

**MINUTES OF THE
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, February 17, 2021, 5-7 PM**

This was a virtual public meeting held through electronic communication means.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken
Charles Craig
Omari Davis
Sarah Garner, Vice Chairwoman
Jennie Gwin
Carmela Hamm
Gerry Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Liz Rogers
Richard Woodruff, Chairman

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Planner
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Planner

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chairman called the meeting to order. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and determined there was a quorum. Staff explained that the January 27, 2021 draft meeting minutes were being finalized and approval would be delayed until the March hearing.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chairman explained the virtual Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures and stated that the virtual meeting format was necessitated as a precaution to protect the Board, staff, and community members from the spread of COVID-19. He communicated the legal authority under which the County was able to hold virtual public hearings, citing the Governor's Executive Orders, legislation adopted by the Virginia General Assembly, and the County Board's Continuity of Operations Ordinance adopted in March 2020. The Chairman then described the logistics of how the virtual meeting would proceed via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

DISCUSSION AGENDA

- 1) Heidi FitzHarris for David and Maria Elena Greene
2204 North Kenmore Street (CoA 20-26A)
Maywood Historic District
Changes to a previously approved request to install a pool, patio, pergola with roof and grill area, and shed.

- 2) Bart and Alexia Collart
Preliminary Review: 3205 23rd Street North
Maywood Historic District
Request to discuss reconstruction after fire damage.

Discussion Agenda Item #1: 2204 North Kenmore Street

The Chairman asked Ms. Bolliger to introduce the first item. Ms. Bolliger explained the Colonial Revival dwelling at 2204 North Kenmore Street was built before 1912 and was a contributing resource in the Maywood National Register Historic District. She said this application was an update to CoA 20-26 approved in December 2020; at that time, the applicants sought preliminary approval before moving forward with a civil engineer and doing a land disturbance study, hence the amendment.

Ms. Bolliger stated the applicants were seeking to modify their original proposal by: moving the 6'-high wood fence from midway along the house to directly behind the first window; moving one air conditioning unit; increasing the approved spa from 5'x8' to 8'x8'; increasing the approved pool from 37'x18' to 38'x 18'; and adding four concrete stucco-covered stormwater planters and private PVC piping connecting all the planters to an existing storm manhole. She clarified that three of the planters would be located in the rear yard, with only one sited in the front of the house directly to the left of the front porch.

- Box 1 at the front of the house will be 3'x5' with the top of the wall at 256.6 and the bottom of the box at 251.2;
- Box 2 midway along the side of the property will be an L-shaped box 20.3 s.f. in area with the top of the wall at 254.7 and the bottom of the box at 249.3;
- Box 3 at the rear of the property will be approximately 3'x6' with the top of the wall at 251.7 and the bottom of the box at 248.2; and
- Box 4 will be free-standing in the rear yard measuring 3.75'x8' with the top of the wall at 247 and the bottom of the box at 241.6.

Ms. Bolliger explained that because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Design Review Committee (DRC) had not been able to meet and so this and all applications would be presented to the full board for discussion. She summarized staff's recommendation of approval of the subject application -- The 6'-high privacy fence was appropriate for the district and had been approved this close to the front of the house by CoA before. Similarly, air conditioning units had been approved closer to the front than the rear of the house when screened by a fence, which this would be. While the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not have parameters for pool or spa size, Ms. Bolliger noted that design approval is at the discretion of the HALRB and the commission had approved the previous sizes.

Ms. Bolliger noted the HALRB approved similar stormwater planters in Maywood for CoA 12-30 and CoA 14-02, where both owners, likewise to comply with land disturbance assessment regulation, were required by the Chesapeake Bay Ordinance to capture the water runoff onsite rather than diverting it to

the public stormwater system. She said that as there will be only one planter visible from the street, and fewer than six inches above grade, staff finds the proposed planters appropriate and the stucco-finished concrete complies with the recommendation in Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* that concrete surfaces be parged.

The Chairman thanked Ms. Bolliger for the report and asked if the owners were present. Designer Ms. Heidi FitzHarris and owner Ms. Maria Greene introduced themselves and welcomed any questions. The Chairman invited comments from members of the DRC. Mr. Craig stated he thought the proposed alterations were appropriate. Ms. Bolliger read a comment from Mr. Dudka, who did not have any objections but would have appreciated more elevations including the planters. Ms. FitzHarris noted there was one sample cross-section included in the plans. Hearing no further comments or questions, the Chairman added his approval and proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 20-26A to allow specific changes to the previously approved CoA contained in the subject application. The proposed changes regarding the fence, air conditioning unit location, and storm water planters are deemed appropriate per previous HALRB established precedent; the proposed dimension changes to the pool size is de minimus; and the planters' stucco-finished concrete complies with Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to read the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0.

Discussion Agenda Item #2: 3205 23rd Street North (Preliminary Review)

The Chairman invited Ms. Bolliger to introduce the next agenda item. Ms. Bolliger explained this was a preliminary review for the historic bungalow at 3205 23rd Street North which suffered a tragic fire in March 2020. She said the owners wanted to discuss their options for reconstruction. Ms. Bolliger noted the HALRB approved an addition to the rear in November 2019 (the applicants had not begun this work yet).

Ms. Bolliger began by clarifying some vocabulary terms given that often some terms are used interchangeably but for preservation issues are nuanced and have different legal interpretations. She stated that *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* consider reconstruction to be identical replication of a structure. She described restoration as the repair of what is or was existing, and that a different approach such as approving a new design would be considered demolition with new construction. For those purposes, Ms. Bolliger outlined four possible staff recommendations:

1. Reconstruction and restoration of the pre-fire structure;
2. New construction in a bungalow vocabulary similar (but not identical) to the previous structure with traditional styling appropriate for a bungalow home;
3. New construction in a style that would be considered appropriate for [the] Maywood [Local Historic District] but not necessarily the same style as the fire-damaged home; or
4. New construction in a 21st century contemporary style to differentiate it from the historic homes in the neighborhood.

The Chairman thanked staff and asked if the owners were present. The Chairman and staff asked repeatedly if the owners were present, and polled the unknown phone numbers in the meeting, but none were the applicants. Ms. Gwin suggested that while they waited for the applicants if staff could highlight the three existing examples of new construction in the Maywood Historic District. Ms. Bolliger explained there were three such examples: 3320 23rd Road North, which was new construction on the front part of a large lot with the historic cottage remaining at the rear of the property; 3209 Old Dominion Drive, which

had been demolished and replaced with new construction in a style considered appropriate for Maywood after it was condemned due to tree damage; and 2322 North Fillmore Street, which had been approved most recently as the replacement for a smaller house on a site that did not allow expansion of the home in an appropriate manner. She noted that of these three examples, the one on Old Dominion Drive was the most relevant because it originally was a contributing historic house that was damaged and replaced in a traditional style. Ms. Bolliger displayed several photographs of the examples. She first showed the property at 2322 North Fillmore Street as an example of new construction built in a traditional style but much larger in scale than the neighboring historic homes and in a manner made to look obviously modern. She next displayed the property at 3209 Old Dominion Drive. The board members discussed the change in styling from the original home to the new construction and the many iterations reviewed by the DRC before approval. The Chairman asked if the subject property [of this preliminary review] had been condemned and Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that this was a question staff had hoped to ask the owners.

The Chairman suggested moving on with the staff and Chairman's reports while waiting for the applicants to arrive.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMAN AND STAFF

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres updated the commission on the status for the approval of the Mount Salvation Baptist Cemetery Local Historic District (LHD). She explained that on February 10, staff and Ms. Hamm brought the nomination to the Planning Commission where it was well received. She thanked Ms. Hamm for her help and announced the Planning Commission was sending the request forward to the County Board with its full support. Ms. Liccese-Torres said the nomination was on the County Board's consent agenda for approval on February 20. Ms. Hamm said it was her pleasure and she was grateful that the Planning Commission was so engaged in the information.

Ms. Liccese-Torres invited Ms. Farris to provide additional staff updates. Ms. Farris informed the commission she was working with the Planning staff on site requirements for the Courthouse Landmark Block site plan project. She said the site plan would be considered by the Planning Commission on March 8 and would then be heard by the County Board on March 20 or 23.

Ms. Farris asked Mr. Davis to speak on the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) Pershing Drive Special GLUP+ (General Land Use Plan) study meeting that occurred on January 27. He explained that they had strengthened the preservation language regarding the [motel's] blade sign and glass-lobby area, and regarding the massing of the [proposed] development.

Ms. Farris next mentioned the recent February 16 meeting on the Courthouse West Special GLUP+ study. She explained that the main topics were an overview of the project, a discussion of how the previous sector plans ignored the study area, and why the GLUP study was necessary, with a heavy focus on height and use. Mr. Aiken was the HALRB representative for the study and agreed with her assessment.

Ms. Farris informed Mr. Craig that the next meeting for the Clarendon Sector Plan Update was scheduled for March 3 and that there was a feedback form circulating for parties to complete. She promised to have some updates on the Plan Lee Highway study in the spring. Ms. Farris also explained that the Housing Conservation District (HCD) planning study recently had been renamed the Multi-Family Reinvestment Study and the [geographic] areas of the study had been expanded. The Chairman asked who the staff member in charge would be. Ms. Farris replied it was Nick Rogers of the Planning Division.

Finally, Ms. Farris noted there was a new site plan project at Penn Place on Army Navy Drive [Amazon HQ2] and while there had been no historic properties identified, she had flagged the potential for archaeological resources. She said she would keep the commission updated on further developments.

The Chairman asked whether the Collarts had been located. Ms. Bolliger stated she had emailed the applicants but had not heard anything. The Chairman chose to move on with the Chairman's report.

The Chairman updated the commission on the proposed LHD designation of 6407 Wilson Boulevard [Febrey-Lothrop Estate]. He explained that the designation request would be going to the County Board next week [February 23] as a Request to Advertise (RTA) item. If approved for advertising, the dates for hearings would be April 5 for the Planning Commission and April 17 for the County Board to give staff time to prepare formal reports. The Chairman thanked staff for the report that they had already put together for the RTA item. He reminded the commissioners that the buildings were still at risk because demolition was an option once the Land Disturbing Activity permit was approved, but the County could not move the process faster than what was legally feasible. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked for confirmation that the Chairman would attend the February 23 RTA hearing, and invited any interested commissioners to register to speak at the meeting via the website. Mr. Laporte thanked Ms. Liccese-Torres for answering his question that this item would be on the County Board's regular agenda and not the consent agenda.

The Chairman asked a final time whether the Collarts were present to discuss their project, when it was established that they were not, the preliminary review was deferred. Ms. Lawrence thanked Ms. Farris for all her work managing the various site plans and planning studies. The Chairman thanked the commission and adjourned the meeting at 5:41 PM.