



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
Neighborhood Services Division
Bozman Government Center 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND
LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, March 20, 2024, 6:30 PM**

This was a hybrid public meeting held both in person and through electronic communication means.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Omari Davis, Chair
Nan Dreher
Andrew Fackler
Alex Foster
Gray Handley
Gerald Laporte
Rebecca Meyer
Kaydee Myers, Vice Chair
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Dick Woodruff

VIRTUAL MEMBERS: Carmela Hamm (Medical, Henrico, VA)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Joan Lawrence

STAFF PRESENT: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Section Supervisor
Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Principal Planner
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. Mr. Davis described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 2024 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft February 21, 2024, meeting minutes. Upon hearing none, Mr. Handley moved to approve the February minutes and Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 8-0-2, with Ms. Foster and Mr. Turnball abstaining; Ms. Meyer and Ms. Myers had not yet arrived.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

Consent Agenda

There was one CoA item on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Woodruff proposed to approve the Consent Agenda and Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 10-0; Ms. Meyer and Ms. Myers had not yet arrived.

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 21-15A, 4201 Fairfax Drive, Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground Local Historic District (LHD)

Ms. Tawney familiarized the HALRB with the location of the Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground (Burial Ground) by pointing it out on an aerial map during the meeting. Ms. Tawney then provided the project background:

The Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground is located at 4201 Fairfax Drive in the Ballston neighborhood and commercial area. The burial ground is situated east of the new mixed-use development called Unity Homes at the former location of the Central United Methodist Church (CUMC). The burial ground contains the gravestones of members of the Ball family.

In 2016, the Ballston Station Housing Corporation proposed the redevelopment of the 1923 church on site for the construction of an eight-story residential building that would incorporate a new church, an on-site childcare and preschool, a mixed income housing component, and below grade parking for residential and church uses. The County Board approved both the site plan and the LHD in February 2017. Construction of the new building is now complete.

In August 2021, the HALRB approved CoA 21-15 to reduce the size of the burial ground, install a cast-in-place concrete wall with a stone veneer topped by a cast iron ornamental fence, and install an interpretive marker about the burial ground. The current proposal is an amendment to this CoA. The applicant proposes to decrease a portion of the existing cast iron ornamental fence on top of the boundary wall located on the north side of the LHD to install the new historic marker. The historic marker would be installed at a 45-degree angle to allow for readability. The size of the area in which the fence would be reduced would measure 3' wide by 1' 6" tall. A horizontal cast iron rail would be installed under the marker for added stability.

The DRC considered this application at its March 6, 2024, [hybrid] meeting. There were no comments or questions, and the DRC placed this item on the HALRB's Consent Agenda.

The Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff recommends approval of this application as submitted. The proposed work would be a minor change from what was previously approved and installed by the applicant; the fence would simply have a segment removed and the remaining fence would stay in place which conforms with the burial ground's design guidelines. The proposed work would not adversely affect the character-defining features of the burial ground and it would improve the pedestrian experience with the LHD since it would make the [interpretive] marker more accessible.

Ms. Tawney invited the applicants, Mr. Scott Shatrowsky of KCM Builders and Mr. Ryan Nash of the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH), to provide further comment about the project, but they had not yet joined the meeting virtually.

Ms. Tawney then asked Mr. Davis to provide the DRC report. He stated the DRC did not see the fence change as significant to what was originally submitted. By placing it on an angle, he explained how the DRC felt the marker would be more readable to visitors, allow visitors to see into the burial ground, and prevent the marker from encroaching into the actual burial ground.

Ms. Tawney mentioned that Dr. Bernie Berne had submitted a public comment to the HALRB on March 20, 2024. Dr. Berne was the only public speaker for this item, and he reiterated some of his written comments; his submitted public comment for the record is as follows:

The applicant is planning to install the new historic marker within the fence on the north side of the historic site. However, this is the wrong side of the fence. Few people will see the marker unless they are walking south on N. Stafford Street. The HALRB should therefore ensure that the applicant place the marker within the fence on the south side of the historic site. The marker will then face the sidewalk on the north side of Fairfax Drive. Many people walking on Fairfax Drive will then see the marker. Some may stop to read the marker. In addition, the applicant needs to present its plans for the re-installation of the County's "Ballston" historic marker. The applicant should install that marker in a location that is near the new historic marker, on the south side of the historic site. People walking on Fairfax Drive will then see both markers and may read both.

The item was now with the Board. Mr. Wenchel stated the HALRB has reviewed this project multiple times over the years and had already discussed that the north side of the fence was the best location for the new historic marker because it would have less vehicle traffic and be less prone to possible damage. He noted that the only change was to the fence and that the project should proceed as proposed. Dr. Berne interrupted the HALRB discussion to state his thoughts on the likelihood of a vehicle hitting the marker. Mr. Davis brought the discussion back to the HALRB. Mr. Turnbull proceeded with his statement, which was to approve the project as is and that he was very proud of the project as a Ballston resident. He did question if the applicant needed to return to the HALRB for a CoA concerning the relocation of the [County's] Ballston aluminum historic marker.

Ms. Farris explained the aluminum historic marker is not part of this discussion but noted that when the HALRB reviewed this portion of the project in August 2021, the motion directed the HPP staff to assist the applicant with determining the best location for the aluminum marker. She said that because the new location of the aluminum marker would be outside the LHD, the HALRB would no longer need to review this aspect of the project and that it could be completed administratively. Ms. Farris said the HPP staff was working with the applicant on the proposed location of the aluminum marker but that it would be in a location similar to where it was previously on the project site (along the sidewalk closest to Fairfax Drive). Mr. Laporte commented that the HALRB has discussed the location of markers in the past, regardless if they are LHDs or not, but he was unsure where the HALRB had this authority. He did not agree that its location was out of their purview to make recommendations of marker locations, and that it should be open to HALRB discussion.

Mr. Handley made a clarifying statement that there are two markers the HALRB is discussing but only one on the discussion agenda; this one will be installed on one of the three sides of the fence, and its location was reviewed [by the HALRB] in August 2021. Concerning the aluminum marker, Mr. Handley stated that it is a County marker to be placed outside the LHD boundaries, but that he agreed the HALRB

could discuss it but not require it to have a CoA. Mr. Laporte stated that the HALRB did previously discuss the location, but he did not know if a resolution was passed. Ms. Farris clarified and reiterated that the HALRB passed a motion in August 2021 for the HPP staff to work with the applicant to find a new location for the aluminum marker.

Mr. Handley mentioned he had visited the project site and made positive comments about the restoration of the Tiffany window and the stained-glass windows from the original church (visible on the Fairfax Drive side). He said he hoped the congregation is happy with the results. He thought that the burial ground was handled appropriately in relation to the new construction and although it is apparent that the public cannot go directly to the grave markers to read the inscriptions, he felt the fence was necessary to provide protection. Mr. Handley thought the HALRB made good decisions on the project.

At that time, Mr. Nash of APAH joined the discussion. He said the project team followed the County's plan concerning the proposed location of the [subject] historic marker on the fence and keeping that placement will complement views of the Burial Ground and the Tiffany window. Mr. Davis was ready to make a motion but was interrupted by Dr. Berne, who stated the HALRB never discussed the location of the historic marker. Mr. Davis replied that the HALRB made motions on both the location of the historic marker and the approach to the aluminum marker in August 2021. Mr. Davis proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-15A at 4201 Fairfax Drive in the Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground as submitted to allow for the angled installation of the new tabletop historic marker.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Turnbull. Upon hearing no further comments or questions, the Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 11-0 (Ms. Meyers had arrived at 6:40 pm).

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 24-08, 3110 Washington Boulevard, Arlington Post Office

Ms. Tawney provided the project background:

In 2003, the U.S. Postal Service, along with Keating Development Company, applied for a site plan project to upgrade and expand the Arlington Post Office (which became a LHD in 1984) and construct an office addition over top and at the rear of the post office as well as the Dan Kain Building (which became a LHD in 1988). As part of the site plan project, the Dan Kain Building and the Arlington Post Office were connected via an infill commercial space at 3110 Washington Boulevard. This infill commercial space is the location of the subject application. Although this commercial space is closer to the Dan Kain Building, it is technically within the boundary of the Arlington Post Office LHD. Between May 2003 and November 2004, the HALRB reviewed and approved CoA 03-02 which outlined the details of this site plan development. The commercial space was built in 2007.

In April 2008, the occupants of the commercial space at 3110 Washington Boulevard were found not in compliance with the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance because they had installed a sign for the business Clarendon Valet without a CoA. The new commercial space between the Arlington Post Office and the Dan Kain Building had not been properly tagged in the County's permitting system as a LHD and as such, the permit for the sign had been issued without review by either the HPP staff or the HALRB. Additionally, the developers of the commercial space did not inform the

buyer, nor were they required by state law, that the building was situated in the LHD. Given these circumstances, the HALRB retroactively approved the sign as installed in July 2009.

In August 2008, the HALRB approved CoA 07-11A for the installation of the awnings, light fixtures, and new door pulls/hardware at 3110 Washington Boulevard. In November 2008, amendments were made to the front entrance via CoA 07-11B. Between 2021 and part of 2023, there was a new occupant of the building, Effective Wellness. This business installed a sign without a CoA or a signage permit from the County per the records available to the HPP staff. The installation of the sign also was not noted during the HPP's inspections. With the recent change of occupancy, the sign has been removed; however, the HPP staff felt it important to note so the HALRB has the full context.

The current proposal is for the installation of a new sign on the façade of the business, The Beauty Clarendon, located at 3110 Washington Boulevard. The sign would have channel lettering and would not be illuminated. The sign, which would be centered above the entryway, would measure 75 inches wide by 30 inches tall; individual lettering would measure between 5 inches and 12 inches in height. The all-white sign would be installed with ¼ inch anchor masonry screws (roughly 2 to 3 anchors per letter) into the façade; neither pre-existing holes nor masonry joints would be used due to needing to position the sign correctly.

The DRC considered this application at its March 6, 2024, [hybrid] meeting. The DRC felt that the sign was not intrusive or flashy, but asked for more information about how it would be installed. They also expressed that a metal finish would be stylistically more appropriate for the casing of the sign since it would complement the sign for Lyon Hall, the neighboring restaurant in the Dan Kain LHD. The DRC felt that if this change was made, the item could be placed on the Consent Agenda.

Following the DRC meeting, the HPP staff spoke with the applicant who had been unable to attend the DRC meeting; the applicant clarified that the entire sign would be white and that the casing around the sign was not black as presented in the initial submission. The applicant stated a desire to bring the project forward without changing the casing to silver. It was for this reason that the item was placed on the HALRB's Discussion Agenda.

The HPP staff recommends approval of the subject application. The size and lettering of the proposed signage would not overwhelm the façade of the building, nor would it detract from the historic nature of the LHD. Additionally, the individual lettering would not exceed 12 inches in height as recommended by the Guidelines for Signage in the Arlington Post Office and Dan Kain Building Historic Districts. The wording of the sign will be limited to the business name, which also is appropriate per the guidelines. Since the sign would not be electric, no additional or new openings would be made for electric connections; however, new openings would be made to anchor the sign per the current proposal. The HPP staff understands that the proper positioning of the sign necessitates new anchor points. Given that the façade is not historic, the HPP staff is less concerned about the creation of new, minor penetrations on the façade, but still encourages the applicant to use mortar joints or pre-existing openings from previous signage when possible. Finally, the proposed project is an alteration which could easily be removed without an adverse effect to the property

which conforms with Standard #10 of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Tawney invited the applicant to speak but they were not in attendance. The item was now with the Board. Ms. Foster asked if the HALRB had jurisdiction over this property since it was not historic. Ms. Tawney replied that the HALRB has purview to offer guidance on signage; this had been discussed at the [March] DRC meeting at which the members determined the HALRB should provide guidance on the signage. Mr. Handley asked about the material on the façade. Ms. Tawney replied it was a concrete material; Mr. Laporte stated it could be limestone.

Mr. Davis provided the DRC summary, stating the DRC had no issues with the sign other than it would be more compatible with the LHD if it had a silver casing similar to the Dan Kain sign. He said the DRC felt the sign's size, font design, and placement on the building were appropriate, but that it would be better in a silver or chrome case.

Mr. Woodruff asked the HPP staff if the provided project images accurately portrayed how the sign would look on the building; staff gave confirmation. He then asked staff to explain how this was a historic building with a historic façade. Both Mr. Davis and Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that it was an infill building, in-between two historic buildings. Mr. Woodruff also asked if it was part of the LHD and Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that the address was all part of the LHD. Mr. Laporte recalled the discussion when the HALRB reviewed the site plan project and that because the infill building was in-between two [designated] buildings, the HALRB wanted to make sure that whatever would be constructed there would reflect the historic character of the [adjacent] LHDs. Mr. Woodruff asked why the building was not considered historic. Ms. Tawney restated that the infill building was built in 2007 and explained that the Dan Kain and the Arlington Post Office buildings became LHDs in the 1980s. She said back in 2007, there was a site plan project at this site, which involved construction of the infill building. Ms. Tawney reiterated that because the infill building was inside the LHD boundary, it was within the HALRB's jurisdiction to review the signage.

Mr. Laporte asked again about the design proposal for the signage. Ms. Tawney summarized that the sign will be white boxed letters with a white case; though the renderings are showing like there is black in the sign, that is only to make the letters stand out more. Mr. Wenchel explained that at the DRC meeting, they recommended that the sign case be silver to have it stand out more and be compatible to the silver details on the adjacent historic buildings. Ms. Lawrence stated that if the signage was to match the Dan Kain building, it should be illuminated. Ms. Tawney said the neon signage at the Lyon Hall restaurant is not historic, having been installed in 2009 or 2010 after approval by the HALRB. She then further described the Lyon Hall signage.

Ms. Foster went over the signage proposal, stating that although the Lyon Hall signage is neon and was approved by the HALRB, and although the proposal before them did not have illumination, she felt that the [proposed] sign's proportions are in character with the adjacent historic buildings. She asked if the applicant was agreeable to not preventing punctures into the façade material, and before staff could answer, Mr. Laporte added that the proposed signage should be in silver because it is more in character with the adjacent Dan Kain building and its Art-Moderne style. He said he believed the HALRB should recommend the sign be in silver. He also stated that it would be better if the signage was back-lit, recognizing that would be more expensive for the applicant but more typical of the Art-Moderne style. Ms. Foster repeated her question about the material of the signage, and Ms. Tawney replied it would have an acrylic face.

Ms. Dreher stated she understood that the HALRB can explain its views on the best design for an effective sign but did not think the Board could refuse to approve the sign because it was too subtle of a

design. She said the fact that the Lyon Hall restaurant got to choose the design of its sign has set precedence. Ms. Myers agreed, saying the proposed sign was an improvement over what had been there before. She said if the business wants the proposed design, she thought it was appropriate. Ms. Tawney reiterated this statement by confirming that the proposed sign follows the design guidelines.

Mr. Handley supported the sign but agreed with Mr. Laporte and other commissioners about this being a missed opportunity to not have an Art-Moderne styled sign similar to the adjacent historic buildings. He said he thought it was up to the business to decide and felt the proposed sign would be an improvement from the previous signage at this location. Mr. Laporte clarified that the first sign had been retroactively approved by the HALRB and the second sign was never approved. The Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 24-08 at 3110 Washington Boulevard in the Arlington Post Office Historic District for the request to install new commercial signage, as submitted, because the size, content, and placement of the sign are appropriate per the *Guidelines for Signage in the Arlington Post Office and Dan Kain Building Historic Districts*.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Upon hearing no further comments or questions, the Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 11-0.

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #3: CoA 24-07, 3511 22nd Street N., Maywood Historic District

Ms. Tawney provided the project background:

The house at 3511 22nd Street N. in the Maywood LHD is a pre-1923 contributing dwelling. In October 2004, the HALRB approved CoA 04-26 for the installation of new main and secondary roofs on the house. The project included the installation of metal shingles on the main roof and the installation of standing-seam metal on the secondary roofs. In December 2013, the HALRB approved CoA 13-11 for the removal of the front porch and sunroom and the construction of a new front porch and one-story side addition. This project was amended three times between 2013 and 2014 with small revisions.

The applicant is proposing to install multiple (a total of 23) solar panels on the main and secondary roofs of the house. The proposal includes the placement of 12 solar panels on the western gable of the main roof; six on the eastern gable of the main roof; two on the south-facing gable of the cross-gable section of the roof; and three on the roof of the front porch (south elevation). The proposed placement allows for maximum solar production. The solar panels will have silver framing to match the roof color. Each solar panel would measure 44.65 inches wide by 67.8 inches tall, and the height between the roof surface and the face of the panel would be 6 inches. The solar meter will replace the current utility meter on the west elevation of the house and an alternate current (ac) disconnect, which would allow someone to turn off the entire system in an emergency, will be installed to the south of the solar meter. A conduit, which is used to protect and cover the wires associated with the solar panels, would run from the utility meter on the west elevation up to the attic where the conduit would be installed, if the attic is accessible. If the attic interior is not accessible, the applicant would install the conduit on the roof's exterior at a 90-degree angle and in a silver color to match the roof coloring.

The DRC considered this application at its March 6, 2024, [hybrid] meeting. The DRC members expressed concerns about the visibility of the proposed solar panels on the front porch roof from the public right-of-way. They noted a preference for the applicants to revise their design by moving this panel configuration to a different, less-visible segment of the roof. Discussion did not center on the panels located on the main roof. Additionally, the DRC members wanted more information about the rationale behind the selected locations of the solar panels. The DRC placed this item on the HALRB's Discussion Agenda.

The HPP staff recommends partial approval of this subject application as submitted. Since the project proposes to place solar panels on the main roof of the historic house, on primary building elevations that are visible from the public right-of-way, and to use multi-roof solutions, it requires HALRB review according to Appendix G of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* rather than staff administrative review. However, the proposed panels would comply with the following Appendix G specifications [in the *Design Guidelines*]:

- Will have a low profile;
- Will be mounted less than or equal to 6 inches above the surface of the roof;
- Will be set at angles consistent with the slope of the supporting roof;
- Would blend with the surrounding features of the historic resource with respect to the color of the panels; and
- Will be arranged in an organized configuration.

The main objectives regarding solar panels noted in the *Maywood Design Guidelines* are to: 1) protect the historic character of the buildings; and 2) reduce the visual impacts of solar panels as seen from the public right-of-way. However, in the subject application, from certain angles, all panels would be visible from the public right-of-way. The panels with the most visibility from the primary elevation are those that would be located on the front porch roof and the south-facing side gable section of the cross-gable roof. The HPP staff recommends that the solar panels proposed in these specific areas either be relocated to less visible locations on the roof or removed from the project to comply with what is recommended in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Although the panels on the main front-gable roof would be visible from certain angles of the main façade right-of-way due to the front-gable roof design and positioning of the house along the street, the HPP staff agrees that the panels' low profile and silver framing will help limit their visibility. Furthermore, staff thinks it is important, and possible, to balance the needs of both historic preservation and environmental stewardship within the Maywood LHD. There are a few examples of properties in Maywood where solar panel technology is in use – the HPP staff can elaborate on these further should it aid in the discussion. Two final thoughts for the HALRB to consider: the first is that the roofing material that would be impacted by the installation of the solar panels is not historic considering it was replaced in 2004; therefore, the impact on the historic fabric of the house would be minimal. The second is that the solar panels could be considered a temporary feature in that they could be removed in the future and still leave behind the essential form and integrity of the historic house; this would align with Standard #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Next, Ms. Tawney introduced the applicant and property owner, Mr. Merrick Hoben, to provide any further details. After some technical difficulties, Mr. Hoben joined the meeting virtually. He said he appreciated the detailed review and consideration in the staff report and understood the need to discuss the historic integrity of the building with concerns to the proposed solar panels. He expressed his interest in energy conservation. He explained they would have considered moving the solar panels to the rear of the property to not be visible from the street, but that there was no place to put them where there was limited shade. He said if they needed to remove the three panels from the front porch roof, this would impact the overall efficiency of the project, which is meant to be there for approximately 20 to 25 years. He further described the panels as having a silver framing, noting there is visibility from every angle on the house, and the proposed placement of the solar panels is for the best area of energy production.

Mr. Wenchel noted the subject house was a contributing resource in the district. He recalled the first solar panel project he reviewed in Maywood had street-facing panels that were visible, but that project involved a non-contributing building. He repeated that this application is for a contributing building and that the porch roof is not original. He felt this item should come to the HALRB for discussion because it was the first solar panel project [in Maywood] being proposed on a contributing building with the solar panels facing the street. Mr. Wenchel recognized that sustainability is a major issue and that the National Park Service (NPS) was against allowing visibility of solar panels on historic buildings. He felt that if the HALRB sees sustainability as important, then he is comfortable with that approach and supports the project. Mr. Wenchel further stated that the details of this project will set a precedence [in the LHD].

Ms. Foster said she did not think they were sacrificing one thing for another, specifically on a solar panel project like this. She felt that the HALRB would be seen as punishing residents who lived in contributing buildings with south facing frontages. She did not feel that the proposed solar panels would diminish the historic significance of the contributing house. Ms. Foster recognized how the property owner is trying to make the project more sensitive by using the silver framing. She thought it is more important [for the HALRB] to show how historic buildings can have a place in the contemporary world by allowing for modern sensibilities.

Mr. Woodruff agreed with Ms. Foster, adding that the houses in Maywood are all old, and that they have had previous owners and will have future owners who will make improvements, some of which will be permanent and non-permanent. He thought solar panels could be removed and would not impact the historic building in any permanent way, while allowing the house to be self-sustaining. Mr. Woodruff agreed that [Maywood] owners with south facing frontages, such as himself, should not be penalized for having solar panels. Mr. Handley used the analogy of other modern improvements being allowed in historic buildings, such as allowing modern plumbing and electricity, and that he did not think the HALRB would be opposed to those modern improvements. He recognized that hopefully there will come a time when society will not need solar panels. He also understood that with this project, there was no other place to install the solar panels and he was surprised the owner was not asking for more south facing panels to help generate more power. Mr. Handley acknowledged that the HALRB wants to preserve these historic buildings [in Maywood], but should allow them to be livable, modern, and energy efficient.

Mr. Laporte stated that the historic preservation profession must have a stance on the argument and wanted to know how other historic preservation review boards handle solar panels on historic buildings. Ms. Tawney shared that Washington, D.C. has entire guidelines dedicated to sustainability, has pledged to require 100% of the city's energy production to be renewable by 2032, and that they want 10% to be generated from solar energy systems. Specifically regarding historic preservation, she said that Washington, D.C. prefers solar panel installation that is compatible with the architectural character of neighborhoods, that does not cover or obscure distinctive features, with preferred locations being secondary elevations to minimize visibility, and low-profile panels flush with the roof. Ms. Tawney explained that the City of Alexandria's guidance, dating to the 1990s, discouraged solar panels if they are

not compatible with the architectural character of the historic district, prefers trim work to match the color of solar panels, and suggests mounting at an angle closest to the roof slope. Lastly, she said the NPS guidance was not flexible to the use of solar panels on historic buildings, preferring they be hidden behind other elements to meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. In summary, Ms. Tawney said the available guidance pertaining to the usage of solar panels on historic buildings was somewhat mixed or required them to be compatible to the existing historic buildings.

Mr. Laporte stated that the subject application is not Mount Vernon nor Monticello, but [an example of an] ordinary home that people want to live in and make sustainable. Regarding Mr. Handley's comments, Mr. Laporte mentioned he has visited historic house museums where bathrooms had been removed. Mr. Handley responded that those are no longer lived in and such actions are for the purposes of historic preservation and historical accuracy. Mr. Laporte said he felt the approval of solar panels on contributing buildings should be done on a case-by-case basis and he appreciated the need to discuss this project since it is precedent setting. He likewise recognized that if the Board approves this application, then the HALRB cannot deny solar panels to anyone else [in the LHD]. Mr. Handley referenced Ms. Foster's comments about trying to improve the compatibility of the project as much as possible.

Ms. Myers said she supported the use of solar panels on historic buildings but had concerns about their placement on front porch roofs because they would be highly visible. She suggested that the applicant find a location for those panels elsewhere on the house. Ms. Myers felt that allowing solar panels on all the front porches in Maywood would destroy the historic character of the LHD. She also questioned the need to have the proposed amount of solar panels to gain the savings and generate the necessary electricity; she wants to balance the beauty of the historic building with sustainability. Mr. Laporte mentioned he has received quotes for solar panels and that companies sometimes propose more panels to produce excess energy and make a larger profit but thought that there should be a balancing act between those two purposes. Mr. Woodruff felt that trying to receive such information from the property owner and the contractor was immaterial.

Mr. Hoben explained how he wished they could remove the panels from the front porch roof but that there is no other alternative. He said those specific panels will generate more electricity and he felt that there was more visibility of the panels proposed on the south facing roof gable than those on the porch roof. He said he believes the low pitch of the front porch roof will limit the visibility of the solar panels. He explained that the project requires the proposed amount of solar panels to be viable. Mr. Hoben expressed his commitment to energy efficiency and battling climate change; wanting to do his part through this proposal is important to him. He stated that if the project could not be approved as proposed, he would cancel it altogether.

Mr. Woodruff did not believe that the aesthetic look of the solar panels on the front porch was inferior to the aesthetics of the standing-seam roof. He asked about the height of the solar panels; Ms. Tawney replied there would be six inches from the roof to the top of the solar panel. He also felt that the design of the solar panels, if they are well installed, will look appropriate. Mr. Woodruff explained that even if the solar panels generate more electricity, it will be returned to the grid – this is an ideal situation that is not just about making a profit, especially since electricity will be more in demand as people transition to electric cars.

Mr. Handley agreed to both sides of the argument, mentioning that Virginia law prohibits buying back your electricity and that it simply goes back into the grid. Therefore, he said property owners cannot make a profit under the current restrictions, and he did not think Dominion Power was going to support that law changing anytime soon. He speculated that the HALRB and the community will get comfortable with the panels and does not think people will want to live in historic properties if they are unable to make use of modern technology in a way that is still respectful. Ms. Myers stated in response that the HALRB often

requires wood windows over the most energy efficient and/or modern options on the market indicating that the Board is not always supportive of the most energy efficient solutions or modern technological advances. Ms. Myers said she believes the HALRB could find a balance between allowing solar panels on a historic property without impacting architectural integrity. She further recognized that approving this project would set a precedent that she does not want to allow. Ms. Foster acknowledged that this would set a precedent, as well as require extra monitoring to determine if the project was the right approach, but she viewed solar panels like a fixture on a building that could be removed. Ms. Meyer (who had joined the meeting virtually at 7:14 pm) agreed with Ms. Myers's views on the proposal, further stating she agreed that solar panels are removable and that this case would be precedent setting, but that the proposed solar panels on the front porch roof would be far too visible.

Ms. Farris provided another perspective specifically from the updated Historic and Cultural Resources Plan (HCRP) that was approved in November 2023. She cited how the HCRP supports flexibility to encourage owners of historic properties to make their buildings more energy efficient by integrating better building techniques and technologies. She stressed how the HCRP's goals emphasize that through careful planning and consideration, historic preservation can be balanced with a desire to achieve higher sustainability standards and help the County become a carbon neutral community. Mr. Laporte emphasized how solar technology continues to evolve and maybe one day will be flush with the roofing material. He acknowledged that if this project is approved, there is a chance that one day another property owner [in the LHD] will use newer solar technology. Ms. Foster suggested writing the motion in a way that recognizes this application as precedent setting and to encourage solar panel projects to have the lowest profile possible. She also noted that solar panel projects will look completely different in 10-30 years, some of which could look transparent. Mr. Laporte supported that approach for the motion.

Ms. Myers requested that the HPP staff present the images of other solar panel projects in Maywood. Ms. Tawney provided brief descriptions of five previously approved solar panel projects, each with varying levels of visibility. Mr. Turnbull referenced a statement of the applicant concerning the solar panels on the main roof as possibly being more visible than the front porch roof panels. However, he did state that he sees historic buildings as being examples of sustainability as they are maintained over time. He thought of the solar panels as not being a permanent fixture, and other than the panels located on the south side of the main roof, he did not have an issue with the overall project. Ms. Dreher stated it would be ideal to have solar panels placed towards the rear of the house, but she recognized this would not be possible for all properties. She also agreed with Ms. Foster's comments. Mr. Fackler mentioned there is a similar approach at the State Department with following the guidance from NPS to find a balance between historic preservation and sustainability. He also recognized there can be a benefit to having solar panels visible to show the community that a historic property can also be sustainable, but he mostly agreed with everyone else that it is a balancing act.

Ms. Hamm stated that she sees solar panel technology as ever changing, and perhaps eventually they could even become the roof shingles. Mr. Davis expressed an interest in better understanding the science behind the need for a certain number of panels and their placement on the roof. He agreed that the subject solar panels would be visible, that they would change the look of the historic house, and that this would be precedent setting. Mr. Turnbull remarked that it would be helpful for applicants to provide renderings to help the HALRB better visualize proposed solar panel projects. Ms. Myers recognized that some of the previous projects approved by the HALRB only had a few solar panels compared to this proposal. Mr. Handley likewise wondered about the number of panels needed but assumed it was because there was a metric to meet based on the size of the house.

Mr. Davis started to wrap up the discussion and proposed the HALRB begin working towards a motion. Some discussion ensued with main suggestions coming from Ms. Foster about the profiles of the solar panels. Mr. Woodruff said that the staff report stated the proposed panels met *The Secretary of the*

Interior's Standards. Ms. Tawney clarified that the staff recommendation mentioned that the solar panels could be removed and would have minimal impact to existing fabric, and that the proposed project complies with aspects of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Mr. Woodruff felt that any extra language in the motion stating that solar panels need to have the lowest profile possible was not necessary, but if other Board members felt otherwise he would not oppose it. The HALRB discussed whether to include language in the motion about the profile height of the solar panels or possibly requesting more cost-effective measures or reasoning in the future. Ms. Tawney reiterated that cost should not be referenced in the motion and that the *Design Guidelines* already includes guidance on profile height for solar panels. Mr. Laporte believed it might be necessary to update the *Design Guidelines* in the future for standards regarding solar panel profiles, especially as technology improves, such as allowing property owners to remove their metal-seam roofs for a solar panel shingle roofing material. The discussion resulted in the following proposed motion from Chair Davis:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 24-07 at 3511 22nd St. N. in the Maywood Historic District for the request to install multiple solar panels on the main and secondary slopes of the roof as proposed in the application; with an emphasis on maintaining the lowest profile available that doesn't detract from the historicity of the contributing house.

Ms. Tawney confirmed the language of the draft motion with the HALRB members. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Upon hearing no further comments or questions, the Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 9-2-1, with Ms. Meyer and Ms. Myers opposed and Mr. Turnbull abstaining.

Informational Item: Barcroft Apartments Section 7 Renovation

Ms. Farris introduced the Jair Lynch project team and provided the following project background:

The Barcroft Apartments (Barcroft) is a garden apartment community located along Columbia Pike. Barcroft is identified in the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Plan (N-FBC), known as the Form Based Code. This item is coming to the HALRB as an informational item and no HALRB motions are needed at this time. The proposed work will be in Section 7, which was constructed between 1947 and 1948. Section 7 includes Buildings 44 through 48. The applicant is required to follow Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards in the Form Based Code. The Jair Lynch project team has presented to the HALRB for multiple renovation projects, with the last project being in Section 1. Each renovation project has involved the project team applying for affordable housing tax credit financing from Virginia Housing, which needs to adhere to Virginia Housing's Minimum Design and Construction Requirements (MDCR), for which the project team is seeking waivers.

The project team's current proposal is for renovations and alterations to Buildings 47 and 48. The project scope includes the repairing of exterior masonry, such as repointing deteriorated mortar, and repainting previously painted brick as necessary; cleaning and washing all existing brick facades; removing and replacing the aluminum double-hung and casement windows with new aluminum windows to match the original design; removing and replacing existing mechanical systems and patching the brick walls where those systems were located; adding new exhaust penetrations; removing and replacing non-original light fixtures with new compatible fixtures; repairing and/or replacing damaged roofs in-kind; repairing and painting numerous architectural elements such as the metal railings, shutters, entry doors and frames, steel lintels, and existing wood fascia and trim; replacing damaged attic louvers in-

kind and painting them; creating outdoor amenity spaces and landscape improvements behind Building 47; creating two accessible units in both buildings for a total of four units by creating new entry openings and windows; modifying an existing window well/areaway near Building 48 to provide an accessible entry; and removing a red maple tree near Building 47. The project team is proposing other aspects to meet Virginia Housing requirements including installing canopies above accessible entrances and/or adding canopies above all entrances, and providing vinyl or aluminum cladding on existing wood trim.

The Jair Lynch project team attended the March 6, 2024, hybrid DRC meeting. The DRC questions focused on understanding the scope better, such as where the four (4) new accessible entries were being proposed and how an existing window well/areaway at Building 47 would be modified to provide an accessible route to the new entry. During the DRC meeting, the project team presented that the aluminum double-hung windows would be replaced with vinyl windows; however, this proposed material has now been changed.

The HPP staff supports the aspects of the project that follow Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards in the N-FBC, such as repairing and replacing in-kind, cleaning the elevations, removing non-historic exterior features, adding landscape improvements behind Building 47, and modifying the existing window well/areaway at Building 48 to provide an accessible entry. These specific items also comply with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties*, specifically standards #1, #2, and #9.

A recent update from the project team has indicated that the window replacement material will now be aluminum. Thus, this will be an in-kind replacement and complies with Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards in the N-FBC.

Although aspects of the project scope are not consistent with Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards, the HPP staff supports the new exhaust penetrations and the necessary changes to create four accessible entries and new window openings at the two buildings. The new exhaust penetrations are necessary to upgrade the residential units and they will occur on the rear elevations, which will be a minimum change to the exterior. Concerning the four (4) new accessible entrances at Buildings 47 and 48, traditionally, staff would recommend new entrances to be located on side or rear elevations; however, because the units must be near accessible pathways and parking areas, staff sees this as a special exception necessary to convert existing units into accessible units specifically within the historic buildings at Barcroft. Also, the accessible entrances have the appearance of secondary entrances, and they do not compete with the more ornate main entrances.

For the items required by Virginia Housing if a waiver is not granted, staff supports canopies over the accessible entrances, as well as the cladding of existing wood trim with either vinyl or aluminum. If canopies are installed over the new accessible entrances, and/or above all the entrances, staff does not believe this will detract from the main facades. These canopies are compatible to the overall design of Barcroft and will be mounted in the mortar joints so as not to cause damage to the historic brick material.

Concerning the cladding of wood trim, staff considers the cladding of existing wood trim materials as a minimal change. The applicant will be required to repair any deteriorated wood prior to cladding it with vinyl or aluminum. Although this cladding will be a visible barrier, the wood material will still exist, and the cladding treatment can be reversed.

Lastly, concerning the removal of the red maple tree, the project team indicated that the tree's health would be negatively impacted by the construction activity and that its current location is too close to Building 47. Further, the project team recognizes the importance of retaining Barcroft's tree canopy and will follow the County's tree replacement program. Staff will defer to the County's Urban Forestry division towards the treatment of the trees at Barcroft.

Next, Ms. Lauren Riley of Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh presented to the HALRB with the assistance of the Jair Lynch project team. Ms. Riley pointed out the location of Section 7 and explained how the renovation use permit was similar to previous phases the HALRB already reviewed (Section 1 in July 2023 and Section 3 in December 2023). She provided more details on the proposal, including the addition of four new accessible units by pulling out window wells to create two new accessible unit entrances. She highlighted the poor condition of the existing metal windows, which they propose to replace in-kind.

The presentation showed an image of a passageway into the back courtyard and Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if this was going to be retained. Ms. Riley confirmed it will remain and explained they will need to install a ramp in the back of the courtyard to provide accessibility to the amenity space. For Building 48, Ms. Riley explained how the existing maintenance area inside the building will be repurposed for the accessible units, which also will require the removal of basement windows to create the two new accessible entrances. She noted that these locations for the accessible units are ideal because the parking is nearly at grade and in front of the units. She said these changes across the two buildings will increase the existing 73 units to 75. After highlighting the proposed renovation summary, Ms. Riley stated that they are requesting canopies over the accessible unit entries; however, they will request a waiver from the Virginia Housing requirements. Ms. Riley next focused on the proposed improvements to the interior courtyard near Building 47, explaining how they plan to create a patio area with some furnishings. She pointed out the two ramp locations that will lead to the two accessible units of Building 47 and out to the courtyard.

Ms. Chelsea Thomas, architect for the project team, explained the renovation plan for the exterior of the two buildings, including washing the brick, replacing the roof shingles, repairing the trim, painting surfaces previously painted, replacing windows and shutters, and repairing and painting exterior doors. Ms. Riley concluded by providing a summary of their application requests that were filed for the FBC use permit, including modifications to the Conservation Area Standards related to the new vent openings, accessible unit entrances, and fiberglass material for new doors. She then asked the HALRB for any questions or concerns.

Mr. Woodruff expressed that he thought the project looked great. He was impressed they were able to find aluminum replacement windows and asked about their source. Ms. Sarah Vonesh of EHT Tracerics said they have not selected a specific vendor yet but could share that with the HALRB later. She reassured the HALRB that the replacement windows would be of the same design and fenestration pattern. Mr. Davis asked about the basement maintenance areas that will be converted into accessible units in the two buildings and whether the maintenance shop would be shrinking or would operate in another location. Mr. Brian Bracey, Development Associate with the Jair Lynch project team, replied that the dimensions of the maintenance shop could be made smaller or that there are other spaces on the property that could be designated for maintenance.

Ms. Farris asked Ms. Riley about the new unit count; she confirmed there were currently 73 one and two bedroom units and the new total will be 75 units because they are adding two basement units in Building 48. Ms. Farris inquired if there would be future renovation phases where the project team foresees adding more accessible units. Ms. Alice Hagemann, Development Manager at Jair Lynch, replied that they have not found many other opportunities to add either more units or accessible units in the existing buildings; however, she said this might change as they dive deeper into the project. Ms. Riley reiterated that a similar question occurred during the Advisory Working Group meeting the week prior. She explained how many things need to come together to create accessible units, such as grading issues and proximity to parking. Ms. Riley asked if the project team could anticipate attending the April HALRB meeting to count as their second public meeting as required by the FBC. Ms. Farris confirmed this approach after there were no concerns expressed by the HALRB.

Historic Marker Review: Fire Station 8 Interpretive Panel

Ms. Liccese-Torres presented this item with Ms. Maire Bourque, who is the project manager from the Department of Environmental Services (DES), and Mr. Matthew White from Capitol Museum Services, who was hired to work on the lobby exhibit and site interpretation being planned for the new station. Ms. Liccese-Torres provided some background context about the project and how this had begun pre-Covid and Mr. Wenchel had represented the HALRB on the Public Facilities Review Committee (PFRC). She said the station was significant for being the first integrated fire station in the County. During the PFRC process, County staff and members of the community convened a plan to honor the site's history and legacy elements. Ms. Liccese-Torres utilized photographs in her presentation to show how the site interpretation will honor the actions and heroics of those who served the station, including using virtue words such as perseverance, courage, and heroes on the building's exterior. She explained that there also will be a timeline walkway on the side of the station with significant dates relevant to its history.

Ms. Liccese-Torres highlighted the proposed interpretive panel that corresponds to the timeline walkway. She noted that this is the fourth version that has been circulated amongst and reviewed by the stakeholders. She asked Ms. Bourque if there was anything more that should be shared with the HALRB based on the last week's final community stakeholder meeting. Ms. Bourque stated that everyone was generally excited about honoring the legacy of Fire Station 8; they also helped choose the photographs and provided input on the marker drafts. Mr. White mentioned that the latest meeting focused on minor changes and rearranging of some of the content.

Ms. Liccese-Torres next focused on the location of the interpretive panel and asked Mr. White to explain the stakeholders' preferred location for the panel. Mr. White replied that the panel would be placed along Langston Boulevard within a garden area in front of the station, as this would be accessible to foot traffic, yet it would be somewhat protected from damage since it is in a high vehicle traffic area. Ms. Bourque explained that the granite strips in the ground will contain the significant dates referenced in the panel. She also noted that the virtue words are on the elevation next to the main entrance doors that lead to the lobby space. She said these virtue words, such as courage, perseverance, and honor, were selected during a lengthy community process with the stakeholders.

Ms. Liccese-Torres presented the proposed interpretive panel to receive feedback from the HALRB members. Ms. Tawney asked if the panel would stand vertically in the ground or if it would be a table-top marker. Mr. White replied confirmed the latter, stating it would be tilted at a 45-degree angle and approximately no higher than waist height. Mr. Handley asked for further clarification on the panel's location on the project site; would it be closer to the main entrance stairwell or the street side and sidewalk? The location was identified as in a landscaped area closer to the building entrance yet not right next to the main entrance, facing west.

Mr. Laporte stated that he approaches the review of historic markers as if this was the first time he was learning about the content. He felt that the authors of the marker were familiar with the property history. For example, he suggested it would be important to identify 2121 N. Culpeper St. and other addresses identified in the marker in relation to the location of the panel. Except for the first statement, he suggested that verbs are needed. For the first statement concerning the action that occurred in 1918, he thought it was necessary to explain there were two different groups of firemen. He struck the word “officially” from the third statement related to the 1927 date because there is no unofficial incorporation. He suggested clarifying language in the fifth statement related to 1940 concerning when entities were being paid. For the 1957 statement, he wanted to identify Alfred Clark’s role with the firefighters as the first captain. He explained that the 2018 statement should state the 100th anniversary or just the centennial. He suggested making the map more meaningful by adding dots or numbers to identify the referenced addresses, including outlining the current site.

Ms. Dreher asked about the size of the marker. Mr. White confirmed it would be approximately 3’ by 4’. Ms. Dreher agreed that the map was confusing and that references on the map are difficult to read; she thought enlarging the map may improve its legibility. She further suggested that images could have dates or small captions. Ms. Liccese-Torres said there are limited images available related to the history of Fire Station and they could not always confirm their dates. Therefore, they worked with the stakeholders to select a sampling of representative images. She suggested that there could be room at the bottom of the panel to serve as a key. Mr. Handley suggested to at least identify what each image represents if dates cannot be confirmed. Mr. White also mentioned that there will be more information about the images in the lobby display.

Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that another aspect of the interpretive project will involve a display in the first-floor lobby space including display cases for donated artifacts, images, and memorabilia. Ms. Dreher focused back on the language in the marker and asked about the 2018 statement; she felt the meaning of HHVFD should be clarified and the spacing of the text in that line should be adjusted. Mr. Turnbull followed up on Mr. Laporte’s comments on how the HALRB is aware that Lee Highway is now Langston Boulevard, but that could be forgotten by the public in a few years. The HALRB further discussed different ways the project team could provide clarifying language to prevent assumptions about the marker text.

Ms. Hamm noted the photographs are not in chronological order, and she provided direction on how some might be arranged on the panel. She also said it was important to clarify and correct that the Hicks family donated the land for the station by deed. Ms. Hamm said the photograph of the station with the flagpole was the “new” station built in 1963; thus, she suggested this be the last photograph shown. Mr. Handley asked if the significant dates on the walkway will have the same dates as those on the marker. Staff provided confirmation. He also suggested that photograph explanations could be included in the lobby exhibit.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked Ms. Bourque to provide an approximate timeline for the project. Ms. Bourque replied that firefighters should be able to move into the new station once some VDOT work is completed near the site; she was unsure of an exact date. She explained a few more phases that will have to occur prior to an opening celebration hopefully in the summer of 2024. The HALRB had no further comments. Mr. Davis proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB support the panel and the establishment of a historic exhibit that is associated with the deep history of this facility as presented with any outstanding details to be further discussed with HPP staff.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 12-0.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Mr. Woodruff gave a summary of his involvement with the special Advisory Working Group (AWG) concerning the Barcroft Apartments. He stated that these meetings will help guide the vision for the property and any potential development that may occur on the site for next thirty years. He said the AWG meeting that occurred on February 26 specifically focused on historic preservation and the HPP staff was there to talk about the historic significance of the complex, buildings, and development of the area. Mr. Woodruff explained how the Jair Lynch project team is proposing redevelopment to occur on the edges of Barcroft that mostly conforms to the plans in the FBC, including potential heights of buildings and transitional areas. He mentioned that their plan proposes to demolish approximately 20 out of 52 buildings, which he is concerned about, but he also recognized that the buildings proposed for preservation will be protected into perpetuity with a historic preservation easement. Ms. Farris confirmed that this was correct and that the County Attorney has clarified that the [forthcoming] historic preservation easements are meant to protect into perpetuity.

Ms. Farris then highlighted the AWG meeting that occurred on March 11, as Ms. Lawrence was not in attendance to provide a summary. She explained how the meeting focused on the multi-modal transportation (vehicular, bike, and pedestrian) network and parking. She said staff presented on the adopted policy for Barcroft concerning these subjects, and the rationale for changing them. Ms. Farris noted that staff provided a draft planning principle for these areas, which was to “Provide safe and inviting multi-modal transportation choices that prioritize pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, maintain an adequate parking supply for Barcroft residents and visitors, and enhance access to robust local transit service available along Barcroft’s boundaries.” She explained that the presentation could be reviewed online. Ms. Farris said the next meeting will be on April 1, and that she believed this will focus on open spaces, creation of mini parks, and the location of the proposed amenity center. There was some discussion amongst the HALRB and Ms. Farris concerning which buildings are potentially going to be demolished that have significant architecture. Ms. Farris explained there are suggestions being made about how to mitigate those losses. Mr. Laporte questioned the possibility of historic preservation easements being overturned; he offered to provide staff a specific example in Arlington County where this occurred.

Mr. Davis gave a summary of the recent County Board budget work session he attended regarding the proposed FY25 budget for the Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development. At the session, he spoke on behalf of the HALRB to support funding the HPP’s work plan, including providing them funds for consultants. He noted that the draft budget includes \$100,000 for an update to the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). Mr. Davis also stated that the Historic Preservation Fund grants are underway and could assist with gaining further financial support from the County Board.

Mr. Davis mentioned to the HALRB that as a public facing board, their decisions can be included in press articles. He suggested that commissioners read some of the latest articles involving HALRB public hearings to get a sense of how the public is digesting their decisions.

Ms. Myers announced that if any HALRB members wanted to propose topics to be considered for updates to the HALRB’s By-laws, to please notify her and staff. She said that such changes would be considered once a year during a short meeting. Ms. Tawney offered to circulate the latest version of the By-laws to the HALRB along with links to some recent press articles.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Tawney reported that the Evelyn Syphax historic marker that the HALRB reviewed and approved last year was just installed. She said the applicant will be hosting an unveiling ceremony this summer. Mr. Woodruff asked about the location of the marker. Ms. Tawney replied that it is located across the street from the Syphax Education Center at 2110 Washington Boulevard near the County’s Sequoia Building.

Ms. Liccese-Torres mentioned that the Implementation Framework for the updated Historic and Cultural Resources Plan has been approved by County leadership and has been posted on the HPP’s website. She reminded the Board that the Implementation Framework sets the short-, mid-, and long-term goals for the HPP over the next decade.

Lastly, Ms. Liccese-Torres announced that Ms. Tawney has been promoted to the HPP’s Associate Planner. She shared that the program is now recruiting for the vacant Historic Preservation Specialist position; she said interviews began in March and staff is working through the hiring process now.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:37 pm.