



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
Neighborhood Services Division

Courthouse Plaza One 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

**MINUTES OF THE
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, December 15, 2021, 6:30 PM**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken
Sarah Garner, Vice Chair
Carmela Hamm
Jennie Gwin
Joan Lawrence
Robert Meden
Rebecca Meyer
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff, Chair

MEMBERS EXCUSED:
Omari Davis
Robert Dudka
Mark Turnbull
Gerald Laporte

STAFF: 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 read the roll and determined there was a quorum.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

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

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 17, 2021, MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for questions or comments on the draft November meeting minutes. Upon hearing none, Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the minutes and Ms. Garner seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres read the roll. The motion passed 8-0-1, with Ms. Meyer abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs) DISCUSSION AGENDA

Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 21-28 at 2329 North Edgewood Street

Ms. Bolliger explained that the property at 2329 N. Edgewood Street was a two-story brick 1944 house which was moved onto the site in 1963. She stated the property was listed as non-contributing to the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD); however, since the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not differentiate between contributing and non-contributing houses, the property would be reviewed according to the design guidelines. She reminded the commissioners that the Design Review Committee (DRC) and HALRB had considered this proposal at their November 2021 virtual meetings and asked the applicants to return to the DRC in December with a revised proposal.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the applicants were requesting to modify the existing dwelling by adding a two-story side addition on the south side of the property with a one-car sub-level garage. She described the proposed project in detail as follows:

The L-shaped footprint of the addition would consist of two massing blocks and would wrap partly around the rear of the existing dwelling and angle toward the street. Both proposed rooflines of the addition would be more than a foot below the original. The addition would be set back 4'6" from the front of the original dwelling.

The proposed façade would have six 3' x 5' six-over-one Weathershield wood windows and Hardie lap siding. The sub-level single-door garage would have a carriage-style overhead door.

The proposed south (right) side of the addition would include two transom windows directly below the frieze board and two 3' x 5' six-over-six Weathershield wood windows. The rear elevation of the addition would have a centered triple six-over-one wood window on the first floor and a smaller single six-over-one wood sash window on the second level. Also on the rear, the applicant proposes to demolish an existing metal handrail to allow for a small porch over the rear door with a single 10" square column. The applicant also requested adding a second air handler to the north side.

The proposed materials included parged and painted concrete for the foundation, horizontal Hardie fiber-cement lap siding, and new asphalt roof shingles on both the original dwelling and new addition.

Lastly, the applicant wants to replace all the windows in the original house with matching six-over-six wood windows.

Ms. Bolliger stated that the DRC considered this application for a second time at its December 1, 2021, virtual meeting. After the feedback received at the November HALRB hearing, the applicants presented multiple updated concepts for DRC review, including one L-shaped angled massing format and two rectangular formats. The DRC had given the following recommendations:

- The L-shaped angled massing (concept #2) was preferred as it broke the plane of the addition, and the hyphen further separated the garage from the original dwelling.
- Fenestration size and volume had been improved. However, the sashes themselves needed to be differentiated from the original house, with either 6/1 or 1/1 windows suggested.
- The basement level window was too similar to windows in the main massing. The DRC members recommended reducing it to appear more like a basement window (as on the existing dwelling).
- Additional elevations of the design were needed in the submission packet.
- Mr. Wenchel continued to have concerns about the front facing garage door and recommended finding additional strategies to mask its visibility from the right-of-way.

In response to the DRC feedback, the applicants implemented the following revisions to their proposal:

- Selected the L-shaped angled plan as per DRC preference;
- Reduced the fenestration sizing on the front elevation and changed the windows in the hyphen and main addition to 6/1 windows;
- Removed the dormers on the addition to simplify the massing and further differentiate the new construction from the original house;
- Added a smaller transition roof line to break up the visual massing;
- Changed the double car garage to a single car garage; and
- Changed the garage door to a carriage style.

Ms. Bolliger stated that overall, staff recommended approval of the proposed addition and found its massing, design, and materials appropriate for the LHD, especially given the unique circumstances of this lot. She said staff agreed that the proposed setback, reduced rooflines, reduced footprint, and broken massing helped convey that the new construction was secondary and a later addition. Ms. Bolliger noted how staff appreciated the removal of the front-facing porch balcony as it simplified the front façade. She stated that the reduced fenestration and 6/1 window style was appropriate for the hyphen and addition; this window style recalled the dimensions and schedule of the windows on the original dwelling without replicating them, further differentiating original and new construction. She said staff found that the attached single-car garage was a more appropriate size than the initially proposed attached two-car garage; however, staff continued to recommend screening for the garage opening so as to be consistent with the HALRB's previous requirement and approval of the street-facing garage for the new house at 2322 North Fillmore Street in 2017 (CoA 15-01).

Ms. Bolliger noted that on the south elevation, the fireplace bumpout originally proposed had been removed, and the previously proposed board-and-batten siding in the gable end had been replaced by lap siding with a band board at the roofline. She stated that staff also would have accepted a material such as a shingle in the gable end. She explained how staff had suggested additional windows to break up the solid massing on the right side of the addition and the applicant has since added them to the design. Ms. Bolliger said staff found that the other materials proposed for the addition were appropriate as per Appendix C and D of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. She concluded by stating that as per the *Design Guidelines* and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*, staff still did not recommend replacing the existing windows.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak and Ms. Long thanked the board for their help.

The Chair next invited Mr. Wenchel to share the DRC's opinion. Mr. Wenchel said the proposal was a marked improvement and that given the non-contributing status of the house and its date of construction it might be the best solution to the lot. He said the commissioners should be aware that they would be approving an attached garage on the front of the home, which would be setting precedent for the neighborhood. He also expressed concerns about access into the garage from the street.

The Chair welcomed other commissioners to give comments. He encouraged conversation about the front facing garage, the gable end material, and the screening for the garage.

Ms. Gwin agreed that it was a marked improvement and commended the applicant. Ms. Lawrence agreed but stated she was troubled by the garage. She believed the door style was too attention-grabbing and that the [new construction] property [at 2322 N. Fillmore St.] used the porch over the garage to inset the entryway and the lattice in front of the doors allowed for further screening. Given that many houses in Maywood did not have a garage at all, Ms. Lawrence urged efforts to minimize the garage and also recommended pursuing the repair of the existing windows.

Ms. Long noted that 2332 N. Fillmore St. [adjacent to 2322 N. Fillmore but outside of the LHD] had a front facing garage and there were numerous properties outside of the LHD but within the boundaries of the Maywood community which had front facing garages. The Chair agreed that the fringes of the civic association boundary outside of the LHD had front facing garages. He also agreed with Mr. Wenchel that there appeared to be no other location on the site for a garage and he did not think it was appropriate for the commission to deny a garage in its entirety.

Ms. Gwin agreed with Ms. Lawrence that the style of the garage door might be overwrought and could benefit from being simplified, possibly to fewer panels or simpler hardware. Ms. Meyer suggested that choosing a finish for the garage door closer to the surrounding materials might be more suitable than stained wood.

The Chair asked staff for recommendations for screening. Ms. Bolliger shared an image of the trellis cover at 2322 N. Fillmore St. as an example but explained that since the proposed door for the subject application would be a roll-up door, she did not have any recommendations for screening. Ms. Long noted that the screening was often open on 2322 N. Fillmore, leaving the garage door fully visible from the street.

The Chair noted he did not believe that non-contributing houses should be required to keep older windows in poor condition and that he believed in-kind replacements were acceptable. He stated he would be making a motion that did not require the owners to retain the original windows and invited the commissioners to amend the motion if they felt strongly otherwise.

Mr. Wenchel said that if the windows on the original home were replaced, they would need to be identical. The Chair stated that he believed identical in-kind replacements were required. Mr. Wenchel then suggested out-swinging garage doors rather than an overhead which could be visually adapted more easily than a roll-up door.

The Chair stated that a motion could be made to exclude the door, which meant the applicants would have to come back with a different garage door option. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that the final review of this element could come back to the DRC only to help expedite the approval process for the applicants.

The Chair asked for further comments. Upon hearing none, he made the following motion:

I move that HALRB approve CoA 21-28 to permit construction of the side addition at 2329 N. Edgewood Street as proposed in the revised subject application, provided that the doors to the garage entrance be further considered at a later date in a conversation between the applicant and members of the DRC and are deemed approved upon their agreement. Furthermore, the HALRB finds that the materials proposed for the addition are appropriate as per Appendix C and D of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and meet the intent of Standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Further, the HALRB finds the additional massing, design, and

materials are appropriate given the unique topographical circumstances and location of the property in the Maywood neighborhood.

Mr. Wenchel seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final questions. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 8-1-0, with Ms. Lawrence opposed.

Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 21-31 at 3421 21st Avenue North

Ms. Bolliger explained that this item was a preliminary review item without a staff report. She introduced the project as a rear addition to a circa 1932 Sears home which would involve the demolition of the existing 1980s rear addition. She also noted that there was a Sanborn map of an accessory building on the lot, but it was closer to the rear fence-line as is typical of historic sheds and garages.

Architect Matt Lee introduced the project and indicated the changes that had been made based on previous commission feedback. He summarized these modifications as: the reduced roof height of the addition, differentiation in roof heights between the original dwelling and new addition, use of a hyphen between the original house and new addition, reduction in size of the garage and the increased setback of the garage structure.

The Chair invited all commissioners to provide comments. Mr. Wenchel suggested an additional, deeper setback on the east side of the hyphen. Ms. Garner said it was a well thought out design, respectful of the historic home, and that she would support it when it returned for official review. Mr. Aiken stated he believed it was an appropriate design for the neighborhood. Ms. Gwin said she was not concerned about the setback of the hyphen on the east side but asked for confirmation on the change in materials. Mr. Uckert explained that there was a change in materials at the hyphen and there was a 3-inch setback between the original home and the addition on the east side.

Ms. Bolliger mentioned a comment received from the community about the size of the garage. Mr. Lee noted that they had lowered the garage roof height and had reached the bare minimum of the size feasible for a double garage. Ms. Lawrence stated that as an affected neighbor she liked the overall design and thought it would be an attractive addition to the neighborhood; however, she expressed concern about the garage. She noted that the use of a two-car garage was unusual in Maywood and situated close to the street. She compared the proposed design to the size and setback of existing 1.5- to 2-car garages throughout the neighborhood. Mr. Uckert replied that they had chosen not to set the garage further back so as not to impose on the view of the screened porch at the rear of Ms. Lawrence's house and to keep the garage aligned with the plane of the home. Ms. Lawrence thanked the applicants for their thoughtfulness but wondered if the position of the garage, while potentially better from her rear porch, was worse for the neighborhood given its location so close to the street. She recommended setting it back further and lowering the roof line again if a one-car garage was not within the project scope.

Ms. Hamm agreed with the comments on the garage. Ms. Meyer recommended the applicants consider moving the garage back past the plane of the house. Mr. Meden stated he did not have any concerns with the design or the garage but found the solutions proposed by the commission valid and interesting. The Chair added that he felt it was a fabulous design but that he believed they should build a one-car garage as the majority of the garages in the neighborhood were one car and it was more appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Lee asked for clarification from the commission about the east setback of the addition as 2 feet was substantial and there was already a 3-inch setback and material differentiation. Mr. Wenchel reiterated that he believed an additional setback would help the façade from the east side.

This concluded the preliminary review discussion. The Chair then asked Ms. Bolliger to confirm that no action had to be taken this evening on the two deferred discussion items [Reevesland and the Green Valley Pharmacy]. Ms. Bolliger explained that both applicants had asked for their respective items to be deferred. She said she would post the materials in advance of the next hearings with ample time for community comment.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair's Report

The Chair mentioned the proposed Outreach and Survey and Research sub-committees and the body of work that staff was developing. Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked the commissioners for offering their time on the sub-committees which will help the program be more proactive. She said that further details would be coming soon.

Regarding the election of the 2022 HALRB officers, Ms. Gwin as representative of the nominating committee nominated Mr. Woodruff to remain as chair and Mr. Davis as vice-chair (Mr. Davis had previously accepted the nomination via email). Mr. Aiken seconded the proposed slate. The Chair asked for final discussion. Upon hearing none, he asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to read the roll. The vote passed unanimously 9-0.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Tawney summarized the recent Historic Preservation Master Plan Update Outreach Week events and engagement. She thanked those commissioners who had attended events.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff hoped to present a draft plan of the Master Plan Update for County leadership in January, and after revisions hoped it would be available for public comment in the spring. She noted there would be robust engagement offerings online and in person and invited the commissioners to help the staff with outreach in the spring and summer. Ms. Liccese-Torres concluded that staff hoped to present the draft plan to the HALRB officially in August 2022 and then go to the County Board for adoption in the fall.

Ms. Liccese-Torres announced that the Fellows-McGrath house had been demolished recently. She said that despite repeated attempts to contact the property owner, staff did not obtain permission to visit and record or salvage anything from the property. Ms. Lawrence thanked the staff for their work over the last virtual year and noted she was not surprised but still disappointed that the owner of the Fellows-McGrath parcel had not responded. She thanked Mr. Woodruff and Ms. Garner for their leadership over the past year.

Ms. Hamm thanked the staff for their contributions toward the time capsule at the Arlington County Naming Centennial event in November.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:04 PM.