



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT  
Neighborhood Services Division

Courthouse Plaza One 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201  
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

*DRAFT*

## MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

**Wednesday, October 18, 2017  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Charles Craig  
Carmela Hamm  
Gerry Laporte  
Joan Lawrence, Chairman  
John Peck  
Sara Steinberger  
Andrew Wenchel  
Richard Woodruff, Vice Chairman  
Mitchell Zink

### **MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Robert Dudka  
Sarah Garner  
Tova Solo  
Mark Turnbull

### **STAFF:**

Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
Rebecca Ballo, Historic Preservation Planner  
John Liebertz, Historic Preservation Planner  
Kyle Fisher, Historic Preservation Management Intern

### **ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. The Chairman welcomed Ms. Pam Jones, who is considering membership on the HALRB. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

### **APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2017, MEETING MINUTES**

The Chairman called for a motion on the draft September minutes. Ms. Lawrence asked that the Chairman's Report section be amended to reflect her statement more accurately. Mr. Craig moved to approve the minutes with the proposed revisions and Ms. Hamm seconded. The motion passed 6-0-2 with Mr. Zink and Mr. Woodruff abstaining; Mr. Wenchel and Ms. Steinberger had not yet arrived.

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

The Chairman stated there were two items on the consent agenda.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Amanda Davis  
2165 North Lincoln Street  
CoA 17-24 (HP1700047)  
Maywood Historic District  
An after-the-fact request to install two retaining walls in the rear of the property.
2. Richard and Christiana Cameron  
3202 23<sup>rd</sup> Street North  
CoA 17-23 (HP1700046)  
Maywood Historic District  
Request to replace the cedar-shingle roof with asphalt shingles.

The Chairman called for a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Laporte moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Zink seconded the motion and it passed unanimously 8-0; Mr. Wenchel arrived at 7:02 pm and Ms. Steinberger had not yet arrived.

**DISCUSSION AGENDA**

1. Robert Neubauer  
1600 North Lexington Street  
CoA 17-25 (HP1700048)  
Washington-Torreyson Historic District  
Request to replace the wood window trim with cellular PVC.

Mr. Neubauer presented his request to the board. The proposal followed the DRC’s recommendation to replace the wood window trim on the historic part of the house in-kind and use PVC trim only on the later additions.

Mr. Craig responded that the DRC would have placed this care on the consent agenda, but the design guidelines for the district do not address the use of cellular PVC trim. He added that similar to other historic district guidelines, the DRC found high quality PVC an appropriate substitute on the additions of the house.

Mr. Liebertz stated the *Washington-Torreyson House Historic District Design Guidelines* do not discuss window trim. The DRC and Historic Preservation staff recommend amending these design guidelines to allow PVC trim on additions to historic buildings, similar to the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Laporte inquired why the board insists PVC cannot be used on original structures.

Mr. Liebertz responded that, per the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the county tries to restrict PVC to non-historic additions and to parts of houses susceptible to water damage. On the historic house, the DRC recommended using a higher-quality wood trim (and not the existing finger-pointed wood trim) so it will not deteriorate as quickly.

Mr Laporte inquired about the basis for such a decision.

Mr. Liebertz stated that it is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and other standard historic preservation philosophy. The goal is to retain historic materials where possible.

Ms. Ballo remarked that one of the Secretary’s standards allows for materials to be replaced when they are unable to be repaired or when repairing them would require the use of hazardous materials such as asbestos.

The Chairman motioned to approve CoA 17-25. Mr. Laporte seconded. The motion passed 9-0-0; Ms. Steinberger arrived at 7:05 pm.

**DISCUSSION ITEM: NAMING OF COUNTY PARK IN SOUTH ARLINGTON**

Ms. Bethany Heim, staff with the Arlington County Department of Parks & Recreation, introduced a new park project being planned and that requires naming. The three names offered for consideration were “South Park,” “Luna Park,” and “Short Bridge Park.” “South Park” has been associated with the project for some time since it will be located in the southernmost part of Arlington. People also are familiar with it. “Luna Park” was the most popular name in an online survey and email feedback. “Short Bridge Park” references the former railroad bridge to be included in the park. Ms. Heim explained that both “South Park” and “Luna Park” are trademarked.

The Chairman stated that as a trademark lawyer, she would have reservations about “Luna Park,” but not “South Park.”

Mr. Woodruff remarked that parks in Italy are called ‘lunas,’ which would make the second option appropriate.

Mr. Liebertz noted that other streetcar amusement parks in the U.S. were known as “Luna Park.”

Mr. Laporte said that the subject memo on this project did not discuss the fact that other parks gave “luna” as a precedent.

Mr. Liebertz commented that “Luna Park” – the name of a nearby amusement park in the early twentieth century – was the only historic name that staff could suggest.

Mr. Laporte inquired whether the City of Alexandria was working on this project, as it was difficult to discern who was working on what given the lack of maps provided. Ms. Heim responded that Arlington is working closely with the City of Alexandria. Alexandria prefers the name “Crescent Park North.” Arlington has the final say in the naming.

Ms. Steinberger said she preferred “South Park,” not considering the similarly-titled television program a hindrance.

Mr. Peck asked who the landscape architect was for the project. Ms. Heim replied it was Rhodeside & Harwell of Alexandria, who had also worked on Four Mile Run.

Mr. Wenchel volunteered the name “South Bridge Park,” since the park needed a feature to define it.

The Chairman agreed to add “South Bridge Park” to the list for consideration.

Mr. Peck responded that he likes this name because trains used to cross the bridge near this point.

Mr. Laporte volunteered the name “Crescent Park.”

On a vote, the preferred park name choices were as follows:

“South Bridge Park” (4 votes): Mr. Peck, Ms. Hamm, Mr. Woodruff, and Mr. Zink

“South Park” (1 vote): Ms. Steinberger

“Luna Park” (1 vote): Mr. Craig

“Short Bridge Park” (2 votes): Ms. Lawrence and Mr. Wenchel

“Crescent Park” (1 vote): Mr. Laporte

Ms. Heim stated she will take the board’s vote to the Parks and Recreation Commission. The Park Master Plan and the preferred park name will go to the County Board in December 2017 or January 2018.

**DISCUSSION ITEM: AMENDMENT TO SECTION 11.3, HISTORIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY DISTRICT, OF THE ARLINGTON COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE**

Ms. Ballo provided background information regarding this proposed zoning ordinance amendment (ZOA) to the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO). She requested the HALRB’s comments on the text of the proposed zoning ordinance amendment, which deals with how Local Historic Districts are requested by the public for study. The HALRB and its predecessor the Landmark Review Board have proposed historic district designations to the County Board since 1976.

Ms. Ballo stated that anyone currently can request the creation of a local historic district, but there is no formal procedure for requests. She noted that there are 26 other Certified Local Governments (CLGs) in Virginia that have historic district overlays. Almost all of these have different local historic district designation processes. She added that the current ordinance allows requests to be made by any individual for any number of properties. Staff is in the process of creating a local historic district designation form for the public to use to request local historic district designations. The application would outline a multi-step internal review process before the request could be heard by the HALRB.

Ms. Ballo stated that local historic district designation requests may be made to designate single or multiple properties. The only change for a single property request is that the person who submits it must be a County resident.

Mr. Woodruff asked for clarification about the intent of the requirement that the individual who submits a request does not have to be an Arlington County property owner. Ms. Ballo replied that nominators would need to be a County resident, but do not have to be a property owner. This was done to restrict the requests to Arlingtonians only. Additionally, one property counts only as one vote (even if there are multiple owners).

Multiple property requests may be submitted by civic associations, homeowner’s or condominium association boards for properties within their own boundaries. They may also be made by petition by 25 percent or more of property owners within the boundary of the proposed designation.

Mr. Craig asked how properties of different sizes would have equal representation.

Ms. Ballo replied that representation is by the parcel, not by each individual building (e.g., the Buckingham Shopping Center, which is four buildings, but a single parcel).

The Chairman asked if there were definitions of “multiple property” anywhere in the zoning ordinance. Ms. Ballo responded that staff had discussed the need for such definitions with zoning staff and had been advised such definitions were unnecessary.

Mr. Peck asked if property owners and households in multi-family housing complexes would be eligible to nominate. Ms. Ballo replied yes.

Mr. Wenchel asked if owner consent for a nomination would be required. Ms. Ballo replied it would not be, just as is the case under current state code. This ordinance amendment only deals with initiating the request to study a property; it would be up to the County Board to decide whether a property is actually designated.

Ms. Steinberger asked if a group could make a request for a single property. Ms. Ballo replied that these standards define the minimum; one or several people may nominate a property.

The Chairman asked why there was a change in submitting the nominations to the zoning administrator.

Ms. Ballo replied that this is typical in the ACZO. The nomination must be passed along to the ‘designee,’ which is the Historic Preservation Program staff. The zoning administrator recommended this language, but it can be discussed further.

The Chairman stated that changing the language to “submitted to the zoning administrator and referred to the review board” would clarify the practices that already exist.

Mr. Woodruff asked who would make the determination about whether the application meets the requirements. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that the preservation staff would.

Mr. Laporte said he also was concerned about who determines if a property meets the requirements. A zoning administrator unfriendly to historic preservation may be disadvantageous for the process if given authority over nominations.

Ms. Ballo responded that the HALRB, Arlington Public Schools, and County Board have independent authority to nominate properties. None of these recommendations infringe on that authority. The HALRB has the authority to complete an application itself.

The Chairman recommended adding language that applications will still be referred to the HALRB after submission to the zoning administrator. Ms. Ballo agreed.

Ms. Steinberger asked why it has been proposed to increase the notification requirements from ten to thirty business days between submitting an application and notifying the applicant of receipt.

Ms. Ballo said the language requiring notification within ten business days had been adopted in the 2009 and 2010 revisions to the ordinance. One unintended consequence of this has been that some property owners believe wrongly that there will be an imminent rezoning of their property. The notification window would be changed so that it would tie into an acceptance of a completed application by the County. Applications would be deemed “complete” when nominators submit all of the required work to ensure the property is at least able to be initially reviewed by preservation staff.

Mr. Laporte inquired why 25 percent of property owners within the boundaries of the proposed designation would have to sign a petition. Ms. Ballo replied that approximately 25 percent of neighborhood support could be considered an appropriate level of community support to initiate the study.

Mr. Laporte said that 25 percent still equated to a lot of support in some communities. However, applicants could still come to the HALRB to make requests, which could be performed on the board’s own motion.

Mr. Woodruff stated that this number provided an appropriately high threshold for measuring community support. Mr. Laporte wondered if using the percentage of properties and not property owners would be a better indicator of support.

Ms. Ballo said that she will take the HALRB's comments to the County Board in November for a request to advertise and subsequent adoption of the ZOA in December 2017.

The Chairman stated that staff will need the board's full comments regarding the proposed amendment before the next HALRB meeting on November 15, 2017.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked the board to compile comments before the next meeting. This item will be on the November HALRB hearing agenda to seek final comments.

### **DISCUSSION ITEM: MARKS STUDY**

Mr. Russell Schroeder (Arlington County Housing Division) and Mr. Andrew Douglass (Arlington County Planning Division) presented an update on the County's ongoing market rate affordable housing (MARKS) study and provided details on the proposed Housing Conservation District (HCD) as a potential tool.

Mr. Douglass noted that the goal of the study is to find ways to reduce the loss of market rate affordable housing in Arlington County. He stated that the County Board set forward three directives when it approved the Affordable Housing Master Plan (AHMP): 1) further examine the Accessory Dwelling Ordinance; 2) study MARKS areas in areas not yet planned; and 3) examine "missing middle" housing. He further noted that the majority of lost market rate affordable housing is due to rising rent.

Mr. Douglass stated that CHPD plans to roll out the study in three phases:

- Phase 1 (with County Board consideration in December 2017): Adopting Part 1 of the Housing Conservation District study; adopting a General Land Use Plan (GLUP) amendment to establish the HCD; adopting an AHMP text amendment; and adopting a zoning ordinance amendment for townhouse development;
- Phase 2 (with County Board consideration likely in February or March of 2018): Adopting a zoning ordinance amendment for the renovation tool within HCDs; and
- Phase 3: Adopting Part 2 of the HCD study; adopting a zoning ordinance amendment for additional density via addition, infill, partial conservation/partial redevelopment and development; and piloting a tax reimbursement plan (with County Board consideration likely in June or July of 2018).

The MARKS study analyzes existing tools to preserve affordable housing. There is an awareness that the affordable housing application process needs to be less cumbersome for property owners.

Mr. Schroeder stated that many MARKS buildings are non-conforming, although several are on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) and/or eligible for National Register listing.

The MARKS study would establish a range of development options and tools permissible in the HCDs.

Mr. Douglass presented on Phase 1 of the study, which will be heard by the County Board for adoption in December. Goals for Phase 1 include: implementing the AHMP via the GLUP; retaining and renovating existing rental affordable housing; creating new affordable units; maintaining the historic character of established multi-family areas; and showing there are multiple tools available to achieve these goals.

The proposed Westover Housing Conservation District boundaries roughly correspond to the low-medium GLUP designation and zoning districts that implement multi-family housing forms.

Phase 1 of the study proposes three tiers of changes within affordable HCDs, ranging from least to greatest impact on historic buildings. Density changes in the first tier would be restricted to renovations and minor additions allowed within existing zoning requirements. Changes in the second tier could include renovations, minor additions, additions, and infill allowed beyond what is currently permitted under zoning. Changes in the third tier could include partial conservation/redevelopment and redevelopment/new construction allowed beyond what is currently zoned.

The major goal of Phase 2 is encouraging investment in, and retention of, existing housing resources while minimizing physical impacts to sites and neighborhoods.

Phase 3 would examine changes in height, density, and/or form to accommodate various stages of development within the HCDs. It would also outline a pilot tax reimbursement program to give more incentives for property owners to provide more affordable housing.

The Chairman called for any public speakers; there was only one.

Mr. Aleksandr Belinsky of Westover read a statement supporting his belief that the proposed Housing Conservation District may be in conflict with the Goals and Policy Objectives of Phase 1 of the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). Mr. Belinsky stated that in a MARKS study County Board work session held on April 4, 2017, staff neglected to include preservation of buildings listed as “Notable” on the HRI. The majority of buildings in Westover named in the MARKS study have a HRI listing of “Notable.” This inconsistency should be reconciled before the County Board takes action on phases 1 to 3 of the MARKS study.

Mr. Peck asked if the intention of allowing additions on townhomes was to make them multi-family housing and therefore increase density. Mr. Douglass responded that this was to clarify that current provisions for setbacks allow for additions without site plan approval and have nothing to do with density.

The Chairman asked for more clarity about the distinctions among “Essential,” “Important,” and “Notable” categories. Mr. Schroeder responded that Mr. Belinsky made an interesting point about the “Notable” properties that staff would need to explore further. The first two phases of the study do not present any hazard to historic preservation. Phase 3 of the study would have the biggest bearing on historic preservation policies when redevelopment is a factor.

Mr. Schroeder offered that he and Mr. Douglass could return to the HALRB for a short update in November if the Board so desired. An endorsement from the HALRB on the Phase 1 proposal is desirable.

The Chairman called for a motion to support Phase I of the MARKS proposal. Mr. Woodruff motioned that the HALRB support Phase 1, write a letter to the County Board, and ask the MARKS study team to return. Mr. Peck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously 9-0.

The Chairman said the HALRB will write a letter of support to the County Board within a week or so. The HALRB looks forward to another update next year on Phase 2 of the study.

**DISCUSSION ITEM: WASHINGTON BOULEVARD AND KIRKWOOD ROAD SPECIAL GENERAL LAND USE PLAN STUDY “PLUS”**

Mr. Anthony Fusarelli (Arlington County Planning Division) presented an update on the Washington Boulevard and Kirkwood Road Special General Land Use Plan Study “Plus” that includes the Ball Family Burial Ground Local Historic District within the study area.

Mr. Fusarelli noted that Planning staff hopes to have the authorization to advertise public hearings by the Planning Commission on November 6, 2017 and by the County Board on November 18, 2017. The hearings would consider adopting the Washington Boulevard and Kirkwood Road Special General Land Use Plan Study “Plus” and Concept Plan; associated amendments to the General Land Use Plan; and associated amendments to the Master Transportation Plan.

Mr. Fusarelli provided background information. He stated that there have recently been multiple requests for land use changes for multiple properties within this area. The study has therefore been expanded to consider principles, guidance, and other recommendation to inform and shape future development for this block. The Special General Land Use Plan Study “Plus” and Concept Plan, once adopted, will serve as established County planning policy and guidance for this area for any future requests for site plan applications and rezonings.

Mr. Fusarelli added that the plan calls for preserving the Ball Family Burial Ground and enhancing access to it off Washington Boulevard. Landscaped areas that could provide a buffer around the cemetery from future redevelopment are ideal. He showed slides of historic cemeteries in other urban areas of the U.S. that incorporate them into public park spaces.

Mr. Fusarelli anticipates the County Manager’s recommendation in November to advertise the public hearings so staff can take action to adopt the plan.

The Chairman called for comments from board members.

As the HALRB representative to the study, Ms. Steinberger commented that the Ball cemetery is in need of preservation. There is a general consensus documented in the GLUP study that people are in favor of preserving it. The site has the potential to be a public green space.

The Chairman inquired if the possibility that the cemetery actually extends beyond the demarcated boundaries has been considered.

Mr. Fusarelli responded that research for LRPC #1 showed historic plats mapped over the current boundary showed a relatively close overlay.

Ms. Ballo commented that the Ball Family Burial Ground was platted in the mid-nineteenth century to the approximate current lines, but only after decades of prior use by the Ball family. There is a possibility that there are human remains outside of this platted boundary. Staff will work closely with developers and archeologists at the state historic preservation office to ensure all due diligence is performed.

The Chairman commented that a buffer around the cemetery’s boundaries would hopefully allow for the expansion of the cemetery if remains were found.

Mr. Fusarelli commented that there are storm water utilities adjacent to the cemetery that must be considered for future redevelopment.

Ms. Steinberger added that the cemetery headstones were moved to a corner of the property in the mid-to-late-twentieth century.

Ms. Ballo stated that the Ball family still owns the burial ground, not the County. The County therefore cannot move the headstones, etc. There are no Ball family members who have come forward to claim ownership. She added that 20 years ago, Frank Ball approached the County as a representative, but not as a designated legal trustee, about acquiring the property. At that time, the County did not pursue the offer. She noted that Mr. Ball has since passed away and no other family member has come forward.

Mr. Tad Lunger, a legal representative for another matter that evening, stated that there is likely a legal mechanism to get a trustee appointed to take ownership of the Ball estate.

Mr. Laporte asked if the GLUP study considered special protections for hikers/bikers. Mr. Fusarelli replied that there is a designated bicycle route in the study, although perhaps this element could be clarified for future presentations.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the YMCA had requested to be redeveloped into office space. Mr. Fusarelli replied that the YMCA wants to continue at that location, but with a renovated facility. They also desire new residential development on the balance of their site to generate income.

The Chairman asked Mr. Fusarelli if he desired a letter of support for the Special General Land Use Plan Study “Plus.” Mr. Fusarelli responded that such a letter would be helpful to present at the November County Board meeting.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEM: COLUMBIA PIKE FORM BASED CODE UPDATE**

Mr. Matt Mattauszek (Arlington County Planning Division) presented on proposed updates to the Columbia Pike Form Based Code (FBC). The proposed changes to the FBC would not affect single family neighborhoods. Mr. Mattauszek stated that there are three primary categories of proposed changes to the FBC:

1. Better organization, intent statements, and supporting visual examples;
2. Greater simplification of standards and consistency between codes; and
3. Improved complete and discrete vertical façade compositions and building placement.

The majority of these changes to the FBC deal with building façade compositions that front public streets. The updates seek to replace the standard of using building height ratios for determining façade changes to using set distances at which façade changes must occur.

Mr. Mattauszek explained that the request to advertise will be submitted to the County Board in November and public hearings for the Planning Commission and County Board will occur in December. All previous workshops and presentations are on a dedicated project website.

The Chairman welcomed the proposed changes, which she believed would lead to better diversification of the architecture on Columbia Pike.

Ms. Ballo recognized the involvement of Mr. Dudka and Mr. Craig on the project as representatives from the HALRB.

Mr. Peck inquired if the FBC required notches between façade changes. Mr. Mattauszek responded it currently does not, but they are proposed. The proposed changes to the form based code would reduce how frequently façade compositions would need to occur.

Mr. Peck noted that only part of Patrick Henry Elementary School was subject to the FBC. Mr. Mattauszek said that Arlington Public Schools and the County Board will develop a charge for a working group in the next several weeks that will address their plan for this site.

The Chairman asked if Mr. Mattauszek would like anything more than comments from the board.

Mr. Mattauszek responded that he is seeking the support of the HALRB for the proposed amendment to the FBC or for any comments on the particular elements of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Craig stated that Columbia Pike suffers from an insufficient number of historic structures. There is not enough design direction there, either. Developers often go only with the most cost-effective method of construction. There is also a lack of review of building materials used along Columbia Pike as well. One serious flaw in the Columbia Pike form based code is that it is not frequently reviewed.

Mr. Mattauszek responded that there are challenges in implementing more frequent review. Too much review takes away from predictability and the current review process. Since development on Columbia Pike is different from other areas, such as the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor, developers seek an especially expedited process. The revisions do restrict the amount of ornamental materials such as metal paneling. There is a county architect that reviews materials before permits are issued.

Mr. Woodruff asked what the County was actually trying to achieve with these revisions to the FBC. Mr. Mattauszek responded that there are many goals the County is trying to achieve through revisions to the FBC. These include affordable housing, streetscape improvements, parks, new retail businesses, and improved architecture. More projects have been coming in for review since the FBC was implemented. He added that the resultant architecture has become more of a focus recently. The FBC may be reviewed again in the next 5-10 years. It has been thirteen years since the last review of the code, so it is certainly time for some changes.

Ms. Steinberger remarked that it is important for this review to occur sooner rather than later. Perhaps looking back over the FBC every 5-10 years is necessary.

Mr. Wenchel commented that the FBC should bring a greater diversity to the planning process.

Mr. Laporte stated that Clarendon has been an outstanding example for diverse architecture. The changes to the FBC presented here are welcomed.

Mr. Woodruff questioned how effective the FBC may actually be for improving the architecture in Arlington. Washington, D.C. seemed to attract better design than Arlington. Mr. Mattauszek responded that years ago planners realized they needed to attract developers who were concerned about risks from restrictions residents wanted to place on new construction. The FBC is a way to try to balance the need to attract development with the need to ensure it happens appropriately. The challenges Arlington faces in developing and implementing FBC are also shared in other places around the region and perhaps nation.

The Chairman called for a motion. Ms. Steinberger motioned that a letter of support be sent to the County Board for the proposal. Mr. Laporte seconded and the motion passed unanimously 9-0. The Chairman stated she would send the letter.

**DISCUSSION ITEM: MARKET COMMON CLARENDON PHASE II (SITE PLAN #339 AMENDMENT)**

Ms. Ballo summarized the Market Common Clarendon Phase II site plan project. The scope of the project includes the historic commercial building at 2836 Wilson Boulevard. The building is listed as “Essential”

on the HRI. It is commonly known as the “Engraver’s Building and was constructed in 1941. The Clarendon Sector Plan calls for preserving the façade of this building. The Iota building at 2832 Wilson Boulevard has been so altered that it is no longer considered to be an historic building. The map in the sector plan mistakenly calls out the Iota building for the same protection as the Engraver’s, but the text of the sector plan document does not. Ms. Ballo explained that it is the text that governs and not the graphics.

Ms. Ballo stated that the HALRB can recommend to the County Board whether a higher level of protection is warranted for a historic property. The Clarendon Sector Plan’s provisions for historic preservation, as well as the HRI Essential designation for the building, compel the county to bring every tool to bear on preserving this historic building. The HALRB must now consider if the provisions for preservation of the Engraver’s Building have been met, specifically if the massing, materials, fenestration and height of the new construction and the proposed alterations are compatible with the Engraver’s Building.

Matt Allman (developer with Walsh-Colucci), Ben Keeney (architect with Antunovich Associates), and Devin Corini, (owner of Regency Centers), presented their plan to amend SP #339.

Mr. Allman presented the zoning aspects of the project. The application proposes to renovate the Engraver’s Building internally and externally, as well as expand it laterally and above with additional stories to the Education Center building /Old Sears building.

Mr. Allman explained that the Market Common Clarendon site plan was approved in 1999 and amended many times since. The current plan proposes to rezone a small section of the property that includes the Iota Café space, Engraver’s Building, and service alley next to the Engraver’s to C-O-1.5, consistent with the rest of the block.

Mr. Ben Keeney presented the proposed design schemes.

Mr. Keeney explained that to allow for trucks to maneuver to a docking position behind the Engraver’s Building, the rear wall must be moved in five feet. Despite this, the design team intends to preserve an historic sign on the rear brick wall of the Engraver’s Building that reads “Conklyn’s Florist.” The design team took earlier remarks from staff and modified an earlier design for the new structure above the Engraver’s Building. They inset the massing above the Engraver’s Building to accentuate the historic building and make the new design less obtrusive. This creates a mezzanine space for outdoor use.

Ms. Ballo presented a sketch by Arlington County Architect Justin Falango that reinterpreted the proposed façade in a Streamline Moderne style found in other historic buildings in Clarendon. Mr. Keeney said he found the design intriguing, but it may perhaps be appropriate to a period slightly later than that of the Engraver’s Building.

The Chairman asked if the adjacent truck loading area would conflict with the intention of the outdoor seating space on the ground beside the wall.

Mr. Corini stated that the outdoor spaces would be used during non-loading hours. He added that a retailer would really know what to do with the side wall of the Engraver’s Building (i.e., whether or not to put windows or doors in it) and how to activate the alley space.

Mr. Craig stated that leaving the side wall intact is advisable. He noted that the outdoor mezzanine space was a great idea; however, perhaps reducing the overhang so it did not overhang over the Engraver’s Building at all would be best. He suggested that the black section to the left of the Engraver’s Building

does not seem appropriate. Mr. Falango's Streamline Moderne interpretation of the new building is not effective. Mr. Craig asked the architect if he could provide samples of materials proposed in the construction. Mr. Keeney replied they could. Mr. Craig also expressed concern that dumpsters in the rear of the property may be unpleasant near outdoor seating areas.

Mr. Wenchel said that he found the new design still too overpowering. He also found the fictitious applied sign on the Engraver's Building sketch distracting. Mr. Wenchel was supportive of using the ground level seating next to the side brick wall.

Mr. Peck remarked on the strong horizontal emphasis of the buildings in Clarendon dating between the 1930s and 1950s. He suggested that further emphasizing horizontal elements could make this project very successful.

Ms. Steinberger remarked that the mezzanine space was very useful and that the proposed large garage doors cut into the brick sidewall were unnecessary. She added that noise from the street level or alley may be a hindrance to the outdoor seating area. She recommended using the façade stone color more in the new design, as well as changing the black color on the adjacent building.

Mr. Laporte stated that he did not favor Mr. Falango's interpretation. He noted that perhaps the earlier design had been criticized as "too looming" because it was trying to repeat what is planned for the additional stories. He added that whatever goes directly above the Engraver's Building should not repeat what is happening on the upper story. Adding windows or doors to the party wall is a good idea to connect the interior and exterior spaces. This wall is utilitarian and planned to separate the Engraver's building from whatever was adjoined to it. It would not be inappropriate to place openings in it.

Mr. Zink remarked that there needs to be a connection between inside and outside and recommended puncturing the side wall.

The Chairman commented that the black colored façade to the left of the Engraver's Building may not be compatible.

Mr. Peck said that the black section to the left of the Engraver's Building in Option C appears a little too "busy."

Mr. Wenchel commented that putting some kind of skylights on the roof of the Engraver's Building would bring light into dark space. He did not recommend the installation of garage doors on the side elevation.

Ms. Ballo invited the applicants to attend the November Design Review Committee meeting before they returned to the HALRB meeting later in November. She stated that this would allow an opportunity to explore different options based on tonight's comments and to further refine the design. She said she would email the applicants a summary of the HALRB's comments.

#### **REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMAN'S COMMITTEE, STANDING COMMITTEES AND STAFF**

Mr. Liebertz stated that the Maywood Design Guidelines Committee has been formed in coordination with the Maywood Civic Association. He asked the Chairman which HALRB members had volunteered to serve on the committee. The Chairman replied that she would serve on the committee with Mr. Wenchel, Mr. Woodruff, and Ms. Solo. Mr. Liebertz stated that the meetings would be held 90 minutes before the HALRB meetings starting in November. The meeting adjourned at 11:27 PM.