Staff responded that there will be an advertisement and HALRB hearing that will provide an opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Liebertz asked the neighborhood representatives if they would accept a version of the document that reorganized content for clarity and included new illustrations, but did not include the edits in Section 1 related to architectural compatibility. The changes to Sections 3 and 4 do not change the policy or intent of the guidelines. Staff made these changes to remove inconsistencies that would result from appending the ACoA section without editing the current guidelines to reflect these changes. Ms. Fitzharris recommended including a revised checklist at the beginning of the current guidelines (after reorganizing it by application type) and adding the

new ACoA process as an appendix at the end of the current guidelines. She suggested that the committee address any inconsistencies between the current guidelines and the new ACoA process during Phase 2 of the guidelines review process.

Ms. Davis stated that she believes the neighborhood will support the proposed changes to the guidelines, but that the committee needs to consider the best method of presenting these changes to residents. She explained that after distributing the draft revisions to the neighborhood in advance of this meeting, she received numerous inquiries as to why particular provisions of the guidelines were changing that were in fact identical to the current guidelines. This demonstrates that there is a gap in knowledge of the current guidelines among neighborhood property owners and it is therefore important that the changes to the guidelines are clearly identified in the revised document. Mr. Wiljanen expressed his agreement with Ms. Davis and suggested staff write an executive summary that describes the changes made to the guidelines. Mr. Woodruff stated that while he believes the reformatted document is clear, he is unsure of what exactly has changed; he would need that information to speak with other owners about the proposed changes. Ms. Fitzharris and Mr. Wiljanen both agreed with Mr. Woodruff's point and further expressed concern that the reformatted document will give neighbors the impression that substantial changes have been made.

Ms. Davis stated her opinion that the committee should proceed with seeking approval for the new ACoA process and concurrently ask neighborhood residents to review the reformatted guidelines document. Mr. Wiljanen and Mr. Woodruff expressed that review of the reformatted document should be separated from implementing the new ACoA process. Ms. Davis clarified that she wanted to use the reformatted draft guidelines document as the foundation for beginning Phase 2 of the guidelines revisions.

Ms. Davis expressed concern that the neighborhood would not support a document stating that architectural compatibility will be the primary factor in HALRB's review of CoA applications and stated that it is important for the neighborhood to have input in the creation of its own guidelines.

Ms. Fitzharris inquired if there is a process to undesignate a district if the majority of property owners no longer wanted to belong to a local district in reaction to how applications are reviewed by the HALRB. Ms. Liccese-Torres responded that the de-listing of a resource has never occurred in the history of the Historic Preservation Program.

Mr. Liebertz stated that staff intended for the reformatted guidelines to be part of Phase 1 of the committee's revision process. The Chairman suggested that to move the revision process forward and avoid the perception that substantial changes have been made to the guidelines, the new ACoA process should be included as an appendix to the current version of the guidelines.

Ms. Fitzharris asked about the process for approving the revisions to the guidelines and whether the neighborhood residents would be able to vote to accept the final document. The Chairman responded that the changes need to be accepted by the neighborhood, then the HALRB will review the changes at a public hearing, and then it will be submitted to the County Board for final approval at another public hearing. Mr. Liebertz said the neighborhood can submit a letter to the HALRB and the County Board that includes the results of any neighborhood polling efforts and a recommendation to either adopt or deny the revised guidelines. Such a letter will serve as neighborhood testimony and will provide useful information to both boards.

Ms. Davis suggested reorganizing the checklist alphabetically and by approval type (ACoAs first, then CoAs). Mr. Wiljanen reiterated that staff should develop an executive summary to include as a cover page to explain the changes that were made to the guidelines.

Ms. Fitzharris inquired as to why the column that notes whether a permit is required for proposed work was removed from the table at the beginning of the guidelines. Mr. Liebertz responded that requirements for building permits can change and staff does not want to inadvertently misdirect applicants by using outdated guidance. Ms. Fitzharris said including permit requirements clearly

communicates to property owners that not all work that requires Historic Preservation Program review will also require a permit. Mr. Wiljanen responded that he did not think it was appropriate for the staff or HALRB to tell applicants when a permit will be required.

NEXT STEPS

Mr. Woodruff asked if there would be a Phase 2 for the guidelines review. Ms. Liccese-Torres responded that Phase 2 has not yet been scheduled because staff believes there needs to be a trial period of at least six months to ensure that the new ACoA process is working smoothly. Ms. Fitzharris suggested that the committee continue to work on revising the guidelines during the trial period for the new ACoA process. Mr. Wiljanen and Ms. Davis expressed support for this idea. Mr. Wiljanen stated that the committee could review the reformatted document as the starting point for continuing work on revising the guidelines.

Ms. Davis said that she would like the committee to create a survey to gauge neighborhood support for the guidelines and assessment priorities (architectural compatibility, economic feasibility, etc.) that would meet the requirements of the County Board.

[6:50 Rae Mueller arrived].

Mr. Liebertz responded that most historic districts consider economic feasibility separate from design guidelines through an economic hardship application process. This provides a standard for evaluating economic feasibility. Ms. Davis stated that it could be difficult for many County residents to prove economic hardship.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff has received committee guidance on next steps to move forward with finalizing the revisions to the ACoA process and asked if the neighborhood representatives would be able to circulate the checklist and Section 8 (ACoA section) of the reformatted document in the neighborhood and report feedback at the next committee meeting. Ms. Davis stated that the neighborhood representatives will plan to go door-to-door and speak individually with neighbors to gauge support rather than having a neighborhood meeting.

DISCUSSION OF REVISED CoA/ACoA APPLICATION FORM

Ms. Davis expressed her support for the newly designed form and requested that a statement be added at the beginning of the form that clarifies the form is required for both CoAs and ACoAs. Ms. Fitzharris requested that there be a different process for an initial ACoA application. Mr. Liebertz explained that the revised CoA/ACoA application form will be used by all the Arlington County Local Historic Districts; therefore, it is easier to keep the single form for either application type.

WRAP-UP AND NEXT STEPS

Mr. Wiljanen asked if the new ACoA guidelines could include examples and descriptions of appropriate metal fences. Mr. Liebertz responded that the new ACoA guidelines only provide for the review of wooden fencing, but that the CoA process provides for review of metal fencing.

Mr. Woodruff inquired as to how committee members should respond to inquiries about the next phase of guideline revisions. Ms. Liccese-Torres responded that there will be a Phase 2 of the guideline revisions after the ACoA process is approved and implemented.

Ms. Fitzharris expressed concern with differences in how the guidelines have been applied to the restoration of historic wood siding that had been covered by asbestos siding, stating that there have been cases where residents were permitted to remove historic wood siding. Mr. Liebertz clarified that the proposed ACoA process pertaining to asbestos siding is allowing for an option for the removal of asbestos siding and preservation of the extant wood siding beneath it without HALRB review. It does not prevent residents from applying to the HALRB to consider alternative options for asbestos siding replacement. Ms. Fitzharris asked if the requirement to



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

preserve historic wood siding to the greatest extent possible was included in the current version of the guidelines. Mr. Liebertz responded that p. 15 of the current guidelines does include this provision.

Ms. Liccese-Torres proposed that the committee reconvene on November 28th at 6 PM. The committee agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:13 PM.