



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

Wednesday, November 16, 2022, 6:30 PM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Omari Davis, Vice Chair
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Robert Meden
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Chair

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY:
Alexandra Foster (personal, Arlington County, VA; joined 6:34 pm)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: John Aiken
Robert Dudka
Carmela Hamm
Rebecca Meyer

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.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

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

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2022, MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for comments or amendments on the draft minutes for September 2022. Upon hearing none, Mr. Meden moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 6-0-1, with Mr. Turnbull abstaining (Ms. Foster had not yet arrived).

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

- 1) Cameron Long
2329 N. Edgewood St., CoA 21-28B
Maywood Historic District
Request to amend CoA 21-28 to coat the original dwelling and addition in mineral paint, and add a stone course to the bottom of the structures.

The Chair asked for any concerns or questions about the consent agenda. Upon hearing none, he proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-28B for 2329 N. Edgewood St. as recommended by staff in the staff report with the understanding that the non-contributing structure was moved to Maywood from its original location and therefore is not necessarily a precedent setting exercise.

Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 8 to 0.

SITE PLAN REVIEW: JOYCE MOTORS PROJECT TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

Ms. Farris provided an overview of the Joyce Motors Site Plan project, which proposes to redevelop the site into a multi-family residential building with ground floor retail, as well as involves the preservation via reconstruction of the Joyce Motors historic façade. She explained that Mr. Davis represented the HALRB during the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) process, with the last meeting held on October 13, 2022. Ms. Farris reminded the HALRB members that the overall project had been introduced to them at their September meeting; much of the HALRB’s discussion focused on the proposed design of the multi-family residential building, how the Joyce Motors facade would be incorporated into the design, and the possibility of an educational component about Joyce Motors given this is a recommendation in the recently updated *Clarendon Sector Plan* (CSP).

Ms. Farris noted that at the September HALRB meeting, Mr. Andrew Painter, land use attorney with Walsh Colucci, mentioned that the project also would involve the preservation of the 1949 Barber Shop building located at 1407 North Garfield Street by transferring its development rights to the Joyce Motors project site (the Barber Shop would have a recorded historic preservation easement protecting its exterior). Ms. Farris provided some background about the Barber Shop building, stating it is located in the Clarendon Revitalization District and that the CSP recommends full building preservation. She explained that although the preservation of the Barber Shop was mentioned at the September meeting, staff felt there had not been a full discussion with the HALRB concerning its preservation.

Ms. Farris focused on section 9.2 of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance (ACZO) where it states that when a property located in the Clarendon Revitalization District is designated for preservation on the County’s general land use plan, and it has been determined that the preservation of said building is in accordance with adopted policies, then the County Board may approve an increase above the allowable density. Further, she said the County Manager then would send the project for review and comment by the HALRB at least 45 days in advance of the public hearing by the County Board so that the Board could consider the HALRB’s recommendation when determining whether the project is consistent with historic preservation objectives and adopted policies. Ms. Farris explained that the CSP identified the Barber Shop for full building preservation, and that its preservation via an easement would follow the CSP

policies, including encouraging the preservation, reinvestment, and adaptive reuse of older and historic structures, plus goals one and three of the 2006 *Historic Preservation Master Plan*. She clarified that the easement would prevent demolition and provide oversight on future alterations by the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff and the County Manager. Lastly, Ms. Farris explained how the transfer of development rights (TDR) would preserve a historic building by shifting the density on the site to a site better suited for redevelopment, and that using this mechanism tool is consistent with historic preservation objectives.

Mr. Nicholas Cummings, a land use attorney with Walsh Colucci, provided a brief presentation about the Joyce Motors project. He thanked the HALRB for their positive feedback during the September HALRB meeting. He discussed the purpose of the TDR and how the Barber Shop was recommended for full building preservation. He said that procedurally, the TDR would be approved concurrently with the approval of their 4.1 site plan application. He also explained the formula for determining the amount of density to be transferred pursuant to the ACZO and CSP (500% of the existing square footage for transferable density, which equates to about 14,760 square feet). He noted that this transferable density would help the Joyce Motors project earn part of its community benefit density.

Ms. Lawrence asked Mr. Cummings to put the approximately 15,000 square feet into perspective, specifically how the additional density would impact the design of the Joyce Motors building. Mr. Cummings gave the following explanation: the base density of 3.0 FAR for the site is calculated by the floor-to-area ratio. They use the site area of the site to calculate how much base density they have and then everything between that base density and the total density of the building that fits within the height limit set by the CSP and ACZO is earned with community benefits. The TDR would earn 14,760 square feet of density. Additional density to be earned includes 12,841 square feet for the LEED Gold green building bonus, and about 57,379 square feet through other community benefits currently being negotiated with the County. The TDR would not increase the height of the building design; the CSP and ACZO enables them to request additional density above the base that fits within the height limit.

Mr. Laporte asked if the project's developer also controls the front of the Barber Shop site (the Mexicali Blues restaurant located adjacent to the subject building). Mr. Cummings replied that he does not represent the owner of that property though they are a partner in the project. He stated he represents the Joyce Motors project, which is where the TDR will be sent upon County approval. Mr. Laporte clarified his intentions with the question, as he explained how he lives near the property and passes it daily. He said that if he were a real estate investor, he would buy the building and preserve it because it looked to once be a gas station; he thought the gas pumps would have been located on the site of the Mexicali Blues building. He did not feel Mexicali Blues was architecturally sensitive to the Barber Shop building and would like to see the site redeveloped with something more appropriate. Mr. Laporte then asked if both properties were owned by the same owner. Mr. Cummings confirmed that both properties are owned by the same owner, but that the discussion this evening was to focus on the TDR to preserve the Barber Shop building.

Ms. Farris tried to further clarify details regarding the Mexicali Blues building. She noted that the CSP did not recommend that building for any preservation treatment, but that the allowable building height is limited, meaning only a one-story building could be constructed if the existing building was ever to be developed by-right. She said she was hopeful that the HPP will cultivate a good working relationship with the property owners, which might influence the future of that parcel.

Mr. Laporte continued to express his desire to see the Mexicali Blues building be included in the project package because the current owner controls both parcels. He also questioned what really was being gained with the preservation of the Barber Shop building since the height of that parcel was restricted to what is currently there. Ms. Farris explained that the property owner could redevelop the Barber Shop

property by-right and construct a new two-story building in its place, but instead has chosen to be a willing partner and preserve the Barber Shop building by agreeing to protect the property through a historic preservation easement. Mr. Laporte said he believed that the County was only getting half of the site preserved; to really preserve the Barber Shop, the Mexicali Blues building needed to be included in the agreement.

Mr. Woodruff asked for clarification on which building shown in the presentation was being preserved and which area was not slated for preservation. He also asked if TDR could be transferred from a building that is not recognized for preservation. Mr. Cummings reiterated that the Mexicali Blues building was not part of the subject request and there is not credit for anything related to that property. Ms. Farris asked if TDR could occur on a property that is not recommended for protection and Mr. Cummings stated that it is not supported by County policy. Mr. Woodruff emphasized that the Mexicali Blues building is not recommended for preservation [in the CSP].

Mr. Laporte restated that the Mexicali Blues building should be part of the community benefits package; he felt it was a lost opportunity within the CSP and that the property should have been recommended for preservation. Ms. Farris and Mr. Laporte continued to discuss what could and could not be considered for preservation. Mr. Woodruff tried to reiterate that the Mexicali Blues building is not relevant to the discussion, and that it did not seem like Mr. Laporte was advocating for the preservation of the building, but control on future redevelopment of the property. Mr. Laporte expressed his vision for the parcel, such as a glass enclosure like what was designed with the historic Courthouse building in D.C.. He said that attention to the future design would make both parcels more commercially viable and be more sensitive to the Barber Shop building. He suggested that more research could be done concerning the Mexicali Blues parcel. He also thought that the Joyce Motors property had the same issues as the parcel in question concerning what had been there previously, such as gas pumps.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the HALRB needed to vote on the project this evening. Ms. Farris clarified that the HALRB would not need to vote on any decisions this evening, but the HALRB could consider the discussed ideas as part of their written recommendation to the County Board in January or February.

Mr. Davis asked who would be maintaining the Barber Shop building. Mr. Cummings replied that the property owner would be responsible for maintenance but that the HALRB would have a role in future changes to the property. Ms. Bolliger noted that the HPP staff conducts annual inspections of all the easement-holding properties and that maintenance of those properties needs to follow *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*.

Mr. Turnbull asked if the Joyce Motors building design was going to be further modified dependent on the accumulation of bonus density. Mr. Cummings responded that the proposed design would not change, and that the TDR with the Barber Shop building was part of how the project would earn density. Mr. Woodruff stated that was the expectation with the County Board's approval; Mr. Cummings agreed but reiterated there were several mechanisms for earning that density and this was clearly established in the CSP and the ACZO. Mr. Cummings explained how this is all anticipated during the project planning process, building design, and public engagement, which works towards the County Board approval. Mr. Laporte thanked the applicant for returning to the HALRB to discuss the Barber Shop component of the Joyce Motors project, and that the discussion brought clarity to what was briefly mentioned during the September HALRB meeting.

Mr. Woodruff asked if there would be a need to create design guidelines for the Barber Shop. Ms. Farris replied that the historic preservation easement, which must be recorded before a specific County permit is issued for the Joyce Motors project, will provide specific guidance for any future changes to the building and who will approve those changes (i.e., the HPP staff and the County Manager for small changes, and

the HALRB for big changes). She stated that the easement would be limited to the exterior of the Barber Shop.

Mr. Woodruff followed up with several more questions: Would the HALRB review the easement before the Joyce Motors project is approved by the County Board? Would the HALRB be involved in the approval of the easement because it is an agreement between Arlington County and the property? What is the difference between an easement and a local historic district? Ms. Farris explained that the HALRB would not review nor approve the easement language since that is finalized with the County Attorney's Office, the applicant, and their counsel. Additionally, she explained how easements prevent demolition [because they are recorded into the land deeds in perpetuity], whereas a local historic district does not provide full protections from demolition.

FORM BASED CODE PROJECT REVIEW: THE HAVEN APARTMENTS

The HALRB welcomed Ms. Lauren Riley, land lawyer with Walsh Colucci, and Ms. Sarah Davidson of Insight Properties Inc. and owner of the Haven Apartments. They presented to the HALRB for a second time concerning the proposed TDR from the Haven Apartments to the Ballston Macy's site plan project, which would result in a historic preservation easement on the Haven Apartments.

Ms. Farris explained how the applicant first presented to the HALRB at its July 2022 meeting, and that this evening's discussion would provide a brief overview about the progress of the historic preservation easement. She reminded the commissioners that the applicant was required to attend two HALRB meetings based on requirements in the *Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Form Based Code* (N-FBC). Ms. Riley summarized their project as follows: They propose to transfer development rights from the Haven Apartments in the west end of Columbia Pike to the Ballston Macy's site plan project, which will involve a 16-story, mixed-use residential building with a ground floor grocer. The Haven Apartments currently has 118 units that are considered market rate affordable. They are requesting the County to amend the N-FBC to designate the Haven Apartments as a Conservation Area to utilize the TDR provision in the N-FBC. The County Board has approved the request to advertise the N-FBC amendment, along with the Ballston Macy's site plan project, which will be heard concurrently during the County Board public hearing on December 17, 2022.

Ms. Riley further explained that they also filed a use permit to allow them to utilize the TDR from the 118 existing units at the Haven Apartments, which will be converted into committed affordable housing units at a 2 to 1 ratio [based on the multiplier prescribed in the N-FBC for sites away from Columbia Pike]; that density of 236 units will be transferred to the Ballston Macy's site plan project. She also gave an update on their overall process, such as meeting with County staff to discuss transportation issues and refining the building design by reconfiguring the loading dock in the alley and making landscape improvements. Ms. Riley said they will be meeting with the Transportation Commission and Housing Commission in early December before going to the Planning Commission and the County Board.

Ms. Farris provided an overview concerning the Haven Apartments being added to the County's easement portfolio. She noted that the property would represent a later period of the garden apartment movement constructed in the County during the 1950s and the easement would be an opportunity to protect the Haven Apartments in perpetuity. Ms. Farris said the HPP would provide oversight on how the property should be preserved, and that the easement would provide flexibility for the property owner. She noted that even though there have been alterations to the property, this should not be viewed as a negative since the modifications adapted for the needs of its residents. She stated the Haven Apartments would be one property within Columbia Pike's western corridor that could have protections in an area where there are

increasing redevelopment pressures, including the possibility of nearby condominium complexes considering redevelopment.

Ms. Farris said the HPP staff drafted the easement language, which is currently under review by the County Attorney’s Office. She expected the draft will be ready to share with the applicant by the end of this year. Since the easement does not need to be recorded before the County Board considers the Ballston Macy’s site plan project, Ms. Farris anticipated the Haven Apartments easement would be recorded in early 2023. She believed there will be continued discussions about the needed changes at the complex over the next decade, which falls under proper maintenance and are requirements for the property to be considered committed affordable housing. She clarified that any major alterations to the Haven Apartments would require approval by the HALRB, such as the construction of bump-outs or expansion of unit sizes but thought additional density likely would be prohibited because of the TDR. She noted the property owner also would be required to follow the renovation guidelines in part seven of the N-FBC, which is like *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties*. Ms. Farris specified that a vote from the HALRB was not needed this evening, but that the HALRB could choose to provide written recommendations to the County Board.

Ms. Farris stated there was one public speaker for this item and invited Mr. Bernard Berne to comment. Mr. Berne spoke in detail about his concerns about granting TDR from the Haven Apartments to the Ballston Macy’s site plan project, which proposes the demolition of the Parkington Shopping Center, ranked in the Minor category of the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). He also shared concerns about the minimal number of proposed affordable housing units at the Ballston Macy’s site plan project, and that residents of the Haven Apartments would be displaced.

Mr. Berne also had submitted a written comment before the hearing which had been circulated to the HALRB members in advance and has been transcribed below for the record:

Re: Form Based Code Project Review: The Haven Apartments

Board members:

This message contains my objections to the proposed Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) for the Haven Apartments. The Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) will discuss the TDR at its meeting of November 11, 2022.

Historic Resources Inventory:

The applicant partially justifies the TDR by stating that the sending site (The Haven) is on the County’s 2011 Historic Resources Inventory. Page 9 of the Inventory lists The Haven at 701 South Florida Street as “Notable”. The Haven was originally named “Columbia Heights, Section 4” and later, “Tyroll Hills Apartments”.

“Notable” is the third highest category on the Inventory, below “Essential” and “Important”. Page 1 of the Inventory ranks 11 garden apartments as “Essential”, pages 2-5 rank 67 apartments as “Important”, and pages 9-10 rank 31 apartments as “Notable”. These are not small numbers.

It is noteworthy that The Haven is one of a total of 109 garden apartments that the Inventory ranks as “Notable” or higher.

The Inventory ranks Fillmore Gardens and Barcroft apartments as “Essential”. The Barcroft Apartments has 1,092 units and covers 43.2 acres. Fillmore Gardens has 448 units and covers

17.6 acres. In contrast, The Haven is much smaller, as it has only 118 units within six sets of units and covers only 4.5 acres. This is a significant difference.

Transfer of Development Rights:

The applicant proposes a TDR of 118 units from the The Haven site (one to two blocks north of Columbia Pike) to the Ballston Macy's site (701 N. Glebe Road) on a 2:1 ratio (236 units). The transfer would enable the applicant to construct on the TDR receiving site (the Ballston Macy's site) a 16-story residential building with a grocery store on its first two levels. The building would contain a total of 555 residential units.

The applicant is offering to provide at the Ballston Macy's site one two bedroom CAF unit onsite at 60% AMI and 11 workforce units at 80% AMI to a new building that the applicant would construct near a Metro station. Those 12 units would constitute only 5% of the total number of apartment units that the TDR would enable the applicant to construct on the site. The project would therefore add only a small number of CAF units to the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor, in contrast to the large number of luxury apartments that it would most likely add.

There can be no justification for awarding a TDR to a project that would provide such a small amount of affordable housing at a receiving site that is near a major transit facility (the Ballston Metro Station).

Further, the TDR would replace Market-Rate Affordable Units (MARKs) at a TDR sending site by adding new covenants that would re-designate the MARKs as CAFs. However, Objective 1.1.3 on page 19 of the 2015 Affordable Housing Master Plan (see <https://arlingtonva.s3.dualstack.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2015/12/AHMP-Published.pdf>) states:

"Make every reasonable effort to prevent the loss of market-rate affordable rental housing. "

The proposed TDR would result in the loss of 118 MARKs. The TDR would therefore contradict Objective 1.1.3. of the Master Plan. The TDR would also result in the displacement of the approximately 50% of The Haven's tenants whose income is too high to qualify for occupancy of its CAF units.

A TDR for The Haven would do little or nothing to accomplish any significant goal of a TDR or of a designation as a Neighborhood FBC Conservation Area related to historic preservation. The proposed TDR does not include the Monterey Apartments.

The Monterey garden apartment complex is on the opposite side of S. Florida Street from The Haven. Monterey Apartments, which was originally named "Columbia Heights, Section 3", closely resembles The Haven ("Columbia Heights, Section 4"). Monterey had the same architect and was constructed by the same builder during the same time period (1949-1950) as was The Haven.

The County's 2011 Historic Resources Inventory does not list Monterey Apartments. However, the illustration entitled "Existing Historic Resources, 2011" on page 4.19 of the 2012 Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Plan identifies Monterey's site as a "Historic Property" (see <https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2014/03/Columbia-Pike.pdf>). The Monterey's site is immediately west of Greenbrier Street, within the same yellow area near the left side of the illustration that contains The Haven's site. Five of Monterey's seven original sets of units are still extant.

To provide a significant benefit for the historic preservation of the County’s garden apartments, the TDR, an accompanying TDR or a designation as a Neighborhood FBC Conservation Area must also include the property that contains the Monterey Apartments. It is not appropriate for the County to award such designations for only one of a pair of historically related adjacent properties, each of which the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Plan identifies as a “Historic Property”

Ballston Macy’s Site (former Parkington Shopping Center):

The TDR receiving site (The Ballston Macy’s site), contains the last intact remnant of the Parkington Shopping Center, except for its County-owned garage. Page 14 of the Historic Resources Inventory identifies Parkington as a historic resource. The applicant’s site plan proposes the demolition of this last building remnant of the Shopping Center, which was historically one of the most important features of the Ballston sector.

The County strongly discourages a TDR for a transfer such as this one by stating in page 2 of its web page entitled “Phase I Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) Goals and Property Objectives” (see https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/Projects/Documents/HRI_Goals-and-Policy-Objectives_Adopted-Oct2011.pdf), which the County Board adopted on October 18, 2011):

“The County will actively promote Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) in exchange for building preservation.”

However, a TDR received from an historic site for purposes of historic preservation by a receiving site plan that proposes demolition of a listed historic resource is strongly discouraged unless the combined community benefits derived from the sending and receiving sites are determined by the County Board to outweigh the loss of the receiving site’s historic resource and address valuable County initiatives.”

As stated above, the receiving site contains Parkington’s last surviving building remnant. The Phase I Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) Goals and Property Objectives” therefore strongly discourages the applicant’s proposed TDR.

Approval of a TDR to the Ballston Macy’s site will create more damage than than benefit to the community in which the site is located. The TDR will enable the applicant to:

- 1. Decrease the site’s publicly accessible ground level open space from the amount of such space that presently exists on the site.*
- 2. Block distant views from several nearby residential buildings, some of which are lower than building that the TDR would enable the applicant to construct on the site, and,*
- 3. Add only one two bedroom CAF onsite at 60% AMI and 11 workforce units at 80% AMI to a new building that the applicant would construct near a Metro station. Those 12 units would constitute only 5% of the total number of apartment units that the TDR would enable the applicant to construct on the site.*

The TDR would also create more damage than benefits to the community in which The Haven is located. The TDR would preserve The Haven. However, The Haven is much smaller than such designated Local Historic Districts as Colonial Village, Buckingham Villages and Cambridge Courts and such other garden apartment complexes as Barcroft Apartments and Fillmore Apartments.

The Haven is only one of 109 garden apartments that the Historic Resources Inventory ranks as “Notable” or higher.

The TDR would not preserve Monterey Apartments.

The TDR would remove all of the MARKs that The Haven presently contains.

The TDR would displace residents of The Haven whose incomes are too high to qualify for CAF units.

The combined community benefits derived from the sending and receiving sites therefore cannot outweigh the loss of the receiving site’s historic resource.

Thank you.

Bernard Berne

Ms. Farris explained to the HALRB that County policy discourages the use of TDR from one historic property to another historic property, and that she discussed the demolition of the Parkington Shopping Center with HALRB representatives, Mr. Aiken and Ms. Sarah Garner, who served in the Ballston Macy’s SPRC process. They concluded that site interpretation would be more appropriate than tangible [building] preservation because of the extensive alterations that have occurred to the Parkington Shopping Center and its low ranking of Minor in the HRI. Ms. Farris mentioned several existing resources that tell the story of Parkington, including historic photographs and 1950s news reels.

Ms. Davidson stated they want to celebrate the history of the Parkington Shopping Center through the Ballston Macy’s site plan, and they hope the proposed design assists with invoking the memories of the building. She also addressed Mr. Berne’s statements about the minimal affordable housing units at the Ballston Macy’s project site; she confirmed that they are not required to provide these units, but they are making the required contribution to the County’s Affordable Housing Investment Fund. Ms. Riley mentioned that after receiving community feedback, they are providing some committed affordable and workforce housing units at the site, which they are not receiving credit for in their community benefits package. Lastly, she said they have made a concerted effort to establish a process that will ensure residents earning above 60% area median income (AMI) and who no longer qualify to live at the Haven Apartments will have ample time to find living accommodations elsewhere.

Mr. Laporte asked if the developer acquired the Haven Apartments with the anticipation of using TDR. Ms. Davidson responded that this was not their intention when they purchased the property in 2017. Mr. Laporte then asked a series of questions to better understand anticipated changes at the Haven Apartments and if residents would be displaced. Ms. Davidson explained that the Haven Apartments would become committed affordable housing and that improvements to the interior and exterior were necessary to meet the County’s threshold for housing conditions (i.e., upgrades to mechanical systems, improving insulation, interior renovations, sustainability upgrades).

Mr. Laporte clarified that he wanted to know if the residents of the Haven Apartments would be displaced once the improvements were completed. Ms. Davidson said the existing residents would not be displaced during renovations and that future renovations would be completed while residents remained there. Mr. Laporte further asked if residents would be able to afford their current units after the renovations. Ms. Davidson explained that currently there is no cap on the rents at the Haven Apartments, and they are going to cap the rent at 60% AMI. Ms. Farris mentioned how current residents making more than 60% AMI would no longer be eligible to live at the Haven Apartments.

Mr. Woodruff asked for an explanation on this aspect of the project. Ms. Davidson stated it was their goal to not displace these tenants and they are establishing a process to assist them, such as providing five years to transition their living arrangements. Mr. Woodruff asked for the percentage of the current residents who make more than 60% AMI. Ms. Davidson replied that it is about 35% of the current tenants. Mr. Woodruff asked if that meant all new tenants would need to be below 60% AMI and Ms. Riley stated that they would need to qualify for HUD-based standards via income requirements. Mr. Woodruff asked how many units at the Ballston Macy's site would be workforce housing. Ms. Davidson responded that there would be about 11 units and one dedicated committed affordable housing unit, with the workforce housing ranging from studios to two-bedroom units.

Ms. Lawrence asked if the historic preservation easement would include the green spaces at the Haven Apartments. Ms. Davidson explained that they will be establishing a north-south pedestrian connection and some flexibility to add a few more parking spaces, but that they agree that the open spaces are important to include in the easement. Ms. Farris noted that the County has the original design specifications of the complex, including the original landscape and circulation plans, and these will be provided in the easement documentation to assist the property owner with future plantings or landscaping changes.

Mr. Laporte brought up some concerns he made about the project at the July HALRB meeting, where he recognized his opinion may have been in the minority. He expressed continued concern that the preservation of the Haven Apartments was not really engaging historic preservation. He provided a hypothetical, implying that if the County were to allocate money to preserve the Haven Apartments that the HALRB would not choose to spend funds on this property. Although he recognized it was ranked as Notable in the HRI, he did not see it as historic or worth preserving. Mr. Laporte stated there are plenty of other historic properties and garden apartments in the County. He understood that at one point in history the County was at the height of garden apartment construction in the United States, but he did not believe all garden apartments needed to be saved to simply represent that period of history. He argued that the County has plenty of garden apartments that are already saved.

Ms. Farris interjected to state that the County did not have any garden apartments saved from this time period [in the garden apartment movement] or in the original complex of Columbia Heights. Mr. Laporte mentioned the preservation of Buckingham and Colonial Village as representing garden apartments from the 1950s. Ms. Farris specified that there are no protected garden apartments in this area of Columbia Pike. She also mentioned how when the County has been involved in the acquisition of historic properties in the past, it takes a very long time to find a viable plan to preserve them and adapt them to new uses. She further explained how there are different perspectives towards historic preservation, like preserving Courthouse Manor (a [more high-style] garden apartment complex that is [Essential on the HRI and] preserved via a historic preservation easement) or a [less ornate] complex like the Haven Apartments. She also stated that the Haven Apartments is worthy of preservation as it was identified within the HRI as a Notable property.

Ms. Liccese-Torres further explained how garden apartments as a genre and a building type in the County came about through the birth of the Federal Housing Administration, particularly from 1934 to 1954. She noted how some garden apartment examples, such as Colonial Village and Buckingham, are preserved via local historic districts and represent the earlier period in the garden apartment movement. She described the Haven Apartments as a later representation of the movement and the HPP staff feels it is important to preserve different complexes throughout that entire twenty-year period and not just the first ones.

Mr. Davis asked if the property owner also owned the Monterey Apartments across from the Haven Apartments. Ms. Davidson replied that they only owned the Haven Apartments. This concluded the HALRB's discussion on the project.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair's Report

The Chair asked for volunteers for the Nominating Committee for the 2023 HALRB leadership slate. Mr. Meden and Ms. Lawrence volunteered. The slate of proposed officers will be presented for a vote at the December HALRB meeting.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres polled the commissioners to check in-person attendance for the December 21, 2022, HALRB meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:49 pm.