



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, December 18, 2013
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charles Craig
Darren Hannabass
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman
Nathan Uldricks
Patricia Weichmann-Morris
Andy Wenchel
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Mark Turnbull
Robert Dudka
Kevin Vincent

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

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. Ms. Ballo called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

RECOGNITION OF CALLAN ROGERS FOR PROJECT AT THE BALL FAMILY BURIAL GROUNDS

The Chairman recognized Callan Rodgers, Eagle Scout, for his recent accomplishments at the Ball Family Burial Grounds. Mr. Rodgers explained that he removed invasive plant species, limited erosion, and cleaned the graveyard, thereby successfully making the area a more peaceful space. The Chairman complimented his efforts stating that there is a notable difference in the site's physical appearance and encouraged the Board to visit the graveyard. For the completion of his project, the HALRB presented Mr. Rodgers with a certificate of appreciation and encouraged him to continue his interest in historic preservation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 20, 2013, MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the November meeting minutes. There were no corrections or comments. Mr. Hannabass moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded and the motion passed 8-0-1, with Mr. Matta abstaining as he did not attend the September meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman read through the public hearing procedures, and noted there were no speaker slips submitted for the CoA cases.

The Chairman said there were two cases on the Consent Agenda and two on the Discussion Agenda. The Chairman called for a motion on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Laporte moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Hannabass seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda:

- 1) 3511 22nd Street North
Merrick Hoben & Diana Bermudez
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-11A (HP1300037)
Request to revise previously approved CoA 13-11 for alteration to bay window on the rear addition.
- 2) 4108 4th Street North
AHC Management, LLC
Buckingham Village Historic District
HALRB Case 13-27A (HP1300034)
Request to revise previously approved CoA 13-27 for installation of monument signs.

Discussion Agenda:

- 1) 2301 North Fillmore Street
Ron Hager/Hilda Rodrigues
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-32 (HP1300035)
After-the-fact request to construct a shed.
- 2) 250, 256 North Glebe Road; 4200 N. Pershing Drive (Buckingham Shopping Center); 4180, 4207 N. Pershing Dr., 4209, 4215, 4223 2nd Road N. (Gates of Ballston)
Number Nine Corporation c/o Jenco Group
Buckingham Village Historic District
HALRB Case 13-33 (HP1300036)
Requests to: 1) Construct a section of wrought iron fence on boundary line between Buckingham Shopping Center and Gates of Ballston; 2) Remove paved walkway and

replace with turf; 3) Install security cameras on Buckingham Shopping Center.

Discussion Agenda Item #1

Mr. Ron Hager, applicant for the project, introduced himself and gave a brief summary. He contended that the Board's objection to the shed is not due to its design or aesthetic appearance, but due to the use of resin as its sole building material. He suggested that the HALRB should approve the retention of the shed due to its minimal size, adherence to required setback requirements, and its complementary appearance to the architecture of Maywood. He proceeded to distribute a letter of support from an adjacent neighbor.

Mr. Craig asked the applicant whether the shed rested on a platform. Mr. Hager responded that the shed is ten inches off the ground.

Mr. Craig gave the DRC report. He stated that if the proposal had come to DRC with appropriate materials, the shed would have been approved; however, the resin lacks dimensionality and appears flat. The DRC discussed various options with the applicant, but believed the topic should be discussed with the full Board.

The Chairman asked for the staff report. Ms. Ballo summarized her written staff report. The historic preservation code inspector opened a code case for a lack of a CoA in July of 2013. Staff offered appropriate solutions to the owner and suggested replacement of the after-the-fact shed. Staff also had provided the applicants with previously approved sheds for their review. Staff further stated that the use of other modern materials, such as cementitious fiber Board and polyvinyl chloride trim, is only allowed in select locations based on the Maywood Design Guidelines. That said, there are no provisions for the use of resin or the faux grain wood pattern evident on the shed. For the introduction of new materials, the HALRB typically examines samples, discusses its benefits and detriments, looks at national precedents, and establishes new guidelines that are vetted by the neighborhood. Therefore, staff recommends that the after-the-fact shed request be denied and the applicants return with an application for a new shed that would meet the Design Guidelines.

The Chairman stated that the case now rests with the HALRB. The Chairman asked if the shed had any framing. The applicant responded that it is completely resin with plastic walls.

Mr. Craig stated that the DRC discussed cladding the shed with approved materials, but the costs of completing such alterations would cost more than purchasing a new shed. He asked the applicant how the shed was fastened to the platform. The applicant responded that it is screwed into a three-quarter inch plywood base that is attached to a block foundation.

Mr. Woodruff advocated that since the shed is not visible from the road, is partially obscured by trees, and since we have no guidelines for other temporary structures (ex., children's playhouses), that the HALRB should consider the appropriateness of asking a homeowner to remove an aesthetically pleasing shed.

The Chairman expressed her concerns about setting a precedent regarding after-the-fact projects using unapproved materials if the Board approves this project. Mr. Craig shared Mr. Woodruff's opinion that the design is not unattractive, but that it fails to meet the established

Design Guidelines and the materials fail to complement the historic buildings in the Historic District.

Mr. Matta spoke to the issue of homeowners improvising shed kits and the inappropriateness of sheds freely resting on platforms/pads. Typically, sheds are fastened into footings. Mr. Wenchel suggested that the design was not in character with the rest of the historic district due to its use of various stylistic elements.

Mr. Laporte commented that he would vote for the approval of the after-the-fact shed due to the house's location in the Historic District and the design of the shed.

Ms. Liccese-Torres and staff reminded the Board that approving the project would establish a precedent for the use of resin in Maywood. In addition, any future applications that proposed the use of resin would have to be heard and the Board would need to specify how the application differed from this particular case. If the Board moves to approve this request, she recommended that the motion be very specific and reference the Design Guidelines to the greatest extent possible in justifying such a motion.

Board members discussed the flexibility and application of the Maywood Design Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation regarding the use of plastic.

After the discussion, the Chair called for a motion. Mr. Matta moved to deny the approval of the applicant's request and Mr. Wenchel seconded the motion. Ms. Weichmann-Morris requested to amend the motion, to state that the denial is recommended because the request does not meet the standards set forth in the *Maywood Design Guidelines* as stated in the staff report. Mr. Matta accepted the amendment. The denial of the application passed 7-2 with Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Laporte objecting.

The Chairman suggested that the applicant work with staff on a suitable replacement shed. The applicant agreed to consult with staff regarding the replacement shed.

Discussion Agenda Item #2

Evan Prichard, the representative and attorney for the applicant, presented the background for the proposal to enclose the existing gate opening with a wrought iron fence. He stated that the owner faced ongoing maintenance issues due to continued litter, safety issues due to trespassers on private property, and other issues due to unclean conditions. Therefore, in coordination and agreement with AHC, the applicant proposes to enclose this section of the gate with materials matching the existing fence and to install security cameras. AHC requested that the applicant remove the existing pedestrian walkway, and the applicant agreed to comply. In regards to the security cameras, the applicant desired to place an additional camera across the street at Glebe Market and submitted a letter of support from the owner of the building.

The Chairman thanked the applicant for the introduction and asked staff why the camera on Glebe Market could not be heard by the Board. Ms. Ballo responded that the request could not be heard since it was not legally advertised as the applicant's request arrived after the deadline for submissions.

Mr. Craig presented the DRC report. The committee examined the history of trash at the site and discussed the placement of the security camera on the existing CVS building (rear or side elevation). Understanding that the Board cannot dictate color, he requested the applicant consider matching the camera to the color of the existing material.

Ms. Ballo asked questions regarding the proposed location of the camera. Mr. Prichard stated that the applicant desired to attach it to the stone elevation. Ms. Ballo confirmed that staff is more concerned about its attachment than its location. All aspects of the camera mounting unit (bolts, etc.) need to be placed in the mortar joints and not drilled through the stone or masonry material.

Ms. Ballo presented the staff report. The HALRB first discussed the removal of the pedestrian path and enclosure of the fence in 2007. AHC had proposed one continuous fence with no gate to assist in the maintenance of their property. At that time, the HALRB denied the request to completely enclose the property and requested that the pathway be left open and unencumbered. However, since that time, trash and litter have not abated, resulting in continuous code enforcement and maintenance issues.

Ms. Ballo stated the history and noted that the path and opening were evident in mid-twentieth century aerial photographs of the property. The *Buckingham Village Design Guidelines* recognize the importance of open spaces within the superblocks; however, there is no distinction or notation recognizing the importance of thoroughfares between residential and commercial uses. In this case, since it is not a major thoroughfare, the proposed enclosure of the gate would not prohibit access or detract from the sense of open space. In addition, this could be considered a reversible alteration to the landscape. Therefore, staff recommended the approval of the enclosure of the fence and that the pathway be removed as it meets the intent of the *Buckingham Village Design Guidelines*. Staff also recommends installation of the security camera on the CVS building.

The HALRB briefly discussed the matter, including the placement of the camera. Mr. Laporte made a motion to approve the application and Mr. Hannabass seconded. The application was approved unanimously.

Discussion Item: 16th Street North Unified Residential Development (URD) Proposal

The following individuals represented Beacon Crest Homes: Mark Leahy, Architect; Sara Mariska, attorney for the applicant; and Derek Huetinck from BeaconCrest Homes. Ms. Mariska introduced the project to demolish four houses in Lyon Village (listed in the National Register of Historic Places) as part of the development of a 161-room hotel. The URD allows for flexibility with setbacks, lots, zoning, and the overall design of the hotel. The applicants came to the Design Review Committee in August 2013 and incorporated some of the feedback into their design.

Mr. Leahy, the project architect, stated that the existing houses lacked historic quality and were in a state of disrepair. The development company desired to respect the existing streetscape, and therefore, placed an alley to the rear of the proposed dwellings to serve as access to the four detached garages.

Mr. Craig presented the DRC report. The committee refuted the developer's claim that the four single family dwellings would function as a screen or buffer for the larger hotel. The Chairman contended that the buildings would fail to screen the development since the dwellings were only 1/3 the height of the hotel. The applicant provided the height of the four dwellings to the mean of the gable: 31'2", 30'4", 31', and 30'11".

Ms. Ballo presented the staff report and reminded the Board that since the buildings are contributing buildings in a National Register Historic District, it is customary for the HALRB to comment to the County Board on the merits of the application. The new dwellings will be non-contributing resources to the district and account for a loss to the district's total count of contributing historic resources. Staff and the DRC worked with the applicant to try and make the architectural styles and details more compatible with the historic district. The developers were overall receptive to comments and feedback and the most noticeable changes were made to the detached garages.

Mr. Laporte questioned the design of the "A-frame" designed dwelling. He suggested that it is not typical of the neighborhood and appeared to be out of place. The applicant stated that the DRC requested its design in favor of more traditional Tudor-Revival elements due to a concern about the contractor's success at accurately replicating specific elements of the style.

The applicants responded to questions about the two options presented for Lot 1 and the detached garages. The development team confirmed that the buyer would have the ability to choose their preference of design (Craftsman or Colonial Revival) at Lot 1. In all four lots, the buyers will have the choice to select one of two garages. The first option is a simple two-car garage, while the second option allows for a living space above. The developers stated that the community preferred the garages with living space above since they believed it would further screen the hotel. The HALRB contended that the community members were misled in this regard.

Mr. Craig stated that the form and massing of the current houses (tall and narrow) were a direct result of the neighborhood's desire to screen the hotel; however, other buildings types, such as an apartment building, would have been more appropriate than the proposed dwellings to achieve this effect.

Mr. Laporte provided a brief history of Lyon Village, but focused on the neighborhood's uniformity of blocks and suggested the mix of four different styles in a row is uncharacteristic. He suggested the need for a unifying design element. Mr. Leahy agreed about the uniformity, but argued that blocks such as this one on the fringe of the neighborhood were more eclectic in design. Mr. Matta expressed concern regarding the lack of consistent design elements in the four buildings and stated that option 1 failed to coalesce with the other three options. He suggested the use of a front porch as a unifying element on all four designs.

Ms. Liccese-Torres and Ms. Ballo commented that the walkout dormer on the proposed house for Lot 3 would be historically inappropriate for the design only because of the dimensions of the roof. In addition, the dormer and roof remained disproportionate due to the amount of roof necessary to achieve the desired height of the building.

Mr. Hannabass addressed Lot 4. He questioned the appropriateness of the design and called attention to the awkward windows on the second story. The applicants agreed that the window should be moved slightly to the left.

Mr. Wenchel asked staff about the impact of demolishing the existing four contributing buildings. Ms. Ballo replied that if the district was resurveyed, the new dwellings would be removed from the district, resulting in a loss of context and overall numbers for the contributing buildings. Numerous National Register Historic Districts in Arlington have lost some of their historic and architectural integrity due to demolitions. While these particular homes are not the linchpin for the district, the slow loss of buildings over time will have a devastating effect. These are of particular concern since the County Board will have sanctioned their demolition.

The Chairman reminded the Board members that they are charged with the decision to recommend or not recommend the design to the County Board. She summarized the concerns/comments of the review Board so far: 1) negative effects to the historic district from demolishing contributing dwellings; 2) the proposal retains a number of the characteristics of Lyon Village; 3) the design of Lot 4, particularly the windows, needs to be corrected; and 4) the large porches provide a sense of uniformity to an otherwise eclectic row of dwellings.

Mr. Matta stated that in addition to the porches, chimneys also would serve as a unifying design element. Board members agreed that chimneys would add character and scale to the development. The applicant stated they were not prepared to discuss chimneys and questioned the appropriateness of virtually fake chimneys since there is a lack of market for urban wood burning stoves/fireplaces.

The discussion returned to the appropriateness of sanctioning the demolition of contributing buildings to a National Register Historic District. Staff reminded the Board that many such historic districts in Arlington County were created through public funding and grants, spending a considerable amount of money over time. The districts provide a financial incentive to property owners and educational value to the overall community.

Mr. Laporte asked how the HALRB needs to proceed with findings and the suitability of sending a letter to the County Board. Ms. Liccese-Torres and Ms. Ballo said that sending a letter was not required, but it is customary for the HALRB to directly comment on such development projects that affect historic resources.

Mr. Matta moved that the HALRB recommend the introduction of unified elements to the four proposed dwellings including: 1) front porches on all four buildings; and 2) the reintroduction of chimneys. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Mr. Wenchel requested that the motion be amended to include that the Lyon Village Historic District is losing four historic dwellings. Mr. Matta amended his motion to include Mr. Wenchel's comment. Derek Huetinck clarified and requested that the amendment instead state that the district would be losing three contributing resources, not four. The HALRB agreed. The motion passed 8-1 with Mr. Hannabass opposed.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman’s Report: The Chairman reported that the County Board recently adopted the new residential Form Based Code for Columbia Pike. The HALRB sent a letter to the Board on this matter.
- B) Survey Report: No update.
- C) Site Plan Review Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres reported on the Blue Goose Site Plan with Marymount University and gave an update on the design’s historical references. Ms. Ballo provided updates regarding the Key Boulevard site plan development.
- C) Staff and other Reports: Mr. Hannabass gave a brief presentation about the review Board training he attended in October at the Preservation Virginia Conference in Roanoke. He noted the highlights of the training, adaptive reuse projects he visited, and the need for the preservation field to raise political awareness.

Ms. Ballo and Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded Board members to turn in their financial disclosure forms. In addition, staff reminded the Board about current and future projects, including the upcoming Arlington Presbyterian Church local historic district designation hearing, the installment of a historic marker at Green Valley Pharmacy, the creation of an online digital archive for Nauck, and the Old Glebe Walkabout. In addition, Ms. Liccese-Torres formally welcomed staff’s newest preservation planner, Mr. Liebertz.

- E) Nominating Committee: On behalf of the nominating committee, Mr. Woodruff nominated Joan Lawrence as Chairman and Charles Matta as Vice-Chairman. Mr. Laporte move to accept the nomination. Mr. Hannabass seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.