



DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE MAYWOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES COMMITTEE

MEETING #2

**Wednesday, January 17, 2018
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood**

MAYWOOD MEMBERS: Dean Arkema
Bart Collart
Amanda Davis, MCA President
Lorne Epstein
Heidi Fitzharris
Ken Friedli
Sean Handerhan
Heather Hanson
Frieda Kulish
Kris McMenamin
Rae Mueller
Carol Rickard-Brideau
Bruce Wiljanen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Alex Berger
Chris Friedli
Maria Greene
Eleanor Harvey
Kris McLaughlin
Andy McLeod

HALRB MEMBERS: Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Sarah Garner
Andrew Wenchel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Richard Woodruff, Vice Chairman

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

INTRODUCTIONS AND PURPOSE

Ms. Lawrence, Chairman of the Maywood Design Guidelines Committee (MGC), called the meeting to order.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if there were any corrections to the November 15, 2017, meeting minutes. There were none.

Ms. Lawrence asked members to introduce themselves.

[6:01 PM: Heidi Fitzharris arrived].

REVIEW OF DRAFT CHANGES TO MAYWOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Liebertz presented the proposed revisions to the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness (ACoA) section of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* created by the HPP staff after the November 15, 2017, MGC meeting. He stated that the section would start with a basic outline and stipulate that the HPP staff will have 1-3 business days to review ACoA applications. Mr. Liebertz added that staff can forward any application to the HALRB if they believe it requires a more public review process.

Mr. Liebertz noted that all sections of the entire *Maywood Design Guidelines* would be reformatted. Although the first half of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* will not be addressed by the committee in this phase, that portion will be reformatted as well for the sake of consistency and readability.

Mr. Liebertz first reviewed existing ACoA requirements for picket fences. He explained there are currently only three types of picket fences stipulated in the current guidelines, but staff approves a range of similar designs. Mr. Liebertz added that the proposed guidelines simply offer additional guidance to property owners about the types of pickets that would be eligible for an ACoA.

Mr. Liebertz then addressed “privacy fencing.” He stated that the current guidelines are inconsistent. The existing guidelines stipulate that fence height should coordinate with the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO); however, the guidelines allow for a maximum height of 6’ for privacy fencing and the ACZO allows for 7’ privacy fencing. Mr. Liebertz stated that the HPP staff’s policy over the years has been to allow 7’ privacy fencing only when the fence has a 1’-lattice top. The revised guidelines explain and illustrate this policy.

Ms. Rickard-Brideau asked if the presented pyramidal post cap was the only that would be allowed. Mr. Liebertz responded that the proposed guidelines also allow for other similar designs. Mr. Wiljanen commented that he had seen metal post caps on wood fences in Maywood.

Ms. Ballo asked if the committee was interested in putting metal post caps for wood fences through the ACoA process. The committee replied yes.

Ms. Davis asked if the removal of fencing currently required an ACoA. Mr. Liebertz replied that it does. Ms. Davis asked to eliminate any requirement that the removal of fencing must be reviewed through the ACoA or CoA process. The MGC and HPP staff agreed.

Mr. Liebertz discussed the proposed requirements for “retaining walls.” He noted that walls under 3’ in height can go through the ACoA process if they are constructed of concrete, brick, or stone. He added that the proposed guidelines prohibit use of creosote-soaked railroad ties.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the ACoA process for timber retaining walls would apply only to certain locations. Any timber retaining walls located towards the front of the property of an interior lot or on the street-facing side of a corner lot would require a CoA.

Mr. Liebertz stated that any retaining walls less than one foot in height would not require a CoA or ACoA, but noted there were stipulations prohibiting terracing of 1’-tall retaining walls without design review.

[6:06 PM: Sean Handerhan arrived].

Mr. Wiljanen asked if free-standing stones are considered retaining walls. Mr. Liebertz stated he would have to check with Zoning to see how they would treat a large stone that functions as a retaining wall. He stated that anything over three feet that is used to hold back the earth is considered a retaining wall and requires a zoning permit. Mr. Wiljanen stated that he has seen examples of large stones serving as retaining walls that did not require a permit.

Ms. Ballo asked if the MGC would like staff to investigate cases when large boulders are used as retaining walls. The committee responded they were not interested in staff investigating.

Ms. Rickard-Brideau asked if staff would note in the “retaining walls” section of the proposed guidelines that the examples depicted are not meant to indicate required methods of construction. Staff responded they would.

Ms. Kulish asked if a resident would be able to replace an existing timber retaining wall with the same material without going through the review process. Mr. Liebertz responded that the guidelines generally allow for the in-kind replacement of materials without review. As long as the wall would be made of the same materials, dimensions, and location, there would be no need for design review.

Mr. Liebertz reviewed the proposed specifications for “driveways and parking pads.” Staff recommends a maximum width of ten feet for a driveway that is detached from the house and a maximum of eleven feet wide when the driveway abuts the house.

[6:09 PM: Lorne Epstein arrived].

Ms. Davis noted that the “Typical Scenario #5” and “Typical Scenario #6” on pages 5-35 and 5-36, respectively, should read “Driveway must be 10’ wide or less.” Mr. Liebertz noted this and said the diagrams would be reworded accordingly.

Ms. Kulish asked if circular or curved driveways (discussed on page 5-33) were entirely prohibited. Ms. Lawrence responded that circular or curved driveways may be permitted, but would need a CoA from the HALRB.

Mr. Arkema noted that the proposed guidelines depicted driveways that were set back from the left side of the property line, and asked if such a setback was required. Ms. Ballo and Mr. Liebertz responded that this was simply for illustrative purposes and that there are no required setbacks for driveways.

Mr. Handerhan asked if driveways could also be replaced in kind without review. Mr. Liebertz responded they could.

Mr. Liebertz discussed “driveway materials.” He noted that brick, crushed stone, and concrete pavers would be considered through the ACoA process. Concrete pavers must be designed to mimic the appearance of brick.

Mr. Handerhan asked why concrete pavers must look like brick. Mr. Liebertz responded that staff reviewed a variety of concrete pavers and that too many were inappropriate for the historic district. To still allow the material by means of the ACoA process, staff selected concrete pavers similar in appearance to brick as it is an appropriate design/material.

Ms. Kulish asked if exposed aggregate concrete would be considered under the ACoA process. Mr. Liebertz responded that the use of exposed aggregate concrete would be added.

Mr. Liebertz reviewed the “patios and walkways” section. The HPP staff proposed that walkways be a maximum of 30” wide and patios be less than 200 square feet to be considered under the ACoA process. Mr. Liebertz added that both patios and walkways must be in the rear half of the property for an ACoA. He discussed the rationale for limiting walkways to the rear half of the property. He noted a recent HALRB case where the board decided an applicant must locate their front walkway from their front porch directly to the sidewalk, in keeping with historic precedent in Maywood. Therefore, he recommended that the CoA process apply to any patios or walkways in front of houses.

In light of the recent HALRB decision Mr. Liebertz mentioned, Ms. Davis asked if there is a uniform standard for determining where walkways can be placed. Mr. Liebertz responded that a

walkway in any location could be considered, but it may have to go through the CoA rather than ACoA process.

Ms. Ballo added that the above-mentioned HALRB case was a design decision. She stated that in some cases, like the one mentioned, staff cannot write enough specificity into the administrative guidelines to approve a request.

Ms. Fitzharris asked why walkway dimensions were limited to 30-inches rather than 36-inches wide. Mr. Liebertz stated he had looked at average walkway dimensions and staff would not object to increasing the width to 36 inches.

Ms. Kulish asked if permeable (i.e., dry laid) walkways were permitted under the ACoA process. Mr. Liebertz said he would add permeable surfaces under “Materials for New Patios and Walkways” on page 5-39. Ms. Kulish recommended staff look at decomposed granite as a walkway material.

Ms. Mueller asked if walkway materials could be replaced with any of the listed materials under the ACoA process. Mr. Liebertz responded that any existing walkway could be replaced with a material listed in this section by means of an ACoA. He noted that the guidelines will be revised to ensure clarity.

Mr. Wiljanen asked if the same would be true for driveways. Mr. Liebertz responded affirmatively, and stated that he also would add similar language to the driveway section.

[6:28 PM: Bart Collart arrived].

Mr. Liebertz asked for additional questions about the “patios and walkways” section.

Mr. Wiljanen asked how staff arrived at the 200-square foot requirement for new patios and walkways.

Mr. Liebertz replied that staff reviewed designs the HALRB had approved to arrive at an approximate average size and discussed what size of patio should require a more public review process.

Ms. Mueller remarked that it would be helpful to specify what new materials may be approved under the ACoA process in the “replacement of patios or walkways” section of page 5-39. Mr. Liebertz agreed.

Mr. Liebertz introduced the section describing requirements for the “installation of stairs and/or railings” in association with paths and walkways (page 5-40). The committee had no comments.

Mr. Liebertz introduced the categories on page 5-41. He stated that A/C condensers, heat pumps, and generators must be located on the rear half of the building. He added that the language describing requirements for “large trees” has been updated to better reflect the Arlington County Tree Replacement Policy. Mr. Liebertz stated that the requirements for satellite dishes are taken nearly verbatim from previous guidelines.

Ms. Davis noted that Figure X on page 5-41 incorrectly refers to a “yellow shaded area.” It should say “blue shaded area.” Mr. Liebertz noted the change.

Mr. Handerhan asked if the installation of satellite dishes should actually require an ACoA. Mr. Liebertz replied that the requirement for an ACoA was appropriate. The requirement prevents them from being placed in clearly inappropriate locations, such as a front porch. Ms. Lawrence noted this had been the policy because of cases where satellite dishes were improperly placed.

Ms. Ballo noted that satellite dish installations used to be more common, but that the request is now infrequent. She added that the review process may be changed or removed in the future if newer technology makes satellite dishes obsolete.

Ms. Davis and Ms. Rickard-Brideau asked if the guidelines could be changed to permit satellite dish installations by-right. If a property owner desired to install a satellite dish in a manner different from what the guidelines specified, then an ACoA should be required. Mr. Liebertz noted the request and would further study the idea.

Mr. Liebertz called for additional comments or questions on the proposed revisions. There were none. Mr. Liebertz said staff would amend the proposed draft in accordance with the committee's feedback at this meeting and present a new draft at the next MGC meeting.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked the committee if they had had enough time to review the current draft of the guidelines prior to tonight's meeting.

The committee responded that they would like to have future drafts sooner to have more time to review. Ms. Davis asked if it would be possible to have both the guidelines draft and the meeting minutes two weeks after each meeting.

Mr. Liebertz replied he could potentially send members the revised guidelines two weeks prior to each meeting, but the minutes could be provided two weeks after each meeting.

IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL ACoAs

Mr. Liebertz shifted the discussion towards the introduction of additional site elements to be studied by the MGC. He stated that the agenda called for a discussion of sheds, firepits, fountains, and garages.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the HPP staff recommends that sheds be less than 100 square feet to be considered under the ACoA process. He added that sheds with gable, hipped, and shed roofs would be appropriate in the historic district. Similar to new construction, synthetic materials like cementitious siding and cellular polyvinyl chloride trim would be considered; however, wood windows and doors may still be required.

Mr. Wiljanen asked if sheds above 100 square feet would therefore require a CoA. Mr. Liebertz replied yes.

Mr. Liebertz stated that he asked Zoning staff for guidance on the definition of sheds. He explained that regardless of materials or foundation, all sheds must follow appropriate setbacks.

Mr. Wiljanen asked if structures like playhouses and doghouses were included in these zoning requirements.

Mr. Liebertz said he had only discussed sheds with Zoning staff. He agreed to follow up with Zoning to discuss structures like playhouses and doghouses.

Ms. Davis said she had read the zoning law about two months ago and interpreted the ordinance differently. She believed that the ACZO distinguished between temporary and permanent structures.

Mr. Liebertz responded that he would follow up with Zoning to get more specifics about the law.

Mr. Wiljanen asked Mr. Liebertz to point the committee to certain pieces of information regarding sheds, playhouses, etc. within the zoning code. Mr. Liebertz agreed to do so.

Ms. Davis offered to email a copy of the zoning code to all committee members.

Mr. Collart asked if the committee could discuss how to apprise new Maywood residents of the requirements in the Maywood Historic District.

Ms. Davis said the next Community Association meeting is currently scheduled for early February and that this topic would be best discussed there. There also used to be a neighborhood welcoming committee that would inform new residents of requirements like those in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Lawrence said there used to be greater outreach to new residents in Maywood. She noted that a number of Maywood residents have come to the HALRB and said they were unaware of the Design Guidelines.

[6:38 PM: Rebecca Ballo left].

Ms. Fitzharris asked if sheds less than 100 square feet should actually require an ACoA.

Mr. Liebertz replied that such a requirement would prevent after-the-fact shed installations that the HALRB may require the property owners to remove.

Ms. Fitzharris asked if staff and/or the HALRB had regularly required property owners to remove sheds.

Mr. Liebertz replied that there have been cases where property owners were required to remove a shed. There was a case in 2017, as well as a number of outstanding cases still under review.

Ms. Fitzharris said she recalled a pre-fabricated shed that was installed in Maywood in the early 2000s that was not reviewed at all by Arlington County. Mr. Wiljanen said he also recalled this example.

Mr. Collart inquired whether play structures would ever be prohibited.

Mr. Liebertz stated that the guidelines currently allow for play structures.

Ms. Fitzharris asked if regulating small structures like sheds, playhouses, etc. was consistent with the mission of preserving the historic homes in Maywood.

Mr. Liebertz replied that the mission of the local historic district overlay and the HALRB is to preserve the character of local historic districts in their entirety. The *Maywood Design Guidelines* are based on the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Although municipalities vary in how they treat sheds, Arlington County consistently has examined cases of shed installations as CoAs at least since the current version of the guidelines was approved in 2005. He added that the purpose of the MGC is primarily to discuss moving items from CoA review to ACoA review.

Mr. Handerhan discussed the relationship of the size of the shed to the review process and recommended retention of guidelines for sheds as it supports the objective of the historic district overlay. Mr. Liebertz asked the committee if they want to consider raising the limit of 100 square feet for sheds. Mr. Arkema requested additional time to consider this so as to ask other residents about their preference about the square footage limit for sheds regulated by the ACoA process.

Ms. Davis said she had noted some Maywood residents had small (approximately 2-foot by 3-foot) plastic storage containers used for tools and the like.

Mr. Liebertz informed the committee that setback violations are zoning violations. He added that there are specific requirements for setbacks of accessory buildings/structures. Mr. Liebertz said he would follow up with Zoning about setback requirements and discuss this information in more detail at the next MGC meeting.

Ms. McMenamain said that the committee needs clarity on what a “shed” is. Mr. Liebertz agreed and would provide more information at the next meeting.

Mr. Handerhan noted that the committee was trying to make it easier for sheds to be installed by shifting the approval process from CoA to ACoA. Ms. Davis added that the MGC needs additional information regarding the definition of a shed. She stated that a Maywood property owner installed a plastic shed and was asked to remove it for violating the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Liebertz reiterated that he would follow up with Zoning to provide the MGC more information about specific regulations for sheds.

Ms. Fitzharris asked if the guidelines could be amended to discuss pre-fabricated and site-built sheds.

Mr. Liebertz replied that pre-fabricated sheds could be approved under the ACoA process, but would still have to meet the requirements for design, materials, etc. Many pre-fabricated sheds from typical hardware stores like Home Depot would fail to meet the requirements, but there are examples from other businesses that would be considered appropriate.

Ms. Fitzharris said households had been fined over inappropriate sheds, so more clarity was necessary on what a “shed” is. Mr. Liebertz agreed and stated that he would consult Zoning for further clarification.

Mr. Liebertz next discussed outdoor firepits and chimneys. He stated that staff recommended that all outdoor chimneys be no larger than 6’ tall to be considered under the ACoA process. In addition, any outdoor chimneys requiring gas lines would require a CoA.

Ms. Davis said she had installed a small stone firepit several years ago after staff gave permission with no review process.

Mr. Wiljanen asked if the circular patio surrounding a firepit depicted in one of the photograph examples would be subject to regulations for patios and firepits.

Mr. Liebertz replied that it would be a patio and a firepit. An applicant constructing a firepit and a patio like the ones depicted in the photograph should note both projects on a single application form.

Mr. Liebertz asked the committee if the 6’-height limit for outdoor chimneys was acceptable. The committee agreed that the examples shown should be reviewed as part of the ACoA process.

Mr. Liebertz then reviewed requirements for fountains and ponds. Staff recommended applications for these elements remain part of the CoA process given their more unique nature. The committee agreed.

Lastly, Mr. Liebertz reviewed requirements for garages. Staff recommended that all garages remain subject to a CoA. He stated that the unique design/site-specific elements of garages should be open to a more public review process. In addition, only the HALRB (not HPP staff) can direct the Zoning Administrator to modify setback requirements. Therefore, the HALRB could allow for better placement of garages than HPP staff. Mr. Liebertz asked the committee for initial feedback on garages.

Ms. Fitzharris stated that garages could be subject to certain architectural, material, and placement guidelines. Mr. Liebertz replied that while the HPP staff does not necessarily recommend moving garages to an ACoA process, materials were prepared to discuss what potential ACoAs for garages would entail.

Mr. Liebertz suggested that any ACoAs for garages be limited to one-car garages no greater than 12’-wide and 18’-deep. Ms. Fitzharris said garages could be 13’ feet wide by 20’ feet deep.

Ms. Lawrence said there are required zoning setbacks from lot lines for garages. She reminded the MGC that exceptions for setbacks must go through the HALRB review process. The HALRB could direct the Zoning Administrator to allow a variation from a setback in certain cases.

[7:05 PM: Carol Rickard-Brideau left].

Ms. Fitzharris recommended that standard-sized garages be considered through the ACoA process.

Mr. Collart said perhaps the staff and committee should focus on requirements for sheds before discussing garages.

Ms. Fitzharris stated she found an ACoA process acceptable for sheds, although she wanted to raise the question of whether an ACoA should be required at all.

Mr. Wiljanen said the line between sheds being allowed by-right vs. an ACoA would have to be established in the future.

Ms. Lawrence asked the committee for further questions.

Ms. McMenamain asked what the committee would consider during the next meeting.

Mr. Liebertz responded that the committee would review the proposed guidelines for sheds, firepits/chimneys, and garages. If time allowed, the committee then would move onto any remaining site elements and then exterior alterations (e.g., solar panels).

Mr. Liebertz informed the committee that the entire guidelines review process will likely require at least one additional meeting (at least 4 to 5 total). The HPP staff realized while creating the first draft for tonight's discussion that the entire guidelines would need to be reformatted to increase readability of the document. The review of the completed revised document, as well any revisions to the existing CoA/ACoA application form, would require an additional meeting as well.

Mr. Handerhan asked if meeting every other month was necessary to give staff time to make changes. Ms. Liccese-Torres replied that it was, as well as to give the committee ample time to review the proposed changes.

Ms. McMenamain asked for the new guidelines to have a summary of changes. This would make review easier. Staff agreed to add a summary of changes to the new document.

Ms. Lawrence asked for feedback on the new format/design of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. The Committee supported the design and stated they appeared easier to read.

Ms. Fitzharris asked who approved the 2005 amendments to the guidelines.

Mr. Liebertz responded that the HALRB amended the guidelines in coordination with the neighborhood, but in 2011, the County Board approved them along with all other County design guidelines when the Zoning Ordinance was updated.

Ms. Lawrence thanked everyone for attending. The next MGC meeting will be on March 21.

The meeting adjourned at 7:09 PM.