

**MINUTES OF THE
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021, 5-7 PM**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken
Charles Craig
Omari Davis
Robert Dudka
Jennie Gwin
Carmela Hamm
Gerry Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Liz Rogers
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Chairman

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Sarah Garner, Vice Chairwoman
Mark Turnbull

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.

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 MARCH 17, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

The Chairman called for any changes to the March 17, 2021, draft meeting minutes. Mr. Dudka stated the minutes indicated that in the discussion of the first agenda item based on Ms. Gwin's argument, he agreed with her recommendation. However, he clarified that during the meeting he had stated independently of Ms. Gwin that either profile choice for the rear deck was awkward and therefore either profile was

acceptable to him. Ms. Bolliger agreed to revise the draft minutes. Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the March minutes as edited by Mr. Dudka and Ms. Gwin seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 9-0-1 with Mr. Craig abstaining; Mr. Laporte was not yet present for the vote.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

DISCUSSION AGENDA

- 1) Stephen Francis
3504 21st Avenue North, CoA 20-20A
Maywood Historic District
Request to amend previously approved CoA 20-20 for accessory dwelling unit.
- 2) Bart and Alexia Collart
3205 23rd Street North, CoA 21-02
Maywood Historic District
Request to construct a new house after fire damage.
- 3) Tim Keough
2326 North Jackson Street, CoA 21-05
Maywood Historic District
Request to construct a new house after demolition.
- 4) Leo Sarli for Michael Castellano and Mina Simhai
2821 23rd Street North, CoA 21-06
Maywood Historic District
Request to construct an exterior walkway and semi-detached two-story covered rear deck.
- 5) Heidi FitzHarris for Robert Swennes
3501 21st Avenue North, CoA 21-07
Maywood Historic District
Request to change a stamped tin roof to a standing seam roof, add two dormers, and add a shed in the rear of the property.
- 6) Andrew McKenna
2206 North Nelson Street
Maywood Historic District
Preliminary Review: Request to discuss conceptual drawings for a second level to the existing property.

The Chairman urged the commission members to weigh in on the busy agenda and encouraged members to turn on their cameras if they had substantive comments.

Ms. Bolliger explained that given the likelihood of continuing virtual commission meetings and the increasingly complex projects under review by the board, that the decision had been made to reinstate the Design Review Committee (DRC) virtually and permission had been granted by County management. Ms. Bolliger announced the first virtual DRC meeting would be held in May [on the 5th] and that all applicants and commission members would be kept apprised.

Discussion Agenda Item #1: 3504 21st Avenue North

Ms. Bolliger presented the application for the dwelling at 3504 21st Avenue North in the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD). She explained that the applicant had submitted two initial design options for a rear accessory dwelling for HALRB review in November 2020 and received a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) approval in January 2021; he has since developed a different interior layout for the proposed accessory dwelling that will result in several minor window changes.

The applicant proposed the following modifications to his previously approved accessory dwelling:

1. Two front windows are now shown 4 inches taller in height and 7 1/2 inches narrower in width. Their centers are now shown 3' 11 5/16" closer to the corners.
2. The kitchen window originally shown in the rear is now shown in the front center, size 2' 2 1/8" x 3' 4 7/8".
3. The bathroom window originally shown on the gable end is now shown in the rear, 2' 0" 1/8 x 1' 8".
4. A family room window is now shown in the rear, size 3' 2 1/8" x 5' 0 7/8".

Ms. Bolliger explained that due to the public health crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the DRC had not been able to convene since the owners submitted their CoA application. Given that there were no changes to any other approved parameters (including footprint, exterior dimensions, roof height, roof pitch, materials, or lot placement), she followed that the Historic Preservation staff recommended approval of the subject application. She said the proposed changes to the windows would be minimal and would not affect the dwelling unit's overall massing or plan in any way that would make its design inappropriate for the LHD. Ms. Bolliger stated the proposed accessory dwelling, including its massing and materials, still complied with the *Maywood Design Guidelines* for new construction and Appendix G. She emphasized that as stated with the original CoA approval, the HALRB's approval would not supplant established new construction regulations, and any final design must comply with the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance or be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

The Chairman invited Mr. Francis to speak, who explained there was no change to the design beyond the window changes. The Chairman invited the board to comment. Mr. Dudka stated he believed the changes were fine and Mr. Craig agreed.

Hearing no further comments, the Chairman made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 20-20A to allow changes to the windows as described in the subject application. The proposed accessory dwelling, including its massing and materials, complies with the *Maywood Design Guidelines* for new construction and Appendix G.

Mr. Davis 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; Mr. Laporte had not yet arrived.

Discussion Agenda Item #2: 3205 23rd Street North

Ms. Bolliger explained that this was a formal application for a project the HALRB reviewed preliminarily in March 2021 for the contributing pre-1932 Bungalow/Craftsman dwelling at 3205 23rd Street North. She read the description from the *Maywood National Register Nomination* as follows:

The three-bay-wide, wood-frame dwelling rests on a solid parged foundation with a raised basement. It is clad in lapped wood siding on the first story and wood shingles on the dormers and has a side-gable roof sheathed in asphalt shingles. It has a one-story, three-bay, wood-frame front porch on Tuscan columns and one-over-one wood-sash windows. Window and door surrounds are unmitered with a projecting backband. Other notable features include a shed-roof dormer with a low balustrade, wide, overhanging eaves, and a vinyl cornice and soffit.

Ms. Bolliger provided the following background information: In November 2019, the HALRB approved CoA 19-23 to allow the owners to demolish the existing rear deck on the property and to construct a new rear addition, deck, and driveway. The proposed rear addition would have had a footprint of 399 square feet in area with a deck that would have been an additional 330 square feet in area (approximately). The addition proposed to include a basement level, a first floor, and a second floor. The applicants were not able to start work on their addition before their property was damaged in a fire in March 2020. The owners had submitted preliminary design concepts to the HALRB in March 2021 to discuss potential options for their property.

She continued, stating that in March 2021, the applicants of the subject property presented some options to the HALRB for preliminary consideration. To ensure clarity in discussion when reviewing the preliminary drawings, she said the Historic Preservation staff outlined the possible appropriate treatments as described by the Secretary of the Interior:

- 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.

Ms. Bolliger then identified four possible treatments for the HALRB's consideration:

- 1) Reconstruction and restoration of the pre-fire condition of the existing house;
- 2) New construction in a bungalow vocabulary similar (but not identical) to the original historic home with traditional styling appropriate for a 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 house; or
- 4) New construction in a 21st century contemporary style to differentiate it from the historic homes in the neighborhood.

Ms. Bolliger stated the applicants submitted several new construction options in an architectural style considered contributing to the Maywood LHD, but not the style historically associated with the property. They did not present an option to reconstruct and restore their existing home as numerous professionals had stated that it was not feasible given the health and safety risk of using the existing structure. Ms.

Bolliger said that staff has asked the applicants to provide a document from the fire marshal, insurance company, or structural engineer certifying that the extant structure was unsafe to use.

Ms. Bolliger explained that after much discussion at the March hearing, the HALRB members overwhelmingly favored treatment option 2 as detailed above, or ‘new construction in a bungalow vocabulary similar (but not identical) to the extant historic house’ as it was similar but not identical to the extant dwelling. The applicants indicated the bungalow option likewise was their preference.

After feedback from the commission at the March meeting, Ms. Bolliger summarized the following: the proposal would involve the demolition of the fire-damaged existing pre-1923 home and its replacement with a new two-story Craftsman-inspired dwelling with a basement built into the slope of the rear of the house. The front facade would include a half-length porch with brick and wood columns and a gable dormer on the second level. The windows would be a mixture of 3-over-1 and 2-over-1 wood Jeldwen windows. The basement level would be encased in brick, the upper levels would have smooth composite Hardie siding, and the roof would be clad in asphalt shingles.

Ms. Bolliger stated the Historic Preservation staff recommended approval of the demolition of the fire-damaged historic dwelling at 3205 23rd Street and the construction of the proposed new home since construction professionals had stated that the fire damage was too severe and extensive to allow the structure to be used as a foundation for proper rehabilitation. Therefore, she said staff could not recommend keeping the extant home.

Ms. Bolliger said the applicants have now returned with a proposal inspired by the massing and architectural style of their original bungalow dwelling that suits the historic streetscape, but with materials which would indicate that the building is new construction. She explained the historic dwelling footprint was 30.4’ wide x 32.4’ long (with an approved unbuilt rear addition 29’ long bringing the approved length to 61.4’ long) and a roof height of roughly 26’ from grade. She said the proposed footprint of the replacement dwelling would be 34’ x 64’ with a roof height of 31’. Therefore, she stated, the proposed dwelling was not substantially larger than the historic footprint and height, maintaining its harmony with the historic homes on the street. Additionally, she said the proposed house fulfills the massing and sizing requirements outlined in Chapter 6 ‘New Construction’ of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Bolliger further noted that the historic house was a Sears mail-order catalog home, and the design of the proposed dwelling is a plan set developed by an architect who lived in a catalog home neighborhood. She said the porch columns evoke the Craftsman style of the original house, which had a single front dormer; the dormer element would be repeated in the new house. While the windows on the historic dwelling were 1-over-1 at the time of the fire, Ms. Bolliger expressed that the proposed 2-over-1 and 3-over-1 wood windows are not inappropriate for a Craftsman home and Jeldwen wood windows are frequently used in Maywood additions (most recently in CoA 18-03 at 2314 North Kenmore Street). She stated that since the proposed screened porch would be at the rear of the house, it is not considered inappropriate for Maywood per the *Design Guidelines* and is similar to many that have been approved in the LHD in the past few years. Likewise, she noted that the wood handrail is considered appropriate for Maywood and the screening would be installed on the interior of the rail as has been required in many recent CoA applications.

Ms. Bolliger stated smooth cement fiberboard is appropriate siding for new construction and additions in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. She said similar faux shake shingles were approved most recently in CoA 18-03, having been outlined as appropriate for gable ends in the *Design Guidelines*. Also, she noted asphalt roof shingles are routinely approved in the LHD and listed in Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* as appropriate replacement materials for other architectural shingles. Ms. Bolliger concluded by stating the Historic Preservation staff recommended approval of the subject application.

The Chairman invited the applicants to speak. Mr. Collart thanked the commission for their time. He clarified that their plan was to have brick on the front foundation but brick stamp on the sides. He informed the commission that they had applied for variances to remain on the original footprint which was no longer within code setbacks as it was under 4' from the neighbor on the left-hand side. He also pointed out that because of the room flush with the porch, by zoning standards the massing of the house would be considered technically closer to the street than the previous house, requiring another variance. However, he explained that without the variance, the house would be set back 8' behind the original footprint, moving it behind the other historic properties on the street and changing the streetscape. He stated that he had a petition signed by his neighbors supporting the variance.

The Chairman next asked each commission member to speak. Mr. Dudka praised the design. He expressed that the commission should support the variances to maintain the historic location of the dwelling as it would be jarring if [the new house was] set behind the other dwellings and it would have remained in the historic location had it been reconstructed. He suggested that it might require a separate motion as it would require a letter to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). Mr. Dudka further pointed out that the room flush with the porch amounted to infill and that similar infill had been allowed by the BZA elsewhere in the County. He raised a concern regarding the demolition with the assumption that the motions would be raised separately. Mr. Dudka expressed concern that the letter from the contractor was not enough evidence that the [extant] house was structurally unsound but that the comment from the insurance adjuster indicated evidence from a structural engineer. He underlined the importance of retaining a high standard of evidence for such major projects as demolition. He followed that a letter from the insurance company would be acceptable; he preferred to have that letter in the records, and he did not feel comfortable approving the demolition without the letter given the establishment of precedent.

Ms. Gwin agreed that the design was suitable but was concerned about the stamped concrete on the [sides of the] foundation. She thought that material was inappropriate for the neighborhood and would be happy to approve the design if that were changed to brick or if it was parged.

Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the commission that Section 15.7.4 of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO) charged the HALRB with the authority to make recommendations to the Zoning Administrator to allow for consistent setback modifications to the streetscape.

Ms. Lawrence agreed with the comments about the appropriate design. She asked whether the black and white measured drawings were accurate as the roof appeared much steeper in these drawings than it did in the renderings. She said she found the sharp slope to be less suitable to the bungalow style. Mr. Collart replied that the renderings were made from the drawings and that he expected the dwelling to look like the renderings. Ms. Lawrence asked about the front porch railings as the material appeared to be vinyl based on the notations. Ms. Lawrence stated she liked the design, that she did not know it was possible to get set designs in this style, and would be happy to support the project.

Mr. Craig recommended parging the foundation rather than stamping the concrete. Ms. Gwin suggested that this was a good compromise and explained to the homeowners that the concern was regarding the attempt to resemble brick. Mr. Collart responded he would be happy to update the plans with that note.

Mr. Davis stated he believed the design was very appropriate and asked whether there would be a driveway. Mr. Collart indicated a ribbon driveway on the site plan which had been previously approved and would be accessed by a previously existing curb cut. Mr. Davis asked whether the rear picture window was set out from the rear façade and Mr. Collart explained that it had been developed to allow a better view of the rear yard.

The Chairman asked for further comments. Hearing none, he agreed that he believed the design was appropriate and supported Mr. Dudka's concern about the demolition recommendation record. However, he recognized that with unlimited [financial] resources it may still be possible to recover a fire damaged property, but that the indication of the insurance adjuster suggested that this was not recommended. The Chairman outlined the need for three separate motions: one on the demolition finding, one on the proposed design, and one regarding support for the setback variances.

The Chairman moved as follows:

1. I move that the HALRB, with respect to CoA 21-02, allow demolition of the fire-damaged historic dwelling.

Ms. Gwin seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Ms. Lawrence noted that with the delay required by the [zoning] variance approval, it may be possible to get further documentation from the insurance company. Mr. Dudka stated he would be willing to support the motion if that amendment was included. Mr. Laporte said that if the insurance company had agreed to pay for the new construction, they had implicitly made the decision that reconstruction of the [extant] house was unfeasible. He did not believe that additional evidence was necessary. The Chairman agreed and asked the other commissioners to weigh in. Upon hearing no further discussion, Ms. Liccese-Torres offered to read the motion again. Then the Chairman asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 10-1-0 (Mr. Dudka opposed; Mr. Laporte had arrived at 5:30 pm and thereby voted).

The Chairman made a second motion as follows:

2. With respect to CoA 21-02, I move that the HALRB approve the construction of the new single-family house as proposed in the subject application. The HALRB finds that elements of the proposed design evoke the bungalow of the original house. Further, the footprint and height of the proposed new dwelling are substantially similar to the historic house and its previously approved but unbuilt rear addition, and fulfill the massing and sizing requirements outlined in Chapter 6 'New Construction' of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Further, the proposed rear screened porch, cement fiberboard siding, faux shake shingles, and asphalt roof shingles are appropriate replacement materials per the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and established neighborhood precedent.

The Chairman asked Ms. Gwin to add her stipulation regarding the foundation which then Ms. Liccese-Torres added to the final motion which read thus:

2. With respect to CoA 21-02, I move that the HALRB approve the construction of the new single-family house as proposed in the subject application with the stipulation that the side and rear foundation walls be either parged or actual brick as opposed to the proposed stamped brick. The HALRB finds that elements of the proposed design evoke the bungalow of the original house. Further, the footprint and height of the proposed new dwelling are substantially similar to the historic house and its previously approved but unbuilt rear addition, and fulfill the massing and sizing requirements outlined in Chapter 6 'New Construction' of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Further, the proposed rear screened porch, cement fiberboard siding, faux shake shingles and asphalt roof shingles are appropriate replacement materials per the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and established neighborhood precedent.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0.

The Chairman outlined a third motion supporting the proposed front setback and asked for comments. Mr. Dudka asked if the side setbacks would be included as the current setback requirements would not allow the approved design without some sort of variance on one or both sides. He followed that the HALRB's approval of the design therefore implied some understanding that a variance would be needed to construct the dwelling. He said he would be comfortable with the commission supporting the side setback required to retain the house on the historic footprint. The Chairman asked staff if that was an appropriate inclusion. Ms. Liccese-Torres re-read the ACZO language stating the HALRB's ability to make recommendations "consistent with the existing streetscape and historic district guidelines" and not specifying front streetscape only. She then suggested that given the original footprint and the owners' desire to build on the original footprint, that if the motion were amended with Mr. Dudka's explanation then the decision to support the side setback could be appropriate if the board found it to be. The Chairman asked the board if they had any objections. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to read back the draft motion and with Mr. Dudka and Mr. Laporte's help amended it to read as follows:

3. Pursuant to Section 15.7.4 of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, the HALRB finds that the proposed front setback and the proposed side setbacks are consistent with the streetscape and *Maywood Design Guidelines* and the new home would occupy the footprint of the existing contributing home and therefore the HALRB recommends the setback variances be approved.

Mr. Dudka seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0.

The Chairman thanked the applicants for their time and wished them luck on their project.

Discussion Agenda Item #3: 2326 North Jackson Street

Ms. Bolliger introduced the third discussion agenda item. She explained that the single-family residence at 2326 North Jackson Street was a 1.5-story minimal traditional vernacular dwelling (called Colonial Craftsman in the *Maywood National Register Historic District Nomination Form*) built before 1923. The nomination form describes the contributing building as follows:

The two-bay-wide, wood-frame dwelling rests on a solid rock-face concrete-block foundation. It is clad in lapped wood siding and has a hipped roof sheathed in diamond-shaped asphalt shingles. It has a one-story, three-bay, wood-frame front porch on Tuscan columns and both one-over-one and six-light wood-sash windows. Window and door surrounds are unmolded with a projecting sill. Other notable features include a hip-roof front dormer with flared eaves, wide, overhanging flared eaves, and a wood soffit.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the history of the demolition approval as follows: After first submitting and then withdrawing a CoA application for a second story addition (CoA 05-34) to the [extant] historic dwelling, the owners applied for a CoA to demolish the extant house in 2006 (CoA 06-04). The HALRB denied that CoA on February 15, 2006. The owners appealed the denial to the Arlington County Board, which upheld the HALRB's decision on October 24, 2006. The owners next took steps to satisfy the requirements of both Section 31A.F.6 (current Section 15.7.11) of the ACZO and Code of Virginia Title 15.2-2306.A.3 to list the property for sale for a period of one year, and filed for a County building permit to demolish the house. Arlington County also hired a real estate appraiser in August 2007 to ensure that the property had been on the market at an appropriate price for one year. The County denied issuance of the demolition permit on the basis that the prerequisites spelled out in the ACZO for the demolition of historic properties had not been satisfied.

Ms. Bolliger continued with the background summary: Consequently, the owners appealed the denial of the demolition permit to the Arlington County Building Code Board of Appeals and provided additional information in support of their case. The Building Code Board of Appeals then requested that the County's Acting Zoning Administrator make a formal determination regarding whether Section 31A.F.6 had been fulfilled so as to entitle the owners to a demolition permit. On July 31, 2008, the County's Acting Zoning Administrator made a final determination that the owners had met the letter of the law and fulfilled the requirements as expressed in then Section 31A.F.6 (current Section 15.7.11) of the ACZO, thereby establishing permission to raze the contributing house. In December 2020, the Historic Preservation staff confirmed with the County Attorney and the current Zoning Administrator that this demolition approval from 2008 was indeed still valid.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the applicant proposed to build a new single-family dwelling with 2.5 stories above grade and one story below grade in an architectural style inspired by several houses found in the Maywood LHD. Ms. Bolliger then described the detailed proposal as follows: the proposed dwelling would be three bays wide with a central entrance, a garage at the first floor of the left bay, and an open porch in the right bay. The dwelling would have smooth fiber cement Hardie siding with a 7" overlap and PVC Azek trim, and the inset second story of the middle bay would have straight-edge Hardie shingle. The front façade columns would be brick piers and cellular PVC/boral column wrap and the porch floor would be synthetic Azek Timbertech TnG. Beneath the porch there would be a brown or black PVC privacy lattice. The roof would be Tamko composite shingle. The driveway pavers would be EP Henry pervious cobble bricks in a square and rectangular herringbone-type pattern. The Pella clad wood, simulated divided lite windows would be a six-over-one design with additional fixed four-lites in the façade. The front entry door would be a Thermatru painted fiberglass 4-lite door with 12"-wide sidelites. The rear would have two floor-to-ceiling six-lite windows and a set of matching French doors by Thermatru in fiberglass with simulated divided lites. The garage door would be a Clopay steel composite Grand Harbor fabrication. The small rear landing would be Azek Timbertech decking and the handrail a Monument vinyl rail with square balusters. The proposed gutters were Seamless field-extruded 6" ogee gutters with 3" x 4" downspouts.

Ms. Bolliger stated the Historic Preservation staff recommended the applicants consider an architectural design and massing that more closely reflected a modern interpretation of the vernacular architectural style represented by the original shotgun dwelling on the property, or as an alternative, a modern style which was not reflective of any of the Maywood homes. She said a design based on an amalgamation of the surrounding homes conflicts with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standard #3*: "Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken."

Ms. Bolliger continued, stating given that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not contend for the circumstance of a complete demolition of a historic dwelling and replacement with new construction, the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* are used as guidelines for decision making. She said a new house inspired by unrelated historic homes in a range of architectural styles would create a false sense of historical development, which is why staff recommended that either a modern interpretation of a vernacular shotgun house, or a new home with a modern design aesthetic, would be the most appropriate replacement for the historic dwelling.

In terms of materials, Ms. Bolliger noted that smooth fiber cement siding and straight-edge shingle have been deemed appropriate for new construction and additions in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. However, she said staff recommended solid wood windows with true divided lites even in new construction. She stated that while fiberglass doors are allowed on non-historic sheds, they are not considered appropriate for homes and should be solid wood. Ms. Bolliger stated that the proposed trim

could be appropriate based on Appendix D of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and the fact that Azek PVC trim has been approved in the past in the LHD (CoA 18-03, 2314 North Kenmore St.) and PVA trellis was approved for 2322 North Fillmore St. (CoA 15-01A). However, she stated front porch columns are decorative architectural elements rather than trim and should be constructed of an appropriate material such as wood or plaster; the proposed CPVC/boral column wrap would not be appropriate for such a prominent decorative element on the front façade. She noted that vinyl, the proposed material of the rear landing and staircase handrail, is considered an inappropriate material as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Ms. Bolliger stated that the use of permeable pavers is permitted in Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Further, she said the Materials Section of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* states that artificial materials may be considered for decks or porch flooring in new construction and non-historic additions and that composite shingles are considered appropriate on new construction

Ms. Bolliger announced there was one public speaker. The Chairman next invited the applicant to speak. Project architect Jay Hanseman stated that there were no guidelines within the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* on modern interpretations of historic styles and that the proposed design was compatible with the historic properties on the street without being one that anyone would mistake for a historic house. Mr. Hanseman said he believed the proposed design was more consistent with the neighborhood than the existing property and that its differentiation but inspiration from the surrounding buildings was consistent to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*.

The Chairman invited the public speaker, neighbor Martha Welman of 2324 North Jackson Street, to comment. Ms. Welman explained that she had lived in the home since 2008 and was concerned that the size of the replacement dwelling compared to the house being demolished would block all the north side windows of her home. She said she bought her home after the demolition permit [for the subject property] was approved and had understood that the neighbors might want a larger home for their family. However, she said she had witnessed years of neglect and now [was concerned about] this decision to sell to a builder and demolish the contributing home and construct a new build at the maximum lot limit. She said her family had bought in the historic district purposefully to avoid the kind of demolition and new construction happening in a widespread manner in Arlington. She concluded with a concern about setting precedent within the neighborhood and a concern about how the design would affect her home.

The Chairman opened the discussion to the board members and asked the applicant to confirm the [proposed] height [of the new house]. Mr. Hanseman explained that it was 32' to the midpoint of the roof from the average grade. Mr. Dudka asked staff to restate when the demolition was approved and whether it was still valid. Ms. Liccese-Torres confirmed that when the applicant had approached staff earlier in the year, staff had consulted with the County Attorney and the Zoning Administrator and they confirmed that the 2008 ruling was still valid. Mr. Dudka suggested that the County review that policy.

The Chairman suggested that this project could be deferred to the DRC now that it was reconvening as it would be a productive way to move the project forward. Ms. Lawrence proposed that commission members make any comments they had to inform the applicant of any constructive suggestions before the next DRC meeting. She then noted that the front facing garage had not been allowed in any previously approved Maywood projects and was inappropriate. Ms. Lawrence also stated she believed the [proposed] massing was too large compared to the previous dwelling and for the lot, then identified both design and material concerns which she believed were not appropriate for the LHD. She concluded that she would not be willing to support this project as submitted.

Ms. Liccese-Torres agreed that the project would benefit from review by the DRC but also urged the board members to give very specific constructive feedback this evening to help guide the applicants in their continued design process. Mr. Dudka agreed he would be happy to review it at DRC and that

constructive feedback was necessary. He followed that he agreed the massing was very large and he did not support the front facing garage. He recalled the [new construction] project at 2322 North Fillmore Street where the applicant could not accommodate a [detached] garage anywhere on the property and had gone to great lengths to bury the garage in the basement level and install screening to shield it from the [front view from the] street. However, he stated there was no precedent [in the LHD] for an at-grade garage. Mr. Craig agreed with Mr. Dudka and Ms. Lawrence that a front facing garage was not appropriate for the district.

Ms. Gwin likewise noted the garage was not appropriate. She clarified that the staff report had not stated that the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* indicated that a new [house] needs to be of a modern design, but that it needed to emulate more closely the character of the home that was being demolished (rather than borrowing from neighboring styles, which was not in keeping with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*). Ms. Gwin also pointed out that within this meeting, a modern construction of smaller massing with modern amenities had been approved, proving that spacious new construction was feasible with smaller massing. The Chairman thanked Ms. Gwin for bringing up such a recent example.

Mr. Laporte agreed with the given comments and explained that the commission's role was to preserve the historic character of this specific district and that this [proposed] home was not dissimilar to many new McMansions throughout Arlington. He said it was particularly important to make sure that the new home was appropriate to Maywood or the commission would not be fulfilling its duty.

Mr. Aiken agreed that the [proposed] house was out of place in the neighborhood. Ms. Rogers agreed that the proposed design was much larger than the original dwelling.

Mr. Hanseman asked to address some of the commissioners' comments, explaining that the house to the left was of a similar style and scale to that proposed for the lot, and that the proposed size was actually smaller than the maximum allotment. He further stated that the lot did not allow for a driveway along the side of the house. Ms. Lawrence noted that no other houses on North Jackson Street had garages and most did not have off-street parking, which was a characteristic of the street.

Mr. Wenchel objected to the scale of the proposal compared to the original house and recommended that the applicant return to DRC. The Chairman agreed with the comments regarding the garage and massing, noting that just because 32' of height was allowed it may not be recommended.

The Chairman invited Ms. Gwin to make a motion and she proposed the following:

The HALRB finds that the proposed design is not in keeping with the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and recommends reconsideration of the design with a focus on a non-forward facing garage and a massing that more closely reflects the existing home and refers the applicant to DRC for a more thorough discussion of the design issues.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 10-0 (Ms. Hamm was not available for the vote).

Discussion Agenda Item #4: 2821 23rd Street North

Ms. Bolliger introduced the project at 2821 23rd Street North, a non-contributing two-story Colonial Revival dwelling in the Maywood LHD. She described the detailed proposal as follows: the applicant was requesting to demolish the existing two-level rear deck and replace it with a two-story covered and screened octagonal porch with a hot tub in the bottom level. The proposed porch would be an octagonal

two-story structure where the upper level would be screened with a stained wood MiniTrack and MeshGuard screen systems. The proposed decking material would be Aeratis Legacy T&G. The lower level patio would be South Blue Flagstone with Weston stone retaining walls and steps. The partially sunk hot tub measures 90”x90”x36” and would be surrounded by removable floorboards in the Aeratis decking. The roof would have asphalt shingles on the octagonal structure and would be flat white EPDM on the porch connection to the house; both with 6” aluminum box gutters and round downspouts.

Ms. Bolliger explained the applicant also asked to construct a ‘boardwalk’ wrapping from the front of the dwelling to the rear with a trellis from the top of the boardwalk handrail in some instances to the ground. She provided the following details: the proposed handrail would be the Accoya trellis with a vertical spindle and a diagonal trellis element. It would run approximately 34’ along the southeast side of the house. The trellis would run from the handrail to grade for the first approximately 10’ of walkway, then run only the height of the handrail for 24’ before arriving at the deck, which would have the trellis run from the handrail height to grade. The boardwalk would end in an open deck connected to the new screened walkway and porch. The proposed decking would be Aeratis Legacy T&G.

Ms. Bolliger outlined that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* stated porches are typical of the neighborhood and while enclosure of front porches is not appropriate, enclosure of back porches is not considered inappropriate. She said many enclosed porches have been approved in the Maywood LHD to increase livable space without negatively affecting historic dwellings. She noted that if the proposed rear porch was to be removed, it would not affect the house, which is in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Rehabilitation* #10: “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

Ms. Bolliger explained that although non-contributing houses within the Maywood LHD are not exempt from design review, non-contributing status may allow for greater flexibility when considering certain kinds of exterior alterations which are not character-defining, not visible from the right-of-way, and not specifically enumerated in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. She said that although the design of the proposed porch was more modern than typically found in the LHD, the property is a non-contributing resource and the proposed project would not be visible from the dead-end right-of-way.

Ms. Bolliger concluded by stating the Historic Preservation staff recommended that the applicant consider a simpler design for the ‘boardwalk,’ with a handrail instead of a trellis and keeping the rail to the height of the walkway, not to the ground. She said Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* recommends that “Railings shall be of a simple design and constructed of metal or wood.” The proposed boardwalk design was very modern, and Ms. Bolliger noted that this walkway configuration had not been approved before within the LHD; if it presented more like a wraparound porch, the boardwalk element might feel more appropriate to the character of the LHD from the public right-of-way.

The Chairman invited the applicant to speak. Architect Leo Sarli introduced owners Michael Castellano and Mina Simhai and explained the development of the design. He said the boardwalk was designed at the behest of the landscaper given the steep grade of the property and the lack of access from the rear. He said the boardwalk was developed to prevent the site from eroding, and that given the non-contributing status of the house this more modern, natural wood lattice design was settled upon for this wooded, natural area.

The Chairman thanked the applicant and opened the discussion to the board. Mr. Dudka stated he struggled with the modernity of the design but understood the design decision to forego a wraparound porch given the wooded nature of the side yard and instead select a walkway directly to the more usable outdoor space at the rear. Mr. Dudka noted that the octagonal porch was not conventional, but it was an

interesting design, would be on the rear and not visible from the right-of-way, and would be on a non-contributing house.

Ms. Gwin agreed that she struggled with the modernity of the design and suggested that removing the diagonal element of the boardwalk handrail would reduce the distracting nature of the balustrade and make it more compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Davis agreed with the comment about the diagonal element of the handrail and recommended pursuing a more vertical handrail design. He stated no concern with the octagonal porch design.

Mr. Castellano thanked Mr. Sarli for his design and invited any questions regarding the property.

Ms. Lawrence echoed the comments regarding a more vertical handrail and shared some concern about the handrail going all the way to grade in the front of the house. She said the grade rail at the rear was not a concern because it mimicked traditional homes which might have trellises, but the front design was more incongruous with typical streetscapes. She asked whether it was being installed to hide anything. Mr. Sarli replied that it would just hide the structure holding the porch up and that a bracket structure had been considered but it looked fussy and this cleaner approach was chosen.

The Chairman asked for contributions to a draft motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that the motion could be split to approve the majority of the project and have the railing return to the next meeting in order to expedite the process for the applicants. Mr. Sarli voiced a concern that he would not be able to apply for other permits without a handrail, therefore two separate motions would not expedite the process. Mr. Dudka pointed out that the major concern had been regarding the diagonal element and the project could be deferred to the DRC (which had in the past approved projects on behalf of the HALRB after agreed-upon changes had been submitted for review). Ms. Liccese-Torres agreed that the HALRB could issue a conditional approval to be finally approved by the DRC. The Chairman proposed a motion as follows:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-06 to allow demolition of the rear existing porch at the non-contributing subject home, and construction of the new porch proposed in the subject application provided that the diagonal railing configuration is removed. The HALRB further moves that the applicant will work with the DRC to develop an appropriate substitute to the railing design and moves further that once agreement is reached by the DRC that the project be deemed approved. The HALRB finds that the deemed project complies with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standard of Rehabilitation* #10.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 10-0 (Ms. Hamm was not available for the vote).

Discussion Agenda Item #5: 3501 21st Avenue North

Ms. Bolliger introduced the project at 3501 21st Avenue North, a contributing dwelling in the Maywood LHD and constructed before 1923. The description is as follows:

The two-bay-wide, wood-frame dwelling rests on a solid brick stretcher foundation. It is clad in weatherboard and has a hipped roof sheathed in pressed metal shingles. It has a one-story, three-bay, wood-frame front porch on Tuscan columns and one-over-one paired wood-sash windows. Window and door surrounds have a molded lintel. Other notable features include a hip-roof dormer and wide, overhanging eaves.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the applicant was requesting multiple modifications, including: 1) construction of a new shed in the rear yard; 2) adding two dormers on each side of the front of the house to allow additional height in the attic; and 3) removal of the original stamped tin shingle roof on the historic house and replacement with a standing seam metal roof.

Ms. Bolliger described the project details as follows:

The proposed shed would be an 8'x12' one-story structure located 2'1" from the west fence line and 3' from the northern fence line. Its south (front) elevation would have a fir wood double door with tempered glass, smooth cementitious 5" exposure siding, and Azek trim boards. The roof would be clad in asphalt shingles with a shed overhang over the door. The east elevation would have a single 2-over-2 lite wood window, but the other elevations would have no openings.

The proposed hipped dormers on the east and west roof elevations of the historic house would be 10'4" wide with one set over the existing stair well to increase the interior ceiling height, and the other installed for symmetry from the right-of-way. Each dormer would have two fixed wood windows to match those on the existing dormer.

Lastly, the applicant proposed to remove approximately 630 s.f. of historic stamped tin shingle roofing material [from the roof of the historic house] and replace it with standing seam metal roofing to match the standing seam on the front porch.

Ms. Bolliger stated the Historic Preservation staff recommended approval of the design of the proposed new shed. She explained the 1936 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map indicated that the property once had an accessory building (the use is not clear, but its small size indicates a shed), although it was closer to the house than the proposed location. She said the design of the new shed, including its size, massing, and materials, could be approved by an Administrative CoA according to Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. She explained, however, the proposed setback was closer to the east fence than fire code recommends for a corner lot and therefore had to be considered by the HALRB as a CoA item. Ms. Bolliger stated the setback modification provision in Section 15.7.4 of the ACZO mainly was intended for character-defining streetscape elements of the Maywood LHD; thus, staff could not recommend approval of the proposed shed location through this setback modification provision since the new shed would be considered a non-contributing element in the rear yard rather than a character-defining feature of the property. She advised the applicants would need to seek approval from the appropriate County departments for the requested setback modification.

Ms. Bolliger also recommended approval of the proposed new dormers on the front portion of the main dwelling. She noted the addition of dormers in a similar roof location had been approved by the HALRB in the Maywood LHD in the past (CoA 03-23 at 3623 22nd Street North). Ms. Bolliger stated the *Maywood Design Guidelines* outlined that the use of dormers was a more traditional way to add space, and that only skylights were inappropriate on the front of historic dwellings. She noted the existing main roof already had a historic dormer, and the proposed construction of additional dormers would be a more appropriate way to convert the attic into usable living space than to construct an addition or raise the roof.

Regarding the proposed replacement of the original tin shingle roof, Ms. Bolliger explained that the HALRB's policy for more than a decade has been to support repair and/or replacement of metal roofs in-kind. She said the board's policy follows the *Maywood Design Guidelines* (Chapter 5: Exterior Renovation), as well as guidance provided by the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, specifically Standards #2, #5, and #6:

Standard 2 – The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Standard 5 – Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Standard 6 – Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials.

Specifically, Chapter 5: Exterior Renovation of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* states the following:

Introduction of new materials should normally be avoided.... The HALRB strongly supports replacing metal roofs with the same materials.

Ms. Bolliger acknowledged that the deterioration of the existing stamped tin shingle roof is evident, but recommended the HALRB continue its existing policy to allow for the replacement of this original architectural feature in-kind as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. She explained that as part of the National Park Service guidance for evaluating when replacement materials should be used, there is consideration given if the original material is no longer available or is made of hazardous materials (e.g., asbestos shingle siding, etc.). However, Ms. Bolliger noted there have been numerous tin shingle roof in-kind replacements in Maywood over the past decade; further, tin shingle roofs remain available from roofing companies and have been installed successfully in the Maywood LHD. She stated staff recommended that the HALRB deny the replacement of the existing stamped tin shingle roof with another material.

Ms. Bolliger stated the *Maywood Design Guidelines* list stamped metal roofs as character defining to the district, and there are only nine such remaining roofs in the LHD. She said the existing stamped metal roof on the subject property is original to the house and thereby considered a character-defining feature to this home and to the district. She noted the County's historic Real Estate Assessment card for the property lists metal as the original roof material, as does the 1936 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. She also said the Arlington County House Card for the property (with older building permit information) does not list any changes to the [main] roof, indicating that the roof material has not changed and is original.

Ms. Bolliger explained that several CoA applications to replace original stamped metal roofs in Maywood with alternate materials had been denied throughout the HALRB's tenure, including CoA 08-09 in 2008 (3201 23rd Street North), CoA 13-32 in 2013 (2301 North Fillmore St.), and most recently CoA 17-04 in 2017 at the subject property, a decision which was upheld by both the County Board and the Arlington County Circuit Court when the owners appealed the denial. She noted the existing tin roof shingles on the subject property appear to be the Horseshoe Stamp Victorian shingle, which is still available via several retailers and installers. Ms. Bolliger suggested that since an in-kind roof replacement may qualify for the 25% state rehabilitation tax credit, the owners may want to consider pursuing tax credits through the Virginia Department of Historic Resources to help offset the cost of replacing the original roof in-kind.

The Chairman invited the applicants to speak. Architect Ms. Heidi FitzHarris noted she had not been aware that the HALRB setback provision did not extend to sheds and confirmed that she would need to submit the shed to the BZA. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that the provision language specified the streetscape and suggested the HALRB needed to decide if a shed in this location would be considered the

streetscape. Ms. FitzHarris explained that she had had two detached garages [in the LHD] approved with this provision and had assumed that sheds fell under the same purview.

The Chairman asked for clarification on the extent of the setback modification required. Ms. FitzHarris explained that although the side setback was acceptable, the rear setback needed to be 10' and they were requesting a 7' waiver to place the shed 3' from the fence line. Mr. Dudka asked for confirmation that the ACZO language had extended beyond the streetscape and Ms. Liccese-Torres confirmed that the provision language included "streetscape and historic district design guidelines". The Chairman suggested that based on that language, the HALRB could make a similar finding for this project. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked for confirmation that the shed complied with the definition of streetscape and the Chairman questioned who would define 'streetscape.' Ms. Bolliger quoted the *Maywood Design Guidelines* (page G-26, fig.62), which stated "neither the HALRB nor staff have the authority to direct the Zoning Administrator to modify the setback requirements for sheds."

Mr. Dudka noted that before the provision allowing the HALRB to override the setback requirements, the HALRB would send letters of support to the BZA for projects whose setbacks needed modification. He stated that he would recommend a letter of support to the BZA given that historically sheds were placed close to fence lines and corners. The Chairman agreed but expressed confusion about why the *Maywood Design Guidelines* would override an ACZO provision. Ms. Liccese-Torres noted that the County Board had approved the updated design guidelines [in March 2020]. The Chairman agreed that the County Board decision validated the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and he offered that the HALRB write a letter of support to the BZA [on behalf of the applicant]. Ms. FitzHarris then asked for confirmation if a larger structure such as a one-car garage could be approved by the HALRB. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that if the garage met the requirements in Appendix G of the guidelines then it could be approved by staff, or if not, it could be reviewed by the board. Ms. FitzHarris then mentioned that the proposed dormers would allow for increased head space but not habitable space.

The Chairman invited members of the commission to comment. Mr. Dudka stated his support for the shed and its location, as well as the dormers, but noted that he believed the roof needed to be replaced in-kind with stamped metal shingles. The property owner Mr. Swennes explained he had recently moved to Maywood and understood the design review process but had expected a standard of reasonability. He shared that he had been quoted \$20,000 to install standing seam roofing on the historic portion of the house and \$40,000 to install stamped tin shingle roofing on the same surface. He believed the standing seam metal was a good compromise between stamped tin and asphalt roofing.

Ms. Lawrence agreed with Mr. Dudka that she could support the shed and the dormers but that the stamped tin roof was a character-defining feature of the district and other owners had been asked to, and successfully had, replace their roofs with stamped shingles ; thus, she could not support the request for standing seam.

The Chairman stated that this particular property had gone to litigation over this issue. He considered it important for every member of the board to speak on the issue. He followed that he had previously voted not to require the [previous] owners to replace the roof in-kind on the basis of the cost, but that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* include no provision for cost consideration.

Mr. Wenchel agreed the stamped tin shingle roof needed to be replaced in-kind and that a standing seam metal roof was not an appropriate replacement. He also noted that the side elevation of the shed showed that the overhang over the door was very deep and it looked unbalanced compared to the depth of the shed.

Mr. Laporte stated he had been privy to the previous conversations on the same roof and that he did not believe enough had changed to cause him to change his position; therefore, he did not support the change in roof material and believed it should be replaced in-kind. Mr. Davis asked for more information on the character-defining nature of the stamped tin. Mr. Craig mentioned a case study in Florida which identified the chain reaction of removing one stamped tin roof affecting all the roofs and removing this feature from a neighborhood entirely. He then reiterated that cost consideration was not this commission's mission, that advocating for historic preservation was, and he believed that cost discussions were beyond the commission's role. Mr. Craig stated his support for an in-kind replacement and his willingness to sign on to a letter regarding the shed location. Ms. Rogers asked if there was another option in between the two roof types which might provide another compromise and she also wondered if the owners had been made aware during their purchase of the expectation of design review. Mr. Swennes replied that he had heard the previous owners had applied for an asphalt shingle roof and thus believed that standing seam was a compromise closer to the original.

Ms. Gwin and Mr. Aiken stated their support for replacing the roof in-kind. The Chairman asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, he recalled a project on 22nd Street North which had been required to replace a roof in-kind and he voiced a concern that if the commission voted to allow a replacement with different material that it would not be fair to that owner.

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

I move that HALRB take the following actions with regard to CoA 21-07:
Approve construction of the proposed shed.

Further I move that the HALRB approve construction of the front dormers on the original house as provided in the application and which complies with neighborhood precedent.

Further that the HALRB reject the proposed replacement of the existing stamped tin shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Craig seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 10-1, with the Chairman opposed.

Regarding the letter to the BZA [for the shed location], the Chairman proposed a motion as follows:

I move that pursuant to Section 15.7.4 of the ACZO that the HALRB approve the setback of the shed at 3501 21st Avenue North as proposed in the current design.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0. The Chairman volunteered to write the letter of support to the BZA. He thanked the applicants for their time.

Discussion Agenda Item #6: Preliminary Review for 2206 North Nelson Street

As a preliminary review project, Ms. Bolliger explained that there was no staff report. She said the HALRB had seen this project in [November] 2020 as an initial preliminary review. At that time, the HALRB recommended that the applicant return with a design more closely reflecting the original style of the property, and which respected the materials and character-defining proportions of the mid-20th century extant dwelling rather than mimicking contributing houses in the Maywood LHD. Ms. Bolliger then invited the applicants to present their project.

Applicants Seth Downing, Andrew McKenna, and Charles Moore thanked the commission for their time and explained they had taken the previous feedback into consideration and were glad to present their updated project. Mr. Downing stated he was a 20-year Arlington resident who was dedicated to restoring buildings and objects with rich histories and was proud to be a part of the Maywood historic community. He followed that he had bought the home 18 months previously and wanted to build something for corporate leaders in his firm to live in with their families. Mr. Moore (the project architect) explained they were working with the existing 1960s house on a large but complex lot with a steep slope and utility easement at the rear. He said the home was beyond the mid-20th century style marker and they wanted to remove the one car garage, build a rear addition, and have additional height in the front. He stated that all the brick on the façade would be retained based on previous feedback. Further, he said they were more interested in moving the design toward the contributing Maywood styles than updating the 1960s style, and followed that he believed it was not possible to make a two-story rambler since the character of a rambler was one story.

The Chairman asked each commission member to contribute their opinions. Ms. Gwin commended the revision and thanked the applicants for considering the board's previous recommendations, including the retention of the bricks and the setback. She asked whether shutters on the two front windows might help the façade but otherwise praised the improvement. Mr. Aiken agreed that the revisions were positive and thanked them for their contribution.

Mr. Dudka agreed that the changes were an improvement but felt there were additional changes needed to the design. He explained the house was not a pure rambler but an amalgamation of a few styles - a low roof slope of a rambler but with the shutters and rear porch of a more traditional house. He explained that while the HALRB had disapproved of a garage on the front of the house in a new construction project discussed earlier in the evening, they did approve of retaining them when they were extant and a feature of the style and era of the house's construction. He said the commission had previously gone out of its way to request that applicants retain the appearance of a front-facing garage as part of the character of a home, and Mr. Dudka noted this was one of the major changes to the home's façade.

Ms. Rogers agreed to the previous comments which thanked the applicants for their changes. Mr. Davis thanked the applicants and noted that he would prefer the retention of more horizontality, possibly by reducing the slope of the roof. He explained how he envisioned the home reinvented more as a raised ranch with more horizontality. Ms. Lawrence echoed Mr. Davis's concern about the pitch of the roof and asked to see more horizontality, possibly with the retention of the garage which might add that back to the building. She agreed the project needed more design work before it could be approved.

Mr. Craig said he had not been present for the first preliminary review and could not attest to progress and did not feel qualified to comment. Mr. Laporte agreed with Mr. Dudka's comments and expressed concern about the various ceiling heights through the house. He followed with a preference to retain the garage as a feature. Ms. Hamm agreed with Mr. Davis and Ms. Lawrence with regards to the slope of the roof, preferring a lower profile. Mr. Wenchel agreed that it was a major improvement but that a lower pitch might help with the horizontality. He was glad that the brick was being retained but believed that the removal of the garage was reducing the opportunity to retain the horizontal feeling of the building. Mr. Wenchel thanked the applicants for the changes but thought there were additional changes needed to address the horizontality of the original style.

The Chairman concluded the remarks with his own, stating he believed the design was a failure of imagination of what could be done with the property. He said the essence of the Maywood LHD was not to make every house appear the same but to preserve the essential characteristics of each property in its own right. He was concerned that this design did not celebrate or elevate any of the features of the

[extant] dwelling and pointed to the many successful rehabilitations of modern and mid-century homes nationwide as models for inspiration.

Mr. McKenna thanked the commission for their notes and comments and agreed to revise their project and return.

Discussion Item: Jennie Dean Park Historic Marker Review

The Chairman called the next discussion item, the review of the Jennie Dean Park historic markers. This item had previously been reviewed in March and had now returned to the HALRB for a second review after receiving community feedback. Ms. Bolliger invited Mr. Jeremy Smith of the County's Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to summarize the project. Mr. Smith explained that many comments from the March meeting had been deferred since the Jennie Dean Park neighbors had not yet had the opportunity to review the markers before the meeting. He said there had been some revisions to the images, language, and captions. He invited Green Valley Civic Association representative Robin Stompler to speak. Ms. Stompler thanked the commission for their time and their edits. She also thanked Ted Urban for his work on researching and designing the pennants. Ms. Stompler invited questions from the commission. The Chairman thanked her for her work on the project and invited the board members to provide comments.

Mr. Laporte noted that he expected to see more revisions to the text as he had concerns about some of the assumptions in the text, the lack of topic sentences, and narrative structures. He asked what the next steps were for the markers. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied by asking for an overall timeline to ensure cooperation with the project deadline and suggested asking whether the [neighborhood's] history committee would be open to feedback on the text. Ms. Stompler explained there had been numerous iterations of the markers and that the information had been researched and the committee considered the content accurate.

Ms. Lawrence thanked the committee for their work and stated that if the community was happy with them, she was glad for the markers to move forward. Mr. Aiken praised the markers and thanked the committee for their work. Ms. Gwin suggested having a caption for the image of Jennie Dean and indicated an alignment issue on the second image. Ms. Hamm echoed the sentiments regarding all the work that went into the project. She asked whether the second and third sentences in the first paragraph of the second marker could be combined to remove the language regarding the assumed source of the park's name. Ms. Stompler suggested "She named it after Jennie Serepta Dean, who founded the Manassas Industrial School for Colored Youth. Established in 1893...."

Ms. Liccese-Torres noted that there were sources missing from some of the images and recommended that all images be sourced properly for copyright reasons. She also suggested that the lilac [background color] on the panel might benefit from being a stronger color. Mr. Laporte stated he had not submitted a full set of written comments because he was waiting to see the revised panels. He asked if minor technical comments could be shared with the community group for consideration. The Chairman agreed to include the suggestions in the draft motion language. Ms. Liccese-Torres recommended submitting the comments to staff to share with DPR by the end of the week to keep the project on schedule.

The Chairman proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB recommend approval of the historic markers proposed for Jennie Dean Park and allow staff and the community to make expeditious minor and technical changes as agreed upon.

Ms. Hamm seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0. The Chairman thanked Ms. Stomblor and Mr. Smith.

Discussion Item: Memorial Plaque for County Board Member Erik Gutshall

Ms. Diane Probus of DPR and Ms. Kathleen McSweeney of the Lyon Park Civic Association presented information and a site plan depicting the location of a proposed memorial plaque for late County Board member Erik Gutshall in Zitkala Sa Park. Ms. Probus explained the County naming policies and invited Ms. McSweeney to share the community's support for the installation.

The Chairman thanked the applicants, voiced his support, and invited the commission members to comment. Mr. Laporte explained that the naming convention used 'in memory of' for the deceased rather than 'in honor of' and recommended moving the [biographical] dates under Mr. Gutshall's name as the later location was confusing. He also indicated that the placement of the adjective 'loving' at the beginning of the descriptors then modified all of them, which did not seem appropriate for modifying his professional roles. Mr. Laporte also suggested clarifying 'Arlington County Board Member' and wondered whether there was a way to explain that Lyon Park was the local neighborhood.

Mr. Dudka stated that as a Lyon Park resident, he did not find the Lyon Park reference confusing. He praised the installation of the plaque, believing it a well-deserved honor. He questioned whether the location of the plaque might conflict with the location of the park fence and recommended moving it somewhere more visible. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested adding the installation date [of 2021 as a] byline. Ms. Lawrence stated her support for the plaque in memory and honor of Mr. Gutshall. Ms. Probus commented that she was not sure if there would be a fence along that edge of the park but that a boulder had been selected and placed for this plaque.

The Chairman asked for further comments and upon hearing none, made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB recommend approval of the Memorial Plaque for Erik Gutshall, and permit staff to make further minor technical changes as agreed upon.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0. The Chairman thanked the applicants for their time.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMAN AND STAFF

The Chairman announced that Mr. Craig would be moving to Williamsburg at the end of the month after serving more than 22 years on the HALRB and 16 years on the DRC. The Chairman read a list of Mr. Craig's achievements with the commission and thanked him for his dedication and service. Mr. Craig thanked the Chairman for his words and expressed his enjoyment of his time on the HALRB. On behalf of the Historic Preservation staff, Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked Mr. Craig for his insight, careful commentary, and humor and wished him the best. Ms. Lawrence, Ms. Hamm, and Mr. Dudka likewise acknowledged Mr. Craig's contributions.

The Chairman invited Ms. Liccese-Torres to update the commission on the [recent outcome of the designation request for the] Febrey-Lothrop Estate. She explained that on the previous Saturday, the County Board made two motions at its public hearing, agreeing with the County Manager's recommendation to deny the designation request due to the buildings being demolished on March 24, and directing the County Manager to have staff explore the possibility of a planning study of the site to look at

furthering objectives of the County's *Affordable Housing Master Plan* and the *Historic Preservation Master Plan*. She said staff would prepare a timeline and scope to present to the County Board by October 2021; at that time the County Board could decide whether such a planning study should be undertaken. Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked the Chairman for speaking at the County Board hearing and for his advocacy throughout the project. The Chairman thanked the Historic Preservation staff for their hard work on the project and lamented the County Board's decision and the loss of the house. Mr. Laporte asked if images from the interior of the house would be available. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that some were available in the County Board report and that she and Ms. Farris would be working on an online gallery of additional images on the County website.

The Chairman thanked the commission and adjourned the meeting at 9:00 PM.