



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 18, 2015  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Joan Lawrence, Chairman  
Charles Craig  
Craig Deering  
Robert Dudka  
Gerry Laporte  
Andrew Wenchel  
Richard Woodruff

### MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Charles Matta, Vice Chairman  
Greg Holcomb  
Tova Solo  
Mark Turnbull  
Kevin Vincent

### STAFF:

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

### ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:35 pm. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

### APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 21, 2015, MEETING MINUTES

The Chairman called for a motion on the October 21, 2015, meeting minutes. There were no corrections or additions. Mr. Matta moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Dudka seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-1 (Mr. Matta abstained; Mr. Deering had not yet arrived).

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

The Chairman reviewed the public hearing procedures regarding speaker slips. She stated there were four items on the consent agenda and two on the discussion agenda. The Chairman asked for a motion on the

consent agenda. Mr. Matta moved to approve the consent agenda; Mr. Woodruff seconded and the motion passed unanimously (6-0); Mr. Deering had arrived.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

- 1) 2204 North Kenmore Street  
David & Maria Greene  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Cases 15-17 (HP1500028)  
Request for the partial demolition and construction of a new two-story addition, replacement of a tin shingle roof, removal of asbestos siding, and other alterations.
- 2) 2302 North Kenmore Street  
Michael Beer & Latanja Thomas  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 15-19 (HP1500036)  
Request to install solar panels on the roof of the rear addition.
- 3) 3321 23<sup>rd</sup> Street North  
Cecilia Kennedy  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 15-20 (HP1500037)  
Request to install solar panels on the eastern slopes of the cross-gable roof (towards the rear of the historic section of the house) and on the gabled hyphen.
- 4) 303 North Glebe Road  
Hugo Palma (on behalf of the tenant)  
Buckingham Historic District  
HALRB Case 15-21 (HP1500038)  
Request to remove the existing signage and install new neon signage

**DISCUSSION AGENDA:**

- 1) 2315 North Kenmore Street  
Theodore Schmitt & Rebecca Knotts  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 14-30A (HP1500035)  
Request to amend CoA 14-30 in order to: 1) match the built conditions on the west (façade) and north (side) elevations; and 2) install concrete paver strips.
- 2) 2133 North Taft Street  
Arlington County Board  
Dawson Terrace Historic District  
HALRB Case 15-23 (HP1500040)  
A request to remove a non-historic porch, install wood steps, and add protective storm windows.

**DISCUSSION AGENDA ITEM #1: 2315 NORTH KENMORE STREET**

The Chairman welcomed Mr. T.R. Schmitt (home owner/applicant) and Heidi FitzHarris (project designer). Ms. FitzHarris briefly discussed the proposal. She noted the project is currently under construction and nearly completed, but had been flagged by the historic preservation inspector due to alterations to the two front gable roofs on the façade and the installation of additional trim elements. The proposal contains a number of drawings including the: as-built drawings, HALRB approved drawings, and three different options to address the field changes. Ms. FitzHarris presented four different options: 1) leave the dwelling as built; 2) modify the trim and siding; 3) reframe the smaller gable over the door and modify the trim and siding; and 4) reframe both gables and modify the trim and siding. She added that the siding is natural cedar and the trim is painted white creating a stark visual difference. She proposed that painting the cedar siding may blend these two elements.

Mr. Liebertz presented the staff report. He stated that the dwelling at 2315 North Kenmore Street was built in 1936 in tandem with its neighbors at 2311 and 2317 North Kenmore Street. The ribbon of three minimal traditional residences with Tudor Revival-styled elements all share the same design. He noted that the DRC, HALRB, and Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff had been flexible in the review of the contributing dwelling. Both the DRC and staff recommended approval of a design that increased the ridgeline of the main roof over 4" and allowed setback variances. Through multiple reviews, all parties created a design that retained the appearance of the façade, but allowed for a visually unobtrusive, two-story addition to the rear. However, the as-built pitch and height of the two front-gable roofs are now noticeably different compared to the adjacent matching dwellings of the same design. Mr. Liebertz recommended approval of Option D as presented as it meets Chapter 5: Exterior Renovation and Chapter 6: New Addition of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. He added that while this option fails to completely return the building to the original design approved by the HALRB, it retains the intent of preserving the façade to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. Dudka presented the DRC Report. He stated that the committee shared staff's concerns about the way the current condition deviates from the HALRB-approved drawings (which were already a deviation from the original condition). He added that the problem is that there is a row of three identical dwellings allowing for a direct comparison. At DRC, the committee did not see a proposed option other than rebuilding the two gables, but suggested the designer disassociate the peak of the gable roof over the front door from the larger front gable. This option, now presented, may help preserve the original sense of the building. The DRC had not evaluated this option as it was not presented at the DRC meeting and is now available to be considered by the full board this evening. Mr. Dudka added that the height and pitch of the gable over the front door has been increased (10" taller than the original condition).

The Chairman opened the discussion to the HALRB. The Chairman stated that a similar situation with a field change occurred in Maywood several years ago and the board required the removal of the roof.

Mr. Woodruff asked the applicant why the construction of the building deviated from the approved plans. The contractor stated that there were several issues, combined with inches here and there adding up to an altered design. Ms. FitzHarris noted the presence of a drop ceiling that altered the calculations. The contractor then raised the small gable roof over the door without receiving any approval to meet the pitch of the new larger gable roof. Mr. Schmitt stated that the decision was made to match the existing condition. Ms. FitzHarris added that the error was not intentional.

Mr. Schmitt added the issue is that two matching dwellings flank their house. He agreed with Mr. Dudka's comment from the previous DRC meeting that they should have approached staff when it was determined that there were differences from the approved set of drawings.

Mr. Deering stated that the issue is similar to a personal case he had with a building permit. The contractor is required to work within the permit. This is part of their license and the home owner has the ability to force the contractor to fix it at their cost. The contractor knows that the extents and bounds of the permit apply and that it is his/her responsibility to advise the owner when in violation of the terms of the permit. He added that this is not the home owner's fault. Mr. Schmitt stated that the overall goal is to complete the house.

The Chairman asked the contractor for an explanation of the current situation. He stated that several contributing factors led to the current situation (drop ceiling, etc.). He noted that he will modify the building to meet the requirements of the HALRB.

Mr. Woodruff said that the current design, from a common sense perspective, looks better than the two adjacent houses. These were never significant, but happened to be located within a historic district. Mr. Liebertz responded that they were contributing dwellings to the historic district. Mr. Woodruff noted that there are established rules, but that the current design is not aesthetically unappealing.

Mr. Craig stated that Ms. FitzHarris first submitted to DRC (for the original application) a proposal with decorative improvements. The DRC and HPP staff, however, determined they were not going to recommend altering the original design of the dwelling. The building is what it is. The HALRB should not alter the design of the contributing dwelling as architectural tastes change over time. Modifications that are appealing at one time often later impinge upon the dwelling.

The Chairman stated that she is upset that the rules were not followed and is struggling to find a correct response. She recognized that it will not be an easy fix, but this may be a learning experience for the architect and contractor. Mr. Schmitt responded that he and his wife elected not to retain Ms. FitzHarris's services during construction. The contractor stated this is his third historic house project, but the first time encountering such an issue.

Mr. Craig confirmed that the main roof complies with the HALRB-approved drawings. Ms. FitzHarris stated that the main raised roof was built as approved.

Mr. Deering stated it was difficult to make a decision without more information and a section. There is a problem with the eaves lines and joist and rafter creep. He asked Ms. FitzHarris how the options will resolve these issues. The drawings simply state that siding will be added. The contractor discussed how the options match the adjacent dwellings. Ms. FitzHarris stated she preferred Option B.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the DRC and staff originally recommended raising the main roof 4" and granting setback variances in order to hide the two-story addition. But more importantly, this allowed for the retention of the two front gables and the preservation of the façade. The whole concept of this approval was to keep those two gables intact to match the adjacent buildings. Option D brings the dwelling as close to the original HALRB-approval as possible.

Mr. Dudka stated that Option D further restores the HALRB-approved roof slopes of the gables. There would be no changes to the side elevation other than the trim board.

Mr. Wenchel moved to approve Option D. Mr. Craig seconded the motion. The Chairman opened the motion to discussion. Mr. Deering confirmed that Option D required reframing the two front gable roofs. Mr. Deering suggested a hybrid option. He suggested that the entry gable be rebuilt and a combination of altering the siding and fascia on the larger gable. The one-inch in twelve in terms of slope is visually negligible. Inverting the proportions of the rim board may lessen the visual impact of the design. Rebuilding the larger gable seems punitive. Mr. Liebertz asked if he was suggesting Option C. Mr. Deering responded that it is not quite Option C, but more of a hybrid of Options B and D. He had additional concerns regarding how the skirt board turned the corner. Different portions of the proposal may bring it back in line with the original intent. He stated that the best outcome has likely not been presented, but rebuilding the larger gable is unnecessary. If the home owner wants an answer today, it should be Option D, but if they want to return, there are likely other options.

Mr. Dudka stated that Option C still needs work, but there could be a way to make it work with additional study. He agreed with Mr. Deering that the gable over the roof must be altered. He added that aligning the gables roofs is not a highly visible component.

Mr. Schmitt stated that he preferred to receive a determination from the HALRB at this meeting instead of waiting for another month. Mr. Woodruff asked if the DRC could approve the application at its next meeting instead of waiting an entire month for the subsequent HALRB hearing. Ms. Ballo responded that the HALRB could authorize the DRC to act within very specific parameters (i.e., hypothetical applicant will lower a roof 6"). The DRC is not allowed to review or evaluate new designs, or make decisions outside of the HALRB. These are the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. FitzHarris stated that Option C is the best option available. She does not think there are more options.

Mr. Wenchel agreed with Mr. Deering and withdrew his motion. He moved to approve Option C instead, which was briefly discussed but never seconded. Mr. Wenchel withdrew his new motion, then moved to approve Option D. Mr. Craig seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-1-1. Mr. Woodruff voted against the motion and Mr. Matta abstained.

**DISCUSSION AGENDA ITEM #2: 2133 NORTH TAFT STREET**

Mr. Peter Connell, Arlington County Department of Environmental Services (DES), introduced the project. He stated that a component of the proposal calls for the removal of the front porch. DES already has removed the porch (and saved the building elements) in order to waterproof the foundation. Excavating the concrete deck resulted in the discovery of numerous archaeological artifacts (glass, bullets, dishes, etc.) and buried window wells. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the Historic Preservation Program is hiring an archaeologist to monitor continued ground disturbance/excavations and to recover historically significant materials.

Mr. Connell discussed the proposed steps to access the two doors on the façade of the dwelling. The application shows two proposed step materials: stone and wood. He noted that excavations revealed masonry materials under one of the front doors.

Mr. Matta confirmed that the question is whether the window wells need to be preserved. Mr. Dudka asked if the HALRB needs to comment on the porch as well. Mr. Liebertz stated that the HALRB will need to approve the removal of the porch, installation of the steps, and addition of storm windows.

Mr. Liebertz stated that staff supported removal of the porch and preferred the installation of wood steps since this option is the least conjectural and of the simplest design. Mr. Connell said that DES preferred stone steps due to ongoing maintenance concerns related to wood steps. There is a significant amount of stone left from the 1960s-era porch that could be re-used. Mr. Dudka agreed that wood steps were more likely to be the original condition for this house. Mr. Liebertz added that we currently lack information about the building's pre-1859 use or appearance. C. Richard Bierce, the historic architect who evaluated the dwelling this past spring, suggested the building dates from the late-eighteenth century and was utilized as a service building. The question then becomes what period of significance for the house will be represented. For these reasons, staff prefers the least invasive and complex option. Mr. Connell added that a number of houses have stone steps as well.

Mr. Matta asked if excavations revealed any evidence of a former stair. Mr. Connell stated that they found a small number of bricks and wrought iron or steel embedded in the stone walls adjacent to the door on the right of the façade.

The Chairman moved to approve the removal of the porch and the installation of stone steps. Mr. Matta asked if footings would be installed on wood steps. Mr. Connell stated that footings would be installed on both options. Ms. Ballo stated that the archaeologist may find evidence of a former stair; therefore, she recommends the motion include a stipulation that stone steps are permitted pending any evidence found during excavations. Mr. Dudka requested the motion be split into two components. The Chairman separated the two items: approval of the porch and installation of the steps.

The Chairman moved to approve the permanent removal of the porch. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Dudka stated that he would support a motion that approves the provisional installation of stone steps pending any evidence found by the archaeologist. Mr. Deering moved that the HALRB approve the stone steps (similar to the main building) unless archeological evidence indicates another method of construction was used and then the request must return to the HALRB. Mr. Dudka seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Connell stated that his intent for the window wells is to remove them intact as a unit from the building. If it is not successful, the window wells will be dismantled brick by brick and reused. Underpinning the wells in place will not be possible due to time and money. Permanent installation will include drainage in each one of the wells and capping. The window wells would be capped with two-inches of concrete. The outline of the window well will be visible (basically one header or about 4" with the cap). Mr. Matta asked why they needed to be capped. Mr. Connell stated they will be filled with gravel, but capping is primarily a maintenance issue (trip hazard, waste collection area, water collection, etc.). He added that the intent is to fill the wells so there is not a void; gravel can be silted, plants can grow into, etc. Leaving it open will create a maintenance issue. The proposed solution is not a permanent cap.

Mr. Deering suggested a honed cap stone (similar to a tread of a stair). This would make it blend with the façade and is typical for historic buildings. Mr. Dudka stated that this would further alleviate drainage issues. Mr. Matta stated that a honed cap stone or exposed gravel is a better solution than introducing a new foreign material (concrete).

The Chairman moved that the windows well be preserved as proposed and that the preferred capping material be stone; however, the applicant can further discuss this item at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Connell discussed the last component of the application, the introduction of storm/protective window panels. The exterior of the building will have laminated glass. Mr. Liebertz added that the proposal calls for the use of Allied Windows, a well-known manufacturer of storm windows for historic buildings. Mr. Connell added that the windows in the building will be non-operable. The Chairman moved to approve the proposed storm windows. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (7-0).

### **REVISED COLONIAL VILLAGE WINDOW DESIGN GUIDELINES**

The Chairman welcomed representatives of Colonial Village: Mike Amatto, President of the Colonial Village III Condominium Board; Chuck Vaughn, Legum & Norman, Manager of Colonial Village II and III; and Ryan McGraw, Revolution Windows.

Mr. Liebertz introduced the proposed window design guidelines. He stated that the HALRB discussed last month options for replacement windows, specifically the use of synthetic materials. The complex currently retains no original window fabric and the existing window design guidelines call for an aluminum-clad wood window. The applicants proposed a vinyl window with simulated divided lights that the HALRB approved in concept. Staff created a revised set of design guidelines based on the specifications of that window, but included a tolerance in order to allow for other vinyl windows (not just one brand).

The Colonial Village Condominium Board had no comments regarding the proposed guidelines. The Chairman requested the applicant show the HALRB the sample window. Mr. Vaughn stated that management will distribute a letter to all property owners notifying them of the changes to the guidelines. Mr. McGraw demonstrated the operability of the window.

The Chairman moved to approve the amended Colonial Village Window Design Guidelines. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (7-0).

### **LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION: STRATFORD SCHOOL**

The Chairman stated that the HALRB is hearing comments on the proposed local historic district designation. Ms. Ballo presented the staff report and provided background information on the designation process to date. She noted that the Arlington School Board has not yet taken action on the designation request or proposed design guidelines. The item has returned to the HALRB in order to review the significant changes that have been made to the design guidelines. In three separate meetings, the Historic Preservation and APS staff have collaborated on several changes since the HALRB first reviewed the draft guidelines back in June 2015. The major changes include: 1) additional text to explain the intents and purposes of the guidelines; 2) review of a number of items by HPP staff instead of the HALRB; 3) removal of items from CoA review (specifically the placement or removal of relocatable classrooms and the removal of trees); and 4) removal of photographs/images. The School Board likely will have more edits in the future. Staff is requesting that the HALRB provide feedback on the revised set of design guidelines tonight.

The Chairman stated that the School Board approved in concept the west addition to the school and indicated that the local historic district designation request will be heard at the December 17, 2015, School Board meeting. The Chairman noted that she hopes the School Board will hear this item sooner since the

next HALRB meeting is on December 16, 2015. She added that the individuals who requested the designation hope to celebrate the designation as part of Black Heritage Month next February. She stated that the HALRB is restrained by the Zoning Ordinance that stipulates that local historic district designations must be presented to the County Board with Design Guidelines unless there is imminent danger to the building. Since that is not the case, the HALRB cannot yet send the designation forward. She called for remarks from the two public speakers.

The first speaker was Mr. Julius Spain, Vice President of the Arlington Chapter of the NAACP. He stated that the NAACP Arlington Branch offers its support on the historical designation of the Stratford School. The NAACP membership understands the history of the school and its local, state, and national significance, and met with County leaders to express their support. He understands that we need adequate space for our students, but that Arlington is comprised of many smart and talented individuals and he is confident we can find a way to create a local historic district and create adequate seats [for students].

The second speaker was Ms. Sandra Green, one of the four requestors of the local historic district and also representing Calloway United Methodist Church in Hall's Hill. She stated she is a lifetime Arlingtonian and entered Stratford in September 1959. She asked for the HALRB's support for the designation. She added that the desegregation of Stratford School is one of the most important historic events that occurred within the County. She fails to understand how the building could not be designated. The four students who desegregated the school are in awe that the designation has not yet occurred. This is Arlington County's contribution to the state of Virginia.

The Chairman commented that in an ideal world, this would have been sent forward by now, but there is a process to create design guidelines. She added that the HALRB will not be voting tonight, but suggested the NAACP and other representatives send any comments on the design guidelines to staff.

The Chairman stated that Mr. Matta, the Vice Chairman, would finish the meeting as she needed to leave to attend a prior engagement. She asked that the HALRB provide suggestions for the design guidelines and review the changes she proposed [and which were distributed in advance to all HALRB members]. The Vice Chairman requested additional information regarding the author of the design guidelines. She stated that staff accepted numerous requests from APS staff to alter review mechanisms, language, etc. The present document is a hybrid document authored by Historic Preservation staff with the input of APS staff to be used by APS (applicant) and the HALRB (review authority).

The Vice Chairman invited APS staff, Ben Burgin (Acting Director of Design and Construction) to the table to discuss APS's position. He noted that APS staff has not yet reviewed the Design Guidelines with the School Board. He added that the School Board has the document, but is unaware of the level of their review.

Mr. Dudka noted a number of items on the Chairman's suggested edits that could be problematic in the future. He discussed the item "painting of unpainted surfaces" and utilized the painting of the Farragut West Metro Station as an example. He added that the omission of guidelines regarding relocatable classroom presents an issue for historic preservation. There should be some general guidance and this needs to be further evaluated. Other items he was concerned about included fencing and railings.

Mr. Woodruff stated that the Chairman's proposed changes help provide context in a less threatening and more objective way. Short of the board members' specific concerns, the Chairman's proposed amendments should be included. Mr. Dudka agreed that minor CoA requests do not need to come to the HALRB and supports the Historic Preservation staff's increased responsibility.

Mr. Deering stated that there needs to be a clear definition of “in-kind” or “like materials.” These terms allow for APS to move without direction, but potentially could create issues. He suggested the creation of a definitions page to clarify terminology. He added that relocatable classrooms should not be allowed in certain locations or require review in particular locations. Mr. Deering requested a live document to edit to improve the accuracy of the design guidelines. He requested that Mr. Burgin relay to his superiors that he is alarmed by the recent statements of the APS Superintendent and School Board regarding the HALRB.

Mr. Woodruff suggested that the HALRB adopt the Chairman’s amendments in total and then amend further to alter the specific items of concern. Ms. Ballo added that the Chairman mostly reorganized the information except for “Other Emergency Situations.” She requested the HALRB discuss this section in more detail and recommended adopting all the text changes above this item. Ms. Ballo stated that there are no other emergency situations (outside of life safety/hazard issues that are defined by code). The situations called out in this sections are man-made/contractor driven errors for which there is a process .There is no emergency situation that would qualify; therefore, staff recommends striking this paragraph. APS is well aware of the review process.

Mr. Dudka discussed the recent *Sun Gazette* article in which a School Board member suggested the windows at Swanson Middle School took six months to approve. He refuted this factual error and stated the applicant proposed an inappropriate solution, received comments from the HALRB, and then did not return for six months due to their own internal process. As seen with Dawson Terrace tonight, the HALRB can respond very quickly if all the information is in order, and reiterated this was an unfair comment. Staff responded that they have tried to correct this misinformation on a number of occasions with little success.

Mr. Matta asked if removing the word “emergency” would satisfy staff’s concerns. Ms. Ballo responded that the paragraph would override the HALRB, which is not allowed by ordinance; the HP staff is not allowed discretion in design review. She again recommended striking the paragraph. Mr. Dudka added that the lack of a defined emergency creates a larger issue. Mr. Matta agreed and struck the paragraph. The HALRB agreed that all items previous to this section are acceptable. Mr. Deering added that a definitions sections should be added.

Mr. Matta expressed that additional details need to be included about particular items that are of greater concern. Ms. Ballo stated that there are character-defining features that will need to be replaced in-kind. The implication being that singular pieces of wood trim or aluminum capping are not as important in comparison to the brick and ashlar cut stone. Mr. Deering suggested creating a table or annotating photographs in order to clarify which elements are significant.

Mr. Matta suggested that the HALRB review the “Architectural Context: School Building Elements” of the *Design Guidelines* (page 3). The HALRB recommended a number of edits to this section. See the table below for revisions:

<u>Current Text (Opening Paragraph)</u>	<u>Revised/Suggested Text</u>
The Stratford School is an architecturally significant International Style building.	The Stratford School is an architecturally significant International Style influenced building.  *Revise designation report to match.

The following exterior architectural and other site and landscape elements of the Stratford School that are characteristic of the International Style and have intrinsic historical value should be protected and preserved.	The following exterior architectural and other site and landscape elements of the Stratford School have intrinsic historical value and should be protected and preserved.
<b><i>Current Text (School Building Elements)</i></b>	<b><i>Revised/Suggested Text</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of building walls and materials in the landscape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of retaining walls and materials in the landscape.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong horizontal bands of repeated building materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong bands of repeated building materials and assemblies.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Axes (used to break up the mass as the grade changes): -Secondary axis to the west and east contain stairwell exits, and are noted by a change in materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Axes (used to break up the mass as the grade changes): -Secondary axis to the west and east contain stairwell exits, and are articulated by a change in materials.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massing and form that define spatial functions within the building for the library, gym, auditorium, stairwells.</li> </ul>	*Include annotated photographs/drawings and include reference markers to call out building elements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Window placement and orientation correspond with solar exposures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Window materials and composition correlate to daylighting interior spaces.</li> </ul> *Add additional details regarding window type and placement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashlar-cut stone at lower levels, stair towers, vertical walls, site walls.</li> </ul>	*Move directly below bullet titled “Long, linear bands of ashlar...” *Add “and” before “site walls.”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blond brick on upper levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blond brick as a unifying element throughout the school.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glass blocks set in steel frames</li> </ul>	*Move directly below bullet titled “Window placement and orientation...”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decorative brick screening wall on southwest elevation.</li> </ul>	*Include annotated photographs/drawings. (Be clear that the pictures are noted as illustrative/representative).

<b><i>Current Text (Site Elements)</i></b>	<b><i>Revised/Suggested Text</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashlar cut stone retaining walls with slate caps.</li> </ul>	*Check drawings to see if “slate” is appropriate. If not, change to “stone caps.”

<b><i>Current Text (Landscape Elements)</i></b>	<b><i>Revised/Suggested Text</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashlar cut stone retaining walls with slate caps.</li> </ul>	*Check drawings to see if “slate” is appropriate. If not, change to “stone caps.”

Mr. Dudka asked if the terrace/berm to the rear of the building should be included under site elements. Ms. Ballo stated the language was removed from an earlier iteration of the document at APS’s request. They were concerned it would prohibit a potential road. Mr. Dudka responded that its inclusion as an important element would not prohibit a road’s construction. Ms. Ballo responded that in the spirit of

coming to a compromise, the HP staff removed the language .She advised the HALRB to leave the language out of the document. Mr. Burgin agreed that there were major concerns regarding the omitted items.

Mr. Dudka raised concerns about the following items:

C. The following items will be exempt from review by HPP staff and the HALRB:

5. Removal, alteration, or addition to any existing relocatable classrooms, including, but not limited to, grading, pouring new foundations, and electrical, mechanical, and plumbing upgrades.
6. Installation of new relocatable classrooms and associated site work, including, but not limited to, grading, pouring new foundations, and electrical, mechanical, and plumbing upgrades.

Ms. Ballo stated that APS staff will not agree to any review of relocatable classrooms by the HALRB or HP staff. She noted that at an earlier meeting, Mr. John Chadwick (APS) suggested that interpretative elements regarding the school integration be considered for historically sensitive locations in order to protect these areas. Mr. Dudka suggested adding zones where relocatable classrooms would not be permitted. Ms. Ballo responded that APS will not accept it.

Mr. Deering noted that he disagreed with the County attorney’s assessment of the Zoning Ordinance and stated that APS’s political position places the local historic district designation and the building at risk. He suggested that the HALRB should send the designation forward to the County Board without Design Guidelines. He stated that he is prepared to make a motion and send the request forward to the County Board without Design Guidelines. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the County Attorney has a different interpretation.

Mr. Dudka responded that in the spirit of negotiating, APS staff and the HALRB should agree to locations where relocatable classrooms can and cannot be placed. Ms. Ballo agreed, but reiterated, that APS staff must have complete control over the relocatable classrooms. From a historic preservation perspective, we must retain control over the physical building. We are not going to get every item we want in a consensus document. She noted that this precedent was set at Swanson Middle School where there is no HALRB/HP staff review of relocatable classrooms.

Mr. Deering responded that Stratford School is not Swanson Middle School. This is the location of an architecturally significant building, but more importantly, a historic event, and different criteria must apply. Portions of the historic even should be excluded from relocatable classrooms. Ms. Ballo reiterated that it will not be advantageous to pursue this issue. Mr. Woodruff responded that relocatable classrooms are temporary structures and we should proceed without requirements for relocatable classrooms in order to achieve a local historic district designation.

Mr. Wenchel stated that the HALRB decided months ago to work in tandem with APS in order to reach a consensus document on the Design Guidelines. The current version of the guidelines is still a strong document. He recommended moving forward without HALRB review of the relocatable classrooms.

Ms. Ballo suggested that the final HALRB motion give direction to the APS School Board and the County Board that the HALRB has concerns regarding the location of relocatable classrooms.

Mr. Deering provided an instruction to HP staff: Please confer with your APS colleagues to see if it would be acceptable to exempt the pathway link and view corridor to the historic event of February 2, 1959, from use as a relocatable classroom location. The HALRB members agreed to Mr. Deering's request. Ms. Ballo stated that members of the BLPC were interested in the preservation of viewsheds. She will pursue this recommendation with APS staff. Mr. Dudka suggested that language be added stating that the HALRB supports the use of relocatable classrooms on the site.

Ms. Ballo said HALRB members can send additional comments to HP Staff. Ms. Liccese-Torres requested the board submit a list of terms that should be included in the definitions appendix. Mr. Liebertz stated that comments would have to be made on a PDF.

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

Mr. Matta requested volunteers for the nominating committee for 2016 HALRB officers. Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Laporte were selected. The slate of officers will be presented to the HALRB for voting at the December meeting.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Key Boulevard garden apartments will be renovated. The threat of demolition is no longer an issue.

Ms. Ballo briefly provided a description of her National Trust Conference field study earlier this month about garden apartments in Arlington.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 PM.