



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
Neighborhood Services Division

Courthouse Plaza One 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

**Wednesday, October 15, 2014
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Charles Craig
Gerry Laporte
Erin May
Tova Solo
Patricia Weichmann-Morris
Andy Wenchel
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Charles Matta, Vice Chairman
Robert Dudka
Mark Turnbull
Nathan Uldricks
Kevin Vincent

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Program Coordinator
Rebeccah Ballo, Preservation Planner
John Liebertz, Preservation Planner

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:35 pm. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2014, HALRB MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the September meeting minutes. Ms. May moved to accept the September meeting minutes. Mr. Wenchel seconded and the motion passed, 4-0-3 (Ms. Weichmann-Morris had not arrived yet; Mr. Woodruff, Mr. Craig, and Ms. Solo abstained).

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman stated that she would readdress the public hearing procedures prior to any discussion items.

The Chairman announced one case on the Consent Agenda and one case on the Discussion Agenda. She asked for a motion on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Ms. Solo seconded and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0 (Ms. Weichmann-Morris had not yet arrived).

- CONSENT AGENDA (CoAs):**
- 1) 2729 23rd Road North
William P. O’Brien
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-25 (HP1400044)
An after-the-fact request to remove a wood retaining wall and install a stone-veneered concrete block retaining wall.

Before addressing the Discussion Agenda, the Chairman stated that there were several Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness requests and she asked for a staff summary. Mr. Liebertz briefly discussed the three projects. Mr. Woodruff had questions regarding ACoA 14-12.

- ADMINISTRATIVE COAs (ACoAs):**
- 1) 3205 23rd Street North
Alexia Collart
Maywood Historic District
ACoA 14-11 (HP1400048)
Request to remove a 34-inch diameter boxelder tree from the rear yard.
 - 2) 2821 23rd Street North
Clint Woodson
Maywood Historic District
ACoA 14-12 (HP1400047)
Request to remove a 35-inch diameter Northern Red Oak abutting the driveway.
 - 3) 2327 North Van Buren Street
Alan Meltzer
Eastman Fenwick Historic District
ACoA Case 14-13 (HP1400050)
Request to replace the existing garage door with a galvanized steel door.

- DISCUSSION AGENDA:**
- 1) 1612 North Quincy Street
Colin & Charu McDermott
Fraber House Historic District
HALRB Case 14-27 (HP1400046)
Request to move the historic garage from county-owned property to the owner’s property. The proposal includes the: 1) removal of an oak tree; 2) extension of the existing driveway; 3) removal of a portion of

the existing brick retaining wall; and 4)
extension of the existing brick retaining wall.

The Chairman welcomed Colin and Charu McDermott, the owners of 1612 North Quincy Street. She quickly summarized the relevant history of the site and its transfer from the County to the owners. Ms. McDermott provided a brief overview of the proposal (relocation of the historic garage from Oakgrove Park, widening and extending the retaining wall, and removing a tree).

Mr. Liebertz presented the staff report. He said staff supported the application for the relocation of the garage from County property to the home owners' property. However, staff does not support the owners' plan to replace the Black Oak tree proposed for removal. Per the County Forester's calculation, the Black Oak requires three replacement canopy trees due to its size, condition, and species. The application presents three different options, but none of them satisfy the forester's recommendations.

Ms. McDermott responded that she had been communicating with Ms. Rachel Jackson, one of the County Foresters (by means of Mr. Liebertz), who provided typical dimensions as far as recommended setbacks for trees. Ms. McDermott distributed a site plan detailing the amount of remaining space when considering the 20' setback from other existing trees, structures, sidewalks, paths, etc. Ms. McDermott suggested that this site plan illustrates the reasons why three canopy trees may be inappropriate. She added that the family desired to leave views of the dwelling from 17th Street North intact. The applicants added a fourth option that included replacing the removed oak tree with a single oak tree (Option 4).

Mr. Craig presented the DRC report. He noted that this issue stemmed from the County failing to incorporate the garage as part of the historic district boundary. Regarding the removed oak tree, the DRC favored saving the garage over preserving a tree that had been heavily trimmed on one side. The DRC believed the tree removal and replacement was an item that should be discussed by the full board.

Mr. Laporte asked staff where they suggest the other two trees should be placed on the property. Mr. Liebertz noted that the HP staff will support the recommendation of the County Forester, who stated that the property had ample space to support three new canopy trees. He confirmed with the applicants that the calculations shown on the site plan were from "trunk to trunk." Ms. McDermott stated that the dashed lines around each of the existing trees is a 20' radius from each existing tree.

Ms. Solo asked more details regarding the County Forester's opinion. Mr. Liebertz stated that the two County Foresters were unable to attend the HALRB meeting tonight. Ms. Solo asked staff if the County Forester expected all three trees to thrive in close proximity to one another. Mr. Liebertz stated that he does not have the expertise to answer that question accurately.

Mr. Woodruff noted that the area along 17th Street would support three trees, but understood the owners' reluctance to block views of the house. He added, however, that such placement of trees is rather typical and not always detrimental. Ms. McDermott responded that the area in front of the house could only likely support a single tree to meet the setback requirements shown in the site plan.

Mr. Liebertz said he discussed with the McDermotts the possibility of bifurcating from their application the relocation of the garage from the number of replacement trees. He suggested additional contact with and review of the information by the County Foresters as the applicants had only provided the site plan at the HALRB meeting. Therefore, the Foresters have not had the opportunity to evaluate or respond to the applicants' latest proposal. This would allow staff to present the most accurate information to the HALRB.

The Chairman asked staff if the two foresters [Vincent Verweij and Rachel Jackson] who examined the trees are in concurrence. Mr. Liebertz responded that the County Foresters were in agreement. He noted that Ms. Jackson stated that setbacks were a case-by-case basis, and therefore, it may not be exactly 20' from each structural element. He stated that the setbacks depend on a number of factors beyond his expertise. He again suggested the board reserve ruling on the number of trees to a future date in order to allow additional time for the Foresters to review the proposal.

Mr. Laporte stated that two locations for trees have been identified, but there appears to be no space for a third canopy tree within the guidelines the applicants were given.

The Chairman noted that Crepe Myrtles can become quite large. Mr. Laporte added that there are Crepe Myrtles that are canopy trees and you must specify the variety. Mr. Liebertz added that the County Foresters do not consider a Crepe Myrtle a canopy tree, and therefore, it will not satisfy their recommendation.

Mr. Woodruff stated that he agrees with separating the approvals, but failed to understand why the County Foresters believe they have the authority to direct the planting of three trees. Mr. Liebertz stated that the number of trees is determined by a tree replacement formula based on the species, condition, etc. Ms. Ballo added that as part of the CoA process and the Historic District Design Guidelines, the HALRB had purview regarding the replacement of trees. The HALRB's policy has been to defer to the opinion of the County Foresters based on this calculation.

Ms. Solo asked about planting trees on County property in order to meet the requirements of the canopy. Mr. Woodruff suggested that this is overstepping the authority of the home owners to plant his/her yard as desired (bushes, gardens, etc.). He added that three trees will shade out the entire area. Ms. Ballo replied that staff's recommendation is to defer to our colleagues, but as the HALRB, the Board can make different decisions/policies moving forward.

Mr. Craig asked staff if the Foresters commented on the other trees on the property. Mr. Liebertz stated that to his knowledge, they had not evaluated all of the trees on the property. He responded that the HALRB can assume that the trees will grow and eventually cover the lot. He agreed with Mr. Woodruff that two canopy trees can fit on the lot, but the shade may limit the ability to plant other types of bushes, shrubs, gardens, etc.

Mr. Liebertz requested additional time to share the presented site plan with the County Foresters and to fully evaluate all potential options with the home owners.

Mr. Laporte made a motion to approve the relocation of the garage, but to defer the replacement of the trees for a future date. Upon request of the Chairman, he clarified his motion to include the removal of the one Black Oak Tree as part of the current approval. Ms.

Ballo recommended the motion also include a condition that the applicants return to the HALRB prior to the approval of the garage inspection. The owners asked whether staff was referring to the final inspection after the relocation of the garage. Staff confirmed that it was not meant to be a hindrance but just a final deadline. Mr. Laporte included Ms. Ballo's comments into his motion. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded the motion and it passed unanimously, 8-0.

DISCUSSION ITEM #1: KEY BOULEVARD APARTMENTS SITE PLAN

The Chairman welcomed the applicants, John Welsh (AHC, Inc.) and George Dove (WDG Architecture). Ms. Ballo presented a brief staff overview, discussing the historic disposition of the Key Boulevard Apartments. She noted that the apartments are designated as Important in the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) and are within the top tier of this category. County policy is that any site plan or use application that involves an HRI Important building needs to come to the HALRB for comments before submission to the County Board. She stated that the apartments were constructed in 1942 and are a rare and excellent example of an Art Deco-styled garden apartment complex in Arlington County. The apartment is also listed in the 2003 National Register Multiple Property Documentation, *Garden Apartments, Apartment Houses and Apartment Complexes in Arlington County, Virginia: 1934-1954* and is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Woodruff asked staff to inform the HALRB about the status of the site plan process. Peter Schulz, the Arlington County Site Planner for the project, stated that the site plan will be heard by the Planning Commission and the County Board in November. He noted that the proposal already has been through three Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) meetings. Ms. Ballo noted that the application was first filed in 2011, but placed temporarily on hold. The original plans have not substantially changed.

Mr. Welsh introduced the project architect, George Dove. He then provided a brief history and overview of AHC, Inc., the types of properties they invest in, programs offered, etc. He then discussed the rationale for redeveloping Key Boulevard Apartments. He stated that the company continues to invest in the property, but the apartment buildings are in need of substantial repairs. This proposal allows them the opportunity to add affordable housing to Rosslyn, an area of Arlington County lacking such units. Ms. Ballo asked the applicant to elaborate on "redevelop." Mr. Welsh responded that AHC plans on demolishing the buildings.

Mr. Welsh provided graphics that showed the dearth of affordable housing in Rosslyn. He stated that AHC is not changing the GLUP [General Land Use Plan], but utilizing tax credits and transfer of development rights from Gates of Ballston. In addition, AHC will not use any County AHIF [Affordable Housing Investment Funds] since this project will be subsidized by market-rate condos. Half of the development will be devoted to market-rate condominiums and the other half will be affordable rental units. The proceeds from the condominiums will subsidize the affordable units.

The Chairman requested the applicant explain AHIF. These are Arlington County funding tools that subsidize loans to help create affordable housing. AHC has utilized this tool many times, but sees Key Boulevard Apartments as an opportunity to create affordable housing in a market condition.

Mr. Welsh showed the HALRB the original plans of the building, stated the public's reaction and three primary requests, and discussed how AHC altered their plans as shown in this proposal. Despite these changes, the neighborhood continues to oppose the project.

Ms. Ballo reminded the HALRB about the County's Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) policy. When the County Board authorizes TDR sending and receiving sites, there must be public benefits associated with the transfer. Historic preservation is one of many benefits, i.e. the preservation of Wakefield Manor and Courthouse Manor for the Wendy's Site Plan. County staff has issue with the use of TDRs for Key Boulevard since the sending site of Buckingham Village is already protected as a Local Historic District. Therefore, there is no public benefit at that sending site. Regarding the receiving site, since the start of the TDR policy, the HALRB has always held that it is poor policy to remove density from one historic property to demolish another historic property. This also fails to comply with the Historic Preservation Master Plan and is not within the spirit of the County's TDR policy.

The Chairman asked the applicants how long the units would remain affordable. Mr. Welsh responded that the units will remain affordable for sixty years. Mr. Schulz confirmed that sixty years is the standard.

Ms. Ballo asked the applicant if AHC completed a formal Building Conditions Assessment as requested by Ms. Liccese-Torres at the first SPRC meeting. Mr. Welsh stated that an ongoing assessment occurs, but noted that the heating system, portable water, and waste lines are original; the windows, roofs, and rock garden on the roof were replaced in the mid-1980s; and air conditioning is provided by window units. Mr. Welsh stated that AHC continues to invest in the property. At an SPRC meeting, they detailed the costs of installing newly renovated kitchens to show their continued interest in the property.

Mr. Welsh recognized the historic preservation interests of the board, but contended that there is so little affordable housing in Rosslyn. At this location, AHC believes that the more important community benefit is affordable housing.

Mr. Craig suggested that Key Boulevard Apartments is already affordable. Mr. Schulz stated that Key Boulevard Apartments is already part of an existing site plan [Atrium Site Plan] and the site plan conditions state that this property must be predominantly low-to-moderate income housing in perpetuity or the property shall vest to the County. Therefore, it is currently required to be affordable housing as long as the Atrium (located across the street) Site Plan stands.

Ms. Weichmann-Morris had questions about the number of units transferred from Gates of Ballston to this site. Mr. Schulz stated that AHC plans to transfer 104 dwelling units from Gates of Ballston to this site. Ms. Weichmann-Morris asked staff what is the maximum development that could occur on this site. Mr. Schulz stated that the County Board approved 48 units on this site, so in theory, they could have a new 48-unit building.

Mr. Dove provided details regarding the design of the proposed six-story building. He stated that reception of the architecture (in itself) at the SPRC garnered support. He noted that the U-shaped building would be divided with affordable housing on one side and market-rate condominium units on the other side, each with their own respective lobby and entrance.

Mr. Welsh concluded that the project would double the number of affordable units, will utilize TDRs, and not require a GLUP change. AHC sees this as an innovation of supporting affordable housing with market-rate condominiums. He added that AHC successfully completed such financing outside of Arlington County. Lastly, he stated that the proposed development will be a LEED Silver site.

The Chairman raised questions about the separation of affordable units and condominium units. She stated that the Affordable Housing Study Group has concerns about the segregation of the different groups. Mr. Laporte added that the affordable units are smaller.

Mr. Laporte asked for clarification regarding how the site became tied to the Atrium. Mr. Schulz explained that in 1981, a single developer owned this property and several parcels across Key Boulevard. The developer submitted a site plan that tied in this building with the Atrium Site. The Atrium was allowed to build more units than would have been allowed on their own parcel, by taking all available density from the Key Boulevard Apartments, and in return, the developer promised that Key Boulevard Apartments would be predominantly low-to-moderate affordable units. In addition, the area north of Key Boulevard was designated a conservation area. As long as the Atrium Building stands, Key Boulevard Apartments will be tied with it. Mr. Laporte asked staff to define “predominately low-to-moderate income housing.” Mr. Schulz stated that the County Attorney considers it to be approximately 52 percent (in number of units). Mr. Schulz added that the current proposal is approximately three times the number recommended in the GLUP. This would be in great excess of the surrounding neighborhood’s density. The County has received other redevelopment proposals over the years for the area north of Key Boulevard due to its proximity to Rosslyn, but the County Board has denied all site plans, rezoning, and GLUP changes that are higher than what is currently recommended.

Mr. Craig had questions about the proposed TDRs from Gates of Ballston. Mr. Welsh stated that there are 157 units of unused density at the Gates of Ballston and these units are eligible to be transferred. Mr. Schulz stated that only the County Board can determine the units as eligible to be transferred, but that in theory, there are 157 potential additional units for that site. Mr. Craig stated that Gates of Ballston was developed with the understanding that historic buildings would be maintained and you were allowed to complete some building. AHC proposes taking the theoretical density to transfer it to Key Boulevard to demolish another historic complex.

The Chairman asked about the benefit of transferring the unused density from a protected garden apartment in order to demolish another historically significant garden apartment. Mr. Welsh stated that the affordable housing is the benefit at Key Boulevard Apartments. Mr. Craig stated that AHC’s nearby office was completed without demolishing a historic building. Mr. Welsh recognized that the HALRB would not necessarily be in favor of the proposal and that this is a different method than utilized in the past, but that AHC’s mission is to develop affordable housing and they accomplish this by varied means. In AHC’s opinion, the placement of affordable housing in this section of Arlington County is the greater good.

The Chairman stated that if AHC was focused on affordable housing, then the entire building would be affordable units and AHC would take the AHIF funds. She objected to demolishing a historic building that is committed affordable because it needs upgrades. She noted that the upgrades are possible, and likely costly, but the historic complex retains significance. The

Chairman added that she would support this project elsewhere in the County, but not at this specific site, and commended AHC for their community programs.

The Chairman further noted that the proposed building will not contribute significantly to affordable housing in Rosslyn. She stated that 40 additional units were nothing in comparison to the overall need for affordable units in the County. Mr. Welsh responded that the additional affordable housing is meaningful for the forty potential families that will be able to live in the area. She stated that the units will have limited impact to the overall issue and recognized that there was a great need. Mr. Welsh stated that developers continually contribute to funds, but do not place affordable units in buildings.

The Chairman stated that there are insufficient reasons to overturn an existing site plan and demolish one of the county's recognized HRI-important garden apartments. She had concerns regarding the precedent of such a project.

Mr. Woodruff remarked there is an important greater good, but argued that this is a convenient solution and asked AHC to consider other sites that do not include the demolition of a historic building. Mr. Welsh stated that there are no other properties owned by AHC where this solution could be accomplished. All of AHC's properties are redeveloped and noted that the units at Key Boulevard are not committed affordable. He stated that this is the last of AHC's unregulated properties free of covenants. Mr. Woodruff asked why AHC cannot buy additional properties. Mr. Welsh responded that AHC actively purchases property, but that purchasing land has further implications (i.e., loans). This proposal will maximize affordable housing in this section of Arlington County.

The Chairman stated that the Affordable Housing Study Group recommends the retention of existing affordable units. New construction would necessitate the relocation of families from existing affordable units. Mr. Woodruff noted that there are few historic properties in Arlington, and that all of the agreements, site plans, and available information, point to the fact that the buildings should be protected. He does not understand why the County would make an exception for this.

Mr. Wenchel stated that one possibility would be to preserve one of the buildings and allow for demolition and new construction on the remainder of the site. He noted the package lacked sufficient site plans/drawings of the existing development. Mr. Wenchel, however, objected to the demolition of all historic resources and reiterated that some sort of compromise was created for the creation of The Atrium that preserved these structures (whether for affordable housing or historic preservation). He recommended that the HALRB strongly oppose the existing proposal.

Mr. Welsh stated that AHC studied preserving a single building, but from a site plan perspective, the existing buildings are located on the middle of the site. Therefore, AHC would not be able to construct sufficient new buildings to meet the goals.

The Chairman requested that each member of the HALRB comment on the proposal. She stated that historic preservation and affordable housing are complementary goals. Therefore, she stated that she could not support this project. She noted that: 1) the County Board recognized the HRI designation; 2) the County Board approved an existing site plan that regulates the building; 3) the property could be rehabilitated; 4) the proposed TDRs is a misuse

of the policy as it was not intended to allow for the preservation of one historic property for the demolition of another historic property; and 5) she commended the efforts of AHC.

Ms. Solo stated she could not support the proposed strategy and noted the Atrium’s existing site plan calls for affordable housing at this property.

Mr. Craig did not support redevelopment of the site. He commended AHC’s preservation of their other existing properties and suggested the organization seek other locations for this project. He agreed with the Chairman’s assessment. Ms. May did not support the project and agreed with the Chairman’s comments.

Mr. Laporte noted that he is conflicted. He is unclear if the County Board set aside this property for historic preservation or affordable housing in the 1980s. If historic preservation was not the determining reason, then this proposed redevelopment provides double the amount of existing units. He added that 41 additional units will still contribute to the overall need. He agreed that the existing buildings retain historic character and merit preservation.

Mr. Woodruff stated that the Key Boulevard Apartments are important buildings that should be protected. Mr. Wenchel echoed his earlier comments [lack of sufficient information in the package], but believed the complications with the Atrium Site Plan and the Conservation Area designation are too great to overcome. Therefore, he stated that the buildings should not be demolished.

Ms. Weichmann-Morris supported the Chairman’s comments. She supported the design of the proposed building, but opposed the segregation of affordable units from market-rate units.

Mr. Woodruff made a motion to reject the proposal. Mr. Wenchel seconded and the motion passed 5-0-2 [Mr. Laporte and Ms. Solo abstained].

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman’s Report: The Chairman discussed the Affordable Housing Forum held the previous weekend. She commented on the lack of community involvement. Ms. Solo also attended the event and commented that developers prefer to transfer rights or pay into future funding instead of building affordable units. The Chairman mentioned the success of Calvert Manor. Mr. Wenchel commented on issues with that project, the removal of the historically significant windows after receiving historic tax credits, and suggested that the property should be evaluated for delisting from the National Register of Historic Places. He noted the overall importance of conserving original material, particularly windows, and suggested the original steel windows could have been rehabilitated and upgraded with insulated glass.

- B) Staff Report: Staff distributed the HALRB’s Envision Courthouse letter recently sent to the County Board. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that CPHD Planning Staff requested a clarification regarding the sentence: “[t]he HALRB has significant concerns about the failure of the Study proposals to adequately address the preservation of historic resources in the Courthouse Square area.” Mr. Liebertz

reviewed highlights of the previous meeting, stating that no formal staff historic preservation recommendations were included in the previous presentation as it was still under review. He requested the HALRB write a brief letter of clarification in order to prevent any misinterpretation as the planning process continues forward. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that Planning Staff will return with formal recommendations for the HALRB to review in 2015.

- C) Survey: Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the request to advertise the proposed Broadview Historic District will be heard by the County Board on Saturday, October 18th. The designation and adoption of the guidelines will be heard by the Planning Commission on November 3, 2014, and by the County Board on November 15, 2014. The item will likely stay on the consent agenda.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the preservation staff talked with a County structural engineer regarding the stability of the Benjamin Elliott's Coal Trestle. The engineer noted that the structure appeared stable from previous visits, but will further evaluate its stability.

Mr. Liebertz added that research is ongoing for the local historic designation requests for Cambridge Courts and The Hermitage.

- D) Site Plan Review: Ms. Ballo stated that the Wendy's Site Plan already completed two SPRC meetings. The third meeting is scheduled for October 27th, 2014. Neither HP staff nor the HALRB representative can attend, but the preservation easements for Courthouse Manor and Wakefield Manor will not be discussed. County staff is working with the property owners on the language of the easements.

Ms. Ballo stated that Charles Matta is attending a meeting for Abingdon Elementary School tonight. The preservation staff is concerned due to its proximity to Fort Reynolds. APS agreed to perform a Phase 1A archaeological assessment. Although the archaeologist found no significant Civil War-era artifacts at the site, they were able to engage with many students. Mr. Matta also will comment on behalf of the HALRB on the proposed Abingdon Elementary renovation (the school is listed as a non-contributing building in the Fairlington National Register District). Any new addition or construction may still impact the surrounding district.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Key Boulevard Apartments Site Plan will be heard by the Planning Commission on November 3, 2014. She requested a member of the HALRB speak at the Planning Commission and County Board meeting. Mr. Woodruff stated he will attempt to attend.

Ms. Liccese-Torres briefly discussed the ongoing WRAPS study. She noted that preservation staff and Mr. Laporte attended the most recent working group meeting. Staff gave a brief presentation regarding the history of the existing buildings on the site, as well as historic preservation options. Mr. Laporte briefly mentioned the discussion of restoring the original facade of the Wilson

School. He noted that the School Board is opposed to preserving or recreating the original facade. Planning staff will be holding a community forum in November. She encouraged members of the HALRB to attend if possible.

- E) Staff and other Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the HALRB to attend the unveiling of the Green Valley Pharmacy historic marker on November 8, 2014, at noon.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Preservation Virginia Conference will be held October 26-28, 2014, in Norfolk, VA. At the conference, Ms. Ballo will be giving a presentation on mid-twentieth century architecture in Arlington. The following HALRB members are attending: Mr. Laporte, Ms. Weichmann-Morris, and Mr. Uldricks.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the HP Program is partnering with the Arlington Historical Society, the Center for Local History at Central Library, and Preservation Arlington on a seminar about how to conduct historic house research. Matthew Gilmore and Ms. Liccese-Torres will be presenting at Central Library on November 5, 2014. This will be followed by a brief hands-on research demonstration at the Center for Local History. There is a waiting list since the 25-participant capacity already has been reached.

The meeting adjourned at 9:54 pm.