



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, March 19, 2014  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Joan Lawrence, Chairman  
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman  
Charles Craig  
Patricia Weichmann-Morris  
Andy Wenchel  
Richard Woodruff  
Robert Dudka  
Nathan Uldricks  
Erin May

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Darren Hannabass  
Gerald Laporte  
Mark Turnbull  
Kevin Vincent

**STAFF:**

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

**ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and introduced Erin May, a new member of the Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRRB). Members of the board introduced themselves and provided background information regarding their experiences with historic preservation. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 19, 2014, HALRB MEETING**

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the February meeting minutes. Mr. Woodruff requested that his comments regarding the term "dying" when referring to the lifespan of a tree be attributed to the opinion of the country arborist. Mr. Woodruff moved to accept the amended minutes. Mr. Dudka seconded and the motion passed 9-0.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)**

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

The Chairman said there were four cases on the Consent Agenda and one item on the Discussion Agenda. The Chairman called for a motion on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Craig moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded and the motion passed 8-0. Mr. Woodruff abstained from the vote.

- Consent Agenda:
- 1) 1612 North Quincy Street  
Colin and Charu McDermott  
Fraber House Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-05 (HP1400008)  
Request to install a total of four vents on the side and rear elevations.
  - 2) 3511 22nd Street North  
Merrick Hoben & Diana Bermudez  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 13-11B (HP1400007)  
Request to remove asbestos shingles from the original dwelling, restore or replace the covered wood siding, enlarge the window on the front elevation, and change two windows from casement to fixed on the sunroom.
  - 3) 2821 23rd Street North  
Clint Woodson  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 13-10A (HP1400006)  
Request to amend previously approved CoA 13-10. Proposed work includes the following: 1) add a new egress door and window on the basement of the addition; 2) replace two existing basement windows on the original dwelling; and 3) install ridge vents and roof vent.
  - 4) 3509 21st Avenue North  
Richard Woodruff & Catherine Wiles  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-03 (HP1400002)  
After-the-fact request to replace three non-historic one-over-one, double-hung metal-sash windows with one-over-one, double-hung, wood-sash windows.

- Discussion Agenda:
- 1) 2301 North Fillmore Street  
Hilda Rodrigues  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-04 (HP1400003)  
Request to install a wood shed (8' x 10')
- Administrative CoA (ACoA)
- 1) ACoA 14-03, 1813 North Rhodes Street #252  
Joseph Van Meter  
Colonial Village  
Replace twelve windows.

***Discussion Agenda #1: 2301 North Fillmore Street***

The Chairman introduced the case to the board noting that the applicants' previous case, CoA 13-32, an after-the-fact request to construct an 8'x10' shed, was denied approval due the use of incompatible materials in respect to the the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Ron and Janine Hager, the applicants, provided a brief history of the project and stated that the board requested the replacement of the existing shed with a shed that adhered to the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Mr. Hager submitted an 8'x10' shed capped with an asphalt shingle roof to match the house. He stated that the Design Review Committee (DRC) had concerns regarding the material of the window. Further investigation after the DRC meeting revealed the window to be aluminum and he requested that the HARLB approve the application with the aluminum window.

Mr. Liebertz provided a review of the case and noted that the property is listed as a non-contributing dwelling in the Maywood Historic District. Mr. Liebertz further detailed the findings from the DRC meeting and noted that the specification sheet from the applicant noted that the proposed 8'x10' shed had a "primed wood siding." DRC placed the item on the consent agenda on the condition that the applicant research the material of the window. Staff called the manufacturer who stated the window was aluminum and moved the item to the discussion agenda. Mr. Liebertz noted that he discussed the issue with Mr. Hager who submitted a potential alternative shed with no windows from the same shed manufacturer; however, the shed had LP Smart Siding (engineered wood siding) that is not permissible per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. As a result of this inquiry regarding the window, staff discovered that siding of both proposed sheds consisted of LP Smart Siding. The engineered wood siding had a faux wood grain finish and not "primed wood siding" as claimed on the manufacturer's description.

Mr. Craig asked staff to confirm the appearance of the siding of the proposed shed. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the siding had a faux wood grain finish and not a smooth finish as required with other permissible synthetic materials such as cementitious fiberboard siding.

The Chairman asked staff if all sheds approved in Maywood had wood windows. Mr. Liebertz responded that the HARLB has required all windows in new sheds to be constructed of wood. Mr. Matta inquired if the proposed windows were aluminum-clad wood windows or aluminum windows. Mr. Liebertz confirmed that the proposed shed has aluminum window with a wood surround.

The Chairman asked the applicants if they looked at other wood sheds; however, prefaced her question with the understanding that the applicants believed they were choosing a wood shed based on its description. Mr. Hager stated that he called three manufacturers of similar priced sheds who stated that engineered wood siding and aluminum windows were standard. He contended that a true 8'x10' wood shed exceeded their budget, particularly with the replacement of the existing denied shed.

Mr. Woodruff asked the applicants' if there were other kit sheds with wood windows. Mr. Hager stated that there were other sheds with wood windows, but they were of a higher grade and considerably more expensive. Ms. Hager noted that the sheds they were looking at were approximately \$1,500 and the wood sheds were a couple of thousand dollars more expensive.

Ms. Hager asked if the board would accept the application if the aluminum window was replaced with a wood window. The Chairman stated that staff moved the item to the discussion agenda to examine not only the window, but to consider the appropriateness of the engineered wood siding. The Chairman reminded the board that the house is a non-contributing resource to the Maywood Historic District. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff wanted the item to be discussed by the board since the design of outbuildings is universal per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*; the same requirements must be met for outbuildings of contributing and non-contributing resources in terms of the design, materials, scale, etc.

Mr. Dudka contended that the guidelines are written to encompass the character of the entire historic district and not individual resources. Therefore, all dwellings, sheds, landscaping, etc., add up to the character of the neighborhood, which is why the guidelines apply to all resources (contributing and non-contributing) equally. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the board has the ability to amend the guidelines to incorporate new building materials that are compatible with the character of the historic district.

Mr. Craig noted that his concern is not the material (engineered wood) of the shed, but the faux wood grain. He stated that faux wood grain siding will be highly visible from the streetscape and stand out as a contemporary building material in a historic district.

Ms. Hager responded that wood sheds are not in the family's price range and asked for an economic hardship exemption. Mr. Dudka replied that the board has faced similar issues in the past and asked staff for cost estimates on previously approved sheds. Mr. Liebertz stated that staff's records do not include costs. He noted that he researched one of the recently approved shed kits, which would cost approximately \$1,500 more than the Hager's proposed shed. Mr. Dudka noted that the applicants, staff, and HARLB must exhaust all possibilities regarding the use of appropriate materials prior to considering exemptions. He stated that he had less concern regarding the aluminum window, but stressed appropriate materials for the siding of the shed. Mr. Woodruff questioned the appropriateness of the board requiring applicants to spend thousands of dollars on a shed.

Mr. Craig and Mr. Dudka stated that additional research should be required to see if there are other sheds in a similar price range that meet the requirements of the guidelines. Both board members were concerned about setting a precedent moving forward. Mr. Dudka suggested that the board approve the item in concept and leave it to DRC to make the final determination on a more appropriate shed.

Ms. Hager requested permission to cover the proposed shed with wood lattice that would be covered with ivy. Mr. Woodruff stated that it was a creative idea and Mr. Matta contended that it was a reasonable request. Mr. Craig noted that he was concerned with its compatibility with the design guidelines.

The Chairman moved that: 1) the case be referred back to the Design Review Committee; 2) approved the proposed shed (option one with the window) in concept; 3) approved the covering of the proposed shed with wood lattice in concept; and 4) requested that staff research potential sheds of a similar size, price, and adhere to the requirements of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Mr. Matta requested an amendment to the motion that DRC can issue the Certificate of Appropriateness. The Chairman further amended the motion to include that the provisional approval by the HALRB is contingent on the fact that the subject property is a non-contributing resource to the Maywood Historic District. Mr. Matta seconded the motion and the motion passed 9-0.

***Administrative CoA(s)***

The Chairman stated that there was a single Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness on the agenda and asked for comments or questions. Mr. Liebertz gave a brief summary of each case. The board had no comments.

***Discussion Item #1: Arlington Village Historic Marker***

On behalf of the Arlington Village 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee, Ms. Virginia Smith introduced the project and provided background information on the garden apartment. She stated that staff discussed with her erecting either a cast aluminum marker or a 36'x24' exhibition-style marker (with graphics and text). The committee voted in favor of the traditional cast aluminum marker. Mr. Liebertz noted that staff is working on solidifying a location for the marker and that the applicants requested the marker be placed in an empty tree well in front of Arlington Village Shopping Center (2500-2516 Columbia Pike). Staff will confirm that the location is best suited for a historic marker in consideration of possible future development associated with Columbia Pike. The Chairman asked if the language for the text could be expanded to connect Arlington Village with other garden apartments. Mr. Liebertz noted that no additional text could be added due to the limitations of the cast aluminum markers. Mr. Woodruff approved the text for the marker. Mr. Dudka seconded and the motion passed unanimously. After the vote, Mr. Dudka added that staff consider adding a QRC code to the marker pole in order to provide additional information.

***Discussion Item #2: Green Valley Pharmacy Marker***

Mr. Liebertz introduced the project and noted the staff made the changes requested by the board at the February HALRB meeting. He then played the audio component of the marker for the review board to review. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff interviewed and recorded Dr. Muse. She asked the board to consider how to organize the sound bites considering there will be a push button on the leg. Mr. Dudka suggested that staff create a single long clip instead of creating multiple snippets. In addition, he suggested that staff re-record audio clips with poor quality. Mr. Matta recommended that staff record an individual framing questions. The board asked staff to re-order the audio clips. Ms. Lawrence made a motion to approve the text, graphics, and audio of the Green Valley Pharmacy Marker, but referred the marker to DRC to review the design of the marker stand, sound component, and power source. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

***Discussion Item #3: 1200 North Irving Street (ZOM site plan) Project Update***

Andy Cretal, lead developer for Zom Holding Inc., discussed the construction progress at 1200 North Irving Street. He stated that demolition of the existing portion of the building uncovered a number of existing conditions that have required alterations to the previously submitted plans. They development presented to HALRB their new plans that addressed these existing conditions.

Anthony Hensley, architect with Esocoff & Associates, discussed the progress of the construction including the preservation of the facade and issues discovered during demolition. In particular, he proposed to reconstruct the deteriorated knee walls below the plate glass window, match the new brick sills to the existing brick sills, and replace an existing wood door to match a previously approved glass door with aluminum framing. Mr. Hensley discussed the difficulty of matching the existing metal roof tiles. The developers and architects are working to match the metal tile as closely as possible and will share samples with county staff prior to installation.

The Chairman asked the applicants if they would like the board to adopt a formal motion. The applicants requested a formal motion be made. Mr. Woodruff approved the concept as presented in the submission packet. Mr. Matta amended the motion to approve the concept as presented, in particular, that the openings are going to match the existing conditions in terms of number and location, and match the material and profile of the previously approved windows submitted in the 4.1 Site Conditions. Mr. Woodruff seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

***Discussion Agenda Item #4: Stormwater Planter Requirements in Local Historic District***

Mr. Liebertz distributed a memorandum to the HALRB. Mr. Woodruff asked about the 2,500 square foot threshold. The Chairman noted that the first example occurred at 3317 23<sup>rd</sup> Street North. Mr. Dudka asked if the approved stormwater planter was reviewed by the HALRB. Mr. Liebertz stated that the board reviewed the planter as part of the application for the addition. Mr. Woodruff asked staff if the review of stormwater mitigation is required by the Department of Environmental Services (DES) prior to the approval of a building permit. Ms. Liccese-Torres confirmed that the review of land disturbance and stormwater mitigation occurs prior to the

issuance of a building permit; she further detailed the procedure for receiving a building permit for a property in a local historic district.

Mr. Dudka commented that DRC is now aware of the stormwater mitigation requirements and will ask applicants their total land disturbance early in the design review process. As a result, the design of stormwater planters will be more compatible with the design of the historic dwelling. The board asked staff if there is literature explaining the stormwater requirements for homeowners. Mr. Liebertz commented that DES is updating the ordinance and will be providing more detailed literature by the end of the year. The Chairman asked staff to contact the county attorney to discuss how to petition the state for an exemption for historic districts. Mr. Dudka stated that the board should adopt guidelines regarding stormwater planters in order to provide direction to applicants.

**REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A) Chairman’s Report: The Chairman reported on the recent Affordable Housing working group.
  
- B) Survey Report:
  
- C) Site Plan Review Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres commented on the 16<sup>th</sup> Street URD project. She stated that the project was sent to the Planning Commission and approved.

Regarding the Key Boulevard Apartment Site Plan, Ms. Liccese-Torres will be presenting at the first SPRC meeting. She will discuss the significance of the complex, the purpose of the Historic Resources Inventory, and asked for members to be involved in the process. The Chairman requested a board member volunteer to attend the SPRC meeting. Mr. Woodruff and Ms. May volunteered to speak on behalf of the HALRB.

- D) Staff and other Reports: Mr. Liccese-Torres reported on the upcoming Envision Courthouse Area Planning Study. She discussed the location and timeline of the planning study. The purpose of the upcoming forum is to inform the public and receive public feedback regarding what will be an appropriate use for the site. Mr. Liebertz will represent historic preservation staff at the meeting. Mr. Uldricks volunteered to attend the meeting on behalf of the HALRB.

Ms. Liccese-Torres commented that staff updated the HALRB charter as directed by the HALRB. In addition, Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the review board of the upcoming Fort Ethan Allen dedication ceremony on March 23, 2014.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.