



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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman
Charles Craig
Robert Dudka
Gerry Laporte
Tova Solo
Nathan Uldricks
Andy Wenchel
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Erin May
Mark Turnbull
Kevin Vincent
Patricia Weichmann-Morris

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Program Coordinator
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 OCTOBER 15, 2014, HALRB MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the October meeting minutes. Mr. Craig moved to accept the October meeting minutes. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-3 (Mr. Matta, Mr. Dudka, and Mr. Uldricks abstained; Ms. Solo 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 that there were two cases on the Consent Agenda and asked for a motion. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Wenchel seconded and the motion passed unanimously, 9-0 (Ms. Solo had arrived).

CONSENT AGENDA (CoAs):

- 1) 2302 North Kenmore Street
Michael Beer & Latanja Thomas
Maywood Historic District
CoA Case 13-05D (HP1400051)
Request to move an approved window on the south elevation.
- 2) 2821 23rd Street North
Clint Woodson
Maywood Historic District
CoA Case 13-10E (HP1400054)
An after-the-fact request to paint (unpainted) masonry walls.

Before addressing the Discussion Agenda, the Chairman stated there were several Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness requests and asked for a brief summary. Mr. Liebertz and Ms. Liccese-Torres discussed each project.

ADMINISTRATIVE COAs (ACoAs): 1)

- 2342 North Van Buren Court
Glenn and Hilary Scherrer
Eastman Fenwick House Historic District
ACoA 14-14
Request to replace existing air conditioning condenser units.
- 2) 3504 21st Avenue North
Stephen J. Francis
Maywood Historic District
ACoA 14-15
Request to remove a 17-inch maple tree.
- 3) 2327 North Van Buren Street
Alan Meltzer
Eastman Fenwick Historic District
ACoA Case 14-13 (HP1400050)
Request to replace the existing garage door with a galvanized steel door.

The Chairman stated there were three cases on the Discussion Agenda. She provided a summary of the public hearing procedures and asked for public speakers to submit speaker slips.

DISCUSSION AGENDA:

- 1) 5800 Washington Boulevard
Arlington Public Schools
Swanson Middle School Historic District
HALRB Case 14-09 (HP1400014)
Request to replace six round arched windows.

The Chairman welcomed the applicants. Representing Arlington Public Schools (APS) were Jason Lynch (Project Manager, TMG Construction) and Mark Waszczak (Facilities and Operations, APS). Mr. Liebertz provided background information on the project. He described the building and discussed the applicant's previous submission heard at the May 23, 2014, HALRB meeting. At that time, the applicant had requested to replace the six original steel-arched windows with simulated divided-light aluminum windows. The HALRB deferred the application and requested: 1) accurate cost estimates for the replacement of the steel windows in-kind; 2) the applicant contact Hope Manufacturers to determine if the company installed the glazing on steel windows; and 3) that the aluminum window cost include spacer bars in future submissions.

Mr. Liebertz explained the applicant's current proposal calls for true divided light (TDL) or simulated divided light (SDL) steel windows. The applicant also plans to discuss aluminum windows at this meeting, but these windows were not discussed at the November DRC meeting as they were not part of the formal application. The DRC, however, requested the applicant return to HALRB with cost estimates for all three options.

Mr. Lynch discussed the three options for the replacement of the steel arched windows. He provided details and full cost estimates (materials and installation). The aluminum windows cost \$103,000, the SDL steel windows \$222,000, and the TDL steel windows \$312,000. He noted that: 1) the internal spacer bars would be included in both the aluminum and SDL steel windows; 2) the hardware on the steel windows will match the existing hardware to the closest extent possible; and 3) the existing muntin profile will match the depth of the new steel windows.

Mr. Liebertz asked the applicant why the cost of the aluminum windows increased from \$86,000 (May 2014 submission) to \$103,000 (current submission). Mr. Lynch replied the increased costs were due to the need for more extensive masonry repair work, particularly to the existing lintels.

The Chairman asked for staff's report. Mr. Liebertz reiterated that staff had supported the use of aluminum windows in the previous application. The current application, however, only included SDL or TDL steel windows. He stated that he contacted Hope Manufacturers to evaluate the appropriateness of SDL in comparison to TDL steel windows. Staff recommended the board approve the installation of SDL windows as they are appropriate to the character of the historic building, respect the design of the original windows, and cost considerably less than the TDL.

Mr. Dudka provided the DRC report. He stated that the Hope steel window would be an appropriate match to the existing steel windows. He recognized that the SDL steel windows are still of considerable greater cost than the aluminum windows, but stated that the six arched windows are iconographic and representative of Swanson Middle School. These are the

windows that the public views, and therefore, there is a higher standard applied to this character-defining element of the school building. The DRC recommended the board approve the use of steel replacement windows, but noted that the differences between the SDL and TDL are subtle and will not be noticeable to the general public.

The Chairman reminded the board that the existing aluminum replacement windows on the school building were installed prior to the creation of the local historic district.

Mr. Matta confirmed the construction specifications of the SDL windows with the applicant and concurred that the windows will appear to match the structural design and appearance of the existing windows. Mr. Dudka confirmed with the applicants that the SDL steel windows had internal muntin spacer bars. In addition, Mr. Lynch stated that the SDL option is more representative of the profile of the existing windows, as the muntins of the TDL must account for the width of the insulated glass. He distributed a sample of the steel windows.

Ms. Solo asked if the steel replacement windows would have greater long-term costs compared to the aluminum. Mr. Waszczak responded the TDL windows had greater associated maintenance costs than either of the SDL windows. The Chairman added, however, that the SDL windows may be subject to a single break rather than replacing small panes. Mr. Waszczak agreed.

Mr. Laporte stated that since APS is a public institution/body, and as such, they should be leaders in implementing public policy such as historic preservation. Therefore, the in-kind replacement of steel windows is appropriate.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked the applicant questions regarding the finish of the steel windows. Mr. Lynch stated that the windows could match the color of the existing windows or the original color of the windows (likely a shade of white). Mr. Dudka asked if there is a powder coat layer on the windows. Mr. Lynch responded that it has a multi-step finish. Mr. Liebertz provided additional details regarding the coating and manufacturing process.

Mr. Scott McKeown, the Vice Principal of Swanson Middle School, stated that the school recognizes the building's architectural uniqueness, but noted that he never heard members of the community discuss the importance of the subject windows. The school desires functional and safe windows, but does not consider the windows as a centerpiece. The Chairman suggested that perhaps increased educational outreach could garner greater appreciation for the architectural characteristics of the building.

The Chairman called for a motion. Mr. Matta moved that the board accept replacement of the six existing windows with Hope's SDL steel windows. Mr. Laporte seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Waszczak noted that the windows will be a budget request line item, but the installation will be determined by available funding and allocation of resources.

- 2) 400 North Manchester Street
Reevesland Historic District
HALRB Case 14-29 (HP1400052)
Request to stabilize, rehabilitate, or replace aspects of the foundation and other structural elements.

The Chairman welcomed the applicants, Richard Pinskey (Facilities Project Specialist, DES, Arlington County) and John Mott (John Miner Associates, Inc.). Ms. Liccese-Torres provided background information on the subject property. She noted that a set amount of capital has been set aside by the County Board to complete basic stabilization work (primarily foundation work) on the house. The County contracted Milner to complete drawings and provide a scope of work. At this point, the HALRB will review the appropriateness of the proposed scope of work as outlined in this submission.

Mr. Pinskey provided additional background information. He stated that available funding and project costs will allow for only the proposed stabilization of the foundation, but this will facilitate future potential uses for the dwelling. The work will include lifting the dwelling, replacing deteriorating structural elements, digging out a section of the basement, and bringing the entire basement space up to current code.

Mr. Mott reiterated that there are several problems that need to be overcome: 1) deterioration of the foundation; 2) insufficient crawl space that fails to meet current code; 3) insufficient basement height that fails to meet current code; 4) insufficient space for mechanical equipment in the basement; and 5) deterioration of floor framing set too close to the ground. He discussed the architectural reasons as to why the problems occurred.

Mr. Mott provided a brief evolution of the property and the relationship of development to potential archaeology. He noted that John Milner Associates previously completed shovel test pits at the subject property, but archaeological testing yielded limited artifacts of questionable historic significance. The majority of the materials discovered were “yard trash.” During the construction of the proposed improvements, the archaeologist will monitor any ground disturbance activity in order to evaluate potential additional artifacts that may date to the nineteenth-century tenant house. Mr. Mott stated that the DRC expressed interest in archaeology and recommended on-site monitoring.

Mr. Mott outlined the specific details of the proposed work, lifting of the house, removal of the porches (in order to lift the house), stabilization of the foundation, and excavation of the basement. All parts of the porches will be properly categorized and reconstructed. He noted that the DRC recommended retaining the current configuration of the porch steps and altering the existing grade instead of adding an additional step as previously proposed.

Mr. Dudka stated that the applicant correctly identified the concerns of DRC, but failed to update the drawings in the application to reflect the number of existing steps and adjustment to the existing grade. The applicant stated they were waiting for the HALRB approval prior to updating the drawings. Mr. Dudka noted that the motion should include language that the applicant will update the drawings and have them reviewed by staff.

Mr. Matta asked if the existing floor framing would have sufficient structural integrity to raise the dwelling. Mr. Mott and Mr. Pinskey stated that a house mover and a structural engineer concurred that raising the dwelling would not result in the building's collapse.

Mr. Wenchel provided additional information regarding the history of the dwelling.

Mr. Pinskey summarized a basic project schedule. The submission of design/development drawings will be completed and sent to bid. In all likelihood, project costs will limit the improvements to stabilizing the foundation. The projected start date would not be until summer 2015, with approximately six months for completion.

The Chairman requested a motion. Mr. Woodruff made a motion to approve the application with a condition to update the drawings as discussed. Mr. Dudka proposed an amendment that the drawings show that the front porch will have three steps and that the grade will be adjusted to meet the grade as shown in the rear. Staff will ensure the drawings are correct. Mr. Liebertz reminded the board to consider adding a condition regarding archaeological monitoring. Mr. Wenchel proposed an amendment that archaeological monitoring be undertaken during excavations. Mr. Woodruff approved the amendments. Mr. Matta seconded the motion and it passed unanimously, 9-0.

- 3) 1612 North Quincy Street
Colin & Charu McDermott
Fraber House Historic District
HALRB Case 14-27 (HP1400046)
Request to discuss replacement tree(s) for the
previously approved removal of an oak tree.

The Chairman welcomed Colin and Charu McDermott, the owners of 1612 North Quincy Street. Mr. Liebertz provided background information. He stated that the HALRB approved moving the garage from County property to the owner's property at the October 2014 meeting. The moving of the garage necessitates the removal of a large oak tree from the subject property. The owners requested permission to plant a single oak tree in lieu of the three replacement trees recommended by Rachel Jackson, Arlington County Forester. The HALRB had deferred a decision on the acceptable number of replacement trees until additional information could be obtained from staff.

Ms. McDermott explained she talked to DPR staff about planting a single tree on their property and two at Oakgrove Park. The DPR responded that such an arrangement would not be possible. She noted that the County Forester had suggested a basic guideline of spacing the trees 20' from the existing sidewalks, structures, retaining walls, and trees (trunk to trunk). Therefore, she submitted the previous site plan noting a general lack of space for three canopy trees. At a recent site visit by Mr. Liebertz and Ms. Jackson, Ms. Jackson stated that the 20' setback is not a steadfast rule but rather general guidance. Canopy trees can be planted within 10-15' of such elements dependent on site conditions. Ms. McDermott stated that the revised site plan shows the various spacing options. Based on this information, she requested the board approve their request of planting a single Black Oak.

Mr. Liebertz stated that staff recommends the planting of three replacement trees, as per the County Forester's recommendation and the existing tree replacement policy. He deferred to

Ms. Jackson to offer expertise on the matter. Ms. Jackson provided a site plan with potential locations for the three trees and outlined the tree replacement calculation. She also listed the tree replacement options in regards to species. Mr. Liebertz added that the County tree replacement policy is utilized in all of the local historic districts to determine the appropriate number of replacement trees. Ms. Jackson stated that the policy is determined by the tree's condition (health), size, and species. She noted other trees, particularly an evergreen on the northeast corner of the property with a large cavity, that will eventually fail. As a compromise, she offered that the applicants could remove this tree as well (without requiring a replacement tree). This would serve as an ideal location for one of the requested replacement oak trees.

Ms. Jackson added that a 20' setback is ideal, but often never accomplished. Foresters try to ensure that trees are never planted on top of one another, but 10' is often adequate. She could recommend other tree species, but all of the species will be canopy trees.

Mr. Woodruff asked about the issue of planting trees in Oakgrove Park. Ms. Jackson stated that the locations near the original site of the garage have compacted soil and are ill-suited for a new canopy tree. Mr. Liebertz added that the HALRB cannot dictate/enforce the planting of trees on other individual's property and are limited to addressing the issue on the subject parcel.

Ms. McDermott stated that the tree removed for the garage was hazardous to the house. She noted that certified arborists determined the evergreen tree in the northeast corner was not in danger of failing in the near future and was perfectly healthy. Ms. Jackson responded that the evergreen tree is alive but it will eventually split in half; it is not a hazard but was a compromise for a tree with a future significant impact.

Mr. McDermott asked if the County regulates trees on private property. Ms. Jackson responded that the county forester monitors and regulates trees in local historic districts. Mr. Craig asked if the two evergreens in front were native cedars. Ms. Jackson listed the trees and types on the property. Mr. Craig stated there are five shade trees and asked if a Crape Myrtle is an understory tree. Ms. Jackson stated that it is an ornamental tree. He asked the forester for the smallest approvable canopy tree. Ms. Jackson responded that the Black Oak is the smallest. Ms. Jackson stated that a typical compromise is planting three understory trees for each canopy tree (3 for 1). Mr. Craig understood that there is an underlying county policy, but sympathized for the home owners as we are suggesting a dense forest. Ms. Jackson stated that the planting of the canopy trees now will compensate for the future failure of the other trees on the property. Mr. Craig remarked Black Oak can grow rather quickly.

Mr. Dudka agreed that there is a lot of trees on the property, but stated that the location next to the driveway is ideal for a tree since it would shade the street not the lawn. He recommended the board approve two trees as a compromise. The Chairman agreed and stated that three trees are too many for the property.

Mr. Laporte made a motion to approve the location of the two trees shown on the site plan distributed by the applicants (the Black Oak tree and the red circle next to the driveway). The Chairman asked if this would be acceptable to the applicants. Mr. McDermott asked if there is a recommended distance from the sidewalk/utility lines. Ms. Jackson recommended 10 to 15' from the corner and not aligned with the pole. She added that she can provide additional species options.

Mr. Wenchel was concerned that the HALRB would be assisting with waiving county requirements on a property it formerly owned. He worried about the establishment of precedent. The Chairman stated that this situation is particularly unique due to the elimination of the garage portion of the property from the historic district boundary and the garage's relocation to the subject property. Mr. Liebertz added that the motion should include language that the HALRB is disregarding the county tree replacement policy and county forester's opinion due to the unique set of circumstances associated with the Fraber House. Therefore, there will be less established precedent regarding the replacement of trees.

Mr. Dudka stated that since the County created this situation (the moving of the garage and thereby the tree) there is a case for leniency in regards to the tree replacement policy. He added that in order to respect the existing tree canopy, and since the proposed location adjacent to the driveway is an ideal location, he again recommended two replacement trees.

Mr. Woodruff asked staff the basis of the county tree replacement policy, specifically the policy that three trees be planted for every tree removed. Mr. Liebertz stated that it is not a static calculation, but takes into account various factors. Ms. Jackson responded that the calculation includes species rating, health, and size. Mr. Woodruff asked if there is a legal basis for the calculation. Ms. Jackson noted that the tree replacement calculation is based on recognized professional guidance. Mr. Liebertz stated that review of trees in historic districts is derived from the districts' respective design guidelines (in this case the Fraber House Design Guidelines). The HALRB reviews trees as outlined in the respective guidelines and requests the county forester evaluate and provide reports on the subject trees. He added that the HALRB is able to deviate from the county forester's expertise, but justifications are necessary. Mr. Woodruff stated that the homeowners are contributing greatly to the canopy of Arlington County, and the HALRB should defer to the owners. Mr. Dudka added that the property owners want to use their property for multiple uses (not just trees) and we should be grateful for their willingness to save and relocate the garage.

The applicant and the board discussed the expense of planting trees. Mr. Craig assured the property owners that the overall expense is limited.

Mr. Laporte reread his motion: to approve the location of the two trees shown on the site plan (the Black Oak tree and the red circle next to the driveway). Mr. Dudka seconded the motion. The Chairman stated that the motion needs to account for why the board is deviating from the tree replacement policy. Mr. Laporte amended his motion to recognize the unique circumstances of the application including the relocation of the historic garage. Mr. Woodruff offered an amendment to locate the second tree elsewhere on the property. Mr. Laporte accepted the amendment with the stipulation that the planting of two trees is coordinated with the county forester's recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEM #1: MARY CARLIN WOODS AT BLUEMONT PARK

The Chairman welcomed the applicants, Steve Cole (representing the Bluemont Civic Association at this meeting) and Caroline Haynes, Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC). He presented a proposal to rename a section of Bluemont Park to "Mary Carlin Woods at Bluemont Park." Mr. Cole provided background information and noted that a Bluemont Civic Association member slipped on a trail and broke her hip in this undefined

location. Emergency responders took over 30 minutes to provide assistance because they were unable to identify the area. Mr. Cole determined that the key issue was that the resident was in a location of the county without a name.

Mr. Cole stated that he arrived at the name “Mary Carlin Woods” after he conducted extensive research. The Carlin family owned the property for over a century and Mary Carlin resided in the nearby log house that bears her name on North Carlin Springs Road. He detailed the history of the land ownership and the Carlin family. Mary Carlin served as a teacher for numerous years at Carlin Hall.

The Bluemont Civic Association endorsed the name “Mary Carlin Woods” and forwarded it to the PRC. The PRC added “at Bluemont Park” to the name. Ms. Haynes stated that the PRC added this phrase to adhere to the overall goal of consolidating parks. She added that the renaming will help create a sense of place, facilitate neighborhood clean-up, and help preserve the woods. The naming also will connect the space to Bluemont Park as it is primarily physically disconnected.

Mr. Liebertz added that the proposed parcel subject to renaming is largely within Mary Carlin’s 1900 property holdings. He noted that the HALRB makes comments to the PRC, who will synthesize the comments to the County Board. He read the general park naming policy for individuals of merit.

Mr. Laporte supported the idea, but recommended dropping “at Bluemont Park” as the main purpose is to assist emergency responders and create a sense of place. He added that he supports the consolidation of parks, but that “Mary Carlin Woods” is better. Ms. Haynes suggested that the “at Bluemont Park” will facilitate creating a sense of place and connect it to the overall park. Mr. Laporte disagreed and noted that “at Bluemont Park” is more of an administrative name, not appropriate for public purposes, and may lead to unnecessary confusion. Mr. Cole stated that “Mary Carlin Woods at Bluemont Park” is a compromise with DPR.

Mr. Laporte suggested that the HALRB’s letter of support omit the “at Bluemont Park” phrase to allow PRC to add the language if they desire. Mr. Craig concurred with Mr. Laporte. Mr. Wenchel stated that you can have a “woods” within a large park and supported recognizing this local historical figure.

The Chairman concurred with the rest of the HALRB and asked for a motion. Mr. Laporte moved to support the renaming of this section of Bluemont Park as “Mary Carlin Woods.” Mr. Craig seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman’s Report: The Chairman stated that Mr. Laporte and Ms. Solo volunteered to be on the 2015 Nominating Committee. She added that Mr. Turnbull was reappointed in October and several other members’ reappointments are now under consideration.

The Chairman noted that the Key Boulevard Apartments site plan was deferred. At the County Board hearing on the subject, she discussed transfer of

development rights and its connection to open space. AHC's long-term plans with the property are unknown.

- B) Survey: Mr. Liebertz briefly discussed Cambridge Courts. He noted that earlier in November, the preservation staff and the HALRB Chairman met with condominium owners to discuss the history of the property, the local designation process, the purpose of design guidelines, and answered general questions. He stated that most of the individuals in attendance were on their condominium board. All informational material provided to the attendees will be posted on their website.
- C) Site Plan Review: Ms. Liccese-Torres briefly discussed the Wendy's Site Plan, noting that there will be two preservation easements forthcoming for Wakefield Manor and Courthouse Manor.

Mr. Matta discussed Abingdon Elementary School. He served last month on a Public Facilities Review Committee (PFRC) to review APS's plans for constructing an addition to the school. The HALRB is involved to advocate for compatibility with the Fairlington National Register District (the school is listed as a non-contributing resource). Potential archaeological sites were investigated, but a Phase 1A assessment yielded no significant artifacts. Mr. Matta will continue to attend applicable PFRC meetings as necessary.

Ms. Liccese-Torres briefly discussed the potential development at Stratford/H-B Woodlawn, Wilson School, and Reed School. Mr. Cole, the Chairman of the Planning Commission, provided additional insight regarding APS's current proposals. Decisions related to these facilities will be determined by the Arlington School Board on December 18, 2014.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that a local resident sent a letter to the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office, concerned about proposed impacts of development at Stratford/H-B Woodlawn (it is listed in the National Register of Historic Places). Subsequently, APS invited an HALRB member to attend future meetings on the proposed school addition/design. Members of the board briefly discussed the historic significance of the H-B Woodlawn site.

- D) Staff and Other Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres provided some brief staff updates. The County Board approved the Broadview Historic District on November 18. The WRAPS group held a community forum on November 8; Mr. Laporte attended and summarized the meeting and outlined potential issues.

Ms. Liccese-Torres noted the recent success of the Green Valley Pharmacy Historic Marker Dedication Ceremony on November 8 and thanked the members of the HALRB who were able to attend.

Ms. Liccese-Torres briefly discussed the Historic Research Workshop sponsored by the Arlington Historical Society. Held at the Center for Local History, the seminar outlined how to research historic houses in Arlington County.

Attendees also visited the Center for Local History to learn more about the available resources. A similar seminar may be scheduled in the spring.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 pm.