

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

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert Dudka
Sarah Garner, Vice Chairwoman
Jennie Gwin
Carmela Hamm
Joan Lawrence
*Rebecca Meyer (non-voting)
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Chairman

MEMBERS EXCUSED: John Aiken
Omari Davis
Gerry Laporte
Robert Meden

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

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.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBER REBECCA MEYER

The Chairman welcomed new board member Rebecca Meyer, who introduced herself and relayed her professional background.

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 16, 2021, MEETING MINUTES

The Chairman asked for questions or comments on the draft June minutes. Mr. Turnbull moved to approve the draft minutes as submitted and Ms. Garner seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further questions; upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 6-0-2; Mr. Dudka and Mr. Wenchel abstained.

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)
CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1) Heidi FitzHarris for David and Maria Greene
2204 N. Kenmore St, CoA 21-26B
Maywood Historic District
Request to amend a previously approved application for a pool, rear patio and pergola.

- 2) Creation Sign LLC for Sal Salim with Tobacco King
243 North Glebe Rd, CoA 21-13
Buckingham Historic District
Request to install a new sign in the commercial district.

The Chairman called for any questions or comments on the Consent Agenda and there were none. The Chairman moved to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Turnbull seconded, and the motion passed unanimously 8-0.

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)
DISCUSSION AGENDA**

Discussion Agenda Item 1: 2326 N. Jackson St

Ms. Bolliger presented the staff report for the single-family residence at 2326 North Jackson Street. She explained that this project had been heard by the commission previously and was returning for review. Per Code of Virginia legislation §15.2-2306.A.3, the owner had received approval to demolish the contributing home in 2008. The applicant was coming forward with plans for new construction in place of the historic home after an initial review in April 2021.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the applicant proposed to build a new single-family two-story house with a front shed dormer in a modern vernacular style inspired by the contributing dwelling. The proposed house would be three bays wide with a central entrance and an open front porch across the first floor. The dwelling would have smooth fiber cement Hardie siding with a 7” overlap and PVC Azek trim, and the dormers and gable ends would have vertical board and batten Hardie plank. The front façade’s square painted wood columns would have square block footings and capitols, and the porch floor would be synthetic Azek Timbertech TnG. Beneath the porch there would be a painted PVC privacy lattice. The front entry door would be a Thermatru painted fiberglass 4-lite door with 12”-wide sidelites.

Throughout the home the applicant proposed Pella clad wood, simulated divided lite windows in a four-over-one design with additional fixed four-lites. The roof would be composed of Tamko

composite shingle. The driveway pavers would be EP Henry pervious cobble bricks in a square and rectangular herringbone-type pattern. The rear screened porch would be inset into the massing and have Azek TimberTech decking and the rear landing would have a painted wooden handrail with square balusters. The gutters would be Seamless field-extruded 6” ogee gutters with 3” x 4” downspouts.

The applicants proposed an 80-square foot side-gabled shed with the same vertical board and batten siding proposed for the dwelling with an asphalt shingle roof, no windows and a wooden door. Three stormwater planter boxes would be installed around the house per stormwater requirements: one at the right side of the front porch, one at the right side of the rear, and one on the left near the mechanical equipment.

Ms. Bolliger stated that in the Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting Mr. Dudka inquired whether stormwater planters would be required given the amount of ground disturbance on the property. He also expressed concern about the front shed dormer windows and asked if the trim between the windows could add a differentiation between each window casing. Mr. Davis suggested that the front porch columns be made slightly more substantial in width. Mr. Dudka asked if the front door sidelites could either be removed or changed since the height of the glass pane matched neither the top nor the bottom of the door. Lastly, Mr. Dudka suggested widening the front porch steps across the width of the central porch bay.

Ms. Bolliger explained that staff recommended approval of the subject application and thanked the applicants for heeding the feedback from the HALRB and staff. After the April 2021 meeting, the applicants pursued a modern design inspired by the historic contributing home and made all changes suggested in response to the July DRC comments.

She followed that the smooth fiber cement siding and asphalt shingles have been deemed appropriate for new construction and additions in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. While vertical boards are not considered appropriate for siding on dwellings, the proposed vertical boards would be used in the gable ends and dormers, and decorative shingle patterns are considered variable design features which contribute to the architectural interest in the Maywood LHD as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Since this project would be for a modern home inspired by a historic dwelling, staff agreed it would not be inappropriate to evoke a typical shingled gable end or dormer with a modern take on the design.

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. Staff found that the proposed trim could be appropriate according to Appendix D of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Azek PVC trim has been approved in the past in the LHD (CoA 18-03, 2314 N. Kenmore St.) and PVA trellis was approved for 2322 N. Fillmore St. (CoA 15-01A). The applicants changed the proposed rear handrail material from vinyl to wood, which is considered an appropriate material as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. The use of permeable pavers is permitted in Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Bolliger noted that staff recommended solid wood windows with true divided lites, even in new construction, and had done so in April 2021 as well. While fiberglass doors are allowed on

non-historic sheds, they are not considered appropriate for homes in Maywood and should be solid wood.

Ms. Bolliger concluded that the proposed shed would be appropriate for staff approval per Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and therefore she had no objections. It would be at the boundary of the acceptable footprint for a shed in an interior lot and would have vertical board and batten siding and asphalt roof shingles to match the proposed new dwelling.

Ms. Bolliger read a comment she had received from neighbor Joy Jacobsen: “I live across the street from this property. I'm very pleased to see these new plans which appear to be much more in keeping with the style of Maywood. My only concern is about the additional hardscape in the front yard--I'm assuming this if for an additional car to park. This is not in keeping with what has been required of other properties. I've lived at 2325 N. Jackson St. for over 30 years. In my opinion the only benefit to the house at 2326 being demoed would be to get rid of all the asphalt in front of the house that we've looked at for all these years.”

The Chairman asked if there were any public speakers. Ms. Bolliger explained that there were none but that the architect Jay Hanseman was present. Mr. Hanseman explained that he and his team had worked hard to respond to HALRB and DRC feedback. The Chairman thanked the applicant and asked each member of the commission to weigh in on their opinion.

Mr. Dudka explained that he considered this a huge improvement on the April 2021 design, and saw it as a larger, modern version of the original house. He reiterated the comments from the July 2021 DRC and noted that coordinated changes were reflected in the current drawings. Mr. Turnbull echoed the neighbor's comment about the driveway and believed it was too much grey hardscape and detracted from the home. He recommended a single-width drive. The architect responded that the current property had a double-wide curb cut and the team did not believe they were proposing a design change from the original home. Mr. Wenchel echoed the concerns about the driveway and that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* had not provided for two car parking in the past.

Ms. Lawrence agreed with the comments about the driveway and noted that many houses in Maywood were not equipped with a driveway at all and recommended increasing the plantings in front of the home. Ms. Lawrence also cited concern with the window and door materials, and asked staff if fiberglass doors had been approved in Maywood before. She stated that the design was much improved, and she was inclined to support it, with the change to a single width driveway and solid wooden doors and windows.

The Chairman asked for clarification on whether non wooden doors and windows were allowed. Ms. Bolliger said that historically windows and doors had been required to be made of solid wood, but that she would need to check on the drawings for the most recently completely new construction to confirm that they had been required in new construction. She noted that the wood windows and doors had been recommended in the staff report both in July and in April.

Mr. Hanseman explained that he did not know whether when painted, a door would be obviously fiberglass rather than wood, and commented that true divided lite windows allowed for greater

air infiltration and were less energy efficient than simulated divided lite windows. He then followed that the windows were technically wooden, although they were aluminum clad.

Mr. Dudka stated he was not aware of ever having allowed clad windows in the past, but that he believed that simulated divided lite windows had been approved. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that solid wood windows and doors were required by the Maywood Design Guidelines and confirmed that the most recent new construction (2322 N. Fillmore St.) had solid wooden windows and doors.

Ms. Gwin echoed the comments about the improved design but agreed that the hardscape should be limited to a single width driveway. She followed that if the guidelines required solid wooden windows then she agreed they should be used, but noted that clad windows had been approved for use in other jurisdictions.

Ms. Garner praised the design and agreed that the driveway should be one width. Mr. Hanseman explained that the asphalt driveway was being converted into a paver driveway, which had felt like an improvement to the architects.

Ms. Meyer asked if changing the color of the driveway would help with the aesthetic. Ms. Bolliger asked if the parking pad and driveway could be separated by grass to break up the volume of paved surface. Ms. Gwin noted that the current plans showed no cars, and that one of the concerns was that with cars parked in both spots that one car would obscure part of the house, which was not typical of the Maywood streetscape. The Chairman agreed that the style was not typical of Maywood and would be a departure from the cultural landscape in the neighborhood. He also stated that he believed that wooden windows should still be required but appreciated the efficiency concerns of true divided lite windows.

Ms. Lawrence stated that in regard to the windows and doors, she viewed a decision as possibly precedent setting and urged the commission to make special consideration before making any decision. Ms. Bolliger confirmed that after checking records, no fiberglass doors had ever been approved on homes in Maywood and that only wooden windows had been approved other than two vinyl windows allowed in humid bathrooms in non-historic additions.

The Chairman also praised the design and said that he was ready to move forward with an approval with the caveat that the project have solid wood windows and doors and a single-width driveway. Mr. Dudka interjected that simulated divided lites should be listed in the motion.

The Chairman made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-05 permitting construction of the new home at 2326 North Jackson Street as indicated in the subject application, provided that all windows are constructed of solid wood which can have simulated divided lights, all exterior doors are constructed of solid wood, and the driveway is constructed as a one-bay driveway not in front of the house.

The HALRB finds that the smooth fiber cement siding and asphalt shingles have been deemed appropriate for new construction and additions pursuant to the *Maywood Design Guidelines*; and further finds the vertical boards contemplated in the gable ends and dormers, and decorative shingle patterns are considered variable design features which contribute to the architectural interest in the Maywood HD as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*; and further finds that artificial materials for decks or porch flooring in new construction and non-historic additions and artificial trim are consistent with Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and Appendix D of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*; and further finds the proposed shed and location are appropriate pursuant to Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*; and notwithstanding, this project is subject to further review by other Arlington county government entities.

Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for final questions, hearing none he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to read the roll. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Preliminary Review Item 1: 2206 N. Nelson St

Ms. Bolliger explained that there was no staff report; however, she reminded the commissioners to consider the precedent setting nature of the decisions they make in regards to this renovation and addition to a non-contributing 1960s house in the Maywood Local Historic District.

The Chairman invited Mr. Moore to present his project. He explained that the team had taken on board the recommendations made at the previous HALRB and DRC meetings. He explained that the design accentuated the horizontality of the 1960s home while adding a second level in a nickel gap horizontal siding to preserve the brick on the first floor. Mr. Moore also explained that the idea of the one-car garage was being retained on the left side of the house but was being converted into an interior space with a setback opening to evoke the original garage. The team was proposing windows with a mullion pattern which would continue to accentuate the horizontal aesthetic. Mr. Moore also noted that the roof pitch had been lowered but that architectural elevation drawings would show the roof more steeply pitched than it would appear in real life. He explained that throughout Arlington you could see rambler roofs with a pitch anywhere from 5/12 to 8/12.

Mr. Dudka thanked the applicant for their improved design and agreed that the drawings communicated a different sensation than the construction would, given the loss of the brick materiality, nickel gap horizontality, and roof pitch. He also noted that the directionality of the horizontal windows would contribute to the aesthetic of the building. Mr. Dudka identified some outstanding recommendations - a further lowering of the roof, maybe from 8/12 to 7/12, and to widen the garage opening void to give the idea of the garage space which currently exists.

Mr. Moore appreciated the comments and explained that there hadn't been time to update drawings since the DRC meeting and that additional changes would be made in the final drawings.

The Chairman invited every commissioner to speak. Mr. Turnbull complimented the new design and the retention of the brick on the first floor. He asked if the window schema could be repeated on each floor as it looked uneven. Ms. Lawrence agreed with Mr. Dudka's comments and complimented the design, agreeing that any additional horizontality would be appreciated. Ms. Gwin complimented the positive development of the drawings and the integration of the bump-outs at the rear. She disagreed with Mr. Turnbull's comment about the façade windows and cautioned against stacking the same window above and below. Ms. Gwin suggested not introducing the siding between the upper openings, creating a sense of balance without mimicking the bottom level, closer to a ribbon window than four separate punched openings.

Ms. Garner appreciated that the design could be read as an interpretation of a modern design. Ms. Meyer agreed with the comments and that the exploration of the ribbon window concept could be beneficial. Mr. Wenchel complimented the new design and looked forward to seeing it at DRC. The Chairman associated himself with the commission's comments and thanked Mr. Moore for working to respect the mid-century building. He reiterated Mr. Dudka's request to reduce the roof pitch further and said he looked forward to seeing the project when it returned.

WASHINGTON-LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL MARKER REVIEW

The Chairman invited Ms. Hamm and former HALRB member John Peck to present the project. Mr. Peck explained that four years previously the HALRB had seen this project, but installation had been halted after the protests in Charlottesville. Enough changes had occurred since the marker was approved that the alumni group felt it was necessary to redevelop the marker and return for review. Mr. Peck explained that the major changes were the title, a discussion of the name change, and more references to the desegregation efforts at the school.

The Chairman asked staff if a vote would be taken on the project. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that she did not believe the commission were being asked to act on the project, only to review it for it to return for a final approval. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked Ms. Hamm and Mr. Peck to outline the timeline for the project. Ms. Hamm explained that money would need to be raised to purchase the marker and asked Mr. Peck to confirm that the marker would cost around \$1,700. Mr. Peck agreed that was the estimated cost of the marker, which had previously been raised by the alumni association. He also explained that the manufacturing was dependent on the approval of a new County logo, and that the installation was planned in tandem with the delayed celebrations for the centennial of the Arlington County name.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked Mr. Peck for the dimensions of the marker and he said he believed it was the standard National Park Service marker but was not sure. The Chairman asked what the commission could provide to the applicants. Mr. Peck explained that the majority of the marker had been approved in the past, but he was looking for approval for the title and narrative changes including the new language on desegregation.

Ms. Lawrence stated that she liked the marker and had approved it previously, that she did not think the changes were substantial, and that she would support a new approval. The Chairman seconded Ms. Lawrence's statement. Ms. Gwin asked whether there were other archival photos

which tied directly to the text as the narrative and the images were disjointed. Mr. Peck thanked Ms. Gwin for her suggestion and explained that the marker had been designed by alumni who were no longer active on the project and that the applicants were not seeking to greatly change the layout. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that the marker remain with the commission for additional review and that it return when more commissioners had been able to review the text. The applicants explained they would be willing to return the next month. Ms. Hamm explained that Mr. Peck had approached her about the state highway marker project and asked him to expand on the project. Mr. Peck explained that he believed that Stratford Junior School (now Dorothy Hamm Middle School) would be a good candidate for inclusion in the state highway marker program and Lee Highway would be a good location for the marker. Ms. Hamm explained that the cost for the state highway marker was \$1,945 and that she had met with a vice-principal at Dorothy Hamm Middle School who explained that they had an active PTA which might be able to help fundraise for the marker and for the school's inclusion in the U.S. Civil Rights Trail. She estimated a highway marker approval time frame of March 1, 2022 for review in the June 2022 state board of historic resources meeting. The Chairman asked what role the HALRB would play and Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that the state highway marker program was separate from the County marker program and that the HALRB would not be involved in approving any state highway marker. The Chairman thanked Ms. Hamm for her hard work celebrating these two historic school locations. Ms. Hamm explained that Mr. Laporte and Mr. Horowitz had brought it to her attention in 2018. Inclusion in the U.S. Civil Rights Trail requires a one-time \$3500 fee to cover associated costs in including a location in the timeline. Ms. Hamm explained that she was working with County Board Member Libby Garvey to secure the money for the project. She followed that the timeline for project submission was between January 1 and July 15, 2022. Ms. Hamm expressed surprise that the U.S. Civil Rights Trail had no landmarks mentioned for 1958-59, which provided a gap for Arlington's court case and the desegregation of Stratford Middle School. The Chairman thanked Ms. Hamm again for taking on this project.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMAN AND STAFF

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres welcomed new staffer Mical Tawney to the team. Ms. Tawney introduced herself and explained her role as inspector and outreach coordinator for the team.

Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that effective September 1, 2021, all County boards and commissions would be required to meet in person. She explained that Virginia legislation required an in-person quorum so a poll would need to be taken to identify the most feasible schedule for attendance. While the commission had historically met in person at 7.30pm, they had started meeting at 5pm virtually, and would need to settle on a time for new in-person meetings. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested any 30-minute increment between 5pm and 7.30pm, and shared staff preference for an earlier time, noting that moving the time to 6.30pm to coincide with DRC meetings might help applicants. She noted that there had not been confirmation on whether subcommittees would be required to meet in person, but that staff would keep the commission updated.

The Chairman invited each commission member to express their preference. He began with Vice-Chair Sarah Garner, who stated a preference for 7pm, no earlier than 6.30pm. Ms. Gwin agreed. Ms. Hamm agreed that 6.30pm was fine, she asked how many times commissioners could call into meetings. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that commissioners were allowed to call in twice per year, but that in-person quorum was still required.

Ms. Lawrence expressed general flexibility. Mr. Turnbull agreed 6.30pm or 7pm would work best. Ms. Meyer explained that any time worked for her. Mr. Wenchel stated that 6.30pm worked for him. The Chairman stated he would support consensus and that the remaining members of the commission should be contacted.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 6:38 PM.