



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

Wednesday, March 15, 2023, 6:30 PM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aiken, Vice Chair
Omari Davis, Chair
Alexandra Foster
Robert Meden
Rebecca Meyer
Kaydee Myers
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY:
Gerry Laporte (personal/medical, Arlington, VA)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Carmela Hamm
Joan Lawrence

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. Ms. Meyer soon arrived at 6:33 pm.

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.

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

- 1) Mark Benas for Wormald
2328 N. Jackson St., CoA 21-05B
Maywood Historic District
Request to amend previously approved CoA 21-05 to add missing porch handrail and amend porch railing.

The Chair asked for any concerns or questions about the consent agenda. Upon hearing none, Mr. Meden moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 9-0 (Ms. Foster had not yet arrived).

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

Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 23-03, 2910 Columbia Pike

Ms. Farris presented the updated application for the window project submitted by the restaurant owner at 2910 Columbia Pike initially in February 2023. She explained that the applicant proposed to modify the initially submitted five-panel bi-fold doors into five-panel folding windows to fit within the existing window openings on the historic façade. She said the proposal included removing the existing 7' by 13' large plate glass windows located on both sides of the recessed main entry and installing two five-panel folding windows each measuring 7' by 13'. She noted the bi-fold windows would be supported by a track system that would allow the windows to fold inside the interior of the restaurant space.

Ms. Farris recounted that the DRC had considered this revised application at its March 1, 2023, hybrid meeting. Since the applicant did not attend, the HPP staff attempted to answer questions from the DRC members. The proposal provided a demolition plan of an additional band of about 8" to be removed at the bottom of the existing window openings. This indicated to the commissioners that the existing window openings would be a different size, which contrasted with the direction provided by the HALRB at its February HALRB public hearing. The DRC noted that the demolition of the 8" band at the bottom of the existing window openings would deviate from the configuration of the other façade windows. In relation to the proposed folding windows, the DRC noted that the five-panel folding windows would alter the fenestration pattern's symmetry and suggested a four-panel folding window instead. Lastly, the DRC members asked for updated drawings of the entire façade to understand the context of the proposed project to the adjacent single windows. The DRC placed the application on the Discussion Agenda for the March 15, 2023, hybrid HALRB public hearing. The HPP staff provided the DRC's comments to the applicant, who had agreed to update the drawings to include the adjacent single windows and to retain the 8" band at the bottom of the existing window openings. However, the applicant asked the HALRB to review the proposed five-panel folding windows rather than sourcing four-panel windows.

Ms. Farris explained that the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff recommended approval of the subject application as submitted. She clarified that the Form Based Code outlined that the HALRB needed to use *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* when considering development projects involving historic facades. She then explained that the subject application complied with Standards #2, #9, and #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Ms. Farris noted that as a historic commercial building, it was necessary to adapt the space to the needs of future owners/tenants. She said staff believed that the existing windows were replaced when the historic façade was reconstructed during the Halstead project in 2004. Ms. Farris stated staff considered the following elements of the Arlington Hardware Building to be character-defining: the two-story form, flat roof, brick cladding, window and door sizing and spatial relationship on the façade, and the original location of the historic façade along Columbia Pike. She noted staff did not consider the existing fixed windows or their existing fenestration pattern to be character-defining features. Ms. Farris concluded that the HPP staff supported the proposed five-panel folding windows into the existing window openings.

Ms. Meyer noted that the drawings still indicated that the inserted windows would be larger than the existing windows and would not meet the bottom sill of the other existing windows, creating an incoherent line across the facade. Ms. Bolliger noted that this might be a mistake in the drawings as the existing conditions also had this misalignment. Mr. Laporte asked why the operable windows were

necessary. Ms. Farris explained that it was not a zoning requirement for egress or ventilation, but rather a design choice for the atmosphere for the diners and air circulation concerns. Ms. Meyer noted a discrepancy between the dimensions on the February 2023 and the March 2023 submission sets and asked for clarification as to which dimensions were correct. Mr. Woodruff asked for confirmation that there would be no additional demolition of the structural sill beneath the windows. The Chair suggested working the specific dimensions into the motion language and requiring correct plans to be resubmitted to ensure adherence to the spirit of the approval.

The Chair thanked the board members for their discussion and proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve the proposed Columbia Pike Form Based Code modification at 2910 Columbia Pike pending that the revised drawings show that the height of the window matches the existing window openings and such that the proposed modification maintain the existing window opening size with in-swing operable windows with five panes. The proposed modification complies with Standards #2, #9, and #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Staff will confirm the window size prior to the issuance of the CoA.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0 (Ms. Foster arrived at 6:35 pm).

Historic Marker Review #1: Fort Ethan Allen Civil War Trails Marker

Ms. Bolliger invited John McNair to present the Department of Parks and Recreation's (DPR) proposed Civil War Trails marker for Fort Ethan Allen [which is a local historic district]. Mr. McNair presented an overview of the fort's existing markers and the history of African American military representation. He stated there were no markers covering this history elsewhere at any of the forts in the County. He outlined the cost of membership in the Civil War Trails marker program. He explained that for cost reasons the proposed marker would replace an existing marker. Mr. McNair said that DPR staff was requesting HALRB approval of the proposed marker design and content, as well as approval of a new location for the marker close to the front of the park.

Ms. Bolliger noted that one public comment from Mr. Bernie Berne had been submitted for consideration, and that the commenter also signed up to speak at the hearing. The public comment has been transcribed below.

Proposed U.S. Colored Troops Marker at Fort Ethan Allen

The text of this proposed marker states that 107th U.S. Colored Troops (USCT) regiment were deployed to forts in Arlington in October 1865 and were mustered out on November 22, 1866. The page containing the text shows a group of colored soldiers standing in front of a building, but does not identify the buildings location.

A page in the application's supporting materials contains a copy of an undated article from the Alexandria Journal that states that the 107th was garrisoned at Fort Ethan Allen, Fort Corcoran, Fort Richardson, Fort C.F. Smith, Fort Morgan and Fort Tillinghast.

There is some doubt as to whether the list is accurate, as it does not contain the name of Fort Woodbury. A November 1, 1865, photograph shows members of the 107th lined up in front of a building at that fort. A November 1865 photograph shows a group of officers of the 107th standing and sitting on a porch and steps in front of a large building at Fort Corcoran.

It is best to erect copies of this marker at the sites of one or more forts at which photographs of the 107th document their presence, rather than at Fort Ethan Allen, where no such primary documentation exists. I therefore suggest that Arlington County should instead erect copies of this proposed marker (as suitably revised) at the former sites of Fort Corcoran and Fort Woodbury, near the historical markers that the County has already erected at those sites.

The markers can contain copies of the photographs that show the presence of members of the 107th at those forts. That would not be possible at Fort Ethan Allen. There is sufficient space available at the sites of Fort Woodbury and Fort Corcoran to accommodate the markers.

The last page in the application's supporting materials contains a copy of the existing "Defenses of Washington" marker for Fort Ethan Allen. The marker contains an 1865 photograph of that fort.

A "Defenses of Washington" marker for the USCT that is located at Fort Ethan Allen would therefore not be complete if it did not contain a photograph of the USCT at that fort. The only photograph that the application contains is one of a group of USCT soldiers standing in front of a building whose location is not identified.

*Further, the proposed marker does not describe the role of the USCT while serving in Arlington. **The marker needs to describe this role.***

The marker should state that the USCT did not generally garrison the fortifications of the Defenses of Washington, but instead worked as temporary laborers on the Defenses. The marker should also state that the USCT dismantled Fort Corcoran and Fort Woodbury.

Photographs taken in November 1865 show that the USCT were at Fort Corcoran and Fort Woodbury at that time. U.S. Army headquarters had ordered the immediate dismantling of those forts on June 23, 1865. The USCT were following those orders when the photographs were taken.

REFERENCES:

General

- [United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service: National Capital Region, Washington, D.C.: Civil War Defenses of Washington: A Historic Resources Study - Parts I and II](#)
- *National Park Service: Civil War Defenses of Washington Historic Resource Study - [Part I, Chapter 1: Introduction](#)*
- *National Park Service: Civil War Defenses of Washington Historic Resource Study - [Part I: Chapter 4: The Civil War Years:](#)
United States Colored Troop Workers:*

“Black troops, designated United States Colored Troops, U.S.C.T., served in the Defenses of Washington. (Reference 89) The USCTs, however, did not generally garrison the fortifications of the Defenses of Washington but served in the Provisional Brigade, commanded by Silas M. Casey, encamped at [Camp Casey](#). The troops did, at times, work as laborers, like many other Union units, on the Washington defenses. (Reference 90: "A few photographs taken during the

Civil War depict USCTs at some of the forts in Washington [see collection of photos accompanying this report] but their stay at the forts was only temporary) ”

Fort Corcoran

- Historical Marker Database (HMdb.org): [Fort Corcoran Historical Marker](#).

The Arlington County government erected this historical marker. The marker is located in a grassy strip on Key Boulevard between the sidewalk and the street, near the northeast corner of the intersection of Key Boulevard and North Ode Street (see [October 2021 street level image on Google Maps](#)).

- Library of Congress: [Arlington, Virginia. Officers' of 107th U.S. Colored Infantry at Fort Corcoran](#). Photograph created by William Morris Smith in November 1865.
- [War of the Rebellion: Serial 097 Page 1293 Chapter LVIII. CORRESPONDENCE, ETC. - UNION](#).

GENERAL ORDERS,
HDQRS. DEPT. OF WASHINGTON,
TWENTY-SECOND ARMY CORPS, Numbers 89.
June 23, 1865

*1. Under instructions contained in Special Orders, Numbers 315, current series, War Department, Adjutant-General's Office, of June 19, 1865, the following field-works are announced as composing the defenses of Washington: North of Potomac-Fort Carroll, Fort Stanton, Fort Baker, Fort Mahan, Fort Lincoln, Fort Totten, Fort Slocum, Fort Stevens, Fort Reno, Fort Sumner, and Fort Foote; south of Potomac- Fort Lyon and Redoubts Weed, Farnsworth and O'Rorke, Fort Ellsworth, Fort Worth, Fort Ward, Fort Richardson, Fort McPherson, Fort Whipple, Fort Morton, Fort C. F. Smith, Fort Ethan Allen, and Battery Rodgers. **All other forts, batteries, and block-houses of the defenses of Washington will be at once dismantled**, excepting Fort Tillinghast and Fort Craig, which will be maintained until Fort McPherson, immediately in the rear of the positions occupied by them, is so far completed as to receive its armament.*

Fort Woodbury

- Historical Marker Database (HMdb.org): [Fort Woodbury Historical Marker](#).

The Arlington County government erected this historical marker. The marker is located in a grassy open space near the northwest corner of the intersection of North Courthouse Road and North 14th Street (see [September 2021 street level image on Google Maps](#)).

- National Park Service: [107th United States Colored Troops \(USCT\) at Fort Woodbury \(Arlington Line Defenses, Virginia\)](#). Photograph created on November 1, 1865.
- [War of the Rebellion: Serial 097 Page 1293 Chapter LVIII. CORRESPONDENCE, ETC. - UNION](#).

*GENERAL ORDERS,
HDQRS. DEPT. OF WASHINGTON,
TWENTY-SECOND ARMY CORPS, Numbers 89.
June 23, 1865.*

*1. Under instructions contained in Special Orders, Numbers 315, current series, War Department, Adjutant-General's Office, of June 19, 1865, the following field-works are announced as composing the defenses of Washington: North of Potomac-Fort Carroll, Fort Stanton, Fort Baker, Fort Mahan, Fort Lincoln, Fort Totten, Fort Slocum, Fort Stevens, Fort Reno, Fort Sumner, and Fort Foote; south of Potomac- Fort Lyon and Redoubts Weed, Farnsworth and O'Rorke, Fort Ellsworth, Fort Worth, Fort Ward, Fort Richardson, Fort McPherson, Fort Whipple, Fort Morton, Fort C. F. Smith, Fort Ethan Allen, and Battery Rodgers. **All other forts, batteries, and block-houses of the defenses of Washington will be at once dismantled**, excepting Fort Tillinghast and Fort Craig, which will be maintained until Fort McPherson, immediately in the rear of the positions occupied by them, is so far completed as to receive its armament.*

The Chair invited Mr. Berne to speak; he repeated his written comment for the commission.

The Chair next invited the commissioners to discuss. Mr. Woodruff asked for clarification on the “alternative language” listed in the packet. Mr. McNair explained that with the strict Civil War Trails word count, he had included text from an historic letter which could be used as alternative interpretation if there was not enough space for all the text.

Mr. Laporte expressed concerns that the proposed marker text was not related to Fort Ethan Allen and needed to be connected to the site if it was installed there or moved to a location better suited for the information. He also noted there was value in the technical information on the original marker and recommended retaining it.

Mr. Woodruff suggested that any of the other nine markers on-site might provide the general Civil War information that Mr. Laporte was concerned about providing. Mr. Woodruff said he believed this proposed text had merit and deserved to be included at the fort. Mr. Aiken agreed that this story was important and aligned with the goals to provide more accessible and engaging historic interpretation; he likewise agreed with Mr. Laporte that the proposed language was not as concise or coherent as it could be.

Mr. Turnbull stated the story had to be contextualized with a better introductory paragraph connecting it to the park. Ms. Myer and Mr. Aiken agreed. Mr. Turnbull noted that there were also existing “Defenses of Washington” aluminum markers for the sites. Ms. Myer asked if the story of the USCT was covered anywhere else in Arlington. Mr. McNair replied it was not, and that the 107th was a regimental history which was largely unknown.

Ms. Bolliger asked where the majority of the Civil War interpretation was in the County and Mr. McNair confirmed that the majority of the markers were at Fort Ethan Allen. Mr. Laporte noted that the majority of the USCT training in the area was held on Roosevelt Island, which might be a good place for such interpretation, although there is no County management of interpretation at that site.

Ms. Bolliger asked Mr. McNair to confirm which part of the approval was highest priority. Mr. McNair explained that the Civil War Trails program would not begin a design layout of the marker until the location was approved; thus, the language could continue to be edited if a site were selected. Given this

information and the HALRB’s interest in updating the language, the Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve the location of the Fort Ethan Allen marker contingent upon additional edits to the text which contextualize the regiment to Fort Ethan Allen. These edits will be reviewed by the HALRB at a future time.

Mr. Meden seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 10-0.

Historic Marker Review #2: Arlington Junction Park Marker

Ms. Bolliger invited Max Ewart (DPR staff) to present the proposed marker draft for the Arlington Junction Park, whose naming had come to the HALRB in 2022. Mr. Ewart explained that the County Board approved a Master Plan for the Park in June 2021, which included the plan for a new name and interpretation of the area. He explained that the two areas they wanted to focus on included the connection with the Alexandria Canal and the Arlington Junction trolley stop.

Ms. Bolliger noted that a public comment from Mr. Bernie Berne had been submitted for consideration, and that the commenter had also signed up to speak at the hearing. The public comment has been transcribed below.

Language for Arlington Junction Park Informational Marker

Where Arlington Junction Park now sits has been the site for many uses throughout Arlington County’s history. Affectionately referred to as “The Teardrop Parcels,” due to the shape of the land, what is now a park was formerly the home for two essential pieces of transportation infrastructure in the County: the Alexandria Canal and Arlington Junction. These two pieces of our local history have played a large role in creating the surrounding neighborhoods, connecting what is now Crystal City to population centers throughout the area in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Alexandria Canal

The Alexandria Canal was completed in 1843, allowing Virginia merchants to reach the Chesapeake and Ohio (C&O) Canal without using the tidal Potomac River. When completed, the Canal connected Georgetown to the future Rosslyn area via a 1,000-foot-long aqueduct that spanned the River.

The Canal then ran seven miles, traveling first through the Arlington Plantation near the present route of Metrorail’s Blue Line. The Canal then passed to the west of Arlington Junction Park’s present location, continued south on and near the route of S. Eads Street, and entered the Potomac River at a tide lock in Old Town Alexandria.

The Canal mostly carried coal from western Maryland mines. Wheat, corn, whiskey, corn meal and flour were also shipped to Alexandria and its docks, while fish, salt, plaster and lumber were carried in the opposite direction. Shipments continued until the canal was abandoned in 1886, coinciding with a demand for a toll-free bridge that would cross the Potomac into Georgetown.

Arlington Junction

In 1896, the Washington, Alexandria, and Mount Vernon Electric Railway constructed an electric trolley line on the towpath of the abandoned Alexandria Canal. The line allowed the Railway to offer continuous service between downtown Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon. The line crossed the Potomac River on the 1872 Long Bridge and later, the 1906 Highway Bridge.

The Railway built Arlington Junction between 1896 and 1900, naming it for the nearby Arlington National Cemetery. The line's route split at the Junction, allowing passengers to travel between Alexandria, the Cemetery, Rosslyn and Washington, as they now can at the Pentagon Metro Station.

Other junctions permitted passengers to travel west to Fort Myer, Clarendon, Ballston, Falls Church, Vienna and Fairfax City or transfer to a diverging line that reached the Green Valley neighborhood. Near Arlington's southern border at Four Mile Run, the railroad company constructed a rail yard and an amusement park, Luna Park, that operated from 1906 to 1915.

The Washington-Alexandria-Mount Vernon line closed during 1932, as did the Junction. The tracks were soon removed when the federal government used portions of the right-of-way to construct the George Washington Memorial Parkway. However, electric trolleys continued to travel between Rosslyn and Fairfax City on a branch of the line until 1936 and until 1941 between Rosslyn and Purcellville on the Washington & Old Dominion Railroad.

The Chair invited Mr. Berne to speak; he repeated his written comment for the commission and recommended that Mr. Ewart review his letter.

The Chair invited the commissioners to discuss. Mr. Laporte said he had reviewed Mr. Berne's edits and developed edits based on the original text and Mr. Berne's suggestions. However, he noted two factual errors such as the use of "Virginian" side of the river, as Arlington was part of the District of Columbia at that time. Mr. Laporte also noted that the reference to the "toll-free bridge" teased the information but gave no context, and he preferred not having that language.

Ms. Farris stated that the [Metrorail] Blue line and Alexandria Canal did follow the same path in North Arlington but went in separate directions near the Pentagon, north of the park location.

Mr. Laporte questioned Mr. Berne's suggestion that the stop had been named after Arlington National Cemetery as that magisterial district had been called Arlington. Mr. Berne explained that junctions where train lines went in different directions would be named after the next major landmark to indicate that this was the junction for that location.

Mr. Aiken suggested reducing some of the word count as it was very text heavy. Mr. Turnbull recommended Mr. Laporte's edits as they were more concise. Ms. Bolliger suggested that viewing a design layout would help to break the text up. Mr. Woodruff asked if there were any images proposed for the marker. Mr. Ewart explained that he wanted to have the text reviewed before developing a design layout. Mr. Ewart also said that DPR staff would review the comments from the HALRB and Mr. Berne and return to the HALRB with a mockup design at a later date.

Mr. Woodruff noted he had noticed that the laminate markers in the W&OD park had aged badly and whether there was a way to find a longer-lasting material. Ms. Bolliger explained that she had recently ordered replacements for some other [County-owned] laminate markers as they had yellowed from

exposure to the sun, and hoped that new laminate technology would age better than that of the 10-year old markers she was replacing.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair's Report

The Chair explained that the County Manager's proposed budget cuts to the HPP's consultant funding were still under review in the annual budget process.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the commissioners that there would be a special informational session for the HALRB on the draft Historic and Cultural Resources Plan on Wednesday, April 26, 2023, at 6:30 pm in the County Manager's Conference Room. She encouraged them to attend.

Ms. Tawney outlined the upcoming community engagement for the updated Plan, including an open house event on May 6 from 12-3 PM at the Arlington Central Library. She invited commissioners to join staff at the event to help answer questions, man learning stations, and support the Plan update process.

Ms. Liccese-Torres polled the commissioners for their in-person availability for the April 19, 2023, hybrid HALRB meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:09 pm.