



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, January 16, 2013
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charles Craig
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman
Mark Turnbull
Nathan Uldricks
Kevin Vincent
Andy Wenchel
Patricia Weichmann-Morris
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Darren Hannabass

STAFF: Michael Leventhal, Preservation Coordinator
Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Preservation Planner
Rebecca Ballo, Preservation Planner

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order and asked for a quorum call at 7:35 pm. Ms. Ballo called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 19, 2012, MEETING

The Chairman called for comments on the December 19, 2012, draft meeting minutes. Mr. Uldricks noted that he had been absent, though the Roll Call noted that he was present at the meeting. Mr. Vincent stated that he was present at the meeting, but the Roll Call noted that he was excused. Ms. Ballo stated she would amend the minutes to note Mr. Uldricks did not attend, but that Mr. Vincent did. Mr. Woodruff made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Uldricks seconded and the motion passed 6-0-2 with Mr. Turnbull and Mr. Craig abstaining.

planter boxes as per the drawings. Mr. Laporte asked specifically about the purpose of the planter. Ms. FitzHarris replied that the planter cleaned the water prior to discharge. There were no further questions. Mr. Turnbull moved to approve the CoA and Mr. Craig seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

There were no ACoA cases on the agenda.

Discussion Item: Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) Millennium Project Draft Environmental Assessment (EA)

Ms. Ballo presented this item. She noted that Mr. Brian Stout, the County's Federal liaison from the County Manager's Office, was also present to discuss the Navy Annex project, and also could answer questions on the Millennium Project.

Ms. Ballo gave a Powerpoint presentation describing the project boundaries, potential impacts to historical, cultural and environmental resources, and the timeline. She described each of the design alternatives in the EA. She stated that staff preferred Alternatives C or F, and not the chosen alternative E that is preferred by the Army Corps as part of the EA.

Mr. Matta asked if staff had seen a section of the proposed walking path. Ms. Ballo stated that she had not. Mr. Matta went on to explain that a path is certainly required for maintenance and access, but it may be narrower than what is being proposed. A section would help to answer this question.

The Chairman noted that there was one speaker for this item. She invited Mr. Bernie Berne to come forward.

Bernie Berne:

- **It will require Congressional Action to stop this project.**
- **There is no assurance that they will not continue into the oldest portions of the woods, say in 20-30 years when ANC hits capacity again.**
- **There will be a tremendous loss of trees with this project.**
- **The answer is that the County Board needs to talk with its Congressional delegation.**
- **During the public meeting in 2005, people said they could take part of the Pentagon parking lots for burials if necessary instead of this land.**
- **It is dishonorable to our veterans to be buried in a ravine and a cut-down woodland.**

Mr. Matta said that Mr. Berne asked a valid question: would you rather have your loved one buried next to a 150-year old tree or a road? He would choose to preserve the trees. Mr. Vincent also agreed with Mr. Berne. He is skeptical that other Federal projects that have had such enormous impacts to the historic and old growth forests have been able to only complete an EA. He asked the group about whether or not they should say it is inappropriate to do an EA, or whether a more detailed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be done.

Mr. Woodruff stated that there is a long-range plan for the cemetery that projects the number of burial spaces and how much longer the cemetery will be able to remain open. He asked if there was any assurance that once capacity is reached, that the cemetery would not then move to take the rest of the forest for burial space. Ms. Ballo replied there was not. Mr. Woodruff asked what the County's position was on this matter.

Mr. Stout stated that the County is asking the Army Corps of Engineers to give all the proposed alternatives a fair look and see if they still can get the numbers they need in terms of burial spaces with a more sensitive design. Mr. Woodruff followed up and asked if Congressman Moran had sent a response yet. Mr. Stout replied that the money already has been appropriated for this project. Many of the County's concerns have been echoed by the National Park Service. Given where this project is in the process, trying to undo the appropriation [as suggested by Mr. Berne] was not politically feasible or desirable.

Given the late hour, the Chairman asked if they could continue the discussion on the Millennium Project and asked for a brief update from Mr. Stout on the Navy Annex project.

Mr. Stout stated that the County Board has entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Army on a formal Land Exchange Agreement. The idea is that in return for vacating Southgate Road, the County would receive the south parking lot area for the proposed Heritage Museum and other uses. He passed out some maps and the MOA that was approved by the County Board. The HALRB thanked him for his time, and returned to the discussion of the Millennium Project.

Mr. Vincent stated that his understanding of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is that process issues tend to stop or slow down projects more than differences of opinion on the proposed alternatives. He thinks it is very important to look at the standards for EAs versus EISs and whether the choice of an EA was appropriate here. He said the HALRB should also strongly question the lack of comparative data and information for Alternative F. From the standpoint of historic preservation, the setting of Arlington House prior to and during the [Civil] War is what is most significant. The project should steer totally clear of the old growth areas, but there should also be significance given to the forests that have regenerated since the War. As we do not have the expertise to do so, he stated he was ok with not commenting on the archaeology at this point. He added that he agreed with Mr. Berne's point that the undertaking to destroy an old forest was disrespectful to our veterans. He does not see an accessibility issue with the paths that could not be minimized through better design.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the HALRB would be writing a letter for the record to the Army Corps on the proposed alternatives versus no alternatives. The consensus was that the HALRB would write a letter to the Army Corps and copy the Arlington County Board.

The Chairman stated that the best grounds to challenge the Preferred Alternative would be on process issues. Mr. Matta asked Mr. Stout if the appropriation of funds was tied to any particular alternative. Mr. Stout replied that it was not. Mr. Woodruff asked if

this project would be heard in front of the Military Construction Subcommittee and Mr. Stout replied that it would.

Mr. Laporte noted that the proposed stream restoration is not really a restoration at all. The adverse impacts to the stream valley and the historic landscape should also be noted.

Mr. Woodruff made a motion for the HALRB to write a letter to the Army Corps. He stated that the letter should do the following: 1) question the appropriateness of an EA vs. an EIS for an area with old growth forests and historic cultural landscapes; 2) point out that Alternative F was not adequately explored due to missing information; 3) include Mr. Matta's earlier comment about minimizing design while still achieving adequate circulation; and 4) stress the importance of the resources in this area. As a positive comment, the letter should note that if an Alternative is chosen, it should be C or F. The HALRB should note its opposition to all impacts to the old growth forest, and would support further design work to minimize impacts to the post-Civil War forests. It is dishonorable to veterans to destroy an old growth forest to bury our war dead. Mr. Laporte seconded and the motion passed unanimously. The Chairman would draft a letter for the group to review. Comments are due by January 20th to the Army Corps.

Discussion Item: Columbia Pike Form Based Code

Jennifer Smith, CPHD Planning Division, and Bill Spack, with cox graae + spack architects and a consultant to the Form Based Code project team, spoke about the latest efforts to implement the new Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Form Based Code in accordance with the Neighborhoods Plan adopted by the County Board last summer. Ms. Smith stated that this effort has been underway since December. Mr. Dudka and Ms. Lawrence (as the backup) are the HALRB representatives to the Advisory Working Group committee. Over the next six months, this Working Group will be drafting and editing the new Code language for the residential areas along the Pike.

The purpose of tonight's presentation was to introduce the architectural standards to the HALRB and discuss how they could be implemented. No Code language had been written yet, but the consultants, and in particular Mr. Spack, currently are working on that with staff. They would like some initial HALRB feedback on the broad outline and ideas at this point. The first draft of the Code should be ready in February.

Mr. Spack gave his Powerpoint presentation, discussing the sources he drew from to create a framework for architectural standards and a code language for Arlington County. He discussed the difference between form and style, and how areas that are not designated as historic can still create codes to encourage and even mandate compatible development. Some of the presentation had information about areas outside of and adjacent to the Conservation Areas identified in the Neighborhoods Plan and that would get different levels of review and design flexibility. This is where the HALRB is seen as having a role in that design review, similar to the other Form Based Code Areas on the Pike and as a result of the Sector Plan in Clarendon.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Spack and Ms. Smith for their presentation. She stated that the areas adjacent to the Barcroft Apartments where historic buildings and the historic landscape are proposed to be demolished are different and deserve more design work for proposed new construction.

Mr. Leventhal asked if the guidelines could also be used for properties ranked as Important on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) that were not included as Conservation Areas in the Neighborhoods Plan. Mr. Spack replied that could certainly be a possibility as the guidelines could be made flexible enough to apply to those areas.

Mr. Vincent thanked Mr. Spack for the presentation. He stated, however, that he is profoundly disillusioned with the overall view of the Plan. That view is that the County supports tearing down everything on the Pike outside of four little islands. But it is entirely up to the owners as to whether they want to demolish and redevelop. Owners could instead choose to renovate their buildings and these renovation standards could be applied outside of the Conservation Areas, thereby doing some good to mitigate all this proposed demolition. Those standards could just be voluntary and compliance merely encouraged.

Mr. Turnbull stated that the maps do not show consistently which buildings are historic. All the maps should be consistent.

Mr. Spack stated that they will be working on actual standards in the next few weeks and would ask for feedback on the “reach” of different types of standards.

Ms. Smith stated that they would return to the HALRB in the Spring with a revised draft of the Code language. The Working Group will next meet on February 12th.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman’s Report: The Chairman and Mr. Woodruff acknowledged Mr. Leventhal and his pending retirement. They thanked him for all his years of dedicated service to Arlington County, and presented him with a card and gifts. The Chairman presented a Resolution from the HALRB honoring him. Mr. Woodruff moved to adopt the resolution, Mr. Laporte seconded the motion, and it was unanimously accepted.

- B) Survey Report: Ms. Liccese-Torres gave the Survey Report. She updated the status of the Green Valley Pharmacy local designation. It was heard by the Planning Commission on January 14th, and the meeting went very well with heartfelt public testimony given from members of the Nauck community. The designation will go before the County Board on January 29th where approval is expected.

The local designation request for the Fraber House will come to the HALRB in March 2013.

- C) Site Plan Review Reports: Ms. Ballo gave updates on the Pierce Queen Apartments Site Plan and the Shreve Apartments Site Plan. Pierce Queen will be coming back to the HALRB for one final review before Planning Commission and County Board meetings in February and March. Shreve Apartments is just beginning its SPRC process.

- D) Staff and other Reports: No other reports.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.