



**MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND  
LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD  
Wednesday, May 15, 2024, 6:30 PM**

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

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Omari Davis, Chair  
Nan Dreher  
Andrew Fackler  
Alex Foster  
Gray Handley  
Gerald Laporte  
Joan Lawrence  
Rebecca Meyer  
Mark Turnbull  
Dick Woodruff
- VIRTUAL MEMBERS:** Kaydee Myers, Vice Chair (Personal, Arlington County, VA)
- MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Robert Dudka  
Carmela Hamm  
Andrew Wenchel
- STAFF PRESENT:** Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Section Supervisor  
Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Principal Planner  
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Associate Planner

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

The Chair called the meeting to order. Before having the roll called, Mr. Davis asked the member of the public sitting at the table with the commissioners to relocate to a different seating area in the room. Ms. Liccese-Torres then called the roll and determined there was a quorum. Immediately after the roll had been called, Ms. Foster and Mr. Handley arrived at 6:35 PM.

**EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES**

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

**APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 2024 MEETING MINUTES**

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft April 17, 2024, meeting minutes. Upon hearing none, Ms. Dreher moved to approve the April minutes, and the Chair seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 5-0-5 with Mr. Fackler, Mr. Handley, Ms. Lawrence, Mr. Turnbull, and Mr. Woodruff abstaining. Ms. Meyer had not yet arrived.

## **PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)**

### **Consent Agenda**

There were two items on the consent agenda. Mr. Davis asked if commissioners had any questions about the items on the agenda; Mr. Laporte asked that the second item, CoA 24-12 at 2900 Columbia Pike, be taken off the consent agenda because he had a question about the project. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested that the HALRB make a motion for the item that remained on the consent agenda before discussing the item pulled. The Chair made a motion to approve the consent agenda [for CoA 24-11]; Mr. Laporte seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 10-0.

### **CoA Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 24-12, 2900 Columbia Pike, Columbia Pike Form Based Code**

Ms. Tawney began the staff report and project overview for this item. Mr. Laporte interjected and stated that he felt the presentation was unnecessary and offered instead his comment about the project. He stated he was not against the project, but wanted to point out that the hipped metal roof was implied to be historic in the staff report. He wanted to clarify that it was not historic because it was not original to the building per information he remembered from previous projects that occurred at this building. He offered that staff could confirm his statement and asked that the staff report be amended so that it no longer implied that the roof was historic. Ms. Liccese-Torres confirmed that staff could clarify this language if needed but reiterated that the current CoA application did not involve the roof. Mr. Laporte acknowledged this, but wanted to correct the record so that the staff report no longer implied the roof was historic. Mr. Laporte then made a motion to approve this item and Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed 10-0. At 6:43 PM, Ms. Meyer arrived.

### **CoA Discussion Agenda Item #2: CoA 24-13, 2904 22<sup>nd</sup> St. N., Maywood Historic District**

Mr. Davis asked the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff to present this item. Before doing so, Ms. Tawney noted that the applicants were in the room. She then gave the following project overview:

The pre-1923 house at 2904 22<sup>nd</sup> St. N. is a contributing dwelling to the Maywood Local Historic District [LHD]. The house has had a few CoAs over the years, but there are two that are most relevant to this current project. In June 2008, the HALRB approved CoA 08-20 to redesign the enclosed front porch. The front porch, which had been an open porch, at some point was screened. In 1978, the owners at that time enclosed both the rear and front screened-in porches by replacing the screens with windows and vinyl siding. It was also at this time that vinyl siding was added to the entire house. CoA 08-20 included the removal of the shed-roof surround at the main entrance, the removal of the front door, and the relocation of the interior door, sidelights, and transom to the outer wall of the enclosed porch in the place of the removed front door. This is the doorway that is visible from the front exterior elevation today. In August 2019, the HALRB approved CoA 19-11 for the replacement of three basement windows and the conversion of a wall penetration containing an A/C unit back into a window.

In July 2023, a storm impacted the Arlington region and caused a large tree in the back yard of the property to fall on the rear of the house. The current proposal, in part, is a response to the ongoing repairs needed due to the storm damage. The applicant is proposing several alterations to both the existing roof and front entryway. The proposal includes the reconstruction of the existing roof using a new truss system which would increase the overall height of the house by 1'. The new roof would be clad in architectural asphalt shingles. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to install a new roof dormer on the west (located on the right side when looking at the house)

elevation; the rear roof elevation would remain without a dormer. Each dormer would have a front-gable roof, a switch from the hipped roofs on the existing dormers. The applicant is also proposing to replace the existing vinyl casement windows in the dormers with French casement, aluminum-clad wood windows with simulated-divided lites. Any replacement siding on the dormers, including the siding used in the gable end of the roof, would match the existing vinyl siding on the house (that was installed in 1978). Repairs to damaged siding throughout the house would be replaced in-kind with the same vinyl siding.

Regarding the front entrance, the applicant is proposing to replace the entire front entryway (door, sidelights, and transom) with a “replica.” The applicant desires to resolve energy efficiency and security issues with the existing door. The existing door handle would be re-used. If possible, the existing decorative woodwork underneath the door glazing will be salvaged; if not, it will be replicated. The existing bevel-edged glass in the door and insulated glass in the sidelights and transom also will be replaced in-kind as will the existing deadbolt hardware.

The Design Review Committee [DRC] considered this application at its May 1, 2024, [hybrid] meeting. After asking some clarifying questions, the DRC members expressed they did not have any concerns about the appropriateness of the proposed project and ultimately supported it, but decided to place it on the Discussion Agenda [for the HALRB] because the project included a change to the front elevation of the house.

The HPP staff recommends partial approval of this application as presented. Staff is sympathetic to the applicant’s desire to make repairs to their home after it was damaged by a storm last year and agrees that most of the proposed work is appropriate for the LHD.

Regarding the change to the roof truss system, staff feels the proposed change in height to the house is minor and would not be largely discernible from the public right-of-way, thereby complying with the spirit of Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. There is also precedent in the Maywood LHD for modest height alterations to houses to accommodate livable spaces. Staff also finds the installation of a new dormer on the west elevation appropriate because it would complement the overall symmetry of the house, would complement the home’s four-square form, and would not have a significant visual impact on the streetscape of Maywood. The *Maywood Design Guidelines* state that because of a dormer’s importance “in helping define the character of the neighborhood, their original design should be maintained.” Although the subject proposal does include a change in the roof type of the original dormers, staff finds the change appropriate in this case because the new roof type “gable” is noted as appropriate for Maywood in the *Design Guidelines* and the change in the dormer roof-type is necessary for the installation of the new roof truss system.

As noted earlier, the existing vinyl siding on the house was installed in 1978 prior to the LHD designation. Today, the use of vinyl siding is not allowable in Maywood. The owner shared at the DRC meeting that the original siding is not underneath the vinyl siding. Per the *Maywood Design Guidelines*, “if the removal of modern substitute materials reveals that the original siding material no longer remains, then replacement with wood siding is preferable” and continues, stating that replacement materials would be considered on a case-by-case basis excluding vinyl siding. This indicates that vinyl could not be considered as a replacement material; however, staff finds that the use of vinyl siding would be permitted in this case because it would be a replacement in kind matching both existing material and design. The replacement siding is only being installed in areas where repairs need to occur, and staff feels there would be a visual disconnect on the house if wood siding was required to be used for the repair areas.

Staff finds that the replacement of the vinyl windows with new windows to be appropriate; however, staff advocates that the windows should be wood rather than the proposed aluminum-clad windows given that those are deemed inappropriate in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Window replacements have been permitted at the property before via CoA 19-11 and would be consistent with previous changes made to the house.

Finally, the HPP staff finds the requested replacement of the front entrance door to be appropriate, but not the entire entryway. As noted previously, in June 2008, the HALRB approved CoA 08-20, which included the removal of the entry door and the relocation of the interior entry door, sidelights, and transom to the outer wall of the enclosed porch. Staff could not discern whether the entryway is original to the house; however, the style, design, and material of the entrance indicate that it is older. The *Maywood Design Guidelines* state that “original entry features such as sidelights, transoms, pediments, and canopies... should be retained.” It is for this reason that the HPP staff advocates for the retention of the surrounding features of the entryway such as the sidelights and transom. The applicant’s main reasoning for the replacement of the front entryway is to resolve energy efficiency and security issues with the door itself. Staff is sympathetic to those needs, especially since the door will be replaced in-kind. However, staff agrees that replacing the door, rather than the entire entryway, would resolve those issues.

Ms. Tawney then shared some additional photos for the project. Mr. Woodruff asked if the interior of the door still looks like what they saw in the 2008 photograph shared by Ms. Tawney. Ms. Jewell, the applicant, said that the door’s interior was still wood, although parts are now painted, and emphasized that the house’s woodwork is the “jewel” of the home. Mr. Davis asked both Ms. Jewell and Mr. Tran if they had anything else to add about their application. Mr. Tran offered more information about why the changes were needed for the roof structure and explained their choice of a gable roof for the dormers rather than a hipped roof. Mr. Davis then provided the DRC report; he reiterated that the DRC did not have any concerns about the appropriateness of the design, but they placed it on the discussion agenda because it was a change to the front exterior of the house. Mr. Handley asked if the DRC had a different opinion than staff about the front entryway. Mr. Davis replied that the DRC did not have any concerns about the front entryway, but after listening to the staff report, he said he agreed with the suggestion to keep the surround if possible.

Mr. Handley then asked for the applicant’s perspective on the entryway. Mr. Tran said that air seeps through the door and its surround, there was no insulation in the entryway, and they intended to install a complete replica of the entryway. Mr. Woodruff asked where the new insulation would be placed in the replica door; Mr. Tran replied that it would be in the seals around the doorway and that it would be double-sealed. Mr. Woodruff asked if the quality of the new wood would be as good as the product of the old wood. Mr. Tran confirmed that he felt the quality would be just as good as the original because the company they plan to use specializes in these types of projects using vintage wood, and they replicate the exact same profiling and detailing as what is found in the original. Mr. Tran also confirmed the use of red oak.

Ms. Meyer said that the drawings note a “double pane insulated glass” in the transom and sidelight, but a bevel-edged glass in the door. Mr. Tran said the drawings note the door having a single-pane glass because that is what is there now. Ms. Meyer understood the difference but wanted to know what the gain would be if the intention was to keep a single-pane of glass there when double-insulated would be more energy efficient. Mr. Tran said the seal around the glass would help with energy efficiency but that keeping the single-pane of glass was more to preserve the look of the original door. Ms. Meyer asked if the transom and sidelights currently have double-paned glass, and Mr. Tran confirmed that they do. Ms. Meyer asked if someone from the company they intended to use could seal up the existing door, but Mr. Tran and Ms. Jewell both noted that the current door is damaged and unsafe and that their preference

would be not to keep the existing entryway. Ms. Meyer expressed her support for the replica replacement given that the entryway was being made by a restoration company that would match the new door to the existing door.

Mr. Woodruff suggested that the HALRB should next discuss the dormer windows. He felt it was excessive to ask the applicant to replace an existing vinyl window with a new wood window in a dormer. Mr. Handley agreed. Mr. Woodruff also said [wood] would be hard to maintain given its location.

Mr. Handley asked the applicant how closely the new windows would match the existing. Mr. Tran responded that the existing windows are single-pane, simulated divided lites (SDL) that were attached to the exterior and not inserted on the interior. He said that the new windows would also be the same SDL configuration. The Chair asked if the new window section [Appendix H: In-Kind Window Replacement Guidelines] in the *Maywood Design Guidelines* offered any guidance on window materials. Mr. Woodruff also asked for clarification about what the current guidelines state regarding windows.

Ms. Tawney noted that the new guidance in the *Design Guidelines* largely does not cover materials specifically and quoted this language: “If existing window material is inconsistent with the age and style of the house, the applicant may submit a material more appropriate for the LHD for the HALRB’s consideration.” She then reiterated that wood windows remain the standard recommendation for Maywood. Mr. Woodruff said he thought that if it was a wood window being replaced that the guidelines recommended it be replaced with a wood window; Ms. Tawney said there have been cases though where applicants came to the HALRB with requests to replace non-wood windows with wood windows.

Ms. Jewell shared that she put the vinyl windows into the house. She explained she had Rebecca Ballo (former HPP staff) come out to the house to evaluate the windows, who determined the windows were “non-contributing” and could be replaced. Ms. Tawney asked for confirmation that she had been allowed to use vinyl windows and Ms. Jewell reiterated that she had been allowed to replace them.

Ms. Meyer asked about the window material on the rest of the house; Ms. Jewell and Mr. Tran replied it was a combination between some wood, vinyl-clad, and vinyl. Ms. Meyer said she was not concerned with the use of aluminum-clad windows in the dormer; she noted she would be more concerned if it was on the front elevation/first floor of the house and in that case would want wood windows used. Mr. Woodruff asked if all the dormer windows [in the existing dormers] would be replaced; Ms. Tawney and the applicant confirmed yes. Ms. Tawney also noted that the applicant needed to change the windows to meet code requirements for egress.

Mr. Davis said he was ready to propose a motion. Ms. Lawrence asked that it be made clear that this decision was not precedent setting with regards to the windows and the HALRB’s approval of using aluminum-clad windows. The Chair made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 24-13, 2904 22<sup>nd</sup> St. N. in the Maywood Local Historic District for the request to install a new roof dormer, change dormer windows to aluminum-clad wood windows from existing vinyl-clad windows...

It was at this time that Ms. Meyer suggested language to supplement the motion and recommended they add that the windows were permissible because one was a new dormer and the others were replacements in kind. Ms. Tawney clarified that none of these windows would be replacement in-kind; they would all be changed from vinyl to aluminum-clad.

Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested Ms. Tawney read back the motion as drafted thus far which Ms. Tawney did. After some additional language suggestions, the Chair proposed the following revised motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 24-13, 2904 22<sup>nd</sup> St. N., in the Maywood Local Historic District for the request to: install a new roof dormer; change dormer windows to aluminum-clad wood windows from existing vinyl windows finding that in this specific situation this is appropriate because it does not alter the appearance of the front of the house; change dormer roof type; install a new roof truss system; and replace the front entryway as submitted because the applicant is utilizing a restoration company that uses historic methods and materials and will re-use some elements of the existing door.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 11-0.

**CoA Discussion Agenda Item #3: CoA 21-30D, 2415 Shirlington Rd., Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District**

Mr. Davis asked for the staff report, and Ms. Tawney gave the following project overview:

The Green Valley Pharmacy, originally built in 1942 as a grocery store, was designated as an Arlington County LHD in 2013. There have been minimal changes made to the building over time. In the past few years, the HALRB has reviewed several CoA projects associated with plans to convert the pharmacy into a restaurant. Between January 2022 and July 2023, CoA 21-30 has undergone several amendments and revisions. Most relevant to the current application is CoA 21-30B (approved by the HALRB in June 2023). This CoA included the installation of three bioretention planters on site. It is this element of their project that the applicant is requesting to change with the current proposal; the applicant now proposes to have only one bioretention planter at the corner of the property near the intersection of Shirlington Road and 24<sup>th</sup> Road S. The planter box would measure 22.4' x 8.9' x 16.3' x 5.9' with a height above ground of 10" and 24" underground.

The DRC considered this application at its May 1, 2024, [hybrid] meeting. The members had reservations and questions about the proposed location of the bioretention planter and asked about the height of the planter. Since the applicant was not present at the DRC meeting, these questions could not be answered. Due to the outstanding questions and concerns, the DRC placed this item on the Discussion Agenda for the May HALRB hybrid public hearing.

The HPP staff recommends approval of the subject application. The proposed change to the bioretention planter plan was made in response to comments received from other County entities while [building] permitting for the broader renovation project has been under review. As such, the current proposal allows the project to comply with other County requirements and stormwater management goals. Since the proposed planter will measure 10" in height, it will not interfere with the view of the historic building. The planter will be installed along the sidewalk, thereby not damaging or affecting any historic site elements. Thus, the planter complies with Standards #9 and #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Ms. Tawney then shared some additional photographs she took on site to show the area where the planter would be located. Ms. Lawrence asked for the specific location and Ms. Tawney clarified that it would essentially be right at the front of the property. Mr. Handley asked how this planter would collect run-off from the roof considering its position in the parking lot. Ms. Tawney and Mr. Davis explained that, according to the drawing, the water would come from a downspout on the corner of the building, funnel through a channel underground, and collect at the box. Mr. Handley asked if the planter box would be big

enough for that amount of run-off. Ms. Lawrence expressed that she thought the County may have refined their approach to stormwater management.

The Chair suggested that the Board hear from the applicant. Mr. Maharmeh reiterated that what was presented was what would be installed and that it was better to have the one planter box rather than three as had been originally proposed. Ms. Tawney asked Mr. Maharmeh to speak specifically to the selected location of the planter box and why it was positioned in that part of the property. Mr. Maharmeh replied that this location was selected because it was close to the outflow; they would need outflow to the closest manhole.

Ms. Myers asked to see the old plan with the three planter boxes; Ms. Tawney shared that on the screen. Ms. Myers pointed out that one of the building's main features was the corner entrance; thus, she felt that it would be better if the planter was located elsewhere on the property. She noted that the short height of the planter would help minimize its visual impact on the building; however, she wanted to keep in mind that the vegetation placed in the planter also would contribute to its visual impact. Ms. Tawney stated that the applicant had said that the tallest plants they would put in the planter would be about 15" in height.

Ms. Lawrence asked about the materials of the planter; Mr. Maharmeh indicated that it could be wood like a garden box. Ms. Lawrence asked for clarification if the wood would clad a masonry structure. Mr. Maharmeh said that it could be both, but that he would want it to all be made of wood. It was asked if the wood would be painted; Mr. Maharmeh said he could either leave it natural or stain it, but that he did not know yet. Mr. Handley stated that it sounded like this element was uncertain at this point. He suggested that since the planter likely would need to be masonry in structure, perhaps it could be faced with stucco to match the building, thereby helping it fade into the landscape. Mr. Maharmeh said that he could match the planter box exterior to the building if that was preferable.

Ms. Meyer asked if the original stormwater planter plan did not meet the County's stormwater requirements. Ms. Tawney indicated she did not know the answer. Ms. Meyer stated that the original plan with three planters took the site and the building into consideration more by keeping the entry open. She felt that the current iteration did not, in both its location and shape, have a relation to the site or the building. She asked if the geometry of the one planter could be refined or studied further to make it relate better to the building. The suggestion was then made by a few HALRB members to potentially explore having the planter echo the shape of the [corner] entryway.

Mr. Laporte stated concern about the use of wood for the planter and doubted if the County would allow this material to be used. He and Ms. Dreher expressed that the material of the planter was still unclear. Ms. Foster shared that the location of the planter box made the entryway feel uncomfortable given that people would have to walk around the planter to go to the [building] entrance. She suggested that the planter be located further north and closer to the building to prevent it from being right at the front of the building.

Ms. Dreher expressed a desire to know more about what other County departments required changes [during their permit review] and the rationale for those changes. She said she wanted to prevent having the HALRB make determinations that would conflict with what other County entities needed or required. Mr. Maharmeh stated that what was presented was very similar to what had already been approved; he said what they were requesting was the same with the omission of two planters. He then said he could not relocate the box to the right because of the required spacing needed for the trees. He also said he had talked to the County, and it was determined that [what he proposed] was the best location. Mr. Davis asked if this single location would be more efficient than having three; Mr. Maharmeh replied that was the case because they did not need as many stormwater planters as previously assumed.

Ms. Meyer said she was not convinced this was the most respectful location for the planter in relation to the building and noted a desire to know and understand the comments from other County entities about the stormwater management. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that Ms. Tawney was trying to access the comments in the permitting system now. In summation, she shared that the number of proposed planters was not required. Ms. Handley asked if there were any comments about the planter location; Ms. Tawney said she would need to study the comments further to find that information.

Ms. Meyer then suggested that the applicant potentially could keep two of the original planters because their sizing was more appropriate. Ms. Tawney stated she felt it would not be appropriate for the HALRB to determine the number of planter boxes that would be used; this should be done by the stormwater professionals in the County. She stated that Mr. Maharmeh, as the applicant, was having further conversations with the County employees reviewing his permit requests. She offered that it would be best for the HALRB to decide about the application in front of them now and it would be appropriate for the Board to ask the applicant to study other possible locations. Ms. Liccese-Torres agreed.

Ms. Myers requested to see the previously approved plan with the three planter boxes. She then asked if the shape was different between the three and the newly proposed [single planter]. Ms. Tawney said that both the shape and the size are different from what was originally proposed. She reminded the Board that at the earlier meeting when the HALRB approved the three bioretention planters, the Board did not object to the proposed locations of the planters even though one of them was situated directly in front of the building. Ms. Myers reiterated that the current proposal's location and shape took away from the entrance. She said she would be more comfortable with the proposal if the planter had a different shape.

Mr. Davis said his objection to the planter was its location right at the corner of the building, which he expressed was the most special architectural element of the building. He said he knew that, previously, the HALRB did not object to the location of a planter in front of the building, but he still did not agree that the current proposal was appropriate. Mr. Turnbull noted that at that meeting, the HALRB discussed other project elements and not just the planters, but also that he did not understand the reasoning behind why the current location was selected and not one of the other two locations previously approved that were in less prominent locations. Mr. Handley asked Mr. Maharmeh if they considered placing the planter box in the space between the driveway and the pergola towards the back of the building. Mr. Maharmeh replied he would be willing to explore other locations for the planter.

Mr. Davis stated a desire to revisit the discuss about materials; Mr. Maharmeh said he could share exactly what the materials would be for the box. Mr. Davis said that what had been proposed thus far was a masonry structure clad in stucco to match the building. Mr. Laporte asked if the HALRB could approve a stucco-clad planter box relocated to the rear of the building tonight. Ms. Liccese-Torres instead suggested the HALRB consider a conditional approval instead given that the HALRB does not have a drawing of that proposal. She also suggested that the DRC could then do the final review and approval [upon submission of an updated drawing].

Ms. Lawrence said she would feel more comfortable with a rectangular-shaped planter. Ms. Meyer noted though that the previous ones did have angles, too; she offered that perhaps instead of stating it needed to be rectangular, that the shape would need to respect the entry and not obstruct the historic entrance. Ms. Lawrence and Ms. Meyer both agreed that they would like to see the bioretention planter relocated to the back of the property. Mr. Handley felt it would also look nicer behind the pergola. Ms. Dreher said the motion could offer conditions that the planter does not block the entryway and request the planter potentially be relocated behind the pergola with the understanding that other locations may work better for engineering reasons the HALRB would not have the knowledge of to consider. Mr. Maharmeh made the point that the location of the trees must also be considered. He said that the best location might be closer to the [rear] walk-in cooler.



The Chair then made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB conditionally approve CoA 21-30D, 2415 Shirlington Rd., in the Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District for the request to change the bioretention planter plan to a less prominent location away from the main entrance of the building. The planter shall be clad in stucco backed up by masonry.

Mr. Maharmeh interjected and said he agreed about the materials but said that if he relocated the planter away from the front of the building, that it would need review from other County entities to see if they agreed with the new location. He also said he did not feel that the proposed 10” height would obstruct the view of the building.

Ms. Lawrence asked if the motion should mention the final review of the plans by the DRC. Mr. Davis amended the original motion accordingly. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked Ms. Tawney to reread the motion. Before doing so, Ms. Tawney asked if the HALRB was still in consensus that the shape of the planter should be rectangular. Mr. Handley offered that the language could say that the planter should be a in shape that is in harmony with the historic site. Ms. Tawney then reread the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Handley noted concern about the section prescribing specific materials to the planter; he said this was going further than the HALRB. Ms. Myers suggested that the motion indicate the materials be submitted for review before the DRC meeting. Mr. Laporte felt that the materials should be submitted to the HALRB for review; other commissioners did not agree and felt the DRC could sufficiently review it. Ms. Tawney asked if the HALRB wanted to be specific or vague about materials in the motion. There was some general discussion about whether stucco should be specified and ultimately, the HALRB decided to omit that specific request. The Chair made the following amended motion:

I move that the HALRB conditionally approve CoA 21-30D, 2415 Shirlington Rd., in the Green Valley Pharmacy Historic District for the request to change the bioretention planter plan to a less prominent location away from the main entrance of the building. The planter should be in a shape and materials that are harmonious with the historic district. This is conditional to DRC approval of the final updated drawings.

Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously, 11-0.

Mr. Turnbull made a request for more renderings as well as more complete CoA applications. Ms. Liccese-Torres acknowledged the comment. Mr. Handley asked if the HPP staff reaches out to other County entities to find out what they have said about projects; Ms. Liccese-Torres indicated yes.

### **Historic Marker Review: Green Valley Historic Preservation Fund Grant Project**

Ms. Liccese-Torres introduced Ms. Inumidun Obikoya, neighborhood project representative, and reminded the HALRB that this interpretive project is one of the Historic Preservation Fund grantees. She said that Ms. Obikoya would be presenting the final three proposed interpretive panels for the HALRB’s review.

After a brief technical difficulty, Ms. Obikoya re-introduced herself as the project manager for the Green Valley History and Culture project. She explained that this grant is helping create a repository for Green Valley, including archiving materials, conducting oral histories of past residents, and highlighting historic

areas and/or sites via interpretive markers and maps. Ms. Obikoya presented a map of Green Valley and mentioned how Arlington County had only three historically African American neighborhoods. She indicated the boundaries of Green Valley as 16<sup>th</sup> St. S., Arlington Mill Dr., Interstate 395/Army Navy Country Club, and S. Walter Reed Dr.

Ms. Obikoya noted the project had identified 18 neighborhood points of interest, 13 of which already have existing historic markers. She described these markers as different in appearance and content – some use the aluminum marker format while others use the tabletop format. She indicated which five of the 18 points of interests do not have historic markers: Chinn Funeral Service, Friendly Cab Stand, Our Lady Queen of Peace [Catholic Church], John Robinson, Jr. Town Square, and the Veteran’s Memorial YMCA. Ms. Obikoya also mentioned they have identified four other sites they would like to add to the list [for interpretation] if funding allows: Nauck (Fort Myer) Line of the Washington, Arlington, and Falls Church Railway, Majestic Barbershop, Star Barbershop, and Naomi’s TV. She then briefly mentioned two of the 18 sites that have historic recognition: Lomax AME Church (on the National Register of Historic Places and a LHD) and the Green Valley Pharmacy (LHD).

Ms. Obikoya shared some of the project goals. She explained the first goal of unifying the different markers and information with a similar branding standard; this would utilize QR code stencils or stamps and similar communications branding. She said the “you are here” map panels would measure 36” x 48” and be in an upright frame; there will be either two or three of these panels in the community. For the new historic sites, she said the interpretive panels would measure 24” x 18” and have a single pedestal base and a lower profile. Ms. Obikoya briefly highlighted the three panels currently under discussion, including the “you are here” map, John Robinson Jr., Town Square, and Veteran’s Memorial YMCA.

There was one public speaker for this item. The Chair invited Dr. Bernard to share his comments with the board. Dr. Berne stated the following:

The map in the project’s historic marker entitled “Welcome to Green Valley” fails to depict the route of the Washington-Virginia Railway and its predecessor and successor. As stated in a historical marker at the opposite end of the neighborhood, this electric trolley line spurred Green Valley’s development.

The trolley line traveled through the neighborhood near the west side of S. Kenmore St., between S. Glebe Road and the area that the map identifies as John Robinson Jr. Town Square. The line’s trolleys traveled between Rosslyn and Green Valley for 36 years, from 1901 to 1937. A 1929 U. S. Geological Survey topographic map of Washington and its vicinity shows the portion of the trolley line’s route that traveled north-south through Green Valley before terminating near the former location of the Kemper School. That school now bears the name “Dr. Charles R. Drew Elementary School.” The trolley’s route was west of S. Glebe Road, which the maps shows as a red-hatched line.

The project’s map can not be complete if it does not identify the trolley line’s route. Further, the text on the left side of the marker should describe the trolley line and its importance to the neighborhood’s development.

Dr. Berne concluded his comments by suggesting the applicant consult with him on future iterations of the map because he has information that may be useful. He ended with a reminder as to where exactly the trolley line was in Green Valley.

Ms. Obikoya asked if she could respond to the comments received; Ms. Liccese-Torres offered that she could and asked to keep the slide with the “you are here” map up so the HALRB could begin their

discussion there. Ms. Obikoya thanked Dr. Berne for his comments, sharing that she is a transportation planner for Arlington County with an interest and passion for transportation. She stated she agreed with Dr. Berne and planned to incorporate the trolley line into the map.

Mr. Laporte asked if Ms. Obikoya had thought about creating a historic marker dedicated to the home of Roberta Flack. Ms. Obikoya replied there is information about Ms. Flack on their [neighborhood] website and other media dedicated to the history of Green Valley. She offered to share the idea with others helping her with this project.

Ms. Dreher said she thought the introduction paragraph could expand upon some of the topics mentioned to provide better context for those less familiar with Green Valley's history. Mr. Laporte agreed with this comment and noted it also was in his written comments for the markers [submitted to the HPP staff]. Mr. Davis suggested that the historic sites and the parks/trails noted on the map have different categorizing systems on the map; he said that in the current iteration, the use of numbers for both was confusing and that perhaps the parks/trails could use letters instead.

Ms. Liccese-Torres shared a few staff comments for the historic map marker. She suggested renaming the items noted as "historic sites" in the key to "sites of interest" because not everything listed there is historic. Next, she questioned whether including all the building footprints in the neighborhood on the map was necessary; staff felt that this made the map look a little busy and took away from the information being presented. She further expressed reservations about including the footprints because there is so much change and development happening in the County that in a few years from now, the map may be seen as "out of date" because it no longer accurately reflects the physical landscape of Green Valley. Mr. Woodruff disagreed with this suggestion because he thought removing the buildings would make parts of the map look empty. He also said their inclusion could be a helpful way for those using the map to orient themselves. Ms. Foster agreed, stating the building footprints added a nice textural element to the map's design and that, even if things [in the neighborhood] do change, she did not feel it would affect the character of the story being told. She suggested that the design team consider adjusting the opacity of the building footprints on the map to see if that would help with legibility. Ms. Myers cautioned against making the buildings too opaque because then they would not stand out at all. Ms. Dreher, Ms. Myers, Mr. Handley, Mr. Laporte and other HALRB members likewise noted an appreciation for inclusion of the building footprints.

Mr. Laporte suggested the need to add a date [year] indicating when the marker would be erected so that the marker has a context. Ms. Dreher suggested adding a credit to the designer/installer with the date. Mr. Handley noted that the marker had been difficult for him to read because the background color was green [the map on top of the background is another shade of green]. He recommended they explore a different color for the full background, even making the map a bit bigger. Mr. Laporte said he appreciated the green background because it tied to "Green" Valley. Other commissioners suggested potentially using a lighter shade of green for the background. Ms. Dreher asked about the locations for these maps. Ms. Obikoya said that they are proposing two locations now, but that they may want to install a third.

The conversation next shifted to discuss the John Robinson, Jr. Town Square marker. Ms. Dreher suggested that on this marker and the Veteran's Memorial YMCA marker that the photos have a sentence explaining who or what is in the photo along with a date if possible. Ms. Lawrence and Mr. Laporte agreed. Ms. Lawrence asked about the name of the sculpture in the town square; it was clarified that it was titled "FREED" and this should be included underneath the photo. Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the HALRB that a suggestion had been made last month [on the other three markers in the project] to relocate the logos to the bottom green band of the design to allow for more space above for text and photographs. Ms. Obikoya said she agreed with that suggestion and would implement it upon receiving comments on all the markers. She noted a willingness to return to the HALRB in the future with the final iterations. Ms.

Liccese-Torres stated it might not be necessary to return to the HALRB for the sake of time and process; she indicated that future changes could be discussed with the HPP staff.

A call for final comments on this marker was made. Ms. Dreher suggested they explore breaking up the paragraph text on the marker a bit more so it did not seem like one large paragraph. Others disagreed because they felt it read as separate paragraphs due to the way it was laid out on the marker.

Lastly, the conversation shifted to the review of the third marker dedicated to the Veteran's Memorial YMCA. Mr. Fackler noted that this marker felt sparse in comparison to the others. Ms. Dreher stated captions for the photographs would be good to include. Ms. Lawrence asked if the swimming pool was ever built at the YMCA; Ms. Obikoya confirmed it had been. The Board noted some confusion with the one photograph shown which appears to be an article from a newspaper; Ms. Obikoya clarified it was part of a fundraising campaign to raise money for the pool. Mr. Handley said the text on the photo was difficult to read and suggested summarizing it or noting why it was included on the marker to help clarify its importance. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked Ms. Obikoya if she knew the address of the YMCA building. Ms. Obikoya replied that the building was still standing at the intersection of 22<sup>nd</sup> St. S. and S. Kenmore St. Ms. Liccese-Torres suggested adding the building address to the marker to help better orient the reader, especially since it was still extant. Given there were no other comments or questions, Ms. Liccese-Torres stated the HPP staff would be in touch with Ms. Obikoya to discuss next steps.

## **CHAIR'S REPORT**

Mr. Davis invited Mr. Woodruff and Ms. Lawrence to each provide a report on the recent Barcroft Advisory Working Group (AWG) meetings [that they attended as HALRB representatives]. Mr. Woodruff shared a summary of the April meeting. He noted a concern for the number of buildings proposed to be demolished within the Conservation Area, in particular, one building that has distinctive architectural features. He said the Working Group asked the Barcroft project team to explore a design that did not include the demolition of that building. He said not much had changed in the [land use] proposal; the plan was still to demolish buildings along the edges of Barcroft but preserve the buildings located at the core.

Ms. Lawrence then provided a summary of the May meeting, the final AWG meeting:

This last scheduled meeting of the Working Group started with wrap up presentations by County Staff and Jair Lynch's representative and ended with comments from representatives of each of the stakeholder groups that participated in the Working Group meetings.

The County Staff presentation reported results of responses to questions asked during about 6 weeks of community engagement, online feedback, and an open house held at Barcroft on May 4, 2024, and looked at Draft Policy Recommendations and the Master Financing & Development Plan (MFDP). The priorities identified by those expressing opinions during this process, including about a third of current Barcroft residents, are providing more parking, preserving Barcroft's historic garden apartment style and features, and preserving trees and natural areas. The Staff report identified four planning documents that will require updating, all related to the Form Based Code, Transportation, and the General Land Use Plan; no changes to the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan are needed. In addition, there are land use elements addressed by the MFDP that require consideration, namely Conservation Area limits, potential mitigation strategies for demolished historic buildings, retention of existing parking spaces, retaining a 50% tree, biophilic design in connection with an east-west pedestrian connection, children's play areas, and a resident amenity center.

It is anticipated that the County Board will hear at least some of the required changes required by the MFDP in July 2024. Prior to this, the Applicant (Jair Lynch) will be making presentations to commissions and stakeholder groups represented in the Working Group. The HALRB presentation is scheduled for June 20, 2024 [since June 19 is the Juneteenth holiday].

Jair Lynch's representative discussed reconfiguration, relocation, and enlargement of the various miniparks that were previously proposed and indicated an increase in the size of preserved natural areas, as well as courtyard renovations with biophilic paths for existing buildings. It was noted that the Conservation Area remains the same; however, removal of an historic building to make the amenity center (10,000-15,00 sq ft; 1-2 stories mentioned) is proposed. Limits of demolition are indicated "TBD," with no indication of when this will happen. There are historic buildings adjacent to Columbia Pike, originally indicated for demolition, that are to be preserved to create a described "historic gateway to Barcroft." Building heights for new construction range from 3 stories adjacent to historic buildings up to 6-8 stories along Columbia Pike up to 10-14 stories (mostly along Four Mile Run in the western edge).

The meeting concluded with each stakeholder group asked to present comments. My comments included acknowledging and commending the Applicant for retaining the historic buildings along Columbia Pike previously indicated for demolition, asking if the arches on Building 40 (which is proposed for demolition) could be preserved in some way, and expressing concern about the demolition of Building 6 for the amenity center. I requested considering repurposing Building 6 and renovating it to incorporate and provide the indoor amenities requested by the residents. I also mentioned the environmental benefits of reusing the existing building and minimizing the demolition of the historic building.

Feedback and comments on the Draft Planning Principles, which are posted on the Barcroft Land Use web page, was requested.

Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked both Mr. Woodruff and Ms. Lawrence for their participation on the AWG Working Group and reiterated that more information about the land use proposal could be found online. She also noted there would be a presentation at the next HALRB meeting in June about Barcroft from the project team as part of their engagement before they go to the County Board.

Mr. Handley expressed the opinion that tearing down 30% of Barcroft seemed like a large amount and he was surprised that these buildings were not protected. Ms. Lawrence and Mr. Woodruff said that these buildings had been protected but then that changed. Ms. Lawrence noted they were part of a Conservation Area in the [adopted] Columbia Pike Neighborhoods plan from 2012; however, the current MFPD proposes making some changes to the boundaries of the approved Conservation Area, which means that some buildings originally identified to remain would no longer be within the Conservation Area. Mr. Handley stated he was surprised by this since the recent Barcroft presentations [at the HALRB] have not discussed any of the demolitions yet. Mr. Woodruff clarified that the portions of Barcroft that have come to the HALRB in the past few months are for the parts being [preserved and] renovated, but that they have not come forward yet to discuss with the HALRB their plans for redevelopment. Mr. Woodruff asked about the status of the preservation easements in the sections of Barcroft [to be preserved/renovated]; Ms. Liccese-Torres stated that staff was still working towards using easements as a preservation tool here.

Mr. Davis continued the Chair's report by sharing a summary of a recent advisory board chair's meeting [sponsored by the County Board]. He said one item discussed was the Arlington 2050 Initiative, an effort to explore what residents envision Arlington County to be like in 2050. He also mentioned a new update to the Advisory Group Handbook. Mr. Davis shared that County staff are taking comments online about

the draft Handbook and that members of the HALRB could share their thoughts. The HPP staff said they would find the link and share it with the HALRB.

## **STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Tawney announced the recent release earlier this month of the HPP's third Cultural Heritage Spotlight Video, this one featuring Heidelberg Pastry Shoppe. She reminded the HALRB members they could watch the video by clicking the link she shared via email prior to the meeting. Ms. Tawney also shared that the William and Margarite Syphax historic marker had been installed; she provided the address so members of the HALRB could visit the marker if they wanted. Finally, Ms. Tawney announced an upcoming unveiling event on June 20 to be hosted by the Department of Parks and Recreation for the new Civil War Trails marker dedicated to the USCT which the HALRB reviewed and approved earlier this year.

Ms. Liccese-Torres encouraged HALRB members to visit the Unity Homes at Ballston [site plan project] and the adjacent Robert Ball Sr. Family Burial Ground to see the new building, the installation of the Tiffany stained-glass Jesus window, and the new interpretive marker installed at the burial ground. She next shared an update on the progress to hire a new Historic Preservation Specialist. She then provided information about the FY25 County budget [adopted in April]. Ms. Liccese-Torres thanked Mr. Davis for attending the County Board's CPHD budget work session to speak on behalf of the HALRB in support for the HPP. She announced that the adopted budget included \$100,000 that was allocated to the HPP program specifically to use to begin the update to the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI).

Mr. Woodruff asked about the HRI update process and what the goals would be. Ms. Liccese-Torres said the goal was to digitize and correct existing HRI data and, if the budget allows, to better connect existing data to GIS thereby making it more accessible. She noted a future goal for the HRI would be to expand upon it (e.g., different resource types to document, analysis of cultural heritage, etc.) but that for now, the housekeeping items would be the initial focus. Mr. Laporte noted the importance of cultural heritage and used the [proposed] markers in Green Valley as an example of a project aiming to share more about culture. Ms. Liccese-Torres agreed and expressed how the field of historic preservation has evolved to include cultural heritage in our work.

Finally, Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the HALRB that the June meeting must be moved from June 19 to June 20 due to the Juneteenth holiday. She asked if anyone knew right away that they could not attend; Ms. Meyer and Ms. Myers both confirmed that they could not be at the June meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:00 pm.