

**MINUTES OF THE  
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD  
Wednesday, August 18, 2021, 5-7 PM**

*This was a virtual public meeting held through electronic communication means.*

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Aiken  
Omari Davis  
Robert Dudka  
Sarah Garner, Vice Chairwoman  
Jennie Gwin  
Carmela Hamm  
Gerald Laporte  
Joan Lawrence  
Robert Meden  
Rebecca Meyer  
Andrew Wenchel  
Richard Woodruff, Chairman

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**  
Mark Turnbull

**STAFF:** Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Planner  
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Specialist

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

The Chairman called the meeting to order. Ms. Farris called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

**EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES**

The Chairman explained the virtual Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures and stated that the virtual meeting format was necessitated as a precaution to protect the Board, staff, and community members from the spread of COVID-19. He communicated the legal authority under which the County was able to hold virtual public hearings, citing the Governor's Executive Orders, legislation adopted by the Virginia General Assembly, and the County Board's Continuity of Operations Ordinance adopted in March 2020. The Chairman then described the logistics of how the virtual meeting would proceed via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

**APPROVAL OF THE JULY 21, 2021, MEETING MINUTES**

The Chairman asked for questions or comments on the draft July meeting minutes. Mr. Dudka noted that near the top of page 5, he was quoted as agreeing that simulated divided lites were more energy efficient, but he posited that he had only said that the HALRB had approved them in the past. Ms. Bolliger agreed to make the change. Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the draft minutes as amended by Mr. Dudka and

Ms. Garner seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for further questions; upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to call the roll. The motion passed 9-0-2; Mr. Aiken and Mr. Davis abstained, and Mr. Wenchel had not yet arrived.

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)  
CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1) Ms. Grey  
2201 N. Lincoln St., CoA 21-14  
Maywood Historic District  
Request to add a new casement attic window in the side gable.
- 2) Ms. Byrnes  
3308 23<sup>rd</sup> St. N., CoA 21-18  
Maywood Historic District  
Request to replace deteriorating column bases with new wooden bases matching the column bases on the rear porch.

The Chairman called for any questions or comments on the Consent Agenda and there were none. Ms. Gwin moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Davis seconded, and the motion passed unanimously 11-0-0 (Mr. Wenchel had not yet arrived).

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)  
DISCUSSION AGENDA**

- 1) Ballston Station- Central United Methodist Church (CUMC) Site Plan Project  
4201 Fairfax Dr., CoA 21-16  
Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground Historic District  
Request to enclose the Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground to allow development of a site plan.
- 2) Ballston Station- CUMC Site Plan Project  
4201 Fairfax Dr., CoA 21-17  
Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground Historic District  
Request to remove and store the Robert Ball Sr. Family headstones.
- 3) Ballston Station- CUMC Site Plan Project  
4201 Fairfax Dr., CoA 21-18  
Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground Historic District  
Request to remove and store the existing Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground historic marker.

The Chairman invited staff to present CoAs 21-16, 21-17, and 21-18 in a single presentation for expediency as all three related to the same project.

**Discussion Agenda Item 1: 4201 Fairfax Dr.**

Ms. Farris introduced the site plan project at 4201 Fairfax Drive in Ballston whose development would include changes to the landscape surrounding the Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground Local Historic District (LHD). Ms. Farris explained that the items being presented by the applicants were part of a larger

redevelopment project (Site Plan #443) that involved the demolition of the existing church building for a new eight-story residential building with church space, childcare and preschool space, and mixed income housing. She explained that the creation of the LHD occurred simultaneously with the approval of the site plan in February 2017, where the LHD was designated as a specific 502 square feet of the burial ground. She followed that the larger site plan project would also involve the restoration of a Tiffany stained glass window from the demolished Abbey Mausoleum, which will have a new home in the new church space.

Ms. Farris explained that the applicants, Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH), along with their partners, were requesting approval to reduce the burial ground to its approved 2017 dimensions and install fencing and a gate around the LHD perimeter. She described the project details as follows: They sought to install a cast-in-place concrete wall with a stone veneer around the burial ground along the north, east, and south perimeter of the LHD. The applicants would use the existing 1950s stone wall along Fairfax Drive for the stone veneer of the new perimeter wall. Resting on top of the new perimeter wall would be a cast iron ornamental fence. The applicants were proposing a gate along the north wall to allow for maintenance and access by County inspectors and Ball family descendants. Lastly, they proposed to install interpretive signage on the north side of the wall near the northeast corner. This interpretive signage would detail the history of the burial ground and the Ball family in Ballston but would be reviewed by the HALRB later prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the church.

Ms. Farris stated that the Design Review Committee (DRC) considered this CoA at its August 4, 2021, virtual meeting. The DRC recommended the applicants provide accurate architectural renderings of the burial ground with the proposed wall and gate, along with simplified architectural specification sheets for details on the wall's construction, measurements, and placement. The DRC placed the proposed project on the discussion agenda for the August 18, 2021, HALRB hearing.

Ms. Farris said staff recommended approval of CoA 21-16, as the reduction of the burial ground followed the approximate square footage approved by the County Board in 2017. She noted the proposed fencing followed the design guidelines by placing the cast-iron fencing on top of the perimeter wall to avoid disturbing any below-ground features. She said the proposed metal pickets would provide public visibility of the gravestones from outside the fence, along with a gate to allow access; there would be no major ground disturbance during installation of the fence. She stated the proposed location of the interpretive signage on the north side of the perimeter wall would avoid blocking pedestrian flow on the sidewalk and main views of the burial ground.

Ms. Farris explained that CoA 21-17 included the removal of the six known gravestones and markers located in the LHD. She introduced Worcester Eisenbrandt Inc. (WEI), as the historic building restoration contractor hired to remove and store the gravestones and markers during construction. She said WEI proposed to photo document the conditions and locations of the stones by utilizing GPS coordinates and measurements, while performing shallow probes to locate any existing stone fragments. She noted that each of the grave markers would be stored in plywood crates and braced using wood and ethafoam to prevent movement during transport. Ms. Farris said the contractors would not use any heavy mechanical equipment to do the task but would rely on hand tools for digging around the grave markers. She said two to three people would lift the stones and place them in the pre-made crates, which would be secured, labeled, and moved to a remote location and stored outside. She explained the contractors would place a protective layer of insulation over the grave area, apply plywood, and secure everything to remain in place during construction. Ms. Farris explained that for further protection, WEI would install temporary fencing around the perimeter as well as “no trespassing” signs. She said WEI would return the stones in their identical locations at a later date.

Ms. Farris stated that the DRC also heard this case at its August 4 virtual meeting, where staff requested more information about WEI. The DRC placed the proposed project on the discussion agenda for the August 18 HALRB hearing.

Ms. Farris recommended approval of CoA 21-17, citing WEI's extensive experience working with historic cemeteries and other projects involving historic masonry restoration.

Lastly, Ms. Farris introduced CoA 21-18, which was the request to remove the Arlington County-owned historic marker sign and post located at the southeast corner of the project site just outside of the LHD boundary. She noted that again the applicants would use WEI's professional expertise. She described the removal steps:

- WEI would photo document the existing conditions of the sign, install scaffolding around the sign high enough to lay a beam and chainfall, wrap the sign in a moving blanket, and secure it using chainfall or a hoist chain.
- The sign would be lifted out of the ground and lowered onto a pallet padded with insulation, and then secured with plastic banding strap before being transported to a remote location and stored outside.
- WEI could either remove the sign and post via hand digging or cutting the post closely to the footing if there is a concrete footer, or discard the existing pole and reinstall a new pole in-kind. Eventually, the relocation of the historic marker would need to be determined by the HALRB and the Department of Environmental Services during construction and prior to the issuance of Occupancy permits in 2023.

Ms. Farris stated that the DRC heard this case at its August 4 virtual meeting, where staff requested more information about WEI. The DRC then placed this item on the discussion agenda for the August 18 HALRB hearing.

Ms. Farris recommended approval of CoA 21-18, as WEI had extensive experience providing appropriate care to remove the historic marker, including using photo documentation, adequate equipment, and storing the marker in a secure location.

The Chairman invited the applicants to speak. Mr. Scott Shatrowsky thanked the commission for their time and invited any questions. The Chairman invited the only public speaker, Mr. Bernard Berne. Mr. Berne explained he had been told by the applicant that the public would be allowed inside the burial ground using the gate, but the staff report stated that only Ball family members and maintenance/inspection staff would be allowed gate access to the burials. He then inquired about the future location of the historic marker believing he had read some language about the re-installation be on the site or an 'adjacent site', as he believed that the marker should remain on that side of the road.

Mr. Shatrowsky said they would work with staff to reinstall the marker near the site. He explained that the site plan language had been very specific about only allowing Ball family members to access the burial ground. The Chairman asked about the content of the historic marker. Ms. Farris replied that it mentioned the Ball family but focused on the entire Ballston area. She noted that the project proposal includes two markers- [a new] one about the burial ground and family which would be affixed to the graveyard's fencing, and the original Ballston County historic marker whose eventual relocation on the property site was yet to be determined.

Mr. Dudka stated the applicants had provided the information requested by the DRC which more thoroughly explained the treatment of the graveyard. He said the DRC also discussed placing the historic sign closer to the corner to garner more attention and bring more passers-by to the cemetery. Mr. Dudka noted it would be helpful to see more specific boundaries of the LHD. Ms. Farris said there was a map of

the minimum boundary and Ms. Bolliger described the location of the GPS coordinates of the boundary in the LHD nomination form. Mr. Shatrowsky explained that the drawings did not match the T shape of the LHD in the 2017 site plan documents because the new plan includes more of the grass landscape than the minimum requirement.

Mr. Laporte asked about an additional gravestone which had been housed elsewhere and recommended it be included in the restoration plan. Ms. Farris reassured Mr. Laporte that she already had the stone in her office and would ensure that it would be returned to the burial ground.

Ms. Lawrence commended the applicants for their respectful treatment of the graveyard, as well as retaining more of the landscape than the minimum site plan requirements as the HALRB had preferred a larger space around the burial ground when it was designated.

Ms. Meyer pointed out that there were two different renderings of the burial ground online and asked for clarification as to which one was final. Ms. Farris responded that the rendering with six stones and the marker on the north side of the fence was the final version.

Mr. Davis asked if there was any value to keeping the existing signpost for the historic marker. Ms. Farris replied that it was not secure and needed to be replaced. Mr. Davis recommended that the retention of the pole be removed from any motion. The Chairman asked for confirmation that the applicants would return to the HALRB to discuss the new location of the marker; staff confirmed this was correct.

Mr. Meden asked about the lighting for the burial ground as the visible lighting on the building did not appear to light the graveyard at night. Mr. Shatrowsky noted he was unsure if there was downlighting for the graveyard but explained that security was very important to the developers and there would be cameras on this space 24/7. Ms. Farris said that since the burial ground would jut into the sidewalk, it would likely also be covered by street lighting.

The Chairman asked for ideas on how to ensure that the project would encompass the correct GPS boundary. Mr. Shatrowsky offered to ensure that WEI would use the GPS coordinates to confirm the burial ground boundary when doing the work. Ms. Gwin asked to confirm that the language used was not ‘architectural drawings’ but ‘overall construction documents’ and ‘foundation and structural documents.’ The Chairman checked for final questions and made the following motion for CoA 21-16:

I move that the HALRB approve the Central United Methodist Church Site Plan Project CoA 21-16 to construct a new enclosure around the Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground in accordance with the development site plan, provided that the foundational drawings related to the structure overall indicate that the proposed burial ground location conforms to the boundaries of the existing historic district boundary.

Ms. Gwin seconded the motion. The Chairman asked Ms. Farris to read the roll. The motion passed unanimously, 12-0-0 (Mr. Wenchel arrived at 6 pm during the discussion).

The Chairman made a motion for CoAs 21-17 and 21-18 en bloc:

I move that the HALRB approve en bloc the Central United Methodist Church Site Plan Project CoAs 21-17 and 21-18, to approve the removal and storage of the Robert Ball Sr. Family headstones in accordance with the protections indicated in the site plan, and provided that the headstones will be returned intact to their current respective locations; and further to approve the removal and storage of the existing Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground historic marker,

provided the marker and new pole will be reinstalled at a time and location to be determined by the appropriate Arlington County authorities.

Ms. Hamm seconded the motion. The Chairman asked Ms. Farris to read the roll. The motion passed unanimously, 12-0-0. The Chairman thanked the applicants for their time.

**Preliminary Public Hearing Item: 6404 Washington Boulevard, Fellows-McGrath House Local Historic District Designation Request**

Ms. Farris explained that the request for consideration of the Fellows-McGrath House as a LHD was initiated on July 1, 2021 when an Arlington resident filed an application form with the Zoning Office. As per the application form, she noted that staff has 45 days upon receipt of an application to review it and determine that it has been sufficiently completed. Ms. Farris said staff made that determination for this application on July 22, 2021. As per Section 11.3.4.A.3 of the County Zoning Ordinance, she stated staff was required to notify the property owner within 30 days of deeming the application complete that an application had been filed. Ms. Farris said staff notified the property owner [via letter] on July 23, 2021; however, since that time, staff had not received any communications from the owner or the owner's representative regarding the designation and next steps.

Ms. Farris recounted some of the building's history as presented in the application form but noted that staff had not yet been able to conduct its own research to validate this information.

Ms. Farris explained that the HALRB had four main considerations:

- 1) To consider the merits of the application based on the information provided in the application form.
- 2) To consider any public testimony received.
- 3) To determine if the property potentially met at least 2 of the 11 designation criteria outlined in §11.3.4.A.6 of the County's Zoning Ordinance.
- 4) Lastly, based on the information and testimony received, the HALRB must decide if the proposed request should continue through the designation process.

Ms. Farris followed that if the HALRB determined that the designation process should continue, then staff would need to be directed to complete additional studies to evaluate the site's historical, architectural, and/or cultural significance. She said this determination would add the request to staff's existing queue of designation requests to be completed. She then noted the additional steps in the designation process:

- The HALRB would need to hold a second public hearing in the future to review the staff findings and determine whether to send the request forward to the County Board.
- If the HALRB determined that the designation request should not continue, then specific reasoning would need to be provided. This determination would end the designation process immediately and staff would not undertake any additional study.

There were two public speakers and the Chairman invited them to present.

Speaker 1: Marlys McGrath

Previous owner Marlys McGrath explained that she and her husband had bought the house in 1977 and undertaken a seven-year renovation. She ran the house as a bed and breakfast and gave it the name Memory House. She described many interior features salvaged from other historic buildings and restored from the original home. Ms. McGrath also noted the many house tours the property was featured in and

discussed the archaeological discoveries she had found. She reiterated that the house was worthy of preserving and had many merits.

Speaker 2: Laura Holgate

Neighbor Laura Holgate explained that she lived in the next-door house which had been built on the land that had been subdivided from the property in 1991. She spoke to the great care that previous owner Pamela Jones had taken to preserve the house and landscaping and described the benefit the entire neighborhood enjoyed thanks to the beautiful home and yard. She strongly supported the application and voiced her support and the neighbors' support for the retention of the historic house. She then yielded the last minute of her time to Ms. McGrath who further described her preservation efforts including the protection of the chestnut tree.

The Chairman put the matter to the board and asked the members to consider if the property met two of the eleven criteria required for designation [as stated in the Zoning Ordinance]. Ms. Lawrence stated she thought it was clear that the property met more than two criteria and asked for the current status of the house. Ms. Bolliger replied that the County already had received permit applications for sewer cap off and land disturbing activity. Ms. Holgate interjected that she had received legal notices for additional work and asked to share the information. She explained she had received a legal notification from the owner that they planned to subdivide the lot diagonally and build two single-family residences.

Ms. Garner stated she believed at least four of the criteria were met and thus would support moving forward with research for designation. Ms. Gwin, Mr. Dudka, Mr. Aiken, Ms. Meyer, Ms. Hamm, and Mr. Wenchel agreed they would support further study. Mr. Davis asked for the eleven criteria, which Ms. Bolliger shared.

The Chairman associated himself with the comments of support made by other commissioners. Ms. Lawrence asked whether the designation could be expedited since demolition plans were already in the works. Ms. Farris replied that staff would need to apply to County leadership for permission to expedite it within their work plan. Ms. Lawrence asked if the project could be completed by-right; Ms. Farris responded that she believed that it was.

The Chairman asked if the deadline on the study could be expedited by the HALRB's motion. Ms. Farris explained that by September, staff could certainly let the HALRB know how quickly it could be expedited. The Chairman stated he believed, based on the situation, that the commission would need to be informed more quickly than a month, and suggested putting the request in the motion. Mr. Dudka, Ms. Hamm, and Mr. Laporte supported that statement. Ms. Gwin offered her help in the research and the Chairman emphasized that any [member] could offer their research services to help staff with the deadline.

Ms. Farris thanked the commission for its enthusiasm and reminded those present that she could not promise an expedited research process and would need to confer with County leadership. Ms. Lawrence recommended that the members of the public in attendance send letters to the County Board to reiterate the importance of this project to supplement the HALRB's decision and to reiterate to the County Board the importance of historic properties in Arlington and their rapid loss to development. Ms. Lawrence recommended organizing neighbors to write to the County Board, County Manager's Office and maybe the media to rouse attention.

Mr. Dudka stated he understood staff's inability to expedite the process without County direction but believed it was possible to write a motion which highlighted the urgency and requested staff to work as quickly as possible, to which staff could return with information from County leadership. The Chairman

agreed that while the decision about designation would ultimately be made by County leadership, it was the HALRB’s role to “push the envelope” on preservation matters.

The Chairman made the following finding and motion with regards to the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO):

Whereas the HALRB has received an application submitted pursuant to, and conforming with, ACZO Section 11.3.4.A.1 for historic district designation of the property located at 6404 Washington Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

Whereas the HALRB has reason to believe the property shall meet at least two of the qualifying criteria enumerated in ACZO Section 11.3.4.A.6.

Be it resolved that the HALRB, pursuant to its authority under ACZO Section 11.3.4.A.2, directs county staff to undertake further study of the property located at 6404 Washington Boulevard, and to report back within 1 month with a recommendation as to whether the property meets the historic designation requirements enumerated in ACZO Section 11.3.4.A.6.

Mr. Dudka seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to read the roll. The motion passed unanimously 12-0-0.

#### **WASHINGTON-LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL HISTORIC MARKER REVIEW**

Ms. Bolliger displayed the most recently edited PDF of the proposed marker and explained that she had asked members for edits in advance of the meeting so Ms. Hamm and Mr. Peck could consider them. Ms. Hamm began reading the suggested edits and her response to each comment. The Chairman suggested instead that the commission approve the marker with the understanding that staff, board members, and applicants could make further technical edits after approval. Ms. Lawrence thanked Mr. Peck and Ms. Hamm for their work and stated she believed it was important to respect the spirit of the original group. The Chairman agreed with the comments and commended Ms. Hamm and Mr. Peck.

The Chairman moved as follows:

I move that the HALRB approve the W-L Marker as presented with the proviso that HALRB members, county staff, and the applicants may make additional clarifying and technical changes if they are agreed to by all the parties.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chairman asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to read the roll. The motion passed unanimously 12-0-0. The Chairman thanked Ms. Hamm again for taking on this project and for all her community work.

#### **MEMORIAL PLAQUE REVIEW: LARRY FINCH**

Ms. Bolliger introduced Ms. Diane Probus of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to outline the project. Ms. Probus introduced Ms. Anne Wilson of the Donaldson Run Civic Association and Ms. Sarah Meservey of the Friends of Arlington Parks to join her presentation. Ms. Probus described the proposed plaque with a 4”x6” photo of Mr. Finch and the language:

1933-2020

In Memory of Larry Finch  
Good Friend and Neighbor

With appreciation for his advocacy of Arlington’s parks and green spaces.  
His sustained commitment improved these areas for all people to enjoy.



Plaque dedicated in 2022.

Ms. Probus explained that the plaque would be installed at the entrance to Zachary Taylor Nature Area at Donaldson Run Park near a swamp oak which was dedicated in his name in 2014. Ms. Probus stated how Mr. Finch’s contributions fulfilled the commemoration requirements for Arlington County. Ms. Wilson and Ms. Meservey shared their personal experiences working with Mr. Finch and how his contributions made him worthy of a memorial plaque.

The Chairman thanked the speakers for their testimony. He made a motion as follows:

I move that the HALRB approve the memorial plaque for Larry Finch to be placed at Donaldson Run Park as presented.

Mr. Davis seconded the motion. Ms. Lawrence thanked the speakers and stated her support for the plaque. The Chairman thanked the speakers for being good friends both to the parks and to Mr. Finch. The Chairman asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Farris to read the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0-0 (Mr. Dudka had left the meeting).

## **REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMAN AND STAFF**

### **Staff and Other Reports**

The Chairman stated that the Virginia legislation had decided that commissions would need to begin meeting in person in September, which, per the HALRB member poll, would begin at 6:30 PM moving forward. Ms. Bolliger explained that per COVID-19 health and safety requirements, the County meeting spaces would have seating restrictions and therefore room changes might be needed. She said allowances would permit all commissioners to be in one space, while speakers might need to cycle into the room to present or present from an adjacent room via the room cameras and speakers. Ms. Bolliger explained that meetings would continue to be livestreamed and applicants and public speakers would have the option to sign up to speak virtually or in person.

Ms. Farris updated the commission on the Clarendon Sector Plan Update. Ms. Lawrence explained that recent discussions included massing, density, and the future of Joyce Motors.

The Chairman thanked the commissioners for their time and urged them to volunteer to research the LHD application property.

Ms. Lawrence noted there was a house for sale in Maywood, a Sears home, which had been advertised as a ‘tear down’ and voiced concern about the future of the property. Ms. Bolliger explained she had spoken to the realtor about the LHD status and design review process and hoped that the real estate listing would be updated promptly.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:31 PM.