



**MINUTES OF THE
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023, 6:30 PM**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Omari Davis, Chair
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Kaydee Myers
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel
Richard Woodruff

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIRTUALLY:
Carmela Hamm (medical, Henrico, Virginia)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: John Aiken, Vice Chair
Robert Dudka
Alexandra Foster
Gray Handley
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 that there was a quorum.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

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

APPROVAL OF APRIL 19, 2023, MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for questions or comments on the April 2023 draft meeting minutes. Upon hearing none, he asked for a motion. Mr. Laporte moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 5-0-3 with Ms. Hamm, Ms. Lawrence, and Ms. Myers abstaining. Mr. Laporte asked a clarifying question about the requirements for voting on this item since three of the members abstained from the vote. Ms. Liccese-Torres and Ms. Bolliger

confirmed that, per the HALRB Bylaws, motions were passed or denied based on the majority of those voting in the meeting not the number of members present in the room. Ms. Liccese-Torres restated that the motion count was 5-0-3.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1) Carolyn Rickard Brideau
3210 23rd St. N., CoA 23-13
Maywood Historic District
Request to replace a wooden basement door with a fiberglass door.

- 2) Kevin Driscoll, KJD Architects
2500 Columbia Pike, CoA 23-12
Columbia Pike Form Based Code
Request to install vestibule for new restaurant in rear of shopping center.

The Chair asked for any concerns or questions about the consent agenda. Upon hearing none, he asked for a motion. Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the consent agenda and Mr. Turnbull seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 8-0.

It was at this time that a member of the public, Mr. John Reeder, asked the Chair if he could bring forward a point of order. He then proceeded to ask if he could make a public comment on an item that was not on the agenda. The Chair replied that Mr. Reeder could not make a public comment on the item in question since it was not part of the HALRB agenda for the evening. Mr. Reeder left the meeting. Another member of the public, Mr. Donahue, asked if his letter in support of CoA 23-10 (the first item on the discussion agenda) had been shared with the HALRB. Ms. Bolliger explained that it had and stated he could speak once the item was officially before the HALRB for discussion.

Mr. Laporte then asked for further clarification about public comments at HALRB meetings. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that she believed the HALRB has never had a public comment period for general topics and confirmed that anyone who wanted to speak about something that has been advertised via the HALRB agenda can do so if they sign up in advance or in person. She and Ms. Bolliger further explained that the existing HALRB Bylaws do not address a public comment period and that the Bylaws would need to be amended if the HALRB wanted to address this specifically.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

DISCUSSION AGENDA

Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 23-10, 1720 N. Queens Ln., #168

Ms. Bolliger presented an application for the replacement of eight aluminum windows with eight vinyl Earthwise double-hung windows at a condominium unit in Colonial Village. She stated that Colonial Village was the first large-scale rental housing project in America insured by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), that it had a major influence on apartment design in the 1930s, and that it was one of the first to apply innovative garden city planning concepts to a low- and middle-income apartment complex. She noted the garden city planning concepts included low-density superblock development,

clustering apartment units into spacious richly landscaped courtyards, separating pedestrian and vehicle traffic, and using an undeveloped interior greenbelt.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the HALRB approved the *Guidelines for Replacement Windows in Colonial Village* in 2015, which allowed for replacement windows meeting specific criteria to be approved by the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff via an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness (ACoA). She said that since 2015, individual condo owners in Colonial Village had been applying for window replacements by ACoA primarily with the Paradigm 7800 hybrid window; however, this window has been discontinued, and the Colonial Village Board and Colonial Village owners had been unable to find a replacement window which fulfilled the existing ACoA criteria. She reiterated that this was the reason the current applicant was coming before the HALRB.

Ms. Bolliger reminded the HALRB that at the May 17, 2023, hybrid public hearing, the HPP staff presented seven window options for the HALRB to consider and compare to the existing guidelines. She said that at that meeting, the commissioners informally discussed a range of dimensions and considered which window options would be appropriate for Colonial Village. Ms. Bolliger also reminded the Board that all the original wood windows in Colonial Village had been replaced with aluminum windows prior to becoming a Local Historic District (LHD).

Ms. Bolliger summarized the subject application:

The proposed windows have a single movable screen which can slide up within a low-profile channel. Dimensions of the window are as follows:

- Distance between the glass and the edge of the frame (top) is 2 1/4”
- Rail: 1 1/4”
- Distance between the glass and the edge of the frame (side) is 3”
- Stile: 1 1/4”
- Meeting rail: depth is 5/8”
- Muntin: width is 7/8”
- Muntin: height is 3/16”.

The major visible difference appears to be the shape of the muntin, which in the *2015 Guidelines for Replacement Windows in Colonial Village* are shown in cross section as a trapezoid, mimicking a standard block wood muntin with glazing putty sealing the glass. On the proposed Earthwise window, the muntin appears as three stepped layers.

Ms. Bolliger said the HPP staff recommended approval of the application as submitted given that the *Colonial Village National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form* described the location, size, layout, and glazing pattern of the windows in the complex, but did not outline their material or structural dimension, which indicates that the fenestration pattern is character-defining, but the window material details are not. Furthermore, given that Colonial Village had originally been constructed as an affordable rental apartment complex, Ms. Bolliger explained, all the original windows would have been identical and maintained/replaced by the same entity, creating a uniformity of appearance. However, she continued, the Colonial Village LHD was converted to condominiums thereby meaning there was varied ownership today; it was for this reason the HPP staff felt that visible uniformity of the windows was important to retain the aesthetic appearance of the buildings. She further stated that the condo owners and the Colonial Village Board had not been able to find a window that fulfilled the existing *2015 Guidelines*. She said that the range of measurements approved for the *2015 Guidelines* and the proposed window in the subject application did not vary widely enough to appear visibly different from the ground. She stated that the HPP staff preferred standard trapezoid muntins but as the width matched the dimension recommended by

the 2015 *Guidelines*, the added element would appear minimal. Ms. Bolliger concluded by stating that many of the windows in Colonial Village are not visible from the public right-of-way but only from privately owned land within the LHD.

Next, the Design Review Committee (DRC) shared its opinions. Mr. Wenchel expressed concern that the muntin appeared to be larger than the dimension approved in the 2015 *Guidelines* and that the profile of the muntin was different. He stated it was for this reason the DRC wanted to discuss the application with the full Board.

Ms. Bolliger invited the applicant to speak before the HALRB. Ms. Lofgren provided some background information to the project, and she spoke to the quality of the window they had selected and the reasons for their choice. Ms. Bolliger then invited Mr. Donahue, who had submitted a letter, to speak before the Board if he so wished. Mr. Donahue expressed his support for the project and stated that he felt the 2015 *Guidelines* should match the dimensions of the windows at the time of construction of Colonial Village so that anyone making window changes in the future would conform to this historic standard. He also shared a book that included a history and photographs of Colonial Village.

Ms. Myers asked for clarification if there were any windows [currently] made that met the current 2015 *Guidelines*. Ms. Bolliger confirmed that the Colonial Village Board had not been able to find any windows that matched all elements of the current guidelines. Ms. Tawney reiterated that the reason this application was coming forward was because the Paradigm model window, which met all the specifications of the 2015 *Guidelines* and was the model most Colonial Village residents used, had been discontinued and could no longer be ordered, thereby forcing residents to find other windows that met the parameters set forth in the guidelines.

Mr. Laporte asked about the current 2015 *Guidelines*. Ms. Bolliger confirmed she had updated the guidelines per the recommendations and discussion the HALRB had in May 2023, but that she still needed to share them with the Colonial Village Board to ensure they approved of the changes before she brought the revised guidelines forward to the HALRB for final approval. Mr. Laporte asked a clarifying question about the window model in this application and if it had been one of the seven the HALRB thought would be appropriate during their discussion in May. Ms. Bolliger replied that the HALRB had agreed it was one of the appropriate windows, but only if the muntin could be a trapezoid. Ms. Lawrence asked if that could be possible, but the applicant confirmed that the muntin could not be in a trapezoid shape.

Mr. Woodruff asked if the 2015 *Guidelines* required the muntin to be a trapezoid shape. Ms. Bolliger confirmed that it does not, but that it does have a drawing showing the trapezoid design. The Board discussed that the updated 2015 *Guidelines* should stipulate this further. Mr. Woodruff stated it did not make sense to approve this window before the updated guidelines had been read and approved by the HALRB. Mr. Laporte also expressed concern that approving this window could set a potential precedent in the LHD. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked how many of the windows in the subject application are on the front of the building; the applicant replied there are three windows on the front. It also was clarified that the proposed windows would have a six-over-six configuration.

The Chair decided to take a straw poll on the application. Prior to the poll, Mr. Turnbull asked to confirm the main issue at hand, and Ms. Myers asked for clarification on the trapezoid shape of the muntin. Ms. Lawrence asked if simulated divided lite windows were currently allowed; Ms. Bolliger said they were as per the 2015 *Guidelines*. The Chair then proceeded to conduct the straw poll; he stated he was inclined to approve the project. Mr. Woodruff, Ms. Myers, Mr. Turnbull, and Ms. Hamm also indicated their support for the project given that the windows mostly fit the requirements of the guidelines and that the windows the applicant proposed to replace were not original to Colonial Village. Ms. Lawrence noted that she did

not feel these were the best version of windows that fit the current Design Guidelines, but said she was interested to see if the difference was notable once installed. Mr. Laporte and Mr. Wenchel expressed concern over the precedent setting-nature of the project and ultimately did not feel that the windows were appropriate.

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

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-10 in the Colonial Village Historic District for the request for replacement vinyl windows which do not fulfill the 2015 ACoA guidelines.

Ms. Lawrence requested the addition of “substantially meet the criteria” to the motion to make it clear that this application would not be precedent setting. The Chair amended the motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-10 in the Colonial Village Historic District for the request for replacement vinyl windows which do not fulfill the 2015 ACoA guidelines; this current application’s windows substantially meet the criteria.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Staff clarified that after the 2015 *Guidelines* for Colonial Village were updated, window projects that followed the guidelines would receive an ACoA and those projects that did not would come to the HALRB for a CoA. Upon hearing no other comments, the Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed 6-2, with Mr. Laporte and Mr. Wenchel opposing.

Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 23-09, 2911 23rd Street N.

Ms. Bolliger presented CoA 23-09 for the installation of a new pergola and patio at the rear of the house at 2911 23rd Street North in the Maywood LHD, as well as the replacement of a wood exterior door with a fiberglass door. She stated that the house was a pre-1922 contributing dwelling and that most recently in September 2019 (CoA 19-14), the HALRB had approved the replacement of the three-tab asphalt shingles on the existing roof of the garage with architectural asphalt shingles and the installation of a skylight on the rear of the same garage. She continued by stating that previously in October 2018, the HALRB approved the installation of a skylight, air conditioning units, and new exhaust vents, as well as the replacement of three existing exterior wooden doors (CoA 18-22). She noted that at that time, the HPP staff completed a survey of the exterior doors on the subject property, including the main entry door, the rear basement door, and the kitchen door, and found them to be in working condition. The applicants then withdrew the door replacement component of their CoA.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the current proposal as follows:

The applicant is requesting to install a pergola with a retractable fabric canopy, install a sunken fire pit, and replace a wooden rear basement door with a fiberglass door. Currently, the rear of the property has a concrete patio at the northwest corner, a walkway along the north edge of the house, and a concrete walk to the garage. The current patio and walkway total approximately 300 s.f. The applicant proposes to replace the existing concrete patio with a new concrete patio with flagstone border, stone patio steps, and a low concrete retaining wall at the northwest corner of the house. A new sunken fire pit will be installed adjacent to the pergola patio at the northeast corner of the home. The total square footage for the new proposed surface area will be 624 s.f. with dimensions approximately 35’7” x 18’.

The proposed pergola will have Craftsman-styled tapered wood columns encased in PVC trim. The pergola will have two columns and seven rafters and will be attached to the existing house

with a new ledger board. The existing concrete walk from the patio to the rear of the property will be replaced in-kind.

The applicant is also applying to replace the existing nine-lite half-glass wooden basement door at the rear with a fiberglass twelve-lite simulated divided lite door to match the twelve-lite front entry door. The “Vista Grande Fir” style exterior door is manufactured by Masonite.

Finally, the applicant is proposing to install a generator next to the sunken fire pit inside a low concrete retaining wall.

Ms. Bolliger stated the HPP staff recommended approval because the proposed pergola and patio would be located at the rear of the property and not be visible from the front elevation right-of-way. She stated that the proposal met the intent of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. She continued by saying that the proposed patio was larger than the 250 s.f. listed as appropriate for approval by staff via the ACoA process which was why it had to be reviewed by the HALRB; patios had been identified as appropriate outdoor living additions in the LHD in the past, and she reminded the HALRB that they approved other patios in Maywood, most recently in December 2020 at 2204 North Kenmore Street (CoA 20-26). Ms. Bolliger noted that the proposed stone and concrete were acceptable materials in the *Maywood Design Guidelines* and that the replacement of the concrete walk would be considered an in-kind replacement. She noted that Appendix D of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* states that “Under certain circumstances, the HALRB may permit the use of PVC trim on non-historic structures, non-contributing structures, new construction, and new additions to historic buildings. Trim elements include, but are not limited to, door trim, window trim, corner boards, cornice, fascia, etc.” All use of PVC trim must comply with the parameters of Appendix D. She continued by stating that the proposed location of the new site elements, as well as the use of concrete, stone, and PVC, meet the intent of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards* #9 and #10.

Ms. Bolliger stated staff does not typically recommend replacement of materials considered appropriate in the Maywood LHD, such as wood, with materials like fiberglass. She noted that wooden doors are typical in Maywood, both for interior and exterior uses and that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* only outline fiberglass doors as appropriate in sheds. She mentioned that the existing basement door in question appears to not be a historic door given that a date of 1984 is etched into the glass. Ms. Bolliger noted that the *Maywood Design Guidelines* do not list fiberglass as an inappropriate material in the LHD and that this is a secondary door opening and not on the primary facade of the home. Given that the material is not historic, Ms. Bolliger stated this change could meet the intent of Standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*.

Ms. Bolliger said that in June 2021, the HALRB approved the replacement of one wooden bathroom window in the addition of a contributing home in the Maywood LHD with an identical vinyl window in the shower (CoA 21-11) due to ongoing moisture issues. She stated this was not a decision based on the desire to replace alone, but due to the ongoing humidity and ensuing rot affecting the site and the material; evidence showed that wood was not appropriate in that location and that replacing wood in-kind would result in the same future outcome. Therefore, Ms. Bolliger stated, a man-made composite material was approved for that site-specific installation. She concluded the staff report by noting however, that the subject door, although a modern door, did not appear to be in the same condition of deterioration as the window in CoA 21-11 or the side door currently being proposed for replacement at 3210 23rd Street North in CoA 23-13.

The Chair invited members of the DRC to discuss the project. Mr. Wenchel noted the location of the house and stated there were no neighbors directly viewing that part of the property given that the lot goes all the way to North Fillmore Street. He also mentioned that in the DRC discussion, there was concern

about how large the pergola was in relation to the house; he stated he personally did not completely disapprove of it given its location and the layout of the property.

The Chair invited the applicants to speak. Mr. Pietan shared they were able to obtain historic tax credits for work they did on the house in 2019 which included portions of a basement renovation. He said the current project tied to that basement renovation project, and their goal was to make the backyard space more usable. He noted that the rear door was not original and did not match any of the other doors on the house currently which was why they wanted to replace it. He also said they wanted to replace their current walkway because it was too narrow and dangerous to use.

The Chair invited discussion from the Board. Ms. Lawrence said other properties in Maywood have similarly sized additions and patios in the rear and felt that she could support the project. Mr. Woodruff thought the project looked great and wanted clarification as to where the generator was on the site plan. The Chair asked if there were any other comments or questions. Upon hearing none, he proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-09 in the Maywood Historic District for the request to install pergola, patio, and replace rear door with fiberglass door.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Discussion Agenda Item #3: CoA 21-30B, 2415 Shirlington Rd.

Ms. Bolliger presented the amended CoA request for a retractable pergola and bioretention planters at the Green Valley Pharmacy. She stated the updated drawings and information about the retractable pergola were submitted after the staff report was written. She then presented information about the bioretention planters; the application includes three bioretention planters -- planter A (93 s.f.), planter B (108 s.f.), and planter C (130 s.f.). She noted all the planters would have a low 2-4” curb on the side farthest from the building to maximize the capture site’s stormwater runoff.

Ms. Bolliger said the HPP staff recommended approval of the bioretention planters because the proposed changes are minor to the landscape and would help the site meet stormwater management goals. She stated the proposed planters, given their location at-grade, likely would not interfere with the view of the historic building and their installation along the sidewalk would not damage or affect any historic site elements. She concluded, stating the application complies with Standards #9 and #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Bolliger next discussed the proposed pergola. She said the HPP staff generally supported a pergola because it would provide additional service space for the new restaurant. Additionally, she noted that the pergola could be removed in the future without any detriment to the historic materials or character of the building, which complied with Standard #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*. She said the pergola would be installed underneath the coping of the roofline, which was compliant with a prior recommendation from Mr. Wenchel.

Ms. Bolliger then invited the applicant, Mr. Maharmeh, to speak. Mr. Maharmeh stated this iteration of the project was a “first draft” and that other changes would be sent to Ms. Bolliger. Ms. Bolliger asked clarifying questions; Mr. Maharmeh noted that the drawing should have the pergola extending past the front window. Ms. Bolliger noted that this would go against what the DRC, in particular Mr. Wenchel, had recommended which was to not have the pergola cover the window. Mr. Maharmeh said that this was what the owner wanted (to eventually close the window), but that they could leave the drawings as they were presented for now. Ms. Bolliger expressed that staff would not support the closing of the window.

Ms. Bolliger asked for clarification from the applicant, given that there were two separate drawings for the pergola – one with a flat roof and one with it sloped – she asked which the applicant preferred. Mr. Maharmeh responded that he preferred a sloped roof which was not the pergola that was presented to the DRC nor had been submitted ahead of the HALRB meeting.

The Chair interjected to state that since there was a discrepancy between what the applicant had submitted for their CoA application and the presentation given at tonight's meeting, that the HALRB would proceed to discuss only the bioretention planters and table the pergola discussion for a future meeting. He then asked the Board if there were any questions about the bioretention planters. Upon hearing none, the Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-30B at the Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District for the request to install bioretention planters only.

Mr. Laporte seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Discussion Agenda Item #4: CoA 23-14, 3829 N. Stafford St.

Ms. Bolliger presented the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)'s request to install a new historic marker at the Fort Ethan Allen LHD. She reminded the commissioners this is the second time they will be considering this marker. Ms. Bolliger noted that Fort Ethan Allen was built in September 1861 as a large bastion-style fort. She said originally the site was surrounded mostly by farmland and forests which were cut down to allow for clear lines of sight toward other fortifications and approaches to Washington, D.C. She stated that the County's DPR, which oversees the Fort Ethan Allen Park, has participated in the Civil War Trails (CWT) program since the 1990s. Ms. Bolliger said that DPR pays annual fees to be included in the CWT program for five interpretive markers: one at Fort Ethan Allen; three at Fort C.F. Smith; and one at the Arlington Mill site. The existing CWT sign at Fort Ethan Allen was installed in a secluded part of the park circa 2003. In June 2013, the HALRB approved the installation of nine historic markers around the fort including four markers set in a circular plaza, as well as a bronze sculpture of the fort site in the northern portion of the park.

Ms. Bolliger summarized the project proposal as follows:

DPR staff is requesting to move the existing CWT marker from a less accessible location near the Fort Ethan Allen Trench to one that is closer to the other markers dedicated to Fort Ethan Allen just off N. Old Glebe Road. The marker would be installed adjacent to the walkway connecting the circular plaza to the sidewalk. The applicant is also requesting to replace the existing language on the marker with previously uninterpreted information about the African American soldiers who served in the United States Colored Troops (USCT) stationed at this and other Arlington forts during the Civil War.

Ms. Bolliger reminded the HALRB that they first reviewed the proposed historic marker at the April 19, 2023, meeting. She explained how at that time, the HALRB considered the proposed site for the marker to be appropriate but requested that the draft marker text return to the HALRB at a later date for additional review of the content.

Ms. Bolliger said the HPP staff recommended approval of the marker as submitted. She said that the area in which the marker would be relocated had been disturbed in the past for the development of the interpretive site and, therefore the location met the intent of Standard #8 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. She also noted that the new topic proposed for the marker was appropriate

for the site and that the new location of the marker would make it more accessible for the visitors of Fort Ethan Allen.

Ms. Bolliger then invited Mr. John McNair, a staff member from DPR and applicant for the project, to speak. Mr. McNair said that Mr. Drew Gruber, a representative from CWT, also was in attendance. Mr. McNair reiterated how DPR works with CWT to make, install, and advertise the CWT signs around the County. He provided additional background information on the original sign's location in relation to other signage at the park and why they proposed relocation. He then invited Mr. Gruber to share any information. Mr. Gruber discussed how the [signage] process works with CWT and the next steps for this sign after it was reviewed and approved by the HALRB.

Ms. Bolliger noted there were two individuals who had sent letters to the HALRB about the project. Additionally, she noted there was one public speaker, Mr. Bernard Berne, who had signed up to speak; she invited him to do so. Mr. Berne stated there were two different locations in the Fort Ethan Allen Park, Fort Ethan Allen and then the Fort Ethan Allen Trench. He noted what he felt were discrepancies in the proposed marker text and requested their correction. He felt that the text should mention that the USCT were there to dismantle the forts in the area. He also felt that the Fort Ethan Allen Trench needed to have its own marker, since this one was being moved away from that location, to note its importance to the public.

The Chair then opened discussion to the full Board. Mr. Woodruff expressed his support for the project. Mr. Laporte felt that it needed to be decided exactly what story was being told in the marker; he stated that the storyline was a bit disjointed. He was supportive of telling this story, the story of the USCT and the 107th regiment, but believed it needed more clarity. The Chair agreed with Mr. Laporte that there could be more clarity in the text.

Ms. Lawrence asked if Mr. Schaffner's comments, a member of the public who submitted a letter, could potentially address some of these issues. Ms. Bolliger noted given the large amount of information available on this topic, not all of it could fit on the marker and asked if there are other places the information could be placed for people to access. This prompted a discussion on the use of QR codes on markers, but Mr. Gruber noted that QR codes could not be used on CWT signage. Ms. Tawney asked if Mr. Gruber could clarify the process for CWT markers. Mr. Gruber walked the HALRB through the process with CWT signs – how they are created, how they are maintained, and how they market these signs to encourage visitation.

Ms. Bolliger asked Mr. McNair for clarification on whether he needed two separate approvals from the HALRB – one for the location and one for the language. Mr. McNair confirmed that the old sign near Fort Ethan Allen Trench had already been removed by CWT staff. He explained why they had selected the new location for the sign and outlined the benefits to having it closer to the other markers in Fort Ethan Allen. The Chair asked if he needed to split up the motion for the location and the text. Ms. Bolliger asked the applicants to confirm if the marker text would return to the HALRB in the format it would be installed. Mr. Gruber spoke more to the process for the production of CWT signs.

The Chair thanked the applicants for the further explanation of the process and proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-14 [for the] request to install the new historical marker and conditionally approve the marker language.

The commissioners further discussed the marker and what they were approving; Ms. Myers noted that they were generally approving the subject matter and the location, but not the exact text since this had to

come back to the HALRB for final approval. This prompted the Chair to change his original motion language to the following:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-14 at Fort Ethan Allen Historic District to request to install the new historical marker at the location proposed and the language regarding the 107th USCT.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Informational Item: Barcroft Apartments Section 3 Renovation

Ms. Farris presented the informational item on the proposed Barcroft Apartments Section 3 Renovation. She reiterated that this was a continuation of the discussion concerning this project which involved the 1,334-unit garden apartment community located along the Columbia Pike corridor between South George Mason Drive and South Four Mile Run Drive. She also noted that Barcroft is identified in the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Plan (or Form Based Code) (N-FBC), which was adopted by the County Board in 2013.

Ms. Farris stated that Barcroft is one of three multi-family residential areas identified as a Conservation Area in the N-FBC. Based on the standards for Conservation Areas, Ms. Farris reminded the HALRB that applicants are required to meet with the HALRB a minimum of two times before the project can be considered by the County Board; tonight was the applicant's second visit to the HALRB.

Ms. Farris stated that the Jair Lynch project team would be presenting the remaining details being proposed for a pilot renovation program focused on Section 3 of the Barcroft Apartments, which would include buildings 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, with rear additions proposed for buildings 24, 25, and 26. She reminded the HALRB that this was an informational item and there would be no necessary HALRB motions/actions.

Ms. Farris summarized the remaining details of the Section 3 renovation scope to be reviewed as follows:

- Different color options for the brick cladding on the “sleeping porch” sections of the additions;
- Attic vent design options for the additions;
- Vinyl window replacements at the basement stories of the existing buildings;
- Replacement of exterior entrance lighting;
- Tree plan and courtyard renovation;
- Repairs to the existing detached historic garages;
- Placement of new penetrations on rear elevations for utility vents; and
- Potential options for two specific elements required by Virginia Housing for the affordable housing tax credit, which include the covering of exterior wood elements and the installation of entry canopies.

Ms. Farris then summarized the DRC's discussion from its June 7, 2023, hybrid meeting:

Concerning the brick color on the “sleeping porch” sections of the additions, the DRC preferred option 1, which was a lighter multi-tone brick that would utilize salvaged historic brick. The DRC preferred the modern design of three rectangular attic vents with the middle vent being taller than the two flanking it, as it could assist with distinguishing the new additions from the original

historic buildings. The DRC acknowledged that it would be appropriate to replace the original metal-framed basement windows with vinyl windows with the same fenestration pattern, as this was seen as a small change and the other windows have already been replaced with vinyl windows. The DRC did not have any issues with replacing the light fixtures, but staff wanted to know how many would be installed and if any new locations were being proposed. For the trees located in Section 3, the DRC acknowledged the project team’s approach, specifically with the removal of seven healthy trees to enable the construction of the rear additions. Staff voiced concerns about some of the trees proposed for removal. For the existing detached garages, the DRC supported the overall proposed repairs but had questions about the existing garage door material and what the replacement garage door material would be. Concerning the Virginia Housing requirements, the DRC recognized the requirements for the cladding of wood trim elements. And for the entrance canopies, the DRC supported option 2 for the main entrances because of its simple shed-roof design, and supported the option provided for the rear entrance canopies.

Ms. Farris concluded her presentation by summarizing staff’s recommendation as follows:

At this time, the HALRB is being asked to provide design feedback to the Jair Lynch project team for these additional eight proposed details for the renovation project. The HALRB can provide its official recommendations and concerns to the County Board when the Use Permit is considered in July 2023.

The HPP staff does not have issue with the two-tone color option for the brick cladding on the “sleeping porch” sections of the additions, the modern-styled rectangular-shaped attic vents for the additions, replacement of the exterior lighting, repairs to the garages, and the new penetrations on the rear elevations for utility vents. These specific items follow the guidance of the Conservation Area Standards in the N-FBC, and *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties*, specifically standards #1, #2, and #9.

Although most of the proposed scope is consistent with *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* and the Conservation Area Standards of the N-FBC, the following items are not consistent:

1. The removal and replacement of the steel-sash basement windows with vinyl basement windows matching the original configuration;

The HPP staff considers the proposed replacement of the steel-sash basement windows with vinyl as a minor change to the historic material of the existing buildings. The HPP staff acknowledges that the original window configuration and fenestration pattern are important to retain, which the applicant is proposing to do for the basement replacement windows.

2. New penetrations for vents on the rear elevations;

The HPP staff sees this as necessary for the historic buildings to adapt to the needs of its current and future residents without negatively affecting character-defining features. These penetrations will be minimal and will only be visible on the rear elevations.

Regarding staff’s recommendations with the Virginia Housing requirements, Ms. Farris provided some additional context. She explained that she was fortunate to have a conversation earlier

[today] with staff from Virginia Housing. She said that although they cannot guarantee the waiver request at this time, they indicated a willingness to work with what is appropriate for the historic buildings and trying to prevent any negative effects. That being said, regarding the Virginia Housing requirements and proposed changes, Ms. Farris outlined the following:

1. The use of vinyl or aluminum cladding on existing wood trim;

The HPP staff agrees that the cladding of existing wood trim materials is a minimal change to these character-defining features. The applicant will be required to repair any deteriorated wood prior to cladding it with vinyl or aluminum. Although this cladding will be a visible barrier, the wood material will still exist, and the cladding treatment can be reversible.

2. The installation of canopies above all entrances;

As for the canopies, the proposed designs will not overshadow the decorative door surrounds on the facades and are compatible to the overall design of Barcroft. Additionally, the installation of the canopies will only affect the mortar joints and will not cause damage to the historic brick material. The cladding of existing wood materials and installation of entry canopies mostly follows standards #6 and #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

The HPP staff is optimistic with the likelihood that the applicant's request for waivers of these Virginia Housing requirements will be approved even if they cannot currently be guaranteed.

Regarding the tree preservation and removal plan, Ms. Farris said the HPP staff was concerned about the proposed removal of the white oak tree, noted as #3343 on the plans. Over the past few days, Ms. Farris explained she had spoken with colleagues in Urban Forestry, Housing, and Planning. Although the proposed removal of the White Oak is unfortunate, she said that the HPP staff supports the tree preservation and removal plan as it will achieve multiple County goals, including as preserving and adapting these historic buildings, promoting affordable housing and increasing much desired family-size units, and planting of 71 new trees by the applicant. She reminded the Board that the County's Urban Forester will have the opportunity to discuss the tree preservation and removal plan during review of the Use Permit that will be going to the County Board in July.

In conclusion, Ms. Farris stated the HPP staff is supportive of the renovation project for Section 3.

At this time, Ms. Farris invited the applicants to present their project to the HALRB. Ms. Lauren Riley of Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, & Walsh, legal counsel for the applicant, provided an overview; she outlined the timeline of the project and when they plan to go before the County Board. Mr. Mehrdad Froozan with the architect team Bonstra Haresign Architects presented the two different brick color options: option 1, the applicant's preferred option, featuring a two-tone brick and option 2 with a mono-tone brick material.

Mr. Froozan then presented the options for the attic vents. He said they originally designed the semi-circular attic vents to match the size of the existing attic vents at Barcroft but felt that they were disproportionate to the buildings. He explained they scaled down the size of the attic vent by 25% which was their preferred design. He also presented an alternate vent option featuring three vertical rectangular vents that mimic the layout of the gable; this vent was more modern in design.

He then proceeded to discuss the windows. Mr. Froozan confirmed that they would use double-pane, insulated glass, simulated divided lite windows for the basement level and the new bump-outs. He said the window material would be vinyl and would match the colors of the other windows at Barcroft. Regarding the exterior light fixtures, Mr. Froozan confirmed that they proposed to use fixtures of similar design and color to the original ones. He noted all existing exterior light fixtures would be changed.

Mr. Jeff Kreps with the applicant's civil engineer firm VIKA Virginia, LLC. presented the tree preservation and removal plan. The intention of their tree plan, according to Mr. Kreps, was to minimize effects on the existing tree canopy because it was one of the best and most unique features of Barcroft. To this end, he said they planned to preserve most of the trees; however, he mentioned there were a few trees that would need to be removed because they conflicted with the construction plan of the additions. He said they also planned to remove any dead and invasive trees (in total, they would be removing 34 trees). Mr. Kreps stated the County required 39 trees to be planted to account for the ones being removed; the Barcroft team would exceed that number by planting 71 trees just in Section 3. The discussion then turned to the proposed courtyard renovation plan. Mr. Kreps noted that the applicant wanted to provide a small outdoor space for residents at Building 22. He noted the courtyard would be made ADA compliant and all changes would have a low impact to retain the health of nearby trees.

Ms. Riley then covered the proposed garage repairs in Section 3. The two garage buildings, which have 22 bays total, need repairs such as the repointing of brick, replacement of damaged brick, roof repairs, replacement of aluminum garage doors to match the existing, and the replacement of light fixtures.

Mr. Froozan concluded the presentation with a discussion of the items required by Virginia Housing: having all exterior trim clad in vinyl or aluminum and having canopies over the entrances. The project team reiterated that it was seeking a waiver for these items given the historic nature of the complex. Mr. Froozan presented two different options for the entryway canopies in case they did not receive a waiver and needed to install them. He described Option 1, the applicant's preferred option, with a more modern design whereas Option 2 features a traditional shed roof design. He also presented a canopy option for the rear building entrances that matched Option 2 in design. Ms. Riley concluded the applicant's presentation by reminding the HALRB that their N-FBC 4.1.2 Use Permit application would be heard by the County Board in July.

The Chair invited the HALRB members to share their comments. Ms. Lawrence felt the more modern elements were out of place and stated her preference for the shed roof canopies (Option 2) and the smaller semi-circular attic vents. Mr. Wenchel explained why the DRC had preferred the more modern attic vents to help distinguish the additions from the original historic buildings. Ms. Lawrence replied that she understood the reasoning but felt that the additions were sufficiently differentiated from the original buildings.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked a clarifying question about the number of canopies that potentially would be installed; the project team confirmed they would need to install a total of 36 canopies (should they not receive the Virginia Housing waiver) at both the front and rear entrances. Ms. Liccese-Torres then asked about how many light fixtures would be installed. The applicant replied that it would be 38 fixtures; none of these would be in new locations, but this total did not include the fixtures needed at the garages. Ms. Farris asked for clarification on the material of the garage doors. The applicant confirmed that the existing garage doors [in Section 3] are aluminum and they did not think they were original because there were wood garage doors on site in other parts of Barcroft. Mr. Laporte stated he hoped the applicant would replace the garage doors with what the design was before, and he also suggested that a fiberglass door might potentially have a better appearance. Ms. Vonesh from the project team confirmed that the garage doors were made of wood but could not discern what the original design was on the elevation.

Mr. Woodruff expressed his support for the tree plan. He asked how many buildings were in the Conservation Area and specifically in Section 3. The applicant replied they could provide the HALRB with the total number of buildings but confirmed that all the buildings in Section 3 are in the Conservation Area.

Ms. Lawrence asked a question about the relocation of current Barcroft residents. The applicant replied that no residents had been relocated yet and that the project team had hired “Housing to Home,” a temporary on-site transfer service firm, to help in this effort in the future. They confirmed that residents would be temporarily transferred to other apartments in Barcroft during the renovation. They must provide a 120-day notice to residents concerning any relocation. They also stated they have distributed materials about the renovation project to residents.

The applicant transitioned back to Mr. Woodruff’s previous question about the number of buildings [in the Conservation Area]. They showed a map of the complex and the Conservation Area boundaries in Barcroft. Mr. Woodruff requested that the map be made available to the HALRB.

Mr. Turnbull asked a question about the entryway canopies and if the 30-inch measurement was the depth of the canopy or the width. The applicant confirmed that the 30-inches was the depth, and it would be 12-inches from the side of the door.

The Chair asked if all members of the HALRB were supportive of Option 2 for the canopies. Mr. Turnbull stated the choice should be consistent throughout the complex. Ms. Hagemann, a member of the project team, stated though there are other canopies existing in other sections of Barcroft, the team thought those designs were not appropriate for door surrounds.

The Chair confirmed if all members of the HALRB were supportive of Option 1 (the two-tone) brick coloring for the bump-outs. He did note that he felt the brick banding could have an alternative pattern with color. Finally, the Chair asked the Board’s preference for the design of the attic vents. Mr. Turnbull, Ms. Lawrence, Mr. Laporte, Ms. Myers, and Ms. Hamm were supportive of the semi-circular vents; the Chair and Mr. Wenchel supported the modern rectangular vents.

Ms. Liccese-Torres asked the applicant if they needed anything else clarified. The applicant felt they had received the comments they needed to move forward. Ms. Farris sought clarification on how the HALRB should approach having their support of the project made known to the County Board; it was decided that a letter would be the best method. Ms. Farris also noted that the HALRB should send a separate letter to Virginia Housing to express support for waiving the project from their requirements. Upon hearing no other comments, the presentation concluded.

Proposed Local Historic District Preliminary Consideration: 4120 41st St. N. “Happinest”

Ms. Bolliger presented a single-parcel residential LHD application for the property at 4120 41st Street N. She explained the LHD nomination was submitted by the owner. Before starting the presentation, she asked if the applicant was in attendance; he was not present.

Ms. Bolliger stated that some historic records indicate the house was constructed in 1933; however, she noted she did not agree with that date given she found some evidence that part of the house was constructed in 1920 with the second part built at a later date. She then shared a map indicating the location of the subject property. She noted it was very close to the Hermitage, another LHD property, and

near other LHDs such as Walker Chapel and Fort Ethan Allen. She said it was not located in a National Register of Historic Places historic district.

Next, Ms. Bolliger shared an image of a 1900 map which showed that a Mr. Jewell owned the land and then a 1936 Sanborn Fire Insurance map which indicated that the road the house is situated along was unpaved. Mr. Woodruff asked about the location of the property; Ms. Bolliger confirmed that the house is located on the road that continued straight off from Chain Bridge. She also stated the house did not appear on the 1959 Sanborn Insurance map either.

Based on the information presented by the homeowner in his LHD application, he purchased the property from the first owners, David Ballard and his wife Fanny Foy Ballard. Ms. Bolliger noted that Mrs. Ballard sounded like a historically interesting person; according to the current owner, she hosted séances and operatic shows at the house. Mrs. Ballard sold the property to Mr. Cossard (the current owner) in the 1980s.

Ms. Bolliger presented a series of photos of both the exterior and interior of the property. She highlighted several original features of the house such as historic doors and a telephone cubby. She also shared an image of an arched door to a wine cellar which was located within a cupboard; the applicant believes that the home may have been used during Prohibition to store alcohol, but Ms. Bolliger stated she would need to substantiate this claim further. Ms. Bolliger said there were several building and landscape additions made to the home over the years, but that the house itself is relatively intact and original. She reconfirmed the location of the house for the commissioners and noted that the County does not currently have another LHD that exhibits this Tudor Revival-inspired style of architecture.

Mr. Woodruff asked for further clarification as to its location. Ms. Myers asked if the house was for sale; Ms. Bolliger confirmed that it was not, but it is currently for rent. Mr. Woodruff indicated his support for placing this nomination on the list for HPP staff to research further. Hearing no other comments from the HALRB in opposition to adding this to the research queue, the Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB add 4120 41st Street N. “Happinest” to the HPP staff’s queue for research as a potential LHD.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed 7-0 (Ms. Hamm did not respond to the vote even though she remained online).

REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF

Chair’s Report

The Chair asked the commissioners if anyone had any questions about the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan (HCRP) that was being updated by County staff. Ms. Lawrence complimented staff on their efforts. Hearing no other comments, the Chair asked for the Staff Report.

Staff and Other Reports

Ms. Liccese-Torres announced that the recent public engagement period for the HCRP had ended the evening before. She shared that the HPP staff had hosted 15 pop-up events and one open house for a total of 16 events. She said staff engaged with hundreds of Arlingtonians at these events. She also noted the timeline for the HCRP remained on track and that the HPP staff planned to bring the HCRP before the County Board in the fall.

Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff would need to bring the HCRP back to the HALRB for a final presentation, and hopefully a motion of support, prior to bringing it to the County Board for consideration. She proposed to either place this item on the regular meeting agenda for the HALRB in August or to have a special meeting, like they did when the HCRP was first released in April. She also noted that since the HALRB would need to make a motion on the HCRP, an [in-person] quorum would be needed. She then asked the commissioners which they would prefer. Mr. Woodruff, Ms. Myers, and Ms. Lawrence supported having it be a part of the regular meeting agenda. Based on the commissioners' feedback, Ms. Liccese-Torres confirmed that the HCRP item would be brought forward at the regular August meeting and that a special meeting would not be held.

Ms. Liccese-Torres then mentioned the HALRB's By-laws. She noted that Ms. Bolliger was working with the County Attorney's Office to edit the by-laws given the challenges of reaching a quorum at the HALRB meetings in recent months. She said that language for how the HALRB could define its quorum was under review. She also asked the commissioners to please let Ms. Bolliger know when they would be attending or not attending meetings; she reiterated the importance of communication so that the HALRB could conduct its monthly business.

Mr. Laporte inquired if there was any information about a presentation happening at the HALRB about the Wakefield Manor site plan. Ms. Farris confirmed that she was coordinating with Planning colleagues on this topic and would have more information soon.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:53 pm.