



**MINUTES OF THE  
HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD  
Wednesday, July 19, 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  
Gray Handley  
Gerald Laporte  
Rebecca Meyer  
Kaydee Myers  
Andrew Wenchel

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

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Robert Dudka  
Alexandra Foster  
Joan Lawrence  
Mark Turnbull

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

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

The Chair called the meeting to order. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

**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.

**INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSIONER**

Mr. Gray Handley introduced himself as a long-time Arlington resident and newest member of the commission after a long career at the State Department and the National Institute of Health.

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

- 1) Elizabeth Rugaber  
3500 21<sup>st</sup> Ave. N., CoA 23-19  
Maywood Historic District  
Request to install an EV charger adjacent to the driveway.

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

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

**Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 23-18, 3421 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North**

Ms. Bolliger presented an application to replace the existing fixed, louvered vinyl shutters on the front of the historic dwelling at 3421 21<sup>st</sup> Ave, a circa 1933 Sears home (most likely an example of the Wexford model). She said the applicant was requesting to install operable, raised-panel wooden shutters on the front two windows, and remove the remaining non-historic vinyl fixed shutters from all the other windows. She explained the new shutters would be installed on black metal offset hinges, such that, when closed, they would fill the entire window opening; the closure to the wall would be an S-shaped black metal shutter dog.

Ms. Bolliger stated the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff recommended approval of the subject application, noting that shutters are appropriate for houses of this time period and both photos and renderings of the home show that it had shutters. She said that wood is an appropriate material in the Maywood Local Historic District (LHD), and operability is appropriate for shutters of this era. She said if the shutters were removed, the historic dwelling would not be damaged, which complied with Standard #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. She continued, noting that operable shutters would be a utilitarian, visually and historically appropriate improvement from non-operable shutters. Ms. Bolliger explained that while there were existing fixed shutters on one window on the west elevation (out of two windows) and on two-and-a-half windows of the original rear elevation (one window was tight against the 1980s addition and only one shutter was applied), these are vinyl and did not appear to be original. Based on the rendering in the Sears catalog advertisement for this model, Ms. Bolliger said the shutters may not have originally been installed on the side and rear of the house, as only the shutters on the front two windows were rendered.

Ms. Bolliger invited the applicant to speak, but he had no additional comments.

Mr. Wenchel stated he believed the applicant should consider retaining the louvered shutter design. Ms. Bolliger read a comment received from HALRB commissioner Ms. Lawrence (Mr. Uckert's neighbor), stating she had no problem with the proposal, but asked for clarification on the style as the spec sheet had both a single and double [raised] panel shutter. Mr. Uckert replied

that his preference was for the double paneled shutter listed as “equal panel” on the spec sheet. Ms. Meyer stated she did not object to changing the panel style and recommended that the shutter dogs be installed in the mortar rather than the brick.

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

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-18, Maywood Historic District, request to replace louvered shutters with shutters of the equal raised panel style. Additionally, the S-shaped shutter-dogs should be installed in mortar joints and not in the brick.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed 8-1-0, with Mr. Wenchel opposed.

**Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 23-15, 800 South Buchanan Street, Barcroft Community House**

Ms. Bolliger presented an application to replace the existing 3-tab shingle roof with architectural shingle roofing at the Barcroft Community House. She said the applicant wanted to replace the current dark grey-green roof with a similar grey-green roof color.

Ms. Bolliger said the HPP staff recommended approval of the application. She said that without design guidelines, *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* were being used as the guidance for the recommendation. Ms. Bolliger noted that the roof material was not listed as a character-defining feature in the *Barcroft Community House National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form*. She explained that it was common for 3-tab asphalt shingle roofs, which are particularly two-dimensional and do not reflect the texture that would be expected from natural shingle, to be routinely replaced with architectural shingle roofing in LHDs.

Ms. Bolliger said the roof was clad in asphalt shingle when the property became an LHD (in 1984), whereas it had been clad in wooden shingles in 1936 based on the Sanborn Fire Insurance map (sheet 225). Additionally, there was a record of a building permit to re-roof the property in 1951 (Historical House Card, 4/18/51, Permit #6965). Therefore, she summarized that the existing material was non-historic, and its proposed replacement met the intent of Standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*. Further, Ms. Bolliger explained that the County-made sign for the Barcroft neighborhood displayed the Barcroft Community House as its symbol for the community and showed it prominently with a green roof. She said that this indicated to the applicants that the green roof color was characteristic of the building in the neighborhood, and she explained that the HPP staff had no objection to the applicants retaining this decorative element.

Ms. Bolliger invited the applicants to contribute; they had no further comment.

Mr. Wenchel stated his concern that per the [submitted spec] brochure, the proposed green color had very apparent shadow lines and would seem unnatural once installed. He had asked for photographs of this color used in actual installations to see the discrepancy between the brochure images and installation images. The applicants had supplied several different shots from videos and installation images in response to his request. While the commissioners agreed that color is

not typically included in design review, the shadow line as it appeared in the brochure implied that the shingles would appear materially different than standard architectural shingle. The commissioners reviewed the other available roofing colors during the HALRB meeting and compared the differences between the installed images and the brochure photos. Mr. Wenchel asked if the applicants had considered green shingles produced by other roof manufacturers. The applicant, Ms. Jennifer Lis, replied they had checked other manufacturers that their installation contractor was willing to use, and all the colors appeared very similar.

Mr. Woodruff stated he had no objection to the proposed shingle color. Ms. Meyer shared some images of the Community House on the Virginia Department of Historic Resources website; she said that based on those photos, she thought the proposed color was appropriate and that she was willing to support the application as presented.

The Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-15, Barcroft Community Hall Historic District, request to replace a three-tab shingle roof with architectural shingle as proposed.

Mr. Laporte seconded the motion. The Chair asked for any final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 7-2, with Mr. Davis and Mr. Wenchel opposed.

**Discussion Agenda Item #3: CoA 23-17, 3605 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North**

Ms. Bolliger presented an application that included some retroactive elements for renovation work at 3605 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue North in the Maywood LHD. She explained that on March 15, 2022, the home suffered an electrical fire on the first floor. She said the HPP's Inspector Ms. Tawney had contacted the owner by e-mail and letter to offer support in planning any repairs or renovation work. Ms. Bolliger also had reached out to the owners by e-mail offering help in any CoA applications for repairs or improvements.

Ms. Bolliger stated that on June 27, 2023, a neighbor informed the HPP staff that contractors were removing existing siding from the home. She said Ms. Tawney went on site that same day to inspect the property and found about ¼ of the siding removed. Ms. Bolliger explained that she and Ms. Tawney spoke to the contractors in person and on the phone [several times] and informed them that they were working in a LHD, they needed permission for any exterior changes, and exterior work should cease until plans had been submitted and reviewed by the HALRB. Ms. Bolliger continued, stating that on June 30, 2023, the HPP staff received another notification from a neighbor that the contractor had continued removing siding from the house. Ms. Bolliger again followed up with an e-mail that same day confirming with the project manager that they should cease all exterior work until the proposed changes had been reviewed.

Ms. Bolliger listed the proposed alterations:

1. To replace all the wooden teardrop siding on the home with smooth 4" lap Hardie cementitious fiberboard siding (partially retroactive approval).

2. To replace all the windows in the home in-kind with matching one-over-one wooden windows (retroactive approval).
3. To replace all the exterior doors, including one set of French double doors onto the rear deck, one rear single door off the rear bumpout into the yard, and the front door, with identical wooden replacements. The rear single door off the bumpout would be a 36” x 80” fir single door with full glass pane. The French doors to the rear deck would be 48” x 80” fir double doors with full pane clear glass.

Ms. Bolliger explained that the HPP staff recommended denial of the siding aspect of the CoA application and instead recommended that the applicant pursue re-installation of the extant wooden siding removed from the historic dwelling or in-kind replacement of matching wooden teardrop siding. She said per Appendix C: Cement Fiberboard Siding Materials of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, “Cement fiberboard is not appropriate as the primary siding material on existing historic buildings.” She noted the subject house is a contributing resource to the Maywood LHD and the National Register Historic District. She continued, stating that wood is considered a typical material in Maywood, particularly as a siding and cladding material, and is representative of the craftsmanship and materials available during the neighborhood’s period of significance. She said a conditions assessment was not completed by the HPP staff before the removal of the siding; however, even if the siding on all the elevations of the house had been damaged beyond repair, any replacement material would need to comply with Standard #6 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Bolliger stated that replacement of typical windows in the Maywood LHD with identical in-kind wooden replacements is allowed per Appendix H: In-Kind Window Replacement Guidelines of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. She said that although the HPP staff did not endorse retroactive reviews, staff recommended approval of the window replacement in this case because it complied with Appendix H.

Lastly, Ms. Bolliger explained that historically, the HALRB had not approved replacements of historic doors without a prior conditions analysis. She noted the doors already had been removed but given the electrical fire location on the first floor, some of the evidence of fire damage, and understanding the possible damage by fire safety officials, staff was able to infer that the doors had been damaged by the fire. Therefore, she said in-kind replacement of the doors met the intent of Standard #6 of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

The applicants, owner Jay Bethard and contractor John Jones, were invited to speak and had no comments.

Mr. Wenchel stated [based on photos shown] that the applicants had appeared to remove siding which had not been damaged. He recommended that the applicants seek in-kind wooden siding for replacement. Mr. Handley asked for clarification that the applicants had continued to remove siding after they had been told to stop by both Ms. Tawney and Ms. Bolliger; Ms. Bolliger confirmed this was the case.

The Chair invited Mr. Woodruff to speak. Mr. Woodruff asked to see the images of the burned siding again to clarify that some of the siding had been damaged.

Ms. Bolliger shared two comments received from the Maywood community:

**Comment #1**

To: Members of the Board, and Interested Parties:

As long-time neighbors (22 years) living alongside the Bethard house, just to the east, we believe the proposed 4” lap Hardie cementious replacement to be an appropriate and much advised replacement for the teardrop clapboard siding that was formerly on the house.

First, a replacement siding was needed. The fire imploded several windows causing the clapboard near the window casings to warp and crack from pressure, and further damage occurred during removal of those windows, thus necessitating much repair to the clapboard in those areas.

Second, “Hardiplank” will be a sturdier foe against the rot issues that have plagued the clapboard for years—resulting in a hodgepodge look of fixes to the siding. The Maggio family spent years/money seeking out drainage fixes but, the way water naturally flows down near the chimney area in particular, together with the heavy shade on that side, deteriorated portions of clapboard there repeatedly. A stream of professionals (gutter, construction, etc.) coming through the property over the years found “no leaks/no solutions” to the rot issues—it’s due to water hitting certain wood areas consistently enough that they never dry. On our side too, the cycle of rot fixes and paint was every few years—I believe the house has needed heavy wood repairs and repainting at least four times in the years we’ve been here and such repairs pushed the last family out. Hardiplank would eliminate the need for constant repair and replacement, and a 4” lap style will look consistently good for years to come. Before the fire, Jay and Rebekah were speaking of scheduling wood clapboard fixes, but post-fire, the depth of the fixes needed is too broad—and now is the right time for the house to have a Hardiplank siding that will stay looking good for more than a few years.

Sincerely,

Patricia & Eric Ciccoretti

**Comment #2**

I do not support the replacement of the historic wood siding with Hardie Plank. If Hardie Plank had a profile similar to the removed wood, I might consider it. We have cedar lap siding on an addition constructed in 1989 similar to our 1909 siding that has held up very well and not needed any repairs. There are portions of our house with this siding that are also shaded. There are likely to be wood siding materials available now that look like the historic siding. I am troubled by the removal of siding that was not in bad shape or damaged by the fire when the project manager was told approval was required.

Joan Lawrence

Mr. Laporte asked if the applicants were able to source a Hardiplank style which matched the wood. Mr. Jones replied they could not, that the closest lap to the 3.5” teardrop siding was a

sharp-edged 4” lap siding. He stated he had been told teardrop siding would need to be milled. The Chair reiterated the *Maywood Design Guideline* language on the appropriate nature of wood siding. Mr. Laporte stated he might be able to support fiber cement siding in this case if it matched the profile of the teardrop siding but could not otherwise. Ms. Meyer asked for confirmation that the fish scale siding in the gable end would be preserved. Mr. Laporte stated support for Ms. Lawrence’s statement and voiced concern about approving retroactive requests which violated the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Handley asked if anyone knew of another fiber cement siding manufacturer which made teardrop siding. Ms. Bolliger explained she had searched for manufacturers who could make matching siding and had not yet found one. She then explained that in-kind replacement might qualify for Virginia State Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits. Mr. Jones stated that the siding on the side of the home had been removed for rot purposes and that the adjacent home had fiber cement siding. Ms. Bolliger reiterated that the need to replace the siding for any reason did not sanction the replacement with non-historic, non-approved siding.

The Chair proposed separating the project into three components for voting purposes. He proposed the following initial motion:

I move that the HALRB deny the portion of CoA 23-17 for 3605 21<sup>st</sup> Ave. N. in the Maywood Historic District that applies to the siding change request. The HALRB finds that the proposed request to change siding material from wood to cement fiberboard (or Hardie Plank) on the contributing structure is incompatible with Appendix C from the *Maywood Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Laporte seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

The Chair then proposed the following second motion:

I move that the HALRB approve the portion of CoA 23-17 regarding the in-kind replacement of the windows.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion and Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

The Chair then proposed the following final motion:

I move that the HALRB approve the portion of CoA 23-17 regarding the in-kind replacement of the three exterior doors.

Mr. Handley seconded the motion. The Chair asked for final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

**Discussion Agenda Item #4: CoA 21-30C, 2415 Shirlington Road South, Green Valley Pharmacy**

Ms. Bolliger presented a new modification request for the project proposal at the Green Valley Pharmacy. She summarized the application as follows:

In June 2023, the applicant submitted updated pergola and awning drawings for consideration along with three bioretention planters (CoA 21-30B). At the June 7, 2023, hybrid DRC meeting, Mr. Wenchel asked for elevations of the proposed pergola against the building and Ms. Bolliger asked for installation information. The commissioners had no concerns about the bioretention planters. At the June 21, 2023, hybrid HALRB public hearing, the HALRB voted to approve the bioretention planters but deferred decision on the pergola because the applicant stated during the meeting that he wanted a different design than what he had submitted.

Ms. Bolliger continued, stating the applicant had submitted two pergola options for consideration.

Option 1: The applicant proposed to install a pergola with a retractable awning on the south side of the historic building along 24<sup>th</sup> Road S. The proposed pergola would be 50' x 14' with a sloped retractable awning supported by 12 wooden beams on concrete footers and 28 wooden rafters supported by a central joist. The pergola and awning would begin beneath the building coping and terminate at 7.67' high. The structure would begin at the outer (eastern) edge of the rear service door and terminate beyond the south storefront window adjacent to the main corner entrance doorway.

Option 2: The applicant proposed to install a pergola with a retractable awning on the south side of the historic building along 24<sup>th</sup> Rd. S. The proposed pergola would be 45'10" x 14' with a sloped retractable awning supported by 10 wooden beams on concrete footers and 23 wooden rafters supported by a central joist. The pergola and awning would begin beneath the building coping and terminate at 7.67' high. The structure would begin at the outer (eastern) edge of the rear service door and terminate before the south storefront window adjacent to the main corner entrance doorway.

Ms. Bolliger reiterated that the HPP staff was supportive of outdoor seating for the new restaurant since a free-standing pergola would provide additional service space for this historically small building without impacting the building itself. Depending on how it was installed, she noted a pergola could be removed in the future without any detriment to the historic materials or character of the building, thereby complying with Standard #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

She explained that the following elements were called out as character-defining in the *Green Valley Pharmacy Local Historic District Design Guidelines*:

The original massing of the building and arrangement of fenestration remains unchanged. Stylistically, the Green Valley Pharmacy is of non-descript architectural design and is a simple, mid-20<sup>th</sup> century commercial building without architectural detailing.



The significant features of the site include the rectangular-shaped commercial building, the adjacent paved parking areas, and the building's prominent location at the corner of Shirlington Road and 24<sup>th</sup> Road South. The priority for preservation of the site will involve maintaining the historic and architectural integrity and character of the entire building, mainly as a one-story commercial building with a corner entrance.

Ms. Bolliger stated staff wanted to ensure that the proposed pergola complied with Standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Bolliger said staff recommended Option 2 and keeping the pergola free-standing from the building. She explained staff's rationale as follows:

The size of the pergola proposed in Option 1 would block one of the only architectural elements of the small building and would detract from the historic corner store frontage. The proposed location and size of the pergola in Option 2 would impede the diagonal view to the historic corner entrance of the building less visibly than Option 1, thereby retaining the character of the original corner store. The proposed height of the pergola would be secondary to the main roofline of the one-story building and would leave the sightline of the building unbroken from the street.

Next, Ibrahim Al-Amin, son of the property owner, spoke on the proposed project and the goals to retain the historic integrity of the site.

Mr. Wenchel expressed concern that the pergola roof was too pitched and would be too visible from the right-of-way. He also expressed disappointment over the 2018 removal of the mansard roof. He stated that he thought Option 2 of the pergola would return some character to the building as long as it did not block the large storefront window located on the southern elevation.

Ms. Bolliger invited Mr. Maharmeh and Mr. Khan, the project applicants, to speak, but neither had additional comments.

Mr. Handley asked if having utilities such as gas within the pergola would be a health concern for those sitting there. He also asked if the utility window [near the side entrance] would be covered. Mr. Maharmeh promised to meet all health and safety codes. Mr. Laporte asked if patrons would be able to sit next to the storefront window. Staff stated they were not sure if there was any fire code preventing people from sitting there. Mr. Laporte clarified that he wanted to confirm that recommending Option 2 might reduce covered seating but would not impose a reduction on seating in general. Ms. Hamm and Mr. Woodruff agreed that Option 2 was preferred.

The Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 21-30C, Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District, request to install a pergola, as presented in Proposed Option 2.

Mr. Laporte seconded the motion. The Chair asked for any final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 9-0.

**Discussion Agenda Item #5: CoA 22-22, 2801 Columbia Pike, Elkins Building**

Ms. Farris introduced the most recent submission for the Commercial Form Based Code (C-FBC) project at 2801 Columbia Pike. She reminded the commissioners that the Elkins Building was recommended for façade preservation in the C-FBC; since there are no guidelines on how to achieve façade preservation, the C-FBC relied on the discretion of the HALRB. She explained that the last time the HALRB reviewed this project was in December 2022. Ms. Farris said that before the December meeting, the applicant had been trying to accommodate a transit shelter in front of the Elkins Building, which would have required moving the historic façade and making further alterations to allow the façade to fit; such discussions led the HALRB to request that the applicant use one of the existing ground-floor retail alcoves and convert that for use as a transit shelter instead of moving the historic façade. She said the HALRB had further recommended the applicant to utilize the Streamline Moderne style of the Elkins Building and its horizontality to influence the design of the new construction.

Ms. Farris outlined the current proposal:

- To retain the two-story historic facade in-situ and provide a 4-foot setback from the new construction of floors three through seven.
- For the transit shelter, to alter an existing retail alcove by removing a single-door entry and storefront window and installing impact resistant panels to mimic the existing storefront glazing. This would create a wider recessed area and allow for two benches and a handicapped accessible space.
- To construct a new building behind the historic facade for floors three through seven with closer inspiration from the Streamline Moderne style, similar to the Elkins Building.

Ms. Farris explained that the DRC had reviewed the project at its hybrid DRC meeting on July 5, 2023. She said the DRC agreed that the new construction for floors 3 to 7 was more in keeping with the Streamline Moderne style of the Elkins Building. There had been suggestion by DRC that the lighter gray colors on floors three through seven be extended towards the top of the building with a thin line near the roof coping. Another DRC suggestion was for the windows at the central, curved section of the new construction to have side-by-side windows.

Ms. Farris said the HPP staff recommended approval of the subject application. She provided the following rationale:

The proposal to retain the two-story historic facade of the Elkins Building in-situ with a 4-foot setback for the new construction provided an appropriate distinction from the historic architecture and the new construction. It also continued the sensation of the two-story building from the street level and supported the pedestrian experience from an urban design perspective. Accommodating a new transit shelter in an existing retail alcove of the Elkins Building was a creative solution to meet the needs of transit riders without having to move the historic facade. The design of the new construction for floors three through seven complemented the Streamline Moderne style of the

Elkins Building through its material choices, subtle architectural details in the balcony design and window fenestration pattern and frequency, and the overall horizontality, using different materials and colors. Finally, the added horizontal band near the roof coping reinforced the shape of the Elkins Building's roof. Staff finds that the proposal conformed with Standards #2, #5, and #9 specified in *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*:

Mr. Wenchel said he felt the project design had come a long way and it would become one of the best buildings along Columbia Pike. He thought the transit shelter design was a good compromise. He also stated that the County's Transportation staff had accepted the idea of a transit shelter in the building and to keep the historic façade on the original property lines. He thought it was a good example of how it sometimes it takes time to reach a good outcome and that the proposed design was respectful of the historic façade.

Mr. Handley complimented the evolution of the building's design and its similarity to other 1930s-era construction. He stated that the elegant solution of the transit shelter in the building was a brilliant approach. He thought this building and the Arlington Draft House were significant anchors for this intersection.

Mr. Woodruff said that this project had simply gotten better over time. He expressed his appreciation for all the hard work of the applicant and staff as he had disagreed with the original idea of moving the historic façade. Mr. Aiken also stated his appreciation for the new design. Mr. Laporte said he believed this was an improvement to Columbia Pike. He asked to see a different approach with the window pattern at the curved section and suggested returning [to the HALRB] with a side-by-side comparison of the windows. The commissioners suggested that the applicant receive a conditional CoA and return to the DRC to review other window options.

The Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB conditionally approve CoA 22-22 [for] the proposed design for a redevelopment project at the Elkins Building subject to the approval of the DRC.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for any final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 9-0.

**Discussion Agenda Item #6: CoA 23-16, 400 North Manchester Street, Reevesland**

Ms. Farris introduced the most recent submission for the historic Reeves Farmhouse. She explained the project background as follows:

The property had become a LHD in 2004 and a County-held easement protecting the exterior was recorded in 2018. In 2017, Habitat for Humanity of Washington, D.C. and Northern Virginia had approached Arlington County and proposed a rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the historic farmhouse as a group home for residents with developmental disabilities. The last HALRB review had been in April 2023. During the April meeting, the HALRB considered the proposed massing and overall design concepts for the

restoration of the exterior of the historic farmhouse and the construction of two new additions.

Ms. Farris said the applicants have returned to the HALRB for their final CoA, including review of additional details on materials and specifications. She outlined the current proposal:

- Windows: There would be one-over-one in-kind wood replacement windows in the historic farmhouse; one-over-one vinyl windows proposed for use in the additions instead of aluminum clad wood windows; and vinyl windows in the dormers on the historic farmhouse.
- The farmhouse also had two, six-over-six wood windows on the second floor that the applicant wanted to replace, but had requested clarification from the DRC in July 2023 if these windows should be six-over-six to match the existing configuration or one-over-one. The DRC members had stated they were comfortable with changing this configuration to one-over-one for consistency.
- Replacement of the existing asphalt shingle roof with new dimensional asphalt shingles.
- On the historic farmhouse, materials along the roof fascia and soffit on the eaves would be prefinished PVC trim, and the existing wood roof eave would remain if in good condition (or be replaced in-kind and repainted to match existing if in poor condition).
- The front porch wood eaves would remain and be prepped/repainted or replaced in-kind to match existing. The DRC did not see issue with the use of synthetic material at the roof eaves.
- At the July 5, 2023, hybrid DRC meeting, discussion occurred about seeing if a metal-seam roofing material could be considered for the front porch roof instead of asphalt shingle.

Ms. Farris explained that the HPP staff recommended approval of the subject application as submitted and supported the proposed restoration/renovation plan for Reevesland. She offered the following rationale:

Since the Reevesland LHD does not have adopted historic district design guidelines, the HPP staff and the HALRB must consider all proposed alterations according to the guidance provided in *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. The subject application complied with Standards #2, 5, 6, and 9. The proposed exterior restoration plan is both appropriate and sensitive to the character-defining features of the historic farmhouse, thereby complying with Standard #2. The repair or in-kind replacement of the exterior materials and/or features, including the one-over-one wood windows on the historic farmhouse, followed Standards #5 and #6. The removal of the existing vinyl/aluminum siding and trim and restoration of any existing wood siding and trim likewise followed Standards #5 and #6.

The removal of the existing asphalt shingles and/or existing metal roofing and replacement with new dimensional asphalt shingles complied with Standard #6, as did the in-kind replacement of the main entrance door and the removal/reconstruction of the brick chimneys. Following Standard #9, the proposed wood railings and wood ramp on the front porch would not detract from the overall design, function, or aesthetics of this historic design feature, and would allow the farmhouse to become ADA-compliant which was an

essential requirement for the new residents. The construction of a new shed-roof dormer on the farmhouse's north roof ridge followed Standard #9 and was compatible in design to an existing dormer located on the 1911 section of the house. The installation of vinyl fixed windows in the new dormers would distinguish between the historic and new construction, and would not detract from the overall design, function, or aesthetics of the historic farmhouse. The proposed one- and two-story additions would not detract from the scale or massing of the historic farmhouse, as their designs were compatible with the existing vernacular architecture. The proposed use of synthetic materials on the additions was compatible to the overall design and character-defining features and materials on the historic farmhouse, and helped distinguish the historic and new construction, thereby meeting Standard #9.

Lastly, the proposal did not conflict with the intent/guidance of the recorded County-held exterior preservation easement. When the final CoA is issued, the HPP staff would seek additional approvals from the County Manager as per the easement process for these major modifications.

Next, the applicants and project architect provided a summary of their proposal: They focused on their use of synthetic materials for the roof details. They mentioned that the shed roof dormer was necessary to allow for head space for an interior stairway. Based on the discussion with the HALRB in April, they proposed in-kind wood window replacements with one-over-one windows. Regarding the existing two, six-over-six windows, they sought consistency and wanted to replace these as one-over-one wood windows. As for the vinyl windows in the addition, this was proposed because of the added expense of the in-kind wood windows. The addition cladding would have a smooth finish with Hardie lap siding. The front porch would qualify as restoration with in-kind replacement of any deteriorated materials.

The DRC provided its input from the July 5, 2023, hybrid meeting. Mr. Wenchel focused on the front porch and how it had not had handrails so as to maximize the views. He said the front of the house was the most visible, with the other elevations in view from the neighboring properties. He felt the six-over-six windows were not visible from the front, and the change to one-over-one would only be noticed by the neighboring properties. He continued to provide comments about the grading and the foundation issues. He recognized that it had been a challenge for the County to find a partner to utilize this house. He felt that this communal use of the property was the best use of this house, and the public would still have a great view of Four Mile Run from this property. He saw this as an extension of the park, and believed this unique setting would be appreciated. He also had some statements about the interior and hoped that there would be options for retaining some of these aspects.

L'Arche representative Luke Smith mentioned that there was a community event in June and members of the Reeves family attended. He said L'Arche thought this was a great use for the home, and that it is an extension of a home for all of Arlington. They would be happy to have the HALRB come visit the property when the project is completed.

The discussion was opened to the HALRB. Mr. Handley complimented the use of the building and the design. He asked about the condition of the milk shed. The HPP staff explained that it

was owned by the County and that its use and condition would need to be a discussion in the future.

The Chair proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 23-16, for the design for rehabilitation and additions at the Reevesland farmhouse in the Reevesland Historical District.

Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. The Chair asked for any final comments. Upon hearing none, Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 8-0 (Mr. Woodruff had left the meeting).

### **HISTORIC MARKER REVIEW: MOUNT OLIVE BAPTIST CHURCH**

Ms. Bolliger presented the first draft of a proposed historic marker for the Mount Olive Baptist Church in celebration of their 150-year anniversary. She invited Ms. Dangerfield, the Mount Olive Baptist Church trustee who had applied for the marker, to speak, who thanked everyone for their time. Ms. Bolliger noted that there was a recent update from the applicant to mention the Old Bell Church in the marker text which was their progenitor in Freedman’s Village. Ms. Dangerfield noted a possible discrepancy with the date of the renaming, which Ms. Bolliger said she and Ms. Dangerfield would check. She agreed with some of the historic details included in the marker and recommended that the broadcasting history could be removed. She noted a desire to include the Christian denomination of the church and suggested changing the dedication line to include the 150 years as the text implied that the 150 years of work were final rather than ongoing.

Mr. Handley stated he believed it was important for the marker to reflect all the changes and values that the applicant wanted. Mr. Aiken noted that a sentence began with a 1 rather than a capital I. Ms. Bolliger explained that she would retype everything for the sign manufacturer and to ensure that the text would fit.

Mr. Laporte mentioned a concern with the term “model community” because it sounded like a permanent planned community, rather than a model refugee camp. He then pointed out the importance of establishing the timeline as a previous draft indicated a different timeline for the church vis-à-vis Freedmans Village. He also noted a concern about a run on sentence, which Ms. Bolliger agreed to fix once the date of the renamed church was confirmed. She also noted his emailed question about the apostrophe in Freedmans Village and he agreed to the spelling with the apostrophe as it had been discussed and used in the past. He noted that there were two dates in one sentence and that they were in reverse order and recommended getting rid of one, as the context was established by a single date.

Ms. Bolliger explained that all the edits would be incorporated into the text, and she would confirm that it would all fit on a marker. Mr. Handley asked if the updated draft could be approved by email. Ms. Bolliger explained that an official vote had to be taken in the meeting so the commission could either vote now to approve it with later edits via email or in August in the meeting. The commission decided to defer the vote to August.

## **REPORTS OF THE CHAIR AND STAFF**

### **Chair's Report**

The Chair briefly noted that if anyone was interested in joining the HALRB's marker committee to help review marker text before meetings, they were welcome to contact staff.

### **Staff and Other Reports**

Ms. Liccese-Torres noted that staff would present an update on the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan at the September HALRB regular meeting and asked the commissioners to plan to ask any final questions or share comments at that meeting.

Ms. Tawney invited commissioners to volunteer with staff at their engagement table at the Arlington County Fair in August.

Ms. Liccese-Torres noted that per Mr. Laporte's question, the Wakefield Manor site plan team would be presenting the project at the next HALRB meeting.

Ms. Bolliger presented a draft update to the HALRB By-Laws. She explained that it had not been updated in 13 years and given the Virginia ruling requiring in-person quorum for architectural review boards, and the desire to make the HALRB more accessible to people not able to attend in person, staff was proposing an official quorum policy as one had never been established. In addition to some previously discussed language about new sub-committees (including a marker and survey sub-committee), Ms. Bolliger presented two options for how to define HALRB quorum, one a fixed number of 5, the other option a majority of the sitting members minus one.

Ms. Bolliger asked if the commissioners believed a Nominating Committee was still necessary. Mr. Laporte expressed concern that nominating and voting in the room might pressure commissioners to vote for a candidate who had elected themselves, rather than the Nominating Committee seeking an appropriate candidate. Mr. Aiken said he had been on the committee in the past and it was not an onerous role and could be retained rather than nominating from the floor.

Mr. Laporte expressed concern with the proposed reduction in quorum and believed that not requiring in-person attendance might indicate that the group was struggling or would not encourage people to attend in person or at all. Ms. Liccese-Torres noted that even with a large and engaged commission [such as the HALRB], circumstances (such as members with children, who had to travel and/or work, who needed medical leave) made it sometimes challenging to get an in-person quorum. Mr. Laporte suggested writing language to exclude members who were absent for medical reasons and requiring a majority of the members not excluded per medical reasons. Ms. Myers noted that the language about quorum in the document was miswritten and recommended an edit. Ms. Bolliger thanked the commissioners for their discussion and said she would return the draft language next month for further consideration.

Ms. Bolliger noted that the site plan project at Courthouse Landmark that the HALRB reviewed was almost complete and looked very good. She encouraged the members to view the fruits of their labor.

Ms. Liccese-Torres held an informal poll of which commissioners would be available for the August meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:39 pm.