



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, June 20, 2012
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charles Craig
Robert Dudka
Darren Hannabass
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Mark Turnbull
Nathan Uldricks
Kevin Vincent
Patricia Weichmann-Morris
Andy Wenchel
Chris Wilson, Chairman
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Charles Matta, Vice Chairman

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

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MAY 16, 2012 MEETING

The Chairman called for comments on the May 16, 2012, draft meeting minutes. There were no comments. Ms. Weichmann-Morris made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Woodruff seconded and the motion passed 8-0-1 with Mr. Dudka abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman stated the procedures for the public hearing portion of the HALRB agenda, and noted there were two cases on the consent agenda, and one case on the discussion agenda. She called for a motion on the consent agenda. Mr. Craig moved to approve the revised consent agenda; Mr. Laporte seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

- Consent Agenda
- 1) 5711 4th Street South
Pete Connell/Arlington County Department of Environmental Services
Carlin Community Hall Historic District
HALRB Case 12-10 (HP1200009)
Request for new front porch and three new landings with railings.
 - 2) 2501 North Underwood Street
Leslie Aun & Michael McClain
Crossman House Historic District
HALRB Case 12-15(HP1200013)
Request for exterior alterations to raise a portion of the roof, alter window and door openings.

The Chairman noted that the fence at the Devine’s property in Maywood, 3501 21st Avenue North, was still not in compliance. Ms. Ballo stated she would follow up with Zoning. Mr. Woodruff asked whether the fences in question on the ACoA list were new or replacements? Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the fence at 3605 21st Avenue was partially new and partially a replacement of an existing fence.

- Discussion Agenda
- 1) 3201/3205/3207 Washington Boulevard
Anselm Griffiths
O’Sullivans, et al
HALRB Case 12-16(HP1200014)
Review of façade preservation as part of the Clarendon Sector Plan.

The applicant for the Discussion Agenda withdrew. He had a new design that would be presented at the July DRC meeting.

The Chair called for staff reports and other items.

REPORTS OF STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman’s Report: The Chair stated that she will not be in town for the County Board meeting on Columbia Pike scheduled for July 21st. She asked that other HALRB members plan to attend. Mr. Leventhal, Ms.

Oronao, and the Chair went to the dedication ceremony for Buckingham Gardens (BVIII).

- B) Survey Report: Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the W&OD designation would likely come forward in August as would Green Valley Pharmacy. Both owners need to review the designations first. The Fraber House and Broadview will go forward in the fall.

- C) Site Plan Committee: The URD for Broadview was approved unanimously by the Planning Commission and the County Board. The application was well received and the Board commented on the value added by the HALRB to the process and the final product. For the Rappahanock Coffee Site, it will come forward for HALRB review in the future, likely this summer.

- D) Staff and other Reports: Mr. Leventhal reported that the County subdivided the parcel containing the Fort Ethan Allen Historic District. Now the Madison Center is on a separate parcel from the historic district. Mr. Vincent stated that this concerned him because even though the property with the Madison Center is not, nor has it ever been part of the historic district, it is still a known archaeological site. The County should be aware of this and should still make sure that work gets reviewed and approved somehow on the site. Ms. Ballo suggested the HALRB write a letter to ISD and the County Board saying a protocol, such as a MOU, needs to be developed for these properties. The HALRB agreed and asked staff to work on the issue.

Discussion Item: Pierce-Queen Apartments

The applicants, Paul Brown with Wesley, working with Jon Kinney and Robert Atkinson Architects, began the presentation. Wesley Housing has owned the subject property, located at 1600 -1610 16th Street North; 1520 N. Pierce Street in the Fort Myer Heights North neighborhood. The site plan proposal would involve the construction of 214,000 sq. ft. of a residential building (208 units w/84 affordable units), with preservation of two existing garden apartment buildings.

Wesley Housing has owned the apartment complex since 1992. They did a ‘light renovation’ of the buildings once before. This is a committed affordable housing development with fifty apartments. The Fort Myer Heights North Plan envisions this block to be redeveloped as a mixed-income development. The new complex would have 84 out of 208 units as committed affordable.

Mr. Doug Carter, with Robert Atkinson Architects, went through the power point, describing the existing site conditions and the proposed new construction and preservation scheme. The Plan for this block had very specific requirements. They are meeting it with a 12 story building, garage with entrance and loading on Queen Street, saving significant trees on 16th Street, planning for a public/shared-use space mid-

block, for the two existing buildings on 16th Street will remain, and a major setback adjacent from the proposed new residential tower to the existing buildings. There will be a new central plaza, and the facades on 16th Street will be redone. They had been proposing archways to define the entrances to the courtyards, but after some comments they are looking at other options to enclose this space. They are proposing to add a new cornice, shutters, and other details to the garden apartments. The complex is listed as Important on the HRI.

The Chair thanked the applicant and opened the floor for comment. She noted that this site plan has not been submitted yet, and that they were still in the beginning stages of the review process.

Mr. Craig noted that there are 5 garden apartments now; 3 will be demolished and 2 will be retained as part of this project. Mr. Craig stated that he had met with the applicant prior to this meeting, and he was concerned about the attempts to create a more formal, more Georgian version, of these very simple buildings. If anything, gussyying them up with more details creates a greater contrast with the simplified and modern apartment building planned for the rear. He is concerned that the application of shutters, a new cornice, door surrounds create a disconnect and are not the goal of historic preservation. Mr. Leventhal stated that there is elegance in the simplicity of the buildings and that by keeping them more honest this would allow the new building to stand out more. Mr. Craig added that he found the archways ponderous, and that they are not a successful transition. A better way to connect the buildings to the tower, one that also frames the courtyard, should be explored.

Ms. Iacomini, Planning Commissioner and HALRB liaison to the Planning Commission, asked if they had filed with the county. The applicants replied that they had as of last week. Ms. Iacomini added that the plan envisioned the stepback for the new building to be a physical one, not an open space.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the chimneys were being removed, and the applicant replied that they were being retained. Ms. Liccese-Torres noted the salvage condition and asked if they had a plan yet for salvaging materials. The applicants said they would look into it.

Mr. Dudka stated that he supports Mr. Craig's comments. Putting shutters with arch-topped windows and adding elaborate set pieces changes the character of the building. He also finds the archway to be heavy. He suggested looking at achieving the desired effects with landscape and hardscape. There seems to be a plinth created by the two-story brick buildings in the front. Maybe add details as you move around the back and transition to the new building. As the Historic Preservation Board, he doesn't see a way to support these embellishments. Ms. Weichmann-Morris supported Mr. Dudka's comments. Mr. Vincent supported the recycling request by staff, stating that they should always do more to focus on environmental issues. He also noted that there would be an archaeological condition on the site plan and that the applicants should be aware of the possibility of finding artifacts during excavation. Mr. Laporte agreed with the previous comments and encouraged the applicants to accentuate the existing

buildings more thoughtfully. Mr. Craig added that, overall, the design needs more cohesion, and something beside the brick to tie it all together.

Mr. Leventhal asked for clarification on the ‘committed affordable’ claim. The applicant said that there were no deed restrictions remaining on their affordable units, but they are a committed owner; it is part of their mission. They are considered within the County’s CAFF requirements.

The Chair agreed with the previous comments. She finds the setbacks and landscaping appropriate. She would prefer to see less height near these low-scale buildings. She asked for a straw poll of the HALRB members on certain issues. It was unanimous that the ornaments proposed should not be added. It was nearly unanimous that the “arch” should be rethought. Mr. Atkinson stated that they would return next month and will develop these concepts further.

Discussion Item: Columbia Pike Land Use Plan

Mr. Matt Mattausek from CPHD began with a powerpoint presentation describing the timeline for the project and the major policy goals for the Plan. The team spent the first year establishing the existing conditions, going on bus tours, and really focusing on gathering as much factual information as possible on the existing residential areas. The County Board charged the planning team with looking at what the County can do in the next 30 years to preserve affordable housing. The policy Framework was released in October 2011. The HALRB was first briefed in December of 2011. They compiled hundreds of comments from the charette last summer and from other public meetings. The Request to Advertise was approved by the County Board on June 16th. The Planning Commission will hear this on July 9th; the County Board will hear it on June 21st, 23rd, or 24th. Tonight, they are looking to review the key elements. They want to make it clear that historic preservation is being looked at in the context of affordable housing, land use, and transportation. They will be asking for a representative from the HALRB to help develop the form based code. He then went through the 7 Plan Goals, including housing. He also pointed out the illustrative Master Plan.

Ms. Jennifer Smith continued the presentation. From the direction given by the County Board in 2008, they are concerned about the loss of affordable housing in this area. In addition, they wanted to do a full comprehensive plan. The goal is to preserve 5000 affordable units for 30 years in this plan. The goal is also to enhance the quality of life along the Pike and preserve some affordable housing in place. The policies are centered on creating units in new structures and preserving units in existing structures. There is a possible new housing loan program that can be used as a tool, but financial incentives will only go so far. They are also looking to create an affordable housing component in the Form Based Code. She spoke briefly on the limited historic preservation policies envisioned by the plan. She showed a map showing the HRI properties that are also eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. There is a partial preservation scheme envisioned for these properties as part of Conservation Areas. The Form Based Code would not apply to these areas, but other financial tools would be available to help encourage the goals of the Conservation Areas. The bonus density would be to preserve affordable housing. The community commented that they were

not willing to give bonus density for historic preservation. She went through the next steps to get to the County Board hearing, and discussed how the HALRB's role in helping to write the Form Based Code might work. She concluded and said she would answer any questions.

The Chair thanked staff and asked the HALRB for discussion and questions.

Mr. Laporte asked for a clarification. In saying that the community did not support giving bonus density for historic preservation, were they against the density, or against historic preservation? He has never heard this said before. Ms. Smith stated that people felt this plan was already achieving significant preservation and they were concerned about the proposed heights with the bonus density. They would like to see additional density offered for affordable housing.

Mr. Woodruff stated that reading the plan and looking at the maps, he could not ascertain the extent to which the plan contemplates losing historic structures. Is this quantified at all? Ms. Smith replied that the plan does not quantify the buildings lost that way. They hope the incentives are enough to keep property owners from demolishing buildings.

Ms. Lawrence stated that while it is difficult to read the maps, at least the earlier iterations had shown more historic buildings being preserved. This latest draft, for example, shows the Oakland and the Quebec totally redeveloped (Map, page 4.22) and replaced with six story buildings. The frustration with the maps is that Columbia Pike itself is hard to find. Mr. Woodruff agreed. Mr. Dudka agreed, saying it was really hard to tell what buildings are missing and presumed to be demolished in the redevelopment scheme. Can something show or list: these are the buildings we are going to lose. Ms. Smith said the maps could be clarified. Mr. Dudka added that at BVI and BVII (Buckingham Villages I and II) the boulevard feel of George Mason was lost along with the buildings when they were redeveloped. Columbia Pike itself has a character that may be lost with all this redevelopment. The Plan needs to think of the Pike itself as a resource. Mr. Vincent agreed with Mr. Dudka's comments. This plan obliterates, to a large extent, the relationships between the existing buildings and the Pike. Mr. Turnbull asked why are there portions of Barcroft proposed for redevelopment far down near Four Mile Run, furthest from the streetcar site. Ms. Smith replied that those redevelopment nodes were responding to what had already been built across Four Mile Run. The team was also looking at areas of Barcroft that could be redeveloped because they were different from the majority of the site and further away.

Mr. Woodruff asked why there is a 10-story building being shown over the W&OD Trail. Ms. Smith replied that it was responding to the Brittainy and the Carlton developments which are already that tall.

Ms. Iacomini, the Planning Commission liaison to the HALRB, stated that some of these issues had been discussed at the Long Range Planning Committee meetings. They also discussed the plans to redevelop the Pike frontage of Barcroft. What is not clear is how many buildings the plan proposes to be demolished. The hardline has not been drawn and the HALRB's involvement will be important in the next steps. Our historic

areas are what have really made Arlington livable and special. Parts of this plan are bad for historic preservation, but there are ways to make it better going forward.

Mr. David Cristeal, from CHPD-Housing, asked if the County were able to preserve Barcroft and Fillmore Gardens the way Buckingham was been preserved, wouldn't that be seen as acceptable. Ms. Iacomini replied that the HALRB didn't necessarily see the Buckingham deal as a win-win for historic preservation. The reality is that Paradigm came to the table to bargain in the first place only because the County considered using its authority to immediately landmark the entirety of Villages I, II and III.

Mr. Turnbull stated that in evaluating the plan, a percentage of the buildings lost would be useful to know. And much of this redevelopment is contingent on the streetcar actually happening. Ms. Smith replied that the bus is already heavily used on the Pike today. The streetcar will continue to be evaluated separate and apart from this study. She stated that rents are already rising on the Pike and people are leaving. Density is one of the tools that can be used to help keep a diversity of housing options on the Pike. Mr. Turnbull stated it would be nice to see a map of what redevelopment options are available by right. Ms. Smith stated that staff considered whether to remove the existing by right RA townhouse zoning from Barcroft and other apartment properties, but that idea was tabled. The County has come up with incentives instead to help keep developers at the negotiating table.

Mr. Woodruff asked staff what is the imminent development pressure at Barcroft. Ms. Smith replied there is none. Mr. Woodruff replied that the County was *inviting* development with this plan. Ms. Smith stated that they are looking to incentivize preservation and transfer of development rights to help guide development away from historic properties. Mr. Woodruff replied that he does not think this is a sensitive plan at all, and certainly does not preserve the boulevard or any other quality of the Pike.

The Chair, Ms. Lawrence, stated that the earlier iterations of this Plan were more sensitive to historic properties. The presumed explanation for why the plan has changed involves the ill-conceived legislation passed in Richmond. There has been no explanation from the County Attorney's office in writing as to why the plan had to change in response. There is a balance not present in this document. It is skewed. Affordable housing is a good and essential goal. In high density areas, there is great potential in preserving affordable housing in historic buildings. There is also great potential for sustainability with such an approach. Where is the discussion of quality of life? What quality of life will there be in Foxcroft Heights when it is surrounded by development on three sides. She cannot believe that housing concerns are driving all this development. The plan essentially presumes all this density will be granted. This seems to be all developer driven, and not driven by a desire to improve the quality of life for the neighborhoods along the Pike. Ms. Smith replied that the incentives are meant to steer developers away from by right schemes and to preserve affordable housing. Mr. Cristeal added that the density is achieving about 20% of the affordable goals. 80% will come from preserving existing units and TDRs. The Chair replied that County policy is ever-evolving; at one point the County saw fit to make the HRI one of its enacted policies, but now it is such a low priority in this plan. Mr. Vincent added that the county's policy, through the adoption of this plan, is saying that all of this area

needs to be redeveloped. There is a serious disconnect between what happened at the charettes and the planning documents. He doesn't know how this plan connects to what the community actually wants. This is troubling.

Mr. Craig stated that he loves the photos of all the beautiful, historic architecture, but notes that there is no mechanism to ensure that gets built along the Pike. This goes back to quality of life. These historic apartments represent old money, and then the plan is incentivizing development and adding new money, all to get a paltry affordable housing increase, that is only guaranteed for one generation. Ms. Smith replied that the Form Based Code would be the opportunity to guide the design of the development.

Ms. Iacomini stated that, unfortunately, the ship has sailed on the height allowances. The study was generated by affordable housing worries and goals rise to the top in different areas. She does not think it was done to say "we don't care about historic preservation", but to spotlight affordable housing. Hopefully, the HALRB will be heavily involved in writing the Form Based Code.

The Chair stated that if she felt this plan would really guarantee affordable housing, she could support it. But she does not see that plan accomplishing that goal. Mr. Woodruff stated that in the RB Corridor, it was the train that brought the development. Here we are creating the incentives to drive the development. He asked staff to show some evidence of this development pressure to help them understand better why the County is pursuing this plan. Ms. Iacomini stated that partially because of what happened in the RB corridor, and what was lost, staff sees this plan as being proactive. It is about preserving affordable housing as a unit count, not just in the bricks and mortar.

Mr. Hannabass stated that he does not have a clear sense of this plan's motivation, but generally, when you follow the money, you find the motivation. He asked where was the definitive plan for the corridor, and where is the quality of life?

Ms. Smith stated that they would try to address these concerns, but understand that the plan has been advertised and will go to hearing in July. Staff would like a letter from the HALRB to the County Board, and a commitment to send a member to serve on the Form Base Code group.

The Chair stated that she will draft a letter for the HALRB to review. Ms. Smith replied that she would need the letter prior to the Planning Commission distribution on July 5th.

Mr. Woodruff moved to have the HALRB write a letter expressing certain reservations about the plan as presented, but also an appreciation of the staff time and effort involved. The letter should detail the HALRBs involvement to date, and express its strong desire to participate in the future efforts to write a new Form Based Code. Mr. Laporte seconded and the motion passed 11-0-1 with Mr. Vincent abstaining.

Ms. Smith added that they would not need the FBC representative until the summer. The Chair stated that they do appreciate the hard work, and Ms. Smith replied that she appreciated the feedback.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 10:20pm.