



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, December 16, 2015  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Joan Lawrence, Chairman  
Charles Craig  
Greg Holcomb  
Gerry Laporte  
Charles Matta, Vice Chairman  
Kevin Vincent  
Andrew Wenchel

### MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Richard Woodruff  
Craig Deering  
Robert Dudka  
Tova Solo  
Mark Turnbull

### STAFF:

Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
John Liebertz, Historic 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 NOVEMBER 18, 2015, MEETING MINUTES

The Chairman called for a motion on the November 18, 2015, meeting minutes. Mr. Matta and Mr. Laporte noted that they were absent from the November meeting. Mr. Matta moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Craig seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-2 (Mr. Matta and Mr. Laporte abstained; Mr. Vincent 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 two items on the consent agenda. However, since there was a public speaker for each item, both items will be moved to the discussion agenda.

- CONSENT AGENDA:**
- 1) 2200 North Nelson Street  
John and Ellen Fitzpatrick  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 15-25 (HP1500042)  
Request to construct a new shed.
  - 2) 2158 North Oakland Street  
Bruce Wiljanen  
Maywood Historic District  
HALRB Case 15-26 (HP1500043)  
Request to alter previously approved CoA 04-11B for a detached garage to change window location. CoA also requires reauthorization.

**DISCUSSION AGENDA ITEM #1: 2200 NORTH NELSON STREET, COA 15-25**

Mr. Liebertz represented the home owner who was not in attendance as per the DRC and staff's recommendation. Mr. Liebertz provided the staff report. He stated that the application is for the construction of a 10' x 4" shed located near the front of the yard. The majority of the shed, however, will be hidden as it abuts a retaining wall located near the end of the driveway. Staff noted that the applicant altered the design of the shed to adhere to the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. There were no other comments regarding the shed, but staff supported its placement due to the zoning setback restrictions in the rear yard.

Mr. Craig provided the DRC report. He stated that the committee believed that the shed design was satisfactory. Zoning requirements restricted other possible locations for the shed.

The Chairman called the first public speaker, Joseph DeBor. Mr. DeBor distributed a copy of his remarks. He stated the following:

I lived at 3630 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North for 28 years. I am a former NRC and International Atomic Energy Inspector. At this time, I am reminded of a quote by Leon Trotsky, "You may not want war, but war my want you." I don't want to be here tonight, but the Maywood Historic landscape is under attack by a tag team of non-contributing applicants for two undesirable infill projects. Regarding the [subject proposal], when the [home owner] purchased 2200 North Nelson Street several months ago, he was made aware of the restrictions that come from Zoning Ordinance 31A [now Section 11.3] and by the publicly approved *Maywood Design Guidelines*. For example, Chapter 9 of the guidelines covers undesirable infill, relocation, demolition, and subdivision. The history of 2200 North Nelson has involved a protracted level efforts of [the owner of 2158 North Oakland Street, Bruce Wiljanen, CoA 15-26] to circumvent the guidelines on page 48 [of the design guidelines] for demolition

and undesirable infill, relocation, and subdivision and Secretary of the Interior Preservation Brief #36. Unfortunately, for Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Wiljanen [the previous owner of 2200 North Nelson Street] demolished the historic garage/shed at 2200 North Nelson without County permission or a CoA and subdivided the property to create 2158 North Oakland Street. Given the minimal spatial organization of the land patterns of 2200 North Nelson Street, a large permanent shed would not be consistent with Maywood's vernacular landscape or in compliance with Preservation Brief #36 for the treatment of historic landscapes for spatial and organizational patterns, circulation, and structures. The last thing that this postage stamp lot needs is another permanent non-contributing structure when rental storage facilities and temporary accessory structures are available. I recommend that the HALRB deny CoA 15-25 based on non-compliance with the guidelines. These people subdivided this lot years ago, circumventing the HALRB process, but it finally got approved. Mr. Wiljanen created a mini-lot and demolished the garage/shed that was there. He demolished it on a holiday weekend when no one was able to stop demolition. Once the shed was demolished there was no debating [subdivision]. It was an old shed that could have been rehabilitated per NPS guidelines for rehabilitation. The two applications are combined in a way, per the guidelines, subdividing the lots and demolishing elements of the property is undesirable. We live across the street from these people, they have don't nothing but move them, subdivide them, etc., and we are sick of it. They are not compliant with the guidelines. I would like the HALRB to examine the guidelines and make a decision on that. I realize we are talking just about some shed, but the problem is that it is permanent. They are living in a house with a porch with one railing, with no shutters, and no gutters. The problem is that there are two of these applications and it is a tag team.

Mr. Matta asked staff if they had a picture of the historic garage that Mr. DeBor referenced. Mr. Liebertz responded that the garage referenced was demolished over ten years ago. The HALRB needs to evaluate the current application as presented, which is the request to build a 10' x 4'" shed on the property. The subdivision and demolition of the garage by a different property owner has no bearing on this application. Mr. Liebertz stated staff and the DRC recommend the approval of the design of the shed as it complies with the guidelines and its placement abutting the retaining wall due to space restrictions in the rear yard. He added that the drop in grade behind the driveway will hide the majority of the shed.

The Chairman asked staff the height of the retaining wall and how much of the shed would be visible. Mr. Liebertz stated that the shed is 6'6" tall. The applicant discussed the height of the shed at the DRC meeting, but the number is not in the present application. He added that it will be visible to a certain extent.

Mr. Laporte estimated the stone wall to be approximately 4' tall. Mr. Craig responded that North Nelson Streets sits up even higher. Mr. Liebertz added that the current owner intends to break the site line of the shed with non-permanent planters located on the retaining wall. Mr. Laporte remembered the 2004 application to subdivide the property. He asked Mr. DeBor if it was a condition of the subdivision that the residence at 2200 North Nelson Street not have a garage/shed built on the property. Mr. DeBor replied that the Maywood landscape is vernacular, but there is an effort to maintain open space. Mr. Liebertz added that he had reviewed the files of the subdivision in preparation for the evening and found no language that precluded the future owners of 2200 North Nelson from constructing an outbuilding on the property.

Mr. Craig summarized details from the case in 2004 for the benefit of the group. He stated that the neighbors disapproved of HALRB's leniency. Mr. Wiljanen then hired Charles Moore who designed the new

house. Its placement and location were legally approved. The owners [Wiljanen] returned with a second application to construct a new garage. The DRC reviewed the proposal and recommended approval after a number of revisions. The applicant received a CoA, but never constructed the garage and now has returned with a slight revision to the drawings and with a request to reauthorize to proceed. Regarding this application, unless the HALRB directs the Zoning Administrator to provide a setback variance for the shed in the rear yard, the only place it can be sited is adjacent to the retaining wall.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the shed will not be very visible in its proposed location and it is more appropriate here than in the open side yard. Mr. Craig suggested that the applicant paint the shed a dark color so it blends with the surrounding landscape.

Mr. Matta asked Mr. DeBor if he objected to both applications on the agenda. He responded that he is not as much opposed to the shed but feared that the two applications being brought forward at the same time is a tag-team effort. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that it was merely a coincidence. Mr. DeBor responded that you can believe that, but that he does not care for coincidences. He noted the he is less opposed to the shed, particularly if it will be less obtrusive. He suggested rental storage or temporary sheds be placed on the property.

Mr. Laporte asked if the DRC discussed placing the shed towards the rear of the property (in the corner of the lot). Mr. Craig stated that it would not meet zoning requirements. Ms. Liccese-Torres also questioned if there was sufficient room. Mr. Liebertz stated that the DRC and staff evaluated the rear location, but determined that the proposed location was still suitable.

Mr. Laporte asked if the item could be deferred until the next meeting pending information regarding the exact placement of the shed, height of the retaining wall, and evaluation of its placement in the rear corner of the property. Mr. Liebertz responded that it will abut the retaining wall, and could not be placed in the corner due to zoning requirements (without a zoning variance) and general space issues. He added that the applicant answered similar questions asked by the DRC who still recommended this item be placed on the consent agenda.

The Chairman moved to approve the application as submitted and recommended the applicant place planters along the retaining wall to obscure views of the shed. Mr. Holcomb seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-1-1 (Mr. Laporte opposed the motion; Mr. Vincent arrived at 8:08 pm and abstained from this vote). The Chairman thanked Mr. DeBor for his comments.

**DISCUSSION AGENDA ITEM #2: 2158 NORTH OAKLAND STREET, COA 15-26**

Mr. Liebertz provided the staff report. He stated that the proposed application is the reauthorization of an expired CoA for a new garage approved in 2004. The application, however, needs an amendment due to the relocation of a window and corrections to the grade as shown on the original plans. Otherwise, the design, dimensions, materials, etc., remain the same. Staff has no comments regarding the amendments and recommends approval.

Mr. Liebertz added that the applicant, Mr. Wiljanen (who is not present), asked that staff relay his contention that the original CoA is still pending due to the language of the approval letter. The approval letter noted the construction of the new house and garage. Since the new house was completed, the application is still pending the completion of the garage and should not require reauthorization. Mr.

Liebertz stated that this is a moot point since the application requires an amendment due to the window change.

Mr. Craig provided the DRC report. He said the grade of the land surrounding the garage was drawn incorrectly in 2004. This has been corrected in the subject proposal. Mr. Matta confirmed that the garage is 10' to the eaves of the garage.

The Chairman called the public speaker, Joseph DeBor. Mr. DeBor stated the following:

The HALRB has absolutely no obligation to approve a new CoA for this non-contributing and undesirable infill project. The CoAs are not grandfathered in year-to-year. This lot has changed with the completion of 2158 North Oakland Street, also known as the yellow monstrosity, which does not contribute to the historic character of Maywood in any way, shape, or form due to size, location, massing, scale, architectural details, and open space. In addition, the proposed relocated infill garage on 2158 North Oakland Street is not in compliance with National Park Service guidance for the treatment of historic landscapes because it changes the character defining features of the landscape including spatial organization and the land patterns, topography, circulation, and structures. In accordance with the *Maywood Design Guidelines* (page 48) and *Preservation Brief #36*, I recommend that the HALRB deny this [garage location]. I know that this is not easy, that it is a nuisance, but what we have is one monstrosity that has nothing to do with Maywood, and now we are adding a second monstrosity junior next to it. Maywood is a historic neighborhood, its overview is governed by Section 31A [of the Zoning Ordinance; now Section 11.3] and this lot is governed by Section 31A [Section 11.3]. The more open space you remove from it, the more it loses its historic value. This is a giant garage, it is not a small garage. We had peripheral concerns about this becoming a rental dwelling, but staff stated there are County rules against that.

The Chairman thanked Mr. DeBor for his concerns. She opened the discussion to the HALRB. Mr. Laporte discussed if this item should be a new CoA or an amendment to the existing CoA. Mr. Liebertz added that he assigned the CoA a new number since this is how it was customarily completed.

Mr. Vincent clarified the new placement of the window. Mr. Liebertz responded that the window is moving from the rear elevation to the left elevation as shown on the drawings. Mr. Vincent confirmed that the placement of the garage is located in the rear corner of the lot. Mr. Vincent asked if the garage was a contentious issue similar to the subdivision and construction of the house. Mr. Craig replied it was a non-issue, but the DRC still had numerous comments and recommendations that lessened its dimensions and design. Mr. Vincent confirmed that this application did not request new information previously rejected.

Mr. Matta had questions about the height of the garage and the doors. Mr. Liebertz discussed the reduction of the size of the garage as originally proposed (prior to the 2004 approval) and that the minutes noted that the DRC/HALRB complimented the applicant on the historic appearance of the garage doors. Mr. Laporte noted that the garage is still small for a two-car garage.

Mr. Vincent asked if staff evaluated Mr. DeBor's fundamental objection that the garage is in opposition to preserving the National Register listing. Mr. Liebertz responded that the HALRB has approved two-car garages in the Maywood district and is a precedent when evaluating garages of this massing/scale. Per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, sensitive additions and infill are permissible over time. The HALRB

determined that the subject garage was appropriate new construction for the neighborhood. Mr. Holcomb noted that there are similar sized garages in proximity to the house. Mr. Liebertz added that the HALRB previously completed a garage study in Maywood to evaluate if this was an appropriate garage design.

The Chairman called for a motion. Mr. Laporte moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Holcomb seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **BLUE GOOSE HISTORIC MARKERS**

The Chairman welcomed Kelly Shooshan and Megan Pierce of the Shooshan Company. Ms. Pierce distributed updated materials. The Chairman stated that the materials still need additional work. Since there is not a rush to complete the project, she proposed a phased approach that included meeting again in a few months to reevaluate progress. The submission package will need to include historic photographs, captions, final text, placement, etc. Ms. Shooshan agreed with the Chairman. She stated that since the board approved the conceptual design of the paneled markers, Shooshan Company can continue work on the design of the markers.

Ms. Shooshan stated that the text before the board has been edited by Mark Benbow. She added that the table-top marker will be located to the former front of the Blue Goose. Ms. Shooshan had concerns about ADA-compliance and other universal standards for the table-top marker.

Mr. Liebertz gave a recap of the HALRB's earlier request that the applicant move the table-top marker to the intersection of Glebe Road and Fairfax Drive. The idea was that the viewer could look at the marker and visualize the entrance to the Blue Goose. Mr. Liebertz asked the applicant if they proposed to move the marker to this location. Ms. Shooshan responded they moved the marker location by means of a site plan condition administrative change that has been recently completed and approved.

Mr. Liebertz asked if the language for the table-top marker will be altered to reflect the HALRB's request that the information relate to the Blue Goose (not Lacey Car Barn). Ms. Shooshan noted that it is specific in the site plan condition that it relate to the Lacey Car Barn. Mr. Liebertz responded that the site plan condition does not require the text to be about the Lacey Car Barn. After referencing the site plan approval, Ms. Shooshan stated that the applicants decided to make the table-top marker about Lacey Car Barn. Mr. Liebertz stated that HALRB members wanted this marker to be about the Blue Goose.

Mr. Craig reviewed with the applicants the materials that will need to be submitted at the next HALRB meeting. Ms. Shooshan asked that the staff send the applicants examples of former submissions. Mr. Craig suggested providing printouts to scale so they could fully evaluate the proposals. Ms. Shooshan stated that the purpose of this meeting is to further update the HALRB on progress.

Ms. Liccese-Torres presented the staff report. She offered a suggestion to revise the themes of each of the transportation markers. Each marker could be dedicated to a single theme as outlined below:

- 1) Early Roads: Focus on the development and history of Wilson Road and Glebe Road.
- 2) Electric Railway/Trolley: General history and site specific information.
- 3) Metro: Discuss the Ballston Metro stop and its effect on the area.
- 4) Photographs: Examine ways to display a number of historic photographs of the area.

She stated that staff had concerns about the general timeline. Ms. Shooshan stated that she had concerns that we are revising items previously approved (text with corresponding image) as shown on the landscape plan.

Mr. Liebertz asked the applicant about the author of the markers. Mr. Benbow stated that these are only rough drafts and includes editing of text submitted in the last 48 hours. The goal is to have the HALRB state that they are heading in the correct direction. The Chairman stated that she has suggestions, but realizes that Mr. Benbow will need additional time to complete this work. Mr. Benbow suggested that Mr. Bernard Berne provide text for the four transportation panels. His [Mr. Benbow's] expertise is the history of the Blue Goose. The text as presented will not be the information presented on the panels.

Ms. Shooshan requested a meeting with staff to further discuss the subject headings. Staff agreed to arrange such a meeting.

The Chairman called the first public speaker, Mr. Bernard Berne. He distributed the site plan condition language and noted that the proposed text is irrelevant to the condition. Mr. Berne read the site plan condition, emphasizing the site-specific language of the condition. Information should be provided about the railway system as it had its headquarters located on the property. He made a number of factual corrections regarding the location of the original Lacey Station. Mr. Berne supported moving the table-top marker to the intersection of Glebe Road and Fairfax Drive. He added that there could be more than five signs placed within the courtyard relating to transportation history. The markers should include routes, maps, photographs, and other items relating to this site. He noted locations where these maps are available.

Ms. Shooshan stated that her team will incorporate the comments made by staff and the HALRB. The Chairman recommended returning to the HALRB in April 2016 with revised content. Ms. Shooshan asked questions regarding the placement of the markers in relation to their location. The Chairman stated that the location of the paneled markers is set with one side of the markers dedicated to transportation and the other side dedicated to the Blue Goose.

The applicant and the HALRB discussed content for the table-top marker. Mr. Laporte suggested that the table-top marker focus on the history of the corner including introductions to the Lacey Car Barn and the Blue Goose. He recommended a picture of both the Lacey Car Barn and Blue Goose. Ms. Shooshan agreed with Mr. Laporte's suggestion. The table-top marker could direct the reader to the paneled historic markers.

Mr. Vincent stated that the site plan condition is requiring too many markers on the site. No additional markers are needed. Mr. Craig advised staff to provide to the applicant explicit details regarding materials for subsequent submissions. Mr. Laporte suggested to scale examples of the markers. Ms. Shooshan stated that she will coordinate with their graphic designer.

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

Mr. Liebertz provided an update regarding the proposed Cambridge Courts Local Historic District. He stated that the County Board approved the Request to Advertise at its December meeting. There were no objections to the request and it remained on the consent agenda. The Planning Commission hearing will be on January 13, 2016, and the County Board hearing on January 23, 2016. He added that the Cambridge Courts Condominium Board will attend these two meetings.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the Arlington Presbyterian Church redevelopment was approved by the County Board.

Ms. Liccese-Torres discussed the ongoing archaeological investigations within the Dawson Terrace Historic District. Monitoring of the site during excavation work related to waterproofing of the historic building resulted in the discovery of about 2,600 artifacts in a 7-day period. One item includes an intact glass inkwell, but the majority of artifacts includes broken glass. An archaeological firm will clean, sort, and analyze the artifacts.

Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the HALRB of the program's ongoing pilot project with Arlington Independent Media (AIM). Three high school interns are creating a documentary discussing Arlington County's Civil War fortifications. Mr. Liebertz and she both were interviewed along with numerous community members. In February, the students will debut the video at the AIM studio and at the HALRB.

Mr. Laporte, representing the HALRB's nominating committee, stated that the committee (consisting of Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Laporte), nominated Ms. Lawrence as Chair and Mr. Matta as Vice-Chair for the upcoming year. There were no other nominations. Mr. Laporte moved to accept these nominations. Mr. Vincent seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

The Chairman provided an update to the HALRB regarding the status of the local historic district designation of Stratford School. She detailed the process of having the County Board review all CoA applications for Stratford. This will require a Zoning Ordinance amendment. The HALRB members discussed the best way to proceed with the historic district designation. The board also discussed the Arlington County Civic Federation's proposal to rename Stratford School.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 PM.