

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE MAYWOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES COMMITTEE

MEETING #6

**Wednesday, November 28, 2018
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Conference Room 715**

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

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

HALRB MEMBERS: Sarah Garner
Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Andrew Wenchel, Jr. (arrived at 6:24 pm)
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 (arrived at 6:30 pm)

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lawrence, Chairman of the Maywood Design Guidelines Committee (MGC), called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Edits/comments addressed since October meeting

Mr. Liebertz went through the list of changes made to the proposed draft guidelines since the October meeting:

- Created an executive summary;
- Incorporated comments from the October meeting to revise Appendix G;

- Revised CoA/ACoA chart; and
- Revised the CoA/ACoA application form.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Liebertz asked for feedback from Committee members on the changes that were made and if the new executive summary adequately addressed their comments from the October meeting. Ms. Fitzharris stated that the changes were clear, but noted that the ACoA section is much more detailed now and there may be too many diagrams. Ms. Davis asked if the homeowners who did not want a photograph of their property included in the document had been removed. Mr. Liebertz confirmed that they had been removed.

CoA/ACoA Chart

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if the Committee had any comments about the revised CoA/ACoA chart. Ms. Fitzharris asked if there would still be the portion of the chart that graphically denoted with an “X” when a certificate would be required. Mr. Liebertz responded that the intention was to remove this component from the revised table. Ms. Mueller suggested that a header be included on the table to distinguish between the three overarching categories: No ACoA/CoA Required, ACoA Required, and CoA Required. Committee members agreed that this would be a good way to graphically organize the information in the table by the action needed to be taken by the property owner.

Ms. Mueller commented that the wording in the Executive Summary implied that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* applied to all the properties in the Maywood community rather than just the properties within the local historic district. Mr. Liebertz confirmed that he would change the wording to specify that the guidelines only apply to the properties within the local historic district.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if the Committee had any objections to the superseded sections of the guidelines being denoted with the word “Void” in the body of the remainder of the document. The Committee agreed that this would be the best way to denote which parts of the guidelines no longer apply until Phase 2 of the guideline review has been completed.

Appendix G

Ms. Liccese-Torres made a call for final comments regarding Appendix G or any of the other recent revisions. Ms. Mueller inquired whether there would be a coversheet before the executive summary. Ms. Fitzharris suggested creating a new coversheet rather than using the same one from the old guidelines to avoid confusion between the old and new documents. Ms. Davis further requested that a table of contents for new matter be included at the beginning of the updated guidelines. Ms. Kulish asked that the pagination of Appendix G be corrected so that this appendix begins with page G-1.

Mr. Wenchel arrived at 6:24 pm.

Ms. Kulish asked if there is any information about the use of permeable pavers included in the guidelines. Ms. Lawrence responded that the HALRB has approved a range of permeable paving materials during its review of Maywood projects. Mr. Liebertz confirmed that there is information pertaining to permeable pavers in Appendix G.

CoA/ACoA Application Form

Mr. Liebertz asked the Committee for comments on the revised CoA/ACoA application form. Ms. Liccese-Torres clarified that the form will be used for all Arlington County local historic districts, not just Maywood. Ms. Fitzharris requested that staff include an annotation with the checklist for submission materials clarifying that the checklist is for the owner’s reference and it does not need to be submitted as part of the application. Mr. Liebertz agreed to include this

information on the checklist and pointed out that the revised form requires owners to submit fewer copies of the printed application.

Ms. Bolliger arrived at 6:30 pm.

NEXT STEPS

Mr. Liebertz told the Committee that staff has scheduled one Design Review Committee (DRC) work session at which time the DRC will review the proposed revisions to the guidelines. Staff will need to schedule a follow-up session if the DRC is not able to finish its review in one session. The goal is for the DRC to complete its review of the proposed revisions to the guidelines so the Committee members may introduce the revisions to their Maywood neighbors in January 2019. Staff anticipates that the HALRB hearing to review the revisions would occur in February. At that point, the revisions will be sent to the County Board for final approval, unless they must first be heard by the Planning Commission. The Committee tentatively agreed on the date of December 5th at 7:00 PM for the DRC work session.

Ms. Kulish asked when the new HALRB liaison on the County Board (replacing John Vihstadt) would be announced. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that this information should be released shortly.

Ms. Fitzharris noted that the new CoA/ACoA application requires applicants to email their application prior to printing copies. Mr. Liebertz replied that this allows staff to provide initial comments before the application is printed in case revisions need to be made. Ms. Fitzharris responded that there should be information on the form indicating the deadline to email the initial application in advance of the monthly DRC meeting.

Ms. Mueller requested that a disclaimer be added to the Executive Summary that states that all guidelines remain in effect unless marked "Void."

Mr. Handerhan asked if instructions for applying for the installation of a new roof could be included on the submission requirements checklist of the revised CoA/ACoA application form. Mr. Wiljanen suggested that this information be included with either "Exterior Renovation" or "Porches or Decks" on the checklist. Mr. Woodruff added that it would be helpful to include a note at the top of the list of submission requirements encouraging applicants to contact staff with questions. Ms. Kulish recommended that the Row labeled "Exterior Renovation" be revised to read "Exterior Renovation/Addition."

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if the current order of the list of submission requirements was acceptable. Mr. Handerhan wondered if the list should be alphabetical and Ms. Fitzharris commented that since it is a short list, it makes more sense for it to be grouped thematically. Mr. Wiljanen stated that the list was already grouped as a progression from large projects to small projects. Mr. Liebertz agreed to include demolition and new construction/additions at the beginning of the list.

Ms. Fitzharris inquired why the information pertaining to window replacement on the submission requirements checklist is specific to garden apartments. Mr. Liebertz explained that not every local district has the same requirements for window replacement; staff was concerned about creating confusion about the procedure for window replacement in each specific district.

Mr. Handerhan asserted that the submission requirement checklist is driven by the materials needed to apply for a CoA and asked if this would be confusing for applicants applying for an ACoA. Mr. Liebertz explained that the submission requirements are identical for a CoA or an ACoA and that the difference between the two certificate types is simply the review process. Mr. Wiljanen inquired as to whether there should be a box to check to indicate whether the applicant is applying for a CoA or an ACoA. Ms. Fitzharris pointed out that the application is the same either way and that it is the staff who will decide whether the application needs to be evaluated as a CoA or an ACoA, not the applicant. Mr. Liebertz stated that it is typical for applicants to contact staff prior to submitting their applications and this is often the point when staff communicates whether a CoA or ACoA is needed. Mr. Liebertz agreed to review point number 2 on the first page of the draft CoA/ACoA application to make sure that the process between applicant and staff is as clear as possible.

Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked the Committee members for a productive year of work to revise the guidelines and asked the Committee to pencil in February 20, 2018, for the HALRB public hearing on the work accomplished by the Committee. Ms. Liccese-Torres clarified that this hearing will occur after the DRC is able to adequately review the revisions and the Maywood committee members have been able to solicit comments from their neighborhood residents.

Ms. Fitzharris stated that she anticipates that community members will inquire about when additional changes will be made to the remainder of the guidelines. She also asked what the Committee members should say about Phase 2 of the guideline revisions. Staff reiterated that it is necessary to have a trial period to test the efficacy of the revisions before beginning a second phase of the guidelines review process. Mr. Wiljanen suggested that the committee members tell the community that Phase 2 will begin after a trial period for Phase 1 is completed, but without a definite time frame. Ms. Davis argued that it is necessary to have a date in place for when the trial period will end and Phase 2 will begin. Mr. Woodruff stated that the Committee has accomplished a great deal during the last year and that members should instead focus on the positive impacts of Phase 1 and how the changes will streamline the CoA/ACoA review process. Ms. Davis responded that she agreed that the Committee had accomplished a great deal, but that she anticipates that there will be questions from Maywood residents about what changes have been made to alleviate some of the costs associated with preserving their historic properties. Mr. Wiljanen summarized by saying that we do not yet know when Phase 2 will commence and that for now Committee members should let residents know there will be a trial period to see how the updated guidelines are working.

Ms. Davis asked if she should hold off on conducting a survey of Maywood residents' feelings about the design guidelines until after the trial period. Mr. Woodruff observed that any survey would need to be conducted in accordance with professional practice and be statistically valid. Ms. Lawrence added that the survey should be conducted by a neutral party and that everyone on the Maywood Design Guidelines Committee would have a conflict of interest in conducting the survey. Ms. Fitzharris asserted that the survey of Maywood residents should be conducted separately from introducing the new guidelines. Ms. Kulish added that the Neighborhood Conservation Program soon will be conducting a survey in Maywood and that it might be possible to coordinate and conduct both surveys at the same time.

Mr. Handerhan stated that when speaking to Maywood neighbors, Committee members can say that there is a target to begin Phase 2 within 6 months of the revisions being adopted, but to direct the conversation towards discussing the Phase 1 revisions. Ms. Lawrence agreed and added that the conversation should be focused on what was accomplished during Phase 1 of the guidelines review.

Ms. Liccese-Torres tentatively proposed that the committee reconvene on December 5 at 7 PM for the DRC work session. The committee agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:09 PM.