



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, April 18, 2018
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Lobby Rooms Cherry and Dogwood**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charles Craig
Sarah Garner
Carmela Hamm
Gerry Laporte
Sara Steinberger
Mark Turnbull

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Joan Lawrence, Chairman
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Vice Chairman

STAFF: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Coordinator
John Liebertz, Historic Preservation Planner
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Specialist
Kyle Fisher, Historic Preservation Management Intern

ROLL CALL & CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Craig, acting Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:33 PM. Mr. Liebertz called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 4, 2018, MEETING MINUTES

The Chairman called for any changes to the April 4, 2018, draft meeting minutes. There were no changes. Ms. Garner moved to approve the draft minutes and Ms. Steinberger seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0-2, with Mr. Turnbull and Ms. Hamm abstaining.

CALL FOR PUBLIC SPEAKERS AND EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chairman called for any public speakers and explained the procedures for public hearings.

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

The Chairman stated there were two items on the Consent Agenda:

1. Alexander Berger & Amber Blaha
3424 21st Avenue North
CoA 18-05 (HP1800011)
Maywood Historic District
Request to install flagstone pathways, landings, and other minor landscape alterations.
2. Anne Braghetta & Tim Huson
2101 North Kenmore Street
CoA 18-06 (HP1800012)
Maywood Historic District
Request to remove a non-historic brick chimney from the rear slope of the roof and restore the eave and cornice of the shed dormer.

The Chairman called for any questions or comments on the consent agenda items. There were none.

Mr. Turnbull moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Ms. Steinberger seconded and the motion passed unanimously 6-0-0.

The Chairman stated there were no Administrative CoAs.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

The Chairman stated there was one CoA on the Discussion Agenda:

1. Tom & Chrissi Gelson
2314 North Kenmore Street
CoA 18-03 (HP1800002)
Maywood Historic District
Request to make the following alterations: 1) demolish and replace the front porch; 2) change the fenestration pattern of the dwelling; 3) remove the asbestos shingle siding; 4) add a shed roof dormer; 5) construct a one-story rear addition with an exposed basement and deck; and 6) other modifications to the house and property.

Mr. Liebertz provided the staff report. He reminded the board that it had voted to treat the house as a non-contributing resource to the Maywood Historic District. Mr. Liebertz reviewed the proposed changes to the house, which included: 1) select demolition; 2) removal of the existing asbestos shingles; 3) relocation of windows; 4) replacement of windows; 5) replacement of the roof; 6) infill of one of the front elevation doors; 7) construction of a full-width porch on the front elevation; 8) construction of a shed roof dormer; and 9) construction of a one-story addition and deck on the rear elevation. Staff recommended approval of the application on the condition

that the applicants return to the Design Review Committee (DRC) for a final review of changes to specific details.

Mr. Gelson said he hoped the final revisions to the proposed changes could occur by May 2 in time for the next DRC meeting.

Mr. Craig gave the DRC report, stating that the DRC had requested more detailed plans from the applicants. If they continue to refine the plans following the DRC's guidance, a final CoA could likely be granted on May 2.

Mr. Liebertz reviewed staff's specific comments on the most recent application. He stated that on page A3, the window sizes need to align with the front elevation.

Mr. Gelson said the architect plans to keep the specified window size, but they would correct the façade wall openings so they aligned with the actual window dimensions.

Mr. Liebertz then specified the following changes:

- The window dimensions need to match the frame details.
- Regarding the varying trim specifications on page A6, the trim sizes should be 8 inches on the gable ends, dormer sides and rear elevation. The trim on the exterior of the sunroom should be reduced to 8 inches.
- Page A8 is missing dormer trim sizes.
- Page A12 requires more information about the vented soffit, including the material and design. Specifications for the front porch roof also should be described on this page. The ridge cap specified in figure #6 is too large.
- The façade windows will be enlarged, as discussed at the previous DRC meeting.

Mr. Laporte inquired whether there was a zoning issue with the porch.

Mr. Liebertz said staff is asking the HALRB to request that the Zoning Administrator grant a setback modification. He stated that the front porch extends approximately two-thirds the width of the front elevation, but the proposal calls for it to be a full-width porch. Zoning setbacks specify that front yard setbacks are required to be at least 25 feet, with front porches permitted to encroach four feet closer to the street, for a setback of 21 feet. The porch has an existing setback of approximately 15 feet, 9 inches. The Arlington County Zoning Ordinance allows the HALRB to direct the Zoning Administrator to grant a setback modification if it finds that the setback would be consistent with the existing streetscape and historic district design guidelines. Based on the design of other houses in the district and the proposed changes, the proposed design would be inappropriate to the existing streetscape and the design guidelines if the porch was not extended. Therefore, HPP staff recommends approval of the request.

Mr. Laporte said he found a lack of evidence in the staff report for requesting a setback modification from the Zoning Administrator. He asked about the setbacks of the adjacent houses.

Mr. Liebertz responded that staff had not conducted a setback study of the surrounding properties. Staff found a setback modification appropriate based on the *Maywood Design*

Guidelines and that the existing porch sets the standard for an appropriate setback from the street.

Ms. Steinberger asked if the variance of the porch extension would be equal to the variance that already exists from the front porch to the street. Mr. Liebertz replied that it would be equal.

Mr. Laporte stated there was no information presented in the staff report about the existing streetscape by which one could compare the proposed setback to surrounding setbacks.

Mr. Liebertz said that the current setback is indicative of the existing streetscape.

The Chairman said that the applicant is only seeking to extend a portion of the existing porch, which already has the proposed setback.

Mr. Laporte said that the applicant [and not the HALRB] should ask the Zoning Administrator for a setback modification, because he found there was no rationale for granting the setback modification based on the existing streetscape.

Ms. Steinberger said she found it appropriate for the board to ask the Zoning Administrator for a setback modification given that the HALRB was not proposing changing the streetscape by changing the house's proximity to the street.

Mr. Laporte reiterated that a lack of information presented about the existing streetscape or the proposed setback modification's consistency with the historic district guidelines prevented him from concurring with staff's request.

Mr. Liebertz replied that the proposed extension of the front porch is consistent with the architectural style, massing, and materials of the rest of the house, which is consistent with the Colonial Revival design that meets the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. He also pointed to the map on the cover page of the staff report that showed the surrounding streetscape and placement of the dwelling in relation to the street.

Upon reviewing the map, Mr. Laporte concluded there was enough evidence to allow the board to request a setback modification.

The Chairman made a motion to approve the application with the condition that any outstanding design elements, specifications, and/or other minor issues are reviewed and given final approval by the DRC at its May 2 meeting or a subsequent meeting. The Chairman also included in the motion a request that the Zoning Administrator grant a setback modification for the small front porch extension. Ms. Steinberger made a friendly amendment to clarify that the design elements to return to the DRC include trim, windows, soffit, and roof details. The Chairman accepted her amendment. Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion and it passed unanimously 6-0-0.

DISCUSSION ITEM: 2825 WILSON BOULEVARD (HISTORIC PRESERVATION EASEMENT)

James Lalli, an architect with Core States Group, on behalf of Chase Bank, presented a proposal for 2825 Wilson Boulevard [former Walgreens building], including changes to windows, openings, and signage. Chase Bank plans to occupy a portion of the building; the use of the rest of the space is currently undetermined. Mr. Lalli summarized the project:

- The landscape will be updated with indigenous, non-invasive, low-growing plant species.
- Three infilled openings on the east elevation will be reopened.
- There are no major changes proposed for the north or west elevations.
- Blue fabric awnings on the south (front) and east elevations are preferred.
- On the south elevation, the non-historic metal canopy above the entry will be removed.
- The bank’s signage (“CHASE” with the blue octagon logo) will be installed under the cornice and on the vertical tower element. These signs will be illuminated internally with white LED lights, and the tower sign will have white LEDs to illuminate the decorative glass block on the tower.
- The brick monument sign at the corner of Clarendon Boulevard and North Edgewood Street will have non-illuminated acrylic lettering with the blue octagon logo. These letters will be illuminated at night from a ground lighting source.
- The applicant prefers the lettering for the tower sign to be tilted 90 degrees with the logo at the top (referred to as “option 2” in the plans). The alternative, preferred by the DRC at the April meeting, is to display each letter below the other, moving down the tower, with the logo at the bottom (referred to as “option 1” in the plans).
- The entire building will be cleaned and painted white.

Mr. Liebertz explained that the HALRB is reviewing this proposal as part of a Historic Preservation Easement on the property (recorded in 2012) required by the Penzance site plan. The HALRB’s is required to provide comments to the County Manager who approves alterations to the building. This project first came to the April DRC meeting. Most of that discussion focused on the tower signage and the knee wall sign. Mr. Liebertz stated that the previous tenant had lettering arranged in the vertical tower. One of the DRC’s concerns was that the proposed tower sign does not have enough letters to make option 2 appropriate.

Mr. Liebertz offered comments provided by Mr. Dudka, DRC Chairman, who could not attend the HALRB meeting. Mr. Dudka preferred option 1 for the tower sign. One alternative would be to write “CHASE BANK” in the style of option 2 to occupy more space on the tower, although this may not be consistent with Chase Bank’s branding. Mr. Dudka also preferred removing the entry canopy.

Ms. Steinberger asked about the construction date of the entry canopy. Mr. Liebertz replied there is a gap in the permit records, but it was likely constructed in the late twentieth century. Mr. Laporte said he believed it was constructed sometime after 1987.

Ms. Steinberger said she preferred option 2 for the tower sign, although she had concerns with the resulting white space on the tower. She asked if Chase Bank would consider it appropriate to place a logo on either end of the lettering.

Mr. Lalli replied that he did not think Chase Bank would find that appropriate. He suggested as an alternative to center the lettering on the tower to reduce the white space between the lettering and the bottom of the tower.

Ms. Liccese-Torres and Ms. Steinberger agreed that might be an appropriate compromise.

Ms. Steinberger also asked if it would be possible to use LED lights only along the portions of the glass block above and below the lettering.

Mr. Liebertz said that that solution might make the LED lights on the bottom half of the tower appear non-functioning. Ms. Steinberger agreed, and added she would like to see a rendering with Mr. Lalli's suggestion of centered lettering.

Mr. Laporte said he preferred option 2 as well. He said the Chase's font style/branding was not suitable for the vertical lettering.

Mr. Liebertz said that option 1 is in keeping with mid-20th century design. Option 1 would therefore be more historically appropriate.

Ms. Bolliger asked if it would be appropriate to leave additional space on the tower for an additional tenant's signage.

The Chairman said that the HALRB would review signage requests for any additional tenants in the future.

Regarding future sign review, Mr. Liebertz reminded the HALRB that applications involving signage for easement properties only require staff review; staff in this case is seeking the board's input.

Ms. Steinberger said this proposal reminded her of a prior example of a 7-11 store on Wilson Boulevard in Clarendon, which decided to use a design similar to option 1 although it was different than the company's typical branding.

Ms. Steinberger asked for confirmation that the proposed openings on the east elevation would be historically appropriate. Mr. Liebertz replied that the applicant would be reopening spaces that existed originally.

Mr. Laporte said that the historic photograph of the building provided by the applicant shows the entrance with a narrower door and no window next to it. He asked if the applicant considered returning to this entrance design. Mr. Lalli replied that they had not considered it as it is unlikely that the client will want a smaller entry.

Ms. Liccese-Torres said that a smaller entry may not be ADA accessible.

Mr. Laporte asked if the applicant planned to keep the charging stations for electric vehicles in the parking lot. Mr. Lalli replied no and that it had been demolished. The client had concerns about the stations being a hindrance to parking and/or customers navigating the parking lot.

Mr. Liebertz asked the applicant to: 1) inform staff when the contractor demolishes the metal canopy above the entry so staff could visit the site to inspect for historic features behind the canopy; and 2) retain any historic features found behind the canopy.

Mr. Liebertz also specified that the length of the “pan” used to conceal the electric cables on the tower should extend the full height of the tower sign.

The Chairman made a motion to approve the application on the conditions that:

- The entry canopy is removed in HP staff’s presence; and
- The “Drive Up Banking” sign is removed from the sign package.

The board also recommended support for reopening the infilled window openings on the east elevation. The board further recommended a design for the tower sign with historically sensitive use of letters.

Ms. Garner asked if Chase would be amenable to removing the blue octagon logo. Mr. Lalli replied he did not think so. Mr. Lalli said the design team could provide more options for the design of the tower sign. The board said they would welcome seeing those options.

Mr. Laporte made a motion that the HALRB write a letter supporting the proposal with the above-named conditions and providing a recommendation regarding the design of the tower sign. Ms. Steinberger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 6-0-0.

HISTORIC MARKER REVIEW: NAUCK TOWN SQUARE INTERPRETIVE PANELS

Ms. Liccese-Torres presented the draft proofs for the Nauck Town Square interpretive panels. She informed the board that the content is still being finalized, although there have been several rounds of edits so far. These signs will replace the five existing banners in the Nauck Town Square. Staff is requesting feedback on the proposed marker content. While the majority of the content matches the existing banners, changes have been made to some of the images and information. She asked the HALRB to begin editing the panels and be able to provide detailed feedback at the next HALRB hearing. Mr. Liebertz said the discrepancies in the font on the “Origins of Nauck” marker will be corrected. Ms. Liccese-Torres commented that the images also will be reorganized on the “Origins of Nauck” panel.

Ms. Garner asked if the County had design standards for the markers. Mr. Liebertz replied no and explained that staff attempts to customize the design to each site. Ms. Liccese-Torres said the only standard element of the panel-type signs is the inclusion of the County logo. Panel sizes are typically 24 x 36 inches.

Mr. Laporte said he preferred adding more traditional aluminum pole historic markers in the future. Ms. Liccese-Torres responded that staff prefers tabletop markers because the style is more conducive for images and larger quantities of text. The tabletop markers also are considerably less expensive.

Ms. Liccese-Torres said the Nauck markers will be displayed in a prominent location in the Town Square in a “trail” connecting the square to the Drew School.

Ms. Hamm asked if there is a standard pole height for the aluminum markers, and if there is ever a situation where the two different types of markers have been combined.

Mr. Liebertz responded that there are both types of markers at Ft. Ethan Allen, as well as at the Blue Goose site.

Ms. Liccese-Torres said the aluminum marker poles are normally buried three feet underground.

Ms. Hamm said she found the aluminum pole marker for the Hall’s Hill Wall difficult to see. Mr. Liebertz explained there were a lot of underground utilities that had to be avoided in that area, so the marker was put at the most feasible location.

Ms. Steinberger said she preferred the inclusion of historic photographs and the combination of text and images on the tabletop markers. It may be appropriate in some situations to have both types of markers.

Mr. Craig said it is often the case that tabletop markers are added next to older aluminum pole signs. In some more urban locations, however, there is only space for the pole signs.

Ms. Garner said the County could benefit from having more uniform historic marker design standards.

Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the board members to provide their editorial comments on the Nauck markers at the next HALRB hearing on May 16.

HISTORIC MARKER REVIEW: JOHN MARSHALL ISLAND

Mr. Fisher presented the draft of an historic marker for John Marshall Island. He explained that this historic marker is part of the Williamsburg community’s Park Enhancement Grant application that the County Board approved in December 2012. The marker will be part of a larger project, coordinated by the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), to improve John Marshall Island.

Mr. Fisher said that a 2015 archeology report undertaken prior to a storm drainage improvement on the island presented evidence of an historic springhead. Further research provided evidence of a springhouse on or near the island that was demolished sometime before the property was subdivided in the 1940s. Through the DPR, which is heading the project, Historic Preservation staff presented a draft of the marker to community leaders, including the Williamsburg Civic

Association, for their comments. Community feedback focused on the color of the sign and marker pedestal, as well as content. Community members thought that the dark colors – blue for the sign and black for the pedestal – would blend appropriately with the surroundings. One community member asked why the marker focused on members of the Minor family instead of Minor Hill. Staff responded that because community members had asked for an historic marker on John Marshall Island, the marker content focused on the history most relevant to that location.

Mr. Laporte said that the name “John Marshall Island” was confusing. He suggested specifying in the text that the marker refers to a traffic island.

Mr. Liebertz said that “John Marshall Island” is the name that the community has used.

Mr. Laporte said an online article referred to the location as “Minor’s Hill.” He added that the marker should discuss the Civil War significance of Minor’s Hill.

Mr. Fisher responded that staff did not want to duplicate information already on the existing marker at Minor’s Hill. Staff, therefore, chose to focus as much as possible on the history of the immediate vicinity while referencing the fact that the land was at one time owned by the Minor family, who first settled at Minor’s Hill. The individuals requesting the marker will likely visit it most frequently.

Ms. Garner said she also found the name confusing.

Mr. Fisher said that this name had been chosen because it is the term that the community uses. Another possibility could be calling the location “John Marshall Park,” since the land was originally platted as a park. However, the land is not an official Arlington County park, so this title would also be confusing.

Ms. Bolliger suggested putting “John Marshall Island” in quotations to convey the meaning that it is a locally-derived term.

Mr. Liebertz said he agreed with Mr. Laporte’s suggestion to use the term “traffic island.”

Ms. Steinberger said that if the community prefers “John Marshall Island,” it should be called that; using this term, however, may seem to diminish the historical importance of the location.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked for other questions or comments on the marker. There were none. She asked if the board wanted to review the marker again after the revisions. The Chairman replied it would not be necessary.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMAN, STANDING COMMITTEES, AND STAFF

Chairman’s Report: The Chairman had no report.

Committee Reports:

Site Plan/Development Review: Market Commons and Red Cross site plan updates

Mr. Liebertz said the Market Commons project is moving very quickly. The preservation easement for the Engraver’s Building will likely be completed in the next 60-90 days. Staff will apprise the board when it is finalized.

The Red Cross site plan will go before the County Board on April 21. A preservation easement for the Whitefield Commons complex is now part of the proposal. The proposed multi-family apartment building will now drop one story in height and will be completely affordable housing.

Staff and Other Reports:

WWI Task Force update; Fire Station 8 Heritage Working Group updates

Ms. Steinberger reported on her attendance at the Arlington County Commissions meeting on April 2 sponsored by the County Board. The meeting focused on improving participation on commissions, training for commissions, and civic engagement. The County Board is seeking leaders for summer 2018 inter-commission discussions regarding community partnerships. The County will handle recruitment and publicity.

Ms. Steinberger also reported on the World War I Commemoration Task Force activities. The Task Force has a full schedule through November 11, 2018. In partnership with MVAC, the Task Force is organizing a speaker panel on the history and treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), with particular attention to advances made as a result of World War I. The event will take place the evening of May 24 at the John Lyon Post in Arlington. The Task Force will be supporting a Valor Run in partnership with Team Red, White and Blue, a veterans’ organization that brings the civilian and military communities together through running. The run is scheduled for May 20 in Norfolk, Virginia, but a “virtual run” that would allow people to run in Arlington is being planned. A World War I/World War II artifact bus will come to the Arlington County Fair in August. Ms. Steinberger also announced that the Task Force has won a \$2,000 grant from the U.S. World War I Centennial Commission to install interpretive signage at the Clarendon War Memorial.

Staff and Other Reports:

Mr. Laporte mentioned that he attended the Planning Commission meeting on April 9 on behalf of the HALRB. He commented on the HALRB’s opposition to the local designation fees being proposed as part of the FY19 budget cycle. He also said that the SPRC Chair commended the HALRB for its recent efforts on the Red Cross site plan proposal, particularly in regards to refinements of the architectural design.

Ms. Liccese-Torres provided an update on the proposed fees for the nomination of new local historic districts. She reported that the Planning Commission voted 5-2 against the adoption of the fees. The County Board will convene to review the proposed FY19 budget on April 19, and will take formal action on the budget package on April 21. Any policy changes to the budget will take effect at the start of the new fiscal year on July 1.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM.