



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, September 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
Mark Turnbull
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Nathan Uldricks
Kevin Vincent
Patricia Weichmann-Morris
Andy Wenchel

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

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:33 pm. Ms. Ballo called the roll and determined there was not a quorum. Only six members were in attendance and seven are needed for a quorum.

The Chair asked members if there were any changes to the minutes. There were no comments about changes.

Ms. Ballo gave a brief summary of the ACoA cases.

Mr. Hannabass arrived at 7:38pm and there was a quorum. The Chair began the regular public hearing.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 17th and AUGUST 21, 2013, MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the July meeting minutes. Mr. Matta moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Craig seconded and the motion passed 7-0.

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the August meeting minutes. Mr. Matta moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Craig seconded and the motion passed 4-0-3 with Mr. Turnbull, Mr. Woodruff and Ms. Lawrence abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman stated that there were five cases on the Consent Agenda and none on the Discussion Agenda.

The Chairman called for a motion on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Craig moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Laporte seconded and the motion passed 7-0.

- Consent Agenda:
- 1) 3301 21st Avenue North
Sean and Kathy Handerhan
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-23 (HP1300025)
Request to remove vinyl siding on rear addition and replace with Hardiplank.
 - 2) 3500 21st Avenue North
Elizabeth & Christopher Rugaber
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-24 (HP1300026)
Request to alter materials on walkway and driveway.
 - 3) 2901 22nd Street North
Donna & Charles Sullivan
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-25 (HP1300027)
Request to construct a shed.
 - 4) 4102 North Glebe Road
James Wright
Walker Chapel and Cemetery Historic District
HALRB Case 13-26 (HP1300028)
After the fact requests for:
 - 1) Installation of light poles;
 - 2) Installation of pavers and stone and block wall for Memorial Garden;
 - 3) Installation of hardscape, stone and block walls, and handrail for Memorial Terrace.

- 5) 4108 4th Street North
AHC, LLC
Buckingham Village Historic District
HALRB Case 13-27 (HP1300029)
Request to install four (4) monument signs.

Discussion Agenda: None.

Discussion Item: 5527 3rd Street South URD Proposal in Glencarlyn

Mr. Tad Lunger gave the presentation. He is the representative for Ms. Julie Lee, the applicant. Ms. Lee was also in attendance.

Mr. Lunger gave a powerpoint presentation which focused on the history of the neighborhood, the project proposal, the by-right versus the URD proposal, and the community goals and benefits of the URD. As the existing house was constructed over four buildable lots, a by-right development could demolish the existing house and build four new single-family houses in its place. The applicant is instead proposing to demolish and construct just one new house. The project requires a URD for approval because the square footage of the new house is greater than what is currently allowed for one lot on the R6 zone. Mr. Lunger also noted that the civic association voted to approve the project.

Ms. Ballo also gave a presentation on the specific history of this house, her site visit, and the proposed historic preservation conditions for the URD. She also discussed the role of the HALRB in regards to this case. The proposal is to demolish a contributing structure in the Glencarlyn National Register District. Since this is not a locally designated historic district, the HALRB has no approval authority for the URD, but should give comments to the County Board since there are historic preservation issues. Staff has recommended architectural salvage, a Phase I archaeological survey of portions of the property, and the creation of as-built measured drawings and photographs for the property file. The applicant is amenable to these requests.

The Chair thanked Mr. Lunger and staff and opened the floor for comments or questions.

The Chair asked for qualification that there were indeed 4 lots involved in the URD. Mr. Lunger replied that that was correct.

Mr. Woodruff stated that the historic house is a really interesting house. He asked staff to clarify why it was being demolished and how that was different from what would occur in Maywood.

Ms. Ballo explained the zoning overlay that protects Maywood generally does not allow for the demolition of historic structures (exceptions are granted in the State Code), but that there are no restrictions on demolitions in the National Register

districts. Mr. Woodruff asked for clarification that the lots are protected in perpetuity. Mr. Lunger replied that they are protected for the life of the proposed structure. Mr. Woodruff stated he would recommend some provision to extend the protection of the lots beyond the life of the new house.

Ms. Lee then spoke about her family and their plans for the house.

The Chair asked Ms. Lee if she had thought about using parts of the old house in the new house. Ms. Lee said she had considered it, but had not found anything that would be rally usable for her.

Mr. Hannabass stated that his impression is that the historic house has some structural challenges, but he does not see that the new house picks up on any of the eccentricities or vocabulary of the historic house. Ms. Lee's architect replied that they did try to replicate some of the massing. Mr. Lunger stated that the neighborhood itself contains a wide variety of styles.

Mr. Matta asked if this could be referred to the DRC. He commends the applicant on her intent, but thinks that the new house, the way it is shown, the elevations are not consistent and the plans don't see firm'd up yet. There is room, in other words, to improve the design if the applicant were willing.

The Chair asked if an open space preservation easement had been considered to put a permanent protection on the lots. Mr. Lunger stated the intent was not to put something permanent on the lots. The Chair clarified this would be for the open space and was not about preserving the house. Mr. Lunger stated that that would prevent someone in the future from reorienting the lots. The intent of his client is to preserve the landscape for the life of the new house only.

Mr. Hannabass stated that he is in agreement with Mr. Matta about the need to look at the architecture, perhaps at the DRC.

The Chair stated that the DRC can offer their services to the applicant should the applicant choose to take advantage of them. She summarized the HALRB discussion stating that there seemed to be support of the preservation of the open space or a scenic easement of some sort, they support the archaeology work and the salvage of materials, and commend the property owner for their concern for the neighborhood.

Ms. Lee added that the new house will be there for a long, long time. They have no intent to develop the lots. Mr. Hannabass asked if she intended to expand the house in the future and Ms. Lee replied that she did not.

Mr. Laporte added that he thinks it would be a mistake to put anything in a letter to the County Board about an easement. He does not want the appearance that the HALRB is 'piling on' when people are coming voluntarily. The Chair stated she would take that into consideration when drafting the HALRB's letter and that it would be circulated to all HALRB members prior to being sent.

The Chair thanked Ms. Lee and Mr. Lunger for their presentation.

Discussion Item: Rappahannock Coffee Site, Columbia Pike Form Based Code

Ms. Ballo gave a brief presentation on the history of this site, Form Based Code requirements, and the purpose of the item tonight. The Rappahannock Coffee site, comprised of two separate buildings, is designated for full building preservation under the Columbia Pike Form Based Code. The HALRB is required to issue a CoA for all sites designation for full building and façade preservation under the Code. The last such project was the Halstead Building (with the preserved Virginia Hardware façade) which was approved in 2004-2005. Staff have been meeting with the applicant on this project. The proposal is for a six-story residential building to be constructed on the entire site. The applicant is specifically asking to change the level of preservation from full building to façade. Given that staff now has a more complete understanding of the history of the buildings, and understanding that their primary contribution to Columbia Pike is in their streetscape presentation, staff is supportive of the request. There will be a full CoA review of the application beginning in a few months. The issue tonight is whether or not the HALRB supports the change in preservation from full building to façade, and what is the Review Board's preferred method to review the CoA case (DRC and HALRB every month, or a few rounds of DRC followed by a final HALRB hearing). Staff would recommend the latter option. Staff also recommends that the HALRB and applicant keep the process similar to what was achieved at the Halstead building. In that case, the HALRB approved a conditional CoA, the case went to the County Board for approval, and then a final CoA was issued after the County Board hearing.

Ms. Cathy Puskar, attorney with Walsh Colucci, represented the applicant. Mr. Temple Washington, the applicant's architect, was also present. Ms. Puskar stated that they are not asking for additional floors or density, but that they are sticking with the 6 stories allowed under the Code. Mr. Washington continued the presentation.

Mr. Washington stated that they looked to historic photographs and other information to determine a more accurate date of construction for the building. Currently, the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) lists the construction date as circa 1930 for both buildings. Mr. Washington showed aerial photographs of the buildings taken in 1949, 1956, 1974 and 1982. The buildings are not present in 1949, but do show up in 1956. Ms. Ballo noted that the permit cards for the buildings have construction dates of 1949. Mr. Washington stated that there were infill buildings and houses abutting the buildings through the 1970s. This explains why the details are concentrated on the facades. He went through a complete categorization of the architectural elements of each building, and noted the change in brick types, materials, and angles of the glass storefronts.

Mr. Washington then gave a brief presentation of the proposed new construction. The new building would be six stories high, with recessed niche areas for the preserved facades, with glass joints on the sides and over top. The preserved facades would not be touched by new masonry. The building is 330 feet long at the base, and the Code requires breaks every certain number of feet with a number of discrete architectural elements required to be incorporated. He wanted to provide something lighter and more

sculpturally prominent than other Form Based Code projects. They are proposing a screen wall adjacent to the Arlington Village condominiums.

The Chair thanked Mr. Washington for the presentation and opened the floor for questions or comments.

Mr. Turnbull asked if the louvered panels on the Pike frontage opened like shutters. He stated if so, that is an interesting idea, though he is not enthusiastic about projections like that onto the street frontage. Mr. Washington replied that he was not sure yet, but that he wanted to bring a sense of movement to the façade.

The Chair reiterated that the HALRB should concentrate on the issue of full building versus frontage preservation for tonight. There will be ample time to discuss the design at future meetings.

Mr. Woodruff asked staff what level of preservation was achieved at the Penzance project. Ms. Ballo replied that was also façade preservation in accordance with the Clarendon Sector Plan.

Mr. Laporte stated that the proposed change in the level of preservation was fine with him. The proposed redevelopment helps to make the case, so he would want to see a proposal similar to what is being shown tonight in the future. He added that the same change was made for the Halstead site.

Mr. Turnbull stated that he too is ok with the change.

Mr. Craig stated he has no issue with the proposed change. He did state that he finds the back of the proposed building problematic, but he looks forward to the design discussions at the DRC.

The Chair stated that she thinks façade preservation is appropriate in this case. The Chair asked if the parapet striping was painted. Mr. Washington replied that some is painted brick to achieve the banding; other portions have painted sign nailers instead. The Art Deco “striping” is instead a 1950s illusion.

Mr. Matta asked if the Roman brick was all on the same plane. Mr. Washington replied that it was.

Mr. Craig asked if the brick was red or yellow. Mr. Washington stated that he assumes it is painted buff, but he has not investigated underneath the paint.

Mr. Laporte stated that he thinks the “striping” is now a nostalgic element that the current signage, with its deco motif, now reflects. He still thinks it would be great to replicate, along with the signage.

The Chair asked about the make up of the foundation striping. Mr. Washington replied that it is also cosmetic, and not comprised of special bricks.

The consensus of the full HALRB is that there are no objections to the change from full building to façade preservation.

Mr. Hannabass asked how the facades would be preserved during construction. Mr. Washington replied they could be left in place (and shored and pinned), they could be removed to the back of the site and replaced on the slab, or they could be deconstructed, stored, and rebuilt on site.

There was some discussion about the methods used in other façade preservation projects. Ms. Puskar will look into the Arlington Hardware sheeting & shoring permit to see what was done on that site.

Ms. Puskar stated that the applicant will also need to revise the Form Based Code to allow for the preservation change.

The HALRB is fine with this application proceeding to DRC when it is ready. Most of the design work can be accomplished at the DRC, and it can return to the HALRB for the vote. All HALRB members are welcome to attend the DRC to comment if they wish.

The Chair made a motion to approve the change from full building to façade preservation and stated that it was appropriate in this case given the character of the existing buildings, their construction dates, and the proposed character of the new development. Mr. Craig seconded and the motion passed 6-0.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman's Report: The Chair stated that she and the HALRB wished to congratulate Ms. Liccese-Torres being hired as the County's new Historic Preservation Coordinator. The Chair also reported that the WRAPS Committee has not yet had members appointed. She will be attending the next Columbia Pike Form Based Code meeting on September 26th. She also noted Preservation Arlington's weekly showcasing of historic preservation projects and suggested that people bookmark their page.
- B) Survey Report: No update.
- C) Site Plan Review Reports: No reports.
- D) Staff and other Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the HP section has been given the green light to hire her replacement. Hopefully there will be a new HP Planner on staff soon. Also, the Fraber House went on the market last Friday.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm.