



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, February 18, 2015
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
County Board Room

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Charles Craig
Robert Dudka
Greg Holcomb
Gerry Laporte
Kevin Vincent
Andy Wenchel
Richard Woodruff
Tova Solo

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Charles Matta, Vice Chairman
Nathan Uldricks
Mark Turnbull

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

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:32 pm. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 21, 2015, HALRB MEETING

The Chairman called for a motion or comments on the January meeting minutes. The Chairman noted the incorrect date on the header of the minutes. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the meeting minutes with the date correction. Mr. Dudka seconded the motion and it passed 8-0 (Mr. Vincent had not yet arrived).

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman stated the public hearing procedures. She requested that any attendees who wished to make public testimony to submit speaker slips.

The Chairman announced that there were two cases on the Consent Agenda. The Chairman called for a motion on the consent agenda. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Vincent seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

- CONSENT AGENDA (CoAs):**
- 1) 3619 22nd Street North
Harold Hofstad
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-20A (HP1500060)
Request to amend CoA 14-13 in order to reconfigure the number and placement of the solar panels.
 - 2) 2313 North Jackson Street
Andrew Lewis & Theresa Wyatt
Maywood Historic District
HALRB Case 14-13A (HP1500001)
Request to amend CoA 14-13 in order to: 1) finish the existing concrete stoop with flagstone; 2) lay flagstone on the existing concrete walkway; 3) remove the chimney from the addition; and 4) install cementitious fiberboard siding on the new addition instead of wood siding.

- DISCUSSION AGENDA**
- 1) None

The Chairman noted there were two ACoAs and asked staff to briefly discuss each. Mr. Liebertz stated that the first item (ACoA 15-01) involved a temporary art exhibit (less than six months) at the Maury School. The exhibit would give the impression that a “worm” was penetrating the windows of the historic building, but no historic fabric actually would be disturbed as part of this exhibit. Mr. Liebertz stated that the second item (ACoA 15-02) followed the guidelines recently established for the Fenwick Courts townhomes.

- ADMINISTRATIVE COAs**
- 1) 3550 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington County Arts Center
Clarendon School Historic District
ACoA 15-01
Request to install a temporary art exhibit titled “The Wormhole.”
 - 2) 2329 North Van Buren Court
Eric & Karla Overturf
Eastman-Fenwick House Historic District
ACoA 15-02 (HP1500003)
Request to replace twenty windows.

HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION REQUEST: WILSON SCHOOL

The Chairman introduced the local historic district designation request concerning the Wilson School located at 1601 Wilson Boulevard. She invited Arlington Public Schools (APS) staff to make a presentation.

Scott Prisco, Director of APS Design and Construction, introduced Jennifer Xu, APS Project Manager, and Steven Wright of Leo A Daly Architects (Planning, Engineering, and Architecture firm), and Bill Marzella, EHT Traceries (Historic Preservation firm). Mr. Prisco stated that the School Board unanimously opposed the historic designation at its February 17, 2015, meeting. He noted four key concerns regarding retention of the original school building: 1) the compromise of green space as identified in the WRAPS process; 2) budgetary concerns as initial cost estimates to restore the exterior of the building are \$3-5 million; 3) budgetary concerns as initial cost estimates to restore the interior of the building are \$2-3 million and such restoration would yield only four classrooms; and 4) no restoration work is included in the Capital Improvement Plan thereby reducing the money for additional seats. Mr. Prisco noted that if the County Board required restoration of the building, it would not appear exactly as shown in the 1910 artistic rendering completed by Mr. DeBor due to the need for access to other spaces. He added that since APS has no dedicated money for restoration, the historic school could stay as it is for a number of years and result in less green space on the site.

Via PowerPoint, Mr. Wright presented the possible consequences of retention of the Wilson School. He noted that its use as a standalone educational facility requires access/egress, handicapped accessible toilets, etc. To accomplish this, he stated that an addition to the rear of the building would be required consisting of two egress stairs and bathrooms. The front of the building would be restored, but the overall massing would retain the footprint of the rear 1920s addition. He added that the design team would strive to commemorate the history of the Wilson School in the new building. Mr. Prisco reiterated that the floor plans shown (primarily the two additions and the elevator) by Mr. Wright are not part of the cost estimates presented earlier in the presentation. There are no funds for any of these proposals.

The Chairman asked Mr. Prisco if APS considered any other uses (art studios, labs, gymnasiums, etc.) for the Wilson School building other than traditional classrooms. Mr. Prisco responded that the current layout of four 800 square foot classrooms would be individually inadequate for one of the “special” rooms.

The Chairman asked for the public speakers. Mr. Liebertz called Audrey Clement, who stated the following as per her written statement:

As an advocate of preserving the Wilson School, I am delighted with the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board’s (HALRB) recent decision to [consider] designat[ing] the site of the Wilson School as a local historic district. Yet last night’s School Board vote to demolish the school proves Stan Karson’s view that the battle to save the school is uphill. I would like to answer a couple of arguments that have been raised by opponents of preservation.

At a recent County Board meeting Jay Fisette argued that preservation wasn’t an option because the majority opposes historic preservation. Fisette didn’t say who constitutes the majority. But unless he is prepared to argue that the HALRB is at odds with the Rosslyn community, it seems that the majority does not include those who reside in West Rosslyn.

Relying on cost estimates from APS staff, John Vihstadt said that renovation of the Wilson School is too expensive. Yet historic status opens the way to federal and/or state historic preservation tax credits, which could cut the cost of renovation by much as a third.

A dissertation defended by Paola Venturi Brooks in 2011 reported that the rehabilitation of two historic Richmond area schools—Maggie L. Walker Governor’s School and

Appomattox Regional Governor’s School for the Arts and Technology around the year 2000—were financed through syndication of historic tax credits to private investors, at considerable savings to their respective school districts.

The dissertation entitled: “Use of Historic Tax Credits for School Construction in Virginia: Costs, Benefits, Administrative Implications, and Public Policy Issues,” compared the cost of these renovations with that of other Richmond area schools that used traditional financing.

Even after discounting for the cost of syndication, historic tax credits covered almost one-third the costs of the Appomattox renovation. Likewise, Venturi Brooks reports that the Maggie Walker Governor’s School was financed as follows: one third with proceeds from the syndication of state and federal tax credits, one third with private contributions, and one third with commitments from localities utilizing the governor’s school.

Clearly historic preservation tax credits brought substantial saving to some sister school divisions in the state of Virginia and could benefit Arlington if only APS staff were to say no to business as usual and start thinking outside the box.

I request that the HALRB create a presentation or a plan to present to the County Board on how this renovation could be financed.

Mr. Liebertz called the next speaker, Stan Carson. Mr. Carson stated:

When I and eleven others in my community addressed the HALRB in a letter late last year to request historic district designation, I knew it was the right place for it to come. I didn’t know the amount of courage and tenacity the HALRB would have for defending historic preservation in Arlington, but I found that out rather quickly. I am not going to speak about Wilson School, but I want to speak about the process. The School Board has met a couple of times on this matter, but the hearings have been charades. It is clear to me that the School Board made up their mind a long time ago and have their own design for a new school no matter what the public requested. I want to compliment this board for having the courage to speak truth to power and I hope that you continue to do so.

I want to challenge two points that the school board used to oppose historic designation. First, the cost of the restoration. A former member of this board, however, has submitted costs that are in the area of \$1.5 million for the exterior restoration work. He had specific items that added up to this cost. The school board does not have specific items that add up to their \$3, 4, 5, or 8 million, I don’t know what the final cost is as it seems to change. So we don’t know the specific cost figures, but we don’t believe it is as high as they say it is. Second, they [school board] says it will reduce open space. As I understand it, the footprint of the existing building will be reduced by roughly two-thirds or so. That gives the school board the ability to add onto that building without reducing the open space surrounding it. But since they know that many of the community members are concerned about open space, they are using that argument which I think is factious. On behalf of the community, I hope that you continue the fight and move forward by recommending historic designation to the County Board.

Mr. Liebertz called Paola Lugli, who presented a PowerPoint presentation. She stated the following:

My name is Paola Lugli. I am an Italian architect living in Arlington since 2000. I am still a friend of Michael Leventhal [former Historic Preservation Program Coordinator] and I worked with him to do a better job with the Swanson [Jr. High School] addition. In 2010, Michael engaged me and my business partner, another Paola, knowing our interests as architects in adaptive reuse, in the Wilson School. That is why when my partner and I saw that there was this meeting at the school board denying designation, we thought it was important to come and speak on the value of architecture. Today, I live in Rosslyn and [the school] is very close and across the street. What we are showing is a hypothetical project to open a discussion, not about whether what is left is good or not, or worth restoring, but about the idea of integrating a building (even without historic designation) into a design. What we started with Michael Leventhal was the entire block and not only the school, and to have a mixed use project with the school preserved in part with the green space and the green roof. The existing school building would be kept as it is, but simply emptied [gutted] so that the image of what it was [could be] retained for the community and Arlington history. So the design incorporated new building around it, underneath, behind, creating a piazza going over the other buildings on the site to create something that is very alive. All of this follows the principle of architectural transformation of old buildings, widely used in Europe and America. Showing this example of building transformation through juxtaposition, weaving and insertion of old and new, is to open a discussion. In Arlington, maybe it is time to open the door and avoid the destruction of buildings, try to do something more creative, and engage the wider community around us.

Mr. Liebertz called Paola Amadeo, who continued the PowerPoint presentation started by her partner Paola Lugli. She played a video of a prior presentation on the subject matter and stated:

I was new to Arlington from Los Angeles where there is little historic preservation. The idea is to present to you the combination of numerous programs presented in 2010 by Robert Brosnan [former Director of Community Planning, Housing, and Development]. The program included 200,000 square feet of residential, 50,000 square feet of commercial, 60,000 square feet for Fire Station No. 10, 40,000 square feet of office space, and amenities. The idea is to integrate the space as you are going from high-rise to low-rise and create an intermediate set of scales. That was aided through scaffolding. You can't really restore the school back to its original glory. The idea for us is not to bring it back to how it looked but to use it. Our idea is to use what was left of the original and represent the rest through more modern scaffolding, LED lights, and more of a public park intervention that would represent what was there. A large image of the school would also behave as a portal and include the rest of Arlington. So the idea included a plaza where there is now a 7-11. The school would still be front and center, but it would not only be a school. It would be used as a public space, underground parking, and gym space. The underground part is open with green spaces, all interconnected. We felt very engaged putting it together.

You have a school being framed with an image and by Courthouse, Rosslyn, and Clarendon. While we as Italians do not believe things should be brought back to the original state, we do support the differentiation of the historic and to use whatever is left of a building and to fill in what is missing through modern intervention. As the section shows, the underground is open to the public space.

There were no additional public speakers. The Chairman stated that the matter is now with the HALRB. She asked the members of the board if they had questions for APS or HP staff. Mr. Laporte asked APS about the cost-benefit analysis, specifically why there are not various alternatives that highlighted the different costs associated with each option. For instance, APS staff noted the cost of the restored front door and cupola, but did not compare it to the cost of a new building. He stated that the front door on the new building would not be free and asked for the differential cost as this is critical for policy determination. He asked APS staff if such an analysis has been completed. Mr. Prisco responded that the only cost-benefit savings would be the reduction of four classrooms. This would be essentially the square foot cost of new construction of four classrooms, approximately 3,200 square feet. Our concern is that the capturing of the four classrooms from the historic building would then include costs of infrastructure as discussed earlier in the presentation. He added that APS has detailed cost estimates.

Ms. Solo asked APS staff if they contracted an architect already and when they expect preliminary designs. A summary of the November 2014 WRAPS meeting stated that half of the responders preferred to see a school on 18th Street North and the other half preferred the school remain on Wilson Boulevard. She asked APS staff if the decision on the location of the school has been made yet. Mr. Prisco stated that the architecture firms have been contracted: Leo A Daly and Bjarke Ingels Group. In terms of the WRAPS charge, WRAPS will not likely decide if the new school is on 18th Street North or on Wilson Boulevard. We are hopeful that this decision will be left up to the Public Review Facilities Committee (PFRC) and Building Level Planning Committee (BLPC) processes. These will run between 8 to 12 months and include all of the stakeholders. Building placement should be part of this design process. The School Board prefers it on 18th Street North due to the potential for more green benefits, but we do not want to stifle our architects. He stated that this will be a large part of the upcoming discussion at the WRAPS meeting.

Mr. Vincent clarified the additional preservation costs in relation to the overall 80 million budget for the school.

Ms. Solo asked if it would be within the School Board's purview to seek federal and/or state tax credits for historic preservation. Mr. Prisco responded that these tax credits are typically for private entities and not available for public bodies. He stated that as a public entity we don't pay taxes, but there may be other ways to circumvent this. If we were mandated to update this building, we would explore all options to offset costs. Again, he reiterated that APS does not have any money allocated to restore the building and it is not in the purview of the school board. In addition, APS does not have any percent of the restoration costs even with assistance from tax credits. Ms. Solo confirmed that these cost saving measures had not been fully considered.

Mr. Woodruff stated that the decision to demolish the Wilson School was made a long time ago with little consideration. He asked APS staff how that decision was made and the rationale behind it. Mr. Prisco responded that he could not speak to the specifics of the 2009 school board decision opposing historic designation as his employment started in 2013. Under today's purview, APS can minimize our footprint and maximize our square footage with a new building rather than combining it with an older building. Again, the several million dollars of restoration is not in APS's budget. He noted that APS is trying to be fiscally prudent with available funding and to construct the most seats possible within environmentally sustainable designs. He added that it would be harder to have the same amount of green space and an efficient footprint with keeping that building. The demolition of the building is very pragmatic.

Mr. Woodruff stated that the footprint of the historic Wilson School is rather small. He asked if the building could be incorporated into the new design without complete restoration of the historic building. If our objective is to protect the building, we can simply request the preservation of the exterior until funding becomes available. Mr. Prisco stated that the initial concept plans for WRAPS showed a secondary school with a smaller recreation field. If this occurs, APS would need to move the building on the Wilson School side and that would make it impossible to realize a future net-zero solar panel array. The retention of the building would result in changes to the footprint of the new building.

The Chairman asked questions about the location of the 7-11 on the proposed site plans. Mr. Prisco stated that for the initial WRAPS design assumptions, it was believed that Arlington County would acquire the 7-11 property; however, the timing of the purchase may not coordinate with this project. Moving forward, the 7-11 building will be incorporated into the site plan drawings.

The Chairman noted that APS is purportedly striving to be environmentally conscious; however, it is widely recognized that reusing existing buildings is the most sustainable route. The proposed demolition will require abatement and other similar requirements. She asked Mr. Prisco if the budget accounts for such costs. Mr. Prisco responded that the budget includes demolition and plans include the reuse of the crushed stone, crushed masonry, and other materials for recycling. This could be used on or off site because it is important to do what is environmentally sound. Regarding the building he stated:

I do realize what you are saying that it is sometimes more sustainable to keep an existing building than tear one down. However, if it means we have to build more or have less viable square footage, and we have to build more than we would in our normal building, the reality of the sustainability, of that idea, is irrelevant because we are building more to make that work or causing more energy (i.e., we have multiple elevators). There are electric costs that will go up. So the true sustainability, the comparison, would have to be analyzed. I am not convinced in this instance. I do agree and am a big proponent of reusing existing building stock rather than ripping down when possible, but I don't agree this is one of those instances.

The Chairman followed with a question regarding the estimated budget, specifically the cost per seat. Mr. Prisco responded that the average cost per seat is approximately \$90,000 without structured parking. The Chairman understood the cost of underground parking and asked if APS considered a turf field on top of the parking garage due to the urban setting of Wilson School. She recommended that APS look at creating a great urban design and take the lead in the possibilities for an urban site. She noted that APS hired architecture firms apt at integrating historic and contemporary construction and found it ill-advised that they are not being given the opportunity at the Wilson School. Mr. Prisco reminded the HALRB that what is shown are conceptual diagrams and that every possible space is considered for open elements, green spaces, green roofs, etc. As shown at the Jefferson School, APS is thinking outside the box when it comes to the use of available spaces and are creative as possible. He noted that APS is looking to move vertically and maximize the green space at the Wilson School site.

Ms. Solo asked Mr. Wright of Leo A. Daly if the contract requests any scenarios regarding the reuse of existing buildings on the site and additional clarifications regarding the design process. Mr. Wright stated that the firm had not examined incorporating the existing building at this point. Mr. Prisco stated that it was assumed that the building would not be preserved based on the earlier denial for historic district designation by the School Board. No final design work has not started at this point; APS is only looking at

programming/concept designs. He confirmed that the current diagrams only show that a school could fit on the site.

The Chairman discussed the current process pursuant to the MoU between the County and the School Board. The School Board voted not to support the local historic district designation. The HALRB is now required to vote whether to recommend local historic district status to the County Board. She distributed copies of a draft motion that is based on the motion sent to the School Board last night. This motion had additional details regarding the designation criteria met by the school and a description of the boundaries.

Mr. Matta (who is absent) had a proposed amendment to the draft motion. The Chairman accepted his amendment that clarified the boundary in the draft motion. She read the full motion for the record:

The HALRB finds, based upon information presented in the Historic District Designation Report of January 20, 2015, and public testimony and documents presented to the HALRB at its meetings on January 21, 2015, and this evening, that the Wilson School meets Designation Criteria B, D, E, F, G, and K for inclusion within a Local Historic District as required by Section 11.3.4.A.4 of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance. Namely, the Wilson School:

- Has character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of Arlington County, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the nation;
- Is associated with persons (at least Charles Robison and Woodrow Wilson) who significantly contributed to the development of Arlington County, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the nation;
- Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, or method of construction;
- Is identified as the work of a master builder, architect (Charles Robinson), or landscape architect;
- Embodies elements of design, detailing, materials, or craftsmanship that render it structurally or architecturally significant; and
- Is suitable for preservation or restoration.

Based on its determination of historical significance of Wilson School, the HALRB recommends designation of a Local Historic District defined by the footprint of the original 1910 Wilson School building to include the original 1910 Wilson School building and the front yard extending the full width of the footprint of the original school building from the front entrance façade to Wilson Boulevard.

Mr. LaPorte seconded the motion. The Chair opened the motion for discussion. Mr. Vincent asked if there would be an opportunity to discuss next steps after the vote. Mr. Vincent suggested the HALRB discuss how to move forward if demolition proceeds and how the board approaches future school designations. The Chairman recommended limiting discussion to the motion at this time.

Mr. LaPorte clarified that the motion will not include that the “HALRB further recommends that the Wilson School building be restored to the appearance of the 1910 school building.” The Chairman concurred. Mr. LaPorte stated that he would not vote in favor of recommending restoration because he was swayed by

the presentation by PaolaSquare Architects. He suggested that the building could be adaptively reused and not necessitate full restoration. This could be a good alternative and meet the objectives of the School Board. APS could think outside the box and preserve aspects of the building. The Chairman noted that such a motion is not before the board.

The Chairman called for a vote on the motion and it passed unanimously (9-0).

The Chairman stated that the HALRB unanimously voted for a motion at the January 21, 2015, HALRB meeting that stated “The HALRB further recommends that the Wilson School building be restored to the appearance of the 1910 school building.” She added that the HALRB is not required to make such a recommendation as part of the process moving forward.

Mr. Vincent agreed with Mr. LaPorte’s earlier comments. While restoration should be considered, it is not the only option moving forward. He commended PaolaSquare Architects for their presentation on how to preserve the existing building material while incorporating it into a modern design. The suggestion is likely too late, but Wilson School could be incorporated in a new design without restoration. The HALRB should continue to recommend considering restoration, but it is not the only option. The motion regarding restoration should not move forward to the Planning Commission or County Board as an explicit recommendation from HALRB.

Mr. Woodruff agreed with Mr. Vincent. He stated that downtown Washington, D.C., is full of buildings that have been preserved but not restored. In addition, preservation of the existing materials will allow for a potential future restoration.

Mr. Dudka stated the recommendation is not offered as an exclusive option. The recommendation to restore the building was removed from the main body of the motion because it is a recommendation. This is more of an aspiration. It is understood there are other ways to preserve a building. The motion is simply a recommendation that it would be wonderful to restore the building to its former glory.

Mr. LaPorte apologized for speaking out of order earlier in the meeting. He suggested amending the language of the second motion in order to achieve unanimity. He offered the following amendment:

The HALRB recommends consideration of restoration of the Wilson School building to the appearance of the 1910 school building.

The Chairman stated that there is not a motion on the floor at this point. The motion from last month was provided to the HALRB for their information. She noted that the HALRB can adopt a new recommendation or not, that is up to the board.

Mr. Woodruff stated that there is no need to review the issue. The HALRB stated that it should be restored for the motion to the School Board, but that is not the controlling motion moving forward to the Planning Commission and County Board. The controlling motion is whether we recommend the Wilson School as a local historic district.

Mr. LaPorte responded that the HALRB is on record for recommending restoration. After our discussion and the presentation by PaolaSquare Architects, I would like to have the board reconsider withdrawing the motion. The Chairman asked Mr. LaPorte to make a motion.

Mr. LaPorte introduced the following motion:

The HALRB revoke the recommendation of last month. In lieu thereof, the HALRB recommends that the restoration of the Wilson School building be considered on the plans for the new school on the site. This would be the case even if historic designation is not granted.

The Chairman offered an amendment to use the word “modify” instead of “revoke.” Mr. LaPorte accepted the amendment.

Mr. Dudka stated HALRB should not make a recommendation for a specific use or owner. Mr. Dudka suggested leaving the motion from the previous month intact. He reiterated that it is only a recommendation and ideally the Wilson School should be restored. Mr. LaPorte agreed and said he did not intend for the motion to be limited to the construction of a new school.

Mr. Vincent added that we need to make it clear that restoration is not an integral part of our recommendation and we are not demanding APS incur this cost even if it may be the best decision.

The Chairman reminded the HALRB that no other action is needed if the board is satisfied with the existing recommendation from last month. She noted that it is only a recommendation. Mr. Woodruff stated that we could amend the motion in order to make it stronger. He offered a new motion that stated:

The HALRB recommends that the Wilson School be protected from demolition and be studied for restoration of the 1910 school building or other use appropriate to the historic designation of the buildings and grounds.

Mr. Woodruff stated that the first motion does not call for excluding demolition or a reasonable study on the cost of restoration. Mr. LaPorte seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion. The motion did not pass (4-4-1). The following four members voted for the motion: Mr. Holcomb, Ms. Solo, Mr. Woodruff, and Mr. LaPorte. The following four members voted against the motion: Ms. Lawrence, Mr. Wenchel, Mr. Dudka, and Mr. Craig. Mr. Vincent abstained.

Mr. Craig noted that Mr. Dudka had excellent examples school buildings that were fully restored and integrated into a new building. Uses on school property are like any public buildings, you shuffle and push the square footage around until you get what you need. The HALRB is a historic preservation board. Yes, creative designs can be done, but the HALRB must ask for historic preservation first and then see what they propose which could be any number of design solutions.

Mr. Vincent asked for a discussion on what the HALRB will recommend as part of the process going forward if the County Board approves the demolition of the building. He suggested a full discussion on potential remediation before the County Board formally rejects the HALRB recommendation.

Mr. Vincent recommended that the School Board consider the following items. First, preparation of a full archaeological assessment due to the amount of open space/grounds and its location along Wilson Boulevard that started as a Native American trail and then a Colonial Road. Second, there are exterior and interior architectural elements that should be reused in whole. These could be placed on site or at other Arlington County buildings. Third, APS needs to determine what commemoration will occur and require review of any commemoration with the HALRB.

Mr. Vincent added that the HALRB came to the Wilson School fight too late. For any future school building, he suggested that the HALRB insert itself early in the design process. The demolition of Stratford Junior High, for example, would be disastrous. That local historic designation request needs to be brought forward now before any design ideas are fully discussed.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Vincent for his points. She noted her frustration with the School Board:

I appear in court from time to time, and you at least felt that even if you suspected that the court was not going to rule in your favor they listened to you. I have to say that I never felt that with the school board. It was a preconceived and predetermined decision. I don't know if it was really looked into as carefully as it might have been back in 2009. [APS] was certainly not good stewards of the building and allowed it to get into this disrepair that it got into, and it is unfortunate that they are now saying, with their consultant concurring, that it is in too bad of shape to preserve. How did it get there? Who did it? I have to say this because I was prevented from speaking at the school board last night as I had been told I could. It is highly unfortunate that schools has had a great opportunity to make something of an important building and just let it get run down. I realize that architectural taste in the 1950s is different than it is now. That is evident. There were some unfortunate architectural mistakes in many quarters, but they could have been remedied, they could have been fixed, but schools chose not to. I keep hearing seats, seats, seats, and the impression is the idea that APS will get as many seats as cheaply and quickly as possible. But that is belied by the architectural talent schools have hired for the site. International architectural firms do not come cheap. Schools wants to make a statement on this site, but it just does not include honoring the past. That is very unfortunate. Fifty to 100 years from now are people going to say we want to improve it. It may have its LED Silver or Gold certification (importance/qualifications is debatable), but is it something the community values? Will somebody fight for what you are building now, will someone want to preserve it.... Arlington's history is suffering a death of a thousand cuts.... [Wilson School] is not a very large building. It would not take that much to work it into a wonderful new project. It could be done, creatively. It could be done within the \$80 million budget.... If you don't want to do it, there is nothing that will make you want to do it.... [The HALRB] has to speak for historic buildings.

The Chairman concluded discussion of this particular item. She welcomed any of the public to stay and listen to the rest of the meeting if desired.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A) Chairman's Report: The Chairman had no additional reports.
- B) Survey: Mr. Liebertz noted that preliminary drafts on the Cambridge Courts Local Historic District would be submitted to the condo association in April.
- C) Site Plan Review: Ms. Ballo noted that the preservation easements for Wakefield Manor and Courthouse Manor under Site Plan 435 (2025 Clarendon Boulevard) will be moving forward to the Planning Commission and County Board in March. No HALRB representative is necessary for these meetings and there will not be much discussion on the easement.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Carver Homes community went forward to the Planning Commission. Mr. Matta spoke in favor of two historic markers on the site. The Planning Commission was receptive to two historic markers and it will move forward to the County Board. It will be heard by the County Board this month.

- D) Staff and Other Reports: Ms. Liccese-Torres updated the HALRB on the collaboration with Virginia Tech on a collaborative graduate student project regarding Arlington’s cultural history, specifically the Little Saigon project. The students will be attending next month’s HALRB meeting to present their findings and interviews. HP staff and Public Arts are collaboratively working on a commemorative event to tie in with the 40th anniversary of the fall of Saigon.

The HALRB had further discussion about the disposition of the Stratford School.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 pm.