



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
Neighborhood Services Division

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

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

**Wednesday, September 17, 2014
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Conference Rooms Cherry & Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman
Robert Dudka
Gerry Laporte
Erin May
Mark Turnbull
Nathan Uldricks
Kevin Vincent
Patricia Weichmann-Morris
Andy Wenchel

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Charles Craig
Tova Solo
Richard Woodruff

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Program Coordinator
Rebeccah Ballo, Preservation Planner
John Liebertz, 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 AUGUST 20, 2014, HALRB MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the August meeting minutes. Mr. Dudka asked staff to change the wording of the first paragraph on the fifth page of the draft August minutes to better reflect his comments regarding CoA 14-12, 1005 South Quinn Street. Mr. Laporte moved to accept the amended August meeting minutes. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded and the motion passed unanimously, 8-0 (Mr. Vincent and Mr. Wenchel had not yet arrived).

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

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

The Chairman announced three cases on the Consent Agenda and one case on the Discussion Agenda. The Chairman, however, moved CoA 13-05C from the consent to the discussion agenda due to a change in materials. She asked for a motion on the remaining two consent agenda items. Mr. Turnbull moved to approve the revised Consent Agenda. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded and the motion passed unanimously, 9-0 (Mr. Wenchel had not yet arrived).

CONSENT AGENDA (CoAs):

- 1) 2336 North Fillmore Street
John M. & Margaret Ross
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-21 (HP1400039)
Request to: 1) replace the current flagstone patio and extend its footprint; 2) replace a wood retaining wall with a stone-faced concrete block retaining wall that contains a gas outdoor fireplace insert; 3) replace a 4' tall picket fence with a 7' tall privacy fence; and 4) construct a new pergola.
- 2) 2329 North Jackson Street
Ashish Katkar
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-24 (HP 1400042)
Request to install a vinyl-sash egress window in the basement.
- 3) 2302 North Kenmore Street
Michael Beer and Latanja Thomas
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 13-05C (HP1400043)
Request to: 1) add vertical wood posts to the previously approved screened-in porch; 2) install a cellular PVC deck flooring; and 3) move the previously approved first-story single-leaf door and second-story sliding glass door on the south elevation.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

- 1) 3619 22nd Street North
Harold Hofstad
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-20 (HP1400031)
Request to install an array of nine solar panels on the southern (street-facing) slope of the gable roof.

ADMINISTRATIVE COAs (ACOs): None

Pulled Constant Agenda Item: 2302 North Kenmore Street, CoA 13-05C

The Chairman welcomed property owners Michael Beer and Latanja Thomas. Mr. Beer stated that the proposal is an amendment to previously approved CoA 13-05B. The only change from the proposal submitted to and recommended for approval by the DRC is the replacement of PVC decking with TimberTech [composite] decking on the new second-story porch.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the HALRB has previously approved composite deck flooring on the rear and side elevations of additions in the Maywood Historic District. Therefore, staff had no comments with a switch in material. Mr. Dudka added that the DRC desired to see a solid product, whether PVC or composite, and that the current proposal satisfies this requirement.

The Chairman called for a motion. Mr. Turnbull moved to approve the application. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded and the motion passed 9-0-1 with Mr. Matta abstaining.

DISCUSSION ITEM #1: 2900 COLUMBIA PIKE, HALRB CASE 14-22

The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the owners: Jerry Cohen, attorney, and Marc Gordon, construction manager. Ms. Ballo provided background information, including the building's location, style, and commercial use. She noted that the building is called out for full building preservation in the Columbia Pike Form Based Code (CPFBC). This proposal is not a CPFBC project, but a by-right renovation project. Therefore, a CoA and approval by the HALRB is not required under the code. Review of the case, however, is encouraged and historic preservation staff will be approving any future permits. The applicants wish to make minor exterior renovations for a new tenant. The HP staff conducted a site visit and the applicants attended the September DRC meeting.

The applicants discussed their plans for the exterior modification of the building. Mr. Gordon stated that the owners desire to modernize the interior of the building and refurbish the exterior. Mr. Cohen elaborated and discussed his historical perspective regarding Columbia Pike. He provided a brief history of the building, discussing its lengthy period as various restaurants and its more recent use as a construction office for the Halstead. Since it served as a restaurant for approximately 50 years, the owners wanted to market it and return the building to this use, but with an updated and modern interior. Mr. Cohen stated that they desire to meld the historical aspects with the needs of a contemporary restaurateur. He hoped to receive the HALRB recommendations and support for the installation of new windows, doors, etc.

Mr. Dudka presented the DRC report. He stated that the proposed changes were very minor and respected the architectural character of the building. He noted that the proposal will return the window on the front facade closer to its original condition. He added that the DRC recommended alignment of the window and door lintels on the side elevation. Mr. Dudka asked the applicants if the proposed single-leaf door [replacing an existing window] on the side entry would contain a transom. Mr. Cohen responded the plans currently call for an 8'6-foot

door. Mr. Dudka responded that the DRC requested the door be consistent with the existing design.

Mr. Dudka stated that the roof and the original shingles would be repaired and replaced in-kind where necessary. The front paneled door would be replaced. The new door would retain the design of the existing door, but replace a number of the panels with glass in order to allow additional light into the interior. The DRC also recommended repairing the existing steel windows, but added that any new aluminum window should replicate the profile and design. The DRC further recommended that applicant remove lighting, awnings, etc. from this application at this time since those elements would change once a tenant has been selected. Mr. Dudka stated that this application complies with the recommendations of the DRC.

Ms. Ballo echoed Mr. Dudka's comments and staff agrees that the application followed the staff recommendations. She applauded the applicant's efforts in preserving the building and added that she neglected to state that the building originally was a bank.

Mr. Laporte stated that the building's Spanish Revival-styled roof was not original to the building and that the Halstead Development Project submitted photographic documentation showing a flat roof without tiles, but that the Chairman of the HALRB at the time insisted on retaining the tiled roof. Mr. Cohen suggested that the mansard roof is out-of-character with the neighborhood and recommended an alternative design to return the building to its original form.

Mr. Laporte stated that he raised the issue to correct staff's record that the roof was an original component. He recommended examining the Halstead project files. Mr. Vincent added that he recalled similar discussions and photographs regarding the roof. Ms. Ballo contended that absent any evidence, staff recommends retention of the existing roofline. Mr. Dudka recommend the applicant contact the Halstead architects. HP staff added that draft copies of the Halstead proposal were not retained (only the final stamped plans).

Mr. Liebertz stated that even if the roof is not original, its form and materials have gained historic significance due to the building's prominent location at the intersection of Columbia Pike and South Walter Reed Drive. The Chairman added that the roof is an architectural feature that acquires significance over time.

Mr. Laporte suggested that the applicant should be allowed to consider the removal of the roof and tiles if the existing roof and tiles are in a state of disrepair. Mr. Cohen stated that he questioned the historic significance of the roof.

Ms. Ballo recommended: 1) tabling the conversation of the original roofline since there is no concrete evidence; 2) that the applicants search for additional documentation; and 3) the applicants return to the DRC/HALRB with an alternative roof plan if needed. She asked the HALRB to comment on any other aspect of the current proposal.

Mr. Matta had several comments regarding the drawings. He agreed with Mr. Dudka that an 8'6 door would be atypical for the entrance. He requested more information be provided on the specification of the entryway. He also asked that the drawings be updated to show the correct sills on the two southernmost infilled windows on the side elevation (the new infill

window should match the existing window). Mr. Dudka requested that future applications correct the drawings.

Mr. Laporte commended the applicants on their proposal and future use of the building.

Mr. Dudka requested that when the applicants find a tenant, the owner or tenant return with lighting, awnings, etc. Mr. Cohen agreed to have the tenant return to the board with any such changes.

Regarding the new single-leaf door on the side entry, Mr. Dudka requested the applicant retain the right side of the existing window and expand the door to the left in order to improve spacing. This would move the door over closer to the rear of the building.

The Chairman requested a motion of support for the proposed modifications to the building. Mr. Dudka made a motion to support the applicant's plans with minor changes (details about the side entry door, correct its spacing, and match the window sills) and asked that any future alterations including signage, lighting, screening of rooftop mechanicals, and outdoor dining return to the HALRB. Mr. Laporte seconded and the motion passed unanimously, 10-0.

DISCUSSION ITEM #2: ENVISION COURTHOUSE SQUARE

The Chairman welcomed Margaret Rhodes, a County employee with the Comprehensive Planning section of CPHD. Ms. Rhodes provided an overview of the study, discussed the project's boundaries and goals, and elaborated on the existing cultural resources (memorial trees, historic markers, and buildings located in the Landmark Block). She spoke to the scale and massing of the Landmark Block and its relationship with the one-story commercial strip on the opposite side of Wilson Boulevard.

Ms. Rhodes discussed the civic engagement components and public workshops, as well as distributed results of a recent public survey. Regarding cultural resources, 41 percent of the respondents preferred no facade preservation in the study area. She asked the HALRB to respond to the need for whole building preservation, frontage preservation, facade preservation, or building location for any of the resources in the Landmark Block. Planning staff is seeking comments and suggestions prior to attending a Planning Commission meeting in November and a workshop with the County Board in December.

Ms. Rhodes presented the current design preferences that illustrated new building locations, pedestrian spaces, open spaces, promenades, farmer's markets, and a relocated Metro entrance. She asked the HALRB for their particular ideas about how the historic resources should be incorporated into the redevelopment of this area.

The Chairman opened the discussion to the board. Mr. Matta questioned the format of the survey, particularly the question relating to facade preservation. Ms. Rhodes responded that the question specified the preservation of facades on the Landmark Block. Mr. Matta asked about those respondents who preferred one building preserved, but not all. Ms. Rhodes responded there was a section in the survey for written comments. Comments included, but were not limited to: demolish all of the buildings, preserve the Cosi building, and preserve all of the facades on the north side of the Landmark Block. She added that 41 percent of the respondents were against preservation of any kind.

Mr. Dudka asked questions regarding the format of the survey and what the A, B, and C categories represented. He noted that the 41 percent represented the C [against preservation], but inquired as to the other 59 percent. Mr. Uldricks stated that at the Envision Courthouse Community Meeting held over the summer, there were three options presented: A) whole building preservation, B) facade preservation, and C) no preservation. The Chairman responded that the statistics could be interpreted that 59 percent of respondents favored some degree of preservation. Mr. Dudka added that any respondents in favor of whole building preservation could have at least preferred facade preservation.

Ms. Rhodes shared additional information regarding the historic preservation portion of the survey. She stated the following results: A) facade preservation, 26 percent; B) building reuse, 33 percent; and C) no preservation, 41 percent. Mr. Vincent responded that the survey results illustrated the board's point that 59 percent of respondents wanted preservation in some form compared to a minority of individuals who preferred complete demolition of the block. Mr. Matta stated that "building reuse" could be interpreted in many different ways. Ms. Liccese-Torres clarified that "building reuse" in this case was specific to the relocation of the Simmonds (now Jerry's) Building. Mr. Vincent and the Chairman contended that the survey questions failed to encapsulate the intricacies of choosing specific buildings for reuse, facade preservation, and relocation; therefore the results are inherently flawed. The Chairman commented that the results still show more support for preservation than demolition. Mr. Uldricks added at the summer workshop, two-thirds of the individuals he talked to preferred some form of preservation.

Mr. Vincent said that the survey comment of "don't overbuild" is directly tied to historic preservation. To consider all of these items, there needs to be a much more nuanced survey that connects these ideas. Mr. Dudka added similar thoughts regarding the survey response "keep the flavor of old Arlington." Mr. Matta responded that the "flavor of old Arlington" is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. Turnbull remarked that the Landmark Block is the most enjoyable part of Courthouse and the buildings speak directly to the commercial buildings on the opposite side of Wilson Boulevard. Mr. Uldricks suggested that the Jerry's Building retains its historic appearance and marries into the idea of retaining the feeling that this is the County seat. The building provides a coherent narrative with the courthouse, jail, bail bonds, etc. Mr. Dudka added that this is the last opportunity to save any of this area's history. The site is particularly suitable since all of the historic buildings are located on one block with many other opportunities for new buildings in the study area. The Chairman and Mr. Dudka discussed the appropriateness of utilizing frontage preservation and facade preservation.

The HALRB reviewed each building individually and discussed their preservation preferences and recommendations. For the Simmonds Building at 2041 15th Street North, the HALRB recommended whole building preservation. The Chairman noted that the building is similar in scale to 2900 Columbia Pike [adjacent to the Halstead]. Similar large-scale development could occur around the Simmonds Building. The HALRB does not prefer the relocation of the building.

For the Commonwealth Building at 2045 15th Street North, the HALRB recommended facade preservation as it was not ranked in the HRI. Mr. Matta added that facade preservation would

retain the scale and massing of the southern half of the block. The Chairman advocated for frontage preservation over facade preservation.

For the First Federal Savings and Loan (Cosi building) at 2050 Wilson Boulevard, the HALRB likewise recommended frontage preservation. Mr. Dudka recommended retention of the entire facade (with additions) and the board agreed. Mr. Turnbull added that the interior clock and tile floors should be preserved in subsequent developments.

For the Conklyn Building (Boston Market) at 2046 Wilson Boulevard, and the USA Print & Copy at 2042-2044 Wilson Boulevard, the HALRB recommended no preservation.

For the Investment Building at 2049 15th Street North, the HALRB recommended facade preservation. Mr. Dudka stated that whole building preservation is not necessary, but the ribbon of windows and form would easily allow for facade preservation.

Ms. Ballo recommended the board consider categorizing any whole building preservation sites as Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) sending sites. This has successfully been utilized in the County to preserve such buildings as Wakefield Manor, and was used successfully in conjunction with the Clarendon Sector Plan.

Mr. Laporte discussed the Arlington Heritage Center and its potential future location at Courthouse Square. Mr. Laporte recommended considering the Simmonds Building for this purpose. The Chairman asked Ms. Rhodes if this has been discussed within the County. Ms. Rhodes responded that there has been public interest about potentially locating the heritage center within the Envision Courthouse Study Area. The HALRB supported consideration of the Simmonds Building as a potential site for the Arlington Heritage Center.

Mr. Vincent asked County staff to disregard and update the survey results. The current results are skewed towards the minority and each question should be revisited.

The Chairman noted that the HALRB supported the retention of the memorial trees and advocated for archaeological work as needed. She stated that the HALRB will send a detailed letter of comments and recommendations to County Staff and the County Board.

DISCUSSION ITEM #3: PROPOSED LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION AND DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR BROADVIEW, 5151 14TH STREET NORTH

The Chairman welcomed the owners of Broadview, Alex Deucher and Angela Guzman. Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked the applicants for their patience and cooperation throughout the designation process thus far. The Chairman stated that Broadview is a wonderful property with a rich history. She thanked staff for the detailed designation report, as did Ms. Guzman.

Mr. Liebertz presented a brief summary describing the property's history, significance to Arlington County, and the local historic district designation criteria it satisfies. Mr. Liebertz noted the inclusion of solar panels as a CoA requirement in the design guidelines, and asked the board to consider the language. The Chairman opened the discussion to questions or comments regarding the specific designation criteria or the design guidelines.

Mr. Vincent asked the owners about their plans for solar technology. Mr. Deucher responded that there are no immediate plans, but they were curious about its installation if they were to consider it in the future. Per Mr. Dudka’s suggestion, the HALRB recommended simplifying the proposed guidelines to include that a CoA is necessary for the installation of solar panels, recommend the use of ground mounted solar panel arrays, and that the panels should have limited visibility from the public right-of-way. The HALRB recommended the deletion of all the other details/specifics [subheadings i-vii] regarding solar panels. The home owners consented to the removal of the language.

Mr. Dudka agreed with staff that the use of only wood siding [no cementitious fiberboard] for all potential additions is acceptable in this case. The home owners confirmed that this was their preference as well.

Mr. Deucher asked about the status of the flower boxes. Mr. Liebertz responded they were not addressed in the design guidelines as staff did not consider the item to be a permanent architectural feature. Mr. Vincent requested that the flower boxes be considered removable items and listed under exemptions from the CoA process.

Mr. Matta asked the home owners if they currently had window air conditioning units. Mr. Deucher stated that the house has central air. Mr. Liebertz responded that the reference to such units in the draft was mistakenly included from a previous set of design guidelines and will be removed.

The Chairman moved that: “the HALRB supports the local historic designation for Broadview on the basis that at least designation criteria A, B, E, G, and K as listed in the ACZO [Arlington County Zoning Ordinance] are met by this property, and that we adopt the design guidelines as amended. Amendments include the deletion of Subheadings I-VII in Section III.A.8.B and the deletion of window air conditioning units and adding flower boxes to Section IV.6.” Mr. Laporte seconded the motion and it passed unanimously, 10-0.

DISCUSSION ITEM #4: PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION ON HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION CRITERIA, CAMBRIDGE COURTS CONDOMINIUMS, 2807 ARLINGTON BOULEVARD

The HP Staff presented the request for a preliminary determination on historic district designation of Cambridge Courts Condominiums. Ms. Liccese-Torres discussed the location of the garden apartment complex near the intersection of North Fillmore Street and Arlington Boulevard (Route 50). Cambridge Courts consists of 19 buildings constructed in 1943. The complex is a contributing resource to the Lyon Park National Register Historic District. Cambridge Courts is listed in the Important category in the HRI.

She stated that the Cambridge Courts Condominium Board approached staff about local designation earlier in the summer. Ten days ago, the Condominium Board requested local designation of the property. Staff sent them a receipt of acknowledgement and notified all 159 property owners that the request was received. The HALRB will need to find that this site warrants further study in order for staff to move forward with the designation report.

Mr. Vincent moved that the site warrants further study. Ms. Weichmann-Morris seconded the motion. Mr. Laporte asked staff if any condominiums currently are local historic districts. Staff

responded that a portion of Colonial Village is a local historic district. The motion passed unanimously, 10-0.

DISCUSSION ITEM #5: PROPOSED FORT CORCORAN INTERPRETIVE SIGN, ROSSLYN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

The Chairman welcomed Jae Cho, representative of the Rosslyn Business Improvement District (BID). She reminded the board this is the BID's second submittal to the HALRB and that the current revised marker responded to many of the board's comments. Ms. Cho noted the changes, including the white font, the photograph of the Aqueduct Bridge, adjustment of the photographs' coloring, and limiting the extents of the historic map on the bottom of the marker to primarily Arlington County and Georgetown. She added that the marker will be placed at the corner of Wilson Boulevard and North Rolfe Street. The Rosslyn BID recognized that Fort Corcoran is not in the exact location of the marker, but that the prototype would remain focused on Fort Corcoran. The final signage may discuss other historic aspects of Rosslyn more appropriate to this intersection.

Mr. Laporte asked if the HALRB should approve a historic marker of an item not at its exact location. Mr. Vincent responded that the current text does not state "here is the location of Fort Corcoran." Therefore, he supported the application since it will stand for a short period of time [one year] and is not inaccurate. The Chairman stated that the actual location of the fort is not very far away. Mr. Vincent reminded the board that many previous historic markers were located on highways quite a distance from the actual site.

Mr. Dudka asked the applicants if they could superimpose the location of the major streets on the historic map. Mr. Liebertz reminded the HALRB that the other side of the marker would have different content relating to Cupid's Garden and a modern way-finding map. Ms. Cho concurred and stated that the historic map may look busy with an additional overlay, but stated she could add a "you are here" mark.

Mr. Dudka asked Ms. Cho to list all the historic forts called out on the map.

The Chairman asked staff if they had any comments. Mr. Liebertz stated he would list staff's comments along with those of Bernard Berne, an Arlington County resident. Mr. Berne requested the caption of the first image be changed to correctly identify Aqueduct Bridge and Georgetown (not Fort Corcoran or Rosslyn). Staff commented that the text on this first paragraph had a number of misspellings. Mr. Liebertz advised the applicant to change "crew of soldiers" to Union soldiers. Mr. Vincent suggested retaining this text, as "crew" is an appropriate term in this case. Mr. Liebertz asked the applicant to correct the spelling of Parrott Rifle and listed a number of other grammatical changes. On the historic map, Mr. Berne requested the applicant move the label of Rosslyn to its actual location. Mr. Berne also asked the application to lower case "sally port" and change "Washington, D.C." to "District of Columbia" when referencing its connection to the Aqueduct Bridge.

The Chairman asked for the following revision: to remove "in order to defend" and replace it with "to defend." Mr. Turnbull requested all references to Washington, D.C. be consistent in their punctuation.

Ms. Cho stated that the Arlington County Zoning Office had not yet determined if the marker should be considered signage. Mr. Vincent asked the applicant to keep the board aware of Zoning’s decision, as it could impact many of the board’s future historic markers.

Mr. Turnbull moved to support the installation of the historic marker as amended by the board. Mr. Laporte asked if the board was approving the final marker design and the text. The Chairman responded that the HALRB would be supporting both aspects. Mr. Vincent seconded and the motion passed 9-1-0 with Mr. Laporte in opposition.

- DISCUSSION AGENDA ITEM #1:**
- 1) 3619 22nd Street North
Harold Hofstad
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-20 (HP1400031)
Request to install an array of nine solar panels on the southern (street-facing) slope of the gable roof.

The Chairman welcomed Harold Hofstad, owner of 3619 22nd Street North. Mr. Hofstad introduced the project. He proposed the installation of nine solar panels in a rectangular layout on the street-facing roof of his non-contributing dwelling in Maywood. He stated that the panels would be installed on racks that rest on the roof and the inverter would be located inside the dwelling. He hopes to be energy independent, but stated the power company will not buy back excess energy. He added that the sewer vent in the top left corner of the roof will be relocated in order to properly locate the panels in the area of greatest exposure, while maintaining the desired rectangular configuration. He suggested the vent be centered above the skylight.

Mr. Liebertz presented the staff report. He noted that the building is a non-contributing dwelling heavily altered ca. 1972. Staff noted that the installation of solar panels had no effect on character-defining architectural features and complemented the existing design. For these reasons, staff supported the use of traditional solar panels and did not request the applicant investigate thin-film solar panels. Mr. Liebertz had asked the applicant to consider more sensitive placements of the solar panels (ground-mounted array, on the rear of the building, etc.), but these locations failed to generate adequate power. Mr. Liebertz stated that he contacted the Maywood Civic Association to see if there were any comments or concerns, but its monthly meeting had not yet occurred. The President of the Civic Association, Antony Maderal, however, supported the application. A homeowner posted on the listserv last weekend that they appreciated the DRC’s forward thinking in recommending approval of the application.

Mr. Dudka noted that this is a non-contributing building with essentially a California modern design that lends itself to the installation of solar panels. He, however, stated that this approval should not serve as precedent for contributing dwellings in the historic district. He recommended the HALRB have a more detailed discussion of solar technology and historic properties in Arlington County at a later date.

Mr. Vincent fully supported the application and stated that the board should allow historic homes to accommodate solar technology, as homes evolve over time. This will allow the homes to continue to be livable.

Mr. Dudka requested staff to assemble a packet or draft guidelines for solar technology for the board's consideration. Mr. Liebertz responded that staff prepared a brief outline for DRC recently, but will expand on this information moving forward. Mr. Dudka further asked staff to see how other jurisdictions have dealt with solar panels. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that perhaps the HALRB could discuss solar panels at a future fifth Wednesday meeting.

Mr. Matta asked the HALRB motion to include the following language: 1) the approval is site specific for a non-contributing dwelling and does not set precedent for the historic district; 2) the panels are parallel in plane to the roof; and 3) that the panels are no more than 6" above the roof. The Chairman and Mr. Dudka agreed with Mr. Matta's suggestions.

Mr. Matta made a motion that the HALRB approve the application for the solar panels in the current configuration with the understanding that the plane of the panels is parallel to the plane of the roof and that the panels are less than 8" above the roof. Mr. Laporte amended the motion to include that the HALRB prefers it to be as low as possible, but no more than 8" above. Mr. Dudka amended the motion to include that the motion is specific to this non-contributing property. Mr. Matta accepted all the amendments. Mr. Laporte seconded the motion and it passed unanimously, 10-0.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman's Report: The Chairman discussed the recent Planning Commission (PC) meeting for the Benjamin Elliott's Coal Trestle local designation request. The PC unanimously supported the designation and adoption of the design guidelines. The County Board will hear both the Benjamin Elliott's Coal Trestle designation and the Fenwick Court Design Guidelines on September 20; both items are on the consent agenda.
- B) Survey: Mr. Liebertz discussed the upcoming local historic district designation for The Hermitage, a home at 4025 North Randolph Street, near Chain Bridge. The building is a log-revival house constructed in the 1920s. The owners are requesting the designation.
- C) Site Plan Review: Ms. Ballo stated that Key Boulevard Apartments is returning for its final Site Plan Review Committee meeting. The applicants intend to bring their application forward to the County Board. Ms. Ballo requested an HALRB representative for the meeting. The project also will come to the HALRB in October, and the Planning Commission and County Board in December.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Wendy's Site Plan is moving forward. This site plan will create the preservation easements for Wakefield Manor and Courthouse Manor. Ms. Weichmann-Morris will be the HALRB representative.

The McKinley Elementary School expansion will be heard by the County Board this month. A Phase IA Archaeological Study will be conducted prior to the start of the project.

APS is at the preliminary stages of the Abingdon Elementary School expansion. Staff is requesting an HALRB representative on the second planning group. APS has already agreed to conduct a Phase IA Archaeological Study due to the school's proximity to Fort Reynolds.

Ms. Liccese-Torres discussed the most recent WRAPS working group meeting. Mr. Laporte continues to serve as the HALRB representative. At the October 8, 2014, meeting, preservation staff will present on Wilson School and Queen Courts Apartments.

- D) Staff and other Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres discussed her involvement with a graduate class from Virginia Tech who will be studying various aspects of Arlington's cultural heritage and creating related projects.

Ms. Liccese-Torres noted that the National Register Nomination for the Unitarian Universalist Church of Arlington will be heard by the State Review Board in Richmond tomorrow, and then hopefully sent onto the National Park Service for review and listing.

Ms. Ballo reminded the group that that the Preservation Virginia Conference in Norfolk is coming up in October, and there is a stipend for an HALRB member who wishes to attend. Mr. Uldricks stated that he would be able to go and would like to claim the stipend. Ms. Ballo thanked him, and said that often there are additional stipends as the conference date gets closer. She is aware that Mr. Laporte and Ms. Weichmann-Morris would also like to attend, so she will check on the status of the stipends and get back to them very soon if more are available.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 pm.