



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, July 17, 2013
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charles Craig
Robert Dudka
Darren Hannabass
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman
Nathan Uldricks
Kevin Vincent
Mark Turnbull
Andy Wenchel
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Patricia Weichmann-Morris

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Acting Preservation Coordinator
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 MAY 15, 2013, MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the May meeting minutes. Mr. Dudka stated that the "he" being referred to on page 3, 5th paragraph was Charles Matta, not himself. Mr. Craig had a question about page 5, 3rd paragraph. He inquired as to whether the building was staying. Ms. Ballo replied it is not. Mr. Craig moved to approve the minutes with Mr. Dudka's edit. Mr. Dudka seconded and the motion passed 7-0-1 with Mr. Turnbull abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman stated that there were no CoAs on the Discussion Agenda and three on the Consent Agenda. However, the Chairman asked to pull Consent Item #1 and put it on the Discussion agenda.

The Chairman called for a motion on the revised Consent Agenda. Mr. Craig moved to approve the revised Consent agenda; Mr. Woodruff seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

- Consent Agenda:
- 1) 2302 North Kenmore Street
Michael Beer & Latanja Thomas
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-05 (HP1300005)
Request to alter façade window and door openings, partial demolition, and construction of a two-story rear addition with deck.
 - 2) 3321 23rd Street North
Cecilia Kennedy
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 12-13A (HP1300018)
Request to amend design of previously approved CoA.
- Discussion Agenda:
- 1) 2821 23rd Street North
Clint Woodson, Touchstone Custom Homes, LLC.
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-10 (HP1300010)
Request for partial demolition, construction of a new rear addition, alteration to roofline, alterations to front elevation, other alterations.

Mr. Clint Woodson, applicant for the project, introduced himself and gave a brief presentation. The existing Cape Cod-style house sustained substantial roof damage when a large tree fell on it. His proposal is consistent with the style of the current house.

The Chairman said she pulled this case from the Consent Agenda to discuss the proposed roofline. She has some concerns that the proposal is not in keeping with other additions that have been approved in the past in the neighborhood.

Mr. Dudka gave the DRC report. This case came through DRC twice and has improved substantially. The DRC felt that given the non-contributing status of the building, and that the addition will be located in the rear down a steep grade, that it could work. After

talking with staff, he does have some concerns about the front dormers. Although the building is non-contributing, it is part of the streetscape of the neighborhood, and as such, the details on the main facade really do need to be correct and compatible. In terms of the roof form for the addition, it will not be visible from the rear, and the side elevations work well with the house and the neighborhood.

The Chairman asked for the staff report. Ms. Ballo summarized her written staff report, but added that staff is concerned about the proportions of the front dormers. The sidewalls should be narrower without so much siding around the windows; it should really be just as wide as a piece of trim, ideally no more than 8". She suggested perhaps moving the dormers further up the roof as their location close to the eave is not quite historically accurate. Otherwise, staff recommended approval as per the *Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Woodruff asked for some clarification on the roof slopes and that issue. Mr. Dudka explained how the slope of the addition on the roof would be difficult to change as it spans the width of the house, making for a shallow pitch. To make the pitch narrower, the walls would need to move, and the design would change completely. Mr. Woodruff also asked if the large tree that used to be in the front was the one that hit the house. Ms. Ballo replied affirmatively.

The Chairman asked if there were any concerns or issues about raising the ridgeline of the roof of the existing house. Mr. Dudka stated that there is some precedent in allowing that change for non-contributing houses. In addition, the slope of the roof still works with the house, and the vernacular Cape Code/Colonial Revival style language of the house is being preserved.

Ms. Ballo added that when it comes to these types of alterations and additions on non-contributing houses, the *Guidelines* are rather vague or silent about what to do. Mr. Woodruff stated that perhaps the HALRB should look at the idea of non-contributing versus contributing buildings and how to deal with them in the design review process.

Mr. Matta asked the applicant how high the first floor ceilings would be. Mr. Woodson replied they would be 9' high. Mr. Matta stated that in terms of moving the dormers up the roof, it needs to be looked at holistically so that it makes sense with the interior ceiling heights. The HALRB cannot just prescribe the number of feet that the dormers need to be moved; it is a more particular design question that needs a closer look.

The Chairman moved to approve the application with the provision that the dormers as shown be redesigned to have the siding removed from the sides of the windows and narrowed to the width of the windows plus the trim, and that the final placement of the dormers be examined by the DRC. Mr. Hannabass suggested as an aside that the applicant look at applicable code issues in regards to the location of the windows. Mr. Laporte seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Discussion Item: 1028 South Walter Reed Drive, Halstead Building. Request to install rooftop telecommunications equipment and associated screening.

Ms. Stephanie Petway from Verizon Wireless presented the application. They originally submitted a Use Permit application to the County for the installation of wireless telecommunications equipment on the Halstead Building at 1028 South Walter Reed Drive. During the review, County staff expressed concern about the design of the screening, as a large penthouse will be visible from the front corner at Columbia Pike and Walter Reed Drive. The owner has expressed wanting to minimize the view of the antennas from units within the building. Verizon is proposing three different sectors of equipment: one on the northeast corner of the building, one facing 11th Street South, and one on the penthouse wall. They also are proposing equipment cabinets. There already has been some discussion with staff about redesigning these so that they are not screened at the corner; Verizon was asked to look at breaking up the equipment cluster in this location. Staff also asked that the equipment be moved entirely off the corner to other locations, but the property owner was not amenable to this suggestion.

Ms. Ballo gave the staff report. She stated that this entire project was approved with a CoA under the Form Based Code due to the preservation of the Virginia Hardware facade. The facade was incorporated into the building. In order to add the telecommunications equipment, the applicant will need to submit a new CoA application. They are here this month to discuss their proposal and will return with a complete CoA application soon. The main issue for the HALRB to determine is whether or not these proposed changes are compatible with the architecture of the building and the Virginia Hardware facade.

Mr. Dudka asked the applicant what the antennas on the corner would look like if they were exposed. Ms. Petway replied that they do not have those visuals to show. Mr. Dudka asked how high the equipment would be above the parapet. Ms. Petway replied it will be 9' above the parapet. The screening wall would then be 10' high.

Mr. Craig stated that the AT&T building across the street has a number of telecom clusters located on it. Could Verizon use any of those? Ms. Petway replied they could not. Ms. Debbie Riddle, also with Verizon, added that they do not own the AT&T building.

Mr. Dudka asked if it would be possible to put antennas on top of the existing mechanical penthouse. Ms. Riddle replied that shadowing would occur and that the signal would be blocked by the parapet. Mr. Dudka asked what area Verizon was trying to cover with the signal. Ms. Riddle replied that they were looking to cover the area north of Columbia Pike. Ms. Petway added that they looked at locating on an apartment building up by Barton Street, but it did not work. Mr. Dudka asked if the focus was also to the east of Walter Reed Drive. Mr. Craig asked if the antennas could be attached to existing penthouses. Ms. Petway replied that one of the clusters is doing that, but it does not give the coverage they need. Mr. Hannabass asked if painting the antennas interferes with the signal. He also asked if they could be split up. Ms. Riddle replied that they could split the antennas, but that it was not easy or even technically a good way to do it.

The Chairman stated that the proposed cluster on the northeast corner of the building really has a negative visual impact and would be a drastic alteration to the architecture. She urged the applicant to present an alternative design. This proposed design would not have been approved if it had been part of the original CoA application.

Mr. Hannabass asked if the antennae could be integrated into the existing segmented panels on the building. He admitted it looked like that option might involve disassembling the parapet and part of the roof structure.

Mr. Matta asked for clarification as to which option was on the table—the staff proposal to move the equipment, or the proposal to place it on the corner.

Ms. Petway stated that the staff option to move the corner equipment, but not the antennae (those would have to stay) was presented, but that is not what the owner would want, and that is not what Verizon is currently pursuing. Verizon is pursuing the option to have the antennae and the equipment on the corner. There are photo simulations in the packet that illustrate the staff proposal.

Mr. Dudka stated that in order to fully evaluate the request the HALRB needs three things: 1) Marked up plans specifically showing what is proposed; 2) Alternative designs; and 3) A better understanding of what equipment can and cannot be moved. They need to see what the corner would look like with just the antennae or none at all. Mr. Dudka asked staff if a building could be built to the west of this one under the Form Based Code. Ms. Jennifer Smith of the County Planning Division staff replied that the Code allows for it, but it would likely be six stories tall and no more. Mr. Dudka asked again if all the equipment could be moved to the existing penthouses. Ms. Riddle replied that from a structural standpoint, it needs to be located on the corner. The structural layout of this building is very odd. They are also limited due to the location of all the rooftop condenser units.

Mr. Dudka stated that the HALRB's interest is in the public facade of this building and its historic compatibility. Mr. Dudka added that since the applicants are already moving some of the condensers (four to be exact), then they should also explore relocating others. Mr. Craig asked if the equipment could be moved further to the west and off the corner. Ms. Riddle replied it could not because they would lose the north coverage they desired.

Ms. Petway stated that she was not sure if they could move the antennae, but asked if they could reduce the size of the equipment structure, would that alleviate the group's concerns? The Chairman and others replied that the most appropriate solution would be to not see it at all. The Chairman went around the group and asked each HALRB member to sum up his or her thoughts to help guide the applicant for their next submission. The HALRB members each spoke in turn regarding their recommendations on the proposal.

Joan Lawrence stated that the applicant must look at other alternatives. At a minimum, the equipment and screening must be moved as far away from the corner as possible. She urged the applicant to look at other locations.

Mr. Laporte shared some of the concerns of the other members, but felt that preserving the Arlington Hardware facade should be the main focus of the HALRB's purview in this case. He was amenable to reasonable solutions for the wireless facility.

Mr. Craig said his major concern was the penthouse on the corner. He would like to see it without decoration, and asked the applicant to try all design measures possible to make it appear to go away. He also recommended that for the next submission, all the photos should be labeled and keyed to the roof plan and surrounding areas. Clarity in the documents would help members better understand the proposal specifics.

Mr. Hannabass said he would like to see the applicant work within the existing framework of the facade and building structure to screen and/or mount this equipment. He mentioned again that the applicants should re-engage the original project architect to discuss these options. He asked if the antennas could be placed horizontally. He also suggested a simply adorned penthouse structure and looking at materials that would blend better.

Mr. Turnbull stated that the applicant should look into making the penthouse smaller or moving it altogether. As proposed, it is a very abrupt and dramatic addition to the roofline. He would like to see it totally unadorned in the next submission for comparison.

Mr. Wenchel said he is not as concerned about the other locations, but the corner, as presented, is really not an acceptable alternative.

Mr. Dudka is very concerned about the equipment and the antennas on the corner. He urged the applicants to speak with the original building architect to see about designing a smaller penthouse and alternate locations. The HALRB worked hard with the original CoA approval to make the building appear smaller. The proposed penthouse diminishes that work. The penthouse should blend in and essentially go away from the Pike view. He also suggested examining other locations and splitting up the equipment.

Mr. Uldricks stated that the next submission should show a better organized idea of the alternatives.

Mr. Matta stated that the top edge of the building and the parapet really define the architecture. The existing penthouses, though tall, are appropriately set back and should be set apart enough so that they do not interfere with the building design and are only minimally visible. One of the alternatives should show building onto the existing penthouses. He asked the applicants to examine increasing the height of the existing penthouses, just to see if it would remain unobtrusive enough without adding a new penthouse structure. The corner option as presented is not appropriate.

Mr. Vincent stated that he was on the HALRB when the original design of this building was approved. They worked for many months with the developer and the architect to get this building right. They also worked hard on the streetscape and labored to make sure the entire building was compatible with that streetscape. And the County granted two extra floors of bonus density for the project. The current proposal looks like another floor and penthouse have been added on the corner. Verizon has many talented engineers and architects who can figure out a good design. It is not the HALRB's responsibility to design it, but will provide the appropriate parameters for the design. He felt that there should not be a big penthouse structure on the corner and the equipment should not impact the facade.

Discussion Item: Columbia Pike Form Based Code: Presentation and Updates.

Ms. Jennifer Smith from CPHD's Planning Division presented the most recent work on the Form Based Code. She read through a memo that was presented to the HALRB detailing new work and current issues. She asked that any comments on this latest draft be submitted by July 22nd. In terms of timeline, a final draft will be prepared in August in anticipation of a September Request to Advertise (RTA) with County Board adoption in October. She then went into detail about the Conservation Area Standards, as well as cross-sections showing potential ways to develop in certain blocks adjacent to the Conservation Areas.

Mr. Bill Spack, architectural consultant to the Form Based Code team, also discussed the Conservation Area standards. He stated it was important that these standards be distinguished from the general architectural standards. Primarily, they looked in great detail at the Fillmore Gardens and Barcroft Apartment complexes. The adjacent areas have new construction standards. The team endeavored to make clear the difference between style and architectural aesthetics.

Mr. Matta stated that the "TO DO" and "NOT TO DO" illustrations are very good, but the team should make sure that the photos being used do not contain details or changes that the text and illustrations do not recommend. Mr. Matta gave an example in Chapter 7, page 97. The photo shows air conditioning vents that have been installed in a way that damages the building, and should not be taken as an example of something that is desirable.

Mr. Vincent said he appreciated the voluntary compliance section. He is concerned about some of the photos showing a false historicism and asked that they be looked at more closely.

Mr. Hannabass suggested the guidelines might be difficult for property owners to understand. There should be more explanation for the lay person.

Mr. Vincent suggested that property owners may not read the voluntary compliance section. He suggested including some of that language in Part 6 and have it in both places.

Ms. Smith then explained the Transition Areas.

Mr. Craig stated that in Section A, it looks like the new building abuts the existing building. He asked if this was correct. Ms. Smith replied that was correct, and that is why they are looking at better transition recommendations in the Neighborhood Manners Transition Areas. They are not looking at hyphens.

After some discussion, the HALRB members agreed that they preferred the transitions that have spaces between the existing and new buildings.

Mr. Dudka stated that generally all of this looks very good, but some of the standards seem subjective. It may be difficult to determine who gets to decide what is acceptable. Mr. Dudka added that sometimes good architecture involves breaking the rules and the language should be amended to deal with that possibility.

Ms. Smith thanked the group for their feedback and reiterated that the comment deadline was July 22nd.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman's Report: The Fraber House designation was approved by the County Board in June and repairs from the tree fall were expected to be completed in late July. The Wilson School Committee should be appointed soon by the County Board. The work of the Affordable Housing Committee is also continuing. The Chairman also reported that she and Mr. Woodruff and Ms. Ballo recently went to the Penrose neighborhood association and discussed tax credits and potential local historic district designation. The meeting went well and there were good questions from the neighborhood representatives.
- B) Survey Report: No update.
- C) Site Plan Review Reports: The SPRC meeting for the Blue Goose site plan will be tomorrow (July 18th). The latest SPRC materials show a few of the existing blue panels being used around a ground floor commercial storefront. Ms. Ballo gave some information on the upcoming 16th Street Unified Residential Development (URD) case in Lyon Village. She stated it will come to DRC for review soon.
- D) Staff and other Reports: Ms. Ballo noted the recent Supreme Court case dealing with land use and takings. The APA recently had a webinar on the topic and she will try to obtain materials for the HALRB to review.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm.