



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

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

**Wednesday, January 22, 2014
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Room 307 (County Board Room)**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Patricia Weichmann-Morris

STAFF:

Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Coordinator
John Liebertz, Historic Preservation Planner

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 18, 2013, MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the December meeting minutes. Mr. Laporte asked for revisions to his comments regarding CoA 13-32, to change the scope of Mr. Hannabass's presentation from review board training to Preservation Virginia Conference, and to reword the motion regarding the nominating committee. Mr. Hannabass moved to accept the amended minutes. Mr. Woodruff seconded and the motion passed 8-0-3, with Mr. Turnbull, Mr. Dudka, and Mr. Vincent abstaining as they did not attend the December meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman said there were two cases on the Consent Agenda and no items on the Discussion Agenda. The Chairman called for a motion on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Vincent moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. LaPorte seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

- Consent Agenda:
- 1) 3424 21st Avenue North
Alex Berger and Amber Blaha
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 12-26B (HP1300041)
Request to revise previously approved CoA 12-26A in order to modify dimensions of rear square bay window, alter the type and/or size of select windows on the rear addition, and change the dimensions of the new rear patio door.
 - 2) 1028 South Walter Reed Drive
DSF Columbia Center
Columbia Pike Form Based Code Area
HALRB Case 4-01A (HP1300040)
Request to revise previously approved CoA 4-01 to add new rooftop telecommunications equipment and associated screening.

Discussion Agenda: None

The Chairman stated that there were three Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness and asked for comments or questions from staff and the board. No comments were made.

- Administrative CoA (ACoA)
- 1) 3550 Wilson Boulevard
Maury School Historic District
ACoA 13-18 (HP1300038)
Install three temporary exterior sculptures.
 - 2) 2324 North Edgewood Street
Maywood Historic District
ACoA 13-19 (HP1300042)
Install wood privacy fence and move existing fence.
 - 3) 3501 22nd Street North
Maywood Historic District
ACoA 13-20 (HP1300043)
Install wood picket fence.

Discussion Item: Arlington Presbyterian Church
3507 Columbia Pike
Historic District Designation

**PLEASE NOTE:* The meeting minutes for the Arlington Presbyterian Church designation request will be a near verbatim transcription of the discussion.*

Chairman: Our main discussion item relates to the Arlington Presbyterian Church and historic designation that has been requested for that property. Just at the outset a little bit of housekeeping. We are using the County Board Room which is wonderful. We have a speaker's podium and there is a timer on the podium. If you have submitted a speaker slip to speak as an individual, you may speak up to three minutes. If you have submitted a slip to speak as a representative of an organization, you may speak up to five minutes. There are lights on the podium that will warn you when your time is almost up. I think that microphone is always on. I want to remind the HALRB members that in order to be heard, your microphone must be turned on, so please make sure that the green light is glowing when you make a comment. We are making an audio recording of this meeting to help us prepare detailed meeting minutes. I hope everyone has submitted their speaker slips. You will be heard in the order that the slips were submitted.

By way of introduction, with this item we are here to consider whether we should recommend that the County Board consider the Arlington Presbyterian Church for local historic designation, district rather, as provided in Section 11.3.4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the County based on facts and information presented to us. This is the next step in a process that was started back in the fall [of 2013] when two members of the church requested that local historic designation of Arlington Presbyterian Church be considered. Following that request, the HALRB at its meeting on November 20, 2013, determined that based on the facts presented, it had reason to believe that the church meet at least two of the eleven qualifying criteria for inclusion in a historic district as set out by the Zoning Ordinance and requested the next step, which is a preparation of a report on the historic significance of the proposed Arlington Presbyterian Church. That report has been prepared and a public hearing is being held tonight, also in accordance with the requirement of the Zoning Ordinance, to consider the [proposed] historic district status of the Arlington Presbyterian Church. And as I indicated, all who want to be heard, may be heard, and make sure you have a speaker slip in.

During our process tonight, we must find at least two of these eleven criteria set out in the Zoning Ordinance have in fact been met based on facts that are presented to us by the report, by the testimony, and whatever else we have before us. If we find that, then we may recommend to the County Board that local historic designation for the Arlington Presbyterian Church be considered. If we make that recommendation, if that is our decision tonight, then the matter will go to the Planning Commission and County Board on two separate occasions; initially as a request to advertise, and then, as a hearing on merits. There will be additional opportunities for public comment and input. I want to emphasize that the County Board makes the ultimate decision in this matter.

I would like to introduce John Liebertz, who is historic preservation staff for the County, to give us a statement about the history of this church.

Mr. Liebertz: Designed in the Colonial Revival style, Arlington Presbyterian Church was built in 1931 on Columbia Pike in the Alcova Heights neighborhood. The congregation, however, has a longer history on Columbia Pike as the oldest extant church building on this significant roadway. In the early twentieth century, due to a lack of accessibility to the First Presbyterian Church of Ballston, influential Presbyterians in South Arlington sought to establish a second congregation. Miles C. Munson started a Sunday School in his home and a mission church of First Presbyterian Church (also known as Ballston Presbyterian Church), was established on Columbia Pike ca. 1906.

Arlington Presbyterian Church was formally recognized in 1908. After worshipping at a temporary building, a more permanent church was constructed in 1911. The congregation remained in this building until it was destroyed by a fire in 1924. After briefly holding services in other buildings, the congregation purchased parts of the present-day parcel in Alcova Heights and accepted a temporary building from the Washington City Presbytery, aptly named the “Little Chapel,” but continued to plan for their new building.

Adolph Thelander, a prominent local architect, designed the oldest section of the present-day church in 1931. It featured a center-steeple plan and a full-height portico. His use of stone was atypical for Arlington County’s places of worship. Today, of the 74 places of worship, only nine extant buildings utilize stone as a primary material. Arlington Presbyterian Church is the second oldest of those nine stone churches remaining in the county.

Due to the success of the congregation and the growth of the county, the church expanded accordingly. In the staff’s designation form, if you turn to page 59, you can graphically follow along. In 1950, McLeod and Ferrara, who specialized in church construction, made alterations to the 1931 building. They removed the original steeple and infilled the portico, constructed the new existing steeple, and placed an addition to the rear. The motivating factor to complete these renovations was to accommodate more congregants. The firm’s design continued the use of stone on the façade of the building by applying it to the new steeple’s tower.

Arlington Presbyterian Church continued to grow resulting in the construction of the education wing in 1961. Designed by local firm Joseph Saunders and Associates, the addition consisted of a large brick veneered ell to the rear of the building and a stone veneered wing to the east of the tower. This largely accounts for the exterior changes to the present day building.

Over the last 100 years, Arlington Presbyterian Church has been associated with individuals who have made significant contributions not only to the congregation, but to the County. These church leaders were civic minded individuals who assisted in many initiatives, including the general improvement of the county, advancement of education, development of health services, breakdown of segregation, and other charitable institutions such as clothing banks.

Based on the research findings, APC meets the following four criteria: Criterion B, the property has character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county, state, or nation; Criterion D, the property is associated with

person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the county, state, or nation; Criterion H, the property has a distinctive location or a singular physical characteristic that makes it an established or familiar visual feature; Criterion K, the property is suitable for preservation or restoration. It is also potentially eligible for Criterion A, the property is listed or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; however, this would require further research to determine if the Alcovia Heights neighborhood is eligible as a potential historic district. This concludes the staff's summary of the research.

Chairman: Thank you. Would you call the first speaker please?

Mr. Liebertz: The first speaker is Harro Wulf.

Mr. Wulf: Good evening. My name is Harro Wulf. I have been an Arlingtonian since 1961 and a member of APC for over 50 years. After perusing the staff's report, I believe now, more than ever, APC at the corner of Lincoln and Columbia Pike should be afforded historical designation. The building is a distinguished landmark on Columbia Pike with its attractive stonework and majestic steeple. Not having this building would be a regrettable loss not only to Columbia Pike residents, including the Alcovia Heights neighborhood, but for generations of Arlingtonians to come. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Janie Wulf.

Ms. Wulf: I know that my talk was longer than three minutes so I am going to cut it. Basically, I want to first of all thank you all, you did a wonderful job as staff writing this report. My talk was basically on the things that I think make APC historical. And I am going to cut it to two paragraphs. Many, many people have put their time, gifts, and talents to the building and its preservation. It was built on farmland when people were scattered far apart. The founders gave their land and the rest of their lives to building and worshipping in the first church. The church was burned and some of these people gave their all to building the current stone church. The history of the people and efforts are a reason to designate the building as a historical landmark. Last week, eleven current members of the church met to talk about historic preservation of APC. We found that we have spent a grand total of 403 years in the church. There were in this group of people who had served as elders, trustees, deacons, treasurers, church school superintendents, Sunday School teachers, youth leaders, singers, and a myriad of other leadership positions. Every one of these members has also been active in the schools and the community. I love that the history that has been written to include our founders and people, that will never be named or have a memorial outside of this building.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Richard E. Cobb.

Mr. Cobb: Thank you friends. Thank you for all of your time. I am Pastor at Central United Methodist Church. I was pastor of Main Street United Methodist Church in Danville prior to coming to Arlington. Main Street was in a district, and I was pastor at that time, and decided that we needed this designation that you are talking about. Main Street received it. Main Street was a cathedral, Romanesque in architecture. It seated 900 members, the stained glass

windows were as tall as that wall [pointing]. It was huge. It had 21 bells in its tower. After receiving that designation, I found that the tower was off plumb 9.5 inches. It took that congregation \$350,000 to re-plumb that tower. That was the last repair that congregation was able to afford. Today, no one hears those bells prepared even though there is a carillon in that tower. No one hears the 22-rank organ played. No one sees the sun shining through those windows because no one could afford to keep that huge cathedral in repair according to the demands of the historical district. The congregation dwindled and failed. The United Methodist Church backed away from its commitment. Today, the cathedral doors are rotting, the termites are glorifying in that building, the rats are existing, the shell is falling apart. When Moses saw the bush burning, God said, it ain't about the bush, it is about the fire. No one gives a building, they give a church. Friends, the church is the body. The building of a church needs to be as fluid as the congregation. I hope you consider with wisdom what you are doing when you look at a church as a historical district. Thank you friends.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Sara Uzel.

Ms. Uzel: Good evening, I started to say good morning, good evening, my name is Sara Uzel and I serve as the President of the Alcova Heights Civic Association. APC is located in our association boundaries. In November, you began to review the request for designation and one of the things you asked me was how our community felt about this and what would they like to see done and why. And I said at that time, I really had not had time to 1) educate our community, and 2) get their responses for this. So the night after your last meeting, we had our first civic meeting about this, and we discussed that process and where we were going, and how we were going to come back with a community conclusion if we had one. We started out with making sure all the reports were provided to people and educating them, and our community also felt that things were moving very, very rapidly, and we sent a letter asking that things be slowed down a little bit so we could understand and make an educated decision or recommendation.

It turns out that the schedule we had hoped to see didn't work out, and so, we didn't have another meeting, so we did a special bulletin and an announcement through our email to get this consensus and a resolution. What we did was we had two people in our community that supported and did not support the historic designation come up with a resolution that we felt was fair and even for our community. The resolution said, "The Alcova Heights Citizens Association acknowledges that church congregations, their physical buildings, and related open spaces provide unique and desirable elements to our community. We encourage the Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board to designate parts of the APC property as historically significant as the church building meets many of the historic criteria defined in the HALRB. We are confident that the developer and the property owner can provide affordable housing, a child care program, a church sanctuary, and program space while incorporating certain historical external architectural features of the existing church structure, church building" [I am sorry]. That was the resolution, and it was put forward by somebody that was really supportive of this decision and someone that wouldn't be. So we were trying to be fair.

So we sent out, and actually if we could get this response to everything I would be so happy and I wouldn't be at so many of these meetings, we'd have more people. We had 64 people actually respond to the survey, which is I believe more people than even responded to our

[neighborhood] conservation survey. We had 59 people say yes they supported the resolution. We had five people say they did not support the resolution. That is 92 percent and 7.8 percent, with some decimals. And then the other big piece you had asked me last time is which criteria could apply to the APC.

After looking at everything, discussion amongst board members, and discussion amongst residents, these were the five criteria that we think qualify at least partially: 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 11 [b, d, e, f, h, and k according to Section 11.3.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance]. I don't have much more time. In closing, this is not a debate about affordable housing, or really historic preservation, for our community and our neighborhood. It's really about more about, I'm sorry affordable housing vs. historic preservation. There are many examples where those can be incorporated and we, as a community, really believe they can co-exist. You can have the affordable housing, the church programs, and some pieces of this architecture, the outside structure, and that is what our community is voting on. Only three people that I know of were active members of this church, so that is not the majority that is for or against, it is a separate aspect than the church decision and how that congregation will move forward.

Chairman: Thank you. Do you have a copy of your resolution?

Ms. Uzel: I did not bring enough copies for everyone.

Chairman: One copy is fine, please give it to John. Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: Cynthia would you like to read what designation criteria were selected for the record.

Chairman: Also please explain where they came from.

Ms. Liccese-Torres: Sure, this is in Section 11.3.4.A of our Zoning Ordinance that has the eleven criteria spelled out. In the ordinance they are lettered instead of numbered. So just for clarity, the ones that Ms. Uzel referenced were: Criterion B, the property has character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county, state, or nation; Criterion D, the property is associated with person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the county, state, or nation; Criterion E, the property embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, or method of construction; Criterion F, the property is identified as the work of a master building, architect, or landscape architect; Criterion H, the property has a distinctive location or a singular physical characteristic that makes it an established or familiar visual feature; and Criterion K, the property is suitable for preservation or restoration.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Nina Janopaul. Excuse me if I mispronounced your name.

Nina Janopaul: Good evening. My name is Nina Janopaul. I am the President and the CEO of Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing [APAH]. We are a non-profit housing developer based exclusively in Arlington. We are proud this year to be celebrating our 25th anniversary, providing as a partner to Arlington County affordable housing. Today, we have 1,000 homes in Arlington in a variety of buildings and structures. APAH's mission has become ever more

critical in Arlington as the community is experiencing a dramatic loss of affordable housing over the last decade. In 2000, Arlington had 17,000 units of market affordable housing. In 2012, there were 5,000 units remaining, a loss of 12,000 homes that were formerly affordable to our neighbors. The trends are clear. The Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Plan was approved unanimously by the County Board in July of 2012. It aspires to create long-term, competitive affordable housing for the 3,000 households currently living in market affordable housing along Columbia Pike. It's a very ambitious plan and it is going to be a challenge for those of us like APAH that are working to meet that goal. It's hard for us to find real estate that is accessible. Small parcels, owners with other aspirations, as you may know there are a lot of properties that have been redeveloped on Columbia Pike with 100 percent market rate apartments, not affordable.

Arlington Presbyterian Church heard the community's call for more affordable housing as part of their visioning process and APAH was honored when they called on us to be part of their future. The church has an amazing vision of service and reengagement with the Columbia Pike community. The APC has embraced the concepts of the Pike's Neighborhoods Plan and the new image of their property under the 2002 Form Based Code. As they ask in their vision statement, for whom does our heart break, APC sees themselves as stewards on this land, embarking on an exciting path for their faith community's future. They are indeed a living church with a dynamic plan. In their discernment process, APC met with several community organizations, including Greenbriar Learning Center, the Arlington Food Assistance Center, CPRO [Columbia Pike Revitalization Organization], and Shirlington Education Employment Center [SEEC]. They discerned that they wanted their worship space to be used throughout the week, connected to that affordable housing, with community programs and services. They want to be a part of this new Pike vision, with a dynamic town center image, a new coffee shop facing the Columbia Pike sidewalk, a new daycare on the first floor. I was very touched to participate in a design meeting with the congregation. The architect asked how best should they try and differentiate the affordable housing on the upper floors from the new church building, from the church on the lower floors. The pastor answered I want the public to identify APC with affordable housing, to know that we are intentional about meeting the community's great need. I am honored to be working with this church and hope that you will support their vision by voting not to designate their current building as a local historic district and giving them the opportunity as a living church to envision the future. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Patricia McGrady.

Ms. McGrady: I am Patricia McGrady. I am a 35-year advocate for affordable housing in Arlington and as of last August I am thankfully also a resident of one of APAH's affordable apartments. I also believe in historic preservation when it is appropriate, but I do not believe it is appropriate in this case for the following reasons. The church has been redesigned many times over the years with parts removed and parts added along the way. It is not the same building that was originally built. The majority of church members have voted to dispense with the current building and build a new one along with building affordable housing on this site. They have seen that the church's mission of ministering to the needy as more important than bricks and mortar. I stand in great admiration of that decision by church members, showing that their support of the church's mission overrides any lesser goals of preserving the church building. I hope that you will support their decision. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Susan Etherton.

Ms. Etherton: May the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in your sight oh Lord, my rock, and my redeemer. Madame Chair, members of the board, good evening. My name is Susan Etherton. I have been a member of APC for thirty years. I am an ordained elder. I am an active member of the vision team that discerned our current vision and I am currently the lead lay person for the redevelopment of our property. I am speaking this evening for the church, the owner, and I want to be very clear, we strongly oppose historic designation, and we are asking you to vote no. In 1908, when APC began as a mission church for the southern part of Arlington County, I imagine the people establishing that faith community had a vision. In 1930, when that faith community built a church building that opened to Columbia Pike and welcomed the neighborhood, I imagine they had a vision. And when they outgrew their building and planned their expansion and reorientation, I imagine even then they had a vision, a vision of a vibrant faith community, growing, and changing with the times. And the membership did grow to 1,000 in 1954. In 1955, it began to decline, and continued a steady decline. Between 1967 and 1972, APC lost an average of 75 members per year and gained only 30. In 1927, Reverend Walker sent a letter to members urging them not to turn away the steady stream of visitors and strangers by protecting themselves from change among old friends. The current membership is now 80.

A few years ago we developed a growing awareness, we had lost our way. The book of Proverbs warns us where there is no vision the people perish. We had no vision. We knew we had a choice, to embark on a journey of discernment listening for God's new vision for us, or to perish. Dwindling in numbers and resources, surrounded by an aging, failing building. And so we began, a small number of us, to listen for God's voice. We committed to daily practices of prayer and bible study. We spent time in the community, had conversations with neighbors, all the while listening. For whom are our hearts breaking? Who is God calling us to serve? Who is God calling this new community to be? Gradually, as we listened, the elements of a vision became clear. First, at the very heart of our vision, we are called to continue to be disciples of Jesus Christ. To be a faith community where people see the love of God and encounter the living Christ. Secondly, we are physical at the crossroads of Columbia Pike and Glebe Road, we will be a place of crossroads and connection. We will offer community gathering space where people can meet and connect.

Thirdly, we will provide affordable housing for our working friends. Teachers, service workers, firefighters, waiters, employed in our neighborhood but unable to afford to live here. As we begin to embrace and live into this vision, we recognize the harmony of who we are called to be as disciples of Jesus Christ and the holistic nature of redeveloped multiuse property that will have at its very core the church, and in it surrounding building opportunities to support the other components of our vision: a child-care center, coffee house, flexible community space and affordable rental housing. We see so clearly how this valuable piece of land, now in the midst of a growing and dynamic urban corridor, can serve our neighborhood and our faith community once again, by allowing us to be reborn and live out this new vision given to us by God. As people of the Word we know the transformational power of a relationship with God. We have been called by God to be a witness on Columbia Pike to this transforming power. We celebrate a God who loves us so much that he came into our common flesh and dwelled

among us. This is radical faith, transformative faith; this is not a faith that hides behind walls of stone. This faith requires us to be fluid and flexible, open and expansive. Our history tells of a faith community willing to change the building to live into its vision. Our current vision calls us to do so once again.

Chairman: Thank you.

John Liebertz: The next speaker is Roy Howard.

Mr. Howard: My name is Roy Howard. I am the chairperson of the leadership council of the National Capital Presbytery, and I am very grateful for you all, and sincerely say that I pray for you as you have to deal with all of these matters in a careful focused mind and come to a decision.

As the local governing body of the Presbyterian Church (USA), the National Capital Presbytery has a vested interest in the question of historical designation of the Arlington Presbyterian Church property. Our organization is made up of 110 churches, over 300 clergy, and about 32,000 church members in Washington, D.C., Northern Virginia, and parts of Maryland. We are the corporate expression of the PCUSA in the greater Washington area. Pursuant to polity, our way of governing ourselves, all property is held by a congregation; its held in trust for the use and benefit of the entire church, and any sale or encumbrance of a National Capital Presbytery church's real property must have the written permission of the presbytery, its governing body.

At its January 8 [2014] meeting, the Leadership Council of National Capital Presbytery, of which I am the chairperson, voted to oppose the designation of Arlington Presbyterian Church property as an historic district and directed me to send this news, announcement, to you all, with respect and kindness. This proposed action we believe will inappropriately impinge on our ability to accomplish the mission of the Presbyterian Church in the world, and specifically, in this neighborhood in Arlington. The proposed designation will limit the Church and Presbytery's property rights, and we would view such designation as a violation of our religious freedom in its most fundamental expression.

We strongly urge that you consider the opposition of both the Arlington Presbyterian Church congregation, and its governing body, the National Capital Presbytery, as you consider this designation for this congregation. We believe that it would in fact be a violation of our ability and our freedom to practice the mission that has been given to us. Thank you very much.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Sharon Core.

Ms. Core: Ladies and gentleman, my name is Sharon Core and I am Pastor at Arlington Presbyterian Church. I come before you with a letter signed by 26 Arlington clergy. At their meeting on November 20 [2013], the HALRB cited APC as being potentially historic because it meets the following two criteria. Number Four: The property is associated with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the county, state, or nation. Number Eight: The property has a distinctive location, or singular physical characteristic that make it an established or familiar visual feature. All houses of worship, by their very nature of service to and presence in the community, would meet these criteria. All communities of faith are associated with leaders in the community and all have distinctive locations and/or physical

characteristics. APC is not unique in this regard. We believe that recommending historic designation for APC, against their wishes, sets an untenable precedent for other faith communities who may be looking at redevelopment as a possible opportunity to continue their presence, mission and outreach in their community.

The letter is signed by: Rabbi Lia Bass, Congregation Etz Hayim; The Reverend Ann Barker, St. John's Episcopal Church; The Reverend E. Cobb, Senior Pastor, Central United Methodist Church; The Reverend Kim L. Coleman, Record, Trinity Episcopal Church; The Reverend Sharon K. Core, Arlington Presbyterian Church; The Reverend Dale Dawson, Senior Pastor, Community Church of God; The Reverend Dr. David Ensign, Pastor, Clarendon Presbyterian Church; The Reverend Glen Evans, President, Art for Humanity; The Reverend Judith Fulp-Eickstaedt, Pastor Trinity Presbyterian Church; The Reverend Felix E. Gonazolez, Pastor, Congregacion Cristiana Misionera Fe Y Alabanze; The Reverend J. Beth Goss, Pastor, Church of the Covenant; The Reverend Horace H. Grinnell, Pastor, St. Charles Borromeo Catholic Church; The Reverend Dr. Leonard L. Hamlin, Sr., Pastor, Macedonia Baptist Church; The Reverend Stephen Hassmer, Pastor, Calvary United Methodist Church; The Reverend Timothy J. Hickey, CSSp, Pastor, Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Church; The Reverend Dr. James B. Johnson II, Senior Pastor, The Church at Clarendon; The Reverend Steve King, Senior Pastor, Cherrydale Baptist Church; The Reverend Scott Maurer, Lead Pastor, West City Fellowship; The Reverend Dr. Matthew A. Merrill, Sr. Pastor, Little Falls Presbyterian Church; The Reverend Dr. Bryan Mickle, Pastor, First Presbyterian Church; The Reverend Scott Seaton, Pastor, Emmanuel Presbyterian Church; The Reverend Bill Shuler, Lead Pastor, Capital Life Church; The Reverend Thomas P. Tunney, CSSp, Associate Pastor, Our Lady Queen of Peach Catholic Church; The Reverend Dr. Edward R. Walker, Senior Pastor, Mount Olivet United Methodist Church; The Reverend Brian Webster, Pastor, Christ Church of Arlington; and The Very Reverend Shearon Sykes Williams, Rector, St. George's Episcopal Church.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Gray O'Dwyer.

Ms. O'Dwyer: My name is Gray O'Dwyer. I am an architectural historian and preservation specialist with EHT Tracerics, which has provided consulting and documentation services to the church. The Arlington Presbyterian Church has occupied a portion of the current site on Columbia Pike since 1909. From 1909 to 1930, the church was located in different buildings on the site and the current 1930 building has been expanded and altered extensively since originally constructed.

The current church building is composed of three sections, including the much-altered remains of the original 1930 sanctuary, the tower, steeple, chapel, and hall of the 1949 addition, and the two 1960 two-story brick education wing. The original Colonial Revival style of the sanctuary is muddled by the Gothic Revival influences of the addition and the significant changes in material between the stone facing of the original building and the painted brick of the 1960 addition. The alterations to the church, in 1949, made a purposeful decision to turn away from the commercialization of Columbia Pike for the quieter streets of Alcovia Heights.

Because of the alterations, particularly the extensive changes to the historic facade which include removal of the columned portico, demolition of the steeple, loss of the bell, and re-

orientation of the church facade from Columbia Pike to Lincoln Street, the church building is not eligible for listing as an individual resource in the National Register of Historic Places. Preservation or restoration of the church building becomes very difficult because so little fabric remains from the original building, which did have a distinctive architectural style and an imposing presence on Columbia Pike. The building, as it currently exists, does not contribute to the architectural landscape of Columbia Pike and the 1949 setback steeple tower is barely visible. The rebuilt facade presents a blank, unwelcoming face to the community.

The site as it exists also conveys a false sense of low density, when historically the property was much smaller and contained multiple buildings. The building itself was never architecturally or stylistically distinctive, and it is altered to such an extent that the building presents an uninspired and confusing expression, and has only peripheral association with locally significant persons.

The church body intends to maintain its history, setting, and commitment to community engagement. The church building has repeatedly changed to accommodate the needs of the ever-evolving church body, and future plans for Arlington Presbyterian will continue to memorialize its founders and congregation, maintaining its essential sense within a new program. The current church building not only fails to fulfill church needs, but is so drastically altered from the original construction that it cannot be considered to have historic or architectural integrity.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Chris Gordon.

Mr. Gordon: Thank you. My name is Chris Gordon. I am the architect for APC. I am also an architect with the firm of KGD Architecture in Rosslyn. I am a 28-year resident of Arlington County. I also serve on the Columbia Pike Neighborhood Form Based Code Advisory Committee, recently, and I am the architect for the residence portion of the Arlington Mill [project]. As part of our design process, we looked at the history of the church, it has a very rich and colorful history, and going through the history of the church the interesting aspect was the amount of change. You just heard the last speaker talk about the amount of change that happened to the physical property of the church. APC and the church's ability to change and adapt to the times, the small congregation grew from a church membership of 1,000 back in the 50s that has included many significant members over its history. As many of the members have moved away from the neighborhood, the church adapted to the changing needs of the congregation by adding the parking lot, moving the primary entrances away from Columbia Pike and facing the church parking lot and Lincoln Street, and taking the direct connection off of Columbia Pike in those alterations. These adaptations at the time were important and consistent with the church's mission and were successful for meeting the needs of that time. Over the century the church has been open, APC has adapted the building to meet the needs of its organization. During that time, Columbia Pike has evolved from a simple road to D.C. into a thriving pedestrian and urban boulevard serving the community around it. During that time, and as today, true to the church's history of change, APC seeks to reconnect to the neighborhood by creating a facility that meets its vision. The historic constant of APC is that they constantly change over time, and they allow their facility to

change to meet those needs. I ask that you allow APC to create their vision by not restricting their ability to adapt.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Jessica Pernani.

Ms. Pernani: Good evening. My name is Jessica Pernani. I am a life-long member of Arlington Presbyterian Church. It is the church where I was baptized, confirmed, and married. I have served as an Elder and I hope to have my baby baptized there this summer. This makes my perspective unique, while I have a long history at APC, I am also of a different generation than the majority of our members. I see among my own peers a growing dissatisfaction with organized religion, both those who grew up as active members in a faith community and those that didn't. There is a sense that religion is increasingly fanatical and extreme and wildly out of touch with the world and people today.

When I talk to people about our vision of the future that we at Arlington Presbyterian have discerned, they are excited and surprised that a church community should have so much involvement in the world outside these doors. That a church community would actually walk-the-walk of serving people in need rather than just talk-the-talk. I am proud to be a member of a faith community that has such a right tradition of being on the "progressive" side of history time and time again. I am even more proud that we are daring to continue this tradition yet again.

I have been a practicing commercial Interior Design for nearly a decade, so I have a appreciation for architecture generally beyond that of the average person. And, of course, for all of the reasons stated above, the building at 3507 Columbia Pike is incredibly sentimental to me. However, the church has never been the building. It has always been the people within that building. All of our congregation's community outreach, our wonderful memories that we have with our loved ones, all of our history is about the people and their good work. It never has been about our building. Through our vision, the people of APC will remain on this site and continue to worship and serve.

I hope that the County will see that the value of our proposed vision, assisting so many individuals and families along the Pike, far outweighs the preservation of this altered and expired building. I urge the Review Board to vote "no" to an historic designation.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Cathy Puskar.

Ms. Puskar: My name is Cathy Puskar. I am here on behalf of the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing. I am an attorney with Walsh Colluci and have represented clients on six projects that have been constructed on Columbia Pike, including one that has come before you for historic façade preservation, and am currently working on this project and another project that has been before you. In 1998, the County Board announced creation of the Columbia Pike Initiative. Through the course of numerous community meetings, the Columbia Pike Initiative, a revitalization plan, was adopted in March 2002. During the Fall and Winter of 2002, there was an intensive community process, with a design and charrette process, to

determine the future for Columbia Pike. The clear goal of that process was to create certainty, certainty for the citizens of Arlington, certainty for the development community, and certainty for property owners. In February 2003, the Columbia Pike, once again, Revitalization Plan, was adopted by the County Board in order to achieve Arlington County's vision, quote: "foster a vital main street through a lively mix of uses." As stated in the Form Based Code, and I quote again, "The Form Based Code is a legal document that regulates land development, setting careful and clear control on building form to shape clear public space with a healthy mix of uses."

Historic designation was definitely considered during the multi-year Form Based Code process as evident by the specific inclusion of eight historic buildings to be preserved and three historic facades to be preserved. Arlington Presbyterian Church was not, and is not, on that list. Instead this property was, and is, included in the town center regulating plan, and is clearly intended for redevelopment based upon its current zoning as set forth in the Form Based Code and the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance. There have been many updates to the Form Based Code in the last ten years, and it has never been amended, or in fact even mentioned, to require preservation of this building or any elements associated therewith. The architecture of this church, based on the research before you, is simply not worthy of preservation. And to suggest as some have, that this property and the other 20 properties listed as quote "noteworthy" in the Columbia Pike Initiative Plan, which is a guide, not an ordinance, would lead to uncertainty, would be contrary to the existing zoning of the property, would negatively impact revitalization, and would compromise the integrity of the Form Based Code which the community worked so hard to create. Sentimental attachment does not create historic designations. The history of this church can be preserved through documentation and photographs, while redevelopment and revitalization occurs as envisioned in the Form Based Code. And it is our belief that the proposed development, which includes a vibrant mix of uses as envisioned in the Form Based Code, will be designed in a thoughtful manor to foster the vital main street that is a core tenant of the Form Based Code that the community has embraced since 2003. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Linda Peebles.

Ms. Peebles: My name is Linda Peebles. I have been a member of Arlington Presbyterian for 15 years and I currently serve on APC's session, our governing board. In the past few years, members of APC have worked to discern a new vision for our faith community, a vision for ministry in this time and place and for the future. The vision emerged after months of prayer, study, discussion, and conversation with community neighbors and organizations. You have heard the others describe it so I will not repeat it.

Throughout the discernment process, APC members were invited to participate, and the vision team and session committed to transparency, communicating with members through presentations during worship, sending out letters and e-mails, and providing information through the church newsletter and other updates. It became clear that while there was no argument on the who and why of our vision, there were some who objected to the how, that is, the redevelopment of the property. We all have happy memories connected to our building, and the expressions of sentimental value were understandable, but the historical value was never raised until now.

The session and the Affordable Housing Team have worked within the Presbyterian Church (USA) structure to implement our vision, keeping the National Capital Presbytery informed of our process and plans. And on November 17th, 2013, members of APC gathered to vote on the redevelopment part of the vision. The vote to approve the redevelopment passed 34-19. Now, however, the initiation of the HALRB process is adding time and expense to the process, and shifting attention and energy away from our efforts to move forward with the redevelopment.

The APC building is definitely old. Historic? I don't know. But I cannot believe that those who came before us ever intended this building to stand in the way of this congregation's witness in our community. It is not a museum. It is a home to a ministry that needs another kind of home to best respond to its call. I urge you to vote 'no' to historic designation. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Donald Peebles.

Mr. Peebles: Good evening, I am Don Peebles, and I am reading this for Reverend Robert Harris, former pastor of Arlington Presbyterian Church. He writes:

I write to support the position of the Arlington Presbyterian Church's Session regarding the redevelopment of its property and to raise several concerns about the staff report. Were I not out of town on a long-planned vacation, I would speak with you directly, but I must communicate by this letter. I encourage the HALRB to approve the proposal to redevelop APC in conjunction with the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing.

I note that the [designation] report names me as the author of an APC history published in 1985 and quotes me extensively. I did not write this history. The report clearly indicates that the authors were Russell Snook, George Hieronymous, Don Loutzenheiser, and Jeannie Miller. Now to more substantive concerns.

I have several major concerns about the report's conclusions. The report focuses on APC as a building, not as a congregation of faith and ministry. Leaders in APC have historically led movements that ran counter to the popular culture and responded to change by innovation and adaptation. Hence the establishment of the clothing bank, ordained an African American elder, employed an African American organist, etc. Those courageous souls who initially organized the congregation were responding to changing population needs in South Arlington.

The current proposal to redevelop the property and congregation is very consistent with this innovative and responsive heritage. It is clear that U.S. cultural values and norms have changed dramatically since I was pastor (I left in 1992). People don't automatically become part of a church or synagogue. In fact many churches around the U.S. are experimenting with new ways to reach out to this increasingly unchurched public. So APC's proposal to provide low to moderate income housing is very consistent with its heritage. Fifty years from now, the current leaders of APC may well be considered pioneers and innovators who met the needs of their new day. To

insist that the current church building be retained as a memorial to the innovators who have led APC through the years dishonors their own innovative leadership.

The English translation of the motto of the Presbyterian Church is: “The church reformed, always to be reformed according to the Word of God in the power of the Spirit. The leaders of APC are acting in this tradition, reforming what has been to meet the challenges of a new era.

Finally, I ask by what authority a quasi-governmental body has the power to dictate how a church uses its property, especially when the church seeks to further the public good. While I am certainly a constitutional lawyer, it seems to be that there’s something in the U.S. Constitution about the separation of church and state.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Rebecca Neuburger.

Ms. Neuburger: My name is Rebecca Neuburger. I have attended Arlington Presbyterian Church for the past 10 years. During that time I spent four years volunteering on the administration team, whose purview included building improvements, maintenance, and emergencies. The challenge of keeping the building in working order, for the congregation and for the daycare it houses, was one reason for my strong support of the redevelopment. Large sums of money were and are being poured into heating and cooling this building as well as preventing it from falling into disrepair. In my opinion that is not what our church’s financial resources should be primarily spent on. Bringing the Kingdom of God to our world, here and now, is. I wish to be a part of a faith community that seeks mainly to work toward creating opportunities for transformation by loving our neighbors, sharing what we have, and with God’s help and each other, providing some relief to many kinds of suffering all around us.

Our congregation has voted to move forward with a plan to do just that, a plan that would mean turning ourselves outward to open ourselves up to the community, to transform us into a life-giving, relevant and sustainable part of the body of Christ. APC has a track record of doing just that at various points in history, and this is the 2014 version. We have a responsible and viable plan and we are working in collaboration with a group of experienced professionals, so this isn’t just one of those nice ideas that have no basis in reality. I have heard and understand the arguments for preservation but no part of me agrees with any of them. It is simply not true that the current building could be preserved while updating it to include affordable housing, retail space and daycare facilities. We have explored this option and concluded the preservation did not support our congregation’s vision. The building has limited historical value as determined not by me but by people whose job it is to assess such things, you heard from Gray O’Dwyer. I lived in Arlington in the late-1990s and never knew this Church even existed. The Bank of America, Wendy’s, 7-Eleven, and Rosenthal Chevrolet (now demolished to make way for a large housing project) are the landmarks I would have to reference to describe the location to others before they knew where I was talking about. The fact is that the church building itself and the steeple are no longer visible or recognizable landmarks.

Finally, as is often the case in these kinds of arguments, there are personal grievances that are being played out using this process. It is my prayer that this larger public process can provide

both healing to the aggrieved, as well as a clear mandate for APC to move forward with their vision to build something valuable and beautiful that serves people and adds richness to this community. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Judith L. Robb.

Ms. Robb: Good evening. My name is Judy Robb. I have been a member of Arlington Presbyterian Church for 25 years, and have lived on or near Columbia Pike for 30 years, and work for a property management company who manages apartment buildings on Columbia Pike, and I have worked there for 35 years. I have raised my daughter in my community, and she is a productive member of society with a good job and a family, and would like to live in the neighborhood where she grew up. She can't afford to. I have seen the Columbia Pike area change from a dreary suburban area to a thriving urban one. I also have firsthand knowledge of the rising cost of renting an apartment along Columbia Pike, driving out the residents who have lived there for years. I have been very involved with the process of discerning the vision God has given us serving our community by providing affordable housing. God's purpose in the future of our church is doing things that Jesus Christ would do if he was here physically. God has blessed our congregation with abundant gifts, not the least of which is our real estate, and we are charged with being good stewards of the gift. Not to hoard it or keep it as it is, but to share it with those in need. Imagine the number of ways that people could be helped by the entire community, not just charity, but an exchange. We have witnessed this type of exchange in our clothing bank, when people have come in to get clothes and they stay there to help hang clothes and keep the place in order. Imagine a relationship like that on a bigger scale. Designating God's building as historic would stop us from furthering the ministry that we have discerned and I am speaking against such designation.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Jan [Jon] Etherton.

Mr. Etherton: It is John.

Mr. Liebertz: Excuse me for that mistake.

Mr. Etherton: Madam Chair, members of the Board, I speak to you this evening, not as a representative of any group, but for myself alone. My name is Jon Etherton. I am currently a member at Arlington Presbyterian Church. I now serve as a member of our Session, and on several other teams and discipleship groups. I even run the sound system on most Sundays. But more importantly, I was also a participant each and every day in the Vision Team process in 2012 that led us, through the work of the Holy Spirit, to our Vision, including the affordable housing and new church space redevelopment project that brings us before you tonight.

Jesus Christ is my Lord and Savior. His life, teaching, death and resurrection are for me the embodiment of the Way to the Source of everything that is and everything that happens. I strive to follow Jesus in every decision and offer my time, my attention, and my money, however necessary, to nurture my faith family at Arlington Presbyterian Church and to

support our common vision for a new Presbyterian witness and presence in South Arlington. On this faith journey, I am all in with everything I have.

I understand the sources of sentimental attachment to the form of the current building housing Arlington Presbyterian Church and also respect the interest in potential preservation that is the basis for your review this evening. In fact I met my wife at the church. I was married in the building, and both of my children were baptized and were raised within its walls. I spend so much time there that the current building is as familiar a place to me as my own house.

Yet after this transforming experience of the Vision Team process, I believe that the claim of our new vision is so much stronger and more vital than the preservation of this building. The walls of the current structure simply cannot house all of it, nor can the current building be the needed beacon of welcome and openness to the Arlington community we strive to engage and serve. I urge each of you to consider how your support of historic designation could add to the time and to the cost of what we are striving forward to achieve at APC.

This Board's mandated focus is clearly on preservation issues. Yet I believe that the Board charter, which speaks of coordinating with other community interests where preservation issues are present, would allow each of you to weigh other considerations beyond preservation in your decision. These considerations should include the impact that historic designation might have on a powerful vision that transcends the stone walls of a building. I urge you to vote against recommending that our property and building be designated as an historic district to allow our vision to go forward.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Karl Veit.

Mr. Veit: Good evening. My name is Karl Veit. I grew up in Alcovia Heights and Arlington Presbyterian Church. In my kindergarten class, I watched the steeple being added to this church. I want to thank the [County] staff members who did a most thorough review of its history. It was wonderful to revisit it. The church has been and should continue to be an oasis of visual and spiritual renewal. We should continue to have, as according to the Washington Star article included, a career in this growing field with bright prospects of success. The county has a significant initiative to create subsidized housing. The few units this project is offering is not a significant addition to that. However, the Pike desperately needs the visual ties to community, family, hope, and faith. The church is more than green space, a relief from unrelenting development. It needs to be a reminder that we are single drops in a river of history and humanity. The Pike needs a whole church, not a veneer as a monument to lost faith and inadequate leadership. You have heard from a whole line of bureaucrats and vested interests, you have heard from a high percentage of those people in the church to make that development. The rest of the congregation, however, was driven away by past management that did not reach out to our community and the people who lived nearby that were the backbone of the church in the past. Because these people who you have heard from do not live in our community, I don't think they reflect Columbia Pike or the need for the preservation of our values or our family environment.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: Apologies if I mispronounce this, Takis Karantonis.

Takis Karantonis: Thank you, good evening. My name is Takis Karantonis. I have the privilege of being the executive director of the Columbia Pike Revitalization Organization [CPRO], and thank you for having and hearing us tonight. I will try and not repeat most arguments that we heard from other speakers. I first have to thank Mr. Liebertz for an excellent read; it was a great report and it opened my eyes, personally, for many, many details of this discussion. The one thing that stands out, for me, was that from the first significant building in 1930 to the 1960s, this congregation has decided to change the building significantly three times in a lifespan of a generation, in 1950 and then 1960. And all additions were pretty invasive, and very important, beginning with canceling the facade on the main street, demolishing that, which I believe is a major sin, in urbanistic terms. It's not surprising to us that the structural evolution of this church ended in 1961.

The 1960s, coincidentally, is also the time that the Pike peaks in relative population density, providing housing for 35 percent of all Arlingtonians. A brief look to the construction dates of the nearby garden apartments is quite revealing. Oakland was built in 1956, Westmont in the 1960s, Quebec in 1953/55, and Barcroft completed in 1958. The Pike had economic and demographic steam for roughly a decade after that last addition to the church and the last expansion to this congregation. After that, the congregation began to decline as the Pike did, until today where we are returning to growth and vitality. This happened, as mentioned before, by the landmark decisions of the Columbia Pike Initiative and the Form Based Code. In which, in the regulating plan, this church was left unmarked as a historic asset. Not only this church, it happened with the Trinity Church, which is further to the east. So this is consistent treatment of these civic buildings. There was a second chance to give historic protection to this asset, if we wanted to, if the community or congregation wanted to, and this was under the Historic Resources Inventory process in 2011 [Note from staff: this Inventory (HRI) conducted to date does not include religious or institutional buildings, but rather only historic garden apartments, shopping centers, and commercial buildings.]. This did not happen there. Now there are many narratives that explain this double exclusion, maybe, but for us, the most convincing narrative is that the congregation remains consistent to its spiritual standard and wants to today, as it did in the 1930s, 1950s, and 1960s, to respond to the most pressing needs of our time and community, that is affordable housing and a bold contribution to a unique sense of place to Arlington's main street. They do it by the way, the Arlington way, by producing a community concentrated, predictable scale, roped in residential buildings, on the arterial road, so that it won't damage the residential neighborhood of Alcovia Heights behind it. And I believe that this is a remarkable effort. Since there is not any new surprising, significant insight that would lead us to question or overturn the decision of 2003 and 2011, I don't see why this board would justify the recommend preservation of the current building on top of all deficiencies the building currently has. Last, but not least, I want to thank Mr. Liebertz again for this excellent report.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Steven Dola.

Mr. Dola: Madam chairman and members of the review board, my name is Steven Dola. I have lived within walking distance of Columbia Pike for 50 years and live in Alcovia Heights, and I have been a friend of the church and consider myself to be a good friend of Arlington Presbyterian Church for 50 years. My wife has been a member for 50 years and has been very

active in that time frame. I wanted to depart from my prepared remarks and address a couple of issues that have come up during the earlier presentations. First, the proposed redevelopment is not exclusively or even principally a religious matter of legitimate interest only to the APC session. That is, only to the board of directors of Arlington Presbyterian Church. The APC board of directors does not propose to self-finance its 3507 Columbia Pike redevelopment vision. Instead, tax payers' subsidies in the form of available federal tax credits and, possibly, Commonwealth of Virginia and Arlington County revenues are to be relied upon. To whatever extent the general taxpayers are asked to finance the 3507 Columbia Pike redevelopment, the public interest requires that no single interest, such as the APC Board of Directors, impose its will on Arlington County taxpayers. Allocation of and spending of tax dollars requires tradeoffs, often very difficult tradeoffs, and properly rest with elected public officials as Madam Chair started this discussion with.

Having made those points, I'd like to say that I do support some of the earlier comments, especially those by Mr. and Mrs. Harro Wulf who spoke earlier. Their expression of appreciation and acknowledgement of the excellent quality for the 74-page, January 2014, Historic District Designation Report for 3507 Columbia Pike, Arlington Presbyterian Church, is something I share. Thank you very much for your effort.

You have heard that others when viewing the architecture and cultural treasure documented in the designation form see only a solid, stone wall. That is all they can see. It is hidden they say. They will repeat that APC, and have repeated, is not seeking designation. They received this vision through discernment and prayer for redevelopment. Let me say that the historic district designation process and vision scrutinized by this review board, the planning commission, and the County Board, all must be assured that the discernment process employed by the Board of Directors of APC is soundly conceived, conforms to the general standard of conduct for directors of corporations, as set forth in Virginia statute and both promotes and safeguards the best interest of the Presbyterian church (USA) as you heard earlier.

Mr. Liebertz: Sorry to interrupt you sir, but you are out of time.

Chairman: Can you just wrap it up quickly please?

Mr. Dola: Yes, I can describe the Virginia statute.

Chairman: No, just summarize your remarks quickly please.

Mr. Dola: Okay, thank you. I will simply say that the planning discernment process used was flawed, there are no alternatives presented, real alternatives, only the vision that they have. And they did not have any independent preparation by someone the church paid to produce a feasibility report. There is only the work of APAH to support this. So there is not a separation of two interests and I think that is a basic flaw. Thank you for your time.

Chairman: Thank you very much.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Robert Listou.

Chairman: Just so we have a sense of time, how many more speakers do we have?

Mr. Liebertz: We have four more speakers.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Listou: My name is Robert Listou. I am reading for Kristine Gabster who could not be here because she is ill.

I find this whole process upsetting because a thing is not more important than human beings' basic needs. We at Arlington Presbyterian Church voted on this as a congregation. Those opposed were there in full force even though they have not worshipped with us for years. Still, the vote was in favor of the redevelopment of the property. The vote was not a close one. There were 34 in favor, and 19 opposed. The redevelopment for the purpose of erecting a building that would include affordable housing is a part of Arlington Presbyterian Church's mission. There is a basic human need for affordable housing in our county. To place a value on a building higher than the value of the needs of human beings is something that I cannot fathom. It's as if the message is "You are good enough to serve me by teaching my children and protecting my home, and you are good enough to serve me by ringing up my groceries and bringing me food at a restaurant, but you are not good enough to be my neighbor." The active members of Arlington Presbyterian Church do not want this historic designation. We feel in our hearts that we are doing the right thing here. Churches are meant to help those who need it, to spread the gospel by being the hands and feet of Christ. If we hold a false belief that a structure, a building, a thing, is more important than humbling ourselves to God's work, then we are truly lost.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Diane Walton Hendricks.

Ms. Hendricks: I am Diane Walton Hendricks and I ask you to vote against an historic designation for the Arlington Presbyterian Church building. My family and I have been residents of Arlington County for about 20 years and I also serve as an ordained pastor on staff at neighboring Falls Church Presbyterian Church. I am also the chair of National Capital Presbytery's Transformation Team, which works with churches throughout the Metro area in decline and danger of becoming irrelevant to its members and communities they serve. Many of the congregations in our presbytery, which were large expanding congregations during the heyday of the Presbyterian Church, now find themselves struggling under the financial burden of the decaying, oversized buildings of that era which do not suit the smaller congregations that now worship there.

Smaller and yet vibrant congregations like Arlington Presbyterian Church long to serve the community as a place where members can find meaning for their lives, strength for their call to be responsible citizens, and hope during times of trial. And they also long to express their faith in service to the neighborhoods around them such as the Alcova Heights neighborhood.

Within the Christian tradition, we believe that acts of compassion, service, and reconciliation are lived out by individuals joining together in communities of faith. To the extent that the physical structure of the church building serves the way the family of faith lives out their

calling in our community, it is a vital part of the church's life. But in the Christian tradition there is no question that the physical structure is not the church, the people are. The physical structure can be a great asset and a part of the church's inheritance, but it is not necessarily so. In situations where the building hinders the mission of the church within the community, the physical structure needs to be altered.

If there is a time when the people of faith are forced to serve the building, then that will be a violation of the command to serve God and neighbor. In the end, the Biblical witness is that those who serve objects, such as a building, do not experience life and vitality, in fact the result is quite opposite. Although the neighbors of Arlington Presbyterian Church may take comfort in the constancy of passing the steeple of APC each day, if the congregation that worships in that space is not permitted to follow God's call, then that congregation will die and the building will be an empty, decaying space that speaks only to a vision that might have been. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you. I am going to ask that the remaining speakers, as we are getting kind of late here, please say what you have to say, but if someone else already said it, please just indicate your agreement with what has already been said.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Nick Kuhn.

Mr. Kuhn: My name is Nick Kuhn. I am a 30-plus year property owner in the Columbia Pike community. I am opposed to any historic designation imposed on the building at 3507 Columbia Pike. As an Arlington County property owner, I call into question the ability of anyone to trigger a lengthy and expensive process to ask for historic designation on a building that he/she does not own.

I am also the husband of the Pastor of Arlington Presbyterian Church and am frequently asked, "What does your wife do?" I tell them she is the pastor of APC on Columbia Pike. The response I get is, "Where is there a church building there?" I proceed to tell them, "Remember where Rosenthal Chevrolet was, it is across the street from there." Their comment, "Oh yes I know where Rosenthal was." The known landmark, ladies and gentlemen, is a former car dealership across the street.

I will read a statement from Rector Kim Coleman, Pastor of Trinity Episcopal Church located on Columbia Pike. She was not able to be here tonight.

It seems to me the County also should keep in mind that the congregation's bold new vision is aimed at moving the congregation from survivalist maintenance (if this term is appropriate) to viability grounded in a mission. Churches that are less than thriving do not enhance the surrounding community as much as those that are overflowing with members who are passionate about improving lives of others. APC's proposed project promises to bring thriving viability to the faith community itself as well as to people in the larger South Arlington County area. In churchy language, we sometimes say you can't put new wine in old wine skins. It seems to me that proposed regulations are an attempt to do just that.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The next speaker is Mark Viani.

Mr. Viani: Good evening members of the Board. I am Mark Viani, counsel for the Arlington Presbyterian Church. I appreciate the opportunity to speak here tonight. I will instead, just briefly note instead of lengthy comments, that the proposed nomination is not supported by the Congregation, nor its national affiliate, the National Capital Presbytery, our regional governing affiliate.

What you have here is the approaching intersection of three public policies: the County's priority in the promotion of affordable housing choices, particularly along Columbia Pike; the right of property owners to utilize their property as they see fit; and the desire to preserve legitimately historic properties for future generations.

I think the County Board got it right in 2005 when they adopted the Pike Plan, when they declined to include the church in the list of priority preservation sites and simply noted that potential historic aspects should be considered when the property was redeveloped. That is the appropriate time to have this discussion, a point where all of the various competing interests here can be fully vetted and appropriate compromises found in one forum.

This nomination seeks to preclude that discussion. It would stop this endeavor and avoid reasonable compromise by freezing the structure in time, saddling the Congregation with the increasing maintenance costs, and depriving them of their right to utilize their property as they see fit and as envision permitted under the County's comprehensive plan all under the pretense of historic preservation. This tonight seems like a missed opportunity. And taking such an extreme positions is not likely to foster a productive environment for meaningful historic preservation efforts, efforts to foster the promotion of affordable housing.. At some point, the opportunity for reasonable compromise under the historic preservation laws for Arlington County is lost. At some point, the burden, the ability to move forward, shifts back to the church. Without the ability to have meaningful dialogue in one forum, when, what else would be able to achieve all of these public goals in a reasonable fashion? I urge the board to recommend against the proposed nomination. Thank you very much.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Liebertz: The last speaker is Jill Norcross.

Ms. Norcross: My name is Jill Norcross and I am the project manager for Arlington Presbyterian Church. APC hired me to represent them in their redevelopment project in partnership with APAH. I have worked in affordable housing for almost 20 years. I'm honored to be working with this amazing congregation, as I have been personally and professionally inspired by the members of Arlington Presbyterian and their vision to use their own resources to live out their faith.

Tonight, you have heard a lot about what Arlington Presbyterian is, but I hope to leave you with three things that APC is not: APC's building is not historic, APC's congregation is not represented by a building, and APC is not interested in preserving their current structure.

APC's building is not historic. The historic value of the church was never raised as a concern in any of the congregational meetings concerning the redevelopment. During the feasibility

study, APC and APAH considered the church's historic relevance. The development team quickly determined that preservation shouldn't be an issue because the building had not been listed as historically significant in any County plan. The County had a chance to designate this building as historic at two separate times and it did not rise to the level of importance as other structures on the Pike. In fact, it is not listed as a building of historical interest on Alcovia Heights Civic Association's website, nor is it on the Arlington Historical Society's website as a place of historic worship. Thus building does not meet the standard for preservation.

APC's congregation is not represented by a building. APC's building has continued to change over time. In fact, APC is currently housed in its 3rd iteration of a church building, one that has undergone two significant renovations since 1930. While a new building may look different after redevelopment, APC will continue as a congregation on this site, continue their history, and continue to honor the people who have helped make this congregation so unique.

Finally, APC is not interested in preserving this structure. This building no longer serves their needs and is at cross-purposes with their vision. A vision supported by the goals of the County to bring much needed affordable housing, child care, and community space to Columbia Pike. Preservation of the building is not their vision, continuing to be a vibrant witness to their faith on Columbia Pike is and I urge you to respect their wishes. I ask now that all who are here in support of APC's vision and against historic designation to please stand [majority of the room stands]. Thank you so much for your time.

Chairman: Thank you. I would like to remind everyone that there are additional comments from individuals who are not able to be here because of the weather or other reasons. Thank you everyone for your comments. We recognize that there are different opinions on what constitutes something as historic and what constitutes historic significance. People can feel passionately about buildings and places, and clearly this church has meant much to the community over the past. Churches are an important part of the community and this particular church has had an impact on the community in many ways. The Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board is not here to stop Arlington Presbyterian Church from carrying out its vision or to stop or mandate that the entire building remain as it is. We are engaged in a process that once started, follows a progression that enables discussion and consideration of historic designation of the property. This process continues to its conclusion. It was mentioned, and I want to emphasize, that the Arlington Presbyterian Church was indicated to be a noteworthy property on the 2005 Columbia Pike Initiative Revitalization Plan. What this resulted from were members of the Columbia Pike community who stated that these noteworthy structures bore some significance, and at a minimum, as the Columbia Pike Initiative says, it suggests that preservation is a consideration to be taken into account once redevelopment occurs or should redevelopment occur. Well redevelopment is proposed here so this is the time to start this conversation. The matter is now before the board and the public comments are finished.

Members of the board, we are charged with looking at the facts presented to us, and whether these facts support at least two of the eleven criteria that are set forth in the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance for historic district designation. I urge you to focus on those particular aspects of what we are supposed to do. We have been presented with a report that finds that four, perhaps five, criteria are met, and it is our task to decide if this is supported. We need to go over each criterion and determine they are met. If we decide that this should be considered for designation as an historic district, we have to define boundaries for the historic

district. These can range from the entire property to a very small section of the property. We also have the possibility not to recommend historic designation, even if we do find that two criteria are met. There are guidelines that will accompany historic designation if we recommend that. These will have to be considered later. That being said, I turn it over to the board for comments.

Mr. Craig: At our last meeting, I know I had very much advocated for the reuse, the repurposing, of this handsome stone building. If you search the internet, you can find numerous examples of churches that have been reused for condos, apartments, including some in this area. Within the existing stone church, you could create three levels of living with dormers in the roof, or you could add a floor at the mid-level of the windows and have community space above and offices below. Outside you could create a garden, a landscaped area, on the Columbia Pike and Lincoln Street side for residents, and pull-in parking for visitors where there is now grass. EHT Traceries, which did historic resources survey for Arlington County, does not consider this to be suitable for National Register nomination because of numerous changes to the original structure as designed by architect Adolph Thelander. As a letter from the Arlington Community of Faith suggests, “Every place of worship is formed and led by important and influential members of the community, although many important Arlingtonians have been involved in this congregation, there has been no single or group of events that cause this structure to stand out from the rest.” Like an old tree, this structure is an important landmark for those not even associated with your congregation. And like an old tree, many will miss it if it is torn down should that be your decision. I hope that you can come together and find a use for this valuable structure. There is a creative solution to this that may bring you back together. As you voted, this is your property to do with it as you will. You oppose historic designation, and I believe that even if we find several reasons to designate this property, I can’t support historic designation.

Chairman: Other comments from board members?

Mr. Vincent: Madame Chair, Joan, I have made a lot of notes and tried to put my thoughts into words, and I wanted to go through them if I could take a few minutes. First, I want to thank John for putting together a great report that lays out in great detail a persuasive case why the criteria for designation are met. I think they are clearly satisfied here. The Traceries report, although well done, illustrates what I know as a lawyer, is that if you hire a lawyer to argue your case, the lawyer is going to argue your case and not the other side. I think if you hire an architectural consultant, you can probably get your case presented as well. Traceries has done a good job showing that the 1930s building is no longer intact and has been altered drastically, but I don’t think they do a good job at all explaining why the 1949 structure does not merit preservation.

Then turning to the views of the church, and one other point that has been brought up, the Columbia Pike Form Based Code. Having participated in the beginning of the Columbia Pike Form Based Code and the charrette process, and seeing how it evolved not at all from that charrette process, I have never been persuaded that the Columbia Pike Form Based Code really reflects the views of the people that live along Columbia Pike. I never find that persuasive. We all know from dealing with historic preservation that the [Form Based] Code does a rather poor job preserving the historic properties along Columbia Pike. I hope that we don’t view the omission or the relatively minor designation of the property in the Form Based Code as any indication that it does not merit preservation.

Having said that, I want to turn to the view of the church. I fully understand that the church is a group of people, it is the congregation, it is not the building. I think it is unfortunate that the church is here today. Obviously a minority of the church has had its views overridden and they are not happy with the decision moving forward. It is also unfortunate that the views of the church seem to be at variance with the views expressed by the community in which it is located, as expressed by the community association comments. I also think it is very unfortunate that we are here faced with a false choice which the church thinks it has with promoting affordable housing or promoting affordable housing and historic preservation. That is very much a false choice. We have shown though the Buckingham effort that historic preservation was used as the very mechanism to preserve the affordable housing for the Buckingham community and this is reflected by looking around the community. If you want to find affordable housing, look in the historic buildings, that is where the affordable housing is found in Arlington County. So the idea that you preserve affordable housing by tearing down historic buildings is false and I think it is very unfortunate that so many people are persuaded by that.

I also think it is unfortunate that the church believes that it can only accomplish its mission going forward by tearing down part of its history, by throwing away its historic walls, and the stories that live within the walls. It is unfortunate that the church has not brought itself where it could incorporate that building and its history moving forward. I also think that the historic designation does not mean that you cannot accomplish your mission. As Charlie [Mr. Craig] pointed out, there are many ways with expansive thinking that you can preserve the good history that is there moving forward. This is very much the wrong environmental choice, to take an intact structure, tear it down, to put in something new. It is not the green thing to do. It is not, to speak in religious terms, stewards of God's nature here on Earth. It is not the right thing to do to tear down buildings that still work to put in new things. So, I think it is very unfortunate we are here today.

Having said all that, I also have to say that I am where Charlie is. I think that we are in a bad place with the HALRB if we end up overriding the views of the property owners. The church has voted to tear down their structure and start over new. I think it is the wrong choice, I hope you will reconsider, and try to think expansively on ways you can complete your mission without taking the step you are doing here. Ultimately, I think we hurt historic preservation if we take actions like this where property owners make their views clear to us and we essentially decide to force historic preservation. The only time we have gone down that path is at Buckingham and that did have many different concerns, and that different concerns where the residents, not the owner, wanted those buildings preserved. So, in this case, I unfortunately, even though I think this is the wrong choice the church is making, I very much find myself voting against the designation here as well.

Chairman: Thank you. Other board members?

Mr. Woodruff: I am going to associate myself with a number of the comments that Kevin [Mr. Vincent] made that were right on, but I am going to come to a different conclusion. At first, let me thank John for a terrific report. I think the Traceries report was a work-for-hire and speaks for itself. I think it is clear that the building meets the criteria for historic designation. It is, I think, a historic building, it is the work of a master builder, and it is suitable for restoration. So, the question then is what is the compelling rationale for doing otherwise? And, we can talk

about creating a new town center, affordable housing, coffee shop, day care, and all of those goals may be laudable, but why do they have to be done here? Why is this an either/or? Why do these interests have to be served at the expense of the building? And when we talk about the building and we talk about the people, there has been a lot said about, in respect to the congregation and the church, it is about the people and not the building. But I think we have to remember that the request for the designation came from the people, came from the congregation itself, from members of the congregation. I know the congregation is divided, a substantial number of people actually support the designation and an overwhelming number of people in the community support the designation. We talk about the owner, and what our obligation is to follow the wishes of the owner of the property, but I have certain issue with ownership here. Who really does own this building? Is it the church or congregation? Who is the owner here? Or is it the congregation of this building over a period of history? There are people who do live here that would like it to be preserved. There are people who worshipped at this church, who were married at this church, who were memorialized there. It is not just about the building, it is about the memory of the community. And as I think as one of the gentlemen said, I think in the face of relentless pressure for development that is ubiquitous in Arlington this is important. So, I support the designation.

Chairman: Thank you. Other comments?

Mr. Turnbull: I am a little distressed about the argument that the renovations and changes to the structure diminish its historic value. I know many historic buildings that have been added onto and changed, and maybe they don't look like they did in 1790 or whatever, but they have looked that way for a long time and contribute to the community and history in a particular way. Therefore, I discount that aspect of it. I am disappointed that there has not been a genuine effort to incorporate the 1950s revised structure, especially considering the waste of space with the parking lot next door. But I don't see a compelling enough case to override the wishes of the property owner, but I would wish and hope that they would incorporate parts of what is there, at least the older part.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Wenchel: It is a very interesting discussion. I would like to thank everyone that has been here and made comments, it is a difficult issue. But I find the comments made by the young lady from Traceries to be fairly convincing. It is a noteworthy building, but it is not a great piece of architecture and it has suffered over time from its original form to what it is now. Because of that, and because of the excellent report that John put together, I find the diagrams rather compelling as what started out in 1931 and what ended up in 1961, I really think that we adhere to the wishes of the majority of the congregation that they don't want historic preservation or historic designation for this building. I would vote against any designation.

Chairman: Thank you. Other comments? I remind you that in our findings, we can find to recommend or not recommend historic designation to the County Board. We can also find that this building meets criteria for historic designation and exercise our authority not to recommend historic designation to the County Board. I would like to hear some reaction from you on those possibilities, paying close attention to the analysis for the criteria for historic designation.

Mr. Woodruff: I would agree that we should consider if the building would meet the criteria before we come to some conclusion about whether we recommend [designation].

Chairman: I am going to poll the board members right now. I would like you to look at the report, look at those specific factors, and communicate whether you think they are complied with or not.

Mr. Wenchel: I just think this is a noteworthy building, but that is it. It is not an outstanding building, it does not have any outstanding architectural merit.

Chairman: Please look at the specific language of the designation criteria. There were four that were found to be demonstrated by this particular building and that is what we need to focus our attention to. These appear on pages 31 and 32 [of the designation report].

Mr. Laporte: I don't understand. Can we take a poll whether we are recommending or not recommending? I don't see the purpose of this discussion, if people have made up their mind.

Chairman: If we decide not to recommend, there are two ways to do it. We can outright not recommend, or we can find that criteria have been satisfied and not recommend.

Mr. Vincent: Joan, can I make a motion that we both find that the criteria for designation have been met, but the HALRB is choosing not to recommend designation? If that passes, it wraps it all up, if it doesn't pass, we can separate it.

Mr. Laporte: Kevin said it better than I did.

Chairman: We would need that to include specific designation criteria in the motion.

Mr. Vincent: So you want to call out the exact criteria?

Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Vincent: Why?

Chairman: It needs to be part of our report.

Mr. Vincent: I make a motion that the [specific designation] criteria mentioned in John's report have been satisfied and, nonetheless, HALRB is not recommending the designation.

Mr. Laporte: I second the motion.

Chairman: Those specifically are Criteria B, D, H, and K.

Mr. Woodruff: I would like to amend the motion into two parts.

Chairman: Are you agreeable to that?

Mr. Vincent: I just want to move forward, sure.

Chairman: How would you divide that Dick [Mr. Woodruff]?

Mr. Woodruff: The first part would be that it meets the criteria and the second part that we do not recommend it for historic designation.

Chairman: Dick suggested that we divide it into two motions. The first would be a motion that determines [the designation] criteria that are met, if any, and the second would be a motion to recommend [designation] or not.

Chairman: Kevin, are you agreeable?

Mr. Dudka: I thought that Kevin's motion was that we are finding that all of the items in the report were met? I believe that is what your motion was?

Mr. Vincent: That was my original motion coupled with the second step.

Chairman: Who seconded the motion?

Mr. Laporte: I seconded the motion. Maybe two of us did? I don't know who did so first.

Chairman: Do you object to dividing the motion?

Mr. Laporte: I think I do, yes. I will withdraw my second if someone else wants to second it.

Chairman: Kevin, can you state your motion again?

Mr. Vincent: In order to move this forward, the first motion is that the HALRB finds that the five criteria for designation reflected in the report have been met for the structure.

Mr. Turnbull: I second that.

Chairman: Is there any discussion on that point?

Mr. Dudka: Can we restate please?

Mr. Vincent: The five criteria for designation reflected in John's report, the motion is that the HALRB finds that they have been met for the property.

Mr. Hannabass: Do you mean four or five?

Mr. Vincent: Whatever the number is?

Chairman: It is four, possibly five [according to the report].

Mr. Vincent: Then I would say four and not argue the possible one has been met.

Chairman: That would be criteria B, D, H, and K. Mark seconded. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion? [Charles Craig, Charles Matta, Nathan Uldricks, Andy Wenchel,

Robert Dudka, Mark Turnbull, Kevin Vincent, Dick Woodruff, Darren Hannabass, and Joan Lawrence voted in favor of the motion.]

Opposed? [No one opposed.]

Abstentions? [Gerald Laporte abstained.]

Chairman: The second part of your motion.

Mr. Vincent: I would like to move that we not [recommend historic] designat[ion] of the building [to the County Board] for the reasons I stated before.

Mr. Matta: I second that.

Chairman: Are there any questions or discussion? All in favor? [Charles Craig, Gerald Laporte, Charles Matta, Nathan Uldricks, Andy Wenchel, Robert Dudka, Mark Turnbull, and Kevin Vincent are in favor of the motion.]

Opposed? [Dick Woodruff, Joan Lawrence, and Darren Hannabass voted against the motion].

The motion passes.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman's Report: The Chairman reported that the Section 106 review process for the Pentagon Master Plan will be starting soon. As a consulting party, Joan asked if any HALRB members would represent the board at relevant meetings. Mr. Hannabass and Mr. Matta volunteered to attend on behalf of the board if scheduling permitted.
- B) Survey Report: No update.
- C) Site Plan Review Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres reported briefly on the Blue Goose Site Plan with Marymount University.
- D) Staff and other Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres reported on the Lyon Park Sears House available to be relocated. She conveyed to the board the national and international interest in moving the dwelling and various proposals are currently under consideration by the owner and architects.
- E) Nominating Committee: No update.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 pm.