



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/TRANSCRIPTION OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

**Wednesday, March 15, 2017
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charles Craig
Robert Dudka
Sarah Garner
Joan Lawrence, Chairman
John Peck
Sara Steinberger
Richard Woodruff, Vice Chairman
Andrew Wenchel
Mitchell Zink

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Carmela Hamm
Gerry Laporte
Tova Solo
Mark Turnbull

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Coordinator
Rebecca Ballo, Historic Preservation Planner
John Liebertz, Historic 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 THE FEBRUARY 15, 2017, MEETING MINUTES

The Chairman asked for any changes to the draft meeting minutes. She called for comments or a motion on the February 15, 2017, meeting minutes. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Craig seconded the motion and it passed, 6-0-2 (Ms. Garner and Mr. Peck abstained; Ms. Steinberger had not yet arrived).

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman reviewed the public hearing procedures. She stated there were two item on the consent agenda. Mr. Woodruff moved to approve the consent agenda as submitted. Mr. Zink seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (Ms. Steinberger had not yet arrived). There were no questions or comments regarding the Administrative CoA.

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Melissa & Michael Paul
CoA 17-03 (HP1700004)
Maywood Historic District
2911 22nd Street North
Request to install shutters.

2. Ginger Brown
CoA 16-16B (HP1700007)
Broadview Historic District
5151 14th Street North
Request to amend CoA 16-16.

ADMINISTRATIVE COA(S):

1. Andrew Baker
ACoA 17-03 (HP1700008)
Maywood Historic District
2917 23rd Street North
Request to install a new fence.

LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION: THE HERMITAGE, 4025 NORTH RANDOLPH STREET (TRANSCRIPTION)

>> John Liebertz: [03:47] The Hermitage is a Rustic Revival-styled log house at 4025 North Randolph Street. The house was primarily constructed in 1931, and it's representative of naturalistic qualities of the Rustic Revival style with its saddle-notch log construction, use of stone, and rustic interior finishes. The design of the house celebrates craftsmanship, echoes the rough-hewn textures found in nature, and embraces the surrounding landscape. The house is unique to the architectural landscape of Arlington County. The Hermitage is located about a quarter mile from Chain Bridge. The house is sited on a triangular-shaped 0.67-acre lot that severely slopes downward towards its eastern extent. The parcel is bound by a paved pedestrian/bike route that connects North Randolph Street to 41st Street North to the north, a private drive and 3 single-family dwellings to the east, and North Randolph Street to the west. Mature white oak, hickory, and large planted ornamental evergreens dominate the site. The well-maintained landscape provides aesthetic and environmental benefits.

Just to give you a little bit brief history of the property, here is an 1865 map that shows the fortifications and roads in the county during the Civil War. The red arrow points to the approximate location of the subject dwelling, built in 1931. Before the Civil War, the property belonged to Dr. Thomas Frye and Annie Frye, who had a small farm. On the map, the blue arrow points to their house. At the onset of the war, Dr. Frye fled south, but his wife, who held the property--the title to the property, remained in the DC area. The Union Army seized her house and constructed Fort Ethan Allen to the southwest, which is here. Here's Fort Ethan Allen, and to the northeast is Fort Marcey. Her house served as headquarters for the

Engineer Corps. In 1862, she sold the property to Gilbert Vanderwerken, who was a successful omnibus operator in the District of Columbia. The other important feature on this map to note is Military Road, which runs right along here, directly west of the house, in the approximate location of North Randolph Street today.

So, the property remained within the Vanderwerken and Jewell family until the 1920s. This is the 1900 map of Alexandria County, and it shows the removal of that portion of Military Road adjacent to the site, which is the red arrow. The subject parcel was briefly owned by Floyd and Wealtha Ezra in the 1920s before it was purchased by Elizabeth Chambers. Elizabeth Chambers transferred the property to her daughter, Martha Fitz-Hugh, who built the log house with her husband, Alvin, in 1931. The Chambers and Fitz-Hugh families were well-off real estate professionals, and would have been well aware of architectural trends going on in the country. The Fitz-Hugh--the Fitz-Hughs, excuse me, were often mentioned in the society pages of the Evening Star. The paper noted numerous gatherings at the house, which they named The Hermitage, between 1933 and 1938. Here's a picture of the facade of the house, from North Randolph Street. You can see the H shaped floor footprint with two wings, one to the north and one to the south. Here are a couple more photographs of the house. The picture on the left, it's the north wing of the dwelling. The top right is the south wing. And the bottom right is view of the rear of the house.

This slide talks about precedent in architecture for log cabin revival architecture in the 1920s. The country has long been infatuated with log architecture as it has deep roots in American culture. Since the mid-19th century, the American public has associated the log cabin with republic idealism and humble origins. Presidents William Henry Harrison and Abraham Lincoln utilized the symbolism of the log cabin to connect with the general populace. And here's a campaign propaganda poster for William Henry Harrison, a view of the log cabin and a barrel of hard cider.

At the turn of the 20th century, log construction experienced resurgence in the northeast U.S. General recoil to the industrial revolution, paired with changing cultural attitudes, led to renewed interest in craftsmanship and authenticity. The Great Camps at the Adirondacks and the National Park Services Parkitecture buildings utilized local materials to harmonize the buildings with the surrounding landscape. The Rustic Revival movement rejected artificial ornamentation and emphasized the beauty of handmade crafts and the honest expression of materials. And the use of log construction quickly spread from the wealthy elite and from the National Park Service to the middle class, who sought to replicate the ideals and tenets of the rustic design on a smaller scale. So, in the bottom left, we have an example of Rustic Revival log house in Virginia that also epitomizes this style. And The Hermitage in Arlington County was designed with a similar intent. Here is an evolution of the Hermitage from its 1931 form to the present. While the house and its historic significance are derived from the construction of the Rustic Revival style log house, the building incorporated a smaller, older log house. This was this pre-1931 wing, and that would have been the north wing of the building. When they did recent renovation to the house to reveal the encapsulated exterior wall, that suggested an earlier log house, but it still had a very sturdy stone foundation, so it wouldn't be dated to, say, a log cabin, because log cabins had very, nonpermanent foundations.

>> Richard Woodruff: [09:44] So what--approximately when—was the first log house built?

>> John Liebertz: [09:46] I don't really have a definitive answer--I have some guesses. The previous owners [before the Fitz-Hughs] owned the house for about 7 years, he was a carpenter. The valuations of the house in tax records and the deed sales show some profit in those couple years he owned it, but not substantial. It's hard to tell from the Jewell period of ownership because the Jewells owned so many acres, to pin down a house or, some type of small log house would have been difficult. And aerial photographs, the earliest ones are from 1929, and we actually don't have those at the county. But those really would not tell us a great deal more than what we already know.

I'm guessing, the early 20th century, maybe as late as the 1920s still. When the other owners [Redwines] acquired the 0.67-acre lot that they could have started that project, and then I believe, moved away and abandoned it, and then the Fitz-Hughs may have just picked it up. But that's just all hypothetical in terms of when it was actually built. Major additions sympathetic to the original dwelling were added to the rear of the building in 1985, and in 1995, resulting in the present day massing and form. And what you can see is that, the form the facade from the street view, you know, all the additions were really pushed to the back, and that log house is still very much visible today in its original form from 1931, when they designed that much larger building.

>> John Liebertz: [11:27] So, the Hermitage meets Criterion E, G, and K of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance to become a local historic district. With respect to Criterion E, the Hermitage is an excellent representation of the Rustic Revival style in Arlington County. The dwelling blends with the surrounding natural environment with its low silhouette, horizontal lines, and subordination to the topography. The log construction, rough-hewn forms, textures, and massing rejects classical symmetry and uniformity. These building elements invoke the romanticized ideal of the American frontier. In addition, there are no other known Rustic Revival style log houses that have been identified in Arlington County to date, and that elevates the architectural significance of this home.

In regards to Criterion G, the Rustic Revival architectural elements of the Hermitage render the house an important component of our built environment. And many of those same elements I just listed before, again, continue into Criterion G. The peeled dark-brown logs richly contrast with the white cement chinking, bringing the log construction to the forefront. And again, there's a sense of craftsmanship is imparted by cutting of the number of the logs at the corners to slightly different lengths. So, it's not just uniform, it has this rustic appearance to the log construction.

And lastly, with Criterion K, it retains sufficient integrity to convey its period of construction and its historic significance. The architectural elements paramount to a Rustic Revival dwelling are all visible from the public right of way, and the house represents the local interpretation of the style and the inherent beauty of the natural materials. So, staff recommends this for local historic district designation.

>> Joan Lawrence: [13:19] Okay. Is there anything that you'd like to add to?

>> Thomas Jensen [property owner]: [13:26] I think the only thing to add is that we've enjoyed working with your staff for--often we're here, for pushing 3 years.

>> John Liebertz: [13:37] I think since 2012?

>> Joan Lawrence: [13:41] A long time.

>> Thomas Jensen: [13:43] For years. There have been babies, there have been changes in jobs, jobs come and gone. But it's been a consistent partnership and very respectful, and we appreciate the professionalism of your staff. Our goal is to--when we bought the house 7 years ago, it was on the verge of getting torn down. And so, we've invested time and effort, a lot of sweat and suffering, and all the good things that homeowners do to try to bring it back so that it'll be there for a long time to come. And we are delighted to have the opportunity to present its historical context to our neighbors. There's a lot of foot traffic, bike traffic. It's a constant stream of people. There's an educational opportunity there. We're re-vegetating with the plants, we talk to people about that, they all ask about the house. It's nice to share that. People are startled that that's essentially where Military Road ran. People don't connect Ethan Allen with Fort Marcey because of the geographic split. So, there are chances to invigorate understanding of Arlington's history here, that we're more than just our pile of logs and mortar.

>> Joan Lawrence: [15:09] It's hard from the photographs to get a real feel for this site, but it really--it's quite a steep, almost like a V in the back.

>> Thomas Jensen: [15:19] There's no question that it was placed to--at that time, Chain Bridge and Lower Falls were visible when the trees were still small enough. All the reports from that time talk about the Falls. And if you look at the area, it was before the fisheries were way out, a bit after the hurricanes in the 30s. So, prior to that time, that was a prime fishing area. It's easy to imagine that it would have been a cabin in the woods for people who liked to fish, walk straight down the hill, which [inaudible] the old hydropower features there. And they put it on this little promontory divided by the two natural drainages. It was a great location until it started sliding in the last 20 years, but we took care of that.

>> Joan Lawrence: [16:11] Yeah, I wondered about that because if you all haven't had a chance, I know the weather was a little bit challenging to go out and actually see this, it is well worth the time. It is just a wonderful setting, and you really do get a feel for the original house when you look right in that original setting.

>> Thomas Jensen: [16:33] The county does have this wonderful education opportunity. There's so many people who aren't just driving by, you know? They're not, you know, just flashing past. And they've got time to talk around on leisure already, have time to pick up [inaudible]. It makes it hard for me to garden.

>> Joan Lawrence: [16:55] Maybe we can start a more permanent marker--making the map for the location. Thank you. Members of the board, any questions, comments?

>> Richard Woodruff: [17:13] Seems like a good addition.

>> Joan Lawrence: [17:16] [inaudible] It's about time we talked about the place in many ways. And I don't know that you can get all this history on one marker, but there's just so much there.

>> Sara Steinberger: [17:30] Is there a plan for a historic marker of its own? Maybe?

>> Joan Lawrence: [17:35] We'd be happy to work with you on that feature. Is that something you'd be interested in?

>> Thomas Jensen: [17:38] I'd love it. Yeah, and I think the neighbors would as well. Everyone has some investment in this place.

>> Joan Lawrence: [17:45] It's so distinctive from everything else around it.

>> Thomas Jensen: [17:48] That's a nice description.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [17:49] And maybe you could get your gardening done.

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [17:52] Yeah, you could just point at the sign when people come and talk to you.

>> Thomas Jensen: [17:55] Yeah, then they want to know about the dog.

>> Sara Steinberger: [18:00] Well, we can't get a sign for the dog, so you're on your own on that one.

>> Joan Lawrence: [18:06] Are there questions, comments? Are there additional criteria that anyone feels might be met by this particular historic district?

>> Joan Lawrence: [18:35] It's sort of important to me the property has character interest or value as part of the development heritage or cultural characteristics in the county, state, or nation. [inaudible]. Any comments on that?

>> Robert Dudka: [18:58] That seems reasonable. John, why did you not include that?

>> John Liebertz: [19:01] I'm sorry.

>> Joan Lawrence: [19:02] Why did you not include that the property has character interest or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county, state, or nation.

>> John Liebertz: [19:11] Those types of designations, it's more for neighborhoods. You know, the development of Maywood talks to the development of Arlington County. For a singular property with no other outside influences to it in terms of development of Arlington County. Arlingwood is the subdivision that created and formed around it in 1950s. [That Criterion] is for development patterns and counties--in Arlington County, and not geared towards individual properties.

>> Joan Lawrence: [19:40] Okay, that explains it. Anybody else have any comments or questions? Yeah, that's my next--okay, there's also a well drafted set of design guidelines that accompany the nomination. And they seem to touch on important features here. And then--and this was a collaborative effort. Are there any comments on the guidelines?

>> Richard Woodruff: [20:29] I have a question about them. Are they roughly--are they similar to the Maywood guidelines?

>> Joan Lawrence: [20:34] No, they are specifically tailored to each property. I mean, there are some--there are some parts that are, you know--

>> Richard Woodruff: [20:40] What's different about them? I looked through and I didn't really notice any real differences.

>> Joan Lawrence: [20:46] Well, Maywood's guidelines are more extensive.

>> Richard Woodruff: [20:49] Right, but I think the basics are--are there any significant differences?

>> John Liebertz: [20:54] I mean, in terms of--I guess it depends what aspect you're talking about, you know? I think they very much mirror what we do in Maywood. Maywood's a good standard for a lot of our districts. But there are elements that are tailored for this property, Maywood's for the entire neighborhood, this is for this property. For example, like the fencing. You know, there's a posted rail fence. That's something that would be appropriate for this house that wouldn't be appropriate at Maywood per se.

>> Richard Woodruff: [21:29] But the general requirements to get a CoA to do structural changes are generally the same.

>> John Liebertz: [21:36] Yeah, that's right.

>> Richard Woodruff: [21:38] No greater, no less necessarily.

>> John Liebertz: [21:44] Yeah, that's accurate.

>> Joan Lawrence: [21:52] There's a specific list of what requires a CoA on page six. It's pretty standard.

>> Richard Woodruff: [21:58] Yeah, I looked at it. I didn't see any major differences.

>> John Liebertz: [22:02] The only element that's not included in this, which will hopefully attach to this, is that we're going to hopefully, with your agreement, I sent you that example of the tree survey we've been doing. And so, the county forester has been going out to our historic districts, the newly listed ones, and doing a tree evaluation and tree survey so everyone starts from the same baseline. It's good--you know, usually the owners enjoy it also because it gives them a good idea of their trees, and the health of

the trees, and to track them over time, and so that we have a baseline to work with looking at trees moving forward. The forester just asked if he could do it in the spring so that there are leaves on the trees, so he can better identify some of the types.

>> Joan Lawrence: [22:40] But still the basic requirement that--

>> John Liebertz: [22:42] Yeah, the basic requirement stays the same.

>> Joan Lawrence: [22:44] If it exceeds 15 inches [inaudible].

>> Joan Lawrence: [22:55] So, any other comments?

>> Joan Lawrence: [23:01] This is--I think this is a really cool house, you know? I'm glad that the owners want to do what they can to design a unique structure around it.

>> Thomas Jensen: [23:21] There is a log house in Falls Church. Yeah, just over the line, very different construction. There's the one on Old Dominion that was brought in. Again, very different construction.

>> Joan Lawrence: [23:36] [inaudible] and Williamsburg way?

>> Thomas Jensen: [23:38] Yes. And then there's the--I'm not sure of the history of this, but right in Arlington Forest and by Four Mile Run--

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [23:49] That's right on Carlin Springs, right?

>> Thomas Jensen: [23:51] By Carlin--sorry, Carlin Springs. See, those are the only ones that have logs. They're all--everyone except the one on Carlin Springs is sort of a big, square-hewn timbers design, quite different from this. You know, the one on Carlin Springs seems like it might have been a small cabin that was then grafted onto the structure, leftover from the mill, I think. We had a conversation about this somewhere in the last 15 years.

>> John Liebertz: [24:24] Yeah, from Mary Carlin, yeah.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [24:29] It hasn't been that long, has it? Close, but not that close.

>> John Liebertz: [24:39] Yeah, that's--we may be talking about. It's Williamsburg and Old Dominion on the southwest--the southwest corner.

>> John Peck: [24:47] I've got the one that's right off [inaudible]. You know the cut-through street between [inaudible] Boulevard and Military Road?

>> Joan Lawrence: [24:58] Yeah.

>> John Peck: [24:59] Well, like two-thirds up the hill, where it's Marymount, on the left, there's a [inaudible].

>> Joan Lawrence: [25:07] I never noticed. I just never noticed.

>> John Peck: [25:10] Never gotten out of the car to read the marker, but--

>> Robert Dudka: [25:12] This is in Arlington? [inaudible].

>> Joh Liebertz: [25:21] So, just moving forward. So, we plan on hopefully having an RTA for this for the County Board in May, and then for the planning commission and County Board in June.

>> Joan Lawrence: [25:22] All right, are there any other comments or questions? Did you--do you want to maybe comment?

>> John Peck: [25:43] Sure. Yeah, sure. Birchwood is in the book Arlington Heritage. We just realized that it's Birchwood.

>> Joan Lawrence: [25:51] Okay. Any other questions or comments? I'm going to move that the HALRB finds that the proposed Hermitage local historic district meets criteria E, G, and K of section 11.3.4.A.4 of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, and recommends designation of The Hermitage as a local historic district with the boundaries recommended in the designation included.

>> Richard Woodruff: [26:28] Is that a motion?

>> Joan Lawrence: [26:29] It's a motion.

>> Richard Woodruff: [26:30] Second.

>> Joan Lawrence: [26:32] Is there any discussion?

>> Richard Woodruff: [26:39] Well, if it hasn't been said enthusiastically, then it's a really great thing.

>> Joan Lawrence: [26:44] It is. I just--

>> Robert Dudka: [26:46] And yeah, I think our silence is more because we don't really have anything to argue against.

>> Sara Steinberger: [26:50] Yes.

>> Robert Dudka: [26:54] Usually, we have lots of points for discussion.

>> Joan Lawrence: [26:55] It's great that somebody's voluntarily come forward and wanted to take the steps to preserve the house within the local historic district.

>> Thomas Jensen: [27:07] We do--we do have a hidden agenda, which is next time the county paves the street, we're hoping that they won't divert all the storm water into our yard. So, this is leverage.

>> Joan Lawrence: [27:24] I hope it works.

>> Joan Lawrence: [27:29] Any other comments, or questions, or discussion? All right, all in favor of the motion? Any other motion? [The motion was unanimously approved.]

>> Joan Lawrence [27:40]: I move that the proposed design guidelines be adopted--recommended to the County Board for adoption. So, I'm moving the proposed design guidelines be recommended for adoption to the county for the Hermitage. Yes, thank you.

>> Sara Steinberger: [27:59] Second

>> Joan Lawrence: [28:01] Any discussion? All in favor? [The motion passed unanimously.] Thank you very much.

>> Joan Lawrence: [28:14] You know the steps that are next, the request to advertise with the County Board, and then [inaudible] and another County Board hearing, and then we'll get you all the dates.

>> Thomas Jensen: [28:26] Thank you. Thank you for working with me on all this.

>> Joan Lawrence: [28:29] Thank you so much for bringing this forward.

>> Thomas Jensen: [28:32] My pleasure.

**DISCUSSION ITEM: STAMPED TIN SHINGLE ROOF POLICY DISCUSSION
(TRANSCRIPTION)**

>> Joan Lawrence: [29:24] All right, as you're aware, we have a case later this evening for the replacement of a metal roof [in Maywood]. We also have had heard a case back in November, I believe it was for a metal roof replacement.

All right, John has distributed a map of the local historic district that has all of the houses with stamped tin shingle roofs, and those are shown in the blue and purple colors. The blue colors are the original stamped tin shingle roofs, and there are nine of them, and there have been seven replacements over the years. The current HALRB practice--I'm going to do a little background on this. So, before we get into the discussion. As you know, that we have the authority that is given to us, that is the HALRB, by the--by Virginia Code. You have sort of a summary of the pertinent parts of Virginia Code, some of it is a direct quote, some of it's not. And the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance under the Virginia Code, no building or structure shall be altered in a historic district unless it's approved by the review board as being architecturally compatible with other buildings and structures in the historic district.

The Arlington County Zoning Ordinance directs us that alterations of a structure must be found to be architecturally or historically compatible with the historic district and the buildings or structures in the district before a COA is issued. I'm happy to go into the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance also deals with when we can take into account interior arrangement. That doesn't really apply. Mostly when we're dealing with roofs, it's more with other--with additions and that sort of thing. And also, under the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, the historic district guidelines will guide the discussions with respect to certificates of appropriateness.

The Maywood Design Guidelines, which are in your handbook, were approved in 2005 and amended in 2011. And these are stated in the introduction to be patterned after the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is defined in the Maywood Design Guidelines, as well as by the Secretary of Interior Standards, as the process of making possible or compatible use of the property through repair, alterations, and additions, while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. There are a few numbered paragraphs in my outline that specifically--I believe these are direct quotes from the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation that appear in the Maywood guidelines. Number two, the historic character of a property should be maintained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, space and spatial relationships that characterize a property should be avoided. Number five, distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques, or examples of craftsmanship should be preserved. Number six, deteriorated historic features should be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of the distinctive feature, the new feature should match the old design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.

Also, in the intro to the Maywood Design Guidelines, it talks--discusses in the design review process economic feasibility, durability, design integrity, and harmony of proposed improvements are important concerns. Guidelines are not intended to prohibit changes, but ensure that changes are respectful and compatible with existing historic fabric and character of the neighborhood. It's also noted that most of Maywood's early--this is the history section of the guidelines --most of Maywood's early houses were made of wood with concrete or brick foundations and metal roofs. Roofing section of the design

guidelines states that the HALRB strongly support replacing metal roof with the same materials, and refers to the Secretary of Interior's Standards number four, roofing for historic buildings.

The policy of the HALRB for the last 10 years or so has been to require the replacement of metal roofs with metal roofs. And then it goes on to discuss some points that are in the Maywood Design Guidelines, as well as in the Secretary of Interior's preservation standards. With some exceptions, most historical roofing materials are available today, though they require some creative thinking and research. Special roofing materials, such as stamped tin metal or embossed metal shingles, can be produced by manufacturers of related products that are commonly used elsewhere, either on the exterior or interior of a structure. This language appears in the new design guidelines. There's a drawing in the roofing section stating that stamped metal is common in Maywood. If you look up and refer to the Secretary of Interior's preservation brief #4, which is roofing for historic buildings, it's meant to be used as guidance. It states, "The roof may impart much of the architectural character." There's a discussion of alternative materials if the availability of historic materials is restricted. The page numbers here refer to the page numbers in the preservation brief. If alternative materials are to be used, it recommends weighing the use of alternative materials carefully against the primary concern to keep the historic character. If the roof is readily visible, match the alternative material as closely as possible to the scale, texture, and coloration of the historic roofing material. In this preservation brief, it refers to asphalt shingles as duplicating the appearance of wood shingles, slates, and tiles. And the alternative materials listed for metals are on those. Cost and ease of maintenance may dictate substitution of the material wholly different in appearance from the original, but the brief goes on to say that on roofs with a high degree of visibility in the patterning and texture, the substitution may seriously alter the architectural character of the building.

That document is available online if you haven't read it already. One of the things that I've done, and the staff has done also, is to look at other localities in Virginia and how they treat requests to replace metal roofs with other materials, such as asphalt shingles. We're all working under the same enabling legislation, so it's instructive to look at how other localities look at this issue. We are only charged with looking at architectural compatibility. Cost is not a factor that our enabling legislation requires us to look into. The City of Chesapeake has looked at considering financial hardship as another factor in the equation, not the only factor. However, their process has an extensive application for financial hardship, and there is a process that must be engaged in. First, the person requesting has to evaluate the cost of repairing the historic roof. If it's less than the cost of a new 30-year asphalt shingle roof, then they can't request hardship and must repair the roof. There's a requirement for at least two competitive bids for the new roof, and there's a special committee that's set up to evaluate part of the application. The review board doesn't see any financial information, just an evaluation of standards. It's a pretty intense--pretty extensive application. And John, correct me if I'm not accurate here, it's my understanding that this hardship application process was put in effect several years ago, and has not been used.

>> John Liebertz: [38:40] That's what the planner who I talked to from the City of Chesapeake said. She couldn't recall a case that actually had to use that for the roofs.

>> Joan Lawrence: [38:49] I looked at a couple other historic districts in Virginia. The City of Portsmouth, which includes three sub-districts, Old Towne, Park View, and Port Norfolk. Stated in their guidelines that the repair of roof materials and elements should be made in kind with the materials that duplicate the original replaced roof cover and, when necessary, use a material that matches the original roof covering in composition, size, shape, color, and texture. And they spend a lot of time in their design guidelines with the maintenance, treatments of different kinds of roofs. Not just metal, but slate and other shingle types: tiles, slates, metal. The City of Alexandria has the old and historic Alexandria district, and also the Parker-Gray historic district. Their architectural review board--actually, the Board of Architectural Review--has a policy that requires historically appropriate roofing material for the period in Alexandria, unlike Arlington, has a more extensive range of historic periods. They also state that--in their guidelines that roofs of historic buildings are a dominant visual element. And if the existing roofing has

acquired historical importance over time, you can replace with the existing [material] rather than the original, and the example they gave is that metal replaced original wood shingles could be replaced with the metal. Essentially, metal roofing must be replaced with the same style of metal roofing. In Alexandria, there do not appear to be tin shingle roofs. They all appear to be standing seam roofs. Excuse me, it also is possible for the Board of Architectural Review Committee finding that if the roof's not visible from public right of way, then an alternative roofing material can be used, and that that's not something that I think is an issue. You know, it's not something we're going to be dealing with. The Board of Architectural Review in Alexandria actually discourages the use of asphalt shingles. Even though they've been available since the early 20th century, they were not widely used in the historic district until the mid-20th century. And also in Alexandria, if you want to replace your roof with a historically appropriate roofing material, which is listed in their guidelines, it can be done administratively. I'm sure that there are many, many other historic districts that have addressed roofs, but given the time, there's three. And I mean, I looked a lot. There's a lot of others that--is there--are there others that staff's familiar with?

>> John Liebertz: [41:59] Other districts? No, we didn't go beyond the ones that you mentioned, I didn't go any further than that. I was more looking towards economic hardship clauses. And with roofs specifically, the only one I had come across while searching was the Chesapeake one, which seemed like a good template. And if you go with the economic hardship application, that would require a County Board action, would require changing the zoning ordinance, and requires a staff work level group; there are many different components. The City of Chesapeake's review panel includes somebody from economic development, you have somebody from the planning department, you have someone from real estate, you have someone from historic preservation on this committee that goes through the tax information and all the financial documents to see if there's a hardship that exists. And then passes on their recommendation to the board. So, that wouldn't be something we could do immediately, but that's something, if the board determines that that be a path they'd like to explore, we can see if it's possible here. We're a county and they are a city, so they have different rules in terms of what they can do. And we have not contacted the County attorneys. We have not approached them with this idea of establishing a hardship clause. Usually, these applications go to federal standards. So, it starts to kick in when you're at 80% of your average medium income for the county, for a family of four is what they set it at.

>> Joan Lawrence: [43:30] All right, discussion.

>> Richard Woodruff: [43:34] What is the item before us?

>> Joan Lawrence: [43:37] Discussing--our policy has been, over the last decade, to require the replacement of tin shingle roofs with tin shingle roofs. Is that something that we should be using?

>> John Liebertz: [43:50] And there had been some requests from the civic association that the board examine this as a policy item. And from--we've had two homeowners who have applied recently to replace their stamped tin shingle roofs. So, that's one of the reasons why we're having this policy discussion in general is to address the Maywood property owners.

>> Joan Lawrence: [44:11] Okay, that makes sense. Any others?

>> Sara Steinberger: [44:15] Can we get a recap for those not remember[ing] how we talked about the situation in terms of the level of availability of getting a replacement. Like, it's really gotten harder and they are expensive, but could you just do a brief rundown about that?

>> John Liebertz: [44:29] Sure. So, they have--they're [stamped tin roofs] harder to procure. There are still at least two manufacturers of these stamped tin shingle roofs. They have different patterns on them, the two dominant companies that make them. There are numerous installers. We've had Alpha Rain in the district. There's a quote from Augustine Roofing, who submitted a quote to install it. There is a quote

from another roofing company that the last applicants who came in November had. So, there are different firms that still install roofs. You do have to do it correctly, you know. As Randy from Alpha Rain had told me, you know, he doesn't go and work on other people's roofs if they--if they're installed incorrectly. So, you do need, you know, skilled craftsmen to do it, but that's similar to many other types of, you know, wood windows and other elements in historic houses. So, it is available still. It's still a material that's available, but it is becoming more difficult over time as there are less roofs to work on, and yeah.

>> Joan Lawrence: [45:31] Okay, properly done well, it can last--

>> John Liebertz: [45:34] A hundred years?

>> Joan Lawrence: [45:35] Up to 100 years or more.

>> Robert Dudka: [45:42] It seems to me--and I've asked at DRC, we discussed this a little bit. And it seems to me one of the other things that's important about this is to understand whether there are tin shingle roofs anywhere else in Arlington because, as far as I know, they only seem to be--there might be one or two somewhere else, but there seems to be a fairly large concentration of them in Maywood. And that, in fact, it is one of the distinctive characteristics of Maywood that there are tin shingle roofs used within the historic district. I think there's only a few other neighborhoods that would--in that time period that might have them. Cherrydale you know, maybe Lyon Village, Lyon Park, although they're a little bit later, and they tend to not do--

>> Joan Lawrence: [46:28] They're more 1920s.

>> Robert Dudka: [46:30] They're more 20s. So, this is--so, the point is that the use of these--of these metal shingle roofs seems to be somewhat unique to Maywood itself. And in itself, that becomes a defining characteristic of Maywood, and I think that's a consideration that we should--that we should consider.

>> John Peck: [46:50] Yeah, I think some of the original Clarendon subdivision homes before Lyon Village had the same type of roof like that, except most of those homes no longer exist. There are a few, but I don't think the material is the original.

>> Robert Dudka: [47:06] I haven't seen any outside of Maywood.

>> John Peck: [47:09] I've seen--I've seen [inaudible], like Wilson Boulevard, you know, [inaudible] those all used to be composed of quite substantial--

>> Robert Dudka: [47:16] No, but are there any now?

>> John Peck: [47:18] No, that's what I'm saying, there are a few homes that date to that period, but I don't think the stamped tin shingle roofs are still there.

>> Sara Steinberger: [47:32] We've talked on other occasions not about roofs, but kind of if a home was going to be torn down somewhere else and reusing parts, and kind of getting--connecting people who might want things that were going to be gotten rid of otherwise. Can that be done with shingles, with metal shingles? Or, once they're taken off a roof, that's--like, that can't be done?

>> John Liebertz: [47:56] You can patch, but you know, these roofs in Maywood are meeting the end of their life expectancy. Most of these homes were built in [the] 1910s. And roofs last about 75 to 100 years if they're maintained. I think most of these replacement tin shingle roofs have all happened in the last 20 years. I think that, that the life expectancy of these next nine, unless they've been really well maintained, is probably, coming up to having to be replaced. I think it's always good to try to salvage materials and

see if we can offer them to homeowners to allow them to patch, where necessary if there's some damage, you know, to certain sections of the roofs. In terms of long term, there will be a need to replace probably these last nine roofs in the next couple of years.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [48:51] The availability of any of the material for salvage is also likely past its useful life.

>> Sara Steinberger: [48:56] Got you, okay.

>> Joan Lawrence: [48:57] Now, there's a company in Pennsylvania that specializes in saving antique roofs, patching where necessary, but they also have new material available. They're in Conshohocken, Pennsylvania, and they've done--according to their website, they've done properties in Virginia, and DC, and Maryland, so they're not just limited to Pennsylvania.

>> Robert Dudka: [49:19] So, they make shingles that can be patched into existing roofs?

>> Joan Lawrence: [49:23] I haven't, you know, called them and talked to them directly, but according to their website, they do seem to do that sort of thing. They also seem to have new materials as well.

>> Brendan Devine [Maywood owner/applicant]: [49:36] We used them--I'm sorry to interrupt, but I thought it would be helpful. They have a latex coating they apply to the tin shingles. It's like thick latex paint that they kind of screw down the edges of the shingles, apply the latex coating, it's got about a 5-year lifespan, 5 or 10. I can't remember what they call it, but--

>> Joan Lawrence: [49:52] This is the company in Pennsylvania?

>> Brendan Devine: [49:53] The company in Pennsylvania. Yeah, I can't remember the woman's name. I think it's--they came to me, I remember, about 6 or 7 years ago.

>> Joan Lawrence: [50:00] Called Roof Menders.

>> Brendan Devine: [50:01] Roof Menders.

>> Sara Steinberger: [50:05] So, that'll work--that'll work. That's saving what's existed. If they put that on a roof that currently had--

>> Brendan Devine: [50:11] That's what's on our roof right now.

>> Jody Devine: [50:12] If you look at the pictures on our project, you can see.

>> Sara Steinberger: [50:14] You can see that? Okay.

>> Joan Lawrence: [50:19] Yeah, it's too bad we're not in Colorado. It's pretty easy to get them there.

>> Richard Woodruff: [50:29] Well, it sounds like we've established that you can buy these shingles, right?

>> Joan Lawrence: [50:36] They're available.

>> Richard Woodruff: [50:37] They're available, they can be done. I guess the question that I have is it sounds like--I don't know what the allocation here is. Is there--you know, what's driving the conversation? Is it that there are homeowners in Maywood that are saying that they need to replace these roofs, but don't want to for some reason?

>> Joan Lawrence: [51:05] Cost primarily.

>> Richard Woodruff: [51:06] Cost. So, have we looked at the cost? Do we know what the cost differential is?

>> Robert Dudka: [51:12] Yeah, do we have--do we have any cost per square for different types of roofs?

>> John Liebertz: [51:18] We've seen the Polis [CoA 16-25] roof, where they were going to replace the entire thing, cost about \$38,000, I think their quote for asphalt was \$11,000. I know the Devines have a quote for, correct me if I'm wrong, \$6,000 for asphalt, and the stamped tin is about \$28,000. We only have one quote from them currently, but that's what their quote's come in at. So, there is--there is a substantial cost difference in these roofs. Sometimes as much as, you know, four times, five times the difference. That just depends on the quotes we've seen. Sometimes, three times about, three, four times, one that's been four or five times the cost. So, it just--it is more expensive.

>> Richard Woodruff: [52:06] Is the repair out of the question?

>> John Liebertz: [52:09] Well, I think at this point, since they've already tried the repair route once, and this is specific to the Devines, I think we'd always suggest to homeowners, in general, that they try repairing their stamped tin first. There are problem spots on stamped tin roofs that can be repaired. The integrity of the roof may be sufficient that it not need to be replaced, but repaired in certain sections. But they've had their roof--for the next case, evaluated, and they had tried to repair it with that latex coating on it, so.

>> Robert Dudka: [52:41] And I guess a related question is, are there tax credits available for--

>> John Liebertz: [52:46] There are tax credits available for historic preservation projects in National Register historic districts, which Maywood is. You have to meet a certain threshold of the assessed value of your house. So, in a larger project, many of these houses would meet that threshold to get your federal and state--your state tax credit. But for projects that are just doing the roofs in Arlington, since the home values are so high, it may not cover. And you may not have enough just by doing those roofs to meet that threshold.

>> Richard Woodruff: [53:16] It's been a while since I did that, what is the threshold? Like, I don't really know.

>> John Liebertz: [53:20] It's 25% of your assessed value of your house. Yeah, of the house, not the land.

>> Richard Woodruff: [53:27] So, the value of a structure is, what, \$300,000, \$400,000?

>> John Liebertz: [53:32] Some of them more than that. Yeah, it depends on--I think, you know--I think--

>> Joan Lawrence: [53:37] So, you don't take into account the land

>> John Liebertz: [53:39] It's just the building. So, if your roof's costing \$35,000, you may need to put in \$50,000 to \$55,000 to qualify for tax credits. If you're doing this as part of a massive, major renovation, you definitely could qualify for doing tax credits on your historic building.

>> Richard Woodruff: [53:58] Yeah, so if they had done that when they did their addition, they probably would have gotten a--it would have worked.

>> John Liebertz: [54:04] It all depends. You know, there's many other factors that go into tax credits, you know, in terms of the design of the additions and the houses. Not every project that the HALRB approves is eligible for tax credits with Richmond.

>> Richard Woodruff: [54:15] But the replacement of a roof would have--on the original house would have qualified as part of the project.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [54:20] Potentially, but any new construction such as an addition, would not count towards the credits.

>> Richard Woodruff: [54:24] I understand that, but the--but the value of the entire project--

>> John Liebertz: [54:31] Well, it depends. You can disqualify your tax credit based--you know, if you put a very large addition on the back of your house, if you add elements that the Virginia Department of Historic Resources didn't agree with, that could disqualify components of your project.

>> Richard Woodruff: [54:44] Is there any retroactive consideration of a project like that?

>> John Liebertz: [54:48] You can do it usually within a year. So, but no.

>> Richard Woodruff: [54:51] What do you mean usually?

>> John Liebertz: [54:52] Well, because if they--if they don't agree with something you did to your house, then you don't qualify for tax credits.

>> Richard Woodruff: [54:57] Well, what if they were to do it now?

>> John Liebertz: [54:59] It's too many years past.

>> Richard Woodruff: [55:00] How do--says who? I mean, what--

>> John Liebertz: [55:02] Says the state.

>> Richard Woodruff: [55:03] Is there a law or?

>> John Liebertz: [55:05] There's requirements from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. I looked into this recently for the Italian Store in Westover, and there is a--you know, there's a limitation to how far out you can be for applying for it.

>> Robert Dudka: [55:20] And there's--and there's no other financial mechanisms, at least in Arlington, that like we don't have--

>> Joan Lawrence: [55:26] We don't have a local tax credit. No, I've been pushing--I've been pushing something like that, but it's not quite so simple to get it going.

>> Joan Lawrence [55:37] Yeah. I just haven't had time to do extensive research on this. Sometimes, there are grants available and funding, but I don't have any specific answers for that. If somebody would like to undertake a research project on how you can fund changes to historic properties that are costly.

>> Richard Woodruff: [56:07] Well, I think it's--there's a--there's a process in place. This just doesn't meet the requirement.

>> Robert Dudka: [56:14] Yeah, but it's one of--it's one of those things that the tax credit process was envisioned for larger projects, but there are still things like this that are significantly expensive when there are cheaper alternatives that naturally people gravitate to that they're not compatible with--

>> Richard Woodruff: [56:33] But you would have to change the requirement.

>> Robert Dudka: [56:35] Right. Or create--or create a special program for certain elements, like something like this, which seems like--you know, this seems like if there was a grant program for--you know, for specific projects like this that somebody could apply to and get, you know? If not maybe you can get the whole thing covered, at least some significant portion of it so that there's some relief and so that they--you take it so closer to a threshold that you could then tell, "Yeah, I'll go that extra--that extra bit because it's worth it then to do it." And unfortunately, we don't seem to have anything like that.

>> Richard Woodruff: [57:13] Yeah, I think it's a great idea, but it would probably require a statutory change, right?

>> Robert Dudka: [57:18] Well, it's also something that--it's something that Arlington, you know, could do. Some of us have been advocating for a while now that, you know, in the same way that there's an art fund, you know, in the county--

>> Richard Woodruff: [57:29] Like a grant program.

>> Joan Lawrence: [57:31] In fact, I mentioned the county--I was at a meeting, I mentioned to the county manager last week, and he said, "Well, I need an issue paper on that, and we need to run it by the county attorney, and just get all--"

>> Robert Dudka: [57:42] Who would create this issue paper, us?

>> Joan Lawrence: [57:45] Well, I was trying to also advocate--I was trying to advocate for more staff.

>> Robert Dudka: [57:51] Well, the point being that if you could get a historic preservation fund and we had, you know, a reasonable amount of money in it, then it could be--it could be used for a lot of different things. It could be used for small grants, for something like this, but it could also be used for larger things, like for instance, you know, the Wilson School, where you know when people say, "Well, we don't have any money to restore that." If there was a fund, you know, maybe you could. And if you could convince people to start looking at historic preservation in the same way that you look at art, where you know, if you put up a building, you ought to have a sculpture in front of it. How about, you know, you think that you have a historic building, you ought to try to save it and restore it.

>> Richard Woodruff: [58:31] Okay, so I think that would be a tough sell politically to get a publically funded grant program that helps homeowners restore their private homes. That's why they set this thing up as a tax credit, so that it's--you know, so that it's not local governments creating pots of money to fund private homeowners. It's instead--

>> Robert Dudka: [58:54] Yeah, but isn't the--

>> Joan Lawrence: [58:55] The part of it would be--part of this would be tied to developers who tear down houses in National Register districts, for example, or developers who tear down historic buildings.

>> John Peck: [59:09] It's only about our whole community in terms of, you know, what we see visually in our neighborhoods, [inaudible]. So, I mean, I get your point, but it falls under the big picture. And one thing that intrigues me is the potential for this fund to help out with specific projects, like Wilson School, but also Swanson, the cupola that burned down in 1968.

>> Robert Dudka: [59:29] Yeah, right, something like that, where nobody's been able to come up with the funding for it, even though, you know, they know it's a very straightforward project to restore the cupola. And yet, it's never done because where are you going to get the money?

>> John Peck: [59:43] In fact, there was a [inaudible] that they rebuilt the base, but they never put the cupola back up.

>> Joan Lawrence: [59:50] Okay, well, we need to focus on the matter before us.

>> Richard Woodruff: [59:56] So, can I ask? So, you did the research on the hardship exemptions?

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:00:01] Just the one--the one city that has that process.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:00:06] There's just--there was one hardship exemption in--

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:00:10] Chesapeake, City of Chesapeake.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:00:18] And what--and what basically is the hardship requirement? I mean, is it--

>> John Liebertz: [1:00:23] So you--so basically, the requirement is that you meet some federal levels of average median income, which is different in Chesapeake and here. So, I think in Arlington County, 80% for a family of 4 is about \$80,000 a year is what your income level [would need to be]. In Chesapeake, they say you can't have, exclusive of the home of which you reside, in excess of \$100,000 in net worth. There are other elements, but those are the two main ones. It's basically your average income. There are financial considerations that can lower it.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:01:11] So, \$100,000 value to home? Or \$100,000--

>> John Liebertz: [1:01:17] This says assets. So, like outside of the home, you can't exceed \$100,000.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:01:21] What was the 80% thing?

>> John Liebertz: [1:01:22] That was the--basically, they use the current fiscal year income documentation system from Housing and Urban Development. And so, I put in Arlington County. 80% of what the average median income is in Arlington is about \$80,000 dollars for a family of 4. So, I think it would depend what your threshold was, is it 60%, is it 80%? You know, it depends on what it is, but the highest one, which is 80%, would be \$80,000 a year for the family.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:01:54] So, similar to, like, qualifying for affordable housing.

>> John Liebertz: [1:01:58] Sure, yeah.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:02:02] I mean, it's certainly something we could look into. It's not going to happen quickly. It's going to require, first of all, probably consulting with the county attorney, talking with County Board members, and them amending the zoning ordinance, assuming that--I mean, Chesapeake was able to get this authorized, and they have the same enabling legislation. So, it's entirely possible we might be able to. But again, there's a lot of work that needs to be done.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:02:39] So, this applies just to roofs.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:02:43] And its metal roofs.

>> John Liebertz: [1:02:44] But there's part of its specifically for roofs. There's some other implications of this document, though.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:02:51] There must be some recognition that a roof is kind of integral to a house.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:02:55] But then there's also recognition that a metal roof is very expensive. And we just found that.

>> John Liebertz: [1:03:00] But talking to the planner [from the City of Chesapeake], you know, the metal roofs are really an important component of their historic district. And so, they moved to protect them to the greatest degree possible. And that's why they-- that there were these types of questions as well about financial hardship, so that's why they implemented this.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:03:23] But no one's used it yet.

>> John Liebertz: [1:03:25] That's what the one planner said.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:03:26] This gives people an exemption from having the requirement to observe the historic--

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:03:33] It's one factor.

>> John Liebertz: [1:03:34] It's one factor because--yeah, it doesn't mean--

>> Robert Dudka: [1:03:37] Oh, I see.

>> John Liebertz: [1:03:38] So, the board--you know, the board could still say, "We're keeping the roof," but this is the idea is that, you know, to show that there's a financial hardship on the property owner, I think the board would look, well, you know, if this committee came out and said, "These individuals have a financial hardship based on the criteria you made," but the board could still vote however they want. They're not bound to agree to replacing it with a different material.

>> Charles Craig: [1:04:05] What is the--what is the life of hardship? How long does it last? Until the house is sold? Until they come back in for the roof and then they are, at that time [inaudible] put that roof back on. Do you know anything about that?

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:04:22] That doesn't seem--I mean, the information I have doesn't address that.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:04:26] The assumption would probably be it's yearly, you know, because your financial information changes every year with your W-2s and the assessments of your net worth from your investment, or whatever it is. So, if someone applies in one year, you know, and then applies 3 years later, in order for this committee to be able to make a determination, you need the most up to date financial information.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:04:49] But why would you be applying again in 3 years? The assumption being that if financial hardship were approved, you would have put on the asphalt roof. That would be a really terrible asphalt we would need to replace in 3 years. I vote metal.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:05:02] Maybe you ran out of money entirely and couldn't do it, I have absolutely no idea. And also, since no one seems to apply for this provision, it's hard to--it's hard to speculate.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:05:10] [inaudible]. So, questions, comments?

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:05:27] I like the idea of doing the legwork of trying to figure out if there's a way that there could be sort of a fund, or a financial hardship, some aspect that we could look into doing what Chesapeake has done, and see if it's feasible.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:05:45] Do you mean a fund, or a financial hardship--

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:05:48] Oh, that's interesting.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:05:49] Yeah, fund would be--

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:05:50] I like both.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:05:52] Again, one excuses you from the requirement, the other one helps you to--it indicates that you are--you have a hardship to actually meet the requirements, which I think this is more valuable than excusing, right.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:06:07] Yeah, I tend to agree with that.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:06:12] Right, and then--and then this brings up the other thing that we've discussed before in the past, which is, in order to try to bring the cost down, try to get more. Instead of doing them one at a time, try to get more people involved. And I think this has happened in the past, right? Where several neighbors got together to do it at the same time?

>> John Liebertz: [1:06:29] That won't affect cost any more. From my one conversation, they may still do it if they ask you, but the cost is going to be same for it. At least that's according to Alpha Rain, that they wouldn't discount the overall cost if you do more than one [roof] at a time, so.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:06:48] But they're one of a few providers, it sounds like.

>> John Liebertz: [1:06:51] Yeah, I mean, but I think the--you know, this is a specialized installation at this point, and product. And so, there are other providers that do it, but I foresee that the same--it's going to be the same outcome is that they're going to charge you what they're going to charge you at this point. You're not going to get a bulk discount on them. The materials are what they cost, and I don't think they're getting less. I think they're making their money on the install, and I don't think they're discounting.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:07:21] And there are--are there any other products that--I'm just imagining, you know, where, like, larger panels that are stamped to look like individual shingles, are there anything like that? Probably because it's such a niche little market that nobody's bothered to do it.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:07:37] I think they do come in panels.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:07:40] But Robert's probably talking, like, a 6 by 6 or something instead of--

>> Robert Dudka: [1:07:43] Or like, you know, like originally asphalt shingles, like on my house, when my house was--the roof was shingled in 1925. The asphalt shingles were actually individual shingles. And you know, and then they came up with this great idea of using the tabs and simulating the idea of individual shingles, which make the installation go so much faster. And you know, I'm just wondering if there are--if you can get--or you know, like hardy shingle now, where you get big panels that are preassembled with--you know, with the individual things, but you mount--the installation goes much faster if the panels are essentially assembled in a factory, so you don't have to do it on a roof. But nothing like that exists as far as you--

>> John Liebertz: [1:08:23] I don't know if it exists. I haven't heard of anything like that. You know, the roofers I talked to didn't suggest that there was material like that that could be used as a substitute, but it's something we can look into. But I think with the product being what it is that there may not be that type of market for it at this point, so.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:08:40] I'm guessing kind of the answer to this question, but there's no sort of aesthetic combo option?

>> John Liebertz: [1:08:49] What do you mean?

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:08:50] Like depending on the roofline. Because some of the concern in some of those homes, the roof is very--is extremely visible, and it is sort of a defining characteristic from all

angles, that's it's kind of in the nature of the home. Depending on location and kind of just visual, you know, structure of some of the homes, the roof is less visible from kind of different angles and sort of less a part--you know, a metal roof might be less kind of a factor of what you see that makes a home historic from the street, from wherever. Is there any--you would never have two different materials on a roof?

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [1:09:31] There are some--there are some historic districts, like for Old Town Alexandria, for example. The design guidelines and the overlay is only applicable to areas that can be viewed from the public right of way. So, there's a lot of scurrying down alleys and there's a lot of work done, like, four seasons to ensure what is visible and what is not. In Arlington County, the zoning overlay is over the entirety of the property, and it applies to all views, and all elevations, and all parts of the property that are under the overlay.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:10:01] Well, I know the application is not for discussion right now, but the house in question has an asphalt roof.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:10:08] There are others too.

>> John Liebertz: [1:10:13] I think--now I think--I think there's a difference, but she's suggesting on the historic house, put like one slope that you can see from the street as stamped tin, and then the slopes you can't see from the street as asphalt. What the--most of the houses that have combinations in Maywood have their stamped tin on either the entire historic house, and then you do an addition on the back, and they switch materials to asphalt. So, it's not, we're not making a hybrid roof on the historic house.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:10:53] No, no, and I understand that.

>> John Liebertz: [1:10:55] I thought you were trying to say something different, sorry about that.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:10:59] No, I mean, I appreciate that. Is it worth having a conversation of whether the requirement, as you said, that this is for the entire area, not what's visible from the right of way, should that policy be revisited?

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [1:11:18] Again, you'd have to make findings about architectural and historical compatibilities. So, under that umbrella, you know, many different things have been done in the district.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:11:26] You know, if you had a hipped roof, I don't know. We had this discussion last time we were here and brought it up. If you have a hipped roof, you can't necessarily combine materials on a single roof, right?

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:11:41] Well, yeah, that why I said this may not be possible, but I wanted to ask the question.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:11:49] All right, so I'm gathering from the sense of comments that pursuing some sort of financial systems, in addition to perhaps a hardship situation, should be done, correct?

>> Robert Dudka: [1:12:04] Well, can I ask another question? Because you know, when somebody was saying that, you know, the cost comparison of asphalt to metal shingles, but if you--if you're comparing, you know, a 30-year asphalt single roof, or a 25-year asphalt shingle roof, or a 20-year asphalt shingle roof to a 100-year roof, it would seem that in terms of--you know, to a future buyer of that home that if you have, you know, a 20-year old 100-year roof, that's a much better thing than a 20-year old, 25-year old roof. And does that--does that translate into the value of the house so that it--you know, so that there is a--that the initial--in other words, your initial investment is really an investment in the value of your house over a long term, and that becomes a consideration as well because it seems like the problem is

people don't really want to put 100 years, you know, of money onto their roof because they're not going to be here for 100 years. They might be here for 20, they might be here for 10.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:13:09] Pretty much everything I read on metal roofs indicated that, yes, you have a higher upfront cost, but in terms of the maintenance and the longevity, really it came out fairly close to an asphalt roof. Better, actually, it was better than asphalt.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:13:26] That's if you are going to live there for 100 years. But I doubt you recover your--the value of that roof in the sale of the house. It's like putting a pool in your backyard. You never get that money back. And I suspect a metal roof is the same. I don't--you'd have to ask a realtor, you know, I think, of the value of a metal roof. I'm sure that--I can't imagine you'd get full value back. It's aesthetic.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:13:55] Even if you didn't get full value back, if you got some of the value back, that makes it more palatable to make that initial outlay. You know, it's--

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:14:04] I guess so. I mean, or you could rent--you could rent the house and depreciate the roof. That would be the way to get the money.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:14:11] It's difficult.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:14:16] It's interesting to see a lot of newer construction that's using standing seam metal.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:14:23] Right. And maybe that's why they do that, because it's sort of perceived as--

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:14:16] Lower maintenance, and yeah.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:14:34] So, what did you--you put something on the table a minute ago. You said something about--

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:14:40] Pursuit of financial assistance and then the creation--

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:14:43] Right, so I mean, in terms of consensus? No, I don't think a motion is in order here, unless you make one. But this was a discussion that we're having because it was requested, and I thought it was important to look at some of these factors because we're going to, in a minute, we're going to talk about a specific case. It's certainly something that, within the terms of the financial hardship situation, certainly something we can look into. We don't have the authority to do anything about that right now, but that's something we can definitely look into in terms of a fund to help with restoring historic features on houses in historic districts.

>> Charles Craig: [1:15:33] Would you guess if financial hardship was explored in Arlington County, given the layers you have to go through, that we're looking at least a year? Nothing moves quickly.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:15:51] Well, I was just going to say, given other things on the plate and other things that we have to complete first, this isn't going to happen in a meeting.

>> Charles Craig: [1:16:00] I mean, because nothing moves quickly. There's just too many layers to go through. And then still there's not--apparently from the City of Chesapeake, that there's no guarantee that any sort of waiver comes out, you know?

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:16:19] Well, doesn't it--sorry, when you spoke to the person in Chesapeake, did they say no one has attempted to receive this, or it hasn't been granted?

>> John Liebertz: [1:16:28] She was unaware of an application.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:16:31] How long has this been in effect?

>> John Liebertz: [1:16:33] This has been in effect since 2012. So, it's been in effect for a couple years. Perhaps she missed one, I can't speak for the planner of Chesapeake. But yes, they haven't had a[n application]--if there had been, there haven't been many.

>>Joan Lawrence: [1:16:59] All right, so people who are interested in pursuing one or both aspects of these, let me know as soon as possible so we can look into it.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:17:12] One was the financial hardship thing, the other was something--

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:17:15] Looking into grants, preservation fund. Preservation fund. I don't know what the County has available other than in the housing area, but that's more basic housing supply, so. Are you aware of anything?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:17:37] There are provisions in the tax code for renovations to apartment buildings and commercial structures. Those aren't specifically historic preservation related. They're more about building maintenance and upkeep. But again, they're geared towards commercial property, and they're not widely used either for that sector. In the County tax code for apartment buildings and some commercial structures.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:17:59] Partial property tax exemption I think it's called, but it's for multifamily buildings. The housing staff is more familiar with it, but I don't think it's a popular thing that's been used in a few years.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:18:11] I wonder if it could be looked at for historic amenities.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:18:16] That's one of those things you, again, looking at the state enabling legislation, what we are and aren't allowed to do for historic properties. It's speculative, but I would venture no because it's not--we don't have a local historic tax credit in Arlington because the state code does not allow it.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:18:32] Yeah, that's why you have to go through the--

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:18:35] You have to start at the top, and yeah.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:18:40] But could we--could there be an expansion of the language in the Arlington tax code that would include historic homes, but wouldn't be directly targeted just at historic homes?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:18:55] Again, it depends on what the enabling legislation is for those tax exemptions that already exist. If the enabling--if the enabling legislation from the state does not specifically say that you can do it for historic, single-family houses, then Arlington county can't do it because we're a Dillon Rule state, we only get those powers that are expressly given, or you know.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:19:15] But what I guess I'm saying is if it said you could do it for any homes, not specifically historic homes, then historic homes could still use it.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:19:22] Yes.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:19:23] Right. Right now, it's just a multifamily--

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:19:24] Right, but that's what we should check, but it wouldn't necessarily have to be that it would avail for historic homes. It could be applied to any single-family homes--

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:19:31] Single-family homes if that existed. And if then--

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:19:34] We could maybe only advertise it to the historical homes.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:19:37] Right. And again, you need the County Manager and the [County] Board to get on board with another tax exemption is a whole other thing. But yes, yes, it's a multi--right, right.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:19:46] You're talking about, like, a county tax exemption?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:19:49] Yes, it's a county tax exemption.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:19:51] It seems to be the most politically viable possible solution. I may be wrong; I don't really know anything about this godforsaken state.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:20:00] You've only lived here 20 years.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:20:02] But you know, if there were some way to amend the historic tax credit to provide for small projects that deal specifically with roofs and give some kind of tax credit for that, if you're restoring to the original condition, that makes sense because you're not--first of all, you're not asking other homeowners in the community to subsidize a grant fund to put a roof on someone else's house, which is sort of the way I look at the grant program idea. But if in Virginia, they're willing to set up a tax credit for historic rehabilitation that has to meet a certain threshold because you've sort of a big projects and stuff, theoretically they might be willing to do a smaller project if it's for something critical like a roof. Because without a roof, you don't have a house, right? It's the most critical thing, right? And historic preservation has to deal with the roof first, right?

>> John Liebertz: [1:21:02] One of the problems in Virginia also is that if you go outside, you know, northern Virginia, in this area, the roof would qualify for most every home. Because of the home values aren't as high as they are around the County. So, if you only have the \$200,000 home value, \$300,000 home value on these larger homes that have stamped tin roofs, that would qualify. But for here, you know, that would be something for the state, the legislation to think about.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:21:32] There's no adjustment?

>> John Liebertz: [1:21:34] No, there's not.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:21:35] It's just statewide?

>> John Liebertz: [1:21:36] It's statewide.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:21:37] That's another inequity in the whole thing.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:21:39] Well, so maybe that's something that could be--that you know--don't we get an opportunity every year to propose changes? Maybe that's something we could propose is that--

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:21:49] We missed this cycle.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:21:51] Well, for the next--for the next cycle, that there be an adjustment, you know, just so that things like this can be handled because it is--this year, it is true that in other parts of the state, the roof would qualify. But because of the property values, it doesn't here. And that just--it seems like an

inequity. And certainly it's a liability for historic preservation in a--in a place like this that maybe the state would be willing to rectify. I don't know.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:22:20] Does Arlington County have a lobbyist in Richmond?

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:22:24] We do. We do.

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [1:22:25] Someone in the Manager's office. But we do. And every--and every year, we do send--we do send suggestions for legislative changes down every year.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:22:39] When is--when is the cycle?

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:22:40] We just did it.

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [1:22:41] It just ended.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [1:22:43] Because the general assembly just ended.

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [1:22:46] Starts in January.

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [1:22:50] And I will say too, if people want to get involved in the tax credit, every year there is a concerted effort to sunset the historic preservation tax credit from downstate Republican conservative legislators. Every year. And every year, we and Preservation Virginia fight back against that.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:23:06] So, they're not going to want to extend it.

>> Rebeccah Ballo: [1:23:07] So, no, I'm not saying that. I'm not saying that. I'm saying it's something that's critically important, so people should also be aware to lobby for the things that are important for us every year, in addition to making, you know, good, targeted suggestions for improvements.

DISCUSSION AGENDA:

1. Brendan & Jody Devine
CoA 17-04 (HP1700004)
Maywood Historic District
3501 21st Avenue North
Request to replace the existing stamped tin roof with an alternative material.

DISCUSSION AGENDA ITEM #1: CoA 17-04, 3501 21st AVENUE NORTH (TRANSCRIPTION)

>> Brendan Devine [owner/applicant]: [1:24:14] Good evening, members of the board. Given that we're following up a tin shingle discussion with a tin shingle case, what a coincidence. I'm not sure that everyone has had a chance to read the letter we submitted as part of our case. If you haven't, then I just feel it might be valuable for me to read it to the board if everyone hasn't had a chance to read it.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:24:39] It's attached to the, it's part of the application.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:24:48] Due to the nature of the project, the letter really is the meat of our request.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:25:00] If you want to go ahead and read it, that's fine. I think most of us have, but just on the off chance anyone hasn't gone through it.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:25:06] Is there anyone who hasn't read it?

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:25:08] You may want to--yeah, go ahead.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:25:10] No, you go ahead. I'll read it as you talk.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:25:12] Okay. So, the letter is as follows. Members of the board, following is submitted in support of our request to replace existing section of [inaudible] architectural asphalt shingles. Our residence, 3501 21st Avenue North, currently has a composite roof measuring an approximate 20 squares in size. Of that, roughly 700 square feet were cleared, consisting of the original Victorian pressed tin shingles. The majority of the remainder is both new architectural asphalt, which was installed in 2012. And currently on the new addition, a new standing seam metal installed on the front portion in 2014. The pressed tin shingle section has exceeded its lifespan and requires replacement due to material failure. Water's beginning to seep into the attic during rains. In 2011, a contractor who's a restoration specialist, we mentioned earlier with Roof Menders, to rehab. Historic preservation staff requested to reattempt rehabilitation first, which we did. So, he came out and applied the latex coating. And due to the level of material decay, the only options to extend the lifespan was the application of latex sealant. The process cost about \$5,000, and only adds an additional few years, about 5 years of roof life. Five years have passed, and the roof is now leaking, and we need to replace it. In late 2016, we sought estimates from the only two local roofing contractors we could find that said they did this work, Alpha Rain and Augustine. Both contractors have worked with a number of roofs in Maywood on approved roof replacements, both asphalt and stamped tin. In order to assess all options, we requested they give us estimates for asphalt, standing seam, and stamped tin. Alpha rain declined to provide a written estimate, citing a recent hailstorm out in Middleburg that booked up all of their appointments through the summer. So, they said they weren't going to provide us an estimate because they weren't taking roof work. Augustine, we got \$28,000 for pressed tin, \$21,600 for standing seam, \$5,575 for architectural asphalt. Both contractors strongly recommended against blending roofing materials of any sort due to waterproofing difficulties with potential complications. Thus, both suggested that asphalt was the better material to allow the best and most watertight roof. Now, moving into the discussion. So, we're talking about the Maywood design guidelines. In 2005 and again in 2011, [inaudible] the overarching vision and intent of the document in the introduction. It includes language establishing that the guidelines are patterned after the Secretary of Interior Standards of Rehabilitation, but no language mandating adherence to these standards. Additionally, it includes the following passage as of particular significance to this situation. The Maywood Design Guidelines are not intended to dictate architectural style which require particular architectural features. Rather, they identify a range of design options which will encourage preservation of new development compatible with the existing character of the Maywood historic district. The design review process, economic feasibility, durability, design integrity, and harmony of proposed improvements are all important concerns, just like Joan mentioned previously in the outline. The introduction goes on to state the following in the later paragraph. The guidelines were developed with the recognition that buildings are not static, but continue to evolve over time. These guidelines are not intended to prohibit changes, but rather to ensure that such changes are respectful of and compatible with the existing historic fabric and character of the neighborhood. The above language clearly lays out the intent of this document, which is not to dictate specific details of individual houses, but to maintain neighborhood character while allowing for homeowners to make reasonable adjustments to the home features based on evolving materials, techniques, and requirements, as long as the character of the district is maintained. Furthermore, the section of the guidelines that discusses roof replacement states the HALRB strongly supports replacing metal roofs with the same materials. It does not say requires, mandates, or directs replacing with the same material. Nowhere else in the guidelines is the issue of replacement addressed. Section 15.7 of the 2017 Arlington County Zoning Ordinance grants HALRB the authority to issue CoAs

for a lot of cases to Maywood homes. Section 15.7.9 further requires the HALRB utilize established neighborhood design guidelines when making code determinations. So, paragraph D addresses this specifically by stating the following. The review board or the county board, in accordance with 15.7.13, to utilize the historic district guidelines relevant to the specific historic district under consideration as review of any COA and make a decision in accordance therewith. The historic district design guidelines will guide and inform decisions with regard to codes. Through discussion with the Historic Preservation Office and HALRB members, we have been told numerous times that the position of the board for the past decade has been that metal roofs are to be replaced with like materials if they're unable to be rehabilitated, but nowhere is there written confirmation of the position aside from meeting minutes, and any neighborhood guidelines or county zoning ordinance. Nor was this position take with any review by, or consent of, neighborhood residents. It is understandable for a board to hold their position one way or another, and they're free to make recommendations or strongly support an approach to roof replacement, but absent negligence to statute, ordinance, or written policy, it remains just that, a recommendation. Residents of Maywood voluntarily agreed to become a historic district and be governed by the Maywood guidelines, not by the positions of the board when they're inconsistent with those guidelines. In addition to exceeding what Maywood residents agree to, HALRB also is inappropriately applying secretary standards for rehabilitation. HALRB frequently cites the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation found in the CFR 67.7 as a guide document for historic preservation in Arlington county. Section 15.7.9 of the [zoning ordinance] addresses use of this statute as well. For districts without approved historic district guidelines, the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, so on and so forth, shall be used to guide the core review process [inaudible]. As clearly stated above, the Secretary Standards are to be applied in absence of any formally approved design guide. Maywood currently has formal guidelines, the use of which to proceed the standards. The HALRB also used rehabilitation standards as a secondary source to inform the determination of appropriateness, and the entirety of these standards need to be considered. Subsection C states that the standards should be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking in consideration economic and technical feasibility. While the terms "reasonable manner" and "economic feasibility" are undefined, a cost increase of over 500% compared to contemporary materials indisputably rises to the level of economic infeasibility. Using the current property as an example, in 2010, we received an estimate from Alpha Rain for replacement of this roof with stamped tin, and the cost was \$2,500 per square. Six years later, the cost for the same supplier was \$4,000 per square. This is more than 60% increase in just 6 years compared to the less than \$900 per square estimated cost for replacing the same roof area with asphalt shingles. It becomes clear that the time has come for the board to recognize that stamped tin shingle are cost prohibitive and no longer viable roofing material for all but independently wealthy. The requirement of metal roofs has become unreasonable, levies an undue financial hardship on neighborhood residents for what is a relatively insignificant alteration in regards to overall neighborhood character. It is true that pressed tin shingles are a unique architectural feature, but the fact remains that they have fallen out of use in new construction, and currently represent a niche product, which is available only through one supplier in the country at an extremely exorbitant cost. This fact relegates them to a category of luxury products as opposed one of the commonly construction materials that an average country resident could be expected to procure at reasonable cost. [inaudible] there was mention of a second supplier. I've done research. There is another supplier that will supply aluminum shingles, but from what I can tell, they aren't--they aren't really--it's an old mom and pop shop that doesn't really operate that much anymore. I've tried to contact them from the website, they didn't--they didn't respond. So, as far as we know, Berridge is the only company supplying stamped tin shingles. That's the only company that all the roofers in this area use. So, as far as I'm concerned, there's one supplier for that material. The majority of property owners in Maywood, our family included, strongly support preservation of the overall neighborhood historical character. We do, however, also strongly feel that allowances must be made when it becomes clear that replacement of materials in kind is no longer a financially reasonable expectation for the board to have for district residents. Our neighborhood is not a museum, and nor are our homes. Maywood is a living district that needs to be allowed the freedom to evolve with time. Here, like other neighbors with similar requests, we

are not asking to use historically inappropriate materials. Asphalt is a historically appropriate roofing material in Maywood. While asphalt shingles were not used in our particular home when it was built in 1915, they were used by the 1890s, and I give a series of citations there. And over the 100 years that passed since our home was built, asphalt roofs have become the predominant roofing material in Maywood. If the resident has the financial means and chooses to replace their tin shingle in kind, then they should be free to do so because, like asphalt, standing seam metals, tin shingle are proved historically appropriate in the neighborhood. If, however, a resident is confronted with the reality that sourcing and installing uncommon materials such as this would result in an economically untenable situation, they should be offered the flexibility to maintain the integrity of their house when it does not represent a significant detractor from the overall neighborhood aesthetic. Alternatively, if a resident requested to install a roof material or style that is not currently represented in the neighborhood, for example heavily textured composite slate [inaudible] Spanish colonial roof, then the HALRB would be fulfilling its mandate to knock* that request. Maywood residents should be free to choose all historically appropriate roofing materials currently present in the neighborhood, depending on both their means and personal preference. This survey of residents of Maywood will show that asphalt, two-tab and architectural, standing seam metal, and stamped tin shingles are all prevalent. The homeowner should be allowed to use the materials interchangeably, which will allow residents of varying economic means to maintain their home without detracting from the overall neighborhood aesthetic, to the point that we have--we have 9 homes that have tin shingles right now, 7 of which have been replaced, and at least a sizeable handful of them have been replaced in about 10 years, I'm sure [inaudible] drive around the neighborhood. These are 90 to 100-year roofs. The fear that these tin roofs are going to disappear from Maywood anytime soon is not really founded in reality because these roofs last for a long time. Even experts in the Department of Interior who wrote the regulations recognize that cost may dictate the substitution of material wholly different in appearance from the original. Another citation. Here, the difference in appearance from the original tin shingle is most minimized by the replacement of asphalt shingles, as opposed to standing seam metal. Another factor to consider is the degree of visibility of patterning or texture that exists on our stamped tin metal shingle roof is very little as a result of the many--result of the many years of paint and latex refurbishing. Substitution of architectural shingles would neither significantly detract from the visual appeal of the roof, nor seriously alter the architectural character of the building. Quite the contrary. The replacement will increase the visual field of the building, best approximate the shingles originally used. Standing seam metal would become more visually distinct from stamped tin than asphalt shingles, making asphalt shingles the replacement material that should be applied. More importantly, the use of asphalt shingles is the keeping with the Maywood guidelines, a fact that cannot be ignored. The purpose of the guidelines is to preserve the character of the neighborhood, not distinct architectural features of a singular home. A change of roofing materials affects the character of the neighborhood in no way, and is much different than the size and massing issues the guidelines were meant to address. In sum, asphalt architectural shingles are prevalent in Maywood, historically appropriate, [inaudible] shingles currently on the building, and are within what the county can expect a reasonable financial means for its residents. The Maywood Design Guidelines do not require replacement of metal roofs in kind, nor do they say the use of architectural shingles is inappropriate. Tin shingles are a unique and attractive feature, but they also no longer fall into the category of what can be made economically feasible. Architectural asphalt shingles are an attractive, widely used roofing material, the installation of which on Maywood homes has been and can continue to be permitted without detracting from the overall neighborhood character. Thank you for allowing me the time to read that.

>> Brendan Devine: You know, just in sum, the major point we're trying to highlight here is the zoning ordinance mandates the use of the design guideline for a neighborhood. Design guidelines are in place for Maywood. The language that's in those guidelines should strongly support what's not directive in nature with a recommendation that's permissive in nature. And the Secretary of Interior guidelines--guidance are to be applied to neighborhoods who don't have design guidelines. And if you are going to apply those rehabilitation standards, you need to take into account the economic feasibility issue, which I know you

say that it's not something you addressed in the past. But to be honest, \$28,000 as compared to \$5,000 for a third of our roof is something that really needs to be considered. We like tin shingles. We want tin shingles. We wanted tin shingles when we put our addition on, but we were told we had to have asphalt shingles because we wanted a distinction between the two. If we could've done the tin shingles at the same time we did our addition and applied for the tax credit, that would've been great, but we couldn't do that. We were told we had to try to rehabilitate our roof first. So, we don't--we're not trying to tear down our house and build some ridiculous home with massing issues. We're trying to maintain the integrity of our roof in a manner that's economically feasible for us. And to be honest, the cost difference between the \$5,000 asphalt shingle roof and the \$20,000, \$30,000 stamped tin roof, that allows us the freedom to do other things that maintain the historic nature of the house, like replace our rotting roof--or I mean porch, our porch ceilings, our columns, our rails, all those other things that give the house the unique architectural character. So that's--in sum, that's our basic position. I am--I am curious to know how the position or interpretations differ from what we've--what we've seen in the County zoning ordinance and the Maywood guidelines on the part of the board. I understand that the positions I'm bringing are not going to have a lot of allies, and probably not popular in this body, but I do want to hear what your--what your alternative interpretations are, maybe point out where we're--where we're missing something.

>> Jody Devine [owner/applicant]: [1:38:56] I just wanted to add one thing too that wasn't in our letter, but it came through to me as we were discussing or you were discussing previously. So, the overall mandate, what you seem to be very, very concerned about, is that anything that happens on these historic homes within Maywood are historically compatible and architecturally compatible with the neighborhood. And as I understand it, as you're reviewing additions and things like that, we make sure that the things that are happening and being added to these homes are architecturally compatible and historically compatible. As a result, you require that these additions have wood windows, right? Because that's what's on the front of the house, that's what you want in the back of the house, that's what's historically compatible or architecturally compatible. But you do allow all these homes to have architecturally--or architectural shingles, asphalt shingles at the back of the house. So, I think what I'm asking you to consider is I don't think that we're asking for anything that is historically incompatible or architecturally incompatible because it is allowed on the addition, so how can we say that it's not architecturally compatible with the rest of the neighborhood, historically compatible [inaudible] before allowing it on the additions?

>> Robert Dudka: [1:40:19] Well, we really didn't get into a detailed discussion of this at DRC because we anticipated that it was going to be a very detailed discussion here at the full--at the full board. And in fact, it was appropriate for the full board to have the discussion, which we have in the--you know, in the general case, and now are having specific case. So, we essentially--we essentially moved it onto the full board for the discussion. We didn't really--we didn't really take a decision.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:40:50] Staff?

>> John Liebertz: [1:40:52] I'm not going to regurgitate everything we had on the last policy discussion again. But basically, the board's policy has been to replace this material in kind following guidance provided by the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Maywood Design Guidelines. Staff recommends denial of the application to replace the existing stamped tin shingle roof with an architectural shingle.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:41:17] I would like to point out that there are eight or nine, I guess, of the Secretary of Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation that are applicable to Maywood, and they're in the introductions. And they are specifically applicable to Maywood. And the replacement of existing materials with the same materials is part from them, is from the Secretary of Interior Standards. Where there--now, number six, deteriorated historic features should be repaired. And then when you've got severity of deterioration,

deterioration rather requiring replacement, then the new feature should match the old. So, that's what has to--that's what's considered to be part of the discussion.

>> Jody Devine: [1:42:03] Economic feasibility should also be part of it.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:42:15] It's that we have the tension with our state enabling legislation.

>> Jody Devine: [1:42:16] Can you explain that?

>> Brendan Devine: [1:42:18] There's a specific provision in the state enabling legislation that prevents you from considering economic feasibility.

>> Jody Devine: [1:42:23] And I don't mean an economic hardship, I mean economic feasibility.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:42:27] The state enabling legislation from the Code of Virginia only allows localities and then their designated review boards to consider architectural compatibility for any changes in designated historic districts. There is no mention in the Code of Virginia about economic feasibility, or economic hardship, or any of those other-

>> Jody Devine: [1:42:47] But let's just--

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:42:48] The state of Virginia is a Dillon--

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:42:49] Chesapeake went through this whole--

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:42:52] Virginia is a Dillon Rule state, where localities are only allowed those powers expressly conferred to them by the Code of Virginia, or those powers that, you know, they're implied to have just from running a local government, like snow removal, for example. So, localities, you know, when we were just talking about tax credits, localities cannot enact legislation that the state code does not expressly allow them to have.

>> Jody Devine: [1:43:13] Okay, but just back up. So, Maywood as a group got together and decided, "We want to be subject to these Maywood guidelines." Just like your prior presenter with his one little house decided he wanted to have these guidelines, right? So, the neighborhood gets together and goes through, and decides, "This is what we want to do." And what they wrote was that they are strongly supporting and suggesting, not mandating these things. They make a reference to the secretary standards, which we are applying, right? So, why part of the secretary standards are going to be applied against Maywood, but other parts such as the economic feasibility, are not?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:43:57] Because, again, we just said the rule--the rule comes from the Code of Virginia. The Code of Virginia allows our ordinance to be established. It's law. And because the law does not say that financial feasibility can be taken--

>> Jody Devine: [1:44:10] What law?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:44:10] The Code of Virginia, the state code.

>> Jody Devine: [1:44:12] But what excludes this part of the secretary standards?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:44:15] The Secretary of the Interior Standards is policy guidance promulgated by the National Park Service, basically to allow for the consideration of tax credit applications by state

historic preservation offices. Now, when the historic district design guidelines from Maywood and other historic districts are adopted, they cite the first ten rehabilitation standards as--you could think of it as the philosophical umbrella under which the other policies then fold into. They are not ordinance. They're not ordinance in Virginia, they're not ordinance in any state. Again, they're just policy guidelines for the National Park Service that are good professional practice for localities to use, again, in promulgating their own design guidelines for their districts.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:45:01] So, the good practices to follow. Then if you call out specific features later on the guidelines, like roofs for example, you need to pay attention to the language in that citation. The language says--does not say, you know, shall or will or must. It says we strongly support and we should.

>> Jody Devine: [1:45:22] But even going back to the guidelines themselves, the guidelines say that economic feasibility should be considered. So, if they're in the guidelines, and the county's legislation says you're supposed to follow the guidelines, if the guidelines say it, why do they say it if it's not allowed?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:45:43] Again, it's not written into our ordinance. And you know--

>> Jody Devine: [1:45:46] But your ordinance says to follow the guidelines. The guidelines say this.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:45:50] The ordinance says that the County Board can adopt design guidelines to help guide the review of Certificate of Appropriateness cases, and it directs the HALRB to use those guidelines to decide--

>> Jody Devine: [1:46:03] That's what we're asking you to do.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:46:06] Is there something in the guidelines about economic feasibility?

>> Jody Devine: [1:46:10] Yes.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:46:12] Yes there is.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:46:13] In the Maywood guidelines?

>> Jody Devine: [1:46:14] Section one, introduction, the Maywood Design Guidelines are not intended to dictate architectural style [inaudible] particular architectural features--

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:46:24] Are you reading from that letter?

>> Brendan Devine: [1:46:25] Yeah, and it said the same thing.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:46:26] It's in the outline I gave you. The sentence starts, "In the design of the process, economic feasibility, reparability, design integrity and harmony of [inaudible] are important concerns." So, there are concerns. There are four concerns in the design guidelines.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:47:12] [inaudible] asphalt shingle roof was installed. What would the board position be on that?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:47:22] I think you should stick with the case. That's my advice as staff is to stick with the case if you can.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:47:32] Discussion though because, you know, if you have an asphalt shingle roof that you have no record of when that was installed, it could've been installed in 1950, and you have a predisposition towards stamped tin shingles based on the fact that they're more historically appropriate, even though asphalt shingles was a concurrent material. Asphalt shingles are predominant in the neighborhood. Where do you draw that distinction between what you deem historical and what's not?

>> Jody Devine: [1:47:55] It's historically compatible and architecturally compatible, and there's no argument that the asphalt shingles are not.

>> Robert Dudka: [1:48:05] I think there's a distinction between individual structures and the neighborhood as a whole. Just because a material is used in the neighborhood doesn't mean that it's appropriate for a particular individual structure. There are individual structures that have tin shingle roofs, and that's the appropriate material for that structure.

>> Jody Devine: [1:48:24] But you can't ignore the Maywood guidelines that specifically say the guidelines are not intended to dictate architectural style or to require particular architectural features. Rather, they are to identify a range of design options encouraging preservation and new development compatible with the existing character of Maywood. This is existing and it's in--it's totally within the historic compatibility and architectural compatibility of Maywood. We're not asking to put in a slate roof, which would not be compatible because it doesn't exist. We already have--in staff discussion, over 90% of the homes have exactly what we're asking to do, so you can't say that it's not compatible with the neighborhood.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:49:06] There's also a paragraph in there that states that it's important to remember, when using the guidelines, every house is unique. Even houses that look identical at first glance have details or characteristics that set them apart from others. This means that what is appropriate for one building may not be appropriate for another. Each building must be looked at on an individual basis with the private property owner by the review board.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:49:29] So, there's conflicting paragraphs within the guidelines and we're choosing the--

>> Robert Dudka: [1:49:34] Well, I think one of the distinctions is--one of the distinctions is that if you take the position that because asphalt shingles are used in Maywood, that any and all structures can have asphalt shingles, then at some point you lose the other materials, and then you no longer have the character of Maywood.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:49:52] I don't think that's true because there's always going to be people--

>> Robert Dudka: [1:49:54] And you know what? Can we have a discussion with the board at some point here? This isn't a--

>> Jody Devine: [1:49:59] You already had a half an hour discussion on that. We've been--

>> Robert Dudka: [1:50:01] I'm sorry that the--

>> Charles Craig: [1:50:03] I agree; I would like a discussion with the board please.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:50:05] Excuse me. I'll give you a chance to make one more comment, and then the matter is going to be with the board.

>> Brendan Devine: [1:50:11] Well, I think we've made our comments. We didn't come here with any illusions that we're going to change anyone's mind here, but we wanted to put our positions on the table. And we think we--in fact, we know we're on legally sound ground, and we just--we're going through this process like we're required to, so.

>> Jody Devine: [1:50:26] Yeah, and we'd like you to see that we were good citizens. We spent \$5,000 to try and rehab this roof already. And if--and ask people, look at the pictures of the roof itself, and ask yourself whether or not what is there looks like stamped tin shingles. It doesn't look like that anymore. I mean, what we're asking--

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:50:44] That's really true.

>> Jody Devine: [1:50:46] It looks like a slick rubber roof.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:50:50] That maybe will be. It's hard to tell from these photos. That's not--I mean, these are black and white photos in here. I don't know that I could--

>> Brendan Devine: [1:50:57] You don't have this photo in your package?

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:50:58] Maybe I do.

>> John Liebertz: [1:50:59] It should be at the back.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:51:01] Sorry, it was not next to the other photos.

>> Jody Devine: [1:51:05] I mean, you can't even tell that those were stamped tin at one point. The point is, what we're asking to do is to simply put on, you know, a shingle roof and to not have to spend an extra \$25,000 and work 6 months out of the year in order to have to do that. And you know, we have other priorities on our rotting house that, you know, we need those to be preserved.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:51:38] I just want to make a point regarding the--this is in the staff report, but in the discussion recommendation, we talked about replacements. And then reading the guidelines, which states that introduction of new materials should normally be avoided. HALRB strongly supports replacing those with the same materials. It's permissive language. It's not mandatory.

>> Jody Devine: [1:52:07] And to that point, we talked to a neighbor--

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:52:09] The matter's with the board now.

>> Jody Devine: [1:52:11] I'm sorry, I just want to raise one other thing. I spoke with a neighbor who, a couple years ago, was allowed to change to a shingle roof. The address is 3613 21st Avenue North. And they specifically, at that time, did a neighborhood survey, and the board allowed them to put in a shingle roof. So, there's precedent. The property's owner is Ted Sterling.

>> John Liebertz: [1:52:37] He went from a stamped tin roof to a standing seam roof, I believe.

>> Jody Devine: [1:52:44] Okay.

>> John Liebertz: [1:52:45] I never, this was before the policy precedent that we discussed since the mid-2000's. Excuse me.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [1:52:52] Well, again, presenting a date and a house and a case at the hearing, we don't have any time to research the history of that case or to get in touch with the property owner to see what the specifics of that may have been. So, we have no--we have nothing else to offer that other than what we just said.

>> Jody Devine: [1:53:07] Well, I'm not asking you to. I just wanted to bring it to your attention that we're not asking to do something that hasn't already been granted.

>> Joan Lawrence: [1:53:13] The matter's with the board.

>> Charles Craig: [1:53:21] In reference to Robert's statement, this is not an uncommon problem in historic districts. [A different historic district] has a different problem. It's not asphalt shingles, it's standing seaming roofs, where the default setting is putting a standing seam roof on. And there are houses that have the stamped tin shingles are the ones that go away. So, it's a very similar sort of thing. Pretty soon, the least expensive alternative is the alternative that is adopted, and then all the tin shingle roofs are gone.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:54:10] Yet they aren't.

>> Charles Craig: [1:54:11] Pardon?

>> Richard woodruff: [1:54:12] Yet they aren't.

>> Charles Craig: [1:54:14] No, and in this jurisdiction, they aren't either because they have to replace them in kind. You can't go from a stamped tin shingle to a standing seam roof.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:54:28] You're suggesting that, unless coerced, then no one would ever replace a metal roof with a metal roof?

>> Charles Craig: [1:54:38] I'm suggesting that this is not a Chinese menu where you can pick one from column A, one from column B, one from column C. This is a distinctive house that had--just as the windows are distinctive of your house, the scale, the proportion--that the roof is a distinctive design element. That's what I'm suggesting. And that if we want everything to be homogenized, then everything will go to asphalt shingles.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:55:05] I don't think that's true. There's a house across the street from me that the homeowners I think replaced an asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam roof.

>> Charles Craig: [1:55:16] Because at the time, might likely have had a standing seam--

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:55:19] No, they just did this a couple years ago. The reason they did it was because they could afford it.

>> Charles Craig: [1:55:26] No, my only point is it may originally have had a standing seam roof, where they used aluminum paint on it, like they did in a lot of houses from period after period to keep the galvanized roof from rusting.

>> Richard Woodruff: [1:55:42] But that's not relevant to the point that I'm making, which is that not everybody will always replace a metal roof with asphalt shingles. Some people will actually replace the metal roof with a metal roof if they think they can afford it. That's what they do in Maywood. That's all.

>> Sara Steinberger: [1:56:07] I do think that the language in the guidelines, being--I forget the exact phrase, wrongly--strongly suggests is, as indicated, not the strongest language we could have used if we wanted to dictate one outcome and only one outcome. You know, I did not participate in the writing of the guidelines, I was not here for that. I would imagine there was some discussion over that. That's what I seem to come back to. I don't know, I see both perspectives on whether or not we might lose stamped tin roofs. I think that is a risk. I think that that is something that, certainly if you're looking at the lowest common denominator, and I don't mean that in terms of it's bad or an unpalatable option, I just mean the reality is that when you're looking at these with the kind of price differentials that we're seeing, a lot of times you're going to lose--some people, as you said, may make a different choice. But oftentimes, you are going to end up at a price point where you're choosing that lowest common denominator. And I don't know, I'm struggling with the conflicts between those two things, but that's just kind of my thought process at the moment.

>> Andrew Wenchel: [1:57:36] If I could, I think what events will--what to look at is the last set of colored pictures on your package. We did not have this at the DRC. We asked them to do this and take some photos of some windows, and whatever. If you look at the coating that was applied to the tin shingles, you can hardly see the imprint of the shingles. So, at this point--and if you go back and look at the black and white photos, what you really see are the eave edges of the shingles forming horizontal lines, and very little in the way of any breakup of that. So, the reality, you know, I think you need to look at what is the condition of the tin roof at this point. It's coated, and to a great extent you can't read it, even close up, as a tin roof. The photos I think are really--need to be looked at closely. If you try to preserve this at this point with another coating, you would--whether that would work in terms of the deterioration of the metal, probably not. But another coating and it wouldn't have any detail at all. At this point, you know, there's been an attempt to save this particular historic fabric, and the result is, visually, you've lost the tin roof, the appearance of the tin roof. And that calls your attention. So, I think you need to look at the reality of what we're talking about. And at this point, it was a tin roof, and probably was a tin roof with a nice set of embossed details, and it's not there anymore. It really isn't.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:00:01] You know, you should see it in person. It's pretty ugly, no offense.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:00:09] Other comments. Any other comments?

>> Robert Dudka: [2:00:29] I guess I'm struggling with this because I agree with Andy. You know, we specifically asked for these photos to be taken because the photos that we saw were black and white photos. We couldn't see anything. And these are--you know, these are great photos. They--because you really can't see, you know, what's really there. And even Andy says even from close up, it's hard to see. And you can just barely see even on the one that's, you know, you're basically looking at from a foot away, you can barely see the shingles. So, you know, from that point of view, it seems like Andy says we've already lost the tin roof. On the other hand, you know, I worry about the precedent of losing tin roofs. And I really--I really believe that they are one of the defining characteristics of Maywood. And that it just--it really--it really disturbs me that we--you know, that if we lose one, then we'll lose another, and then the precedent, you know, will--or somebody will come and say we let them do it, and then before long, we will lose the remaining ones that we do have. Yes, there are some that were--that were kept and those will remain, but they will be--you know, they will be a very small subset of what Maywood was. And I really think that the thing that puts--that does distinguish Maywood from other parts of Arlington is this is actually one of the things that's very important because the prevalence of sort of four-square, farmhouse, vernacular with the tin shingles is what really makes Maywood unique. Maywood isn't like other neighborhoods in Arlington. You know, it really is--it's unique. It's also why it is the only local historic district in Arlington--you know, neighborhood in Arlington because when it was created, people recognized that it was unique, even in Arlington. You know, it's like there are a number of bungalow neighborhoods and--but there aren't really--there really isn't anything like Maywood. So, I'm kind of torn

because I see that in this particular case, and I'm also torn about the whole economic hardship issue. And I guess for me, I guess one of the things is, is there any hope that we might be able to, in a year or two, actually get some relief? And so that this--so that this roof could be restored? Or is that just a pipe dream? I mean, are we, you know, getting the situation in Richmond or even with the board here in Arlington? Because if--you know, if there was a way to carry this roof another year or so and then be able to truly restore to its original condition, I think that would be--that would be worth a try. But I don't know the answer to that question. I don't know whether this is just one of these things we would love to do, but has no political viability. So, I'm very torn, and I'm not really sure, you know, what the answer here is.

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:03:48] Can I follow up? So, one of the major problems with metal roofs, typically the fasteners that were used were old roofing nails in many cases, and that's what deteriorates through galvanic action. That's a cause of a lot of the deterioration. You can't expect a roof that's not properly fastened with compatible fasteners, i.e., nails, to last 100 years. Many of these roofs are probably essentially time bombs. The way they were installed with inappropriate or cheaper alternative fasteners, they're not going to last 100 years, or they're going to deteriorate rapidly. So, I think there are some other reasons why tin roofs are a problem. I think the other point that was made about the house, and the financial and economic feasibility whatever, the roof is the most important part of the house. But the property owners described they've got problems with the porch railings and the columns and other things that need to be addressed that are also major character features of the house. Maybe we're asking quite a bit in terms of economic questions as to, you know, spend the money on the roof, and would the porch go to hell because you could afford only so much? That's an interesting question. I don't know how I really stand on that, so I really--ideally, I would like to see tin roofs stay. And there's a lot of problems with tin roofs.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:06:35] You know, regarding that, this is a really interesting thing because it shows nine original stamp tin shingle houses, but it shows seven that were replacements.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:06:50] Stamped tin metal?

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:06:53] Well, it says replacement metal shingle. I assume that's-- Replaced with what?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:07:01] Replace in kind.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:07:02] So, we have all this concern about shingled houses going away [inaudible]. Seven of them have been replaced.

>> John Liebertz: [2:07:12] Well, that's partially because since 2000--

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:07:16] Right. Right. So, they're not going away. The point is they're not going away.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:07:24] Well, I think the argument that would be that if we're no longer requiring that as the replacement, then all of those houses that we--that now have metal shingles--they're not supposed to last a long time, so we'll have at least seven or nine, but the number will not increase from that.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:07:42] Not necessarily because some people like--

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:07:44] No, no, that's the--that's the argument.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:07:46] Right, right. But it's not--it's not a valid argument because there are some people who will actually replace it, even though not with tin shingle or standing seam.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:07:58] Yeah, some. I think there's two sides to the argument.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:08:01] But that's the case.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:08:02] No, no, but I think--I think argument from the other side, people are saying they will go away is that this is apples and oranges. That if to this point we've been saying, "You have to replace like with like." So, those people didn't have a "choice" but to replace the metal shingles. And if they have that choice going forward, then none of those might have metal shingles. That's possible.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:08:24] That's possible.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:08:25] Right.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:08:27] We have taken a consistent position [inaudible] which is supported by the guidelines and our [enabling] legislation. And we're often criticized for not being consistent. So, this is something to think about carefully. They're [inaudible]. There are people who would not have put tin shingle roofs on if they were not required to do so. So, it's not an easy situation.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:09:08] I'll respond to that by saying that, as a member of the board, I've been pretty consistent in my votes on the board in trying to be understanding of the financial impact that some of the things that we require have on people, on homeowners in Maywood. Very consistent about that. And you know, I am completely supportive of the historic district and understand its value, which has preserved this neighborhood. But you know, the only reason why it's unique and there's only one of these districts in Arlington is because the word is out about how rigid it is and that, you know, no one else would subject themselves to these kind of restrictions because of the economic impact in rigidity. And if we ever want to have more of these [local]districts, you're going to have to be more understanding with people's financial economic situations.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:10:26] I think to really get into the financial aspects of it is going to require some authorization that we cannot look at now.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:10:53] I'm going to move that we deny this application.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:11:09] I'll second that as a courtesy. We're going to have--we're going to have--

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:11:13] Discussion?

>> John Peck: [2:11:22] In terms of policy, in terms of partially funding that, which doesn't seem terribly imminent.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:11:40] It's hard. It's pretty speculative right now.

>> John Peck: [2:11:51] I mean, it's something that we could do, should do.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:11:57] So, to that point, I would say that I hear and I understand how you'll be potentially setting a precedent if we allow this petition at this time for future -- and the effect that it would have on future roofing decisions in Maywood. That said, I do think that there are unique circumstances to this roof, both in terms of the condition and what it looks like aesthetically at this point, that it's very hard

to identify that it is a stamped metal roof. Additionally, I think that if we do follow this kind of policy path and try to get this kind of a fund or some other kind of credit in place that we could--that we would be able to kind of, you know, work the path to make that a reality, then I think that would change the circumstances for, in a year or two, when we do have that in place, for future applicants. So, I think that, yes, there would be one example where we allow something like this to happen, but the ground would've changed again, and we would no longer--it would not be a direct parallel, so I think we would be within our rights to make individual decisions based on the individual home that was before us on future occasions, either from a financial hardship scenario if we're kind of looking at that the way Chesapeake did as a formal evaluation factor, or if we had some sort of a fund that people could apply to and then kind of consider that in the future. So, that's how I'm thinking of it.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:13:25] I do want to remind everybody that we had a case in the fall, in November I believe it was, in which we required replacement of a deteriorating metal roof with metal.

>> Charles Craig: [2:13:40] I have no way to judge. And it's not in our purview. I mean, I mean, we could all plead financial hardship, and it would be true to varying degrees. I have no way to judge it.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:13:59] I agree. I don't either.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:14:01] Well, I think the criteria we have to look at what Chesapeake did. And we talked about, you know, what's the standard line. It'd probably be similar to the criteria for how they do affordable housing? We have to get more information.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:14:13] The ones we've seen tend to track against federal hardship standards, you know, typical federal poverty measures, things like that, yeah.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:14:20] Percentage of, you know--for the area you're living in, percentage of the mean household income or something. Okay.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:14:31] Do we have further discussion?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:14:35] [A] vote on the motion. All in favor?

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:14:37] Can you repeat the motion?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:14:38] I move that we deny this application. All in favor? [Charles Craig, Joan Lawrence, Sarah Garner, John Peck]

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:14:56] Opposed? [Andrew Wenchel, Richard Woodruff, Sara Steinberger, Mitchell Zink]

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:15:07] Abstain? [Robert Dudka]

>> John Liebertz: [2:15:04] It's four-four.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [2:15:06] It's a tie.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:15:15] Is it legal for a board member to abstain a vote? No, I'm kidding.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:15:21] County Board does it all the time.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:15:27] All right, so it's tied.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:15:31] The motion fails if it ties. It fails.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:15:36] So, does the--so, what happens now?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:15:39] New motion. You need to get a motion passed for the item to conclude.

>> Jody Devine: [2:15:44] Can I add some information, please? The homeowners that you guys just discussed opposed the other house. We took an opportunity to talk to them about their experience, what was going on. They haven't replaced the roof. They have a tarp on their roof, and they have not yet been able to come up with the funds to replace the roof. That's why they have a tarp on their roof. It's leaking. And you know, I think it's something that you should consider. I think that the fact that the Maywood guidelines are permissive--

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:16:20] Excuse me.

>> Jody Devine: [2:16:20] No, I'm sorry, Joan. I would like to finish what I'm saying. I think that the gentleman that you had in here before who came in voluntarily with guidelines that he's expected to follow that the county says that if you have neighborhood guidelines, this is what you're supposed to follow. If in fact you have guidelines that are permissive and the board doesn't want to allow them to be permissive, that is going to prevent other people from coming in here and saying, "I voluntarily agree to this." Because if you change the sign post--I've been in Maywood since 2001. And that's--this is not what the neighborhood agreed to. The agreement was permissive on this issue, and that's all.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:17:07] I just want to point out that the tarp is on part of the roof that has asphalt shingles, which they were--they can replace with asphalt shingles. It's not on the metal.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [2:17:30] So, we need another motion.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:17:34] If a new motion is proposed, again, the motion to deny, there were--there were citations in the staff report about the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in the Maywood Design Guidelines. So, as staff, we would recommend any alternate motion that's considered and passes needs to cite the design guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. There needs to be some contextual basis. You have to make your own findings for why the motion would be architecturally or historically compatible since the one based on the staff report failed. Whatever you decide to do with it.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:18:08] Well, does it have to be tied to the Interior's guidelines, or could it be tied to the Maywood guidelines?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:18:14] You have to make standards of architectural and historical compatibility based on the guidelines for the neighborhood. And the guidelines with the neighborhood include the first ten of the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:18:38] The guideline says the introduction of new materials should normally be avoided. Of course dot, dot, dot... HALRB strongly supports replacing metal roofs with same materials. I don't know why another motion needs to cite the Secretary of the Interior's [Standards].

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:18:59] All I mean is that any motion that the HALRB approves has to have findings of fact and conclusions to support your motion. The documents that we use to provide your findings and fact to support your conclusions are the Maywood Design Guidelines, which includes

citations from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards that are cited--that are cited within it. So, that is my advice to you as the staff, that any--you can't just say--I would not recommend that you make a motion that does not have findings of fact and conclusion from your design guidelines from the district because it opens you up to a charge of being arbitrary, particularly given the similarities of the case that you denied.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:19:42] Well, I'm not planning to make a motion, but if I was going to make one, I would--I would cite the Maywood guidelines.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:19:50] You need--again, we would want the specific text from it, which--

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:19:55] Which doesn't seem--

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:19:57] You received a copy of the neighborhood guidelines.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:19:59] Well, as I said, I'm not planning to make one. I was just curious.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:20:04] Actually, can I see those? Oh, sorry. [inaudible].

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:20:09] Does anybody need an extra binder? Because we have copies.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:20:17] Maybe it would be a good idea to postpone discussion.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:20:27] Postpone the discussion of--

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:20:31] Well, or to defer. I mean, we seem to be at an impasse, unless someone else is going to make a motion.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:20:39] I mean, I can make a motion if I have a little assistance in citing.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:21:47] So, these are from the Secretary of Interior's Standards? I would make a motion that, in light of these specific circumstances to the roof at hand, that the level of deterioration of the metal shingles on this particular house, this distinct specific property, has obliterated the distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques that would make this home--that would mandate the replacing like with like. Further, that the language of the design guidelines does allow for the replacement of similar materials, similar historically appropriate materials, of which it appears that asphalt is historically appropriate. I'm not going to remember what I said to go to be able to repeat that statement. So, try again? This is my first motion. Yeah. Can I withdraw that one and try again?

>> John Liebertz: [2:23:05] It's up to you.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:23:06] It's true, it's up to you.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:23:08] Oh good, yeah. No one second that one.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:23:21] First part sounded pretty good.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:23:24] Oh, do you remember what I said?

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:23:27] It was something of the effect that--

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [2:23:28] I paraphrased. In light of the specific circumstances for this roof, given the level of deterioration of the shingles, it would not mandate the replacement of like with like.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:23:40] Oh, close enough. Yeah, I know. No, I do [inaudible]. Okay, so for a motion, [given] the unique, specific nature of this home, and the level of deterioration of the current roofing material, I find does not mandate--we've lost standard five, the distinctive features, finishes, and kind of construction technique that indicate that this is a metal shingle roof. As a result, it is appropriate within the Maywood Design Guidelines to replace this roof with another historically appropriate material, of which asphalt is an option. Does that work?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:24:32] Yeah, the only thing I would add to it is--

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:24:35] Oh please, open to suggestions.

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:24:36] That the applicant has also treated the existing metal shingles to try and spot the deterioration and the leaking of the roof, and that's essentially what's added to the deteriorated appearance. So, they already made one good faith effort.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:25:06] Can I recommend that we don't set a precedent by saying that asphalt shingles are appropriate?

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:25:13] Okay, yeah.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:25:13] And then we actually say we're reading from--that you know, one of the things it says in roof form here [in the design guidelines] is that roof material and roof edge details should be compatible with nearby roof materials, the material's details. There is asphalt on the other half of the house. You could make the case without saying so.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:25:41] Then how do you distinguish this from the case last fall?

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:25:45] Well, I don't see--I don't know--I don't know how you do that. I mean, I voted the same way last fall. So, I'm struggling myself with how you--you know, this--you know, I guess this creates a precedent if we pass a motion that allows them to put an asphalt roof on there.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:26:08] I think the distinction is that this is the specific site, that the condition of this particular metal shingle roof is so deteriorated as to no longer bear the historical characteristics of being a metal shingle roof.

>> Charles Craig: [2:26:29] Are we at the discussion stage yet?

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:26:31] Please.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:26:32] Well, it didn't get a--I'm sorry, it didn't get a second yet for the motion.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:26:36] I'm withdrawing it.

>> John Liebertz: [2:26:38] Your second motion you withdraw?

>> Sara Steinberger: Yeah, I don't think anyone liked it.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [2:26:43] I think it's just a work in progress.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:26:43] Sorry, okay. I'm just saying--I'm just saying to have the discussion, someone--procedurally, someone should second it.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [2:26:59] Were you taking notes, John? I'm not sure mine--

>> John Liebertz: [2:27:01] What? I'm sorry, what was your question? At this specific roof, due to the level of deterioration, it does not meet--it does not meet the criteria or the Secretary of Interior's guidelines standard number five. And as a result, it is appropriate to replace the roof with another historically appropriate material, that would be asphalt. Then Andy made an amendment that said that it should be noted that this applicant tried to preserve the roof in 2011 to stop its further deterioration, but that also led to its current appearance.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:27:41] Okay, so I would argue that the roof, because it's got plastic coating on, is that a fact?

>> John Liebertz: [2:27:47] It has a latex coating on it.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:27:50] It's no longer a metal roof.

>> John Liebertz: [2:27:52] I don't know if that's a--I mean, in terms of historic preservation, materials conservation, I don't think that's valid. Because it's still a metal roof. And you put--you put protectants on tons of different materials all the time to try to make them last. It doesn't change the composition of the roof.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:28:09] By that principal, if you leave the metal on and you put asphalt over the top of it, it's still a metal roof. By that logic.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:28:21] Well, latex by itself would not hold up as a roofing material.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:28:25] What?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:28:25] Latex by itself would not hold up as a roofing material.

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:28:31] Latex is nothing more than basically a kind of--a kind of--it's a kind of--

>> Charles Craig: [2:28:38] We have something, a case that has nothing to do with roofs, and it's been within the past year. And I remember a quote from someone, it was demolition by neglect. So, if you have a structure and you neglect it to the point that it no longer stands, historic structure that no longer stands, and you've done nothing to maintain it at all, it's still a historic structure. Because we have been down this road before. So, this is still a metal roof even if it has a temporary coating on it to preserve it. So, I don't--to me, this idea of putting a temporary coating on it and it looks really bad is not a reason to say that because pretty soon, we're going to have other people putting temporary coatings on things that say, "Well, that looks like crap. You could hardly tell what it originally was. And so, therefore we should be able to put some other finish on it."

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:29:41] But it's not like they weren't following what the protocol was. They were told to put the coating on it.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:29:47] They were trying to preserve it.

>> Charles Craig: [2:29:49] They were trying--they were trying to preserve it, and the preservant ran out, and its natural life--

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:29:54] Is there going to be a motion, another motion, or not?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:29:58] Was there a second for--is there a second for the motion that's on the table?

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:30:03] Huh? I would--I'm still not clear on what it says.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:30:08] Okay, well, Andy offered a friendly amendment, which was accepted?

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:30:14] Yeah.

>> John Liebertz: [2:30:16] So, the first part of the motion was that, due to the unique--the unique, specific nature on this roof and the level of deterioration, it does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's standard number five, and as a result, it is appropriate to replace this roof with another architecturally historically appropriate roof, and that was the asphalt shingle roof. Is that accurate?

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:30:39] I would like to strike where I say asphalt.

>> John Liebertz: [2:30:42] Okay. Then the--Andy made a friendly amendment that basically said the applicant, attempted to protect the roof with a latex coating, a coating in 2011 to stop deterioration. Andy, is that accurate?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:31:02] Yeah.

>> John Liebertz: [2:31:02] I think that was to go towards the specific circumstances of this property was what Andy's amendment was for.

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:31:12] It's getting at why this is--I would maybe insert Andy's amendment earlier, before the part of the motion that says, you know, therefore different material is acceptable. So, it would say something like, "Due to the unique circumstances of this particular structure, the metal shingle roof no longer meets these characteristics for distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques to qualify for standard five of the Interior's guidelines. And as a result, it is appropriate to replace this roof with another architectural and historical material."

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:32:03] Do you have that?

>> John Liebertz: [2:32:05] Yeah, I also have it on recording, so I have it in that form.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:32:13] Is there any further discussion?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:32:15] We need a second.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:32:16] I'll second it.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:32:17] Oh, okay. I thought--I thought you already had.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:32:20] No.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:32:20] All right, all in favor?

>> Sara Steinberger: [2:32:23] I think there was still discussion on it.

>> John Liebertz: [2:32:24] Yeah. I think--I thought there was going to be discussion.

>> Charles Craig: [2:32:29] Yeah, my only point is, so when someone comes in and they have a standing seam roof, and they can't afford it, and they want to replace it with a shingle--asphalt shingle roof, what do we do then? I mean, we keep going refining down. Now, I know if someone came in with a standing seam roof and said, "We want to put on a copper standing seam roof," we would say no because that is not historically appropriate.

>> Robert Dudka: [2:33:01] Actually, we have done that.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:33:02] I think we have done that.

>> Robert Dudka: [2:33:03] It seems to me that what we--we have a very difficult case here, and what we need to do is after--whichever way this goes, after this, we need, as a board, to address this issue and plug whatever holes need to be plugged, you know, so that things aren't--there's less leeway. And then we make it very clear what it is that we want as a board to do in this historic district because you know, right now, this is just a very--it's very difficult. And it's easy to go either way with this. And my big concern is the precedent issue, which I think is addressed in this motion to a large degree, not totally. And so, it's--you know, it's one of those things as a board we have to--we have to come to grips with this.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:33:55] You know, I agree. And I don't--I don't know if we actually did resolve the precedent issue really. I mean, we probably are creating precedent. But I do think the way to get to this is not to create like a hardship exemption so much, but to create some calculation over--that sort of takes into consideration the cost comparison between what the--you know, what the standard--sort of the standard of care is these days of putting on the new roof generally costs \$5,000, \$10,000, whichever.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:34:34] But our enabling legislation doesn't let us do that.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:34:36] I disagree with that. You know, I mean--okay, I shouldn't say that because I have no idea. But you know what? We're a board. We can do stuff like this. I think we can figure it out without just saying we're not allowed to do it. I mean, I think it's worth considering. And I don't think they're--like with a roof, a metal roof and an asphalt roof, we have this huge cost differential. And I'm not sure that's the case like with wooden windows. Wooden windows are not really very much more expensive, if at all, than a crappy vinyl window or aluminum window. And I don't think anybody here would argue or would support a homeowner who came in and said, "I'm not going to replace my, you know, wooden windows with wooden windows," because they don't cost that much more. But we're really talking about a serious cost differential here. Was it 38,000? I mean, so I think there is some--there's some--

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:35:42] Well, we have one estimate. So, it is a little hard to get all the facts. What are you going to say to the people who came in last fall?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:35:52] Could I address that, Joan? I think that there was a distinct difference, and the difference was that the applicant in the fall, the original roof had a ridge line. And that ridge line extended across the addition out the back, across the non-historic portion of the house so that there was no real distinction other than the difference in materials between the roofs, which is one of the things we've been talking about on a number of applicants, is that you need to distinguish what the historic roof was from the addition out the back. And if you allow, which we had previously, an extension of that ridge line

and the eave line at the same level, you lose any distinction between what was the historic roof versus what was. So, that's the difference here. These roofs are at different levels.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:37:02] Well, the original roof was also pre-historic district.

>> John Liebertz: [2:37:06] And just to talk about that case, the motion for that case, if I remember it correctly, was the approval of replacing actually the stamped tin with stamped tin, and then creating a curb to asphalt shingles on the back. You were not--you know, what the HALRB approved is not mandating that the entire roof be replaced with stamped tin.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:37:25] They had that option.

>> John Liebertz: [2:37:26] They had that option, you know, but the alternative was, you know, to break the roof. The HALRB allowed to make a distinction on the existing roof. So, there was still the difference giving in that case of the stamped tin being replaced with stamped tin.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:37:40] We still got a deteriorated metal roof, and we still have part of the roof that was asphalt.

>> Andrew Lawrence: [2:37:46] I don't think it could've been coated, though. I think that's probably the difference.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:37:50] Probably not.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:37:52] It had been painted. I mean, there are many ways over time. The latex is just the latest iteration of how to preserve metal roofs. Some of them have been tarred in the district, like I know the one on 22nd Street North has been tarred 'cause that's the way you would patch the holes over time. From a historic preservation point of view, painting or tarring the metal does not change the material integrity of the material, it just does not.

>> Andrew Lawrence: [2:38:16] No, it changes the appearance That was--

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:38:19] Of course, just as, you know, painting wood over many, many decades also changes the appearance of it, but it's still wood.

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:38:26] I can use the example of a Karl Barton house on the other side of the river. It was a standing seam metal roof. It was coated by a latex coating, probably the same that was used on this roof. And while the latex held up pretty well over time, the roof itself deteriorated from all of the trapped moisture. It had sealed any means of water vapor escaping from the roofs, so that basically then you destroyed the roof from the bottom of the roof instead of the top. And that's a problem. That's the problem with this roof now. And then I think that basically what they've done is they've sealed the roof off so it doesn't breathe. There's no opportunity for it to reduce the humidity level so that it's deteriorating rapidly from the bottom now.

>> Robert Dudka: [2:39:44] I have a question of staff. We've been given two prices here. Have you seen the actual estimates?

>> John Liebertz: [2:39:54] I think there's an estimate from Augustine in there, isn't there, in your application?

>> John Liebertz: [2:40:03] Alpha Rain did not provide an estimate.

>> John Liebertz: [2:40:10] {to the applicant} Did he give you a written, formal estimate, or an email estimate, just in the text of the email, correct?

>> Brendan Devine [2:40:17] Yes, but it would have been comparable to what we got from Augustine.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:40:21] So, where is the Alpha Rain report? All right, is there any further discussion?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:40:32] My concerns are precedent, that death by 1,000 cuts is one way to put it. Yes, this is one roof, but there are others. And I don't know that we have a good answer for the people who are going to want to, instead of repair their roofs or replace them with metal, replace them with asphalt. I just don't think we have a good answer for that. Particularly in view of the consistent position that we've taken, which is, again, I feel supported by the guidelines and Secretary of the Interior's Standards. We've been consistent with--as a board, we have required replacement of metal stamped tin shingled roofs with metal stamped tin shingled roofs. Excuse me. All right, I'm going to call for a vote on the motion. All in favor? [Andrew Wenchel, Mitchell Zink, Richard Woodruff, and Sara Steinberger]

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:42:10] Opposed? [Joan Lawrence, Robert Dudka, Charles Craig, John Peck, and Sarah Garner]

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:42:19] No, motion fails.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:42:23] We just can't get anything done today.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:42:25] This is the thought. It's a hard--it's a hard case.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:42:28] It is a hard case, I agree.

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:42:33] Could I make a suggestion? I don't think that this came up with the DRC that there was only two of us there. And I think it might--and we didn't have the photos that are in the back, color photos. I'd like to suggest that maybe we have DRC take a look at this and explore what other options might be available, that we give more of an appearance of standing seam--or not a standing seam, I'm sorry, metal shingle roof or whatever. Further investigate that.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:43:28] So, to explore material options?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:43:31] Material options. And then review that if the applicant can put up with a leaking roof for that long. That might be--it might be at least worth a discussion and getting--because the last time we just decided that we didn't have enough people there to really make any kind of recommendation, whether we do it or not.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:44:04] Well, and there also was a request from the neighborhood that the board have a policy discussion about roofs.

>> Robert Dudka: [2:44:12] Right. I mean, I think that the sense of the DRC was that, one, there was only two of us there, but secondly, we don't make policy at DRC. We simply make recommendations about specific cases to the board. And since we were going to have a policy discussion before the full board anyway, there was really no reason to have it at DRC. But what we could do at DRC is look at actual design options for this particular case, which is what DRC does. But we can't do the--we shouldn't have

the general policy discussion at DRC. But we've had the general policy discussion here, so. And I don't know if that--how that necessarily--that will move us forward, but--

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:44:57] Well, I have a question. You know the Anderson house in Maywood?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:45:02] Yeah.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:45:03] What kind of roof is that on that house?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:45:05] It's a stamped tin roof.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:45:07] But it's not standing seam.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:45:09] No, it's stamped tin.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:45:11] Standing seam is--look out your front door at the house--the house on the corner with the picket fence, the white picket fence. That's standing seam.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:45:20] But it's stamped--it's not on this list, is it?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:45:22] Yeah, it is. They're on Monroe, right, the Andersons?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:45:27] Monroe, 247.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:45:28] Yeah, they're purple. They did that as part of a tax credit project. No, actually their tax credit I think was denied, but they did the metal roof anyways.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:45:36] But is that the same kind of roof that we're talking about?

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:45:39] Yes.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:45:39] You know, as a replacement.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:45:43] That would be acceptable.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:45:46] But it's not an individual shingle thing, right?

>> Joan Lawrence: It's not. Not anymore.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:45:55] But is the value--does the cost of the roof that they're talking about, I mean, the roof that we--that they have costed out, is that a different kind of roof from the one--

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:46:07] It's the--it's the same. It's the same manufacturer. And I should say as to cost too, which you know, whether or not we should get into it, we have asked people for quotes over the years, the prices of metals are volatile. You know, this is--this is actually a much smaller cost differential than the ones we were looking at 10 years ago, when it was much larger because, you know, metals have their own--for whatever reason, it's a very volatile--it's traded as a commodity. So, the prices can be all over the place in terms of looking at the differential.

>> Charles Craig: [2:46:42] I have a question for John. In your search did you--I thought there was a WF Norman company?

>> John Liebertz: [2:46:49] Yeah, that's the second one I was referring to. That's in Nevada, I think, or there's another company. They have two different types of shingles, tin shingles.

>> Brendan Devine: [2:46:57] I tried to contact them.

>> John Liebertz: [2:46:59] No, that's a different one. This is--

>> John Liebertz: [2:47:03] This is WF Norman. They're based in--yeah. I don't--I mean, I could show you the website if that's the one you looked at, but that's the--that's the second one I had been referring to, other than the one that everyone uses in Arlington County.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:47:29] But I'm sorry, is that roof, the Anderson roof, is it like one big sheet?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:47:34] No, no, it comes in sections. It's not one big--

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:47:38] How big are the sections?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:47:39] I don't--I don't know. I'd have to go back and look up the specs.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:47:44] Are they rolled?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:47:45] No, no, they're placed.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:48:06] So, this one--this one spec website that John has pulled up, it's 145 shingles per square in each of the squares.

[Dialogue missing here.]

>> Brendan Devine: [2:48:48] We would. We're going to approach the DRC and the board in the future with a request to put in dormers on the sides of the house.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:48:59] The old house?

>> Brendan Devine: [2:49:00] The old house. It would be similar to the ones on the front. So, that may again be a contentious discussion. We'd like to do the roof concurrent with that project. As far as the leaks go, it's moist on the inside of the attic, there are moist areas, moistness on the joists.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:49:25] If you're doing dormers, are you building out your attic, finishing your attic?

>> Brendan Devine: [2:49:30] No, no, not right now. It's more just 'cause the--if you get more light storage space up there right now to go up the attic stairs, basically I have to put my face on my knees to get up that space, so it's a walkup access to the attic.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:49:52] Yeah, I wonder if that would get him beyond the threshold to get a tax credit.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:49:56] Well, it may not qualify for a tax credit.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:49:59] 'Cause it's in the old part of the house.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:50:01] Because it's an alteration to the old house.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:50:04] That doesn't qualify?

>> John Liebertz: [2:50:06] The state's very--

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:50:08] It's not [inaudible]. It depends.

>> Richard Woodruff: [2:50:10] It's not rehabilitation work, so the cost of that wouldn't go towards the tax credit, but the appropriateness of it could or could not take it out of consideration. I mean, maybe. You know, it's a lot about the design. But the cost of it couldn't go towards the tax credit.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [2:50:27] So, I guess, Andy, are you making a motion then to ask the applicant to return to DRC?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:50:30] I was suggesting that might be an option. If you want, I can make a motion there.

>> Cynthia Liccese-Torres: [2:50:38] 'Cause you have an active [inaudible].

>> Robert Dudka: [2:50:39] Why don't you make the motion then?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:50:43] I recommend that--

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:50:45] [inaudible] roof on and then--

>> Brendan Devine: [2:50:50] No, we want to see what happens with this before we do that, so it's also a matter of we don't have enough money to do it. So, it's kind of very much in the speculative phase. The roof, I mean, in the timeline we can afford to go back to DRC, [if] that's something that the board wanted to consider.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:51:14] I mean, if you had an emergency situation, which I hope you don't.

>> Brendan Devine: [2:51:18] No, I mean, any amount of moisture in the attic is not good. But it doesn't look like there's a lot of progress being made tonight.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:51:31] Well, it's a difficult case.

>> Brendan Devine: [2:51:34] I certainly appreciate y'all taking the time to discuss it and give it some real thought.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:51:39] Important issues here. So, would you like, Andy, to turn his idea into a motion?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:51:47] I'd like to--well, I move that we defer this action to the Design Review Committee for further review, and specifically look at materials and other materials that might give the appearance--I started looking through this, and I have not been successful, but I didn't spend that much time on it. And I think that there just might be some other materials, so that gives us a month to do some research.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:52:39] Can I ask you to be specific about--so, we've got “defer to DRC for further review to look at materials and other materials,” for what end?

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:52:49] Well, review the--

>> Robert Dudka: [2:52:51] For subsequent recommendations to the board.

>> Andrew Wenchel: [2:52:53] For subsequent recommendations to the board.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:52:54] Okay, thank you.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:52:56] But you could come in--I mean, because theoretically, you could come in next month.

>> Robert Dudka: [2:53:08] Okay, so are we clear about that motion?

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:53:11] If you guys feel that you as the DRC have sufficient direction and that the applicant has sufficient direction about what it is we're going to be talking about. Do you?

>> Charles Craig: [2:53:24] Oh, I'm interested to see what new materials are coming in.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:53:27] Okay. So, we need a second.

>> Robert Dudka: [2:53:30] I'll second.

>> Rebecca Ballo: [2:53:31] Okay.

>> Joan Lawrence: [2:53:32] All right, all in favor? Unanimous.

REPORTS OF CHAIRMAN, STAFF, AND STANDING COMMITTEES:

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the members of the County's World War One Task Force have started to plan two events. Staff will keep you posted on the dates and times of upcoming events.

Ms. Liccese-Torres provided an update regarding the Unified Residential Development for Reevesland that will be heard by the County Board. Approval of the County Manager's recommendation would ultimately lead to the sale of the property. The Parks Department will be returning to the HALRB with an application to make landscape improvements to record the subdivision of the lot in May 2017.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Stratford Use Permit and CoA will be heard by the County Board this month. This is the culmination of many years of work and there are no issues with the CoA.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 PM.