

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

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken
Omari Davis
Robert Dudka
Sarah Garner, Vice Chairwoman
Jennie Gwin
Carmela Hamm
Gerry Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Liz Rogers
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Chairman

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Charles Craig

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Lorin Farris, 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.

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.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 27, 2021 AND FEBRUARY 17, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

The Chairman called for any changes to the January 27, 2021, draft meeting minutes. Mr. Dudka noted that in the final paragraph of the third line on page 13, instead of saying that [the house] fell into the shingle style, Mr. Dudka clarified that he remembered saying that it had elements of the shingle style similar to some projects by McKim, Mead, and White. The Chairman requested that staff make that change. Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the January minutes as edited and Mr. Aiken seconded the

motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 10-0 with Mr. Turnbull abstaining; Ms. Hamm was not audible for the vote and thereby not counted.

The Chairman next asked if there were any changes to the February 17, 2021, draft meeting minutes. There were no comments. Ms. Gwin moved to approve the February minutes and Mr. Omari seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 8-0 with three abstentions (Mr. Dudka, Mr. Turnbull, and Mr. Wenchel). Ms. Hamm was not audible for the vote and thus not counted.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

DISCUSSION AGENDA

- 1) Walker Chapel Trustees
4102 North Old Glebe Road, CoA 19-27A
Walker Chapel and Cemetery Historic District
Request for final approval for previously reviewed landscaping changes including replacement of failing retaining wall and addition of a columbarium.

- 2) Heidi Fitzharris for Traci and Sean McKeever
3312 21st Avenue North, CoA 21-03
Maywood Historic District
Request to change front door, replace heat pump, add roof over existing rear deck and change roof material on first floor roofs.

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

Discussion Agenda Item #1: Walker Chapel Trustees, 4102 North Old Glebe Road

The Chairman asked Ms. Farris to introduce the first item. Ms. Farris stated the Walker Chapel and Cemetery was designated a Local Historic District (LHD) on October 3, 1978, and the current chapel was constructed in 1962. She explained how the Walker Cemetery was still active, and the entire parcel consisted of approximately 2.13 acres. Ms. Farris reminded the Board that in December 2019, the Chapel and Cemetery Trustees submitted a CoA application seeking conditional approval of a conceptual project to provide their board with reassurance that they could begin fundraising; the HALRB granted conditional approval in January 2020 (CoA 19-27). Ms. Farris explained that the Trustees have returned for approval of their final design and she described the proposed project components: 1) removing the existing timber retaining wall; 2) building a new retaining wall that includes columbaria for additional burials; 3) installing a ramp for circulation with lighting along the walkways, benches for seating, and guardrails; and 4) reconfiguring the existing parking lot.

Ms. Farris further provided details about the applicants' request to replace 210 linear feet of failing timber retaining wall located on the northeastern portion of the property just west of the parking lot. She said the replacement retaining wall would be in the same location on the property, but of a new design and configuration. Concerning the columbaria, Ms. Farris explained that the new wall would be primarily stone veneer interspersed with columbaria to provide space for additional burials. She said the design

calls for a limestone sign on the retaining wall facing the parking lot and the Eickhof niche cabinet columbaria will be faced with stone veneer. Ms. Farris stated the new configuration of the retaining wall will require some grading. She explained the proposed design includes a new ramp with powder coated steel guardrails and new stairs, and the wall will incorporate lighting elements to illuminate the pathway plus custom benches in the memorial garden. She noted the existing parking lot will be reconfigured; it currently accommodates 55 cars and this number will be reduced to 50.

Concerning landscaping, Ms. Farris explained that a mature cherry tree in the project area will need to be removed as part of this work due to its failing health, not because of its proximity to the retaining wall. She said the County's Urban Forester evaluated the tree in 2020 and agreed it could be removed. She noted the design calls for planting both red maples and Norway spruces around the new retaining wall. Ms. Farris stated that the Design Review Committee (DRC) heard this case in 2019 and [early] 2020 as part of the conditional CoA review and approval; however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the DRC has not reconvened, and this case has not been reviewed since the final drawings were submitted.

Ms. Farris stated that the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff recommends approval of the applicants' request to redesign the existing retaining wall and approach to the Walker Chapel Memorial Garden. She said the applicants have provided the outstanding information requested at the time of the conditional approval in January 2020, including the: 1) titles and design of the limestone sign and panels; 2) design and configuration of the columbaria; 3) details for the lighting along the ramp and wall; and 4) design and details of the proposed BMPs in the parking lot. She further explained that the design is appropriate for the LHD. Ms. Farris noted the proposed work would not be visible from the portion of the cemetery with the oldest burials and it will have a positive impact on the viewshed from a large portion of the cemetery grounds and the chapel. Given the lack of documentation of this LHD (there are no design guidelines and only a brief site history), she stated the HPP staff recommendation was based on the assumption that this area of the property already was disturbed when the original church was demolished and the new church constructed. Ms. Farris also stated that this portion of the property has less historical significance than other parts of the site. Furthermore, she said the HPP staff recommended that the applicants ensure their contractors monitor for archaeological finds during construction activities and use any such findings to learn more about the evolution of the site.

The Chairman thanked Ms. Farris for the report and asked if there were any representatives from the Chapel present. Larry Danforth, the Project Manager, introduced himself and architect James Wright, the manager for the construction phase of the project. Mr. Wright explained how their primary challenge has been funding for the project, which has required them to approach this as a phased master plan project. He said their permit request is now more limited in scope than what was presented by staff; the main item that will not be included in this initial phase is the ramp, but there will be a curved stairway leading from the parking lot to the cemetery where there currently is no direct access. Mr. Wright said that instead of the ramp, they have increased the planting area and it is possible that the ramp may not be constructed in the future. He noted they are not touching the parking lot and that other than those changes he described, the rest of the scope of work is the same (the retaining wall and columbaria). Mr. Wright further described how they will begin the work in phases as funding becomes available. He said the Church now has a contractor, Utica Contracting, that is assisting with cost estimates for the project, and Ramco, who are permit expeditors, to help them navigate the permitting process. The Chairman asked if any other church representatives wanted to speak. Reverend Ellen Grant stated she was appreciative for their work and being able to move the project forward.

The Chairman then recognized one public speaker, John Lee. Mr. Lee is a neighbor, scout leader sponsored by the church, and a navy chaplain. He expressed support of the project because the retaining wall has been a concern for some time and he offered assistance from the scout troop for the church.

The Chairman turned the discussion over to the HALRB and asked if the DRC members wished to comment on the project since they did review the project previously. Mr. Dudka remembered seeing it at DRC and at the HALRB, and he expressed full support of the project and its design. Ms. Lawrence agreed with Mr. Dudka and hoped they will be able to raise funding for its other aspects such as the ramp. Mr. Davis asked if without the ramp, would there be any ADA accessibility issues to the area? Mr. Wright replied the cemetery would not be ADA accessible at this time, but they have come up with an alternative ramp design. He explained that instead of the parking lot, there is a location next to the cemetery gates that also was identified as another location for a future ramp; this new proposed location has the advantage of being under the land disturbance limit that would not trigger additional storm water management requirements or costs, and this proposed scope is identified in their landscape master plan.

Ms. Lawrence asked if the HALRB would be approving the ramp as shown in the submitted plans. The Chairman asked staff for clarification on what was being approved by the HALRB now that the applicants only were [going to proceed] with the scope focused on the retaining wall and columbaria. Ms. Liccese-Torres advised it would be best for the HALRB to call out in its motion what is not currently being proposed for the project. She suggested the church representatives comment on the project's timing because after the CoA is approved, they will have a full year to begin work on the project. She said the church could leave in the ramp portion of the project for this CoA if they think they may begin the project in the next year, and therefore would not need to come back for additional approval in the future. She said, however, if they felt it was no longer in their scope or budget at the moment, the HALRB could choose to remove the ramp from the approval, which would require the church to come back for approval for another CoA.

Mr. Wright stated that the proposed ramp had been removed from the submitted plans, and they would like to keep that option open for them covered under this CoA, but understood that might not be practical based on what they submitted to the HALRB. The Chairman had questions about the proposed signs, panels, lighting, and parking lot BMPs. Mr. Wright stated the parking lot BMPs were not included in this initial phase because they are under the land disturbance limit since the church is not constructing the ramp. Concerning the signs, panels, and lighting, Mr. Wright clarified that they will be part of this project, including all aspects of the retaining wall and any columbaria integrated within it.

The Chairman explained that based on this information, he would recraft [his draft] motion, and Ms. Liccese-Torres agreed with that approach. Hearing no further comments or questions, the Chairman expressed his support for the project and proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 19-27A to allow redesign of the existing retaining wall to the Walker Chapel Memorial Garden in accordance with the proposed signs, panels, columbaria, [and] lighting as submitted by the applicant subsequent to the HALRB's January 2020 conditional approval. The HALRB finds that the design meets the intent of Standards #2, 9, and 10 of the Secretary of Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Gwin 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 12-0.

Discussion Agenda Item #2: 3312 21st Avenue North

The Chairman invited Ms. Farris to provide the staff report. Ms. Farris noted that the dwelling at 3312 21st Avenue North was constructed in 1981 and is a non-contributing resource in the Maywood LHD and is not included in the Maywood National Register Nomination; however, the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not exempt non-contributing buildings from review. She stated the applicant is requesting

to make the following exterior alterations: 1) cover the existing rear deck with a standing seam metal roof and remove the existing fabric awning and trellis; 2) install a new standing seam metal roof over the front porch; 3) install a new exhaust vent for the range; 4) replace the heat pump; and 5) replace the front door with a new door. She explained that the new front door would include the transposition of the glass sidelight from the left to the right, and a stylistic change to a wooden door with a top lite and two shaker panels.

Ms. Farris stated the HPP staff recommended approval of the subject application because many similar enclosures of rear decks have been approved [by the HALRB in the Maywood LHD], most recently at 2201 North Lincoln Street (CoA 20-27) and 2300 North Kenmore Street (CoA 20-25). She noted that the deck is barely visible from the public right-of-way and since there is currently an awning, its profile will not change. She said standing seam metal is considered an appropriate roofing material in the Maywood LHD; thus, the material change for the front and rear is acceptable. Ms. Farris mentioned that front doors are usually considered character-defining architectural features; however, since this house was built in 1981 and the front door has been replaced since 2006, the existing door is non-historic material and does not contribute to the character of the LHD. Lastly, she noted that the proposed heat pump and exhaust vent could have been approved by an Administrative CoA according to Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

The Chairman thanked staff and asked if the owners were present. Ms. Heidi FitzHarris, the architect for the project, stated that the staff summarized the project accurately. The Chairman asked if the homeowners wanted to add anything and there was no response. The Chairman asked if the DRC had any comments. Mr. Dudka inquired if any Board members were bothered by the new porch structure on the deck and how the columns come down to the cantilevered beams. He thought that visually, this will look like the structure is just hanging up in the air. He explained how in a more traditional vocabulary, those columns would come down to the ground somehow, as opposed to simply ending on a deck. He believed it looked awkward, however he also recognized that the solution would be to add posts below the columns but there would already be post and cross beams holding up the cantilevered deck elements. He noted he did not have an issue with the rear porch itself. Ms. FitzHarris said it was an existing deck structure they were choosing to build on for cost reasons and they were reinforcing the beams. Ms. Gwin stated that in historic preservation, adding faux structures was not ideal and she would rather have the proposed scope as is. Mr. Dudka stated that from a visual standpoint either option of bringing supports from the ground or leaving the feature hanging in the air would look awkward and held no preference toward either one. Mr. Laporte had similar thoughts as Mr. Dudka, and stated the columns did not look authentic and that the design was trying to mimic a Colonial Revival style. He said the columns probably would have been on some type of masonry foundation. Mr. Laporte also recognized that this [proposal] was on the rear of the house, but he did not know of a solution other than to not use that column design or to change the design as an awning. He did not believe that the design of the proposed new structure on the deck was compatible. Ms. Lawrence agreed with Ms. Gwin but did not have any issues with it because the dwelling was non-contributing and the proposed work would be occurring at the rear. The Chairman, Ms. Lawrence, and Mr. Turnbull agreed with Ms. Gwin. Mr. Wenchel supported Mr. Dudka's concerns about the visuals with the columns but understood that the proposed work would be at the rear of the house and it is non-contributing to the LHD.

Hearing no further comments or questions, the Chairman noted his support for the project and proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-03 to allow the exterior alterations requested in the subject application: to cover the existing rear deck with a standing seam metal roof; remove the existing fabric awning and trellis; install a new standing seam metal roof over the front porch; install a new exhaust vent; replace the heat pump; and replace the front

door with a new door. The HALRB finds that these alterations are appropriate and consistent with previous design and material changes approved in Maywood and meet the aspects of Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to read the roll. The motion passed 11-0-1; Mr. Laporte abstained.

Discussion Agenda Item #3: Preliminary Review for 3205 23rd Street North

The Chairman introduced the third item, which was a preliminary review of the Collarts property, located at 3205 23rd Street North. The object of the discussion was to give the Collarts guidance concerning their historic property that was damaged by fire. The Chairman asked for the staff report. Ms. Farris explained that this was a contributing, pre-1923 Bungalow/Craftsman dwelling. She provided a brief architectural description. She described how the Collarts previously came to the HALRB in November 2019 (CoA 19-23) for approval to demolish the existing rear deck and construct a large new rear addition, deck, and driveway; However, the owners were not able to start work on their addition because the house suffered significant damage by a fire in March 2020.

Ms. Farris explained that the Collarts wanted to understand what rebuilding options would be supported by the HALRB, as their insurance company has given them one year to complete their construction before the funding on their replacement dwelling expires. She stated the Collarts were inquiring about replacing their dwelling with new construction, utilizing materials that were kinder to the environment and more efficient with modern features, and they wanted to use solar panels, super insulation, energy efficient lighting and appliances, and energy and budget friendly windows.

Mr. Collart provided six images of different architectural styles they wanted direction on: (1) Bungalow, which typically represents the architectural style found in the Maywood LHD; (2) 21st Century Craftsman; (3) another 21st Century Craftsman design; (4) Contemporary version, which Ms. Farris mentioned can usually be seen in the neighboring National Register historic districts; (5) Modern; and (6) Prairie Contemporary. Ms. Farris said the HALRB also could review the images and specification sheets of a prefabricated house that the Collarts provided for the February HALRB meeting [but which was not discussed].

Ms. Farris explained that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not provide guidance for this situation, therefore staff is referencing the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. She said that historically, staff uses the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, but since rehabilitation is not possible for the Collarts' property, other treatments that are described by the Secretary of Interior need to be considered. Ms. Farris noted the following treatments could be considered: reconstruction, or identical replication of what is missing with new construction; restoration, or repair of what is extant; or demolition with new construction, which would involve the removal of the remaining historic house and construction of a new house of a similar or different style. She then presented images of the property before and after the fire.

Ms. Farris explained staff had identified four possible treatments for consideration to assist with the HALRB's conversation. She described these as follows:

1. Reconstruction and restoration of the pre-fire condition of the existing home.
2. New construction in a bungalow vocabulary similar, but not identical, to the original historic home with traditional styling appropriate for a bungalow. Ms. Farris referenced the first image the Collarts provided that showed a typical bungalow.

3. New construction in a style that would be considered appropriate for the Maywood LHD but not necessarily the same style as the original historic home. Ms. Farris explained that the image of the 21st century craftsman could be appropriate for this option. She also showed images of three new construction examples in Maywood, all that were designed in traditional styles. These included: 3320 23rd Rd. N. (new construction in the front of a large lot with the historic property in the rear); 3209 Old Dominion Dr. (contributing home which was damaged and rebuilt in a traditional style); and 2322 N. Fillmore St. (non-contributing house with no opportunity to expand the property appropriately, then demolished and constructed in a Maywood style but with modern proportions.
4. New construction in a 21st century contemporary style to differentiate it from the historic homes in the neighborhood. Ms. Farris referenced images of houses in the Contemporary and Modern style provided by the applicants.

The Chairman thanked staff and asked if the owners were present. Mr. Collart explained how they had always thought they would construct another bungalow. He said they were surprised that the HALRB was not in support of the prefabricated design that was presented during the February 2021 HALRB meeting. Therefore, he explained that they needed guidance from the HALRB and so provided different options of what could be built, all of which are the same width as their existing house (about 30 feet). Mr. Collart also wanted clarification on what it means for them now that their house is no longer contributing to the Maywood LHD. He noted they are leaning more towards the bungalow example, which was option 1 or image 1, but he wanted to know if they were still required to use historic materials, such as wood windows and wood cladding for the new construction. Mr. Collart concluded by stating why they liked the other options, but ultimately stated they saw the bungalow example as being the best fit for Maywood.

The Chairman then asked the HALRB to provide feedback. Mr. Dudka was sympathetic to the Collarts' situation. He referenced the image showing the exterior damage caused by the fire, and that he did not think that the form of the house was really missing other than the three columns and the porch floor and steps. He believed that most of the house was still standing. Mr. Dudka referenced having a friend in Lyon Park that went through a similar situation and they were able to restore the house to its original condition; thus, he did not understand why the Collarts could not do the same. He perceived the fire damage as only needing to rebuild the front porch. Mr. Dudka recognized that the fire department can cause significant damage to the inside of a house, but he did not see this as being enough of a reason to rebuild the house entirely. He stated he saw the bungalow option as the only option. He also did not believe that the existing house was no longer contributing, and that from an architectural point of view that its significance was still extant. Although Mr. Dudka said he understood the Collarts' desires to make their house more modern and energy efficient, he pointed out that Maywood was a historic district and so he supported the house being restored to its original condition, while allowing them to expand it in a sensitive manner.

The Chairman recognized Mr. Dudka's concerns and asked Mr. Collart to explain why they did not consider restoring the house. Mr. Collart replied their builder would not construct a house on the existing foundation and that the fire damage was more extensive than presented in the photograph. He described that they were going on their builder's recommendation, and they would like to move forward with a total demolition and new construction. Mr. Wenchel thought the bungalow option was the most appropriate because it was similar to the original house. He recognized that the interior was probably completely damaged and that he would prefer to see new construction designed in a similar style to the original house. Mr. Wenchel suggested the Collarts could possibly replicate the façade of the house and build out the back, but the other options presented were not appropriate, especially the examples with garages on the front. He believed there was enough space to build a [detached] garage at the rear of the property. Mr.

Wenchel did not believe the house could be restored, and that it appears to have more damage than what is shown in the photograph.

Ms. Gwin agreed that the bungalow example was the best option. She acknowledged that they were requiring the Collarts to build in a historic style when it is important to differentiate new construction from historic properties. She felt that specific details, such as the materials, would create a distinction between new and historic materials, while allowing the owners to make their home energy efficient. Mr. Collart appreciated Ms. Gwin's comments and that they were considering adding a plaque to the exterior stating that the new construction was built recently. Ms. Gwin did not believe it needed to be that obvious, but sometimes the small visual differences and materials can make it obvious.

Mr. Dudka added that the need to demolish the house was new information to the HALRB. Similar to how the HALRB considers following the advice of the County's urban forester when managing trees in the historic district, Mr. Dudka explained that they depend on the advice of experts. He did not believe it was enough information to just have one contractor's explanation. Mr. Dudka used another example in Lyon Park where a house was demolished because it was extensively damaged by a fallen tree, and that it was the opinion of the County to condemn the property. Therefore, Mr. Dudka requested, from a procedural point of view, wanting assurance that in fact the house does need to be demolished and replaced. If demolition is necessary, then Mr. Dudka believed that path forward would be clear and it would not be necessary to rebuild the same house, but one designed in a compatible style for the LHD. Mr. Collart replied that they heard from three different builders saying they would not build a house on the current foundation. He offered to present this information to the HALRB in writing if that would be helpful.

The Chairman recognized that it depended on how much money the Collarts were willing to spend to restore the property, and they may still not be satisfied with the results. Mr. Turnbull agreed the best option was the bungalow example. He said he would have been open to other options if the property had not been contributing to the LHD. Mr. Turnbull was concerned about the contemporary and modern options because of their massing. Ms. Lawrence mentioned that the only time the HALRB has approved a demolition and reconstruction in Maywood was the [new] house on North Fillmore Street, and that example of new construction went through a lengthy [design review] process to ensure it conformed to the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. She expressed that the bungalow was the only appropriate option for the neighborhood and agreed with Ms. Gwin's comments to focus on the details to differentiate it as new construction. Ms. Lawrence also believed that a bungalow could meet the owners' needs, as they had previously gotten approval for the rear addition in 2019.

Mr. Laporte agreed the bungalow option was the safest and easiest approach. He recognized that the HALRB's role is to focus on the neighborhood staying historic, and not just one property within it. Mr. Laporte agreed with Mr. Turnbull that modern and contemporary houses can work well in historic neighborhoods, but that this can be challenging and time consuming. Ms. Garner, Mr. Aiken, and Mr. Davis likewise agreed the bungalow option was the most appropriate for the LHD.

Mr. Davis asked staff about the second option, the 21st century craftsman, and how it aligned with staff's recommendations for possible treatment options. Ms. Farris replied that the two 21st century craftsman options would fall under the third treatment where it could be new construction in a style that would be considered appropriate for the Maywood LHD but not necessarily the same style as the original historic home. Mr. Davis agreed with this analysis but expressed support of the bungalow as being the most appropriate. Ms. Hamm concurred with the bungalow option as being the better design. The Chairman then clarified that Board members were referring to the bungalow example when referencing option one, in which Mr. Davis confirmed that this was correct. Ms. Rogers also stated she supported the bungalow option.

Ms. Farris further clarified that since the Board is leaning towards the bungalow option, the treatment they were concurring with was new construction in a bungalow vocabulary similar to the original historic home with traditional styling appropriate for a bungalow. The Chairman weighed in by agreeing with the Board's expressed opinions about a bungalow being most appropriate for the setting. He did not believe a modern structure would be appropriate at this location. Regarding the question about doing a complete rebuild as opposed to rehabilitating the existing structure, the Chairman felt that was asking too much of the property owners. He recognized that the Collarts are following the advice of their builder and he personally would not want to rehabilitate the remainder of the house either.

Mr. Collart appreciated the constructive feedback from the HALRB. In moving forward with these plans, he asked if they were required to build the new construction in the exact spot of the original house, which was closer to their neighbors on one side. Ms. Liccese-Torres clarified that this was a question for Zoning. She said they would not be grandfathered into keeping the exact same footprint of their existing home, but any new construction would have to fit within the confines of the zoning regulations. She recommended having a consultation with their builder and Zoning staff to answer these types of questions. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that they should continue to work with the HPP staff and the HALRB on the design details such as the massing and materials.

Mr. Collart had further questions about timing and process for demolition and if they needed to have an approved plan before they could proceed with demolition. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained these processes can happen concurrently, which is what occurred with the new construction on North Fillmore Street; in that case, the demolition was contingent upon getting approval of the new design. Ms. Lawrence concurred that the condition of the demolition [on N. Fillmore St.] was based on the approval of the new structure, but that the Collarts' was a different case because of the fire and they would need a demolition permit. Ms. Lawrence questioned if the HALRB could approve a demolition permit that evening. Ms. Gwin was surprised that the Collarts' insurance would only give them one year to complete construction. Mr. Collart explained that it was less than one year because their insurance had already paid for them to live in a rental property over the past year, and that delays from the insurance company were to blame. Ms. Gwin recognized that less than one year was a tight timeline and the HALRB will do what they can to help them. Ms. Gwin supported granting the Collarts a demolition permit as soon as possible to assist with this tight timeline.

Ms. Liccese-Torres clarified that the HALRB was providing the Collarts with only a preliminary review this evening and that they had not yet filed a CoA application for either demolition or new construction. The purpose of tonight's discussion was to provide them specific guidance so they could produce the necessary paperwork for a CoA application. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that if the Collarts felt they had enough direction from the HALRB and they knew which option they wanted to pursue, they could file a CoA request for demolition by April 2021 and start preparing the documents and drawings for the new home they would want to build in its place. She stated the HALRB only can provide the Collarts direction at this time, but staff will continue to work with them on all the other pieces that come next. The Chairman thought this approach was reasonable, and that the HALRB will try and accommodate their schedule.

The Chairman asked if the HALRB could give any leeway in some zoning to meet the historic standard, such as setback requirements. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that was correct, but to do that, the HALRB would need to include that finding in their motion in the approval of the new design. The Chairman asked Mr. Collart if they had enough information to move forward, to which Mr. Collart responded yes and that they already had plans for the bungalow option. The Chairman clarified that they would need to use appropriate materials for their new construction, and they would not be able to build a vinyl house. Mr. Collart acknowledged that he understood this condition, and that they were interested in modern materials

that would be appropriate, such as steel windows. The Chairman did not want to comment on this material choice. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that they should review the *Maywood Design Guidelines* about new construction, which provides direction on appropriate materials, however wood windows are probably the only option. She invited the Collarts to reach out to staff with any other questions.

Discussion Item: Jennie Dean Park Historic Marker Review

The Chairman called the next discussion item, review of the Jennie Dean Park historic markers. Ms. Farris introduced Jeremy Smith from the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). Mr. Smith gave a brief overview of the park and requested feedback from the HALRB on the proposed historic markers. He explained the current renovation efforts to Jennie Dean Park and how DPR worked with the Green Valley neighborhood to honor the historic significance of the park to this community. Mr. Smith said DPR staff had numerous meetings with Green Valley and they set up a history committee. He noted that Robin Stompler from the Green Valley Civic Association also was in attendance this evening. He explained that the history committee came up with specific renovation requests for the park, including a historic walkway to tell the history of Green Valley through ground markers. Mr. Smith said that DPR also worked with a graphic artist to create pennants [in tribute to] the old baseball teams who played here and they plan to hang the pennants in the outfields of the ballfields. He stated that DPR also will be naming the ballfields after two community members who provided significant contributions to Jennie Dean Park over the years. Mr. Smith said that the two historic markers the HALRB will review this evening will be located near the entrances of the ballfields; they will be part of a three-sided triangular kiosk in which one side will be a community bulletin board and the other two sides will be for the historic markers.

Mr. Smith next provided an overview of the first panel, including images that were collected and curated by Green Valley, the graphic artist renderings of the baseball pennants, and photographs of the old baseball teams that played from Green Valley. He noted that two of the photographs likely will be removed after consultation with the community concerning baseball teams that played in Green Valley but were not from Green Valley. He explained that the text on the first panel focused on the importance of the Green Valley ballpark that was owned by the Peytons, which was then sold to Arlington County and turned into Jennie Dean Park (it was the sole recreational area for the African American community).

For the second panel, Mr. Smith explained the HALRB had two options to consider. The first option mimics a community bulletin board with old newspaper articles on Robert Winkler and Ernest Johnson, the namesakes of the ballfields. He said the second option has the same content but is organized in a similar style to the first panel. He concluded by stating these have been presented to the community as drafts.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked Mr. Smith to describe the size of the panels, and Mr. Smith replied they would be 42 inches wide by 48 inches tall. The Chairman asked if what was presented showed both option 1 and 2 for both panels. Ms. Liccese-Torres clarified that the HALRB is reviewing just one option for panel one, and panel two had two options. Ms. Gwin asked if this was a draft preliminary review and once DPR received feedback from the community they would return to the HALRB, or if this was the only time the HALRB would have the opportunity to comment. Mr. Smith replied that DPR was doing a concurrent review with the community and the HALRB, but most of the content and photographs were provided by the community.

Mr. Smith predicted there would be some minor copy editing and style changes. The Chairman asked for comments from the HALRB on the proposed style and content. Mr. Turnbull favored the [styling of the] first panel, and he preferred option 2 for the second panel, but would defer to what the community preferred. He felt that option 1 [bulletin board format] would be difficult to read and that it lacked information about Jennie Dean, which is present in option 2. Mr. Turnbull then provided some editing

requests concerning the first paragraph about Jennie Dean in option 2. Ms. Gwin agreed with Mr. Turnbull's concerns about option 1 and added that she did not think the bulletin board mock-up would age well. The Chairman then asked Mr. Smith if the community preferred option 1 or 2 [for the second panel]. Mr. Smith responded that they did not yet and referred to Ms. Stomblor if the Green Valley Civic Association had an early discussions about the panels.

Ms. Stomblor provided some context to the project, stating that it had been underway for several years. She explained how they convened a history committee to consider the naming of the ballfields, who the community wanted to honor, and how to honor the Green Valley community. She said that for much of the first year, planning involved the community sharing stories and photographs, conducting surveys, and voting on options at community festivals for the naming of the ballfields. Ms. Stomblor explained that the baseball team pennants were developed by a local graphic artist [and are an interpretation of] what they may have looked like. Mr. Smith provided more images of these pennants for the HALRB. Ms. Stomblor said that much of the history about Green Valley has been handed down through oral history, which is why some of the proposed text involves non-committal phrases. For example, she said it is unclear if Jennie Dean had a connection to Green Valley, therefore, the history committee thought it was important to express the history of Green Valley with flexible language. Ms. Stomblor mentioned that the history committee submitted the text, photographs, and pennants to DPR in May 2020, and the first she had seen the proposed historic markers was on Monday, March 15, 2021. Ms. Stomblor said she circulated the historic markers to the history committee for their consideration; therefore, she wanted to wait to provide her comments on the historic markers.

Mr. Laporte praised the project and observed that the content appears to have been written for the community and not for the general public. He suggested framing the content more as a historic marker since some readers may not know anything about Green Valley. He further suggested waiting for the community's feedback and then having the HALRB review the historic markers again or find a way for the HALRB to collaborate with the history committee. He stated his preference was for a historic marker approach rather than a way for the community to tell stories to itself. Mr. Laporte preferred option 2 for the second panel, but did point out that both panels say "Welcome to Jennie Dean Park", which he thought was conflicting because the panels would be placed on a three-sided kiosk and the reader would not be able to see all of the panels at the same time. He said the transition from each panel should be clear.

Ms. Hamm added that her family migrated from North Carolina to Bailey's Crossroads around 1925. Other than the elementary and middle schools that were located at Bailey's Crossroads, she said children had to go into Washington, D.C. for continuing education for high school. Ms. Hamm stated that when the Jennie Dean School was built in Manassas, Virginia, many children went there for high school. She described how her mother's younger sister went to the school in Manassas and that her father taught drafting. She said it was when her mother took her younger sister to a school dance that she met Ms. Hamm's father. Ms. Hamm mentioned that her 93-year old aunt grew up in Green Valley [and she could ask her] about any details that could contribute to the history of the ballfields and the relationship to Jennie Dean and Arlington County. Ms. Garner commended the community on the effort that has gone into developing the historic markers, especially the engaging photographs. Ms. Lawrence also praised the historic markers, stating she also preferred option 2 for the second panel, but deferred to the preference of the community. She submitted additional comments to the text to HPP staff to share with Mr. Smith.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked Mr. Smith to explain the timeline for the project. Mr. Smith stated that the park renovations are under construction now, but the historic markers would not need to go up right away. He said the contractor would need plans in the next 75 days or so; therefore, he will work with the community in the next few weeks, make the necessary changes based on feedback, and then return to the HALRB with a more final version next month. The Chairman confirmed with staff that the HALRB did

not need to make a formal motion this evening. Ms. Liccese-Torres concurred, but did ask for HALRB members to send any more edits, comments, or new content to staff by the end of this week so it could be shared with Mr. Smith. The Chairman thanked Mr. Smith and Ms. Stompler for attending the meeting.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMAN AND STAFF

Staff and Other Reports

The Chairman updated the commission on the proposed LHD designation of 6407 Wilson Boulevard [the Febrey-Lothrop Estate]. He explained that the County Board met on February 23 and approved the Request to Advertise (RTA) and agreed to hold public hearings on the designation in April. He said there were discussions about affordable housing, making the property into a park, potential for additional density, and the historic significance of the property. He commended the HPP staff on articulating the historic significance and value of the property, which he felt convinced the County Board that the property was historic. But he stated the Trustees were still adamant in their opposition to the designation of the property, and that they have been successful in receiving their County demolition permits. He reminded the Board that the County could not hold these [permits] up since it is an administrative review process, and although there might have been a way to halt them from going through, it would probably have resulted in litigation. Based on other conversations, he asserted the Trustees are determined to demolish the buildings and that they felt railroaded by the designation process. He stated the Trustees agreed to allow the HPP staff to access the property, but this has not been scheduled. The Chairman mentioned a silent community protest scheduled [for this upcoming Saturday]. However, the Chairman contended that demolition is eminent and that the County Board will probably not approve the LHD overlay, unless they find resources to focus on archaeological potential. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that she will inform the HALRB when staff gets access to the property and that staff must meet many internal deadlines to proceed with the Planning Commission public hearing on April 5 and the County Board meeting on April 17.

Ms. Liccese-Torres announced that the County Board approved the creation of the Mount Salvation Baptist Cemetery Local Historic District at its meeting on February 20. She highlighted the work occurring with the Historic Preservation Master Plan (HPMP) update, and that staff has created a social media campaign through the use of four, 2-minute video snippets from the November 2020 HPMP kick-off event. Ms. Liccese-Torres mentioned that all this information can be found on the County website, including a brief questionnaire linked to each of the four videos. She said this feedback will help shape the goals for the HPMP update. She encouraged the HALRB to access this webpage, the snippets, and subscribe to the HPP's e-newsletter.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that she just received approval to advertise for the job vacancy within the HPP. The position is for a Historic Preservation Specialist that focuses on the program's outreach and inspection efforts. She encouraged members to share the job listing.

The Chairman asked if there was any update to when Arlington County commissions would be allowed to meet in person. Ms. Liccese-Torres did not have any update on this subject. She said that she knew County officials were having discussions about county staff coming back in person, but not on how commission meetings will be held. For the foreseeable future, she said the virtual format will continue.

Ms. Farris provided an update on the latest sector plans and site plans. She stated the next meeting for the Pershing Drive GLUP study would be on April 28, and she asked that Mr. Davis attend the meeting. She mentioned that staff is pulling together the reports for the study, including staff recommendations. Concerning the Courthouse Landmark Block site plan project, Ms. Farris mentioned that Ms. Lawrence joined her during the Planning Commission meeting to express the HALRB's concerns about the project.

Ms. Farris stated that staff has provided extra documentation to ensure the preservation of the historic facades of the Investment Building and the First Federal Savings and Loan Bank building, as well as clear language for the historic preservation site plan conditions. Ms. Lawrence mentioned that she told the Planning Commission that this would set precedent and is not the way historic facades have been treated in Arlington County by moving the historic facades to a different location. Ms. Farris thanked Ms. Lawrence for her participation in the project.

Ms. Gwin reminded Ms. Farris about the recent Missing Middle working group meeting. Ms. Gwin mentioned that Arlington County is in Phase I of a three phase, 2-year project on how missing middle housing can be improved in Arlington. Ms. Gwin participated in the working group, which involved looking at different housing typologies. She said the meeting included single-family housing developers and builders and the goal is to rezone certain areas that are currently zoned for single-family. Ms. Gwin mentioned that many of the County's National Register Historic Districts contain single-family housing, therefore we should look closely at this study and its results over the next two years.

The Chairman thanked the commission and adjourned the meeting at 7:11 PM.