



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
Neighborhood Services Division

Courthouse Plaza One 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

**Wednesday, June 18, 2014
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Charles Craig
Robert Dudka
Erin May
Mark Turnbull
Kevin Vincent

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

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:33 pm. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MAY 21, 2014, HALRB MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the May meeting minutes. There were no comments. Mr. Woodruff moved to accept the meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded and the motion passed 7-0. Ms. Solo had not yet arrived at the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman stated that she would readdress the public hearing procedures prior to the discussion items.

The Chairman said there were three cases on the Consent Agenda, but pulled CoA 11-11A for discussion. She asked for a motion for the remaining two consent agenda items. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve CoA 14-06 and CoA14-15 on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Uldricks seconded and the motion passed unanimously, 8-0 [Ms. Solo had arrived].

- Consent Agenda:
- 1) 3210 23rd Street North
Carol Rickard-Brideau & Scott E. Brideau
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-06 (HP1400010)
Request to: 1) demolish a rear two-story porch (first story enclosed) and deck; and 2) construct a two-story rear addition with a second-story porch and deck.
 - 2) 2318 North Kenmore Street
VMAP #4, LLC
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 11-11A (HP1400022)
An after-the-fact request to amend CoA 11-11. Completed work includes the: 1) installation of a parged retaining wall at the front of the property; 2) addition of a timber window well/retaining wall on the rear elevation; 3) alterations to an approved window well on the left side elevation; and 4) addition of a 48"x36" window well with a safety grate and a shallow galvanized metal window well on the left side elevation.
 - 3) 2333 North Van Buren Court
Glen & Hilary Scherrer
Eastman-Fenwick House Historic District
HALRB Case 14-15 (HP1400023)
Request to replace a garage door.

Pulled Constant Agenda Item: 2318 North Kenmore Street, CoA 11-11A

The Chairman asked if there was a representative for the project in attendance. Mr. Liebertz stated that Mr. Van Vonno, on behalf of VMAP #4, LLC, would not be attending the meeting, and that staff and the DRC could answer questions regarding the proposed changes. The Chairman said she pulled the item since it was an after-the-fact application and she desired to discuss this with the applicant. In addition, the applicant had contacted staff, who had recommended that he apply for a CoA before the onset of any of the completed changes.

Mr. Laporte suggested that the HALRB table the item until the following month. The Chairman noted that all of the changes were already completed and that deferring the application would have no effect. Mr. Woodruff asked if the builder had completed construction. Staff responded that all work was completed. Mr. Woodruff asked if there were any issues with the completed project other than not receiving proper approval before the commencement of work. The Chairman stated that the applicant had discussed the completed changes with staff prior to starting work, but failed to file for an amended CoA.

Ms. Ballo provided background information. She stated that the applicant contacted staff concerning erosion issues over a year ago. At that time, she told the applicant that staff and the HALRB would likely have limited comments regarding the construction of a retaining wall, but encouraged him to submit an application. Mr. Van Vonno, however, failed to submit the necessary paperwork. She added that the applicant is very aware of the HALRB process.

Mr. Liebertz discussed the most recent June DRC meeting. He stated that the DRC requested the applicant square the front retaining wall and infill its stepped design. The DRC had no comments regarding the addition of the window wells on the side and rear elevations.

Mr. Matta asked staff if Mr. Van Vonno has already received an occupancy permit. He questioned if the applicant complied with the building code due to the lack of a railing on the steps. Ms. Ballo responded that the county had not yet issued a certificate of occupancy, but remained unsure if a railing would be needed.

The Chairman moved to approve the application, provided that a letter also be sent to the applicant that outlines the concerns of the board and requiring that any further changes to the property must receive a CoA prior to the onset of work. Ms. Solo seconded the motion. Mr. Wenchel asked if the application could be tabled in order to request the applicant attend next month's HALRB hearing. He contended that this ruling could be setting a precedent for after-the-fact cases.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the applicant was fully aware at the DRC meeting that he had ignored the procedural process and could be required to remove all unapproved changes. The board still has the authority to require applicants to remove or further amend any non-compliant work in the Maywood Historic District. Therefore, the approval of this application would not be setting a precedent for future after-the-fact CoAs.

Mr. Matta asked staff to read the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated: "The Chairman moved to approve the application with a letter outlining the concerns of the board and requiring that any further changes to the property must receive a CoA prior to the onset of work." The Chairman asked for further discussion. Mr. Matta amended the motion to include that the applicant return to DRC if the building inspector requires any further changes to the design (such as a railing due to the height of the retaining walls). Mr. Laporte asked for the amendment to specifically note the lack of a railing. The Chairman and Ms. Solo accepted both amendments. The amended motion was approved unanimously.

- Administrative CoA (ACoA):
- 1) 3309 23rd Street North
Michael and Maureen Petron
Maywood Historic District
ACoA Case 14-04
Request to remove an 18-inch diameter boxelder (acer negundo) from the rear yard of the property.

Mr. Liebertz presented a summary of the case and described the species and placement of the tree on the lot. He stated that the County Urban Forester recommended the replacement of the tree and that staff issued an ACoA.

- Discussion Agenda:**
- 1) 2302 North Kenmore Street
Michael Beer and Latanja Thomas
Maywood Historic District
CoA Case 13-05B (HP1400025) Request to amend CoA 13-05A in order to: 1) remove the approved porch steps from the façade; 2) decrease the width of the addition by 5 inches; and 3) use PVC trim on the new addition.
 - 2) Pierce Queen Apartments, Site Plan #425
1600 16th Street North and 1520 Pierce Street
Review of proposed screening for mechanical units on the roof of 1600 and 1610 16th Street North.

Discussion Agenda Item #1: 2302 North Kenmore Street, CoA 13-05B

The Chairman welcomed the applicant. Michael Beer, the property owner, discussed his proposed CoA amendment. The HALRB approved CoA 13-05A in April 2014. Since that time, the applicants realized that the existing property survey was incorrect and their construction drawings required minor alterations to meet the building setback requirements.

Mr. Liebertz presented the staff report. Since the application called for only minor amendments, he accommodated the applicants' construction schedule by placing the case on the HALRB discussion agenda instead of sending it back to DRC; he noted that he conferred with both the DRC and HALRB Chairmen. Mr. Liebertz added that the proposed changes include: 1) retaining the existing conditions on the front porch by omitting the approved porch steps; 2) decreasing the width of the addition by 5 inches and shifting the windows as necessary; 3) decreasing the height of the peak of the gable roof by 2.75" to accommodate the new pitch; and 4) adding AZEK trim on the addition as per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Solo asked to propose a discussion regarding the appropriateness of alternative replacement materials, particularly cementitious fiberboard and cellular polyvinyl chloride. The Chairman described both of these items to Ms. Solo noting that the

Maywood Design Guidelines were changed to permit the use of these alternate materials in particular circumstances and conditions. The Chairman stated that she could discuss such items with the board after the conclusion of the public hearing. Ms. Solo asked questions about how the applicants plan on painting the alternative materials. Mr. Beer replied they had not yet decided on paint schemes. Mr. Liebertz added that the design guidelines, however, do require that all AZEK be painted. Ms. Solo asked about new materials and tax credits. The staff responded that tax credits adhere to a set of standards put forth by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and the National Park Service.

The Chairman asked if there were any further questions or comments. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the proposed CoA. Mr. Laporte seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Beer thanked the staff for expediting the approval process.

Discussion Agenda Item #2: Pierce Queen Apartments, Site Plan #425

The Chairman welcomed the applicants back to HALRB. Representing the applicants were: Hilary Goldfarb, Bozzuto Development Company; Doug Carter, DCS Design; and Paul Brown, owner of the property with Wesley Housing Development Corporation. Ms. Goldfarb stated that the development team is returning to HALRB with more details as construction details progressed. Mr. Carter presented the proposed screening for the air condensers on the roofs of the two historic buildings to be preserved at 1600 and 1610 16th Street North. He stated that each roof currently contains ten condensers. The proposed work will replace the HVAC equipment with a total of six new air condensers divided into two groups of three. He added that the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance requires that screening be placed to hinder views of the mechanical units, but understood that an exception could be possible due to historic preservation efforts.

Mr. Carter presented photographs of the existing conditions, photographic simulations of the buildings and condensers without screening, and photographic simulations of the buildings with metal screening on the roof. He suggested two colors (varying shades of an anodized aluminum) that matched elements of the new construction. He stated, however, that they are open to the board's suggestions and comments regarding the screening and color.

Mr. Carter detailed the specifications of the new air condensers, noted their sleek design and gently curved corners, and suggested that the units were less obtrusive in comparison to the existing units. He further stated that their visibility on the roof in lieu of screening may be more compatible with the buildings' design.

The Chairman asked the applicants about the height of the current units. Mr. Carter stated that the units are raised off the roof and are approximately 4' above the parapet. The new units will use the existing penetration points and dunnage (framing elements), and will be no more than 3'6" above the roof.

Mr. Matta asked if they could lower the framing elements for the new units, thereby decreasing their overall height. Mr. Carter stated that they would likely be able to drop it, but still need to maintain the necessary clearances. Mr. Matta responded that since the roof will need to be replaced, changing the height of the framing should be conceivable.

He asked the applicant whether the proposed width of the screening could be narrower. Mr. Carter stated that the screening could be narrower and they would try to bring it in as close as possible.

Ms. Ballo presented the staff report. She provided background information and stated that a condition of the site plan required the developers to receive approval of HALRB for any changes to the roof. She noted that the current rooftop mechanical units are very unobtrusive and not noticeable from the public right-of-way. She contended that placing metal screen walls often draws the viewers' attention to the roof. Staff recommends that the new units be left unscreened since: 1) visibility of the current units is minimal; 2) the new units will be smaller (dimensionally); 3) there will be four less units per roof; and 4) new trees will further block views. In the future, if different mechanical units are installed, then the HALRB reserves the right to require screening. There is a willingness to defer to the HALRB if the board considers it more appropriate for the buildings not to have a screen wall, as there is a recognition that these are historic buildings and the most minimally obtrusive elements possible should be approved.

Mr. Wenchel noted that the screen walls detract from the design of the building, but suggested that a darker color screening may be less obtrusive. He stated that he concurs with the staff opinion and recommended no screening for the mechanical units.

Mr. Laporte asked for clarifications regarding the height of the existing and proposed units. Mr. Carter answered his questions and noted that the color of the new mechanical units would be a soft gray. The units themselves would disappear into the background.

Ms. Solo asked about the rooftop terrace on the proposed new construction and asked if such elements could be installed on the historic buildings. The Chairman noted that the two historic buildings are being preserved as close to their original conditions as possible. Ms. Solo noted that the metal screening would be inappropriate and suggested a brick wall to better blend with the existing building. Mr. Carter responded that the structural implications for masonry on the roof presented issues for the design. The Chairman stated that any type of enclosure would add additional massing to the buildings and recommended against the installation of metal screening. She reminded the board the only relevant question is whether the units should be screened as proposed or left unscreened.

Mr. Matta noted that since the largest unit is only 39" per the specification sheet, lowering the structural support for the units would make them barely noticeable from the public right-of-way. If screening is necessary, he suggested that the screening be dark so the units will appear to disappear and not reflect light. He recognized that condenser lines visible from upper floors of the new construction will be unsightly and screening might hide these elements. He thought the main issue here is to lower the new units to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. Wenchel moved to approve the units without screening and to stipulate the developers lower the units to the greatest possible extent. Mr. Matta seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion Item #1: Gables North Rolfe Street, Site Plan #432: Park Naming and Potential Historic Marker

The Chairman welcomed Meliha Aljabar, a Planner with Arlington County’s Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). She briefly discussed the context of the proposed park within the Gables North Rolfe Street Site Plan, the process for naming a park in Arlington County, and the potential for a historic marker. Ms. Aljabar made a brief presentation showing the location of two multi-family residential buildings and the replacement of one County-owned transitional living facility. The 8,000 square foot park will be located at the corner of 14th Street North and North Rhodes Street. The developer will pay for the construction of the park and share some maintenance responsibility.

Ms. Aljabar stated that the site plan is currently undergoing review by the Site Plan Review Committee. The review of this parcel is guided by the Fort Myer Heights North Plan, which calls for open space, a gateway feature to the neighborhood, and preservation of significant views. Also, DPR was asked to spearhead the development of this park.

Ms. Aljabar presented images of the current site. She noted that the proposal calls for the preservation of three trees, including two white oaks and one southern red oak. The current concept celebrates the preservation of the trees and the use of this site as a gateway. A series of paths and boardwalks will preserve the trees and root system, and offer accessibility. Other features include a children’s play area, naturalistic climbing features, stepping stone paths, seating, café tables, seat wall, signage, and a gateway feature. A unique feature would be a tree timeline. On the site, one tree will not be able to be preserved, but the goal is to repurpose the tree in the timeline feature. Other ideas include possibly utilizing the lumber in some of the site furnishings.

Per the County’s naming policy, Ms. Aljabar stated she was here to discuss any naming options prior to DPR making its official recommendation to the County Board. She said the policy states that the name be rooted in the historical, geographical, or ecological relationship of the site. Ms. Aljabar explained that DPR received one official name recommendation, “Three Oaks Park,” from the Radnor/Ft. Myer Heights Civic Association. The Civic Association selected this name in continuance with their overall call for tree preservation as part of the site plan and to raise awareness of the diminishing tree canopy in Arlington County. She asked the HALRB for its opinion on the name “Three Oaks Park” and if the board had any other suggestions. Ms. Aljabar also stated that a number of citizens discussed a historic marker during the park planning process, with content geared more towards the greater community than to this particular parcel.

Steve Campbell, a representative of the community association, stated that the neighborhood has interest in preserving the tree canopy and thanked the developers for their conscious efforts to protect trees. The community believed it was important to highlight these trees in the naming of the park.

Ms. Weichmann-Morris asked about the number of oak trees on the site. Mr. Campbell stated that there are five significant trees on the site, but three within the park area hence the name “Three Oak Park.” Ms. Weichmann-Morris asked Mr. Campbell what happens if an additional tree is removed and then there are less than three. She

suggested maybe naming it simply “Red Oak Park” or “Oak Park.” Ms. Weichmann-Morris then asked about the lifespan of a red oak. Board members responded they could possibly live up to two hundred years. Mr. Campbell stated that another tree could be planted to maintain three oak trees.

Evan Pritchard, attorney for the developer, responded that there are questions about the use of a number in naming the park. He provided some background regarding the developers’ and County foresters’ determination on the number of trees to be preserved based on their health. The three oak trees to be preserved are all in good health.

Mr. Liebertz presented an alternative naming option. He stated that many of the obvious names were utilized in other nearby parks (Rocky Run, Fort Myer Heights, etc.) and that no historically significant individuals previously owned the site. He briefly discussed the history of the site, noting that the property was part of a large 220-acre estate prior to the Civil War. At this time, there were over 2,200 oaks on the land. When the family that owned the 220-acre property attempted to sell parcels of the land, they named a 22-acre parcel Buena Vista due to its views of the surrounding topography, magnificent views, and its fine shade trees. The alternative name that staff suggests due to the relation of the history of the area is “Buena Vista Park.”

Mr. Laporte asked if there was an associated mansion house at Buena Vista. Mr. Liebertz responded that his research did not uncover a mansion house and that the owners of the property primarily lived outside of Arlington County. Mr. Matta suggested “Magnificent Oak Park” due to the use of the word “Magnificent” in an advertisement for the land. He added that he preferred Ms. Weichmann-Morris’s suggestion of “Red Oak Park” since it did not associate the park with a specific number of trees. Board members commented that not all of the trees were red oaks.

Ms. Solo asked the applicants to define a transitional living facility. Mr. Prichard stated that it was a transitional living facility, a half-way house for a lack of a better term, which assists individuals in recovery. The Chairman reminded the board that its focus was on the naming of the park and a potential historic marker. She moved that the board recommend the adoption of the name chosen by the civic association, “Three Oaks Park.”

Mr. Laporte stated that the motion should be that the HALRB does not oppose the name since it has no historic significance. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the board has a role in naming, whether it was a historic site or not. Mr. Woodruff stated that since there is no other compelling reason to choose a different name, the HALRB should support the neighborhood’s preference. The Chairman asked for a second to the motion. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chairman opened the motion for discussion.

Ms. Weichmann-Morris asked if the civic association had considered “Buena Vista Park.” Mr. Campbell stated that the neighborhood had not discussed the suggestion. Staff explained there was an issue with timing regarding bringing the item back to the civic association due to the Park and Recreation Board’s meeting dates and the planned County Board meeting in September. Ms. Aljabar stated that she could present the Park and Recreation Board with numerous options.

Ms. Weichmann-Morris asked if the HALRB could approve the neighborhood's recommendation with other options, including: 1) Three Oaks Park; 2) Red Oak Park; 3) Oak Park; or 4) Buena Vista Park. She suggested that the civic association share the other names and make a more informed decision with the understanding that the HALRB supports all of the above options.

Ms. Aljabar asked that the civic association consider any other options prior to the NCAC meeting in July. The Chairman read the motion on the floor. Ms. Weichmann-Morris amended the motion to support the civic association's choice of "Three Oaks Park" or an alternative name. Mr. Matta seconded the amendment and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chairman requested more information about the potential historic marker. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the marker was discussed as part of the SPRC process. The HALRB needs to determine if it is an appropriate request and offer guidance on what the content might be. Mr. Liebertz stated that the marker would not need to be site specific, but could discuss the history of Fort Myer Heights.

Mr. Laporte expressed concerns about having excess historic markers and recommended against a marker unless there is an interesting story to tell. Mr. Pritchard stated that intentions at other meetings were broader to include a basic way to note the site (more of an identification marker) in lieu of a formal historic marker.

Ms. Aljabar noted that the tree timeline could be included as part of HALRB review. Mr. Liebertz added that a marker could discuss the changes to the topography/landscape over time. Ms. Ballo stated that a marker on the environmental history of the site would be very interesting as it could discuss the topography and impact of development on the site over time, and the interesting geology of the immediate area. Mr. Campbell supported the idea. The Chairman further supported tying in the tree timeline coupled with a historic marker. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if the HALRB could have the opportunity to comment on the tree timeline marker. Ms. Ballo stated that such requests could be part of the site plan conditions. Ms. Aljabar noted the proposed location of the tree timeline within the park.

Mr. Pritchard clarified that a site plan condition imposes on the developer, but had no objection to cooperate with staff who would be performing the necessary research and design of the marker. Ms. Ballo agreed that a site plan condition may not be the best way to incorporate a marker. Ms. Aljabar stated that any formal statement be addressed to the SPRC Chair and staff.

The Chairman further moved that the HALRB be involved in the planning of the proposed tree timeline and the addition of an historic marker directed to the environmental history of the park area. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman's Report: The Chairman stated that the County Board approved the Request to Advertise for the Benjamin Elliott's Coal Trestle Historic District on

June 17, 2014. She gave a brief overview regarding the recent partial demolition of the trestle. Ms. Liccese-Torres outlined the upcoming public hearing schedule for the remainder of the designation process. If the designation is approved by the County Board in July, she reminded the HALRB that staff will return to the HALRB and County Board with design guidelines in the fall.

The Chairman discussed the proposed redevelopment of the Wilson School and the Western Rosslyn Area Planning Study (WRAPS) initiative once again underway. There will be a kick-off meeting and walking tour this coming weekend which Mr. Laporte plans to attend. Mr. Laporte volunteered to attend all the upcoming WRAPS meetings.

The Chairman reminded the board members of the County's upcoming volunteer appreciation celebration to be held on June 23 at the Arlington Mill Community Center on Columbia Pike.

The Chairman stated that the Affordable Housing Task Force she attends on behalf of the HALRB continues to meet once a month. She continues to discuss with the task force the inherent affordability of historic garden apartments and also discussed the proposed redevelopment of the Park Shirlington complex.

B) Survey Report: Regarding the proposed Broadview Local Historic District, Mr. Liebertz stated that research is ongoing and the proposed local historic designation hearing will occur at the August HALRB meeting.

C) Site Plan Review Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the Envision Courthouse community workshop scheduled for tomorrow evening has been postponed until later this summer, likely July. Mr. Uldricks stated that he will attend the subsequent meetings. Ms. Ballo stated that there will be a second SPRC meeting for Key Boulevard Apartments Site Plan on July 14, 2014. Ms. Liccese-Torres already shared the meeting information with Mr. Woodruff and Ms. May since they attended the first SPRC meeting for the project.

For the Park Shirlington Site Plan, Ms. Ballo stated that she is working with the developers to start a Phase 1A archaeological assessment, but the developers are focused with rezoning the property. There is no planned second SPRC meeting as of yet.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Rappahannock Coffee Form Based Code project will be returning to DRC in July. Based on the meeting, the applicants may present to HALRB in July to share the design before moving forward.

D) Staff and other Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres requested the board members send any updated contact information to Mr. Liebertz to keep records current and so that a new member roster can be distributed.

Ms. Ballo requested board members to share with staff any training they attended or will attend as part of the CLG board training requirements. She said that the Preservation Virginia Conference will be held in Newport News, Virginia, in October 2014. She noted that she will be presenting at the meeting on a panel with staff from DHR. The National Trust for Historic Preservation will have their annual conference in November in Savannah, Georgia. She reminded everyone to attend a lecture or a class, such as those offered at the National Building Museum. Board members asked if any in-house training could occur on a fifth Wednesday. Staff agreed to research potential presenters and dates.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff presented to the Envision Courthouse working group prior to the HALRB meeting this evening. The next community workshop is scheduled to be held during the summer.

The meeting adjourned at 9:37 pm.