



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
Neighborhood Services Division
Bozman Government Center 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201
TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND
LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, April 17, 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
Alex Foster
Kaydee Myers, Vice Chair
Andrew Wenchel

VIRTUAL MEMBERS: Carmela Hamm (Medical, Henrico, VA)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Andrew Fackler
Gray Handley
Gerald Laporte
Joan Lawrence
Rebecca Meyer
Mark Turnbull
Dick Woodruff

STAFF PRESENT: Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Historic Preservation Section Supervisor
Lorin Farris, Historic Preservation Principal Planner
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Associate Planner

CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair began the meeting with the Chair's Report while waiting for a quorum of members to arrive. Since Ms. Lawrence was absent, Ms. Farris provided a summary about the latest efforts with the expanded Form-Based Code Advisory Working Group (FBC-AWG) for the Barcroft Apartments land use analysis, which last met on April 1, 2024:

Ms. Lawrence represented the HALRB at that meeting, which focused on public open spaces and natural areas, including the tree canopy, natural resources, and planned parks. County staff provided policy overviews related to Barcroft's open spaces and natural areas, such as the Columbia Pike Revitalization Plan, the Neighborhoods Area Plan, the Stormwater Master Plan, the Public Spaces Master Plan, the Public Art Master Plan, and the Forestry & Natural Resources Plan.

For future public spaces, the Jair Lynch project team is proposing two new public spaces each being relocated and reconfigured from the previously envisioned locations. County staff sees these areas as being constrained by future building footprints, and that given the scale of future redevelopment, staff expressed that these two public spaces should be considered for expansion. County staff also believes the areas should be easily accessed and be integrated with adjacent public trails. For tree canopy goals, the Barcroft goal is to have 40% tree canopy, which can be achieved

through conserving existing trees and planting of trees in redeveloped areas, on site, and along streets. Much of the discussion from the FBC-AWG focused on understanding how the project team would be able to achieve the tree canopy goals and how the new public spaces would serve the existing residents, new residents, and the surrounding community.

Ms. Lawrence stated the importance of the environmental setting at Barcroft Apartments and how the trees, open spaces, and pedestrian circulation help support the complex's historic significance. She wanted the project team to keep this in consideration when proposing to make alterations in these areas.

Ms. Farris mentioned that the next FBC-AWG meeting will occur on April 22, 2024, to discuss urban design. She also announced an open house on May 4, 2024. After the Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff concluded this recap, enough HALRB members had arrived for an in-person quorum.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Ms. Myers arrived at 6:36 pm, allowing the Chair to officially call 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.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 2024 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft March 20, 2024, meeting minutes. Ms. Myers asked Ms. Tawney to read out the proposed edits she had previously sent to staff. Ms. Tawney explained that on page 10 of the draft minutes, Ms. Myers is described as saying that the HALRB allows for energy efficient windows, but she meant the opposite. Ms. Myers clarified that she meant that the HALRB regularly requires wood windows over the most energy efficient window option; she asked this change to be incorporated into the minutes. Ms. Myers also identified a typographic error with the misspelling of her surname on page 11. Mr. Davis moved to approve the March minutes with the amended language and Ms. Dreher seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

CoA Consent Agenda

There was one item on the Consent Agenda, CoA 24-10 for 1758 N. Rhodes Street in the Colonial Village Local Historic District (LHD). Given there were no questions or concerns, Ms. Myers proposed to approve the Consent Agenda and Chair Davis seconded the motion. Ms. Liccese-Torres called the roll and the motion passed unanimously 6-0.

CoA Discussion Agenda Item #1: CoA 24-09, 2725 23rd Road North, Maywood LHD

Ms. Tawney provided the project background. She familiarized everyone with the location of the property by providing photographs of the house and its surroundings; she referenced the photographs throughout her staff presentation. Ms. Tawney gave the following project overview:

The pre-1916 house at 2725 23rd Rd. N. is a contributing dwelling to the Maywood LHD. It is situated at the end of 23rd Rd. N. and at the edge of the LHD boundary. There are no neighboring houses to the east and south of the property; the closest neighbor is situated to the west, a non-contributing dwelling at 2729 23rd Rd. N. Thrifton Hill Park, a public park, surrounds the house to the south, east, and portions of the north. According to HPP records, no CoAs have been applied for or completed at this property.

In addition to there being a house, the property also includes a detached garage. The Maywood *National Register Nomination* gives a construction date of 1936 for the garage and notes it as a contributing historic resource. The source of this date is attributed to a map, likely the 1936 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, which shows the house with a detached garage. However, recent research by the HPP staff indicates that the present-day garage was most likely constructed in 1983. Documentary evidence in the form of early County [building] permit records, and a brief staff field survey of the garage in April 2024, support this revised construction date. It is for this reason that staff believes the current garage to be non-historic and no longer contributing to the Maywood LHD or National Register district.

The applicant is proposing to construct a two-story rear and side addition to the existing house that would connect it with the existing detached garage. The construction would require the partial demolition of about one-third of the rear of the existing house, the partial demolition of the rear portion of the existing garage, and the partial demolition of the existing rear patio space. To construct the addition, the applicant would also need to remove a healthy Japanese Cryptomeria (Japanese Cedar) tree situated directly behind the garage. The proposed addition features a two-story, side-gabled-roofed hyphen that would connect the existing house to a larger two-story front-gabled side addition overtop of the existing garage. A secondary entrance featuring a half-glazed wood door and wood entry stairs and deck would provide access to a first-floor mudroom in the hyphen section. Siding throughout the addition would either be wood lap siding to match the siding on the existing house or smooth fiberboard cement siding. All trim would be PVC. Roof shingles on the addition would be architectural asphalt shingles. The garage would feature a new wood overhead door with a faux double door appearance. All windows would either be from the Anderson 400 vinyl-clad wood window series or from the Pella wood window series. The rear elevation features a sliding glass wood door and a wood deck.

The DRC first considered this application as a preliminary review item at its March 6, 2024, [hybrid] meeting. The DRC asked if a rear-only addition had been explored. The applicant noted significant grade issues and side-yard setback restrictions as the reasoning behind why the [proposed] design was oriented toward the side of the existing house. The DRC also had questions about scale and massing of the addition and suggestions for ways to help distinguish further between the old and the new. The DRC considered the application again at its April 3, 2024, [hybrid] meeting. The DRC's discussion largely focused on the various roof lines of the design and the proposed

fenestration. Suggestions were made for ways to simplify those design elements. The DRC placed the project on the Discussion Agenda for the April HALRB [hybrid] public hearing.

Staff thanked the applicant for their hard work to implement the design changes recommended by the DRC and staff. Staff greatly appreciated the changes that have been made to the design since it was first brought forward.

The HPP staff's primary concern remains the massing and scale of the addition to the existing house. The *Maywood Design Guidelines* state that a "new addition should not be prominently visible from the street and should be located to the rear of the house, if possible." It continues with "additions should not be larger than and should be visually secondary to the original house." While staff understands how the lot limitations have influenced the project's design, staff feels that the design presented still has the potential to overwhelm the existing house and changes the directional expression of its original Bungalow form. Staff would support a decrease in size to the addition so that it reads as more secondary to the original house. That being said, staff finds that the following elements are *not* adversely affected by this design: the front setback, the uniform spacing between houses; the floor-to-floor heights; and the proportion and rhythm of the windows. Staff encourages the HALRB to discuss the scale and massing of the proposed addition to determine its appropriateness to the subject property and its surrounding context.

Regarding materials, the proposed siding and trim meet the standards outlined in the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. The use of wood as the material for both the mudroom porch and the rear deck is also appropriate per the *Guidelines*. Staff also finds that the proposed design, dimension, and appearance of the windows for the addition meet the intent outlined in Chapter 6: New Addition/Building of the *Guidelines*; however, they encourage the HALRB to discuss the proposed materials for the windows. The applicant has two different window types proposed – a vinyl-clad window or a wood window. Staff recommends the use of wood windows (not clad) in the addition because the *Guidelines* state that the use of vinyl or aluminum-clad windows is inappropriate in Maywood. Furthermore, recent side and rear addition projects in the Maywood LHD have exclusively proposed and were approved for wood windows.

Finally, staff initially had reservations about the inclusion of the existing garage into the design in terms of the precedent that could set within the LHD. However, given staff's research on the garage, we find its incorporation acceptable and see it as an innovative means by which to incorporate existing materials and fabric into a design.

Ms. Tawney invited the applicants, Mr. Bryan Coe and Ms. Lisa Coe, to provide any further comments. Their architect, Mr. John McKenna, explained how the DRC meetings had been focused on different opinions for roof designs. He described how they further reduced the hyphen to emphasize the separation of the addition from the historic house and brought back the front facing gable on the addition as a nod towards the historic dormer and the existing garage. He said they have gone through extensive design iterations; what is proposed is their most successful layout, with a well thought out addition design that is distinctly different from the historic house.

Ms. Foster provided the DRC report. She said the DRC agreed that the addition should be compatible with, but distinct from, the existing house. She noted that the DRC suggested the applicant consider lowering the height of the "hyphen" to provide [more of] a distinction between the historic building and

the new addition, as well as simplifying and refining the roof design by reducing additional gables and aligning eave lines. Furthermore, Ms. Foster said the DRC recommended adjusting the spacing and proportion of the windows on the extension to better complement the existing [historic] architecture.

The item was now with the Board. Mr. Wenchel mentioned that the HALRB usually does not recommend colors, but said the DRC did suggest the applicant utilize color to differentiate the new construction from the historic house and garage.

Ms. Myers asked if the front street driveway trees would remain because she appreciated the value they brought to their property. She recognized that the trees could act as a screen to the addition. She had some questions about whether it was a requirement to have a separate garage but realized that the *Guidelines* do not require this.

Ms. Farris asked if there were any questions about the rear elevation. Mr. Davis stated he appreciated the changes that were made to the rear elevation. He felt that the rear addition should have wood windows. Ms. Tawney asked if there were any opinions about the window type being proposed on the addition. Ms. Foster asked about a window to the right of the sliding door and Mr. McKenna replied this would be in a stairwell. Ms. Myers likewise noted her preference that wood windows be used. Ms. Dreher noted that the number of [existing] trees on the property, combined with its downward slope, makes a difference to the appearance of the addition when comparing the spec sheets and the photographs. She asked about the proposed location for the replacement tree. Ms. Tawney replied that its location is not identified at this time but assumed it likely would be outside of the construction zone. She also mentioned that the replacement tree does not need to be near the location of the removed tree and that the applicant must follow the tree replacement guidelines provided by the Urban Forestry staff.

Mr. Wenchel asked to see the site plan. He pointed out the property's location next to Thrifton Hill Park and that the rear property drastically dropped down into a ravine. He did not think that the addition affected the park, and thought the neighboring properties are far away from the proposed addition. He recognized that the lot is an unusual shape and that the project was challenging. Mr. Davis stated how the spec sheets, renderings, and photographs of the property are all needed to understand the complexity of the project and how the proposed addition will work well with the historic house. Ms. Tawney asked if there were any other questions about the massing or scale of the addition and there were none.

Ms. Tawney said staff advocated that the siding of the hyphen and addition be smooth-finished Hardieplank siding; she emphasized how this will differentiate between the new and historic architecture. Ms. Myers referenced Mr. Wenchel's prior comment about using color to effectively differentiate between the new and existing construction, but she asked for clarification if one or two colors would be used. Mr. McKenna replied that there would be different colors. Ms. Myers stated that if a project can show how and why it is different, then she could understand that approach; she felt if they are too similar then it could look off. She was unsure if that would be the case here by having Hardieplank versus wood siding, but it could look odd if these materials were next to each other. She did not know if she would recommend that approach either since it was difficult to visualize at the meeting.

Mr. Wenchel asked to see the rear elevation; he thought the color on the rear elevation corner was too literal to have as a different color to distinguish it from the original house. Mr. McKenna responded that the only reason the lower first level has the existing siding on the bottom right corner is because the full first story on the rear elevation is being maintained except for the different window size. He explained that they reduced the height of that window for the kitchen, so everything for the existing house would remain except the reduced window size. Concerning the siding, Mr. McKenna said that this location was the only place where the two different materials would connect, but they should be able to match to the Hardieplank siding if the HALRB preferred. Ms. Myers stated that if it were her house and it was a flat

wall, she would not want two different kinds of siding meeting up. Ms. Foster agreed and felt that it would be difficult for long term maintenance term. She said that because of all the other elements of the new design (i.e., massing, roofline, and addition's setback), the material did not need to be different to strengthen the distinction between the original house and the addition. Ms. Myers agreed. Ms. Tawney asked if the applicant should choose which siding material to use and the HALRB concurred.

Mr. Davis focused on positive aspects of the design changes. He mentioned that he had wanted to see how the side addition roof looked as a side gable instead of a front gable, but found the front gable also appropriate.

Mr. Davis was about to propose a motion, but Ms. Foster asked if the windows above the garage space would be the only ones with that specific window fenestration pattern. Ms. Tawney showed the spec sheets and indicated that the hyphen at the second story also has that same fenestration pattern (three over three). Ms. Foster asked if the applicant had considered three over one windows instead. Mr. McKenna clarified that the main facade of the original house, new hyphen, and the addition would have windows that match, and the other elevations of the addition will have single-hung windows. Ms. Liccese-Torres stated her preference for those windows to be casements but deferred to the HALRB. Mr. McKenna said the windows could be switched out from a single-hung window to casement windows, as they would be more functional. Ms. Tawney asked if there were any casement windows on the original house and Mr. McKenna confirmed their location. Ms. Myers further clarified that the smaller square windows on the original house are casement windows but that they operate differently but the applicant proposed single-hung windows; Mr. McKenna confirmed this was correct.

Ms. Foster asked that for all the single-hung windows that are existing and the new (except for the portion on the new side elevation), the bottom sash would not have divided lights. She recognized that this approach was not consistent, however, it did not bother her. Mr. McKenna stated they would be willing to switch those windows to be casements to match the original house and that this switch would be more functional.

There was no further HALRB discussion and Chair Davis proposed the following motion:

I move that the HALRB approve CoA 24-09, 2725 23rd Rd. N., Maywood Local Historic District, request to build a rear and side addition to connect the house with the existing non-historic garage provided that wood windows are provided and that casement windows (6-pane) replace the single-hung windows. The HALRB finds the home project complies with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* Standard #9, which pertains to new additions, and the spirit of Chapter 6: New Additions/Buildings of the *Maywood Design Guidelines* because the addition is harmonious with the original house, it differentiates between the old and the new, and its massing and scale are appropriately secondary to the original house. Further, the addition is situated on the rear and side of the house away from and less visible from the predominant public right-of-way, complying with the spirit of the *Maywood Design Guidelines*. Finally, the HALRB finds this project appropriate because of the specific site constraints of this property which necessitate the construction of the addition in this manner.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wenchel. Upon hearing no further comments or questions, the Chair asked Ms. Liccese-Torres to call the roll. The motion passed unanimously 6-0.

Informational Item: Barcroft Apartments Section 7 Renovation and Section 1 Renovation Update

Ms. Farris introduced the Jair Lynch project team and provided the following project background:

The Jair Lynch project team is here this evening to provide an update to both the Section 7 and Section 1 Rehabilitation projects. Concerning the Section 7 rehabilitation project, the project team presented at the HALRB's public hearing on March 20, 2024. As specified in Part 7 of the Conservation Area Standards in the Neighborhood Form Based Code (FBC), applicants need to meet with the HALRB a minimum of two times before the project can be considered by the County Board.

The project scope, which involves Building 47 and 48, includes an entire menu of rehabilitation activities that the HALRB is very familiar with, such as repairing architectural elements or replacing them in-kind. The larger scope items include removing and replacing the aluminum double-hung and casement windows with new aluminum windows to match the original design; creating outdoor amenity spaces and landscape improvements behind Building 47; creating two accessible units in each building for a total of four units via new entry openings and windows; and modifying an existing window well/areaway near Building 48 to provide an accessible entry.

There has been a change to the scope for Section 7. The Jair Lynch project team contacted County staff about an update to the Section 1 rehabilitation proposal for Buildings 12-16; the HALRB reviewed this phase in January and February 2024, and the use permit will go to the Planning Commission and County Board in May. While developing permit drawings, the project team discovered the need to add air duct vents to the front facades for each unit within the preserved buildings of Section 1 and would need to do the same in Section 7. The HPP staff and the Jair Lynch team determined these changes could not be made administratively and needed feedback from the HALRB. Previously, all such vent openings had been placed only on the rear elevations of buildings and the vents have been a focused topic of HALRB discussion.

The proposed vents will be approximately the size of the horizontal side of a brick (a stretcher), painted to blend into the façade, and placed strategically to help minimize any impacts to character-defining building features. Staff considers the addition of new exhaust penetrations for Sections 1 and 7 as necessary to upgrade the residential units with new mechanical systems, including the installation of new washers and dryers in every unit. Although these penetrations do not follow the Conservation Area Standards of the N-FBC, they will be a minimal change to the buildings' front and rear exteriors, and will not affect the overall design of the complex.

Next, Ms. Lauren Riley of Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh presented to the HALRB with assistance from the Jair Lynch project team. Ms. Riley mentioned that this [change] is coming so late in the process for Section 1 because their team had made a series of assumptions with the use permit drawing set since these buildings are similar to the previous projects, especially the mechanical layout. However, she said in reality these buildings in Sections 1 and 7 are different enough that the duct work requires access through the front of the buildings. Ms. Riley said they are adding this to the scope of work for Section 1 (Buildings 12-16) and to the Section 7 renovations that were discussed last month with the HALRB. Therefore, those changes will be the focus of the presentation.

Ms. Alice Hagemann of Jair Lynch focused on the full scope for the project and repeated that the main change involves the vent locations. She utilized photographs of Building 11, which is next to Building 16,

to show a variety of the different existing exhaust vents on the building, some of which are larger than the vents planned for installation. She mentioned again that the HVAC vents will be infilled. She showed images of buildings in Section 9 with similar vents, as well as how the vents would look on both a painted and unpainted brick façade. She utilized renderings where the vents could be located and how the vents will look in the actual elevation. She explained that the vents will not be larger than a brick and will be painted to match and placed intentionally to make them more sensitive to the façade. Ms. Hagemann continued to show examples of vents in the existing elevations and how they were not visible. She recognized that some buildings have pilasters which will make it challenging to place the vents, but they will explore all the options.

Mr. Tom Liebel of the Jair Lynch team noted that vents are required because of the building code and to meet Virginia Housing requirements. He explained how they did studies to minimize the vent penetrations, stating they will do their best to place the vents on the side elevations, but a few penetrations will need to occur on the front façades. Ms. Hagemann mentioned that without these vents, bulk heads would be required that would take up a large area of living spaces and would reduce the ceiling height from 8 to 7 feet, which is the minimal. She provided spec sheets of the vent product type and stated the vent sizing as 4” by 8” or 4” by 12” for kitchen vents. Mr. Davis asked, going forward, that the HALRB be provided with spec sheets for the [proposed renovation] projects; Ms. Riley agreed.

Ms. Foster asked if adding additional vents would reduce the amount of bulkheads. Mr. Liebel replied that they have dropped areas for soffits over either closets or bathrooms, and therefore would not be adding more vents. He said they tried to minimize the routing of the vents. Ms. Hagemann mentioned the building code requires intake and exhaust vents to be separated by 10’; thus, she did not believe they could do other reductions. She showed the locations of the mechanical closets in relation to each unit.

Ms. Hagemann reviewed Building 47 and where the vents would be located on the facades, indicating locations on both painted and unpainted façades. Ms. Myers asked if the building code required the kitchen vent exhaust to be higher than the window height; Ms. Hagemann confirmed, stating the kitchen exhaust vent would either have to run through the ceiling or above the cabinets and typically it would be at ceiling height. She pointed out that many of the units have the same layout, therefore the vent locations will be consistent. Ms. Myers stressed this was importance. Ms. Hagemann remarked that some of the vents closer to the roofline will be tricky. Ms. Farris offered that the HPP staff could assist with any adjustments administratively with placement of the vents, but that this broader discussion with the HALRB was necessary. Ms. Riley noted the project team likely will not return to the HALRB [with the next proposed renovation phase] until this fall.

Historic Marker Review: Green Valley Historic Preservation Fund Grant Project

Ms. Farris introduced Ms. Inumidun Obikoya and explained how the interpretive project is one of the Historic Preservation Fund grantees. Ms. Obikoya introduced herself as the project manager for the Green Valley History and Culture project. She said the project is all about preserving their history and helping revitalize the community. 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 16th Street S., Arlington Mill Dr., Interstate-395/Army Navy Country Club, and S. Walter Reed Drive. She provided the following project summary:

Their project has identified 18 points of interest, with 13 already having County historic markers (including two LHDs, the Lomax African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church and the Green Valley Pharmacy). Existing markers are not treated the same, with one [for the LHDs] being the traditional silver marker and the other a table-top marker. The markers for non-designated sites in the neighborhood likewise vary, including Shirlington Crest (formerly the Dunbar Mutual Homes Association), Dr. Roland Bruner (this panel was recently replaced), Mt. Zion Baptist Church, Washington & Old Dominion Trail, and Macedonia Baptist Church.

They want to rebrand all 18 sites by utilizing similar colors for markers and QR code stencils or stamps; these would lead to webpages if existing. They intend to create six new interpretive panels, one being a “you are here” map, and then the other five locations will have single markers that are 24” x 18” on a pedestal base. Ms. Obikoya briefly highlighted the three historic markers now under discussion, including the Chinn Funeral Service, the Friendly Cab Stand, and Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Church.

Ms. Farris requested that the HALRB focus on high-level suggestions instead of technical text edits. She recognized how some commissioners provided their edits beforehand, which was appreciated; these will be considered in the editing process but not at the meeting to save time.

Ms. Obikoya began with the Chinn Funeral Service marker. She noted the location of the property and said the business has serviced the Green Valley community for nearly eight decades. She emphasized that the new panels will showcase businesses that provided crucial services to the neighborhood given that many African Americans were not welcome at other commercial establishments. Next, Ms. Obikoya focused on the Friendly Cab Stand and how it was instrumental to transporting African Americans outside of Arlington for medical and maternal care. Lastly, she described Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Church, which was established by African Americans who wanted their own safe space to worship during the era of racial segregation.

Ms. Farris suggested that the HALRB first provide feedback on the layout and graphics for the Chinn Funeral Service marker. Ms. Foster stated she liked the graphics and design and that she was looking forward to seeing the map [of sites] during the next iteration of reviews. For consistency, she suggested that the Green Valley logo be placed in the green band at the bottom so it is more visible. Ms. Obikoya asked for clarification about the logo placement; Ms. Foster suggested moving the County and Green Valley logos down to the bottom green band on each of the markers. Ms. Liccese-Torres commented that this could allow more space for larger photographs. Ms. Myers likewise suggested this also could allow more room for the larger paragraphs to be spread out. Ms. Dreher asked about one of the smaller photographs showing the building and how the caption references the name, but that in the marker text it sometimes says Chinn-Baker Funeral Services. She asked which was correct. Ms. Obikoya noted the differences in the name of the business, and offered to ask Mr. Baker to clarify and see what he prefers.

Ms. Myers recommended that all the marker titles should be the same size. Ms. Obikoya replied that this and other suggestions provided by the HALRB already have been corrected. Ms. Liccese-Torres asked if the marker titles would be in all capital letters; Ms. Obikoya said that they would not and all the titles will look like the Chinn Funeral Service marker.

Ms. Farris explained that the HPP staff reviewed the marker drafts prior to the HALRB meeting. She asked if the HALRB had a chance to read staff’s edited versions and if the overall content and design were headed in the right direction. Ms. Dreher said that the HPP staff edits provided more historical context, such as with the Our Lady Queen of Peace marker. Ms. Obikoya mentioned that she will need to

go back to the congregation concerning those edits to make sure they are comfortable with them. For example, there was a suggestion that one of the new images be related to their community efforts during COVID-19; the Green Valley Historic Preservation and Revitalization Committee thought that the suggestion may not be accurately reflected or meet the goals of explaining the origins of the church within the community. Ms. Farris agreed, emphasizing the importance of working with different partners on proposed language for the markers. She encouraged Ms. Obikoya to continue communicating with the neighborhood stakeholders as the content is finalized.

For the Our Lady Queen of Peace marker, Ms. Foster suggested using photographs with people or parishioners so it is more human focused. Ms. Dreher agreed and wondered if there were any images of the original 16 founders. Ms. Obikoya stated there are some images of them that could be considered. Ms. Dreher reiterated the suggestion of shifting the placement of the Green Valley and County logos to provide more space for flexibility of the narrative text. Ms. Myers suggested that more than one photograph be used for the church and the cab stand. Ms. Obikoya agreed that could be an option. Ms. Myers asked if the Friendly Cab Stand company actually picked people up from their houses or if there was an actual cab stand or location for the business. Ms. Obikoya mentioned that the graphic designer advised using a minimum of two images per marker and she agreed, but she had not been able to find additional photos for some of the markers prior to the submission deadline for the HALRB meeting. She offered to continue to look for images to improve the markers. Ms. Tawney suggested other ideas for images, such as newspaper advertisements. Chair Davis suggested using an image of or from a Green Book. Ms. Farris further suggested images of memorabilia and business advertisements.

Ms. Farris redirected the conversation towards specific suggestions for the markers. She noted that she liked the black and white image on the Church's website showing an African American woman holding a shovel perhaps in a groundbreaking ceremony, while recognizing the challenges of finding photographs that might be the best quality for a marker. Ms. Obikoya referenced that one of the next markers that will be presented to the HALRB might use an advertisement that was discovered. She said she is continuing to do research and hopes to find more images at the Center for Local History. Ms. Farris stated the HPP staff might be able to assist with looking for more images. She said if the HALRB is comfortable with the overall design approach, the HPP staff can continue working behind the scenes with the grantees on edits and refinements.

Ms. Tawney stated that commissioners could share any other text edits or suggestions via email with her or Ms. Farris, who then would discuss them with Ms. Obikoya. Mr. Davis remarked that he appreciated all the different stories being featured with the project and it is a good idea to show how the neighborhood sites are interrelated. Ms. Farris mentioned that she is currently seeking County Manager and County Board approval to provide extensions (beyond June 30, 2024) for completion of some of the Historic Preservation Fund grant projects. She said that the extensions would allow grant projects such as the Green Valley marker project to have until the end of the calendar year to be finished.

Ms. Dreher said she thought it was a good idea for the HALRB to send in their edits ahead of time to the HPP staff to prevent lengthy discussions at the public hearings, which is not efficient. Ms. Farris stated that the HPP staff has more suggestions for how to improve the marker review process in the future.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Tawney mentioned an upcoming 45-minute walking tour of Little Saigon in Clarendon. She said two tours are scheduled for the morning of Saturday, May 4, 2024, in partnership with the Arlington Public Library's Center for Local History and local author Kim O'Connell. She offered to email the commissioners with the details since registration is required. She mentioned that Ms. O'Connell is the author of the County's Little Saigon booklet.

HALRB Minutes – April 17, 2024

Ms. Liccese-Torres reminded the Board that the HPP is trying to fill its [Preservation Specialist] vacancy. There were two candidates offered the position who declined. The County has readvertised the position. She also noted that the upcoming HALRB meeting on June 19 falls on a County holiday; therefore the HALRB meeting will be moved to Thursday, June 20 instead.

Ms. Liccese-Torres said that on Saturday, May 18, 2024, Arlington View will be hosting its neighborhood day which will focus on its history. She shared the all-day event will have different vendors, community groups, and activities. Lastly, she encouraged the HALRB to visit the newly completed Unity Homes at Ballston site plan project, which involved the Central United Methodist Church. She noted there had been an unveiling ceremony on Monday, April 15 that featured the restored and displayed “Christ in Blessing” Tiffany window [salvaged in 2001 from the Abbey Mausoleum].

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:14 pm.