



**MINUTES OF THE
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD**

Wednesday, October 19, 2022, 6:30 PM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken
Omari Davis, Vice Chair
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Robert Meden
Rebecca Meyer
Andrew Wenchel

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY:
Carmela Hamm (medical, Henrico County, VA)
Richard Woodruff, Chair (personal travel, New Mexico)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Alexandra Foster
Mark Turnbull

STAFF PRESENT: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Program Manager
Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Planner
Serena Bolliger, Historic Preservation Planner
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Specialist

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and determined there was a quorum (seven commissioners were physically present while two members were participating virtually).

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. He stated that due to the end of the County Board's Continuity of Operations Ordinance adopted in March 2020, the HALRB was required by Virginia law (as of September 1, 2022) to have an in-person quorum to conduct business. Mr. Woodruff described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

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

- 1) Maywood Holdings LLC
2206 N. Nelson St., CoA 21-21A
Maywood Historic District

Renewal of CoA 21-21 to demolish attached garage and build a second story and rear addition to non-contributing house.

- 2) Larry Danforth for the Walker Chapel Trustees
4102 Old Glebe Rd., CoA 22-19A
Walker Chapel Historic District
Amendment to CoA 22-19 to increase size of free-standing shed.
- 3) Maria Elena Greene and David Greene
2204 N. Kenmore St., CoA 20-26C
Maywood Historic District
Retroactive amendment to CoA 20-26B including construction of a shed and change of material of retaining wall.
- 4) Colin Uckert
3421 21st Ave. N., CoA 21-31B
Maywood Historic District
Amendment to CoA 21-31A to reduce size of two windows in garage (from 6/6 to 4/4) and change basement level windows from single-lite to 3-lite.

The Chair asked for any concerns or questions about the consent agenda. Upon hearing none, Mr. Meden moved to approve the consent agenda. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 9 to 0.

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

- 1) Anwar Maharmeh and Nasir Khan for Jessie Al-Amin
2415 Shirlington Rd., CoA 21-30A
Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District
Amendment to CoA 21-30 to modify approved hardscaping and parking, and to install a pergola.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the history of the Green Valley Pharmacy and its architectural description. She then explained the minimal changes made to the building over time and described the HALRB's most recent CoA approvals:

- CoA 18-13 in July 2018 for: 1) the demolition of the false mansard roof (built ca. 1983) and restoration of the building's roofline to its original minimalist design; and 2) the removal of a healthy tree (greater than 15" diameter at dbh) abutting the rear of the building.
- CoA 18-13A in September 2018 for the installation of a metal cap on the parapet.
- CoA 18-13B in December 2018 for the installation of a new HVAC system.
- CoA 21-30 in January 2022 to allow the installation of a walk-in cooler at the rear (with the provision that the original chimney be retained) and various hardscaping changes to allow access and parking around the building.

Ms. Bolliger noted that the applicant most recently submitted a CoA amendment (CoA 21-30A) for changes to the hardscaping and parking in September 2022 but chose to defer the application to finalize some details. She explained that the applicant had initially proposed to use the rear alley for access; however, in the current proposal the rear alley would no longer be used and only the loading area access

facing 24th Road S. would be retained on that side. She said parking access was now proposed from Shirlington Road rather than 24th Road S., via a two-way access route located entirely on private property mostly on the adjacent 2411 Shirlington Road parcel situated to the north of the pharmacy lot. She clarified this adjacent parcel also is owned by the subject applicant, but it is outside the Local Historic District (LHD) zoning overlay and therefore outside of the HALRB's purview.

Ms. Bolliger provided the following summary of the project: The applicant proposes to remove the concrete pad and dumpsters at the northeast corner of the pharmacy as was noted in CoA 21-30 and instead have a 5' sidewalk between the building and the two-way driveway north of the building. Also, the applicant proposes to install a free-standing AlunoTec pergola adjacent to the building over the seating along the south side of the building fronting 24th Road S. The proposed height would be approximately 10' tall (lower than the height of the building in order to retain an unbroken roofline from the street), and the ground coverage would be approximately 50' x 16'. The roof would be of a retractable motorized waterproof fabric. The sides would be motorized rolldown zipper semi-blackout shade screens in white or clear. The unadorned aluminum frame would be secured to the concrete ground surface with columns every 10' for structural stability.

Ms. Bolliger then summarized the Design Review Committee (DRC)'s comments from its September 7, 2022, hybrid meeting (the pergola element was not part of the application at that time): Mr. Davis had asked if the existing tree would be retained. Ms. Bolliger explained that the HALRB approved removal of the tree in CoA 18-13, which was still active; therefore, the applicant still has the right to remove the tree. Mr. Wenchel said he believed the DRC could recommend approval of the application. Given that the project had received public interest, the DRC placed this item on the discussion agenda for the September 21, 2022, hybrid HALRB public hearing. However, the HALRB did not consider the application in September because the applicant requested deferral to the October review cycle to have extra time to finalize the application.

Ms. Bolliger stated the DRC considered the application again at its October 5, 2022, hybrid meeting. She noted that the plans now included a reference to an awning (since changed to a pergola), but without any detailed specifications. Mr. Wenchel had asked for additional information about the awning, particularly materials, specifications, and installation methods. He recommended that the awning be installed below the building's roof cap to ensure that the roof line of the historic building would not be obstructed from the street level. He also requested an elevation drawing showing how the installed awning would look against the massing of the building. The DRC placed this item on the discussion agenda for the October 19, 2022, hybrid HALRB hearing.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the Historic Preservation staff recommended approval of the proposed modifications to the hardscaping and parking plan only. While staff did not object to the idea of a pergola to provide additional service space for this historically small building without impacting the building itself, she stated that more detail was needed to fully review the application. She said staff supported Mr. Wenchel's request for an elevation drawing or renderings showing the proposed pergola against the building, specifications on the anchor points into the ground, and specifications for the rafter end detail. Further, she encouraged the applicant to consider a transparent or opaque material for the rolling shades on the sides to avoid any safety concerns. For these reasons, Ms. Bolliger said staff recommended that the pergola element be separated from application CoA 21-30A and return for the November design review cycle to allow for further refinement of the proposal.

Ms. Bolliger brought attention to a comment from the Green Valley Civic Association which had been received and distributed to the HALRB members before tonight's hearing:

While GVCA does not have a formal statement at the moment, the following may be helpful:

- 1. Naming. GVCA addressed the issue of naming some time ago, yet the applicant has made no attempt to amend the business name. The applicant was interested, at one point, in changing the name from "Times Square Grill" to a more appropriate name, such as retaining Green Valley Pharmacy.*
- 2. Removal of the tree in the northeast corner remains problematic. Given the new parking configuration, it appears unnecessary to remove the tree. Also, while outside the historic designation boundaries, other large shade trees are slated for removal - according to the blueprints you shared.*
- 3. Again while outside the purview of HALRB, there is concern with the potential restaurant relying on an adjacent property for parking/permitting.*
- 4. The back alley, which will no longer be used for ingress/egress, may be an important location for additional shade and privacy trees. HALRB may wish to consider recommending this idea.*
- 5. The staff recommendation to wait for additional information on the outside pergola is appropriate. Without addressing the pros and cons here, it does raise questions that have not been answered about obstructing a historic building.*

Again, not official GVCA comments, but rather issues to consider.

Ms. Bolliger asked if any representatives for the project were available to speak but none were present. The Chair recommended that the commissioners provide actionable recommendations for the applicants in their absence. Ms. Bolliger explained that the applicants had told her that they were very open to adapting the pergola design to the HALRB's standard.

Mr. Wenchel said he believed the proposed pergola was not technically appropriate for a historic pharmacy, but it was more appropriate than an awning as it would be separate from the building. He reiterated his recommendation that the sightline of the building's roof remain unbroken from the street and that the pergola should not block the view of the roofline from the right-of-way. He also asked for drawings to be presented to the DRC with heights and other dimensions indicated.

Mr. Aiken asked about interpretation of the site's history. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that the building has a County historic marker with an audio element. The audio had been recently repaired but had since failed and staff was working to restore it. He also asked for a rendering showing the relationship of the pergola to the building and more specific design details.

Mr. Davis asked again about the existing tree on the site. Ms. Bolliger reminded the HALRB members that they had approved its removal in 2018 based on the understanding that the new landscaping would damage the root systems and make the tree unstable. Additionally, she explained that this was a volunteer tree located very close to the building, and that tree plantings were not character-defining to the LHD or generally found on commercial lots of this type.

Ms. Lawrence likewise asked for drawings showing the relationship of the pergola to the building and recommended that the pergola be secondary to and blend in with the historic building. She noted that the proposed size was not insubstantial and would need further planning to make it appropriate for the building.

Ms. Meyer stated that she thought a pergola was not an inappropriate way to add temporary outdoor seating, but there was not enough information to comment on the design. She said the concept examples

provided by the applicants were too diverse to indicate the style the applicants wanted to pursue. She recommended that the applicants return to DRC.

Mr. Davis recommended siting the pergola behind the storefront window [along 24th Road S. so as not to block that historic opening]. Ms. Lawrence agreed.

Ms. Bolliger asked several questions to gauge the sentiment of the commissioners [and to provide further direction to the applicants]. She asked if there were any objections to the proposed pergola being retractable. There were no objections. She asked if the commission thought a pergola or an awning would be more appropriate. Ms. Meyer, Mr. Meden, and Ms. Lawrence believed that the free-standing nature of the pergola would be more appropriate. Mr. Woodruff commented that the sample images showed imposing pergolas and he was unsure if he could see a structure of this massing as appropriate for the pharmacy.

Ms. Hamm inquired about the whereabouts and potential usage of the original signage. Ms. Liccese-Torres explained that the applicants did not submit signage as part of this application, but it was her understanding that the family had the original sign.

Mr. Wenchel noted that an awning could be appropriate over the storefront window as it is typical for awnings to be installed over windows, but he believed awnings to be inappropriate over walls.

The Chair made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve the minor hardscaping and parking modifications as proposed in the subject application for CoA 21-30A, 2415 Shirlington Road, Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District, which will allow appropriate traffic flow for the facility and reduce the possibility of damage to the building caused by service vehicles.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair followed with a second motion:

I move that the HALRB defer action on that part of CoA 21-30A, to allow installation of a proposed pergola, pending the receipt, evaluation, and HALRB approval of elevation drawings or renderings that specify the pergola's material, construction, and its positioning against the historic building and its anchoring points.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT NOMINATION: ANDERSON HOUSE

Ms. Bolliger presented the history and significance of the Anderson House at 3500 14th Street North. She described the property as a vernacular four-square single-family dwelling with minimal Prairie stylings that was begun ca. 1912 by Joseph C. Anderson. She continued, stating that around 1916, Anderson modified the original rectangular footprint by building a front addition and porch that gave the house its distinctive four-square massing.

Ms. Bolliger clarified that this request for LHD designation was initiated by the current owner of the home, Dr. Marie Schum-Brady in 2015. Since then, the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff have

collaborated closely with the owner for content and editing support during the research and field survey phases of the project and development of the nomination form.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the Anderson House was found to meet Designation Criteria E, G, and K of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO):

E - The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, or method of construction.

Although the Anderson House features a typical four-square massing, its wrap-around first level porch with masonry columns, second hipped main roof, and wide overhanging roof eaves evoke the Prairie architectural style. While Craftsman, bungalow, and Colonial Revival houses were most typical in Arlington during the early-to mid-20th century, Prairie style examples are uncommon in the County. The subject house is a remarkable local example of early-20th century vernacular residential construction.

G - The property embodies elements of design, detailing, materials, or craftsmanship that render it structurally or architecturally significant.

The Anderson House embodies a vernacular single-family dwelling with unusual Prairie-styled elements. Its four-square floorplan is a common subtype of the Prairie architectural style. Distinguishing architectural elements include the bullnose radial brick columns, shallow hipped porch roof, stone belt coursing, second story side elevation porches, and pyramidal-hipped main roof with flared eaves, decorative brackets, and dormers.

K - The property is suitable for preservation or restoration.

The Anderson House retains sufficient integrity to convey its architectural and historic significance. The home's design and materials have remained essentially unchanged from the first half of the 20th century. The workmanship used in the construction of the house is evident in the extant massing and unusual bullnose radial brick elements. The dwelling's location has remained the same and its feeling and association are likewise unchanged as the property still conveys its historic residential character and function. The setting has changed substantially since the building's period of significance due to the subdivision of the lot in 1950 and subsequent surrounding residential development.

Ms. Bolliger also summarized the proposed design guidelines for the LHD. She noted that twelve CoA guidelines and six Administrative CoA guidelines had been drafted for the property; as with all design guidelines, these are not intended to prohibit changes, but rather to preserve the most important physical aspects of the LHD and ensure that any changes are respectful of and compatible with the historic and existing fabric and character. Ms. Bolliger emphasized that as with all design guidelines, routine maintenance, replacement in-kind, and general repairs were encouraged and did not need staff or HALRB review.

Ms. Bolliger invited Ms. Schum-Brady to speak. Ms. Schum-Brady recounted many of the maintenance and improvement projects she completed over the years, including replacing the roof, repointing the brick, and replacing the storm windows in order to protect, preserve, and enhance the property.

The Chair commended Dr. Schum-Brady for applying to preserve the home, noting that he had driven past it many times in the past and admired both the home and her stewardship. He also commended staff for the thorough designation report.

Ms. Lawrence thanked Dr. Schum-Brady, saying that she had noticed this unique home many decades prior and was grateful for her preservation of such a notable house.

Mr. Laporte explained that he rode his bike past the house often and that he regarded it as a gem and a gift to the community. He stated that Arlington was very lucky to have owners like Dr. Schum-Brady to preserve these important homes.

The Chair asked for any final concerns or questions about the application. Upon hearing none, he made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB, pursuant to the authority granted in Subsection 11.3.2.D.1(a) of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO), finds that the property known as the Anderson House, located at 3500 14th Street N., Arlington, Virginia, meets the following 3 of 11 designated criteria enumerated in ACZO Subsection 11.3.A.6 as necessary to receive a local historic district recommendation: subsections (e), (g), and (k), and recommends that such historic district designation be approved.

I further move that the HALRB, pursuant to its authority under ACZO Subsections 11.3.4.A.7 and 11.3.4.A.8, favorably transmit such recommendation to the County Board together with proposed historic district guidelines for the subject property for the Board's further consideration.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair's Report

The Chair explained he had no report beyond stating that he would be attending the next HALRB meeting in person in November.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Farris reminded commissioners about the final opportunities to comment on the Missing Middle Housing Study in the upcoming public meetings. She directed the HALRB to the meeting schedule and educational materials produced by the County staff team on the County website. She also offered to answer any questions.

Ms. Farris gave a brief overview of several active site plan projects, including Joyce Motors, Americana Hotel, and Bingham Center.

Ms. Liccese-Torres requested a representative to speak on behalf of the HALRB at the upcoming December Planning Commission and County Board hearings for the Anderson House LHD designation. Mr. Laporte volunteered to represent the HALRB.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:44 pm.